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 225

Held at: Tenue à:

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

Friday, May 2 2008 Vendredi, le 2 mai 2008

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

Appearances/Comparutions

Ms. Juli	e Gauthier	Registrar
----------	------------	-----------

Ms. Mary Simms Commission Counsel

Mr. Ian Stauffer

Mr. John E. Callaghan Cornwall Community Police
Mr. Peter Manderville Service and Cornwall Police

Service Board

Mr. Neil Kozloff Ontario Provincial Police

M^e Claude Rouleau Ontario Ministry of Community

and Correctional Services and Adult Community Corrections

Mr. Darrell Kloeze Attorney General for Ontario

Mr. Peter Chisholm The Children's Aid Society of

the United Counties

Mr. Allan Manson Citizens for Community Renewal

Mr. Dallas Lee Victims Group

Mr. Michael Neville The Estate of Ken Seguin and

Doug Seguin and Father Charles

MacDonald

Mr. William Carroll Ontario Provincial Police

Association

Mr. Frank T. Horn Coalition for Action

Table of Contents / Table des matières

List of Exhibits :	iv
STUART McDONALD, Sworn/Assermenté	1
Examination in-Chief by/Interrogatoire en-chef par Mr. Ian Stauffer(cont'd/suite)	1
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Allan Manson	76
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Frank Horn	105
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Dallas Lee	128
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Michael Neville	141
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. John Callaghan	160
Re-Examination by/Ré-interrogatoire par Mr. Ian Stauffer	164

iv

LIST OF EXHIBITS/LISTE D'EXHIBITS

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO
P-1568	(717055) Index Stuart McDonald	41
P-1569	(717056) Photo # 7 Stuart McDonald	43
P-1570	(717057) Photo # 9 Stuart McDonald	44
P-1571	(712989) Audio Taped Interview Report - Stuart McDonald with OPP J.B. Dupuis dated 16 Jul 99	129
P-1572	(712991) Audio Taped Interview Report - Stuart McDonald with OPP J.B. Dupuis and P. Hall dated 10 Feb 00	144
P-1573	(100333) Letter from Stuart McDonald to Emile Robert dated 22 Oct 90	150
P-1574	(728381) Internal Correspondence from J. St.Denis to C. Johnston dated 28 Apr 94	152

1	Upon commencing at 9:37 a.m./
2	L'audience débute à 9h37
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.
11	MR. STAUFFER: Good morning, Mr.
12	Commissioner.
13	If we could ask Staff Inspector McDonald to
14	come forward?
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Certainly.
16	Good morning, sir.
17	STUART McDONALD, Resumed/Sous le même serment:
18	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF BY/INTERROGATOIRE EN-CHEF PAR MR.
19	STAUFFER (cont'd/suite):
20	MR. STAUFFER: Good morning, Staff
21	Inspector.
22	MR. McDONALD: Good morning, sir.
23	MR. STAUFFER: Staff Inspector, I wanted to
24	return to a topic from yesterday, having thought about it
25	myself overnight and perhaps you were thinking about it as

I	well, but the topic is the question of when the complaint
2	came in to the station. And the complaint, of course, that
3	I'm talking about is the one from Mr. Silmser that was
4	recorded by Sergeant Nakic in his internal correspondence
5	that we referred to yesterday.
6	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
7	MR. STAUFFER: Sir, I'm going to suggest a
8	few things to you to help you out here, if it helps you
9	with your memory and so on.
10	As we discussed yesterday, there's a
11	notation on the internal correspondence that says "11:55".
12	MR. McDONALD: Correct.
13	MR. STAUFFER: And we got into this thing as
14	to whether it's 11:55 in the morning or in the afternoon.
15	And I'm going to suggest to you, \sin , that it's in the
16	morning, and the reason I'm going to suggest it is this.
17	The memo itself, as you quite rightly
18	pointed out is created, of course, after the fact; that is,
19	Sergeant Nakic has put down certain information and he's
20	put down your instructions to him and what he's done with
21	respect to the Silmser matter.
22	So, sir, the date on and perhaps in
23	fairness again
24	MR. McDONALD: I recall it, and I won't
25	disagree with you. I think it probably was 11:55 a.m. that

25

1 he wrote. 2 MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Fair enough. Well, I 3 appreciate that, Staff Inspector. That saves us quite a bit of time. 4 5 So, sir, a couple of other matters I want to 6 put to you to see if this refreshes your memory. It's our 7 understanding presently that Chief Shaver, when he 8 testifies, will say that both you and Sergeant Nakic came 9 to him contemporaneous with the complaint coming in. 10 Now, again, this is what we understand right 11 It may turn out different when he comes and actually 12 testifies, but do you have any recollection at all, thinking back over the years, as to whether Sergeant Nakic 13 14 was in your presence and the Chief was in your presence? So the three of you were all together at the same time in 15 16 some part of the building? 17 MR. McDONALD: No, sir, I don't. As far as 18 I recall, it was only the Chief and myself. 19 MR. STAUFFER: All right. 20 And, sir, it's again our understanding from 21 interviewing Sergeant Nakic that his evidence would be, if he were called -- and there's no intention of calling him 22 at this point -- but if he were called, that he would say 23

perpetrators' names, namely, Father Charles MacDonald's

that he did pass on to you obviously both alleged

1	name and Ken Seguin's name.
2	So, again, having put that to you, have you
3	any recollection of that?
4	MR. McDONALD: I don't have any recollection
5	of it, but I wouldn't argue with it.
6	MR. STAUFFER: I'm sorry?
7	MR. McDONALD: I wouldn't argue with that.
8	I just don't have any recollection of it.
9	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Because, again, sir -
10	- and I hope you would agree with me and I think you are
11	the internal correspondence created by Sergeant Nakic seems
12	to be all pretty contemporaneous; that is, it's all within
13	a few hours of everything transpiring?
14	MR. McDONALD: Correct. M'hm.
15	MR. STAUFFER: And the reason I say that,
16	again, is because it's dated December $9^{\rm th}$. The Deputy
17	Chief's inscription if that's indeed his inscription and
18	he will be called as a witness but it's our
19	understanding right now that's his inscription. It says
20	December 9^{th} on it, that he passed it on and so on, or that
21	he noted Sergeant Lortie's potential involvement.
22	So am I right in thinking, sir, that you
23	would have known that Sergeant or sorry, that Ken
24	Seguin's name was on the internal correspondence probably
25	that day; that is, December the 9 th , 1992?

1	MR. McDONALD: If I did, I don't have any
2	recollection of it.
3	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Because again, just by
4	way of a little bit of further understanding of your
5	knowledge at that time back in '92, were you aware of Ken
6	Seguin?
7	MR. McDONALD: I'd known him for some time,
8	yes.
9	MR. STAUFFER: Surely.
10	MR. McDONALD: Yes.
11	MR. STAUFFER: That he was a probation
12	officer?
13	MR. McDONALD: That's correct. He was in
14	our building weekly.
15	MR. STAUFFER: Sure. So you knew of him and
16	so the name and perhaps it's a common name but it's
17	mentioned as probation officer here. You would have you
18	ought to if you'd seen it, you ought to have made the
19	connection that this was indeed the Ken Seguin probation
20	officer you knew?
21	MR. McDONALD: I certainly would have if I
22	had recalled seeing it.
23	MR. STAUFFER: All right. Thank you, sir.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, all right.
25	Can we go in I don't know if you plan to

1	go into what he knew of Mr. Seguin in the sense that were
2	they friends or anything like that?
3	MR. STAUFFER: Sure. Yes, at some point,
4	but why don't we do that right now.
5	The Commissioner would like to know, I
6	think, Staff Inspector, how far back then did you and Mr.
7	Seguin go professionally? I guess you would have predated
8	him in terms of you becoming a police officer versus him
9	becoming a probation officer? I'm trying to remember when
10	he started.
11	MR. McDONALD: I knew Mr. Seguin before I
12	became a police officer.
13	MR. STAUFFER: Okay.
14	MR. McDONALD: My wife's family is from St.
15	Andrews area, as is Mr. Seguin. I knew a couple of his
16	brothers. I knew him. I would have seen them at dances we
17	attended or at church prior to marrying my wife and coming
18	to Cornwall.
19	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. So at some point are
20	you saying Mr. Seguin and yourself attended the same church
21	from time-to-time?
22	MR. McDONALD: Probably.
23	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Which church would
24	that have been, just out of curiosity, if you can remember?
25	MR. McDONALD: St. Andrews Parish.

1	MR. STAUFFER: I see.
2	And that
3	MR. McDONALD: I didn't live here at the
4	time, but I would go to church there sometimes.
5	MR. STAUFFER: Is that the very large
6	structure at the corner of
7	MR. McDONALD: It is.
8	MR. STAUFFER: 138 and I'm not sure
9	what that road is, but
10	MR. McDONALD: Beside the traffic light in
11	St. Andrews.
12	MR. STAUFFER: Right. Where Quinn's is.
13	Okay.
14	And, sir, in terms of other professional
15	dealings, did he act as a probation officer on any of the
16	cases that you were dealing with as a police officer?
17	MR. McDONALD: No, sir. Most of the time
18	I was in charge of administration for a great deal of the
19	time that I got to know him on a regular basis, and he
20	would be in on a daily or weekly basis looking at files.
21	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. So you would be a
22	manager, if I can put it that way, and administering
23	certain parts of the Department and he would be coming in
24	to check on for possible probationers' files?
25	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.

1	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. And, sir, did you have
2	any socializing at all with Mr. Seguin? By that I mean it
3	could be as light as having a coffee with him or going to
4	dinner with him regularly?
5	MR. McDONALD: No, sir, I don't drink coffee
6	and I didn't associate with him.
7	MR. STAUFFER: All right.
8	With respect to perhaps we can just go
9	further here with Mr. Seguin. There are allegations from
10	sources, and I'm sure you know what I'm talking about, that
11	you had attended one or more on one or more occasions at
12	Mr. Seguin's residence.
13	So, first of all, I realize he's had more
14	than one residence, but do you remember ever being at any
15	house that was owned by Mr. Seguin or occupied by Mr.
16	Seguin?
17	MR. McDONALD: No, I never was.
18	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. So this is right up to
19	the time of his death, which I understand
20	MR. McDONALD: I had no idea where he lived
21	or ever lived, for that matter.
22	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. With respect to Mr.
23	Seguin and these allegations we've heard that he
24	potentially abused probationers under his care, when did
25	you become aware of those rumours or that type of

I	information coming forward? I appreciate you've said you
2	didn't you don't recall seeing it in Sergeant Nakic's
3	internal correspondence. So can you tell us when you first
4	became aware of those rumours and that information?
5	MR. McDONALD: Probably not until after his
6	death.
7	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. So we understand
8	that's late November of 1993, okay? Is that what you're
9	talking about in terms of the timeframe, sometime in '94?
10	MR. McDONALD: Sometime after his death. I
11	didn't even know he was as I say, I probably should have
12	known that his name was on that memo, but I don't recall
13	ever seeing it and I didn't ever recall hearing his name
14	mentioned in any of this.
15	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Now, sir, I'd like to
16	take you to and Mr. Seguin's name may come up again, but
17	I'm going to now take you to some specific questions
18	relating to Mr. Dunlop, so Perry Dunlop.
19	So I understand the connections here, you
20	are married, as I understand it, to the sister of Helen
21	Dunlop?
22	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
23	MR. STAUFFER: And Helen, of course, is
24	Perry Dunlop's wife?
25	MR. McDONALD: Correct.

1	MR. STAUFFER: And I understand that Carson
2	Chisholm also comes into the picture. Who is he?
3	MR. McDONALD: My wife's brother.
4	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. So he's your brother-
5	in-law?
6	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
7	MR. STAUFFER: And how long then, sir, would
8	you have known Perry Dunlop when you recollect first coming
9	in contact with him?
10	MR. McDONALD: I guess when he joined the
11	police department.
12	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. So my information is
13	August of 1983 when he came on the job. Does that sound
14	right to you?
15	MR. McDONALD: I couldn't tell you, to be
16	honest with you. I think.
17	MR. STAUFFER: But it's from the time anyway
18	he joined the police service.
19	MR. McDONALD: It is.
20	MR. STAUFFER: All right.
21	MR. McDONALD: I wouldn't argue with that.
22	MR. STAUFFER: All right. And sir, did you
23	ever, as a senior officer, evaluate Mr. Dunlop, Constable
24	Dunlop?
25	MR. McDONALD: In what respect?

1	MR. STAUFFER: Well, during the annual
2	reviews. You understand what I mean, there were
3	performance reviews undertaken. Did you ever review his
4	performance?
5	MR. McDONALD: I don't recall.
6	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. We've heard from
7	Inspector Trew that he did do a performance appraisal, if I
8	can put it that way, of Constable Dunlop back in the
9	earlier part of 1985. And again, I'm paraphrasing but
10	essentially he found Constable Dunlop certainly to have a
11	positive future at that point a couple of years or so after
12	joining up.
13	Do you have a recollection I know we're
14	going back over 20 years now, but do you have a
15	recollection of the early days as to your view of Mr.
16	Dunlop as a police officer?
17	MR. McDONALD: I think he was a hardworking
18	enthusiastic police officer.
19	MR. STAUFFER: All right.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: When he joined the force
21	when you joined the Force, were you related then or when
22	did the marriages take place? Can you help me out on that?
23	MR. McDONALD: I think he's been married
24	some 16 or 17 years, so
25	THE COMMISSIONER: So he was a single man

1	when he came on?
2	MR. McDONALD: Correct.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: You weren't related to
4	him then.
5	MR. McDONALD: No.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. And was Mrs.
7	Dunlop and he dating when he joined?
8	MR. McDONALD: I think they have a very
9	short courtship. It was I'm not sure just how they met
10	but as I recall, she was working in the Yukon or something
11	and came home. They met and he went to the Yukon and they
12	rekindled their relationship and ended up getting married
13	within a short period of time.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Thank you.
15	MR. STAUFFER: It's my understanding, Mr.
16	Commissioner, that Mr. Dunlop was married in 1989.
17	Does that sound right to you, Staff
18	Inspector?
19	MR. McDONALD: Yeah.
20	MR. STAUFFER: All right. Did you attend
21	the wedding, Staff Inspector?
22	MR. McDONALD: I think they got married out
23	west.
24	MR. STAUFFER: Really?
25	MR. McDONALD: I think so, but I

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Don't look over there.
2	Just
3	MR. McDONALD: Or maybe they came home and
4	got married. I don't recall, to be honest with you.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: There you go.
6	MR. McDONALD: I don't remember.
7	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Well, let me suggest
8	something to you because, again, I appreciate it's almost
9	20 years ago.
10	MR. McDONALD: Now that I think I
11	remember hearing they got married at St. Columban's by
12	Father Charlie.
13	MR. STAUFFER: All right.
14	MR. McDONALD: I remember hearing that now
15	and if that was the case, I probably did attend the
16	wedding.
17	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Because you'd be a
18	member of the family, if I can put it that way?
19	MR. McDONALD: My wife has 12 brothers and
20	sisters.
21	MR. STAUFFER: Fair enough. So there's a
22	lot of dates to remember there. Okay.
23	MR. McDONALD: I don't remember them all, I
24	can assure you.
25	MR. STAUFFER: All right. Staff Inspector,

l	in terms of any other church functions, did you attend the
2	baptism of any of Perry Dunlop's children?
3	MR. McDONALD: Probably. I believe my son
4	is the godfather of one of his children.
5	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Do you know which one
6	that would be?
7	MR. McDONALD: Heather.
8	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. And because it's our
9	understanding, again to perhaps refresh your memory, that
10	Mr. Dunlop and Mrs. Dunlop's first born was baptized by
11	Father Charles MacDonald.
12	Does that sound right to you?
13	MR. McDONALD: I don't remember who baptized
14	my children.
15	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. So you don't have a
16	specific recollection of that event?
17	MR. McDONALD: No, I don't.
18	MR. STAUFFER: Or more accurately attending
19	that event?
20	MR. McDONALD: No, sir. I'm not saying I
21	wasn't there but I don't recall.
22	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. So, sir, from let's
23	start from the date of the marriage onwards. Did you and
24	Mr. Dunlop and I'll just deal with the two of you
25	gentlemen did you see each other on a family basis, if I

1	can put it that way, from that time onwards?
2	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
3	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. So would that be a
4	relatively frequent contact; you get together for family
5	dinners or family functions of some kind?
6	MR. McDONALD: Yeah. I believe so, yeah.
7	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Was there any time
8	when that stopped or changed in any radical fashion; that
9	is getting together as a family, you and Mr. Dunlop?
10	MR. McDONALD: After after this all
11	exploded and Perry was accused of by the police
12	department of misconduct or something, they thought that I
13	didn't support them and basically cut off my wife and
14	myself from family connections.
15	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Let's see if we can
16	get this located in time as best we can. If we go to 1994
17	is that the timeframe you're talking about as to when Mr.
18	Dunlop starts being disciplined by the Service?
19	MR. McDONALD: I think it might have been
20	maybe even sometime after that. There was a day that
21	Carson Chisholm, Helen, Perry and their lawyer came to my
22	place.
23	MR. STAUFFER: All right. Now, sir, my
24	understanding of that date is November 18^{th} of 1996. So
25	again, let's just stop there for a moment.

1	MR. McDONALD: M'hm.
2	MR. STAUFFER: Does that date sound right to
3	you as the date of the visit that you were about to
4	describe?
5	MR. McDONALD: Quite possibly, yes.
6	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. If I could just take
7	you back in time for a moment, before that visit, what's
8	the status of Perry with the Service at that point? Is he
9	undergoing any kind of discipline?
10	MR. McDONALD: I don't know. I wasn't
11	there. I had already left the Service.
12	MR. STAUFFER: And I appreciate that. You
13	were telling us yesterday you formally, if you will,
14	retired in May of '95 but you were not in the building
15	MR. McDONALD: After this.
16	MR. STAUFFER: past the fall of '94.
17	MR. McDONALD: Correct.
18	MR. STAUFFER: So let's take you up to the
19	time that you're still in the building. What's happening
20	at that point with respect to Perry and the Service?
21	MR. McDONALD: Nobody communicated very much
22	with me, probably because they knew we were related, and
23	nobody from the Force would speak to me about Perry, not
24	from vindictive or mean reasons but just I wasn't in the
25	loop and they probably thought that it was best that I not

there.

1	be in the loop, being related to him. And I didn't speak
2	to Perry on a regular basis about it either.
3	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Well, we'll take this
4	step by step. You had at that point before you formally
5	leave the Service, you have two superior officers; you have
6	the Chief and the Deputy Chief.
7	Did either of those gentlemen say to you
8	something like "You know, Stuart, we're not going to really
9	be keeping you in the loop because of your relationship
10	with Perry. I hope you understand that, but you know,
11	you're the a relative. So we're just going to deal with
12	this without your involvement"?
13	MR. McDONALD: No.
14	MR. STAUFFER: Did they they didn't
15	something accurate like that? And again, those are my
16	words but I'm trying to get some sense of it.
17	MR. McDONALD: No, it wasn't I was never
18	informed formally that nobody would be doing this. It just
19	evolved, so to speak.
20	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Because, again, I'm
21	assuming that if there was no obvious decision that you'd
22	be cut out of the loop, if I can put it that way, that
23	you'd be still working as the third ranking police officer
24	and you must have heard what was going on from time to time

1	Is there anything you can tell us why you
2	wouldn't know what was going on?
3	MR. McDONALD: I didn't make a conscious
4	effort to try and find out what was going on between Perry
5	and the Force because I didn't want to be biased or
6	whatever. I did my work. I was in charge of Uniform
7	Branch at the time and I
8	MR. STAUFFER: And basically Perry I guess
9	would have come under your command, if I can put it that
10	way, because he was in uniform.
11	MR. McDONALD: Correct.
12	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. And again, I
13	appreciate he's off from time to time and so on, but he's
14	in the uniformed part of the Service while you are still
15	the Staff Inspector.
16	MR. McDONALD: Correct.
17	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. So did anyone approach
18	you, Staff Derochie or anybody at the that was somewhat
19	of your managerial level and tell you what was going on and
20	what the Service's feeling was as to what was to be done
21	with Perry?
22	MR. McDONALD: There might have been on a
23	couple of occasions, Staff Derochie might have mentioned
24	something to me but it wasn't official or it wasn't you
25	know, it was just that he was working doing things with

1	Perry and I didn't push it.
2	MR. STAUFFER: Well, were you aware, Staff
3	Inspector, of the allegation that Mr. Dunlop had taken the
4	Silmser statement from your Service and given it to someone
5	at the CAS?
6	MR. McDONALD: I was.
7	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. How did you find out
8	about that?
9	MR. McDONALD: It might have been through
10	the media.
11	MR. STAUFFER: Okay, you don't remember that
12	coming up at any morning meeting or any other meeting of
13	_
14	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
15	MR. STAUFFER: the management.
16	MR. McDONALD: No, I don't remember.
17	MR. STAUFFER: With respect to Mr. Dunlop
18	going off on sick leave for a period of time in this
19	timeframe; do you remember him taking off work for awhile?
20	MR. McDONALD: I remember that he he
21	wasn't around, but I couldn't give you specific times or
22	dates.
23	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Are you speaking to
24	him at this point? And again, we're talking really in the
25	earlier part of 1994.

1	MR. McDONALD: Yeah, I I was speaking to
2	him, I believe, at family functions and stuff like that.
3	MR. STAUFFER: Okay.
4	MR. McDONALD: There was no never any
5	animosity on my part.
6	MR. STAUFFER: No, I appreciate that.
7	So at this point, before you formally leave
8	the building in the fall of '94, is your relationship with
9	Perry still more or less the same as it was in the earlier
10	years? Had there been any kind of ice or whatever come
11	into the relationship at this point?
12	MR. McDONALD: There wasn't any on my part,
13	I'll put it that way.
14	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Well, tell us what you
15	mean then? What's Perry's attitude towards you?
16	MR. McDONALD: Well, at the present time,
17	and dating back some years, neither Perry or Helen cared to
18	talk to my wife or I and it has nothing to do with the wife
19	or I feel about him.
20	MR. STAUFFER: Did you hear that Helen
21	Dunlop had apparently gone over to Chief Shaver's office,
22	and this is in the latter part of '93, as I understand it?
23	THE COMMISSIONER: His home?
24	MR. STAUFFER: Yes, did I not
25	THE COMMISSIONER: You said office.

1	MR. STAUFFER: Yes, that Helen Dunlop went
2	over to Chief Shaver's house to talk to him directly about
3	her view as to how, so to speak, the Service was treating
4	Perry?
5	MR. McDONALD: I remember hearing about
6	that, yes.
7	MR. STAUFFER: Okay, how did you hear about
8	that?
9	MR. McDONALD: I don't know.
10	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Did you do anything at
11	all about that? Did you talk to Helen or talk
12	MR. McDONALD: No, I didn't.
13	MR. STAUFFER: to your wife or talk to
14	Perry?
15	MR. McDONALD: No, I didn't.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Did Chief Shaver come
17	over to you and say, you know, look at, you know what your
18	brother-in-law did
19	MR. McDONALD: No.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: or your sister-in-law
21	or whatever? No conversation like that?
22	MR. McDONALD: No.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
24	MR. STAUFFER: So up until the time you
25	leave the building in the fall of 1994, is it your sense

1	that Perry is going to be disciplined or was in the process
2	of being disciplined or what was your understanding
3	MR. McDONALD: I had no understanding at
4	that point. I didn't know what was going on.
5	MR. STAUFFER: All right. And Perry had not
6	said anything, he had not confided in you as to what he
7	thought was going on?
8	MR. McDONALD: No, he hadn't.
9	MR. STAUFFER: Again sir, I appreciate all
10	families are different, but is there a reason why, from
11	your perspective, Constable Dunlop wasn't telling you what
12	was going on from his perspective?
13	MR. McDONALD: Away from the police
14	department, we didn't talk about police work.
15	MR. STAUFFER: Okay, but this is perhaps
16	more than police work; this is his career. You know, he's
17	now got a young family and
18	MR. McDONALD: I appreciate that, but I
19	didn't discuss those things with him.
20	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Sir, you started to
21	tell us, and I stopped you, about this meeting which we
22	understand is in November of 1996, when a group of people
23	comes over to your house. Can you give us a tiny bit of
24	background, were you aware that anyone was coming over to
25	your house?

1	MR. McDONALD: No, I wasn't.
2	MR. STAUFFER: So how did you find out?
3	MR. McDONALD: Well, Carson showed up at the
4	door.
5	MR. STAUFFER: Sorry, Carson?
6	MR. McDONALD: Carson Chisholm.
7	MR. STAUFFER: Yes, Carson Chisholm, yes.
8	MR. McDONALD: Showed up at the door and he
9	showed me a statement by Mr. Leroux stating that I had been
10	at Ken Seguin's and that I had been at Malcolm MacDonald's
11	place and various things like that, and I was associating
12	with people who were there and I denied it. I said I'd
13	never been to Ken Seguin's place or Malcolm MacDonald's
14	place; I didn't know where they lived.
15	And then a short time later Perry and Helen
16	and their lawyer, Mr. Bourgeois, I think, came over and we
17	sat at the the dining room table and I told them that I
18	had never had anything to do with these people; I didn't
19	know where they lived; I'd never been there and that I'd
20	swear on the Bible; I'd take a lie detector test; I'd do
21	whatever they wanted to proved that I had never been there.
22	And I don't know whether it was Helen or Perry or Mr.
23	Bourgeois or whoever it was said they didn't believe me and
24	after a short period of time, I told them, I said, "You've
25	known me a lot longer than I think you've probably known

1	this Mr. Leroux and I've never done any of those things,"
2	and they rather insulted me by saying they didn't believe
3	me and I asked them to leave the house.
4	MR. STAUFFER: Okay, I'm just going to talk
5	to your counsel for one second
6	MR. McDONALD: Sure thing.
7	MR. STAUFFER: if you don't mind.
8	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
9	MR. STAUFFER: Staff Inspector, thank you.
10	Is there a document that you've been able to
11	locate in the paperwork that either we've provided or your
12	counsel has shown to you which is the document that you
13	referred to a moment ago when Mr. Chisholm came to speak to
14	you? Because there are many documents and I just don't
15	want to start muddying the waters here. Is there a
16	particular document that you've seen that you can identify
17	as being the one that Mr. Chisholm showed to you?
18	MR. McDONALD: No, I all I know, it was a
19	statement by a Mr. Leroux.
20	MR. STAUFFER: Right.
21	MR. McDONALD: And I couldn't tell you what
22	specific statement it was. It was one that was taken by
23	Perry or Carson.
24	MR. STAUFFER: Okay.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Was Carson still there or

1	
2	MR. McDONALD: Yes, he was still at at
3	the house at that time.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: So Carson comes in first.
5	MR. McDONALD: Yes.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: And then does he retreat
7	and come back with the others or
8	MR. McDONALD: I think there might have been
9	a phone call or something.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
11	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Could I put this to
12	you at least, Staff Inspector, without showing you a
13	document right now, but tell me if this is what you
14	understand was being put to you, if you will, by Carson
15	Chisholm. Is it an allegation that there were several
16	parties at Ken Seguin's house, at Malcolm MacDonald's
17	summer residence and St. Andrew's Parish house and this is
18	what Mr. Leroux was saying in one of his documents where he
19	observed, among others and there's a whole list of names
20	and you're number 21 on the list; does that refresh your
21	memory at all as to what you were being shown by Mr. Leroux
22	or sorry, by Mr. Chisholm?
23	MR. McDONALD: I've seen several statements
24	in the last short period of time and I couldn't tell you
25	exactly which one of them it was. I I believe that I

1	was accused of being there with Chief Shaver and perhaps
2	Sergeant Brunet, but I'm not sure, to be honest with you.
3	I I it took me completely by surprise; I had no idea,
4	you know, I had never been there. I was flabbergasted; it
5	almost took my breath away whenever they showed me this.
6	MR. STAUFFER: Okay.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Was your wife present?
8	MR. McDONALD: Yes, she was.
9	MR. STAUFFER: Okay, so if I could again,
10	Staff Inspector, back up just a little bit so now we're in
11	November of '96 when Mr. Chisholm's come over; before he
12	comes over and I'm talking about not just the day
13	before, but in the weeks and so on before has there been
14	any notion at all that you have been named in some document
15	
16	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
17	MR. STAUFFER: as I have to finish
18	the question here
19	MR. McDONALD: Okay.
20	MR. STAUFFER: that's all right named in
21	any document that would link you to some kind of illegal
22	activity or immoral activity?
23	MR. McDONALD: No, sir. This was the first
24	time I'd ever heard of it.
25	MR. STAUFFER: So this is November is the

1	first time that you've ever heard from any source that
2	you're potentially named in some document as having
3	committed an immoral act or been associated with people who
4	are accused of having immoral acts?
5	MR. McDONALD: Correct.
6	MR. STAUFFER: The so like you say,
7	you're taken aback, and the Commissioner's established your
8	wife's there. So are the three of you talking initially,
9	that is, you and your wife and Mr. Chisholm about this
10	allegation?
11	MR. McDONALD: I I don't recall my wife
12	being there when I first talked to Carson about it, but she
13	she was there whenever the rest of us
14	MR. STAUFFER: Okay.
15	MR. McDONALD: were sitting there
16	talking.
17	MR. STAUFFER: And so how much time and
18	again I appreciate this is over 10 years ago, but how much
19	time do you think passed between Mr. Chisholm's, if you
20	will, final discussions with you and then Mr. Dunlop and
21	his wife?
22	MR. McDONALD: Probably a couple of hours.
23	MR. STAUFFER: Okay
24	MR. McDONALD: Probably.
25	MR. STAUFFER: But Mr. Chisholm stays in the

1	house.
2	MR. McDONALD: M'hm.
3	MR. STAUFFER: And so Helen, Perry and Mr.
4	Bourgeois come; anybody else come during any of this
5	timeframe?
6	MR. McDONALD: I don't believe so.
7	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. And so you have the
8	discussion. Do they show you, that is, Helen, Perry or Mr.
9	Bourgeois, do they show you other documents besides what
10	Mr. Chisholm has brought?
11	MR. McDONALD: I don't think so. I know
12	they had papers with them but I I don't recall them
13	showing me anything.
14	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. At this meeting or
15	before this meeting, are you aware that Mr. Dunlop is
16	taking a statement or statements from people who are
17	alleging child abuse has taken place, either in their lives
18	or in the lives of others.
19	Are you aware that Mr. Dunlop's taking
20	statements?
21	MR. McDONALD: No, not really the taking
22	statements. I know he was doing work and tried to
23	investigate but I didn't what he was doing specifically.
24	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Well, we'll get back
25	to that in a moment but just to continue on with the

1	mosting that would begin with those falls
1	meeting that you're having with these folks.
2	So you have no recollection of being
3	actually presented with any other document other than what
4	Mr. Chisholm shows to you?
5	MR. McDONALD: No, I don't recall.
6	MR. STAUFFER: There maybe other papers
7	spread out but you don't no one says, what about this,
8	you know
9	MR. McDONALD: No.
10	MR. STAUFFER: and thrusts it in your
11	face?
12	MR. McDONALD: Not that I recall.
13	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. So how long do you all
14	of you meet then? Now, we've got a whole group of people.
15	How long does this go on?
16	MR. McDONALD: I you know, it was more
17	than ten minutes but probably less than an hour. I really
18	I think I was a little upset, confused.
19	MR. STAUFFER: Right.
20	MR. McDONALD: And my wife and I were
21	talking about it and I remember saying that I would I'd
22	take a lie detector test to prove that it wasn't I
23	wasn't there and Carson seemed to think that was a good
24	idea. And then Mr. Bourgeois said no that wouldn't be a
25	good idea, you know.

1	MR. STAUFFER: Sorry, Mr. Bourgeois said it
2	would not be a good idea?
3	MR. McDONALD: Yeah, he wouldn't want that
4	to happen and
5	MR. STAUFFER: Why not?
6	MR. McDONALD: he didn't believe me. I
7	don't know why he said that but obviously they had their
8	reasons.
9	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Do you know at this
10	point, sir, that a lawsuit had been started by Perry
11	against various individuals in the Police Service and so
12	on?
13	MR. McDONALD: I know that now.
14	MR. STAUFFER: But back then, in November of
14 15	MR. STAUFFER: But back then, in November of 1996, were you aware of any type of legal proceedings
15	1996, were you aware of any type of legal proceedings
15 16	1996, were you aware of any type of legal proceedings having been started by Mr. Dunlop?
15 16 17	1996, were you aware of any type of legal proceedings having been started by Mr. Dunlop? MR. McDONALD: I don't know when they
15 16 17 18	1996, were you aware of any type of legal proceedings having been started by Mr. Dunlop? MR. McDONALD: I don't know when they started or when I became aware of them. I couldn't give
15 16 17 18 19	1996, were you aware of any type of legal proceedings having been started by Mr. Dunlop? MR. McDONALD: I don't know when they started or when I became aware of them. I couldn't give you dates to be honest with you.
15 16 17 18 19 20	1996, were you aware of any type of legal proceedings having been started by Mr. Dunlop? MR. McDONALD: I don't know when they started or when I became aware of them. I couldn't give you dates to be honest with you. MR. STAUFFER: But did I'm assuming I
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	1996, were you aware of any type of legal proceedings having been started by Mr. Dunlop? MR. McDONALD: I don't know when they started or when I became aware of them. I couldn't give you dates to be honest with you. MR. STAUFFER: But did I'm assuming I know the answer to this, but that did not come up then
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	1996, were you aware of any type of legal proceedings having been started by Mr. Dunlop? MR. McDONALD: I don't know when they started or when I became aware of them. I couldn't give you dates to be honest with you. MR. STAUFFER: But did I'm assuming I know the answer to this, but that did not come up then during this November, 1996 meeting that you're talking

1	opinion, perhaps not at that meeting but either before or
2	after the meeting, that Mr. Dunlop was taking statements to
3	further a civil lawsuit?
4	MR. McDONALD: I can't say that at that
5	time, no, I don't think I made that association.
6	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Did you ever make that
7	association?
8	MR. McDONALD: I might have had suspicions
9	in the last five years, but at that time I didn't.
10	MR. STAUFFER: Okay.
11	MR. McDONALD: I had a lot of wonderings and
12	thinking in my own mind and a lot of possibilities would be
13	kicked around, many of them viable or not viable but, you
14	know, you go through a whole list of possibilities. And
15	I'm not saying it didn't cross my mind at some point in the
16	last five or six years, but I haven't reached any
17	conclusions.
18	MR. STAUFFER: Right. So at the meeting,
19	does anything else come out than what you've told us? Any
20	other pertinent details at all as to what allegations are
21	being made against you or against others or other people's
22	names mentioned?
23	MR. McDONALD: There were other people's
24	names mentioned. I wouldn't I know Chief Shaver's name
25	was mentioned. I think Brunet's name was mentioned. I

1	remember hearing the Bishop, Malcolm MacDonald. Names like
2	that.
3	And since then I've seen several lists and I
4	would be wrong if I said I remembered all those names from
5	the initial meeting that November and I wasn't mixing them
6	up with names I've seen
7	MR. STAUFFER: Since.
8	MR. McDONALD: since then, sure.
9	MR. STAUFFER: So Mr. Dunlop and the rest of
10	them, do they ask you for a photo of yourself at any point?
11	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
12	MR. STAUFFER: Are you aware that at some
13	point your photo does come into their hands?
14	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
15	MR. STAUFFER: And do you know how that
16	happened?
17	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
18	Apparently, sometime in the early
19	proceedings at this Inquiry, someone indicated that a
20	picture of myself of Mr. Ken Craibe was produced and I
21	don't think Ken's name was correct initially. It was some
22	other first name.
23	And I said to my wife never had my picture
24	taken with Mr. Craibe, and she said, yes. Mr. Ken Craibe
25	was a somewhat of a seamstress or tailor and my parents had

brought back some tartan from Scotland and I had had this

tartan for some time and I was -- I wanted to get a pair of

pants made and a vest.

And my wife suggested that Mr. Craibe make

them and I was reluctant because I knew -- I had been told

them and I was reluctant because I knew -- I had been told that Mr. Craibe was a homosexual and I didn't really want to go and have my pants made by him. But she convinced me to go, she said don't worry about it, you know, and so I ended up getting a pair of pants and a vest made.

And then I believe sometime after that another brother-in-law was getting married at St. Andrews and Mr. Craibe was there and we had our picture taken together by my wife and I was wearing my vest and my tartan pants.

And then sometime after that, Helen had been to our house and asked my wife if she could have the picture. My wife said well, I guess so, you know, and she gave it to her and not thinking anything of it at the time.

And I don't know when that was, but that's how they got a picture of me and Mr. Ken Craibe apparently in front of the Church in St. Andrews.

And I never remembered having a picture taken. I didn't remember seeing the picture before but my wife said, yes, Helen had asked for it and she had given it to her.

1	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Did you become aware
2	at any point that a picture of yourself, without anybody
3	else in the photo, also got into circulation somehow?
4	MR. McDONALD: I have seen statements where,
5	apparently, I was number 7 or number 9 or something in a
6	list in a lineup of pictures that was picked out by
7	whoever.
8	And I don't know where those pictures came
9	from and I don't know what those pictures are. Somebody
10	mentioned that they might have come from the Police
11	Department, but I again, I have never seen them so I
12	don't know.
13	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. If you can just bear
14	with me for one moment. Somewhere in all of these papers I
15	think there is a photo of yourself.
16	My friend advises me, Mr. Commissioner,
17	we've not actually put that photo into the list of
18	documents.
19	Let me ask you this, Staff Inspector, in
20	terms of your consent, if you will, to having a photo of
21	yourself circulated, did you ever give anyone consent?
22	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
23	MR. STAUFFER: And, again, I'm talking about
24	a photo of yourself being made public in relation to, I
25	guess, investigations that Mr. Dunlop and others might have

1	undertaken?
2	MR. McDONALD: No, sir, I never did.
3	MR. STAUFFER: So if I could ask you, Staff
4	Inspector, in terms of your knowledge of Mr. Dunlop, I'd
5	just like to get this as clear as we can as to him
6	conducting what I call anyway a private investigation, when
7	did you first become aware that he was doing that?
8	MR. McDONALD: I don't know.
9	MR. STAUFFER: I think you've indicated, but
10	correct me if I'm wrong, that you knew of that before
11	November, '96, that is this meeting that we've been talking
12	about?
13	MR. McDONALD: I think I did but I couldn't
14	give you a specific year or a time.
15	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Did you ever speak to
16	Constable Dunlop first of all, let's just deal with him
17	did you ever speak to Constable Dunlop about what he was
18	doing in terms of
19	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
20	MR. STAUFFER: these private
21	investigations?
22	Could I ask you, sir, why you wouldn't do
23	that?
24	MR. McDONALD: I just didn't do it.
25	MR. STAUFFER: Okay, because again I don't

1	want to put words in your mouth, but would you agree with
2	me here you're quite a bit older chronologically and you're
3	certainly a much more senior officer than Perry Dunlop and
4	you've been around a long time by the time he come on the
5	force. Is that fair?
6	MR. McDONALD: Fair.
7	MR. STAUFFER: Yeah. And, again, I'm not
8	trying to age you up here.
9	MR. McDONALD: No.
10	MR. STAUFFER: But the long and the short of
11	it is Mr. Dunlop is a new officer coming on. By the '90s,
12	he's perhaps been on the job about 10 years or so.
13	Did you ever think what danger lurked here
14	in Mr. Dunlop carrying out these private investigations?
15	So let's start with that. Did you have any concerns as to
16	what the ramifications might be by his undertaking these
17	investigations?
18	MR. MANDERVILLE: I think it should be borne
19	in mind that Mr. McDonald had retired and had left the
20	Service, active duty, by late '94, and we do know the
21	timing of when Mr. Dunlop appears to be starting his
22	investigation.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
24	MR. STAUFFER: No, no, and I appreciate
25	

that. You're not really in authority ---

1	MR. MCDONALD: NO.
2	MR. STAUFFER: when Mr. Dunlop is
3	undertaking these private investigations.
4	But as someone who had gone through a long
5	service with the Cornwall Police Service and so on and as a
6	retired officer, did you ever think what ramifications
7	might come out of Mr. Dunlop carrying out the private
8	investigations?
9	MR. McDONALD: To be honest with you, I
10	really didn't know what he was doing. I know that he was
11	doing some investigating, but I didn't know what he was
12	doing.
13	MR. STAUFFER: But, sir, could I ask why
14	wouldn't you ask him what let me step back.
15	Would you agree with me that this was
16	something you'd never seen before as a police officer; that
17	is, some member, active member of a police service,
18	undertaking private investigations?
19	MR. McDONALD: They really didn't want to
20	hear from me, I don't believe.
21	MR. STAUFFER: No, but the question is had
22	you ever seen
23	MR. McDONALD: No, I didn't.
24	MR. STAUFFER: this type of behaviour
25	before

1	MR. McDONALD: No.
2	MR. STAUFFER: in all the years you had
3	ever been on the job?
4	So this is a unique situation; would you
5	agree with me?
6	MR. McDONALD: M'hm.
7	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Yes.
8	So that's why I'm wondering, Staff
9	Inspector, did you not have any concerns as to what Mr.
10	Dunlop was doing? And I appreciate you're retired at this
11	point, but he's a family member and he's a younger officer
12	and I'm just wondering what your thoughts are?
13	MR. McDONALD: I think I had some concerns
14	and I had I was concerned, but I don't believe they
15	wanted to hear from me at that point.
16	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. But why wouldn't they
17	want to hear from you? What is it that's stopping the
18	communication here?
19	MR. McDONALD: I believe they my belief
20	is that they believed I didn't support Perry when he first
21	got the statement of Mr. Silmser and disseminated it to
22	whoever he disseminated it to, and they believed that I
23	should have and it's my belief, I should say, that they
24	believed that I should have been supportive more
25	supportive of Perry and backed him completely.

1	MR. STAUFFER: Well, did someone ask you;
2	that is, did Perry ask you, Helen ask you that, you know,
3	"Please, Stuart, go to bat for us with"
4	MR. McDONALD: No.
5	MR. STAUFFER: Because this would
6	MR. McDONALD: Those were impressions I got
7	after.
8	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Because this would
9	have been, again, in fairness, while you're still serving
10	with the CPS at that point?
11	MR. McDONALD: Certainly.
12	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. So no one asked you to
13	support them?
14	MR. McDONALD: No.
15	MR. STAUFFER: But you have the view that
16	they thought you should have been supporting him?
17	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
18	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. But that's as far as
19	it went? There's no actual
20	MR. McDONALD: That's as far as it went.
21	MR. STAUFFER: request and denial from
22	them
23	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
24	MR. STAUFFER: and you? Okay.
25	So, Staff Inspector, is there anything more

1	you can tell us as to after the November '96 meeting? Did
2	you continue to have a family relationship with the Dunlops
3	or did that bring everything to a screeching halt, or where
4	were we at after the meeting?
5	MR. McDONALD: I think it was very strained.
6	As I said, there was no animosity on the part of my wife or
7	myself. I viewed it as a very unfortunate situation and
8	that mistakes had probably been made, but that I had
9	empathy for their family, their children, and the lack of
10	communication, I believe, was one-sided.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: So before we leave the
12	meeting at your home, is there any alcohol involved?
13	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Did they appear to be
15	under the influence of alcohol?
16	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: They appeared serious and
18	convinced of their position?
19	MR. McDONALD: Apparently.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: And were there any
21	threats made?
22	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you.
24	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. So, Staff Inspector,
25	do you have any communication anymore if I can take us

I	right through to the present day, do you have any
2	communication with the Dunlops anymore?
3	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
4	MR. STAUFFER: Okay.
5	MR. McDONALD: We have a my wife and I
6	both have attempted to communicate with them, but they
7	don't want to meet with us.
8	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Ably supported by my
9	friend, Ms. Simms, we've found a few documents. They
10	actually are in our binder. So perhaps if I could just ask
11	Staff Inspector McDonald to look at a few documents.
12	The first one, Mr. Commissioner, is 717055.
13	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
15	Exhibit 1568 is a document with the name
16	Stuart McDonald on it.
17	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-1568:
18	(717055) Index - Stuart McDonald
19	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Staff Inspector, I'm
20	just wondering if you can identify the source for this
21	document? Now, I do note at the bottom it has what I've
22	come to understand to be an OPP designation, but can you
23	help us at all as to where this came from?
24	MR. McDONALD: I don't see a picture.
25	MR. STAUFFER: I'm sorry.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: No, there's no picture.
2	There's just a
3	MR. STAUFFER: Yes. The document that you
4	have in front of you right now, Staff Inspector, should be
5	a one-page document. It's just typewritten and it's on the
6	screen.
7	MR. McDONALD: M'hm.
8	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Now, I'm just
9	wondering, sir, can you tell us where this came from? Can
10	you tell us the source of this document? And as I was
11	indicating to you to help you out, this may be an OPP-
12	generated document. I'm just wondering if you can identify
13	it?
14	MR. McDONALD: No, I can't.
15	MR. MANDERVILLE: It's not an OPP-generated
16	document. We believe it to be a Perry Dunlop-generated
17	document.
18	MR. STAUFFER: All right. Thank you very
19	much.
20	So, Staff Inspector, had you seen this
21	before preparing for your testimony?
22	MR. McDONALD: I think I have.
23	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Did you give any of
24	this information to someone or is it someone collecting
25	information from other sources?

1	MR. McDONALD: I don't know. Like I say,
2	some of the stuff is correct. Some of it is inaccurate,
3	but who wrote it? I have no idea.
4	MR. STAUFFER: Okay.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: So could you go through
6	the list?
7	MR. STAUFFER: Yes, sir.
8	To help you out, Staff Inspector, there is
9	reference in this Exhibit 1568 to what's called Picture No.
10	7 and Picture No. 9.
11	So, Madam Clerk, I'm going to ask you to
12	come up with Document 717056 and as well, Madam Clerk,
13	Document 717057.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
15	So Exhibit Number 1569 is a photograph
16	photocopy of a photograph with number 7 beside it.
17	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-1569:
18	(717056) Photo #7 - Stuart McDonald
19	MR. STAUFFER: Thank you.
20	So, Staff Inspector, if you look at that
21	document the Commissioner has just referred to, is that a
22	photocopy of a photograph of yourself?
23	MR. McDONALD: It is.
24	MR. STAUFFER: All right.
25	Could you give us any more detail as to when

1	you believe that was taken, the circumstances, where and
2	when it was taken?
3	MR. McDONALD: No, sir, I have no idea.
4	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. And, Mr. Commissioner,
5	I'd also like Staff Inspector McDonald to look at 717057,
6	which is the Clerk is saying she does not have a copy of
7	this right now.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: We'll put it on the
9	screen and then
10	MR. STAUFFER: Yes, sir.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: we'll give it an
12	exhibit number for now.
13	MR. STAUFFER: Thank you very much.
14	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
15	THE COMMISSIONER: So we have on the screen
16	a photograph with the Number 9 beside it
17	MR. STAUFFER: Yes.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: which will be Exhibit
19	1570.
20	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-1570:
21	(717057) Photo # 9 Stuart McDonald
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Can you identify that
23	photograph for us, sir?
24	MR. McDONALD: It's me.
25	MR. STAUFFER: All right.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: And do you know what the
2	circumstances were when this photo was taken, that kind of
3	thing?
4	MR. McDONALD: No, sir, I have no idea.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
6	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. So, Staff Inspector,
7	you've made reference to a photo of yourself with another
8	gentleman that Mrs. Dunlop asked for at some point.
9	Are either of these photographs, Number 7 or
10	Number 9, part of that photograph that you were talking
11	about?
12	MR. McDONALD: I don't believe so.
13	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. So these as far as
14	you can tell, anyway, and I know it's difficult because
15	there's just yourself in the picture, but you think these
16	are separate photographs than the one you were talking
17	about before?
18	MR. McDONALD: I think so. I think the one
19	that I was talking about before was taken outside the
20	church, type of thing, and but I don't recall ever
21	seeing that one either.
22	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Well, just to try to
23	tie up a loose end, the one that you are talking about
24	and it's difficult to talk about this in a vacuum, but did
25	you see that photograph at some point after it had left

PUBLIC HEARING AUDIENCE PUBLIQUE

1	your nouse?
2	MR. McDONALD: No.
3	MR. STAUFFER: So other than what you've
4	told us; that is, Mrs. Dunlop asking for the photograph
5	_
6	MR. McDONALD: I didn't know it existed
7	until I heard about it here at the Inquiry.
8	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Can you tell us what
9	circumstances you had heard it being used in what
10	circumstances had it been used?
11	MR. McDONALD: Again, I don't know whether
12	it was Mr. Leroux that was testifying or who it was, but he
13	identified me, I believe, from a picture that was taken by
14	with Mr. Craibe, and I believe it happened here at the
15	Inquiry, but I wasn't watching the Inquiry that day and I -
16	- it's what I was told.
17	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Do you have any
18	further information at all as to how the that photograph
19	was used?
20	MR. McDONALD: No, I don't, other than
21	apparently Helen acquired it from my wife and it was used
22	to identify me to Mr. Leroux.
23	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. And with respect to
24	these two photographs we're looking at today, Number 7 and
25	Number 9, do you have any further information as to how

1	they were used, if any use was made of them?
2	MR. McDONALD: Other than I've seen in the
3	past short while where I was picked out of an apparent
4	line-up, identified as Number 7 or Number 9, or Number 21
5	or something by people who supposedly were at the Seguin or
6	MacDonald residence.
7	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. When again, try to
8	put your mind to this, when did you first become aware that
9	any of the three photographs you were talking about were
10	used in some fashion? I think you've told us about the
11	first one and that you only heard about it through the
12	Inquiry's testimony.
13	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
14	MR. STAUFFER: These two photographs 7 and
15	9, did you hear about them at any time around the time of
16	the meeting, the November
17	MR. McDONALD: I believe that's quite
18	possible that at the time of the meeting they indicated to
19	me that I had been picked out of a my picture had been
20	picked out of a book or a line-up or something.
21	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. I don't know if we'd
22	heard that before. If we had, I apologize.
23	MR. McDONALD: I might not have said it.
24	MR. STAUFFER: So when you have the meeting
25	in November of 1996, let me you ask you this to start.

1	Were you shown a photograph of yourself
2	MR. McDONALD: No.
3	MR. STAUFFER: any photograph, perhaps
4	not these photographs but any photographs of yourself?
5	MR. McDONALD: No.
6	MR. STAUFFER: And you weren't shown Number
7	7 or Number 9 at the meeting in November of 1996?
8	MR. McDONALD: No.
9	MR. STAUFFER: So but you're told that
10	your photograph some photograph of yourself had been
11	used to identify you when someone is taking a statement?
12	MR. McDONALD: I believe so.
13	MR. STAUFFER: And who is taking the
14	statement?
15	MR. McDONALD: Either Perry or Carson, I
16	guess. I don't know.
17	MR. STAUFFER: So
18	MR. McDONALD: Or Mr. Bourgeois.
19	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. So just so I've got it
20	clear here, Staff Inspector, in November of 1996, when
21	you're having this meeting, you're advised at this point
22	that someone has at least one photograph of you and they're
23	using it to show to people who are giving statements, "Is
24	this someone you recognize?"
25	MR. McDONALD: I think I that's

1	MR. STAUFFER: And you have no idea which
2	photograph that is?
3	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
4	MR. STAUFFER: Well, did you ask them?
5	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
6	MR. STAUFFER: Hold on now. You didn't ask
7	them where they got the photo of you that was being used to
8	
9	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
10	MR. STAUFFER: pick you out of a photo
11	line-up?
12	MR. McDONALD: If their family is like my
13	family, we have many, many pictures of all the members of
14	the family.
15	MR. STAUFFER: Right.
16	MR. McDONALD: And there's many pictures of
17	Helen and Perry and all of my brothers and sisters and
18	their families and my wife's brothers and sisters and
19	families in albums throughout our house.
20	MR. STAUFFER: No, I appreciate that.
21	But I mean as a police officer, or retired
22	police officer in 1996, surely you must have asked "What
23	photo are you using of me to have me picked out of a photo
24	line-up?"
25	MR. McDONALD: It never entered my mind.

1	MR. STAUFFER: Okay.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Can we will you be
3	going down Exhibit 1568 to give him the opportunity to
4	comment on those?
5	MR. STAUFFER: Yes, sir. Thank you. Thank
6	you for directing me in the right direction, Mr.
7	Commissioner. Let me get back to that.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: I don't know if it's the
9	right direction, but
10	MR. STAUFFER: Yes, sir.
11	So if you look, Staff Inspector, at this
12	Document 1568 is the exhibit number we dealt with
13	pictures 7 and 9. It shows you as ex-Staff Inspector,
14	Cornwall Police Service, which I guess is an accurate
15	comment.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: "Is an accurate." You've
17	got to be careful with the inaccurate and an accurate.
18	MR. STAUFFER: Yes, sir.
19	MR. McDONALD: It's correct. I admit to
20	that.
21	MR. STAUFFER: All right. Fair enough.
22	The third bullet is:
23	"Was involved in the initial intake
24	of David Silmser's complaint."
25	MR. McDONALD: I admit to that.

1	MR. STAUFFER: The next one is:
2	"Was privy to morning meetings'"
3	And they've got an apostrophe "s" there, so
4	a bit of a typo:
5	"where the case was discussed."
6	What do you have to say about that bullet,
7	if anything, Staff Inspector?
8	MR. McDONALD: The only morning meeting that
9	I recall where the case was discussed was the instance
10	where Chief Shaver and Staff Inspector Brunet indicated
11	they would be going to Ottawa to speak to the Papal Nuncio.
12	MR. STAUFFER: Okay.
13	MR. McDONALD: And that was the first time.
14	I believe it was as a result of the payoff and the first
15	time I heard about it.
16	MR. STAUFFER: Could I go to the bullet that
17	says:
18	"Personal friend of Father Kevin
19	Maloney"?
20	MR. McDONALD: Well, he was our parish
21	priest at Blessed Sacrament Parish and, yeah, personal
22	friend.
23	MR. STAUFFER: Okay.
24	MR. McDONALD: Sure.
25	MR. STAUFFER: The next bullet:

1	"Heavily involved in the Catholic
2	Church as a layperson."
3	MR. McDONALD: I guess that's a quantitative
4	thing. I am involved with the Church, whether it's
5	heavily, that's somebody's opinion.
6	MR. STAUFFER: All right.
7	And then the next bullet I think we dealt
8	with, but I'll just put it to you again:
9	"Was seen at the residence of Ken
10	Seguin by several people."
11	MR. McDONALD: I was never there.
12	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Staff Inspector, have
13	you been shown in the past various documents or statements
14	by people who have said you were at Ken Seguin's residence?
15	I gather you've had different documents put to you by
16	various people?
17	MR. McDONALD: I've seen them
18	MR. STAUFFER: Yes.
19	MR. McDONALD: in preparation for my
20	testimony.
21	MR. STAUFFER: Yes. And despite having seen
22	those, you're standing by that, that you were never at Ken
23	Seguin's residence
24	MR. McDONALD: Correct.
25	MR. STAUFFER: at any residence,

1	because, again, he had more than one?
2	MR. McDONALD: Never at any of his
3	residences nor Malcolm MacDonald's residence.
4	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. And this is a follow-
5	up, really, to the prior bullet:
6	"Denies ever being at Seguin's house
7	and further states that he does not
8	even know where it is."
9	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
10	MR. STAUFFER: And then:
11	"Is the brother-in-law of Perry Dunlop
12	and believes that Cst. Dunlop was wrong
13	in reporting the incident to the
14	Children's Aid Society."
15	So perhaps we could just deal with that
16	bullet for a moment, Staff Inspector. Did you ever discuss
17	to start this, did you ever discuss with Constable
18	Dunlop his turning over of the Silmser statement to someone
19	in the CAS?
20	MR. McDONALD: No, I don't believe I ever
21	did.
22	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Do you have any idea
23	why this is written?
24	MR. McDONALD: No, I don't.
25	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Do you today or at

1	any time, did you believe that Constable Dunlop was wrong
2	in reporting to the Children's Aid Society?
3	MR. McDONALD: I think under the
4	circumstances at that time, it was not correct. I'm not
5	saying that there might not have been a time or an instance
6	where it would have been incorrect, but I believe at that
7	time it was not the proper step procedure to take.
8	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. So again, I appreciate
9	this is a very bald statement, this bullet here, and it may
10	have all sorts of meanings in terms of belief. So are you
11	telling us that back in 1993, let's say, in late '93, it
12	was your view that legally Constable Dunlop should not have
13	turned over the statement to the CAS?
14	MR. McDONALD: I don't believe he had a
15	right to take it from the police station, to copy it and
16	that, as I say, there might have been a time and a case for
17	turning this statement over to the Children's Aid Society,
18	but I don't believe that it was under the proper
19	circumstances at that particular time.
20	MR. STAUFFER: Has your view changed at all
21	with the passage of time for any reason?
22	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: You
24	MR. STAUFFER: Yes, sir.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: There are other matters

1	on the page that you should address.
2	MR. STAUFFER: Yes. Mr. Commissioner, I'll
3	put them to Mr or to Staff Inspector McDonald then.
4	Sir, if you look at the bullet that says
5	"was charged and convicted of possession of illegally
6	reporting liquor into Canada"
7	THE COMMISSIONER: "Importing".
8	MR. STAUFFER: Did I say something else?
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
10	MR. STAUFFER: "Importing".
11	MR. McDONALD: I was charged but not
12	convicted of that.
13	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. So that's one of the
14	errors in this summary, if I can put it that way?
15	MR. McDONALD: Correct.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: And did you resign from
17	the Cornwall Police during all of this?
18	MR. McDONALD: Yes, I did, but I was never
19	sentenced.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
21	MR. STAUFFER: All right.
22	MR. McDONALD: Prior to sentencing, I was
23	I paid a fine for under the provincial statutes as a
24	result of that liquor, but and I did resign prior to
25	paying the fine, but I was well aware of what the charge

1	was and what the fine was that I would be paying prior to
2	my resignation. And the resignation was for personal
3	reasons, not as a result of this.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: How much was the fine,
5	sir?
6	MR. McDONALD: A hundred dollars or
7	something like that.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
9	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Again, I don't want to
10	oh, my friend wants to say something.
11	Staff Inspector, could you briefly go into
12	the circumstances then of the charge?
13	MR. McDONALD: What do you mean?
14	MR. STAUFFER: I guess what's involved, how
15	much liquor are we talking about and
16	MR. McDONALD: I don't know the number of
17	cases. I remember hearing or reading that there was a
18	couple of cases of liquor that were purchased that were
19	contraband. My name was on the Liquor Licence Act. When
20	the inspector came or the police officer came to the hall
21	where the function was being held, they discovered the
22	liquor. I was charged with importing liquor. Later on, it
23	was there was some agreement between my lawyer and the
24	authorities and I pled guilty to a Liquor Control Act
25	charge and it was about \$100 I think, a fine.

1	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. This was liquor for
2	some wedding?
3	MR. McDONALD: My daughter's.
4	MR. STAUFFER: Yeah. All right. Just bear
5	with me for one moment. Sir, just a couple more questions
6	concerning Constable Dunlop, as quickly as we can here.
7	Were you aware that Constable Dunlop had
8	been ordered to disclose material, and by that I mean that
9	someone in authority at the Cornwall Police Service had
10	ordered him to disclose?
11	MR. McDONALD: Not until long after it
12	happened apparently. I read about it but I wasn't aware of
13	those circumstances when I was with the Police Department.
14	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. This would be in 1997.
15	So you're retired, obviously, but this had never been
16	brought up in family discussions, Mr. Dunlop
17	MR. McDONALD: Again, the Dunlops were not
18	discussing much with my family.
19	MR. STAUFFER: All right.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Stauffer?
21	MR. STAUFFER: Yes, sir.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Maybe just quickly, if we
23	could pull up an affidavit or where it's alleged that this
24	gentleman has been together with other people, other and
25	I'd like to go through that list and

1	MR. STAUFFER: Yes, sir.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: and ask him what the
3	relationship was.
4	Mr. Manson?
5	MR. MANSON: I was just going to say I
6	intended to do this, Mr. Stauffer.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
8	MR. STAUFFER: That's fine, of course.
9	MR. MANSON: I intended to do this.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, good.
11	MR. STAUFFER: I'll earn my pay here.
12	Let me get that document, and Mr.
13	Commissioner, I think one document that we could look at
14	would be 100507 which is already Exhibit 1076.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: One-zero-seven-six
16	(1076). Okay.
17	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
18	MR. STAUFFER: Inspector, have you seen this
19	document before now?
20	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
21	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Because, again, in
22	fairness, we're always happy to have the person read
23	through the entire document. This is quite a long document
24	and if you've looked at it already, that will be much
25	appreciated because we can speed through it somewhat.

1	I was referring actually in one of my
2	earlier questions to you to paragraph 6 at the bottom of
3	this
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry. Mr. Manson?
5	MR. STAUFFER: Oh, I'm sorry.
6	MR. MANSON: I just wanted to point out, Mr.
7	Commissioner, we have in the record various versions
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
9	MR. MANSON: purport to be the November
10	13 th , 1996 Affidavit of Mr. Leroux.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
12	MR. MANSON: This is one of them
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
14	MR. MANSON: taken off of
15	THE COMMISSIONER: The website.
16	MR. MANSON: the website.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah.
18	MR. MANSON: It's not one of the ones that
19	we put into evidence and that were identified as being
20	sworn by Mr. Leroux on November 13 th , 1996.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
22	MR. MANSON: I just wanted to point that out
23	for Mr. Stauffer so he well, my point is, if I recall,
24	in comparing them, there are one or two tiny changes
25	between this and the this is like a cut and paste job

1	_
2	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
3	MR. MANSON: going back to the original
4	November 13 th .
5	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. So which one
6	do you suggest we use?
7	MR. MANSON: Well, I think there's two
8	purposes, Mr. Commissioner.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah.
10	MR. MANSON: If the question is about
11	anything Mr. McDonald saw from the website, this is the
12	right document because it was on the website.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
14	MR. MANSON: If we want to be accurate about
15	what existed in the world on November $13^{\rm th}$, 1996, I wouldn't
16	put my money on this document.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Good. So
18	MR. McDONALD: Your Worship, I didn't see
19	anything on the website.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: So you know, with
21	MR. STAUFFER: Yes, sir.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: You know, why don't if
23	Mr. Manson is he's coming up right after you.
24	MR. STAUFFER: Sure.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: So why don't we let Mr.

1	Manson do it? He's propably got questions all lined up for
2	
3	MR. MANSON: I was to go through both of
4	them, but I mean (off mic)
5	THE COMMISSIONER: No, so
6	MR. MANSON: because I'm not happy with
7	this (off mic).
8	THE COMMISSIONER: And we certainly want to
9	keep Mr. Manson happy.
10	MR. STAUFFER: Yes, sir.
11	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
12	MR. STAUFFER: It's on a Friday, so I defer
13	to Mr. Manson, but I will ask one question about this
14	document while you have it in front of you, Staff
15	Inspector. So again, I'm referring to Exhibit 1076.
16	Had you ever had an opportunity did you
17	ever look at it? Did you ever look at any websites
18	relating to Project Truth to start with?
19	MR. McDONALD: No, I don't believe so.
20	MR. STAUFFER: Did you ever look at any
21	websites that might relate to allegations of child abuse,
22	the Sylvia MacEachern website, anything at all on the
23	internet that related to generally or specifically
24	historical sexual child abuse?
25	MR. McDONALD: My wife has brought them up

1	but I don't believe I've ever read any of them.
2	MR. STAUFFER: Okay.
3	MR. McDONALD: I've heard her talking about
4	it but I don't believe I have ever read any of it.
5	MR. STAUFFER: So this particular document
6	that we've got in front of us here, when, if ever, did you
7	first see this?
8	MR. McDONALD: I would have seen a hard copy
9	in the last few weeks.
10	MR. STAUFFER: Few weeks or a month,
11	something like that, but in preparation for today?
12	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
13	MR. STAUFFER: But it's not something that
14	came to your attention. This seems to be July 2000, for
15	example, on the top of it. Did you see it back then?
16	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
17	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. So what we're going to
18	do, Mr. Commissioner, if that's all right with everyone,
19	I'll certainly have Mr. Manson then ask Staff Inspector
20	McDonald questions.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: One last question about
22	recommendations.
23	MR. STAUFFER: Oh, no, I'm not quite not
24	quite done.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Oh.

1	MR. STAUFFER: I'd like to say I was done,
2	but
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, okay.
4	MR. STAUFFER: No, I just got a few more.
5	Staff Inspector, we'll turn to one last
6	topic here and that is, I do want to get your view on how
7	the Cornwall Police Service was being managed back in the
8	latter part of the last century, and I'm talking
9	specifically 1989, 1990 and thereabouts when you were still
10	there.
11	And what I'd like to show to you, sir, very
12	quickly well, we're getting there.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: It's just it makes a
14	little older when we talk about the last century.
15	MR. STAUFFER: Yes. I appreciate that. I
16	don't mean to age anybody in this room more than they
17	already are.
18	In any event, Mr. McDonald, I wanted you to
19	look at what we have in our materials, if I can find it, is
20	the senior officer's report almost there. Thank you.
21	Here we go. Yeah, all right. What I would
22	like to deal with, Staff Inspector, is indeed Exhibit 1347.
23	And I'd like you to turn to what we call Bates page
24	7180586, which in my copy at least, is the first page after
25	the cover page. Are you with me?

1	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
2	MR. STAUFFER: Thank you. And it's dated
3	April 4^{th} , 1990. It's a memo to Chief Shaver and to Deputy
4	Chief St. Denis from the senior officers. And it says,
5	"re: report from the staff sergeants."
6	Sir, am I right then just by reading this to
7	start with that you and Inspector Burke and Inspector Trew
8	had received a report prepared by six staff sergeants. Is
9	that correct?
10	MR. McDONALD: Correct.
11	MR. STAUFFER: And you obviously had an
12	opportunity to read it and to discuss it. And you say in
13	the second paragraph of your memo to the Chief and Deputy
14	Chief:
15	"We are of the understanding that the
16	staff sergeants initiated their
17	comments in accordance with management
18	teams Administrative Directive Number
19	12. Our comments follow that format."
20	And then you go on to say:
21	"After lengthy deliberations, it is in
22	the atmosphere of sadness that we
23	concur with all their concerns."
24	So, sir their
25	MR. McDONALD: It doesn't say all their

1	The desired the de
1	concerns. It just says their concerns.
2	MR. STAUFFER: Did I say all their concerns?
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Stauffer edits from
4	time to time.
5	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
6	MR. STAUFFER: Did I say all their concerns?
7	MR. McDONALD: Yes, you did, sir.
8	MR. STAUFFER: Well, let's see if you do
9	agree with all their concerns. All right. So now we're
10	going to go to the next page.
11	Now the next page is Bates page, the last
12	three numbers, 587. And again, I don't want to go through
13	all this unless you want to read every single word, but I
14	want to go to what's called the
15	MR. McDONALD: I'm sorry, sir, I don't have
16	the next page is 506.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, no, no, sir, you have
18	to look on the left-hand side on top.
19	MR. McDONALD: Oh, 58 okay, right, I'm
20	-
21	THE COMMISSIONER: No, no it's okay.
22	MR. STAUFFER: Now in this case, Staff
23	Inspector, you are a rookie. You're a rookie at dealing
24	with these our system.
25	MR. McDONALD: I'll admit to that.

1	MR. STAUFFER: All right. So, sir, near the
2	middle of that page it says:
3	"The following consensus of opinions
4	was arrived at."
5	Are you with me?
6	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
7	MR. STAUFFER: Yes, sir. So it says:
8	"The Chief's actions have resulted in
9	the office of the Chief of Police
10	losing all credibility with the men and
11	women of the Force, the Police
12	Commission, and the community."
13	That's obviously one of the staff sergeants'
14	concerns. And am I right that the three inspectors
15	concurred with that concern?
16	MR. McDONALD: I think with the yes,
17	again, "losing all credibility with the men and women of
18	the Force" might have been a little more than was required
19	but they I think the credibility was definitely in
20	question.
21	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. And I'm not trying to
22	really cross-examine you here.
23	MR. McDONALD: No, I realize that.
24	MR. STAUFFER: I'm trying to I'm just
25	trying to get you obviously to agree that when you write

1	your memo to the Chief and the Deputy Chief, there's
2	nothing in that memo that says we agree with the staff
3	sergeants somewhat or we'd like them to edit some of their
4	comments. You just simply say we concur with that report
5	that they prepared.
6	MR. McDONALD: Correct.
7	MR. STAUFFER: Is that fair?
8	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
9	MR. STAUFFER: And so without belabouring
10	this and going through every one of the concerns that they
11	have, the memo that you're that you and the other
12	inspectors have sent essentially adopts
13	MR. McDONALD: It was a consensus memo that
14	we agreed with agreed on.
15	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. And so then you
16	finalize your memo by saying:
17	"We would recommend one further
18	action"
19	THE COMMISSIONER: No, it's an option.
20	MR. STAUFFER: Sorry, option.
21	"We would recommend one further
22	option"
23	Are you with me there?
24	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
25	MR. STAUFFER: Yes, sir.

1	"that this matter remain 'in-house'
2	and the Board conduct their own
3	inquiry."
4	So, sir, could I ask you to start, who
5	actually wrote this memo?
6	MR. McDONALD: I don't recall.
7	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Am I right in thinking
8	it would have been you as the senior inspector?
9	MR. McDONALD: It might have been.
10	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Because again your
11	name appears at the top, I'm assuming because of the fact
12	that you're the senior of the three inspectors.
13	MR. McDONALD: Probably.
14	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Well, you are the
15	senior.
16	MR. McDONALD: I was.
17	MR. STAUFFER: Yes, okay.
18	MR. McDONALD: I wasn't the senior, I was
19	the highest ranking.
20	MR. STAUFFER: All right. So you're saying
21	one of these fellows or both of them came on the job before
22	you did?
23	MR. McDONALD: Inspector Burke did.
24	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Now the long and the
25	short of it is I want to deal with this recommendation of

1	one further option.
2	Is that the option that the three inspectors
3	recommended or
4	MR. McDONALD: I believe so.
5	MR. STAUFFER: is it another option?
6	MR. McDONALD: To be honest with you, I
7	don't really recall.
8	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. What came of this
9	process, then? Did anyone follow up with any option here?
10	Because essentially again, to help you out, the staff
11	sergeants had given two recommendations and I'm going on to
12	the next page, sir which is the number two page before the
13	signatures. Yeah.
14	And you see where the staff sergeants are
15	saying:
16	"It is out of a sense of loyalty to the
17	members of our Force and the community
18	and it is after much consideration with
19	sincere regret that we make the
20	following recommendations."
21	And the first one is that the Chief tender
22	his resignation. The second one is:
23	"or failing this that the Cornwall
24	Police Commission invite the Ontario
25	Police Services Branch and the

1	Solicitor General's office to conduct
2	an inquiry in to the management of the
3	Cornwall Police Force."
4	So you'll see those are the two
5	recommendations, if you will, or options that the
6	recommended options that the staff sergeants are putting
7	forward.
8	You fellows, the three inspectors have now
9	come up with another option. Are those the three options
10	then, to start with, that or recommended options that
11	are being put forward to the Chief and Deputy Chief?
12	MR. McDONALD: Yes, I guess so.
13	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. So which if any of
14	those was acted upon?
15	MR. McDONALD: Well, I believe and I
16	stand to be corrected again later that year the Ontario
17	Police Commission did come in and conduct an investigation
18	or an audit of our Force.
19	MR. STAUFFER: Okay.
20	MR. McDONALD: I think that later that year
21	the Chief initiated a strategic planning session of some
22	form to clarify his role as Chief of the Force and to give
23	to the members of the Police Force a comprehensive planning
24	document that
25	MR. STAUFFER: Okay.

1	MR. MCDONALD: I think those things were as
2	a result of this.
3	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Would you agree with
4	me, Staff Inspector, finally on these documents that the
5	recommendation then or the recommended option that it
6	actually happened was that someone came in from the
7	Solicitor General?
8	MR. McDONALD: I believe somebody came in.
9	I don't know if it was as a result of the Board asking them
10	to come in or if it was done on a regular basis.
11	I believe they were there; how they arrived
12	I couldn't tell you.
13	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. But again the three
14	options are, you know, resign; go to the outside source, or
15	stay in-house. And I guess the option that was ultimately
16	acted upon was the Solicitor General's team came in and did
17	an inspection or an audit.
18	MR. McDONALD: And again, I don't know at
19	whose request they were there or
20	THE COMMISSIONER: I don't know that that's
21	quite correct.
22	MR. STAUFFER: Okay, sir.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: I think it started off
24	with the Board, is it not? I mean, we've heard evidence
25	all about that, I don't know why we're going

1	MR. MANDERVILLE: You're correct, Mr.
2	Commissioner, and an outside consultant came in
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, yes.
4	MR MANDERVILLE: to assist the Board and
5	the
6	THE COMMISSIONER: So
7	MR. MANDERVILLE: Police Service.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: we've heard from
9	others. We don't need to bother this gentleman with that.
10	MR. STAUFFER: That's fine.
11	I take it, just to wrap up on that point
12	then Staff Inspector, your name is shown as someone who
13	participated as part of the management team then in that
14	strategic planning session. So you were somebody who
15	participated in that?
16	MR. McDONALD: I was, yes.
17	MR. STAUFFER: Okay.
18	Sir, one of the concerns, obviously, that
19	was raised in different documents, not just the ones we're
20	talking about here but others, was the fact that morale was
21	an issue, an issue back in 1990.
22	By the time you retired in the fall of 1994
23	or May of 1995, would you say that morale was still an
24	issue within the Force or the Service?
25	MR. McDONALD: I've never been on a police

1	force or I've never seen any police force that there
2	wasn't some morale issues, whether it's a small percentage
3	of the police officers or a larger amount of police
4	officers, there's always some discord. There are always a
5	certain amount of or percentage of police officers who
6	feel they've been hard done by. They were passed over for
7	promotion, they weren't treated properly.
8	And, as I say, I was with the OPP, I was
9	with the city police, I worked in a hospital setting, and
10	there were always the complainers and those people that
11	were hard done by. The percentage sometimes rose or
12	sometimes was minimal, but there are always those who or
13	every squad, on every team who were naysayers, who were
14	malcontent.
15	MR. STAUFFER: M'hm. From all your
16	experience, both direct and indirect as a police officer,
17	have you ever been involved in a situation or heard of a
18	situation where, essentially, all of the staff sergeants
19	and the inspectors have recommended as an option that the
20	Chief resign?
21	MR. McDONALD: No, this was an this was
22	the first.
23	MR. STAUFFER: All right.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: And the last?

MR. McDONALD: Yes.

(LAUGHTER/RIRES) 1 2 MR. STAUFFER: Okay. 3 Now, Mr. Commissioner had talked, Staff Inspector, about recommendations. Sir, do you have any 4 5 recommendations for the Commissioner to consider? 6 MR. McDONALD: I think that it's a very 7 unfortunate situation that has arisen with the Dunlop 8 family and I'm not saying that it's not somewhat, maybe 9 self-inflicted to a degree, but I feel that it's a very sad 10 situation for their family. 11 I don't want to assess blame or attach blame to anybody. I just have a lot of empathy for a lot of 12 members of the Cornwall Police Department who have suffered 13 14 and had to work under these circumstances. 15 I have a lot of sympathy for a lot of 16 members of our community who have had some rather bad 17 memories brought back up and regurgitated and I have a lot 18 of sympathy for them. 19 It is my honest opinion that almost every 20 municipality in the world has a certain percentage of deviants, and it's a sad situation when a spotlight is 21 brought to bear on the community because of a very small 22 23 percentage of people. And, unfortunately, I believe that 24 this small percentage of people has given our community a 25 black eye and it has, again, shone the spotlight on the

1	railings of a very rew. And it's red to a rot of people's
2	name, mine included, being degraded, brought down, when
3	there's very little evidence other than the say of one of
4	two people whose motives I think are suspect.
5	And, as I say, I have a lot of sympathy for
6	a lot of people in this community, and I only hope that
7	they can put a lot of this behind them in a relatively
8	short period of time.
9	Thank you.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: All right, thank you.
11	We'll take the morning break and we'll come
12	back in 15 minutes.
13	MR. McDONALD: Thank you.
14	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre;
15	veuillez vous lever.
16	This hearing will resume at 11:15.
17	Upon recessing at 11:02 a.m./
18	L'audience est suspendue à 11h02
19	Upon resuming at 11:18 a.m./
20	L'audience est reprise à 11h18
21	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre;
22	veuillez vous lever.
23	This hearing is now resumed. Please be
24	seated. Veuillez vous asseoir.
25	STUART McDONALD, Resumed/Sous le même serment:

1	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR.
2	MANSON:
3	THE COMMISSIONER: The thread of your cross-
4	examination is, Mr. Manson?
5	MR. MANSON: I'll just start.
6	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
7	MR. MANSON: Now witness
8	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
9	MR. MANSON: Where were you on May the 3 rd ?
10	MR. McDONALD: I apologize.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Not a problem. It's
12	okay.
13	MR. McDONALD: I apologize, sir.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Not a problem.
15	Mr. Manson?
16	MR. MANSON: Mr. McDonald, my name's Alan
17	Manson. I'm one of the lawyers for the Citizens for
18	Community Renewal which is a group of Cornwall citizens who
19	support institutional reform and especially the protection
20	of young people.
21	Before I start out, I want to apologize to
22	you. In a few minutes, I'm going to have to talk to you
23	about some family matters. I know those are always
24	delicate and difficult, but I think you appreciate that
25	that's the nature of this exercise to some extent.

1	But talking about family, you said that your
2	wife has 12 brothers and sisters; correct?
3	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
4	MR. MANSON: Can you just situate her age
5	for me in relation to Helen Dunlop? You don't have to tell
6	me their ages, but who's older and by about how much
7	approximately?
8	MR. McDONALD: Well, my wife is she's
9	probably 10 to 15 years older than Helen.
10	MR. MANSON: Okay. And Carson Chisholm is
11	your wife's brother?
12	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
13	MR. MANSON: And can you tell me their
14	MR. McDONALD: He's a few she's a few
15	years older than Carson.
16	MR. MANSON: So Carson Chisholm would be in
17	between your wife and Helen.
18	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
19	MR. MANSON: And, again, just to be
20	completely clear about our timelines, you formally retired
21	early '95; correct?
22	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
23	MR. MANSON: Do you have any recollection of
24	when your last operational duties were?
25	MR. McDONALD: In the fall,

1	September/October of '94.
2	MR. MANSON: September/October. So at that
3	time, September/October '94, Mr. Dunlop would be subject of
4	the Police Act charges; correct? Can you recall that?
5	MR. McDONALD: No sir, I don't.
6	MR. MANSON: Okay. You made it quite clear
7	in your evidence in-chief that you bore no personal
8	animosity towards Mr. Dunlop. Did he have any reasons to
9	have a grievance against you?
10	MR. McDONALD: You'd have to ask him that.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: To your knowledge
12	MR. MANSON: Were you
13	THE COMMISSIONER: To your knowledge?
14	MR. McDONALD: I don't know what it would
15	take to make somebody mad at me.
16	MR. MANSON: Okay. Well, let me ask you
17	another question.
18	I understand that you were involved in a
19	disciplining disciplinary matter involving Mr. Dunlop in
20	1985, prior to his marriage to your wife's sister; correct?
21	MR. McDONALD: I was involved in a couple of
22	disciplinary matters.
23	MR. MANSON: And the one involving the
24	damage to the vehicle, you were the hearing officer;
25	correct?

1	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
2	MR. MANSON: Did he bear you any malice as a
3	result of that?
4	MR. McDONALD: I don't know.
5	MR. MANSON: Did you and he ever discuss it?
6	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
7	MR. MANSON: Let's move to the November,
8	1996 attendance at your home by Carson Chisholm and others.
9	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
10	MR. MANSON: You've got that fixed in your
11	mind; correct?
12	MR. McDONALD: As well as I can do.
13	MR. MANSON: But I mean, you recall that
14	event clearly?
15	MR. McDONALD: Oh, yeah.
16	MR. MANSON: This was an extraordinary event
17	and it's made an impression on you?
18	MR. McDONALD: Yes sir, a definite
19	impression.
20	MR. MANSON: Now, with respect to the date,
21	my friend asked you whether November 18, '96 sounded right.
22	Are you in agreement with that date?
23	MR. McDONALD: Sounds right. I couldn't
24	tell you the exact date or for that matter, I couldn't tell
25	you what year it was.

1	MR. MANSON: Well, can we just quickly look
2	at Exhibit 579, Mr. Commissioner? This is the Will State
3	prepared by Mr. Dunlop in the year 2000, and it's Bates
4	page
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Hold on. Hold on a
6	second. Not you, not you, Mr. Manson.
7	MR. MANSON: It's Bates I believe it's
8	579, Mr. Commissioner.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sure. It's just I
10	don't have the book here.
11	MR. MANSON: Oh. And it's Bates page ending
12	in 4952.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. I'm sorry,
14	Bates page again?
15	MR. MANSON: Ending in 4952, and at the
16	bottom it says page 51 of 110.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. That's good.
18	MR. MANSON: Bottom right-hand corner.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
20	MR. McDONALD: The bottom is 51 of 110?
21	MR. MANSON: Yes.
22	MR. McDONALD: I'm there.
23	MR. MANSON: And you'll see the date, 18
24	November 1996?
25	MR. McDONALD: Yes.

1	MR. MANSON: So it appears that according to
2	this document prepared by Mr. Dunlop, he's indicating the
3	meeting was November 18 th , 1996; correct?
4	MR. McDONALD: Correct.
5	MR. MANSON: And if I can just read:
6	"Attend Stuart McDonald's house with
7	Helen, Carson Chisholm and my lawyer…"
8	And that lawyer was Charles Bourgeois;
9	correct?
10	MR. McDONALD: I believe so.
11	MR. MANSON: Had you ever met Mr. Bourgeois
12	before that time?
13	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
14	MR. MANSON: And your evidence was that
15	Carson came first and maybe there was a phone call and then
16	the three others attended; correct?
17	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
18	MR. MANSON: And let me read on:
19	"Stuart denies knowing Ron Leroux."
20	That's correct?
21	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
22	MR. MANSON: "He denies ever going to Ken
23	Seguin's house."
24	That's correct?
25	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.

1	MR. MANSON: "He denies any knowledge of
2	the case other than being informed by
3	Sergeant Nakic."
4	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
5	MR. MANSON: "Indicates he knows Ron
6	Leroux was in town."
7	I believe from your statements you've
8	indicated that you thought you knew an uncle of his
9	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
10	MR. MANSON: who worked on the bridge?
11	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
12	MR. MANSON: But you did not know Ron
13	Leroux?
14	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
15	MR. MANSON: You'd never met Ron Leroux?
16	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
17	MR. MANSON: Can we turn the page?
18	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
19	MR. MANSON: "Tells everyone to fuck off
20	and get out of his house."
21	MR. McDONALD: I don't normally use that
22	type of language. Whether I did that day or not, I
23	couldn't tell you. I did ask them to leave the house.
24	Whether I I'm not going to affirm or deny the fact that
25	I used those words.

1	MR. MANSON: I take it you recall asking the
2	group to leave your house in stern language?
3	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
4	MR. MANSON: Then look at the next sentence,
5	Mr. McDonald:
6	"With the exception of me"
7	That being Mr. Dunlop:
8	"I left earlier because I no longer
9	wanted to be in his presence."
10	Can you recall that he left earlier?
11	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
12	MR. MANSON: "I no longer wanted to be in
13	his presence. I had heard enough. I
14	noticed he"
15	I'm assuming that's you.
16	"was visibly upset."
17	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir, I was.
18	MR. MANSON: Shaken and upset?
19	MR. McDONALD: I was.
20	MR. MANSON: You told the Commissioner that
21	this group that attended your house were serious?
22	MR. McDONALD: I believe they were.
23	MR. MANSON: Were they hostile to you?
24	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir, I guess maybe I
25	would indicate that they were probably hostile when I

1	indicated that I wasn't there and that I was telling them
2	the truth. They said they didn't believe me and I guess
3	that would equate to being hostile.
4	MR. MANSON: And this wasn't a casual,
5	"We're hearing some things about you, Stuart. What do you
6	have to say?" This was an accusation, wasn't it?
7	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
8	MR. MANSON: And you were shown a document
9	that appeared to be a statement from Ron Leroux that made
10	various accusations against you, didn't he?
11	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
12	MR. MANSON: Now, I know it's difficult to
13	recall exactly the document, but I want to show you one
14	document that we have on record. It's Exhibit 567.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: And that would be in the
16	same book, I hope. Yes, it is.
17	Madam Clerk? Okay. You're there, 567?
18	MR. MANSON: Five-sixty-seven (567).
19	And this purports to be an affidavit sworn
20	by Ron Leroux before the Commissioner of Oaths. The
21	signature is Charles Bourgeois. This is on page 8 and
22	dated November 13 th , 1996. So this would seem to be just a
23	few days before their arrival at your house; correct?
24	MR. McDONALD: Apparently.
25	MR. MANSON: If it's accurate; correct?

1	MR. McDONALD: Apparently, yes.
2	MR. MANSON: Now, can we just look at page 1
3	for a minute?
4	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
5	MR. MANSON: You'll see at the top a court
6	file number and what we, in the lawyer business, call a
7	style of cause; that is Perry Dunlop versus various people.
8	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
9	MR. MANSON: Do you recall seeing this when
10	Carson Chisholm presented this to you a statement to
11	you?
12	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
13	MR. MANSON: When Carson Chisholm attended
14	your house and presented a statement to you, were you aware
15	that there was any lawsuit between Mr. Dunlop and various
16	people involved with the Police Services and the Diocese?
17	MR. McDONALD: I don't remember knowing that
18	at that time. I couldn't tell you. No, I
19	MR. MANSON: Did any of the people present
20	that evening, Mr. Chisholm, Ms. Dunlop, Mr. Dunlop or Mr.
21	Bourgeois, tell you there is a lawsuit ongoing?
22	MR. McDONALD: No, sir, I don't believe so.
23	I don't recall that.
24	MR. MANSON: Can we just look at paragraph 6
25	on page 2?

1	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
2	MR. MANSON: This is a long list of names
3	that starts with:
4	"I was at several parties at Ken
5	Seguin's house."
6	This is Mr. Leroux speaking.
7	"Malcolm MacDonald's summer residence
8	and St. Andrews parish house where I
9	observed, among others"
10	And of the 33 named people, you're number 29; correct?
11	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
12	MR. MANSON: You're 21 and 29. Somehow you
13	got double attention. I apologize.
14	MR. McDONALD: That's all right. I've seen
15	it before.
16	MR. MANSON: You've seen it.
17	Your evidence is you were never at parties
18	at Ken Seguin's house or Malcolm MacDonald's summer
19	residence or St. Andrews parish house; correct?
20	MR. McDONALD: No, sir, I've never been
21	there. I've been to the parish house in St. Andrews, but
22	not when Father Charles MacDonald was there.
23	MR. MANSON: And was it a party that you
24	attended?
25	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.

1	MR. MANSON: Can we look at paragraph 26 of
2	this statement?
3	"On or about June or July 1993, I
4	started to"
5	And this again is Ron Leroux speaking.
6	"I started to hear the name Stuart
7	McDonald being discussed by Malcolm and
8	Ken Seguin. Ken advised that the
9	allegations against him and Father
10	Charlie were not going to go anywhere
11	as Stuart McDonald was now looking into
12	it."
13	Were you ever asked by any of these people
14	to look into the allegations against Father Charlie?
15	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
16	MR. MANSON: "I continued to hear the name
17	Stuart McDonald frequently from Ken
18	during the months of June, July and
19	August 1993."
20	Do you have any idea why someone would say
21	that?
22	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
23	MR. MANSON: Paragraph 28 is a very long
24	paragraph about a meeting on a Sunday morning in September
25	on Stanley Island, attended by a large group of Cornwall

1	men.
2	Can we just start:
3	"On the Sunday morning at approximately
4	8:30 a.m. myself and Ken are having a
5	coffee in Ken's backyard. Malcolm
6	arrives and states that he has steaks,
7	beer and booze for an army.
8	Malcolm states that a lot of important
9	people are showing up for dinner today.
10	Malcolm stated that Ron Wilson, Claude
11	Shaver, Bishop Larocque, Stuart
12	McDonald, Brunet, a judge from his
13	drinking days, and Father Charlie would
14	be in attendance."
15	Later, on the next page, we see reference to
16	Claude Shaver arriving with two other males:
17	"They exited the car and I observed the
18	two other males to be Stuart McDonald
19	and another cop. They go to Ken's
20	wharf and get into Malcolm's boat.
21	They, Malcolm, Claude, Stuart and
22	another cop, head towards the island
23	and wave at me as they are leaving."
24	Is this account of a trip to Stanley Island
25	true, sir?

1	MR. McDONALD: No, sir, it's not.
2	MR. MANSON: At least you were not there; is
3	that correct?
4	MR. McDONALD: I was not there.
5	MR. MANSON: I want to take you to another
6	document, Exhibit 672.
7	Mr. Commissioner, this is the amended
8	Statement of Claim.
9	Now, if you look at the first page, Mr.
10	McDonald, you see the same Style of Cause, court file
11	number, Perry Dunlop and the number of defendants; correct?
12	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
13	MR. MANSON: Same one we just saw in the
14	Affidavit; correct?
15	MR. McDONALD: Okay.
16	MR. MANSON: Can you turn to the very last
17	page, which, Mr. Commissioner, is Bates page 7011022,
18	you'll note right at the bottom is Mr. Bourgeois' name;
19	correct?
20	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
21	MR. MANSON: And just slightly above that
22	the date November 15 th , 1996; correct?
23	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
24	MR. MANSON: So this document it would
25	appear, if it's accurate, was issued just a few days before

1	the visit to your house; correct? It seems to be the case.
2	The visit was November 18^{th} and this is a few days before
3	Mr. Bourgeois issued this document.
4	MR. McDONALD: Apparently.
5	MR. MANSON: Have you ever seen this
6	document before, an Amended Statement of Claim or anything
7	that looks like it, 64 pages long?
8	MR. McDONALD: No, sir, I don't think I have
9	ever seen it. No, I don't think I ever have seen it.
10	MR. MANSON: When the group of the Dunlops,
11	Carson Chisholm and Mr. Bourgeois came to your house,
12	you've told us they didn't tell you anything about a
13	lawsuit. Did they tell you anything that you were going to
14	be named in a lawsuit?
15	MR. McDONALD: No, sir, I don't believe so.
16	MR. MANSON: Let's look at paragraph 31.
17	The reason some of these words, phrases or sentences are
18	underlined is that reflects the amendment that was done
19	because this Action was actually started back in July.
20	Halfway down the paragraph:
21	"Dunlop further states that a lawful,
22	proper and legitimate investigation
23	into the allegations made by the victim
24	was never conducted by the Cornwall
25	Police, and more specifically,

1	Constable Sebalj, Brunet, Shaver, St.
2	Denis, Stuart McDonald, Wells, and
3	Johnston."
4	And later on, again, your name in the same
5	list and the allegation is you're:
6	"liable at law and their
7	unconventional conduct in this case
8	stands alone as conspiracy and abuse of
9	process."
10	My question is, when they attended at your
11	house, was there any indication that you were, or were
12	about to be, named as a party to a conspiracy like that's
13	set out
14	MR. McDONALD: No, sir. This very moment is
15	the first time I have ever heard that I was named as a
16	conspirator or I was going to be sued. I had never heard
17	of it until
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, in fairness, you
19	weren't sued.
20	MR. MANSON: No, you weren't you're not
21	being sued. You're not a defendant.
22	MR. McDONALD: Oh.
23	MR. MANSON: I didn't say you were being
24	sued. I said you were named in the document.
25	MR. McDONALD: Oh, I'm sorry. I

1	THE COMMISSIONER: No, no, it's okay. So
2	your surprise can be that your name is in there but don't
3	be don't be
4	MR. McDONALD: I'm not being sued.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: You're not being sued.
6	MR. McDONALD: Okay.
7	MR. MANSON: No, you were never sued.
8	You're not one of the named defendants.
9	MR. McDONALD: No, sir, I don't recall them
10	ever telling me that I was named in a lawsuit.
11	MR. MANSON: There's an allegation in
12	paragraph 83 can we turn to that? It's on page 43,
13	Bates page 7011001, and I'm going to ask you your response
14	to the allegation, solely as it relates to you:
15	"Dunlop states that allegations made by
16	the victim against Father"
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Hold it. Sorry, sorry.
18	Page 53?
19	MR. MANSON: Page 43, Mr. Commissioner.
20	It's paragraph 83.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Right. Are you there,
22	sir?
23	MR. McDONALD: Yes, I am.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Go ahead.
25	MR. MANSON: "Dunlop states that

1	allegations made by the victim against
2	Father Charles MacDonald and Ken Seguin
3	were held in abeyance and left dormant
4	purposely by the senior management of
5	the Cornwall Police, specifically
6	Shaver, St. Denis, Stuart McDonald, and
7	Brunet."
8	MR. McDONALD: I think it's nonsense.
9	MR. MANSON: It's nonsense? Okay. Thank
10	you.
11	MR. McDONALD: I don't know of any police
12	officer that would condone that type of
13	MR. MANSON: But as far as the allegation
14	against you, it's nonsense?
15	MR. McDONALD: It's nonsense.
16	MR. MANSON: I want to turn you to one more
17	exhibit that we have in evidence. It's Exhibit 672 no,
18	I'm sorry 572A, Mr. Commissioner.
19	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
20	MR. MANSON: Have you got this, Mr.
21	McDonald?
22	MR. McDONALD: Five seven two (572), yes.
23	MR. MANSON: It's 572A, I believe. It
24	should be called "Videotaped interview report No. 1" and in
25	the middle of the page at the top 712799.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah.
2	MR. McDONALD: Seven nine nine (799)?
3	MR. MANSON: Is that
4	THE COMMISSIONER: No, he's referring to the
5	one on the top right-hand corner now.
6	MR. MANSON: Yeah.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: It is. It is.
8	MR. MANSON: Now,
9	MR. McDONALD: I'm sorry; I'm lost.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Exhibit 572? Exhibit
11	572?
12	MR. McDONALD: Yes, I'm there.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: You're there.
14	MR. MANSON: Okay. I think that
15	MR. McDONALD: Five seven two (572).
16	MR. MANSON: Yeah, I think that's fine for
17	now, Mr. McDonald.
18	MR. McDONALD: Okay.
19	MR. MANSON: I just want to say, Mr.
20	Commissioner, you'll hear about this later during final
21	submissions but you'll recall there is an evolution to
22	these documents.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
24	MR. MANSON: And at a later time, I'm sure
25	they'll all be put into sequence for you but that's not the

1	point of me putting it to this witness.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
3	MR. MANSON: But there is a sequence that is
4	significant.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: I understand that.
6	MR. MANSON: Can we turn to Bates page
7	7048605? Mr. McDonald, this is an interview conducted by
8	the OPP with Ron Leroux at the Orillia detachment on
9	February 7^{th} , 1997, and it's a very lengthy interview.
10	MR. McDONALD: I'm sorry. I missed the
11	page, Mr. Manson?
12	MR. MANSON: It ends in 8605.
13	MR. McDONALD: Eight six zero five (8605).
14	MR. MANSON: This will be in the top, the
15	little numbers in the top left corner.
16	MR. McDONALD: Okay.
17	MR. MANSON: And I'm reading partway through
18	the third line where it says "Leroux."
19	MR. McDONALD: Yes.
20	MR. MANSON: Again, I'm going to ask you to
21	comment on the accuracy of this statement:
22	"I know for a fact that Ken Seguin,
23	Stuart McDonald, Malcolm MacDonald and
24	Charlie MacDonald were homosexual
25	lovers."

1	MR. McDONALD: False.
2	MR. MANSON: Did you have any idea that Mr.
3	Leroux was saying this about you in February of 1997?
4	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
5	MR. MANSON: When this group of people
6	visited you November 18 th , 1996, did any of them make this
7	accusation against you?
8	MR. McDONALD: No, sir. To my knowledge,
9	all they said was that I was seen at MacDonald and Seguin
10	residences.
11	MR. MANSON: The parties at the various
12	residences?
13	MR. McDONALD: That's right.
14	MR. MANSON: During this conversation, Mr.
15	McDonald, was the word "paedophiles" used?
16	MR. McDONALD: I don't recall.
17	MR. MANSON: And this conversation would
18	have been somewhere, you thought, between 10 minutes and an
19	hour?
20	MR. McDONALD: M'hm.
21	MR. MANSON: And you were being confronted
22	with these accusations?
23	MR. McDONALD: That's correct. Only that I
24	was there.
25	MR. MANSON: Yes.

1	MR. McDONALD: They didn't accuse me of
2	doing anything improper other than showing up at the
3	residence.
4	MR. MANSON: But you can see that shortly
5	afterwards there are much more serious allegations
6	MR. McDONALD: Yes.
7	MR. MANSON: being made against you?
8	MR. McDONALD: I didn't know about this
9	until, again, a few weeks ago. I within the last couple
10	of weeks I saw the statement. Prior to that, I didn't know
11	I was accused of these things.
12	MR. MANSON: In your examination in-chief,
13	you mentioned the word "lists," you said "I've seen lists
14	of names before."
15	When Carson Chisholm attended at your house
16	on November 18^{th} , 1996, did the document have a long list
17	similar to the one that I just showed you?
18	MR. McDONALD: I couldn't say, to be honest
19	with you.
20	MR. MANSON: So what do you mean when you
21	say "I've seen lists before"?
22	MR. McDONALD: I've seen statements like
23	this with those particular lists of names that you showed
24	me a little while ago on it, where I was number 21 and 29.
25	I've seen them all in the last few weeks again in getting

1	ready for my testimony.
2	MR. MANSON: In between November 18 th , 1996
3	and getting ready for your testimony, did you ever see any
4	documents with lists of names like that on it?
5	MR. McDONALD: Not to my recollection, no.
6	MR. MANSON: Did you see lists making
7	allegations against other people that may not have included
8	you?
9	MR. McDONALD: No, sir. I didn't see any
10	lists that I recall.
11	MR. MANSON: Now, you told us that your wife
12	had seen the website
13	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
14	MR. MANSON: which was called Project
15	Truth at the time.
16	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
17	MR. MANSON: And did she mention that to
18	you, that she had looked at it?
19	MR. McDONALD: I heard her mention the name
20	of Ms. MacEachern. Some years back, apparently there was a
21	fellow by the name of Nadeau, is it?
22	MR. MANSON: Dick Nadeau, yes.
23	MR. McDONALD: That had a website address
24	-
25	MR. MANSON: That's the one I'm speaking of.

1	Did your wife have a look at that; do you know?
2	MR. McDONALD: No, I don't recall. She
3	might have.
4	MR. MANSON: My question is did your wife or
5	any members of your family speak to you about having seen
6	your name on a website?
7	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir, I think so.
8	MR. MANSON: Can was this your wife or
9	someone else who
10	MR. McDONALD: Quite possibly my wife. It
11	could have been some of my friends.
12	MR. MANSON: Can we now go back in time a
13	little bit? If we're using November 18 th , 1996 as a cut-off
14	point, I take it that you've had virtually no communication
15	with Helen and Perry Dunlop since?
16	MR. McDONALD: Very little.
17	MR. MANSON: Have you seen them at any
18	family gatherings?
19	MR. McDONALD: No, I don't recall.
20	MR. MANSON: What about Carson Chisholm;
21	have you had communications with him?
22	MR. McDONALD: Oh yes.
23	MR. MANSON: Regularly?
24	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
25	MR. MANSON: Family gatherings?

1	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
2	MR. MANSON: Has he been to your home for
3	dinner since November 18 th , '96?
4	MR. McDONALD: I don't know if he's been
5	there for dinner, but he's been there several times.
6	MR. MANSON: Have you been to his home?
7	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
8	MR. MANSON: So your relationship with
9	Carson Chisholm has continued to be familial, to put it
10	that way?
11	MR. McDONALD: Yeah. As I say, I hold no
12	animosity towards anybody.
13	MR. MANSON: But you continue to speak with
14	Carson Chisholm on a familial level?
15	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
16	MR. MANSON: Have you talked to him about
17	Perry Dunlop's situation?
18	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
19	MR. MANSON: Do you know that he was, back
20	in the period 1996 and 1997, working with Perry Dunlop,
21	attempting to get statements from witnesses and victims?
22	MR. McDONALD: It's my information that yes
23	he worked with him.
24	MR. MANSON: Have you and he talked about
25	that?

1	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
2	MR. MANSON: Did you know that he took a
3	trip to Florida with Ron Leroux in an effort to investigate
4	various allegations?
5	MR. McDONALD: I think I might have read it
6	someplace, but
7	MR. MANSON: So you've never talked to
8	Carson Chisholm about that?
9	MR. McDONALD: No, sir. I never talked to
10	any of them about this particular
11	MR. MANSON: Have you heard Carson Chisholm
12	in any of the conversations you've had with him, have
13	you heard him talk about paedophiles?
14	MR. McDONALD: No, I don't think so.
15	MR. MANSON: But you know that this is a big
16	concern for him?
17	MR. McDONALD: Well, I've seen things in the
18	paper, you know, where he's carried signs and placards, and
19	I've read articles in the paper, but I've never talked to
20	him directly about that.
21	MR. MANSON: So have you ever, at a family
22	gathering or other social gathering, overheard him speaking
23	about paedophiles?
24	MR. McDONALD: No, sir, I don't think so.
25	MR. MANSON: Have you ever heard him

1	speaking about homosexuals or homosexuality?
2	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
3	MR. MANSON: If I suggested to you that
4	there's some indication that he's hostile towards
5	homosexuals, would you agree?
6	MR. McDONALD: I think from what I've read
7	in the newspapers, yes, I would agree.
8	MR. MANSON: Now, have you seen that
9	hostility in speaking with him personally?
10	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
11	MR. MANSON: If we can talk about the
12	photographs for a minute? You mentioned a photograph that
13	your wife had taken of you in
14	MR. McDONALD: Company?
15	MR. MANSON: Well, no, I was just going to
16	say that you were wearing
17	THE COMMISSIONER: A vest.
18	MR. MANSON: a vest and pants made from
19	
20	MR. McDONALD: McDonald tartan.
21	MR. MANSON: That's the same tartan?
22	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
23	MR. MANSON: And
24	THE COMMISSIONER: And yours, Mr
25	MR. MANSON: Mine? Mine aren't bugs. This

1	is a "Save the Children" flag. Yes, this tartan comes from
2	Minsk, not quite the same.
3	But yours is a lovely tie, Mr. McDonald.
4	MR. McDONALD: Thank you, sir.
5	MR. MANSON: And a tailor made those for
6	you, Mr. Craive (sic).
7	MR. McDONALD: Craibe, C-R-A-I-B-E.
8	MR. MANSON: And I take it he did a good
9	job?
10	MR. McDONALD: Well, they didn't fit for
11	very long.
12	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
13	MR. MANSON: Well, tailors can't do
14	miracles. There may be another reason for that, but
15	anyways.
16	When you were talking about Mr. Craibe, you
17	indicated that you were at first reluctant to hire him
18	because you had heard that he was a homosexual?
19	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
20	MR. MANSON: How many years ago would that
21	have been?
22	MR. McDONALD: Probably about 50 pounds ago.
23	Maybe the mid-'80s.
24	MR. MANSON: Mid-\80s.
25	Would you agree with me that in the mid-'80s

1	that may have been a common view amongst a segment of the
2	population in Cornwall?
3	MR. McDONALD: I wouldn't like to comment on
4	how other people felt.
5	MR. MANSON: But by common view, I'm talking
6	about a reluctance to associate with homosexuals?
7	MR. McDONALD: Probably.
8	MR. MANSON: On the Police Force, would you
9	hear comments about homosexuals?
10	MR. McDONALD: No, sir, I don't recall ever
11	hearing that.
12	MR. MANSON: We've seen some signs in
13	Cornwall linking paedophiles with homosexuals. You'd agree
14	with me that they're two very different groups of people?
15	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
16	MR. MANSON: And you'd agree with me that it
17	would be a big mistake and quite injurious to make a link
18	between paedophiles and homosexuals?
19	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
20	MR. MANSON: Thank you very much. Those are
21	all my questions, Mr. Manderville (sic).
22	MR. McDONALD: You're welcome.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
24	MR. MANSON: Mr. McDonald, I'm sorry.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, sir.

1	Mr. Horn.
2	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR.
3	HORN:
4	MR. HORN: Have you ever hard any
5	discussions with Helen Dunlop regarding
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Horn
7	MR. HORN: Oh, sorry, Frank Horn, Coalition
8	for Action.
9	And I'm just wondering if you've ever had
10	any discussions with Helen Dunlop regarding her views and
11	Perry's views on homosexuals?
12	MR. McDONALD: I don't recall ever having
13	that discussion, no.
14	MR. HORN: Are you aware that last night she
15	made a very public statement regarding these allegations
16	against her? Were you aware that that
17	MR. McDONALD: I know that there was a
18	meeting. I don't know what was said at that meeting.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Why?
20	MR. HORN: Pardon?
21	THE COMMISSIONER: What are you doing?
22	MR. HORN: I'm just asking if he was aware
23	that that whole issue was discussed last night at a public
24	meeting in Cornwall.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: How is that relevant?

1	MR. HORN: Pardon?
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr
3	MR. MANSON: Mr. Commissioner, I was very
4	careful in my questions of the witness. I spoke only of
5	Carson Chisholm.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
7	MR. HORN: The reason why this came out the
8	way it did was because she was concerned about the
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Whoa, whoa
10	MR. HORN: suggestions that are being
11	made.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: What suggestions?
13	MR. HORN: Suggestions that are being made
14	that there's a homophobia by the Dunlops and the Carson
15	Chisholm, and that they're somehow they hate the or
16	they dislike homosexuals and they wanted to make the public
17	statement that that is not true.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: And are you making the
19	public statement for them?
20	MR. HORN: Well, I'm speaking on behalf of
21	the I was at the meeting last night. I heard the
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Sir, I don't need a
23	reporting of what happened last night. You're here to
24	cross-examine this gentleman on the evidence that he has to
25	give.

1	No questions were made of Helen Dunlop or
2	Perry Dunlop's views on homosexuality; none.
3	MR. HORN: Okay. The but it was
4	suggested that Mr. Stuart McDonald here would not have his
5	picture taken with Mr. Craibe because he was a homosexual.
6	MR. McDONALD: No, sir that's not correct.
7	MR. MANSON: (Off mic)the evidence.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Of course not, it isn't.
9	It's not.
10	MR. McDONALD: I had my picture taken with
11	him.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Exactly.
13	MR. HORN: Pardon?
14	MR. McDONALD: I had my picture taken with
15	him.
16	MR. HORN: But initially you didn't want to
17	have it because he was homosexual.
18	MR. McDONALD: No, sir that was not true. I
19	had no
20	MR. MANSON: The evidence was with respect
21	to ordering a suit.
22	MR. McDONALD: The clothes.
23	MR. MANSON: Yeah.
24	MR. HORN: Ordering clothes then. But still
25	

you had reservations about having any association with Mr.

1	Craibe
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Did you
3	MR. HORN: because of it.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: at the beginning?
5	MR. McDONALD: I had some reservations,
6	yeah.
7	MR. HORN: You had reservations about
8	MR. McDONALD: That was some 20 some years
9	ago.
10	MR. HORN: Okay. So maybe you should go get
11	some counselling from Helen Dunlop in regards to this.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, no, no. Mr. Horn,
13	that
14	MR. CALLAGHAN: That's way off.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: that is totally
16	inappropriate.
17	You are a barrister and solicitor. You are
18	an officer of this Inquiry. You have a duty to maintain
19	the decorum and the rules of this Inquiry.
20	And you've been around the block a couple of
21	times and you know that what you just did was improper.
22	And so
23	MR. HORN: I'm sorry. I'm sorry if I've
24	made a mistake and it won't happen again regarding this
25	issue.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: all right. Well, sir
2	MR. HORN: The
3	THE COMMISSIONER: I'm going to hold you
4	to that.
5	MR. HORN: Hey, well, one of the issues that
6	was a major concern of the Coalition was really canvassed
7	to quite an extent by many of the other people who have
8	cross-examining Mr. Stuart McDonald. And it's in regards
9	to the meeting that took place when with the Chief of
10	Police and yourself, Mr. Wells and others.
11	Do you remember that meeting?
12	MR. McDONALD: I don't know what you're
13	talking about.
14	MR. HORN: I'm talking about the meeting
15	that was mentioned by Mr. St. Denis in his evidence.
16	MR. MANSON: We haven't heard from Mr. St.
17	Denis yet.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, Mr. Manson decorum.
19	If you want to object you get up and you do it properly.
20	MR. MANSON: I'm just saying we haven't
21	heard from Mr. St. Denis yet.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: I know that. I know
23	that.
24	MR. HORN: Okay, then we'll I'm talking

about that morning meeting. The morning meeting of the

1	staff where Mr. McDonald was there at the meeting and Mr.
2	Lortie was asking certain questions.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I don't know and
4	you might want to canvass that with him whether the
5	meeting that Lortie Sergeant Lortie described is the
6	same one that this gentleman was at. I don't know.
7	Do you see what I mean?
8	MR. HORN: Pardon?
9	THE COMMISSIONER: There are many morning
10	meetings.
11	MR. HORN: Okay.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Lortie says that he went
13	to a meeting and he said what he said and what everybody
14	else said. You'd have to confirm with this gentleman
15	whether or not the meeting he was at where he heard that
16	the Police Chief and Brunet were going to see the Pope's
17	representative, right
18	MR. HORN: I understand that.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: is the same meeting.
20	MR. HORN: Okay. Was he at a meeting when
21	Mr. Lortie was came and there was some discussions
22	regarding the Silmser matter?
23	MR. McDONALD: I don't recall Mr. Lortie or
24	Sergeant Staff Sergeant Lortie making any comments at
25	the meeting when I heard that the Chief and Staff Sergeant

1	Brunet were going to Ottawa.
2	I wouldn't I can't confirm or I don't
3	think it was the same meeting.
4	MR. HORN: Were you did you watch any of
5	the proceedings before the Commission in the last little
6	while, I believe it was when Mr. Lortie was testifying?
7	MR. McDONALD: No, sir I didn't.
8	MR. HORN: You didn't watch? Did you hear
9	about the him or read about it in the newspaper?
10	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir I did.
11	MR. HORN: Okay. And did you know that he
12	was questioned about this issue about that meeting?
13	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir, I believe so.
14	MR. HORN: And it was by my friend Mr.
15	Stauffer, and Mr. Lortie mentions this okay, we can
16	go to Volume 215.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Just a sec. No, no.
18	MR. HORN: Page 26.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Just a second. We'll get
20	that up on the screen and you'll get a copy in a moment,
21	sir.
22	MR. HORN: Page 26.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Page 26,
24	you're there. What line, sir?
25	MR. HORN: Yes. Line number 2 where Mr.

1	Stauffer was asking the question regarding that meeting and
2	it was supposed to have been the September the $28^{\rm th}$ meeting
3	in which Mr. Lortie answered and said that the Chief was
4	there, the Deputy Chief, Inspector Wells, and he mentioned
5	that you were there also. Do you remember that?
6	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
7	MR. HORN: You don't remember that meeting?
8	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, there were more
10	people than that I think, eh? Am I reading this right?
11	I'm guess Stan Willis was at the meeting.
12	So Wells, the Deputy the Chief, the
13	Deputy Chief, Wells, Mr. McDonald, Mr. Brunet, and maybe
14	Stan Willis.
15	MR. HORN: Yes. And later on at page 189
16	_
17	THE COMMISSIONER: One eighty-nine (189)?
18	MR. HORN: Yes.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, what page?
20	MR. HORN: When my this is when my
21	colleague
22	MR. McDONALD: What line, I'm sorry?
23	MR. HORN: It would be Mr. Paul was asking
24	Mr. Lortie about that meeting. I believe it would be the
25	line 5 yeah, 5.

1	(SHORT PAUSE/COURT PAUSE)
2	MR. HORN: Okay. The gist of what Mr. Paul
3	was dealing with is that he was under the impression that
4	the people who were at the meeting were giving the
5	impression to Mr. Lortie that they knew more than they were
6	telling him about the settlement that had taken place
7	previous to that.
8	MR. McDONALD: I knew nothing about the
9	settlement.
10	MR. HORN: You may not have, and that's the
11	impression that the Chief and others that were there also
12	gave to Mr. Lortie, but he believed that they knew more.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Where do you see that?
14	MR. HORN: If you look at page 189, line 18
15	through to 21:
16	"And the conclusion today that you
17	would draw is that if for some reason
18	there were people at the meeting that
19	did not want to fill you in on the full
20	picture for some reason."
21	THE COMMISSIONER: And the answer was:
22	"Well, they may have thought it wasn't
23	any of my business at that point."
24	Yes, you're right, Mr. Horn.
25	MR. HORN: Pardon?

1	THE COMMISSIONER: You're right.
2	MR. HORN: Yeah, that's right.
3	But earlier on he said earlier on line
4	13, he says:
5	"And having heard that, you would
6	still maintain, obviously, that you
7	were given the impression that nobody
8	knew what was going on at the meeting?
9	That's the impression."
10	THE COMMISSIONER: I think you're on the
11	right track there, Mr. Horn.
12	MR. HORN: Yes. I'm just okay.
13	Whether it's for whatever reason though,
14	that's when when asked the question, really held back
15	information from you. Would you agree with that, that Mr.
16	Paul was asking that question?
17	MR. McDONALD: I'll make it easy on you; I
18	knew nothing about the settlement and I don't recall this
19	meeting and I don't recall Sergeant Lortie asking any
20	questions. So I couldn't give you an opinion one way or
21	the other.
22	MR. HORN: Okay. So you're saying that you
23	were not even at that meeting?
24	MR. McDONALD: I'm not saying that at all.

All I'm saying is I don't recall -- other than -- the only

1	discussion that is relative to the Silmser case was that I
2	heard that the Chief and Staff Sergeant Brunet were going
3	to Ottawa to see the Papal Nuncio and I don't recall what
4	precipitated that statement. I don't know why it came up
5	other than probably somebody said that there was a payoff
6	by the Diocese, but I can't tell you any more than that.
7	MR. HORN: And would you so you're saying
8	that you would not have any understanding as to why this
9	was going on? You were outside the loop?
10	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
11	MR. HORN: So whatever was going on between
12	Shaver or anyone else who was going to the Nuncio, you
13	didn't have any idea about that?
14	MR. McDONALD: No, sir, I didn't.
15	MR. HORN: So you were basically left in the
16	dark, the same as Mr. Lortie, about what was really going
17	on?
18	MR. McDONALD: Well, I you can say
19	whatever you like. I don't know. I don't know whether it
20	was intentional or unintentional, but I was in the dark.
21	MR. HORN: You were in the dark? Did you
22	ask any questions as to why they were going to Ottawa to
23	see the Nuncio?
24	MR. McDONALD: I believe someone had
25	indicated that they there was a payout by the Diocese

1	but, again, I don't know who said it or under what
2	circumstances.
3	MR. HORN: So did you hear it then or
4	afterwards, or when did you hear that?
5	MR. McDONALD: Well, I definitely heard it
6	afterwards, but I probably heard it then for the first
7	time.
8	MR. HORN: Okay. So when you heard
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Ask I'm sorry
10	MR. HORN: Yes.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: you're losing me.
12	What afterwards? That they were gone to that there was
13	a settlement?
14	MR. HORN: A settlement. They were he
15	was under the impression that they were going to Ottawa to
16	see the Papal Nuncio because there was a settlement.
17	Is that what you learned afterwards or at
18	that time?
19	MR. McDONALD: At that time.
20	MR. HORN: At that time? You thought that
21	there was a settlement?
22	MR. McDONALD: Well, I heard that they
23	weren't happy with the Bishop because there was a payout of
24	some kind.

MR. HORN: Okay. Now, that was -- you knew

1	that at that meeting?
2	MR. McDONALD: I believe so.
3	MR. HORN: Okay. So you knew about the
4	settlement then?
5	MR. McDONALD: Only at that meeting.
6	MR. HORN: Pardon?
7	MR. McDONALD: I only found out about it at
8	that meeting. I didn't know about it prior to the meeting.
9	MR. HORN: Did you know anything about the
10	fact that there was a there was pending charges of any
11	kind against anybody?
12	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
13	MR. HORN: So all you knew is that there was
14	a payout?
15	MR. McDONALD: Well, I'll say I did. I
16	don't recall the exact words or who might have said it.
17	All I remember is that the Chief announced that he and
18	Staff Sergeant Brunet would be going to Ottawa to speak to
19	the Papal Nuncio because they weren't happy with the
20	actions of the local Bishop.
21	MR. HORN: Did you inquire right then and
22	there or a little afterwards about a little bit more
23	about what was really going on?
24	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
25	MR. HORN: What was your position at that

1	time?
2	MR. McDONALD: Staff Inspector in charge of
3	Field Operations.
4	MR. HORN: And you still were you still
5	working closely with the Chief of Police and Deputy Chief
6	on these morning meetings and going to all of them?
7	MR. McDONALD: I was going to them when I
8	was there. I don't know how closely I was working with the
9	Chief.
10	MR. HORN: So you're saying that the meeting
11	that took place that time and they were discussing this,
12	you had a suspicion that something was going on?
13	MR. McDONALD: No, sir, I had no suspicions.
14	MR. HORN: There was a payout?
15	MR. McDONALD: I didn't know anything about
16	a payout prior to that meeting.
17	MR. HORN: Okay. But when you heard it, you
18	knew that there was a payout then?
19	MR. McDONALD: Well, I guess if I heard it,
20	I would have known it, yes.
21	MR. HORN: Okay. At that moment you would
22	know that there was a payout?
23	MR. McDONALD: I guess so.
24	MR. HORN: Okay. So did you inquire or did
25	you say, "I don't want to know anything about this"?

I	MR. McDONALD: No, I think it came out in
2	the newspaper and it was fairly common knowledge within a
3	day or two that what had gone on, what had happened.
4	MR. HORN: So would are you suggesting
5	that you heard this; you suspected something?
6	MR. McDONALD: I didn't suspect anything.
7	MR. HORN: You said there was a payout. You
8	thought there was a payout?
9	MR. McDONALD: I was told
10	MR. CALLAGHAN: The witness was told said
11	there was a settlement. You keep on using "payout".
12	MR. HORN: Okay. I'm sorry, a settlement.
13	MR. McDONALD: I was told apparently that
14	there was a settlement, that the Chief and Staff Sergeant
15	Brunet were not happy with the fact that there was a
16	settlement. They were going to go to Ottawa to speak to
17	the Papal Nuncio because they were unhappy with the fact
18	that the Bishop or the Diocese had made a settlement with
19	Mr. Silmser.
20	MR. HORN: Okay.
21	MR. McDONALD: Prior to that meeting, I knew
22	nothing about that.
23	MR. HORN: Okay. So now that you knew, were
24	you did you feel that it was none of your business to
25	get involved in it?

1	MR. McDONALD: No, I don't think so.
2	MR. HORN: Well, what would you what do
3	you think your responsibility was then?
4	MR. McDONALD: I don't think I particularly
5	had a strong feeling that I had a responsibility. The
6	Chief I wasn't involved with the case in any shape, form
7	or way and the Chief and Staff Sergeant Brunet were looking
8	after it. So there was no onus on me to do anything at
9	that point.
10	MR. HORN: And the did that were you
11	aware that Perry Dunlop was involved
12	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
13	MR. HORN: at that point?
14	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
15	MR. HORN: Did you were you aware of
16	anybody else being involved in that other than what you
17	heard there?
18	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
19	MR. HORN: And you only found out a little
20	bit more about what was going really going on a few days
21	later?
22	MR. McDONALD: Sometime after the meeting,
23	yes.
24	MR. HORN: So you didn't do anything for the
25	next few days regarding something like this, whether going

1	to the Papal Nuncio for a very major issue involving the
2	police? You didn't do anything yourself?
3	MR. McDONALD: Such as?
4	MR. HORN: Well, you knew this was going to
5	be a very, very controversial issue, wouldn't you say?
6	MR. McDONALD: I knew it was going to be a
7	controversial issue when I got the complaint about Father
8	Charlie.
9	MR. HORN: No, at the time when you heard
10	that they were going to have to go to Ottawa to the Papal
11	Nuncio dealing with a very controversial issue, did you
12	realize that it was going to be controversial then?
13	MR. McDONALD: I guess so.
14	MR. HORN: And so what was your response?
15	MR. McDONALD: I don't know where you're
16	leading me.
17	MR. HORN: Well, I'm just saying what's your
18	response?
19	THE COMMISSIONER: How did you feel? What
20	did you think, if anything?
21	MR. McDONALD: I guess I well, I didn't
22	know the circumstances of the settlement for that matter
23	and I guess I the Chief and Staff Sergeant Brunet were
24	going to find out from the Papal Nuncio what could be done.
25	So I guess my initial reaction probably would have been one

1	of shock or surprise.
2	It's not something that you hear of very
3	often happening and but again, the Chief was looking
4	after the situation and there was no onus on me other than
5	to perform my normal regular duties. I wasn't involved
6	with this case.
7	MR. HORN: Okay. So you didn't learn
8	anything on your own. You didn't go out and try to find
9	anything out prior to reading it in the newspaper?
10	MR. McDONALD: Well, no, I might have
11	there might have been some discussion going on around the
12	station but I don't think very many people knew very much.
13	There weren't many details other than there had been a
14	settlement. I can't tell you anymore than that.
15	And to be honest with you, back then, some
16	15, 18 years ago, whenever it was, I don't have a
17	tremendous memory at best and I don't recall how I felt or
18	what I was doing at that time.
19	MR. HORN: How did you feel when it involved
20	your brother-in-law?
21	THE COMMISSIONER: At what point?
22	MR. HORN: A family member.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: At what point?
24	MR. HORN: I'm talking about the fact that
25	he was the one that opened this situation up.

1	MR. McDONALD: I didn't know it at that
2	time.
3	MR. HORN: But when you did find out?
4	MR. McDONALD: I was probably disappointed,
5	somewhat taken aback but, as I say, I mixed feelings
6	probably.
7	MR. HORN: Okay. So what was the why
8	would the family feel that you let them down?
9	MR. McDONALD: You'd have to ask them that.
10	MR. HORN: Did you did you feel that you
11	let them down?
12	MR. McDONALD: No, sir, I didn't.
13	MR. HORN: You don't feel that you let Perry
14	down?
15	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
16	MR. HORN: My friend was asking you about
17	the situation back in the '80s when you were the one that
18	was involved in disciplining Perry. He may not have been
19	your brother-in-law yet but was he with Helen at the time?
20	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
21	MR. HORN: And
22	MR. McDONALD: There was no relationship
23	then.
24	MR. HORN: There was no relationship at the
25	time?

1	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
2	MR. HORN: And the was there a feeling of
3	anger afterwards between you and him?
4	MR. McDONALD: Not on my part.
5	MR. HORN: No, I'm talking about you must
6	have sensed something from him?
7	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
8	MR. HORN: Or Helen.
9	MR. McDONALD: Helen wasn't around then.
10	MR. HORN: Oh, okay, I understand that.
11	Okay. But Perry, was there any feelings of animosity?
12	MR. McDONALD: You'd have to ask him that.
13	MR. HORN: Okay.
14	MR. McDONALD: I had none.
15	MR. HORN: Now, the situation that occurred
16	with the when you were charged because of the liquor
17	offence.
18	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
19	MR. HORN: Was there suggestions that that
20	was Helen and Dunlop are behind that?
21	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
22	MR. HORN: Or Carson?
23	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
24	MR. HORN: You never suggested that?
25	MR. McDONALD: No, sir. I never had any

1	suspicions that they were involved any way any which
2	way.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Wait a minute; we're
4	talking about your daughter's wedding.
5	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: That you organized?
7	MR. McDONALD: That's well, it was a
8	reception prior, yeah. No, there was never any belief that
9	they were involved in any way whatsoever.
10	MR. HORN: You never thought that they were
11	the ones that went to and reported you?
12	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
13	MR. HORN: There's just one other area.
14	Were you involved in any way with the Skinner
15	investigations?
16	MR. McDONALD: I believe that they
17	questioned me as to my role in the taking the complaint.
18	MR. HORN: How did you feel about the
19	suggestion that Sebalj was put into a position where she
20	was over her head?
21	MR. McDONALD: I believe it was a person's
22	opinion and I don't know whether she was over her head or
23	not. My only feeling was that when it was initially
24	that she didn't have enough experience. I believe that she
25	was a very intelligent, competent investigator, police

1	officer, but my only feeling at the time of the assigning
2	was that she didn't have the experience to maybe
3	required to handle that type of investigation. It wasn't a
4	slight on her personally and I had no feelings afterwards.
5	If it was reassigned, it was reassigned.
6	MR. HORN: Okay. Did you feel that when you
7	since you found out about the fact that the Chief had to
8	go see the Papal Nuncio that and this was going to
9	become a very controversial situation. How did you feel
10	about Mrs. Sebalj being put into the position of being
11	responsible for the investigation?
12	MR. McDONALD: I can't say I ever made the
13	connection, to be honest with you.
14	MR. HORN: You knew that there was going to
15	be lots of controversy, didn't you?
16	MR. McDONALD: I thought it had the
17	possibility for controversy. I shouldn't say controversy
18	but being a high profile investigation, I'll put it that
19	way.
20	MR. HORN: Okay. Do you think that they
21	should have assigned somebody with more experience to
22	something like this?
23	MR. McDONALD: I'm not going to second guess
24	anybody.
25	MR. HORN: Okay. So because it was out of

1	your nands, somebody else made that decision?
2	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
3	MR. HORN: So you never you never thought
4	that that was you may have thought that it was wrong but
5	you didn't say anything about it?
6	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
7	MR. HORN: You kept it to yourself?
8	MR. McDONALD: I didn't think it was wrong.
9	I kept it to myself. I I didn't have all the facts.
10	For whatever reason, it was assigned to her. It was
11	assigned to her. Again, I didn't know the circumstances.
12	I didn't know until many months later that she was
13	conducting the case. I thought for a long time it was
14	Staff Sergeant Lortie that was doing it. And to be honest
15	with you, it wasn't discussed and if it was given to
16	Inspector or Constable Sebalj, it was obviously felt by
17	the people that did it that she could handle it and I'm not
18	going to I didn't lose any sleep over that.
19	MR. HORN: That's all the questions I have.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Horn.
21	Can we canvass time to see how we're going
22	to manage our time from now until 2:00?
23	MR. STAUFFER: I have tried to do that
24	informally and Mr. Commissioner, Mr. Lee 10 to 15
25	minutes. Then Mr. Neville is saying of course depending on

l	what Mr. Lee asks, he won't be that long. I gather no
2	questions from the Ministry of the Attorney General or
3	Corrections, or from the OPP. I'm not sure about the OPPA;
4	no questions. No questions from the CAS.
5	And so I think we're looking pretty good, I
6	hope, in terms of the two o'clock deadline, Mr.
7	Commissioner.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you.
9	Let's go.
10	Go ahead, Mr. Lee, and then we'll take a
11	short break and then we'll finish up.
12	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR. LEE:
13	MR. LEE: Staff Inspector McDonald, my name
14	is Dallas Lee. I'm counsel for the Victims' Group. I just
15	have a couple of areas that I want to touch on briefly with
16	you.
17	Do you recall being interviewed by the OPP
18	in the summer of 1999?
19	MR. McDONALD: I remember being interviewed
20	by the OPP on a couple of occasions. I couldn't tell you
21	what year it happened.
22	MR. LEE: Let me take you to a document
23	here.
24	Madam Clerk, it's a new document; 712989.
25	MR. McDONALD: There was one occasion I was

1	interviewed by Constable Dupuis and another officer.
2	MR. LEE: What I'm going to show you here is
3	an audio taped interview report of an interview dated July
4	16, '99 and conducted by Officer Dupuis.
5	MR. McDONALD: Okay.
6	MR. LEE: I just have on small point I want
7	to take you to on that.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Exhibit
9	Number 1571 is an audio taped interview report of Stuart
10	McDonald on 16 th of July 1999.
11	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-1571:
12	(712989) Audio Taped Interview Report -
13	Stuart McDonald with OPP J.B. Dupuis dated
14	16 Jul 99
15	MR. LEE: Do you have that in front of you,
16	sir?
17	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
18	MR. LEE: And it says here that the place of
19	the interview was the Long Sault Detachment OPP. Do you
20	recall that?
21	MR. McDONALD: I think so.
22	MR. LEE: It looks like it was about 24
23	minutes long; does that seem about right to you?
24	MR. McDONALD: Okay.
25	MR. LEE: The only part I want to take you

1	to is if you look down at the very bottom right hand on the
2	page there's page 9 of 16, I'd like to take you to.
3	It's a Bates page ending in 795 and the a little bit
4	lower than that, Madam Clerk; the second answer from the
5	Staff Inspector.
6	And what Officer Dupuis asks you is:
7	"Do you feel that there was any cover-
8	up by the senior management of the
9	Cornwall Police Department, to your
10	knowledge?"
11	And I'm interested in the first part of your
12	answer here, you answer:
13	"Not that I'm aware of. I'd never seen
14	any before and, um, of course, I had
15	Chief Shaver and I weren't on the best
16	working relationships because I didn't
17	always feel that he was 100 percent
18	truthful in all his relations and
19	conversations."
20	Do you see that, sir?
21	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
22	MR. LEE: And then you go on to something
23	else and over on the top of the next page, Officer Dupuis
24	follows up with you on that and he asks:
25	"When you said you didn't think Claude

1	Shaver was just always truthful in his
2	comments, was this pertaining to this
3	specifically or any other items through
4	your work relationship?"
5	And you answer:
6	"Other things through my work
7	relationship, putting out clearance
8	rates; I still see in the paper where
9	they're putting out clearance rates of
10	45 and 50 percent, and any police
11	department that can say that they're
12	solving 50 percent and I did
13	statistics for many, many years and I
14	know in the summer they get 2,000
15	bicycles and I know they don't solve
16	1,000 of them. And anybody, any police
17	department that says they're solving 50
18	percent of their caseload, I look at
19	with a wry eye, I'll put it that way."
20	Do you see that, sir?
21	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
22	MR. LEE: And I won't ask you if you
23	specifically recall giving that answer to
24	MR. McDONALD: I do, sir.
25	MR. LEE: You do remember giving that

1	answer?
2	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
3	MR. LEE: And was that true at the time?
4	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
5	MR. LEE: And you still feel that way now?
6	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
7	MR. LEE: Can you explain to us a little bit
8	exactly what your concern is with the clearance rates?
9	Possibly if you'd like to begin by explaining what your
10	understanding what clearance rates means.
11	MR. McDONALD: Every time you have a crime,
12	the crime is either cleared by charge or cleared otherwise
13	or unfounded and or not cleared at all. And a clearance
14	rate means that you've cleared the crime by laying a charge
15	or saying it was unfounded which means it didn't happen at
16	all or cleared otherwise meaning that there was
17	circumstances sometimes a person might be charged with
18	15 break and enters and you'll say, "Well, we'll only
19	charge you with five of them and we'll clear the other 10,"
20	otherwise not using up the court's time. Most of the time
21	the it's a guilty plea is going to be received on
22	five of them and the other 10 are just cleared otherwise.
23	So that for every crime you have, if you
24	have a clearance if you have 100 crimes and you have a -
25	- you clear 10 of them or you charge 10 people, you've got

1	a 10 percent clearance rate. If you've got 3,000 charges,
2	you'd have to clear 3,000 crimes, you'd have to clear
3	1,500 of them in order to get a clearance rate of 50
4	percent.
5	MR. LEE: One of the things you say in your
6	answer here is that you did statistics for many, many
7	years.
8	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
9	MR. LEE: When you refer to statistics, do
10	you mean clearance rate statistics?
11	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
12	MR. LEE: And what would you expect, based
13	on that experience, an accurate clearance rate to be?
14	MR. McDONALD: Somewhat less than that.
15	MR. LEE: Can you quantify that at all?
16	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
17	MR. LEE: Ten (10) percent?
18	MR. McDONALD: Probably more than that, but
19	
20	MR. LEE: Ten (10)percent would be on the
21	low side.
22	MR. McDONALD: Probably, yes.
23	MR. LEE: How about 30 percent?
24	MR. McDONALD: Depending on the crime, but -
25	_ _

1	MR. LEE: One in every three.
2	MR. McDONALD: Well
3	MR. LEE: It sounds a little more reasonable
4	than 50 percent to you anyways?
5	MR. McDONALD: Yes.
6	MR. LEE: And do you recall ever having a
7	discussion with Chief Shaver at any point about these
8	clearance rates that were being put out there?
9	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
10	MR. LEE: And can you tell us what was said?
11	MR. McDONALD: I objected to the way that
12	they were attempting to clear clear crimes merely to
13	have the statistics look good.
14	MR. LEE: And what was his response to that?
15	MR. McDONALD: I don't think he cared much
16	one way or another what my opinion was at that time.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: But did he respond to
18	you?
19	MR. McDONALD: Probably, but I I don't
20	I don't recall the exact
21	MR. LEE: Do you recall at any point under
22	Chief Shaver there being a shift in the way that crime
23	statistics were reported?
24	MR. McDONALD: Could you ask that question
25	again, please?

1	MR. LEE: My question is whether or not
2	during the time you spent working with Chief Shaver whether
3	at any point there was a shift in the way those were
4	reported? In other words, did it appear to you that your
5	concerns were taken to heart and changes made?
6	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
7	MR. LEE: In the first part of your answer
8	that I read to you, you said that, and I quote:
9	"I didn't always feel that he was 100
10	percent truthful in all his relations
11	and conversations."
12	And then when Officer Dupuis follows up with
13	you on that you talk about the clearance rate. Was there
14	anything else you were referring to there?
15	MR. McDONALD: I don't recall at the time.
16	MR. LEE: What about sitting here today
17	looking back on it, do you have any other concerns about
18	Chief Shaver's truthfulness in his relations and
19	conversations?
20	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
21	MR. LEE: Can you expand on that, please?
22	MR. McDONALD: No, in general conversations,
23	I often I often felt that Chief Shaver used numbers to
24	his convenience, and where they came from was suspect.
25	MR. LEE: Was this with you generally that

yes.

1	you observed this?
2	MR. McDONALD: No, with everybody.
3	MR. LEE: Did you ever raise that issue with
4	Chief Shaver?
5	MR. McDONALD: A lot of people did. I think
6	that's what led to some of the correspondence we looked at
7	earlier.
8	MR. LEE: In terms of the memo from the
9	staff sergeants.
10	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
11	MR. LEE: And from the inspectors.
12	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
13	MR. LEE: You've been asked about certain
14	statements made by various individuals about having seen
15	you at certain places in your associations with certain
16	people. We've heard evidence from people at this Inquiry
17	who would have well, let me ask you this; are you aware
18	are you familiar with the names Gerald Renshaw or Robert
19	Renshaw?
20	MR. McDONALD: I've heard the names before.
21	I don't know those people.
22	MR. LEE: Do you know in what context you
23	would have heard those names, at this Inquiry or
24	MR. McDONALD: In relation to the Inquiry,

24

25

some of your thoughts. And one of the things you told us

recommendations and you talked to us a little bit about

chief, you were asked whether or not you had any

24

25

1	near the end was that there was little evidence to support
2	the allegations that we've been discussing here generally
3	that led to this Inquiry, and I took that as meaning, not
4	specifically the allegations of who you were involved with,
5	but generally what has surrounded Cornwall. Was that what
6	you were referring to?
7	MR. McDONALD: I I just think that I
8	was trying to say that there's a very small percentage of
9	the community that is involved in this paedophilia and that
10	it's a very unfortunate situation that the the whole
11	community is is tainted or painted by a small percentage
12	of of people that has received more notoriety than it
13	probably deserves. Not not the fact that there were
14	victims, but that the thing has become blown out of
15	proportion, I believe. And, again, not for not for the
16	victims, but it's just a spotlight has been put on a very
17	small percentage of this population and it's it's a very
18	unfortunate situation.
19	MR. LEE: And you understand there are a
20	couple of issues being dealt with; one is child abuse and
21	who was victimized and who was doing the victimizing, but
22	the other part of it and what really leads us here today is
23	the allegation of cover-up.

MR. McDONALD: That's correct.

MR. LEE: And you don't have any information

1	about what evidence exists in terms of supporting or not
2	supporting the idea of a cover-up, is that right?
3	MR. McDONALD: I I never believed that
4	there was any cover-up. I have no evidence to to
5	substantiate that there was or was not a cover-up. I have,
6	as I say, a firm belief that there never was a cover-up by
7	anyone within the Cornwall Police Department. Those people
8	that I know when I worked there would not do something like
9	that and it's it's insulting to me that anybody would
10	insinuate that any member of the Cornwall Police Department
11	would cover up this type of action.
12	MR. LEE: I am not going to bicker with your
13	personal opinion, sir. What I'm interested in is the basis
14	for them, I suppose.
15	You last worked at the Cornwall Police in
16	the fall of 1994.
17	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
18	MR. LEE: Your retirement date was in the
19	middle of 1995?
20	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
21	MR. LEE: You have never personally
22	investigated any matter relating to the allegations we're
23	dealing with here?
24	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
25	MR. LEE: You've never supervised any such

1	investigation?
2	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
3	MR. LEE: You never played any part in any
4	of the OPP investigations relating to these matters?
5	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
6	MR. LEE: You've not been privy to the
7	details of any of those investigations?
8	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
9	MR. LEE: So the information that you have
10	is based on conversations you've had with people?
11	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
12	MR. LEE: It's based on media reports?
13	MR. McDONALD: Probably.
14	MR. LEE: Maybe based to some extent on what
15	you've heard at this Inquiry?
16	MR. McDONALD: Yeah, and the fact that I
17	knew most of the people that I worked with.
18	MR. LEE: And would you agree with me that
19	not only have you not had access to the actual fruits of
20	investigations, you personally have not had an opportunity
21	to assess the adequacy of those investigations?
22	MR. McDONALD: No, sir, I haven't.
23	MR. LEE: Thank you very much. Those are my
24	questions.
25	MR. McDONALD: You're welcome.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Neville?
2	Oh, I'm sorry; why don't we take a short
3	break. We'll take a 10-minute break, then we'll come back
4	Thank you.
5	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre
6	veuillez vous lever.
7	This hearing will resume at 12:50.
8	Upon recessing at 12:34 p.m./
9	L'audience est suspendue à 12h34
10	Upon resuming at 12:54 p.m./
11	L'audience est reprise à 12h54
12	THE REGISTRAR: This hearing is now resumed
13	Please be seated. Veuillez vous asseoir.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Neville.
15	MR. NEVILLE: Good afternoon, Commissioner.
16	STUART McDONALD, Resumed/Sous le même serment:
17	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR.
18	NEVILLE:
19	MR. NEVILLE: Good afternoon, Mr. McDonald.
20	My name is Michael Neville and I represent
21	Father Charles MacDonald and the Estate of Ken Seguin and
22	his family, and I only have a just a few questions to
23	ask of you this afternoon to finish off.
24	Could I refer Inspector McDonald,
25	Commissioner, to the same document that Mr. Lee did, the

1	statement of July '99? And I may have missed whether it
2	was made an exhibit. I didn't hear a number. It was
3	1571, Commissioner.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
5	MR. McDONALD: I've got it here.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, we have it here.
7	MR. NEVILLE: And if I could just refer you
8	what the officers do here, Mr. McDonald, is they take
9	you through a series of names and ask you who you knew
10	whom you knew, I should say; right?
11	MR. McDONALD: Okay.
12	MR. NEVILLE: And one of the persons they
13	asked you about was, for example, Murray MacDonald, this
14	fellow Leroux, et cetera, various numbers of priests and
15	how you knew them and the like; right?
16	MR. McDONALD: Correct.
17	MR. NEVILLE: So if I could refer you
18	I'll use the little numbers at the bottom, page such-and-
19	such of 16. For Father MacDonald, it's on page 12 of 16.
20	MR. McDONALD: Yes.
21	MR. NEVILLE: It's at the bottom. Have you
22	found that?
23	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
24	MR. NEVILLE: So Officer Dupuis asks you
25	about your knowledge of him, and you say:

Carnegie course.

1	"I've known Father Charles since I was
2	probably in Grade 7 or 8. I knew he
3	came from Glen Nevis."
4	That's a small area just outside Cornwall?
5	MR. McDONALD: Yeah, between near the
6	Quebec border.
7	MR. NEVILLE: Right.
8	"And he was a teacher before he went
9	into the priesthood. I know he went
10	out with Katherine Olive MacPhee on
11	occasion. I don't know. They would go
12	to dances and stuff like that. She was
13	from Alexandria."
14	And he asks you if that's part of Father
15	Charles being a priest and you say, "Yes".
16	Now, how did you have that degree of
17	knowledge of him?
18	MR. McDONALD: Well, I grew up in
19	Alexandria, a town of about 2,500 to 3,500 people.
20	MR. NEVILLE: Okay.
21	MR. McDONALD: You knew everybody.
22	MR. NEVILLE: Right.
23	MR. McDONALD: And when I was in Grade 7 or
24	8 I took a Christopher course. It's something like a Dale

l	MR. NEVILLE: Yes, speaking in the
2	MR. McDONALD: For public speaking, and I
3	believe Father Charles MacDonald or Charles MacDonald, at
4	that time, was one of the instructors.
5	MR. NEVILLE: Okay. So you've known him a
6	great deal of time then?
7	MR. McDONALD: After that, I wouldn't say
8	that I knew him personally or had very close contact
9	perhaps until I saw him occasionally as being a priest, but
10	I knew him on a first-name basis.
11	MR. NEVILLE: All right.
12	And the next reference I'd like to give you
13	to look at, Commissioner, it's a different statement done
14	by Mr. McDonald, and the Document Number, sir, is 712991.
15	It's a second interview with the Ontario Provincial Police
16	on the $10^{\rm th}$ of February, 2000, not yet an exhibit, sir.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm. Thank you.
18	Exhibit Number 1572 is an audio-taped
19	interview report of Stuart McDonald. The date of the
20	interview is the 10^{th} of February, 2000.
21	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-1572:
22	(712991) Audio-taped Interview Report -
23	Stuart McDonald with OPP J.B. Dupuis and P.
24	Hall dated February 10, 2000
25	MR. NEVILLE: And I just want to refer Mr.

1	McDonald, Commissioner, to page again using the bottom
2	numbers page 8 of 12.
3	Actually, the question is and I'll just
4	read it to save time. It comes on the bottom of page 7,
5	Commissioner, as follows. Inspector Hall says:
6	"Did Perry Dunlop ever discuss with you
7	his concerns about the investigation
8	being terminated?"
9	And your answer starts at the top of the
10	page as follows:
11	"No, not to my knowledge. Now, they
12	there were some conversations. They
13	were at my place. Constable Dunlop and
14	his wife, Carson Chisholm and their
15	lawyer had come to my place to inform
16	me that, um, a Leroux chap had made
17	allegations that I was seen at some
18	cottage down in the east front and
19	there was a lot of conversation went on
20	that day. The gist of the thing was I
21	told them I had never been there and
22	I'd be glad to take a lie detector test
23	to prove that I'd never been there, and
24	they basically called me a liar and a
25	whole bunch of other things. So I

I	threw them out of the house."
2	So I take it there were more negative things
3	said to you and about you than simply the fact they felt
4	you were lying?
5	MR. McDONALD: Probably at that time, but I
6	
7	MR. NEVILLE: I'm asking you that because
8	one of the other lawyers asked you whether the word
9	"pedophile" Mr. Manson, I believe "pedophilia" had
10	been mentioned. I'm going to suggest that they may well
11	have even accused you of being a pedophile?
12	MR. McDONALD: I don't have a conscious
13	recollection of that, to be honest with you.
14	MR. NEVILLE: I understand.
15	MR. McDONALD: And what might have been
16	said, what those other things were, I can't consciously
17	recall at this time.
18	MR. NEVILLE: Certainly. But when you were
19	interviewed by these officers some eight years ago, you
20	were able to recall that there was more than just being
21	called a liar involved?
22	MR. McDONALD: Possibly. I don't recall at
23	this time.
24	MR. NEVILLE: Would you stand by this
25	version that you gave them?

1	MR. McDONALD: Probably, yes.
2	MR. NEVILLE: Fair enough.
3	MR. McDONALD: And just further down, sir,
4	in the middle of the page, there's a specific question
5	about the lawyer. Mr. Hall says:
6	"If I mention the name Charles
7	Bourgeois, would that sound"
8	Yourself:
9	"Could be, quite possibly could be. He
10	didn't enamour me to himself at that
11	particular interview."
12	Can you explain what you meant when you told
13	Officer Hall that?
14	MR. McDONALD: He probably I'm trying to
15	think of a nice word for what I want to say. He upset me.
16	MR. NEVILLE: All right.
17	I take it he was one of the ones being
18	and don't please agree if you don't agree with me,
19	say so. He was one of the ones being particularly
20	accusatory of you?
21	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
22	MR. NEVILLE: Okay. So it isn't just family
23	members. It's this member of the Bar who's doing it?
24	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
25	MR. NEVILLE: In your own home, at your own

1	dining room?
2	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
3	MR. NEVILLE: Now, just on that particular
4	point, prior to what we'll call the Perry Dunlop
5	controversies, Perry and Helen Dunlop had been in your
6	home, I presume, on many occasions?
7	MR. McDONALD: Correct.
8	MR. NEVILLE: And you in theirs?
9	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
10	MR. NEVILLE: And they are aunt and uncle to
11	your five children?
12	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
13	MR. NEVILLE: And you and your wife are aunt
14	and uncle to their children?
15	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
16	MR. NEVILLE: And your children knew their
17	children as they were growing up?
18	MR. McDONALD: Up until they left for the
19	west coast.
20	MR. NEVILLE: Right.
21	And I take it, sir, and we'll try to help
22	you with the date that things started going downhill, but
23	certainly all of that family foundation is gone as of now?
24	MR. McDONALD: With the Dunlops it is. It's
25	not gone with the rest of the family.

1	MR. NEVILLE: No, no, I mean just with Perry
2	and Helen and their family?
3	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
4	MR. NEVILLE: And that is not by your choice
5	or the choice of you and your wife?
6	MR. McDONALD: No, sir. We've tried on at
7	least a couple of occasions to see them and speak to them,
8	but we weren't able to do it.
9	MR. NEVILLE: All right.
10	Now, I just want to touch briefly, and I'll
11	come back to a couple of those points in a minute to close,
12	but I just want to make a reference to one professional
13	dealing you had with Mr. Seguin whom you knew as a
14	probation officer. You knew him a little bit from your
15	younger days and his in the St. Andrews area, is what I
16	understood?
17	MR. McDONALD: Correct.
18	MR. NEVILLE: And teen dances or young adult
19	dances, social events?
20	MR. McDONALD: Correct.
21	MR. NEVILLE: And you got to know him on a
22	social level albeit perhaps not well but certainly you've
23	talked to him and who he was.
24	MR. McDONALD: Correct. We didn't travel in
25	the same circles

1	MR. NEVILLE: Right.
2	MR. McDONALD: by any stretch of the
3	imagination but we definitely conversed.
4	MR. NEVILLE: All right. And if I
5	understood you correctly your wife is from the St. Andrews
6	area as is the Seguin family?
7	MR. McDONALD: Correct.
8	MR. NEVILLE: Fair enough. If I could refer
9	the witness, Commissioner, to Document 100333? This is a
10	letter authored by Staff Inspector McDonald, Commissioner,
11	on October 22 nd , 1990.
12	And I'll leave it with you, sir. I'll just
13	simply have him identify it and confirm the topic.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, it's to Emile
15	Robert.
16	MR. NEVILLE: It is, sir but yes I'll deal
17	with it briefly.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: One five seven three
19	(1573) is the exhibit.
20	MR. NEVILLE: Thank you, 1573.
21	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-1573:
22	(100333) Letter from Stuart McDonald to
23	Emile Robert dated 22 Oct 90
24	MR. NEVILLE: And you're the author of this
25	letter, Staff Inspector?

1	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir, I am.
2	MR. NEVILLE: And you sent it to Mr. Robert,
3	then the Area Manager of Corrections here in the city?
4	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
5	MR. NEVILLE: And it deals with you
6	commending Mr. Seguin for an act of courage in helping to
7	resolve a hostage-taking situation?
8	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
9	MR. NEVILLE: And you are a direct
10	participant with him?
11	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
12	MR. NEVILLE: And much of that is actually -
13	- starts on the bottom paragraph on, I'll use the number of
14	the letter, page 3, through to the end of the letter
15	including the fact that the gentleman was clearly
16	emotionally disturbed, if not mentally disturbed, and was
17	eventually take for care at a hospital in the company of
18	yourself and Mr. Seguin in the cruiser.
19	MR. McDONALD: Correct.
20	MR. NEVILLE: And you were commending him
21	for recognition to his boss.
22	MR. McDONALD: It was a very touch
23	situation.
24	MR. NEVILLE: All right; thank you.
25	Now coming back to this question of timing

1	and the breakdown of the family connection between you and
2	your family and the and Mr. Dunlop and Helen, that is
3	Perry and Helen Dunlop, if I understood your evidence for
4	the Commissioner the things started to go bad, take a
5	downturn when you were felt to have been not supportive of
6	him in relation to a Police Act matter arising out of the
7	dealings he had had with the Silmser statement and the CAS?
8	MR. McDONALD: Correct.
9	MR. NEVILLE: And we know from your evidence
10	to the Commissioner that you were effectively retired by
11	the fall of '94, as in not reporting to the station;
12	playing out the time basically.
13	MR. McDONALD: Correct.
14	MR. NEVILLE: All right. So if I could
15	refer the witness, Commissioner, to help us with a date to
16	Document 728381.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Exhibit
18	Number 1574, internal correspondence to Acting Chief
19	Johnston from Deputy Chief St. Denis dated April 28th, 1994.
20	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-1574:
21	(728381) Internal Correspondence from J. St.
22	Denis to C. Johnston dated 28 Apr 94
23	MR. NEVILLE: You have the document there,
24	Staff Inspector?
25	MR. McDONALD: Yes, I do.

1	MR. NEVILLE: All right. And we can see on
2	the bottom left that you're cc'd on it. It's safe to
3	assume you likely got it, albeit it's a long time ago.
4	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
5	MR. NEVILLE: All right. And we can see
6	what it's about. In essence it's an indication that Mr.
7	Silmser had filed a citizen's complaint, and our
8	Commissioner's heard a great deal about that and will
9	likely hear a bit more when Staff Sergeant Wells comes.
10	And it appears that there was a management
11	level discussion, so to speak, and that you declared a
12	conflict, I presume, because by that point you were in-
13	laws?
14	MR. McDONALD: Correct.
15	MR. NEVILLE: All right. And then it says
16	that the matter had clearly been decided upon as one
17	meriting a proceeding under the PSA and that's what this
18	memo indicates with a date of late April almost exactly 14
19	years ago, late April 1994.
20	So the breakdown in the relationship from
21	your purported non-support likely measured from roughly
22	this time, the spring of 1994. Because I think the
23	Commissioner will hear, sir, that if he hasn't already,
24	that Mr. Dunlop was served officially I believe Mr.
25	Wells will tell us that in May of '94.

1	MR. MCDONALD: I was the Hearing Officer for
2	the Force and as such I would act as judge
3	MR. NEVILLE: Right.
4	MR. McDONALD: for any Police Act
5	charges. Prior to Constable Dunlop marrying Helen, I acted
6	as the Hearing Officer on a couple of occasions but that
7	was prior to his marriage.
8	MR. NEVILLE: Yes, we've heard we've had
9	some evidence on that, just so you know.
10	MR. McDONALD: So now what I was saying is
11	if I guess we probably met and I don't recall this
12	specifically but if we met, I indicated that now that Mr.
13	Dunlop was my brother-in-law that I would be in conflict
14	sitting as the Hearing Officer on any charges.
15	MR. NEVILLE: Of course. I'm more
16	interested in, sir and the reason I went to this
17	document is to try to help us with a date. Because what
18	you told the Commissioner was that your wife and yourself
19	were frozen out, pushed aside I forget the exact words
20	he used by Helen and Perry Dunlop because you were felt
21	to have not been of sufficient support to him on this
22	Police Act matter.
23	MR. McDONALD: Perhaps. I think it was a
24	gradual or an evolutionary thing and I don't know if
25	there's a specific date or time or month that you could put

1 your finger on when this took place.

As I say, I couldn't put a month or a two or three or four month timeframe or a year. I think it was an evolutionary thing and when it became known or realized by myself and my wife -- my wife says I'm rather clueless in things of that nature, that she would be much more attuned to other people's feelings. If I found at all it probably was from her.

MR. NEVILLE: All right. Let me just come back here because here's what I took down in evidence. And I believe this is actually with Mr. Stauffer. He confirmed with you that you all would see each other on a family type basis, dinners, et cetera and he asked you at what point -- if in fact and at what point things changed.

And your answer was much to this effect;

"after all of this -- after this all exploded when Perry

Dunlop was charged, they felt I didn't support him. They

cut off my wife and I from family matters."

MR. McDONALD: Yeah. And it was after but I don't know ---

MR. NEVILLE: Okay, I know that. So it would be after -- would it be not fair to say having seen this memo with its date, it would be sometime after this date, because up until this date or shortly after he wasn't charged.

1	MR. MCDONALD: 1
2	MR. NEVILLE: Is that fair?
3	MR. McDONALD: It's fair.
4	MR. NEVILLE: Okay. So by the time you get
5	this very unpleasant visit at your dining room table in
6	November, 1996 there had been effectively no family
7	relations, no family rapport between your family and the
8	Perry Dunlop family for a couple of years?
9	MR. McDONALD: As I say, I don't know if it
10	was early '94 or late '94 or early '95. There was a
11	chilling of the relationship that my wife attempted to
12	visit their house and talk with them and there was a lack
13	of reception, perhaps.
14	MR. NEVILLE: Right. All I'm getting at,
15	sir, if you just listen to the question, is that by the
16	time the event happens in November, '96, which was not
17	pleasant, there had a very there had been a very chilled
18	relationship between the two families, let's say for some
19	time. Is that not accurate?
20	MR. McDONALD: It's possible it's accurate.
21	I wouldn't say very chilled. There was no animosity on the
22	part of my wife and myself.
23	MR. NEVILLE: But that's the point, sir,
24	there wasn't anything causing you to treat them
25	differently. But for some reason you were being treated

1	differently.
2	MR. McDONALD: That's correct.
3	MR. NEVILLE: All right.
4	Now I just want to finish off with one
5	point, briefly. Mr. Manson had you look at one of the
6	Statements of Claim in Mr. Dunlop's lawsuit, and in
7	particular had you look at a series of paragraphs which
8	said very nasty things about you.
9	MR. McDONALD: M'hm.
10	MR. NEVILLE: Now, am I correct and
11	please tell me if I'm not as part of preparing yourself
12	to assist us here at the Inquiry, you, I take it, saw some
13	of these documents in recent weeks?
14	MR. McDONALD: I did.
15	MR. NEVILLE: And read the statement of
16	claim that Ms. Manson showed you, which I think is our
17	Exhibit 672. You would have seen that prior to his showing
18	you paragraphs today?
19	MR. McDONALD: Probably.
20	MR. NEVILLE: And you certainly saw one or
21	more versions of Leroux's statements as part of
22	MR. McDONALD: Yes, I did.
23	MR. NEVILLE: Okay. So you're aware from
24	looking at that statement of claim and the Leroux documents
25	that the Leroux documents in particular, not exclusive but

1	in particular, are very much a foundation of the
2	allegations against you in the statement of claim that you
3	have now seen?
4	MR. McDONALD: I can understand that.
5	MR. NEVILLE: And against others?
6	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
7	MR. NEVILLE: And when we look at the
8	statement of claim, or the style of cause as Mr. Manson
9	described it, we see apart from the former Chief in
10	that, we see Staff Sergeant Brunet?
11	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
12	MR. NEVILLE: Staff Sergeant Wells?
13	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
14	MR. NEVILLE: You knew those men?
15	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
16	MR. NEVILLE: Worked with them for a number
17	of years?
18	MR. McDONALD: From the time they started on
19	the Police Department.
20	MR. NEVILLE: Honourable men?
21	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir, very honourable.
22	MR. NEVILLE: Good police officers?
23	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
24	MR. NEVILLE: You saw in the same statement
25	of claim equally devastating allegations about them; right?

1	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
2	MR. NEVILLE: Corruption?
3	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
4	MR. NEVILLE: Some of the worst allegations
5	you could make against a citizen, let alone a police
6	officer?
7	MR. McDONALD: Correct.
8	MR. NEVILLE: And the fallout that you spoke
9	so painfully and eloquently about in the end in your
10	recommendations and the tainting of the community flows
11	from this lawsuit and those statements, in part?
12	MR. McDONALD: Probably.
13	MR. NEVILLE: Thank you. That's all.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. All right.
15	So Mr. Chisholm, you have no questions?
16	MR. CHISHOLM: No questions. Thank you.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
18	Monsieur Rouleau?
19	MR. ROULEAU: No questions.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: No questions.
21	Mr. Kloeze?
22	MR. KLOEZE: No questions. Thank you.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
24	Who do we have left here? So Mr. Kozloff?
25	MR. KOZLOFF: Good afternoon, sir.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Good afternoon.
2	MR. KOZLOFF: I have no questions, Mr.
3	Commissioner.
4	I just wanted to reassure the witness that
5	my wife thinks exactly the same thing and I'm sure
6	everybody else in the room who has been married as long as
7	you and I have are in the same boat, sir. Thank you.
8	MR. McDONALD: Thank you.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: I wouldn't know because I
10	am much younger than you, Mr. Kozloff.
11	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
12	MR. KOZLOFF: There will come a time, sir,
13	you will see.
14	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Several years after
16	yours.
17	Mr. Wallace's partner?
18	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
19	MR. WALLACE: Touché. Nothing. Thank you,
20	sir.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
22	Mr. Callaghan?
23	CROSS-EXAMINAITON BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR.
24	CALLAGHAN:
25	MR. CALLAGHAN: Inspector McDonald, I just

1	have a few questions.
2	If I could take you to Exhibit 1571 and Mr.
3	Neville was reviewing with you certain names when you
4	have that in front of you.
5	MR. McDONALD: Yes, I do.
6	MR. CALLAGHAN: In front of yourself; okay.
7	All right.
8	If we could go to page 11? You'll see that
9	Officer Dupuis says:
10	"I have a list of names here. Maybe
11	you can tell me if you know these
12	people."
13	Towards the top.
14	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
15	MR. CALLAGHAN: And I'm going to take it
16	three lines from the bottom. I won't ask you to read the
17	name in that line. He says: "A person by the name of"
18	And we call that person C-8. Do you see that?
19	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
20	MR. CALLAGHAN: And then you answer, "I
21	don't recognize the name"."
22	Am I correct that you do not know who C-8
23	is?
24	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
25	MR. CALLAGHAN: And if C-8 said that he saw

1	you at Ken Seguin's house, he'd be mistaken?
2	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir, because I was never
3	there.
4	MR. CALLAGHAN: And would that apply to the
5	two people who Mr. Lee mentioned, that's Gerald Renshaw and
6	Robert Renshaw, they would be mistaken to put it
7	charitably, if they saw you said they saw you at Ken
8	Seguin's house?
9	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir, because I was never
10	there.
11	MR. CALLAGHAN: All right.
12	And just to go back just on the issue of the
13	visit in November, it may be self-evident but just for the
14	record, Mr. Bourgeois had never been to your home before?
15	MR. McDONALD: No, I don't think so.
16	MR. CALLAGHAN: Not to your knowledge?
17	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
18	MR. CALLAGHAN: And I take it Mr. Bourgeois
19	would have known
20	MR. McDONALD: Hasn't been there since
21	either.
22	MR. CALLAGHAN: All right. I can appreciate
23	that.
24	I take it Mr. Bourgeois appreciated that you
25	were related to Helen and Perry Dunlop?

1	MR. McDONALD: Oh, I think so.
2	MR. CALLAGHAN: All right. And he
3	participated in the conversations?
4	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
5	MR. CALLAGHAN: And do you recall anything
6	in addition to what you've mentioned about his discussion?
7	He's the one that waived off the polygraph but
8	MR. McDONALD: That's correct. My wife made
9	particular note of that, that whenever I mentioned that I
10	would take it, Carson seemed to say, "Well, oh, okay", but
11	Mr. Bourgeois said, "No, we'll not have any that" I guess
12	or something to that effect.
13	MR. CALLAGHAN: And do you recall any other
14	specifics about Mr. Bourgeois' participation?
15	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
16	MR. CALLAGHAN: All right.
17	And the last thing, and it's not
18	particularly relevant to the Inquiry but since it's been
19	raised, you talked about your daughter's wedding and that
20	you were the permit holder?
21	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
22	MR. CALLAGHAN: Were you aware that there
23	was contraband alcohol at the event?
24	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
25	MR. CALLAGHAN: All right. And that was the

1	charge?
2	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
3	MR. CALLAGHAN: All right. Thank you.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Stauffer?
5	RE-EXAMINATION BY/RÉ-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR. STAUFFER:
6	MR. STAUFFER: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.
7	Staff Inspector, just something arising from
8	a couple of my friends with respect to Gerald Renshaw.
9	Mr. Commissioner, if I could just ask Mr.
10	McDonald to look at Exhibit 548? This is Document 704055.
11	Staff Inspector, again, this is a fairly
12	lengthy document. I don't intend to go through this other
13	than to refer you first to the front page, and specifically
14	the paragraph that starts, "On or about 1989 to 1990". Do
15	you see that?
16	MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir.
17	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. So if we could just go
18	through this together, maybe that's the fastest thing
19	because there's some detail in here and I think I know the
20	answer to this already but I think in fairness this should
21	be put to you directly.
22	"On or about 1989 through 1990, I
23	observed Malcolm MacDonald, Claude
24	Shaver (ex-Chief of Police), and Stuart
25	McDonald at Ken Seguin's home in

1	Summerstown, Ontario."
2	And then he goes on to say:
3	"All three of them were standing at the
4	northwest corner of Ken's front yard in
5	front of Malcolm MacDonald's car. The
6	car (Malcolm's) was a 1987 Fifth
7	Avenue, gunmetal blue. It was a nice
8	summer afternoon and I was returning
9	from work at Richmond Die Casting in
10	Summerstown, Ontario. I was returning
11	from work to get a change of clothes.
12	I remember seeing either one or two of
13	them holding duffel bags. I said hello
14	to them and I don't believe that they
15	responded. I go inside Ken's home and
16	get my change of clothes. I stay
17	inside approximately five minutes and
18	exit through the back door. As I go to
19	my truck, I observed again Malcolm
20	MacDonald, Claude Shaver and Stuart
21	McDonald still standing and talking in
22	the same general area in the front yard
23	of Ken's home. I then got into my
24	truck and left."
25	And he closes, I think, with respect to

1	yourself by saying:
2	"I observed Stuart McDonald, police
3	officer, at Ken Seguin's home on other
4	occasions, at least twice."
5	So, sir, having looked at that, does that
6	refresh your memory at all as to being at Ken Seguin's
7	house?
8	MR. McDONALD: No, sir. I was never at Ken
9	Seguin's house.
10	MR. STAUFFER: All right.
11	And, sir, this statement, although not
12	sworn, seems to have been signed by Mr. Renshaw, and do you
13	recognize the individual and again, I appreciate it's a
14	poor photocopy. Do you recognize the individual who has
15	signed the last page?
16	MR. McDONALD: No, sir, I don't know the
17	signature and I don't know Mr. Renshaw.
18	MR. STAUFFER: No, but if I I'm looking
19	now at Bates page that ends with 4264 and there is a
20	signature "Gerald Renshaw". Again, I'm assuming it's
21	Gerald Renshaw's signature.
22	Underneath that, there's another signature
23	and that's what I'm referring to.
24	MR. McDONALD: I don't know whose signature
25	that is. It's not mine.

1	MR. STAUFFER: No, I appreciate that. If I
2	suggested to you that it's Perry Dunlop, would you agree or
3	do you not know?
4	MR. McDONALD: No, sir, I don't know. It
5	looks like a "P" and a "D", but I I wouldn't recognize
6	his signature I don't believe.
7	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Let me put this to
8	you, Staff Inspector. Assuming and I'm just assuming
9	that this is taken, if you will, by Constable Dunlop do
10	you recollect him ever showing this to you?
11	MR. McDONALD: No, sir, I don't.
12	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Can you give us any
13	reason again, assuming that this a statement that he
14	took from Mr. Renshaw, can you give us any reason as to why
15	he wouldn't have shown it to you?
16	MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
17	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. And to put it in time
18	context, it appears that this is December $5^{\rm th}$ of 1996; so a
19	couple of weeks or so after that November meeting at your
20	house.
21	MR. McDONALD: Apparently.
22	MR. STAUFFER: Yeah. So I there's
23	nothing further you can help us with then as to why Mr.
24	Dunlop didn't raise this statement with you?
25	MR. McDONALD: No, sir. I had very little

1	contact with Mr. Dunlop and, again, I categorically deny
2	ever being at Ken Seguin's, Malcolm MacDonald's or anything
3	or around the house in St. Andrews when Father Charles
4	MacDonald was there.
5	MR. STAUFFER: Okay. Could I ask you one
6	final thing then with respect to Mr. Renshaw? Did
7	Constable Dunlop ever say his name? He may not have shown
8	you this statement
9	MR. McDONALD: I don't recall.
10	MR. STAUFFER: But again, what I'm saying is
11	at any time after the November 1996 meeting, did he say to
12	you something like "I've spoken with Mr. Renshaw. He's
13	accusing you of being at
14	MR. McDONALD: Again, we didn't discuss
15	we didn't discuss this matter at all and I don't recall
16	hearing Mr. Renshaw's name probably until it was in the
17	newspaper or something with regard to the Inquiry.
18	MR. STAUFFER: Sir, I want to thank you very
19	much for coming here with your vacation pending. So thank
20	you, sir. Those are all my questions.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, sir,
22	for your assistance. We'll wish you a good trip on the
23	other side of the pond and I appreciate you taking the time
24	to come and testify.

MR. McDONALD: Thank you, sir.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
2	All right. Let's go.
3	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre;
4	veuillez vous lever.
5	This hearing is adjourned until May 12^{th} at
6	1:00 p.m.
7	Upon adjourning at 1:24 p.m./
8	L'audience est ajournée à 13h24
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

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