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 105

Held at: Tenue à:

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

Thursday, April 19, 2007

Jeudi, le 19 avril 2007

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

ERRATA

Volume 86 January 30th, 2007

Page 201, Line 16

MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.

The first time you were interviewed by Children's Aid, that was with Mr. Bough and Ms. DeBellis?

Should have read:

MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.

The first time you were interviewed by Children's Aid, that was with Mr. Bell and Ms. DeBellis?

Page 202, Line 18

MR. ENGELMANN: All right.

The other individuals you dealt with from Children's Aid, Mr. Bough, Ms. DeBellis?

Should have read:

MR. ENGELMANN: All right.

The other individuals you dealt with from Children's Aid, Mr. Bell, Ms. DeBellis?

Page 203, Line 3

MR. ENGELMANN: There we some letters that were signed by Mr. Bough, Ms. DeBellis and Mr. Carriere who I think was their supervisor.

Should have read:

Appearances/Comparutions

Mr. Peter Engelmann	Lead Commission Counsel
Ms. Julie Gauthier	Registrar
Mr. John E. Callaghan Mr. Mark Crane	Cornwall Police Service Board
Mr. Neil Kozloff Ms. Diane Lahaie	Ontario Provincial Police
Mr. David Rose	Ontario Ministry of Community and Correctional Services and Adult Community Corrections
Mr. Christopher Thompson	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. David Bennett	The Men's Project
Mr. David Sherriff-Scott	Diocese of Alexandria-Cornwall and Bishop Eugene LaRocque
Mr. Dominic Lamb	The Estate of Ken Seguin and Scott Seguin and Father Charles MacDonald

Ms. Jill Makepeace

Mr. William Carroll

Mr. Jacques Leduc

Association

Ontario Provincial Police

Table of Contents / Table des matières

	rage
List of Exhibits :	iv
Submissions by/Représentations par Mr. John Callaghan	1
Submissions on behalf of Ms. Birrell of the Catholic District school board by/Représentations de la part De Ms. Birrell de la Commission Scolaire Catholique	
Par Mr. Peter Engelmann	78

LIST OF EXHIBITS/LISTE D'EXHIBITS

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO
P-405	(728485) Letter from L. Brunet to David Silmser - September 1, 1994	18
P-406	(728471) Letter from T.F. Smith to Carl Johnston - July 21, 1994	21
C-407	(721620) Excerpt 7080536-37 Handwritten Notes of David Silmser - August 21, 1995	34
P-408	(738118) Letter from Rev. Kevin J. Maloney to St. Columban's Parish - Oct 18, 1995	42
P-409	(738119) Letter from David Sherriff-Scott to Bryce V. Geoffrey - October 18, 1995	44
P-410	(738123) Letter from Bryce V. Geoffrey to Peter B. Annis, Michael Hebert, Thomas Swabey Mike Chambers & Denis Power - Oct 19, 1995	45
P-411	(200063) Handwritten Notes of Emma Wilson-kir - Aug 24, 1995	ng 48
P-412	(716120) Excerpt 7059707 Notes of Constable Dunlop - May 6, 1999	65

1	Upon commencing at 9:34 a.m./
2	L'audience débute à 9h34
3	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre;
4	veuillez vous lever.
5	This hearing of the Cornwall Public Inquiry
6	is now in session. The Honourable Mr. Justice Normand
7	Glaude presiding.
8	Please be seated. Veuillez vous asseoir.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
10	MR. CALLAGHAN: Good morning Mr.
11	Commissioner.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Good morning.
13	MR. CALLAGHAN: If you're ready.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: I'm always ready sir.
15	MR. CALLAGHAN: I had left off in the fall
16	of 1993 and I would have
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Excuse-me Mr. Callaghan,
18	I just want to notice one thing, that Mr. Lee is sitting in
19	the seat that's usually occupied by yourself. I don't know
20	if that's a
21	MR. CALLAGHAN: Well, I think Mr. Lee's
22	moving up in the world but let's take a look.
23	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Again, a little humour is
25	always a good thing.

1	MR. CALLAGHAN: Well, you'll have to
2	understand that we as professional counsel are friends
3	outside the adversity that might appear in the courtroom.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: There you go.
5	MR. CALLAGHAN: What I was about to take you
6	to next
7	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
8	MR. CALLAGHAN: Mr. Commissioner was the
9	discussion that Ms. Sebalj has with Constable Sebalj has
10	with Mr. Silmser in November of 1993 and it's referenced in
11	Exhibit 296. And I just to set the context while Madam
12	Clerk sets it up on the screen.
13	It has been reviewed so I won't go in great
14	detail but this is the discussion that she has with him
15	about whether he wants to proceed against Mr. Seguin.
16	And I would have referred him I first
17	would have referred him to the paragraph,
18	"Silmser further advise that his lawyer
19	had contacted him on behalf of the
20	police to enquire as to his intentions
21	with Ken Seguin".
22	At this, Constable Sebalj asked him if he
23	wished to pursue that matter and, as before, Silmser
24	declined.
25	"Silmser made himself very clear, he no

1	longer wanted to talk about all this."
2	And I would have asked him about that
3	interchange. I would have asked him about what knowledge
4	he had about Heidi Sebalj contacting his lawyer to make the
5	inquiry. And I would have asked whether the contents were
6	true. I would have suggested to him that he was indeed,
7	well, if that was true, assuming he agreed, that he was
8	simultaneously telling the Children's Aid that he was not
9	done with matters
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Before you go there, I
11	think we should go to the paragraph before however
12	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: where he says,
14	however:
15	"That if other victims came forward,
16	that he would gladly assist as a
17	witness, however, he did not want to be
18	any part of any agency's fishing
19	trips."
20	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: So there was still that
22	little door there.
23	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right. And it wasn't that,
24	it was the issue about Seguin absolutely. I think he was
25	prepared, recognizing that if others came forward, he would

1	too… cooperate.
2	And then, I would have taken him to Exhibit
3	270. And recognizing that others have done some of this,
4	I'll try to move quickly Mr. Commissioner.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
6	MR. CALLAGHAN: And it the 24 th page Madam
7	Clerk back to page 24 and two more, there you go.
8	And I would have taken him down to the
9	passage, "I brought". I would have read to him the
10	passage:
11	"I brought this suit against MacDonald
12	after took a lot of thinking about it
13	and I wanted to take him to court and I
14	wanted people to know what kind of man
15	he was."
16	I would have stopped him there and confirmed
17	to him that what he is talking about suit against
18	MacDonald, he is talking the criminal investigation because
19	that is the only thing that preceded November 2^{nd} . And I
20	would have continued reading saying:
21	"Start with MacDonald first anyways and
22	so I phoned the Bishop and I phoned the
23	person who handled it and within two or
24	three weeks of telling me there, you
25	know, this is what I'm going to do to

1	you, take you to court, they had
2	settled with me, for they gave me
3	\$32,000 to keep my mouth shut."
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
5	MR. CALLAGHAN: And then I would have
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, again you're you
7	would have asked him whether or not the suit referred to
8	criminal proceedings or civil proceedings.
9	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right, but there were no
10	criminal or civil proceedings.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, no, no. See, if
12	you read through this here though, I mean, you know, I
13	don't think you're coming to conclusions as a lawyer,
14	there was no civil suit. But if you read through the
15	paragraph, he says like
16	"So I phoned the Bishop and I phoned the person who handles
17	it and within two or weeks of coming there, of telling me
18	there, you know, that this is what I am going to do to you,
19	take you to court, they had settled with me for \$32,000."
20	MR. CALLAGHAN: Well
21	THE COMMISSIONER: So it may well be that it
22	was in his non-legal mind that bringing in the suit is
23	phoning somebody and telling them that they're going to do
24	that. So I don't agree with your conclusion that because
25	there was no suit ergo, because he is not here, you're

1	going to tell me that it was that. I think that you
2	could have put it to him
3	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right, as you point out,
4	we're not in a position to say that, but I would have and I
5	don't mean to debate it, but when he says "I brought a suit
6	against MacDonald" seems to be a positive assertion and the
7	only thing he did as far as I am aware, is to start a
8	criminal investigation and I would have asked him if that's
9	what he was speaking of and I guess, we might have found
10	out that I misunderstood the phrase.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
12	MR. CALLAGHAN: But I can only go but I
13	would have
14	THE COMMISSIONER: No, no, no. But I've got
15	to stop you there. I just want to make sure that what
16	you're doing is you're saying what questions would have
17	been put.
18	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: But then you're coming
20	back and saying "A ha, but the only conclusion is this:
21	because he had not brought suit." And I am saying to you
22	no, that is not the only conclusion.
23	MR. CALLAGHAN: I appreciate that. I guess
24	I have an oversized view of my abilities as an examiner,
25	but I think that he probably would have said it and I think

1	but that's my own view, and who knows, if A, then B, if
2	B, then C, I mean you know, as you know from being on our
3	side of the fence, you know, if he'd given another answer,
4	the examination as I said at the outset might have gone a
5	different way.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
7	MR. CALLAGHAN: I don't know. But I would
8	have anticipated him to say that rightly or wrongly. And
9	then I would have taken him down, I wouldn't have
10	regurgitated how he came to the \$32,000 which has been read
11	to you I think now twice. I wouldn't have put that to him.
12	I would have taken him down to the passage
13	at the bottom of the next page, page 25, you've got it
14	right Madam Clerk, at the bottom. And if you can see that,
15	I would have picked it up,
16	"But I'm not going to stop where I am
17	now. I don't know how to approach it
18	but I still got a story to tell in
19	Cornwall some way or another and I
20	still got I still got to make these
21	people pay for what they did to me, and
22	that's Seguin and that's along also,
23	and I'm still on the war path with
24	them.
25	And it's either by writing a book and

1	getting it published and letting people
2	know what kind of man these people are.
3	Or I don't know, I haven't thought
4	about it enough yet, but I haven't
5	stopped yet
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Callaghan I
7	understand what you're saying, I guess I am not explaining
8	properly. What I'm trying to convey to you is that that's
9	all well and fine, it's all there.
10	I just don't want you to give me or the
11	public conclusions that are not makeable and so no, those
12	passages do not necessarily make it that a suit has to be a
13	criminal proceeding. You can't do that. I won't let you
14	do that.
15	MR. CALLAGHAN: Okay. And I understand
16	that. I think, I mean, this is the difficulty with the
17	process because, clearly it would be open to me to cross-
18	examine that way. And I know we did this discussion and I
19	don't mean to open it but that illustrates the problem.
20	This illustrates the problem because the predicate of the
21	cross-examination is he would have said this and I would
22	have gone on further. But then the cross-examination falls
23	flat because the predicate isn't achieved. We would move
24	on to another area.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: We know that. We've been

1	there and we've done it twice now. And I asked you not to
2	do it and you come back and say "Well, I'm not going to do
3	it but I'll do it anyways". And I am
4	MR. CALLAGHAN: Well
5	THE COMMISSIONER: and I am saying "No,
6	no, no, no, no. No, no, no." We know that this is not
7	a perfect system. We know that, and what I've asked you to
8	do is point me to the places. Tell me what you would have
9	done, but please no conclusions.
10	MR. CALLAGHAN: But I would have, I would
11	have put to him that's what he meant and then the whole
12	cross-examination sequence which I am trying to articulate
13	here would make sense. And what I would have done next
14	after having done that, I would have pointed out that
15	indeed, that while he has told Heidi Sebalj he didn't want
16	to talk about it, he was indeed planning to do something as
17	articulated
18	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
19	MR. CALLAGHAN: and indeed, I would have
20	then taken him to the OPP interview at Exhibit 271.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. So far, I agree
22	with you that if you look at the phone call that was
23	apparently recorded by Ms. Sebalj and this, that within
24	on November 4^{th} and whenever
25	MR. CALLAGHAN: November 2 nd .

1	THE COMMISSIONER: November 2^{nd} , that he is
2	apparently saying different things to different people.
3	MR. CALLAGHAN: Okay.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: That's from the
5	documents. So stick to the documents and I think you'll be
6	fine.
7	MR. CALLAGHAN: I'll stick
8	THE COMMISSIONER: No, you won't.
9	MR. CALLAGHAN: Let me put it this way, I'll
10	try to be fine.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: No, you won't.
12	MR. CALLAGHAN: I would have then taken him
13	to Exhibit 271.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
15	MR. CALLAGHAN: And again, this is something
16	you've seen before and I would have taken him to
17	THE COMMISSIONER: This is November 26 th , '93
18	
19	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: which is the
21	interview report which is yes.
22	MR. CALLAGHAN: I may have the wrong number
23	here.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, this is his
25	statement in any event. Is that what you're looking for?

1	MR. CALLAGHAN: Exhibit 271, this is yes,
2	I actually sir, I actually have the typed version in my
3	hand.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
5	MR. CALLAGHAN: And I would have if I
6	could be given a minute just to situate it next to the
7	handwritten.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Just tell me what part
9	you're looking at.
10	MR. CALLAGHAN: It says "I phoned Malcolm
11	MacDonald".
12	THE COMMISSIONER: That would be near the
13	end.
14	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes. That's page 4.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, page 4, bottom half.
16	MR. CALLAGHAN: And Mr. Commissioner, I will
17	read off the typed version so if it's different then, my
18	eyes won't be on the screen I am afraid.
19	Now to situate ourselves, this is
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Just a second, let me
21	make sure we got yes.
22	MR. CALLAGHAN: This is
23	THE COMMISSIONER: There it is, right in the
24	middle, okay.
25	MR. CALLAGHAN: November

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Twenty third (23 rd),
2	twenty well hold on a minute now. November 26, '93, now
3	query this is how did that work this is the statement
4	he had prepared?
5	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: And they came back to him
7	and asked him to sign it.
8	MR. CALLAGHAN: This is I think this is
9	where he meets one of the OPP officers, they sit down, they
10	write out a statement and he signs it.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: The statement he prepared.
12	It's an earlier exhibit. That's in February.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. All right.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: It's the interview just
15	after Ken Seguin's death.
16	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, sorry, thank
18	you very much for that.
19	MR. CALLAGHAN: So it's with the OPP, it's
20	not with the Cornwall police, it's November 26 and he says
21	and this passage has been, I believe, read to you by
22	maybe Mr. Sherriff-Scott
23	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
24	MR. CALLAGHAN: or Mr. Neuberger, I
25	can't recall. But it said:

1		"I phoned Malcolm Macdonald, asked if
2		he was representing Ken Seguin. He
3		said no, not at this time. I phoned
4		Ken Seguin around a week or so ago at
5		work."
6	Now,	that would put us about November 16 th or
7	17 th .	
8		"I told him that I wanted a settlement
9		from him for what he had done to me.
10		He told me to talk to Malcolm
11		MacDonald, his lawyer. I called
12		Malcolm, he asked me if I had a lawyer,
13		I said no. He said he could not be
14		involved in this case if I had a
15		lawyer. Then he asked me how much I
16		wanted. I didn't tell him till the
17		next day. I wanted \$100,000. Malcolm
18		said that was a lot of money. I said
19		he didn't have the money, I was going
20		to sue the Ministry of Probation and
21		Parole. That was it for that
22		conversation."
23	And a	again, the point that you've just made
24	shortly after the d	iscussion, he appears not to want to do
25	any he is in fac	t doing something by dealing with Mr.

1	Seguin and his lawyer.
2	I would have briefly taken him to Exhibit
3	372, which also has been covered by others.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: This is the letter?
5	MR. CALLAGHAN: No, I have it noted as the
6	occurrence report.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
8	Madam Clerk, could I get the next binder?
9	MR. CALLAGHAN: There we go.
10	I won't bore you, Mr. Commissioner. Mr.
11	Neuberger read this. You will recall this is the call that
12	one of our officers receives from someone who purports to
13	be Mr. Silmser and purports to indicate to him, that if
14	something should happen to Mr. Seguin
15	THE COMMISSIONER: No, to himself. If
16	something should happen to him.
17	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right. Him being, I
18	understood to be Mr. Seguin or Mr. Silmser. Did I say
19	Mr. Seguin? My apologies.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Yes.
21	MR. CALLAGHAN: I'm getting my names mixed
22	up. I apologize.
23	If something happened to Mr. Silmser that
24	Ken Seguin and Charlie MacDonald were to be considered
25	suspects. I won't read it all. It was already read to you

1	by Mr. Neuberger. So I would have inquired about that and
2	got the confirmations that Mr. Neuberger had sought, as
3	well.
4	The next thing I would have covered was the
5	issue that came up when Mr. Sherriff-Scott was examining
6	him, and for the record, at Volume 90, page 207, wherein he
7	stated that at some point in time he was shown a letter by
8	Constable Sebalj. If you wish, we could take a look at
9	that. It's
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Which letter do you mean?
11	MR. CALLAGHAN: Well, that was never
12	identified. He said he was shown a letter from the Crown
13	Attorney
14	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
15	MR. CALLAGHAN: by Constable Sebalj.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
17	MR. CALLAGHAN: And I would have sought
18	confirmation as to exactly when that occurred. It wasn't
19	clear. I would have further examined him as to whether he
20	had told that to anybody in the course of the last 14
21	years, because there doesn't seem to be a record of that
22	event occurring.
23	I would have asked him whether Exhibit 301
24	was the letter.

THE COMMISSIONER: That's the letter dated

1	September $14^{ m th}$, 1993 from Murray MacDonald, the Crown
2	Attorney
3	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: from Staff Sergeant
5	Lucien Brunet?
6	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right.
7	I would have asked him whether he read the
8	contents of the letter, as he seems to have said, whether
9	he understood the letter, whether in fact he read the
10	predicate letter. That is the letter referred to in the
11	first paragraph. I would have asked him what his
12	understanding of it was. I would have asked whether he
13	had indicated under testimony that he thought Heidi
14	Sebalj's hands were tied and whether he understood that
15	they were tied because of the advice she was being given
16	from the Crown Attorney. I would have asked those course
17	of questions.
18	But unfortunately, there is not much I can
19	point you to, Mr. Commissioner, as to how he might have
20	answered because it hasn't previously been covered by any
21	of the other interviews.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
23	Interesting from where your conversation
24	yesterday. I don't know when we'll probably cover that
25	in institutional response, but MacDonald is saying, "Also

1	the officer was tentative on the issue of R. and P.G.
2	before the so-called settlement".
3	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Grounds are now even
5	further but anyways. Okay. We'll cover that later.
6	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes. Just for the record, 1
7	mean, this letter follows up a discussion with Luc Brunet,
8	who is the Staff Sergeant responsible for Constable Sebalj,
9	and that the letter of Exhibit 300 just basically said that
10	it was the understanding of Luc Brunet that the Crown
11	wouldn't proceed if the victim wasn't willing. And that's
12	an issue obviously you have to consider in the Exhibit
13	300 that's an issue that obviously as a matter of
14	policy, we'd probably want to look at in the Inquiry, but -
15	
16	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
17	MR. CALLAGHAN: that was the advice
18	being given. I'm not sure how much of what the letter
19	meant, Mr. Silmser understood. And I would have asked him,
20	if indeed this is the letter, the predicate issue of
21	whether what the answer would have been.
22	I would have then moved on to the issue of
23	Marcel Lalonde.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
25	MR. CALLAGHAN: I would have and I'm not

25

1	sure it's necessary, but I would have confirmed with him
2	again, that the first time he raised it as in fact, I think
3	it was Mr. Lee who confirmed, was with the Children's Aid
4	Society to Mr. Bell on November 2 nd '93.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
6	MR. CALLAGHAN: I would have confirmed that
7	he did not advise the Cornwall Police when he was
8	interviewed, which he has already testified to. I would
9	have taken him to a document document 728485.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
11	Exhibit 405 is a letter addressed to Mr.
12	Silmser dated September 1 st , 1994 from L. Brunet, Staff
13	Sergeant, Criminal Investigations.
14	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-405:
15	(728485) Letter to Mr. Silmser from
16	Staff Sergeant L. Brunet, Criminal
17	Investigations, dated September 1, 1994
18	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right. I would have gone
19	over the fact that the letter was written. I would have
20	just for the record, Mr. Commissioner, the first line
21	refers to a letter of July 29, 1994, that Acting Chief Carl
22	Johnston received from Detective Inspector Smith. For the
23	record, that is I'm afraid that's not a letter. I'll go

18

to that letter next. I thought it was already an exhibit.

I will go to that letter next just for continuity purposes,

1	for the record.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
3	MR. CALLAGHAN: But that they'd received a
4	letter advising for the first time of the allegation
5	regarding Lalonde.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Well
7	MR. CALLAGHAN: Well, that's whether, the
8	context again, sir.
9	Then
10	THE COMMISSIONER: It is the letter from the
11	OPP advising the Cornwall Police
12	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: of this situation.
14	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
16	It will be up to you through the
17	institutional response, we'll hear from the Cornwall Police
18	as to whether or not it was the first time.
19	MR. CALLAGHAN: Fair enough.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
21	MR. CALLAGHAN: I would have reviewed the
22	letter with him and that they were asking for him to
23	contact them, either directly or through counsel, if he was
24	in order to proceed with the complaint.
25	I would have asked if he got the letter and

1	what, if anything he did about it.
2	Just to be clear, as I said a moment ago, I
3	would, for the sake of clarity for the record, I would have
4	put in I suppose, document 728471, which is the letter
5	referred to in the first paragraph, which I think there's a
6	misdate. But we'll obviously hear about that.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: I don't you know, it's
8	always interesting when you're reading letters for the
9	first time. It says:
10	"In order for us to accomplish this, we
11	will have to meet with you and obtain
12	full disclosure of the assaults in
13	question that you referred to during
14	previous interviews."
15	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Well
17	MR. CALLAGHAN: I think what you'll see is
18	that the interview he relays it to the OPP. Well, we'll
19	hear about that.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Do you agree with me that
21	when you're reading that, there is an issue of during
22	previous interviews?
23	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right. Which is referable
24	to the information received from the OPP and also the
25	Children's Aid Society because there was the

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, that's why you
2	better file the other letters to put in context
3	MR. CALLAGHAN: Sure.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: because this letter
5	standing alone doesn't quite mean
6	MR. CALLAGHAN: No and I misspoke. I had
7	thought the other one was in evidence. So it's document
8	728471.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
10	That will be Exhibit 406, a letter dated $21^{\rm st}$
11	of July, which is not the $29^{\rm th}$ of July
12	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: as referred to in
14	your letter.
15	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Exhibit 406, which is a
17	letter, addressed to the Chief of Police Carl Johnston and
18	signed by Detective Inspector Smith, Criminal Investigation
19	Branch, Kingston Unit.
20	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-406:
21	(728471) Letter to Chief of Police Carl
22	Johnston from Detective Inspector
23	Smith, Criminal Investigation Branch,
24	dated July 21, 1994
25	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right.

1	And the contents of that letter briefly, are
2	bringing to the attention of the Cornwall Police, that this
3	allegation had been made at first to the Children's Aid and
4	then brought to the attention of the OPP, who were
5	forwarding it to the Cornwall Police.
6	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
8	MR. CALLAGHAN: I don't think there's any
9	need to read it into the record.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: No.
11	MR. CALLAGHAN: I would have then taken him
12	to Exhibit 280, which was obviously put to him.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Two-eighty (280).
14	Which is a letter dated September 12 th , 1994,
15	which is addressed to him, to Mr. Silmser from Staff
16	Sergeant Brunet.
17	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right.
18	It refers to a conversation that he had with
19	Acting Chief Carl Johnston
20	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
21	MR. CALLAGHAN: and his expressing
22	reluctance to make a statement to the Cornwall Police.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
24	MR. CALLAGHAN: I would have asked him about
25	that. His request to consider making the allegation to

1	another police agency that could independently investigate
2	the complaint. So I would have asked him about the
3	circumstances. My understanding is the letter was sent by
4	registered mail. I don't know if that made a difference
5	but I would have asked whether he got it or not. I was
6	just asking Mr. Engelmann and neither of us can recall
7	whether he said he doesn't recall the letter or he didn't
8	get it. I don't but I would have asked him about his
9	conversation and I would have asked him about the receipt
10	of the letter.
11	I would have reviewed with him briefly the
12	release of the statement and the airing of the statement in
13	January '94 on the television.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
15	MR. CALLAGHAN: I would have talked to him
16	about his contacts with the reporter, Charlie Greenwall. I
17	would have asked him about his contacts with others, the
18	Cornwall Police and I would have reviewed with him his
19	commencement of a lawsuit and his commencement of a public
20	complaint.
21	I would have then moved on to discuss his
22	relationship with John MacDonald and I would have, first
23	obviously confirmed that, as he did say that he hadn't seen

THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.

1	MR. CA	LLAGHAN: And that Mr. MacDonald came
2	back in May of '95 and	d made contact again, the summer of
3	′95.	
4	I would	d have reviewed with him his testimony
5	on January 30 th , at pa	ge 162. Mr. Engelmann, at about line
6	7:	
7	"]	Did you contact other victims or
8	a	lleged victims, to your knowledge,
9	d	uring that calendar year?"
10	M	r. Silmser: "I can't remember that
11	Y	ear."
12	M	r. Engelmann: "Well, do you recall if
13	Y	ou ever spoke to any other victim or
14	a	lleged victim about the details of
15	w.	
16	M	r. Silmser: "Mine?"
17	M	r. Engelmann: " the alleged
18	al	buse?"
19	M	r. Silmser: "Oh! Never."
20	M	r. Engelmann: "You never have?"
21	M	r. Silmser: "Never have."
22	M	r. Engelmann: "Not even with John
23	M	acDonald?"
24	M	r. Silmser: "John MacDonald, I
25	be	elieve has never read his statement

1	nor have I ever read his statement."
2	And then they go on to discuss John
3	MacDonald.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
5	Mr. CALLAGHAN: His relationship. And then,
6	if you go over page 199 91, Mr. Engelmann picks it up.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry, what page?
8	MR. CALLAGHAN: Page 191.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah.
10	MR. CALLAGHAN: And Mr. Engelmann picks up
11	the point:
12	"Until this time, no one else had
13	come forward? Mr. Silmser: that's
14	correct. Mr. Engelmann: Or at least,
15	that's what you'd been told, that no
16	one had come forward, that there was
17	no other victims. Mr. Silmser:
18	that's correct. Mr. Engelmann: did
19	he get into the details the of the
20	alleged abuse that he suffered that
21	he Mr. Silmser: No, we'd never
22	talked about that."
23	Now obviously he's talking about John
24	MacDonald at that point.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm

1	MR. CALLAGHAN: and then, at Mr. Lee's
2	question in Volume 88, which would be February $1^{\rm st}$
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Madam Clerk? Yeah.
4	Thank you.
5	M'hm. What page, sir?
6	MR. CALLAGHAN: Page 12.
7	And page 12.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah. I'm sorry, where's
9	the well
10	UNIDENTIFIED: Twelve (12). Page 2.
11	MR. CALLAGHAN: Twelve (12)? One and two?
12	There we go.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah.
14	MR. CALLAGHAN: Oh, sorry. Right. Thank
15	you, Madam Clerk.
16	"Mr. Lee: My question is, have you
17	ever met with a victim of abuse and
18	gone into the details of your abuse?
19	Mr. Silmser: Absolutely not. Mr. Lee:
20	Have you ever met with a victim of
21	abuse and gone into the details of
22	his abuse, whoever that victim might
23	have been? Mr. Silmser: Absolutely
24	not."
25	I would have then talked about his meetings

1	with John MacDonald, we know that they met
2	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
3	MR. CALLAGHAN: And they had the day
4	together, I believe it was on August 12^{th} .
5	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
6	MR. CALLAGHAN: I would have taken him to
7	and again I obviously his view was he didn't talk about
8	it, I would have taken him to Document 721620.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
10	MR. CALLAGHAN: And this is a
11	Thank you. Oh, I I want to make sure,
12	Mr. Commissioner, you have the right Bates Page. It's
13	7080536.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: That's what it is.
15	MR. CALLAGHAN: Okay.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: So it's an excerpt of
17	Document 71 721620, and what is this?
18	MR. CALLAGHAN: This is a handwritten note
19	of a phone call we understand, a phone call between Mr.
20	Silmser and Mr. Abel at the Children's Aid Society, on
21	August 21 st , 1995.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
23	MR. CALLAGHAN: And it says:
24	"Lots happening in the last two days.
25	Altar boy in B.C., back four months

1	ago"
2	And I would have asked him whether he was
3	talking about John MacDonald at that time.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
5	MR. CALLAGHAN: Sorry, Madam Clerk's just
6	getting it on the screen.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah, okay. Go back to
8	the top there, Madam Clerk.
9	MR. CALLAGHAN: Seven zero eight (708)
10	you need the Document number? Or the Bates Page?
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Seven zero eight, zero
12	five three six (7080536). There you go.
13	So this is
14	MR. CALLAGHAN: Then actually, if we could
15	take it
16	THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry, this is a note
17	that Mr. Abel would have made?
18	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Of a call from?
20	MR. CALLAGHAN: We understand Mr. Silmser,
21	we would have asked the question.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah. M'hm.
23	MR. CALLAGHAN: Okay?
24	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm not sure what I mean, if
25	Mr. Silmser was here and doing this cross examination, I'm

24

25

not sure if I wouldn't be objecting at this point, in the
sense I'm not sure what this has to do with Cornwall
Police.
I'm not sure what this has to do with the
Cornwall Police Service institutional response. We're now
in the summer of 1995.
THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
MR. ENGELMANN: Maybe Mr. Callaghan could
just explain that?
MR. CALLAGHAN: Well, I mean, to be clear, I
would have thought that the issue has been raised in this
inquiry. It's been Commission Counsel's raised it, the
victim's lawyers raised it, and I think as a general
proposition, I think Mr. Commissioner should be apprised of
information that might be a little different than what
you've been hearing.
THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
MR. CALLAGHAN: And I think that's only
fair, I think credibility, as I indicated previously
with the quote from the Krever Commission, is an issue.
I have indicated earlier, that you know,
discussions amongst victims, et cetera

people including the Cornwall Police as Mr. MacDonald does,

MR. CALLAGHAN: --- and their dealings with

THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.

1	and as Mr. Silmser does in a minute in respect of that this
2	very time is an issue.
3	And I was just highlighting that perhaps,
4	when we talk about it, there was more communication. And I
5	recognize that's a conclusory statement and I know you
6	don't want to hear it, but I was just pointing out the
7	inconsistency.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: No, no, no. Just a
9	minute. Here, I might agree with you.
10	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
11	THE COMMISSIONER: But we have to be very
12	clear. Credibility as to the complaints
13	MR. CALLAGHAN: M'hm.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: and not as to whether
15	the actions or the charge the events that would have led
16	to charges.
17	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: We're just dealing with
19	the credibility, with respect to the complaints.
20	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yeah. This does - this only
21	has to do with credibility of complaints.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Absolutely.
23	MR. CALLAGHAN: This is not verifying an
24	assault
25	THE COMMISSIONER: No.

1	MR. CALLAGHAN: Or not verifying anything.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: No. So what you're saying
3	is that if I'm and let me try this, so
4	MR. CALLAGHAN: To speed it up, perhaps.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, you're saying, if
6	Silmser phoned Abel and if it was Silmser calling, he told
7	him that it was the same retreat, same bush in Bishop's
8	house in country
9	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: and if it was Silmser
11	who made the call and if he was talking about MacDonald,
12	well then that imputes some knowledge to him of what
13	MacDonald was alleging as an abuse.
14	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right and also
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
16	MR. CALLAGHAN: It also illustrates that,
17	whether - going back to the quote of Ostler and I'm not -
18	well its, Ostler being people get mistaken about some of
19	their testimony, and you're going to have to weigh this
20	testimony. This is if this is the what has been
21	said, then frankly
22	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
23	MR. CALLAGHAN: he hasn't his
24	testimony wasn't as clear here, then, as it might have been
25	

1	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
2	MR. CALLAGHAN: If this had been put to him.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
4	We should be careful though with this
5	document, there is a name in that document that is subject
6	to a publication ban.
7	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right. And I don't intend
8	to use say that name.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: No, no I know. I know,
10	but for purposes of the media and whoever is looking at
11	these documents, I tried to outline for them, especially
12	the media, so that if they're looking at these documents,
13	that while it's their responsibility to ensure that they
14	are not in breach of any publication ban, it's nice if we
15	can highlight that for their sake.
16	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right, and then we can tell
17	them it's a C-3 and C-9, if that assists the media.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
19	MR. CALLAGHAN: The I would have pointed
20	out the note just above those names:
21	"Family wrote church 15 years ago."
22	THE COMMISSIONER: I don't know if it's 15
23	or 25, but okay.
24	Fifteen (15) or yeah. Sorry, I may be
25	misread 25 sounds logically the right number, but:

1	"Never got an answer, parents well
2	respected."
3	I would have asked whether that was
4	communication from John MacDonald
5	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
6	MR. CALLAGHAN: that he believed that
7	his mother had written the church.
8	I would have also put to him that and I
9	can just, rather than pull it up, there was a question at
10	his discovery. Exhibit 374, and I'll it's just one
11	question:
12	"Question: did John tell you what
13	Father Charles MacDonald did to him?
14	Answer: Yes…"
15	THE COMMISSIONER: No 374?
16	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Two (2) 374, right.
18	Okay. Say that again.
19	MR. CALLAGHAN: Page 192.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
21	Okay, and so, Line 950, is that where you're
22	going?
23	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes. Right:
24	"Did John tell you what Father
25	Charles MacDonald did to him?

1	Answer: "Yes, to a certain point[]
2	Did you tell John MacDonald what
3	Father Charles had done to you? []
4	No, I don't believe so."
5	I would have sort of, simultaneously moved
6	into his discussion with Constable David Bough
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I don't maybe
8	you can go back to Document
9	MR. CALLAGHAN: Sure.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Exhibit 407. Is
11	there any comment about that first sentence on top, there?
12	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. C-407:
13	(721620) Excerpt 7080536-37,
14	Handwritten notes of David Silmser -
15	August 21, 1995
16	MR. CALLAGHAN: "Lots happening in the last
17	two days"? Or the next page?
18	THE COMMISSIONER: No, that next page.
19	Slip it over.
20	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes. I mean it obviously
21	identifies the person
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, it depends, I mean
23	
24	MR. CALLAGHAN: But I mean, I didn't think
25	there was a big I didn't think that was going to be a

1	big issue, as to whether that that that's was what he
2	was talking about. But that that to me would have
3	suggested
4	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
5	MR. CALLAGHAN: I would have and I would
6	take him back to the point that he's talking to Carson
7	Chisolm and this is, just to put it in context, August of
8	195
9	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
10	MR. CALLAGHAN: just while we're on the
11	document.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, thank you.
13	MR. CALLAGHAN: I'm advised that I did miss
14	one point, which was that Exhibit 206, page 54, this is an
15	interview of John MacDonald to the
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Two oh six (206)?
17	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Madam Clerk, can you help
19	me out with the other book, there?
20	MR. CALLAGHAN: She's there and it's page
21	oh, I'm sorry. Help you out. I thought you all right.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: I hope I don't have it
23	here.
24	THE REGISTRAR: (inaudible)
25	THE COMMISSIONER: No, there's (inaudible).

1	Pardon me?
2	THE REGISTRAR: (inaudible)
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, I may have it,
4	let's see here. No, I don't think so. (Inaudible)
5	THE REGISTRAR: (inaudible)
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, in any event maybe
7	I can just go on with the monitor then, Madam Clerk.
8	MR. CALLAGHAN: It's page 54 of the
9	document.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
11	MR. CALLAGHAN: And we're down at the
12	bottom, Madam Clerk. And then:
13	"After this: okay, and then since
14	then, who have you told of these
15	events"
16	She's got it at the top of the screen.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, yes.
18	MR. CALLAGHAN: (Reads)
19	"I'm interested I believe, even a
20	little bit, what you tell David
21	Silmser. John: I'd showed him the
22	letter, this letter, the bottom only.
23	Tim: Okay, did you discuss any of the
24	three events with him, that occurred?
25	John: No, except for sitting down

Right. So that -- just to finish it off, and you'll recall, sir that there -- the evidence you'd heard was that they met with Mr. Geoffrey some time, and I think it's the 10th of October, but I may have the date wrong.

I would have asked -- would have then segued into his contact with Constable David Bough, exhibit 234, and I would have reviewed with him his discussions with Constable Bough, and I think we last day found these notes were out of order, but they start at the bottom of Exhibit -- the first page.

THE COMMISSIONER: What date did you want to go to?

MR. CALLAGHAN: I just point out the first page, that he contacted him on the 22nd, and I would have asked him, of course, why did he contact Constable Bough; how it is he came to know of Constable Bough, because he

38

later, but this is August '95.

1	I would have again pointed out:
2	"Dave advises that John and parents had
3	written a letter to Charlie 25 years
4	ago."
5	Which is part of the was referred to earlier.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: No. No, no, no. The
7	parents wrote a letter, not to Charlie, because Charlie
8	could be Charlie Greenwell or Charlie MacDonald. But he
9	wrote a letter parents wrote.
10	MR. CALLAGHAN: Sorry, I misread that.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: To the church 25 years
12	ago. That's what it says.
13	MR. CALLAGHAN: Sorry.
14	And I sort of filled in the point that I
15	think we heard from John MacDonald.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
17	MR. CALLAGHAN: And I would have gone over
18	to the 12^{th} of September and I would have confirmed his
19	discussion with him, with Constable Bough, on the $12^{\rm th}$ of
20	September and that he was going to
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Where do you see that
22	now?
23	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right at the top.
24	"The 12 th of September, 10:21, telephone
25	call to David Silmser."

1	THE COMMISSIONER: No, it says oh, right,
2	down there. Right. Sorry. Okay.
3	MR. CALLAGHAN: "To confirm our
4	appointment tomorrow."
5	THE COMMISSIONER: "He won't be coming?"
6	MR. CALLAGHAN: "He won't be coming.
7	Advises will be going to the press."
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, no, no, no, going
9	to the papers.
10	MR. CALLAGHAN: Sorry, the papers.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Madam Clerk, could you
12	and madam reporters, make sure that the name is at least
13	
13 14	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right.
	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right. I would have gone on to read beyond that.
14	
14 15	I would have gone on to read beyond that.
14 15 16	I would have gone on to read beyond that. "Charlie Greenwall told him that Dunlop
14 15 16 17	I would have gone on to read beyond that. "Charlie Greenwall told him that Dunlop put it on T.V. Carson Chisholm is
14 15 16 17 18	I would have gone on to read beyond that. "Charlie Greenwall told him that Dunlop put it on T.V. Carson Chisholm is Dunlop's wife's brother. He's trying
14 15 16 17 18 19	I would have gone on to read beyond that. "Charlie Greenwall told him that Dunlop put it on T.V. Carson Chisholm is Dunlop's wife's brother. He's trying to back-up Dunlop. Government where
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I would have gone on to read beyond that. "Charlie Greenwall told him that Dunlop put it on T.V. Carson Chisholm is Dunlop's wife's brother. He's trying to back-up Dunlop. Government where you have to sue in six months. Dave's
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I would have gone on to read beyond that. "Charlie Greenwall told him that Dunlop put it on T.V. Carson Chisholm is Dunlop's wife's brother. He's trying to back-up Dunlop. Government where you have to sue in six months. Dave's re-sued them for \$2.8 million."
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I would have gone on to read beyond that. "Charlie Greenwall told him that Dunlop put it on T.V. Carson Chisholm is Dunlop's wife's brother. He's trying to back-up Dunlop. Government where you have to sue in six months. Dave's re-sued them for \$2.8 million." And I would have asked whether that's

THE COMMISSIONER: Scroll down, please,
Madam Clerk.
MR. CALLAGHAN: They wanted
THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
MR. CALLAGHAN: Settle with him, Sean Adams,
Leduc, Malcolm MacDonald. So I would have asked him about
his discussions and the tenor of his discussions with
Constable Bough.
I would have the purpose obviously was
just to review the communications with him and his
interactions with the Cornwall Police. But I would have
also wanted to ask him about his allegation that he made
the other day about the picketing issue, if you recall.
THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
MR. CALLAGHAN: There is no note of that
discussion.
THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
MR. CALLAGHAN: I would have gone over it
with him what
THE COMMISSIONER: That's the picketing
where after Malcolm MacDonald's plea of guilt?
MR. CALLAGHAN: No.
THE COMMISSIONER: No?
MR. CALLAGHAN: See, there are two
picketing.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
2	MR. CALLAGHAN: And that's one of the things
3	I would have put to him. He had testified that he said he
4	was going to picket the church and that he contacted
5	Constable Bough about picketing the church and that
6	Constable Bough said that he would shoot him if he picketed
7	the church.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
9	MR. CALLAGHAN: And I would have put it in
10	the strongest of terms that that didn't happen. And I
11	would have put to him that his evidence was that after that
12	discussion he decided not to picket the church, which is
13	what he indicated to Mr. Engelmann.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
15	MR. CALLAGHAN: And I would have put to him
16	that indeed it had nothing to do with any alleged
17	discussion with Constable Bough, which, again, I would have
18	alleged never took place. It had to do with communications
19	he had between his lawyer and the Diocese lawyer, and I
20	would have taken him first to document 738118.
21	I would have asked him about this
22	discussion. This is a "To Whom it may Concern". It's
23	signed by Father Kevin Maloney.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. So Exhibit is
25	it 408, Madam Clerk? It looks like 468.

1	EXHIBIT NO./ PIÈCE NO P-408:
2	Letter from Rev. Kevin J. Maloney to St.
3	Columban's Parish - October 18, 1995
4	(738118)
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Go ahead.
6	MR. CALLAGHAN: And the date of the
7	communication the memo is October 18 th . It says:
8	"Telephone call received on Monday
9	October 16 th , 1995 at approximately
10	10:30 a.m. Phone call answered by
11	Father Rory MacDonald. The caller
12	identified himself as David Silmser.
13	He informed Father Rory that he would
14	be picketing St. Columban's Church on
15	the following weekends. David was
16	polite and non-confrontational. He
17	stated that he just wanted us to know
18	that would be happening."
19	And I would have confirmed whether that
20	discussion took place.
21	And then I would have taken him to document
22	738119.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Do you know how much
24	longer you'll be, sir?
25	MR. CALLAGHAN: Forty-five (45) minutes.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
2	Exhibit 409 is a letter to Bryce Geoffrey
3	dated October 18 th , 1995 from David Sherriff-Scott.
4	EXHIBIT NO./ PIÈCE NO P-409:
5	Letter from David Sherriff-Scott to Bryce V.
6	Geoffrey - October 18, 1995 (738119)
7	MR. CALLAGHAN: And I would have put to him
8	the letter which said:
9	"I'm advised by the Reverend Gordon
10	Brian that your client called the
11	Diocese on October 16 th , '95. Reverend
12	Brian was informed that your client
13	intends to start picketing in front of
14	St. Columban's Church every weekend
15	starting the weekend commencing October
16	20 th , '95. I'm sure you can appreciate
17	that the kind of activity which your
18	client is contemplating will not be
19	productive to the resolution of matters
20	between him and our client. Other
21	potential implications of his intended
22	actions are of course known to you."
23	Over to the next page:
24	"I understand that you have been
25	speaking with your client and are

1	attempting to dissuade him from the
2	course of action he is contemplating.
3	Would you let me know what his
4	intentions are before the weekend, if
5	you can."
6	Then I would have taken him to document
7	738123, and this is
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Exhibit 410.
9	It's a letter dated October 19^{th} , 1995 addressed to a
10	variety of lawyers from Bryce Geoffrey; amongst others
11	Peter Annis of your firm no, I'm sorry, not your firm.
12	The firm of Scott Neely.
13	EXHIBIT NO./ PIÈCE NO P-410:
14	Letter from Bryce V. Geoffrey to Peter B.
15	Annis, Michael Hebert, Thomas Swabey, Mike
16	Chambers & Denis Power - Oct 19, 1995
17	(738123)
18	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
19	MR. CALLAGHAN: And if you can just scroll
20	the screen down a little bit, Madam Clerk.
21	And I would have referred him to the first
22	paragraph:
23	"Further to my recent correspondence,
24	as you may have heard my client had
25	intended to picket outside the St.

1	Columban's Church in Cornwall this
2	coming weekend. Fortunately I have
3	been able to convince him that this
4	would not in any way advance his
5	interests but rather would likely be
6	counterproductive in the circumstances
7	of this case. Although he is currently
8	accepting my advice he is volatile at
9	different times, to say the least."
10	The rest of the letter goes on to talk about
11	a settlement discussion.
12	I would have obviously put to him that the
13	sequence of events was that having put to him that the
14	discussion never occurred; that indeed it was as a result
15	of communications between lawyers and his discussion with
16	the lawyers that the picketing did not occur.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
18	MR. CALLAGHAN: And I would have asked were
19	there discussions about it and whether indeed I had the
20	same thought, whether he was confused and he was talking
21	about something else or whether John MacDonald was
22	involved. I would have inquired further.
23	I would have then asked him about his
24	communication with Constable Emma Wilson-King and I would
25	have attempted to have him describe those communications

1	and his reaction to those communications, and this deals
2	with the request not to phone Father Maloney.
3	I would have put to him the notes of
4	Constable Emma Wilson-King, which is document number
5	200063.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: These are notes from?
7	MR. CALLAGHAN: These are notes of Officer
8	Emma Wilson-King.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Right. And she's an
10	officer with?
11	MR. CALLAGHAN: The Cornwall Police Service.
12	And I would have taken him to the fourth
13	page and I would have read him the note:
14	"Call the phone number David Silmser.
15	Informed him who I was. At which time
16	he said 'Is this a fucking joke. Next
17	time you want to speak to me come here
18	and see me.' I asked the address. He
19	said `551 Woodside. I don't give a
20	fuck who you are. I'll be calling the
21	Chief of Police tomorrow and lay a suit
22	against you.' I again tempted to
23	reason with him and he hung up."
24	And I would have asked whether that accords
25	with the discussion his recollection of the discussion

1	he had with Emma Wilson-King.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: By the way, the exhibit
3	was wrongly described. It should be 410. Right?
4	THE REGISTRAR: Four-eleven (411).
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Four-eleven (411).
6	Sorry.
7	EXHIBIT NO./ PIÈCE NO P-411:
8	Handwritten Notes of Emma Wilson-King -
9	August 24, 1995 (200063)
10	MR. CALLAGHAN: I would have taken him to
11	Exhibit 204.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
13	MR. CALLAGHAN: Which are the notes of John
14	MacDonald, and I would have pointed out the series of notes
15	and they're very faint, I'm afraid, Mr. Commissioner, on
16	the second page.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: What part?
18	MR. CALLAGHAN: We covered this with Mr.
19	John MacDonald. The note on August $24^{\rm th}$, the $8:00~{\rm p.m.}$
20	refers to a discussion that John MacDonald has with Emma
21	Wilson-King.
22	"8:30 - Dave called saying same. Said
23	he was going to call back police
24	station.
25	8:40 - Dave called back. Said that he

1	gave someone shit.
2	8:45 - Left message"
3	Which I think it was John MacDonald left the
4	message for Emma Wilson-King.
5	"4:35 - Emma Wilson-King called back.
6	Explains situation. Dave taped."
7	And I had asked John MacDonald, I believe
8	about that and I would have asked Mr. Silmser whether there
9	was a tape of any of the communications they had with Emma
10	Wilson-King.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
12	MR. CALLAGHAN: And if there is, where is
13	it?
14	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
15	MR. CALLAGHAN: I would have then reviewed
16	Mr. Silmser's contacts with Mr. Dunlop and Mr. Chisholm. I
17	would have reviewed with him the testimony on January $31^{\rm st}$,
18	2007, which is Volume 87 at page 31.
19	Starting with:
20	Mr. Engelmann: "Okay."
21	At line 9.
22	"So Spencerville; are you living in
23	Spencerville in August of 1996?"
24	Mr. Silmser: "Yes, I am."
25	Mr. Engelmann: "So how was it that

1	this man Carson Chi	sholm comes to visit you at your home?"
2		Mr. Silmser: "I don't really know how
3	he got there."	
4		Mr. Engelmann: "Did he phone you?
5		What happened?
6		How was this set up?"
7		Mr. Silmser: "I think he just showed
8	up."	
9		Mr. Engelmann: "He just showed up?"
10		Mr. Silmser: "I believe so."
11		Mr. Engelmann: "Okay."
12		Mr. Silmser: "But I'm not 100 per cent
13	sure."	
14		Mr. Engelmann: "All right.
15		Did you know who he was?"
16		Mr. Silmser: "No."
17		Mr. Engelmann: "All right.
18		Did he come with someone else?"
19		Mr. Silmser: "Perry Dunlop."
20		Mr. Engelmann: "All right.
21		And did you know who he was?"
22		Mr. Silmser: "I don't know if I met
23	Perry before that.	I don't think so."
24		Mr. Engelmann: "All right."
25		Mr. Silmser: "I think that was the

1	first time."
2	Mr. Engelmann: "You had heard of him,
3	though, by that time?
4	Mr. Silmser: "Yes."
5	I would have tried to clarify with Mr.
6	Silmser that indeed communications with Carson Chisholm and
7	perhaps Perry Dunlop had started at least by the summer of
8	1995. I won't take you back but we've already reviewed two
9	notes in the summer of '95; the one of Mr. Abell, that
10	referred to Carson Chisholm and the one of Constable Bough,
11	referring to Carson Chisholm.
12	I would have reviewed with him his
13	interactions with John MacDonald and Carson Chisholm. You
14	will recall that John MacDonald testified that he was
15	introduced to Carson Chisholm by Mr. Silmser and how Carson
16	Chisholm appeared at his home.
17	I would have reviewed
18	THE COMMISSIONER: How Mr. Chisholm appeared
19	at John MacDonald's home.
20	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
22	MR. CALLAGHAN: I would have reviewed that
23	with him and then asked what his involvement was with
24	arranging contact between Mr. Silmser and pardon me, Mr.
25	MacDonald and Mr. Chisholm.

25

1	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
2	MR. CALLAGHAN: I would have enquired
3	further as to what his understanding of the relationship
4	between Mr. Chisholm and Mr. Dunlop and we just reviewed
5	Constable Bough's note that Carson Chisholm was helping
6	Perry Dunlop. It wasn't entirely clear but I would have
7	asked in what capacity and to what end was the statement
8	what then was Carson Chisholm trying to assist John
9	MacDonald and whether he knew about Carson Chisholm taking
10	the statement and releasing it as was thought by John
11	MacDonald to the press; whether he agreed with that.
12	I would have reviewed with him whether he
13	had contact with Perry Dunlop at this time. We've heard
14	from Mr. MacDonald that he had some contact. He contacted
15	for example, Mr. Dunlop to get the number of Bob Roth, a
16	reporter. We know that Perry Dunlop requested John
17	MacDonald to come by and pick up scrapbooks. I don't know
18	what involvement Mr. Silmser would have had at that stage,
19	in '95, with those items. There's no record for me to
20	point you to.
21	So I would have inquired. I would have
22	pointed out that he had obviously had dealings with Helen
23	Dunlop earlier, back at least in '93, which I take from

52

I don't want to put words in their mouth, but I would have

suggested that was not a pleasant communication. He wasn't

1	happy about hearing Helen Dunlop. So I would have wanted
2	to further explain. He knew that Carson Chisholm was the
3	brother-in-law and I would have asked how he came in
4	contact again with Carson Chisholm and the Dunlops.
5	I would have taken him to oh, and I would
6	have we just talked about whether he had any involvement
7	in the rally that John MacDonald spoke of, which he was
8	doing with Carson Chisholm and Mr. Dunlop.
9	I would have taken him to Exhibit 395.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Which is the interview
11	report of Mr. Silmser, dated August '97.
12	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right.
13	I would have taken him to the bottom of that
14	first answer.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: This is dealing with
16	death threats. Right?
17	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
19	MR. CALLAGHAN: I would have taken him to
20	the bottom where he says:
21	"Perry told me the threats"
22	And these are death threats on the Dunlops,
23	not the Seguin matter.
24	" told me the threats on numerous
25	occasions; once in Toronto when we met

1	with our lawyers, Perry's lawyers and
2	mine"
3	THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry. I'm sorry to
4	interrupt you, but didn't the threats also concern him, as
5	well? It said:
6	"The threat consisted of taking my life
7	and Perry Dunlop's life."
8	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes. Well, I would have to
9	double check as to whether that was the investigative issue
10	or whether that was his perception. I can't recall.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: All I'm saying is I'm
12	responding I hear you saying that it didn't have to do
13	with Mr. Silmser and I'm just perusing this and I'm saying,
14	wait a minute now. It says that.
15	MR. CALLAGHAN: We'll leave it to the OPP.
16	I don't know exactly what the investigation was.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: In any event, you're
18	saying Perry so
19	MR. CALLAGHAN:
20	"Perry told me of the threats on
21	numerous occasions; once in Toronto when we met with our
22	lawyers, Perry's lawyers and mine."
23	I'm not sure what that's at.
24	"Al, I don't recall his last name,
25	Robichaud. That was about eight months

1	ago."
2	So eight months ago just to put it in
3	context, is probably November '96.
4	"Another time at Brockville Hospital, I
5	was visiting John MacDonald in July of
6	'96. Perry was there visiting, as
7	well."
8	"When was the first time you were made
9	aware of the threats?"
10	And they go on.
11	But the point being is that clearly by July
12	'96, he indicates that he had made contact with
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Perry Dunlop.
14	MR. CALLAGHAN: Perry Dunlop and as I
15	say, I would have asked whether there were earlier
16	discussions.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
18	MR. CALLAGHAN: I would have then taken him
19	to Exhibit 303, which was discussed yesterday or two days
20	ago by Mr. Kozloff.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Three-zero-three (303).
22	M'hm.
23	MR. CALLAGHAN: I would have asked when he
24	says:
25	"Received a second call from Mr.

1	Silmser at 11 a.m."
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Well, first of
3	all, this is Mireille is a secretary or support staff at
4	the Crown Attorney's office?
5	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Okay.
7	MR. CALLAGHAN:
8	"Received a second call from Mr.
9	Silmser at ll a.m. Wanted to leave the
10	message that another victim had been
11	located by a private investigator."
12	And it goes on.
13	I would have asked him whether the private
14	investigator was indeed a reference to Mr. Dunlop.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
16	MR. CALLAGHAN: I would have taken him to
17	Exhibit 287.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: These are
19	MR. CALLAGHAN: Exhibit 287, if my note is
20	right, it should be the interview.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Do you want the document
22	number, Madam Clerk?
23	Exhibit 287, you're on. One one six two
24	eight three (116283). That's not what it's supposed to be
25	though.

1	MR. CALLAGHAN: Maybe Mr. Commissioner, I
2	have to get a Bates Page. One second, please.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: One zero two five
4	MR. CALLAGHAN: I have 1102560.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Is that a 6 or an 8?
6	Yes, that's what we need, I think.
7	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: And what are these?
9	MR. CALLAGHAN: These have been identified
10	as notes of or almost a statement of Mr. Silmser, if you
11	go to the seventh page.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
13	"This is a statement true and given
14	freely. My memory of these events. A
15	statement to Carson Chisholm."
16	MR. CALLAGHAN: Right. It's a statement to
17	Carson Chisholm.
18	So I would have explored why it is he was
19	giving a statement to Carson Chisholm; what the purpose of
20	the statement was.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
22	MR. CALLAGHAN: I would have queried whether
23	it was in support of the lawsuit of Constable Dunlop. I
24	would have further queried how it was set up, the extent of
25	the relationship, again, which presumably would have been

1	covered.
2	So I would have gone into some detail as to
3	the surrounding circumstances. The content would not have
4	been an enormous issue because it's content we've heard.
5	But I why he's giving a statement is of interest.
6	I would have then taken him back to the
7	transcript in Volume 87, page 46. It says at the top:
8	"So when she calls you"
9	And we're talking about Helen Dunlop.
10	" in the fall of 1996 had you ever
11	met her?"
12	Mr. Silmser: "No."
13	And I obviously would have put to him that
14	presumably he met her at least, at the very least, during
15	the period when she was purportedly hounding him in '93.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Well.
17	MR. CALLAGHAN: Well, communicating with him
18	in '93.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: There you go.
20	MR. CALLAGHAN: I'm not sure he would have
21	disagreed with it though, but
22	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
23	MR. CALLAGHAN: I hear what you're
24	saying.
25	Mr. Engelmann: "All right.

1	So she introduced herself on the
2	phone?"
3	Mr. Silmser: "That's correct."
4	Mr. Engelmann: "And why does she want
5	you to go to Toronto?"
6	Mr. Silmser:
7	"She said that Perry is doing an
8	investigation on sexual abuse cases,
9	and you wanted to take a statement from
10	me. I refused the first couple of
11	times she phoned. I really didn't want
12	to go but she's kept on insisting and
13	said that they would even pay my train
14	fare down there and my meals and
15	whatever, so I finally agreed to go."
16	And I would have queried further into that
17	communication. I would have asked whether he understood
18	these to be official police investigations; about what he
19	understood Constable Dunlop's role to be and why they were
20	asking him to go to Toronto to see Mr. Dunlop's lawyer.
21	I would have confirmed it was Mr. Bourgeois,
22	I would have confirmed that he understood Mr. Bourgeois was
23	a civil lawyer for a civil lawsuit who he was meeting with.
24	I would have taken him and asked him whether
25	notes were taken at that meeting by Mr. Bourgeois. I

1	would have asked whether notes were taken by anybody other		
2	than Mr. Dunlop. I would have asked him what other		
3	discussion took place with Mr. Bourgeois and Mr. Dunlop. I		
4	would have asked whether anybody whether they told him		
5	it was in furtherance of the lawsuit. So I would have		
6	canvassed at some length about it. I would have tried to		
7	clarify the exact date he went down. There is a statement		
8	that he does give Mr. Dunlop on November 30 th , 1996.		
9	Oh sorry, Exhibit 288. And the statement		
10	here is relating to Mr. Lalonde and I would have asked		
11	further questions. He had indicated during his testimony		
12	that he wasn't aware that that would come up, because he		
13	didn't know how Mr. Dunlop knew about it, and so I would		
14	have queried further one of their discussions and whether		
15	that was the purpose of the meeting.		
16	I would have, obviously, queried further as		
17	to what other further discussions ongoing discussions		
18	he was having with Mr. Dunlop.		
19	I would have taken him to Exhibit 289 and I		
20	would have asked him about further follow-up meetings with		
21	Mr. Dunlop and Mr. Chisholm and, in particular, this		
22	consent form and what the purpose of providing this to Mr.		
23	Dunlop and Mr. Chisholm.		
24	I would have asked, during the course of his		
25	discussions, either in any of this period, whether he had		

1	come in contact with Mr. Leroux or Mr. Don LaBelle or			
2	indeed if he came into contact with others who might have			
3	discussed the goings-on leading to the situation in			
4	Cornwall.			
5	MR. CALLAGHAN: I would have also taken him			
6	to Bates Page 7059707, and these are notes of Constable			
7	Dunlop. They're a series of notes, Mr. Commissioner. We			
8	have been entering them as they come up, on a page-by-page			
9	basis because of the fact that there are names throughout			
10	them.			
11	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.			
12	MR. CALLAGHAN: But anyway			
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry, is this a new			
14	exhibit now?			
15	MR. CALLAGHAN: This would be a new exhibit.			
16	I don't believe this particular page has been entered.			
17	I would have pointed out the May 6, '97			
18	entry			
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, but just a second,			
20	just a second. We're not			
21	MR. CALLAGHAN: Yes, the one you have on			
22	screen is the right page.			
23	THE COMMISSIONER: So that's Exhibit number			
24	412?			
25	THE REGISTRAR: Four-twelve (412).			

1	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
2	THE REGISTRAR: We don't have that one.
3	MR. CALLAGHAN: The document number for this
4	is 716120, which is a large bundle.
5	THE REGISTRAR: Yes, I'll mark that, thank
6	you.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: It might be time for a
8	break.
9	MR. CALLAGHAN: Sure.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Let's take the morning
11	break.
12	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre;
13	veuillez vous lever. The hearing will resume at 11:15.
14	Upon recessing at 10:56 a.m. /
15	L'audience est suspendue à 10h56
16	Upon resuming at 11:17 a.m. /
17	L'audience est reprise à 11h17
18	THE REGISTRAR: The hearing has now resumed.
19	Please be seated. Veuillez vous assoir.
20	MR. CALLAGHAN: Shall I wait?
21	Okay, I could just get away with something.
22	I can't get away with anything around here.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: No, I don't think you'll
24	get away with anything, Mr. Callaghan.
25	Sir, could you go and seek out Mr.

1	Engelmann, please? You don't mind? Thank you. I thought
2	for sure he had left and come back.
3	Well, is there anything else we want to talk
4	about Mr. Engelmann while he's away?
5	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
6	MR. CALLAGHAN: Well, you know, I was going
7	to say, this morning, if it isn't too out of place I was
8	at a breakfast for the Children's Treatment Centre
9	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
10	MR. CALLAGHAN: That we've heard a lot
11	about.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
13	MR. CALLAGHAN: And I got to tell you, this
14	community, the support that that event got and I will
15	urge all my fellow lawyers to support their Bikeathon
16	which, as we all know
17	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
18	MR. CALLAGHAN: this is locally funded,
19	government does not fund
20	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
21	MR. CALLAGHAN: so I hope the my
22	friends way to my rear will dig into their pockets and help
23	because, you know, it's part of what we're here to do.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah. M'hm.
25	MR. CALLAGHAN: So, that was good use of

1	time while Mr. Engelmann came back.
2	I was just going to briefly take you to a
3	note of Constable Dunlop's, which I believe you have, and
4	it's of May 6 '97. And I would have
5	THE COMMISSIONER: And well
6	MR. CALLAGHAN: sought a little
7	clarification
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Just a second, now.
9	We couldn't find this. This is a note from
10	Officer Dunlop?
11	MR. CALLAGHAN: It's in his notebook. It
12	was the bundle of notebooks, and I had indicated earlier
13	that we put we were putting them in one at a time so as
14	to avoid any confidentiality issues with other
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
16	MR. CALLAGHAN: And all I was going to
17	point out to him was, that in this note, the references
18	and I can only read it, it says:
19	"DS stop. Stated he told CPS about
20	Marcel Lalonde in '92, '93, first saw
21	Heidi."
22	And I would have asked him about that
23	because, of course, his testimony was he didn't tell the
24	CPS, he told the CAS, and whether Mr. Dunlop got it wrong
25	or whether there's something else I don't know, but I would

1	have put that to him.	
2	THE COMMISSIONER: All right, so this is	
3	Exhibit number 412.	
4	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO P-412:	
5	Excerpt from Notes of	
6	Constable Dunlop - May 6, 1999 (716120)	
7	MR. CALLAGHAN: I would have asked him, sir,	
8	whether he was aware of the material that Mr. Dunlop had	
9	sent in December '96 to Chief Fantino and whether he was	
10	aware of that. I would have asked him how much he was	
11	aware, again, about the allegations and the lawsuit. And I	
12	would have taken him to his preliminary inquiry transcript.	
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Well it wasn't his	
14	preliminary inquiry, but	
15	MR. CALLAGHAN: He oh, sorry. No, the	
16	one that involving Charlie MacDonald. His testimony at	
17	the preliminary inquiry may barely stated.	
18	And that is sorry, I should have been	
19	clearer, it's Exhibit 291.	
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Actually, I think it's	
21	290.	
22	MR. CALLAGHAN: I'm sorry, I'm at the	
23	September 10 th date.	
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.	
25	MR. CALLAGHAN: And I would have put to him	

1	that, as I understand it, Mr. Dunlop actually attended at	
2	the preliminary inquiry, and I would have put to him page	
3	29 and a question at line 15:	
4	"because the history was there was	
5	an investigation by Cornwall?	
6	Answer:	
7	"Yes."	
8	Question:	
9	"No charges resulted; we'll come to	
10	why?"	
11	Answer:	
12	"Because because of the cover up	
13	with the Crown Attorney. Did you know	
14	that he's under investigation right now	
15	because of the cover-up?"	
16	Question:	
17	"Tell us about that."	
18	Answer:	
19	"The Crown Attorney, as far as I know,	
20	is a cousin of Malcolm MacDonald and he	
21	had a meeting on Stanley Island with	
22	Malcolm MacDonald, Father Charles	
23	MacDonald, Ken Seguin and the whole	
24	bunch of them. And they decided that	
25	they were just going to pay me the	

1	\$32,000 and drop all, not bring any
2	charges, that's what I heard."
3	Question:
4	"Which Crown attorney is that Mr.
5	Silmser?"
6	Answer:
7	"Murray MacDonald."
8	Question:
9	"Current Crown Attorney?"
10	Answer:
11	"Yes."
12	Question:
13	"Part of the cover-up?"
14	Answer:
15	"Yes, as far as I know."
16	Question:
17	"As far as you know?"
18	Answer:
19	"Yes."
20	Question:
21	"Did you witness this meeting?"
22	Answer:
23	"I had people that know there was a
24	meeting."
25	Question:

1	"Who's that?"
2	Answer:
3	"Perry Dunlop."
4	Question:
5	"Was he at the meeting?"
6	Answer:
7	"You'd have to ask him, I don't know."
8	So I would have asked him about the
9	information he was receiving from Perry Dunlop, and I would
10	have asked him whether he was aware of where Perry Dunlop
11	was getting his information, and whether it is indeed
12	whether it was from Ron Leroux. Then I would have asked
13	him further questions relating to why he would raise it in
14	the middle of the preliminary.
15	So I would have put those series of
16	questions to him.
17	The last area I would have touched upon is,
18	I would have touched upon the evidence, you know, recall
19	when I examined Mr. John MacDonald. There was a note of
20	Mr. John MacDonald's wherein he had indicated in the note
21	that David Silmser had advised him that he had told, or
22	that he had reported, the abuse of Father MacDonald to the
23	Children's Aid Society six months before Constable Dunlop,
24	and I would have reviewed that in light of the comments in
25	the transcript of January 30 th .

1	And it's page 200.
2	I would have then, at line 14 and it
3	starts "Mr. Engelmann: Okay. The first time you were
4	interviewed by Children's Aid that was" and he says "Mr.
5	Bough".
6	I think that should be corrected. I think
7	it was Mr. Bell.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: I don't see where you
9	are.
10	MR. CALLAGHAN: Volume 86, page 201. Sorry,
11	I might have the wrong okay. And if you can go down,
12	Madam Clerk, a little bit.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: So you're saying that the
14	transcript is in error?
15	MR. CALLAGHAN: Well, in fact, Mr. Engelmann
16	just whispered to me. He says he believes it's already
17	been corrected. Mr. Bough is Mr. Bell. I mean, it's
18	either a misspoken or it's a mistranscription.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
20	MR. CALLAGHAN: Mr. Silmser:
21	"That's right."
22	Question:
23	"Have you looked at the document
24	already today, the November 2^{nd} , '93?"
25	Mr. Silmser:

1	"That's right."
2	"And so you and Mr. Abel had an
3	agreement about"
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Had an argument.
5	MR. CALLAGHAN: "had an argument when
6	about that date was?"
7	Mr. Silmser:
8	"That's correct."
9	Was there something else? You comment on the notes.
10	Sliding under the door. It was a certain date.
11	Mr. Engelmann:
12	"All right."
13	Mr. Silmser:
14	"Then I went to Children's Aid. It was
15	either it was before or after my
16	statement at the T.V. I believe."
17	Mr. Engelmann:
18	"All right. We know what happened in
19	January of '94."
20	Mr. Silmser:
21	"I see."
22	I'm being advised there is an earlier
23	portion I was to read at page 200.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Engelmann.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Just to clarify the record,

1	and I know Mr. Carriere brought this to my attention. I
2	think I brought it to the reporters' attention at the time.
3	But that error repeats itself, the reference to Mr. Bough
4	and it should be Mr. Bell, Mr. Greg Bell. And it's on
5	pages 201, 202 and 203 of the transcript, and I think we
6	caught some of the errata earlier. Volume 86.
7	MR. CALLAGHAN: Thank you.
8	If I can go back to page 200. I apologize,
9	Mr. Commissioner, my notes were out of order.
10	They're talking about a meeting between John
11	MacDonald and Mr. Abel and Mr. Engelmann starts at the top
12	of page 200:
13	"All right."
14	Mr. Silmser:
15	"It was John MacDonald's meeting
16	basically. John wanted to talk to
17	him."
18	Mr. Engelmann:
19	"Yes. What happened at that meeting?
20	Mr. Silmser:
21	"We sure didn't see eye to eye."
22	Mr. Engelmann:
23	"What happened?"
24	Mr. Silmser:
25	"There was an argument about something,

1	about when I went to see Children's Aid
2	in the first place and they made a big
3	deal about the date and I said 'Well, I
4	don't understand. I think it was this
5	date. I want to see.' Well, he had
6	one of his employees slide a piece of
7	paper under the door."
8	Mr. Engelmann:
9	"This was during your meeting?"
10	Mr. Silmser:
11	"Yes. It was like a big top secret
12	thing and I just couldn't believe it.
13	He was just I don't know. He might
14	have had his reasons but he just looked
15	so stupid and so I kind of seen the
16	character he was and I just didn't like
17	him and I walked out with bad
18	feelings."
19	Mr. Engelmann:
20	"Well, let me just understand the
21	context. You went to a meeting that
22	John MacDonald was having with Richard
23	Abel. Right?"
24	Answer:
25	Mr. Silmser:

1	"Yes."
2	Mr. Engelmann:
3	"If I remember correctly, and you were
4	there, what, to provide him with some
5	support or was there another purpose?"
6	Mr. Silmser:
7	"I can't remember now."
8	Mr. Engelmann:
9	"All right. And why is that? You and
10	Mr. Abel started to have a discussion?
11	Mr. Abel (sic) - Mr. Silmser:
12	"Because of this all I can remember is
13	because at a certain time I want to see
14	Children's Aid. It was before Perry
15	Dunlop. Something to do with Perry
16	Dunlop anyways."
17	"Okay."
18	And so and then Mr. Engelmann goes on to
19	talk, which is what I read about, that the first time he
20	was interviewed was November 2 nd , '93.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Can I stop you there.
22	MR. CALLAGHAN: All right.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Madam Reporter will
24	be noting that you said Mr. Abel but it was really Mr.
25	Engelmann.

1	MR. CALLAGHAN: Oh, did I? Sorry.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: You flipped over a name.
3	Do you understand what I'm saying, question
4	and answer, question and answer? I believe he put Mr. Abel
5	in there when it was either Mr. Engelmann or Mr. Silmser
6	who was speaking. I think it was Mr. Engelmann.
7	MR. CALLAGHAN: And I would have taken him
8	back to his evidence at the preliminary inquiry of
9	September 10 th , which is Exhibit 291.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Exhibit 291. Right.
11	MR. CALLAGHAN: If I can just be given a
12	minute to situate myself, whether it's and I hope I said
13	it correctly, Exhibit 290. I think I said 291. My
14	apologies. And it's September 9 th I note. On page 72, Mr.
15	Commissioner.
16	And I would have started at line 19:
17	Question:
18	"Do you remember when that interview
19	was?
20	Answer: and they're talking about the
21	interview with Mr. Bell and Ms. DeBellis.
22	Answer:
23	"Not exactly, no."
24	Question:
25	"If I suggest to you it was the 2^{nd} of

1		November '93 would you agree with that,
2		accept that?
3	A	nswer:
4		"No, I wouldn't."
5	Qı	uestion:
6		"Okay. Well, I'm taking it off the
7		transcript. It's dated."
8	Aı	nswer:
9		"But there's a problem there."
10	Qı	uestion:
11		"What's that?"
12	Aı	nswer:
13		"What I feel the Children's Aid Society
14		have, have changed dates in order to
15		protect Perry Dunlop on something. I
16		think I seen him a lot. A lot. It was
17		before that date they were written
18		down. I think the Children's Aid they
19		are involved in this cover-up in
20		Cornwall."
21	Qı	uestion:
22		"Okay."
23	A	nswer:
24		"So I wouldn't stand by any of those
25		dates. I wouldn't stand by any of that

1		information from Children's Aid.
2	Ques	tion:
3		"Okay. They're part of a cover-up?"
4	Answ	er:
5		"I believe so."
6	Ques	tion:
7		"And they're involved in a cover-up
8		with whom, with Mr. Dunlop?"
9	Answ	er:
10		"No, no. I think they've covered up
11		some dates so they wouldn't they
12		covered up dates because what happened
13		there was I went to see the Children's
14		Aid Society and the Children's Aid
15		Society said that Perry Dunlop went to
16		see them before I did, and I'm saying
17		no, I didn't work that way so they
18		changed dates type of thing. So I
19		don't know why it's just
20	Ques	tion:
21		"Let's take another try at this. Where
22		is the discrepancy again?"
23	Answ	er:
24		"The discrepancy's in the dates. I
25		went to see them first, the first

1	meeting."
2	Question:
3	"I'm sorry?"
4	Answer:
5	"The first meeting I had but there's a
6	discrepancy in the dates."
7	And I would have asked whether he indeed
8	went before the six months before Perry Dunlop. I would
9	have followed that through.
10	There are other references that he talks
11	about a cover-up. I would have I frankly would not have
12	given it any credence but I didn't because when you read
13	the transcript it's hard to understand what he's talking
14	about, but I would have wanted to clarify the date in which
15	he went to the Children's Aid Society. And that would have
16	been the conclusion, mercifully.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: No. Thank you very much.
18	I think you've taken over was it from Mr. Lee who had
19	started at the Inquiry with these time estimates? I think
20	you get the golden star for
21	MR. CALLAGHAN: I'm sorry. It is very
22	difficult.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: It is. It is.
24	All right. Mr. Engelmann.
25	SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF MS. BIRRELL OF THE CATHOLIC

1	DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD BY / REPRESENTATIONS DE LA PART DE
2	MS. BIRRELL DE LA COMMISSION SCOLAIRE CATHOLIQUE PAR MR.
3	ENGELMANN:
4	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm about to do something
5	very unusual.
6	Ms. Birrell, who is counsel for the Catholic
7	District School Board of Eastern Ontario was unable to be
8	here. She wrote Commission counsel a letter setting out
9	some background as to what she would have done if she would
10	have had the opportunity to cross-examine Mr. Silmser. I
11	spoke to her about it. Submissions, if there were any,
12	have been deleted and she's asked me just to very briefly
13	read into the record what she would have done and I said I
14	would do that for her.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Have other counsel been
16	made aware of this?
17	MR. ENGELMANN: I believe so, very
18	informally though. I don't know if anybody has any
19	objections.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Go ahead.
21	So for the record, this is Mr. Engelmann who
22	is reading but on behalf of Ms. Birrell.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: So to speak. I've been
24	asked on occasion to ask questions for counsel and do other
25	things for counsel and I think it's part of the ongoing

	1	role	we	have	as	Commission	counsel
--	---	------	----	------	----	------------	---------

This is a bit of a narrative, like what I received from Mr. Neuberger, and we did not make that an exhibit. So I think it would be inappropriate to make this an exhibit. And I'll just read in as best I can what she would have done.

So by way of background, she states the board could have reviewed Mr. Silmser's educational history with the former Stormont-Dundas & Glengarry County Roman Catholic Separate School Board when he attended St. Anne's, St. Columban's and Bishop MacDonell schools and would have asked him to confirm that the last year in attendance at a school within the SDG Separate Board was the '71-'72 school year. Would have asked him to confirm that he left the separate board in '72 to enter the public board system. Would have confirmed with him that he attended CCVS, which is a public school, for the calendar year '72-'73, or the school year '72-'73.

With respect, and her next caption is "Allegations of Abuse", and she indicates, and we've heard this from other counsel, that Mr. Silmser's made allegations against one of his former teachers, and had they been provided with the opportunity to cross-examine, the board could have confirmed that in making these allegations, Mr. Silmser is not alleging that one -- any

abuse took place while at school or during any school
related activity, and two, that any abuse took place during
school hours or on school board property. And she would
have referred him to pages 46 and 47 of the transcript of
his evidence in-chief on January $29^{\rm th}$, 2007 to confirm that
The next caption being "Non-reporting Abuse

to the Board". She states -- and would have had him confirm that in his evidence in-chief he did not allege that he had ever reported his allegations of abuse to the board. This is with respect to Marcel Lalonde.

THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.

MR. ENGELMANN: The board then says it could have cross-examined Mr. Silmser and had him confirm that he never reported his allegations of abuse against the teacher to any representative of the Catholic District School Board or any school board official. And to rely upon that they would have relied upon Exhibit 278. I don't' think we need to put it on the screen, sir.

It's a letter dated July 28th, 2004 from the CAS to Mr. Silmser wherein it's captured that he advised -- he was advised to report allegations against a teacher to "the relevant school board". Which indicates the board would have confirmed that Mr. Silmser never followed the advice of the CAS or would have asked him whether he followed that advice and tried to confirm that he never

1	reported the allegations to their board.
2	She would have also made a reference to
3	Exhibit 316, and this is an examination for discovery held
4	on December $14^{ m th}$, 2005, at page 221, which is our Bates Page
5	number 7164856 of the transcript. And she wanted to read
6	in a question and answer from Mr. Silmser under oath.
7	Question:
8	"Did you tell anybody, the police or
9	anybody about the incidents with the
10	grade 8 teacher?"
11	Answer:
12	"I believe I told the Children's Aid
13	Society."
14	Question:
15	"Anybody else?"
16	Answer:
17	"No."
18	Lastly, she indicates had the board been
19	provided with an opportunity to cross-examine, the board
20	could have explored why the allegations against the teacher
21	were not raised with the board, when the witness, meaning
22	Mr. Silmser, indicated that he had raised allegations
23	against other persons with various institutions.
24	That was essentially what she wanted to
25	cover, by way of confirmation.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: So that was the last of the
3	parties that did not have an opportunity to cross-examine
4	Mr. Silmser when he was here.
5	I don't know if there are any other parties
6	who wish to make any comments or any submissions, but those
7	are the five that didn't have that opportunity and this was
8	the alternative process that all parties agreed to consider
9	and to follow, as I say, while reserving their rights, if
10	they were dissatisfied with the process to take some
11	action. Obviously sir, you did the same.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: I don't know if there's
14	anyone else who has any further comments with respect to
15	maybe I should stand down for a minute and make sure. And
16	then I'll just comment briefly on the Commission's role.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: I don't see anybody
18	rushing here.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, there are a number of
20	things that have arisen during the course of this
21	alternative process. As Commission counsel, rather than
22	try and engage in that process, I think more properly there
23	are a number of issues that have arisen that Commission
24	counsel will be covering with witnesses as we move into the

institutional response stage of Phase 1 of this Hearing.

1	So I will not attempt to suggest what I
2	would have done by way of re-examination.
3	I should also point out that I received an
4	email from Mr. Culic, who is Mr. Silmser's lawyer.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: He was, of course, advised
7	of your decision to allow him to participate in this
8	process and he indicated to me in an email yesterday that
9	his schedule did not permit him to be here. So the offer
10	was made. He indicated to us that he was otherwise
11	occupied and couldn't be here.
12	So I think that concludes then, this aspect
13	of the evidence of David Silmser and the alternative
14	process that we've engaged in.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
16	Thank you.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, then the last thing
18	that has been planned for today is an all-counsel meeting
19	with counsel for all the parties.
20	We will then be back here on the record with
21	the parties next Thursday, that is the I believe it's
22	the 26^{th} of April. We had indicated to the parties that we
23	wanted to at that time, go through an overview of
24	documentary evidence for a witness who has a moniker here.

As well, I believe there was a report that you were going

24

25

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

85