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 298** 

Held at: Tenue à:

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

Thursday, October 30, 2008

Jeudi, le 30 octobre 2008

# ii Appearances/Comparutions

Ms.	Brigitte Beaulne	Registrar
Ms.	ierre Dumais Maya Hamou Karen Jones	Commission Counsel
Mr.	Mark Crane	Cornwall Community Police Service and Cornwall Police Service Board
Ms.	Neil Kozloff Diane Lahaie Tilton Donihee	Ontario Provincial Police
M <sup>e</sup> C	laude Rouleau	Ontario Ministry of Community and Correctional Services and Adult Community Corrections
Ms.	Jodie-Lynn Waddilove	Attorney General for Ontario
Ms.	Michele R.J. Allinotte	The Children's Aid Society of the United Counties
Mr.	Juda Strawcynski	Citizens for Community Renewal
Mr.	Dallas Lee	Victims' Group
Ms.	Gisèle Levesque	Diocese of Alexandria-Cornwall and Bishop Eugene LaRocque
Mr.	Michael Neville	The Estate of Ken Seguin and Doug Seguin and Father Charles MacDonald
	William Carroll Mark Wallace	Ontario Provincial Police Association
Mr.	Frank T. Horn	Coalition for Action

Mr. Jim McWade

Mr. Larry O'Brien Randy Millar

#### Table of Contents / Table des matières

Table of Concents / Table des matteres	Da
List of Exhibits :	<b>Page</b> V
JAMES ROBERT McWADE, Sworn/Assermentée	1
Examination in-Chief by/Interrogatoire en-chef par Mr. Pierre Dumais	1
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Juda Strawczynski	55
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Frank Horn	68
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Dallas Lee	79
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Michael Neville	93
Submissions by/Représentations par Mr. Larry O'Brien	96
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. William Carroll	100
Re-Examination by/Ré-interrogatoire par Mr. Pierre Dumais	103
ARTHUR LALONDE, Sworn/Assermenté	107
Examination in-Chief by/Interrogatoire en-chef par Mr. Pierre Dumais	108
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Frank Horn	116
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Dallas Lee	126
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. William Carroll	130

## Table of Contents / Table des matières

	Page
CHRISTOPHER McDONELL, Sworn/Assermenté	134
Examination in-Chief by/Interrogatoie en-chef par Ms. Karen Jones	135

#### LIST OF EXHIBITS/LISTE D'EXHIBITS

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO
P-2520	(200307) Career profile of Jim McWade	5
P-2521	(706160) Information to Obtain Search Warrant - 10 Feb, 93	10
P-2522	(112710) Interview report of Randy Millar- 03 Dec, 98	21
P-2523	(112696) Interview Report of Patrick Dussault - 19 Jan, 99	27
P-2524	(121104) Toronto Sun Article "OPP defend pedophile inquiry" - 05 Apr, 99	64
P-2525	(714169) Interview Report Of Arthur Lalonde - 15 Mar, 94	118
P-2526	(200218) Career Profile of Christopher McDonell	135
P-2527	(737493, Excerpt: 7156847; 7156942-6946) Notes of Christopher McDonell - 13 Sep, 93 to 25 Nov, 93	139
P-2528	(111131) Will say of Christopher McDonell	140
P-2529	(715637) Occurence Report - 25 Nov, 93	152
P-2530	(737494 Excerpt: 7156975-7049) Notes of Christopher McDonell	176
P-2531	(737494 Excerpt: 7156975-6978) Notes of Christopher McDonell	176
P-2532	(737494 Excerpt: 7156983-6984) Notes of Christopher McDonell	177
P-2533	(737494 Excerpt: 7156986-6991) Notes of Christopher McDonell	177
P-2534	(737494 Excerpt: 7156995-6998) Notes of Christopher McDonell	177

## INTERNATIONAL REPORTING INC.

vi

#### LIST OF EXHIBITS/LISTE D'EXHIBITS

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO
P-2535	(737494 Excerpt: 7157000-7002) Notes of Christopher McDonell	177
P-2536	(737494 Excerpt: 7157014) Notes of Christopher McDonell	177
P-2537	(737494 Excerpt: 7157019-7020) Notes of Christopher McDonell	177
P-2538	(737494 Excerpt: 7157028-7031) Notes of Christopher McDonell	177
P-2539	(737494 Excerpt: 7157033) Notes of Christopher McDonell	177
P-2540	(737494 Excerpt: 7157036-7040) Notes of Christopher McDonell	178
P-2541	(737494 Excerpt: 7157042) Notes of Christopher McDonell	178
P-2542	(737494 Excerpt: 7157045-7049) Notes of Christopher McDonell	178
P-2543	(715309) Interview Notes of Malcolm MacDonald - 21 Dec, 93	187

25

1	Upon commencing at 9:35 a.m./
2	L'audience débute à 9h35
3	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre;
4	veuillez vous lever.
5	This hearing of the Cornwall Public Inquiry
6	is now in session. The Honourable Mr. Justice Normand
7	Glaude, Commissioner, presiding.
8	Please be seated. Veuillez vous asseoir.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Good morning.
10	MR. DUMAIS: Good morning.
11	Mr. Commissioner, prepared to call our next
12	witness, Mr. Jim McWade.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
14	JAMES ROBERT McWADE: Sworn/Assermenté
15	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF BY/INTERROGATOIRE EN-CHEF PAR MR.
16	DUMAIS:
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Good morning, sir.
18	So I'd ask you to sit up close to the
19	microphone. There's fresh water and clean glasses. You'll
20	have the screen to look at some of the documents and they
21	will be in hard copy as well. If you have any questions,
22	you feel uncomfortable about something, please let me know
23	and we'll try to deal with it. All right?

THE COMMISSIONER: In the meantime, answer

MR. McWADE: Okay.

1	the questions the best you can.
2	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
4	MR. DUMAIS: Good morning, Mr. McWade.
5	MR. McWADE: Good morning.
6	MR. DUMAIS: I understand that you're a
7	retired Staff Sergeant with the Ontario Provincial Police?
8	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
9	MR. DUMAIS: And you would have retired in
10	1991?
11	$MR.$ $McWADE:$ I retired the $31^{st}$ of December,
12	2001.
13	MR. DUMAIS: Two-thousand-and-one (2001),
14	sorry.
15	And I understand that, at that time, you
16	were Detachment Commander of the Renfrew Detachment. Is
17	that correct?
18	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
19	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
20	I'm going that a document be put to you. It
21	is a Career Profile that was prepared on your behalf. It
22	is Document Number 200307.
23	Do you see the document, Mr. McWade?
24	MR. McWADE: A portion of it, yes.
25	MR. DUMAIS: All right. So, essentially,

1	you would have started as a probationary officer with the
2	OPP in 1969?
3	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
4	MR. DUMAIS: And you were, at the time,
5	stationed at the Shabaqua Detachment in Thunder Bay?
6	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir. It's just west of
7	Thunder Bay.
8	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
9	And for a certain period of time, you were a
10	force diver with the OPP. Is that correct?
11	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
12	MR. DUMAIS: And you would have been
13	promoted to the rank of Detective Constable in 1977?
14	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
15	MR. DUMAIS: And then to the rank of
16	Corporal in 1985?
17	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
18	MR. DUMAIS: My understanding is that, at
19	one point-in-time, that rank was changed or abolished with
20	the OPP and you then became a Sergeant. Is that correct?
21	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
22	MR. DUMAIS: And you became a Staff Sergeant
23	and you were posted at the Lancaster OPP Detachment on
24	January 1 <sup>st</sup> , 1990?
25	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.

1	MR. DUMAIS: And you were Detachment
2	Commander from 1990 until you were transferred in November
3	of 1993?
4	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
5	MR. DUMAIS: So, essentially, the questions
6	that I will be putting to you will relate to your role as
7	Detachment Commander at the Lancaster Detachment during
8	that period of time. And more specifically, we'll be
9	looking at one particular event.
10	In 1993, you were then transferred to the
11	Renfrew Detachment where you were the NCO. Is that
12	correct?
13	MR. McWADE: I was transferred and I was
14	again Detachment Commander of Renfrew.
15	MR. DUMAIS: And for some period of time,
16	you transferred to the Ottawa Detachment. Is that correct?
17	MR. McWADE: After Renfrew, I went to the
18	Ottawa Telecommunications Unit located inside the same
19	building as the Ottawa Detachment.
20	MR. DUMAIS: All right. And my
21	understanding is that you, after a couple of years,
22	transferred back to Renfrew and you were the Detachment
23	Commander for some time and then you took your retirement?
24	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
25	MR. DUMAIS: And

1	THE COMMISSIONER: EXHIBIT Number 2520 is
2	the exhibit number for this C.V.
3	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-2520:
4	(200307) Career Profile of Jim McWade
5	MR. DUMAIS: And this career profile, Mr.
6	McWade, provides at the last page a number of training
7	courses that you've completed with the OPP. You've had a
8	chance to review those training courses. They are
9	accurate?
10	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
11	MR. DUMAIS: All right. Thank you.
12	If we can then just start with when you're
13	transferred and you became the Detachment Commander at the
14	Lancaster Detachment.
15	Can you just give us a sense of how many
16	officers you were responsible for? Just give us a sense of
17	the detachment, how it's run, how many officers, and what
18	your role was there?
19	MR. McWADE: When I first arrived in January
20	of 1990, Lancaster was a 24-hour detachment that was just
21	in the process of reverting to extended hours but,
22	basically, over a not a 24-hour operation. We were
23	ending at around, I believe, 3:00 o'clock in the morning,
24	and so we were going through that transition.
25	And so some realignments of personnel were

1	being made at the same time. I can't give you specifics on
2	the exact numbers but we had a complement of myself, two
3	sergeants, detective constables, I believe two, and a
4	series of constables of different service length.
5	MR. DUMAIS: All right. So, just in general
6	terms, what were your responsibilities as Detachment
7	Commander?
8	MR. McWADE: Administration of the office.
9	The deployment of the manpower and resources that were
10	provided to me.
11	MR. DUMAIS: And as Detachment Commander,
12	who would you report to?
13	MR. McWADE: Directly to District
14	Headquarters.
15	MR. DUMAIS: All right. And headquarters,
16	where is that located?
17	MR. McWADE: At that time, it was in Long
18	Sault.
19	MR. DUMAIS: For that
20	MR. McWADE: Through that time period, it
21	was Long Sault. It's been restructured since then and now
22	the Regional Headquarters is Smith Falls.
23	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
24	Now, I understand that on December $18^{\rm th}$ ,
25	1992, there's a complaint that came in to your station and

1	I'm just going to ask Madam Clerk for if a moniker
2	can be identified for you, C-8?
3	So, Mr. McWade, the names of certain
4	individuals are protected here and we refer to them as
5	moniker in the hearings room.
6	MR. McWADE: Okay. Thank you.
7	MR. DUMAIS: It is my understanding that C-8
8	would have made a complaint against a Mr. Ron Leroux. So
9	you're aware of that complaint, Mr. McWade?
10	MR. McWADE: I recall it.
11	MR. DUMAIS: All right. And did the that
12	information or that complaint come in directly to you?
13	MR. McWADE: I don't believe so. I have no
14	recollection of it. Occurrences are received in various
15	manners and I don't have any personal recollection.
16	MR. DUMAIS: So do you recall assigning this
17	occurrence or this investigation to someone specifically
18	from your detachment?
19	MR. McWADE: No, sir, I don't.
20	MR. DUMAIS: All right. My understanding is
21	that at one point-in-time one of your officers, Officer
22	McDougald, would have begun this investigation?
23	MR. McWADE: That is my understanding.
24	MR. DUMAIS: All right. So do you recall
25	what rank Officer McDougald had at the time?

1	MR. McWADE: Constable, I'm not sure of the
2	direct classification because there is different levels of
3	constable.
4	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. Do you recall this
5	investigation specifically?
6	MR. McWADE: Not in great detail.
7	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. So you required the
8	assistance of some of the documents that were put to you to
9	refresh your memory. Is that correct?
10	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
11	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
12	I understand, as a result of this complaint,
13	a number of firearms were seized or given to your
14	detachment for safekeeping. Is that correct?
15	MR. McWADE: That's yes, sir.
16	MR. DUMAIS: And my understanding is that
17	Officer McDougald, in his investigation, would have
18	uncovered that there would have been two outstanding
19	firearms located in the residence. Is that correct?
20	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
21	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. And my understanding is
22	that the information about these two outstanding firearms
23	came to you initially. Is that correct?
24	MR. MCWADE: My recollection is that I
25	called the Firearms Registration people to obtain

1	information in regards to weapons that individual had
2	registered to his name and the location that they were
3	properly registered to.
4	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. And you would have
5	related this information to your officers. Is that
6	correct?
7	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
8	MR. DUMAIS: And my understanding is that at
9	some point in time a warrant would have been prepared, a
10	search warrant?
11	MR. McWADE: There was, sir.
12	MR. DUMAIS: And perhaps if I can just ask
13	Madam Clerk to show you this document, which is Document
14	Number 706160?
15	And, Madam Clerk, there are a number of
16	documents here, the information to obtain the warrant and
17	the actual warrant itself, and its Appendix are in separate
18	document form.
19	So it's 706160, 706161, 706162
20	actually, it's all Exhibit 603 and 706163. And it is
21	all Exhibit 603.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Six zerothree (603)?
23	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
24	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
25	The first document number I gave you, Mr.

1	Commissioner, is not an exhibit yet. It's the information
2	to obtain the search warrant. So that should be filed as
3	the second exhibit this morning.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
5	Exhibit 2521 will be an Information to
6	Obtain a Search Warrant and it's sworn on the $10^{\mathrm{th}}$ of
7	February, 1993.
8	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-2521:
9	(706160) Information to Obtain Search
10	Warrant - February 10, 1993.
11	MR. DUMAIS: So you have the Information to
12	Obtain before you, sir?
13	MR. McWADE: Yes, I do.
14	MR. DUMAIS: So if we look at the top there,
15	it appears
16	MR. WALLACE: Mr Commissioner, the last
17	exhibit is the Information, but there are two appendixes
18	that form
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah.
20	MR. WALLACE: part of the Information
21	that are the latter documents, so I think they should all
22	go in. Referring to the Information, they would form part
23	of the Information although they are separate documents.
24	MR. DUMAIS: I mean that's right.
25	It wasn't filed at the time, Mr.

1	Commissioner, so
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I have Appendix A
3	and B, and they are on are you saying I'm looking at
4	603, and Page 2 and 3, there's Appendix A and Appendix B
5	there. Is that the Appendix A and Appendix B that we're
6	looking for?
7	MR. DUMAIS: That's correct, Mr.
8	Commissioner.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
10	MR. DUMAIS: I think Document Number the
11	Appendix A and B, which is in the Exhibit 603, actually go
12	with the Information to Obtain the warrant.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. I'm clear on that.
14	Thank you.
15	MR. DUMAIS: So then this is an Information
16	to Obtain a Search Warrant. The information is being sworn
17	by Steve McDougald. You see where I'm at, at the top of
18	that document?
19	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
20	MR. DUMAIS: And then it refers to a the
21	search of a dwelling house, a garage and a boathouse of a
22	Mr. Ronald Leroux?
23	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
24	MR. DUMAIS: And I understand that this
25	search warrant is being requested to look for two weapons,

1	and they're identified there on the Information. You see
2	this?
3	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
4	MR. DUMAIS: And it appears that this
5	Information was sworn on the 10 <sup>th</sup> day of February, 1993?
6	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
7	MR. DUMAIS: And in this Information, there
8	are two Appendices that are attached. The Number 1 are
9	essentially the grounds that Officer McDougald would have
10	had to obtain the warrant.
11	And I'm just going to ask you to look at
12	Appendix B of Exhibit 603.
13	And I'm assuming, Mr. Commissioner, that at
14	the time that this exhibit was filed, it was filed as a
15	confidential exhibit?
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, it was.
17	MR. DUMAIS: Thank you.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Hence
19	MR. DUMAIS: So you have this Appendix
20	before you, Mr. McWade?
21	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
22	MR. DUMAIS: So essentially that tells a
23	story, so what happened, that he conducted his
24	investigation and his grounds, his reasonable belief for
25	believing that the weapons are located at that residence.

1	Is that correct?
2	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
3	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
4	So the decision of Mr or Officer
5	McDougald to obtain this search warrant and him swearing
6	information before a justice, were you involved in that
7	process at all?
8	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
9	MR. DUMAIS: Did you provide him with any
10	direction?
11	MR. McWADE: I believe I may have assigned
12	him somebody or asked him to seek out the assistance of
13	Randy Millar. He was one of our detective constables.
14	MR. DUMAIS: So he would have assisted in
15	the execution of the search warrant. Is that correct?
16	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
17	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
18	But do you recall at the time whether or not
19	you would have reviewed either the information to obtain or
20	the search warrant once it was granted and before it was
21	executed?
22	MR. McWADE: I did not, sir.
23	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
24	But at one point in time, you would have
25	become aware that these officers were executing this

1	warrant; is that correct?
2	MR. McWADE: I don't recall whether I knew
3	exactly when they were going to do it. I may have found
4	out after they had completed it or aware just before they
5	were going to the residence. I just cannot specifically
6	recall.
7	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
8	And you certainly were not involved with the
9	search itself; is that correct?
10	MR. McWADE: I was not involved, sir. I was
11	not there.
12	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
13	And as far as you know, Officer McDougald
14	and Officer Millar would have been involved in executing
15	this warrant. Is that correct?
16	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
17	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
18	And were both these officers directly under
19	your command?
20	MR. McWADE: They were part of, yes, sir, my
21	responsibility.
22	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
23	So Detective Constable Millar reported to
24	you as well; is that correct?
25	MR. McWADE: It was a situation where he was

1	part of a District Crime team as well as being a resource
2	of the detachment. So dependent on whatever was required,
3	I would seek out see if he was available to provide
4	assistance because he may be in another area assisting on
5	another case.
6	MR. DUMAIS: So my understanding is he would
7	and you made reference to this, that he reported to the
8	Area Crime Sergeant; is that correct?
9	MR. McWADE: Yes.
10	MR. DUMAIS: And he was part of the Regional
11	Criminal Investigation Bureau Commander or he reported
12	to him?
13	MR. McWADE: I missed the last part there.
14	MR. DUMAIS: He reported to the Regional
15	Criminal Investigation Bureau Commander? Did he report to
16	anyone else other than to
17	MR. MCWADE: He was involved with the Area
18	Crime Sergeant and there was there's a chain of command
19	with them as well as a chain of command within the
20	detachment. He was a shared resource.
21	MR. DUMAIS: Okay.
22	MR. McWADE: But the paperwork and
23	accountability fell within the detachment, providing cars
24	and administrative assistance and occasionally
25	investigative assistance.

1	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
2	So do you recall whether or not the
3	Detective Constable was involved in the initial part of
4	this investigation, so when the information first came in,
5	in December, or whether or not he was just involved with
6	the search itself?
7	MR. MCWADE: I have no definitive recall on
8	that, sir. I'm not 100 percent sure.
9	MR. DUMAIS: Do you have any specific memory
10	of assigning him to this search or assisting Officer
11	McDougald?
12	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
13	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. Now, my understanding is
14	that the search warrant was executed by the officers, and
15	at one point in time they would have returned to the
16	detachment.
17	Do you recall whether or not you would have
18	spoken to any of the officers when they came back?
19	MR. MCWADE: In all probability I did, but I
20	don't have any direct recall of it as to the exact time of
21	day and when I exactly met one or the other or both.
22	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
23	I'm going to ask you then to look at the
24	and I think this is the last page of Exhibit 603, which we
25	just looked at.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Is the last page 198?
2	MR. DUMAIS: That's correct, Mr.
3	Commissioner.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
5	MR. DUMAIS: Now, my understanding, sir,
6	this is a return to a Justice on the execution of a search
7	warrant. Is that your understanding as well?
8	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
9	MR. DUMAIS: And this document is usually
10	prepared after the warrant is executed and you go back
11	before a Justice of the Peace and essentially indicate what
12	has been seized
13	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
14	MR. DUMAIS: during the execution of the
15	search. Is that correct?
16	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
17	MR. DUMAIS: And if we look at the bottom,
18	just below the date, there's two items that are noted.
19	The first one I believe reads:
20	"Seized Item 2, unknown weapons, 45
21	cal. [calibre], serial number 3."
22	And the second item that's indicated there:
23	"Seized unidentified restricted
24	weapons."
25	Is that correct?

1	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
2	MR. DUMAIS: So were you made aware when the
3	officers returned to the detachment that they had the
4	occasion to seize these two weapons?
5	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
6	MR. DUMAIS: And were you aware that after
7	the when they returned to the detachment, that they had
8	also seized a number of videotapes and a suitcase?
9	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
10	MR. DUMAIS: And these items do not form
11	part of the return that was made to a Justice. Is that
12	correct?
13	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
14	MR. DUMAIS: Do you have any explanation for
15	that?
16	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
17	MR. DUMAIS: Were you made aware that it was
18	not part of the return to Justice back at that time?
19	MR. McWADE: I don't recall.
20	MR. DUMAIS: Okay, so you don't recall
21	reviewing this document when it was prepared at the time?
22	MR. McWADE: No, sir, I've never seen this
23	document before.
24	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. Do you recall having any
25	discussion with the officers who had executed the search as

1	to whether or not they should include this on this return
2	to Justice, any type of conversation?
3	MR. McWADE: No recollection on that, sir.
4	MR. DUMAIS: All right. Is it fair to say
5	then that the first time that you were made aware that this
6	was not part of the listed items seized at the time was in
7	preparation for your evidence here today?
8	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Were you surprised by the
10	fact, sir, that it wasn't in the return?
11	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Is that a usual practice
13	that people don't put the whole thing down?
14	MR. McWADE: My understanding of it is if
15	you seize something as a result of a search warrant, that
16	every item that's seized should have been or should be
17	on the warrant.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Thank you.
19	MR. McWADE: The disposition of it is to be
20	determined, but it should be listed.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
22	MR. DUMAIS: Now, I understand that later
23	on, Detective Sergeant Pat Hall would have conducted a
24	number of interviews with respect to this search, and I
25	understand that you would have been one of the persons

1	interviewed. Is that correct?
2	MR. McWADE: Yes, I was, sir.
3	MR. DUMAIS: And my understanding is that
4	the officers that were interviewed were Detective Sergeant
5	Randy Millar. Is that correct?
6	MR. McWADE: It's possible, sir. I know he
7	interviewed myself and he mentioned that he'd interviewed
8	Constable McDougald, but I can't remember any others.
9	MR. DUMAIS: And these interviews would have
10	been conducted at different times in 1998 and in 1999. Is
11	that correct?
12	MR. McWADE: I believe they started then.
13	Mine was in '99.
14	MR. DUMAIS: All right. And you were no
15	longer at the detachment at that time?
16	MR. McWADE: No, I was the Unit Commander of
17	the Telecommunications in Ottawa.
18	MR. DUMAIS: Okay, but had you been made
19	aware that Detective Sergeant Hall was looking into this
20	matter and was interviewing a number of your officers?
21	MR. McWADE: At some point-in-time I was
22	advised that I was going to be interviewed in regards to an
23	occurrence in Lancaster, and then when I met with him I got
24	the full details of what was going on.
25	MR. DUMAIS: So we're just going to go

1	through some of these statements that were given, Mr.
2	McWade, starting with Document Number 112710.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
4	Exhibit 2522 is an interview report of Randy
5	Millar. The date of the interview is the $3^{\rm rd}$ day of
6	December, 1998, and there should be or should there not
7	be yes, a ban on publication stamp?
8	MR. DUMAIS: Yes, please, Mr. Commissioner.
9	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-2522:
10	(112710) Interview Report of Randy Millar -
11	December 3, 1998
12	MR. DUMAIS: The name of C-8 appears on the
13	second page.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
15	MR. DUMAIS: So this appears to be the
16	statement that was given by Detective Sergeant Randy Millar
17	on the $3^{\rm rd}$ day of December, 1998 and, essentially, he's
18	being asked what his involvement in this search was.
19	And he starts his statement or his answer
20	starts at the second paragraph on that first page,
21	essentially indicating that he would have been assisting
22	with the search and the times he would have attended the
23	residence on February 10 <sup>th</sup> .
24	If you just look at the second page of his
25	statement, the first paragraph, and I'll just read it out

1	for you.
2	I'm starting to read it from the second line
3	I'll start with the first line:
4	"It was beside a bathtub. They
5	appeared to be hidden because of their
6	location. There was two loose
7	videotapes which appeared to be
8	pornographic. They were seized and
9	both tapes and suitcase were seized. A
10	telephone call was made to Project P to
11	ascertain if any Criminal Code
12	violations, but couldn't get an answer
13	on the phone. I located a handgun in
14	the closet which looked old and rusted.
15	It was in a closet at the entrance to
16	this house. We left the residence at
17	1540 hours, and it was secured by C-8.
18	Constable McDougald received all
19	evidence. That concludes my involvement
20	in that case."
21	So Detective Sergeant Millar appears to be
22	indicating here that he would have contacted Project P?
23	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
24	MR. DUMAIS: If you can just start, do you
25	know what Project P was?

1	MR. MCWADE: A specialized group of
2	individuals that investigate pornographic aspects, based
3	out of Orillia.
4	MR. DUMAIS: All right. And were you made
5	aware when the officers came back or at any point-in-time
6	doing this search that the officers were contacting Project
7	P?
8	MR. McWADE: I believe it was mentioned that
9	they had contacted Project P but were unsuccessful.
10	MR. DUMAIS: Do you recall whether or not
11	any other attempts were made to contact them after the
12	execution of the search?
13	MR. MCWADE: I have no recollection, sir.
14	MR. DUMAIS: But certainly Detective
15	Sergeant Millar appears to indicate here that he would have
16	had no further involvement in this case. Is that your
17	recollection as well?
18	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
19	MR. DUMAIS: And is that your recollection
20	that he would not have been involved in either reviewing
21	the videotapes or the destruction of them?
22	MR. McWADE: That's correct, sir.
23	MR. DUMAIS: Is it your understanding that
24	the video this suitcase would have been opened at the
25	residence?

l	MR. McWADE: My understanding of it is it
2	was opened at the residence.
3	MR. DUMAIS: And do you recall were you
4	provided with the description of what was found in the
5	suitcase?
6	MR. McWADE: I can't recall whether I was
7	told of what the contents were or whether it was shown to
8	me, but my understanding of it, it was full of tapes and
9	then there was two tapes that were didn't fit in the
10	case, they were loose.
11	MR. DUMAIS: Do you recall whether or not
12	you had been made aware whether or not the tapes had been
13	reviewed on site at the residence itself?
14	MR. McWADE: I can't recall, sir.
15	MR. DUMAIS: You can't recall.
16	At one point-in-time you would have provided
17	your officers with instructions with respect to those
18	tapes. Is that correct?
19	MR. McWADE: I directed them to view the
20	tapes for content to determine if there was anything that
21	might fall under pornographic guidelines.
22	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. Were you specific in
23	giving them instructions as to how they should be reviewing
24	these tapes?
25	MR. McWADE: I have no specific recall of

1	it. I don't recall whether, like, "Watch it all" or
2	"Reviewing the beginning, review the end and random in the
3	middle" to determine the content of the video. I just
4	don't have a total recall of that.
5	MR. DUMAIS: Okay.
6	And perhaps we can just have a look at the
7	statement you would have given on the $4^{\mathrm{th}}$ day of February
8	1999, and that's Exhibit 691.
9	And you're explaining this to, again,
10	Detective Sergeant Pat Hall. I'm just looking at the last
11	three lines of that first page.
12	"All of the tapes appear blank tapes
13	with recorded material on them. Some
14	are labelled. I directed that each of
15	the tapes be viewed for content. I
16	observed some of the contents. They
17	appeared to be copies of professionally
18	commercially produced movies involving
19	homosexual relationships between adult
20	males. Constable Steve McDougald, and
21	I'm not sure if there was someone else,
22	viewed the tapes."
23	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
24	MR. DUMAIS: So is that your recollection as
25	well that you would have viewed some of the contents of the

1	tape?
2	MR. McWADE: At some point-in-time I believe
3	I walked into where the reviewing process was being done
4	and saw for myself the material. I didn't stay for a
5	length of time, but I did personally see.
6	MR. DUMAIS: There were quite a number of
7	tapes. I believe there was 22 tapes in the suitcase and
8	the additional two loose tapes. Is that correct?
9	MR. McWADE: I'm not sure of the total
10	number. I think it was 22 in total.
11	MR. DUMAIS: Okay.
12	MR. McWADE: My recollection is a case a
13	locked case that had been opened.
14	MR. DUMAIS: Yes.
15	MR. McWADE: And two loose ones.
16	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. It would have taken a
17	considerable period of time to review all of these tapes
18	from end to end?
19	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
20	MR. DUMAIS: Do you recall whether or not
21	your officers were directed to review them from end to end?
22	MR. McWADE: I can't recall specifically
23	whether I told them to watch from end to end. I have a
24	thought in my mind that either "fast-forward" I didn't
25	have the resources to watch 22 tapes at full standard play

1	for that amount of time. It needed to be done, but by
2	doing the start, the finish, and random, they would be able
3	to give an opinion for viewing of the tapes.
4	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
5	And we'll look at Officer McDougald's
6	statement in just a minute, but in the latter part of this
7	paragraph you indicated to Detective Sergeant Hall that you
8	weren't sure who the second officer was that would have
9	reviewed these tapes?
10	MR. McWADE: Pardon me? I'm sorry, I missed
11	it.
12	MR. DUMAIS: You indicated in your statement
13	that you weren't sure who the second officer was that would
14	have reviewed the tapes?
15	MR. McWADE: At that time I wasn't sure,
16	sir.
17	MR. DUMAIS: Okay.
18	And I'm just going to ask you to look at
19	Document Number 112696.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
21	Exhibit Number 2523 is an interview report
22	of Patrick Dussault. The date of the interview is $19^{ m th}$ of
23	January, 1999.
24	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-2523:
25	(112696) Interview Report of Patrick

1	Dussault - January 19, 1999
2	MR. DUMAIS: Now, this is a statement that a
3	police officer from the OPP Lancaster Detachment would have
4	given on the $19^{\mathrm{th}}$ of January, 1999. There's no rank there,
5	but do you recall whether or not Officer Dussault was one
6	of your officers during that period of time?
7	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir, he was.
8	MR. DUMAIS: And you have and he appears
9	to indicate that he would have assisted Officer McDougald
10	in reviewing these tapes?
11	MR. McWADE: That would be entirely
12	possible.
13	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. So you have no reason to
14	disbelieve that?
15	MR. McWADE: No, sir, none at all.
16	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
17	Now, the next statement is a statement that
18	would have been taken from Officer McDougald, and that is
19	Exhibit 690. So, again, this is a statement that was given
20	to Detective Sergeant Hall on the $11^{\rm th}$ day of December, '98.
21	I'm just looking at the last paragraph on
22	that first page. So Officer McDougald is referring to the
23	search warrant being executed on the $10^{\rm th}$ day of February at
24	Mr. Leroux's house. And I'm going to start reading from
25	the last four lines from the bottom:

1	"we contacted a lawyer, Malcolm
2	MacDonald, lawyer for Ron Leroux, and
3	advised him that a warrant was to be
4	executed at Ron Leroux's residence.
5	Detective Constable Randy Millar and
6	myself attended Ron Leroux's residence.
7	[C-8] was already at the residence and
8	had unlocked the front door. The house
9	was searched for restricted firearms on
10	the search warrant."
11	So my first question is, were you aware that
12	at the time, Mr. Leroux was represented by Mr. Malcolm
13	MacDonald?
14	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
15	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. Were you aware that the
16	officer had contacted him and asked him whether or not he
17	would attend the residence so that the search warrant could
18	be executed?
19	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
20	MR. DUMAIS: Did you subsequently become
21	aware that Mr. Malcolm MacDonald was acting for Ron Leroux
22	on the criminal charges?
23	MR. McWADE: I'm not 100 percent sure, but I
24	believe I first was advised there was charges laid and it
25	was at a court appearance later on, much later on. I think

1	April I think it's April.
2	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
3	MR. McWADE: But it was much later.
4	MR. DUMAIS: Do you recall whether or not
5	you were present at that court appearance?
6	MR. McWADE: I don't believe so.
7	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. So you think the
8	information would have come then from one of your officers
9	who would have reported back after the plea had been
10	entered?
11	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
12	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
13	And as far as you remember, Mr. Leroux had
14	entered a plea of guilty to the charge?
15	MR. McWADE: That's my recollection, sir.
16	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
17	So I'm just looking at the second page now
18	in the top paragraph. So I'm just looking at about halfway
19	in that paragraph and I'll just read it out for you. The
20	sentence starts with "The suitcase". So:
21	"The suitcase and tapes were seized.
22	It is not known whether any firearms
23	were being held inside the suitcase.
24	Handguns were found in the residence
25	and seized pursuant to the warrant.

1	The suitcase was opened and 20 more
2	videos were located inside. I took
3	possession of all the seized items
4	located in the house. C-8 made no
5	comments about the videotapes. All
6	items were removed from the house and
7	transported to the Lancaster detachment
8	and placed in the property room."
9	Is that correct?
10	MR. McWADE: That would appear to be the
11	evidence from Constable McDougald
12	MR. DUMAIS: And certainly
13	MR. McWADE: and my recollection is at
14	the end, when they returned to the detachment.
15	MR. DUMAIS: Right. But certainly you will
16	agree with me that Constable McDougald appears to be
17	indicating that the suitcase would have been opened at the
18	residence itself?
19	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
20	MR. DUMAIS: All right. And, as far as you
21	know, C-8 would not have been asked to provide a statement
22	about his knowledge of these tapes?
23	MR. McWADE: Not that I'm aware of, sir.
24	MR. DUMAIS: All right. And certainly you
25	would not have directed your officers to interview C-8

1	afterwards?
2	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
3	MR. DUMAIS: All right. Now, I'm then
4	looking at the second paragraph of that same page, and it
5	reads as follows:
6	"It was determined by Staff Sergeant
7	J. McWade that I view the videotapes
8	randomly to ascertain if there was any
9	child pornography or home video of
10	local people."
11	So, Officer McDougald appears to indicate
12	here in his statement that he had been instructed to review
13	the tapes randomly. Do you agree with that
14	characterization of Officer McDougald?
15	MR. McWADE: That that sounds forms,
16	like, part of my recollection, that I have it stuck in my
17	mind, kind of thing, that that's what I directed him to do.
18	MR. DUMAIS: All right. Now and the
19	second part of that statement is that you would have
20	directed him to review the tapes, keeping in mind
21	that whether or not there was any child pornography or
22	home videos of local people. Do you recall giving those
23	instructions to Officer McDougald?
24	MR. McWADE: I'm not sure if I if the
25	terminology I used for the content of the tapes, but I was

1	concerned about child pornography, yes.
2	MR. DUMAIS: And the second part of that, of
3	those instructions, were to look for home videos of local
4	people. So do you recall using those words and instructing
5	him specifically to look for that?
6	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
7	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
8	MR. McWADE: And would there have been
9	anything, any reason, in 1993 at the time of the search for
10	you to be looking for home videos for local people? Did
11	you have any prior knowledge that tapes were in existence,
12	or that was something that you were concerned with?
13	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
14	MR. DUMAIS: All right. After the tapes had
15	been reviewed by the officers, do you recall whether or not
16	they would have reported their findings to you afterwards?
17	MR. McWADE: I believe they just indicated
18	that they Constable McDougald indicated that the task
19	was completed and it was all material relating to, by and
20	large, sexual relations between adult males.
21	MR. DUMAIS: Do you recall whether or not
22	you were told if they were commercial tapes or if they were
23	homemade videos?
24	MR. McWADE: I believe he mentioned that,
25	and I also recall that when I was that I'd seen

1	commercial-type tapes or labels on on the tapes.
2	MR. DUMAIS: All right. I understand that
3	at one point in time Mr. Leroux would have been asked to
4	come at the detachment, is that correct, after this
5	seizure?
6	MR. McWADE: My understanding is for some
7	time they tried to contact him and they were not
8	successful, but sometime in the spring he did present
9	himself to the detachment and was and met with Constable
10	McDougald.
11	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. You were not part of
12	this interview?
13	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
14	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. I'm just looking at the
15	last paragraph of this statement, and this appears to be a
16	summary of the interview that Mr. Leroux would have given,
17	and reads as follows:
18	"During this interview, Leroux was
19	asked who owned the videotapes. He
20	replied that they were not his, and
21	that he found them in a garbage
22	dumpster at the Raisin River Camp
23	Ground where he was employed. He
24	stated that he took the suitcase with
25	videos away from the campground so that

1	they would not fall into the wrong
2	hands, or kids would not get a hold of
3	them."
4	So do you recall whether or not you had been
5	made aware of that, that Mr. Leroux was indicating that he
6	had found these tapes?
7	MR. MCWADE: After the completion of the
8	interview, the Constable McDougald advised me that
9	the Mr. Leroux had indicated that the tapes were not his
10	and that they'd been found in a garbage can.
11	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. But you recall that,
12	that he had specifically said that he had found the tapes?
13	MR. McWADE: I got that information from
14	Constable McDougald.
15	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. And my understanding is
16	that Officer McDougald would have offered to return the
17	tapes to Mr. Leroux? Is that correct?
18	MR. McWADE: That's correct, sir. The tapes
19	that he had was not on it is not unlawful to possess
20	them, after the review, so he would have returned them.
21	MR. DUMAIS: My understanding is that
22	Mr. Leroux did not want the tapes to be returned to him, is
23	that correct?
24	MR. McWADE: That's correct, sir.
25	MR. DUMAIS: And my understanding is that he

1	would have executed a quit claim?
2	MR. McWADE: Yes.
3	MR. DUMAIS: And has agreed that these tapes
4	could be destroyed by the OPP?
5	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
6	MR. DUMAIS: All right. And if we can just
7	show you Exhibit 1144; do you recognize this document, Mr.
8	McWade?
9	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir. It's a property
10	report form. At that time, it was known as a LA135. It's
11	for control of property within the detachment.
12	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. So after a search
13	warrant is executed, one of these property reports has to
14	be filled out by the officers, just as some sort of a
15	control of the property that's
16	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
17	MR. DUMAIS: under your control? And it
18	refers here to if we look at the top of their document,
19	it provides the address of Mr. Leroux, it indicates the
20	name of Mr. Leroux, and then there's a description here of
21	the tapes?
22	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
23	MR. DUMAIS: And I think the first item is
24	the 20 tapes that were found in the briefcase or the
25	suitcase, sorry, and then the other two loose tapes. So

1	you were correct, there were 22 tapes. Do you see that?
2	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
3	MR. DUMAIS: And, if we look at the bottom
4	there, there's a signature that appears to have been given
5	on the $25^{\text{th}}$ day of April, 1993. It appears to be the
6	signature of Mr. Ron Leroux?
7	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
8	MR. DUMAIS: Would you have been the one
9	that witnessed his signature?
10	MR. MCWADE: I don't recall if I did or not,
11	sir.
12	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. But at one point in time
13	you would have been made aware that he would have agreed to
14	sign the quit claim?
15	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
16	MR. DUMAIS: All right. And then there's
17	another signature at the bottom. It appears to have been
18	signed on the $4^{\text{th}}$ day of May, 1993, and if you look at the
19	middle box it appears to indicate, "Disposal approved," and
20	then there's a little "X" down there, at "Detachment
21	Commander," and there's a signature to the right. Is that
22	your signature, sir?
23	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir, it is.
24	MR. DUMAIS: All right. So am I to
25	understand then that you, as Detachment Commander, need to

1	sign off on the destruction of any property in your
2	Detachment?
3	MR. McWADE: There's procedures in place, or
4	there was at that time. I'm not aware of the current
5	policy, but there was procedures in place for disposal of
6	property, and it depended on the type of property how it
7	gets disposed of.
8	For example, liquor would be disposed of in
9	one manner. For example, it would be poured down the sink
10	and empties returned to the Beer Store. The other glass
11	would, at that time, have gone in the garbage. There's
12	particular areas that go back to the owner. If it was
13	found property, then there was criteria in our police
14	orders directing us as to how to do it. And if it was of
15	no value or deemed to be it could be destroyed, then it
16	would be signed off in that fashion.
17	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. But I guess the form
18	specifically provides that well, there was only one
19	checkmark for the detachment commander. Do you see that at
20	the bottom?
21	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
22	MR. DUMAIS: I guess my question was are you
23	the only one that can sign off on the destruction of
24	property?
25	MR. McWADE: For this kind of property, yes,

1	sir.
2	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
3	MR. McWADE: Unless I've designated it to
4	somebody else, but in this case I did it myself.
5	MR. DUMAIS: Yeah. But in I mean, does
6	this mean that you specifically have to destroy the
7	property yourself or does it simply mean that you have to
8	give the order?
9	MR. McWADE: Give the order.
10	MR. DUMAIS: Okay.
11	MR. McWADE: Some of the items, they
12	required the involvement of a uniform member.
13	MR. DUMAIS: And if I'm looking just on top
14	of your signature there at the bottom, it appears to
15	indicate "destroyed by fire". Is that correct?
16	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
17	MR. DUMAIS: All right. And that's your
18	handwriting, sir?
19	MR. McWADE: That's my handwriting, sir.
20	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. And during that period
21	of time, can you just give us an idea of what was the
22	method of destruction of seized property? Was there a
23	specific way that your detachment was destroying property?
24	Was there more than one way?
25	MR. McWADE: There is different ways of

l	disposing of the property. It was all laid out in what
2	they call Part 10 police orders and it provided directions,
3	for example, of found property; try and locate the owner;
4	period of retention; and if you still couldn't if there
5	was any value to it, how you can dispose of it by bids.
6	There was a whole series of guidelines laid out for us that
7	we follow.
8	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
9	So do you recall what the guidelines were
10	for the destruction of pornographic material?
11	MR. McWADE: To my recollection, there was
12	nothing specific relating to a specific area or line for
13	that kind of material.
14	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. And my understanding
15	it's indicated here that these tapes would have been
16	destroyed by fire. Do you recall how things were set up at
17	the detachment for the destruction of property by fire?
18	MR. McWADE: The caretaker had a 45-gallon
19	drum in the backyard that occasionally the property would
20	get destroyed in. It would get set on fire and be gone.
21	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
22	So you guys, at the time, were not using any
23	type of incinerators locally? Everything was being
24	that required to be burned was burned at the detachment
25	itself?

1	MR. McWADE: If it was an item that could be
2	burned locally, then it was burned locally. Some items,
3	for example, drugs, needed to be incinerated or taken
4	someplace else for disposal. They were dealt with in a
5	different fashion.
6	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
7	And you indicated that there was a drum. So
8	there's just a drum in the back of the detachment. Is that
9	correct?
10	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
11	MR. DUMAIS: And a fairly large drum, a 45-
12	gallon drum. Is that correct?
13	MR. McWADE: I believe it was a 45-gallon
14	drum.
15	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. And do you recall
16	specifically in this instance what your involvement
17	well, whether or not you would have directed someone to
18	destroy those tapes or whether or not you had some personal
19	involvement?
20	MR. McWADE: I'm the one who put them in the
21	fire and personally burned them. I did not leave until
22	they were completely on fire.
23	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
24	And my understanding is that the caretaker,
25	Mr. Lalonde, would have been involved as well?

1	MR. McWADE: I have no specific recollection
2	of it. Whether he was standing right beside me when I did
3	it or he was someplace else, I'm not sure. All I can
4	recall was the barrel was on fire and I put the tapes in it
5	myself.
6	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
7	MR. McWADE: I just I can't remember
8	where he was or what he was doing.
9	MR. DUMAIS: Okay.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Would he have been aware
11	that you were burning these things?
12	MR. McWADE: I would think that he would be
13	aware that I was burning something, but not specifically
14	what it was.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
16	MR. McWADE: I don't have any specific
17	knowledge of him being there. I could have set it like
18	started the barrel on fire myself, but I just don't recall.
19	MR. DUMAIS: Do you recall whether or not
20	any accelerant had been used, whether or not there was any
21	gas?
22	MR. McWADE: I can't recall, sir.
23	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
24	So, just generally speaking, when property
25	requires to be destroyed by fire and your policy provides

1	that you can do it locally, who would typically do that at
2	your detachment?
3	MR. McWADE: It could be myself. One of the
4	NCOs would supervise the destruction or disposal of
5	property.
6	MR. DUMAIS: Is there any reason why you
7	would become personally involved with the destruction here?
8	MR. McWADE: No, sir, I just did it.
9	Sometimes there was days when I was the only
10	one that was in NCO that was in the office, and I would
11	do it.
12	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
13	So then my understanding is that the seized
14	items would have been in some sort of a property facility
15	at your detachment?
16	MR. McWADE: There was a property room
17	inside the detachment building, sir.
18	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. So do you have a
19	specific recollection of going to that room, grabbing that
20	suitcase and those tapes?
21	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
22	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. Do you recall whether or
23	not just the tapes were destroyed or was the suitcase
24	destroyed as well?
25	MR. McWADE: My recollection is the whole

1	thing went in, sir.
2	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. And do you recall
3	whether or not you would have been involved in starting the
4	fire in the barrel prior to putting the items in there?
5	MR. McWADE: I'm sorry, but I have no
6	recollection of that part.
7	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
8	Now, you indicated that you would have
9	placed the items in the barrel, sir. Do you recall whether
10	or not you would have stayed there until just to assure
11	yourself that everything had been destroyed?
12	MR. McWADE: When I left, everything was on
13	fire.
14	MR. DUMAIS: Okay.
15	MR. McWADE: Now, exactly I didn't wait
16	for the fire to burn out, I don't believe.
17	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. So you were there. You
18	made sure that the items were on fire, but you would have
19	left before you would have been able to ascertain that they
20	had been completely destroyed. Is that fair?
21	MR. McWADE: I don't recall remaining how
22	long I remained.
23	MR. DUMAIS: And would you recall, sir,
24	whether or not when you left, whether or not there was
25	anyone there at the barrel?

1	MR. McWADE: I don't recall, sir.
2	MR. DUMAIS: But certainly at one point-in-
3	time there would have been an indication that you would
4	have asked the caretaker to destroy these videos. Is that
5	correct? You've seen that in documents?
6	MR. McWADE: It may have, but I don't
7	recall.
8	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
9	And I mean I think if you can just look
10	again at the Exhibit 690?
11	So then at the last page, and this is
12	Officer McDougald's statement, so the last third paragraph
13	from the bottom. He indicates as follows:
14	"I was advised by Staff Sergeant McWade
15	on the $4^{\text{th}}$ day of May, 1993 that the
16	videotapes and suitcase was destroyed
17	locally by the caretaker burning them
18	in a 45-gallon drum that date."
19	Do you see that?
20	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
21	MR. DUMAIS: Do you know whether or not you
22	would have advised Officer McDougald of that fact?
23	MR. McWADE: I don't recall saying that.
24	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
25	MR. McWADE: My recollection is that I

46

1	burned them.
2	MR. DUMAIS: Pardon me?
3	MR. McWADE: My recollection is I am the one
4	who physically put them in the fire, not the caretaker.
5	MR. DUMAIS: Now, I'm just going to ask you
6	to look at another statement, sir.
7	It's a statement that Mr. Leroux would have
8	given and it is Exhibit 562.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Five-six-two (562)?
10	MR. DUMAIS: And this, sir, is a statement
11	that a Ronald George Leroux would have given to Detective
12	Constables McDonell and Fagan. The date of interview in on
13	the 28 <sup>th</sup> day of March, 1994.
14	And am I correct, sir, that at that
15	particular date, you were no longer the Commander at the
16	Lancaster Police Detachment?
17	MR. McWADE: That's correct, sir.
18	MR. DUMAIS: And this, as I understand it,
19	is a statement that was given by Mr. Leroux and it appears
20	that he would have been asked some questions about his
21	knowledge of the Ken Seguin suicide?
22	MR. McWADE: It would appear so, sir.
23	MR. DUMAIS: And I'm looking at the last
24	page of that statement, there's a reference here to
25	videotapes. And it's at about mid-page, there's a date

1	there. It starts with "In February of 1993". Do you see
2	that?
3	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
4	MR. DUMAIS: It reads as follows:
5	"In February of 1993, Ken put a
6	briefcase in my house containing VCR
7	tapes of gay men and the police seized
8	them when they took some guns from my
9	house when I wasn't there. The guns
10	were since sold to C-8. The Lancaster
11	OPP were the police department that
12	seized the tapes and guns."
13	Were you aware, sir, that Mr. Leroux had
14	subsequently indicated that these tapes actually belonged
15	to Mr. Ken Seguin?
16	MR. McWADE: I have no knowledge. I've
17	never heard that, sir.
18	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. So you had never been
19	made aware of that?
20	MR. McWADE: Just what I'm reading here now,
21	sir; never heard of it before.
22	MR. DUMAIS: And, actually, what Mr. Leroux
23	had indicated when he came to the detachment was that he
24	would have found those tapes at a camper. Is that correct?
25	MR. McWADE: The Raisin River campground. I

1	believe he worked there.	
2	MR. DUMAIS:	Correct. That was what he told
3	you in 1993. Is that corre	ct?
4	MR. McWADE:	Yes, sir.
5	MR. DUMAIS:	Or what he told to Officer
6	McDougald?	
7	MR. McWADE:	Yes
8	MR. DUMAIS:	Now, do you recall whether or
9	not during this investigati	on, and I mean the 1993
10	investigation of your offic	ers, whether or not the name of
11	Mr. Ken Seguin ever surface	d?
12	MR. McWADE:	Not to my knowledge, sir.
13	MR. DUMAIS:	As far as you know, he would
14	not have been interviewed i	n this investigation?
15	MR. McWADE:	Not that I'm aware of, sir.
16	MR. DUMAIS:	And you would not been aware,
17	at the time, of any reason	why he should be interviewed?
18	MR. McWADE:	Not that I'm aware of, sir.
19	MR. DUMAIS:	All right.
20	Now, Mr. Seg	ruin would have committed suicide
21	later in that year, in Nove	mber of 1993?
22	MR. McWADE:	Yes, sir.
23	MR. DUMAIS:	Do you recall that?
24	MR. McWADE:	Yes, sir.
25	MR. DUMAIS:	And were you still the

48

1	Detachment Commander of the Lancaster Detachment?
2	MR. McWADE: My transfer date was just
3	before that. I was in the process of going from one to the
4	other.
5	MR. DUMAIS: Yes.
6	MR. McWADE: I was physically working in
7	Lancaster, but on paper I was in Renfrew.
8	MR. DUMAIS: Do you believe that you were
9	still because your transfer date, I believe, is November
10	7 <sup>th</sup> , 1993?
11	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir. But I at that
12	point-in-time, there were still things that needed to be
13	done so I remained as the Detachment Commander, physically,
14	until I think the first week of December when then I
15	went up to work in Renfrew.
16	My family was still in the Cornwall area and
17	didn't move until June. So I requested permission to
18	finish some items that needed to be done. And so I was
19	still the Detachment Commander sitting in that seat
20	physically until I believe it was the first week of
21	December.
22	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
23	If you can just have a look at Exhibit 922?
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Nine-two-two (922).
25	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)

1	MR. DUMAIS: Now, this is the critical
2	incident report that was prepared by Mr. Émile Robert, who
3	was the area manager in Cornwall at the Probation Office;
4	and he did testify here at the Inquiry.
5	And in his report, if you look at the third
6	line, it starts with "Staff Sergeant" and I'll just read it
7	out to you:
8	"Staff Sergeant Jim McWade, Ontario
9	Provincial Police, Lancaster
10	Detachment, advised me that a friend
11	had obtained access to his residence
12	and found Ken Seguin hanging."
13	So do you recall having this discussion with
14	Mr. Robert?
15	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
16	MR. DUMAIS: Do you recall advising him of
17	that? What do you recall?
18	MR. McWADE: Having been advised by my
19	officers that Mr. Seguin was deceased.
20	MR. DUMAIS: Yes.
21	MR. McWADE: And knowing where he was
22	employed, I contacted their office to advise them of his
23	passing.
24	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. So you recall then
25	speaking to Mr. Robert?

I	MR. McWADE: I know I called the office. I
2	don't remember the individual's name specifically.
3	MR. DUMAIS: Okay.
4	MR. McWADE: I know that it was a supervisor
5	there.
6	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
7	Mr. Commissioner, if we can just take I
8	believe I'm done if we can just take the morning break.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Certainly.
10	MR. DUMAIS: I'll just review my notes and
11	make sure I've covered everything and we can come back at
12	11:00.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Certainly.
14	We'll take the morning break.
15	MR. DUMAIS: Thank you.
16	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre;
17	veuillez vous lever.
18	This hearing will resume at 11:00 a.m.
19	Upon recessing at 10:44 a.m. /
20	L'audience est suspendue à 10h44
21	Upon resuming at 11:07 a.m. /
22	L'audience est reprise à 11h07.
23	THE REGISTRAR: All rise. Veuillez vous
24	lever.
25	This hearing is now resumed. Please be

1	seated. Veuillez vous asseoir.
2	JAMES ROBERT McWADE, Resumed/Sous le même serment:
3	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF BY/INTERROGATOIRE EN-CHEF PAR MR.
4	DUMAIS (cont'd/suite):
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Proceed, sir.
6	MR. DUMAIS: I'm almost done, Mr. McWade.
7	We've looked at a number of documents here today, we've
8	filed a number of them as well and certainly, you've used
9	them to refresh your memories. Do you have any personal
10	notes that you were taking during that particular period of
11	time?
12	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
13	MR. DUMAIS: All right. And is it just that
14	you're not able to find your notes or you didn't have any
15	notes then?
16	MR. McWADE: Unable to locate my notes for
17	that time period.
18	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. So you think you were
19	keeping notes when you were Detachment Commander at
20	Lancaster; you're just not able to find them?
21	MR. McWADE: I I would have notes. How
22	much specific detail, I don't recall.
23	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. Certainly you were
24	not able to review any of these notes to refresh your
25	memory before you testified here today?

1	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: So you searched for these
3	notes.
4	MR. McWADE: Oh, yes sir.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: And would they normally
6	have been kept someplace?
7	MR. McWADE: When I retired, sir, I recall
8	packaging them up with my firearms and other police
9	paraphernalia and sending them to our headquarters in
10	Orillia, and neither they nor I have been able to locate
11	them.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you.
13	MR. DUMAIS: And just one final issue, Mr.
14	McWade. Arthur Lalonde was your caretaker during the
15	relevant period of time?
16	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
17	MR. DUMAIS: And he's the only caretaker at
18	the detachment?
19	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
20	MR. DUMAIS: And would one of his duties or
21	responsibilities have been the destruction of exhibits?
22	MR. McWADE: The responsibility and duty of
23	it fell to myself and the other supervisors. He may have
24	assisted us but it was not his responsibility.
25	MR. DUMAIS: Not responsibility; fair to say

1	that he would have assisted with the destruction of
2	exhibits?
3	MR. McWADE: Sometimes he did, like when you
4	start dumping lots of you know, liquor for example. He'd
5	take away the empties, put out the garbage, things like
6	that, but the responsibility of it fell to us, not him.
7	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
8	And you have been made aware that Mr.
9	Lalonde has been asked the question whether or not he would
10	have assisted in the destruction of videotapes, and that
11	his answer is that he doesn't remember being involved in
12	this?
13	You've been made aware of that?
14	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
15	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
16	And you've given us your explanation
17	previously. Is that correct?
18	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
19	MR. DUMAIS: All right. So Mr. McWade,
20	these are my questions.
21	We did indicate to you that you would be
22	provided with the option either to comment on the effects
23	of participating in the Inquiry has had on you, or whether
24	or not you wish to make any recommendations for the
25	Commissioner to consider. You have the opportunity to do

1	that now, before I turn over to cross-examination.
2	Do you wish to say anything?
3	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
4	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
6	MR. McWADE: Thank you.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Strawczynski?
8	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR.
9	STRAWCZYNSKI
10	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: Thank you. Good morning,
11	Mr. Commissioner.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Good morning.
13	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: Good morning, Staff
14	Sergeant McWade.
15	My name is Juda Strawczynski. I'm here on
16	behalf of a community group called Citizens for Community
17	Renewal. It's one of the parties with full standing here
18	at the Inquiry, and our organization's interest is it's
19	concerned principally with promoting institutional reform
20	to ensure the protection of children, and justice for all.
21	I just have a few questions relating to the
22	tapes that were seized. And first, just as a point of
23	clarification, with respect to the return to the Justice
24	and the discussion we had had earlier, is it your
25	testimony, sir, that in your opinion the tapes should have

1	been identified on the return to Justice at the time?
2	MR. McWADE: That's my opinion, yes, sir.
3	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: Okay. Thank you.
4	I'm going to begin at the initial stages of
5	the search. When you found out that C-8 had been present
6	at the search, did that cause any concern to you?
7	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
8	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: The fact that Mr. Leroux
9	was not present at the house either, did that cause any
10	concern to you at the time either?
11	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
12	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: And in terms of the tapes
13	that were seized, I'm still having some difficulty
14	understanding why they would have been seized and whether
15	that might have posed some difficulty for you at the time?
16	Do you have any indication, any recollection
17	as to why the tapes may have been seized; what the officers
18	may have told you then?
19	MR. McWADE: I don't recollect exactly what
20	they what they told me, but I can understand that
21	there's provision for seizure of items that might be part
22	of a criminal offence that are not specifically listed in
23	the search warrant. So they would be able to seize these
24	items and and review them, and that's what they did do.
25	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: And I understand these

1	were mostly commercially available tapes, is that correct?
2	MR. McWADE: On examination, yes sir.
3	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: And at that point at
4	the time that they were seized, that would have been aware
5	to the officers?
6	MR. McWADE: Not without reviewing them,
7	sir. Like, you're dealing with a plastic item with a label
8	on it. It still needs to be reviewed as to the content.
9	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: Okay, I understand.
10	Now you've already spoken about not having
11	access to notes that you may have had at the time and not
12	necessarily having a complete recollection of what you
13	would have instructed the officers to review.
14	But do you know whether you would have asked
15	them to review each and every tape to a certain extent, or
16	whether a random type of investigation may have been just
17	to randomly select one tape out of the pile and then
18	another tape out of the pile and do a few?
19	MR. McWADE: I cannot remember my specific
20	instructions but I'm quite sure that it would include the
21	review of each and every tape.
22	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: And that would have
23	included the two separate tapes, as well as all of the
24	tapes
25	MR. McWADE: All of the tapes, sir.

1	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: Okay.
2	Now I in your view, would it have been
3	best practice for the reviewing officer to have kept an
4	itemized list of each tape that was being reviewed and to
5	keep notes on them?
6	MR. McWADE: That would be a good practice,
7	yes.
8	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: And to your knowledge,
9	was any such record made by the reviewing officer?
10	MR. McWADE: Not that I'm aware of.
11	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: At the time that the
12	officer was presenting you with his report of what had beer
13	found on the tapes, did you ask him why there was no such
14	note?
15	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
16	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: It didn't trigger
17	anything for you at the time?
18	MR. McWADE: I didn't inspect his his
19	notebook for the content. It's not something that I do, or
20	would do, on a regular basis. They're given instructions
21	in the content of their notes and he puts in the material
22	that he feels is appropriate. In hindsight, it would
23	appear that it would have been beneficial to put more
24	information in his notebook if it's lacking.
25	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: So I understand you just

1	heard verbally from the officer having reviewed the tapes
2	that there was no evidence that was causing him concern at
3	the time?
4	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir. Plus I had also seen
5	a couple myself.
6	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: There's no template or
7	form sheet that the OPP provides to officers when reviewing
8	such evidence, or does the officer normally just provide
9	notes straight into a notebook?
10	MR. McWADE: There was there was nothing
11	in place at that time, other than list them on the Property
12	Record Report. I'm not aware of current policy or
13	procedures.
14	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: In terms of the tapes
15	themselves, you had mentioned that they were labeled. Were
16	any of them packaged?
17	MR. McWADE: I believe they were all open
18	but I'm not one hundred percent.
19	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: They by open, do you
20	mean they
21	MR. MCWADE: Like there was no cellophane on
22	them.
23	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: There was no cellophane
24	but did they have a VHS cover, for example?
25	MR. McWADE: Can't recall, sir.

1	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: You don't recall whether
2	they were all loose tapes or whether some of them had
3	marketing attached to them?
4	MR. McWADE: Had what, sir?
5	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: Had some sort of
6	marketing, promotional material on their cover?
7	MR. McWADE: My recollection of it was a
8	black tape with a label on on the tape. Now whether
9	some of them had the sleeve, the commercial sleeve that
10	might have come with it, I can't recall.
11	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: Okay. I'd just like to
12	take you to one document, sir.
13	It's Exhibit 691, and the Bates page is 556,
14	6, and this is your statement made July $4^{\rm th}$ , 1999? I
15	believe, sir, in your testimony earlier today you indicated
16	that the quit claim discussion with Ron Leroux occurred
17	with Officer McDougald. Is that correct?
18	MR. McWADE: That's my recollection, sir.
19	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: If you look at the first
20	full answer on this page, you've been asked as to your
21	knowledge as to who owned the videotapes, and you state:
22	"I don't know who owned them, but when
23	I spoke to Mr. Leroux in later April,
24	1993, he indicated that the suitcase
25	was not his. I asked him if he knew

1	who owned it, and he said no. I asked
2	him, since he didn't know who owned
3	them, would he object to having them
4	destroyed. He replied he didn't object
5	and signed a quit claim."
6	Sir, does this refresh your memory at all as
7	to discussions you may have had with Mr. Leroux?
8	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
9	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: And is there anything in
10	addition to what is found on this interview that you can
11	recall?
12	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
13	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: Do you have any
14	explanation as to why Mr. McDougald also may have had a
15	discussion with Mr. Leroux with respect to a quit claim?
16	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
17	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: When you did ask Mr.
18	Leroux about who he thought owns the tapes, did you find
19	his answer surprising, that there would have been a
20	suitcase of tapes in his house which he had never he did
21	not know who had owned them?
22	MR. MCWADE: He indicated that he didn't own
23	them, and I just took him at his word and and asked him
24	if he would it would appear, if he would object to
25	having them destroyed.

1	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: Now, I just want to take
2	you to one document with respect to the destruction of the
3	tapes, and it's Exhibit 1144, I believe.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: One-one?
5	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: One-one-four-four (1144).
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
7	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: It is the property report
8	with respect to the tapes.
9	Now, sir, you had mentioned that you had not
10	received any officers' notes with itemized lists, and here
11	once again we don't have any itemized detail on any of the
12	tapes. Is that correct?
13	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
14	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: Now, when we look to the
15	standard form here we've already reviewed that it was
16	you who had signed on the "Disposal approved by" section of
16 17	you who had signed on the "Disposal approved by" section of the form; correct?
17	the form; correct?
17 18	the form; correct?  MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
17 18 19	the form; correct?  MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.  MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: There doesn't, however,
17 18 19 20	the form; correct?  MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.  MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: There doesn't, however,  appear to be anywhere in the form to show who had destroyed
17 18 19 20 21	the form; correct?  MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.  MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: There doesn't, however,  appear to be anywhere in the form to show who had destroyed the property. Is that correct?
17 18 19 20 21 22	the form; correct?  MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.  MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: There doesn't, however,  appear to be anywhere in the form to show who had destroyed  the property. Is that correct?  MR. McWADE: No, sir.

1	had conducted the destruction of the property?
2	MR. McWADE: Not to my recollection.
3	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: Do you think it might be
4	helpful to have a form that would include that?
5	MR. McWADE: It could be an addition to a
6	form, just to indicate who'd done the actual disposal.
7	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: And I understand from
8	your testimony that absent that information you simply
9	hand-wrote "destroyed by fire" above your signature;
10	correct?
11	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
12	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: And that was to indicate
13	that you had undertaken to destroy it?
14	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
15	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: I'd like to just take you
16	to a new document. It's Doc Number 121104. It's an
17	article that appears to have initially appeared
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Excuse me
19	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: in the Toronto Sun.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: it's a new document.
21	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: The copy provided to the
22	Inquiry appeared on a web site, subsequently.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
24	Exhibit 2524 is a what is this now? This
25	is a newspaper clipping? Is it a newspaper article?

1	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: It appears to be a
2	Toronto Sun article, Mr. Commissioner
3	THE COMMISSIONER: All right, thank you.
4	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: that appeared on the
5	canoe.ca web site afterwards.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Right. Monday,
7	April 5th, 1999.
8	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO. P-2524:
9	(121104) <u>Toronto Sun</u> Article "OPP Defend
10	Pedophile Inquiry" - April 5, 1999
11	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: And if we can scroll down
12	to Bates page 314, the writer of this article, sir, has
13	suggested at the bottom that:
14	"The most popular urban myth about this
15	case is that police found and then
16	destroyed smoking-gun kiddy porn tapes
17	showing prominent citizens having sex
18	with their victims."
19	So, sir, clearly the incident involving the
20	tapes has been a very controversial issue for members of
21	this community. Would you agree?
22	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
23	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: Do you recall when you
24	first became aware of how elevated this issue had become
25	within the community?

1	MR. McWADE: Not not for sure. Until
2	I I may have heard, prior to when I met with Pat Hall in
3	1999, but I like, I can't remember. Like, I knew
4	that I'd moved away, and it's what you hear in the news.
5	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: Of course. But looking
6	back on it now, would you agree with me that there was a
7	lack of proper record-keeping at certain key points in this
8	investigation?
9	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
10	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: Would you agree with me
11	that currently we don't have any notes to document your
12	instructions to officers as to how to review the tape?
13	MR. McWADE: I have no notes available to
14	me. I explained I turned them in.
15	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: And that the tapes
16	themselves were not included on the return to justice as
17	they ought to have been, according to your evidence?
18	MR. McWADE: My understanding is that it
19	should have been.
20	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: And that there was no
21	itemized list of the tapes or their contents provided for
22	by the reviewing officer?
23	MR. McWADE: That would have been better.
24	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: And that, in fact, there
25	was some inconsistency between your interview and Officer

1	McDougald as to who had discussed receiving the quit claim
2	from Ron Leroux?
3	MR. McWADE: Was trying to do the best with
4	recall.
5	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: And I understand that.
6	I guess my point, sir, is that given the
7	lack of paper record-keeping at this point, it is now
8	difficult for the OPP to finally disprove rumours that were
9	circulating in the community with respect to the tapes and
10	the smoking gun or alleged smoking gun evidence that
11	may have been in your possession. Isn't that correct?
12	MR. McWADE: I'm sorry, sir, I'm not
13	completely understanding where you're going with the
14	question.
15	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: What I'm suggesting, sir,
16	is that unfortunately now possibly due to inadvertence,
17	possibly due to a passage of time for whatever reason,
18	at this point we do not have notes from yourself; we did
19	not have notes at the time from the officers reviewing the
20	tapes.
21	MR. McWADE: M'hm.
22	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: We do not have clear
23	evidence within the documentary evidence to date as to who
24	would have spoken to Ron Leroux for the quit claim, and we
25	do not have an itemized list in the return to justice,

1	which would have made the authorities aware of the tapes in
2	the first place.
3	So, with all of that, that lack of proper
4	documentation in this case on record, it's difficult to
5	disprove that all of the tapes were thoroughly reviewed and
6	only destroyed after we had decided after the decision
7	was made that they did not affect any possible criminal
8	investigation. Is that correct?
9	MR. McWADE: When records aren't are not
10	available, it makes it difficult to rely strictly on
11	recall. For me, this has been 15 years, and I was a
12	policeman for 32 years, and you rely heavily on your
13	notebooks.
14	It has made my life very uneasy for me
15	realizing that I don't have my notebooks too, because it is
16	an assistance to me as well as yourself. And when it comes
17	to content of out notebooks, we put in as much information
18	as we can and it is a very personal thing, and sometimes
19	people would like us to put in more and it's not there, but
20	we try.
21	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: It certainly would have
22	been your preference had your notebook been located in
23	advance of this Inquiry?
24	MR. McWADE: Oh, yes.
25	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: Thank you, those are my

1	questions.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
3	Mr. Horn? Good morning, sir.
4	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR.
5	HORN:
6	MR. HORN: Frank Horn, Coalition for Action,
7	and I just have a few questions.
8	There were 22 tapes in the seizure?
9	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
10	MR. HORN: Okay. And there were three
11	officers that viewed the tapes?
12	MR. McWADE: At least three that I'm aware
13	of; myself and McDougald and Dussault.
14	MR. HORN: Do you know anybody else that
15	viewed them?
16	MR. McWADE: No, not that I'm aware of, sir.
17	MR. HORN: So you gave instructions to the
18	two officers to look at the tapes. You saw some of them?
19	MR. McWADE: I gave McDougald instructions.
20	I'm not sure how Constable Dussault got involved with the
21	assignment and then my sticking my nose in and having a
22	peek. Other than that, I'm not aware of anyone else.
23	MR. HORN: So the only evidence that we
24	would really have is three officers who viewed the tapes,
25	direct evidence?

1	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
2	MR. HORN: So your evidence, yourself, is
3	that you only saw some child pornography, which was
4	commercial?
5	MR. McWADE: Pardon me, sir? No.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: No, no. No, no.
7	MR. CARROLL: We don't see any child
8	pornography.
9	MR. HORN: Oh, I'm sorry.
10	You did not see any child pornography but
11	you saw commercial pornography?
12	MR. MCWADE: It appeared to be commercial,
13	male adult.
14	MR. HORN: Okay. And the other two
15	officers, did they tell you what they saw?
16	MR. McWADE: Constable McDougald did. I'm
17	not I don't recall Constable Dussault if he told me as
18	well.
19	MR. HORN: You didn't give any instructions
20	to Constable Dussault?
21	MR. McWADE: Not that I recall, sir.
22	MR. HORN: Okay, now can we look at the
23	statement of Constable Dussault?
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Sure, what exhibit?
25	MR. HORN: It's 112696. What is it? Two?

1	MR. McWADE: Two-five-two-three (2523).
2	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
3	MR. HORN: If you take a look at the first
4	answer after the initial question, in the second paragraph:
5	"I viewed several of these tapes,
6	but"
7	"Types" actually it's a mistake, typo:
8	"found them to contain all gay-type
9	movies involving male in homosexual
10	situations. I did not view any
11	children or clergy in these tapes."
12	Okay?
13	"clergy in these tapes. These
14	movies were commercially made video-
15	tapes."
16	Now, why would do you have any idea why
17	Mr. Dussault would be looking for clergy in the tapes?
18	MR. CARROLL: Excuse me. If I may, perhaps
19	my friend could also read the question that is put to this
20	witness and that puts his answer in context.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
22	MR. HORN: "We are investigating
23	allegations of historical sexual
24	assault involving clergy and other
25	people in Cornwall and surrounding

1	area."
2	And he's asked about that.
3	So any direction to Mr. Dussault was not by
4	yourself but it was the interviewer who basically asked him
5	a question about the clergy?
6	MR. McWADE: It would appear so, sir.
7	MR. HORN: But you didn't do that?
8	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
9	MR. HORN: So it was the interviewer who
10	actually posed the question suggesting the answer?
11	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: No. No. I don't know
13	that he was suggesting the answer. Mr. Horn, let's not
14	forget that this was in 1999, this interview.
15	MR. HORN: I understand.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: And that the search
17	warrant was in 1993 two or three.
18	MR. CARROLL: Three.
19	MR. HORN: Okay. I understand. I
20	understand but you're not the one, in any way, directing
21	him to look for clergy in the tapes.
22	MR. McWADE: That's correct, sir.
23	MR. HORN: Okay. And the initial complaint
24	by is it C-8?
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, C-8.

71

1	MR. HORN: Yes that came to the Ontario
2	Provincial Police in is it Lancaster? Was that ever
3	followed up with criminal charges? Did that ever go to
4	court, criminal complaints?
5	THE COMMISSIONER: For the guns?
6	MR. HORN: Yes, the guns.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah, they did.
8	MR. HORN: Okay. And so they did go to
9	there were charges laid?
10	MR. MCWADE: Yes, sir, in the spring of
11	1993.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: And a plea of guilty was
13	entered.
14	MR. HORN: Okay, and the items that were
15	seized, when were they destroyed; prior to the plea or the
16	end of the trial or was it afterwards?
17	THE COMMISSIONER: There was no trial.
18	There was a plea of guilt where the
19	MR. HORN: I understand, but the the
20	evidence that was seized, was it destroyed? The tapes
21	destroyed before the plea; and the guns, were they dealt
22	with prior to the trial being completed; do you know?
23	MR. MCWADE: I have no idea as to when he
24	cleared court, sir.
25	MR. HORN: Pardon?

1	MR. MCWADE: I have no idea when he pled
2	guilty and received sentence. I don't know the date.
3	MR. HORN: You have no idea when it went
4	through and you could legally get rid of the evidence then
5	afterwards?
6	MR. CARROLL: No. That's, in my respectful
7	submission, that's an inappropriate proposition in terms of
8	illegally or legally getting rid of evidence. He keeps
9	referring, as I presume, to the tapes as evidence.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
11	MR. CARROLL: And they're items seized.
12	They're not evidence of anything and particularly not
13	evidence of any charge under the Criminal Code relating to
14	guns.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, a couple of things.
16	First of all, I think Mr. Carroll is right in the sense
17	that you've got to keep them different, but I think that
18	there's still some area to explore about answering why the
19	tapes weren't put on the return of the warrant. I mean I
20	think it's fairly clear they ought to have been.
21	MR. HORN: Yeah.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: But the guns; the guns is
23	something different.
24	So if you're saying my understanding is
25	that the tapes were destroyed on or about May $4^{th}$ , 1993.

1	Right?
2	MR. HORN: Yes.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: So now when the guns were
4	destroyed, I don't know, but I know that Leroux entered a
5	plea of guilt on that possession and was fined.
6	MR. HORN: Okay. Are you aware that the
7	guns eventually were sold to C-8?
8	MR. McWADE: I have no idea, sir. I have no
9	recollection of that.
10	MR. HORN: This is according to Mr. Leroux'
11	evidence I mean his interview. He indicates let's
12	see here, at page on his interview. That would be
13	Exhibit 562.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: What page, sir?
15	MR. HORN: Page it would be 7098543. The
16	last page, sir.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: So in the middle of the
18	page, maybe one, two, three, five paragraphs down, it says,
19	"In February of 1993"
20	MR. HORN: Yes.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: "the guns were
22	since sold to C-8."
23	MR. HORN: That's right. Were you aware of
24	that?
25	MR. McWADE: I have no recollection of that,

1	sir.
2	MR. HORN: So the Complainant on the guns
3	eventually purchased the guns; is that were you aware of
4	that?
5	MR. CARROLL: Excuse me; this is the
6	statement of Ron Leroux. This is what he says happened.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
8	MR. CARROLL: The witness has said time and
9	again he has no knowledge of this.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. So he doesn't
11	know.
12	MR. HORN: Okay. All right. He doesn't
13	know. I'm just asking if he did know that. What
14	eventually happened to the guns?
15	THE COMMISSIONER: He doesn't know.
16	MR. HORN: Okay. Have you subsequently
17	spoken to the other two individuals who viewed the
18	videotapes regarding the content? Did you talk to them and
19	ask them what was in the tapes, what they viewed?
20	THE COMMISSIONER: He already answered that
21	he doesn't remember if he spoke to Dussault. Is that his
22	name?
23	MR. McWADE: Dussault.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Anybody spoke to
25	McDougald.

1	MR. HORN: Okay. Now, you viewed some of
2	them, the tapes?
3	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
4	MR. HORN: And they viewed some of them. Do
5	you have any idea if you duplicated and saw the same ones
6	or you have no idea how they distributed who was going to
7	look at what?
8	MR. CARROLL: Excuse me; I don't believe his
9	evidence was "they viewed some of them". He gave
10	instructions, but he did not testify that the officers
11	viewed some of the tapes. He did not say that.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. No, but we have in
13	Dussault's statement he viewed some of the tapes.
14	MR. CARROLL: That's Dussault.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
16	MR. CARROLL: The instructions went to
17	McDougald and the officer's evidence is that he was
18	instructed to review them all in a fashion, but not it
19	never was the instruction to McDougald to view some of
20	them.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. But so far what we
22	have is this gentleman reviewed some of them and Dussault
23	reviewed some of them. Carry on.
24	MR. HORN: Okay. So you never went back and
25	talked to them and said, "Well, which ones did you look at"

1	and "These are the ones I looked at"? Do you know who else
2	looked at these? Did you ever have any conversations in
3	that regard?
4	MR. MCWADE: My directions were to Constable
5	McDougald, and it was his responsibility to review the
6	tapes. I don't recall how Constable Dussault got involved
7	in it, and my involvement was to stick my nose in the door
8	briefly to see how they were making out, and it would be,
9	say, a minute, more or less, that I viewed whatever tape
10	was in the machine, and I left.
11	MR. HORN: So you must have told them then
12	the ones you looked at, so that they wouldn't look at them
13	again?
14	MR. McWADE: No, sir. I walked in while
15	they were being reviewed.
16	MR. HORN: Oh, you didn't take them
17	separately and do the
18	MR. McWADE: No, no. I, no I walked in
19	while Constable McDougald was reviewing a tape, saw what
20	was there, and I left.
21	MR. HORN: Okay.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: So the question, I guess,
23	is do you recall if McDougald ever came in to you and said,
24	"Sir, I'm reporting back to you. I've looked at them all
25	the way you instructed me, and this is what I found"?

I	MR. McWADE: I know when he completed the
2	task he told me that he that it was done and what he had
3	found, but the exact date and the time, I don't have any
4	recollection.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Fine.
6	MR. McWADE: It was a long process.
7	MR. HORN: So you're indicating at that time
8	there was no interest in doing anything regarding some sort
9	of a conspiracy or anything. That was never on the table
10	at that time when you were involved initially?
11	THE COMMISSIONER: What do you mean by
12	"conspiracy"?
13	MR. HORN: I'm talking about the interviews
14	that took place afterwards
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
16	MR. HORN: in by the OPP in regards
17	to Project Truth.
18	But back then, in those days, you're saying
19	that really none of that was even in the air at the time?
20	MR. McWADE: The only thing that we were
21	looking for was child pornography or something what do
22	they call them bondage, snuff films, those kinds of
23	pornographic material to see if it was anything other than
24	on the face of it, it appeared to be commercial consenting
25	adults.

1	MR. HORN: Thank you.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Lee?
3	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR. LEE:
4	MR. LEE: Mr. McWade, my name is Dallas Lee.
5	I'm counsel for the Victims Group. I have a few questions
6	for you.
7	Can we start with Exhibit C-603, please?
8	These are the search warrant materials.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
10	MR. LEE: If you can turn to Appendix B when
11	you have that up, please, Bates page 197.
12	MR. McWADE: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Appendix B.
14	MR. LEE: Appendix B, please.
15	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
16	MR. LEE: And if you look at the second
17	paragraph, it sets out the officer's grounds and it states
18	that on December $18^{\rm th}$ , 1992, he received information from C-
19	8. Do you see that?
20	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
21	MR. LEE: And as we know, the search was
22	ultimately executed on February 10 <sup>th</sup> , 1993.
23	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
24	MR. LEE: Do you have any information about
25	the delay there, the period of time between December $18^{\rm th}$ ,

1	'92 and the search being executed on February 10 <sup>th</sup> , '93?
2	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
3	MR. LEE: Would that have been typical at
4	that time for that amount of time to take place on a case
5	like this?
6	MR. McWADE: I couldn't comment on
7	without all of the facts and notes.
8	MR. LEE: You have no recollection of any
9	discussion at any point on
10	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
11	MR. LEE: that?
12	Do you have any recollection of a discussion
13	around February $10^{\rm th}$ , 1993 about why the search warrant
14	would proceed at that time?
15	MR. McWADE: On February rather than
16	December?
17	MR. LEE: Well, in terms of a fair amount
18	of time has passed, and at some point, obviously, a
19	decision is made to go ahead and get the search warrant and
20	to execute a search. Do you recall any discussion at that
21	time about why it was happening right at that point?
22	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
23	MR. LEE: I want to put some information to
24	you and ask you whether or not you knew any of this at
25	time, okay?

1	MR. McWADE: Sure.
2	MR. LEE: And I appreciate it's a long time
3	ago, but are you familiar with the name David Silmser?
4	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
5	MR. LEE: You've never heard that name in
6	relation to in the media or anything like that, the
7	alleged abuse at the hands of Father Charles MacDonald and
8	Ken Seguin, and he was the one at the centre of the
9	controversy with an illegal settlement?
10	MR. McWADE: I may have heard it, sir, but I
11	don't recall under what context.
12	MR. LEE: We know from evidence here that
13	Mr. Silmser reported to the Cornwall Police Service on
14	December $9^{th}$ , 1992 that he had been sexually abused by
15	Father Charles MacDonald and Ken Seguin. That's the
16	evidence we have here.
17	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
18	MR. LEE: Would you have known by February
19	$10^{\mathrm{th}}$ , 1993 that Mr. Silmser had reported such abuse to the
20	Cornwall Police?
21	MR. McWADE: Not necessarily.
22	MR. LEE: You don't recall any
23	MR. McWADE: It's I don't recall anything
24	like that.
25	MR. LEE: Okay. And Mr. Silmser has said

1	that prior to going to the Cornwall Police, he advised an
2	OPP officer that he had been abused and that he was then
3	referred to the Cornwall Police because of an issue with
4	jurisdiction. The alleged assaults had occurred in
5	Cornwall and so he was referred from the OPP. That's what
6	he said.
7	Do you have any recollection of hearing
8	anything about that at that time?
9	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
10	MR. LEE: And does the name Heidi Sebalj
11	mean anything to you?
12	MR. McWADE: Pardon me, sir?
13	MR. LEE: Heidi Sebalj? She was a constable
14	with the Cornwall Police Service
15	MR. McWADE: No.
16	MR. LEE: in 1993.
17	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
18	MR. LEE: Never had any dealings with Ms.
19	Sebalj?
20	MR. McWADE: No.
21	MR. LEE: And what we know is that from
22	Ms. Sebalj's notes is that Mr. Silmser called her on
23	February $10^{\text{th}}$ , 1993, so the same day that the search warrant
24	was obtained and the search executed, to advise that Ken
25	Seguin was "running scared". Okay? Do you recall ever

1	having heard that before?
2	MR. McWADE: Never heard that, sir.
3	MR. LEE: Were you aware, prior to coming to
4	this Inquiry, that Ron Leroux was both neighbours and
5	friends with Ken Seguin?
6	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
7	MR. LEE: None of you didn't know any of
8	that at all prior to February $10^{\rm th}$ , 1993, as far as you can
9	recall?
10	MR. McWADE: As far as I can recall, no,
11	sir.
12	MR. LEE: Have you ever had any discussions
13	with any of the officers we've discussed, McDougald, Millar
14	or Dussault, about any of the questions any of the
15	issues I've just raised with you?
16	MR. McWADE: In generalities. We know why
17	we're here. I've reviewed I had access to the documents
18	that I've seen today, their statements, my statements, Pat
19	Hall's. Information was provided to me like that, and I've
20	reviewed it, but once I left Lancaster, I was not involved
21	in the case and did not stay current with the case.
22	MR. LEE: You have no recollection
23	whatsoever of having discussed David Silmser or Ken Seguin
24	or Ken Seguin's relationship to Ron Leroux prior to
25	February 10 <sup>th</sup> , 1993 with any of these officers?

1	MR. McWADE: My next recollection or my only
2	recollection with Mr. Seguin is when the day he passed
3	away.
4	MR. LEE: Can you turn up Exhibit 690,
5	please? This is the interview report of Steve McDougald.
6	Do you have that, sir?
7	MR. McWADE: The interview with Steve
8	McDougald?
9	MR. LEE: Yes.
10	MR. McWADE: Yes.
11	MR. LEE: And you see this as an interview
12	being conducted by Pat Hall on December 11 <sup>th</sup> , 1998. And if
13	you turn over to the second page, I believe you were taken
14	here in-chief, the first full paragraph on the page; down a
15	little lower, Madam Clerk, "It was determined." The
16	paragraph that yes, that's the one:
17	"It was determined by Staff Sergeant J.
18	McWade that I view the videotapes
19	randomly and ascertain if there was any
20	child pornography or home videos of
21	local people."
22	Do you see that?
23	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
24	MR. LEE: And what you told us in-chief was
25	the part about child pornography makes sense to you?

1	MR. McWADE: Pardon me?
2	MR. LEE: That makes sense to you? It's not
3	
4	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
5	MR. LEE: something you specifically
6	recall saying but it sounds like something you likely would
7	have said?
8	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
9	MR. LEE: And you're not so sure about the
10	home videos of local people?
11	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
12	MR. LEE: Are you telling us that you
13	definitely did not say that or that you simply cannot
14	recall saying that?
15	MR. McWADE: I can't recall saying anything
16	in that terminology.
17	MR. LEE: Do you take issue with the
18	specific phrase, "home videos of local people?" Or do you
19	take issue with the idea of it in general? I mean I'm not
20	sure that Officer McDougald's
21	MR. McWADE: That like the child
22	pornography would make sense; the home videos of local
23	people, I don't know what context to put that in, so
24	MR. LEE: Presumably to say something like
25	that, you would have had some suspicion then.

1	MR. McWADE: Well, no, I was thinking along
2	the lines of before you get into bondage, deeper stuff that
3	might have been homemade. Something that might be
4	classified as
5	MR. LEE: So in other words, homemade
6	pornography that would be illegal.
7	MR. McWADE: Yeah, yeah.
8	MR. LEE: And during your examination in-
9	chief, you told us that the tapes were "by and large" of
10	male homosexual activity. What did you mean by, "by and
11	large?"
12	MR. McWADE: My understanding, I don't know
13	how many incidents there were on the tapes, is that there
14	was elements of male/female relationships as well.
15	MR. LEE: Adult?
16	MR. McWADE: Yeah.
17	MR. LEE: That's your recol that's not
18	something you saw, that's information you gleaned from the
19	officers
20	MR. McWADE: Yes.
21	MR. LEE: who reviewed the tapes?
22	MR. McWADE: Yes. What I saw what male and
23	male.
24	MR. LEE: And you've also been asked about
25	labels. Do you recall whether or not you specifically

1	looked at all of the video not viewed the videotapes but
2	looked at the actual tapes themselves in terms of reviewing
3	the labels?
4	MR. McWADE: Not all of them. I looked down
5	and it appeared to be a commercial label, not the ones that
6	you comes with it and you peel it off and stick it on
7	and fill out your own information.
8	MR. LEE: Sorry, did you or did you not flip
9	through each every one of them to review the label?
10	MR. McWADE: Every one of them?
11	MR. LEE: Yes.
12	MR. McWADE: No.
13	MR. LEE: Do you recall seeing any that did
14	not have a label?
15	MR. McWADE: I believe there was a couple
16	but I'm not 100 percent sure.
17	MR. LEE: Do you recall seeing any with
18	any that had labels with handwritten descriptions on them
19	rather than commercial printed descriptions?
20	MR. McWADE: I can't remember.
21	MR. LEE: Okay.
22	And do you still have Exhibit 690 up?
23	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
24	MR. LEE: Can you turn to the last page of
25	that, page 3 of 3, Bates page 550?

1	We saw this in-chief as well. The third-
2	last paragraph, the end of one of your answers as I was
3	advised or one of Officer McDougald's answers rather is:
4	"I was advised by Staff Sergeant McWade
5	on 4 May '93 that the videotapes and
6	suitcase was destroyed locally by the
7	caretaker, burning them in a 45-gallon
8	drum that date."
9	Do you see that?
10	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
11	MR. LEE: And you'll see that Officer
12	McDougald references a specific date?
13	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
14	MR. LEE: Four (4) May '93?
15	MR. McWADE: Yes sir.
16	MR. LEE: Has it been your experience that
17	typically a police officer giving a statement like this
18	would have his notes with him?
19	MR. McWADE: I don't know the circumstances
20	of what he had available to him when he made this
21	statement, sir.
22	MR. LEE: And as I pointed out earlier, the
23	statement is December 11 <sup>th</sup> , 1998 so almost 10 years ago?
24	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
25	MR. LEE: And you've told us your efforts

1	and the OPP's efforts at finding your notes from that
2	period have been unsuccessful.
3	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
4	MR. LEE: You told us that Arthur Lalonde,
5	who was the caretaker at the Detachment, would sometimes
6	assist in the destruction of materials but that would not
7	be his responsibility, that was the responsibility of a
8	police officer to do that. Is that right?
9	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
10	MR. LEE: You have no specific recollection
11	of starting the fire?
12	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
13	MR. LEE: And you have no specific
14	recollection of extinguishing the fire?
15	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
16	MR. LEE: And would it be fair for me to say
17	that you typically wouldn't leave a fire going in a barrel
18	in the yard unattended?
19	MR. MCWADE: I wouldn't think so. But like
20	I said, I have no specific recollection as to the state of
21	the fire when I left.
22	MR. LEE: And leaving the actual destruction
23	of the tapes aside, would you agree with me that if a fire
24	needed to be started in order to destroy evidence,
25	typically the caretaker would be assigned that task at

25

1	least?
2	MR. MCWADE: I don't recall. Everyone has
3	access to it. I just don't recall.
4	MR. LEE: Do you recall was Mr. Lalonde
5	the caretaker of the detachment throughout the entirety of
6	your time there?
7	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
8	MR. LEE: Was he still there at the time you
9	left?
10	MR. McWADE: I believe so.
11	MR. LEE: Did you ever have any problems
12	with him at all?
13	MR. McWADE: No.
14	MR. LEE: Ever discipline him?
15	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
16	MR. LEE: Never had a falling out or
17	anything like that?
18	MR. McWADE: No, sir. He used to run most
19	days with me at lunchtime.
20	MR. LEE: Sorry, I missed that.
21	MR. McWADE: I used to run most days at
22	lunchtime with him.
23	MR. LEE: Thank you very much, sir. Those
24	are my questions.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. McWade, is there --

1	do you know in your experience, it seems on this occasion
2	before exercising the search warrant, they phoned Malcolm
3	MacDonald the lawyer? Is that a procedure that is normally
4	carried out before you exercise execute a warrant?
5	MR. McWADE: I don't know how Mr the
6	lawyer got involved that like that was something to do,
7	I believe, with Constable McDougald and Constable
8	Detective Constable Millar.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
10	MR. McWADE: So I don't know exactly how it
11	came to be that they had contact with them.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
13	MR. McWADE: It's not usual but it sounds
14	like they received information but I don't know where.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: No, but my question was,
16	is it usual for an OPP executing a search warrant to phone
17	up a lawyer and tell him that we're about to go and execute
18	the warrant at his client's house?
19	MR. McWADE: No, sir; it's not usual.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Is it would it be
21	unusual?
22	MR. McWADE: I think I've I don't recall
23	ever doing it in my career.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
25	MR. LEE: Mr. Commissioner, I don't intend

1	to put another question to the witness but just for your
2	own information on that point,
3	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
4	MR. LEE: we have an Exhibit Number 1163
5	
6	THE COMMISSIONER: One-one-six-three (1163).
7	MR. LEE: that is an earlier interview
8	report of Steve McDougald, again taken by Pat Hall this
9	time with Joe Dupuis and
10	THE COMMISSIONER: One-one-six okay, I've
11	got it.
12	MR. LEE: One-one-six-three (1163) is a
13	September 2 <sup>nd</sup> , '98 interview report.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
15	MR. LEE: And if you look towards the very
16	bottom of the second page
17	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
18	MR. LEE: he summarizes what happened on
19	December $20^{\text{th}}$ , 1998 where he proceeded for the Leroux
20	residence and advised him of C-8's complaint of harassment.
21	And he goes on over onto page 3 to describe how Officer
22	McDougald would have become aware that Malcolm MacDonald
23	was representing Ron Leroux.
24	And so that doesn't necessarily respond to
25	the question of why he would have contacted Malcolm

1	MacDonald but at least it lets us understand how he would
2	have known about Malcolm MacDonald at all.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
4	MR. LEE: For your information.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
6	Mr. Neville?
7	Good morning, sir.
8	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR.
9	NEVILLE:
10	MR. NEVILLE: Good morning, Commissioner.
11	Good morning, Mr. McWade. You and I know each other.
12	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
13	MR. NEVILLE: I represent Father Charles
14	MacDonald and the estate of Ken Seguin, his brother and his
15	family.
16	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
17	MR. NEVILLE: I just have two or three
18	questions briefly for you.
19	One of the other counsel touched on the fact
20	that these tapes and the history of them became somewhat
21	controversial eventually?
22	MR. McWADE: That's my understanding.
23	MR. NEVILLE: And do you know at that
24	time in 1993 and a year or two thereafter, did you know
25	Constable Perry Dunlop of the Cornwall police?

1	MR. McWADE: I know the name.
2	MR. NEVILLE: Did you know him though as a
3	police officer or in any other capacity?
4	MR. McWADE: I never had any occasion to
5	work with the man or cases, or never had any involvement
6	with the man whatsoever.
7	MR. NEVILLE: And did you eventually become
8	aware that one of the persons making an issue, a
9	controversial interpretation, of these tapes was Mr.
10	Dunlop?
11	MR. McWADE: I read an item that he or
12	evidence that he took issue to the tapes.
13	MR. NEVILLE: Yes. And did you become aware
14	that another person by the name of Gary Guzzo was making a
15	controversial issue over these tapes?
16	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
17	MR. NEVILLE: Did either Mr. Dunlop or Mr.
18	Guzzo ever speak to you about the history and nature of
19	these tapes?
20	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
21	MR. NEVILLE: Thank you. Those are my
22	questions.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
24	Ms. Allinotte?
25	MS. ALLINOTTE: No questions.

## PUBLIC HEARING AUDIENCE PUBLIQUE

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
2	Maître Rouleau?
3	MR. ROULEAU: No questions.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
5	Ms. Waddilove?
6	MS. WADDILOVE: No questions, sir.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
8	Mr. Crane? Sorry, Diocese excuse moi;
9	Madame Levesque?
10	Me LEVESQUE: Pas de questions.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Parfait. Merci.
12	Mr. Crane, no questions.
13	So Mr. Kozloff or Ms. Lahaie?
14	MR. KOZLOFF: No questions.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
16	Mr. Carroll?
17	MR. CARROLL: Thank you.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, sorry. Wait a minute
19	now; where do you fit in?
20	MR. CARROLL: You missed somebody?
21	MR. O'BRIEN: I'm Mr. O'Brien.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I know
23	MR. O'BRIEN: I would address the Commission
24	
25	THE COMMISSIONER: You want to address me?

1	Sure.
2	SUBMISSIONS BY/REPRÉSENTATIONS PAR MR. O'BRIEN:
3	MR. O'BRIEN: Yes. As you're undoubtedly
4	aware, on September $5^{\text{th}}$ you provided limited standing to me
5	
6	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
7	MR. O'BRIEN: with respect to any
8	alleged misconduct involving Detective Inspector Randy
9	Millar.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
11	MR. O'BRIEN: We've heard evidence today
12	that, in my humble submission, is in that area. We're
13	talking about the illegal search allegations and the
14	various smoking guns, if you will, of a conspiracy that
15	involves the OPP. It involves Randy Millar, another OPP
16	officer that would be represented by the OPPA. It involves
17	this gentleman here.
18	In my respectful submission, I would be
19	interested in asking questions with respect to the return
20	and the like from this witness, to fairly represent the
21	interests of Detective Inspector Randy Millar.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, was Millar involved
23	in this search at all?
24	MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, he was the one that had
25	the tapes. He's the one that found the tapes.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. McDougald asked
2	for the search warrant.
3	MR. O'BRIEN: That's correct.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
5	And McDougald's the one who made the return
6	on the search warrant.
7	MR. O'BRIEN: That's correct.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
9	MR. O'BRIEN: And Detective Inspector Randy
10	Millar accompanied McDougald to the Leroux residence.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
12	MR. O'BRIEN: It's Detective Inspector Randy
13	Millar that found the tapes that were hidden up near the
14	bathtub
15	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
16	MR. O'BRIEN: and returned the tapes to
17	Officer McDougald, and both officers returned to the
18	detachment.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
20	MR. O'BRIEN: It's my understanding in the
21	evidence that Detective Inspector Randy Millar was a PC at
22	the time, or detective constable, and he was asked to
23	assist as he has more experience, and that's why he went on
24	the search.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. But how would the

1	do you know anything about Officer Millar's involvement
2	in this search warrant?
3	MR. McWADE: Other than assisting Constable
4	McDougald with the search, my understanding of it, when he
5	left the house and came back to the office, that he was
6	done. I don't recall him being involved any more after
7	that.
8	MR. O'BRIEN: Mr. Commissioner, there's one
9	document that's before the Court. I'll get right to the
10	chase. There's a document before the Court that talks
11	about the return to the Justice of the Peace.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
13	MR. O'BRIEN: Nobody has mentioned that
14	there's a box in there that is ticked off that is Section
15	49.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Where what's 603?
17	MR. O'BRIEN: That's Document 706164.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: No, it's Exhibit 603.
19	MR. O'BRIEN: Six zero three (603).
20	THE COMMISSIONER: And there's a Section 47
21	and there's a Section 49.
22	MR. O'BRIEN: That's correct.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
24	MR. O'BRIEN: Now
25	THE COMMISSIONER: So

25

Thank you.

1	MR. O'BRIEN: The warrant was issued under
2	47.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
4	MR. O'BRIEN: Items were seized items
5	were taken by Detective Inspector Randy Millar, given to
6	Officer McDougald. In the return, what we have is the box
7	ticked off on 47 and we have a listing of the weapons.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
9	MR. O'BRIEN: We also have a box ticked off
10	under 49.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
12	MR. O'BRIEN: And as Mr. McWade has
13	indicated, that provides legal authority to seize items
14	that were not named in the warrant, and I think that's
15	pertinent, especially when it's attributable to items that
16	were seized by Detective Inspector Randy Millar. That
17	should be brought out, that there was a return that was
18	before a Justice of the Peace that indicated that there
19	were other items seized.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
21	MR. O'BRIEN: And in addition to that, a
22	property report does itemize those documents. That's the
23	area that I have.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: You made your point.

1	MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Carroll.
3	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR.
4	CARROLL:
5	MR. CARROLL: I want to ask you about your
6	awareness of any policies, standard operating procedures or
7	orders in relation to the
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Your microphone, Mr.
9	Carroll.
10	MR. CARROLL: I'm sorry.
11	I would like to ask you a couple of
12	questions about your awareness of any policies or standard
13	operating procedures or orders in relation to the
14	responsibilities of a detachment commander when you were at
15	the relevant time during the issuance of the search warrant
16	and the return of the items to the station. Okay?
17	MR. McWADE: Sure.
18	MR. CARROLL: To your knowledge, was there
19	any OPP policy, standard operating procedure or order
20	directing the detachment commander to assist an officer in
21	the writing of the Information to obtain the search
22	warrant?
23	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
24	MR. CARROLL: Was there any such policy,
25	standard operating procedure or order directing the

1	detachment commander to review the Information and the
2	search warrant before it's presented to the Justice of the
3	Peace?
4	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
5	MR. CARROLL: Was there any policy, standard
6	operating procedure or order directing the detachment
7	commander to accompany the searching officers as they
8	conducted the search?
9	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
10	MR. CARROLL: Was there any policy, standard
11	operating procedure or order directing the detachment
12	commander to review the items seized once they were brought
13	back to the station?
14	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
15	MR. CARROLL: Was there any policy, standard
16	operating procedure or order directing the detachment
17	commander to follow up in terms of where the items seized
18	were stored?
19	MR. MCWADE: There is policy in regards to
20	the property room, the property audits, but under the
21	management and inspection process, the detachment commander
22	can delegate that to other supervisory staff.
23	MR. CARROLL: All right.
24	Was there any policy, standard operating
25	procedure or order directing the detachment commander to

1	review the return to the Justice?
2	MR. McWADE: No, sir.
3	MR. CARROLL: From what you were able to
4	was there a storage facility for items seized at the
5	detachment?
6	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir, there's a property
7	room.
8	MR. CARROLL: And were the items, to your
9	knowledge, that were seized, both listed and not listed in
10	the return, stored in the proper location within your
11	detachment?
12	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
13	MR. CARROLL: You've given us your best
14	recollections of the destruction of the tapes and the
15	process involving that. When you left the barrel, left the
16	tapes in whatever state, were you satisfied that those
17	tapes were in the process of being destroyed?
18	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
19	MR. CARROLL: Did you have any specialized -
20	- you talked about the Project "P" being a specialized
21	unit.
22	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
23	MR. CARROLL: Did you have any specialized
24	training in matters related to Project "P" or pornography
25	in general?

1	MR. McWADE: Not specific. During one of
2	the courses that I took I'm not sure of the exact date
3	- a member of Project "P" came into the classroom and
4	provided us guidelines and it was information to let us
5	know that they existed and we are a resource to them.
6	MR. CARROLL: They're a resource to you?
7	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
8	MR. CARROLL: All right.
9	From what you observed yourself or what was
10	reported to you from by your officers, were you
11	satisfied that there was no illegal criminal activity
12	contained in those tapes?
13	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
14	MR. CARROLL: Thank you, sir.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Maître Dumais?
16	RE-EXAMINATION BY/RÉ-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR. DUMAIS:
17	MR. DUMAIS: Just one issue, sir. If you
18	could just have a look at Exhibit 603; that's the warrant.
19	So if we look at the itemized things that
20	Mr. McDougald has listed as being searched for, item 1 is
21	the Smith & Wesson .22 caliber revolver and there is a
22	specific serial number indicated there. Do you see that?
23	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
24	MR. DUMAIS: And the number 2 item is an
25	unknown European .45 caliber revolver, serial number 3.

1	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
2	MR. DUMAIS: Do you see that?
3	And if you can just have a quick look then
4	at the last page which is the return made to the Justice.
5	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
6	MR. DUMAIS: And I believe a point Mr.
7	O'Brien was making is that two boxes had been ticked off,
8	one being Section Item C pursuant to Section 47; the
9	second one being Section 49 which relates to other items
10	seized. So both are ticked off; correct?
11	MR. McWADE: Yes. Yes, sir.
12	MR. DUMAIS: And if we look at the bottom,
13	and you've looked at that already earlier today, the first
14	item that's indicated is seize Item Number 2, unknown
15	weapon, .45 caliber that appears to relate to Item 2 that
16	is found on the warrant which we just looked at.
17	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
18	MR. DUMAIS: The second item is seize
19	unidentifiable restricted weapons, which appears to be a
20	different weapon than the one that's listed on the top of
21	the warrant?
22	MR. McWADE: Yes, sir.
23	MR. DUMAIS: All right. Thank you.
24	Those are my questions Mr. McWade. Thank
25	you.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much, Mr.
2	McWade. You're free to go.
3	MR. McWADE: Thank you very much, sir.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much for
5	coming.
6	MR. DUMAIS: Mr. Commissioner, our next
7	witness has been, I believe, asked to attend at 1:30, if we
8	can take an early lunch break. And it should be he
9	should be a very short witness. And the third witness that
10	we intend on calling today is present in the building as
11	well.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. So I see this
13	gentleman didn't have any notes and the fellow yesterday
14	brought his notes. Are we going to have more discussions
15	about notes or how is that going?
16	MR. DUMAIS: Well, we had been advised early
17	on that Mr. McWade could not locate his notes and the OPP,
18	either the detachment or the head office, could not locate
19	his notes either. We had been advised of that.
20	So there's also the issue that came up
21	yesterday with respect to the witness, Mr. Fougère, there
22	was some issue with respect to those notes. Perhaps you
23	had instructed, I was not in the courtroom but you had
24	instructed that these Constable Fougère left his notes
25	with us to review. And Mr. Fougère would not leave us his

1	notes yesterday and left with them.
2	The I did have some discussion we had
3	a meeting with both Mr. Kozloff and other members of his
4	team last night. Mr. Kozloff indicated to me in a
5	subsequent telephone conversation that Mr. Fougère had
6	agreed to come back with his original notes sometime next
7	week and meet with one member of our staff so that we can
8	review those notes.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Sometime next week?
10	MR. DUMAIS: Correct, Mr. Commissioner.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: I'll think about that
12	one. Thank you.
13	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Break for lunch.
15	MR. DUMAIS: Yes, thank you, 1:30?
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Quarter to two.
17	MR. DUMAIS: Thank you.
18	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre;
19	veuillez vous lever.
20	This hearing will resume at 1:45 p.m.
21	Upon recessing at 12:11 p.m. /
22	L'audience est suspendue à 12h11
23	Upon commencing in public at 1:57 p.m. /
24	L'audience débute en public à 13h57
25	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre;

1	veuillez vous lever.
2	This hearing is now resumed. Please be
3	seated. Veuillez vous asseoir.
4	
5	THE COMMISSIONER: For those of you who are
6	watching, we started a little later because we went in
7	camera to assign monikers to the names that were protected
8	yesterday.
9	MR. DUMAIS: I'd like to call our next
10	witness, Mr. Arthur Lalonde.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
12	Good afternoon, sir. Go ahead.
13	ARTHUR LALONDE, Sworn/Assermenté:
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
15	Good afternoon, sir.
16	MR. LALONDE: Good afternoon.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: You may have to refer to
18	some documents, I don't know, but in any event, if you
19	could speak into the microphone so we can hear you. There
20	is fresh water and glasses. There is a computer there that
21	you may or may not use. In any event, please answer the
22	questions to the best of your ability and if you have any
23	problems or you feel uneasy about something, just refer to
24	me and I'll help you out with it. Okay?
25	MR. LALONDE: M'hm. Right.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
2	Oh, yes, you have to answer yes or no for
3	the microphone.
4	MR. LALONDE: Yes.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Okay.
6	Go ahead.
7	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF BY/INTERROGATOIRE EN-CHEF PAR MR.
8	DUMAIS:
9	MR. DUMAIS: Good afternoon, Mr. Lalonde.
10	I understand that you are a long-time
11	resident of Cornwall; is that correct?
12	MR. LALONDE: Yeah, m'hm.
13	MR. DUMAIS: And I understand that although
14	you're now retired, you worked for the Lancaster OPP
15	Detachment for your entire career. Is that correct?
16	MR. LALONDE: For 28 years, that's right.
17	MR. DUMAIS: And you would have started in
18	1968 and you took your retirement in 1996; right?
19	MR. LALONDE: That's right.
20	MR. DUMAIS: And you were the caretaker at
21	the detachment. Is that correct?
22	MR. LALONDE: That's correct.
23	MR. DUMAIS: And I understand that
24	throughout your employment at the Lancaster Detachment,
25	from time to time, you would be asked to destroy some

1	property. Is that correct?
2	MR. LALONDE: Yes, that's correct.
3	MR. DUMAIS: And can you just give us a
4	sense of what type of property you were asked to take care
5	of and how you would do that?
6	MR. LALONDE: Well, mostly it was well,
7	say if there was clothes, if there was papers we burnt
8	all the papers in those days outside. We didn't have to
9	worry about but there was always an officer there,
10	accompanying me there.
11	MR. DUMAIS: All right. And what was the
12	setup for the burning process? I mean, was there a furnace
13	or something like that that you guys were using?
14	MR. LALONDE: No. This is going back. It
15	was a barrel. And we burnt it and when it was empty, we'd
16	put it in the garbage and the garbage picked it up.
17	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. So, sir, was it one of
18	your responsibilities to take care of this barrel, to burn
19	stuff in the barrel?
20	MR. LALONDE: If it was pertaining to the
21	containers in the office that I would empty, I'd bring them
22	out and burn them. But if the sergeant or an officer asked
23	me to burn something, they'd accompany me and watch me do
24	it.
25	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. So by "container" do you

1	mean, essentially, paper and garbage that accumulate
2	MR. LALONDE: Yes, that's right.
3	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
4	MR. LALONDE: And we have garbage pick-up
5	once a week.
6	MR. DUMAIS: Okay. But sometimes, some of
7	the officers would seize some items, for example, drugs,
8	marijuana. Would you be asked to destroy that as well?
9	MR. LALONDE: A couple of times, I witnessed
10	the burning of marijuana. I got a free high on it, but
11	just a few times; that's it.
12	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
13	MR. DUMAIS: All right. And when you say
14	"witnessed the burning" would that mean that you're
15	actually the one operating the barrel, if I can put it that
16	way?
17	MR. LALONDE: Yes.
18	MR. DUMAIS: So you're lighting the fire.
19	You're putting the stuff in and you
20	MR. LALONDE: But there will always be the
21	officer that accompanied me there.
22	MR. DUMAIS: So you're never asked to do
23	this alone. Is that correct?
24	MR. LALONDE: No.
25	MR. DUMAIS: And was that a practice of the

1	detachment, whenever there's some burning that there's
2	always two persons doing this?
3	MR. LALONDE: Well, there would be me and
4	the officer.
5	MR. DUMAIS: And you remember the Detachment
6	Commander between 1990 and 1993, Staff Sergeant Jim McWade?
7	MR. LALONDE: Yes.
8	MR. DUMAIS: And you were employed as a
9	caretaker while he was there?
10	MR. LALONDE: M'hm.
11	MR. DUMAIS: And was there more than one
12	caretaker working at the detachment?
13	MR. LALONDE: No.
14	MR. DUMAIS: Okay, so there was just only
15	you?
16	MR. LALONDE: M'hm.
17	MR. DUMAIS: And if I can just ask you to
18	look at one exhibit quickly, and that is Exhibit Number
19	690. It should be in front of you, Mr. Lalonde.
20	MR. LALONDE: It is, yes.
21	MR. DUMAIS: And I am going to ask you to
22	look at the last page of that exhibit. It's going to come
23	up on the screen as well.
24	And just so that you know what you're
25	looking at

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Actually, Madam Clerk, I
2	think in front of there, there's a typed version. So if
3	you want to go to 7052550; yes, m'hm.
4	MR. DUMAIS: So this is a statement that was
5	given by a police officer stationed at the Lancaster
6	Detachment, Constable Steve McDougald. Do you remember Mr.
7	McDougald?
8	MR. LALONDE: Yes.
9	MR. DUMAIS: And he's here giving a
10	statement, answering questions of a Detective Sergeant Pat
11	Hall. Detective Sergeant Hall is asking him questions
12	about the seizure of videotapes in 1993 and their eventual
13	destruction at the detachment. So that's the context of
14	the question.
15	MR. LALONDE: M'hm.
16	MR. DUMAIS: So and if you can just then
17	look at the last page, the third last paragraph.
18	And this is Officer McDougald speaking:
19	"I was advised by Staff Sergeant McWade
20	on the $4^{\rm th}$ day of May, 1993 that the
21	videotapes and suitcase was destroyed
22	locally by the caretaker burning them
23	in a 45-gallon drum that date."
24	So, Mr. Lalonde, do you remember being
25	involved in the burning of videotapes or a suitcase at

1	about that period of time?
2	MR. LALONDE: No, I don't. I can't really
3	say I know, no.
4	MR. DUMAIS: Do you recall ever being
5	involved in the destruction of videotapes or a suitcase
6	during your entire career at the detachment?
7	MR. LALONDE: No, I can't say I can. No.
8	MR. DUMAIS: These were tapes that would
9	have been seized at the home of a gentleman called Ron
10	Leroux in 1993.
11	Were you ever aware that videotapes had been
12	seized at that location and were being stored at the
13	detachment?
14	MR. LALONDE: No. I never made a point to
15	know the property that was seized. That was the officers,
16	and my job was caretaker. That's it.
17	MR. DUMAIS: All right. And you don't
18	recall then the Detachment Commander asking for your
19	assistance in burning any videotapes?
20	MR. LALONDE: No.
21	MR. DUMAIS: And you would not have been
22	asked to burn videotapes by Constable McDougald either?
23	MR. LALONDE: I don't remember that, no.
24	MR. DUMAIS: Or Constable Dussault?
25	MR. LALONDE: No. No.

1	MR. DUMAIS: Do you remember whether or not
2	the Detachment Commander would would you ever have
3	witnessed him burning any type of property in the drum or
4	the barrel?
5	MR. LALONDE: No, but as I say, that drum
6	was used for that purpose; to burn. Now, like, what was
7	burned there? You know.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Was there ever any
9	burning being done there without you being involved?
10	MR. LALONDE: There could be, sir.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, did you ever
12	MR. LALONDE: There could be.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Did you ever see anyone
14	burning anything without your assistance?
15	MR. LALONDE: No.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: And do you know
17	videotapes?
18	MR. LALONDE: Yes.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, okay, to me, it's
20	not like paper or wood. So did you ever burn anything in
21	there that was like plastic or anything like that?
22	MR. LALONDE: It's possible, yes, because
23	there'd be plastic bottles, you know, whatever. We'd just
24	throw them in.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: So you remember throwing

1	plastic bottles in?
2	MR. LALONDE: Well, in those days, there was
3	no recycling.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: No, I'm not no, I'm
5	not questioning your environmental footprint.
6	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
7	THE COMMISSIONER: What I'm saying is you
8	threw anything and everything in there?
9	MR. LALONDE: Well, if we could destroy it,
10	we would and then we'd put it in the garbage, yeah.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, so but what I'm
12	saying, you know, to me, 22 videotapes in a fire, I just
13	can't picture that.
14	MR. LALONDE: Well, I don't remember I
15	can't remember that, sir.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: No, no, no, but do you
17	remember burning unusual things that would be like plastic?
18	MR. LALONDE: No.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Mr. Dumais?
20	MR. DUMAIS: All right.
21	Thank you, Mr. Lalonde. These are the
22	questions I have for you.
23	My friends may have questions for you.
24	Thank you.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Strawczynski?

1	MR. STRAWCZYNSKI: I have no questions, Mr.
2	Commissioner. Thank you for participating, Mr. Lalonde.
3	MR. LALONDE: Thank you.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
5	Mr. Horn?
6	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR.
7	HORN:
8	MR. HORN: Frank Horn, Coalition for Action.
9	I just have a couple of questions, a few questions.
10	When the matter that would come to you,
11	anything that you had to do to anything that you had to
12	destroy or burn, was there anybody that was there to keep a
13	record of that. Do you know?
14	MR. LALONDE: All I can say, sir, is that
15	there'd be an officer there, and we'd do it. After that, I
16	don't know.
17	MR. HORN: So you weren't involved in any
18	record-keeping of any kind?
19	MR. LALONDE: No.
20	MR. HORN: Okay. And did you have an
21	assistant of any kind, anybody that was helping you?
22	MR. LALONDE: No. No, just the officer that
23	would be there.
24	MR. HORN: And do you know any of the names
25	of the people that have been mentioned, like Mr. Leroux or

1	any of the names
2	MR. LALONDE: Just what I've read in the
3	paper and watched on the Inquiry.
4	MR. HORN: So none of these names are
5	familiar to you at all?
6	MR. LALONDE: No.
7	MR. HORN: Okay. So you would know what a
8	videotape was then?
9	MR. LALONDE: Yes.
10	MR. HORN: Okay. It's not like you're
11	you don't you're not involved in listening to tapes or
12	that. Some people maybe wouldn't know, but you would know
13	what a tape was and what it did?
14	MR. LALONDE: M'hm, yeah.
15	MR. HORN: And you didn't see anything like
16	that?
17	MR. LALONDE: No.
18	MR. HORN: Was there ever any discussions
19	that you ever overheard of, any tapes or anything that was
20	destroyed that involved pornography?
21	MR. LALONDE: I made it a point, sir, that I
22	didn't get involved in hearing what was going on. That
23	wasn't my job, I'm sorry.
24	MR. HORN: The only way you knew it was
25	marijuana was because you smelled it and you knew what

1	marijuana was?
2	MR. LALONDE: Yes.
3	MR. HORN: Yeah. And the liquor, too also.
4	Did you destroy liquor also?
5	MR. LALONDE: We'd pour it down until the
6	law changed that they brought it to the liquor store and
7	emptied it there.
8	MR. HORN: Okay. I just have one other
9	area.
10	If you could look at 714169? This is an
11	interview that was done with you on March the $15^{\rm th}$ , 1994.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Just a second, sir. It's
13	a new document.
14	MR. LALONDE: Okay.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
16	Exhibit Number 2525 is an interview report
17	of Mr. Lalonde taken on the 15 <sup>th</sup> of March, 1994.
18	EXHIBIT NO. /PIECE NO. P-2525:
19	(714169) Interview Report of Arthur Lalonde
20	- March 15, 1994.
21	MR. HORN: This was done in 1994, is that
22	_
23	MR. LALONDE: Yes, sir.
24	MR. HORN: Do you remember that interview?

1	see, B do you remember that?
2	MR. LALONDE: What I have here, it's in '63
3	and '64?
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry? Again?
5	MR. LALONDE: I have here
6	THE COMMISSIONER: In 1963 or '64? Oh, no,
7	no right. That's you talking
8	MR. LALONDE: M'hm?
9	THE COMMISSIONER: but you met with the
10	police on March 15 <sup>th</sup> of 1994 and it seems it was a Detective
11	Constable Beatty that would have interviewed you.
12	MR. LALONDE: M'hm.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Do you recall that?
14	MR. LALONDE: Excuse me, sir, like what year
15	what this; '94?
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
17	MR. LALONDE: I think so, yes.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
19	Without mentioning any names there, Mr.
20	Horn?
21	MR. HORN: Okay. Do you remember the
22	interview?
23	MR. LALONDE: Yes, I do now, yes. Now that
24	I see like what it pertains to, yes.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Sure, sure.

I	MR. HORN: Do you remember what was the
2	purpose of that interview? Were you told?
3	MR. LALONDE: Well, it was asking about a
4	certain individual.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, we can Milton
6	MacDonald.
7	MR. LALONDE: Yeah.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, we can say that
9	name.
10	MR. HORN: Okay. And according to your
11	statement, you'd known Milton MacDonald for some time?
12	MR. LALONDE: For years.
13	MR. HORN: You used to live in Lancaster?
14	MR. LALONDE: Yes, that's right, sir.
15	MR. HORN: Now, were you like, back in
16	those days, you were living in Lancaster
17	MR. LALONDE: M'hm.
18	MR. HORN: you weren't living in
19	Cornwall. Do you live in Cornwall now?
20	MR. LALONDE: Yes.
21	MR. HORN: But back then you were
22	MR. LALONDE: In Lancaster.
23	MR. HORN:in Lancaster. And did you
24	is it like your home town? Is that where you grew up?
25	MR. LALONDE: Yes, I was raised there.

1	MR. HORN: Okay. So you would know a lot of
2	the local people in that community?
3	MR. LALONDE: That's right.
4	MR. HORN: And being raised now,
5	according to this, you started a gymnastic club for boys
6	and you worked with a certain police officer?
7	MR. LALONDE: That's right.
8	MR. HORN: And you were also involved with
9	the Boys' Club
10	MR. LALONDE: Boy Scouts.
11	MR. HORN: Boy Scouts, so you were
12	involved quite a bit in the community
13	MR. LALONDE: That's right.
14	MR. HORN: back in those days. So you
15	were a gymnastics teacher?
16	MR. LALONDE: Yes.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Get to the point, Mr.
18	Horn.
19	MR. HORN: Okay.
20	And now one of the things that when you
21	were being interviewed, did you have any idea why you were
22	being asked to be why they came to you? Did you have
23	any reason why? They just didn't go to anybody else but
24	they wanted to talk to you?
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, how would he know?

1	MR. HORN: Well, they might have told him.
2	MR. LALONDE: Maybe because I lived there
3	all my life, almost, all my adult life and my teenage
4	years. That's the only thing I can see.
5	MR. HORN: Did you have any did you ask
6	them why you were chosen to be the police come and talk
7	to you?
8	MR. LALONDE: No, because when a police
9	officer asked me a question, I just answered them. It
10	didn't matter who it was as long as they showed me who they
11	were.
12	MR. HORN: Okay, so you had no idea why they
13	were
14	MR. LALONDE: No.
15	MR. HORN: but the some of your
16	answers were quite quite interesting in what was going
17	on in the community at the time.
18	One of the things you said was:
19	"As a result of this investigation, it was kept so quiet,
20	so hush-hush."
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Where do you see that,
22	Mr. Horn?
23	MR. HORN: It's on the third paragraph.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Third paragraph from the
25	top, Monsieur Lalonde.

1	MR. LALONDE: From the top? Okay.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: It's in July of 1968.
3	"It was shortly after that Milton MacDonald was arrested
4	for being involved in some way with a little boy. It was
5	kept so quiet, so hush-hush."
6	MR. HORN: Do you remember that?
7	MR. LALONDE: Yes, I do.
8	MR. DUMAIS: And perhaps before we go any
9	further, Mr. Commissioner, perhaps there should be a
10	publication ban here?
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
12	MR. DUMAIS: It appears from this document
13	that this a is possibly one of the victims and if the
14	matter proceeded to court, I'm sure there must have been ar
15	outstanding criminal publication ban.
16	So the name is third line from the bottom,
17	about
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah. "The boy's name at
19	the time was", and the name there will have a ban on
20	publication of the name and any identifiers.
21	Mr. Horn, can you get to the point, please?
22	MR. HORN: Yes. So the what I'm
23	interested in is the last statement you made on the next
24	page.

123

THE COMMISSIONER: So that is:

25

124

MR. HORN: Just rumours, you're saying?

MR. LALONDE: Well, talk.

1	MR. LALONDE: Pardon me?
2	MR. HORN: You're just saying rumours?
3	MR. LALONDE: I guess.
4	MR. HORN: Okay. But as far as what you
5	knew yourself, you had no idea why all of a sudden
6	everything just went completely it just stopped like
7	that?
8	MR. LALONDE: M'hm.
9	MR. HORN: You had no idea
10	MR. LALONDE: No.
11	MR. HORN: what caused it?
12	MR. LALONDE: No.
13	MR. HORN: So to make that statement, what
14	was do you remember what it was that was in your mind?
15	Was that kind of a startling thing for you?
16	MR. LALONDE: Yes, it was in a way, yes.
17	MR. HORN: Why would that be startling to
18	you?
19	MR. LALONDE: He was always an outstanding
20	gentleman as far as I was concerned. I never saw him do
21	anything wrong.
22	MR. HORN: Okay. And you've known him for
23	quite a number of years?
24	MR. LALONDE: Forty-five (45) years, I
25	suppose.

1	MR. HORN: Okay. And did you know about
2	what happened to him eventually?
3	MR. LALONDE: Yes. Yes, I did.
4	MR. HORN: Okay. So at that time, you
5	didn't know?
6	MR. LALONDE: No, until he was proven
7	guilty, I guess.
8	MR. HORN: Okay.
9	All right, thank you. That's all.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
11	Mr. Neville? I'm sorry. Mr. Lee, yes.
12	MR. LEE: I'll be very brief, sir, but if
13	can just have one moment?
14	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
15	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR. LEE:
16	MR. LEE: Mr. Lalonde, my name is Dallas
17	Lee. I'm counsel for the Victims' Group. I have just a
18	very few questions for you.
19	You retired from the Lancaster Detachment in
20	1996?
21	MR. LALONDE: Yes.
22	MR. LEE: Do you recall being contacted
23	after that time by any police officer to ask you about your
24	time spent as the caretaker at the detachment?

MR. LALONDE: I informed Jack ---

1	MR. LEE: Mr. Dumais
2	MR. LALONDE: that last summer, I forget
3	the exact date, there was a phone call. My wife answered
4	and she said it's for you.
5	And this person said she was with the OPP in
6	Toronto and I said, "I'm very sorry but I don't talk to
7	people I don't know or give out information on the phone",
8	and I hung up. That's the last I heard of anything.
9	MR. LEE: Did this woman identify herself?
10	MR. LALONDE: No, she just said she was with
11	the OPP.
12	MR. LEE: Did she give you a rank? Do you
13	remember?
14	MR. LALONDE: I think she said Inspector.
15	MR. LEE: And do you recall you said, as
16	I understand it, you weren't comfortable speaking on the
17	phone with somebody you didn't know?
18	MR. LALONDE: That's correct.
19	MR. LEE: Did you suggest you might be
20	willing to speak in person?
21	MR. LALONDE: No, I said if you wanted to
22	send somebody I think I said that to come and see me
23	at home.
24	MR. LEE: And do you know what the purpose
25	of the call was; did the woman say?

1	MR. LALONDE: No idea, sir.
2	MR. LEE: So you just did she at least
3	identify the fact that it related to your time as a
4	caretaker at the detachment?
5	MR. LALONDE: She asked me if I had worked
6	there, yes.
7	MR. LEE: Okay, and you can't offer me any
8	information than that?
9	MR. LALONDE: That's correct.
10	MR. LEE: When you were the caretaker,
11	you've been asked some questions about destroying material,
12	and as I understand it this would have been a big, large
13	barrel you would have done this in?
14	MR. LALONDE: A 45-gallon drum. We'd change
15	it every three months; it would burn out.
16	MR. LEE: How would you start the fires?
17	MR. LALONDE: A paper and a match.
18	MR. LEE: A paper and a match?
19	MR. LALONDE: M'hm.
20	MR. LEE: And would you have had any wood
21	onsite or anything like that?
22	MR. LALONDE: No, never used wood.
23	MR. LEE: Any lighter fluid or accelerants
24	or anything like that?
25	MR. LALONDE: No; no fluid, no gas.

1	MR. LEE: And what about extinguishing the
2	fires, how would you put them out?
3	MR. LALONDE: I'd make sure that there was
4	no threat to the surrounding area.
5	MR. LEE: Did you use water or sand or
6	anything like that?
7	MR. LALONDE: I'd use sand, yeah.
8	MR. LEE: And do you recall ever having left
9	the barrel alight and walking away or were you would always
10	make sure that it was
11	MR. LALONDE: No, I'd always make sure
12	before I went home that it was out.
13	MR. LEE: Do you ever recall being left with
14	you've told us that you were always in the company of a
15	police officer when you were burning anything?
16	MR. LALONDE: If they brought something they
17	wanted destroyed, I'd they'd stay there until it
18	was done.
19	MR. LEE: Do you ever recall a situation
20	when an officer would have walked away once it was pretty
21	much done and left the rest to you?
22	MR. LALONDE: No, they'd make sure.
23	MR. LEE: Thank you very much. Those are my
24	questions.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Mr. Neville.

1	MR. NEVILLE: No questions.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Ms.
3	Allinotte?
4	MS. ALLINOTTE: No questions.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Mr. Rouleau?
6	MR. ROULEAU: No questions.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Ms. Waddilove?
8	MS. WADDILOVE: No questions.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Mr. Crane?
10	MR. CRANE: No questions.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, I'm sorry. They keep
12	crossing out the Diocese. Excuse moi, Madame Lévesque.
13	Des questions; no?
14	MME. LÉVESQUE: Pas de questions.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Kozloff?
16	MR. KOZLOFF: No questions.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Carroll?
18	MR. CARROLL: Yes, thank you.
19	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR.
20	CARROLL:
21	MR. CARROLL: Good afternoon, Mr. Lalonde.
22	My name is Bill Carroll and I'm the counsel for the Ontario
23	Provincial Police Association.
24	MR. LALONDE: M'hm.
25	MR. CARROLL: And I just have a few

1	questions for you.
2	I just want to understand the protocol of
3	the detachment while you were there. And as I understand
4	your evidence, the rules required that if you were going to
5	burn something, particularly property seized, there be a
6	police officer present?
7	MR. LALONDE: That's correct.
8	MR. CARROLL: There was no corresponding
9	rule that if a police officer was burning something, you
10	had to be present?
11	MR. LALONDE: That's correct.
12	MR. CARROLL: You told various questioners
13	that, I think I got the quote right, you never made a point
14	of knowing what property that was being destroyed that had
15	been seized?
16	MR. LALONDE: That's correct.
17	MR. CARROLL: So whatever was to be burnt
18	was burnt and it was any of your I take it your position
19	was it was none of your business as to what had been seized
20	or what was being destroyed?
21	MR. LALONDE: That's correct.
22	MR. CARROLL: You also at one point you
23	were talking Mr. Horn was asking you questions and you
24	said if a question was put to you by a police officer who
25	properly identified him or herself, you would answer the

1	questions?
2	MR. LALONDE: That's correct.
3	MR. CARROLL: And I take it, sir, you were
4	following that policy when whoever it was phoned you,
5	obviously could not prove they were a police officer, so
6	you declined to answer their questions?
7	MR. LALONDE: That's right.
8	MR. CARROLL: And finally, in dealing with
9	the back to the barrel for a moment, you were asked if
10	you made sure the flames were out and the fire was out and
11	your answer was, "I'd always make sure it was out before I
12	went home."
13	MR. LALONDE: That's correct.
14	MR. CARROLL: So I take it from that how
15	deep was the barrel, sir, may I ask you that? How high?
16	MR. LALONDE: It would be a 45-gallon drum,
17	so it would be three feet.
18	MR. CARROLL: Three feet in diameter?
19	MR. LALONDE: Yeah.
20	MR. CARROLL: And about what four or five
21	feet high?
22	MR. LALONDE: Oh, about four feet.
23	MR. CARROLL: Four feet high, okay. So what
24	I understand is you'd get a fire going or you'd put
25	material in it to be destroyed?

1	MR. LALONDE: M'hm.
2	MR. CARROLL: And went about your business
3	making sure at the end of your shift that it was out; have
4	I got that right?
5	MR. LALONDE: I'd stay there until it was
6	completely burnt.
7	MR. CARROLL: You would stand at the barrel
8	until it was completely burnt?
9	MR. LALONDE: I'm make sure, yes.
10	MR. CARROLL: All right. I guess you can't
11	account for the practices of the police officers but that
12	was your practice?
13	MR. LALONDE: That's correct.
14	MR. CARROLL: Okay. Thank you very much.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
16	Mr. Dumais?
17	MR. DUMAIS: No further questions. Thank
18	you very much.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Lalonde, thank you
20	very much for coming. You're free to go. Au revoir.
21	MR. DUMAIS: Mr. Commissioner, if we could
22	just take five minutes, and I will get the exhibits.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
24	THE REGISTRAR: Order all rise. À l'ordre
25	veuillez vous lever.

1	This hearing will resume at 2:35 p.m.
2	Upon recessing at 14:26 p.m. /
3	L'audience est suspendue à 14h26
4	Upon resuming at 14:36 p.m. /
5	L'audience est reprise à 10h50
6	THE REGISTRAR: This hearing is now resumed.
7	Please be seated. Veuillez vous assseoir.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. The next
9	witness, please. The next witness's name is?
10	MS. JONES: Yes, Officer McDonell.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
12	MS. JONES: Christopher McDonell.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
14	CHRISTOPHER McDONELL, Sworn/Assermenté:
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Good afternoon, sir.
16	You may have heard this before, but in any
17	event, the water will become important at some point, so
18	there are fresh glasses and fresh water. Please speak into
19	the microphone.
20	We'll show you some documents either on the
21	computer or in hard copy. If there is any time you need a
22	break, let me know and if there is something you don't
23	understand or you feel uneasy about, let me know.
24	In the meantime, please answer the questions
25	as best you can and if you don't understand the question,

1	have him repeat it.
2	Thank you. Go ahead.
3	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF BY/INTERROGATOIRE EN-CHEF PAR MS.
4	JONES:
5	MS. JONES: Good afternoon, Officer
6	McDonell.
7	MR. McDONELL: Good afternoon.
8	MS. JONES: The way that we're going to
9	proceed here today is that first I'm going to go over your
10	background and then I'm going to ask you a few questions
11	about certain situations that you were involved in over
12	your career here that are relevant to the Inquiry.
13	So just to deal with the first matter, your
14	career profile would be the first exhibit, which is
15	Document 200218.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Exhibit 2526
17	is a CV or employment record of Christopher McDonell,
18	Ontario Provincial Police.
19	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-2526:
20	(200218) Career Profile of Christopher
21	McDonell
22	MS. JONES: I'm just going to go over some
23	of the salient points here.
24	You were an ancillary consort at Long Sault

Detachment for 18 months prior to joining the OPP on April

1	8 <sup>th</sup> , 1968.
2	You were initially posted to the Napanee
3	Detachment and became a provincial constable there in
4	April, 1969.
5	You then went to Downsview Detachment until
6	1972 and then from then to '74 you were at Elk Lake
7	Detachment in North Bay.
8	From 1974 to 1990 you were at the Lancaster
9	Detachment, District 11, and from November $20^{\rm th}$ , 1977 you
10	were assigned to general law enforcement duties at the
11	Lancaster Detachment and this also involved criminal
12	investigations.
13	You were acting sergeant at Lancaster from
14	December, '86 to '87 and then promoted to senior provincial
15	constable at Lancaster after that.
16	In either '91 or '92 you're promoted to
17	detective constable at Lancaster.
18	MR. McDONELL: I believe that's I would
19	have been I think those so-called promotions came with
20	the I think I became sort of a detective constable in
21	'76, '77. I'm not just sure what year because and then
22	as time went on, they changed the names of the positions or
23	whatever.
24	MS. JONES: All right.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: So what did you do to

1	merit a posting in Elk Lake?
2	MR. McDONELL: I was general duties in Elk
3	Lake and a diver up there.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: A nice little community?
5	MR. McDONELL: That's right.
6	MS. JONES: In 1998 I presume from 1990
7	to 1998 you were at the Lancaster Detachment?
8	MR. McDONELL: That's correct.
9	MS. JONES: And in 1998, you're promoted
10	or you're acting sergeant position at Long Sault, and you
11	were doing that for a few months, and then you returned to
12	Lancaster in July '98, again as a Detective Constable. And
13	you retired from the OPP on July 30 <sup>th</sup> , 1999.
14	You successfully completed a variety of in-
15	service training courses throughout your career in the OPP.
16	However, you do not have any specialized training related
17	to the investigation of sexual abuse of children or
18	historical sexual assaults. Is that fair to say, unless it
19	comes about in general training concepts?
20	MR. McDONELL: Yeah, we would have had in-
21	service training to deal with some of that.
22	MS. JONES: Okay. So the topics that I'm
23	going to be talking to you about here today and possibly
24	tomorrow as well is, first of all, we are going to start

off with the suicide of Ken Seguin. We are then going to

1	move on to the David Silmser extortion investigation and,
2	lastly, we are going to be looking at the Jean-Luc Leblanc
3	situation and your work between September and December 1998
4	at Lancaster.
5	So the very first issue that we are dealing
6	with here has to do with the Ken Seguin sudden death, and
7	there's a couple of documents that perhaps would be useful
8	for you to review.
9	What I'm going to try to do is give you the
10	documents ahead of time and then ask questions about them,
11	so that I'm not asking questions that you can later find
12	the source of in your notes, if you understand what I mean?
13	Sometimes I might like you to have two sources in front of
14	you for ease of reference. And do you remember how to
15	source the document? The document number is on the right-
16	hand side, and the Bates page is on the left hand-side; do
17	you recall that? Okay.
18	So if we could please have Officer
19	McDonell's police notes. It's Document 737493. And I'm
20	going to give you the Bates page, 6942 to 6946.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Exhibit 2527
22	is an excerpt of Document Number 737493, which are Officer
23	McDonell's notes, part thereof.
24	MS. JONES: Just a moment, please.
25	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)

1	MS. JONES: Could I add one more document to
2	that excerpt? I apologize if this causes a problem. I
3	think what I am going to do is add the front pages just to
4	give the context of the date. That might make things
5	easier.
6	Same Document Number 737493, but could I
7	please add Bates page 6847 to that first exhibit, and if I
8	could put that in the front? It just gives the cover page
9	of the notebook, which will make it easier to facilitate
10	the dates. So if that could be added to that exhibit.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. So the
12	notebook 2527 will be the a page will be added, and it
13	shows your notebook notes from 13 <sup>th</sup> of September '93 to the
14	25 <sup>th</sup> of November '93. Thank you.
15	MS. JONES: Thank you.
16	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No P-2527:
17	(737493) Excerpt: 7156942-6946 - Notes of
18	Christopher McDonell
19	MS. JONES: Another useful reference I would
20	like to have with Mr. McDonell would be Document Number
21	111131.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Exhibit
23	Number 2528 is a Will-Say of Christopher McDonell let's
24	see what's it dated?
25	MS. JONES: I don't believe it's dated.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, but that's what it
2	is.
3	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO P-2528:
4	(111131) Will-Say of Christopher McDonell
5	MS. JONES: That might help you refresh your
6	memory as to dates and chronology. It's just a bit easier
7	to read sometimes than your handwritten notes.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: So this is really no,
9	it's okay. Never mind. Go ahead.
10	MS. JONES: So we have if we go to your
11	notes, which are Exhibit 2527, it would appear that you
12	were called on the $25^{\rm th}$ of November to attend at the scene
13	of the suicide of Ken Seguin. Is that correct?
14	MR. McDONELL: That's correct.
15	MS. JONES: What exactly was your role
16	there?
17	MR. McDONELL: In what how do you mean?
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Were you first on the
19	scene?
20	MS. JONES: What capacity did you have?
21	MR. McDONELL: No, we were not first on the
22	scene. We were the detectives. I was with, at the time,
23	Constable Millar.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes?
25	MR. McDONELL: And it was our function to

1	investigate the death.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: So you were the officer
3	in charge?
4	MR. McDONELL: No, I well, I was
5	assisting Constable Millar.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: So Officer Millar was the
7	officer in charge and you were assisting him.
8	MR. McDONELL: That's correct.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: That's what he was doing
10	there.
11	MS. JONES: Okay. And what do you then
12	assisting the officer in charge? What was your function or
13	your duties?
14	MR. McDONELL: Well, it would be pretty much
15	to assist the officer in charge. I mean taking notes,
16	trying to establish what happened; calling the proper
17	people in to assist with the investigation, the coroner,
18	whatever, things like that.
19	MS. JONES: What is the difference between
20	what you would do, say, and Officer Millar?
21	MR. McDONELL: Not a lot. We'd be working
22	together to come up to a resolution.
23	MS. JONES: So it wasn't a matter that
24	Officer Millar was the senior and you were the junior; you

worked more parallel? You were together more in ---

1	MR. McDONELL: I'm afraid I'm a little more
2	senior than he is, I mean, in age, but we worked together,
3	yes.
4	MS. JONES: So part of your role then would
5	be assessing what steps you take for the investigation, who
6	gets interviewed?
7	MR. McDONELL: That's correct.
8	MS. JONES: How do you secure the crime
9	scene, those sorts of decisions?
10	MR. McDONELL: That's right.
11	MS. JONES: Okay. Is it true that when you
12	arrived at the scene, as you arrived on the $25^{\mathrm{th}}$ of
13	November, 1993, that you obviously have a death involved,
14	that you treat deaths as you find them initially as
15	suspicious until you rule otherwise or find otherwise?
16	MR. McDONELL: Correct.
17	MS. JONES: Is that right? So when you are
18	first on the scene on the 25 <sup>th</sup> of November '93, proper
19	police procedure would be to treat this as a possible
20	homicide until you determine otherwise?
21	MR. McDONELL: Correct.
22	MS. JONES: And the reason for that is
23	because you want to do things like preserve evidence,
24	preserve the crime scene, ensure that the proper steps are
25	taken forensically and anything else that comes out of the

1	proper homicide investigation?
2	MR. McDONELL: Correct.
3	MS. JONES: Had you done homicide
4	investigations before this?
5	MR. McDONELL: Yes, several.
6	MS. JONES: Okay. Was there anything that
7	caused you concern at the time when you arrived at the
8	scene; anything noteworthy?
9	MR. McDONELL: I don't remember but I don't
10	believe there was anything out of the ordinary. There were
11	some police officers there upon our arrival, and we took
12	over the scene at that time.
13	MS. JONES: You said there was nothing out
14	of the ordinary?
15	MR. McDONELL: At the scene?
16	MS. JONES: Yes?
17	MR. McDONELL: No, I wouldn't not that I
18	can recall offhand.
19	MS. JONES: All right. And in your opinion,
20	was the when you arrived, you said there were already
21	police officers there. I believe one of the officers, in
22	fact, I think that one of the first officers on the scene
23	was Officer Dussault. Do you recall that?
24	MR. McDONELL: Yes, I believe so.
25	MS. JONES: And do you recall that Officer

1	Dussault was assigned the task of keeping the crime scene
2	secured?
3	MR. McDONELL: That's correct, taking names
4	of people that arrived and times.
5	MS. JONES: Had you specifically tasked him
6	to do that?
7	MR. McDONELL: I don't recall. I haven't
8	got it written here, but it would be Constable Millar or
9	myself, one or the other.
10	MS. JONES: And with regards to the people
11	that were interviewed, did you do interviews that day?
12	MR. McDONELL: Well, I believe I spoke with
13	Mr. Seguin, Keith Seguin and Douglas Seguin, which would be
14	brothers of the victim. I don't believe there was so-
15	called statements taken at that time.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Do you have any
17	recollection independent recollection of that day?
18	MR. McDONELL: Yes, I do, Your Honour.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: I know it's a long time
20	ago, but are you basing your testimony solely on the
21	statements that you have in your notes or do you have
22	anything independent recollection?
23	MR. McDONELL: Well, parts of it most of
24	it is from my notes.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Let's carry on.

1	MS. JUNES: You said you spoke to some
2	members of the Seguin family that day?
3	MR. McDONELL: Correct.
4	MS. JONES: But you did not take formal
5	statements?
6	MR. McDONELL: No.
7	MS. JONES: Was there anyone else you spoke
8	to at that time?
9	MR. McDONELL: I don't remember that. I
10	don't I spoke with the coroner, the pathologist, the
11	ident. officers, other police officers. 'Til we cleared
12	the house, we weren't talking to too many people 'til we
13	established what evidence we required and whatnot.
14	MS. JONES: And was there care taken to
15	ensure nothing was removed from the scene, for example?
16	MR. McDONELL: Well, I don't remember, but I
17	would say yes, it wouldn't be. Not while we were there,
18	there was nothing removed.
19	MS. JONES: You're certain of that?
20	MR. McDONELL: Well, as far as I can recall.
21	MS. JONES: Was there anything missing from
22	that investigation that you would look back on, for
23	example, something that could have been done that wasn't
24	done?

MR. McDONELL: No, not that I can say, no.

1	MS. JONES: So when you left the scene then
2	on November 26 or when you and Officer Millar left the
3	scene, what was the status of the investigation at that
4	point? When you finished for the day on November 26 <sup>th</sup> ?
5	MR. McDONELL: As I recall or what I have in
6	my notes, I went with the undertaker to the Hotel Dieu
7	Hospital and placed the body in a vault and locked it,
8	sealed it.
9	After that, we spoke with Émile Robert who
10	was a boss of Mr. Seguin and as he was quite concerned
11	about his worker.
12	MS. JONES: And do you recall what you told
13	Mr. Robert?
14	MR. McDONELL: No, I do not.
15	MS. JONES: If we could go please to another
16	exhibit; these are more of your notes.
17	It's ExhibitI'm sorry, Document 737494.
18	I can say that Exhibit 396 is this particular document
19	number and the excerpts of 396 are 6951 to 6964.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: So if it's already an
21	exhibit, why don't we just go to it?
22	MS. JONES: We can. The problem is I need
23	more pages in that particular exhibit.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
25	MS. JONES: I think I'm going to just have

1	to ask for a new exhibit.
2	Sorry, so 737494 and the excerpts are going
3	to be 6950 to I'm sorry, have I given notice to Document
4	7049? Is that consistent with yeah, 6950 to 7049.
5	Just a moment, please?
6	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
7	MS. JONES: Just a moment, please? This is
8	a confusing could I please could I have Exhibit
9	then 396? We'll stick to that, 6951 to 6964?
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, just let's get
11	with the Exhibit 396 first of all.
12	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
13	MS. JONES: It's always a bit confusing with
14	notes because they come in chunks. We don't need all the
15	notes.
16	So if we go to Exhibit 396, these are your
17	notes dating from November 26, 1993, 737494
18	THE COMMISSIONER: I see, sir, you're
19	referring to your originals, is that what you wanted to do?
20	MR. McDONELL: I have them here with me.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
22	MR. McDONELL: You don't want me to
23	THE COMMISSIONER: No, I'd rather you look
24	at the photocopies for now because that's what we're doing,
25	unless there's something new that you put in there in the

1	last little while?
2	MR. McDONELL: No.
3	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. What page?
5	MS. JONES: Okay. It would be Bates page
6	6952.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Six-nine-five-two (6952).
8	MS. JONES: And you'll see on that page that
9	the date is the $26^{th}$ of November, '93. Do you see that?
10	MR. McDONELL: Correct. Yes.
11	MS. JONES: And that it was clear and cold
12	that day?
13	MR. McDONELL: Yes.
14	MS. JONES: Apparently, on that day you also
15	consulted with Cornwall Police and made an appointment to
16	see them. And you said to them you're going to go after
17	the post-mortem, but you made an appointment to see
18	Cornwall Police to find out more information about Ken
19	Seguin at that time. Do you recall that?
20	MR. McDONELL: But that's not the way
21	that morning, I proceeded to Cornwall with Constable
22	Millar. And Millar went to Cornwall police and I went to
23	the post-mortem.
24	MS. JONES: Let me show you one document, if
25	may be of some help actually. It was a late filing by

24

it's 7092.

25 S. JONES: And you can see at 26<sup>th</sup> November,

THE COMMISSIONER: --- 092.

1	'93, towards the top there, about four lines down? If I
2	could possibly have it to the bottom of the page, Madam
3	Clerk? Sorry; just save you doing it twice.
4	Okay, so these are I think they're Staff
5	Sergeant Brunet's notes? And on the 26 <sup>th</sup> of November '93,
6	800 hours:
7	"Constable Chris McDonell called
8	back"
9	He actually called you first, I think:
10	"and reported he would be in after
11	the post mortem."
12	Which is consistent with what you just said
13	earlier. And:
14	"At 9:40, went to the senior officers'
15	lounge with Staff Sergeant Derocie and
16	Randy Millar, briefed them on what we
17	knew about Charlie MacDonald, Ken
18	Seguin, and Malcolm MacDonald."
19	And then, at the bottom:
20	"At 1055 hours, Constable McDonell
21	arrived in lounge."
22	So, that's pretty consistent with what you
23	have here. Do you see that, sir, on your notes as well?
24	At ten yours is 10:45, but
25	MR. McDONELL: Yes, I've I don't really

25

151

THE COMMISSIONER: Do you have any recollection of that, sir?

1	MR. McDONELL: No, I don't.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm. So, we've got
3	you you've gone to the post mortem, you're coming back,
4	you're catching up with Millar and at the Cornwall
5	Police Service.
6	MR. McDONELL: Right.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: And you stay there about
8	an hour?
9	MR. McDONELL: That's correct, yes.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Thank you.
11	Exhibit 2529 is an Occurrence Report, death investigation,
12	and the date
13	MS. JONES: These are actually handwritten
14	notes of Officer Millar; Randy.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. On an Occurrence
16	Report
17	MS. JONES: Yes.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: dated 25 <sup>th</sup> of November
19	1993.
20	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO P-2529:
21	(715637) Occurrence Report - 25 Nov 93
22	MS. JONES: Yes. I'm just saying they were
23	prepared by Randy Millar, so these are his notes.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Good. Now let's get on
25	with it, please.

1	MS. JONES: Bates page 8233, which is
2	page 3.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Eight-two-three-three
4	(8233).
5	MS. JONES: In the middle of the page it's
6	talking about the conversation that you had with Cornwall
7	Police, it would appear, and the sentence that I wanted to
8	focus in on, it says, "CPD investigators" It's towards
9	the bottom there. Yes, that's fine. So, where the cursor
10	is:
11	"CPD investigators felt corroboration
12	was required on the statement"
13	And this is David Silmser's statement:
14	"due to the lengthy criminal
15	record of Silmser which included crimes
16	of deceit."
17	Do you recall that conversation?
18	MR. McDONELL: No, I don't.
19	MS. JONES: But you'll agree that at the
20	Cornwall Police you certainly had, it would appear to be, a
21	meeting with Brunet, Derochie, Officer Millar and yourself
22	present?
23	MR. McDONELL: That's correct.
24	MS. JONES: Okay. And it would appear
25	Officer Millar's notes seem to be the most detailed of all

25

1	three sources at that point?
2	MR. McDONELL: That's correct.
3	MS. JONES: And you were present for that
4	meeting?
5	MR. McDONELL: Well, I was present for part
6	of
7	MS. JONES: Part of that meeting?
8	MR. McDONELL: the meeting, yes.
9	MS. JONES: Okay. Is it fair to say that if
10	something was discussed, and you hadn't been there, that
11	Officer Millar would have said something to get you up to
12	date on things?
13	MR. McDONELL: I'm sure that while we were
14	driving to Bourget, he would have.
15	MS. JONES: Okay. Do you recall having
16	conversation with Officer Millar about that very point, the
17	credibility of David Silmser?
18	MR. McDONELL: No, I do not.
19	MS. JONES: Now, at that particular point in
20	time we learned that later on that same day you end up
21	interviewing Mr. Silmser.
22	MR. McDONELL: That's correct.
23	MS. JONES: Is it fair to say that if you
24	had spoken to Officer Millar, certainly, about what had

just been discussed with Cornwall Police, that the issue of

1	Mr. Silmser's credibility would likely have been discussed
2	between you before you met with David Silmser? Is that a
3	natural assumption?
4	MR. McDONELL: Well, I've never really held
5	a criminal record against too many people, or
6	MS. JONES: But is that something that would
7	naturally have flowed in your conversation?
8	MR. McDONELL: I don't remember that being
9	discussed, but I I would have to think that it was.
10	MS. JONES: And you also learned, I
11	understand, that Staff Sergeant Dupuis had received a phone
12	call from David Silmser the night before the sudden death,
13	in other words, November $24^{\rm th}$ , 1993? Do you recall that,
14	where David Silmser said, "If anything happens to me, look
15	at Ken Seguin or Malcolm Macdonald"?
16	MR. McDONELL: That, I believe, was I
17	probably got that on Friday on the night of the
18	investigation, before that's probably the reason that
19	Millar went to the police department and I went to the post
20	mortem. That's
21	MS. JONES: All right. You clearly remember
22	that?
23	MR. McDONELL: I remember that, yes.
24	MS. JONES: All right. So these are the
25	facts, or the notions that you have in your mind, before

1	you meet with David Silmser and interview him on the $26^{\mathrm{th}}$ of
2	November, 1993?
3	MR. McDONELL: Yes, because I never heard of
4	David Silmser before that.
5	MS. JONES: So it would appear that on
6	the $26^{\text{th}}$ of November 1993, you attend the residence of David
7	Silmser in Bourget, Ontario with Officer Millar for the
8	purposes of conducting an interview with him.
9	MR. McDONELL: That is right.
10	MS. JONES: Okay. And in that interview
11	you were present for it throughout?
12	MR. McDONELL: That's correct.
13	MS. JONES: And do you recall that he made
14	allegations, or described the allegations he had made
15	against Ken Seguin and Father Charles MacDonald? Is that
16	right?
17	MR. McDONELL: Yes.
18	MS. JONES: And he also said to you at that
19	time that it had been reported to the OPP in Long Sault,
20	who then referred him on to Cornwall Police?
21	MR. McDONELL: That's correct; I have that
22	in my notes.
23	MS. JONES: Was this the first time that
24	you'd heard of these allegations?
25	MR. McDONELL: That's correct.

1	MS. JONES: Now, had you had previous
2	dealings with Ken Seguin, say, on a professional level?
3	MR. McDONELL: That's correct.
4	MS. JONES: And can you describe that? How
5	well did you know Ken Seguin?
6	MR. McDONELL: Well, I knew Ken Seguin for
7	several years as a probation officer. I often obtained
8	information from him, got help from him, and in
9	relationship to different people.
10	`THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm. So, that's a
11	professional level. Did you see him outside of his work
12	and your work; socially?
13	MR. McDONELL: No, I did not, Your Honour.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. So if you
15	were walking down the street, would you say "Hi" to him?
16	MR. McDONELL: Yes, I would.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Would you
18	stop and have a conversation with him?
19	MR. McDONELL: Yes, I would.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. And would
21	that conversation be, as most Canadians, about the weather,
22	sports, that kind of thing? Or
23	MR. McDONELL: That's that's correct.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Did you get into any
25	professional or personal matters?

1	MR. McDONELL: No.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
3	MS. JONES: And you'd known him for some
4	period of time as well? Professionally, I mean.
5	MR. McDONELL: Yes. I believe Ken Seguin
6	was a probation officer when I arrived at Lancaster in '74.
7	MS. JONES: M'hm?
8	MR. McDONELL: I believe he was a probation
9	officer then, and I would have got to know the man then.
10	MS. JONES: So almost 20 years?
11	MR. McDONELL: Correct. If he was if he
12	was a probation officer when I went to Lancaster, I would
13	have met him through my dealings in the courts.
14	MS. JONES: Is it also true that sometimes
15	at your job, if you need to ask a question about a
16	probation order or something, Ken Seguin would be someone
17	that you might phone, just to say just to ask a
18	question, to fill in a gap of knowledge?
19	MR. McDONELL: That's correct. If he was
20	looking after the person I was interested in, yes.
21	MS. JONES: Okay. So you had a good working
22	relationship with him?
23	R. McDONELL: That's correct, yes.
24	MS. JONES: What about Father Charles
25	MacDonald? Did you have any knowledge of him?

1	MR. McDONELL: Yes, I knew Father Charles.
2	MS. JONES: How did you know him?
3	MR. McDONELL: Well, he was a local priest
4	in the area and I am a Catholic.
5	MS. JONES: M'hm.
6	MR. McDONELL: And I've seen him several
7	times in different churches and functions, whatever.
8	MS. JONES: Was there a personal
9	relationship or just, again, sort of a more professional
10	relationship?
11	MR. McDONELL: Just professionally, yes,
12	just a priest.
13	MS. JONES: Just priest and parishioner, I
14	suppose?
15	MR. McDONELL: No, he wasn't in my parish.
16	MS. JONES: Okay. So what were your
17	thoughts, then, when you heard these allegations against
18	Ken Seguin?
19	MR. McDONELL: Well, I was a little
20	horrified, I guess you could say, or a little I couldn't
21	they're quite the allegations.
22	MS. JONES: Right.
23	Did you believe David Silmser when he said
24	it?
25	MR. McDONELL: Yes, I believed him, but it

1	was something that would have to be investigated, it wasn't
2	something you just take his word for it and, up into the
3	courts.
4	MS. JONES: All right. You were aware that
5	Cornwall Police had been investigating it?
6	MR. McDONELL: No, I was not.
7	MS. JONES: Did you ask him?
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Ask who?
9	MR. McDONELL: No, he told us.
10	MS. JONES: Did you ask did you ask David
11	Silmser the status of the investigation when he said that
12	it was being investigated?
13	MR. McDONELL: I don't remember.
14	MS. JONES: Did you follow-up in any way
15	with Cornwall Police to find out the status of the
16	investigation, after speaking to David Silmser?
17	MR. McDONELL: Well, I believe we had
18	information that Randy had obtained in the morning, so is
19	that what you mean?
20	MS. JONES: Okay. There was no all I'm
21	saying is, was there any information David Silmser provided
22	you that you needed to follow-up on with Cornwall Police?
23	Or did you feel you already had the information of Cornwall
24	Police?
25	MR. McDONELL: We already had the

1	information of Cornwall Police.
2	MS. JONES: Had you ever heard before
3	talking to David Silmser, had you ever heard any rumours
4	about Ken Seguin; behaviour or about his sexuality in any
5	way?
6	MR. McDONELL: Not before the night of his
7	death. Never heard a word and I dealt with a lot of people
8	that he dealt with and never have I ever heard did I
9	ever hear anything about
10	THE COMMISSIONER: His sexual orientation?
11	MR. McDONELL: Never. Never.
12	MS. JONES: Okay. If I can refer you to
13	your notes, please? And that would be Exhibit 396 again,
14	Bates page 6964 at the very bottom.
15	MR. McDONELL: Which binder would that be
16	now?
17	MS. JONES: Exhibit 396; these are your
18	notes.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. It's in a binder
20	and all the numbers are on the side there, so you've got
21	396. Madam Clerk, would you give him a hand?
22	MS. JONES: Bates page 6964.
23	MR. McDONELL: I have it.
24	MS. JONES: Right. It's just at the very
25	bottom.

1	MR. McDONELL: Of what page?
2	MS. JONES: Six-nine-six-four (6964).
3	THE COMMISSIONER: It's a back page, last
4	one.
5	MS. JONES: That's good enough, Madam Clerk.
6	I'm just looking at the bottom entry. It
7	would appear that after you had talked to Mr. Silmser, he
8	actually called you back at 15:57, it's the last sort of
9	entry before you're off duty there. And he actually gave
10	you the name of another person that he's saying was
11	assaulted by Ken Seguin.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Which we won't name.
13	MS. JONES: Which we won't name, and I don't
14	see any notes thereafter that show any sort of a follow-up
15	on that particular name.
16	MR. McDONELL: I don't understand why I have
17	that phone that in there, to tell you the truth. Who
18	phoned me, do you know?
19	MS. JONES: It would appear to be David
20	Silmser.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: And how what what
22	makes you conclude that?
23	MR. McDONELL: Because we didn't have cell
24	phones in them days.
25	MS. JONES: Actually that's a very good

1	point. That should be my first question, I suppose.
2	Who told you that?
3	MR. McDONELL: That what? There's no phone?
4	MS. JONES: The last, that another person
5	was assaulted by Ken Seguin?
6	MR. McDONELL: I don't know. I don't
7	recall.
8	MS. JONES: Okay.
9	Is it fair to say you didn't do any follow-
10	up on that, that you didn't interview that particular
11	individual?
12	MR. McDONELL: I believe I did down the
13	road.
14	MS. JONES: Yes, that's true, in July 1994,
15	but with regard to this investigation of the death of Ken
16	Seguin.
17	MR. McDONELL: Well to tell you the truth, I
18	don't remember. If I followed up on this name?
19	MS. JONES: Yes.
20	MR. McDONELL: I would believe we did but I
21	don't remember.
22	MS. JONES: I don't see any evidence of it
23	in your notes.
24	MR. McDONELL: No, I'm not the best note
25	taker in the world either.

1	MS. JONES: Right. In the final report
2	of the suicide, which I'll go to in a moment, there's no
3	reference made to that either.
4	And there is an interview with this
5	individual in July 1994 with respect to something else but
6	there doesn't seem to be any follow-up at this particular
7	stage.
8	MR. McDONELL: I can't help you there. I
9	don't know why if there isn't. Obviously you went through
10	my notes on down and there's nothing with that name?
11	I believe that individual was a cellmate in
12	a penitentiary but I'd have to check my notes to find out
13	for sure.
14	MS. JONES: You've also learned, on November
15	26, that there was a certain person that was a beneficiary
16	of Mr. Seguin's will. Do you recall that? Yeah, there
17	are.
18	MR. McDONELL: Whereabouts?
19	MS. JONES: On the 26 <sup>th</sup> of November.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Where in the notes,
21	please?
22	MS. JONES: Just looking for the reference,
23	here. Just a moment, please. I do have it.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Let's take the afternoon
25	break.

right now, sir.

1	MS. JONES: I'll leave that and come back to
2	it.
3	Okay, thank you.
4	THE REGISTRAR: Order. All rise. À
5	l'ordre. Veuillez vous lever.
6	This hearing will resume at 3:35 p.m.
7	Upon recessing at 3:18 p.m. /
8	L'audience est suspendue à 15h18
9	Upon resuming at 3:38 p.m. /
10	L'audience est reprise à 15h38
11	THE REGISTRAR: This hearing is now resumed.
12	Please be seated. Veuillez vous asseoir.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
14	Mr. Dumais?
15	MR. DUMAIS: I apologize, Mr. Commissioner,
16	just one matter that I had addressed this morning with the
17	witness from yesterday, Mr. Fougère.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
19	MR. DUMAIS: I've spoken to counsel for the
20	OPP. Mr. Fougère will be here on Monday with his original
21	notes and they will be reviewed by Commission counsel.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Is that correct, Mr.
23	Kozloff?
24	MR. KOZLOFF: I'm communicating with him

1	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you.
2	MR. DUMAIS: Thank you.
3	CHRISTOPHER McDONELL, Resumed/Sous le même serment:
4	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF BY/INTERROGATOIRE EN-CHEF PAR MS.
5	JONES (cont'd/suite):
6	MS. JONES: Thank you.
7	I found the reference. My large yellow
8	sticky note wasn't large enough for me, I guess.
9	I'm looking at Exhibit 2527, which was
10	entered this morning, and these are your notes so you would
11	have a hard copy of that. It was entered this morning;
12	737493.
13	Now specifically looking at the last page,
14	actually, so it's Bates page 6946.
15	Have you got it there, sir?
16	MR. McDONELL: No, I have 6946, is the last
17	page I have.
18	MS. JONES: That's correct. That's the page
19	I want you to look at.
20	On the previous page, it says the $26^{\mathrm{th}}$ of
21	November but I actually think it's the $25^{\mathrm{th}}$ of November, not
22	that it really matters, to be quite frank, but on the last
23	page there, under 2025, it says, "A name was the
24	beneficiary."
25	Can you see that? I believe that's what

## PUBLIC HEARING AUDIENCE PUBLIQUE

1	your notes say:
2	"Changed as beneficiary to his Estate,
3	September 30 <sup>th</sup> , '93."
4	MR. McDONELL: Yes.
5	MS. JONES: And then you have a name there,
6	which appears, as I understand it, to be the beneficiary.
7	MR. McDONELL: I don't know.
8	MR. LEE: There is no concern with that
9	name.
10	MS. JONES: There's no concern? Thank you.
11	The name Gerry Renshaw; do you see that?
12	MR. McDONELL: Yes, but I don't know why
13	it's there. I don't is it "charged"?
14	THE COMMISSIONER: "Changed."
15	MS. JONES: "Changed as beneficiary to his
16	Estate." Which I'm assuming is Ken Seguin's, you're
17	investigating that.
18	MR. McDONELL: Yes, I think
19	MS. JONES: I understand the will was found
20	on the scene; correct?
21	MR. McDONELL: Pardon me?
22	MS. JONES: I understand a will was found on
23	the scene?
24	MR. McDONELL: Not that I recall.
25	MS. JONES: No? It looks as if that's

1	Gerry Renshaw was changed as a beneficiary on that date,
2	according to your notes. I'm just asking you to verify
3	that.
4	MR. McDONELL: I don't know what it means.
5	I see we were in his office. It's not at his house. It's
6	at the probation office; correct?
7	MS. JONES: Pardon me?
8	MR. McDONELL: Is that probation offices
9	MS. JONES: No, I think
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Hold it. Hold it.
11	You have it in your note, sir, you have it
12	in your notes "Changed beneficiary to his Estate, September
13	30 <sup>th</sup> , 1993, Gerry Renshaw."
14	You don't recall anything of the note?
15	MR. McDONELL: No, and we were at the
16	Probation Services at this time.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Sure, okay. So can we
18	get to the point and get on it?
19	MS. JONES: Okay. I just want to clarify,
20	was that somebody that was a beneficiary or that you
21	thought perhaps was a beneficiary?
22	MR. McDONELL: That's correct. That's what
23	it says there.
24	MS. JONES: Did you do any follow-up with
25	this individual?

at least at some point?

1	MR. McDONELL: Not that I recall.
2	I should maybe clarify that I believe that
3	gentleman was interviewed at a later date.
4	MS. JONES: That's right, but in regards to
5	your investigation of the suicide, you did not interview
6	him?
7	MR. McDONELL: Not at that time, no.
8	MS. JONES: Okay. If I could just refer you
9	to Exhibit 972, Document 704018.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Nine-seven-two (972).
11	MS. JONES: I can identify this document for
12	you, Mr. Commissioner, if you wish. This document is the
13	Final Report written by Randy Millar. The date of the last
14	entry is the $26^{\text{th}}$ of November 1993 even though on the front
15	page, it says $25^{\text{th}}$ of November 1993. It actually has two
16	dates thereafter.
17	And the earlier handwritten version that I
18	had referred you to earlier as an exhibit seems to
19	incorporate most of that in this Final Report and,
20	presumably, as you and Officer Millar were working side by
21	side on this incident, you were involved, in part anyway,
22	with the preparation of this Final Report?
23	MR. McDONELL: That's correct.
24	MS. JONES: And you would have read it over

169

25

or ---

1	MR. McDONELL: That's correct.
2	MS. JONES: If I could just take you to
3	Bates page 3763, which I believe is the final page, and
4	this is a very important paragraph because it's giving the
5	conclusions that were found, first of all, that after the
6	investigation and autopsy, there's no foul play suspected
7	in the death; this was a suicide.
8	And the second sentence:
9	"Extortion does not exist against
10	Silmser as per Section 346 subsection 2
11	of the Criminal Code of Canada."
12	Can you read that, sir?
13	MR. McDONELL: Yes.
14	MS. JONES: Okay. Do you recall the two of
15	you coming to the conclusions that you came to, as stated
16	on this page?
17	MR. McDONELL: Not on that date. I don't
18	know why the dates are like that, but I would believe that
19	that would be down the road, at least. I don't know how
20	many days, but I would think it would have been sometime
21	later than the next day.
22	I know the signature, I know the date is
23	there, but these reports were done over a length of time

and then they were typed when they went to a major incident

1	MS. JONES: M'hm. But it would appear that
2	this particular report was finalized on the $26^{\mathrm{th}}$ of November
3	'93, at least.
4	MR. McDONELL: It would appear that way, but
5	I don't believe it was.
6	MS. JONES: Okay, and the last entry on that
7	last page is dated the $29^{\mathrm{th}}$ of November '93, and something
8	to do with the driver's licence, nothing too significant at
9	that point, but certainly, it seemed to be everything was
10	finished before the $29^{\rm th}$ of November. Would you at least
11	agree with that?
12	MR. McDONELL: Possibly the 29 <sup>th</sup> , yes.
13	MS. JONES: Okay. So you were aware then
14	that at this particular stage, both yourself and Officer
15	Millar did not believe there was any form of extortion on
16	the part of David Silmser as against Ken Seguin?
17	MR. McDONELL: That's correct.
18	MS. JONES: Now, if I could please go to
19	Document 737494.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: That's a new one, sir.
21	MS. JONES: These are also going to be your
22	notes. And the excerpt will be 6975 to 7049 6975 to
23	6978; 6983 to 84; 86 to 91; 983; 995 to 98; 7000 to 7002;
24	7014; 7019-20; 7028 to 31; 7033; 7036 to 40; 7042; and 7045
25	to 49.

1	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Madame Lévesque.
3	MS. LÉVESQUE: Mr. Commissioner, I object to
4	the notes for Bates page 6986 and 6987 being referred to or
5	entered as exhibits.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Just a second. Let me
7	see, and why is that?
8	MS. LÉVESQUE: They relate to a conversation
9	with Malcolm MacDonald.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
11	MS. LÉVESQUE: I don't have the opportunity
12	to test that evidence. I'm entitled to test the evidence.
13	As well, the information which is contained there is not
14	was not put into a statement, is not found in a statement
15	of this, bearing the same date of this interview.
16	It's hearsay.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Of Malcolm we've been
18	dealing with hearsay, double hearsay, triple hearsay
19	throughout the Inquiry. So
20	MS. LÉVESQUE: I just wanted to put my
21	position on the record.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Fine, thank you.
23	MS. LÉVESQUE: Thank you.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Any comments?
25	MS. JONES: No.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Then you want me to
2	exclude them?
3	MS. JONES: Oh, no, I have no comment,
4	except that they should be included.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Why?
6	MS. JONES: Because they are relevant to the
7	proceedings and I'm not sure why Malcolm MacDonald's words
8	are should be excluded. I don't understand the rules of
9	exclusion. Quite frankly, I don't really understand the
10	objection.
11	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
12	THE COMMISSIONER: All right, Madame
13	Lévesque, which page you object to being put in there?
14	MS. LÉVESQUE: Six-nine-eight-six (6986),
15	and 87.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Nine-eight-six (986)? So
17	we've got
18	MS. LÉVESQUE: Six-nine-eight-six (6986); I
19	think the way they were produced by Commission counsel,
20	they start 11-877, 0800 hours.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, "Proceed to Cornwall
22	re follow-up Seguin death".
23	MS. LÉVESQUE: M'hm.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: "Lawyer, Malcolm
25	MacDonald, Malcolm MacDonald's office,

1	Malcolm MacDonald."
2	Okay.
3	MS. LÉVESQUE: That's correct. And then the
4	next page
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Right, which is 87?
6	MS. LÉVESQUE: Yes, but it would stop
7	halfway through the page, if you like. It's difficult to
8	separate the pages.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, hang on.
10	MS. LÉVESQUE: And then the next entry from
11	the officer's notebook would be November 15 <sup>th</sup> , that's
12	THE COMMISSIONER: No, first of all, I've
13	got to read it.
14	MS. LÉVESQUE: Sorry.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: And it's difficult to
16	read. I can't can you Okay.
17	So what is it that you object to?
18	MS. LÉVESQUE: Pardon me? What is it?
19	THE COMMISSIONER: What is it that you
20	object to?
21	MS. LÉVESQUE: The information contained
22	here does not is not part of a statement that was taken
23	on that day.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
25	MS. LÉVESQUE: It's hearsay.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
2	MS. LÉVESQUE: And regrettably, Malcolm
3	MacDonald is deceased, so I'm unable to cross-examine him.
4	There's a reference to a meeting here, which
5	THE COMMISSIONER: "Meeting with Silmser
6	and"
7	MS. LÉVESQUE: "Diocese Committee."
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
9	MS. LÉVESQUE: Which has been denied by the
10	Bishop and the Clergy.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: What can I tell you?
12	Okay. Does anybody else wish to make any comments on that?
13	Is there another place?
14	MS. LÉVESQUE: No, Mr. Commissioner, that's
15	the only.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, thank you.
17	MS. LÉVESQUE: Thank you.
18	MS. JONES: Well, I think that has been
19	mentioned several times in many different forms. I'm not
20	sure that this one more reference to it is going to cause
21	any undue concern.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. I no, I'll
23	permit it in. Is there that's it.
24	MS. JONES: Thank you.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: It's not in for the truth

22 --- EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-2530:

23 (737494 Excerpt: 7156975-7049) Notes of

24 Christopher McDonell

25 --- EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-2531:

1	(737494 Excerpt: 7156975-6978) Notes of
2	Christopher McDonell
3	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-2532:
4	(737494 Excerpt: 7156983-6984) Notes of
5	Christopher McDonell
6	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-2533:
7	(737494 Excerpt: 7156986-6991) Notes of
8	Christopher McDonell
9	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-2534:
10	(737494 Excerpt: 7156995-6998) Notes of
11	Christopher McDonell
12	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-2535:
13	(737494 Excerpt: 7157000-7002) Notes of
14	Christopher McDonell
15	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-2536:
16	(737494 Excerpt: 7157014) Notes of Christopher
17	McDonell
18	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-2537:
19	(737494 Excerpt: 7157019-7020) Notes of
20	Christopher McDonell
21	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-2538:
22	(737494 Excerpt: 7157028-7031) Notes of
23	Christopher McDonell
24	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-2539:
25	(737494 Excerpt: 7157033) Notes of Christopher

1	McDonell
2	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-2540:
3	(737494 Excerpt: 7157036-7040) Notes of
4	Christopher McDonell
5	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-2541:
6	(737494 Excerpt: 7157042) Notes of Christopher
7	McDonell
8	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-2542:
9	(737494 Excerpt: 7157045-7049) Notes of
10	Christopher McDonell
11	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-2543:
12	(715309) Interview Notes of Malcolm MacDonald -
13	21 Dec, 93
14	MS. JONES: If we could go, please, to your
15	notes dated December 15 <sup>th</sup> ?
16	THE COMMISSIONER: What page please?
17	MS. JONES: Bates page 6984.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
19	So at 3:00 o'clock, sir, you "meet with Doug
20	Seguin and mother and brother and sister re the death of
21	Ken Seguin." Do you remember that, sir?
22	MR. McDONELL: I don't believe I have that
23	page here.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Well it's Exhibit 2531.
25	MR. McDONELL: Yes.

McDONELL

In-Ch(Jones)

24

25

## INTERNATIONAL REPORTING INC.

during this meeting? Were they upset about things?

MS. JONES: Do you recall their demeanor

sister Helena and myself talked to

1	Constables Chris McDonell and Randy
2	Millar at the Lancaster Detachment of
3	the OPP. They said they had
4	investigated my brother's death. They
5	said it was a suicide and then gave us
6	an atrocious description of what they
7	said my brother and others had been
8	doing to young boys. When questioned,
9	their suspicions turned out to be
10	nothing more than innuendo with the
11	notion that Ken was homosexual. They
12	cannot back up any of their accusations
13	and made some vague references to other
14	investigations going on in the area at
15	that time."
16	Do you recall saying things of that nature
17	during that meeting to the Seguin family?
18	MR. McDONELL: No, I do not. I remember the
19	meeting. I remember telling them that we told him that
20	his brother had committed suicide and that there was
21	allegations of him being homosexual. But an
22	"atrocious", I don't believe that stuff. I never saw this
23	before.
24	MS. JONES: All right. So you would
25	disagree with that classification that you'd made some

1	atrocious comments?
2	MR. McDONELL: I would, yes.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, never let's take
4	away the characterization, never mind the atrocious.
5	Did you tell them that well, you say
6	there's an allegation being homosexual. Well, being
7	homosexual even in 1993 wasn't illegal was it?
8	MR. McDONELL: No.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. So did you make
10	any allegation that he was that he had been abusing
11	young boys?
12	MR. McDONELL: I don't recall, Your Honour.
13	The thing is we probably, in the best way we could,
14	explained to him why we thought or our suspicions were
15	that he was homosexual. That he was picking on young boys,
16	I don't believe that was part of the allegations.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
18	MS. JONES: Do you remember the Seguin's
19	reaction to what you were saying at the time?
20	MR. McDONELL: No. I mean, they were upset
21	with their brother's death as any family would be I would
22	imagine, and they didn't seem that upset with what we told
23	them. I didn't figure they were any more upset than they
24	should be.
25	MS. JONES: All right. If we just go to the

1	bottom of that same page that we're on, 1474. That's the
2	one; at the bottom paragraph, please.
3	If you look at the bottom paragraph of that
4	document. If you have if you find it easier to look on
5	the screen, it's also on the screen, it's larger print, I
6	sometimes find it easier.
7	It turns out that later on, in February, the
8	Seguins went to Con sorry, Superintendent Fougère and,
9	according to them, made a complaint about the conduct of
10	yourself and Officer Millar.
11	According to Doug Seguin:
12	"He immediately called the East
13	Regional Headquarters in Orillia and
14	started the formal investigation of
15	Silmser for extortion. Unfortunately,
16	they used Chris McDonell, one of the
17	same officers who we had complained
18	about and who was also involved in
19	Inspector Tim Smith's investigation of
20	Father Charles MacDonald. In other
21	words, they were using the
22	investigation to Silmser as an added
23	way of investigating Father MacDonald
24	and to my brother, Ken."
25	Can you see that?

1	MR. McDONELL: Yes.
2	MS. JONES: Were you aware that there had
3	been a discussion about yourself and Officer Millar at the
4	time?
5	MR. McDONELL: No, I was not.
6	MS. JONES: Were you ever made aware there
7	was any sort of a complaint or any sort of an allegation
8	made against you even it wasn't a public complaint?
9	MR. McDONELL: No. Not until last night or
10	recently.
11	MS. JONES: One of the problems that the
12	Seguin family had, of course, was that you had perhaps a
13	preconceived notion about the death of Ken Seguin and then
14	when you were put on this later investigation, that you had
15	this preconceived notion that you were bringing into this
16	newer investigation?
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Whoa, whoa. I'm sorry.
18	What's the preconceived notion?
19	MS. JONES: About Ken Seguin and his
20	homosexuality and the allegations that they listed earlier.
21	MR. McDONELL: Well, I would like to think
22	any conclusions I came to it was proven to myself for me to
23	come up with that gesture, I believe. I just didn't dump -
24	- jump to conclusions.
25	MS. JONES: We heard from Superintendent

1	Fougère yesterday, or was it the day before yesterday, and
2	he testified that when he related that conversation, in any
3	event, that your name and Officer Millar's had actually
4	been brought up in conversation.
5	But you never received any information from
6	him or heard from Duhamel or anyone else involved in any
7	future investigation that you'd be assigned to about this?
8	MR. McDONELL: No.
9	MS. JONES: Had you heard at any time that
10	the Seguin family were not happy that they, the family, had
11	not been interviewed at the time of the suicide
12	investigation?
13	MR. McDONELL: I don't understand what you
14	mean by that.
15	MS. JONES: Had you ever heard that the
16	Seguin family were not happy with the fact that you or
17	Officer Millar had not interviewed them at the time of the
18	investigation of Ken Seguin's suicide?
19	MR. McDONELL: I think you'll find that the
20	night of the death, they weren't formally interviewed but
21	we talked to them at that time. And from then on for some
22	time, they were not available.
23	MS. JONES: All right.
24	MR. McDONELL: I'm not sure of the date of
25	the funeral or whatever but it was down the road some time.

1	MS. JONES: If I could please
2	MR. McDONELL: And I did not know that they
3	were upset for not being interviewed either.
4	MS. JONES: If I could please go to Document
5	725210? Sorry, that's not correct; 725175.
6	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Was the fact sir, was
8	the fact or as to whether or nor Mr. Seguin was a
9	homosexual have anything to do with your investigation of
10	the suicide?
11	MR. McDONELL: Nothing whatsoever.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
13	MS. JONES: Do you recall on December
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Hold it, hold it.
15	MS. JONES: I'm sorry.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: We don't have the
17	document yet.
18	MS. JONES: No. I understand that. I'm
19	trying to find another document to go
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, if you don't want to
21	go with the document then
22	MS. JONES: Yeah.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Go ahead.
24	MS. JONES: Just a moment, please.
25	(GUODE DAUGE (GOUDES DAUGE)

(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)

1	MS. JONES: Can we go to Document 715309?
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Exhibit 2513
3	(sic) is an assignment document dated the $21^{\rm st}$ of December
4	1993.
5	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO P-2543:
6	(715309) Interview Notes of Malcolm
7	MacDonald - 21 Dec 93
8	MS. JONES: On this assignment, Mr.
9	McDonell, it seems that you were going to be interviewing
10	Malcolm MacDonald on the $21^{\rm st}$ of December '93. Do you see
11	that?
12	MR. McDONELL: Yes.
13	MS. JONES: And I'm just wondering you
14	did interview Malcolm MacDonald on that date, and I'm just
15	curious, at this particular point, we are talking December
16	26 <sup>th</sup> ; now the suicide investigation presumably had been
17	finished the previous month. The final report had been
18	made, but you met with the Seguin family on December $15^{\mathrm{th}}$ ,
19	and now you're meeting with Malcolm MacDonald on the $21^{\rm st}$ of
20	December to discuss the situation between Ken Seguin and
21	David Silmser.
22	What was the purpose of taking this
23	statement from Malcolm MacDonald?
24	MR. McDONELL: I'd have to look at my
25	notebook to find that. This is to do with the extortion, I

1	believe, investigation.
2	MS. JONES: Well, it's dated December 21st,
3	'93. The extortion investigation doesn't start until
4	February, which we will talk about next.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: So I made a mistake. The
6	Exhibit should be 2543.
7	Okay. So do you recall this, sir?
8	MR. McDONELL: No, I don't, Your Honour, but
9	it's not my handwriting either but
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Whose handwriting is it;
11	do you know?
12	MR. McDONELL: I don't know whose it is.
13	MS. JONES: Do you recall meeting with
14	Malcolm MacDonald around that time?
15	MR. McDONELL: I met with Malcolm MacDonald
16	several times.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: On these matters?
18	MR. McDONELL: I would say, yes. I knew
19	Malcolm MacDonald quite well as he was a local lawyer in
20	the town and if I was doing something and required some
21	information on this case, we would go and see him.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
23	MR. McDONELL: But as for this, I don't
24	it's not my writing, and I don't know whose it
25	THE COMMISSIONER: It doesn't matter about

25

1	the writing. It's just to refresh your memory about you
2	having interviewed Malcolm MacDonald and him having told
3	you that he was the go-between between Seguin and Silmser,
4	and that Silmser was demanding money because he was
5	claiming he had been sexually assaulted by Seguin while he
6	was on probation.
7	MR. McDONELL: I remember taking that
8	statement, yes, sir.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
10	MS. JONES: You do remember taking that?
11	MR. McDONELL: Yes.
12	MS. JONES: Thank you.
13	So again, I reiterate, if you've already
14	finished your findings on the Seguin suicide, what was the
15	purpose then of interviewing Malcolm MacDonald on the $21^{\rm st}$
16	of December?
17	MR. McDONELL: I'm not sure.
18	MS. JONES: I don't have any notes for that
19	particular date.
20	MR. McDONELL: I'm not sure.
21	MS. JONES: So I'm not able to refer you to
22	that.
23	MR. McDONELL: I'm sure if I looked at my

notebook, I would see previously what I was doing in

relationship to this.

23

24

25

You know, so maybe the date was wrong, but it sure does say that the investigation continues after the  $29^{\rm th}$  of November and even if date and time of the report is the  $25^{\rm th}$  of November '93, it might be a mistake.

So the question though is why would -- never mind if the investigation is over, why were you talking to

1	Malcolm MacDonald; do you know?
2	MR. McDONELL: I do not recall, but it had
3	to do with following up on this.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Wallace?
5	MR. WALLACE: There is a document that has
6	been notice has been given on as one of the cross
7	documents, 715308.
8	(OFF-RECORD DISCUSSION/DISCUSSION HORS ENREGISTREMENT)
9	MR. WALLACE: Okay. I think we'll just have
10	to agree at this stage that he didn't prepare this document
11	and if the date says something, it may be right; it may not
12	be right.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, we'll check with
14	Millar. Okay, let's just carry on.
15	MS. JONES: That's fine.
16	Perhaps I can refer to an Exhibit, 0973;
17	it's a statement of Malcolm MacDonald, a handwritten
18	statement, 715456.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: What is the exhibit?
20	MS. JONES: It's Exhibit 973.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Nine-seven-three (973).
22	MS. JONES: Document 715456.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Right, right here. Just
24	flip it over. So this is a statement of Malcolm MacDonald.
25	MS. JONES: Okay. Does this refresh your

1	memory, that you had been present during this statement? I
2	believe that's your signature on the left-hand side on the
3	pages, to confirm that
4	MR. McDONELL: That's correct.
5	MS. JONES: you were present and such.
6	It seems the substance of this does
7	surrounds events leading up to November 25 <sup>th</sup> , 1993?
8	MR. McDONELL: That's correct.
9	MS. JONES: So are you, when you are
10	interviewing Malcolm MacDonald, are you then doing
11	something in furtherance of investigating a suicide at this
12	point?
13	MR. McDONELL: That's why I told you that I
14	don't believe the date on that first report is correct.
15	MS. JONES: Okay.
16	MR. McDONELL: Because this continued on for
17	some time.
18	MS. JONES: Right. And were you also
19	looking into the circumstances of extortion by David
20	Silmser at this point?
21	MR. McDONELL: I don't know. I would
22	believe so, but I don't know for sure.
23	MS. JONES: This statement, by the way, the
24	way that it's written, looks like Malcolm MacDonald just
25	wrote it out himself. Is it his handwriting?

1	MR. MCDONELL: No, it is not. It's Millar.
2	MS. JONES: Okay. Was it something that he
3	dictated at the time; do you recall that?
4	MR. McDONELL: That's correct.
5	MS. JONES: Because it doesn't seem to be a
6	question-answer thing. It's just a monologue.
7	MR. McDONELL: Well we would it was a
8	practice in taking a statement, you would go in and tell
9	people what you were doing, who you were interviewing and
10	they would go through a scenario and then we would sit down
11	and put it to paper.
12	MS. JONES: But is it fair to say at that
13	point the only interest, really, that you have in Malcolm
14	MacDonald is to find out the background of events leading
15	up to November 25 <sup>th</sup> , 1993?
16	MR. McDONELL: I would say yes.
17	MS. JONES: Now, on January 7 <sup>th</sup> , I understand
18	that you also met with Officer Brunet, and I'd like to
19	direct you perhaps to Exhibit 1439 that we referred to
20	earlier.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: What page?
22	MS. JONES: Bates page 7094. And I'll just
23	give a bit of background leading up the $7^{\rm th}$ .
24	On the $5^{th}$ of January this was a very

significant date because there was a lot of press

1	surrounding this whole issue, and it would appear that
2	according to officer Brunet, Constable Sebalj had
3	approached him and advised him that David Silmser had just
4	called her and was very upset about requesting where the
5	information came from.
6	He, David Silmser, had told her that Charlie
7	Greenwall called him at home and he was on his way to see
8	him. Then it states:
9	"Greenwell advised him he was being
10	investigated by the police for
11	extortion. I agreed to call him back
12	and explain the status of our
13	investigation."
14	And a little way down it states that:
15	"There was no investigation where he
16	was a suspect in."
17	And I'm just wondering, at that particular
18	point in light of your conversation with Malcolm McDonald
19	on the 21st of December, '93, was there an extortion
20	investigation going on by yourself at that time?
21	MR. McDONELL: I don't recall. I don't
22	recall.
23	MS. JONES: Then if I could please go to
24	Bates page 7097? Friday, January 7 <sup>th</sup> , 1994.
25	Officer Brunet says:

1	"Called Constable McDonell, Lancaster
2	OPP, and left message. During the
3	morning he came in and said they had a
4	statement from Seguin in his own
5	handwriting. He will try and make that
6	available to me to review."
7	Do you recall why you would be exchanging
8	that, or giving a copy of that particular statement?
9	MR. McDONELL: Are you talking about
10	Ken Seguin's statement?
11	MS. JONES: Yes.
12	MR. McDONELL: I don't recall.
13	MS. JONES: Okay.
14	And I want to refer you to your notes dated
15	January 12 <sup>th</sup> . If I could go to it's Bates page 7001.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: What exhibit?
17	MS. JONES: I don't know which exhibit it is
18	as this point; 7001; 7157001.
19	THE REGISTRAR: It's 253.
20	MS. JONES: Thank you, 2535 Exhibit. The
21	Doc is 737494.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Sir? So you have to go
23	through that mess of documents that we've got here, and
24	2535 and what's the exhibit 997? And what did you
25	want?
-	

24

25

1	MS. JONES: Two-five-three-five (2535).
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. What Bates page
3	number?
4	MS. JONES: It's 7001. Madam Clerk has it
5	on the board there.
6	On the previous page it is dated the $12^{\rm th}$ of
7	January, '93; I just want to confirm that. It does say
8	that.
9	So, according to your notes, at 14:00 hours
10	it says:
11	"Proceed to Cornwall re. statement for
12	Luc Brunet re. Ken Seguin."
13	I believe that's what your handwriting says?
14	MR. McDONELL: Yes.
15	MS. JONES: All right. And according to
16	Brunet's notes for the same date, it says;
17	"Received package from Constable
18	Millar."
19	I'm not sure if he got the two of you mixed
20	up or not, but was there anything else besides the
21	statement of Ken Seguin that you can recall leaving with
22	Officer Brunet?

"the package" is that's received. I don't have that. Do

INTERNATIONAL REPORTING INC.

MR. McDONELL: Do you have the statements?

MS. JONES: I don't, sir. I don't know what

10 THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm?

11 MR. McDONELL: --- this after -- this

12 morning that I never saw before.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: Right.

14 MR. McDONELL: If that's the statements

15 she's talking about.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, we'll find out

17 tomorrow, I guess.

18 MS. JONES: I have one more Bates page

19 reference and that's it.

20 Again, it's the officer's notes and, I'm

21 sorry, don't know exactly which exhibit it is, but it's

22 Bates page 7157020.

23 MR. McDONELL: Do I have that?

24 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, you must. We have

to find out what exhibit it is. 25

	AUDIENCE TUDELQUE
1	THE REGISTRAR: It's 2537.
2	MS. JONES: So 2537.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: So on the top, 2537?
4	MS. JONES: It's Bates page 7020?
5	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
6	MS. JONES: That's correct.
7	Just the very top entry there briefly refers
8	again to speaking to the Seguin family about the death of
9	the brother. The date of that is on January $26^{th}$ , $1994$ .
10	Do you recall what the purpose would be of
11	talking to the Seguin family at that point? I believe it's
12	the last time; it's the last reference I saw in your notes.
13	MR. McDONELL: Well, I will tell you that I
14	probably spoke with the Seguins once a week for from the
15	time of their brother's death. This it doesn't say
16	which member of the family it is?
17	THE COMMISSIONER: "The Seguin family."
18	MR. McDONELL: Seguin family, but it's
19	usually Helena that would call and she'd just call us to
20	talk, how things were going, or follow up on the case, but
21	I don't particularly remember what was discussed at that
22	-

## MS. JONES: All right.

24 At that point, had you already made a 25 finding as to the cause of death of Ken Seguin?

1	MR. McDONELL: I would say we made a
2	decision on the cause of death the night of his death.
3	MS. JONES: So what would be the purpose of
4	still talking to the Seguin family then?
5	MR. McDONELL: I guess mostly to prove to
6	people like yourself that it was a death by suicide.
7	MS. JONES: Was it difficult for them to
8	accept that? Is that why you were continuing
9	MR. McDONELL: It was difficult for
10	any any person that their family member commits suicide,
11	it's very difficult to accept. It's not something that
12	comes easy to anybody.
13	MS. JONES: Thank you.
14	That will be a good place to stop.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. We'll come
16	back tomorrow morning at 9:30.
17	Thank you.
18	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. À l'ordre;
19	veuillez vous lever.
20	This hearing is now adjourned until tomorrow
21	morning 9:30 a.m.
22	Upon adjourning at 4:29 p.m. /
23	L'audience est ajournée à 16h29
24	
25	

2	CERTIFICATION
3	
4	I, Marc Demers a certified court reporter inthe Province of
5	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, Marc Demers, 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	
15	Maile
16	
17	Marc Demers, CM
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	