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 52

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

Wednesday, October 4, 2006

Mercredi, le 4 octobre 2006

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

Appearances/Comparutions

Mr. Peter Engelmann Lead Commission Counsel

Ms. Raija Pulkkinen Commission Counsel

Ms. Louise Mongeon Registrar

Mr. Peter Manderville Cornwall Police Service Board

Ms. Reena Lalji

Mr. Neil Kozloff Ontario Provincial Police

Ms. Suzanne Costom

Dect.Staff Sgt.Colin Groskopf

Mr. David Rose Ontario Ministry of Community
Mr. Mike Lawless and Correctional Services and

Adult Community Corrections

Ms. Leslie McIntosh Attorney General for Ontario

Mr. Peter Chisholm The Children's Aid Society of

Ms. Elizabeth MacLennan the United Counties

Mr. Peter Wardle Citizens for Community Renewal

Mr. Dallas Lee Victims Group

Mr. David Bennett The Men's Project

Ms. Marie Henein Mr. Jacques Leduc

Ms. Jill Makepeace

Mr. Mark Wallace Ontario Provincial Police

Association

Ms. Nadya Tymochenka Upper Canada District School

Ms. Nicola Simmons Board

Ms. Jennifer Birrell Catholic District School Board

Ms. Lynn H. Harnden

Table of Contents / Table des matières

	rage
List of Exhibits :	iv
Opening statement by/Déclaration d'ouverture Ms. Leslie McIntosh	2
Opening statement by/Déclaration d'ouverture Mr. Neil Kozloff	8
Opening statement by/Déclaration d'ouverture Mr. Peter Chisholm	17
Opening statement by/Déclaration d'ouverture Ms. Nadya Tymonchenka	24
Opening statement by/Déclaration d'ouverture Mr. Peter Engelmann	28
Final opening statement by Justice Normand Glaude	62
MR. LARRY SÉGUIN, Sworn	65
Examination in-Chief by/Interrogatoire en-chef par Mr. Peter Engelmann	66
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Peter Wardle	123
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. David Rose	136
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Ms. Leslie McIntosh	140
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Peter Manderville	146
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par MR. Dallas Lee	167
Re-Examination by/Ré-Interrogatoire par Mr. Peter Engelmann	169

LIST OF EXHIBITS/LISTE D'EXHIBITS

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE	NO
P-62	Larry Séguin - Statement of a Witness February 15 th , 2001	71	
P-63	Larry Séguin - Medical Records	93	
P-64	Letter from Larry Séguin to John Cleary January $14^{\rm th}$, 2001	96	
P-65	Larry Séguin - Statement of a Witness October 30 th , 1987	111	
P-66	Larry Séguin - Statement of a Witness October 31 st , 1987	112	
P-67	Letter from John Cleary to Chief Tony Repa January $30^{\rm th}$, 2001	129	
P-68	Internal correspondence from Chief Tony Repa to Deputy Laverty - February 7 th , 2001	130	
P-69	Internal correspondence from Deputy Laverty To Staff Sergeant R. Carter February $8^{\rm th}$, 2001	131	
P-70	Letter from Etienne Saint-Aubin to Larry Séguin - May 24 th , 2002	157	

1	Upon commencing at 10:13 a.m./
2	L'audience débute à 10h13
3	THE REGISTRAR: Order. All rise. À
4	l'ordre. Veuillez vous lever.
5	This hearing of the Cornwall Public Inquiry
6	is now in session. The Honourable Mr. Justice Normand
7	Glaude presiding.
8	Please be seated. Veuillez vous asseoir.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Good morning
10	all.
11	I apologize for the delay in beginning. We
12	are having some problems with the web cast, and I will be
13	speaking with them because we can't we have to learn to
14	begin promptly and to get this Inquiry moving as quickly as
15	possible.
16	In that vein I should advise, folks, that
17	given that we will be dealing with witnesses very shortly
18	that I intend to keep a very strict timeline, and we've
19	advised the parties that, where possible, we will begin at
20	9:30 and work until five-ish to ensure that witnesses are
21	properly dealt with and properly accommodated.
22	All right. Mr. Engelmann.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Good morning, Mr.
24	Commissioner.
25	I understand that we are up online.

PUBLIC HEARING AUDIENCE PUBLIQUE

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Good.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: So again, I apologize to
3	counsel and members of the public for the delay.
4	This morning, we have the continuation of
5	opening statements from counsel for the parties.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: We will start this morning
8	with the Ministry of the Attorney General of Ontario and we
9	have their lead counsel here, Leslie McIntosh.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
11	Yes, Ms. McIntosh.
12	OPENING STATEMENT BY/DÉCLARATION D'OUVERTURE PAR MS.
13	McIntosh:
14	MS. McINTOSH: Good morning, Mr.
15	Commissioner, and thank you for the opportunity to make an
16	opening statement on behalf of the Attorney General for
17	Ontario, for the purpose of Part 1 of the Inquiry.
18	In your ruling on standing and funding, Mr.
19	Commissioner, you granted standing to the Attorney General
20	for Ontario for both Parts 1 and 2 of the Inquiry, and you
21	referenced the fact that under the Ministry of the Attorney
22	General Act the Attorney General is responsible for
23	superintending all matters connected with the
24	administration of justice in Ontario. As a result, it's
25	clear that the mandate of the Inquiry to inquire into the

1	institutional	response o	of the justi	ce system	directly
2	affects the du	uties of th	he Attorney	General.	

This Inquiry has already heard some contextual evidence about the two main aspects of the justice system administered by the Ministry of the Attorney General, that is, the Crown attorney system and victim services.

You will recall, Mr. Commissioner, that under the Crown Attorneys Act, Crown attorneys are required to aid in the local administration of justice and perform the duties that are assigned to them under the laws of Ontario. And also under that Act, Crown attorneys are made agents of the Attorney General for the purpose of the Criminal Code.

The obligation of Crown attorneys in furthering the administration of justice is primarily a public duty. A Crown attorney is the representative of the public interest in the criminal process. The role of the Crown is a cornerstone of the criminal justice system and, as the Supreme Court of Canada has stated, it cannot be overemphasized that the purpose of a criminal prosecution is not to obtain a conviction, it is to lay before a jury what the Crown considers to be credible evidence relevant to what is alleged to be a crime.

Counsel have a duty to see that all

available legal proof of the facts is presented. It should be done firmly and pressed to its legitimate strength, but it must also be done fairly. The role of a prosecutor excludes any notion of winning or losing. His function is a matter of public duty than which in civil life there can be none charged with greater personal responsibility. It is to be efficiently performed with an ingrained sense of the dignity, the seriousness and the justness of judicial proceedings.

In our view, the Crown attorney system in Ontario is a model of professionalism, fairness and diligence. Crown counsel in Ontario are strong and effective advocates for the prosecution as well as guardians of the overall public interest in ensuring that the criminal justice system operates fairly for all.

The Attorney General is proud of the important contribution that Crown attorneys make to the administration of justice. Crown counsel act with the highest values of professionalism and dedication to public service in performing their mandated duties.

We believe that Crown counsel are also at the forefront of safeguarding and promoting the legal rights and obligations of fairness owed to the public, to victims of crime and to the accused in accordance with the Charter and all of the legal obligations imposed by other

legislation and the common law.

The Attorney General is committed to a criminal justice system that operates fairly to all, is transparent in its administration and helps to make Ontario a safe place to live. The Attorney General is confident that the evidence led at this Inquiry will demonstrate that all Crown counsel acquitted their important public duties with professionalism and, at all time, in the public interest.

The Attorney General is also committed to the wellbeing of those within our province who have experienced some form of victimization through a criminal offence and recognizes that this experience often causes profound distress to victims and their families.

The Attorney General fully supports the Victims' Bill of Rights proclaimed in June of 1996 and which contains a legislative set of principles to support victims throughout the criminal justice process. The guiding principles, as you know, Mr. Commissioner, of the Victims' Bill of Rights, are that victims of crime should be treated with compassion and fairness and that the justice system should operate in a manner that does not increase the suffering of victims of crime and does not discourage victims of crime from participating in the justice process.

1	The staff of Ontario Victim Services
2	Secretariat, formerly the Victim Services Division of the
3	Ministry of the Attorney General, invest their skills and
4	energies on a daily basis to ensure that victims of crime
5	are treated with dignity and respect and can access a
6	network of coordinated victim-centred services throughout
7	the province.
8	The Ministry understands that this Inquiry
9	will inquire into the institutional response of the justice
10	system and other public institutions in relation to the
11	allegations of historical abuse of young people in the
12	Cornwall area. The Inquiry in Part 1 will include an
13	inquiry into the policies and practices then in place to
14	respond to such allegations, and the creation and
15	development of policies and practices that were designed to
16	improve the response to allegations of abuse.
17	The Commission is also mandated to make
18	recommendations directed to the further improvement of the
19	response of the justice system in similar circumstances.
20	Over the years, the Ministry of the Attorney
21	General has endeavoured to improve its own institutional
22	response to allegations of child abuse as the understanding
23	of the incidents and seriousness of abuse has changed and
24	improved over the past 30 years.

Evidence already heard at the Inquiry from

expert witnesses has shown that there has been a growing awareness of both the incidents and the devastating effect of sexual abuse on child victims. This increase in public awareness is a fairly recent phenomenon. The evidence heard thus far has also demonstrated that the institutional and legal responses to the incidences of child sexual abuse has been progressively more responsive to the interests and needs of victims, to addressing the restrictiveness of evidentiary rules, to alleviating the intimidating nature of the court process and, generally, to creating more and more secure opportunities for victims to come forward to speak about their experience and seek the intervention of judicial institutions.

The Attorney General welcomes the opportunity to demonstrate that its own institutional response to the increasing knowledge and awareness of issues relating to child sexual abuse has been at the forefront of public institutions.

The Attorney General looks forward to assisting the Commissioner to arrive at recommendations to improve the response of the justice system even further.

The Attorney General has participated in the establishment of this Inquiry to ensure that the public of Ontario, especially the citizens of the Cornwall area, are able to have the full and independent public inquiry into

1	these matters that they deserve.
2	In conclusion, the Attorney General, as a
3	party to this Inquiry, fully supports the mandate of the
4	Commissioner and is committed to offering his full
5	assistance, so that the Commissioner can make all necessary
6	inquiries into the matters set out in the Order in Council
7	and make all appropriate recommendations relative to
8	improving the institutional response of the justice system
9	and other public institutions.
10	The Attorney General recognizes the
11	importance of this Inquiry to the citizens of Cornwall and
12	to the surrounding community, and also recognizes the
13	importance and benefits of the recommendations to come to
14	all citizens of Ontario.
15	Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Commissioner, the next
18	party is the Ontario Provincial Police. Present for the
19	OPP this morning, Neil Kozloff, Diane Lahaie and Suzanne
20	Costom, and Mr. Kozloff will be addressing you.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
22	Good morning, sir.
23	MR. KOZLOFF: Good morning, sir.
24	OPENING STATEMENT BY/DÉCLARATION D'OUVERTURE PAR MR.
25	KOZLOFF:

1	MR. KOZLOFF: Mr. Commissioner, I would
2	first like to take this opportunity to thank the Commission
3	for the opportunity to open and to introduce the Ontario
4	Provincial Police legal team. My name is Neil Kozloff, and
5	I appear as lead counsel for the Ontario Provincial Police.
6	Present in the hearing room are two of my
7	associate counsel, Diane Lahaie and Suzanne Costom. The
8	third member, Ms. Gina Brannan, Q.C., is in Toronto and I
9	expect is watching our every move on the live web cast.
10	Together we represent the Ontario Provincial
11	Police, the Commissioner and all commissioned officers.
12	You have already heard the opening statement
13	delivered by my colleague, Mark Wallace, on behalf of the
14	Ontario Provincial Police Association. Mr. Wallace and his
15	colleague, Bill Carroll, represent the non-commissioned
16	officers of the OPP; that is to say all officers holding
17	the ranks currently comprised of constable, sergeant,
18	sergeant major and staff sergeant, and which have in the
19	past included the rank of corporal.
20	Commissioned officers of the OPP include the
21	commissioner, the deputy commissioner, chief
22	superintendent, superintendent and all inspector ranks.
23	These officers have received their royal commission and are
24	therefore entitled to be referred to as commissioned
25	officer. They are in effect the senior management ranks of

the Ontario Provincial Police.

During the substantive evidence portion of this Inquiry upon which we are about to embark, I together with Ms. Lahaie and Ms. Costom will be the counsel directly involved. Ms. Brannan has previously attended with respect to contextual evidence, corporate presentations, motions and court appearances related to these proceedings, and she will continue to do so. And in addition, we will continue to be the beneficiaries of her wise counsel.

Our instructing officer is, as you know,
Acting Detective Superintendent Colleen McQuade. Acting
Superintendent McQuade began the OPP's preparations for
this Inquiry in November 2004; literally on the day
following the Premier's announcement that an inquiry would
be called. She has assembled a hardworking and highly
capable team of officers and civilian employees to assist
her and the OPP legal team.

The prodigious efforts and careful attention to detail of Acting Superintendent McQuade and her team are evident not only to us as OPP counsel but also to Commission counsel, investigators and staff and to counsel representing other parties with standing.

Acting Superintendent McQuade has been present during the majority of proceedings thus far in this Inquiry and will continue to attend in the hearing room

1	when circumstances permit. Her performance, sir, is an
2	eloquent demonstration of the care and concern of the
3	Ontario Provincial Police for the citizens of this
4	community and the issues raised in this Inquiry.
5	By way of introduction, Mr. Commissioner,
6	the Ontario Provincial Police has a direct and substantial
7	involvement in the events giving rise to this Public
8	Inquiry. Mr. Commissioner, you have recognized this by
9	granting full standing to the OPP in respect of both Phase
10	1 and Phase 2.
11	The Ontario Provincial Police together with
12	the Cornwall Community Police Service are the relevant
13	investigative authorities in the United Counties of
14	Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry. As such, the OPP is one of
15	the public institutions whose response to allegations of
16	historical abuse of young people in the Cornwall area will
17	be scrutinized in this Public Inquiry. It is important to
18	keep in mind as we embark on this process that we are
19	looking back into history with the benefit of hindsight.
20	We maintain that neither public institutions
21	nor individuals should be held to a standard of perfection.
22	At the same time, the Ontario Provincial Police welcomes
23	public scrutiny of its work in this community. It is in
24	the public interest.
25	I would add that the OPP recognizes that

PUBLIC HEARING AUDIENCE PUBLIQUE

1	introspection on the part of public institutions serves the
2	public good.
3	The Commission has now identified the first
4	of those substantive witnesses who are to be called to give
5	their testimony in the days to come. We know who those
6	initial few witnesses will be. We do not know as yet the
7	identity of the other witnesses that Commission counsel
8	intends to call.
9	As counsel acting for the OPP, it is our
10	hope and it will certainly be our guidepost that all
11	witnesses to come before this Inquiry will be treated with
12	respect, compassion and patience even as counsel may probe
13	and, where necessary, dispute the evidence.
14	I want to take a moment, Mr. Commissioner,
15	to read the opening words from the preamble to the Order-
16	in-Council that established this Commission of Inquiry.
17	"Whereas allegations of abuse of young
18	people have surrounded the City of
19	Cornwall and its citizens for many
20	years, the police investigations and
21	criminal prosecutions relating to these
22	allegations have concluded. Community
23	members have indicated that a public
24	inquiry will encourage individual and
25	community healing."

1 Let me say something, Mr. Commissioner, 2 about allegations. Allegations are unproven facts. Only 3 some of the allegations were made to police officers, only some of the allegations could be investigated and only some 4 5 of the allegations could be tested in a court of law. And those are not the only allegations that should concern us 6 7 here. 8 For many years, misinformation, 9 inaccuracies, false rumours, half truths and outright lies 10 have been fed to this community regarding historic abuse in 11 the Cornwall area. The misinformation, the inaccuracies, 12 the false rumours, the half truths, the outright lies 13 became newsworthy, and so they were disseminated through the local, regional and national media. They were 14 communicated via various websites, some of which continue 15 to publish to this day. 16 Eventually, they were the subject matter of 17 18 gossip and repetition around the water coolers, in the 19 lunchrooms, at the hair salons and barber shops, along the courthouse corridors and on the streets of Cornwall and the 20 21 surrounding communities. The spread of misinformation, 22 inaccuracies, false rumours, half truths and outright lies has poisoned the atmosphere in this community. It has 23 caused anger, mistrust, divisiveness, and disharmony. 24

has ruined lives in the process.

those inaccuracies, false rumours, half truths and outright

lies were investigated and disproved.

The fruits of those investigations have been turned over to the Commission and now to the parties with standing and will undoubtedly become a matter of public record.

We recognize that there is in this community an overwhelming need to heal. However, we believe that it would be a mistake for anyone to rely upon this inquiry alone as the answer that all that ails this community as a consequence of the events which bring us here. It is not a panacea. This inquiry alone cannot heal this community.

We believe, however, that by exposing the events to careful scrutiny, this Inquiry can address the negative effects that have resulted from the misinformation, inaccuracy, false rumours, half truths and outright lies. This will assist the community and, in particular, those individuals directly affected by the events in question to begin the healing process.

The Ontario Provincial Police applied for standing at this inquiry in order to be able to participate

1	fully in the work of this Commission. The OPP has
2	participated in this inquiry and will continue to do so in
3	an open, transparent, cooperative, professional and
4	responsible manner. The OPP team has endeavoured to assist
5	Commission counsel and to work cooperatively and
6	productively with the other parties with standing and their
7	counsel and will continue to do so.
8	As one of the public institutions in the
9	justice system with standing at this inquiry, the OPP
10	welcomes the review and public scrutiny of its responses to
11	the allegations of historical abuse of young people in the
12	Cornwall community.
13	The OPP recognizes that it is important for
14	you, Mr. Commissioner, to understand what policies and
15	practices the OPP had in place at the time of its responses
16	to the various allegations.
17	We also recognize that you will need to be
18	cognizant of the policies and practices that were designed,
19	created and developed to improve its response to
20	allegations of abuse. That is because when the evidence at
21	this inquiry is complete and final submissions have been
22	made, you will be making recommendations directed to the
23	further improvement of the OPP response in similar
24	circumstances.

At the same time, the OPP undertakes to

1	assist you in the inquiry process that when you do come to
2	make your recommendations, they will be based upon an
3	accurate record of what occurred in the Cornwall area.
4	Some final words, we must not lose sight of
5	the fact that when the evidence at this inquiry is complete
6	and the final submissions have been made and your report
7	and recommendations, Mr. Commissioner, have been delivered,
8	when the work of this inquiry is over, the Ontario
9	Provincial Police will continue to serve and protect the
10	people of the United Counties of Stormont, Dundas and
11	Glengarry.
12	It is our hope that at the end of the day,
13	this inquiry will have done its part to encourage public
14	discourse, ensure public accountability, renew confidence
15	in public institutions, strengthen cooperation between the
16	citizens of Cornwall and the United Counties and the public
17	institutions that serve them, promote healing and bring
18	closure. People of this community deserve as much.
19	Thank you.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, sir.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Commissioner, the next
22	party to make submissions is the Children's Aid Society.
23	Peter Chisholm is here as is Elizabeth McLennan, in-house
24	with the Society. Mr. Chisholm will be making submissions.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

1	Good morning, sir.
2	OPENING STATEMENT BY/DÉCLARATION D'OUVERTURE PAR MR.
3	CHISHOLM:
4	MR. CHISHOLM: Good morning, Mr.
5	Commissioner.
6	I'd like to start by taking you through the
7	Society's view of the commission's primary mandate. The
8	Commission's primary mandate is to examine the
9	institutional response of the justice system and other
10	public institutions in relation to allegations of
11	historical abuse of young people in the Cornwall area.
12	While the mandate of the Commission speaks
13	of historical abuse of young people, from the contextual
14	evidence called thus far it would seem that the public
15	institutional response relating to child sexual abuse may
16	be at the crux of this inquiry.
17	We've heard evidence with respect to the
18	problem. We've heard from the expert witnesses such as Dr.
19	David Wolfe and Dr. Peter Jaffe and there is no doubt child
20	sexual abuse is a problem that has plagued many communities
21	both in Ontario and beyond.
22	We know from the expert evidence given thus
23	far that child sexual abuse was deeply hidden within
24	society in general and that society in the past was in a
25	state of denial with respect to this problem.

The contextual evidence presented reveals that until not that long ago child sexual abuse was a problem that, for the most part, went undetected by the institutions which were tasked with protecting young people in our society.

It was only fairly recently that child welfare legislation and practice directives started to focus on the problem of child sexual abuse. We know that child sexual abuse can have a devastating impact on those who were victimized and on their parents, spouses, children and other family members.

Later today, this inquiry will begin its evidentiary hearings. During these hearings, we will hear from some members of the Cornwall community whose lives have been adversely affected as a result of child sexual abuse. It will be important for all of us to bear in mind what the experts have told us about the negative effects of child sexual abuse when we hear from the witnesses who will be testifying in the upcoming weeks.

There is some good news in the evidence we've heard thus far. The evidence presented to date would suggest that a number of the public institutions have responded in a positive fashion to the challenge presented by child sexual abuse. There is little doubt that the institutional response to allegations of abuse of young

people has become more sophisticated with the passage of time.

This Commission of Inquiry provides the Cornwall community with the opportunity to take note of where we have been in the past, where we are today and where we wish to be in the future with respect to how this community's public institutions respond to abuse of our young people. The practices, policies and protocols of our community's public institutions have evolved over the past 50 years and will hopefully continue to do so in the next 50.

There are a number of themes and principles that I would submit that are imported to bear in mind in the continuation of this inquiry. The first principle is that the responsibility of keeping children safe is not only that of the police or the Children's Aid Society.

Keeping children safe is a community responsibility that is best accomplished through the establishment of collaborative networks within the professional community and the general public.

The second theme, and I have touched upon this, is that both society and public institutions of today are not the same as the society and public institutions that existed 50 years ago. They have evolved. An example would be a child placed in foster care 50 years ago would

IENCE PUBLIQUE

have a very different experience than a child placed in
foster care today.

You'll recall the testimony of Ian MacLean that was given in April of this year with respect to the fostering philosophy and how the approach many years ago permitted foster parents to raise a foster child as their own in contrast of that to the approach and philosophy of today which might be best summarized by the African proverb that it takes a village to raise child.

Because public institutions have evolved over the years, it is important that any assessment of their past performance be measured against the standard of the day in question and not by today's standards.

The third theme that I submit should guide this inquiry deals with the accountability of public institutions. In order for a public institution to be effective in its work, be it policing, protecting children or some other endeavour, it is important that the public institution enjoys the confidence of the public. To enjoy the confidence of the public, institutions must be accountable to the public.

A fourth theme that I would ask you to bear in mind, Mr. Commissioner, is that from the perspective of the Children's Aid Society, it must be emphasized that child sexual abuse forms a relatively small proportion of

1	the cases of child mistreatment that the Children's Aid
2	Society must deal with. We must not lose perspective by
3	focussing on child sexual abuse to the exclusion of other
4	forms of child abuse.
5	It is society's position that
6	recommendations directed to the improvement of the public
7	institutional response to child sexual abuse should not be
8	made at the expense of efforts designed to prevent harm to
9	children brought about by other forms of mistreatment such
10	as domestic violence or neglect, to name but two examples.
11	Another theme I would ask you to bear in
12	mind, Mr. Commissioner, is the impact of technology on
13	child sexual abuse. The Internet, which facilitates
14	distribution of child pornography and which allows abusers
15	to contact potential victims through chat rooms, has become
16	a new weapon that can be used to harm and to lure children.
17	This non traditional aspect of child maltreatment is not
18	currently dealt with in the Child and Family Services Act
19	and is an area that needs more attention from a child
20	welfare perspective.
21	At the same time, Mr. Commissioner, the
22	technology has allowed us to record, track and access
23	information concerning child sexual abuse in a way that we
24	never could in the past.

Given the prevalence of the problem, the gap

1	in the child protection legislation and the benefits that
2	technology can now provide with respect to data on child
3	sexual abuse, the Commission may well wish to consider
4	making recommendations that will address these issues.
5	The sixth theme, Mr. Commissioner, deals
6	with joint training and joint investigations. The
7	contextual witnesses who testified with respect to the
8	issue of joint training and investigation all seem to be of
9	the view that cooperation among the authorities produces
10	better child sexual abuse investigations. The importance
11	of cooperation between police officers, child protection
12	workers and Crown attorneys cannot be underestimated.
13	As such, it is worthwhile keeping the
14	experts' advice in mind when we move forward in this
15	Inquiry.
16	The final theme with respect to Phase I
17	would be the importance of Phase II of this Inquiry. As a
18	result of rumours, allegations and uncomplimentary media
19	coverage the Cornwall community has suffered over the past
20	many years, Part II of the Inquiry will hopefully present
21	the community with an opportunity to heal and move forward.
22	While much of the focus thus far has been on
23	Part I of the Inquiry, we must not lose sight of the
24	importance of the second phase of the Inquiry. We should
25	all approach Phase II of the Inquiry with an open mind and

1	create a thinking which would allow the citizens of
2	Cornwall and area to heal and move forward.
3	Finally, Mr. Commissioner, dealing with the
4	factual issues which need to be addressed during this
5	Inquiry, at least one party with standing has suggested
6	that local institutions in Cornwall failed to respond
7	appropriately to allegations of historical abuse of young
8	people. Given such suggestions, it will be necessary for
9	the Commission to review the public institutional responses
10	to allegations of historical abuse of young people with a
11	view to determining whether or not such responses were
12	appropriate at the time.
13	The Children's Aid Society is a public
14	institution that is accountable to the public. The
15	Children's Aid Society is of the view that it responded
16	appropriately to any information brought to its attention
17	suggesting that children were at risk. If the Children's
18	Aid Society failed, Mr. Commissioner, to respond
19	appropriately, it wants to be told about it.
20	Thank you for the opportunity to make these
21	submissions.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Commissioner, the next
24	party to give an opening statement is the Upper Canada
25	District School Board. Nadya Tymochenko is here for the

1	Board.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
3	Good morning.
4	OPENING STATEMENT BY/DÉCLARATION D'OUVERTURE PAR MS.
5	TYMOCHENKO:
6	MS. TYMOCHENKO: Good morning. Thank you,
7	Mr. Commissioner, for giving the Upper Canada District
8	School Board this opportunity to make opening submissions
9	in Part 1 of the Inquiry.
10	The Upper Canada District School Board
11	sought full standing for Parts 1 and 2 of the Inquiry
12	limited to those issues that affect publicly-funded
13	educational institutions and the interests of the Board.
14	The Board considers it very important that
15	educational institutions be involved in responding to the
16	allegations of abuse of young people in the Cornwall area,
17	including policies and practices in place to respond to
18	such allegations and the creation and development of
19	policies and practices that were designed to improve the
20	response to allegations of abuse.
21	As the publicly-funded educational
22	institution responsible for educational services for
23	English language public schoolchildren in the jurisdiction
24	of Lanark, the United Counties of Leeds and Grenville, the
25	United Counties of Prescott and Russell and the United

1	Counties of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, the Board is
2	responsible for providing educational services to
3	approximately 34 of the areas' children and we have
4	approximately 5,500 staff.
5	The Board sought standing in order to
6	provide information regarding the Board's policies,
7	procedures and practices historically and presently and to
8	make recommendations with respect to the further
9	improvement of a response of publicly-funded educational
10	institutions of child sexual abuse.
11	Senior Board staff, both past and present,
12	have testified regarding the policies and procedures and
13	practices that have been in place and that are in place to
14	report a child in need of protection and to screen
15	employees who might have access to children.
16	The Board has identified that the
17	institutional response of school boards has evolved over
18	time.
19	You heard evidence regarding the many
20	changes that resulted from Justice Robins' Report,
21	including legislative and policy changes; for example,
22	legislation requiring criminal background checks for all
23	employees, service providers with access to children, as
24	well as the Board's policy requiring such criminal
25	background checks for all its volunteers.

1	You also heard evidence regarding the change
2	in the definition of sexual inappropriate conduct to more
3	broadly include examples of sexual harassment, as well as
4	grooming behaviours.
5	The Ontario College of Teachers has adopted
6	Justice Robins' sexual misconduct definition into its own
7	sexual misconduct guidelines which now form the Board's
8	practice and the Board's standards with respect to its
9	teachers.
10	As well, the Board has shared some concerns
11	regarding a provision of training for staff to enable them
12	to identify children in need of protection and has, in a
13	limited manner, shared ways that improvements might be
14	facilitated. We hope that in Part 2 we will be able to
15	provide further information.
16	The Board, as a public institution with
17	responsibility for educating children in this jurisdiction,
18	has a duty to provide a secure, safe environment, free from
19	sexual misconduct or the risk of sexual misconduct.
20	Moreover, the Board plays an important role
21	through education in shaping our future society.
22	The Board acknowledges that victims of
23	historical sexual abuse or students of its schools and not
24	perpetrators have access to victims through the Board's
25	schools.

The Board respectfully submits that the evidence the Commission will hear in Part 1 of the Inquiry regarding victims who chose not to report abuse to School Board staff as well as the response of School Board staff to abuse that was reported should be used to inform the educational programs, policies and practices in the future to stem sexual misconduct by Board staff and service providers and to ensure that all victims feel safe and secure to report alleged abuse and to ensure that staff are aware of and comply with their duty to report a child in need of protection.

Thank you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Commissioner, the last party wishing to make opening -- well, there are two parties that haven't had an opportunity to make opening submissions. One is the party you just granted standing to, and we have spoken to counsel and they are not prepared to make opening submissions today. So we will find a time that doesn't interfere with witness schedules and a time that's convenient to counsel to do that.

THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.

MR. ENGELMANN: The last party that has not had an opportunity to make opening submissions is Father

Charles MacDonald. I attempted to accommodate Mr. Cipriano

by putting him on the end of the list. He advised he was not able to be here today and we are presently trying to work out an appropriate time for him to come and give an opening submission that wouldn't be interfering with the evidence from witnesses.

THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.

MR. ENGELMANN: So I will endeavour to let you know as soon as I can as to when that can be arranged.

--- OPENING STATEMENT BY/DÉCLARATION D'OUVERTURE PAR MR.

ENGELMANN:

MR. ENGELMANN: I too wish to make some submissions at the start of this process and I want to start by thanking all counsel for the parties for their insightful opening statements. They provided us with some written thoughts as to their views as to where we should be going and how we should be working together, and now they have come forward over the last day or so and provided us with their oral submissions. We are getting to know them and we are working together, I think, in a collaborative way and I look forward to working with all of them through the substantive Inquiry.

I recall just yesterday hearing Mr. Wallace for the OPPA and two or three other of my friends indicating that the problem of child sexual abuse is not simply a problem for Cornwall.

And just driving here this morning,
listening to the news about a congressman, who is a person
in a position of authority and trust, allegedly abusing
teenage boys in Washington and how he was allegedly abused
as a child brings that home. The next story about a man
who killed some children in Pennsylvania who is an alleged
child sexual molester when he was younger; a judge who
allegedly abused teenage prostitutes. All three stories on
the news this morning, and it just brings home that this
problem is prevalent. This problem just isn't a problem
for Cornwall, Ontario or Canada. It's a problem throughout
the world.

So we're here and we're here to look at how institutions respond to this problem, how hopefully they can prevent the problem, but when it does happen, how they respond to it and whether they have responded to it appropriately.

We have heard from some of the counsel about what brought about this Inquiry. We need look no further than the preamble to the Order in Council to have some sense, but there are a number of important points, and to recognize the context in which the Inquiry is occurring we have to look at the events which came to light in the early '90s here in the City of Cornwall and in the surrounding community, allegations of abuse against many people here in

the community of Cornwall, investigations by police, both the Cornwall Community Police Service and the OPP, criminal prosecutions and concerns by many people in the community, whether they are victims or alleged victims, offenders or alleged offenders, or members of various institutions or just people at large as to how the investigations were dealt with, the outcome of some of the charges that went through the courts, et cetera.

Some of the groups that are before you such as the Victims Group said that as part of the context and the need for the Inquiry revolves around, at least in part, rumours, innuendo and allegations relating to a ring or clan of persons within and without public institutions who perpetrated sexual abuse and conspired to prevent victims from coming forward. That's an allegation that's out there. It's an allegation that many of the counsel you've heard over the last day have said we must look at. Many have said that half truths, mistruths, lies have been perpetrated. We need to look at those issues and determine if there's any substance to them.

As on the one hand people have said the ring exists, the clan exists, public institutions either participated or didn't do enough, on the other hand, we've heard just the opposite, where people say there is no problem. There's no problem with a clan. There's no

problem with child sexual abuse and any reports were
overblown or exaggerated and that institutions responded
appropriately, whether they were investigating others or
investigating their own to one or to rogue elements within
them.

All of the parties here have indicated a desire for the Commission to do its important fact-finding function and we intend to do that.

The differences really revolve around the emphasis, the scope of the mandate and its focus.

It is hoped that this Inquiry will allow the community to know more about what happened and why, and that is why the fact-finding role that we are entering into in Phase 1 of this Inquiry is so important. And it is hoped that it will help to restore and build confidence in this community and in the province at large in our public institutions. It is also hoped it will encourage individual and community healing, and some of the counsel have said already and have had some kind words already about the role that the Commission has played with respect to witness support, counselling services, the appointment of an advisory panel and many of the things that have taken place as an adjunct to Phase 1 or as part of Phase 2 of the Inquiry to allow that healing process to start.

Phase 1 of this Inquiry presents some unique

challenges. The allegations for which we're looking at institutional response are historical. They span several decades. There are numerous public institutions involved in this case, so the responses are different not only because of the different nature and functions of those public institutions but because some of them employed alleged offenders whereas others were simply involved in investigating them from afar.

There have been many calls for this Inquiry for a long time and for many reasons and from many perspectives. And as you've heard on several occasions already, there are many, many documents because of the historical nature and the number of participants and institutions.

Despite this fact and the fact that there are many parties, all counsel have demonstrated a great deal of commitment to their clients and to the work of this Inquiry.

Another difficult and unique issue that we are dealing with are privacy concerns. They're recognized right in the Order in Council and there are some unique privacy concerns in this case, both common law and statutory, and I'm thinking, for example, of the Youth Criminal Justice Act ss just one. But we must balance those privacy issues, those confidentiality issues with an

objective, open, fair, transparent and thorough inquiry and yet also recognize that such an inquiry must be efficient.

We've already seen and tried to develop some methods for dealing with this Inquiry, which I believe is like none so far. You've seen some technological advancements and some days they seem to work better than others, but we have a website with a video stream. We have video monitors in the hearing room. We have electronic documents. We have electronic databases and we have public access with the assistance of video screens and, of course, the WebCam that is being broadcast hopefully as I speak.

We have an opportunity here to examine the past, to find out what happened and to find out whether the responses to these allegations were appropriate or not and for you to make recommendations at the end of the day to help prevent any inappropriate responses from happening again or to strengthen and make constructive comments on those that were appropriate.

Even though the emphasis here is on the institutional response, as we go through Phase 1 of this Inquiry, we can't lose sight of the inter-relationship with this phase and the healing and reconciliation phase that is concurrently running in Phase 2. That inter-relationship poses some further challenges, especially in a case where many of those allegations of child sexual abuse were not

acknowledged or not admitted and, in several cases, where the facts had not be fully adjudicated. We have to deal with the harm that some of these allegations have caused to individuals and the community at large.

In Phase 1, we need to hear from some victims and alleged victims, but in doing so we must be sensitive. We must be cognizant and aware that this process may be difficult for many witnesses and we want to take steps to minimize any harm this will cause them during Phase 1 as, of course, in causing harm in Phase 1, we're doing the opposite of what we would try to be doing or what we're supposed to be doing in Phase 2 and allowing for healing and reconciliation. It just shows how much interrelationship there is between these phases.

I want to talk briefly about the mandate and the comments on the approach of the parties and our view.

The mandate is set out in Sections 2 and 3 of the Order in Council, and a number of counsel have referred to Section 2, which of course is really what we're doing here in Phase 1:

"Inquiring into and reporting on the institutional response of the justice system and other public institutions, including the interaction of that response with other public and

PUBLIC HEARING AUDIENCE PUBLIQUE

1	community sectors, in relation
2	tohistorical abuse of young people in
3	the Cornwall area"
4	We've talked about looking at policies and
5	practices then in place, the response to such
6	allegations and the creation and development of
7	policies and practices designed to improve the
8	response.
9	And again, the important role in Section 3
10	of the Order in Council, to:
11	"inquire into and report on processes,
12	services or programs that would
13	encourage community healing and
14	reconciliation."
15	Given the public nature of this Inquiry,
16	given the historical nature of the Inquiry and
17	given some of the complex issues that I have
18	talked about, Commission staff, its counsel and
19	its investigators have been seeking the
20	assistance of the parties and the public for
21	their views on the scope of our mandate. We had
22	a number of meetings over the past year and, in
23	effect, we've undertaken a consultation process
24	with each and every one of the parties and with
25	some of the parties, we've had several meetings.

We've heard over the past day of the views of several of these parties on the scope of our mandate.

Some of the parties see our role as more limited, more defined in scope and would suggest that we should look only at Project Truth investigations or a few incidental and ancillary investigations; how they were conducted; how complaints were received; and how the institutions reacted.

Some parties as well have said we must be very sensitive to the timeframe and to what people knew at the time as they were working with this difficult issue and investigating and/or prosecuting child sexual abuse and that it would be inappropriate to hold them to a more contemporary or learned standard.

This more limited approach is one that is more present focused and may not allow us to look at the systemic or root causes of some of the nature of the responses in the 1980s and the 1990s.

Other parties have taken a broader approach, whether dealing with the Victims Group, the Citizens for Community Renewal, the OPP, OPPA, and several of them have talked about the need to uncover the truth, to lift the cloud to allow the members of the Cornwall community to truly understand how local institutions responded and

whether they responded appropriately.

We need to be cautious. We need to emphasize the fact that we're not looking and we're not trying to uncover the truth of an allegation of child sexual abuse but whether the institutional response to those allegations was appropriate in all respects.

The jurisprudence tells us, in my respectful submission, that the mandate of public inquiries is to be interpreted broadly. We have heard a submission yesterday that that is not the case. I think we have to look no further than the consortium case from the Supreme Court of Canada in 1998 about the broad nature of the mandate of judicial inquiries and the power to authorize a judicial inquiry was stated as an important safeguard of the public interest and should not be diminished by a restrictive or overly technical interpretation of the legislative requirements for its exercise.

As I said, we heard some jurisprudence and some submissions from counsel for the Diocese yesterday about a more narrow or limited approach and, in doing so, the importance of balancing the rights of individuals with the investigative functions of public inquiries.

We say that those two goals are not mutually exclusive. We say and we believe we can have a thorough and broad inquiry, but we can do so and balance the rights

not mutually exclusive. Certainly while the Commission
will look at the actions of some individuals, we know that
the focus of the Inquiry is on the institutional response.
There is, for the most part amongst the
counsel and the parties, a consensus that the Inquiry must
examine all relevant public institutions. We have the
benefit of many, certainly most of them, as parties here
before the Inquiry.
Some parties are also of the view that the
Inquiry must also look at the actions of key players and by
key players, we will be looking at the actions of those in
charge of the various public institutions over time, their
deputies, their employees and a number of others,
including, for example, the oft-mentioned Perry Dunlop.
So it is Commission counsel's view that we

of individuals as we go through this process. The two are

should take a broad, thorough approach. We need to look at the historical basis, the roots of the causes of some of the issues that then blew up in the early '90s and led to the Project Truth Inquiry and looking back in time to appreciate the context and the changes over time. We have to look at the policy and culture in place at the time. We need to be fair and judge individuals based on the standards at the time in question, but we also need to be vigilant and careful so as not to simply excuse

So just generally speaking, where are we going and what are the stages? Well, perhaps I'll start with where we've been. Mr. Commissioner, I don't want to say much on that because you've commented on that in your preliminary remarks. We have had certainly a number of decisions on standing and funding, and we just had one. There may be more to come. But we have as a result parties representing a very broad range of interests and views, which makes for a thorough and successful inquiry, in my respectful submission.

We had a number of context-setting experts who told us a number of important things, starting with Dr. David Wolfe, an expert in child sexual abuse and the impact of child sexual abuse on victims who told us about the underreporting of child sexual abuse and some of the reasons for it. He told us about the overwhelming prevalence of the acquaintance molester form of abuse, as opposed to the stranger danger. He told us about some of the peculiar issues and difficult issues when we're dealing with alleged abuse by persons in positions of trust and authority. He also spoke about the evolution of the knowledge in this area and the evolution of the parties having to deal with it from the Badgley Report in the early

80s and onwards.

We heard from Professor Nicholas Bala, an expert on the evolution of legislation, law and legal processes involving children and, in particular, child sexual abuse. He spoke to us about the difficulty in successfully prosecuting some cases of child sexual abuse and how the laws have been changed and modified to help with that. He also spoke about the level and sophistication of training that he was directly involved in with police officers, Children's Aid officers, Crown prosecutors and judges in the mid to late 80s and onwards.

We heard from Dr. Nico Trocmé, an expert in

We heard from Dr. Nico Trocmé, an expert in the reporting of child abuse and, in particular, child sexual abuse who spoke to us about the increase in reporting of child abuse and neglect, and he told us that it has been steadily rising over the past 35 years in the province of Ontario.

We heard from John Liston, an expert in the child welfare response to allegations of child sexual abuse. And he spoke to us about how institutions worked together with inter-agency policies and procedures and how important that work is. He talked to us about that development in the mid 80s and onwards and how that isn't enough, and the parties' need to build and maintain working relationships, personal relationships in addition to simply

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

having written protocols.

We heard from Dr. Peter Jaffe, another expert in child sexual abuse and, in particular, the institutional and community response to it. Dr. Jaffe spoke to us about the subject of the prevention of child sexual abuse and how it has to be integrated into all community systems and institutions and that we need a national public awareness strategy. He told us that we cannot deal with issues of violence and abuse within the confines of courtrooms or therapists' offices and that these have to be important public issues addressed in all institutions, from local governments to churches and other institutions. And, of course, he told us the story that Mr. Bennett repeated to us yesterday, and it illustrates, at least from the view of an important public figure, the conflict that people in positions of authority sometimes have between doing what your heart tells you to do and what your head tells you to do.

We heard from Robert Fulton, an expert in social work with a particular emphasis in community needs assessments. Mr. Fulton provided some statistical and demographic information about Cornwall and surrounding areas and he spoke to us about population, education, family composition, et cetera, in explaining to us some of the risk factors that exist when it comes to child sexual

abuse.

We heard from Wendy Leaver, a detective with the Metro Toronto Police Force and an expert in the investigation of sexual offences and historical sexual offences and the training of police officers in this area, and she spoke to us about the evolution of knowledge and training of police officers dealing with offences against children from the Badgley Report onwards, a report she was personally involved in.

Although the experts to date were contextsetting and therefore generally provided non Cornwall-based
evidence, at this preliminary stage some themes may be in
existence. We have to be cognizant of, as we go forward
and listen to this evidence, the underreporting theme, the
deniability problem, the denial of acquaintance-type abuse,
disbelief of allegations against persons in positions of
authority, whether or not allegations are true, other
themes that have come from some of those experts.

There's still more important context-setting evidence to come. We have evidence to come from Father Loftus, a psychologist and priest and an expert in the response of the Catholic Church to allegations of child sexual abuse and the treatment of priests who may have been sexual offenders.

We also have the evidence of Wendy Van

24

25

1	Tongeren, an experienced Crown prosecutor with particular
2	expertise in the area of the prosecution of sex crimes and
3	crimes against persons who experience vulnerability.
4	Sir, you have heard corporate policy
5	evidence from almost all of the public institutions
6	represented here, and I believe that was a good
7	illustration in the main about the collaborative efforts
8	and the cooperation between Commission counsel and counsel
9	for many of our parties, and that policy evidence has
10	illustrated the relevant policies and procedures that were
11	in place over time and the evolution of them.
12	We still have some holes to plug. So, Mr.
13	Kozloff, we may see Ms. Brannan again for that purpose with
14	the OPP. We have some holes to plug there. We have a
15	corporate presentation from a school board and there may
16	well be other policies and procedures that parties have to
17	bring to our attention.
18	A number of important issues have been
19	debated and they've been resolved, and I'm reminded about
20	when I started this, talking to some Commission counsel for
21	other inquiries I remember the comment, "Don't worry,
22	Peter; things will just get going. There won't be many

43

motions or preliminary matters. It doesn't really happen

perhaps that says something about the sensitivity of some

at preliminary inquiries." Well, we've had a few here, and

of the issues we're dealing with or the complexities of the mandate.

We've had the usual ones, the standing and funding decisions that you would expect at any public inquiry. Then we've had issues dealing with whether the Diocese is a public institution, whether alleged victims of Father MacDonald can testify.

As you've said already, Mr. Commissioner, there is a leave application pending with the Court of Appeal on that issue.

There have been issues with removing names and/or identifying features from affidavits that have been filed. There have been rulings on funding requests to go to the Divisional Court. There have been rulings on Rule 31, solicitor-client privilege, a judicial review application and an amendment to our Rules. There have been rulings on redaction, and I'm sure I've missed some.

But there have been a number of times when we've come to you, and that doesn't mean that counsel haven't made efforts to try and resolve issues without coming to you. I think all of us would say that we have made and have had good meetings and good compromises on many issues, but there are times when decisions have been required and those decisions need to be made in an open, transparent and public way and in fashion.

21

22

23

24

25

1 There are still issues and there will be 2 issues with respect to witnesses and/or other key players 3 who may wish to participate, and some of them may request 4 funding for counsel or possibly even party status. 5 I just want to comment on that for a minute with respect to Perry Dunlop. We have invited him to 6 7 participate in this process, and as you've heard from the 8 opening statements over the last day, there are several 9 parties that say it's very important that we examine what 10 he did and how his efforts may or may not have affected 11 some of the work that was being done by local police 12 forces, the Crown, the Children's Aid Society, et cetera. 13 We have invited him to participate. This is a provincial public inquiry. We are fully cognizant of our summons 14 15 power and some of the limitations in asking people to come 16 from out of province, but we have invited him to participate. To date, we have not had an acceptance of our 17 18 invitation. That invitation is still outstanding, and it's 19 clear from counsel for the Cornwall Community Police

So where are we going? Well, as you know,

Service that they are not representing Mr. Dunlop and if he

wishes to participate in this process, he could apply for

party status or certainly, as a witness, could apply for

counsel assistance. So we will see if he takes us up on

our offer as we go on.

Mr. Commissioner, we've gone through and we have given two large disclosures to all of these parties that are on something called an external hard drive. And I'm going to get better at this as we go on, but I'm sure that applies to the vast majority of my friends who may not be completely computer literate. There are more disclosures to come. There are some redaction or removal issues with respect to some sensitive documents, and those will be issues that we will be dealing with.

But where we're going right now is we're starting our evidentiary hearings. We're going into some of that fact-finding that so many people have urged upon us and that public inquiries, since the get-go, have been told this is their primary function. It's taken some time to get to this point, but I think important groundwork has been laid.

So Stage 1 of those evidentiary hearings is we're going to hear testimony from some victims and alleged victims of child sexual abuse. In some cases, we will have factual overviews or reports of their evidence, where those individuals are either unable, unwilling, or otherwise not in a position to offer that testimony in person.

After that stage we will be going into Stage 2, if I can call it that, where we're hopeful to have some testimony of offenders and/or alleged offenders. We have

invited offenders and alleged offenders to do that and to give that evidence viva voce, in person. To date, no one has taken us up on that offer. We think their stories can provide some evidence about some of the concerns we've heard and some of the problems they have suggested they had with respect to the justice system and other public institutions.

We have asked two of the parties that are present here, Jacques Leduc and Father Charles MacDonald to come forward and testify about some of the concerns they may have had and we've heard some of those concerns, at least through submissions of counsel with respect to incomplete investigations, possibly biased investigations or tunnel vision.

Unfortunately, to date they have indicated to us that their clients do not wish to testify, and I say that's unfortunate because if they have firmly held police that the investigations were inappropriate in any way, we believe that their first-hand views would be helpful to the work of this Inquiry.

Again, if we have none who come forward, we may or may not have some factual overviews or reports about some of those concerns.

The third stage is testimony from employees or officials of institutions with respect to their response

to allegations of historical abuse against young people and, in some cases, that testimony will be from institutional witnesses regarding the employment of an offender or alleged offender within their institution. And that's what I talked about earlier when I talked about an internal response as opposed to an external one.

We already know from the corporate policy evidence that the policies and procedures for dealing with both have changed over time and at the end of the day, the Inquiry will look at policies and procedures and gauge actions based on them and determine whether or not there were deficiencies, and if there were, no matter what they were, to comment on them, whether that's a failure to comply with a duty to report or any other perceived or stated deficiency.

How do we do this? How do we lead the evidence of victims and alleged victims? We start by saying there's been much discussion about how the evidence of victims and alleged victims will be led. Almost daily I get advice about what I should do or shouldn't do, and believe me, I'm not alone in getting that advice. I'm working with a team of lawyers and investigators who are trying to do this and trying to do this in an efficient and thorough manner.

The nature of the evidence that will be led

is shaped by the focus of this Inquiry. In other words, we're looking at the institutional response of the justice system and other public institutions and the interaction with community sector organizations. We are not engaging in trial-like prosecutions, as some would suggest.

The Commission will have to keep in mind individual rights. This is a concern raised by one of my friends yesterday and privacy and confidentiality concerns over the course of this evidence. Commission counsel is aptly aware of the difficulty that some of this evidence will cause, some of the difficulties it will cause for victims and/or alleged victims to testify and surely for alleged offenders or offenders if they choose to and, again, for some of those officials working in some of those institutions dealing with this difficult allegation or difficult allegations of child sexual abuse.

The media has played an important role in covering not only this Inquiry but some of the allegations and some of the controversy, some of the rumours and innuendo that you've heard about over the course of the last day and earlier and they play an important role in respect of this public inquiry as with any other public inquiry, and when looking at the media we have to be concerned about balancing not only the public's right to know but public privacy and confidentiality concerns.

1	We have heard already there will be some
2	applications to ban the publication of names and we will
3	have to deal with these issues on a case-by-case basis as
4	we go forward, and there will be individuals who wish to
5	testify but not wish to testify fully in a public way,
6	whether that be in camera, by way of non identifying
7	initials or otherwise.
8	So those are steps, those are processes that
9	we will be putting into place we will be attempting to
10	put into place as we proceed.
11	And as I said, the media, both the
12	mainstream media and some of the alternative media you've
13	heard about today from counsel and yesterday, these
14	websites we've heard about, have contributed in some ways
15	as to how the community's views have been shaped with
16	respect to these allegations. I'm very hopeful that in
17	performing our fact-finding function here, we can deal with
18	this and we can get to the bottom of many of the issues
19	that have been swirling around the City of Cornwall.
20	Now, in doing this and in calling this
21	evidence, there will be some shortcuts, and by using
22	shortcuts we are in no way trying to restrict or make this
23	Inquiry less thorough.
24	We cannot realistically call all victims and
25	alleged victims who had concerns surrounding the

institutional response to allegations of abuse. For many reasons several people who fit those categories have told us they do not want to appear, they do not want to testify no matter what protection we can offer them because of where they are in their lives, with their families, with their jobs, et cetera. We have also heard, as you have

7 heard, about some of those institution officials, like Mr.

Dunlop and others, who may not wish to testify.

So some of these shortcuts will be dealt with through the use of section 5 of the Order in Council and I just want to reference that very briefly because I think the government in passing this specific Order in Council recognized some of these difficulties that we would face and how we could try and do this in a thorough yet efficient way.

What we have talked about and what we are allowed to do according to the Order in Council is refer to and rely on any of the following materials: transcripts or records of public preliminary matters, trials or appeal proceedings; factual overview reports, whether they're prepared by commission counsel or by parties; the testimony of representative witnesses in certain cases, where appropriate; and medical, professional, social science and similar evidence and background evidence by way of reports.

What are some of the questions we have been

asked to answer in the identification of themes and
patterns? Well, as I said, we have parties here from all
spectrums, all perspectives, and we have public
institutions, many of whom have come forward over the last
day and said, "We did things right from top to bottom. We
don't think our employees did anything wrong. They acted
in good faith and they did the best job they could in the
circumstances they were in."

So we will be looking at the appropriateness of the response, and that appropriate response would be a complete response, a professional response, a competent response, a sensitive response, an effective response and an efficient response when we're dealing with allegations of child sexual abuse.

We also have parties who have suggested that they were inappropriate responses and we are going to hear that from several victims and alleged victims. And those inappropriate responses, and this is in no sense or order, could be insensitivity, inexperience, a lack of training, perhaps tunnel-vision or blindness, indifference, wilful blindness, incompetence, systemic failures, lack of resources, lack of training and knowledge, undue influence. We have even heard, at its worst, allegations of collusion, conspiracy or cover up.

So we have to look at appropriate responses,

whether they were appropriate responses, whether they were
inappropriate responses and those are some of the themes
that we will be looking at in judging appropriateness or
inappropriateness, and, in many cases, whether there was a
response at all will be an issue.

Some areas that we will be looking at: the big picture context. We've had media reports swirling around about the number of charges that arose out of Project Truth, the number of persons who were charged and yet the small number of convictions. We hope to elaborate on that in more detail so that the public can be made aware of what happened.

There are allegations that witnesses were not interviewed, that documents were ignored, that investigations were interfered with by third parties and others, and the community is and has been living these events and has the right to know what happened.

There are a number of questions which flow from this. A number of those questions are set out by the Citizens for Community Renewal in their oral and written submissions, including, on the investigation side, whether the allegations were investigated, whether they were investigated appropriately, fairly, thoroughly, was there a coordinated interrelationship between the Crown and the investigators, were there systemic flaws. We intend to go

1	there. We intend to ask and answer those questions.
2	The same with the prosecutions, whether they
3	were handled appropriately, were they successful or
4	unsuccessful and how do you measure that standard. Ms.
5	McIntosh told us today we have to be aware of what it is
6	and what the goal of a successful prosecution is.
7	We will hear from victims and alleged
8	victims about how they were treated by the institutions at
9	hand, whether they were supported, kept informed,
10	consulted, and the concern about re-victimization by public
11	institutions, how it arises, how it can be minimized.
12	We hope to hear, at least in some fashion,
13	from offenders or alleged offenders about how they were
14	treated, were the investigations of their charges thorough,
15	were they objective, were they open minded, how were they
16	dealt with by public institutions.
17	And again, looking at systemic failures, if
18	any, and identifying them, identifying whether there were
19	patterns and whether there was coordination between
20	institutions and community sector organizations.
21	We will look at those allegations of
22	conspiracy and try and answer how they arose, why they grew
23	and how they should be dealt with at the end of the day.
24	As I said, sir, I'm not like some of my

54

friends and able to do things a little more quickly than I

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

opportunity to do so.

1 first anticipated, so I apologize for the length. I have just some brief concluding remarks. 2 3 I'm looking forward, as are all of my colleagues on our legal team and on our investigation team, 4 5 to this new stage of the Inquiry, the evidentiary hearings. We recognize that this is important and yet difficult work. 6 7 We are delighted that counsel for the parties have shown a 8 willingness to work together with us to collaborate and we 9 have heard now the positive goals they have. I think every 10 single person that has come forward has said they want to 11 see this community mend. 12 We have heard it said by parties that those 13 who allege the existence of a ring or a clan must come 14 forward. They must be examined. They must be cross-15 examined. We agree. This is their opportunity. If people are going to make these allegations they should come 16 forward and they should do so here. This is the 17

Those people who come forward can do so in various ways and, as we have said earlier, with various protections, and the inquiry has established a counselling program as well as a witness assistance and support program.

There may still be more victims and more alleged victims, more perpetrators, more alleged

1	perpetrators or offenders who have views on what has
2	happened and they may have an important story to tell.
3	One of the things that has worked very well
4	over the last year, despite what some have to say about
5	certain websites, that our website has attracted the
6	public, it has attracted public responses.
7	We have had consultation with the parties,
8	with their counsel and we continue to have dialogue with
9	the public and we welcome that dialogue.
10	I would welcome those members of the public
11	who are listening to contact us if they have important
12	stories to tell, whether they can tell them to us with
13	their names or without, because it's important when we're
14	looking at the institutional response in this case to know
15	the full story. So we encourage the public to continue to
16	contact us as they have.
17	And for some of them that write to us a lot,
18	I apologize if we don't get back to you all as quickly as

we can, but we encourage you to continue to correspond with
us and share your views with us, whether they be views on
experts we should be calling, whether they be views on the
advisory panel or whether they be views on the mandate and
scope of this Inquiry. We have been pleased with the
public response to date and we continue to welcome your
input and views.

1	It is only through that type of dialogue
2	that we can do the thorough job of fact-finding that all of
3	us on the Commission team wish to do here. We are ready,
4	willing and able to do it and we need your help to do it.
5	Mr. Commissioner, I have some very brief
6	comments on some of the comments that we heard that I
7	haven't been able to incorporate and I wanted to start with
8	a comment by the Cornwall Community Police Service from
9	yesterday.
10	As I said, I certainly agree with Mr.
11	Callaghan's comment that people who allege conspiracy or
12	innuendo or rumours or collusion on the part of his client
13	need to come forward. He needs to have a chance to
14	confront them.
15	He also suggested to us that we're not
16	really leading a representative sample of victims or
17	alleged victims and that we shouldn't be making
18	determinations based on a few witnesses that come forward
19	and who may have had concerns about the Cornwall Community
20	Police Service.
21	And I believe he told us that there were
22	1,100 sexual offences successfully investigated and/or
23	prosecuted. Well, tell us about them, give us some
24	examples and we'll look at a representative sample. We're
25	not just here to look at inappropriate behaviour. We're

here to look at appropriate behaviour and what's done. So we welcome his client to come forward and give us further information.

We welcome officials from the Ministry of Community and Correctional Service, as Mr. Neuberger told us, who will come forward and tell us how they dealt with individuals who may have been sexually abused by two employees of their Ministry and how those other officials dealt with it, how they got victims or alleged victims of sexual abuse off to appropriate counselling, et cetera. So we welcome those witnesses in that discussion.

Counsel for Jacques Leduc told us about some of the concerns that he has with what has happened and I would repeat my invitation that they should reconsider and he should come forward and tell us some of those concerns firsthand so that we can deal with them here.

Counsel for the CCR told us about the need to have a broad and thorough inquiry and I think we have addressed that. I think we're on the same page on that. And they told us how important it was to have the role of Perry Dunlop examined. That will be examined and if Mr. Dunlop does not participate we will be putting together a factual overview report on that and we know already from some of the public institutions involved here that they will be having comments on his role and how it affected

their ability to respond.

We heard from the Diocese and I think I have commented on that and the need for a careful balancing and the need not to violate individual rights, and we think we can do that with a broad and thorough inquiry.

We heard from the OPPA about how we should approach this task in the spirit of transparency and we intend to do that, and how the process must be fair and thorough.

We heard from the Men's Project about some of the work that's been done on Phase 2 and also the comment at the end by Mr. Bennett about how we must look at the legal process itself and whether it can contribute to a lack of humouring and is there another way, perhaps a better way to do this.

We heard from counsel for the Victims Group about the fact that there's two sides to the Perry Dunlop story and the need to look at very carefully some of the actions of institutions to determine whether there was naivety, ignorance, incompetence or something more sinister.

We heard from the Ministry of the Attorney

General about a number of issues and about the role of

Crown prosecutors and we will have to look at that and how

the Ministry of the Attorney General wishes us to be a full

1	independent public inquiry.
2	We heard from the OPP about the need to deal
3	with all witnesses with respect, compassion and patience
4	and I'm sure that all counsel echo those concerns.
5	We heard from the Children's Aid Society
6	about our mandate, the contextual nature of the mandate and
7	some of the problems that are associated with child sexual
8	abuse and that, in particular, that it was important for
9	all of us to bear in mind the negative effects of child
10	sexual abuse when hearing the evidence of witnesses.
11	And we heard from the Upper Canada District
12	School Board about how the School Board and others have
13	adopted the Robins' Report to change and to deal with some
14	of the issues that arose therein about abuse within
15	schools.
16	So I think there are common themes here,
17	sir. We look forward to working with all counsel and
18	particularly look forward to starting this next phase of
19	the Inquiry.
20	Those are my not-so-brief opening comments.
21	Thank you.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
23	So where do we go from here now?
24	MR. ENGELMANN: What I would propose, sir,
25	is I believe I have a witness waiting and that is Mr. Larry

PUBLIC HEARING AUDIENCE PUBLIQUE

1	Seguin who will be our first witness this afternoon.
2	I propose perhaps that we take our lunch
3	break now and perhaps we come back earlier than our usual
4	start of 2:00.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: So 1:30?
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes, 1:30 would be fine.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you.
8	We will break until 1:30 and we will start with the
9	evidence.
10	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre;
11	veuillez vous lever.
12	The hearing will reconvene at 1:30.
13	Upon recessing at 11:43 a.m./
14	L'audience est suspendue à 11h43
15	Upon resuming at 1:33 p.m./
16	L'audience est reprise à 13h33
17	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre;
18	veuillez vous lever.
19	This hearing of the Cornwall Public Inquiry
20	is now in session. Please be seated. Veuillez vous
21	asseoir.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: So, Mr. Engelmann? Mr.
23	Engelmann, good afternoon. I take it we're about ready for
24	our first witness?
25	MR. ENGELMANN: We are.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
2	Well, I have a few comments though.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: I am glad.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Why is that?
5	MR. ENGELMANN: I am always happy to have
6	your comments, sir, and I need two minutes.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Good.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: I would be very happy to
9	have your comments now.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: I think the witness is just
12	outside for a health break for a moment.
13	FINAL OPENING STATEMENT BY/DÉCLARATION D'OUVERTURE
14	FINALE PAR JUSTICE NORMAND GLAUDE:
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Good. Well, why
16	don't I say what I have to say and then we will see where
17	the witness is. Very good.
18	I think it's appropriate to say "And so it
19	begins at long last." Some of you have waited years, some
20	of you waited patiently and others less so.
21	Good afternoon. I just have a few comments
22	to make then we will get right with you.
23	Some feel apprehension. Others feel a sense
24	of relief. As we embark on the stage of this Inquiry,
25	there will be some difficult questions asked, certainly

difficult questions or answers given.

If this stage of the Inquiry is to be meaningful, it is essential that we all be sensitive to the issues at hand and that no matter how charged the testimony may be at times, we must treat all of the witnesses with respect and that translates to keeping an orderly room, quiet and attentive, asking the media to respect the wishes of the witnesses and my orders dealing with confidentiality and, in that regard, I ask them to refer to the protocols that we posted.

On the administrative side, there may be some slight delays in bringing documents on the screen. There may be times when I decide to hold an in camera hearing. Those are hearings which exclude the public, where I am called upon to make decisions about confidentiality measures. There will be times when we exclude the public to determine whether or not there should be confidentiality measures or complete in camera evidence. That does not mean that the hearings are private. As you know, the parties represent all of the interests possible from alleged victims and victims to alleged perpetrators to police and community interest groups. And so the public can rest assured that as we conduct in camera hearings, that all matters are fully argued and all points of view are being considered.

23

24

25

64 FINAL OPENING STATEMENT/ DÉCLARATION D'OUVERTURE FINALE (Engelmann)

1 As well, after the hearing is completed, I 2 shall publically explain the issue and provide my reasons 3 for the ruling. In that way, the public will continue to be fully informed as to the progress the Inquiry is making. 4 5 Finally, a word to the public. This Inquiry will continue to be open and transparent. The reason for 6 7 that is simple; it is to give you, the public, full access to the facts surrounding the events touching the matters 8 9 that give rise to this Inquiry. 10 In so doing, while this is not a trial, the public is much like a jury. A jury is presented with facts 11 12 and is asked to come to a decision applying the law to the 13 evidence -- law of the evidence with the facts as they find In order to do its job properly, all juries are 14 reminded at the outset that they must keep an open mind 15 until all of the evidence is heard, until all is said and 16 done. It will be all too easy to latch on to one set of 17 18 facts in this Inquiry and make your determination. That 19 would be a grave error. We have waited long enough for 20 this Inquiry. It is imperative that we get it right. 21 Accordingly, if you wish to be part of the

Accordingly, if you wish to be part of the jury, so to speak, I charge you with the responsibility of keeping an open mind until the last witness is heard and the last submission is delivered. Then, and only then, will we be in a position to assess and come to proper

1	conclusions in this matter.
2	And with that, Mr. Engelmann, I see that our
3	witness is here and you are ready to go.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Thank you.
5	The first witness is Mr. Larry Seguin. If
6	the witness could be sworn, please?
7	LARRY SEGUIN, SWORN/ASSERMENTÉ:
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Seguin, you're here
9	as the first witness in this Inquiry on the evidentiary
10	hearings and what I want to do is just run through some
11	guidelines for you.
12	MR. L. SEGUIN: Sure.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: The first thing is that
14	I'd ask you to wait until the question is asked to give an
15	answer. If at any point in time you don't understand the
16	question, it's okay to say "I don't understand" and have
17	them repeat it. Sometimes lawyers, you know, they get lost
18	in their words and we have to straighten them out every
19	once in a while.
20	The other thing is, if you don't know the
21	answer to a question, it's okay to say that "I don't know
22	the answer". All right?
23	So if at any time you want a break or if
24	there is anything you don't understand, simply turn to me

and we can talk and iron things out.

25

1	MR. L. SEGUIN: Okay.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Do you have any questions
3	of me at this time?
4	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Keep your
6	voice up loud.
7	Mr. Engelmann, go ahead.
8	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF BY/INTERROGATOIRE EN-CHEF PAR MR.
9	ENGLEMANN:
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Thank you.
11	Mr. Seguin, I just also wanted to echo a
12	couple of comments the Commissioner made. If you can't
13	hear me or understand the question, just ask me to repeat
14	it.
15	MR. L. SEGUIN: Okay.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: And after I ask you
17	questions, some of the lawyers for some of the other
18	parties here may have some questions for you.
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: Sure.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: We're going to have a few
21	documents that I am going to ask you to look at and you'll
22	get a paper copy when I do that and you'll also have the
23	document up on the screen. So you'll have a choice if you
24	want to read it on a hard copy form or on the screen.
25	MR. L. SEGUIN: Okay.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: If you can't hear me loudly
3	enough, there is a microphone right next to you and you can
4	turn that up if you need to
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Actually, it's called a
6	speaker.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: A speaker.
8	MR. L. SEGUIN: A speaker.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes. All right.
10	So, Mr. Seguin, let me just start with some
11	preliminary questions. I understand that you're a member
12	of the Victims Group; is that correct?
13	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: And as a member of the
15	Victims Group you're represented by Mr. Lee and his firm?
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: And did you swear an
18	affidavit in support of the Victims Group application for
19	standing and funding in this Inquiry?
20	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, I did.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
22	Mr. Seguin, are you aware that this Inquiry
23	is examining how public institutions responded to
24	allegations of sexual abuse against young people in
25	Cornwall?

1	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, I am.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Now, we have a number of
3	public institutions involved in this case, but as I
4	understand your concerns and concerns you have about a
5	public institutional response, are they mostly about the
6	Cornwall Police Service?
7	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, I understand that there
9	were two incidents of sexual abuse that you reported?
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: And I understand with
12	respect to the second incident, you also have some concerns
13	about another public institution?
14	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: And that's the Ministry of
16	the Attorney General or Crown Prosecutor Office?
17	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Seguin, can you tell us
19	your date of birth and your current age?
20	MR. L. SEGUIN: October the 4^{th} , 1971 and my
21	age is 35.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: So your birthday is today?
23	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: You're 35 years of age today?
25	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Seguin, I understand
2	that either you or your mother would have reported two
3	incidents of sexual abuse that would have reported that
4	you were sexually abused as a child on two instances. Is
5	that right?
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: I'll deal with these two
8	separately, but I want to start with the first one. I just
9	want to try and confirm the date. It's my understanding
10	that the first incident in the first report of child sexual
11	abuse was in February of 1978?
12	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you recall the time of
14	year that it was when this happened?
15	MR. L. SEGUIN: It was in the wintertime.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And how old would you
17	have been then?
18	MR. L. SEGUIN: Six.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: I understand, sir, that you
20	and/or your mother reported that you were sexually abused a
21	second time in late October of 1987.
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: And at that time you would
24	just have turned 16?
25	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: So, Mr. Seguin, I'd like to
2	take you to the first incident, if I could. And I'd like
3	to show you a document which I believe is a statement that
4	you gave the police about that incident.
5	For the record, the document number in the
6	electronic database system is 736048.
7	Mr. Seguin you should have a document that
8	is two pages.
9	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: And, the Bates page number
11	for the record 7139970. It's a document that has in bold
12	print "Cornwall Police Service Statement of a Witness"?
13	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: It appears to be dated on
15	February 15 th , 2001.
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
18	And there is a signature at the bottom of
19	the first page?
20	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's the bottom
21	MR. ENGELMANN: A signature of witness?
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, that's my signature.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
24	And could you turn to the second page? Tell
25	us whose signature appears at the bottom of that page.

1	MR. L. SEGUIN: That would be my signature.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
3	Mr. Seguin, do you remember are you able
4	to tell us whether this is in your handwriting or in
5	someone else's handwriting?
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: This is in my own
7	handwriting.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
9	And this appears to be a statement that you
10	gave to the Cornwall Police Service February 15 th , 2001, at
11	or around 11:00 in the morning?
12	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you recall giving that
14	statement, sir?
15	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, I do.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: And do you recall in whose
17	presence you would have given that statement?
18	MR. L. SEGUIN: Sergeant Rick Carter.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm wondering if that could
20	be the next exhibit, Mr. Commissioner?
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, 62.
22	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-62:
23	Larry Seguin - Statement of a Witness -
24	February 15, 2001
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Seguin, this statement

72

1	that you wrote out in your own hand for the Cornwall Police
2	Service in 2001 is now just over five years old?
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: And it's referring to events
5	which took place almost 30 years go.
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: To your knowledge, if you
8	can help us here, do you know if this statement I just
9	want you to look at the first page and a half of the
10	statement for a minute. Again, you can either read the
11	hard copy or the screen. If you need the screen moved, you
12	can just ask the clerk.
13	MR. L. SEGUIN: Okay.
14	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
15	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, I recognize the
16	statement.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: So you've had an opportunity
18	to read the first page and a half or so, sir?
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, I did.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: And to your knowledge, does
21	that accurately describe what you would have told not just
22	the police when you wrote the statement in 2001, but what
23	you might have told the police officer at that time in
24	1978?
25	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: It describes both an
2	abduction and a sexual abuse.
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: And this is by a man who you
5	didn't know?
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Can you give us a sense as
8	to what time of day this might have occurred, sir?
9	MR. L. SEGUIN: Between 3:30 and 5:00 p.m.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: And how do you know that or
11	what makes you think that?
12	MR. L. SEGUIN: I know it was after school
13	and also I know I was trying to get back to my house in
14	time for my favourite show, which I know started before or
15	at 5:00 p.m.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
17	MR. L. SEGUIN: I believe it started at
18	5:00. I'm not too sure exactly.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
20	And, sir, you described being abducted or
21	taken from a place near your mother's home, the home you
22	were living in?
23	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Taken to somewhere else here
25	in the City of Cornwall?

1	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: And then returned close to
3	your mother's home?
4	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: And do you know
6	approximately when it would have been that you would have
7	returned to your mother's home?
8	MR. L. SEGUIN: It would have been
9	approximately an hour. It seemed longer at the time, but I
10	figure it would have been about that time, about an hour at
11	the most.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: And what did you do when you
13	got home?
14	MR. L. SEGUIN: I told my mother what had
15	happened. She had phoned the police.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you have some sense as to
17	how long it took the police to arrive?
18	MR. L. SEGUIN: I remember it was fairly
19	quickly that they had showed up, the police.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: So I want to ask you what
21	then happened. Do you recall if the police officer asked
22	you some questions at the scene I mean at your mother's
23	home?
24	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, I had told the officer
25	what had happened. We ended up going to the scene to try

1	and retrieve a glove that was discarded
	and retrieve a glove that was discarded.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: And then also the officer
4	took myself and my mother to the Hotel Dieu Hospital. I'm
5	not sure exactly which happened first, if we went to the
6	hospital first and then went to look for the glove or if we
7	looked for the glove first, but I think we probably would
8	have went to look for the glove first. I'm not sure
9	exactly which
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. So the police officer
11	came to the house?
12	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Was it one officer or two?
14	MR. L. SEGUIN: One.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you remember if it was a
16	man or a woman?
17	MR. L. SEGUIN: It was a man.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you remember his name or
19	number?
20	MR. L. SEGUIN: No, I don't.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And there was some
22	discussion at the house or not?
23	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, I told him what had
24	happened and
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And then he either

1	took you to the place you described as where you were
2	sexually abused?
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes. I believe now that
4	I'm thinking, I'm pretty sure it happened first. We went
5	to the scene and then we went to the hospital afterwards.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: But you remember doing both?
7	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: And you remember doing both
9	with the police officer?
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you remember if your
12	mother was there?
13	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, my mother was there.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, do you remember being
15	examined by a doctor at the hospital?
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, I do.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you remember who that
18	doctor was?
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: I was just informed of the
20	doctor, who was my family doctor, Dr. Legault. From
21	memory, I don't remember it being him.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. You know that because
23	you've looked at a report?
24	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.

1	Was your mother present during that
2	examination?
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, she was.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you know if the police
5	officer was there?
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: I believe he was.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Now, the spot that you would
8	have attended with the police officer, was that somewhere
9	in the City of Cornwall?
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you remember
12	approximately where that was?
13	MR. L. SEGUIN: It would have been down
14	Brookdale Street towards the bridge, heading towards the
15	401, although I'm not sure if it would have been Tollgate
16	Road or the road afterwards.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
18	MR. L. SEGUIN: It was one of the two
19	streets.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: And where were you living
21	then?
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: At 52 Westgate Court.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: And what is Westgate Court,
24	Mr. Seguin?
25	MR. L. SEGUIN: Westgate Court is low rental

1	units which is located close to 13 th Street, right beside
2	the Best Western.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. Now, Mr. Seguin, we
4	know from some reports that you would have attended the
5	hospital on February 17 th , 1978.
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: And do you recall that your
8	hospital attendance was the same day as the reported sexual
9	abuse?
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, it was.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: And that was apparently a
12	Friday?
13	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Can you tell us if there was
15	any follow-up by the officer later that night or sometime
16	that weekend?
17	MR. L. SEGUIN: No, there wasn't.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. Can you tell us if
19	there was any follow-up by that officer with you at any
20	time after Friday, February 17 th , 1978?
21	MR. L. SEGUIN: No, there wasn't.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you know if there was any
23	follow-up by the officer with your mother?
24	MR. L. SEGUIN: I don't believe there was.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you know if you ever saw

1	that police officer again?
2	MR. L. SEGUIN: I can't say. I don't
3	remember his face. I may have run into him afterwards on
4	an unrelated matter, but I don't believe that I ran into
5	him again.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: So after February 17 th , 1978,
7	did anyone from the Cornwall Police Service ever initiate
8	any contact with you about the abduction and sexual abuse
9	complaint that you made as a six-year old boy?
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: Are we talking before I had
11	actually seen the person again?
12	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm asking you if they ever
13	initiated the contact.
14	MR. L. SEGUIN: No, they didn't.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Now, in 1978, your statement
16	indicates some of the things you would have told them about
17	the car, the fact that there was a dog, things of that
18	nature.
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you recall if you would
21	have given them a description of the man at that time?
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: I know I had given him a
23	description verbally, but as far as them having somebody
24	come for a sketch or anything like that, that wasn't done.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. Now, this was 1978

1	now when this happened, when you reported it. Do you
2	remember if you would have provided them with a licence
3	plate number at that time?
4	MR. L. SEGUIN: At that time, no.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. Now, Mr. Seguin, did
6	something happen the following year with respect to the
7	same person that you reported as sexually abusing you?
8	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: And can you tell us briefly
10	what happened?
11	MR. L. SEGUIN: I had seen the person who
12	had sexually assaulted me and kidnapped me. I had seen the
13	car in the parking lot. I had made a mental note of the
14	licence plate and I went in and told my mother.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. Well, let me just
16	stop you there for a minute.
17	So this is in 1979?
18	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: And do you remember the
20	season or the month?
21	MR. L. SEGUIN: It would have been the
22	spring or summer.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And you say that
24	because?
25	MR. L. SEGUIN: Because I just remember we

1	were all of us playing outside and it was nice weather. So
2	I know it would have been in either the spring or the
3	summer.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. Do you remember if it
5	was a weekday or a weekend?
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: I believe it would have been
7	a weekend because a lot of us were playing outside and it
8	was early enough in the afternoon. So I believe it would
9	have been a weekend.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And you said you saw
11	this man again?
12	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
14	And do you describe this in Exhibit 62, in
15	your statement to the Cornwall Police Service in 2001?
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: And where do we find that?
18	MR. L. SEGUIN: On page 2, the last
19	paragraph from the bottom.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: And again, you would have
21	written this out?
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: So you saw the man?
24	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you see him in a house

1	or enter a house?
2	MR. L. SEGUIN: It would have been in the
3	parking lot is where I seen him.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And you saw the same
5	car again?
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
8	And did you notice the licence plate this
9	time?
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, I did.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: And did you write it down or
12	remember it?
13	MR. L. SEGUIN: I remembered it.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And what did you do
15	after you saw the man and you saw the car and you
16	remembered the licence plate?
17	MR. L. SEGUIN: I went into my house and I
18	told my mother, at which point she had phoned the police.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: And do you know again, sir,
20	about how long it might have taken the police to arrive?
21	MR. L. SEGUIN: They responded fairly
22	quickly. I don't remember waiting on them. I can't say
23	exactly how many minutes, but I know it was a fairly quick
24	response.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: And, sir, do you remember

1	did one officer show up or two officers?
2	MR. L. SEGUIN: I believe it was one
3	officer.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. Do you remember the
5	person's name?
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: No, I don't.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you remember the person's
8	gender, whether it was a man or a woman?
9	MR. L. SEGUIN: It was a man.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: And do you remember if it
11	was your mother or you who contacted the police?
12	MR. L. SEGUIN: My mother would have made
13	the call.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: And do you remember having a
15	discussion with the police officer when he showed up?
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: And you've described that in
18	summary form at least in Exhibit 62. Do you know if that's
19	all you said to the police officer that day or all that he
20	said to you?
21	MR. L. SEGUIN: What I wrote here in the
22	statement was basically a little bit simplified. What he
23	had said was he didn't say that the judge wouldn't
24	believe me. He said something to do with how the judge
25	would take the response of a seven-year old for a crime

1	that happened a year ago, so that they would not be laying
2	any charges, but if the person bothered me again, to give
3	them a call.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. Well, let's just take
5	a look at the summary that you've given. You say the
6	officer then said it was too late to lay charges.
7	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: That too long a period had
9	passed or has passed.
10	"The officer told me to stay away from
11	him and if he bothered me, to phone
12	police. The car he was driving was
13	green or blue in colour and the plate
14	number was NER 660 Ontario."
15	Do you remember does that accurately
16	describe
17	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: at least part of what
19	you told the police officer?
20	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct, yes.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: And you say that there was
22	some further discussion, sir, on top of that?
23	MR. L. SEGUIN: Just basically what I just
24	stated about how the judge would take the testimony of a
25	seven-year old for a crime that happened a year ago.

84

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And that's something
2	that the police officer said to you?
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes. I don't know if it's
4	the exact wording, but it was that was basically the
5	statement given.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And did you give the
7	police officer the licence number at that time?
8	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Now, to your knowledge, how
10	long was this interaction with the police in 1979?
11	MR. L. SEGUIN: Maybe 20 minutes.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: So did the police officer do
13	anything after you spoke to him? Did he go looking for
14	this man?
15	MR. L. SEGUIN: No, he basically left right
16	away.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Is there anything else you
18	can recall from the encounter with him?
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: With the officer? No.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you remember how either
21	you or your mother felt after that incident?
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: I know I felt basically let
23	down and I was very upset, basically developed some dislike
24	for the police because of it.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Seguin, do you know if

1	either of these officers, either the one from 1978 or the
2	one from 1979 did any follow-up with you about the incident
3	from 1978?
4	MR. L. SEGUIN: No, there was no follow-up.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: And did you ever see that
6	man again, the man that you reported as abducting and
7	abusing you?
8	MR. L. SEGUIN: After the report in '79?
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yeah.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Can you tell us
12	approximately when and in what circumstance?
13	MR. L. SEGUIN: It would have been maybe a
14	couple of weeks after. My friend and I were basically in a
15	fight, and him being a little bit bigger than I was, I kind
16	of got the worst end of the stick, but I remember this man
17	going up to my friend, Claude, and telling him to leave me
18	alone. It was a very awkward situation. I basically
19	what I interpreted from that was that he was trying to make
20	some kind of amends for what he did by, you know, by
21	protecting me from this guy kind of thing. So it was very
22	awkward.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Did he do anything to you at
24	that time?
25	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you tell the police that
2	you had seen him again?
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Why not?
5	MR. L. SEGUIN: Well, because I didn't think
6	they would do anything and also I didn't believe that there
7	was anything a crime that occurred at that time.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you know if you told your
9	mother about seeing him again?
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: I don't remember. I don't
11	believe I did.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Seguin, we've looked at
13	Exhibit 62, and it's a document that has you giving a
14	written account of what happened in 1978 and 1979 to the
15	Cornwall Police Service in 2001.
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: February. Can you tell us
18	what happens at some point between 1979 and 2001 that leads
19	to that statement?
20	MR. L. SEGUIN: Well, I had started using
21	drugs at a very young age, 10 years old. Because of the
22	assault that had happened to me, I kind of felt different
23	from other children, so I hung out with older people and
24	got involved with drugs, which became a real problem for
25	me, and I went into a treatment program. And it was

1	suggested by the counsellors that in order to maintain
2	sobriety, it would be a good idea for me to deal with my
3	childhood issues, which led me to meeting with the Cornwall
4	Police to look into this.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: So a counsellor suggested
6	this to you?
7	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: And that counsellor was with
9	what outfit or what agency?
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: It would have been the
11	Anchorage Program out of Ottawa. It is run
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. Is that a program for
13	people with drug or alcohol problems?
14	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Because of that, you
16	contacted the Cornwall Police Service?
17	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you remember, was that
19	sometime before February of 2001?
20	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you remember
22	approximately when?
23	MR. L. SEGUIN: Approximately a year and a
24	half.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay; so sometime in the

1	latter part of 1999?
2	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you remember to whom you
4	reported at the Cornwall Police?
5	MR. L. SEGUIN: Sergeant Rick Carter.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: So you reported to Sergeant
7	Carter or Staff Sergeant Carter in late '99?
8	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: And you gave a statement to
10	him in 2001?
11	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: To your knowledge, Mr.
13	Seguin, the written statement you gave that is Exhibit 62,
14	was that the first time you were asked to write a
15	statement?
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: When you first met with
18	Sergeant or Staff Sergeant Carter in late 1999, can you
19	tell us what happened?
20	MR. L. SEGUIN: Well, I met with Rick
21	Carter, basically told him what had happened and he told me
22	he was going to look into it.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you tell him about the
24	incident in 1978?
25	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you tell him about the
2	follow-up in 1979?
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you describe the vehicle
5	or the dog or other issues?
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: What about the licence plate
8	number?
9	MR. L. SEGUIN: I believe I would have given
10	him that as well.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: So you remembered the
12	licence plate number
13	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: 20 years later?
15	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct. I still
16	remember it.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: You still remember it today?
18	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Why is that?
20	MR. L. SEGUIN: Just it's the first plate
21	number I ever remembered, and it just stayed in my head my
22	whole lifetime and I don't believe I'll ever forget it.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you tell that to
24	Sergeant or Staff Sergeant Carter the first time you met
25	him in 1999?

1	MR. L. SEGUIN: I'm sure I did.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Now, between sometime in
3	late '99 and the statement in February of 2001, do you know
4	if you had any other meetings with Staff Sergeant Carter or
5	anybody from the Cornwall Police?
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: There might have been a few
7	phone calls; called to check with him to see if there was
8	anything happening with the case. I remember at one point
9	I was told he was having a hard time getting the medical
10	records.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And do you remember
12	if that was in relation to when you first saw him in '99
13	and when you gave the statement in 2001, do you remember if
14	it was closer to one end or the other with the medical
15	record?
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: I really couldn't say for
17	sure. I just know at one point, I was kind of frustrated
18	with what was happening and once he told me that once he
19	told me he was having a hard time getting the medical
20	records, I went down to the Hotel Dieu Hospital and
21	retrieved the records for him.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. Let me just stop you
23	there for a minute.
24	MR. L. SEGUIN: Okay.
25	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Seguin, I am just going
2	to show you a document, counsel document number 736052,
3	Bates page number 7139977 and 9978. Mr. Seguin, do you
4	have the two-page document in front of you?
5	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, I do.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: And do you recall if this is
7	the document that you would have obtained from the Cornwall
8	Hotel Dieu Hospital?
9	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct. It is.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: I note it has on the front
11	page a reference to your name?
12	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: The date, February 17 th , '78.
14	Your age is six. And it says something about an assault.
15	I am looking at the top right corner.
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: Okay.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: The name of the doctor,
18	patient's doctor attending, Dr. Legault?
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: You were brought in by your
21	mother and there's a reference to a police constable.
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: And it says "Sergeant"
24	someone.
25	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: And that doesn't help you
2	with the person's name?
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And there's a
5	brief handwritten description of an incident?
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: And that's not your
8	handwriting?
9	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: If that could be Exhibit 63
11	Mr. Commissioner?
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Exhibit
13	number 63.
14	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO P-63:
15	Two-page document from the Cornwall Hotel
16	Dieu Hospital, dated February 17, 1978
17	MR. ENGELMANN: So Staff Sergeant Carter
18	indicated to you he was having trouble getting a medical
19	record?
20	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: You went to the Hotel Dieu
22	Hospital?
23	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: You obtained Exhibit 63?
25	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: What did you do with it?
2	MR. L. SEGUIN: I brought it down to
3	Sergeant Carter.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
5	And you are not sure right now whether that
6	was shortly after you first met with Staff Sergeant Carter,
7	sometime in '99, sometime in 2000?
8	MR. L. SEGUIN: I believe it would have been
9	sometime close to the initial contact with Sergeant Carter
10	because of the fact that I was kind of at that point,
11	kind of anxious to get things going with this so I can put
12	it behind me, and once there was once he had told me
13	that he could not find the document, I basically took it
14	upon myself to go down and get it.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. Now, I understand
16	that after that you didn't have a lot of contact with Staff
17	Sergeant Carter until you gave the statement?
18	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: And do you know if you had
20	one, two, three contacts, are you able to tell us, over the
21	next year or so?
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: Well, basically, the contact
23	number he was given is my mother. He had her phone number.
24	Her address has been the same for the past 15 years. She's
25	still at that address now.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: So you gave them that
2	contact information?
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: And do you know on
5	approximately how many occasions you would have seen Staff
6	Sergeant Carter during that period of time? I'm thinking
7	the year 2000 up until 2001.
8	MR. L. SEGUIN: Possibly three different
9	occasions.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Seguin did you at some
11	time see someone or talk to someone about the delay in your
12	investigation?
13	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: And who did you see or talk
15	to?
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: I went down to the MPP's
17	office. I had spoken with somebody there about it. They
18	had suggested to me that I put it in writing to them.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. Is the MPP a fellow
20	by the name or was then a fellow by the name of John
21	Cleary?
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
24	I am just going to show you a document,
25	counsel document number 737804, Bates page 7158932.

1	Mr. Seguin, I would like you to look at the
2	second page of the document. Can you tell us whose
3	signature appears?
4	MR. L. SEGUIN: Mine.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Can you tell us what this
6	document is?
7	MR. L. SEGUIN: It is a letter to the
8	Legislative Assembly, John Cleary.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: He had an office here in
10	Cornwall?
11	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct, on Montreal
12	Road.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: And you had gone to that
14	office beforehand and were asked to put something in
15	writing?
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Commissioner, if this
18	could be Exhibit 64?
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Thank you.
20	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO P-64:
21	Two-page letter written by Mr. L.
22	Seguin to Mr. John Cleary of the
23	Legislative Assembly, dated January 14,
24	2001
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Seguin, if you could

1	have a brief look at that letter. It appears to have been
2	received it's dated January 14, 2001, received by Mr.
3	Cleary's office January $17^{ m th}$ and then by the Cornwall Police
4	Service on February 7 th , 2001?
5	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Can you tell us why you
7	wrote that letter, sir?
8	MR. L. SEGUIN: I wanted this to be looked
9	into and put behind me. There was never any
10	acknowledgement by the public that this had ever even
11	happened. Also, I was very dissatisfied with the response
12	of the Cornwall Police in handling this matter.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Are you talking about the
14	response in 2000 or the response earlier or both?
15	MR. L. SEGUIN: I'm talking about the
16	response in 1978; also in 1999, when I had contacted Rick
17	Carter originally.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: So in this letter, you
19	describe a little bit about what happened in '78 and '79?
20	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: What else are you describing
22	for Mr. Cleary?
23	MR. L. SEGUIN: Well, I mean, do you want me
24	to read the letter?
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Or just summarize it, if you

1	could.
2	MR. L. SEGUIN: Basically, I told him I
3	found the person a year later and I was told by the police
4	to stay away from him, that it was too late to lay charges.
5	This was very devastating to me as a child and was very
6	detrimental to my upbringing. Basically, I told him that I
7	couldn't understand why the officer had said that to me,
8	that it was too late to lay a charge.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: In 1979?
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
11	I expressed that, when I look back now, it
12	seems that the police were going out of their way to keep
13	this quiet. I talked about how devastating this could be
14	for a child and also without having nobody acknowledging
15	it.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: So you were this is now
17	January 14, 2001?
18	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: You're still getting some
20	treatment at this time?
21	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, I am.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Are you still on some drug
23	or substance abuse program?
24	MR. L. SEGUIN: I am not in a drug or
25	substance abuse program right now. I am currently seeing

1	Dr. Caley, dealing with counselling and also some family
2	counselling as well.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. I'm sorry, I meant in
4	2001, sir. Sorry, my question wasn't clear.
5	In 2001, when you wrote this, were you
6	getting some counselling for either drug or alcohol abuse
7	or for the child sexual abuse that you reported?
8	MR. L. SEGUIN: I believe that I was
9	involved at some point with the Men's Project, but as far
10	as the actual date that was, I can't remember when.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
12	MR. L. SEGUIN: If it was before I wrote
13	this letter or after.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
15	I'm looking at the bottom of the first page
16	and you say:
17	"I went to the Hotel Dieu Hospital,
18	retrieved the records, delivered them
19	to him in person."
20	You're referring to Staff Sergeant Carter?
21	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: "I was told by Carter that
23	he would look into it and contact the
24	investigating officer of Project
25	Truth."

1	MR. L. SEGUIN: M'hm.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you ever, to your
3	knowledge, deal with Project Truth? Do you remember?
4	MR. L. SEGUIN: I don't believe I did, but I
5	don't remember.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
7	MR. L. SEGUIN: I don't think I called I
8	talked to anybody from Project Truth. I believe that's the
9	OPP that was handling that?
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
11	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes. I don't remember if I
12	spoke with anybody. Or I may have briefly on the phone,
13	may have talked to somebody on the phone. He may have
14	referred me to somebody else, but I don't recall.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: I don't believe I did.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Then you say:
18	"After more time, like 20 years was not
19	enough, I was instructed to see Tom
20	Racine from the Cornwall Police. I did
21	so and I was told that this case was
22	all he was working on all week."
23	So you met with someone by the name of Tom
24	Racine from the Cornwall Police?
25	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: And that was before January
2	14 th , 2001?
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: "Carter and Racine were to
5	set up some sort of photo line up.
6	Carter and Racine both had my mother's
7	phone number and address and they have
8	failed to contact us. I will now ask
9	the questions I desperately need
10	answers to so I can start the healing
11	process."
12	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: So you asked a number of
14	questions.
15	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: And that's what we see on
17	the next page?
18	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: What do you mean in question
20	5 when you say:
21	"Why was this crime not acknowledged by
22	anyone, including the public?"
23	What did you mean by that?
24	MR. L. SEGUIN: Well, whenever you have
25	somebody who abducts a child and sexually assaults him, the

1	crime is reported to the Cornwall Police. You would think
2	that the police would issue some kind of alert for the
3	public to be on the lookout for a predator abducting
4	children or that they were even investigating a sexual
5	assault on a child and a kidnapping. The media wasn't told
6	about this.
7	And also in 2001 or even in 1999 when Rick
8	Carter started allegedly started investigating this,
9	there wasn't anything printed that they were, you know,
10	they were investigating a crime that had happened, you
11	know, a historical crime. Like, there was no
12	acknowledgement ever by the public that this crime had even
13	happened and that was kind of upsetting because you see
14	people who get charged for speeding, I seen in the paper,
15	doing 134 kilometres on the 401, you know, and they print
16	that in the paper. Why wasn't this in the paper at all?
17	Why wasn't the public notified?
18	MR. ENGELMANN: So that's what you're
19	talking about in that large paragraph underneath the
20	questions?
21	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Then you had that sixth
23	question:
24	"Why would police release news about a
25	speeder and not disclose to the public

1	that they were investigating a sexual
2	assault crime?"
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, that's correct.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Seguin, one of your
5	questions talks about Project Truth.
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: M'hm.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: To your knowledge, was it
8	going on either in 1999, 2000, 2001 when you were dealing
9	with the Cornwall Police?
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: I believe it must have
11	because I didn't put it in here, in the letter, so I think
12	it might have been actually started.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: You also say in your letter:
14	"I cannot remember my eleventh
15	birthday, which is normal for a man my
16	age, but I can remember when I'm six
17	like it was yesterday, including the
18	suspect's licence plate number."
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: So Mr. Seguin, do you recall
21	this is now mid-February, 2001 do you hear from Staff
22	Sergeant Carter at some point after this letter?
23	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you remember when that
25	would have been, approximately?

1	MR. L. SEGUIN: A couple well, I'm not
2	sure when the initial contact with him was. I believe it
3	would've been basically the date of the statement.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. So February 15 th ?
5	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: So he had you come in and
7	give a written statement about what happened in 1978 and
8	'79 on February 15 th , 2001?
9	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: So about a month after you
11	write this letter?
12	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: And after you write the
14	statement, do you recall what happens after that?
15	MR. L. SEGUIN: I was called a short time
16	afterwards within a week or two weeks, maybe a little bit
17	longer, maybe two and a half weeks, with results.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. What do you mean by
19	results? What did they do?
20	MR. L. SEGUIN: Well, he was able to find
21	the lady that this person was living with in Westgate, who
22	was Mrs. White. She was up in Ottawa and he had retrieved
23	some photos from her. He showed me a picture of the
24	person.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Were you able to identify

1	the man?
2	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
4	Do you know how they were able to get that
5	information? Did they tell you?
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: I think Sergeant Carter had
7	told me that he had located Mrs. White's son who was in the
8	federal institution.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: And that was how he was able
11	to find his mother.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you know what, if any,
13	help the licence plate number was to them?
14	MR. L. SEGUIN: Well, he was able to
15	retrieve the man's name from the licence plate number and I
16	believe there would've been a photo with that.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. Do you know
18	MR. L. SEGUIN: As far as helping to find
19	that person, the licence plate, I'm not too sure, but I
20	know that he at least got the person's name out of it.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
22	Were you told then who the person was?
23	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: And were you told if that
25	person was dead or alive?

1	MR. L. SEGUIN: I was told he was deceased.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: And that was sometime
3	shortly after mid-February of 2001?
4	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Did they tell you when this
6	man died?
7	MR. L. SEGUIN: I don't recall.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: And was there anything else
9	done after that?
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: No, although Sergeant Carter
11	assisted me in the claim to the Criminal Injuries Board.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. The Criminal Injuries
13	Compensation Board?
14	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you remember when that
16	was, Mr. Seguin?
17	MR. L. SEGUIN: Offhand, I don't.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you remember if the claim
19	was successful or not?
20	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, it was.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: So you got some compensation
22	for the sexual abuse you reported as a six-year-old child?
23	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: My understanding is that
25	this decision awarding you some compensation was in 2005?

1	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Is that right?
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: So that would be 27 years
5	after the fact?
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Seguin, I want to ask
8	you a few questions now about a second incident when you
9	reported other child sexual abuse. At this point you had
10	just turned 16.
11	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: As I understand it, this is
13	something that occurred on October 30 th , 1987.
14	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: And you reported this to the
16	Cornwall Police Service?
17	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you know the person who
19	sexually and physically abused you at that time?
20	MR. L. SEGUIN: I had just basically met him
21	that night. He was a friend of my mother's. Rather, it
22	was my mother's friend's friend.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: And I understand, sir, that
24	as a result of both physical and sexual abuse, you went to
25	the Cornwall General Hospital?

1	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: And it was there that the
3	Cornwall Police came to interview you?
4	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you know, sir, if anyone,
6	either the police or the hospital, would've called your
7	mother that evening to tell her you were at the hospital?
8	MR. L. SEGUIN: I know the police were
9	phoned by the nurses basically immediately after I got
10	there. I'm not too sure how who phoned my mom. I
11	believe they would've phoned my mother.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you know if it was that
13	day or the next day?
14	MR. L. SEGUIN: I don't remember.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. Did you have to stay
16	in the hospital?
17	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: And you had injuries, as I
19	understand it?
20	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: To your face?
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, the face and eyes.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: I'd like to show you a
24	document, sir, and I'll just be a moment.
25	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Seguin, do you have
2	and there should be a document number on the upper right-
3	hand column, 734010?
4	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Counsel, that's Bates page
6	7134086. That appears to be another form from the Cornwall
7	Police Force Statement of Witness?
8	Mr. Seguin, is there a signature at the
9	bottom of the first page that you can identify?
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's my signature.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: And we also have a signature
12	on the second page?
13	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, my signature as well.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: And is that your handwriting
15	or someone else's handwriting?
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: Somebody else's.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: So you were in the hospital
18	on October 30 th ?
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: And it appears to be a
21	legible signature for the police officer, Gary Leger?
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you remember Constable or
24	Sergeant Leger?
25	MR. L. SEGUIN: Not particularly. I

1	remember Constable Racine was there.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you remember when you
3	would've met with Constable Racine, whether it was that
4	night or the next day or shortly thereafter?
5	MR. L. SEGUIN: I can't recall. I just
6	remember I remember that the officer who showed up was
7	somebody familiar to me.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And that's Constable
9	Racine?
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
12	So if you could just take a look at this
13	statement; are you able to read it, sir?
14	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
15	MR. ENGELMANN: This is apparently an oral
16	statement you gave to a police officer on October $30^{\rm th}$,
17	1987?
18	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: And he recorded it?
20	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, he had written it down.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And I don't know if
22	you're able to tell us this. I know it's a long time ago,
23	19 years. Does it, to the best of your knowledge, describe
24	what you would've told the police officer about what
25	happened that day?

1	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, that's correct.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm wondering if that could
3	be the next exhibit?
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Exhibit 65?
5	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO P-65:
6	Larry Seguin - Statement of Witness -
7	October 30 th , 1987
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Seguin, I'd like to show
9	you another document. It's document number 734009, Bates
10	page 7134083.
11	Sir, is that your signature at the bottom of
12	the first page?
13	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Likewise on the bottom of
15	the second and third pages?
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: This appears to be a
18	statement that you gave to Constable Racine?
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Is this is your handwriting
21	or in his?
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: His.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And is it again
24	describing physical and sexual abuse to you on October $30^{\rm th}$,
25	1987?

1	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: If that could be the next
3	exhibit?
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, number 66.
5	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-66:
6	Larry Seguin - Statement of Witness -
7	October 31, 1987
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Were you still in the
9	hospital on October 31 st ?
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Seguin, the address
12	that's given there, is that your own address at that time
13	or were you living with your mother?
14	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
15	MR. ENGELMANN: It indicates, I believe,
16	that there was no telephone at that time?
17	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you know if you continued
19	to live in that home for some time after October 1987?
20	MR. L. SEGUIN: I know we weren't living
21	there too long. That building actually eventually burned
22	down. We weren't living there at the time though.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you recall if you
24	continued to live there for the remainder of 1987?
25	MR. L. SEGUIN: I don't remember moving in

1	the winter, so I'm sure I did.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. Were you a resident
3	of the City of Cornwall in 1988, to your knowledge?
4	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Seguin, I want to ask
6	you, after being hospitalized and complaining about
7	physical and sexual assault to two officers of the Cornwall
8	Police Service on October $30^{\rm th}$ and October $31^{\rm st}$, 1987 , can
9	you tell us when either of these officers would have
10	followed up with you next about this incident?
11	MR. L. SEGUIN: There was no follow-up.
12	I've never seen them in relation to this after seeing them
13	at the hospital.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: What about another officer
15	from the Cornwall Police Service?
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: No one?
18	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: These were both male
20	officers?
21	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you know, Mr. Seguin,
23	after this you gave these two statements, you knew this
24	man? You had met this man who did this to you
25	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: that day?
2	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: And you knew his name?
4	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: And did you find out what
6	happened to these did you find out if there were charges
7	laid and what happened to them?
8	MR. L. SEGUIN: I knew he was arrested, but
9	I only heard through word on the street. I don't know
10	exactly the sentence he got out of it and I heard he got
11	three months, but I don't know exactly what he got for
12	that. I would like to say for sure other than a rumour I
13	heard.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Were you ever called by
15	anybody from the Crown Prosecutor's Office?
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Were you ever called by
18	anybody about this incident, to the best of your knowledge?
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Were you ever asked to fill
21	out a Victim Impact Statement or anything of that nature?
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Were you ever offered any
24	victim's assistance or support?
25	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you ever have any say in
2	what this individual got by way of a sentence?
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you ever attend court to
5	testify in his case?
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Seguin, you've described
8	for us two incidents of abuse, the first one being child
9	sexual abuse and the second one, looking at your statement,
10	indicates a physical abuse, abuse with a weapon an
11	assault with a weapon and a sexual act.
12	Can you tell us when, if ever, you received
13	any form of victim's assistance from a police force or some
14	other institution in our criminal justice system?
15	MR. L. SEGUIN: I was offered assistance by
16	Sergeant Carter in regards to help with the Criminal
17	Injuries Compensation Board, as well as I believe he had
18	mentioned something about the Men's Project, at which point
19	I had told him that I was already involved with the Men's
20	Project.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. And that assistance
22	you received from Staff Sergeant Carter was after 2001 or
23	later in 2001?
24	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, that was basically upon
25	the completion of his investigation.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: And you said you had had
2	some help from the Men's Project before then.
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: M'hm.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you remember how you got
5	in touch with them or who might have told you about them?
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: I remember initially I was -
7	- again through the Anchorage Program I had no, that's
8	not correct. It would have been here in Cornwall when I
9	first I really can't say for sure who referred me to the
10	Men's Project. I just don't remember at this point.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Seguin, can you describe
12	for us the impact these incidents had on you and, if you
13	are able to, the impact, if any, the follow-up or lack of
14	follow-up by authorities with respect to them had on you?
15	MR. L. SEGUIN: Well, the crime itself had
16	basically because that's what we're talking about, the
17	crime and the response?
18	MR. ENGELMANN: M'hm.
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: The crime itself basically
20	led me into like I had mentioned earlier, I kind of felt
21	different than the other kids and hung out with older
22	people, got myself into using drugs basically to erase
23	to get rid of the pain I was feeling emotionally, which
24	kind of led me into the wrong path of life.
25	The response of the police was basically a

1	shock to myself. I was I felt betrayed and hurt. The
2	show that I was on my way home to was basically about
3	firemen and police helping people out and stuff like that
4	and that's the way I seen them at that age, and after the
5	second in 1979, when I basically found the person and
6	the police failed to lay a charge, it kind of left me with
7	I guess you can say with some hate towards them because
8	they didn't help me. They didn't do anything to help me
9	out, to find this person, to get him, to arrest him.
10	Also, just basically different aspects of my
11	life was involved. Communication, I had a problem with
12	that even with my family. Changing my own child's diapers
13	kind of felt awkward because of what had happened to me. I
14	don't know what else to say. Basically, my life could have
15	been a lot different than what it is today.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Are you still getting are
17	you still going for counseling as a result of either the
18	child sexual abuse or some of the impact in
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, I am.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: You mentioned you're seeing
21	Dr. Caley?
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: He's a psychologist here in
24	Cornwall?
25	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Seguin, have you, before
2	today, ever spoken about being a victim of child sexual
3	abuse?
4	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Publicly?
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: Publicly, no.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: I understand, sir, that
8	sometime in the last few years you have spoken though about
9	substance abuse or drug abuse?
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Can you tell us how that
12	came about?
13	MR. L. SEGUIN: I had upon completing
14	treatment for substance abuse, I kind of wanted to I
15	didn't want to have that hate I had anymore for police and
16	also I felt bad for some things that I had done myself to
17	the community because of my drug use that took me into
18	crimes, shoplifting and property crimes. I worked with the
19	Cornwall Police just doing speeches at high schools here in
20	Cornwall about the effects of drug use. I worked with the
21	RCMP in Ottawa, doing speeches at children centres and also
22	done a conference with the Party Smart Program in Ottawa.
23	The reason being was for myself it was to help me heal and
24	also to give back to the community and to try and get rid
25	of the hatred I had towards the police. I kind of wanted

1	to see if try working with them to help children out.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Has that helped to some
3	extent?
4	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, it has.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Did Staff Sergeant Carter's
6	help more recently with the Criminal Injuries Compensation
7	Board help as well?
8	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Seguin, you know why
10	we're here?
11	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: We're here to look into how
13	public institutions have responded to allegations of child
14	sexual abuse, how they should respond to this type of
15	abuse. I'm just wondering, as a witness here and as
16	someone who has reported two incidents, child sexual abuse
17	and one of physical assault, if you have any
18	recommendations for us about how public institutions should
19	deal with victims and alleged victims of child sexual
20	abuse? Do you have any thoughts on that, sir, any thoughts
21	you want to leave with us?
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: Sure. Being a victim of
23	sexual assault, I had the opportunity to speak with other
24	victims and I know from experience sometimes children may
25	feel uncomfortable speaking with a certain gender. I think

1	whenever police respond, they should have a woman and a man
2	present so that the witness can determine who he would feel
3	more comfortable speaking with about what had happened.
4	Also, I think that the victim should always
5	be involved in the sentencing phase or at least the court
6	procedures.
7	There's something else I wrote down for you
8	too. And involving the sexual assault I believe if any
9	crime is going to be reported in the newspaper, I think
10	that definitely a sexual assault crime should be reported
11	to the news to the public. That's another thing I
12	thought could also help to catch the perpetrator as well,
13	if the public are aware that somebody is out there doing
14	this to somebody.
15	In my own case back in 1978, I think for
16	sure that there should have been a warning to the public
17	that there's a man abducting children and sexually
18	assaulting them, you know, be on the lookout, that kind of
19	thing. That would be helpful for the community as well.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: You've talked about involved
21	in the court process or in sentencing. How important is
22	follow-up to you, some kind of contact?
23	MR. L. SEGUIN: Well, I know that when I found out second-
24	handedly from word on the street that this person received a
25	three-month sentence I was very devastated and hurt by that. I

1 think the victim should be at least aware of what's happening

121

- 2 with the court. I mean, if they want to make a deal, a plea
- 3 bargain so that the witness basically isn't needed in court to
- 4 testify, they should at least notify the person the day of
- 5 sentencing, so that they can be there and put in their own
- 6 they can add something to, you know, to ensure they get a proper
- 7 sentence.
- 8 MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Seguin, is there
- 9 anything else you wish to add before answering questions of
- 10 others?
- 11 MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
- 12 MR. ENGELMANN: I want to thank you very
- much for coming.
- 14 MR. L. SEGUIN: Thank you.
- 15 MR. ENGELMANN: I think we might take a
- 16 break and then we're just going to figure out -- those
- 17 lawyers who wish to ask you questions will identify
- 18 themselves. They'll tell you who they represent, and then
- 19 they may have some questions for you and there may be a few
- documents for you to look at.
- 21 MR. L. SEGUIN: Okay.
- MR. ENGELMANN: All right?
- 23 THE COMMISSIONER: Let's take the afternoon
- 24 break. We will be back in 15 minutes.
- 25 THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre;

1	veuillez vous lever.
2	The hearing will reconvene at 3:05 p.m.
3	Upon recessing at 2:48 p.m./
4	L'audience est suspendue à 14h48
5	Upon resuming at 3:12 p.m./
6	L'audience est reprise à 15h12
7	THE REGISTRAR: This session of the Cornwall
8	Public Inquiry is now in session. Please be seated.
9	LARRY SEGUIN, Resumed/Sous le même serment:
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Commissioner, just
11	before parties start their cross-examination, there was a
12	question that I wanted to ask Mr. Seguin, and I didn't have
13	an opportunity to or I simply forgot. I wanted to do that.
14	* EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF BY/INTERROGATOIRE EN-CHEF PAR MR.
15	<pre>ENGELMANN (cont'd/suite):</pre>
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Seguin, I just wanted to
17	ask you, you've indicated reporting allegations of child
18	sexual abuse on two occasions
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: when you were 6 and when
21	you were 16, and I'm wondering if you ever spoke with Perry
22	Dunlop or anyone associated with him, his wife or any of
23	his friends with respect to these allegations of child
24	sexual abuse?
25	MR. L. SEGUIN: No, I did not.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
2	Mr. Commissioner, the order for cross-
3	examination will be similar to the order we've had before.
4	I understand it, Ms. McIntosh will go second last and Mr.
5	Manderville will go last.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: So if you could just keep
8	that in mind for your sheet.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: I'll try.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Thank you.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
12	So Mr. Wardle.
13	MR. WARDLE: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.
14	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR.
15	WARDLE:
16	MR. WARDLE: Mr. Seguin, my name is Peter
17	Wardle and I am counsel for the community group Citizens
18	for Community Renewal.
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: Hi.
20	MR. WARDLE: I would like to start, if I
21	might, by just taking you back to Exhibit 62. That's the
22	statement you gave in February 2001, Mr. Seguin?
23	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
24	MR. WARDLE: And I want to just take you, if
25	I can, to the second page of the statement. You told us

1	before the break about the incidents of abuse which took
2	place in 1978 and then you told us about seeing the man
3	again and seeing the car the following year in 1979, as I
4	understand it.
5	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
6	MR. WARDLE: And now this, of course, is the
7	statement that you gave the Cornwall Police many years
8	later, but on the second page of the statement, you
9	describe in the last paragraph seeing the man again in
10	1979. Do you see that? This is the part that starts
11	"Approximately a year later"?
12	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
13	MR. WARDLE: And so I take it from what is
14	in your statement that and I'm just going to quote, it
15	says:
16	"Approximately a year later, this
17	person had started staying in Westgate
18	where I was living."
19	And I just want to pause there. You and
20	your mother, as I understand it, were on Westgate in 1978
21	and 1979, correct?
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's right.
23	MR. WARDLE: So now, a year after the
24	initial events, you are seeing the man and the car in the
25	same area where you are living.

1	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
2	MR. WARDLE: Is that correct?
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
4	MR. WARDLE: And would it be fair to say
5	that that was of great concern to you?
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
7	MR. WARDLE: In fact, would it be fair to
8	say that you were afraid?
9	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
10	MR. WARDLE: And now, as I understand it,
11	the police were called on this occasion, and this is when
12	you reported that the man was in the neighbourhood and you
13	reported the car, correct?
14	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, that's correct.
15	MR. WARDLE: Okay. And as I understood your
16	evidence before the break, the police officer said to you -
17	- and I'm just going to quote what I think you said prior
18	to the break, and just tell me if I've got this correctly -
19	- "How would the judge take the word of a seven year old
20	for something that happened a year ago, but if he bothers
21	you again, please call us." Something like that?
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
23	MR. WARDLE: Is that right?
24	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
25	MR. WARDLE: And is that how you remember

1	it?
2	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
3	MR. WARDLE: Okay. And I just want to pause
4	for a minute and just go back to the first part of this.
5	"How would the judge take the word of a seven year old for
6	something that happened a year ago".
7	And can I just ask you, Mr. Seguin, thinking
8	back, how did that make you feel at the time?
9	MR. L. SEGUIN: Well, I felt betrayed. I
10	felt like I wasn't worth their time basically.
11	MR. WARDLE: And would it also be correct
12	that you felt that you weren't being believed?
13	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's a hard question. I
14	really don't remember. I really can't honestly answer
15	that.
16	MR. WARDLE: That's fine.
17	Can we now go forward to 2001, to the time
18	you gave your statement. And first of all, as I understand
19	it, and I'm just going to follow the sequence of events
20	here, you come forward in late 1999 and you give some
21	information to Sergeant Carter, correct?
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, that's correct.
23	MR. WARDLE: And you have some interaction
24	with Sergeant Carter over the next period of a little over
25	a year, correct?

1	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
2	MR. WARDLE: And then you become
3	dissatisfied with what's taking place and you write the
4	letter to the MPP, and that's in early 2001.
5	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
6	MR. WARDLE: And then things start to move
7	and you come in and give the formal statement that we're
8	looking at, correct?
9	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
10	MR. WARDLE: And within a short period after
11	that time, Sergeant Carter is able to show you a photograph
12	and you made an identification from the photograph?
13	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
14	MR. WARDLE: And do I understand, sir, from
15	the documents I've read that that was a very emotional
16	occasion for you?
17	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
18	MR. WARDLE: And is it also fair to say that
19	that was, looking back, an important event that you were
20	able to do that? That you were able to finally identify a
21	photograph of this individual?
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
23	MR. WARDLE: All right.
24	Now, I want to just take you then, if I can,

1	exhibit. Sorry, I don't have the exhibit number, but it's
2	_
3	THE REGISTRAR: Exhibit 64.
4	MR. WARDLE: It's Exhibit 64.
5	If we could just turn that up for a moment?
6	You wrote that letter in mid-January 2001 really out of
7	frustration, sir?
8	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
9	MR. WARDLE: Okay. Now, I want to show you
10	a document that I don't think you have seen, and that is
11	document 737803. If we can turn that up on the screen?
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Because we are using the
13	real thing, there's some slowdowns, I think. The real
14	data.
15	MR. WARDLE: I in fact have hard copies, but
16	I hate to even suggest that we use them, but if that would
17	help speed it up
18	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
19	MR. WARDLE: I believe the easiest route,
20	Mr. Commissioner, may be for me to hand out my hard copies.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Engelmann?
22	MR. ENGELMANN: That's fine.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Just out of concern, is
24	there anything in those documents that when you were
25	talking about redactions and that kind of thing

128

1	MR. ENGELMANN: No, I had communication with
2	Mr. Wardle earlier and there's no problem.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
4	So this would be Exhibit Number I'm
5	sorry?
6	THE REGISTRAR: Exhibit 67.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Sixty seven (67). Thank
8	you.
9	EXHIBIT NO./Pièce No 67:
10	Document number 737803; Letter from Mr.
11	Cleary to the Chief of Police of the
12	Cornwall Police Services forwarding Mr.
13	Seguin's letter.
14	MR. WARDLE: Now, Mr. Seguin, have you ever
15	seen this letter before?
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
17	MR. WARDLE: I would like you just to read
18	it for a minute.
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: Okay.
20	MR. WARDLE: And you will see in the letter
21	that Mr. Cleary is forwarding to the Chief of Police of the
22	Cornwall Police Services your letter.
23	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
24	MR. WARDLE: And the letter starts by
25	saying:

1	"Just recently, I had the opportunity
2	to meet with a constituent of mine, Mr.
3	Larry Seguin, of Cornwall over a matter
4	of great concern."
5	Do you recall meeting with Mr. Cleary?
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, I do.
7	MR. WARDLE: And then you will see in the
8	second paragraph, Mr. Cleary says:
9	"Mr. Repa, I would appreciate your
10	taking the time to review the issues
11	that Mr. Seguin has raised in his
12	letter and offering any assistance or
13	clarification deemed appropriate at
14	this time."
15	Do you see that?
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
17	MR. WARDLE: Now, I am now going to show you
18	another document, and this is 737801. Again, I think it is
19	going to be easier for me to simply hand up we've got
20	hard copies.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: So that's Exhibit No. 68.
22	MR. WARDLE: Thank you.
23	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No 68:
24	Document number 737801; internal Cornwall
25	Police Service Memo from the Chief to the

1	Deputy Chief dated February 7, 2001
2	MR. WARDLE: So we are just following what
3	is a little trail here, Mr. Seguin.
4	Now, this document we are looking at is an
5	internal Cornwall Police Service Memo from the Chief to the
6	Deputy Chief. Do you see that?
7	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
8	MR. WARDLE: And it has "Subject: Mr. Larry
9	Seguin; Date: February 7, 2001."
10	"Would you please ensure that
11	allegations as stated in the letter by
12	Mr. Seguin are investigated."
13	And then in handwriting, it has below
14	"Assigned by D/C to Staff Sergeant Carter".
15	Do you see that?
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
17	MR. WARDLE: And then finally, the last
18	letter I want to refer to, or the last document I want to
19	refer to is 737806.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. That will be
21	Exhibit No. 69.
22	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No 69:
23	Document number 737806; internal Cornwall
24	Police Service correspondence from the
25	Deputy Chief to S/Sgt. Carter dated February

1	8, 2001
2	MR. WARDLE: And now, Mr. Seguin, the
3	document we have in front of us is a memo dated February
4	8th. This is also internal Cornwall Police Service
5	correspondence
6	It's from the Deputy Chief to Staff
7	Sergeant. It says "Cater" but I believe it's "Carter" if
8	you look at the first paragraph.
9	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
10	MR. WARDLE: And you'll see the contents, it
11	says:
12	"Staff Sergeant Carter, please refer to
13	the attached letter which was submitted
14	to the Cornwall Community Police
15	Services Board. From various comments
16	it appears that there has been work
17	done on this case."
18	And then below it says:
19	"Please ensure that all of the
20	questions brought our"
21	I think it's intended to be "out".
22	"by Mr. Seguin are addressed.
23	Please forward me a response with a
24	synopsis of what has been done by
25	February 15 in the morning. We will

1	need to ensure that a copy of the
2	report and investigations are all in
3	order."
4	Do you see that?
5	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
6	MR. WARDLE: Now again, these are documents
7	you have never seen before, I take it?
8	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
9	MR. WARDLE: But just picking up the date on
10	this document, February 15 th , of course we know that
11	February 15^{th} is the date that you came in and gave your
12	formal statement.
13	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
14	MR. WARDLE: So just looking at those
15	documents, going back to your meeting with Mr. Cleary, your
15 16	documents, going back to your meeting with Mr. Cleary, your letter to Mr. Cleary and then the correspondence that seems
16	letter to Mr. Cleary and then the correspondence that seems
16 17	letter to Mr. Cleary and then the correspondence that seems to follow, it seems pretty clear to me that it was your
16 17 18	letter to Mr. Cleary and then the correspondence that seems to follow, it seems pretty clear to me that it was your letter that instigated, shall we say, a heightened level of
16 17 18 19	letter to Mr. Cleary and then the correspondence that seems to follow, it seems pretty clear to me that it was your letter that instigated, shall we say, a heightened level of investigation in February 2001.
16 17 18 19 20	letter to Mr. Cleary and then the correspondence that seems to follow, it seems pretty clear to me that it was your letter that instigated, shall we say, a heightened level of investigation in February 2001. MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
16 17 18 19 20 21	letter to Mr. Cleary and then the correspondence that seems to follow, it seems pretty clear to me that it was your letter that instigated, shall we say, a heightened level of investigation in February 2001. MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct. MR. WARDLE: And it was as a result of that
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	letter to Mr. Cleary and then the correspondence that seems to follow, it seems pretty clear to me that it was your letter that instigated, shall we say, a heightened level of investigation in February 2001. MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct. MR. WARDLE: And it was as a result of that heightened investigation that the photograph was obtained

1	questions for you.
2	Thank you very much.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
4	Mr. Lee? How did you figure in all of this?
5	Usually he goes last? Or have you discussed this matter?
6	MR. LEE: My understanding is that everybody
7	gets to cross-examine, and I get to re-examine prior to Mr.
8	Engelmann re-examining.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
10	MR. LEE: If that makes sense. Is that
11	right?
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Well, that would
13	follow the procedure we have been following, but unless
14	some and I'm prepared to adopt that so long as no one
15	has any grave objections.
16	All right. So you can have
17	MR. LEE: We may have an objection.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: We may have objections.
19	MS. McINTOSH: I don't have an objection per
20	se, Mr. Commissioner, but what I would say is if it's to be
21	what I would call a sweetheart cross-examination, without
22	meaning to disparage it, it should probably look more like
23	a real re-direct rather than a cross-examination.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
25	MS. McINTOSH: That's all I would say.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: No, that's fair. That's
2	a fair comment.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: I just want to echo Ms.
4	McIntosh's comments. We had some issues about this earlier
5	
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: in this proceeding. Now
8	that we're in the substantive hearing I think it's that
9	much more important.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Do you understand that,
11	Mr. Lee?
12	MR. LEE: I do. That's been my
13	understanding all along.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Terrific. Thank you.
15	All right. So we go to Mr. Bennett. You
16	have no questions? No.
17	Mr. Cipriano is not available.
18	Mr. Chisholm.
19	MR. CHISHOLM: I didn't speak to the matter,
20	Mr. Commissioner.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry?
22	MS. MacLENNAN: Mr. Commissioner, the
23	Society has no questions of Mr. Seguin.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you.
25	Who is here today, is it Rose? Mr. Rose,

1	are you the one who is
2	MR. ROSE: Yes.
3	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR.
4	ROSE:
5	MR. ROSE: Good afternoon, Mr. Seguin. My
6	name is David Rose. I act for the Ministry of Community
7	Safety, specifically the Probation and Parole Office and
8	people there. I just have a few questions for you.
9	Mr. Seguin, you talked about being on the
10	wrong path in life
11	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
12	MR. ROSE: as a result of the various
13	things that have happened to you over the years. Remember
14	that?
15	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
16	MR. ROSE: Without getting into the specific
17	incidents, you found yourself in legal troubles over the
18	years?
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
20	MR. ROSE: Contact with the police over the
21	years?
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
23	MR. ROSE: And in fact that resulted in a
24	number of probation orders, hasn't it?
25	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.

1	MR. ROSE: And you found yourself meeting
2	with a number of probation officers over the years?
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
4	MR. ROSE: Earlier today, sir, you recalled
5	giving some evidence about the Men's Project?
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
7	MR. ROSE: The Men's Project is a specific
8	group that deals with survivors of abuse such as yourself.
9	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
10	MR. ROSE: They have various forms of
11	counselling. Is that right?
12	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
13	MR. ROSE: One-on-one counselling?
14	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, they have one-on-one,
15	group counselling, group sessions.
16	MR. ROSE: In other words, they do both one-
17	on-one counselling and also group counselling?
18	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
19	MR. ROSE: And obviously, it's specifically
20	focused to people like yourself?
21	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
22	MR. ROSE: Earlier today when you were asked
23	how you came to be referred to the Men's Project, I recall
24	your evidence was that you couldn't remember.
25	MR. L. SEGUIN: I couldn't remember the

1	initial my initial referral. To give you an example, I
2	was referred by the Anchorage Program in Ottawa, which I
3	had attended the Men's Project in Ottawa, but I had contact
4	with the Men's Project previous here in Cornwall.
5	MR. ROSE: Right, which is to say that if
6	I understood your evidence correctly, it was not the
7	Anchorage Program that referred you to the Men's Project.
8	MR. L. SEGUIN: Initially, no.
9	MR. ROSE: Right.
10	Is it possible, sir, that it was the
11	probation people who referred you to the Men's Project?
12	MR. L. SEGUIN: It could be.
13	MR. ROSE: Okay.
14	And I take it that, in terms of your
15	attendance at the Men's Project, it's gone in phases,
16	hasn't it?
17	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
18	MR. ROSE: In other words, initially, going
19	back to 2002, you attended several meetings at the Men's
20	Project.
21	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
22	MR. ROSE: Do you recall that?
23	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
24	MR. ROSE: That ended.
25	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.

1	MR. ROSE: There was a period where you
2	didn't go to the Men's Project.
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
4	MR. ROSE: Later on, you did go back to the
5	Men's Project.
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
7	MR. ROSE: And I take it, Mr. Seguin, that
8	if you were going back to the Men's Project you must have
9	found it to be helpful to you?
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
11	MR. ROSE: As a survivor of this type of
12	physical abuse?
13	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
14	MR. ROSE: That's why you went back?
15	MR. L. SEGUIN: Correct.
16	MR. ROSE: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.
17	Those are my questions.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
19	Ms. Makepeace.
20	MS. MAKEPEACE: No, thank you.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: No questions? Thank you.
22	No one here for the Diocese.
23	Where do we go? We go to the OPP?
24	MS. LAHAIE: No questions.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

1	OPPA?
2	MR. WALLACE: No questions, Mr.
3	Commissioner.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
5	Upper Canada School Board?
6	MS. TYMOCHENKO: No questions.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Catholic School Board?
8	MS. BIRRELL: No questions.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
10	Then we go back to Ms. McIntosh.
11	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MS.
12	McIntosh:
13	MS. McINTOSH: Mr. Seguin, my name is Leslie
14	McIntosh and I'm here for the Ministry of the Attorney
15	General.
16	In your testimony today, you told us that
17	you heard on the street that Mr. Desjardins had been
18	convicted of an offence. Is that correct?
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
20	MS. McINTOSH: And I take it you understood
21	then that he must have pleaded guilty to some offence. Is
22	that correct?
23	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
24	MS. McINTOSH: Did you know what offence he
25	pleaded guilty to?

1	MR. L. SEGUIN: No, I don't.
2	MS. McINTOSH: No one else was there, I take
3	it, during the events you described with Mr. Desjardins,
4	the assault?
5	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
6	MS. McINTOSH: Did you have any physical
7	injuries that would demonstrate that you were the victim of
8	a sexual assault as well as the beating to your face?
9	MR. L. SEGUIN: You mean as in physical?
10	MS. McINTOSH: Yes.
11	MR. L. SEGUIN: No, I don't believe so.
12	MS. McINTOSH: And you understood then that
13	as a result of Mr. Desjardins pleading guilty to an
14	offence, you would not be required to testify with respect
15	to the events. Is that correct?
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, I understand that.
17	MS. McINTOSH: I take it that you have no
18	problem with the fact that you would not be required to
19	testify as to these events at the time. I take it your
20	complaint is that you wanted input into the sentence. Is
21	that correct?
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: That possibly a victim
23	impact statement.
24	MS. McINTOSH: Do you know whether the law
25	permitted a Crown attorney to introduce evidence with

1	respect to victim impact at that time?
2	MR. L. SEGUIN: I would not have any idea of
3	that.
4	MS. McINTOSH: Let me ask you to think back
5	to that time shortly after this assault took place and you
6	were 16 years old and so on. At that time, did you want to
7	go to court and testify either about the events or about
8	the impact on you, do you think?
9	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes. Yes, it was the most
10	brutal thing that had ever happened to me in my life, and I
11	definitely would've liked to have been more involved in the
12	case and how it was basically handled.
13	MS. McINTOSH: So it's not just now looking
14	back on it, it's you think that when you were 16 you also
15	wanted to be involved?
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
17	MS. McINTOSH: Now, you say that no one in
18	the justice system or I took it from your evidence that
19	no one in the justice system told you that Mr. Desjardins
20	had pleaded guilty. Correct? You heard it on the street.
21	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes. Yes, that's correct.
22	MS. McINTOSH: Do you know whether at that
23	time there was any law or policy that would have required
24	someone in the justice system to notify victims of guilty
25	pleas?

1	MR. L. SEGUIN: I don't believe I don't
2	believe that there was a law requiring that to happen, but
3	I really wouldn't know one way or the other.
4	MS. McINTOSH: All right.
5	Now, you also heard on the street that Mr.
6	Desjardins went to jail for three months. Did I understand
7	you correctly?
8	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's what I heard.
9	Whether that is true or not, I'm not sure.
10	MS. McINTOSH: All right. So you don't know
11	
12	MR. L. SEGUIN: I was told here today it was
13	closer to a year, but that's not confirmed as of yet.
14	MS. McINTOSH: So you don't know whether the
15	three months was correct or incorrect?
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: I have a feeling it was
17	incorrect judging by what I heard here today.
18	MS. McINTOSH: So was it the three months
19	when you were under the impression that it was three
20	months, was it that that you felt hurt by, that you felt
21	that was inadequate? Is that what you meant?
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: I think the whole sentence,
23	whether it was three months or whether it was a year, I
24	believe it was inadequate, and I feel that I should have
25	been involved, I mean, to give a victim impact statement or

1	something, anything, or at least to let me know what
2	happened with this person that did this to me.
3	MS. McINTOSH: All right.
4	Well, if the three months was not correct
5	and he got a 12 months jail sentence and three years
6	probation, you still feel that that was an inadequate
7	sentence?
8	MR. L. SEGUIN: Of course.
9	MS. McINTOSH: I take it that you don't have
10	any legal training, Mr. Seguin?
11	MR. L. SEGUIN: No. I know that when I was
12	12 years old, I was hit with a 12-month sentence for
13	stealing a \$16 speedometer, so I know that. What this
14	person did to me, he should have at least been in put in
15	a federal penitentiary.
16	MS. McINTOSH: My only point is that you
17	wouldn't know what the law is with respect to the range of
18	reasonable sentences for this offence.
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: No, I don't.
20	MS. McINTOSH: Do you think it's appropriate
21	to take into account the fact that someone pleads guilty to
22	an offence in determining what their sentence is?
23	MR. L. SEGUIN: Depending on whether or not
24	there's evidence, sure. I mean if there's not enough
25	evidence to convict in a trial, then obviously you got to

1	take what you can get, but I believe that there was enough
2	evidence for there to be a trial in this.
3	MS. McINTOSH: Okay. But would you agree
4	with me that it might have been difficult to get a
5	conviction for a sexual assault in this case as opposed to
6	an assault?
7	MR. L. SEGUIN: I don't think so. The
8	person had some priors as well.
9	MS. McINTOSH: All right.
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: It was a common thing for
11	this person to victimize people.
12	MS. McINTOSH: And did you know that at the
13	time when you went over there?
14	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes. Actually, not when I
15	went there but just a few minutes before the attack, he was
16	showing me his federal penitentiary cards that he had.
17	MS. McINTOSH: All right. And do you think
18	it's appropriate to take into account that a person acts by
19	reason of substance abuse when they commit an offence in
20	determining the sentence for that offence?
21	MR. L. SEGUIN: I don't believe that would
22	be appropriate.
23	MS. McINTOSH: Is that something are
24	those factors, a guilty plea or acting by reason of
25	substance abuse, are those things that you asked for

1	consideration with respect to when you've been an accused
2	before the court?
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, I believe so.
4	MS. McINTOSH: So it may be appropriate to
5	take those things into account in determining sentence
6	then?
7	MR. L. SEGUIN: If the person has done
8	something to better himself to deal with his substance
9	abuse problem, I guess maybe it could be appropriate.
10	MS. McINTOSH: Those are my questions.
11	Thank you.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
13	Mr. Manderville?
14	MR. MANDERVILLE: Thank you, Mr.
15	Commissioner.
16	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR.
17	MANDERVILLE:
18	MR. MANDERVILLE: Good afternoon Mr. Seguin.
19	My name is Peter Manderville. I'm counsel for the Cornwall
20	Police.
21	I want to take you back to the February 1978
22	incident, the assault. You were 6 years old at the time
23	this happened, were you?
24	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
25	MR. MANDERVILLE: And the officer, who is

1	now deceased, by the way, came to your home in response to
2	a call from your mother?
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
4	MR. MANDERVILLE: And you told him what had
5	happened?
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
7	MR. MANDERVILLE: And there were no
8	witnesses to what had happened, were there?
9	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
10	MR. MANDERVILLE: And he took you to the
11	scene of the incident or what you thought was the scene of
12	the incident?
13	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
14	MR. MANDERVILLE: And you could not find the
15	cloth or glove that you had told him your assailant had
16	used and thrown outside the car, correct?
17	
	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
18	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct. MR. MANDERVILLE: He looked and you looked
18 19	
	MR. MANDERVILLE: He looked and you looked
19	MR. MANDERVILLE: He looked and you looked and you couldn't find it?
19 20	MR. MANDERVILLE: He looked and you looked and you couldn't find it? MR. L. SEGUIN: That's right.
19 20 21	MR. MANDERVILLE: He looked and you looked and you couldn't find it? MR. L. SEGUIN: That's right. MR. MANDERVILLE: And you did not know the
19 20 21 22	MR. MANDERVILLE: He looked and you looked and you couldn't find it? MR. L. SEGUIN: That's right. MR. MANDERVILLE: And you did not know the name of your abuser at the time, did you?

1	learned about?
2	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
3	MR. MANDERVILLE: That same officer took you
4	to the hospital?
5	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
6	MR. MANDERVILLE: As we heard, you were
7	examined there?
8	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
9	MR. MANDERVILLE: And there was no evidence
10	of an assault, physical evidence of an assault, was there?
11	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
12	MR. MANDERVILLE: Lots of psychological
13	impacts to the assault but no physical evidence, was there?
14	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
15	MR. MANDERVILLE: And no evidence of semen
16	or ejaculate?
17	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
18	MR. MANDERVILLE: Now, Mr. Seguin, I don't
19	expect you to know this, but we've heard expert evidence to
20	the effect that the law in Canada in 1978 and indeed before
21	1988 required that the evidence of young children had to be
22	supported or corroborated by other evidence, a witness,
23	some form of physical evidence or forensic evidence that
24	assisted in showing that the child was telling the truth.
25	Are you aware of that?

1	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
2	MR. MANDERVILLE: You are not aware of that
3	today?
4	MR. L. SEGUIN: I am now.
5	MR. MANDERVILLE: Moments ago?
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
7	MR. MANDERVILLE: And you certainly weren't
8	aware of it back in 1978?
9	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
10	MR. MANDERVILLE: And through no fault of
11	your own, there was no witness to your abduction and your
12	assault, was there?
13	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
14	MR. MANDERVILLE: You did not, through no
15	fault of your own, know who your assailant was, you
16	couldn't identify him?
17	MR. L. SEGUIN: If I had seen him, I'd be
18	able to identify him but other than that, no.
19	MR. MANDERVILLE: But you couldn't tell your
20	mother or the officer
21	MR. L. SEGUIN: That it was some
22	MR. MANDERVILLE: it was this person
23	MR. L. SEGUIN: I couldn't point the finger
24	at anybody, no.
25	MR. MANDERVILLE: And again, despite your

1	search and that of the officer, you couldn't find the cloth
2	or the glove that might have given some additional evidence
3	of what had happened, could you?
4	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
5	MR. MANDERVILLE: And at the hospital, there
6	was no additional evidence to assist you and to assist the
7	law in showing that what you were saying was true, was
8	there?
9	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
10	MR. MANDERVILLE: And again, none of this is
11	your fault. So unfortunately, there was no evidence at all
12	to support your information about what had happened to you,
13	other than just your story?
14	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
15	MR. MANDERVILLE: I'm going to suggest to
16	you that it's quite likely that the investigating officer
17	told your mother that.
18	MR. L. SEGUIN: I don't know. She never
19	mentioned it to me if he did.
20	MR. MANDERVILLE: You would agree with me
21	that, rightly or wrongly, if the law at that time required
22	some sort of supporting evidence for the story of a young
23	child, there was none on this occasion, was there?
24	MR. L. SEGUIN: I guess not.
25	MR. MANDERVILLE: So I want to take you

1	forward to a year later, 1979, and you're 7 years old by
2	this time, right?
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
4	MR. MANDERVILLE: Your birthday is in
5	October. You hadn't quite turned 8 if it was in the
6	summertime?
7	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
8	MR. MANDERVILLE: You see the man and you
9	see the car, and this time you get the licence plate
10	number, right?
11	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
12	MR. MANDERVILLE: And you tell your mother
13	and she calls an officer and he comes to your home.
14	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
15	MR. MANDERVILLE: And again, through no
16	fault of your own, there is no evidence other than your
17	story to link this man to what had happened to you one year
18	before, is there?
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
20	MR. MANDERVILLE: And again, I'm going to
21	suggest to you that given what you and I have talked about
22	being the law at that time, it's likely that the officer
23	told your mother that there was no possibility of a
24	successful prosecution.
25	MR. L. SEGUIN: It's basically what he said,

1	how the judge would take the testimony.
2	MR. MANDERVILLE: And you recall more or
3	less that he suggested to your mom that the judge wouldn't
4	believe your version of events just on its own.
5	MR. L. SEGUIN: I don't think that he put it
6	that way. It was how the judge would take the testimony of
7	a 7-year-old for a crime that happened a year ago. So I'm
8	thinking that maybe some memory thing went in that he may
9	have thought about I don't think that he was suggesting
10	that I would not be believed.
11	MR. MANDERVILLE: Okay. Now, I want to
12	fast-forward a little bit to October 30, 1987 and the
13	assault you sustained on that occasion. You had just
14	turned 16, right?
15	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
16	MR. MANDERVILLE: And you're physically and
17	sexually assaulted by a man at his home?
18	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
19	MR. MANDERVILLE: You went to the hospital
20	for your injuries?
21	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
22	MR. MANDERVILLE: The police meet you at the
23	hospital?
24	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
25	MR. MANDERVILLE: You told them what had

1	happened.
2	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
3	MR. MANDERVILLE: And this time you're able
4	to identify the man and tell the police what his name was
5	and where he lived, correct?
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's right.
7	MR. MANDERVILLE: And the police arrested
8	that man the very same day, didn't they?
9	MR. L. SEGUIN: I believe so.
10	MR. MANDERVILLE: He was charged that very
11	same day, wasn't he?
12	MR. L. SEGUIN: I would assume he was. I
13	know he was arrested. I don't know exactly what the charge
14	was.
15	MR. MANDERVILLE: And you do know that he
16	was subsequently successfully convicted?
17	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
18	MR. MANDERVILLE: Now, if I understand your
19	evidence with Mr. Engelmann correctly, you expressed a
20	concern that you weren't contacted about the progress of
21	the prosecution, right?
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
23	MR. MANDERVILLE: And if there was no policy
24	or protocol in place to notify victims about the progress
25	of the prosecution at that time, you would say that was not

1	a good thing?
2	MR. L. SEGUIN: Sure.
3	MR. MANDERVILLE: And that's a practice that
4	should be changed?
5	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
6	MR. MANDERVILLE: And if I were to tell you
7	it has changed and there are protocols in place for such
8	advice, you'd say that's a good thing?
9	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
10	MR. MANDERVILLE: I take it also, Mr.
11	Seguin, that you're not aware that the various victims'
12	assistance programs now offered by the province did not
13	exist in the City of Cornwall until the late 1990s.
14	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, that sounds about
15	right.
16	MR. MANDERVILLE: So you would agree with me
17	that the police in Cornwall, back in 1987, would not be
18	able to refer you to a victims' assistance program if it
19	didn't exist, of course?
20	MR. L. SEGUIN: I suppose.
21	MR. MANDERVILLE: Now, Mr. Seguin, you have
22	freely acknowledged here that you have a somewhat of a
23	history of drug abuse.
24	MR. L. SEGUIN: Sure.
25	MR. MANDERVILLE: Which you have, to a

1	greater or a lesser extent, difficulty overcoming from time
2	to time?
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
4	MR. MANDERVILLE: And you have also been
5	charged and convicted of a number of criminal offences
6	since 1990?
7	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
8	MR. MANDERVILLE: From the late 1990s to the
9	present, you have lived in a number of different places?
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
11	MR. MANDERVILLE: Sometimes with your mom,
12	sometimes with a girlfriend?
13	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
14	MR. MANDERVILLE: Sometimes elsewhere in
15	Ottawa?
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
17	MR. MANDERVILLE: Sometimes in a
18	correctional facility?
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
20	MR. MANDERVILLE: I understand that about a
21	year ago, around August 2005, you received compensation
22	from the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board?
23	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
24	MR. MANDERVILLE: And that was in respect of
25	both the 1978 assault and the 1987 assault?

1	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
2	MR. MANDERVILLE: Now, the process of
3	applying for and obtaining that compensation took more than
4	four years, didn't it?
5	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
6	MR. MANDERVILLE: And I suggest to you that
7	one reason for that is that your lawyer at the legal aid
8	clinic had considerable difficulty getting a hold of you or
9	a number of occasions.
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: I don't believe that's why
11	the delay was. To be honest, I can't really tell you
12	exactly what the delay I don't believe that that was the
13	reason. I remember there was something that happened with
14	Mr. Etienne Saint-Aubin, he had not didn't file some
15	paper or something. The Criminal Injuries Board was
16	waiting for a paper that Etienne did not send. And it took
17	me to get a hold of Etienne to find out what was going on
18	and then, he had sent the paperwork. But there was a
19	couple of times where Mr. Aubin was sending letters to my
20	mother's house which I may have been incarcerated at that
21	time. So I was unable to have contact with him.
22	MR. MANDERVILLE: Were you able
23	MR. L. SEGUIN: I didn't receive my letters
24	basically that he was sending.
25	MR. MANDERVILLE: I would ask that the

1	witness be shown document 116707?
2	MR. ENGELMANN: Just be a minute.
3	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
4	MR. MANDERVILLE: What you should have in
5	front of you, Mr. Seguin Mr. Commissioner, do you have
6	that?
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, which will be
8	exhibit no. 70, the letter dated May $24^{\rm th}$, 2002.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes, thank you.
10	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO P-70:
11	Letter from the legal aid lawyer to Mr.
12	Larry Seguin, dated May 24 th , 2002
13	MR. MANDERVILLE: That's a letter to you
14	addressed to 635 Sydney Street from the legal aid lawyer,
15	isn't it?
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
17	MR. MANDERVILLE: At the time, he is
18	commenting that you have missed another appointment without
19	calling to say why. He notes that he can no longer spend
20	time running after you as they are too busy.
21	MR. L. SEGUIN: M'hm.
22	MR. MANDERVILLE: And he threatens to close
23	your file and have you pursue the matter on your own,
24	doesn't he?
25	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.

1	MR. MANDERVILLE: And again I suggested to
2	you a moment ago that one reason why your Criminal Injuries
3	Compensation application took a while to process was that
4	you were difficult to get a hold of.
5	MR. L. SEGUIN: And I would say that I don't
6	believe that was the reason it took so long. This letter
7	suggests that I had missed my two appointments in a row
8	basically. So we're talking within a two-week period.
9	MR. MANDERVILLE: So you would say that
10	other than this two-week period, the Legal Aid Clinic did
11	not have difficulty getting a hold of you despite your
12	various addresses and phone numbers?
13	MR. L. SEGUIN: I remember changing my
14	address frequently with Mr. Saint-Aubin. I was also
15	incarcerated on a couple of occasions, at which point I had
16	done an address change. The address on this letter, 635
17	Sydney Street, that was my wife's mother's house. We had
18	to stay there in between moves because we had difficulties
19	finding an appropriate house. So we had stayed there for a
20	month, I believe it was.
21	MR. MANDERVILLE: And that was an address
22	you told Mr. Saint-Aubin, "You can reach me at this
23	address"?
24	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
25	MR. MANDERVILLE: And subsequently you

1	moved?
2	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
3	MR. MANDERVILLE: And I take it, and this is
4	not a criticism, you forgot to tell Mr. Aubin about your
5	new address?
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: It's possible I didn't
7	notify him right away. I might have thought of it a week
8	later or something and, "Oh yeah, I better call and let him
9	know where I'm at" kind of thing.
10	MR. MANDERVILLE: Now, in 1999 you go to
11	Sergeant Carter, in the latter part of 1999?
12	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
13	MR. MANDERVILLE: And you tell him about the
14	1978 assault and then give him the licence plate number?
15	MR. L. SEGUIN: M'hm.
16	MR. MANDERVILLE: That's a yes?
17	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes. Sorry.
18	MR. MANDERVILLE: And Officer Carter
19	confirmed that the owner of the vehicle was dead and had
20	died in 1985, didn't he?
21	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
22	MR. MANDERVILLE: And later Officer Carter
23	obtained a photo of the vehicle owner, who is now dead, and
24	you identified the person in the photo as the man who had
25	assaulted you back in 1978?

1	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
2	MR. MANDERVILLE: And somewhat like your
3	experience with the Legal Aid lawyer in the Criminal
4	Injuries Compensation Board, I suggest to you that Officer
5	Carter called you at your mother's house and your
6	girlfriend's house on numerous occasions concerning this
7	matter and his calls were not returned, and on several
8	occasions when you arranged to meet with him, you did not
9	keep the appointments. That's correct; isn't it?
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: I don't believe so.
11	MR. MANDERVILLE: So if Officer Carter were
12	to say he arranged several meetings with you in
13	MR. L. SEGUIN: Mr. Carter may have called
14	my mother's house and left a message for me, but I possibly
15	was not residing with my mother, but my mother would give
16	me the message at some point. There may have also been an
17	occasion where I may have been incarcerated, at which point
18	he would basically, in order to speak with me, he would
19	have had to went down to jail to do so.
20	MR. MANDERVILLE: And he wouldn't
21	necessarily know exactly where you were on a given day,
22	correct?
23	MR. L. SEGUIN: Well, he would basically
24	just have to phone my mother and my mother would know where
25	I'm at.

1	MR. MANDERVILLE: Would she tell Officer
2	Carter?
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: Sure, yes.
4	MR. MANDERVILLE: "Mr. Seguin is in jail.
5	Go see him there."
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
7	MR. MANDERVILLE: And had you given Officer
8	Carter permission to tell your mother or, if he were to
9	call your girlfriend, your girlfriend about the details of
10	why he wanted to speak to you?
11	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, I believe Sergeant
12	Carter had spoke with my mother on a couple of occasions in
13	regards to the case.
14	MR. MANDERVILLE: And what about your
15	girlfriend?
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: I don't I'm not too sure.
17	MR. MANDERVILLE: Do you recall giving
18	Officer Carter permission to speak with your girlfriend
19	about the details to explain why he wanted to speak with
20	you?
21	MR. L. SEGUIN: I don't believe so. I don't
22	remember though. I'm not too sure if Sergeant Carter has
23	ever spoke with my wife in regards to this. It might be a
24	question for her.
25	MR. MANDERVILLE: Now, we know you saw

1	Officer Carter in the latter part of 1999 for the first
2	time.
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
4	MR. MANDERVILLE: And I suggest to you that
5	Officer Carter got your hospital records within five days
6	of your initial visit with him?
7	MR. L. SEGUIN: I don't think so.
8	MR. MANDERVILLE: You believe it was a
9	longer period of time?
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, much longer. I don't
11	know exactly what date that I had provided him with. You
12	may have that there. I don't know. I'm not sure exactly
13	what date.
14	MR. MANDERVILLE: If Officer Carter were to
15	suggest he got them within five days of first seeing you,
16	you would dispute that or would you accept that?
17	MR. L. SEGUIN: I know in one of the papers
18	here it said that Mr. Carter was having problems getting
19	the was having problems locating the hospital records.
20	I don't know which paper that was. I have seen it today, I
21	believe, with Mr. Engelmann.
22	MR. MANDERVILLE: And I would also suggest
23	to you that at the time you had that letter written to Mr.
24	Cleary in January 2001, you already knew that the owner of
25	the vehicle with the licence plate you had identified was

1	dead and that you had been so informed in September 2000.
2	Do you recall that?
3	MR. L. SEGUIN: No.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry, informed by whom?
5	MR. MANDERVILLE: Officer Carter.
6	At the time you wrote to your Member of
7	Provincial Parliament, Mr. Cleary, you also knew that
8	Officer Carter was attempting to track down a photo of the
9	vehicle owner?
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: In 2001?
11	MR. MANDERVILLE: Before you wrote to Mr.
12	Cleary, you had also been told that in addition to the fact
13	that the owner of the vehicle was dead, that Officer Carter
14	was also attempting to track down a photograph of the
15	vehicle owner?
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: No, that's incorrect.
17	MR. MANDERVILLE: And if Officer Carter were
18	to say that, you would dispute that, would you?
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes, I would.
20	MR. MANDERVILLE: And you did know that
21	Officer Carter had attempted to contact you through your
22	mother on several occasions and may not have been
23	successful in getting you to contact him back?
24	MR. L. SEGUIN: I know that Officer Carter
25	contacted my mother. It would have been in February 2001,

1	asking me to come down to fill out a statement.
2	MR. MANDERVILLE: And is it your view that
3	he never contacted your mother at any time before that?
4	MR. L. SEGUIN: No, he probably has
5	contacted my mother before that at some point.
6	MR. MANDERVILLE: Similarly, he would have
7	contacted your girlfriend before that time in an attempt to
8	reach you?
9	MR. L. SEGUIN: Again, I can't answer that
10	question. I'm not too sure if he had spoke with my wife or
11	not.
12	MR. MANDERVILLE: I'm sorry, I said
13	girlfriend.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
15	MR. MANDERVILLE: And I take it, Mr. Seguin,
16	by January 2001, you were simply getting a little bit
17	frustrated with not seeing the photo of perhaps your
18	assailant?
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: I wasn't aware of any photo
20	until the investigation was basically closed. It would
21	have been approximately two and a half weeks after the
22	statement was written on February the 15^{th} , 2001.
23	MR. MANDERVILLE: So is it your evidence
24	here today, Mr. Seguin, that at the time you wrote to Mr.
25	Cleary, you had not been told that the owner of the vehicle

1	had passed away, and you had not been told that Officer
2	Carter was trying to track down a photo of the owner of the
3	vehicle?
4	MR. L. SEGUIN: Basically, they were telling
5	me they were trying to do all kinds of things, right up
6	from 1999 until the actual investigation was closed in
7	2001. It was not until I had wrote to the MP on let's
8	just see here; where is it? Too many papers. January 14,
9	2001 I wrote the letter to the MP. It was received by the
10	Cornwall Police on February the $7^{\rm th}$ and on February the $7^{\rm th}$,
11	I got an internal correspondence to Deputy Chief Laferty
12	from Chief Repa, asking to "Ensure that the allegations as
13	stated in the letter by Mr. Seguin are investigated".
14	Also, the next correspondence was to Staff
15	Sergeant Carter, basically attaching the letter that was
16	submitted to the Cornwall Police Services Board, and then
17	after this, it would have been another week or two, and he
18	had everything wrapped up.
19	MR. MANDERVILLE: And in late February or
20	early March 2001, you identified your assailant from the
21	photo you saw?
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: Pardon me?
23	MR. MANDERVILLE: In late February or early
24	March 2001, you attended the police station and identified
25	the photo as being a picture of the person who assaulted

1	you in 1978?
2	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
3	MR. MANDERVILLE: And at that time Officer
4	Carter suggested that you seek out Criminal Injuries
5	Compensation?
6	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
7	MR. MANDERVILLE: And then you have gone on
8	to have a more positive relationship with the police
9	MR. L. SEGUIN: I have
10	MR. MANDERVILLE: Sorry, go ahead.
11	MR. L. SEGUIN: I have a feeling that it's
12	possible that the Criminal Injuries Board, it may have been
13	already in process, but Sergeant Carter had offered
14	assistance in any way he could. He said, "If you need any
15	assistance in that," that he would be willing to help.
16	MR. MANDERVILLE: And you were pleased with
17	that?
18	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
19	MR. MANDERVILLE: And you've gone on to
20	participate with the police in presentations?
21	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
22	MR. MANDERVILLE: And have a more positive
23	relationship with the police?
24	MR. L. SEGUIN: Well, that was my hope, yes.
25	MR. MANDERVILLE: Thank you very much, Mr.

1	Seguin.
2	MR. L. SEGUIN: Thank you.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
4	Mr. Lee?
5	MR. LEE: Can I just have one moment, Mr.
6	Commissioner?
7	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
8	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR. LEE:
9	MR. LEE: I only have one brief area.
10	You've told us today, Mr. Seguin, that your
11	involvement with the Cornwall Police in terms of the 1978
12	and '79 incidents and in 2001, when you identified the
13	perpetrator and were advised that he was deceased; is that
14	correct?
15	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
16	MR. LEE: When would you have begun your
17	Criminal Injuries Compensation claim? Do you know if it
18	was before or after that time?
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: I'm not too sure. It would
20	have been around the year 2000. It could have been in
21	2001. It could have been, as this gentleman suggested,
22	after my interview with Sergeant Carter.
23	MR. LEE: And as Mr. Manderville suggested,
24	that process took a number of years?
25	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.

1	MR. LEE: How important was the criminal
2	investigation being conducted by the Cornwall Police into
3	the incidents in 1978 and 1979 to you in the late '90s and
4	early 2000?
5	MR. L. SEGUIN: Well, it was important to me
6	because basically there was no acknowledgement that this
7	had happened, and I was trying to get it behind me, so I
8	can move ahead in my life.
9	MR. LEE: And this is around the period that
10	you wrote to your MPP, Mr. Cleary; is that correct?
11	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
12	MR. LEE: Mr. Manderville suggested today
13	that you were a difficult man to get a hold of for some of
14	these periods and that on occasion you were in prison. Is
15	that correct?
16	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
17	MR. LEE: Would the Cornwall Police have
18	known how to contact you when you were in prison?
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes. The Cornwall Police,
20	basically as we know, I've had many dealings with them over
21	the years. My mother has had the same address and phone
22	number for the past 15-20 years and basically they know how
23	to get a hold of me through my mother. They had no
24	problems showing up at my job site to arrest me for a
25	breach. So, I mean, they know how to get a hold of me.

1	MR. LEE: So you've had dealings with them
2	both as a victim of crime and as a suspect or a person of
3	interest?
4	MR. L. SEGUIN: That's correct.
5	MR. LEE: Have they ever had any trouble
6	getting a hold of you or finding you when you were a
7	suspect or a person of interest?
8	MR. L. SEGUIN: Never.
9	MR. LEE: Those are my questions.
10	I just want to take a brief moment I know
11	that it's been difficult for Mr. Seguin being the first
12	witness at these hearings, and I just wanted to thank him
13	and let him know that he's done a good job today.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
15	Mr. Engelmann.
16	RE-EXAMINATION BY/RÉ-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR. ENGELMANN:
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Seguin, do you have
18	Exhibit 64? It's your letter to Mr. Cleary.
19	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: I just want to ask you a
21	question to clarify something.
22	Could you look at the bottom of the page?
23	This is a letter you're writing January 14, 2001.
24	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: In particular, you say:

1	"After more time, like 20 years was not
2	enough, I was instructed to see Tom
3	Racine from Cornwall Police. I did so
4	and I was told that this case was all
5	he was working on all week. Carter and
6	Racine were to set up some sort of
7	photo line-up."
8	MR. L. SEGUIN: M'hm.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: You were just asked a few
10	questions about a photo line-up. It would appear that
11	sometime before January $14^{\rm th}$ at least of 2001, there was to
12	be some form of photo line-up.
13	MR. L. SEGUIN: Yes.
14	From that, I believe it would have been made
15	possibly from the licence plate number I provided. They
16	were talking about setting up some kind of photo line-up.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: Do you know when?
18	MR. L. SEGUIN: That never happened though
19	until after I wrote this letter.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. Do you know when that
21	was supposed to be done? Do you remember?
22	MR. L. SEGUIN: I couldn't say for sure.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. That's my only
24	question.
25	Thank you.

1	MR. L. SEGUIN: Thanks.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
3	Mr. Seguin, I would like to thank you for
4	coming here today. I think it took a lot of courage, and I
5	hope that you can build on this, this being your birthday
6	and all. I wish you well.
7	MR. L. SEGUIN: Thank you.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: You may step down. Thank
9	you.
10	MR. L. SEGUIN: Thank you.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Engelmann?
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Commissioner, the next
13	witness is Mr. Seguin's mother, who will be with us first
14	thing in the morning. I apologize for not having her
15	available right now.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: I am at your pleasure with
18	when you would like us to start.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Oh.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: At 9:30?
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Sure, yes, 9:30 would be
22	fine. Any idea how the day will go tomorrow?
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes, I anticipate Mrs.
24	Seguin will be quite brief.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: So I anticipate we will be
2	into the evidence of Lise Brisson, the third witness,
3	sometime after the morning break.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: In any event, before the
6	lunch hour.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you.
8	We will break and resume at 9:30 then.
9	Thank you.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Thank you.
11	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre
12	veuillez vous lever.
13	This hearing is now adjourned. L'audience
14	est ajournée.
15	Upon adjourning at 4:14 p.m./
16	L'audience est ajournée à 16h14
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

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