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 186

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

Monday, January 21 2008 Monday, le 21 janvier 2008

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

ERRATA

August 21, 2007 Volume 128

Transcript, Page 33, line 5:

Sensory deprivation, torture, mind control experiments, LCD, sodium pentothal, electroshock treatment to my teeth, my testicles and my toes, I was subjected to that treatment.

Should have read

Sensory deprivation, torture, mind control experiments, \underline{LSD} , sodium pentothal, electroshock treatment to my teeth, my testicles and my toes, I was subjected to that treatment.

Appearances/Comparutions

Mr. Peter Engelmann Lead Commission Counsel

Ms. Julie Gauthier Registrar

Ms. Raija Pulkkinen Commission Counsel

Mr. Peter Manderville Cornwall Police Service Board

Mr. Neil Kozloff Ontario Provincial Police

Mr. Joe Neuberger Ontario Ministry of Community

and Correctional Services and Adult Community Corrections

Mr. Darrell Kloeze Attorney General for Ontario

Mr. Jeremy Glick

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

Scott Seguin and Father Charles

MacDonald

Mr. William Carroll Ontario Provincial Police

Association

Mr. John Westdal Mr. Jos Van Diepen

Mr. Frank T. Horn Coalition for Action

Mr. Ian Paul

Table of Contents / Table des matières

List of Exhibits :	Page iv
Opening Remarks by/Remarques d'ouverture par Mr. Peter Engelmann	1
JOS VAN DIEPEN, Resumed/Sous le même serment	1
Examination in-Chief by/Interrogatoire en-chef par Mr. Peter Engelmann(cont'd/suite)	1
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Allan Manson	215
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Ian Paul	270

LIST OF EXHIBITS/LISTE D'EXHIBITS

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO
P-1178	(100551) Memorandum from Paul Downing to Jos van Diepen - 14Sep,00	72

1	Upon commencing at 9:36 a.m./
2	L'audience débute à 9h36
3	THE REGISTRAR: This hearing of the Cornwall
4	Public Inquiry is now in session. The Honourable Mr.
5	Justice Normand Glaude, Commissioner, presiding.
6	Please be seated. Veuillez vous asseoir.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Good morning
8	all.
9	Mr. Engelmann.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Good morning, Mr.
11	Commissioner.
12	Good morning, Mr. van Diepen.
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Good morning.
14	JOS VAN DIEPEN: Resumed/Sous le même serment
15	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF/INTERROGATOIRE EN-CHEF PAR MR.
16	<pre>ENGELMANN (Continued/Suite):</pre>
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, when we left off on
18	Friday, we had a brief discussion about some documents that
19	you thought were missing?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you recall that?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Aside from a legal opinion,
24	were there other specific documents that you could think of
25	that you thought were missing, sir?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Can you give us a sense as
3	to what those documents would relate to?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: There were a number of
5	overlying documents relating to the issue of the website as
6	well as there were more specific documents relating to my
7	request for legal representation; as well as, I believe,
8	that there should have been some documentation respecting
9	"notes to file" on decisions and/or verbal communications.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, on Friday, we took a
11	look at Exhibit 1177. Do you have that handy?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I have no exhibits with me.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: It's a fairly lengthy email
14	from you in that document dated September $7^{\rm th}$.
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Before we go into the
16	matter of the public the Project Truth website
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I'm wondering, and I
19	don't understand procedural matters, I'm not a solicitor,
20	so His Honour may correct me.
21	However, I would like to revisit, if I
22	could, some evidence that was given because I wish to
23	clarify the factual record.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay, well, you have a
25	lawyer, sir, and he will be asking you some questions.

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I think I may have
2	provided erroneous information based on the questions that
3	you asked me.
4	MR. WESTDAL: There was an exchange at the
5	end of Friday and we've had a look at the transcript and
6	Mr. van Diepen has answered a question and, upon review,
7	didn't appreciate the question that was asked of him, and I
8	think it's very important I should think the question
9	crossed the line.
10	And I think it's very important that the
11	facts be made very clear and that Mr. van Diepen be given
12	an opportunity right at the outset to just clarify his
13	response. I think it would be very helpful to the
14	Commission to do that. It was at the end of the day on
15	Friday and it I think it would assist the Commission and
16	just avoid any sort of as this examination continues
17	avoid any false assumptions about what he either knew or
18	what he said.
19	But, really, in essence, it's the answer to
20	a question that was put to him he'd like to change or at
21	least revisit. I'm not saying change outright.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Did you advise Commission
23	counsel of this before we started?
24	MR. WESTDAL: No, I haven't.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, why not?

1	MR. WESTDAL: It can be dealt with in re-
2	examination or later, but this is the way these things
3	have transpired, it's eleven o'clock last night, I'm on the
4	phone with Mr. van Diepen.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: No, I understand that.
6	MR. WESTDAL: Yes.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: What I'm saying is that I
8	would have thought that before the hearing started you go
9	see Mr. Engelmann and you say, "Look it, we've got this
10	situation here", so that Mr. Engelmann can assess the
11	situation and determine how it's going to affect his
12	examination and the whole dealing with this witness.
13	MR. WESTDAL: Okay.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Would you like a few
15	minutes, Mr. Engelmann?
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, sir, I'm troubled by
17	this news. I'm also troubled by the fact that Mr. van
18	Diepen has spoken to his counsel in the middle of my
19	questioning about the evidence apparently.
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No. I
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Just no, no. One
22	person at a time.
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Thank you, Your Honour.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: That's essentially what's

just been explained and I'm quite surprised. So I don't really know what to say at this point.

Obviously, Mr. Westdal knows what Mr. van

Diepen wishes to speak about and it puts me in a difficult

situation. I don't know if you gave him an express warning

at the end of the day on Friday, we certainly had earlier,

and I'm just -- I'm very concerned.

MR. WESTDAL: Let me be clear.

I have not spoken to Mr. van Diepen about what evidence he has given or may give. He has asked me procedurally, you know, what can he do? He's the one that's aware. He's the one that raised it and I have been very, very, careful in terms of -- I'm not coaching him. I am not discussing what he should be saying.

It is more that -- and I can tell you that this arose from a media report over the course of the weekend and he contacted me in terms of, you know, "What should I do procedurally?" Not what should I be saying; not me coaching him in terms of what he should say. And I think that the role of counsel, you know, it's appropriate for him to be asking me that question and I'm saying, "If you didn't give a response that -- if the response you gave you want to change, one option is to do that at the outset or at least to raise the issue".

Obviously, I have an opportunity later to

1	ask Mr. van Diepen questions and that may be an opportunity
2	for me to elicit that, but it's a significant thing. It
3	arose in a media report and it was Mr. van Diepen that
4	looked and feels that
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. All right.
6	So before this thing becomes greater than
7	what it should be, I would have preferred if you would have
8	risen and said, "Look it, we have a situation here", and I
9	would have appreciated if you would have spoken to Mr.
10	Engelmann before we started, but in any event, we'll take a
11	break.
12	Mr. Engelmann
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, I'm content with him
14	saying what he has to say and if I need a few minutes
15	afterwards I'll take it before I finish.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Fine.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: I just I anyway. I've
18	made my comment.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: That's fine. All right.
20	So, sir, you say that you answered a
21	question. Do you know what question that is?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, Your Honour, and just
23	for the record, Your Honour, I want to assure you that this
24	matter was initiated by me and it was as a result of some
25	of the media attention that the Inquiry is drawing and that

1	headline is what triggered my memory and I said, you know,
2	this is not right. I'm not providing His Honour with the
3	correct facts.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. So do you
5	know what part of the transcript it's at?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, Your Honour, I had a
7	chance to look it up.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: So what volume is it?
9	It's in the last volume? It's in his Examination in-Chief,
10	okay. What page?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Page 96, Your Honour. I
12	just have a I just did a cut and paste.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Page 96, okay.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: This is Friday's transcript,
15	sir? I don't have it.
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
17	On Friday, in reference to a matter of me
18	having reported to the police of an incident that took
19	place in 1976 involving an unnamed person who's name is
20	protected, there was a lengthy discussion between Mr.
21	Engelmann and myself.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: At page 96, line 10 of the
24	transcript, Mr. Engelmann says:
25	"You had an allegation from a 17 year-old where he's been

1	referred […] to a priest and there's an allegation of
2	inappropriate sexual behaviour."
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Your Honour, I wish to
5	bring to your attention that there was never any
6	inappropriate sexual behaviour
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Whoa, whoa that was
8	reported to you?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That was reported to me.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And, subsequently, I'm led
12	to believe that there were three separate police
13	investigations and my understanding of it is, is that
14	Father MacDonald was never charged as a result of any
15	contact, at that point or at any other time, with the
16	alleged victim.
17	And so the issue comes down to, you know,
18	Mr. Engelmann is saying that I did nothing because as a
19	result of an allegation of inappropriate sexual behaviour;
20	there was no inappropriate sexual behaviour for me to
21	report, Your Honour.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, how do you know
23	that?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, based on what the
25	client told me.

PUBLIC HEARING AUDIENCE PUBLIQUE

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Just so I get it
2	straight.
3	This is the situation where Barque says he
4	has you tell Barque and Barque that you have a fellow
5	that needs a place to stay?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct, Your
7	Honour.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: He drives him out to
9	Father MacDonald's parish?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's right.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Later on the fellow comes
12	back, tells you I'm not going back there and all of that,
13	that's what we're referring to?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, Your Honour.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, let me just ask
17	you a couple of questions about
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, maybe I could
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Can I finish?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I'm not finished.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: By all means.
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: There was also you pointed
23	out a number of times that I should have referred the
24	matter to the CAS and I can tell you, sir, that
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Where is that in the

1	transcript, sir?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: It's in there. Again, it's
3	and you mentioned something that I should have gone to
4	the CAS. It should have been reported to the CAS. And I
5	just want
6	MR. ENGELMANN: If you could just find the
7	reference, that would be helpful, since you've obviously
8	read it.
9	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Anyways, I guess your
11	point is that there was no obligation to report to the
12	Children's Aid Society because he was over 17, over 16? Is
13	that what you're saying?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, well, yes, Your
15	Honour.
16	One, he was an adult within the definition
17	of the law at that time and, two, there was no sexual
18	there was no so the CAS and we've had other
19	situations at that time where the CAS would not accept a
20	referral on an adult.
21	So the matter so what happened was that
22	the term, "the inappropriate sexual behaviour", was
23	construed by the media as that there was a matter of abuse
24	and I did nothing.
25	The other part

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Hang on, Mr
2	MR. MANSON: This is around page 92, 93 last
3	
4	MR. ENGELMANN: I just wanted to read
5	something to him. I found it. I just want to make sure
6	that we're using the same words, Mr. Van Diepen.
7	I asked you on page 93
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: What line is that, Mr.
9	Engelmann? Oh yes.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: So there's been some
11	discussion about follow-up because of the client's wishes
12	and I asked you concern about the possibly what might
13	have happened to other children:
14	"Yes, all right, that's fine."
15	And then I say:
16	"Did you report this to the CAS?"
17	And you say, "No".
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Right.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: And you say he was an adult
20	at the time?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Right.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So we had a
23	discussion about that?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: And I asked you whether you

1	did?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: There's no reference to you
4	saying you had to or you should have; there was a question
5	about whether you had done it.
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Is that fair?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, but I construed from
9	you, sir, that I should have or ought to have.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: I wanted to know from you
11	whether you had done it.
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: The other thing, Mr.
13	Engelmann, that I don't think which was abundantly clear,
14	was at that time in 1976 I was a new probation officer, a
15	Probation Officer Level One who was being mentored by a
16	senior probation officer. Anything other than a routine
17	matter, i.e. reporting, was referred to the mentoring
18	probation officer for either his direction or the matter
19	was taken completely into his hands.
20	So, in other words, if for the purposes of
21	our discussion, there was a sexual abuse or, for example,
22	if there was a case where there would have been
23	enforcement, such as a breach of probation, I could take no
24	action other than to report the matter to Mr. Seguin.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Was there a note or a

1	directive to that effect that he was your mentor?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes. And furthermore, in
3	spite of that, had there been a sexual abuse and I reported
4	it to Mr. Seguin and Mr. Seguin nevertheless decided to do
5	nothing, I can assure this court that I would have done
6	something and I would have followed it up.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Well
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, sir, you've already
9	told us that you were a young probation officer?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: You've already told us that
12	you reported the pornography to Ken Seguin?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: The handcuffs to Ken Seguin?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: And this incident
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: to Ken Seguin?
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: All within a year?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: And you've already told us
23	that as far as you know there was no follow-up on any of
24	them; correct?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I'm not aware of any, no.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. And you're telling
2	us that there was nothing you could do but report to Mr.
3	Seguin; that's your answer?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: My job was to report all
5	matters, not all contentious matters were to be handled
6	by Mr. Seguin.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And you don't
8	know what happened
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't know what happened.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: to this 17 year-old
11	probationer when he spent a few days with Father Charles
12	MacDonald do you?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, all
14	MR. ENGELMANN: You don't know what
15	happened?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Only what the client
17	reported to me.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. And what he reported
19	to you, at least what you reported to the police in
20	February of 1994, was what's described in your statement?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
22	The other thing, Mr. Engelmann, is that the
23	police were not there to see me about a probationer. The
24	police were there
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, just take that name off

1	the record, please?
2	THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry. Oh yes.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: We'll take that name off the
4	record. We've already talked about this, Mr. Van Diepen.
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: My apologies, sir.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: They were there to see you
7	about Ken Seguin's death?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: They were there to see me
9	about matters associated with Mr. Seguin and whether or not
10	I knew of any inappropriate sexual behaviour on the part of
11	Mr. Seguin, to which I replied I was not aware of anything.
12	Then they asked, well, are you aware of anything at all and
13	it was at that point that I brought up the matter of the
14	individual who should not be named.
15	So in other words what I'm suggesting to
16	you, sir, if I had not mentioned that name, the police
17	would never this matter this entire matter would have
18	never seen the light of day.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: So just so I'm clear, they
20	were there to see you about suspicions or concerns they had
21	about Mr. Seguin's death and correct?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, yeah, not necessarily
23	the death. I believe a broader
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Not just the death.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: So they were also interested
2	in anything you would know about any inappropriate sexual
3	behaviour on his part?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: That was your understanding?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: And you had the sense then
8	they were investigating that issue?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: And these are the first
11	officers in 1994?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Now you said
14	that well, do you know if the OPP actually followed up
15	and investigated this particular allegation?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Do I know or do I believe?
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you know.
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh, I don't have any first-
19	hand information. The police did not those
20	investigations were confidential.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Did they ever
22	get back to you and ask you further questions about this
23	particular probationer?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Not the '94 group.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm talking about the

1	individual that you've just brought up to us, the 17 year-
2	old.
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Not the '94 group.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And to your
5	knowledge, would they have ever followed up and asked you
6	for your case notes dealing with that individual?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, they did not.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And how do you
9	know that there were no charges dealing with Father
10	Charlie's contact with that individual?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I made a number of
12	inquiries.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Those inquiries you made
14	this weekend?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: And who did you make those
17	inquiries with?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: One of the individuals was
19	counsel for Father MacDonald.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: So you spoke to him this
21	weekend?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: That's Mr. Neville?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: You spoke to Mr. Neville

1	directly this weekend?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, Your Honour.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: You phoned him or you saw
4	him?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I saw him.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, were you all right,
7	what did you discuss?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I asked him essentially
9	I was I was not interested in Mr. Neville breaching any
10	confidence between he as counsel and his client, however, I
11	wished to ask him if he knew if he had any information
12	whatsoever which would lead me to believe that there were
13	charges as a result of the information in which I've
14	brought forward to the police.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: This particular information?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's right that's
17	right.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: That you had testified to on
19	Friday?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: When did you have your
22	meeting with Mr. Neville?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: This morning.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Is there anybody else
25	that you talked to about this?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes. I talked to the
2	counsel for the Children's Aid Society and I asked to
3	again, I wanted to make sure that I had I was not
4	presenting false information to this Inquiry. I wanted to
5	make sure I understood the role of the CAS.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: So you had a discussion with
7	Mr. Chisholm about your evidence as well?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I did.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Anyone else?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: With my wife, a number of
11	family members and friends. Obviously, they were not happy
12	with the headlines and they and I can tell you that my
13	weekend was not an enjoyable one, sir.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, I I didn't read the
15	newspaper. I often don't.
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I I suggest, sir,
17	that you should because I think it is important to
18	understand the harm that this Inquiry has caused my family
19	and myself, and this is only a continuation and a
20	confirmation of the falsehoods and innuendo placed on that
21	website. And, sir, I can tell you
22	THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry? On the
23	website? The Nadeau website, you mean?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, the Nadeau website and
25	even even to this day, sir, there's a website, as you

are aware, and again there are -- there are misleading facts reported in that. And when I say the media, I -- I can tell you that the -- that the radio station headlines were even more troubling to me than the -- than the printed media.

And, sir, I need to tell you something else, sir, is that I have a great deal of difficulty with your questioning when you provide me with erroneous assumptions and otherwise mislead me in answering them. These -- these questions do not -- these -- these style of questions do not help me in providing His Honour with all the information that he needs to properly adjudicate this case.

What I find myself being is defensive rather than focusing on providing a detailed and full answer and recalling my -- from my memory the circumstances and events that you're questioning me about.

And also, sir, I need you to be aware that although you've heard from a number of victims, I also need you to understand that I too am a victim. I'm a victim of a -- of a false relationship with two co-workers. I'm a victim of a Ministry that failed to support me. I'm a victim of a -- of a website and I'm a victim of a media and -- and the public. Sir, I can tell you that I have people that I considered friends who do not speak to me anymore; people have spat at me and I can tell you that this -- that

1	the circumstances of this past weekend only go to further
2	traumatize me.
3	And I ask you to be cognizant of that, sir,
4	because I not only is it affecting me, but I think
5	potential future witnesses and victims are going to be very
6	reluctant to come forward and share their story.
7	Thank you, sir.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Anything else, Mr. van
9	Diepen? I I have a couple of questions for you arising
10	from that. I just want to make sure I've got everything.
11	Anyone else you've talked to about this?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Were you not
14	aware, sir, that you were not to discuss any details of
15	your evidence with anybody? Were you not told that?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I didn't initiate the
17	contacts, sir. I just and I was
18	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, sir. Let me just
19	understand what you're saying by that. You're saying that
20	Mr. Neville approached you this morning?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I approached Mr.
22	Neville.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Chisholm approached you
24	this morning?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I approached Mr. Chisholm.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: And what about all of these
2	other people you've spoken to?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: They approached me.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: And did you
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: They approached me as a
6	result because they were not happy with the headlines of
7	the media.
8	MR. WESTDAL: Just in in fairness to Mr.
9	van Diepen, do we know that he has disclosed his evidence?
10	That was the question. You said do you know that you're
11	not supposed to disclose your evidence. I haven't heard
12	that. He hasn't disclosed his evidence. I mean, what I
13	have heard is that he's asked questions. That's not
14	disclosing his evidence.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Greatest of respect to my
16	friend, I think that's a distinction without a difference.
17	He's clearly been discussing issues that he's discussed
18	here at this Inquiry with many individuals by his own
19	admission and I'm deeply troubled by that.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: So let's go to another
22	assertion you've just
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I
24	MR. ENGELMANN: made, sir. You're
25	you're aware of the fact

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Mr. Neville
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Sir, Mr. Neville
4	MR. ENGELMANN: you're here to answer
5	questions.
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Mr. Neville wishes to
7	speak.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm sure he does.
9	MR. NEVILLE: I certainly do. I arrived
10	here, Mr. Commissioner, almost at nine-thirty sharp and the
11	person who approached me to discuss this area was his
12	counsel.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
14	MR. NEVILLE: And as we finished our
15	conversation, Mr. van Diepen came out of the side door and
15 16	conversation, Mr. van Diepen came out of the side door and approached us as we finished. I did not discuss any
16	approached us as we finished. I did not discuss any
16 17	approached us as we finished. I did not discuss any details with him, I discussed them with his counsel,
16 17 18	approached us as we finished. I did not discuss any details with him, I discussed them with his counsel, period. He was there as we finished our conversation and
16 17 18 19	approached us as we finished. I did not discuss any details with him, I discussed them with his counsel, period. He was there as we finished our conversation and I'm sure Mr. Westdal will confirm that.
16 17 18 19 20	approached us as we finished. I did not discuss any details with him, I discussed them with his counsel, period. He was there as we finished our conversation and I'm sure Mr. Westdal will confirm that. MR. CHISHOLM: Good morning, sir. I'll tell
16 17 18 19 20 21	approached us as we finished. I did not discuss any details with him, I discussed them with his counsel, period. He was there as we finished our conversation and I'm sure Mr. Westdal will confirm that. MR. CHISHOLM: Good morning, sir. I'll tell you what I have to say.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	approached us as we finished. I did not discuss any details with him, I discussed them with his counsel, period. He was there as we finished our conversation and I'm sure Mr. Westdal will confirm that. MR. CHISHOLM: Good morning, sir. I'll tell you what I have to say. I was sitting at my table. Mr. van Diepen

1	my comments to Mr. Westdal, but I I would not say that I
2	was discussing Mr. van Diepen's evidence with him.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Okay.
4	Mr. Engelmann, why don't we take a short
5	break?
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Sure.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Let's take 15 minutes.
8	Sir, and you are not to discuss your
9	testimony with anyone.
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: All right. Thank you, Your
11	Honour.
12	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Nor are you to ask
14	questions.
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I'm sorry?
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Nor are you to ask
17	questions of anyone associated with this Inquiry. You have
18	a lawyer; he's representing you; you speak with him; all
19	right? Well, don't speak with him during your testimony
20	but after it's finished, you can talk to him then; all
21	right?

22 MR. VAN DIEPEN: Thank you, Your Honour.

23 **THE REGISTRAR:** Order; all rise. À l'ordre;

veuillez vous lever.

25 This hearing will resume at 10:20 a.m.

1	Upon recessing at 10:04 a.m. /
2	L'audience est suspendu à 10h04
3	Upon resuming at 10:23 a.m. /
4	L'audience est reprise à 10h23
5	THE REGISTRAR: This hearing is now resumed.
6	Please be seated. Veuillez vous asseoir.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. van Diepen, I have a
8	few comments to make and so I want you to take them in the
9	best of ways.
10	First of all, I certainly do not doubt that
11	if there was a transgression in your speaking to your
12	lawyer and him and you speaking to others that I I
13	find that it was done, I have no doubt that it was done in
14	good faith; that you didn't mean any harm by it; and that
15	you thought that you were doing the right thing. All
16	right; so there's that.
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Thank you, Your Honour.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: But now I'll read you
19	Rule 25; okay?
20	Rule 25 says:
21	"Except with the permission of the Commissioner, no counsel
22	other than Commission counsel may speak to a witness about
23	the evidence that he or she has given until it is complete.
24	Commission counsel may not speak to any witness about his
25	or her evidence while the witness is being cross-examined

1 by other counsel."

Now, I understand that there may be a gray area here about you weren't asking about the evidence, you were asking about procedure; all right? But in telling of the procedure, you had to tell them about the evidence that you were questioning and there lies the problem; all right?

MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, Your Honour.

and I will -- and I guess well, I'm going to have to tell that to all of the witnesses that the proper way to do it would be to say to your lawyer, "I have a problem here."

That's it. He's not sending a post-it note about what the evidence is all about and he can speak to Mr. Engelmann and they'll figure things out. That's number one.

Number two, I quite understand your feelings with respect to how you're feeling. You're in a tough position obviously; tough because you're going to have some hard questions to answer; all right? You're not on trial here. One of the reasons why we have a counselling program here is to help all people so I would -- and that applies to witnesses; it applies to me; it applies to everyone that's been touched by this thing.

So, please, if you feel that you need it, please take advantage of it.

The other thing I've got to say is that no

1	one is asking unfair questions. All right? You may feel
2	that way and that's something that we all have to work with
3	in trying to minimize that but hard questions have to be
4	asked.
5	You have a lawyer here. He's representing
6	your interests and if there's something in there that is
7	wrong, he will object.
8	Now, the press; we are all suffering from
9	the slings and arrows of the press. They're trying to do
10	their job and they have a right to report on all of this.
11	I'm going to ask you one thing which I've
12	asked all of the people and it's tough because I'm the one
13	who's going to make the findings here and I'm not going to
14	make any findings until the end of the Inquiry.
15	And so in the meantime, we have to suffer
16	the slings and arrows of what's going on in the newspaper
17	but we are not I will not participate in that and I've

Now, what I'm going to ask Mr. Engelmann to do is to review with you where you feel that he has asked you an improper question. I can tell you that I don't think that there's been an improper question. I think we'll just go over that and see where we can get with it.

asked all of the people involved in all of this to wait

All right?

until the end.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	So, again, I really want you to know that
2	all of the witnesses here have been treated with respect
3	and dignity, and I insist that that continues.
4	I think that's that's about all I really
5	want to say. So, is there anything that you need to tell
6	me arising out of what I told you?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Your Honour, I'm here to
8	clear my name and to set the record straight and to provide
9	you with all the information that I can possibly provide
10	you with.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: If the nature of the
13	questions are directed and come to me as if they were a
14	cross-examination rather than an Examination of Chief, I am
15	put on the defensive and I become uncomfortable and,
16	therefore, my emotional state rises and I cannot I
17	cannot I don't have the psychological energy to draw on
18	events that occurred more than 30 years ago.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And I think I think it's
21	unfair to me but also to the victims that need to hear what
22	happened.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And so I can only do what I
25	can humanly possibly do, Your Honour, and I'm just not

1	some of the questioning style was just I feel was
2	inappropriate because I don't have the I don't have the
3	benefit of counsel and that's the
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, you have the
5	benefit.
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I can't review
7	evidence with him, Your Honour, and I so I'm alone, and
8	if Mr. Engelmann was helping me in bringing the evidence
9	forward then I would be much more comfortable in providing
10	the information to His Honour.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Let me just say one
12	thing. You may be here to clear your name; right, but I'm
13	here to hear your evidence.
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: So whether your name is
16	cleared or not, that's something I'm going to deal with,
17	maybe, at the end. All right?
18	I'm just here to get the best evidence so
19	whether you're here to clear your name or for any other
20	reason, that's a background issue for me. You have to
21	understand that. You understand that you're going to be
22	cross-examined by folks.
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh, I understand that.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. So bottom
25	line is, what you're saying is the style and where you

1	got you probably know a lot about the law if you know
2	what cross-examination is and the rules on examination.
3	I sure hope your lawyer didn't tell you that on the weekend
4	or yesterday but we'll deal with that.
5	Anyways, I think the issue is over for now
6	and Mr. Engelmann is going to ask you some questions about
7	go over the evidence with respect to that 17 year old
8	and where you felt that it was unfair and then we'll so
9	you understand, though, that there may be some spots where
10	the evidence is what the evidence is and that's up to me to
11	interpret, all right, and it's not up to you to give me
12	conclusions. All right?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Thank you, Your Honour.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. So now what I will
15	do though is I want to also tell you that during the rest
16	of your examination, all right, if you feel that things are
17	emotionally for you you know, so that's a separate thing
18	about your lawyer and anything else and you're saying
19	you're there; you're all alone, well, you're not because
20	you can always talk to me live, right here, in front of
21	everybody and just say "Stop, I need a break" or "I need to
22	do something" and I'm here to give you directions on how to
23	help you deal with that.

24 MR. VAN DIEPEN: Thank you, Your Honour.

THE COMMISSIONER: Is that all right?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, Your Honour.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr yes?
3	MR. WESTDAL: Thank you for your comments
4	and I am sorry that the manner in which this has arisen
5	regarding speaking to counsel; raising the names of other
6	counsel. It was an awkward weekend for me as a solicitor
7	to a client knowing that I cannot discuss evidence. I did
8	my best to advise the client without breaching the Rules.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
10	MR. WESTDAL: I appreciate your comments
11	that if there was a there's possibly a grey area. If
12	there was a transgression, you accept that it was done in
13	good faith.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
15	MR. WESTDAL: Let me assure you that that's
16	the case but I will also say if there was a transgression,
17	then I do apologize to this hearing. I genuinely do.
18	I also want to make the comment, and I think
19	this is very important, that the names of Mr. Chisholm and
20	Mr. Neville were raised this morning and they have in no
21	way breached their roles to the Court and it's very awkward
22	for them.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Sure.
24	MR. WESTDAL: And I you know, I think
25	it's been a difficult, I'd say, last half an hour for them

1	because they're placed in a very awkward position where
2	discussion comes up, and I really don't want a cloud or
3	there be a nagging suspicion that those two counsel have in
4	any way done anything improper.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, if I wasn't clear
6	on that, and I should be, is I think that from what I
7	understand of all that happened here, all right, Mr.
8	Neville and Mr. Chisholm are dealt with the matter in
9	an honourable way and there's no cloud on that whatsoever.
10	Let me just close this all off by saying
11	that and put it to bed once and for all, the matter has
12	been dealt with. I appreciate everyone's candid views on
13	the matter. It's done. Let's carry on. All right?
14	MR. WESTDAL: Thank you.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Engelmann?
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. van Diepen, you
17	understand that you are in a unique situation as a witness
18	here in that you worked with both Mr. Barque and Mr.
19	Seguin. Fair enough?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's the nub of the
21	issue.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes. And what we're trying
23	to do is ask you, in the main, questions about things
24	you've already said. Do you understand that?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And you also
2	understand that at the end of every witness' evidence
3	because I know you've read some this, that Commission
4	counsel gives the witness an opportunity to talk about some
5	of the effects this had had on them personally and also to
6	make recommendations? You realize you'll have that
7	opportunity?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Now, sir before we broke,
10	you suggested that, in my questions I had, I believe, used
11	misleading facts or misleading allegations. I just want to
12	go back to that because I'd like to clear that up if we
13	could.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: And I've instructed him
15	to do that.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: So where were the concerns?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Which I think you said
19	"misleading facts" but I may be wrong.
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: We you referred to
21	inappropriate sexual behaviour. And you implied that there
22	was inappropriate sexual behaviour that I knew about, and I
23	should have done more.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Is there

1	anything else?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I can't think of anything
3	right now.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: There was the duty to
5	report, but we covered that before the break in the sense
6	that he asked you whether or not you had any concerns that
7	other children may be at risk, and you said "Yes." And you
8	didn't report to the Children's Aid Society.
9	Okay?
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Was there any so that's
11	what you are concerned about.
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I'm sure there were some
13	other things that I'm my mind's blank right now, Mr.
14	Engelmann.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
16	Because I just want to make sure if you're
17	suggesting that anything I asked you is misleading, I'd
18	like to clear it up.
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I
20	MR. ENGELMANN: So
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I think I've I hope that
22	I've outlined I've corrected my evidence from Friday and
23	provided it presented it in the light in which I
24	intended to present it.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: No, I think we have to go
2	I'm sorry. Yeah.
3	No, what I think we have to go back to
4	that page
5	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm happy to do that, sir.
6	And I'll
7	THE COMMISSIONER: That's at page 98 or
8	Madam Clerk, can I have the transcript? Can I give it
9	away?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Page 96.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. And I think it's
12	where you have said you were talking about a 17 year old
13	comes to your office, he's angry. He tells you, "I'm not
14	going back there." He describes Father MacDonald as being
15	well, what were your words
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, I think the best thing
17	to do is, if we go back to Mr. van Diepen's own words.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, exactly.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: And that's in his statement
20	of the time.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: No, but in the
22	transcript, I mean.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, he was asked a number
24	of questions arising from his statement and I think the
25	facts

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: that were given to him
3	are set out
4	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: or, he sets them out in
6	the statement.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: All right, fair enough.
8	Fair enough.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: So let's go back to it's
10	Exhibit 1063, or Exhibit 1175, either the handwritten
11	version or the typed version; your choice, sir.
12	I don't think there's any change on this
13	issue; any significant change, anyway, so
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Hold it.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: So if I understand from you
16	this morning
17	THE COMMISSIONER: I don't have that. It's
18	1175? Sorry. Okay.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: The discussion in 1175
20	starts on the second page, and it starts with the words,
21	"In 1976."
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Remembering we're not
23	supposed to mention the probationer's name.
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, Your honour.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay, now just before we get

1	into it, you told us this morning that this interview was
2	not just about suspicions or concerns about Mr. Seguin's
3	death. You were also being asked about any inappropriate
4	sexual behaviour on his part.
5	Is that correct?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: And you weren't being asked
8	at that time, about any inappropriate sexual behaviour on
9	the part of Mr. Barque, or were you?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I'd have to review the
11	statement. I gave I've given so many statements over
12	the years, and to so many different parties, I don't I
13	may have there may have been some discussion about Mr.
14	Barque; I don't recall.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: I know there was a
16	discussion about Mr. Barque in the statement; we've gone
17	through all of that.
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Okay.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: And we went through that in
20	the '94 statement, we went through it in the '98 statement
21	and we went through it in your statement to Mr. Downing.
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Okay.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: But what I'm saying is the
24	purpose, when the OPP officers came to see you in 1994 and
25	they interviewed you at your office, this would have been

1	within two months of Mr. Seguin's death.
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Right.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Al right? Or approximately
4	two months after he died. And my understanding was and
5	you've corrected me, my understanding was they were going -
6	- they were talking to people about suspicious
7	circumstances or circumstances surrounding his death.
8	I understood that they were talking to
9	people about a possible extortion by Mr. Silmser, against
10	Mr. Seguin but that wasn't your recollection of something
11	they would have said to you. And you've also told us that
12	they were also interested in knowing about any
13	inappropriate sexual behaviour on the part of Mr. Seguin.
14	That's what you told us this morning.
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: And do you recall if there
17	was anything else? Did they ask I mean, just at the
18	beginning of the interview, as to the purpose of the
19	interview? I know you got into things about Mr. Barque.
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Were they looking for
22	inappropriate behaviour on the part of collages, as well?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I they were looking I
24	think they were looking they were, if memory serves me
25	right, they were looking for any evidence or any knowledge

1	that I had about any inappropriate sexual behaviours, not
2	only within our office, but in the community at large.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And they wanted
4	to know what you knew?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Exactly.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
7	So you brought up the issue about the 17-
8	year-old probationer?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: They had no information
11	about that?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: And what you told us this
14	morning is, if you hadn't brought it up, you don't think
15	they would have known about it.
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Exactly.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
18	And what you were told about this issue by
19	that 17 year old back then and I just want to use your
20	words. You had sent him there on Nelson's suggestion to
21	live with Father Charlie, correct?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: It wasn't your idea; it was
24	your colleague's idea.
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
2	You say:
3	"He landed on my doorstep and he didn't want to stay
4	there."
5	Correct?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: And this is being related to
8	you by the 17 year old.
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's right.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: "He said that Father
11	Charlie was a queer."
12	Those weren't your words; those were his
13	words to you?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: "He liked little boys."
16	So he's telling you Father Charlie's a queer
17	and he likes little boys. Those are his words.
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
20	"But never specified."
21	Right? That's what I've read.
22	"He said once he was sleeping on his bed, woke up and
23	Father Charlie was sitting on his bed, but wouldn't say
24	anything more."
25	Those are his words to you; but when you say

40

1	"Wouldn't say anything more," he wouldn't say anything more
2	to you and you didn't press him.
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I did press him.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah. So sir, if you didn't
5	think at the time that this might have been inappropriate
6	sexual behaviour, why did you raise it with the OPP.
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I raised it with the OPP
8	because I wanted to the OPP to know everything that I
9	knew. Whether or not it was inappropriate sexual
10	behaviour, if they investigated and, in fact, there was
11	inappropriate sexual behaviour, I wished the OPP to know
12	about it.
13	If there was no inappropriate sexual
14	behaviour, I still wished the OPP to know about it, but I
15	wanted to provide them with all the information that I had
16	at hand, regardless of whether or not there was any kind of
17	breach there.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And so
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And from my understanding,
20	the client indicated to me there was no physical contact.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, let's we'll come to
22	that in a minute. I just you've told us that the OPP
23	wanted to know not just about any inappropriate sexual
24	behaviour on the part of Mr. Seguin but any inappropriate
25	sexual behaviour you might have known about.

41

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: So clearly, when you related
3	this to the OPP in February of 1994 you were concerned that
4	this might have been inappropriate sexual behaviour?
5	Correct?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No I don't believe there
7	was inappropriate sexual behaviour. I just my feeling
8	was it was behaviour which as a adult male would certainly
9	I, as an adult male, would not have done that.
10	Now it may have been very innocent at the
11	time; I did not know Father MacDonald's background. It
12	could have well been very innocent, late night counselling
13	on an issue that happened of the day to which that that
14	the client reacted to, but I don't know that. I know that
15	there was all I know is that there was a sitting on the
16	edge of the bed I don't know where in relation Father
17	MacDonald sat on the bed and I know that there was no
18	physical contact.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: You knew there was no
20	physical contact but this is what you told the OPP 18 years
21	later?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's my statement, yes.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Why didn't if you knew
24	there was no physical contact, why didn't you say that to
25	the OPP?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I didn't I'm sure I told
2	the police that. We're you I think you have some
3	time lines, Mr. Engelmann, as to the length of the
4	interview. I mean, I described in great detail what took -
5	- what might what was in my memory at the time. And it
6	was condensed to, I think, two sentences or one paragraph.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: So, you're again, I'm
8	just you're the one who told us that you had no reason
9	to bring this forward or they nobody would have known
10	if you hadn't brought this forward.
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's right.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: And what I thought you were
13	just going to say to us is, you weren't sure whether there
14	was inappropriate sexual behaviour or not and you wanted
15	them to find out.
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I just told I told
17	them what I knew. I told them about handcuffs. I mean,
18	the handcuffs in did not are not as correct me
19	if I'm wrong, I don't believe that to be any kind of sexual
20	act or whatever I just told them what I knew. I told
21	them everything I knew.
22	I just said, here's everything I know,
23	police officers, and I we had a you know it was some
24	two hour conversation. And I just basically told them
25	everything that I knew as whether it was good, bad or

1	indifferent. And they could, if they saw that if it
2	they wanted to know everything that they could I would
3	possibly know so that it could possibly lead them in
4	certain directions.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So you're saying
6	you told them about handcuffs at this time?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: You told them that there was
9	no physical contact between Father Charlie and this
10	probationer?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: They just didn't write that
13	down here.
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I the
15	conversation, if memory serves me right, the conversation
16	about the this client and the incident in 1976 took much
17	longer than the time it takes for you to read that one
18	little snippet.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Oh, oh, fair enough. I mean
20	you were with them almost two hours.
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Exactly.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: So more was said than we
23	have here.
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Exactly.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: And if there's something

1	that you think is important that's not here, then that's
2	why we're here.
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Because we're
5	looking at institutional response, and that includes how
6	the OPP do things, et cetera.
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So by this point
9	February of 1994 you were aware of other allegations
10	involving Father Charlie, were you not?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I I
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Let me try and refresh your
13	memory.
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't I don't whether
15	it was '94 what I knew in 1994 what I know now, yes.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: No, but you were already
17	aware by February 1994 that Mr. Silsmer had made
18	allegations against Father Charlie.
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Were you not?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: You knew that from Malcolm
23	MacDonald?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, that's correct.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And you knew

1	that Mr. Silmser was a former probationer?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: And you knew as well by
4	February of 1994 that he made allegations or had made
5	allegations that he was sexually abused by Ken Seguin as a
6	probationer. You knew that?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I don't believe I
8	knew that I knew that there was I knew that Mr.
9	Seguin was in there was some sort of investigation of
10	Mr. Seguin involving Silmser. I don't know what that
11	what the nature of that investigation entailed.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: But, you knew from Father
13	I'm sorry you knew from Malcolm MacDonald that Silmser
14	had made allegations against Ken Seguin.
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: And that those were
17	allegations of sexual abuse while he was a probationer?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't I don't believe
19	I knew the exact extent of I knew there was something
20	but I don't know I at that time I didn't know the
21	extent of the allegations. And you know I know there
22	I know there was something I knew it was of some sexual
23	nature but whether or not there was an actual physical
24	abuse, there was sexual abuse, there was or the nature
25	of that abuse at that time I was not aware of it.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Well the at
2	least whatever we have, from what you said in 1994, is
3	going to be more an accurate reflection of what you knew
4	
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Right.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: than your memory today.
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, at this point I still
8	do not know the exact nature of the sexual contact between
9	Mr. Silmser and Seguin.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Can we at least say that
11	after the 17 year old told you that, you were worried?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: In the yes.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: You were angry with
14	Barque for having put him there?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. And you followed
17	up with the probationer on several times to try to get him
18	to talk to you about what happened?
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, Your Honour.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: So, would it be fair to
21	say that at the very least you were suspicious or concerned
22	that something might have happened?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I was concerned if I
24	could rephrase your question?
25	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm. Yes.

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I was concerned that
2	something possibily could have happened.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: To the point where you
4	asked Seguin, "Is Father Charlie gay?"
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That is correct.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. So your
7	concern would have been towards a sexual impropriety?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That is correct.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Okay.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: And that's why you told us
11	you were upset with Nelson Barque for putting one of your
12	clients at risk.
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. I think I've
15	covered it now, sir. So let's go back to where I wanted to
16	start and that was
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Are you okay now with
18	everything? Well, you're okay with that area?
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I think so, Your Honour,
20	yes.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Is there anything else that
22	you remember during the course of your examination where
23	you think a misleading factor or allegation was put to you,
24	please let me know and I'll cover it.
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Thank you.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: So when we left off on
2	Friday, there was a discussion about missing documents.
3	You've now told us that there were some additional
4	documents that you believe existed.
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: And the reason that I was
7	turning you to your e-mail of September 7 th
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Right, okay. What
9	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm just going to try
10	and remember I believe it's Exhibit Number 1177, yes. I
11	wanted you to take a look at that, sir, because what I
12	wanted to know was whether or not there were other issues
13	that you were concerned about?
14	Because the two issues that seem to come out
15	loud and clear here are that you're concerned that the
16	Ministry is having someone in to investigate you or to ask
17	you questions this is a Mr. Downing. I don't know if
18	his name is mentioned but that's the first paragraph when
19	you say, "this has created just a few problems for me."
20	And in the context you are concerned that you are being
21	investigated and you're not being provided with a lawyer.
22	And then in the next paragraph, you're
23	concerned that you want to take some action because of this
24	Project Truth website and you've talked to some prosecutors
25	and you want a lawyer or you want the Ministry to do

1	something about it.
2	I don't mean to narrow your concerns. I'm
3	just trying to summarize what they were. Do I have the
4	crux of your concerns?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: In so many words, yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. So although there
7	maybe other documents that we don't have, would those
8	documents deal with additional concerns or would they be
9	other documents dealing with these concerns, to your
10	knowledge?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: The primarily the
12	concerns of Ministry's lack of support.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: And when you say "lack of
14	support", you don't mean lack of EAP or counselling, you
15	mean lack of support in the form of a lawyer or lawyers
16	taking some action on your behalf?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: My inability to respond to
18	the allegations in the website were, in my opinion, a
19	presumption of guilt.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: By Ministry officials
21	concerning you in those allegations?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Both, both the Ministry and
23	the public.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Now, did you
25	eventually get a lawyer from the Ministry?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I did not.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: And, sir, did that concern
3	you?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, extremely so.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. I believe you
6	told us that officials at some other institutions were
7	provided with counsel and you weren't?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, I believe other
9	agencies responded proactively.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: And you believe that your
11	employer treated you adversely?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Is there
14	anything else about the website issue, I mean and you'll
15	have a chance to comment on this, sir, at the end when I
16	ask you about effect and recommendations is there
17	anything else about the website issue, aside from the
18	Downing investigation and interview because I'll come to
19	that
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: M'hm.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: in just a minute, but is
22	there anything else before you are investigated by Mr.
23	Downing that we've missed; that the Ministry, in your view,
24	should have done?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, the Ministry had a

1	legal opinion
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: a lengthy document of
4	several pages outlining that I had a prima facie case for
5	legal representation, the Ministry's own lawyers.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: And you know that because
7	they shared that with you?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: And in spite of that, they
10	didn't provide you with a lawyer?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Did they give you a reason
13	why they didn't follow that opinion?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I asked and that's part of
15	the information that is missing because I said, "Well,
16	look, you know, you have a legal opinion and I mean it's
17	very clear as to the outlining the reasons why I should
18	have a lawyer, outlining the that there is a precedent
19	for situations like this, yet you are doing nothing. Why
20	are you doing nothing? What more do you need from me to
21	proceed with this?"
22	MR. ENGELMANN: How did they respond?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: They essentially, there
24	was a stonewalling and at some later point I was told
25	verbally that I would it would not happen.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, but were you ever
2	given reasons from any of your supervisors or people higher
3	up the chain as to why the Ministry decided not to follow
4	this internal legal opinion?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, because it was the
6	it was a sort of a chain of communication from higher-ups
7	to down the line, and there was something to the effect
8	I was told that it wouldn't happen.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Tell me, what are the
11	ministries you say that people got representation?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I believe there were a
13	number of other individuals who were named in the website
14	and some of those individuals took action resulting in the
15	closing of the website.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm. So who are they?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Offhand, You Honour, I
18	don't recall.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Would these have been church
20	officials, to your knowledge?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I believe church officials
22	included, yes.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: So that would be your reason
24	for arguing that you were treated differently or adversely
25	by your employer?

l	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's right.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: So it was the lack of legal
3	support to take some, I think you used the term "proactive
4	challenge", to the website?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: It wasn't necessarily a lack
7	of a lawyer or legal representation to deal with the
8	investigation, the internal investigation?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I certainly would
10	have hoped that if I had legal counsel, I would have been
11	able to discuss the matter at length and to help solicit a
12	different response from the Ministry, as well as responding
13	to the website itself.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So let's talk a
15	little bit about what the ministry was doing but, just
16	before that, you told us on Friday about contacts that you
17	had from a Mr. Nadeau?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: And what I want to ask you
20	is if someone by the name of Chisholm attempted to contact
21	you or did contact you; Carson Chisholm?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: And do you recall when
24	approximately that was and give some description of what
25	happened?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That was that was much
2	later.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: And when you say "much
4	later"
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Weeks, months.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. So this would have
7	been after the interview with Mr. Downing, which was in
8	late September of 2000?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Possibly.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you remember how the
11	contact came about?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: He arrived on my doorstep
13	at home.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: He came to your house?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's right.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: And uninvited?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And do you
19	recall was he on his own?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Was he?
21	MR. ENGELMANN: On his own?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, he was alone. Yes.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And what
24	happened?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, he came in and

1	described himself as a he was a private he was doing
2	some private investigations on behalf of this group and he
3	wanted to solicit information from me regarding what I knew
4	about the alleged pedophile clan in the City of Cornwall.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: This group that he said he
6	was acting for, was this the same group that Mr. Nadeau
7	said he was acting for or do you know?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't know.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you even get very far in
10	the conversation? What happened?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you invite him in, for
13	example?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, he did come in and he
15	stood inside the doorway, yes.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: This is at your home in St.
17	Andrews?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I knew Mr. Chisholm.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Oh, okay.
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I knew he
23	MR. ENGELMANN: How did you know him?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: He lives he's a long-
25	time resident in the outlining area of St. Andrews.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And so I essentially told
3	him what, that you know, my position that I could not
4	discuss a lot of the information that was known to me
5	because I was in, potentially, in a conflict as a Ministry
6	employee.
7	I however, I did tell him that I was not
8	aware of any pedophile clan and Mr. Chisholm's response was
9	to the effect, "Oh, come on, you know more, and you're just
10	not telling it" and all that. And at that time, I think,
11	the exchange became less than pleasant and he departed.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Was there any
13	other contact between the two of you that you can remember
14	about this issue?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes. There was a contact
16	sometime later and that would have been a couple of years
17	later. I was running a in the summertime, I was running
18	a waterslide for the kids on the hill in St. Andrews, and
19	basically just a plastic tarp with and we were squirting
20	water on the plastic tarp so the kids could slide down this
21	great big huge tarp, and Mr. Chisholm had brought his
22	children there. I believe they were his children. I don't
23	know his children.
24	And he was sitting there, and there was
25	there were some I guess some there was an exchange

1	about, again, about, "Come on, you know something" and all
2	that sort of stuff, and I just walked away from him.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So it was if
4	there was a discussion, it was brief?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Very brief.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Any other contact?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Nothing else comes to my
8	mind.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So let's talk
10	about what happens with Mr. Downing.
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: In September of 2000. And
13	he has some notes which may help us with respect to dates.
14	Exhibit 1064.
15	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, if you look at page 5
17	of those notes?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: The handwritten notes?
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: They're fairly easy to read.
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Near the top of that page,
24	there's a reference to September 13 th , 2000. In the third
25	line:

1	"Telephoned Jos van Diepen at the Cornwall P&P office."
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Hold it, hold it. What
3	exhibit?
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Exhibit 1064.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: These are Mr. Downing's
7	interview notes of his investigation. I'm at the top of
8	page 5. Page 5 at the bottom. It's Bates page 1148324.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah.
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't have that.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: The Document Number is
12	123486.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Yep.
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Oh, it's the second page 5
16	so it's the Bates page is 1148324.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: One over.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: It should start the page
19	should start with:
20	"September 13 th , 2000 at 9:30, telephone Bill Roy."
21	Do you see that?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, I do.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: So on the third line down,
24	there's a reference to telephoning you and he's informed he
25	is on special assignment. Do you see that?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: So can you tell us, sir, by
3	September $13^{\rm th}$, 2000 were you still working in the Cornwall
4	Probation and Parole Office?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, I believe I was.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. Do you know why there
7	might be a reference to you being on special assignment?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, the what happened
9	was, I had I was about if I wasn't actually at the
10	site in the IJ site, I was certainly about to be.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: IJ?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: The IJ Integrated
13	Justice.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And that was as a result
16	I had charged an offender with a breach of probation for
17	failing to report and his evidence or his defence was to
18	the effect that he did not report to the probation office,
19	specifically to me, because we were all a bunch of diddlers
20	and he felt that his safety was at risk.
21	The at the time
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Let me just stop you for a
23	second, sir. Is this in different words something you
24	described in that long e-mail we just looked at?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't know which long e-

60

1	mail
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Eleven-seventy-seven (1177).
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't know if it was in
4	there, but I can tell I remember very clearly that there
5	was an allegation that we were all diddlers and he felt his
6	safety was at risk and that's why he didn't report.
7	At the time there was, for lack of better
8	words, a rent-a-Crown, who took no action to
9	THE COMMISSIONER: A what?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: A rent-a-Crown there
11	wasn't a regular Crown, your Honour, and they took no
12	action and the case was ultimately dismissed. I went to
13	the Crown Attorney and expressed my concerns to the Crown
14	Attorney and so on and so forth.
15	I expressed my concerns to my supervisor at
16	the time and, of course, these matters all went up the line
17	and they felt that my capacity to my function as a
18	probation officer certainly created some difficulties.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And so you've
20	had discussions with your supervisor and/or his supervisor
21	about where you should work and what you should do?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, as a result of the
23	communication with my supervisor, the regional manager at
24	the time, Deborah Newman, came down and we had a meeting.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And as a result

1	of that meeting, what was decided?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, as a result of that
3	meeting, Ms. Newman suggested that my role continued
4	role in the Cornwall office would be somewhat difficult and
5	asked me if I would consider working elsewhere and that had
6	been preceded by I mean, there was already some
7	discussion about that and then she asked would I consider
8	something else and I said, you know, what sort of thing
9	were you considering.
10	She suggested that I asked me if I would
11	want to work in Toronto for the Integrated Justice project.
12	I don't know the actual I don't recall the actual start
13	date of my work in at the Integrated Justice project,
14	but it was in around the same time.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So they
16	suggested it, you agreed and you were transferred to
17	Toronto essentially?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Essentially, yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Did you suggest
20	it and they agreed or do you remember?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, they suggested it.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And this one
23	incident with this one probationer was an example of why
24	they thought there should be a transfer?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: And presumably why you also
2	agreed to it?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, under the
4	circumstances, I didn't have there weren't
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you have a choice?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: There weren't very many
7	other options.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, all right. Okay,
9	and you remained there for how long, sir?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, the Integrated
11	Justice project wound down. There was some difficulties
12	with the implementing the entire concept of integrated
13	justice so that the only piece that came online with
14	respect to the Ministry was the electronic case notes
15	package referred to as "OTIS", however, the dove-tailing
16	with other stakeholders in the justice cluster never took
17	place. So there had been some cost over-runs and it became
18	a political football and they pulled the plug on that
19	project.
20	As a result of my experience with Integrated
21	Justice, I was then asked to if I would work for the
22	technology group in North Bay. I worked in a number of
23	different areas with the technology group in North Bay.
24	Until I was asked to they asked me to
25	continue to go to North Bay but they would not pay for my

I	expenses and I said, "What do you mean, you don't want to
2	pay for my expenses?" Well, you know you're this, that and
3	the other thing and they couldn't do it or they wouldn't do
4	it and I so I say, "Well, no, you know, I can't do
5	you want me to"
6	I mean, it was so ludicrous. At one point
7	they suggested I rent an apartment and that I go to yard
8	sales and buy furniture and kitchen utensils at yard sales
9	to stock my apartment and that I could travel back and
10	forth on the weekends with a vacuum cleaner in the trunk of
11	my car to vacuum my apartment.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Where were you living at
13	this time?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I was living I was
15	working I was living in my present address
16	MR. ENGELMANN: In Cornwall or St.
17	Andrews?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes. And then I would be
19	working during the week in North Bay.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So you moved
21	back you moved to Toronto to work for Integrated Justice
22	or not?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I never moved, no.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, but you ended up
25	working there?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: You kept your residence in
3	Cornwall?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Cornwall area?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Then you start working for
8	the Ministry in North Bay?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: And that doesn't work
11	presumably given what you're saying?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's right.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: So when does that end and
14	you come back to your substantive position here in
15	Cornwall? Approximately.
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: It was in March
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Is this 2004 perhaps or do
18	you recall?
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: It was either 2004 or 2005.
20	I don't remember but I know that
21	MR. ENGELMANN: All right; okay. So let's
22	go back to the fall of 2000 then.
23	Mr. Downing, a couple of pages later in his
24	notes at page 7 and there's only one page 7, I think,
25	although it's hard to read the page numbers, but there's a

1	short paragraph that says:
2	"September 13, 2000, 1400h, telephone Jos van Diepen
3	residence."
4	That's your home number or was?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: He says he left a voice mail
7	there and then again on the next page, page 8, at the
8	bottom he's saying that he:
9	"Telephoned Jos van Diepen at his residence. Requested to
10	meet with him. Jos said he wanted to cooperate, but that
11	he had had"
12	I'm not sure what that says.
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: "Legal advice."
14	MR. ENGELMANN: "received legal advice
15	not to talk to anyone including Ministry officials until he
16	retained a lawyer that he said would be paid for by the
17	Ministry."
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Does this
20	confirm with your recollection of your first call with Mr.
21	Downing?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
23	
	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. MR. VAN DIEPEN: I probably seeing that

1	suggest that I was already at Integrated Justice at that
2	point.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And it goes on
4	onto the next page where he's saying:
5	"Explained to Jos that I need to meet with him and would
6	consult and/or review his position. I suggested that I
7	forward him a copy of a Ministry directive"
8	and he lists it.
9	"that outlines his responsibility as a Ministry employee."
10	Do you recall discussing that issue?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yeah, that's not quite the
12	that's not quite the nature of the discussion.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. It goes on a bit
14	further.
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yeah.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: So just have a look at the
17	whole thing. He says:
18	"I explained that I would be giving him an opportunity to
19	explain and/or provide an explanation to information on
20	Project Truth website that specifically mentions his name
21	and provide any other relevant information that may assist
22	me complete my assignment. Jos asked that I forward the
23	material to the area manager in Cornwall. I also said that
24	I wished to meet with him on September 28 th , 2000."
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So that's his
2	version of that conversation. Do you recall it at all
3	differently than that?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So what do you
6	recall about the conversation, sir?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I recalled that I
8	said, you know, this is this matter, at that time, I
9	said I informed Mr. Downing, you know, this matter is
10	probably going to come to some kind of an inquiry.
11	At that time, I had I was of the personal
12	opinion that there would this would result in a public
13	inquiry. Having dealt with the project Jericho and the
14	Alfred Training School things, I felt that there was you
15	know, certainly at this point ample evidence to suggest
16	that this was going to go much further.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Was there some public talk
18	at the time of an inquiry
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: That you knew of?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Not from you sir, but from
23	others?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No. No, I
25	MR. ENGELMANN: You just thought of that on

1	your own?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: yeah, in fact I told
3	everybody, "Just watch, this is going to become a public
4	inquiry".
5	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And, anyway, I said that,
7	given that the nature that this is probably going to go
8	much further, beyond your investigation, I think it's
9	important that I have some legal representation.
10	He indicated that I you know, if I wanted
11	to get legal representation, it was up to me to get it. I
12	phoned the union and the union, basically, they're not very
13	helpful. They said they couldn't provide anybody and that
14	I should simply just say I don't remember.
15	And the Mr. Downing went on to explain
16	that even though I had a solicitor there, the solicitor
17	could not speak. If the solicitor advised me on how to
18	answer a question, he would ask to have that solicitor
19	removed. And
20	MR. ENGELMANN: This was during your initial
21	phone call, sir?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh, yes, it was quite a
23	long conversation.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And that if the if the -

1	- if I did not fully cooperate with him, including taking
2	the advice of legal counsel, I would be subject to
3	disciplinary action including dismissal.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: And this all came up in the
5	first call?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, it did.
7	Well, I there may have been another
8	conversation but there was certainly there was certainly
9	it was via telephone.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Engelmann, any time
12	you want to take a break there, we'll
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Just a minute if I may, sir.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah, that's fine.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: So sir, do you recall him
16	suggesting he could forward something to you that
17	essentially gave him his authority to ask you questions
18	this directive?
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes. I wanted a hard copy
20	because I wanted to present it to my solicitor.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And did he in
22	fact send one the next day, to your knowledge?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I did I don't know
24	if the next day or not. I ultimately received the
25	memorandum.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: If we could just take a
2	quick look at that and then break.
3	It's Document Number 100551. In fact got
4	it, okay.
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: One-zero-five-five (1055) -
6	
7	THE COMMISSIONER: No, no. Exhibit 1178 is
8	a
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh, okay.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: cover sheet.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: It's a memorandum, sir, from
12	Mr. Downing to Mr. van Diepen. It's sent care of the area
13	manager, at least on the fax cover sheet.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Dated September 14 th 2000.
15	Okay.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Correct.
17	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-1178:
18	(100551) Memorandum from Paul Downing to Jos Van Diepen -
19	September 14, 2000
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: The other thing I recall of
21	that, sir, is that even though that document is dated the
22	14^{th} of September, it did not come into my hand until very
23	shortly before that meeting, on September $28^{\rm th}$. I believe
24	it was the it was the Friday before. And it was given
25	that short timeline, it was impossible to get anybody to be

1	present at that at such short notice, at that date and
2	time.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay, but if you look at Mr.
4	Downing's notes, he says:
5	"Jos asked that I forward the material to the area manager
6	in Cornwall."
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: "And I also said I wished
9	to meet with him on September $28^{\rm th}$."
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Right.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: So he said what he'd do?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: And when he wanted to meet
14	with you?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: He apparently sent it the
17	next day?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Right.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you follow up with Mr.
20	Legault or did he follow up with you about receiving this
21	from Mr. Downing?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: But you're saying that
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: There was
25	MR. ENGELMANN: that didn't

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: there was some delay in
2	it coming into my hands and I don't know how this thing was
3	whether this thing was faxed to the Cornwall office and
4	it was faxed to Mr. Legault and Mr. Legault was away and,
5	therefore, was unable to relay this document to me, I don't
6	know, but this document did not come into my hand on the
7	date it was received in the Cornwall office.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
9	Perhaps we can take a break, here.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. We'll take
11	the morning break?
12	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. A l'ordre;
13	veuillez vous levez.
14	Upon recessing at 11:22 a.m. /
15	L'audience est suspendue à 11h22
16	Upon resuming at 11:42 a.m. /
17	L'audience est reprise à 11h42
18	THE REGISTRAR: This hearing is now resumed;
19	please be seated. Veuillez vous assoir.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Engelmann?
21	JOS VAN DIEPEN: Resumed/Sous le même serment
22	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF/INTERROGATOIRE EN-CHEF PAR MR.
23	<pre>ENGELMANN (Continued/Suite):</pre>
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. van Diepen, if we could
25	just go back to Mr. Downing's notes. One-zero-six-four

l	(1064) is the exhibit number and it's page 10 on the
2	bottom.
3	Do you have that? It starts with a
4	handwritten caption at the top, "September $14^{\rm th}$, 2000".
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: What page, sir?
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Ten (10). For the record,
7	Bates page 1148327.
8	I don't know, sir, if you would have
9	reviewed this when you reviewed some documents beforehand
10	or not?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I didn't.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
13	What it says is:
14	"September $14^{\rm th}$, 2000, 9:20 hours. Spoke with Claude
15	Legault, Area Manager, Cornwall. Arranged to forward
16	confidential correspondence and material to his office and
17	to be delivered/or have Jos van Diepen pick it up (as
18	arranged)."
19	So you had had a discussion with Mr. Downing
20	and it appears the following day he's following up with Mr.
21	Legault to make sure you get this documentation.
22	Do you remember when it was, sir, that you
23	would have received it?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I believe it was the Friday
25	before.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Were you not in
2	contact with the Cornwall office during those two weeks?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I believe and
4	substantiated by the nature of the call to my residence, I
5	must have been at the in Toronto.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Do you know if
7	you made any effort to contact Mr. Legault to see if he
8	received this for you? Because that appeared be the page -
9	
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I would the only
11	way it would have came into my hand with me going into the
12	office.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And picking it up.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: But did you recall if you
16	would have called Mr. Legault to find out if it had come in
17	or anything of that nature?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't recall.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. In any event, on
25	September 28 th , you have an interview with Mr. Downing. Is

1	that correct?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: And there's a reference in
4	his notes, and I'm looking at page 17, same exhibit we were
5	on, 1064, it says, "September 28 th , 2000 at 9:30" I
6	can't read the rest.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Interview
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Can't read the next
9	THE COMMISSIONER:
10	"Interviewed Jos van Diepen at the Eastern Regional
11	Office"?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm not sure do you know
14	what those initials mean there, sir?
15	THE COMMISSIONER: At 9:30 hrs h-r-s?
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Oh, hours, sorry:
17	"interviewed Jos van Diepen at the Eastern Regional
18	office."
19	Now, sir, was your interview at an office or
20	was it at a hotel?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, it was
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Or did you start in an
23	office and move?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, it that was one of
25	the difficulties, was that you know the interview was

1	conducted in Kingston.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And so that was one of the
4	problems I alluded to, was trying to get obtain some
5	representation at a meeting which took place 180 kilometres
6	from here.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Just to get back
8	to my question, so it was in Kingston. Was it at a hotel
9	or was it at the office or do you recall?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: It was at the Regional
11	office.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And were you aware,
13	sir, that he was interviewing other people as well?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. He didn't
16	indicate to you who else he was seeing?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, okay. And an
19	interview took place?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: And my understanding was it
22	took the better part of a day?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: It took the entire day.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And, sir,
25	thinking back on that day, what do you recall, just of the

1	interview itself, now it was conducted, your experience as
2	a result of the interview?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I had some difficulty
4	with the nature of the interview. Certainly, there was a -
5	- there was a I was not afforded an opportunity to
6	obtain any kind of outside assistance, and that's the
7	reason why I brought my spouse with me.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: So she was in attendance
9	throughout the interview?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Aside from not
12	having a legal or external representation, any other issues
13	about how the interview was conducted or what was
14	discussed?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, the nature and the
16	tone of Mr. Downing was that I was guilty of the
17	accusations raised on the website, and he his
18	investigation pursued along those lines.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, which accusations on
20	the website did you feel that he had formed some opinion
21	on?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, that I was at these -
23	- I was at these sexual abuse parties and that I had
24	somehow seen a you know, suicide notes, and I knew about
25	Ken Seguin sexually abusing clients, and so on and so

1	forth.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: So you were of the view that
3	he thought all of the accusations on the website were true?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I think he I think
5	he made the he made an assumption before he interviewed
6	me, and then me and then I $\operatorname{}$ he made every effort to prove
7	those assumptions correct.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, had he, to your
9	knowledge, had an opportunity to review statements you
10	might have previously given?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, but he wouldn't let me
12	see them.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, it's my understanding
14	that he didn't actually have them. He had just reviewed
15	them when he attended the OPP.
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I that was not relayed
17	to me.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: His answer to me was that
20	no, I couldn't have them.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: So these were statements
22	you would have given to the OPP?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct, Your
24	Honour.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: So you understand that

1	we've had some evidence heard that it was OPP policy not to
2	release those statements to Mr. Downing?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I am aware of that now,
4	Your Honour.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: He didn't tell you that at
7	the time?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, he did not.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: And he didn't tell you that
10	he didn't actually have the statements, just notes of them?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: He certainly not.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Sorry?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I think it was more I
16	think it was probably worded more strongly; I didn't have
17	the right to.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. I so at the time
19	you asked for whatever he had that you might have said
20	earlier.
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: And do you feel that was
23	important to have that information before you were
24	interviewed?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Do you think
2	that affected how you gave your answers in any way?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I think the entire
4	nature of his investigation of me was somewhat imbalanced.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Somewhat?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Imbalanced.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Imbalanced?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Imbalanced.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And that's for the
10	reason you already gave, that you thought that by the
11	nature and tone of his questions, that he had made up his
12	mind that you were guilty of these accusations?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Now, sir, did he
15	explain to you that he had met with the OPP already?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yeah, I believe he may
17	have. I don't recall.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: I just want to show you part
19	of his notes, and I want to ask you whether he would have
20	relayed this to you.
21	His notes are Exhibit 1064. Again, it's
22	part of the package that I don't think you had time to
23	read.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: What page?
25	MR. ENGELMANN: It's page 15. Just at the

1	bottom of the page, he says:
2	"September 27^{th} , 2000, met with OPP Pat Hall at the Four
3	Points Sheraton at 7:20 hrs to 8:40 hrs regarding
4	investigation."
5	Would he have advised you that he met with
6	the OPP just the day before
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: do you recall?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I don't believe he did
10	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And it says:
11	"Took summary of statements provided by Jos van Diepen."
12	Again, do you recall if he told you he
13	didn't have the statements, just his notes of them?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, sir.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Then he says:
16	"OPP Pat Hall is of the opinion that Jos knows much more
17	than he is sharing."
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Never met never met the
19	man, and I have no idea who he is, other than it describes
20	him as OPP Pat Hall.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: You didn't know that he was
22	heading up the OPP Project Truth investigation?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Never spoke to the man;
24	didn't know he even existed.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And you are

1	saying that Mr. Downing wouldn't have told you about
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Never referenced Pat Hall.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. With this
4	statement, sir, that you gave and I will go through it;
5	I have to go through all of them briefly at least, but this
6	particular statement to Mr. Downing, would you agree with
7	me that it was somewhat similar to statements police
8	officers took with you in that you're asked to initial the
9	pages and to sign the statement?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: And you did do that?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: And I think it goes even
14	further, if I'm not mistaken. I'm just looking at the end.
15	Yes, in fact, every page says:
16	"I have read this statement page, and it is a true and
17	accurate account of the facts herein."
18	And you've signed each and every page to
19	that effect?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And then you've
22	signed the last page of the statement, as does your
23	observer?
24	THE COMMISSIONER: What exhibit are we
25	looking at?

1	MR. ENGELMANN: We're looking at it's a
2	part of the Downing report, 958A and it's the section that
3	deals with Mr. van Diepen's interview. There's several
4	interviews, sir. It follows the interview with Bill Roy, I
5	believe. I'm sorry; it follows the interview with Emile
6	Robert.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: And it's just before the
9	interview of Father Maloney. Do you have that document,
10	sir?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I don't.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: No, not yet.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Oh, I'm sorry. All right;
14	so it appears that the comment that I read to you:
15	"I have read this statement page and it is true and
16	accurate account of the facts herein."
17	That appears to be on each and every page of
18	the statement.
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: And at the very end of the
21	statement, there's something called a conclusion of
22	statement.
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: M'hm.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: It says:
25	"I fully understand that any intentional omissions or false

1	and/or misleading statements may subject me to disciplinary
2	action."
3	Do you see that?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
5	MR. ENGELMANN:
6	"I declare the above and preceding 18 pages were given to
7	me. The statement has been read to me or by me and I fully
8	understand its content."
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: This statement
10	was never given to me.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm sorry?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I I never received a
13	copy of that statement so it I'm not sure what what
14	the phrase, "were given to me" is meant, but I was not
15	given a copy of that statement. And I asked him for a copy
16	of the statement and he said he couldn't do that.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay, so if it was given to
18	you, it was given to you only for the
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Just just
20	MR. ENGELMANN: purpose of reading it
21	over?
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Just a minute. Are we
23	looking at it says:
24	"I declare that the above and preceding pages were given by
25	me."

1	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm sorry, not to, "given by
2	me." You're absolutely right, sir. I misread it.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Right. So so, yes.
4	Do you understand what it reads?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, my mistake, Your
6	Honour.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: No, no, no, no, no.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: No, it was probably my
9	mistake so let's in any event, it says they, "were given
10	by me." This:
11	"statement has been read to me or by me and I fully
12	understand its content."
13	So
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: I I assume that now,
16	how did this actually work? Did he actually have it typed
17	while you were there?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And was he
20	typing as he was asking you questions or was there someone
21	else there or how did that happen?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: In the in the morning,
23	there was no one else there. In the afternoon, he brought
0.4	
24	a a woman who I do not know did not know who was from

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: to be a witness, but he
3	was the one who he'd ask, okay, what do you know about
4	a, b or c. There would be a discussion on it and then he
5	would at the end of that, he would type what you see
6	before you.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And in the
8	morning, he was doing the same thing, but just on his own?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's right.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And when did he
11	ask you to confirm each and every page as true and
12	accurate?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: At the very end.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: At the very end?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: At the end of the day.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And were you
17	given an opportunity to review it and to make changes that
18	you thought were appropriate?
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, at the end of the
20	day, yes, it was quite a lengthy statement and I glanced
21	over it, made a few small changes, asked me to initial the
22	pages and and sign off on the last page.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Did you feel you
24	had enough time to do that?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you ask for additional
2	time, sir?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I commented that there was
4	quite a lengthy statement. I would like to kind of go over
5	it at some length, but he wanted it to he wanted to
6	conclude the close the matter at that point.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So on page 3,
8	for example, the statement when you see the handwriting
9	that's difficult to read on the side, can you tell us
10	whether that's you that has added that handwriting or
11	whether that's him or how that worked?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's my handwriting.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Not sure if we're no,
15	page 3.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Can you just are you able
17	to tell us what that says, actually, on the right-hand
18	side?
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Madam Clerk, can we flip
20	that over so I can see it that way?
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Or blow it up, maybe?
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, let's do it this
23	way first.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: If it's in your hand, I
25	thought maybe you could just help us. Some of it's hard to

1	read.
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, there's it's
3	cropped. My copy is cropped a bit on the bottom.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Let's see:
5	"So at this point, I asked the interviewer where he would
6	like to start."
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: "It was" I don't know
9	what "agreed that since Barque left the Ministry"
10	MR. ENGELMANN: "First."
11	THE COMMISSIONER: "first that we would"
12	I would "we would begin with him," or something like
13	that.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Does that seem correct, sir?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: I don't know what the
17	last
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't know I don't
19	know what the last part is either.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. But in any
21	event, the changes that we see on the following pages,
22	these are all your changes?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And interview's
25	concluded at 16:45, according to the last page, and then

1	there's a signature; something's witnessed at 17:20?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: So about half an hour later?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: And is that when things end
6	then, sir, at about 17:20?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I did not memory serves
8	me correctly, it was closer to 6:30 that I left the
9	Regional office.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: 18:30 then would be the -
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, so you had
13	did you have some additional time then to review the
14	statements?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I I remember
16	waiting a long time and there was, you know I don't know
17	the Mr. Downing was was away in some other area of
18	the building and I remember sitting with my wife for some
19	time until I until I was told I could leave.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: And you didn't get a copy of
21	this statement at the end?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Nor did you get a copy of
24	statements that you gave to the police at the time you gave
25	them?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: So again it seems his
3	process was a bit well, somewhat similar to the police
4	process?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, I meant with respect
7	to having you initial every page, having you sign it and
8	then not giving you a copy at the end.
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Was it different with the
11	police?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I was never given a copy of
13	the police statement either.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And you were
15	asked to initial pages and then sign the end of a
16	statement?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: But you're saying it was
19	different?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Those were your why is
22	that?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, it was more of an
24	inquisition than an interview.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Anything else that was
2	different?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I would say that that
4	interview was out conducted under considerable duress.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And why do you
6	say that?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I had I had few options
8	available to me in terms of representation. I think it was
9	strategically done on his part to interview me in Kingston
10	so that I would not be able to avail myself of any kind of
11	representation. The nature and the tone of his
12	investigation, his questions, his demeanour were all of a -
13	- of an interrogation rather than an interview. I had some
14	experience with interviewing techniques and I thought that
15	his interviewing techniques were flawed.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: In what way, sir?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, if I have a I have
18	taken a number of courses in advanced interviewing
19	techniques including taking an advances a number of
20	courses in statement analysis as well as neurolinguistic
21	programming and the premise of the on how to interview
22	differs considerable from his style
23	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Well, is it for
24	the same purpose though, sir?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes. Statement analysis is

1	used by the police agencies every day.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: All right; because one of
3	the things that was different about those interviews was
4	that, in Mr. Downing's case, he was interviewing you about
5	allegations involving yourself.
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Whereas when the police
8	interviewed you, they weren't interviewing you as a suspect
9	or as someone who had allegedly done something.
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: All the more reason to
11	change the style of the interview, sir.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And had you had
13	any experience doing essentially what Mr. Downing was
14	doing, doing some kind of administrative review on behalf
15	of the Ministry of allegations against an employee?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Were the courses that you
18	had attended courses that were to be used for that purpose?
19	Did I understand that?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: They were to be used for
21	criminal investigations of perpetrators as well as victims.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: He did not follow the
23	standard practice? I just want to make sure I understand
24	the concern about that particular institutional response.
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, there are two styles

1	of interviewing, Mr. Engelmann. There's one is that you
2	ask the client to tell us what you know and to allow the
3	interviewee to provide the information in a open manner.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And the other is to be very
6	to is that, if I can use that stereo the phrase
7	that stereotypical police interrogation style, you know.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: But if the person doing the
9	interview has significant information already
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: wouldn't it make sense
12	that it wouldn't just be a
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: tell us what you know.
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, that's what I said to
16	your earlier, sir, is that you want to do the exact
17	opposite.
18	If you want to get the truth then you need
19	to allow the opportunity for the person to speak. An
20	interview is not a relationship between the interviewer and
21	the interviewee.
22	The interview is a relationship between
23	clauses.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Between?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Clauses.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Clauses?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Clauses.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: C-L
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: As in a claused sentence.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: But in your first scenario -
7	- presumably that's the scenario you think he should have
8	used?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I'm which scenario are
10	we talking about?
11	MR. ENGELMANN: That is, "just tell us what
12	you know."
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: That's the one you thought
15	he should have used.
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. In that
18	scenario, is he not to put direct questions to you?
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, you use direct
20	questions as follow-up for clarification.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And only I would suggest
23	to you that would only be done as a last resort. If you
24	were using doing the interview, you would and you
25	wanted further clarification, you would begin with

1	something like "I'm now going to take you back to point A
2	at this point and you were saying such and such. Please
3	continue."
4	MR. ENGELMANN: And you thought that his was
5	the second style; the interrogation style.
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh, very much so.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And just again,
8	why in those circumstances was that inappropriate?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't feel it was I
10	don't think it was done in best interests of getting at the
11	information. I think it was unprofessional. I think it
12	was due to a lack of experience and I think it was I
13	think he made the tactical error that to have made an
14	assumption and "now I'm going to prove it."
15	If you agree to do the interview, you need
16	to do the interview with an open mind that everything that
17	the interviewer is the truth and if you have any doubts in
18	that, well, what is it true of.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So, it would be
20	fair to say that you were you are quite critical of the
21	way that Mr. Downing did his investigation.
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh yes, sir.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: At least with respect to
24	you.
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, that's the only part

1	of the investigation that I have any knowledge on.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So you didn't
3	discuss it with Emile Robert to say, "Did you think he was
4	fair to you" or words that that effect?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh, there were follow-up
6	conversations about Mr. Downing's interviewing style,
7	methods.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: With?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Ministry staff.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Management.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Can you are these some of
13	the documents that we don't have or is this something else?
14	I want to make sure I understand your concerns.
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, there were I believe
16	there were conversations.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. With whom?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: With Emile Robert; with
19	Regional management.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Now, by the time you were
21	interviewed, Robert was no longer your manager. Correct?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: You would have still had
24	interviews or contacts with him in any event?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes because I was still

POPLIC H	PAKTING
AUDIENCE	PUBLIQUE

1	living in St. Andrews.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Was he also
3	living there?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Mr. Robert?
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: In St. Andrews?
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, he lived in Cornwall.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. I'm just
10	wondering
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: In the office, in the
12	office.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. But I thought as of
14	1998, he was no longer in the Cornwall office.
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I'm sorry, Mr. Legault.
16	I'm sorry, Mr. Legault, yes.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: All right so, okay. I
18	was a little confused. So let me just let's just make
19	sure we're absolutely clear on this.
20	At or around the time you're being
21	interviewed by Downing
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Robert is also being
24	interviewed by Downing. You're not discussing this with
25	Robert?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh no. No.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. You didn't
3	discuss much with him when he was in your office. There'd
4	be no reason to discuss a lot with him when he was outside.
5	Is that fair?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I had no contact with Mr.
7	Robert.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So when you're
9	discussing concerns you had about the interview process,
10	about Downing, you would have expressed those concerns to
11	Mr. Legault.
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Exactly.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. To anyone else
14	or was that the principal person?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I believe I had discussions
16	with Regional management.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Ms. Newman?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I believe so, yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Fair enough.
20	So, let's anything else about the
21	interview style or how he interviewed or do we do we
22	have your views on that?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yeah, I believe that's
24	pretty much it.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Okay, so now I

1	want to ask you a little bit about the content, and I want
2	to go back and cover off a couple some points from other
3	statements and just that we haven't dealt with. I'm not
4	going to repeat ones we have.
5	The first one is the statement that you gave
6	to the OPP in February of '94 and the original handwritten
7	copy of that is 1175 and the typed version of that, where
8	you make some amendments, is 1063.
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: And I'm looking at 1175;
11	we've covered the first several pages. I want to turn to
12	page 5.
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Of 1175?
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: All right; it's Bates page,
17	for the record, 7057836.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: So, that's page number 4
19	then.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Oh, I'm
21	THE COMMISSIONER: No, it's 5, sorry.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: It's hard to see that.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: No, you see on the top is
24	5, on the bottom is 6 oh, continued on page 6, sorry.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: I guess it is page number 4

1	at the top right.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Now in this statement, and
4	this is a statement, sir, that you've signed and
5	initialled; correct?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: It says in the middle of the
8	page:
9	"I know Malcolm's queer. I know
10	Malcolm's boyfriends. I know Ken's
11	boyfriends."
12	Do you see that statement?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Now did you say
15	that to the OPP on February 14 th , 1994?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I did not. I did not.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: You did not say that?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No. You have a corrected
19	version.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay, well, all right.
21	I know you corrected it, sir, and we had a
22	dispute about when that might have happened?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: And we can come to that in a
25	moment, but you're actually saying you didn't say these

1	words?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's right.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Even though you initialled
4	the page?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I had no evidence before
6	me, sir, that I knew that at that time that Mr. MacDonald
7	was gay and I had suspicions that he was gay. I knew of
8	only one individual at the time that I would consider that
9	may have been a boyfriend of Mr. MacDonald and I certainly
10	do not know of any of Ken's boyfriends, and I think those
11	changes I made reflect those facts.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, I'm going to suggest to
13	you let me just ask you this. So if Officers McDonell
14	or Genier come here and say those were the words you used,
15	you're going to say they're mistaken?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I'm going to say they're
17	mistaken.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: So as opposed to, "I said
19	these words, Malcolm's boyfriends and I know Ken's
20	boyfriends and when I went to the next statement whenever
21	that was, I corrected it there"?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Those are the same
23	statement, Your Honour.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Same
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Same statement, but

1	typewritten.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Right, right, right. But
3	what I'm saying though, where's that just there's a
4	difference between "I never said that" and "there's a new
5	statement" or "I did say that but then when I saw the typed
6	copy, I changed it around."
7	You're saying you never said that to them?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I never said that. You
9	know there was a for example the, "I know Ken's
10	boyfriends."
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I do not know Ken's
13	boyfriends. When I had the discussion with the police
14	officers, I described a number of friends that I or
15	individuals who I knew to be Ken's friends and none of
16	those were in a boyfriend relationship. These were all
17	adult men who were married and in heterosexual
18	relationships and nothing there would cause me to conclude
19	that any one of them were gay.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, you were a probation
21	officer for over 30 years?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: You know the importance
24	about being truthful?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: You know the importance
2	about being truthful to the police?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: And you did, did you not,
5	get an opportunity at the end of the interview with those
6	two officers to review each and every page of that
7	statement?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I just what I did at the
9	time, sir, was that these police officers as I indicated
10	earlier in my testimony, those police officers came in
11	unannounced at a very inopportune time and I tried to get,
12	for lack of better words, get rid of them as quickly as
13	possible.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: But, sir, it's not every day
15	that you're interviewed by two police officers?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I'm interviewed I have
17	discussions with police officers every day.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Police officers that are
19	doing an active criminal investigation?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: And you know the importance
22	of telling them the truth?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: And being complete and
25	accurate?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: And you're saying that you
3	would have read these pages and in the interests of wanting
4	to get it over with, would have initialled and signed it
5	on?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, without looking at it
7	closely.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: And yet there are several
9	changes even on this handwritten copy that you made?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, I just I remember
11	making some I remember having a discussion with Chris
12	McDonell to the effect that, "You really want me to sign
13	this statement?"
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah.
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And he
16	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm sure he said he did.
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: He shrugged his shoulders.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Like he didn't care?
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, it was up to me. It
20	was like I could sign it or not sign it.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: But you did sign it?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I did sign it.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: And did you not, sir, I
24	mean, there was a question at the very end:
25	"Would you read your statement and s

1	sign it?:
2	Answer, "Yes."
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Mr. Engelmann, I have no
4	knowledge of Mr. MacDonald's boyfriends other than the one
5	individual who I don't know if he has a moniker or not, and
6	I have no knowledge of Mr as alleged, Mr. Seguin's
7	that I had some list of Mr. Seguin's boyfriends. The only
8	individual that I could possibly conclude who may have been
9	a boyfriend of Mr. Seguin was another individual was one
10	individual, who at some point prior to Mr. Seguin's death,
11	resided with him.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: And you're not saying that
13	you used these words and then later changed them; you're
14	saying you never used these words?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't no.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: That's what you're saying?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's what I'm saying.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
19	And, sir, just to turn to 1063, if I can
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Which is?
21	MR. ENGELMANN: which is the typewritten
22	version.
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Ten sixty-three (1063).
24	THE COMMISSIONER: New volume, a different
25	volume I think. Ten sixty-three (1063)?

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes. You've got to go to
2	the other one.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: No, keep that one handy
4	though.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: The reference, sir, is at
6	the bottom of the second page.
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: You see the original words
9	there, "I know Malcolm is queer."
10	And that's been initialled or it's been
11	changed to, "I believe Malcolm is gay."
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: And you would have made that
14	change?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: And then it says, "I knew"
17	it used to say, "I knew Malcolm's boyfriends."
18	And you would have changed it to, "I know
19	some of" or "knew some of Malcolm's male friends."
20	You made that change?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: And then it used to say, "I
23	know Ken's boyfriends."
24	And you now say, "I knew some of Ken's male
25	friends."

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: You made those changes?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: We talked about this before.
5	Sir, it's my understanding that the two police officers who
6	saw you on August $4^{\rm th}$, 1998, those are Officers Seguin and
7	Dupuis, will say that you made those changes on August $4^{ m th}$,
8	1998, four-and-a-half years after you signed a statement to
9	that effect with two other OPP officers? Does that refresh
10	your memory?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No sir. You've made that -
12	- you've made that suggestion a number of times.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm now actually saying that
14	I mean, I'm informed that those officers will come
15	forward and say that you made those changes on August 4^{th} ,
16	1998. I'm asking if you want to think about the answer you
17	gave earlier?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well I'm all I can say,
19	sir, is that that does not match my memory.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. Well, earlier you
21	said to us that two or three days after February $14^{ m th}$ you
22	were provided with a written statement?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's my version, yes.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Written or typed?
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Typed.

l	THE COMMISSIONER: Typed; you said written.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: And let's just go back to
3	that for a minute. How did that come up? Did you call
4	them?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Did they call you? What
7	happened?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: They dropped in
9	unannounced.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Again?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. At your office?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And they
15	provided you with a written or typed statement at that
16	time?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Now they hadn't given you
19	the written statement?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No. I have received no
21	statements, any statements, written or typed.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, did they come in
23	with the written statement as well, or just the typed
24	statement?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Typed statement.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: And did they ask you to sign
2	the typed statement?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: We don't have a typed
5	statement with your signature, that's why I'm you
6	actually have a recollection of these two officers coming
7	back two or three days later giving you a typed version and
8	your signing it at that time and making these changes?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Because they're going to say
11	it happened four-and-a- half years later.
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well
13	MR. ENGELMANN: They're mistaken?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I'm not accusing anybody of
15	misleading this court. I'm telling you what is in my
16	memory
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Right.
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And I'm telling you what is
19	to the best of my memory, sir.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Because when
21	they interviewed you in '98
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, I gave another
23	statement.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah, and that was and
25	that was they were investigating Project Truth?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: That was a much broader
3	investigation?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Is that your evidence?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And at that
8	point they were asking questions about the relationship
9	between Malcolm and others and
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: and things of that
12	nature?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, let's look at the next
15	paragraph.
16	Again, I want to ask you if this is
17	something that you said to the OPP at the time and I want
18	to make sure that we've got it right?
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Which? The typed or the
20	-
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Let's go back to the
22	handwritten statement.
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Handwritten statement,
24	yes.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: "I talked to Malcolm after

1	Ken's death."
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't which where -
3	
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Eleven-seventy-five (1175);
5	page 4.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: The handwritten
7	MR. ENGELMANN: "I talked to Malcolm after
8	Ken's death."
9	THE COMMISSIONER: No, just a second,
10	please.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm sorry.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Eleven-seventy-five
13	(1175). Madam Clerk?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't appear to have it.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Eleven-seventy-five
16	(1175) is what we're looking for. I think he well nope,
17	here we go. So 1175
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: is the exhibit number
20	and it's on the second page at the bottom. No, I'm sorry,
21	now I'm looking at
22	MR. ENGELMANN: No, page 4, sir.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Bates page 7057836.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. So it's

1	about, just about a little
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Right after the paragraph I
3	just read.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: It says, "I talked to
5	Malcolm". Do you have that now, sir?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
9	"So I talked to Malcolm after Ken's
10	death, that there was a proposed
11	settlement of eleven-thousand dollars
12	(\$11,000). Malcolm said Ken gave a
13	statement admitting Ken gave him a hand
14	job. That was in December 1993.
15	Malcolm was trying to work out a deal."
16	Do you see that?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Did you tell the
19	OPP on February 14 th , 1994 what we see there?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And, in fact, I
22	don't think you changed that later. M'hm, no, there are no
23	changes to that to that paragraph.
24	So this relates to a conversation you have
25	in December of 1993 with Malcolm MacDonald; this

1	information?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yeah, I'm not sure what
3	the context of that sentence is but it was as I
4	indicated earlier in testimony there was a conversation
5	with Mr. MacDonald, myself, after Mr. Seguin died.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. You knew he was
7	a friend of both Ken Seguin's and Father Charles
8	MacDonald's?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: And he's talking to you
11	about allegations that are being made by David Silmser?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: And he's telling you that
14	when he says, "A proposed settlement", was that did you
15	understand that to be the payment of money from Mr. Seguin
16	to Mr. Silmser?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes. I there was some -
18	- I understand there was something involving money, yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And did he tell
20	you at that time about a previous payment of money
21	involving Father Charles MacDonald and Mr. Silmser?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: We didn't have that
23	discussion, no, but I believe that there was I think it
24	was public I think it may have been public knowledge or
25	it may have been in my mind that there was something

1	involving Mr Father MacDonald and Mr. Silmser and
2	involving some exchange of funds.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Well, it
4	certainly became public, public in January of 1994
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: but there were people
7	here in the community who some people who knew something
8	about it?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: It's a small town?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: And I guess what I'm asking
13	you is, in December of 1993 when he's telling you about
14	what he was doing what he'd been trying to do for Ken,
15	if he told you what he had done for Charlie, for Father
16	Charlie.
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't recall he may
18	have, but I don't recall it and it's not in my statement,
19	sir.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, I know it's not there,
21	but you've told us that you had a two-hour interview
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: and that you said a lot
24	more than what we have here?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: So I'm just trying
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't know. He may have,
3	I'm not denying that he may have
4	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: but, again, if memory
6	serves me right, we were and when I say "we", we in the
7	office were aware of the MacDonald issue; Father MacDonald
8	issue.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: But okay, and this is
10	December of 1993? How what do you mean "aware of it"?
11	You were aware of the settlement?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, we we weren't
13	aware of the settlement. We were aware of the rumours of
14	some sort of a settlement. We weren't privy to any inside
15	information.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay, would would Malcolm
17	MacDonald have told you that would he have suggested to
18	you that the payment of this eleven-thousand dollars
19	(\$11,000) would have anything to do with not proceeding
20	with a criminal charge?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't recall that, sir.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Do you recall
23	anything more about what the payment of the eleven-thousand
24	dollars (\$11,000) would be for?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I believe it was some as

1	I understood it, it was some form of compensation to Mr.
2	Silmser for wrongdoing.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And the sexual
4	act that apparently Malcolm is telling you Ken confesses to
5	is giving Mr. Silmser a hand job?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's what's written
7	there, yes.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: And is that what you
9	remember hearing from Malcolm MacDonald?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Nothing more than that?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's that's it. Mr.
13	MacDonald could not he was very very uncomfortable in
14	providing me with any details.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you ask him for a
16	statement?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I did not. You mean
18	like a written statement?
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah.
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Ken's written statement?
21	No, I did not.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Right because he your
23	saying to the police Malcolm said, "Ken gave a statement
24	admitting Ken gave him a hand job"?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yeah.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: And I'm wondering
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't know if that's a
3	statement to Mr a verbal statement to Malcolm
4	MacDonald, a written statement to the police or a statement
5	of wrongdoing in in the way of a settlement. So I don't
6	know what that what that refers to.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And I certainly I any
9	type of that document, no matter what it was, I never had -
10	- I never laid eyes on it.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Would you have asked to see
12	it at the time?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I did not.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you did he tell you
15	that this sexual act had happened when Mr. Silmser was a
16	probationer of Father Charles MacDonald?
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Whoa, whoa, no, was a
18	probationer of Father Charles MacDonald.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Oh, I'm sorry, I'm sorry.
20	Strike that strike that completely.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: It's almost time for
22	lunch break though.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Strike that completely. We're
24	talking about Ken Seguin.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: I apologize.
2	You're speaking to Malcolm MacDonald. He's
3	telling you about a sexual act that apparently Ken Seguin
4	does to David Silmser?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Does he tell you that
7	Silmser is on probation at the time to Ken Seguin?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, but I am aware of the
9	fact that at some point-in-time Silmser was a client of Mr.
10	Seguin and under his supervision. Whether or not that
11	sexual act took place during the period of supervision or
12	shortly thereafter or at some later date, I have no
13	knowledge of that. And I have no knowledge of when Mr.
14	Silmser was on probation.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Well, did you
16	ask Malcolm MacDonald that?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I did not, sir.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: What he's telling you that
19	your former colleague, who's just committee suicide
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: committed some kind of
22	sexual act
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: but he was willing to
25	pay eleven-thousand dollars (\$11,000) for

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: to someone who had been
3	on probation with him, correct? Mr. Silmser had been on
4	probation with Ken Seguin?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: And you didn't ask whether
7	the sexual act occurred while he was on probation?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No. The information that
9	Mr. MacDonald provided to me was very brief and very
10	limited and he was concerned that even telling me the
11	little he did tell me would be considered a breach of
12	client lawyer-client privilege.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Wasn't it important to you,
14	sir, as a current probationer officer at that time, to know
15	whether or not the sexual act that's talked about there
16	happened when Mr. Silmser was on probation to Mr. Seguin?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: And
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: But I also understood at
20	that time there were there was an on-going police
21	investigation.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: An ongoing police
23	investigation of what?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Of circumstances
25	surrounding Mr. Seguin's death. There were a number of

1	the rumour mill was pretty pretty active at the time.
2	There were rumours of extortion. There were rumours of
3	monies being paid out. There were rumours of the Church
4	being involved, and my understanding is that the police
5	were still had not concluded their investigation.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: In fact, they didn't talk to
7	you until this time in February; correct?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: February of '94?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: But wouldn't that have been
12	even more a reason to know? You're a probation officer.
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, and I
14	MR. ENGELMANN: This is your former
15	colleague. He's just committed suicide.
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Your friend, Malcolm
18	MacDonald, is telling you about his friend, Ken Seguin,
19	your former colleague, a settlement, a hand job, don't you
20	want to know? Don't you want to know how old Mr. Silmser
21	was at the time? Don't you want to know whether he was on
22	probation at the time?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Why don't you ask?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Mr. MacDonald as I said,

1	sir, Mr. MacDonald was very reluctant to divulge any
2	information whatsoever and so he gave me a snippet and in
3	effects it was to the effect that, "that's all I can
4	tell you."
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you know that Mr.
6	Silmser had been on probation, both as a juvenile and as an
7	adult?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I No. I had no idea
9	of that. As a juvenile to Mr. Seguin?
10	MR. ENGELMANN: It's my understanding.
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I did not.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Again, you didn't ask.
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I'm sorry?
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Again, you didn't ask.
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Ask whom?
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. MacDonald Malcolm.
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I'm not even sure Mr.
18	MacDonald would have known, but again, sir, I want to I
19	want to repeat that Mr. MacDonald was very reluctant to be
20	forthcoming as to the circumstances, and it was only upon
21	repeated prodding that I was given the information that he
22	did give me.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Did you go back
24	to your office and look at some files about this; do any
25	investigation on your own?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: The Silmser file was not
2	available at the time.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you report this to your
4	boss at the time?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Robert?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, there were
8	discussions.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay, you told Mr. Robert
10	you're saying you told Mr. Robert that you had this
11	conversation with Malcolm MacDonald about
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Silmser and
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Seguin?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I we had discussions
17	with Mr. Robert about that there was evidence or there was
18	information that Mr. Seguin had been involved with Mr.
19	Silmser and that the but this information was
20	apparently, this information was already known.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: When did you have the
22	discussion and who is "we"?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, certainly, there were
24	discussions among staff and there was discussions with Mr.
25	Robert.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, there wasn't a great
2	relationship with Mr. Robert. That's what you've told us.
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's right.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: And, in fact, before Mr.
5	Seguin is dead, he's the office snitch, so presumably you
6	and other staff are talking amongst each other not with
7	about some issues with either Mr. Seguin or Mr. Robert.
8	Correct?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Am I who am I having
10	these conversations with?
11	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm sir, you've told us
12	that you had a dysfunctional working relationship.
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: You've told us about a
15	poisoned work environment.
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: You've told us about all
18	sorts of issues
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: and how it affected
21	everybody's work.
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: So what I'm trying to figure
24	out now is and I'm these discussions with Mr. Robert
25	that you say took place, were they only after Mr. Seguin

1	died?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, and
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, actually I had
5	discussions there were other discussions I had with Mr.
6	Robert.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: About inappropriate activity
8	on the part of Mr. Seguin?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: On the part of Mr. Seguin
10	not fulfilling his role as a probation officer.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: I am talking about
12	inappropriate
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Inappropriate
14	MR. ENGELMANN: contact or inappropriate
15	sexual contact.
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Inappropriate sexual
17	contact I yes, I had that conversation with Mr. Robert
18	following my discussion with Mr. MacDonald.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay, so that's only after
20	Mr. Seguin is dead?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: You didn't say anything to
23	Mr. Robert about inappropriate sexual activity or
24	inappropriate client contact by Mr. Seguin with
25	probationers before he's dead?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I was not aware of them.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Not even of inappropriate
3	client contact?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I had discussions with Mr.
5	Robert about his role as a probation officer prior to his
6	death.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: What do you mean by that?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I think I may have
9	broached on that earlier in my testimony where I had some
10	concerns with Mr. Seguin not fulfilling his role as a
11	probation officer and how it impacted on my ability to
12	perform my role.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: What was he not doing that
14	impacted on your ability to perform your role?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Not doing proper follow-up
16	and enforcement. This was also post-Varley, as I believe I
17	mentioned to you earlier, the investigator had
18	conversations with me and asked me to bring it to the
19	attention of Mr. Robert. We had a rather lengthy telephone
20	conversation in which I suggested to the police officer
21	that he should put his concerns in writing to Mr. Robert
22	but preferably to a more senior level of management. And
23	as well, I had a discussion with a Cornwall police officer
24	who I don't recall his name, but he there was a matter
25	which required our follow-up for enforcement, and I,

1	subsequent to receiving his there's a form that's used
2	to report an allegation of a breach, and I followed that up
3	with a telephone conversation with that police officer, and
4	he said, "Well, how come you're getting back to me? Mr.
5	Seguin isn't doing that?" And so on and so forth.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Engelmann, can you
8	pick a spot there for lunch?
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. I'll just be a
10	moment.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: You will agree with me that
13	the comments Mr. Malcolm MacDonald makes to you about Ken
14	Seguin could be described as a confession of sorts?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That Mr that, who, Mr.
16	MacDonald confessed to me or that Ken Seguin confessed to
17	Mr. MacDonald or
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Right.
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't know, I never saw -
20	- I never saw any statement. I don't know what it all I
21	can tell you is what Mr. MacDonald told me.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Right, which was:
23	"I talked to Malcolm after Ken's death
24	that there was a proposed settlement of
25	\$11,000. Malcolm said Ken gave a

1	statement admitting Ken gave him a hand
2	job."
3	Presumably that's Silmser?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Correct;
6	"That was in December '93, Malcolm was
7	trying to work out a deal."
8	So I'm talking about the statement, whether
9	it's in writing or oral, that Mr. Seguin gives to Mr.
10	Malcolm MacDonald, that that could be construed as a
11	confession of sorts?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I there is I
13	think there is I deduce from that that there was some
14	admission of guilt by Mr. Seguin to Mr. MacDonald.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: In what manner or form that
17	took place? I don't know.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Maybe we could leave it
19	there, sir.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: We'll take the lunch
21	break now. Thank you.
22	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre;
23	veuillez vous lever.
24	This hearing will resume at 2:00 p.m.
25	Upon recessing at 12:43 p.m./

1	L'audience est suspendue à 12h43
2	Upon resuming at 2:04 p.m./
3	L'audience est reprise à 14h04
4	THE REGISTRAR: This hearing is now resumed.
5	Please be seated. Veuillez vous asseoir.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Engelmann.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Good afternoon, Mr.
8	Commissioner.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, sir.
10	JOS VAN DIEPEN: Resumed/Sous le même serment
11	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF BY/INTERROGATOIRE EN-CHEF PAR MR.
12	<pre>ENGELMANN (Cont'd/Suite):</pre>
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Good afternoon, Mr. van
14	Diepen.
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Good afternoon, sir.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: If you could just have out
17	for a moment either 1175 or 1063. We had talked about
18	paragraph it's the same in both about what Malcolm
19	MacDonald had told you in December of 1993?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: M'hm.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And I'm
22	wondering can you tell us, other than in this statement to
23	the OPP in February of '94, can you recall if you would
24	have told others about that?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And can you
2	recall to whom you might have spoken?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, there is more than
4	one conversation, more than one individual, different
5	combinations of individuals in the Cornwall office with my
6	fellow staff and with my supervisor.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. So you would have
8	told any number of people you worked with?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes. Well, there was
10	wasn't as if
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Was it is it sorry
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: wasn't as if I was
13	running up to
14	MR. ENGELMANN: No, no.
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: You know, these were on-
16	going events that were that we were becoming aware of as
17	they unfolded and we were we were collaboratively
18	sharing information.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And I don't go
20	back to what people knew before he died, so let's just talk
21	about what they knew after he died, in the office.
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Right.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: There would have been a
24	number of discussions?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And so at one or
2	more of those discussions you would have brought up this
3	issue that Malcolm told you about Ken, the eleven-thousand,
4	hand jobs, issues of that nature?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I might not have mentioned
6	that I heard it from Mr. MacDonald
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: but I certainly shared
9	the information I received.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. What about
11	outside of your office?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I may have mentioned it to
13	others, yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And when you
15	did, would you have talked about it as an admission, as a
16	confession or as both or
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Not your confession or
19	admission.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: No, no, but
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Would you have related it
22	as if Ken Seguin was admitting or confessing to?
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you know?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I among the best of
25	my memory, sir, is that it was a admission of guilt.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. I guess what I'm
2	asking is, six or seven years later, this website appears
3	and there is a story about a confession?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Seguin?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Is it possible that this
8	that that part of the story could have arisen from this
9	confession or admission that you were discussing with your
10	colleagues?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, because I think the
12	website speaks about me having found a written confession -
13	
14	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
14 15	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. MR. VAN DIEPEN: in the office and I
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: in the office and I
15 16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: in the office and I destroyed it or
15 16 17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: in the office and I destroyed it or MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
15 16 17 18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: in the office and I destroyed it or MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. MR. VAN DIEPEN: or something to that
15 16 17 18 19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: in the office and I destroyed it or MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. MR. VAN DIEPEN: or something to that effect.
15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: in the office and I destroyed it or MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. MR. VAN DIEPEN: or something to that effect. In other words, this would have been some
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: in the office and I destroyed it or MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. MR. VAN DIEPEN: or something to that effect. In other words, this would have been some document or paper that Mr. Seguin prepared before his death
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: in the office and I destroyed it or MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. MR. VAN DIEPEN: or something to that effect. In other words, this would have been some document or paper that Mr. Seguin prepared before his death and it was left in the office and I was the one that

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh, yeah. We're not
2	talking about the same timeline or or events.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, I know it's not the
4	same timeline.
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Right.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah. That's why I asked
7	you if that could have percolated into the other. All
8	right.
9	So let's look quickly at the next paragraph
10	and again it doesn't matter which one we look at, there was
11	no change.
12	It says:
13	"I think Emile Robert knew that Ken was
14	an homosexual. Ron Gendron and I tried
15	to talk to Ken about his clients living
16	there and that, but Ken would always
17	tell us to get out of his office. Once
18	Ron Gendron and I spied on him at the
19	Cornwall Square. Nelson would hang out
20	there. Ken asked Emile once if Gerry
21	Renshaw could live with him. Ken and
22	Gerry were lovers. Gerry owed Ken
23	about ten thousand"
24	et cetera.
25	Okay. And you say Ron Leroux and someone

1	else, C8, were always at Ken's et cetera.
2	Now, just a couple of things about that
3	paragraph. Did you tell Emile Robert anything about Mr.
4	Seguin's sexual orientation?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I at the prior to his
6	death or after his death?
7	MR. ENGELMANN: This statement's being made
8	
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, it's all over the map
10	
11	MR. ENGELMANN: February of '94.
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I mean that statement's all
13	over the map. There's a number of different thoughts and
14	items all strung together in one paragraph.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Right.
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: So what I'm you know,
17	these were separate I call discussions I had with the
18	police at the time, that they encapsulated into one
19	paragraph and one sentence not having anything to do with
20	the other. You know, the when I
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, let's try and break it
22	down.
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Sure.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: First sentence. Do you know
25	if you were talking about before his death or the two

1	months thereafter because he you're apparently making
2	this comment in February of '94?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Are you able to help us?
5	THE COMMISSIONER: So what I think Emile
6	Robert knew that Ken was homosexual?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: I think he knew that before
9	Ken died?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: In 1994, I believe that Mr.
11	Robert knew before Mr. Seguin died that Mr. Seguin may have
12	been an homosexual.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: And had you informed him of
14	that?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: At that point?
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Before Mr. Seguin died?
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Now, again that was my
22	conclusion I drew in 1994.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Okay. So I it was not
25	something that I had a conclusion I drew prior to Mr.

1	Seguin's death.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay, but I thought you told
3	us that
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: But so what I'm saying
5	to you, sir, is that in 1994
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: at the time I gave the
8	statement
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Two months after Mr. Seguin
10	died.
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: two months after Mr.
12	Seguin died, I believed at that time that Mr. Robert had
13	some knowledge prior to Mr. Seguin's death.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. I understood that.
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Okay.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: And I'm asking you
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: and that's what I'm
18	saying.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: I was asking if he got that
20	from you?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Did Mr. Robert get that
22	I told Mr. Robert that?
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Now, later on in

1	that paragraph, you say:
2	"Ron Leroux and C-8 were always at
3	Ken's."
4	See that? Just near the bottom of the
5	paragraph?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. How did you know
8	that?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Mr. Seguin told me.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So that was my
11	question. You don't say you learned that from someone.
12	When you read this it's almost as if, well, you were there
13	and that's why you knew?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yeah I you know
15	MR. ENGELMANN: You're not saying you know
16	that from your personal observations?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, there you know,
18	there is some I had some trouble with the the
19	semantics
20	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: the language. In other
22	words, you know, there's there's another little thing
23	there that, you know, that Ken would always tell us to get
24	out of his office, you know. There was only and I think
25	I've described to you, sir, that there was only one

1	incident and one incident only in which I was told to get
2	out of his office.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah, so it colourful and
4	you
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yeah, so I didn't construct
6	those sentences. They're not they're not my words.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, they are words you
8	adopt though?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Pardon?
10	MR. ENGELMANN: They're words you adopt.
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I adopt?
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: How?
14	MR. ENGELMANN: You adopted them at the
15	time. You signed the statement, you initialed it.
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: You read it.
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I mean, there was, you know
19	I mean that's I told you earlier, sir, that I had
20	some difficulty signing the statement and I you know
21	and I because I didn't think it was really an as
22	accurate as it could be. You know, there was, for example,
23	getting back to the thing of always, there was no always,
24	there was only once. You know, there was
25	MR. ENGELMANN: But, again, just thinking

1	about the importance of giving a statement to the police
2	and you'd been a long serving probation officer, didn't you
3	think it advisable that or write a note saying, "I have
4	some concerns about this", or make some changes
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I certainly made that view
6	known to the police officers.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And just on that
8	point:
9	"Ron Gendron and I tried to talk to Ken
10	about his clients living there."
11	Who do you mean by that?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Gerry Renshaw.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: But you are using "clients"
14	in the plural.
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I didn't again, sir, the
16	only client that I'm aware that lived with Ken Seguin was
17	Gerald Renshaw.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, but didn't you in
19	earlier statements talk about the Cornwall Police Service
20	dropping people by to live with him?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, when I worked
22	MR. ENGELMANN: A mistake.
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: well, we're talking
24	about different timeframe. We're talking about a different
25	circumstance. We weren't talking about living there.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Okay. We're talking about
3	living there, we're talking about somebody co-habitating.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And my understanding and
6	the only knowledge I have was that Mr. Renshaw was co-
7	habitating with Mr. Seguin.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. But whether
9	people are living there or whether they're spending the
10	night there, you'd agree that would be in contravention of
11	Ministry policy if they were probationers or ex-
12	probationers?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, my understanding of
14	it is, and correct me if I'm wrong, is that Mr. Seguin had
15	received permission for Mr. Renshaw to reside there.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: No, I'm not talking about
17	the Renshaw issue, and you're correct. That's in many
18	of these documents it talks about having run that by Mr
19	Robert.
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Right.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Now, I'm talking about
22	people being dropped off to spend the night.
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh, yeah, certainly. Do I
24	think it was inappropriate?
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Right.

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I think it's inappropriate.
2	Was everyone aware of that? Yes. Did Ken Seguin talk
3	about that openly? Yes. Did Mr. Robert know about that?
4	Yes.
5	I mean, did we know about it at the time it
6	happened? No. We were talking we became about those
7	things as a historical fact.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: So you say you didn't know
9	about them at the time?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I certainly did not.
11	Did you know that Ken Seguin came to me the following
12	morning and said, "Oh, guess who I had as a house guest?"
13	MR. ENGELMANN: So back in late '70s/early
14	`80s?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I had at that time I had
16	no knowledge.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Did we cover this the
18	thing with Mr. Gendron and him going over the mall to
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, that's the next
20	sentence and I believe that one of my colleagues would have
21	done that.
22	You do say and, sir, this is the next
23	sentence is:
24	"Once Ron Gendron and I spied on him at
25	the Cornwall Square."

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: And my understanding, sir,
3	is that would have been later on in his tenure; close to
4	_
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Towards the end, yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah.
7	And did you follow him from the office?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: And did you discuss it
10	beforehand?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: With whom?
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Ron Gendron.
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: And why was it that you were
15	going to follow him?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, Mr. Seguin was one of
17	these I guess, for lack of better words, a creature of
18	habit.
19	I could predict to you what suit he would
20	wear on a Monday; what time he would take his coffee break;
21	I mean, he was very regimented in his lifestyle.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: M'hm.
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: So much so that it you
24	could you know, like I said earlier, you could predict
25	what he was going to do tomorrow.

1	Suddenly, there was this radical change in
2	his behaviour. All of a sudden, he started taking off in
3	his vehicle during the morning break. And we're both sort
4	of saying, "Well that's kind of weird; what's that all
5	about?" And we had no idea what it was about. We don't
6	know and you know, you're suggesting that it may have
7	been sexual in nature; it may have been but we had no clue
8	that what was taking place. We were just curious as to
9	what actually happened.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, let's just be clear.
11	You're the one who's talking to the police -
12	
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Right.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: here.
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: You're the one who tells us
17	that the police are not just asking you about circumstances
18	surrounding his death.
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Right.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: But I don't want to get the
21	I think you said, "They also wanted to know about any
22	inappropriate sexual behaviour on his part."
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: So you're the one that's
25	giving this answer, in that context.

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, yes, but the you
2	know, that sentence is taken out of context, sir, when they
3	ask me about, you know, "What do you know about Mr.
4	Seguin?" You know, "What else can you tell me about Mr.
5	Seguin? What else did you do?"
6	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: You know, "Were you ever
8	did you ever have any kind of concerns?" You know, so
9	we're talking, again, a two-hour conversation with the
10	police in which they ask me, what did I know or what did I
11	do.
12	And so I gave them what I did and what I
13	knew. You know, in hindsight, perhaps I should have said
14	nothing and said, "I don't know."
15	MR. ENGELMANN: No, but I'm sure you
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And so, what I did was I
17	volunteered, because I wished the police to know everything
18	that I knew.
19	Whether it was whether or not Mr. Seguin
20	was doing something inappropriate or not, I you know, I
21	simply remarked on it that that is what we did and if
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Fair enough.
23	But you knew the context and that's why you
24	were giving this information to them, so that they could
25	figure out

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, sir.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: whether or not it
3	involved inappropriate sexual behaviour.
4	Fair enough?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, yes.
6	It may have been; it may have been. We
7	don't at before we followed him, we had no idea what
8	it was about and we did it because, well, I think both of
9	us I think we were sort of giggling like a bunch of school
10	kids following him, to see what he was really doing.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Now, again in this
12	statement, about a third of the way down the page that we
13	were on, you say that:
14	"Ken was good friends with Malcolm, Ron
15	and Jerry."
16	Do you see that? And then, in the next
17	sentence you say:
18	"Guy DeMarco, Ken Seguin and Father
19	Charlie were buddies. He was the ex-
20	Crown in Cornwall; now he's a judge in
21	Windsor."
22	I'm assuming you must be referring to Guy
23	DeMarco?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.

1	So did you know him as a former Crown, here?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you know when he was a
4	Crown here?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, dates? No, I
6	MR. ENGELMANN: While you were a probation
7	officer?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
10	Do you remember if it was at or about the
11	time of Peter Sirrs?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I would say that, yes.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And you
14	reference him a little further down the page, as well. You
15	say:
16	"DeMarco, Ken, Father Charlie they
17	went around to each other's houses.
18	They also went to a priest's in
19	Montreal. He was also an architect"
20	Et cetera."
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Now, how was it you were
23	aware of that, sir?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Ken Seguin told me.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Did he tell you what they

1	were doing together?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: They were all bachelors and
3	they'd in turn, one would cook up a one would it
4	was one in turn it was one of their responsibilities to
5	make supper.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So you have no
7	personal knowledge of those references to Guy DeMarco;
8	those would be comments that were made to you by Ken
9	Seguin?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Exactly.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Had you ever met the fellow?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: And had you ever seen him
14	with Ken Seguin?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: All right; but only in the
17	office, or elsewhere?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes; only in public.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
20	And would you have told the police that,
21	that you
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Which
23	MR. ENGELMANN: The police, when you're
24	talking to them in this during this statement.
25	Would you have told him that you weren't at

1	these parties; that you just heard this from Ken?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Or exactly. Yes.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: You would have told them
4	that?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
7	Because again, it's not here.
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Whether it's a personal
10	observation, or whether you're told.
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Exactly.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: That's why I'm asking.
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes. No I
14	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Fair question.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Can you help us out why
17	you're bringing up the paragraph in the middle?
18	Presumably you did; this is in reference to
19	someone named Mona and then a trip to a psychiatrist.
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Does that have anything to
22	do with circumstances surrounding his death, or in
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, no, no, no.
24	This happened before my employment with the
25	Ministry.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Mr. Seguin was involved in
3	a relationship with both of those females. He was engaged
4	to the one that was and I remember Ken once seeing a
5	psychiatrist or something, and the engagement was broke
6	off.
7	And that the this woman was, from what
8	and again, I wasn't there.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: So I can't tell you from
11	firsthand
12	MR. ENGELMANN: All right
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: But what was told to me was
14	that she was devastated by it.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And then so
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Let me just stop you for a
18	second.
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: and so they're asking
20	me about, well, "What else to you know?" And I said, "I
21	don't know anything more than that; if you want to know
22	more, speak to Marcel Léger who would have been an employee
23	at the time."
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So that
25	paragraph's all about things that you heard from Mr. Seguin

1	that took place before you even knew him.
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
4	Jack Fraser.
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yeah.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Is that someone who's known
7	to you?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Who was he?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Eastern Regional Vice
11	Chairman of the Ontario Board of Parole.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And was he a
13	friend of Mr. Seguin's?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't believe so.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And the
16	reference to the person in the bottom paragraph, was that a
17	person who had been on probation or was on probation?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, he at one point, he
19	was on probation to me.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So why are you
21	bringing this up? What's the significance of this when
22	we're dealing with Ken Seguin's death, whether it's
23	suspicious and/or possibly inappropriate sexual behaviour
24	on his part?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well they're the police

1	are asking me, "Is there anything else, do you know? Is
2	there anything else that you can tell us that may lead us
3	in any direction?" You know, "Can you help us? Tell us
4	anything you know at all, no matter how insignificant you
5	think it is."
6	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And so they're asking me,
8	you know, "Think about it; draw everything you can from
9	your memory and, if it's not important, well it's
10	unimportant. But it may be important to us, or it may
11	corroborate certain information we already have."
12	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: "So just be as free ranging
14	and as open as you can," and I was.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: So you don't know of
16	anything that would tie this to his death or inappropriate
17	sexual behaviour, thinking back?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, all I can tell you is
19	
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Just don't mention the
21	fellow's name.
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No; all I can tell you is
23	is that there was an incident what which happened and
24	then the office which struck me as odd.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And you reported

1	that to the police?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Exactly.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Now, what about
4	the paragraph which is perhaps more relevant to the subject
5	matter where it says:
6	"I heard once at a dinner party,
7	Silmser was there and that Father
8	Charlie sodomized Silsmer then and Ken
9	didn't do anything. I forgot where I
10	heard that but it was a while back."
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So is it fair to
13	suggest that you didn't hear that from Ken Seguin?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh, no. Mr. Seguin
15	wouldn't have told me that, no.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: He wouldn't have told you
17	that?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh, no.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: He knew that and then didn't
20	do anything?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yeah, exactly.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. That's what I
23	thought.
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: So he's the source of a lot

1	of the information you've given us on this page?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Right.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Who was likely the source
4	here?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I had no idea. It was a
6	friend if memory serves me correctly, it was a friend of
7	well, an acquaintance of ours.
8	We were at a we were at, I believe if
9	memory serves me right, we were at a dinner party. There
10	was a discussion, as there are discussions, about this
11	whole Project Truth, the sexual abuse and stuff and one of
12	the individuals at this group mentioned that Ken Seguin
13	mentioned what I just what you just read.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, hang on. This is
15	February '94?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Project Truth
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, you know what I
19	MR. ENGELMANN: doesn't happen until
20	'97.
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: the subject matter of
22	Project Truth.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Help me out.
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Okay. Let's let's
25	remove the word "Project Truth"; okay?

1	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: There was a lot of rumours
3	about sexual impropriety on the part of Ken Seguin and
4	others in the community.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: When?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Pardon?
7	MR. ENGELMANN: When?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: When, when?
9	MR. ENGELMANN: When were there those
10	rumours?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Immediately after Ken's
12	death there was just a hornet's nest of activity.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, so
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And so I'm thinking that
15	this might have been a Christmas party.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: So this would have been very
17	fresh then?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: As opposed to some of the
20	information here that's many years earlier?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: But you do say in your
23	in that paragraph:
24	"I forgot where I heard it but it was a
25	while back."

1	So
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah, that's why I thought
3	this was
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: You know, it was, you know
5	
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Isn't it more likely, sir,
7	that it was before Mr. Seguin died?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't believe so, sir,
9	but I don't have a I don't have anything that comes in
10	mind that helps me frame it helps with the timeframe.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Isn't it also true that
12	there were some rumours about Ken Seguin before he died?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: So surely this could have
15	been before then?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: It might have been.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Now, sir, in
18	just be a second.
19	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Now, in this particular
21	statement, and I'm talking about the February $14^{\rm th}$, '94
22	statement, you don't specifically reference being at either
23	Ken Seguin's house or at Malcolm McDonald's cottage when
24	young men were there; correct? In this statement.
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Do I do I say that I was

1	there?
2	MR. ENGELMANN: No. I'm saying you don't.
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Okay, yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: In this first statement.
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Okay.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: You can check it if you
7	like, but I don't see a reference to your being there
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Right.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: at either the
10	Summerstown do I have that right; Summerstown
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: House or his house on
13	Alguire or the cottage on Stanley Island when there were
14	young men there?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Probationers or otherwise?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: That's not in the '94
19	statement?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: And why is that?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I would I don't know.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Well, had you
24	been there when there were young males there who were
25	probationers or ex-probationers?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Let's go to the
3	August 4^{th} , '98 statement. I want to just go through it
4	briefly. It's Tab sorry, it's Exhibit 1176.
5	Mr. Commissioner, there is a handwritten
6	copy of this; we've seen these before. It's Document
7	Number 713466.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm wondering, sir, if the
10	handwritten version could be marked as Exhibit 1176A.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Sure.
12	Well, wait a minute now. Isn't it already
13	in here?
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Oh, you know what, it is the
15	same document. I apologize. It's already there.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: It's all known as 1176.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah.
18	So, Mr. van Diepen, do you have a typed
19	version and a handwritten version attached?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, I do.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So and I've
22	just this is the summer of 1998. Project Truth is on
23	and you're interviewed by Officers Seguin and Dupuis.
24	We covered this very briefly before. The
25	handwritten document, the end, it again it contains your

1	signature at the end? Is that correct?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: And did they ask you to
4	initial each page as well, sir?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: And then do you recall, sir,
7	when it was you would have seen a typed version or have you
8	ever seen the typed version before you were looking at the
9	documents here?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: So the first time you would
12	have seen the typed version would be here as you're
13	preparing to give your evidence?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And the
16	handwritten version you would have seen at the time, but am
17	I right that they did not give you a copy to take home?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Do you recall
20	the circumstances of this statement?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you recall where it took
23	place?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I believe it took place in
25	the office.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And I'm looking
2	at the time there. It appears to have been an interview of
3	about half-an-hour. Does that seem about right?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't know. I don't
5	recall.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Oh, I'm sorry.
7	I've read 15h39. It's 13h39 to 16h05, so that would be
8	about two-and-a-half hours.
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Okay.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: That's even longer than the
11	first one?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Does you don't have any
14	recollection of the time.
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't recollect
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you remember the two
17	officers?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Dupuis and Seguin?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Were they known to you, sir?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Through your
24	work?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.

159

1	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm not suggesting there
2	were other reasons.
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: And, sir, on page 3 of 8 we
5	have a discussion about the
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: The typed version, sir?
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah, let's just use the
8	typed version. I don't think there there are no changes
9	on this, so let's just use the typed version.
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Okay.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: There's a reference to the
12	17 year-old probationer that we talked about earlier?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: And it's fair to say that
15	your memory of that incident was better in '94 than it
16	would have been in '98?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Correct.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: You don't take issue with
19	that?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't see why I should,
21	no.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: And there are some aspects
23	of the earlier version that aren't there any more. For
24	example, there's no reference to the alleged comment or the
25	comment that this probationer made to you that Father

1	Charlie liked little boys. That's not there?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's not there.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: And there's a reference to,
4	at the end:
5	"There's some kind of contact that I
6	don't remember."
7	So if you'd known about contact in '94,
8	although you didn't write about it, by this point you say
9	you don't remember. Is that fair?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: And you wouldn't have
12	reviewed those case notes that you took
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That file would have been
14	gone a long time ago.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Right, because that was
16	1976?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So there'd be no
19	reason for your memory to get better about that incident?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's right.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: In fact, more likely it
22	would just fade some more?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Then on the
25	following page, page 4, at the bottom you confirm, sir,

1	that when you ask about Ron Leroux, and again we won't
2	mention the name of who he was living at the time, but you
3	say that Ron and the other person were good friends with
4	Ken?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And again you're
7	asked about Father Charlie and this is when you say, and we
8	talked about this briefly, that he was a good friend of
9	Ken's?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: And that they'd gone through
12	seminary together?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And you're asked
15	about this incident concerning the dinner party?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: And Silmser being apparently
18	sodomized?
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: And you say, "I wasn't at
21	the dinner party," so I get the sense, sir, that the
22	reference to dinner party is where something happened, or
23	am I mistaken?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, what I said earlier.
25	This alleged act

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: took place at one of
3	these dinner parties with the that took place.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, and to be
5	perfectly clear about it, you're saying you weren't there,
6	that you heard about it from you don't know whom?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: From Mr. 'X'.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And you believe
9	did you believe those other individuals were there or
10	are you able to help us? I'm just reading
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Exactly. The only
12	information I have was the information that I reported to
13	the police. I don't have any other information other than
14	that. That's what the information that was thrown out at
15	our dinner table.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you ever tell anybody
17	about this?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Who would you have told?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I told the police.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: No, no, clearly here you
22	told the police.
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I believe I told them in
24	'94 as well.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes you did.

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you tell anybody else
3	about this allegation?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I may have mentioned it to
5	a coworker.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: And do you remember if that
7	would have been before or after Mr. Seguin's death? Can
8	you help us?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I can't help you with that
10	sir.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, that's fine.
12	Now at the bottom of the page, you confirm
13	your friendship with Malcolm MacDonald?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: And you say you became of
16	his orientation during his drinking heyday?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you remember when that
19	was?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I'm going to say 70's.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, early on in the
22	relationship?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, and you talk
25	about an alternative lifestyle?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: And you say:
3	"It's not anything I witnessed actually
4	for any of these guys, Ken or Nelson.
5	Never did I see anything that would
6	make me to say, 'wow, wait a minute.'
7	And specifically towards any client
8	contact, I never witnessed anything."
9	"What do you mean by alternative
10	lifestyle?"
11	"Homosexual, I guess, is or in the
12	proper term."
13	All right? So you're saying that you don't
14	recall how you became aware of this alternative lifestyle
15	but at least at this point you're saying you're aware of it
16	for all three of them; correct?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yeah, I think that's
18	probably a poor choice of words. I
19	MR. ENGELMANN: You don't hedge that one at
20	all here?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I mean, again I I, you
22	know, and I think I alluded to it in the statement that I
23	had no proof.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: And in the middle of the
25	next page you're asked:

1	"Did you ever go to Ken's house in
2	Summerstown?"
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: This is right after well
5	hang on, let's back up for a second. You're asked about
6	Malcolm's male friends?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: I don't want a name right
9	now because I'm not sure about that name.
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: But you say:
12	"He was around 18, 21; Malcolm was
13	around 50. He was always hanging
14	around his cottage. I'm not pulling up
15	any names right now. There was a
16	series of young men that were hanging
17	around Malcolm's cottage as well as
18	Ken's house"?
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, so when I read
21	that my first thought is well you were there and you saw
22	this?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Is that fair?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: You're still saying you
2	weren't there?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I was not there.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, well then in the
5	next sentence, the next question is:
6	"Did you ever go to Ken's house in
7	Summerstown?"
8	And you say.
9	"There's two cases in particular that I
10	recall when some young guys, including
11	at least one male client, Gerry
12	Renshaw, were hanging out at Ken's.
13	They certainly knew their way around."
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: And when I read that, I mean
16	that seems to suggest without a doubt that you were there?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I was I was at I
18	never denied that I was at Ken Seguin's house.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Oh, okay, okay. But
20	apparently you were there when there were some young males
21	hanging around?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: One of them was Gerry
24	Renshaw?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, and the other one was,

1	as I subsequently discovered, was C-8.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. "They certainly
3	knew their way around"?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So if Gerry
6	Renshaw said he saw you there that's not a surprise because
7	you saw him there?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's right.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, and then it says:
10	"Were you ever at any parties at
11	Malcolm's cottage on Stanley Island?"
12	You say:
13	"I remember being there twice, once
14	with other couples, my wife and I and
15	some other adult couples, including Dr.
16	Joe McLean. I've never been there when
17	there were any young males there. I've
18	stopped by and seen some young males
19	there but I never stayed."
20	All right, so what are you referring to
21	there in that last sentence?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't recall.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you remember coming up
24	and about and seeing him there with a bunch of young men?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't recall. Honestly,

1	I don't recall.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, and then at the
3	bottom of that page and onto the next page, you are asked
4	about whether you see certain people at Malcolm's cottage?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Like the Bishop?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Police chief?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: And you were also asked if
11	you see other people at Ken Seguin's?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, And you never
14	say help me out here, you never say I was never there or
15	I was almost never there?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I never
17	MR. ENGELMANN: You answered the question?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, so presumably you
20	were there on a few occasions, both places?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And the one
23	person that you say you may have seen at Malcolm's is this
24	fellow, Ron Wilson?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: But I think I correct it

1	later on where I say I think it was at Ken's house may
2	have but I said I'm not sure.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Well just on
4	page 7, you say:
5	"Have you ever seen Ron Wilson at
6	Malcolm's cottage?"
7	"I may have. They have been good
8	friends for years and years."
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yeah.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, so you knew about
11	their friendship?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: And in fact he was one of
14	the fellows who had come to Harv's for lunch?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: And then again you were
17	asked about seeing people at Ken's and you say no to a few
18	people and then you say, "and Ron Wilson, I'm not sure"?
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: You're not sure if you saw
21	him at Ken's?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's right.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
24	Now you are asked some questions on the last
25	page about trips to Florida?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: And you never went to
3	Florida with any of these people?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Never.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And your
6	knowledge about these trips to Florida by Malcolm or Ken or
7	others, or Ron Wilson
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: would that have been as
10	a result of conversation?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: They'd be talking about
13	going or coming from?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: In conversation at Harv's or
16	elsewhere?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And you're
19	asked:
20	"Do you know where they stayed in Fort
21	Lauderdale?"
22	And you say:
23	"For years and years Malcolm went to a
24	motel not right on the beach but on the
25	main drag; don't know what the name of

1	it is."
2	Would that have been the Saltaire Motel?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I have no idea.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: You can't remember?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. I want to ask
7	you about the very last thing, because it doesn't make any
8	sense to me and maybe you can help me, sir.
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: It says:
11	"Would you like to read and sign your
12	statement?"
13	And if you want to look at the handwritten
14	portion, it may be helpful, I don't know, but it says:
15	"Regarding the confession, I was told
16	by someone obviously but I do not
17	recall who."
18	And then I think it says.
19	"They content, should read not told by
20	a person who had firsthand knowledge."
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: The English is a bit choppy
23	there.
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Can you help us as to what

1	that means?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I think I'm referring to
3	as near as I can ascertain from that, and again this is
4	1998.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: So I'm only hazarding my
7	best guess here.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: This is referencing this
10	incident of sodomization.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And the I think it
13	should read, "The content should read"; not "they content."
14	Should read:
15	"Not told by a person who had firsthand
16	knowledge."
17	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And that has
18	nothing to do with the other confession which is attributed
19	to Project Truth, which is two years later?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yeah.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
22	Now let's look very briefly at the Downing
23	interview notes, that's 958A. Yes, the Downing report,
24	there's a 19 or 18 pages of an interview he took with
25	you?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: You talked about references
3	to Nelson Barque. At the top of page 5, the first page 5
4	or I guess it's the only one here. There's no reference
5	here, is there, when you're saying:
6	"I do not have any knowledge of him
7	having a liaison with Ministry
8	clients."
9	You see that?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: No reference here about
12	people staying at his place or being dropped off by the
13	Cornwall Police Service; correct?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: We're talking about Ken
15	Seguin?
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes. This is all about Ken
17	Seguin. It starts on the previous page.
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: You don't talk about that at
20	all?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Do you recall
23	talking about it and he just doesn't record it or you don't
24	think you talked about it?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I talked about it.

174

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Is that here?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't know. It's a long
3	statement, sir. I don't know if it's referenced in that
4	statement
5	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: it could at some other
7	point.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: I didn't see it, that's why
9	I'm asking.
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Okay.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. I may be
12	mistaken.
13	Now, the incident that's being referenced in
14	the second full paragraph, that's the shooting incident
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: when Mr. Seguin had some
17	people
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: at his house just before
20	someone was shot?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. The reference to
23	just give me a second fourth paragraph down.
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Which page?
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Same page, page 5.

175

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: You're alleged to have said:
3	"About the time that some hush money
4	was offered to David Silmser (1992) by
5	the Catholic Church, Ken Seguin was
6	reportedly being pressured by a former
7	client."
8	Do you see that?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: And then you say:
11	"Later, I remember one day, Ken did not
12	show up for work and Emile asked me to
13	accompany him to Ken Seguin's residence
14	in Summerstown."
15	All right?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: So, sir, this suggests that
18	you knew something about him being pressured by a former
19	client before he died?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Are you saying that I knew
21	something before he died or I knew about it in 2000? That
22	something that he was being pressured before he died.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm saying the way this
24	reads, it would appear you knew it at the time.
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.

177

he also missed his appointment with his

1	dentist. I knew something was wrong."
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: "I decided not to
4	accompany Emile to Ken's residence in
5	Summerstown. Ken was subsequently
6	found dead."
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, how was it that you
9	knew something was wrong?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Sir, this was in response
11	to a question something along the lines of, "What can you
12	tell us about Ken Seguin's death? What events do you know
13	about that led up to his death?" And so that's a
14	transcription in what I believe to be a chronological order
15	of events that were part of my knowledge base in 2000.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Well, if you
17	trace the document, if you go back to page 3
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: the last question is:
20	"Would you now in your own words
21	explain any information, knowledge or
22	provide an explanation in regards to
23	the statements associated with you on
24	an internet website?"
25	Do you see that?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: And you start giving a long
3	answer and you say, "Can I start with Nelson Barque?" And
4	you do.
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Then on the following page,
7	and this seems to be, "Tell us what you know" type of
8	interview, at least at this stage.
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Question:
11	"Please go on."
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: And you carry on.
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: M'hm.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: And then he says, at the
16	bottom of page 5:
17	"We can take a break from our
18	interview. Prior to taking a recess,
19	I'd like to first review what's been
20	recorded prior to our break."
21	So you seem to be giving him a narrative of
22	what's happening
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: of what's happened?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: You don't disagree with
2	that?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: So on the day he dies, you
5	suspect something's wrong?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And, in fact,
8	we've heard from others about how he was different in the
9	months before he died.
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: And do you acknowledge
12	noticing that as well?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, the only that I recall
14	was Mr. Seguin's going outside to smoke a cigarette and
15	pace, if I can use the word, pacing in the parking lot.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: And had this been happening
17	for some time before he died?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yeah, I'm going to say yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. But in any
20	event, on the day he died, you were concerned?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Why were you concerned?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Again, you could set your
24	watch by Mr. Seguin. And he I know that he at the
25	time, he had some he was undergoing a lengthy procedure

1	of oral surgeries in Ottawa. And what triggered the event
2	was that the Mr. Seguin was not present in the office.
3	However, Mr. Seguin was scheduled for another session of
4	oral surgery and so was not expected to be in the office.
5	Then what happened was we received a phone
6	call from this oral surgeon. "Where's Mr. Ken Seguin?" And
7	then everybody said, "Whoa, wait a minute". You know, this
8	surgery business was very important to Mr. Seguin.
9	He had undergone a number of surgeries which
10	were quite invasive and uncomfortable and he needed to go
11	for a couple of more to correct and I think it was
12	receding gums or something to that effect.
13	And the nurse or whatever called and said,
14	"Where's Ken Seguin?" And we said, "We don't know. He's
15	supposed to be" and again this was handled by support
16	staff who answered the phone. And they said, "We don't
17	know. We think he is on his way up there."
18	So then we tried to find out what happened.
19	Did he get in a car accident? What took place?
20	And then they called the house; there was no
21	answer there. And then I just sort of said it was just
22	like a premonition and I just sort of said, "Ooh, I don't
23	like the feel of this at all, at all".
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, we heard that he as
25	I said from other people, that he wasn't himself; that he'd

1	attempted to commit suicide earlier that same year?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yeah, that's the first
3	you told me that I believe on Friday. That's the first
4	I've heard of that.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: In fact, your colleagues or
6	you and your colleagues were so concerned that someone took
7	someone called the police?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I if, and correct
9	me if I am wrong, they called the police after they went to
10	the house. And there was his car, I think, there was
11	if I remember reading the transcripts or the notes or
12	whatever it was that was provided, the car was in the
13	driveway but there was nobody answering the door.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: So what you know about this
15	is from your reading transcripts here or notes here?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Why did you decline to go?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Just had that premonition.
19	I just didn't have a good feeling about it.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: But right at the end, I
21	think everybody says your relationship wasn't the same with
22	him as it had been?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's right. And Ron
24	Gendron volunteered to go anyway.
25	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)

1	MR. ENGELMANN: And this was pretty
2	traumatic for the whole office, was it not, when you found
3	out about his death?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, it was.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: And was there an arranged
6	debriefing or counselling for all of you, as a result?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: If memory serves me right,
8	I believe that it was quite some time later they were
9	they made they brought somebody in for some sort of
10	counselling session and group counselling session, and it
11	was a day that I was scheduled to be in Morrisburg anyway,
12	and I just just, the whole thing just sickened me, and I
13	didn't want to have anything to do with it. But this would
14	have been some time later.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. As I understand,
16	Mr. Robert will say that he arranged some debriefing or
17	counselling
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh, I don't doubt that he
19	did, yes.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And he said, at
21	least back then to Mr. Downing, that you appeared to be
22	more affected by Ken's death than the other staff; do you
23	recall that?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Do I recall him saying that
25	or

I	MR. ENGELMANN: No, do you recall feeling
2	that way?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh, I was I was
4	particularly struck by it because, you know, this is now
5	the second my second co-worker who is involved in a
6	breach of trust with clients and, you know, I was sort of
7	at the I was at the stage now, you know, fool me once,
8	shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me. And I you
9	know, I went through a lot of self-doubt and self-second
10	guessing. You know, what did I why didn't I; or what
11	should I have; or how come I didn't know? Or what you
12	know, and so on and so forth.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: And you were having
14	difficulty sleeping and eating at that time?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: That was attributed to you
17	in any event?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: And that was because of the
20	allegations that you were now becoming aware of or his
21	death or both?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: What allegations?
23	MR. ENGELMANN: What you've just said; yet
24	another co-worker
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh, the sexual well, I

1	guess what troubled me, in particular, was that another one
2	of my co-workers
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: was abusing clients.
5	And I was you know, out of what was initially a three-
6	man office, two of these individuals now had been involved
7	in sexual activities with clients.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: And you're learning of that
9	from whom?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Everybody.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And you're
12	saying you're learning of it then, for the first time?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, you're going to have
14	to be you know
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Then being
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I knew I already
17	knew about Mr. Barque.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And I already knew about
20	that.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm talking about Mr.
22	Seguin.
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And then, subsequently, at
24	his death, I discover that, wait a minute, there's a whole
25	we are now discovering that there may even be that

1	the Seguin may even be bigger than the Barque issue. And
2	so everyday there somebody is dropping a new snippet or a
3	new rumour.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Like, we're just like
6	the office is just pinging at this point.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: I'll just be a moment. I'm
8	almost done, sir.
9	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, if we could turn to
11	page 12 of the interview with Mr. Downing. I just want to
12	sort something out and want your advice on it.
13	Right at the bottom of the page after you're
14	asked questions about boyfriends, et cetera, you are asked
15	the question:
16	"So you don't recall making such a
17	statement to the OPP?"
18	"I don't recall that statement."
19	You are referring to those words, right?
20	Not the fact of making a statement to the police. Am I
21	right?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I am having trouble finding
23	where you are, sir.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: The bottom of page 12, very
25	bottom.

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: "So you don't recall making
3	such a statement to the police?"
4	I just want to make sure I understand the
5	context. That's talking to the police about Malcolm's
6	boyfriends or Ken's boyfriends?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: That's not the fact of
9	actually making a statement on February 14 ^{th, '94} ?
10	You remember that you were interviewed?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah, okay.
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I think it was I think
14	that Mr. Downing had an unedited copy of the '94 statement,
15	and he was assuming that I had made a statement that I
16	knew, and my corrected statement was that I believed or
17	and that I did not know.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: So what he had, just so we
19	are clear, is he had his notes
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: of a statement that he
22	looked at.
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Okay.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right, and I asked you
25	this earlier, so I don't want to go back.

1	Sir, on page 14, you are asked about it's
2	about two-thirds of the way down, you provided the OPP a
3	statement that you and Ron Gendron tried to talk to Ken
4	about his clients living there and that, but Ken would
5	always tell you to get out of his office:
6	"Why were you concerned enough to
7	confront Ken about his association with
8	Ministry clients outside the
9	workplace?"
10	Do you see that?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I don't. Where is
12	this? On page 14?
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Page 14.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: It's near the top.
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Near the top?
16	MR. ENGELMANN: If you look at the screen,
17	right where the arrow is.
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: And you are asked you
20	say:
21	"I felt that his behaviour was
22	inappropriate."
23	"Why?"
24	"To protect Ken Seguin and the client."
25	And then you elaborate. So that's the

1	answer you gave to Mr. Downing with respect to this issue?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. You don't take
4	any issue with that?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, again, it was you
6	know, I want to be clear that there was only one contact
7	with Mr. Seguin with the in the accompaniment of Ron
8	Gendron. We tried to talk to him, and that's when he told
9	me to get out of his office.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Did he tell you what we see
11	at the top of page 15?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Those were his words?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And in a very loud voice
15	that was heard by others in the office.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: So Mr. Gendron would have
17	heard that as well?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh, exactly, yes. He was
19	there in the office with me, and I believe that Mr. Robert
20	became aware of that exchange.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah, I'm looking a little
22	further down page 15.
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Okay.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: You say:
25	"It may have been about the same time

1	that we followed Ken, it might have
2	been around that time. I did speak to
3	Emile Robert about my concerns."
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: "Prior to this, you said
6	you would not report such matters to
7	Emile. Why now? Why did you think it
8	was a significant matter to go to him
9	and report it then, when you previously
10	couldn't because of the poor working
11	relationship?"
12	"Notwithstanding my poor working
13	relationship with Emile Robert, I went
14	to him and told him about my concerns
15	regarding Ken Seguin's relationship
16	with clients."
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: So you're telling Downing
19	that you had concerns about Seguin's relationship with
20	clients?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Is that correct?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, but as long as you
24	don't take that out of context. I mean his professional
25	relationship with his clients vis-à-vis performing his role

1	as a probation officer.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Oh, we are not talking about
3	the conflict of interest issue?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, we're just talking
5	what, we are talking about him being too, I think, close
6	with his clients and just just engaging them socially
7	rather than professionally and that led to issues of his
8	work him not performing the duties properly
9	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: as a probation officer.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: When I when I read this
12	again it was in the context of perhaps having inappropriate
13	contacts.
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: You're talking about
15	you know, I again, sir
16	MR. ENGELMANN: I I whether sexual or
17	not.
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yeah, I again I want to
19	reiterate, I did not know that Ken Seguin at prior to
20	his death, was involved in inappropriate sexual contacts
21	with clients and I want to repeat that and I want to keep
22	repeating that, sir
23	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: because that is the
25	truth.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: All right, but but on
2	the previous page, you did have some concerns about that
3	because if you look at your answer why would you felt
4	that this was his behaviour was inappropriate.
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Why, and why would you
7	"because to protect Ken and the client."
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: To elaborate from
10	misunderstanding of their relationship, a conflict of
11	interest, maybe a complaint about his sexual conduct with
12	clients and a number of other concerns, but amongst those
13	concerns, you had a concern about inappropriate sexual
14	conduct.
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, but not at that time,
16	sir. Your Honour, I was not aware prior to at that
17	point you know, this is a statement given in 2000, some
18	seven years after his passing where there was a lot of
19	other information came forward; prior to his death I was
20	not aware of him being involved in any sexual relationship
21	or suspicion of sexual relationship.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: But sir, if you read what
23	you've said there, again
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: and I I, you know, I

1	
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I realize the language is
3	difficult, Mr. Engelmann, and I all I can tell us is
4	what I know to be the truth.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay, but just just hear
6	me out for a second
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: because again it's one
9	of these ones where it appears to be different
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: at the time because you
12	say you provided the OPP a statement that you and Gendron
13	tried to talk to Ken about his clients living there, and
14	this is back in '94
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: the first time, but Ken
17	would always tell you to get out of his office. Why were
18	you concerned enough to confront Ken about his association
19	with Ministry clients outside the workplace and then we get
20	down to the part the Commissioner read to you:
21	"from misunderstanding their
22	relationship, a conflict of interest,
23	maybe a complaint about his sexual
24	conduct with clients and a number of
25	other concerns."

I	So it appears that that was one of the
2	reasons you went to him then. He was alive; you went to
3	him about this concern. Do you see how anybody reading
4	this would see that as
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I I
6	MR. ENGELMANN: having happened at the
7	time?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: you know, there you
9	know, there's a number of different ways you could read
10	that, you know, and in fairness to your argument, sir, I
11	could read into that that I knew I had full knowledge of
12	Mr. Seguin being involved sexually with his clients and
13	that that statement could be interpreted a number of
14	different ways and all I can tell you is what I know
15	knew then and what I know now.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, this issue about
17	reporting to Mr. Robert about Ken Ken Seguin's
18	relationship with his clients, he is going to tell us that
19	you didn't report to him about that.
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I I think, sir,
21	you can you've had evidence to the contrary; that my co-
22	worker that I reported to my co-worker that I would be
23	speaking to Mr. Robert and that I subsequently confirmed
24	that I did speak to Mr. Robert. And after Mr. Seguin's
25	passing away, Mr. Robert approached me in some conversation

l	to ask me what else I knew about Mr. Seguin, so I would
2	suggest to you, sir, that that is if not direct
3	corroboration, it certainly indirectly corroborates that I
4	did speak to Mr. Robert.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: So what did you tell Mr.
6	Robert after Mr. Seguin passed away?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I told him about my
8	concerns; how it impacted on my role. He was not doing
9	proper follow-up. I explained about the that there were
10	concerns expressed by the police about following the
11	the am I allowed to say well, the murder?
12	MR. ENGELMANN: So let me just stop you for
13	a second. So you're now suggesting or you are suggesting
14	that you told him about things before Mr. Seguin died and
15	you told him about things after? Am I do I have that
16	right?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, no, the the the
18	Varley or are they am I allowed to be saying that?
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes, that
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Is he a moniker?
21	THE COMMISSIONER: No.
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I'm sorry. Well, the -
23	- anyway, the murder took place before Ken Seguin passed
24	away.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Absolutely.

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, so the the it
2	was after that incident that I spoke to Mr. Robert.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: About inappropriate contacts
4	he was having with others?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. I I just the
7	reason I bring it up is that's what he tells Mr. Downing in
8	a statement in September and then again in Exhibit 1087
9	which is a letter dated October 18, 2000, if we can bring
10	it up just very quickly?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I also understand
12	that Mr. Robert denied having received certain
13	correspondence.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, he's not here yet.
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, okay. I'm just
16	telling you, sir, that there was some some issues with
17	what he's what he's reporting.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: It's a short letter, but
19	it's fairly emphatic.
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes. I'm aware of that
21	letter, sir.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes, you've seen this in the
23	package.
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: All right and so you're

1	saying that's not true.
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Absolutely untrue.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: And then, sir, on page 16 of
4	the Downing statement, 958A, you describe this incident
5	with a 17-year-old probationer; it starts about halfway
6	down the page.
7	What struck me as strange is now this is the
8	year 2000, we seem to have a lot more detail than we had in
9	'98 and a lot more detail than we had in '94.
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: And you've told us you
12	wouldn't have looked at the file
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: but yet you seem to be
15	saying some things, especially in the third paragraph of
16	your answer, that are brand new about a fellow saying:
17	"He awoke to Father Charlie
18	brushing/rubbing his arm."
19	And:
20	"I I far as I know there was no
21	'sexual content' whatsoever."
22	And there's more about not only bringing it
23	up with Ken, but also bringing it up with Nelson. That's
24	new because before it was just bringing it up with Ken
25	about Nelson and Charlie. Now, you're saying

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And no, sir, I think I
2	my earlier testimony, I was I made Mr. Barque know
3	aware that I was very unhappy with his his the choice
4	of placing my client at and I was not happy about that.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, can I just bring
6	you back to that before last paragraph. In your
7	probationer's mind, he was clear that there was some sexual
8	intent on Father Charlie's mind?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: M'hm.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Do you did he tell you
11	that?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't believe that that's
13	what his words were to that effect. I think that is
14	something that I may have deduced because he talked about
15	Father Charlie being gay and he saw himself as possibly
16	being approached in that manner.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, so it goes back to
18	if we go back to piecing together what you knew
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: right, that's a
21	deduction that you made at the time; right? Then it is
22	fair to conclude that you at least had a concern that this
23	gentleman, the probationer, had been exposed to someone who
24	had an intent a sexual intent towards him and that he
25	had been put in that element by Nelson Barque?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct, sir.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, the reason it's not
3	just those that detail that's new and more expansive,
4	but the comment about Ken and Nelson. If you go back to
5	1063 for a minute and it's the same in the August $4^{\rm th}$ '98
6	statement, you describe the incident starting at the bottom
7	of the first page onto the top of the second, and then in a
8	paragraph you say:
9	"At this point, I was really upset with
10	Nelson, so I talked to Ken about it."
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: M'hm.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay, you never, ever
13	say anything about approaching Nelson Barque about this.
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: But it's not it's not
15	specifically referenced in the statement but I do remember
16	talking to Mr. Barque about it.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: What did you tell him?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I told him I was not happy
19	with him placing that placing that client there when I -
20	
21	THE COMMISSIONER: What did he tell you?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: and I asked I was
23	looking for an explanation and Mr. Barque said, "Well, I
24	don't know anything about that".
25	THE COMMISSIONER: So Mr. Engelmann, are you

1	will you be finished shortly or
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: It'll be time for the
4	break.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: M'hm, I'll be just a moment
6	if I can?
7	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
8	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Yeah, I just want to show
10	you, sir, if I can, it's a passage of some questions and
11	answers with a fellow by the name of Ron Leroux. You may
12	have read this. It's Volume 121 if I can?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: One
14	MR. ENGELMANN: One-twenty-one (121).
15	THE COMMISSIONER: You won't have that
16	MR. ENGELMANN: of the transcripts.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Those things never work
18	the way you want them.
19	What page, Mr. Engelmann?
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Page 67. In fact, you might
21	want to start on 66.
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Sixty-six (66)?
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: I think we went here once

1	before about the Morrisburg issue. And I simply it's
2	been suggested by Mr. Leroux, and he wasn't alone and I
3	wish I could give you another name but, that you and he had
4	a conversation at the time of Mr. Seguin's funeral?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: And it was in a driveway or
7	something?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Or just outside?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And he says,
12	among other things, not just that's the context on
13	page 67 after several comments:
14	"ENGELMANN: So Mr. van Diepen was
15	telling you that he'd warned Ken about
16	his behaviour because he talks about
17	fooling around et cetera?
18	LEROUX: Yeah, warned him about his
19	behaviour and, you know, I don't know
20	how many times I told him to watch his
21	step."
22	So Leroux is saying that's what you told
23	him.
24	"I don't know how many times I told him
25	to watch his step. He knew what he was

1	doing apparently. He knew what he was
2	doing, what Ken was doing."
3	"Why the argument?"
4	Because he claims he had a little bit of an argument with
5	you there.
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Who?
7	MR. ENGELMANN: This is Leroux
8	THE COMMISSIONER: This is Leroux at the
9	funeral.
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Leroux and I had an
11	argument?
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: He's saying:
15	"Why didn't he help him? He is in the
16	office with him, knew he was having
17	problems. You work in an office for
18	years with somebody, you work with them
19	every day? Why be mean to them, why
20	don't you go and help them? Why didn't
21	he go to Corrections and Parole and say,
22	'Look, this guy should be should not
23	be there. This guy should have another -
24	- be in another branch or something of
25	the government or should be doing

1	something else because I know what he's
2	doing.' But if you know and you don't
3	help, I mean, what the hell is this?"
4	So Mr. Leroux
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: None of that took place,
6	sir.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: The only conversation I had
9	with Mr. Leroux at any time around the death of Mr. Seguin,
10	I was in the accompaniment of my wife and if you wish to
11	ask her, she will testify as well. At the wake, I was in
12	the company of my wife. I had no communication with Mr.
13	Leroux whatsoever.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Well
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: After, at the funeral
16	services, outside the front doors, I was standing with a
17	group of my colleagues, where Mr. Leroux had exited the
18	church on the east doors and was standing by hiself (sic)
19	in a almost fetal position and he was beckoning me with
20	his finger to come to him when I noticed him.
21	And I went to him and he was, what I could -
22	- he appeared to be in a disassociative state. He was
23	blubbering things that I could not understand he was
24	saying. There were the words were not, certainly not in
25	any kind of sentence structure. I couldn't make out what

1	he was saying.
2	He was deeply distraught. He appeared to be
3	perhaps under the influence of something and the only thing
4	that I did at the time was I put my hand on his shoulder
5	and I said, "Everything's going to be okay. Just give it
6	time, relax, everything will be better and it all and
7	everybody will come out of this for the better."
8	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So you're
9	telling us that
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: This
11	MR. ENGELMANN: you didn't have this
12	discussion or semi-argument with Mr. Leroux?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No. You know and the
14	you know, at some other point he makes some accusation that
15	I confirmed for him about the suicide note and I don't I
16	don't know if that was asked of him in the Inquiry but,
17	again, that was those things never took place.
18	And I the other thing, sir, I would like
19	to tell you is that I would never breach my responsibility
20	as a Probation Parole Officer and to the Ministry to
21	discuss confidential matters with a member of the public in
22	this manner.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, he's not really
24	suggesting you responded. He was asking questions and he
25	did it here as well, and it was, why didn't he help him?

1	He's in the office with him, he knew he was having
2	problems, et cetera, et cetera. That's how he put it here.
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, he's saying
4	something, "So Mr. van Diepen" you say:
5	"So Mr. van Diepen was telling you that
6	he had warned Ken about his behaviour?"
7	"Yeah, warned him about his behaviour,
8	and you know I don't know how many I told
9	him to watch his step."
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's I don't know
12	where that comes from. It that never took place.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Because you're telling us
14	here that you didn't know?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I'm sorry?
16	MR. ENGELMANN: You're telling us here that
17	you didn't even know?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I'm telling you, sir, that
19	this this this entire exchange is never took
20	place.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, it could have in
23	his mind when he was blubbering things to you which you
24	didn't understand.
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, perhaps, Your Honour.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, at it's best
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: He was quite emotional when
4	he talked about exchange here as well. You said he was
5	emotional at the funeral, I'm sure.
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh, yes.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Good friend of Mr
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Sir, I wanted to
10	ask you two final questions about effect and impact about
11	recommendations. How about I let you think about it over
12	the break. We'll come back with that?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
16	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre;
17	veuillez vous lever.
18	Upon recessing at 3:25 p.m./
19	L'audience est suspendue à 15h25
20	Upon resuming at 3:40 p.m./
21	L'audience est reprise à 15h40
22	THE REGISTRAR: This hearing is now resumed.
23	Please be seated. Veuillez vous asseoir.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, I canvassed the issue
25	of cross-examination with counsel, and around two and a

1	half hours is what I was told.
2	You wish to sit for a while?
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, yes. Oh, yes, we'll
4	see how far we can get. All right sir?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, thank you, Your
6	Honour.
7	JOS VAN DIEPEN: Resumed/Sous le même serment
8	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF BY/INTERROGATOIRE EN-CHEF PAR MR.
9	<pre>ENGELMANN (Cont'd/Suite):</pre>
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. van Diepen, this
11	morning, you had you spoke to us a little bit at the
12	beginning of the day about some of the impact, the website
13	and your difficulties with your own ministry as a result of
14	these allegations and things that have come to light have
15	caused you, in your personal and professional life and, to
16	some extent, some of the emotional impact.
17	But I want to give you an opportunity to say
18	that now. If you want to talk to us at all about the
19	impact or effect some of this has had because you've
20	described yourself as a victim here today, and this is an
21	opportunity to say that to the Commissioner.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: As well as
23	recommendations.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Absolutely, that's where we
25	are going afterwards.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, okay.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, perhaps in terms of
4	recommendations.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Sure, if you want to start
6	there.
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I could start there?
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I believe that my
10	colleagues have expressed to you on a number of occasions
11	recommendations as to what the Ministry of Correctional
12	Services should be doing and perhaps even to the entire
13	justice cluster in response to dealing with victims. And I
14	believe that they have made a number of references to
15	training, and I would concur with that.
16	I also believe that the need to that the
17	Ministry needs to change its hiring practices. I think
18	that their how they hire is somewhat flawed. I think
19	that there is a need for some form of screening in addition
20	before they're even hired. Their suitability for the
21	role and I don't I have some ideas but I don't I
22	haven't sort of fleshed them out as to how that screening
23	should be done, but I think what I'm suggesting is that the
24	screening should reflect that person's that they're
25	suitable for the role and that their personality and

1	lifestyle lends itself to the role in which they're about
2	to partake.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Let me just interrupt you
4	for a second. I want to make sure I understand. You are
5	talking about much more than criminal background checks?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh yeah.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: You are talking about
8	extensive interview process or
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yeah. Because what happens
10	now what's happening a lot now is that there's a
11	shortfall a sudden shortfall in the staffing needs.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And they hire somebody on a
14	short-term basis. Well, I would say that many of the
15	suitable candidates are not about to walk away from a full-
16	time job to take a contract position.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: So they're hiring people
19	off the street who are unemployed and who are perhaps not
20	necessarily the best candidate. Then, at some later stage,
21	they decide that they're going to fill the position on a
22	permanency basis and then the interview becomes knowledge-
23	based.
24	Well, I would suggest to you, sir, that the
25	knowledge-based interviews would certainly put somebody on

the street at quite a disadvantage.

2	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I remember when I was
4	interviewed, I had taken liberty of contacting Mr. Seguin
5	and asked him for the policy or what was then called the
6	Probation and Parole Manual and being interviewed in
7	Kingston for my job. And I went to great lengths to
8	explain what I knew about they asked me what do I know
9	about the job and what do I know about probation and what -
10	- and I went to great lengths to describe what the job,
11	what probation was and what parole was. The only problem
12	was I had the two reversed, so when I was speaking about
13	parole, I was talking about probation and vice versa.
14	So just an example so it was, you know
15	the interviewing process is knowledge-based, and I think it
16	should be beyond that.
17	So if you're doing a knowledge-based
18	interview, you're going to certainly disadvantage some very
19	suitable candidates, and I've seen some very suitable
20	candidates be unsuccessful in securing employment as a
21	probation and parole officer.
22	The other thing I think a little closer to
23	home is that I think the Ministry needs to the Ministry
24	should review its policy with respect to protecting its
25	employees. And I realize that this is somewhat of a unique

1	situation, but I can tell you that it is not unique in the
2	sense that this is the first time it has ever happened;
3	that a probation and parole officer has overstepped
4	themselves, and I can also assure this Commission that it
5	will happen again.
6	With respect to this Inquiry, I am somewhat
7	conflicted as to if someone, a potential victim or a
8	witness were to approach me today and say to me, ask me,
9	"Do you think I should testify or provide evidence to the
10	help bring these matters to resolution?" I am deeply
11	conflicted as to whether or not I would suggest to them
12	that they should proceed.
13	This process is extremely difficult. It's
14	very heart-wrenching. I can tell you that either as a
15	victim or a witness, they are already conflicted with self-
16	doubt, with questioning whether or not they did the right
17	thing, accusing themselves of not having you should have
18	known; why didn't you know; shouldn't you have done more;
19	how can you and then how can you be so stupid not to
20	have seen that this thing was going on; and so on and so
21	forth.
22	So I they're already persecuting
23	themselves and then being put under the gun to second guess
24	themselves yet again, is a very emotionally trying.

I came to this -- my reason for being at

also here my primary reason for being here is to help	this Inquiry is, as I explained earlier, was one, to try
the all the victims that have that were to try an do something right; to try and help where I think my co-	and clear my name, which I doubt will ever happen, but I'm
do something right; to try and help where I think my co-	also here my primary reason for being here is to help
	the all the victims that have that were to try and
workers did wrong.	do something right; to try and help where I think my co-
	workers did wrong.

And I have made every effort to do what I thought was right, and yet I'm conflicted with the thought as maybe I should have been smarter and just shut my mouth and not said anything or said that I don't know; and then I wouldn't be faced with many of the questions that I've been asked.

And especially to recall events properly, events that occurred over some 30 years ago, and on, it's extremely difficult.

Anyway I'm here. I believe I've answered every question to the best of my ability. I'm here to -- I've gone through this exercise and I hope that I've been of some assistance to the victims and to this Inquiry.

In terms of the impact I alluded to earlier,
I understand, sir, that you are from out of town. I don't
know if you can appreciate the mechanics or how things work
in a small town, but you know, the innuendo and the
accusations and the finger pointing, and all these people
who will judge without having heard the evidence or make

broad-based assumptions have been very troubling to not only myself but to my family, my wife, my children, my extended family, my parents, my close friends.

And it seems like that -- it seems like ever since this started, it's like yet another chapter. It boomerangs. It continues to boomerang where you are -- once again it's yet another round of -- of I guess for me, self-doubt and not -- and in dealing with what is very troubling to me personally, you know, the breach of trust, the entire concept of this breach of trust, the sexual nature of the acts as I understand them are personally very troubling to me and what makes it even more troubling is that they were done by two co-workers who misled me and took me into their confidence and ultimately, I believe, used me.

The website -- I don't know how it's to be resolved, but you know these websites -- these so-called affidavits and stuff are still out there. There are still people to this day that believe these things to be gospel and I don't know how I can get it across to this Inquiry or to these authors of these websites or to the media that these events as reported on these sites are totally inaccurate and are prejudicial to me, unfair, and has left me in a -- this, I guess, no man's land.

And I understand as the longest serving

1	probation officer in the Cornwall Office that I had a lot
2	of information that I could supply to the police and, you
3	know, I cooperated fully with the police. And again, like
4	I say, I'm conflicted wondering whether or not I should
5	have done that. Perhaps I should have said I don't know
6	and perhaps I would have not gone through this.
7	But I think that having done it, I think I
8	did the right thing. My conscience is clear, and if it in
9	any way helps any of the victims out there, I think it was
10	the effort is not lost.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Thank you.
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Thank you.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. van Diepen, sir, unless
14	you have any questions, some of the lawyers in the room,
15	some of my friends here will have some questions for you.
16	They will identify themselves. They will tell you who they
17	are acting for and they will have a few questions.
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: All right? And after that,
20	Mr. Westdal may have some questions for you at the end and
21	I may have some very brief questions for you at the very
22	end.
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Thank you.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Manson?
2 -	

--- CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR.

MANSON:

1

2	MR. MANSON: Is this the moniker list?
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes, it is.
4	MR. MANSON: I'm just going to keep it close
5	at hand so I don't get into any difficulties.
6	Mr. van Diepen, my name is Allan Manson. I
7	am one of the lawyers for the Citizens for Community
8	Renewal, which is a local citizens group concerned with
9	institutional reform, and especially protecting young
10	people.
11	I have a number of questions for you about
12	discrete topics and I will try and tell you the topic
13	beforehand.
14	But just to start, I take it that one of the
15	things you are trying to say in your evidence is that when
16	being asked about knowledge, it's difficult sometimes to
17	sort out knowledge at what particular time.
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct, sir.
19	MR. MANSON: In other words, today you know
20	a lot that's been accumulated over thirty years. At
21	different points in time you've been asked questions about
22	what you know and so it's in your mind it's sometimes
23	difficult to sort out when and where the knowledge came
24	from?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.

1	MR. MANSON: I want to clarify a couple of
2	issues that were raised by Mr. Engelmann and if I can go to
3	this one first.
4	I'm correct that, with respect to the gender
5	of your clients when you were a probation officer, your
6	office would work with both women and men probationers;
7	correct?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
9	MR. MANSON: And after the split in 1975,
10	you would work with adults but not juveniles; correct?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: The split took place prior
12	to 1975.
13	MR. MANSON: Prior to 1975, yes.
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
15	MR. MANSON: So prior to your coming to the
16	office?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
18	MR. MANSON: And we have that young offender
19	period of 16, 17 year olds, but other than that regardless
20	of who we call an adult, your clients were over 16?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Sixteen (16) and older.
22	MR. MANSON: Sixteen (16) and over?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
24	MR. MANSON: And after the office expanded
25	from yourself, Nelson Barque and Mr. Sequin, it wasn't long

1	before there were women probation officers as well;
2	correct?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, the next person who
4	came into the office was Stu Rousseau.
5	MR. MANSON: Yes, but then in 1982 there was
6	Ms. Cardinal?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Uh, yes.
8	MR. MANSON: My point is simply this; as you
9	mentioned just about an hour ago and also you mentioned
10	when you first got into the witness stand a few days ago,
11	you are adamant that any sexual relations between a
12	probation officer and a client is wrong; correct?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
14	MR. MANSON: And it doesn't matter whether
15	they are heterosexual relations or homosexual relations;
16	correct?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
18	MR. MANSON: So by the same token that it
19	would be viewed as silly is you went to your manager and
20	said, "Officer X is a heterosexual," would you agree with
21	me that it would be wrong to go to your manager and say,
22	"Officer Y is a homosexual"?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't know how to answer
24	that, Mr. Manson. You know, my I guess it's a personal
25	view as to whether or not you are troubled by somebody who

1	is leading a homosexual litestyle. And when I say
2	homosexual lifestyle, I'm talking about a relationship with
3	a consenting male adult.
4	Is that I'm of the mind that if both
5	parties are willing participants and they do it in a loving
6	and caring fashion, then I would have to put any personal
7	concerns I have about that aside.
8	MR. MANSON: I guess my point, in a
9	nutshell, is while it would be right for a probation
10	officer to go to a superior with respect to suspicions of
11	improper sexual relations, it wouldn't be right to go to a
12	superior simply to talk about someone's sexuality; correct?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, I would agree there
14	with that.
15	MR. MANSON: Another thing that I want to
16	clarify and maybe you've already done this when you say
17	there is a number of interpretations. But I want to offer
18	you one.
19	Can we look at Exhibit 958, this is the 2000
20	report by Paul Downing and, in particular, I'm looking at
21	page 14, this was one of the last matters that Mr.
22	Engelmann raised with you. I'll wait for you to find it.
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Broke your binder.
24	MR. MANSON: You broke the binder? That's
25	another recommendation, better binders.

maybe a complaint about his sexual

1	conduct with clients, and a number of
2	other concerns."
3	This was the confusing part of the evidence
4	that was put to you by Mr. Engelmann; correct?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
6	MR. MANSON: And you said it's open to a
7	number of interpretations; correct?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
9	MR. MANSON: Could we look at Volume 177
10	please?
11	THE COMMISSIONER: You don't have that, sir.
12	MR. MANSON: This would be Ron Gendron
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. What page Mr.
14	Mason?
15	MR. MANSON: It's page 35, Mr. Commissioner.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
17	MR. MANSON: Line 11. Just to situate this
18	for you, Mr. van Diepen, did you read the transcript of Ron
19	Gendron's testimony?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I scanned it.
21	MR. MANSON: This is a part where Mr.
22	Stauffer, Commission counsel, is asking him about
23	interactions between you and he, he being Mr. Gendron, and
24	Ken Seguin. At line 11, Mr. Stauffer:
25	"Okay. Without sending too thick here,

1	why were you concerned about him
2	socializing with his clients?"
3	Mr. Gendron: "Because I was worried that
4	Ken was putting himself in a position
5	of being vulnerable and compromising
6	himself."
7	And then if we go to the bottom of page 36,
8	Mr. Gendron:
9	"You know Ken driving to, you know,
10	it's great to drive a client to a
11	treatment center but along the way,
12	you're in a private vehicle with a
13	client."
14	I'm suggesting to you that what Mr. Gendron
15	was talking about was the possibility that these kinds of
16	social interactions put a probation officer in a position
17	where they could be compromised or manipulated by a client.
18	Isn't that how you read that?
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
20	MR. MANSON: And is that perhaps what you
21	were talking about at page 14 where you say, "Maybe a
22	complaint about his sexual conduct"?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes. And I would say, sir,
24	that I Mr. Gendron articulated those concerns much more
25	effectively than I did.

wife; correct?

1	MR. MANSON: So perhaps if we had a chance
2	to do it again, you'd prefer to reword that; maybe a false
3	complaint about his sexual conduct?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, that would be one very
5	serious concern.
6	MR. MANSON: And that's why you say above,
7	"to protect Ken Seguin and the client."
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Exactly.
9	MR. MANSON: It's a concern about both.
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
11	MR. MANSON: Now I want to switch topics and
12	go to something that I know is upsetting but it's important
13	for the Commission, and this is the website. You are as I
14	recall the first well, you are certainly a distinctive
15	witness in terms of being named on the website falsely and
16	slanderously, you'd agree with that?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes sir.
18	MR. MANSON: When you were first asked by
19	Mr. Engelmann, you about this, we go back to some day in
20	August of 2000; correct?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
22	MR. MANSON: And your understanding is that
23	your daughter was directed to the website by a friend and
24	your daughter comes home very distraught and talks to your

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
2	MR. MANSON: And sometime after that, your
3	wife came to tell you about this; correct?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
5	MR. MANSON: Your evidence was that you
6	"went postal"?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
8	MR. MANSON: Now, I'm not familiar with that
9	term but I take it it's the same someone else might say "I
10	went ballistic"?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
12	MR. MANSON: And what you meant was you were
13	very upset and you were very angry.
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
15	MR. MANSON: Can you recall how long the
16	conversation with your wife was?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't recall exactly, but
18	the conversation the introduction of the subject area
19	led to us looking at the website.
20	MR. MANSON: I understand from your evidence
21	about working with the IJ project and other technology that
22	you were a computer literate person? Is that correct?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Some would dispute that but
24	I believe I am, yes.
25	MR. MANSON: Were you in 2000 a computer

1	literate person?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
3	MR. MANSON: And did you have internet
4	access at home?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
6	MR. MANSON: And you and your wife both sat
7	down at the computer?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
9	MR. MANSON: Did you use Google to find the
10	website or did you use some other search engine?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Probably; I don't recall.
12	But I think we had some, we had the name of the website and
13	either Googled it or typed it in in the header bar or used
14	Yahoo or some anyway, we got to the site.
15	MR. MANSON: Was it hard to find?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
17	MR. MANSON: Do you recall how long this
18	first encounter with the website, do you recall how long
19	the two of you spent with it, approximately?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I think I revisited
21	the web if memory serves me right, I revisited that same
22	website on three separate occasions because I just I was
23	upset and then I would have to just take another look at
24	it. And I'd only get more upset and I'd have to get away
25	from it. Then I'd go back to it again and it was just

1	like, you know, like walking up to an electric fence and
2	getting shocked and then backing up and then just wanting
3	to, you know
4	MR. MANSON: So were these three occasions
5	during the same timeframe?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
7	MR. MANSON: And can you recall that total
8	timeframe, even with your breaks?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh, that would have been, I
10	would say it comprised the better part of a weekend.
11	MR. MANSON: Can you tell us in terms of
12	hours how much time approximately you might have spent
13	looking at the website?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I'd only be hazarding
15	but it's several hours.
16	MR. MANSON: Several hours.
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I mean, I went to every
18	part of the website including parts of the website that had
19	nothing to do with me because I wanted to understand
20	exactly what was going on here.
21	MR. MANSON: So you saw more than just the
22	stuff about you.
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh, yes.
24	MR. MANSON: Now, I'm trying to remember
25	what day of the week today is. It's Monday, right? So

1	this would be Friday, yes, the 18th, which is volume 185.
2	I don't think we need to turn to this, but
3	at page 159 you said there were affidavits and my name was
4	in amongst, at that time, known or suspected paedophiles
5	and it went on and on and on at length, in no particular
6	manner or chronology, but my name kept coming up on this
7	website that I was part of this supposed clan. That's what
8	you said last Friday. Correct?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
10	MR. MANSON: Do you recall seeing an
11	affidavit appparently sworn by Ron Leroux on November 13 th ,
12	1996.
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't recall the date,
14	but I am familiar with the Affidavit of Ron Leroux. Yes.
15	MR. MANSON: And by affidavit you mean a
16	formal legal document that sworn by a Commissioner for
17	taking oaths. Correct?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, that's what I
19	understand an affidavit to be, yes.
20	MR. MANSON: And that's what you believe you
21	saw, correct?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
23	MR. MANSON: I know that this is upsetting
24	and I don't intend to make more of it than it's worth but
25	could we look at the Exhibit 567 please? This is one of

1	the many copies the Affidavit of Ron Leroux, sworn November
2	13 th , 1996.
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Thanks. Yes, sir, I have
4	it before me.
5	MR. MANSON: Just wait until it's up on the
6	screen. We can start with the front page. I'm just
7	waiting for Mr. Commissioner, I can't be sure what copy
8	was on the website; there are a variety. This is the front
9	page. Do you recall seeing something that looks legal and
10	formal like this on the website?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
12	MR. MANSON: And you would agree with me, it
13	does look legal and formal, doesn't it?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, it certainly does.
15	MR. MANSON: It says, "Court File Number,
16	Ontario Court General Division."
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
18	MR. MANSON: Can we turn to the second page,
19	please? Paragraph 6, this is the long list. And I just
20	want to read the first sentence, "I was at several"
21	This is Mr. Leroux speaking, the affiant:
22	"I was at several parties at Ken
23	Seguin's house, Malcolm MacDonald's
24	summer residence and St. Andrew's
25	Parish House, where I observed among

1	others"
2	And if we turn to No. 33, there you are,
3	correct?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
5	MR. MANSON: Followed shortly by male
6	prostitutes both adults and juveniles, alter boys and
7	several others. Correct?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
9	MR. MANSON: And then in paragraph 7 we see
10	the reference to the clan of paedophiles in another list of
11	names. Correct?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
13	MR. MANSON: Did you you may not have
14	looked at this transcript, but a number of months ago I
15	cross-examined the lawyer who prepared this document and
16	swore this affidavit, and I suggested to him that the
17	inclusion of this list of all sorts of names, including
18	male prostitutes and then followed by paragraph 7, was a
19	nasty tactic. Would you agree with that adjective or would
20	do you have another adjective to add?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I I know that
22	there is some other names on there that if even if those
23	events took place those names should not be on there.
24	MR. MANSON: But do you agree with my
25	characterization of this tactic as nasty? Or would you

1	prefer another adjective?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I I can think of
3	stronger words, sir, but I'll I'll accept your word,
4	nasty.
5	MR. MANSON: I'd be happy to hear a stronger
6	words, because it's your it's your impression that I am
7	concerned about. You're the one who's named.
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yeah. I don't know what to
9	tell you, sir. It's just you know, I think I've
10	portrayed my emotions on this, my feelings on this matter
11	and I've just it's very upsetting to me.
12	MR. MANSON: Because of course because if
13	someone turns to this, they see what looks like a formal
14	legal document and they see a list of names that seems to
15	imply, here are the bad guys. Right?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
17	MR. MANSON: Here are the men involved in
18	this clan. Correct?
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Exactly.
20	MR. MANSON: That's the impression that
21	would be created.
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
23	MR. MANSON: Later at page 7, if we can just
24	turn to page 7, paragraph 36, here's the reference to the -

- to you and the alleged finding of the report.

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
2	MR. MANSON: "A few days prior to November
3	21 st , 1993 Ken advised that he was going
4	to draft a confession in a report form
5	and quit his position. He was
6	attempting to figure out his pension
7	and talked about the point system. Ken
8	stated that he was going to write it
9	all down in a report. The report was
10	later verified by Jos van Diepen at
11	Ken's funeral."
12	Your evidence is that is false. Correct?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well,
14	MR. MANSON: I mean the last sentence:
15	"The report was verified by Jos at
16	Ken's Funeral."
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's wholly false, yes.
18	MR. MANSON: And the next part of the
19	paragraph:
20	"Jos advised me at the funeral that Ken
21	had a report on his desk. He also
22	stated that he told Ken to watch his
23	step for years."
24	The rest isn't about you.
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.

1	MR. MANSON: Your evidence is that is false
2	as well.
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Absolutely.
4	MR. MANSON: Do you know what the source of
5	this allegation about this report is?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I have no idea. To this
7	day I have no knowledge of a confession of one of these
8	confessions, a suicide note or anything to that effect. I
9	have no knowledge of that and the police have never
10	informed me about anything of that nature, whether anything
11	was found at his house, and I can, with one hundred percent
12	degree of reliability, sir, I could tell you that there was
13	no such note at the office.
14	MR. MANSON: Maybe I can help you; at least
15	inform you of the source. Could we look at Exhibit 712,
16	please? Page 2 that I am interested in.
17	Mr. Commissioner, these are handwritten
18	notes of Helen Dunlop of the telephone conversation with
19	Charles Bourgeois, their lawyer, this is the lawyer who
20	prepared that affidavit that we were just talking about. A
21	phone call from Mr. Bourgeois in Maine to Mrs. Dunlop, I
22	take it in Cornwall, but I'm not sure. I'm just waiting
23	for it to come up on the screen, Mr. van Diepen. There is
24	a bit of cruel irony in this given your evidence about not

-- your evidence of fluency with French, but let me just

1	read you what is a note of part of the telephone
2	conversation. And if we could turn to page 1 I'd just want
3	to find the date, please. October 30 th , 1996. Mr. Charles
4	Bourgeois from the Ramanda Inn in Auburn, Maine.
5	And now, can we go to page 2 please? And my
6	question for you is about whether you'd ever heard this,
7	but:
8	"Ken Seguin's suicide ruined the plan
9	to hit Perry. Ken confessed (in
10	writing before he died), to all of this
11	plan. In possession of this document
12	is Jos van Diepen, the Frenchman in
13	charge"
14	That's the cruel irony.
15	Have you ever heard of this conversation
16	before?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, sir. I have never seen
18	this document before.
19	MR. MANSON: Just to advise you, this was
20	Mr. Bourgeois was in Maine meeting with Ron Leroux.
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: And he phoned Mrs. Dunlop
23	who took notes of the conversation.
24	MR. MANSON: Yes.
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, I understand that.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
2	MR. MANSON: And, Mr. Commissioner, through
3	my searching of the documents; this is the first reference
4	to anything being found in Mr. van Diepen's hands.
5	Can I go back to your daughter for a minute?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
7	MR. MANSON: Did you eventually have a
8	conversation with her?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
10	MR. MANSON: How old was she at this time?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: A teenager.
12	MR. MANSON: Can you tell us the age
13	approximately, 2000?
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Seven years old. How old
15	is she now?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: It changes every year, Your
17	Honour.
18	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
19	MR. MANSON: So does my age. I'm 26 this
20	year!
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: My daughter was born in
22	'81.
23	MR. MANSON: Okay. So in 2000, she is about
24	19?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.

1	MR. MANSON: Was that a difficult
2	conversation?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
4	MR. MANSON: Was it a long conversation?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: A very emotional
6	conversation.
7	MR. MANSON: I don't think we need to get
8	into any of the details, but I take it you were trying to
9	say to her this is false; correct?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
11	MR. MANSON: Did anyone else ever mentioned
12	the website to you; anybody close to you that you cared
13	about?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
15	MR. MANSON: Can you give us some examples,
16	please?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Colleagues.
18	MR. MANSON: From Probation?
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes. My other family
20	members; friends. I mean once word got out that this
21	website was on I think I would think that just about
22	every person in Cornwall that had a computer or if they
23	didn't have a computer, went to some probably went to
24	the library to read this website.
25	MR. MANSON: And can you just give us an

1	approximation of how many people would have mentioned it to
2	you? Is that possible to do?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't I don't very,
4	very many, sir.
5	MR. MANSON: Are we talking more than 10?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh, yes.
7	MR. MANSON: More than 50?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Over the years, probably.
9	MR. MANSON: And did you lose any friends
10	over this?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Certainly.
12	MR. MANSON: Some people who used to call,
13	who used to interact with you just disappeared all of a
14	sudden?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, they don't speak to me
16	anymore.
17	MR. MANSON: Can we look at Exhibit 1093
18	please? This is the collection of emails between Claude
19	Legault and, I believe, Deborah Newman. It's page 2, the
20	email of August $10^{\rm th}$, 2000 that I'm interested in.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Ten ninety-three (1093)?
22	MR. MANSON: I hope so.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, we're getting our
24	exercise with you, Mr. Manson. You are going from one book
25	to another.

1	MR. MANSON: You always feel better after
2	exercise, Mr. Commissioner, always. That's my experience.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Ten sixty-nine (1069),
4	you said?
5	MR. MANSON: Ten ninety-three (1093).
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Ten ninety-three (1093)
7	MR. MANSON: This is it. Can we go to page
8	2? This one looks like it's yes, I was wrong it's
9	August 11 th , Claude Legault to Deborah Newman, talking about
10	you mentioned just now discussions with co-workers. If
11	we look is this the bottom of the page, Madam?
12	It is? Oh, there it is.
13	That starting "Discussions with staff".
14	This is shortly after people are becoming aware of the
15	website, and Mr. Legault is writing to Ms. Newman:
16	"Discussions with staff raised some
17	questions in their minds and here are
18	the main ones"
19	Have you seen this document before?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, I have, sir.
21	MR. MANSON: "Have we been duped by Jos
22	when he claimed that he had no
23	knowledge of any abuse by Ken Seguin
24	and others. Why is he not talking to
25	his colleagues to reassure them that

1	there is no truth to the allegations in
2	the website? Staff were confident with
3	the efforts made by everyone to be
4	above-board. It would be clear for
5	everyone who the good guys and bad ones
6	were. This serves once again to blur
7	the distinction and creates doubts over
8	everyone."
9	This must have been upsetting for you to
10	know that this is what your colleagues are thinking?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I yes.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: When did you find out
13	about this?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I Your Honour, I became
15	aware of this the change in attitude from the staff
16	before I ever saw this email.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I mean, it was I walked
19	in and it was some people thought I mean I thought I
20	had the plague.
21	MR. MANSON: So we are talking around August
22	of 2000; this period?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
24	MR. MANSON: We have been talking about the
25	was there any degree of ostracism? Is that what you are

1	suggesting?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: There was some officers
3	did not speak with me.
4	MR. MANSON: We have been talking about the
5	Dick Nadeau website that, I believe, was called Project
6	Truth, something like that. Correct?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
8	MR. MANSON: Earlier in your testimony, you
9	mentioned that there has been a successor website created
10	in Cornwall.
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I believe there has
12	been several websites. There's including one that is
13	still ongoing.
14	MR. MANSON: With respect to the ongoing
15	one, have you ever gone into it to find out what it's
16	saying about the Inquiry, about witnesses or, more
17	particularly, about you?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I prefer not to it's
19	just too upsetting.
20	MR. MANSON: Okay. Then I
21	THE COMMISSIONER: But have you?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I have, yes.
23	MR. MANSON: Ah! That was and have you
24	seen references to yourself?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.

1	MR. MANSON: Do you find those references to
2	be accurate?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
4	MR. MANSON: Now by inaccurate, I just want
5	to be careful, there's two kinds of inaccuracies that we
6	might be looking at; one might be a balled Mr. van Diepen
7	did "X"; as compared to a reference that some document said
8	that Mr. van Diepen did "X".
9	Can you explain which kind of inaccuracies
10	or maybe both you have seen?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I wouldn't be able to at
12	this point, Mr. Manson, I wouldn't be able to clarify that
13	for you because just reading the material, it just creates
14	a gut reaction, and you just you're not thinking
15	logically. You're thinking emotionally and I wouldn't be
16	able to tell you whether or not I just know that there's
17	just this it's just a continuation of this urban legend.
18	MR. MANSON: So it just seems a repetition
19	of the same old stories is gut-wrenching for you?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: It keeps regrinding it,
21	regrinding out the same information.
22	MR. MANSON: Let me move to another area
23	now.
24	First, I want to talk to you about Alfred.
25	You've just mentioned Alfred earlier today.

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
2	MR. MANSON: And I only want to talk about
3	Alfred from the perspective of Cornwall, Mr. Commissioner.
4	Did you read the transcript of Paul
5	Downing's testimony?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yeah, I believe I looked at
7	it. I scanned it.
8	MR. MANSON: What I want to ask you is you
9	started working in Cornwall in the Probation Office 1975-
10	76, part-time and then full-time; correct?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
12	MR. MANSON: At this time, Alfred was an
13	open, active, reformatory, training school, however you
14	want to call it. Correct?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes. Yes.
16	MR. MANSON: Can you tell the Commissioner
17	what its reputation within the probation community or the
18	larger justice community was?
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well
20	MR. MANSON: Here, I'm asking you to situate
21	your knowledge not today but in your early days as a
22	probation officer.
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: In my early days as a
24	probation officer, I had no knowledge of the goings on at
25	Alfred. I assumed it was a training school, and that was

1	it.
2	MR. MANSON: Do you have any recollection of
3	when you would have had some knowledge of abuse at Alfred?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
5	MR. MANSON: When you would have acquired
6	it?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes. I had a client who
8	alleged that there was abuse at Alfred.
9	MR. MANSON: And can you help us in terms of
10	the timing? I know it's difficult, but
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: It would have been prior to
12	the whole Alfred Inquiry.
13	MR. MANSON: So are we talking mid '80s?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That would be a fair guess,
15	yes.
16	MR. MANSON: And with that event in your
17	mind, was that becoming common knowledge amongst the
18	probation-justice community, that there were allegations of
19	serious abuse at Alfred?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh, yes.
21	MR. MANSON: Were boys still being sent from
22	Cornwall to Alfred?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I I don't know, you
24	know, at what time the I believe, you know if memory
25	serves me right, boys were sent to Alfred until the place

1	closed. That's all I can tell you. Now, whether when
2	the last resident arrived there or detainee arrived there,
3	I can't tell you that, sir.
4	MR. MANSON: But at in this point in the
5	mid-80s, you're not dealing with juveniles?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, of course. I've never
7	dealt with juveniles.
8	MR. MANSON: So it's another ministry that's
9	dealing with juveniles.
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
11	MR. MANSON: The reason I asked you about
12	Mr. Downing, during his testimony and when I was cross-
13	examining him, I put to him a statement that one of his
14	investigators had obtained in 2000 where the man, number
15	one, alleged that as a juvenile he had been abused by Ken
16	Seguin and, number two, as a juvenile alleged that I
17	don't know the right way to say it, that he had been
18	threatened by Ken Seguin that he would end up in Alfred if
19	he didn't comply.
20	Have you ever heard an allegation like that
21	before? A threat to send a juvenile to Alfred?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: In 2000?
23	MR. MANSON: Oh, no, no. This was an
24	allegation about events in the early `70s.
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Okay. It Mr. Seguin's

VAN DIEPEN

Cr-Ex(Manson)

25

1	role with juveniles would have ended sometime, and on my
2	best guess, is in early 1974.
3	MR. MANSON: Yeah.
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: So his mandate over
5	juveniles would have ended at that point, so his ability to
6	return juveniles to detention or custody is whatever I
7	don't know what the term was back then, would have ended at
8	that point.
9	MR. MANSON: But the I don't want to get
10	into details of the allegation
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: But I
12	MR. MANSON: and I don't want to name
13	the person, but it was an allegation about the early '70s.
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Okay. I've never heard. If
15	you're asking me do I know something about allegations of
16	Ken Seguin returning a juvenile to custody under threat of
17	no, I am not aware of that.
18	MR. MANSON: Or of just making the threat?
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't know, no, I don't
20	know about that. This is the first I hear about that.
21	MR. MANSON: Have you heard of anyone in the
22	larger justice or law enforcement community threatening
23	juveniles about Alfred?
24	THE COMMISSIONER: So you know, like, "If

you don't behave, we're going to send you back to Alfred"?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: On, I Would I Would
2	assume that, you know, that that would be a reasonable
3	statement to make to a young person who, if they're not
4	following the conditions of their probation repeatedly and
5	they're being, how would I say it, obstinate or obtuse
6	about following being of good behaviour, I would think
7	it would be a reasonable statement for a police officer or
8	a probation officer or a social worker to say, "If you
9	don't smarten up we're going to send you back to Alfred".
10	MR. MANSON: And it would probably have a
11	big impact because youngsters coming back from Alfred would
12	be telling other youngsters about what went on at Alfred?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I would assume that, yes.
14	MR. MANSON: So even if you didn't know to
15	the mid '80s, the kids on the street would know; correct?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh, yes. There was yes.
17	MR. MANSON: If I can switch topics for a
18	minute.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Before can I before
20	you switch topics
21	MR. MANSON: Go ahead, Mr. Commissioner.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Sir, so when that young -
23	- well, when that person, probationer, must have been an
24	adult, told you that they had been abused in Alfred, what
25	did you do?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, there were a number
2	of compounding problems.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: First of all, this
5	gentleman had a long-standing, serious, multiple and
6	multiple substance abuse problem
7	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: as well as psychiatric
9	problems, and my first efforts were to get him to seek
10	treatment to get him sober. That's the first step. And
11	the second phase of that was to get him help to deal with
12	the abuse, so that he could make whatever informed
13	decisions because at that point the gentleman was an adult
14	and then he would be able to deal with the matter of the
15	abuse.
16	At the point where I was dealing with him,
17	he didn't want to do anything, but there was well,
18	concurrent to me to him telling me that he didn't want
19	to do anything, he had also been speaking with a lawyer.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. And what year was
21	that, about, ballpark.
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't recall, Your
23	Honour. I just recall the gentleman and I recall that he
24	presented a multiplicity of difficulties from a supervision
25	point-of-view, and at one point we did manage to get him

1	sober but I think he was only sober for a couple of months
2	and relapsed, and relapsed very
3	THE COMMISSIONER: And in what year again
4	was that?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I don't
6	THE COMMISSIONER: You don't know.
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I don't know, Your
8	Honour.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Was Alfred still working?
10	Was still
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't recall, Your
12	Honour.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: I'm wondering, wouldn't
14	there be a protocol, you know, to report never mind to
15	the police in a criminal matter, but protocol to report to
16	your Ministry that the that this allegation was there?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes. The matter was fully
18	documented.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: So you did that?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: And okay, that's fine.
22	MR. MANSON: As I think we've heard, for
23	quite a while there's been protocols within the Ministry
24	dealing with allegations of criminal activity; correct?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.

1	MR. MANSON: And this would be an allegation
2	of criminal activity?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
4	MR. MANSON: Just because it's criminal
5	activity by someone within the extended justice community,
6	it's still criminal activity?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, correct.
8	MR. MANSON: And, therefore, should be
9	reported within the Ministry and should be dealt with
10	according to the protocols; correct?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, I there were a
12	number of I had a number of clients where I used the
13	protocol and in relation to clients who had been victimized
14	and by individuals other than those in the justice cluster.
15	MR. MANSON: So if we move from Alfred for a
16	minute, are you familiar with Laurencrest?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
18	MR. MANSON: And is that a group home that
19	operates in the Cornwall area?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
21	MR. MANSON: And can you tell the
22	Commissioner what its reputation within the probation, law
23	enforcement community is, as you understood it while you
24	were a Probation Officer?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: To the I was not aware

1	of any impropriety at Laurencrest.
2	MR. MANSON: So you've not heard any
3	allegations about abuse at Laurencrest?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: At the time, no, but I'm
5	subsequently informed that there have been some other
6	there are some matters that have arisen in relation with
7	Laurencrest.
8	Now, again, I don't have firsthand knowledge
9	of that. I don't have I have not seen any
10	documentation. I can only tell you that there were
11	rumours.
12	MR. MANSON: So we're talking about rumours
13	in Cornwall, not something that you would have learned in a
14	professional capacity?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Exactly.
16	MR. MANSON: Are you familiar with the name
17	Brian Dufour?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's the gentleman I was
19	thinking about.
20	MR. MANSON: So you know that he was charged
21	and then died before he came to trial?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That I didn't know.
23	MR. MANSON: Can I change topics again?
24	Just like a 10-speed bike, I have many gears
25	and I have 10 points actually.

1	I want to talk to you about socializing
2	within the probation office. You've told us a little bit
3	about the times that you'd go out with Ken Seguin. I think
4	you said occasionally you'd got have a beer with Ron
5	Gendron. Is that correct?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
7	MR. MANSON: Did you ever socialize in
8	couples, you and your wife with a colleague and their
9	spouse or partner?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: The with probation?
11	MR. MANSON: Yes.
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Christmas parties.
13	MR. MANSON: I'm sorry?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Christmas parties.
15	MR. MANSON: Christmas parties, yes. Other
16	than Christmas parties, dinner parties, anything like that?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
18	MR. MANSON: We've heard evidence from
19	Carole Cardinal, one of your colleagues, correct? And she
20	said, about you, that the two of you had a good working
21	relationship.
22	Would you agree with that?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
24	MR. MANSON: You know that her husband is

Claude Lortie, a Cornwall Police Service officer; correct?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
2	MR. MANSON: Would you meet him at Christmas
3	parties?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Over the years, yes, and
5	outside of Christmas parties.
6	MR. MANSON: You'd meet him professionally
7	outside of Christmas parties or socially or both?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Professionally mostly. At
9	one point, he was my I was supervising intensive clients
10	and he was the person that was the liaison for these type
11	of clients.
12	MR. MANSON: So you would talk to Claude
13	Lortie about mutual clients?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
15	MR. MANSON: You're the supervisor. He may
16	have been involved in the past investigation or some
17	current investigation?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, not necessarily the
19	individual who was doing the investigation, but he would
20	liaise with the police officers within the department
21	because these police officers are on different shifts,
22	they're on their days off, we can't get the information.
23	And he would, you know, obtain the reports or speak to the
24	officer about our concerns to do a follow-up, et cetera.

The intensive supervision protocol is a

1	high-contact type of protocol. A lot of police a lot of
2	collaterals with police and other agencies in the
3	community. So it was much easier to speak with one person
4	in the department. And so I would speak to Claude Lortie,
5	not about one client but, "Here are my clients. Here are
6	my concerns. Is there anything that you can tell me about
7	my clients?" And so on and so forth.
8	MR. MANSON: Now, can you just help us with
9	the time period? You had a 30-year career, so this time
10	period where you were doing intensive supervision and
11	Claude Lortie was the liaison?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
13	MR. MANSON: Approximately.
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That was after my return
15	from my return back as a Probation Parole Officer in
16	when did I
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Two-O-four (2004), 2005?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
19	MR. MANSON: So it's very recent?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
21	MR. MANSON: I want to take you but you
22	obviously knew him from before then?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh, yes.
24	MR. MANSON: And you would have professional
25	contacts before then?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
2	MR. MANSON: And you'd have some social
3	contacts?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
5	MR. MANSON: Okay. I want you to think back
6	just as a marker, I'm not going to ask you about it, but
7	just as a marker, the date of Ken Seguin's death.
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
9	MR. MANSON: Prior to that, had you ever
10	talked to Claude Lortie about the Silmser allegations
11	against Father Charles MacDonald?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
13	MR. MANSON: You're quite sure of that?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I am positive.
15	MR. MANSON: Had you ever talked to Claude
16	Lortie about allegations against Ken Seguin?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Afterwards?
18	MR. MANSON: Before.
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
20	MR. MANSON: What about afterwards?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
22	MR. MANSON: Can you remember that time or
23	context?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: All I can recall is what
25	it would be a quite some time after Ken Seguin's death,

1	and it was a conversation about we're both sort of both
2	of us appeared to have been hoodwinked by Mr. Seguin.
3	MR. MANSON: Hoodwinked in the sense that he
4	knew him as the colleague of his spouse?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: He knew Mr. Lortie knew
6	Mr. Seguin as "Mr. Probation Officer", outstanding member
7	in the community, beyond credentials were beyond
8	reproach, and subsequently there was these findings.
9	MR. MANSON: Fair to say that that wouldn't
10	that view "Mr. Probation", beyond reproach, wouldn't be
11	unique? In other words, Lortie wouldn't be the only person
12	who had thought that?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh, I'm yes, that's
14	correct, yes.
15	MR. MANSON: Talking about the period
16	substantially before his death?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
18	MR. MANSON: You were asked by Mr. Engelmann
19	about Richard Hickerson. Do you recall that?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
21	MR. MANSON: And I believe at page Volume
22	184, page 67 to 69, you referred to him as a "go-to guy"
23	for the purpose of labour or employment questions?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: More specifically for
25	placement.

1	MR. MANSON: For placement?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
3	MR. MANSON: Did you ever send a client to
4	Manpower to look for jobs?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
6	MR. MANSON: Would that be something that
7	you would do often?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
9	MR. MANSON: Would you tell a client, "Go
10	see Richard Hickerson"?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, in fact, often we
12	would phone what we'd do is phone Mr. Hickerson saying,
13	"Look, I'm looking for a job for one of my clients. He's
14	unemployed, hanging out on the streets, going to get into
15	trouble. Have you got anything, you know, that would fit
16	this"
17	And we'd give a brief outline of the
18	client's CV if there was anything in many cases there
19	wasn't and, "Do you have anything that would match?" you
20	know. And a lot of those would be unskilled labouring-type
21	of jobs.
22	MR. MANSON: So it wouldn't be uncommon for
23	you to actually set-up the appointment with Hickerson
24	before the client got there?

MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh, yes.

1	MR. MANSON: Yes?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
3	MR. MANSON: It would not be
4	MR. MANSON: Yes, it would not be uncommon.
5	I'm sorry if it was a double negative.
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: It would be routine. It
7	would be routine.
8	MR. MANSON: And I take it you've learned
9	more recently that there have been allegations of abuse by
10	Mr. Hickerson as well?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
12	MR. MANSON: Can I move to the period at
13	probation. I think I've only got a few more minutes, Mr.
14	Commissioner.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: That's fine. We're here
16	for a while.
17	MR. MANSON: The period of probation where
18	Emile Robert was the area manager.
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
20	MR. MANSON: I'm using your language, but
21	you've described the environment both as dysfunctional and
22	poisoned. Is that correct?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
24	MR. MANSON: We've heard from other
25	witnesses that Mr. Robert seemed to show favouritism to Ken

1	Seguin. Is that your view?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, sir.
3	MR. MANSON: Can you give us any specific
4	examples?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes. Issues of scheduling
6	vacation time; issues of office practices. I think you saw
7	some memorandum about me failing to sign some piece of
8	paper or a sign-out sheet in the office.
9	Everybody would forget to do it because it
10	was just a nuisance thing. Your hands are full; you had a
11	briefcase in one hand; you've got files in the other;
12	you've got your keys; you're going out the door because
13	you've got to go to court the following day and you're
14	supposed to on your way out, there was a thing you're
15	supposed to sign out. Well, sometimes that didn't happen.
16	And, of course, Mr. Seguin would be I don't know what
17	happened to Mr. Seguin's case, but I would be getting
18	letters on my personnel file.
19	MR. MANSON: Do you know that he did not get
20	them?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I know he didn't get
22	them, yes, I know he didn't get got them.
23	MR. MANSON: Did you talk to him about it?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
25	MR. MANSON: Any other examples of

1	favouritism?
2	THE COMMISSIONER: You said vacations. In
3	which way?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, you know, time slots.
5	I mean, I'd been there for a number of years, Your Honour,
6	and of course after a number of years you'd have a
7	lengthier period of vacation and I wouldn't be allowed to
8	take my vacation if I wanted to take, say, four weeks at
9	a time, I couldn't. Ken Seguin could. And it just wasn't
10	just about me. There were other officers there who were
11	similarly discriminated against.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. But did it go by
13	seniority? Was there a rule that seniority
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, it was supposed to be
15	by seniority but then, you know, they would say, "Okay,
16	well, you know, you have the seniority, but you can't take
17	all your vacation during that time". There was just it
18	was there was just ongoing conflict all the time.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, Seguin was senior
20	to you?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: So, presumably, if you
23	wanted four weeks and he wanted four weeks, he would get
24	it?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, there was at that

1	time, there were a number of officers so it would be
2	impossible to just keep one officer off at one point-in-
3	time because that way, some staff would have to take their
4	vacation in January or at inopportune times.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: So there would be provision
7	for as long as there was enough officers to handle walk-
8	in and emergency cases, there would be no reason not to
9	schedule vacation.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I'm sure I can if I went
12	home, I would be able to come back with a much longer list
13	of favouritism.
14	MR. MANSON: Now, if we again move to the
15	'92-'93 period. Can you focus your mind on that for a
16	minute?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
18	MR. MANSON: By this time you know that in
19	the past Gerry Renshaw had been living with Ken Seguin;
20	correct?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't recall when Gerry
22	Renshaw began to live with Ken Seguin. What I remember was
23	that there was a discussion in the office and a number of
24	the officers were quite upset about the fact that Gerry
25	Renshaw was living at Ken Sequin's and that the area

1	manager had approved that Renshaw lived with Seguin.
2	MR. MANSON: This would have happened before
3	'92-'93 that you became aware of that?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't, see I don't
5	you'd have to refresh for me, sir, when that timeline
6	occurred, when did Renshaw live with Seguin? Right now I
7	am drawing a complete blank. Obviously it was before his
8	death and whether it was in '92 or '93, I don't know.
9	MR. MANSON: What I want to talk about in a
10	minute and I just wanted to put the background are the
11	time of the spy mission and your visit to Mr. Seguin's
12	office to talk to him about his professionalism.
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
14	MR. MANSON: At those points, you already
15	knew about the Renshaw situation; correct?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
17	MR. MANSON: And you did not approve?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
19	MR. MANSON: So you thought it was wrong
20	that Mr. Robert had approved it?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
22	MR. MANSON: You already knew about the
23	Varley incident?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
25	MR. MANSON: And I take it from your

1	evidence today that you spoke to Constable Millar about the
2	Varley incident?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Actually it was Constable
4	Millar who contacted me because he had some concerns.
5	MR. MANSON: And this was before he wrote to
6	Emile Robert?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I was not privy to his
8	communication with Mr. Robert so I don't know which came
9	first, but his contacting me was as a result of his
10	frustration in getting the matter properly addressed.
11	MR. MANSON: Fair to say your view was Mr.
12	Robert wasn't treating it as seriously as it ought to have
13	been treated; is that fair?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yeah, that would be one way
15	of putting it.
16	MR. MANSON: And so these are things on your
17	mind when you go have your confrontation with Mr. Seguin,
18	when he throws you out of the office?
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
20	MR. MANSON: You also said when Mr.
21	Engelmann was asking you, you used the word,
22	fraternization?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Okay.
24	MR. MANSON: It's at Volume 185, page 154,
25	line 10, Mr. Engelmann said:

1	"You're telling us today that that's
2	about having a cigarette with clients,
3	that's the extent of it.
4	Mr. van Diepen: Cigarettes and
5	fraternization, socialization, you
6	know, chummy with clients rather than
7	being professional."
8	By "fraternization", do you mean seeing Mr.
9	or did you have any information that Mr. Seguin, other
10	than the Varley incident, had probationers over to his
11	house for drinking purposes?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I did not.
13	MR. MANSON: Did you have any information
14	about Mr. Seguin going to local taverns with probationers?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: The only information that I
16	had, sir, is as I reported earlier in my testimony was that
17	I believe I did anyway. I certainly remember
18	referencing it with the police that on at least one
19	occasion when we went for a beer at a local bar, there were
20	what I believed to be clients who approached Mr. Seguin and
21	Mr. Seguin engaged himself socially with those clients.
22	MR. MANSON: So you would be in the bar with
23	Mr. Seguin and clients would come up to you?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Up to him.
25	MR. MANSON: Up to him?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
2	MR. MANSON: So he wasn't sitting with
3	probationers in a bar and you would walk in with a friend
4	and see him with a bunch of probationers?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
6	MR. MANSON: The reason I'm asking is, and
7	again this may be a problem of language so please just
8	correct me.
9	If we go back to Exhibit 958, this is the
10	Downing interview, at page 5 right at the top. This is
11	page 5 of the interview with you that is one of the
12	appendices to the Downing report.
13	Do you see the second sentence?
14	"Probationers stopped by his house in
15	Cornwall and also met with him at a
16	local tavern."
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
18	MR. MANSON: Can you help us what you're
19	talking about there?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I'm speaking about my
21	mindset in 2000, having become aware that there were
22	reports of a number of clients stopping by Ken Sequin's
23	house and that he was drinking with them at a local tavern.
24	MR. MANSON: So this isn't your own
25	firsthand knowledge?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No.
2	MR. MANSON: We've heard evidence from one
3	of your colleagues that you and Mr. Seguin had different
4	philosophies about the role of the probation officer, and
5	what we were told was that he had more of a social work
6	emphasis and you had more of an enforcement emphasis; would
7	you agree with that?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I would not.
9	MR. MANSON: We were told that with respect
10	to non-compliance with certain conditions that he would
11	tend to leniency on occasion, not always, but on occasion
12	and you would tend towards strict enforcement. Would you
13	agree with that?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No. That would be, I
15	think, an over simplification.
16	MR. MANSON: But you would agree with me
17	that one does get the sense that you're a rule-oriented
18	person? I don't mean that in any pejorative sense.
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Let me just
20	MR. MANSON: There's other rule-oriented
21	people in the room.
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Let me clarify for you,
23	sir, if an individual is on probation with a number of
24	conditions, say for example to make restitution to a victim
25	and the judge orders a condition, you must pay "X" number

1	of dollars by such and such a date or you will be subject
2	to a breach.
3	Well, what happened was that on certain
4	occasions, there was nothing done to see these monies
5	collected. My position was that if His Honour saw fit that
6	this person make restitution as part of a probation order;
7	he would expect me to see that condition fulfilled.
8	I would make every effort to ensure that
9	this individual would make that restitution and we would
10	certainly allow a long leeway. In other words, we would
11	even apply for variations, extensions, reduction in the
12	amounts when circumstances had changed.
13	But when we're getting to a situation where
14	there is a wilfulness, a knowing wilfulness and a failure
15	to comply, then we're talking about the potential for a
16	breach. And in those situations, I would be forced to file
17	a breach. And if I still felt that there was grounds
18	perhaps that it should not be breached, I would discuss the
19	matter with the Crown attorney for further guidance.
20	But Mr. Seguin, on the other hand, this
21	stuff would be swept under the rug.
22	MR. MANSON: So there certainly was a
23	difference between the two of you with respect to condition
24	enforcement?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, but not in the way you

1	first outlined it, sir.
2	MR. MANSON: Okay. Not in the philosophical
3	approach but in the day-to-day practice there were
4	differences?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
6	MR. MANSON: This is the last area I want to
7	take you to. I want to talk about Harv's Diner?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
9	MR. MANSON: Can we go to Volume 184, page
10	113, please.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: I don't think we have
12	that again.
13	MR. MANSON: I'm sorry, Mr. Commissioner.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: I'm looking at the
15	witness whose
16	MR. MANSON: No, it will come up in the
17	screen in a minute.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: No, there is a hard copy
19	that will be made available as well.
20	MR. MANSON: Let me put it to you while
21	you're looking at page 113, let me put it to you in
22	generalities first.
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, sir.
24	MR. MANSON: I take it your evidence was
25	

that part of -- you'd go to Harv's Diner maybe one or two

1	Fridays a month and have lunch, and there would be a group
2	of people who included Ken Seguin. Is that correct?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
4	MR. MANSON: Was there like one big I've
5	never been to Harv's diner. Was there one big table that
6	was where Ken Seguin and his buddies hung out?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, when I would arrive
8	there, these were all small tables where four people sat on
9	each one on each side. And we would arrive we would be,
10	generally, near the window and the lunch tables would be
11	slid together, and there would be a good collection of
12	individuals there and it would you know, it would be a
13	sort of a little group, camaraderie and as well as
14	eating lunch.
15	MR. MANSON: And there would be 8, 10 or 12
16	people maybe?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
18	MR. MANSON: And occasionally do you have
19	your moniker list C-8 would be there.
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: yes.
21	MR. MANSON: Okay.
22	And occasionally C-8 would bring Ron Leroux
23	with him?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
25	MR. MANSON: And you told us that, as well,

1	there would be a number of contractors.
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
3	MR. MANSON: Correct?
4	And you understood that C-8 was a
5	contractor?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
7	MR. MANSON: And that's probably why he was
8	there?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
10	MR. MANSON: Did you understand that C-8 and
11	Ron Leroux were business partners
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: You know
13	MR. MANSON: in the contracting
14	business?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No. I did not.
16	MR. MANSON: Is that news to you when I
17	explain that to you?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes it is, sir.
19	MR. MANSON: What did you believe was Ron
20	Leroux's occupation.
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: My understanding that Ron
22	Leroux was had been employed as a jeweller in Montreal.
23	That's all I know about his employment.
24	MR. MANSON: Did you know that C-8 had an
25	office in the basement with same floor as Malcolm

1	MacDonald?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Very briefly, towards the
3	end, yes.
4	MR. MANSON: Towards the end of what? I'm -
5	
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Towards the end of
7	Malcolm's practice.
8	MR. MANSON: And so we're talking early
9	'90s, mid-'90s, around that time?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I all I can recall, it
11	was
12	MR. MANSON: Well
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: What I can recall, sir, is
14	that it was only for a couple of months. Because there was
15	really no office space; it was what I recall of it,
16	there was a desk in the waiting room.
17	MR. MANSON: And this and C-8 would work
18	out of that for a couple of months?
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
20	MR. MANSON: Is this the same building that
21	you were located in, at the time?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: We were in the same yes,
23	the corner of Fifth and Pitt, yes.
24	MR. MANSON: And Malcolm MacDonald's in the
25	basement?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
2	MR. MANSON: And C-8's running his business
3	out of that area for a couple of months.
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
5	MR. MANSON: And you're occasionally meeting
6	C-8 for lunch with this other group.
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
8	MR. MANSON: Okay. He's not as regular as
9	everyone else, but he's comes. Correct.
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well I'm not sure as to
11	how regularly he came. All I can tell you is that he was
12	there, perhaps two, maybe three times when I was there
13	when I was there on that those odd Fridays.
14	So if he was there on, say, a Monday, or a
15	Tuesday, I would have no knowledge of that.
16	MR. MANSON: Did you ever see him in your
17	building when he was working in the basement for those few
18	months?
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't believe so.
20	MR. MANSON: But you knew he was down there.
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, I knew that was his
22	he was using that as an office, yes.
23	MR. MANSON: Did Malcolm MacDonald tell you
24	that?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.

1	MR. MANSON: But you alan't know that Ron
2	Leroux was his partner.
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Again sir, in what
4	capacity?
5	MR. MANSON: A business partner.
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: As a contractor?
7	MR. MANSON: Yes.
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I just I have a hard
9	time envisioning Mr. Leroux as any kind of a contractor,
10	sir.
11	MR. MANSON: Thank you Mr. van Diepen; those
12	are all my questions.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Mr. Paul?
14	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR.
15	PAUL:
16	MR. PAUL: Mr. van Diepen, my name is Ian
17	Paul. I appear for a group by the name of the Coalition
18	for Action.
19	Just at the outset, I'd like to ask you a
20	few points, to clarify some dates that I wasn't sure of.
21	First of all, with respect to the meeting
22	with Mr. Seguin and Mr. Gendron, can you give a timeframe
23	of when that occurred?
24	This is the occasion when you went to Mr.
25	Seguin's office with Mr. Gendron to raise concerns. Can

1	you give a timeframe of when that would happen?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I as I explained
3	earlier, it was some time it was shortly before his
4	passing on.
5	MR. PAUL: Is it when would it be in
6	relation to you raising concerns to Mr. Robert, where they
7	
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Before I spoke to Mr.
9	Robert.
10	MR. PAUL: Okay; is it shortly before, in a
11	matter of weeks, a matter of days?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I don't recall
13	exactly, but given Mr. Seguin's response, or I should say
14	lack of response, I felt it that I had every I had
15	given Mr. Seguin every opportunity and I felt that the
16	matter still needed redress, and I spoke to Mr. Robert.
17	MR. PAUL: So as far as that timeframe, you
18	wouldn't put it as far back as the late '80s or early '90s,
19	`89-`90?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I don't believe it was
21	in the '80s.
22	MR. PAUL: You wouldn't put it back as far
23	as '90 or '91?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Sir, I'm telling you that,

to the best of my recollection, that it was towards the end

1	and if you were to tell me that it was otherwise, I would
2	not be in a position to dispute it, because I don't have a
3	clear I know when I spoke to Mr. Robert; it was it
4	was post-Varley and post-Constable Millar's conversation
5	with me, so it would be in that same timeframe.
6	So maybe that would help orient you, as to a
7	timeframe?
8	MR. PAUL: As far as the content, can you
9	recall specifically what you would have said to Mr. Robert?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I spoke to Mr. Robert about
11	him, Mr. Seguin, not following up on properly on
12	enforcement issues; that I had received complaints from the
13	OPP as well as the Cornwall police department and that it
14	was impacting on my ability to do my job as a probation
15	officer
16	MR. PAUL: And was the Varley incident
17	specifically discussed when you went in and spoke to Mr.
18	Robert?
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Did I mention I'm and
20	when you say "specifically," I pointed out to Mr. Robert
21	that I was in communication with the investigating officer
22	dealing with the Varley matter, and he that he had
23	concerns, and that his concerns were to the effect that
24	there were a number of that there were a number of
25	irregularities and he was going to put something in

1	writing, or attempted to put something in writing, or
2	attempted to contact and there's something to that effect.
3	MR. PAUL: Just so I understand, are you
4	talking about when you and Mr. Gendron go in to see Mr.
5	Seguin, are you suggesting that the topic of the Varley
6	incident was brought up in some way?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't think I don't
8	believe we even got to the Varley matter before the
9	conversation was terminated.
10	MR. PAUL: All right. Is it discussed in
11	any way in the presence of Mr. Gendron?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Mr. Gendron was in the room
13	fully in the room with me in Ken Seguin's office.
14	MR. PAUL: But there's some discussion about
15	contact with an officer that alludes to the Varley
16	incident; is that what you're saying?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I'm sorry? I lost your
18	question.
19	MR. PAUL: When you're speaking to Mr.
20	Seguin in the presence of Mr. Gendron, is there any kind of
21	discussion that in any way alludes to or refers to the
22	Varley incident or the officers involved?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't understand the
24	question, Your Honour.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Right. Well, maybe it's

1	getting a little late, too.
2	What he's saying is, when you went in to see
3	Seguin, did you talk to him about the Varley incident?
4	But I think you've already answered that in
5	the sense that you said no, because he kicked us out of his
6	office before we even got to that.
7	Is that fair?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, that correct.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: That's what you're
10	saying?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
12	MR. PAUL: All right. Did you go in there
13	with the intention of speaking about the Varley incident?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: We I went with the
15	intention of using the Varley incident as an example.
16	MR. PAUL: So you would have I presume
17	you would have spoken to Mr. Gendron about the plan or what
18	the plan was going to be before the two of you go in and
19	talk to Mr. Seguin.
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
21	MR. PAUL: And the two of you talked about
22	the Varley incident?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
24	MR. PAUL: Okay. So if Mr. Gendron would
25	have suggested that this discussion occurred with Mr.

1	Seguin prior to '92, prior to the Varley incident, you
2	wouldn't agree with that timeframe?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, when did the when
4	did the Varley matter take place?
5	MR. PAUL: I believe it's early 1992.
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: All I can tell you, sir, it
7	was post-Varley and it was post the police follow-up
8	investigation and that as in perhaps Constable Millar
9	would have something in his field notes about our
10	conversation but, you know you're asking me again about the
11	timeline. I honestly don't know, sir.
12	MR. PAUL: Could it be the case that you and
13	Mr. Gendron actually focused on the Renshaw incident and
14	went in there with the intention of speaking mainly about
15	the Renshaw incident. Is that possible?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't if Mr. Gendron
17	had a conversation? Are you asking me did Mr. Gendron have
18	a conversation with Mr. Seguin about Renshaw? I wasn't
19	privy to that.
20	MR. PAUL: I'm asking you if you went in
21	there with the intention you and Mr. Gendron discussed
22	the Renshaw incident, and went in with the intention of
23	focusing on the Renshaw incident when you spoke to Mr.
24	Seguin?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Sir, we went there with the

1	intention of directing Mr. Seguin's potential conflict of
2	interest with respecting clients and if Renshaw would have
3	been part of that, I think that would have been included.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: I know but I think what
5	he's suggesting is that you're basing your timeframe on the
6	Varley incident and what he is suggesting to you is maybe
7	you got flipped out in the sense that you were really
8	concentrating using the Renshaw incident because the Varley
9	incident hadn't already occurred.
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I No, again, I want
11	to repeat it was post-Varley, sir.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: And I am very clear on
14	that, but you're asking me a time and date, no, because I -
15	-one of the as I said to you, one of the or I said
16	earlier, one of the triggers was the phone call from
17	Constable Millar.
18	MR. PAUL: So you would agree that prior to
19	that incident of contacting Mr. Robert, there were never
20	any other occasions when you contacted Mr. Robert about
21	issues surrounding socialization with clients and Mr.
22	Seguin. It was only done once; correct?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: There was only one meeting
24	with Mr. Robert about Mr. Seguin's, yes.
25	MR. PAUL: Just on another topic, generally,

1	in terms of attributing generally blame, I realize it's
2	awkward to look at blame of individuals, but I believe that
3	in your evidence, you seem to be suggesting that obviously
4	Mr. Seguin has part of the blame for what you call a fraud
5	that was put on you and the other employees. Is that
6	correct? You'd attribute a large part of the blame to Mr.
7	Seguin's fraud; correct?
8	THE COMMISSIONER: The blame for what
9	though?
10	MR. PAUL: In terms of what transpired in
11	the office and the fact that this wasn't uncovered or
12	you put a lot of blame on Mr. Seguin, I take it; correct?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Blame for what, sir?
14	MR. PAUL: In terms of what transpired with
15	any improper actions with Mr. Seguin and clients, you're
16	indicating that it's a fraud on his part that other
17	employees did not uncover it. Correct?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I think the fraud was
19	the was that he tended to present he presented
20	himself in a light other than he was actually conducting
21	himself. That's the issue of the fraud.
22	MR. PAUL: Apart from Mr. Seguin, would you
23	generally find fault with management in some of their
24	decisions, for example, the decision to approve residence
25	with Gerry Renshaw. Do you think that that's something

1	that management should be faulted with?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: It it's against Ministry
3	policy.
4	MR. PAUL: And you don't understand why that
5	would have approved. Correct?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I have no I have I
7	was never privy into any of that decision-making process.
8	MR. PAUL: All right. In terms of the
9	approval of Mr. Renshaw to reside with Mr. Seguin; is that
10	something you would have disagreed with at the time?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh, I would have strongly
12	disagreed, yes.
13	MR. PAUL: And generally the other staff
14	members generally disagreed with that?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Oh yes.
16	MR. PAUL: Looking at your first contact
17	with the Ontario Provincial Police in 1994, I understand
18	that first contact would have been a verbal interview
19	around the 14 th of February 1994?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
21	MR. PAUL: And they would have come in
22	unannounced basically?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
24	MR. PAUL: With interviewing individuals,
25	you have some familiarity with interviewing individuals.

1	Interviewing someone unannounced, is that something you
2	would ever do as a probation officer?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't want to I don't
4	want to be perceived to be second-guessing the role of the
5	police officer.
6	MR. PAUL: Okay. My question is though, is
7	that something you would do on occasion as a probation
8	officer?
9	THE COMMISSIONER: What's that, interview
10	people after hours? Is that what you said?
11	MR. PAUL: No, interviewing unannounced.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, okay, right.
13	MR. PAUL: Mr. Commissioner, unannounced; is
14	that something you would do occasionally; either attend a
15	residence or interview someone unannounced?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, that's a rather
17	loaded question because if we're it depends on which
18	sense you're speaking, sir.
19	If we are talking, for example, about the
20	intensive supervision model, clients are informed that they
21	can expect unannounced door knocks at their residence to
22	ensure that they were complying with curfews, and those
23	door knocks would be done by police officers and/or
24	probation officers, depending on which jurisdiction it's
25	taking place.

1	MR. PAUL: All right.
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: By and large, if
3	interviews are conducted otherwise in the office, and they
4	are scheduled appointments.
5	MR. PAUL: In terms of this particular
6	instance where you are interviewed unannounced in an
7	unannounced fashion, do you not agree that perhaps that
8	might help in obtaining a more truthful series of
9	responses, given that there's a in an unannounced visit,
10	there is no opportunity to be affected by speaking to
11	anybody else in the interim?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I suppose you could that
13	could be one viewpoint, yes.
14	MR. PAUL: Would you agree that Mr. Downing,
15	as one of the concerns he raised, was the fact that you had
16	contact with a couple of people, such as Mr. Rousseau prior
17	to the interview. Correct?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
19	MR. PAUL: In this particular instance, the
20	first opportunity you had to speak to police, you hadn't
21	spoken to anyone obviously because you weren't expecting
22	anything; correct?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I'm missing something here.
24	MR. PAUL: You hadn't spoken to anybody in
25	advance

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Did the police interview me
2	before 1994? No.
3	MR. PAUL: Okay, and in terms of the
4	interview of 1994, that was your first formal interview,
5	correct?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
7	MR. PAUL: So the events, in terms of how
8	fresh they were in your mind, perhaps it's a better version
9	of the events in 1998 or 2000?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Possibly.
11	MR. PAUL: As well, I would suggest that by
12	the time, 2000, when you're interviewed by Mr. Downing,
13	you're perhaps somewhat affected by the concern that that
14	interview may have some effect on your career. You're
15	concerned about who is doing the interview?
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Are you can you rephrase
17	that question?
18	MR. PAUL: Mr. Downing, before Mr. Downing
19	interviews you, you know who Mr. Downing is; correct?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
21	MR. PAUL: You know he's in the nature of
22	something like an SIU investigator?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
24	MR. PAUL: And you have the belief that he's
25	coming not just to get the facts, he's perhaps looking to

1	recommend some form of punishment against you. That's a
2	possibility. Correct?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, that's certainly,
4	there's that potential.
5	MR. PAUL: So in terms of the 1994
6	interview, the 1994 interview, you're merely providing
7	information to assist a police investigation; correct?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
9	MR. PAUL: And you are in no way concerned
10	about implications to you at that point, right?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's right.
12	MR. PAUL: So for that reason, would you
13	agree that perhaps the 1994 interview is perhaps a better
14	version of the events by you than the Downing interview?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I in the '94 statement
16	and in the 2000 statement, sir, both my statements were
17	truthful to the best of my and given to the best of my
18	ability.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: I guess what he's saying
20	is that in the 2000, right, you now know about the website.
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: You have been after the
23	Ministry to give you some representation and they're not
24	giving it to you.
25	

MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: You're feeling nervous
2	with going to see this fellow. You bring your wife because
3	you think that they brought you down to Kingston to prevent
4	you from having a lawyer. You're feeling intimidated and
5	your back is against the wall. Therefore, your answers may
6	be a little more guarded than they were in 1994. Is that
7	about right, Mr. Paul, is that what you were trying to get
8	at?
9	MR. PAUL: Yes.
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I answered the questions he
11	put to me truthfully in 2000.
12	MR. PAUL: Would you agree though that you
13	were objecting the fact that you didn't have counsel
14	present?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I objected to the process.
16	MR. PAUL: And you would have preferred,
17	given the potential implications of a statement, not to
18	have given any statement at all. Is that correct?
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I wanted to cooperate.
20	I think there is some correspondence to the effect that I
21	wanted to cooperate fully with the Ministry to put this
22	matter behind me.
23	MR. PAUL: Would you agree that, at least
24	initially in that statement, you were somewhat reluctant to
25	give any information suggesting that Mr. Seguin was

1	involved in any homosexual relationships, you were
2	reluctant to say that at the beginning of the interview?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I'm you know, at
4	that time, did I have knowledge of homosexual
5	relationships; I did not have any firsthand knowledge that
6	there were homosexual relationships.
7	MR. PAUL: You would agree though that as
8	far as your 1994 interviews, while you altered the portion
9	of the statement about knowing how Malcolm and Ken's
10	boyfriends, the portion about that statement Gerry and Ken
11	being lovers, you never changed that did you; that remained
12	in your statement?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I believe it may have, yes.
14	MR. PAUL: Okay, and when you were being
15	interviewed by Mr. Downing, did you know right from the get
16	go at the beginning of the statement that he had some kind
17	of access to a summary of what you had told the OPP?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't recall.
19	MR. PAUL: Is it possible that he basically
20	took you by surprise in the middle of the interview and
21	said this is what you said to the OPP?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I think I had
23	reasonable I could reasonably expect him to avail
24	himself to other statements.
25	MR. PAUL: You would agree that the first

1	point you admit in that interview with Mr. Downing that
2	there was a homosexual relationship involving Mr. Seguin is
3	when he confronts you with the OPP statement and then you
4	acknowledge that you believe there was a relationship
5	between Gerry and Ken, but it's only after he confronts you
6	with the OPP statement; correct?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Did I know about sir,
8	you're going have to clarify what I knew and when I knew
9	it.
10	MR. PAUL: I'm not asking what you knew or
11	when you knew. I'm suggesting that the only time you
12	reveal it to Mr. Downing, you don't reveal it initially but
13	when he confronts you with the OPP statement later in the
14	interview, it's only at that point that you acknowledge
15	that "Yes, I might have known there was a relationship
16	between Ken Seguin and Gerry Renshaw."
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Okay.
18	MR. PAUL: Mr. Commissioner, I want to refer
19	the witness to a portion of Mr. Downing's evidence.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
21	MR. PAUL: It would be Volume 172, I
22	believe, page 23.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: I don't think you have
24	that. We'll get that in a minute. To his testimony,
25	right, so it's in the transcript; right?

1	Thank you.
2	What page, sir?
3	MR. PAUL: It would be page bottom of 23
4	to the top of 24, Mr. Commissioner.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. All right, so
6	we're there, so basically Mr. Downing is commenting about
7	"what was your assessment of Mr. van Diepen's version of
8	the events;" right?
9	MR. PAUL: Yes.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
11	MR. PAUL: I'd like to ask you, given the
12	type of pressure, obvious pressure you would have been on
13	dealing with Mr. Downing and given, I would suggest, is
14	some reluctance to initially give information on Mr. Seguin
15	to him, would you not agree that his assessment at page 23
16	and 24 suggest to him that you could have been more
17	forthright and you had significant knowledge of Ken's
18	association with a friend of his in the community.
19	Contrary to Ministry rules, would you not
20	acknowledge that given the pressure you were under that
21	that's a relatively fair assessment of your statement, of
22	your evidence to Mr. Downing?
23	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I can't I can't comment
24	on what was in Mr. Downing's mind at that time, sir.
25	MR. PAUL: Okay. Would you not agree though

1	that his comment about you could have been more forthright,
2	that that's a fair assessment of how your interview
3	proceeded?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I think that Mr.
5	Downing made the fatal interviewing error that he had an
6	assumption and before he even saw me and then he went about
7	his interview to support that assumption. So he never got
8	an opportunity to clear his mind and listen to the
9	evidence.
10	All I'm saying to you, sir, is that he said
11	that it's A, therefore I'm going to prove A and never so
12	it's, you know scientifically it's a bad way to proceed and
13	investigatively it's a poor way to proceed.
14	MR. PAUL: I'm suggesting that perhaps you
15	were not completely forthright at the beginning of the
16	interview because of the pressure and the concern about
17	employment implications for you?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Sir, I already said that I
19	was completely forthcoming in my interview with Mr.
20	Downing.
21	MR. PAUL: All right. I want to get back to
22	another area, back to just briefly over the Barque area
23	because there were a few questions; I had to clarify some
24	matters.
25	I just wanted to ask you, first of all, I

1	don't think you've been asked if you've ever heard rumours
2	with respect to Mr. Barque before he left employment? Did
3	you ever hear rumours specifically from RCMP or Cornwall
4	police about any problems with Mr. Barque's conduct before
5	he left?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Not before he left, sir.
7	MR. PAUL: Okay, so only after?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, sir.
9	MR. PAUL: Now I think you did characterize
10	yourself as being mad at Mr. Barque because of his
11	recommendation that your complaint go to Father Charlie?
12	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
13	MR. PAUL: I just want to ask you, the fact
14	that you were angry or mad, would that suggest that you
15	fully believed the allegations or what you had from the
16	young person who fled that assignment or that posting?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: My role was to protect that
18	individual and I saw that there was the potential for that
19	person being placed at risk.
20	MR. PAUL: All right. But if the allegation
21	was discounted or believed not to be true, then certainly
22	you wouldn't have indicated that you were angry. The fact
23	that you said you were angry, I would suggest indicates
24	that you fully believed what you were told by the young
25	person?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I believed I had full
2	belief in faith in that, who at the time was not a young
3	person; it was an adult, sir.
4	MR. PAUL: Now I think that you indicated
5	that you spoke to Mr. Seguin and he indicated that Father
6	Charlie was not gay?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
8	MR. PAUL: But did he also make some comment
9	that you should have not sent the person to that location?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
11	MR. PAUL: Okay, I don't think it was never
12	I'm not sure if there was ever a reason, did you get a
13	reason or explanation of why you should not have sent him
14	there?
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I did not.
16	MR. PAUL: Okay. And you didn't ask or
17	inquire what that reason was?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes, I did.
19	MR. PAUL: That unanswered issue, did that
20	leave you with some nagging question or doubt about what
21	the problem was there with Father Charlie?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I had some concerns
23	and I would certainly not, with those concerns, not see
24	that one of my clients be placed there.
25	MR. PAUL: All right. Now the information

1	you obtained about Mr. Barque while he was employed there
2	included you referred to the pornography and the
3	handcuffs?
4	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
5	MR. PAUL: You did hand that information
6	over to Mr. Seguin; correct?
7	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
8	MR. PAUL: Because he was the senior person
9	there?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
11	MR. PAUL: But he was not in the nature of
12	management I take it?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Sir, I explained that a
14	number of times. I was a junior probation officer. Other
15	than routine matters, they were taken out of my hand. I
16	could not, in other words, I could not lay a breach of
17	probation, even if I wanted to, without first discussing it
18	with Mr. Seguin, and if the matter was contentious enough,
19	it would be taken completely out of my hand and handled by
20	the mentoring officer.
21	So in other words, my job was to do the
22	things that I was given authority to do and beyond that,
23	the matter was turned over to the mentoring officer.
24	MR. PAUL: All right. Mr. Seguin was the
25	person you described as having something you called a

1	little thing going on with Mr. Barque; correct?
2	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
3	MR. PAUL: And that was some type of unusual
4	relationship where they spoke to each other away from you;
5	correct?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
7	MR. PAUL: At some point did you have a
8	concern about the closeness of their relationship; that
9	nothing was going to be done about these issues?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't know, sir. All I
11	can tell you is that I reported the matter to Mr. Seguin.
12	MR. PAUL: Similarly to the Father Charlie
13	issue, you reported that to Mr. Seguin as well; correct?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
15	MR. PAUL: And you are not aware of anything
16	being done about either incidence?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I'm not aware of anything
18	being done, no.
19	MR. PAUL: Whether I mean, whether you
20	had concerns about Mr. Seguin prior to Barque's departure,
21	I'd suggest you certainly should have had concerns about
22	Mr. Seguin once Mr. Barque left that office. Would you
23	agree?
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I'm sorry?
25	MR. PAUL: Do you not agree that once Mr.

1	Barque left that office, there would be some obvious
2	concerns raised about Mr. Seguin?
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Why?
4	MR. PAUL: I understand that upon
5	Mr. Barque's departure there was some comment made by
6	Mr. Sirrs suggesting that if had the same inclinations as
7	Mr. Barque he should go to Montreal. That was said to him?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes. Did you're
9	deducing from that that there was some that there may
10	have been relation I you know, again I don't know
11	what what Mr. Sirrs' direction to Mr. Seguin were. I
12	the you know, it may have just been simply if you are
13	gay, practice your activities in Montreal.
14	MR. PAUL: Okay. As opposed to
15	MR. VAN DIEPEN: As opposed to
16	MR. PAUL: Cornwall area.
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: In other words, sir, what
18	I'm suggesting to you is that I don't think Mr. Sirrs would
19	knowingly tell Mr. Seguin to engage in illegal acts outside
20	the Province of Ontario.
21	MR. PAUL: Okay. But you wouldn't have
22	necessarily have any concern about homosexual behaviour
23	with peer persons other than clients would he? Is that
24	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I'm sorry.
25	MR. PAUL: Mr. Sirrs would not necessarily

1	have any concern about homosexual conduct with Mr. Seguin
2	and people who are not
3	MR. VAN DIEPEN: You'll have to ask Mr.
4	Sirrs.
5	MR. PAUL: Well, as far as what Mr. Sirrs
6	said, he didn't he didn't give any warning to you
7	similar to the warning that was given to Mr. Seguin,
8	correct? The only person was warned, if you had any
9	inclinations like Mr. Barque or Mr. Seguin?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I don't even know if
11	it was a warning. All I can tell you is that there was a
12	conversation behind closed doors that Mr. Seguin reported
13	to me. So I don't know if Mr if it was in the form of
14	a warning, if it was guidance, if it was a friendly
15	suggestion, I don't know that.
16	MR. PAUL: Okay. Now, I think you indicated
17	that at the funeral of Mr. Seguin, you did not make any
18	comments to Mr. Leroux about having given the warnings to
19	Mr. Seguin about staying away from clients; correct?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's correct.
21	MR. PAUL: Okay, but nevertheless you did
22	indicate to Mr. Seguin at some point after Mr. Barque left,
23	you interpreted the comments of his boss, Mr. Sirrs, as
24	being if you're queer, don't do it here; correct?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Mr. Seguin no, Mr.

1	Seguin just to I want to be I want to be clear on
2	this, Mr. Seguin asked me what he thought Mr. Sirrs meant
3	when he when he spoke to him. And I gather from Mr.
4	Seguin that the conversation may have been coached in such
5	a manner that he wasn't getting a clear impression or he
6	was blind-sided by it and was just seeking re or
7	affirmation of what was really being said.
8	MR. PAUL: Having heard what the comments of
9	Mr. Sirrs were and you having interpreted that as "if
10	you're queer, don't do it here" in the context of Mr.
11	Barque's departure, would that not raise some concerns with
12	you to be suspicious about Mr. Seguin?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Suspicious, as about him
14	being a homosexual or being or engaged in sexual activity
15	with clients?
16	MR. PAUL: Conduct with clients.
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I no, I didn't think
18	that Mr. Seguin would would ever would ever do such a
19	thing.
20	MR. PAUL: Certainly, over the years after
21	Mr. Barque's departure I would suggest that there wasn't a
22	situation of a total fraud without knowledge by you. I
23	would suggest that there were a number of factors that may
24	have alerted everybody in that office about Mr. Seguin's
25	possible difficulties with clients. Would you not agree?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Possible difficulties with
2	clients, how?
3	MR. PAUL: Well, first of all, you mean, you
4	did have information that clients were approaching him in a
5	tavern, speaking to him. That was one factor; correct?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
7	MR. PAUL: Okay. You did have information -
8	- everybody there knew that it was approved that he could
9	reside with a former probationer, Mr. Renshaw; correct?
10	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
11	MR. PAUL: Okay. And later on by 1992
12	there's an incident of obvious drinking alcohol
13	with clients in 1992; the Varley incident?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
15	MR. PAUL: And there is the socializing,
16	smoking cigarettes around the office?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
18	MR. PAUL: And, of course, you and Mr.
19	Gendron do decide to follow Mr. Seguin to the Cornwall
20	Square; correct?
21	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
22	MR. PAUL: Suggest not something an employee
23	would do to a fellow employer unless you have some
24	particularly strong concerns. Would you agree with that?
25	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I would no, I would not

1	agree with that.
2	MR. PAUL: So it was nothing out of the
3	ordinary to follow another employee and see what he was
4	doing at a shopping mall?
5	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, that now you're
6	saying two different things, sir. You know we were
7	we were I think I indicated that we were very curious as
8	to what was going on.
9	MR. PAUL: You were expecting to find
10	something out of the ordinary, something improper?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No. We were there was
12	something out of the ordinary. His behaviour was out of
13	the ordinary. He was very, a very routine type of
14	individual. So we were wondering, well, what is it that's
15	going on.
16	MR. PAUL: Okay.
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: In other words, we weren't
18	you know your suggesting that we were going to expect
19	to find him in the arms of a of a juvenile lover or
20	something like that. No, we weren't going there with that,
21	we were just wondering, what is it that is going on? And
22	you know we're
23	MR. PAUL: Well, you were going there with,
24	I would suggest, a concern that perhaps he might be meeting
25	and socializing, talking to clients?

25

concerns. Would that be fair?

perceive is probably not going to do anything about your

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I don't know I did not
2	know how Mr. Robert would react.
3	MR. PAUL: You'd agree that Mr. Robert was
4	the one that was involved in the approval of the Renshaw
5	matter?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
7	MR. PAUL: Okay. And you had the impression
8	that he was not doing anything about the socializing?
9	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I'm not sure what Mr.
10	Robert knew or not knew. All I can tell you is that there
11	was from what I understood there was there was the
12	the request from Mr. Renshaw to reside at Mr. Seguin's
13	residence was done in writing, above-board, and documented.
14	MR. PAUL: Okay. So it was done in writing
15	unlike the way that you approached Mr. Robert. You did not
16	approach him in writing; correct?
17	MR. VAN DIEPEN: That's right.
18	MR. PAUL: So there's no written record of
19	you making any contact with Mr. Robert?
20	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I I'm Mr.
21	Robert may have made notes-to-file on the matter.
22	MR. PAUL: We're given given what I would
23	suggest should be at least some concern that Mr. Robert
24	might not do anything about this because it's his favourite
25	and his snitch, did you not want it documented?

1	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Well, I I what I I
2	had discussions with Constable Millar and I had every
3	reason to believe that there would be some further
4	documentation in writing, on police header letterhead,
5	going to either Mr. Robert or to senior management.
6	MR. PAUL: Now, you were concerned at the
7	time about what you perceived as harassment by Mr. Robert?
8	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
9	MR. PAUL: Him making a big deal over issues
10	such as Morrisburg Court attendances and signing-in logs
11	and making a large issue about what you probably believed
12	as a minor matters?
13	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
14	MR. PAUL: Would you not be concerned that
15	if there was no written record of taking up this issue with
16	Mr. Seguin that you might open yourself up to more
17	harassment?
18	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
19	MR. PAUL: So would it not if you had
20	contacted him, would you not have a written record in case
21	there was some further harassment?
22	MR. VAN DIEPEN: I made no if you are
23	asking me did I make a written record, I did not.
24	MR. PAUL: All right. Do you agree that
25	possibly the contact at the time there is contact with

1	Mr. Robert, that perhaps then it's somewhat too little, too
2	late, in the sense that there were a lot of indications
3	earlier about Mr. Seguin's contact, and as well it's too
4	little in the sense that if you don't go to senior
5	management above Mr. Robert?
6	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No, I don't think I
7	don't agree with that whatsoever.
8	MR. PAUL: A question about C-8. You would
9	have been at Ken Seguin's residence at some points when C-8
10	was present?
11	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Yes.
12	MR. PAUL: Would there have ever been either
13	children or young males there when you were there?
14	MR. VAN DIEPEN: Children or?
15	MR. PAUL: Or young males.
16	MR. VAN DIEPEN: The only people that were
17	there were C-8 and Renshaw.
18	MR. PAUL: Okay. And no other individuals?
19	MR. VAN DIEPEN: No. And I was there very -
20	- I can also tell you, sir, I was there very briefly and I
21	think my purpose in being there was to drop off a mitre
22	box.
23	MR. PAUL: Those are my questions, Mr.
24	Commissioner.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. I think we'll

1	call it a night.
2	So we'll start at 9:30 tomorrow.
3	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre;
4	veuillez vous lever.
5	This hearing is adjourned until tomorrow
6	morning at 9:30 a.m.
7	Upon adjourning at 5:40 p.m. /
8	L'audience est ajournée à 17h40
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

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