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 141

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, September 20, 2007

Jeudi, le 20 septembre 2007

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

Appearances/Comparutions

Mr.	Peter	Engelmann	Lead Commission Counse	1
Ms.	Julie	Gauthier	Registrar	

Ms. Raija Pulkkinen Commission Counsel

Mr. John E. Callaghan Cornwall Police Service Board

Mr. Mark Crane

Mr. Peter Manderville

Mr. Neil Kozloff Ontario Provincial Police

Ms. Suzanne Costom Ms. Diane Lahaie

M^e Claude Rouleau Ontario Ministry of Community

and Correctional Services and Adult Community Corrections

Mr. Darrell Kloeze Attorney General for Ontario

Mr. Peter Chisholm The Children's Aid Society of

the United Counties

Mr. Peter Wardle Citizens for Community Renewal

Mr. Dallas Lee Victims Group

Mr. David Bennett The Men's Project

Mr. David Sherriff-Scott Diocese of Alexandria-Cornwall

and Bishop Eugene LaRocque

Mr. Michael Neville The Estate of Ken Seguin and

Mr. Giuseppe Cipriano Father Charles MacDonald

Me Danielle Robitaille Mr. Jacques Leduc

Mr. William Carroll Ontario Provincial Police

Association

Mr. Frank T. Horn Mr. Carson Chisholm

Mr. Ian Paul

Table of Contents / Table des matières

List of Exhibits :	Page iv
HELEN FRANCES DUNLOP, Resumed/Sous le même serment	1
Examination in-Chief by/Interrogatoire en-chef par Mr. Peter Engelmann (cont'd/suite)	1
Statement by/Déclaration par Ms. Helen Dunlop	27
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Peter Wardle	40
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Frank Horn	76
Objection by/Objection par Mr. Peter Engelmann	81
Objection by/Objection par Mr. Peter Manderville	87
Objection by/Objection par Mr. Peter Englemann	88
Objection by/Objection par Mr. Peter Manderville	93
Objection by/Objection par Mr. Peter Engelmann	94
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. David Bennett	96
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogaroire par Mr. Frank Horn(cont'd/suite)	99
Cross-Examination by/Contre-interrogatoire par Mr. Peter Manderville	106
Re-Examination by/Ré-interrogatoire par Mr. Peter Engelmann	124
Statement by/Déclaration par Ms. Helen Dunlop	128

LIST OF EXHIBITS/LISTE D'EXHIBITS

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE	NO
P-660B	(727742) Helen Dunlop - Excerpts from Officer Notebook of Pat Hall (7109373-74, 7109376, 7109410-11, 7109416)	3	
P-660C	(727743) Helen Dunlop - Excerpts from Officer Notebook of Pat Hall (7109437, 7109450-51, 7109458-59, 7109476, 7109478-79, 7109487, 7109522-23)	3	
P-660D	(727744) Helen Dunlop - Excerpts from Officer Notebook of Pat Hall (7109549, 7109554-57, 7109559-60, 7109563-65, 7109576-78, 7109624, 7109628-29)	3	
P-660E	(727746) Helen Dunlop - Excerpts from Officer Notebook of Pat Hall (7109641-42, 7109644-46, 7109675-76, 7109678, 7109692-93, 7109697)	4	
P-660F	(727747) Helen Dunlop - Excerpts from Officer Notebook of Pat Hall (710979-801, 7109812)	4	
P-660G	(727748) Helen Dunlop - Excerpts from Officer Notebook of Pat Hall (7109871-72, 7109898-99, 7109904-05, 7109912-13, 7109930, 7109937, 7109945-46)	4	
Р-660Н	(727750) Helen Dunlop - Excerpts from Officer Notebook of Pat Hall (7109961, 7109963, 7109966-68, 7109991-95, 7100020-21, 7110030, 7110032-35, 7110040, 7110045-46)	5	
P-660I	(727751) Helen Dunlop 2013 Excerpts from Officer Notebook of Pat Hall (7110064, 7110140, 7110143-46)	5	

LIST OF EXHIBITS/LISTE D'EXHIBITS

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE NO
P-663	(726461) Helen Dunlop - Letter from Yvonne Pink to Chief Superintendent Frank Ryder re: Helen and Perry Dunlop - 25 Oct, 04	8
P-664	(726460) Helen Dunlop - Letter from Chief Superintendent Frank Ryder to Yvonne Pink re: Helen and Perry Dunlop - 02 Nov, 04	16
P-665	Helen Dunlop - Letter from Peter Engelmann to Perry Dunlop re: CPI - 21 Sep, 06	19
P-666	Helen Dunlop - Letter from Peter Engelmann to Perry Dunlop re: CPI - 05 Jan, 07	20
P-667	Helen Dunlop - Order of the Supreme Court of BC re: CPI and Dunlop's Certificate of Justice Thomas R. Lederer Summons to Witness outside Ontario Letter from Peter Engelmann to Helen Dunlop re: Witness Fees and Travelling Expenses Endorsement	21
P-668	(731764) Helen Dunlop - Letter from Deputy Chief of Police Joseph G. St-Denis to Cst. Perry Dunlop - 09 Feb, 96	50
P-669	(731781) Helen Dunlop - Letter from Allan R. O'Brien to Deputy Chief St. Denis re: LTD Claim - 12 Apr, 96	51
P-670	(718490) Helen Dunlop - Letter from Cst. Perry Dunlop to The Cornwall Police Association - 21 Mar, 96	53
P-671	(717336) Helen Dunlop - Notice of Action - 07 Jun, 96	55
P-672	(703633) Helen Dunlop - Amended Statement of Claim (Action commenced by Notice of Action) -15 Nov, 96	115
P-673	(718931) Helen Dunlop - Fresh Amended Statement of Claim (Action commenced by Notice of Action) - 15 Jan, 97	126

1	Upon commencing at 9:51 a.m./
2	L'audience débute à 9h51
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. Good
10	morning, Mr. Engelmann.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Good morning, Mr.
12	Commissioner. Good morning, Mrs. Dunlop.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Good morning, Mrs.
14	Dunlop.
15	HELEN DUNLOP, Resumed/Sous le même serment:
16	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF/INTERROGATOIRE EN-CHEF PAR MR.
17	<pre>ENGELMANN (Continued/Suite):</pre>
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Madam Clerk, can we have
19	a cup for Mrs. Dunlop?
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Commissioner, the first
21	thing I'd like to do this morning is one housekeeping
22	matter, if I may?
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: And that is yesterday, we
25	entered an exhibit, Exhibit 660-A. It's a typewritten

1	transcript or summary of contacts Detective Inspector Hall
2	had with the Dunlops and I took Mrs. Dunlop through the
3	document and you had asked, "Where are the notes?". Fair
4	enough. And the difficulty we had was this document
5	actually came from several sets of notes
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: so this may seem a
8	little tedious, but I want to just read into the record the
9	various documents numbers and the Bates page numbers so
10	that counsel can follow, and this will give you the actual
11	handwritten notes of the officers. There are some
12	differences.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: They are not verbatim
15	transcripts. So it's important that we have the actual
16	notes.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: So rather than just having a
19	660B, we're going to have 660B through I.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Just bear with me, Mrs.
22	Dunlop, this may seem completely tedious but I'm just going
23	to be reading some numbers into the record. I'm not going
24	to these documents with you. Okay.
25	So 660B is Document number 727742 and the

1	Bates page excerpts 7109373 and 74, and there are two other
2	Bates page excerpts for that document, 7109376, 7109410 and
3	11, and one more, 7109416
4	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO P-660B:
5	(727742) Helen Dunlop - Excerpts from
6	Officer Notebook of Pat Hall (7109373-74,
7	7109376, 7109410-11, 7109416)
8	Then for Exhibit 660C, which relates to
9	Document Number 727743, there are a series of Bates page
10	excerpts. They are 7109437, 7109450 and 51, 7109458 and
11	59, 7109476, 7109478 and 79, 7109487 and 7109522 and 23.
12	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO P-660C:
13	(727743) Helen Dunlop - Excerpts from
14	Officer Notebook of Pat Hall (7109437,
15	7109450-51, 7109458-59, 7109476, 7109478-79,
16	7109487, 7109522-23)
17	The next exhibit number would be 660D. That
18	relates to Document Number 727744. I'll hand this up to
19	the reporters when I am done as well. The excerpts are
20	7109549, 7109554 through 57, 7109559 and 60, 7109563
21	through 65, 7109576 through 78, 7109624 and 7109628 and 29.
22	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO P-660D:
23	(727744) Helen Dunlop - Excerpts from
24	Officer Notebook of Pat Hall (7109549,
25	7109554-57, 7109559-60, 7109563-65, 7109576-

1	78, 7109624, 7109628-29)
2	Exhibit 660E relates to Document Number
3	727746. The excerpts are 7109641 and 42, 7109644 and 46,
4	7109675 and 76, 7109678, 7109692 and 93 and 7109697.
5	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO P-660E:
6	(727746) Helen Dunlop - Excerpts from
7	Officer Notebook of Pat Hall (7109641-42,
8	7109644-46, 7109675-76, 7109678, 7109692-93,
9	7109697)
10	Exhibit 660F relates to Doc. number 727747,
11	and there are two references to Bates pages. Those are
12	7109799 through 801 and 7109812.
13	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO P-660F:
14	(727747) Helen Dunlop - Excerpts from
15	Officer Notebook of Pat Hall (710979-801,
16	7109812).
17	Exhibit 660G relates to Document Number
18	727748. Bates page references are as follows: 7109871
19	through 72, 7109898 and 99, 7109904 and 05, 7109912 and 13,
20	7109930, 7109937 and 7109945 and 46.
21	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO P-660G:
22	(727748) Helen Dunlop - Excerpts from
23	Officer Notebook of Pat Hall (7109871-72,
24	7109898-99, 7109904-05, 7109912-13, 7109930,
25	7109937, 7109945-46)

1	Next Exhibit number is 660H. It relates to
2	Document Number 727750, and the Bates page references are
3	7109961, 7109963, 7109966 through 68, 7100991 through 95,
4	710020 and 21, 7110030, 7110032 through 35, 7110040 and
5	7110045 through 46.
6	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO P-660H:
7	(727750) Helen Dunlop - Excerpts from
8	Officer Notebook of Pat Hall (7109961,
9	7109963, 7109966-68, 7100991-95, 710020-21,
10	7110030, 7110032-35, 7110040, 7110045-46)
11	Lastly, Exhibit 660I, Document Number that
12	it relates to is 727751; 7110064, 7110140, 7110143 through
13	46.
14	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO P-6601:
15	(727751) Helen Dunlop - Excerpts from
16	Officer Notebook of Pat Hall (7110064,
17	7110140, 7110143-46).
18	Sir, those are all the references. As
19	difficult as that was to read, it was very much work to
20	find. I want to thank Commission staff who worked last
21	night to do that for me.
22	So those are the exhibit references and I'll
23	pass that up to the reporters.
24	Thank you.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Sorry about that, Mrs.
2	Dunlop. It's important that we get the record straight.
3	There are a lot of documents.
4	Mrs. Dunlop, you came to me this morning and
5	told me that you wanted to refer to some documents this
6	morning and I think copies have been made for you. Is that
7	correct?
8	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, except the letters from
9	you to me, I don't have them.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. They will be
11	handed up to you as well.
12	MS. DUNLOP: All right.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Let's start with I
14	understand that you wanted to make a correction for
15	something you said yesterday?
16	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: And what was that?
18	MS. DUNLOP: It was when you were asking me
19	about the officers that attended my residence in Duncan in
20	September of 2004.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes?
22	MS. DUNLOP: I mistakenly said Constable
23	Dupuis when I meant Constable Seguin and Constable Genier.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. All right.
25	I know you're leaning forward a lot. I am

1	just wondering, Madam Clerk, if you could push oh, okay.
2	Is that better?
3	MS. DUNLOP: Easier on the back.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: I just want to make sure we
5	can hear your voice
6	MS. DUNLOP: Thank you.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: and that the microphone
8	is back.
9	All right. So you were mistaken as to the
10	names of one of the officers?
11	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, sir.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And Mrs. Dunlop,
13	there was an exchange of correspondence that you wanted to
14	refer to?
15	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, that I would like read in
16	on the record.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And you
18	indicated to me there were two letters and these letters
19	are actually both in our databank, if I can call it that.
20	The first one is Document Number 726461, and
21	that is a letter from Yvonne Pink to Chief Superintendent
22	Frank Ryder. Is that one of the letters you wanted to
23	refer to?
24	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, sir.

MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Do you have a

1	copy of that with you, Mrs. Dunlop?
2	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: You were given your copy
4	back I hope?
5	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And this is a
7	letter that this is a solicitor that you and your
8	husband would have retained in British Columbia?
9	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: And she wrote a letter on
11	your behalf concerning this incident where the OPP officers
12	came to your home?
13	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: So Exhibit 663 is the
15	letter from solicitor Pink to Chief Superintendent Frank
16	Ryder, dated October 25 th , 2004.
17	Thank you.
18	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO P-663:
19	(726461) Helen Dunlop - Letter from Yvonne
20	Pink to Chief Superintendent Frank Ryder re:
21	Helen and Perry Dunlop - October 25, 2004
22	MR. ENGELMANN: So is there something in
23	particular you wanted to tell us about that exhibit, Mrs.
24	Dunlop?
25	MS. DUNLOP: I just want to read it into the

1	record because it basically very well explains how we felt
2	and also the response that we received from the OPP.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
4	MS. DUNLOP: Is that okay?
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Go ahead.
6	MS. DUNLOP: "Dear Sirs: The OPP
7	investigation's Project Truth. I am
8	counsel for Perry and Helen Dunlop and
9	write to you regarding the recent
10	attendance at their home by Constables
11	Steve Seguin and Don Genier.
12	On the morning of Monday, September
13	$27^{\rm th}$, 2004, at approximately 7:10 a.m.
14	Constables Seguin and Genier, having
15	travelled all the way from Cornwall,
16	Ontario attended at my client's home in
17	Duncan, British Columbia to hand a
18	deliver a photostatic copy of the order
19	of production made on September 13 th ,
20	2004 by the Honourable Mr. Justice
21	Plantana. Constables Seguin and Genier
22	arrived at my client's home unannounced
23	and completely without warning.
24	Over the years Mr. and Mrs. Dunlop had
25	made it clear to the investigating

1	officers that they do not want to be
2	contacted by police at their home
3	telephone number. Given that they have
4	three young children at home this is
5	understandable, a fact well known to
6	the constables.
7	The officers did have the Dunlop's e-
8	mail address and personal cell phone
9	numbers and I can see no reason why the
10	constables could not have made their
11	intentions known through these means.
12	The courtesy of a heads-up would have
13	been appreciated. Failing that, as
14	investigating officers for Project
15	Truth, Constables Seguin and Genier
16	would have had prior knowledge of my
17	involvement on behalf of the Dunlop's
18	through my pervious correspondence and
19	telephone discussions with Detective
20	Inspector Patrick Hall. These would
21	have been a matter of record. Clearly,
22	they could have contacted me to make
23	adequate provisions for the delivery of
24	the order of production.
25	The constable's untimely arrival at the

1	Dunlop residence, before their children
2	had left for school, was completely and
3	utterly insensitive and unleashed a
4	series of painful and frantic reactions
5	from my clients' three young daughters.
6	It is next to impossible to adequately
7	express the flashbacks of fear and
8	terror these children experienced on
9	the morning of September 27 th . The
10	Dunlop family left Cornwall, Ontario
11	more than four years ago to remove
12	themselves from such harassment. They
13	sought refuge on Vancouver Island to
14	live a quiet family life and to begin
15	healing the wounds caused by years of
16	humiliation, harassment and threats as
17	a result of these investigations.
18	The three Dunlop girls were slowly
19	reaching a turning point in their young
20	lives where they were beginning to feel
21	safe, safe from phone calls, knocks on
22	the door and police investigators.
23	The Dunlop's oldest daughter still
24	requires regular therapy for post-
25	traumatic stress disorder as a direct

1	result of the Project Truth
2	investigations.
3	There is no question that this family
4	has suffered considerably since 1993
5	from the on-going investigations by
6	both the Cornwall Police Service and
7	the Ontario Provincial Police.
8	As a result of the tactics used by
9	Constables Seguin and Genier on the
10	morning of September 27 th , 2004, the
11	Dunlop family has once again been left
12	feeling shattered, vulnerable and
13	fearful.
14	What was the point of this unannounced
15	visit? On whose authority did the
16	constables travel to Vancouver Island?
17	Neither constable offered up any such
18	explanation on the morning of September
19	27 th . Instead, my clients were left
20	with an overwhelming sense that one or
21	possibly two things were going to
22	happen on or about October 1st, 2004.
23	A search warrant would be executed at
24	their home and/or Mr. Dunlop would be
25	arrested. The constables indicated

1	they would be in town for a week.
2	Nothing was said by either of them to
3	assure or dissuade my clients from
4	either of these possible actions.
5	Mr. and Mrs. Dunlop had been subjected
6	to this type of behaviour in the past
7	by Project Truth investigators.
8	Therefore, the arrival of Constables
9	Seguin and Genier begs the question,
10	were their actions deliberately
11	orchestrated? What could possibly be
12	the purpose? If it was intimidation,
13	they succeeded.
14	Mr. and Mrs. Dunlop are not criminals.
15	They have not been charged or convicted
16	of any crimes. They have done their
17	utmost to comply with all that has been
18	asked of them. Prior to leaving
19	Ontario, Mr. Dunlop left behind 11
20	banker-type boxes of material. These
21	were handed over the Project Truth.
22	The materials collected by Constables
23	Seguin and Genier on September 30 th ,
24	2004 from my office were duplications
25	of documents contained in those

1	banker's boxes; a fact acknowledged by
2	Constable Seguin.
3	Mr. Dunlop has no more information,
4	documents or other materials. I do not
5	know how this can be made any clearer.
6	What was accomplished by this mission
7	other than my clients and their young
8	family feeling harassed and
9	intimidated? Why was it necessary to
10	send two constables all the way to
11	Vancouver Island at public expense to
12	hand-deliver a photocopy of an order
13	that could have been sent to me by fax?
14	In future, any communication between
15	the Ontario Provincial Police and Mr.
16	and Mrs. Dunlop, should such be
17	necessary, is to be directed to me.
18	I look forward with great interest to
19	your response. Yours very sincerely,
20	Yvonne Pink. Attention: Chief
21	Superintendent Jay Hope."
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Mrs. Dunlop, this letter
23	describes some of what you described to us near the end of
24	the day yesterday about the visit?
25	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: And would it be fair to say
2	that the comments with respect to the facts, they would
3	have come from you or your husband?
4	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: And there's a reference to
6	hand-delivering a photostatic copy of an order of
7	production. Do you know whether or not that was required
8	to be done in person or whether it could have been done by
9	some other means?
10	MS. DUNLOP: No, I don't know that they were
11	bringing it and, yes, I do believe it could have been sent
12	by fax.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you get a response to
14	this letter?
15	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, we did, through our
16	lawyer.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
18	Mrs. Dunlop I know you have a copy, for the
19	rest of us it's Document Number 726460. It's a letter
20	dated November 2 nd from Commander Frank Ryder to Yvonne
21	Pink. If that could be put up on the screen, please, Madam
22	Clerk?
23	THE COMMISSIONER: That's attached to
24	Exhibit 663 now.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: It should be separate.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: It should be separate?
2	All right.
3	So 664 will be the letter dated November $2^{\rm nd}$,
4	2004 to Mrs. Yvonne Pink from Mr. Frank Ryder, Commander,
5	Investigation Bureau.
6	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-664:
7	(726460) Helen Dunlop - Letter from Chief
8	Superintendent Frank Ryder to Yvonne Pink
9	re: Helen and Perry Dunlop - November 2,
10	2004
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Just so that counsel has it,
12	could that be put up on the screen, please? Document
13	Number 726460.
14	Mrs. Dunlop, if you could just take a look
15	at the screen? Is this the letter that you wish to refer
16	us to next, the response?
17	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, sir.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
19	MS. DUNLOP: "Dear Ms. Pink: Your file
20	number 9424: Perry and Helen Dunlop. I
21	am in receipt of your letter dated 25
22	October 2004. Please be advised that
23	in future you will be contacted if we
24	require anything further with respect
25	to you clients, Mr. Perry Dunlop and

1	Mrs. Helen Dunlop. Sincerely, Frank
2	Ryder, Commander, Investigation
3	Bureau."
4	MR. ENGELMANN: So is the response you
5	received through your lawyer for the letters she sent on
6	your behalf?
7	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, sir.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Is there anything else you
9	wanted to say about that, Mrs. Dunlop?
10	MS. DUNLOP: We didn't get any of the
11	questions we asked, answered.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Mrs. Dunlop, I believe you
13	came to our office with three other documents this morning
14	two letters that I would have written to you and your
15	husband some time ago?
16	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, sir.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: That you referred to at the
18	beginning of your evidence a couple of days back?
19	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: And also an order from the
21	Supreme Court of British Columbia with respect to this
22	summons?
23	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, sir.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Mr.
25	Commissioner, the letters were obviously private letters

1	that I wrote so they are not in our database.
2	They are going to need to be given a
3	document number. I ask that copies be made for counsel. I
4	don't know if we have copies.
5	Do you want to refer to the first letter,
6	Mrs. Dunlop, September $21^{\rm st}$, 2006? Is that the first letter
7	you wanted to refer to, my letter to your husband?
8	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: Madam Clerk, we'll need a
10	document number.
11	MADAME CLERK: I don't have my copies.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm sorry? You don't have
13	them? Oh, you didn't get them back? We'll give it a
14	document number later. They aren't in our database because
15	they are private correspondence.
16	So if my letter to Mr. Dunlop dated
17	September 21 st , 2006 I guess it's the next exhibit.
18	MS. DUNLOP: I just wanted to refer to the
19	second last paragraph.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Certainly. Was it given
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Six-six-five (665).
22	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm sorry?
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Six-six-five (665) is a
24	letter dated September 21st, 2006, addressed to Perry Dunlop
25	from Peter Engelmann, Lead Commission counse.

1	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-665:
2	Helen Dunlop - Letter from Peter Engelmann
3	to Perry Dunlop re: CPI - September 21, 2006
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Go ahead, Mrs. Dunlop.
5	MS. DUNLOP: I just want to refer to the
6	second last paragraph on the second page.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
8	MS. DUNLOP: "Despite our efforts and
9	those of others, we understand at
10	present you do not want to participate
11	in the Inquiry for personal reasons.
12	We are not able to compel you to come
13	to Cornwall and testify before the
14	Inquiry."
15	MR. ENGELMANN: That's all you wanted to
16	read?
17	MS. DUNLOP: That's what we took at face
18	value, yes.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Right. This letter, since
20	we're here, indicates reasons why the Commission thought it
21	was important for your husband to testify?
22	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: And you wanted to refer to
24	another letter, Mrs. Dunlop?
25	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, please.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Is that a letter dated
2	January 5 th , 2007? Can you give the witness she brought
3	in copies this morning.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Exhibit 666 is a letter
5	dated January 5^{th} 2007 addressed to Mr. and Mrs. Perry and
6	Helen Dunlop from Mr. Engelmann.
7	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-666:
8	Helen Dunlop - Letter from Peter Engelmann
9	to Perry Dunlop re: CPI - January 5, 2007
10	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
11	THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry. Where are we
12	now?
13	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm not sure. The witness
14	wanted to refer to the letter, sir.
15	MS. DUNLOP: I wanted to refer to page two,
16	second paragraph.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
18	MS. DUNLOP: "I also want to make it very
19	clear that since this is a Provincial
20	Inquiry, your appearance before this Inquiry
21	as a non-resident is, therefore, voluntary."
22	We took that at face value.
23	MR. ENGELMANN: Is there anything else in
24	the letter that you wanted to refer to?
25	MS. DUNLOP: No, thank you.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Again, would it be fair to
2	say the letter sets out, at least in the view of the
3	Commission, a number of reasons why the Commission believes
4	your husband's participation is important?
5	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. Mrs. Dunlop, there
7	was one other document you wanted to refer to?
8	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, please.
9	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. That's an order
10	that was served on you and your husband. Is that correct?
11	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, sir.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: Did you get your copy back?
13	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Exhibit 667 is an Order
16	of the Supreme Court of British Columbia dated the $22^{\rm nd}$ day
17	of August 2007.
18	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-667:
19	Helen Dunlop - Order of the Supreme Court of
20	BC re: CPI and Dunlops' Certificate of
21	Justice Thomas R. Lederer Summons to Witness
22	Outside Ontario Letter from Peter Engelmann
23	to Helen Dunlop re: Witness Fees and
24	Travelling Expenses Endorsement
25	MS. DUNLOP: I'd like to refer to page two

1	of J. Lederer's submission.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Just so we're
3	all on the same page we don't have this on the screen so
4	
5	THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry?
6	MR. ENGELMANN: It hasn't been handed out
7	yet. I'm just going to describe the package and then you
8	can tell us what you want to do with it, Mrs. Dunlop.
9	MS. DUNLOP: Thank you.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: It appears to be the order
11	on the first page with a certificate that follows; and then
12	on the third page Summons to Witness Outside Ontario to
13	Helen Dunlop; then there's a cheque for conduct money;
14	there's a letter dated August 22^{nd} , 2007 to Mrs. Dunlop from
15	me; then there's the endorsement from the court, and that's
16	the Honourable Justice Lederer, who I believe was the judge
17	in Ontario.
18	MS. DUNLOP: I believe so.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Because it was Justice Smart
20	in British Columbia.
21	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: And then there's the
23	endorsement from the Ontario court, the handwritten
24	endorsement which follows.
25	

Mrs. Dunlop, you wanted to refer to the

1	typed form of the endorsement. Is that correct?
2	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, page two.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Page two?
4	MS. DUNLOP: I have it asterisked.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. Please tell us what
6	it is you wanted to refer to?
7	MS. DUNLOP: Well, I don't know where J.
8	Lederer got his or her information from, but it states
9	here:
10	"After he left the police, he and his
11	wife continued to investigate these
12	matters and delivered material to
13	public officials. This and more
14	satisfies the first test."
15	That is a lie.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay. So what is incorrect,
17	Mrs. Dunlop?
18	MS. DUNLOP: It's not true that after Perry
19	and I or Perry left the police force that he continued
20	to investigate matters, and I certainly was not
21	investigating any matters, and we did not deliver materials
22	to public officials after he resigned from the Cornwall
23	police.
24	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. So what it
25	should have said perhaps is, "While on leave from the

1	police, he continued to investigate matters and delivered
2	materials to public officials".
3	MS. DUNLOP: Well, I don't know that you can
4	say that Mr. Engelmann. I would want to speak to whoever
5	wrote this and see where they got their information because
6	it's incorrect, and it seems to me that that's how they got
7	this summons was by serving this, and it came as quite a
8	shock considering the first two letters say we cannot be
9	compelled to testify.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Well, it is true, is it not,
11	that while he was on leave he investigated matters
12	involving child sexual abuse?
13	MS. DUNLOP: That's not what it says here.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: No, no. I know that. I'm
15	just asking you a question.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Your point is duly noted.
17	MS. DUNLOP: Okay.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Now, he's just asking you
19	a question.
20	MS. DUNLOP: Okay.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Your husband investigated
23	matters involving child sexual abuse while he was on leave
24	from the Cornwall police?
25	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, sir.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: And he did deliver
2	significant materials to public officials?
3	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, sir.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: And that was all while he
5	was on leave from the police force?
6	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, sir.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
8	MS. DUNLOP: But I have to wonder if the
9	British Columbia Supreme Court would have endorsed this had
10	they known this was not true.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Is there anything else that
12	you wanted to say about the order?
13	MS. DUNLOP: No, thank you.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. There were
15	letters to you and your husband about the fact that matters
16	were going to be argued in both Ontario and in B.C. before
17	a judge. Is that correct? There was notice given?
18	MS. DUNLOP: That they were going to be
19	argued in Toronto.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes, and then further notice
21	that there was going to be an argument in British Columbia?
22	Do you know what I mean by notice? That you were notified
23	that there was going to an argument about a submission made
24	about a summons?
25	MS. DUNLOP: I can't remember.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: It says an ex-party
3	application
4	MR. ENGELMANN: No, I know. There are a
5	number of letters that I don't have here. I wasn't
6	would you have received some letters from Patti Latimer or
7	someone from Stockwoods?
8	MS. DUNLOP: I remember her name from this
9	document because I wondered who she was.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Those were the documents
11	that you wanted to refer to, Mrs. Dunlop? Is that correct?
12	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, thank you.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: Now, when we left off
14	yesterday, Mrs. Dunlop, we had left off just before the end
15	of your examination in-chief, and I think I had advised you
16	and others that we have had a practice here of asking
17	individuals who have appeared as witnesses, particularly
18	people who have appeared as victims and alleged victims of
19	child sexual abuse, to comment on the effect the abuse had
20	on them; to comment on any concerns they had with respect
21	to their dealings with public institutions or public
22	institution officials; and then to give us some
23	recommendations or suggestions for the future, so that the
24	Commissioner can consider them in preparing
25	recommendations.

1	I am not asking you to talk to us about the
2	effects of child sexual abuse. You are not here as a
3	victim or an alleged victim of child sexual abuse.
4	However, you and your husband were obviously deeply
5	involved in bringing something to light here in the City of
6	Cornwall, and you have testified at some length about some
7	of the effects that had on him and on you and on your
8	family.
9	So if there is anything else you want to say
10	about that, or if there is anything you want to say in
11	addition to what you've already said about concerns of
12	yours with respect to how you were dealt with by various
13	institutions, this is the time. And if you have any
14	recommendations for perhaps how this could be done
15	differently, in light of your concerns, this is the time.
16	STATEMENT BY/DÉCLARATION PAR MS. HELEN DUNLOP:
17	MS. DUNLOP: I appreciate the opportunity.
18	I want to first address the Inquiry process.
19	Since this Inquiry started, I have had the opportunity to
20	either watch or read the proceedings on an almost daily
21	basis. Several aspects or areas of concern have stood out
22	over time.
23	One, the obvious adversarial and trial-like
24	hostile environment that has so often been displayed here.
25	Example, testimony of David Silmser; the shameful treatment

1	of Steve Parisien and Albert Roy; the oftentimes hurtful
2	and irresponsible media coverage locally, and a huge
3	obvious lack of national media attention on an issue that
4	is of life-threatening importance.
5	There should be more transparency and less
6	secrecy concerning witnesses and evidence. There should
7	have been more input from victims of child sexual abuse
8	before, during and during this Inquiry, as they are the
9	real experts on the issue of abuse. To that end, I would
10	like to quote from the <u>Canadian Criminal Evidence Handbook</u>
11	regarding opinion evidence. The Handbook states:
12	"An expert is one who has by experience
13	acquired special or peculiar knowledge
14	of the subject of which he undertakes
15	to testify. It is immaterial whether
16	such knowledge was acquired by
17	scientific works or by practical
18	observation, Regina v. Wald, 1989,
19	Alberta Court of Appeal."
20	The handbook also states:
21	"A university degree is not a
22	prerequisite to have developed
23	expertise in any particular area.
24	Regina v. Dugandzic, 1981, Ontario
25	Court of Appeal; and Regina v. Rodych,

1	1978, B.C. Provincial Court."
2	There should be less attempt by certain
3	institutions to change the focus from honestly searching
4	for the truth to shooting the messenger.
5	Another area of concern is all the questions
6	that are still unanswered. Why, to this very day, some 14
7	years after Perry disclosed to the Children's Aid Society,
8	the David Silmser statement and pay-off deal, have none of
9	the following gentlemen been investigated or charged with
10	obstructing justice: Eugene LaRocque, Sean Adams, Claude
11	Shaver, Murray MacDonald, Jacques Leduc, and several
12	members of the Cornwall Police Service.
13	Why was Perry charged under the Police
14	Services Act in 1994 for following provincially legislated
15	law? Who ordered or orchestrated this, and, secondly, why
16	weren't those officers who failed to report the same
17	suspected child abuse ever charged for not following this
18	mandatory reporting legislation?
19	Why weren't Ken Seguin and Charlie MacDonald
20	questioned after David Silmser submitted his statement in
21	1992, thereby leaving untold numbers of potential victims
22	at risk?
23	The Ottawa Police Service conducted an
24	investigation on the Cornwall Police Service's handling of
25	the David Silmser complaint. Where is that official

1	report? Who ordered Constable Heidi Sebalj to hide David
2	Silmser's occurrence under the Project files rather than
3	under the regular system and why?
4	Who ordered the illegal search warrant at
5	Ron Leroux's house where a suitcase full of pornographic
6	tapes were taken? Who were those officers? Who ordered
7	those same tapes destroyed, thereby destroying potential
8	evidence?
9	Why were there no search warrants executed
10	by police on Malcolm MacDonald's home, office or cottage?
11	Also the homes of Ken Seguin and Charlie MacDonald and, for
12	that matter, any of the alleged pedophiles?
13	Was there ever any damaging evidence
14	collected from the homes of Richard Hickerson, Nelson
15	Barque, or from the homes of other alleged abusers who
16	committed suicide? Who attended these homes? Is there
17	evidence there?
18	Why has the taxpaying public never been
19	allowed to access and read the Sears Report. What is the
20	Ontario government trying to hide?
21	How many millions of dollars in damages has
22	the Ontario government paid out to victims of childhood
23	sexual abuse in and around this area in the past 14 years?
24	And I would like to read in my
25	recommendations.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: On, yes, yes.
2	MS. DUNLOP: First, mandatory education in
3	all public schools regarding sexual abuse of children for
4	all students from Kindergarten to Grade 12. This should
5	include the signs and symptoms, consequences, and lifelong
6	effects sex abuse has on a victim.
7	We should be making childhood sexual abuse
8	cases in the courts a top priority. We should speed up the
9	court process and close the loopholes for the alleged
10	perpetrators.
11	We should offer better education of police
12	officers and all other officers of the court on a mandatory
13	and ongoing basis.
14	Whistleblower legislation with serious
15	protection for whistleblowers and their families.
16	We should enforce zero tolerance for alleged
17	sexual assault perpetrators or pedophiles.
18	Stiffer sentences with mandatory serving
19	times for pedophiles.
20	More therapy centres for male victims of
21	sexual abuse in this province.
22	Equal investigating, charging and sentencing
23	of pedophiles with no preferential treatment because of
24	position, power, clout, connection, money or control.
25	Harsh penalties for individuals or

1	institutions who knowingly harbour or protect pedophiles.
2	We should be implementing an anonymous tips
3	line to report suspected child molesters with a system
4	whereby the caller could follow-up on the progress of the
5	case.
6	Those are my recommendations.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: Thank you for your
9	recommendations, Mrs. Dunlop.
10	Just a brief comment, if I may. We welcome
11	your concerns and welcome the suggestions you have given us
12	for areas to look at during the remainder of our Inquiry.
13	We welcome those suggestions from all members of the
14	public. We've been receiving them.
15	I can tell you several of the things you've
16	asked questions about are areas that we will deal with in
17	the institutional response stage that is coming.
18	You mention documents. We have some of
19	those documents and they will be shared in a very open,
20	very transparent way, right here at this Inquiry.
21	MS. DUNLOP: I look forward to that.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
23	Mrs. Dunlop, there are a number of lawyers
24	here for other parties.
25	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.

1	MR. ENGELMANN: They may have some questions
2	for you.
3	What I'm going to ask them to do is what
4	they have done with other witnesses, and that is to
5	identify themselves and to let you know who they are
6	representing before they ask you questions.
7	MS. DUNLOP: I'm not finished.
8	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm sorry, I thought you
9	were finished. I apologize. I didn't mean to cut you off.
10	MS. DUNLOP: Long-winded Irish man.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: All right.
12	MS. DUNLOP: Sorry.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: No, no.
14	MS. DUNLOP: I won't be
15	MR. ENGELMANN: You have other
16	recommendations? I'm sorry.
17	MS. DUNLOP: Yes. It's not much longer.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Take as long as you want.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: I apologize.
20	MS. DUNLOP: That's okay.
21	I want to tell you all about the Perry
22	Dunlop I know.
23	I have the privilege of being married to
24	Perry Douglas Dunlop for more than 17 years. We have
25	raised our three wonderful children together.

1	Perry's childhood dream was to become a
2	police officer and he was one of the very best, a fact
3	acknowledged several times by his own superiors.
4	After loyally serving more than 16 years
5	with the Cornwall Police Service, Perry was forced to
6	resign a job that he loved and using his own words, he
7	"Turned in his gun belt for a tool belt".
8	Perry is also an incredibly talented
9	musician and entertainer and anyone who knows Perry will
10	tell you he is an intelligent, good natured, fun, talented,
11	hard-working, self-confident man, who is generous to a
12	fault and extremely loyal to his friends and his family.
13	Perry has always had the courage of his
14	convictions and, as a policeman, was always willing to do
15	what was right even if it meant taking risks and paying a
16	personal price for doing so.
17	In his quest to protect children of this
18	community, he has paid an immense price. He has lost his
19	police career, suffered ill health, survived death threats
20	and he worries constantly for my well-being and the health
21	and safety of our children. The price has been enormous
22	and the stress, at times, unbearable.
23	After being charged under the Police
24	Services Act by the very department he so loyally served,
25	Perry became very distrustful of the police.

1	With minimal support from the police union,
2	he felt ostracized and alone. The effects of his co-
3	workers' admonishments remains in his heart to this day.
4	Perry was recognized by the Vancouver Island
5	Human Rights Coalition and by the Southwestern Law
6	Institute of Texas. Perry received the Ethical Courage
7	Award and was the first non-US citizen to ever receive it.
8	To no one's surprise, Perry remains admired and trusted for
9	his ethics and integrity.
10	Most people believe that if Perry Dunlop had
11	not had the courage to blow the whistle on sexual abuse we
12	would not be here today, and many child molesters would
13	still be at large.
14	I can tell you that our three daughters
15	adore and respect their father. He is their friend, their
16	mentor, their light.
17	His honesty and determination to fight for
18	those who could not has created huge awareness about child
19	sexual abuse and I couldn't be more proud to stand by him
20	in this fight. Like Perry, I worry about his mental health
21	and physical safety and it is a concern shared by his
22	doctors and our many friends.
23	Lastly, I want to tell you about our family
24	and the effect the past 14 years have had on our life.
25	Before 1993, we were your typical ordinary

1	family in many respects. We had great jobs, a wonderful
2	social life, bright futures, large extended families,
3	religious beliefs, perfect health, and a world full of
4	hopes and dreams in our future. We have three beautiful,
5	intelligent, sensitive children. Monica, a.k.a. "The Bird"
6	is our youngest. She is our bright, happy and musically
7	gifted comic who wants to some day work with
8	underprivileged children in some capacity.
9	Monica was less than 2 years old when Perry
10	blew the whistle. She doesn't remember those earlier
11	years, but has grown up to the point where she now
12	questions me, "Mom, if daddy followed the law, why is he
13	always having to fight?"
14	Before we left to come here this week, she
15	kissed her dad good night on Friday and asked, "Who am I
16	going to cuddle with when you're gone, dad?" She has
17	called every day since, sad and heart broken that she
18	misses her father and me so much.
19	Heather is our middle daughter. She looks
20	like her dad and acts like her mom; imagine her potential.
21	She is very athletic, loyal to a fault to her friends, and
22	deeply committed to her family. She is the organized,
23	hard-working socialite of the gang and although at times
24	she wants to defy parental rules and boundaries, she deeply
25	respects her parents and admires our courage in the face of

When the second summons was delivered to our home on September 1st, Heather was at home with us. She felt our anxiety and disappointment and said to me, "Mom, why do I have to feel so old when I'm so young?" She phoned me late last night just to say she had been watching the webcast and that she was so proud of me, but she wants us to come home.

Marlee is our oldest daughter. She is a quiet, natural beauty, with ever-changing dreams and aspirations for her future. She is the family worrier and sees her role as the guardian and protector of her sisters and her parents.

Marlee has been the most dramatically affected by all that has happened to us. She is very angry at times because she has been forced to live away from her extended family. This is a void that cannot be filled.

She argued with me about wanting to come here this week. She wanted to tell the Inquiry how badly our family has suffered because of all that has happened. When I spoke to her late last night, she said to me, "Tell dad I'm sorry, I was only trying to help".

So as you can see and you can hear, our girls are individuals, with a strong sense of self and a deep love for their parents. No amount of time or money

1	can ever replace what we've missed or lost over the past 14
2	years. Our children have spent almost their entire lives
3	growing up with this case and suffering from the fallout.
4	There are days when Perry and I feel so guilty for
5	unintentionally involving the girls in our fight for the
6	victims of sexual abuse.
7	But then we realized that life is often a
8	landmine of adversities and they are learning at an early
9	age what every one of us should know and practice. Do unto
10	others as you would have them do unto you.
11	As hard as our journey has been, the victims
12	of childhood sexual abuse have suffered so much more.
13	I hope our family can one day heal from the
14	many years of fear, resentment, anger, harassment, and
15	bullying that we have endured these past 14 years.
16	We want to be that small ray of light and
17	hope that people could look up to and know that somebody
18	cared enough to at least try to make a difference.
19	Our family motto was and still is, "Stand up
20	for what's right even if you're standing alone".
21	Thank you.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Take a break. Thanks.
23	THE REGISTRAR: Order; all rise. A l'ordre;
24	veuillez vous levez.
25	Upon recessing at 10:40 a.m. /

1	L'audience est suspendue à 10h40
2	Upon resuming at 11:02 a.m./
3	L'audience est reprise à 11h02
4	THE REGISTRAR: This hearing is now resumed.
5	Please be seated. Veuillez vous asseoir.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: Excuse me for a minute, sir.
7	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Bennett.
9	Mr. Engelmann.
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Sir, I indicated to a number
11	of counsel and others who were out that we were on, and
12	Mrs. Dunlop is here.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
14	Counsel don't have to come if they don't
15	want to. We can leave them outside.
16	I am just making a comment about the wayward
17	lawyers this morning.
18	Mr. Wardle.
19	MR. ENGELMANN: Thanks again, Mrs. Dunlop,
20	for
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
22	Mr. Wardle, good morning.
23	MR. WARDLE: Good morning, Mr. Commissioner,
24	Mrs. Dunlop.
25	MS. DUNLOP: Good morning.

1	MR. WARDLE: Mr. Commissioner, just a
2	housekeeping matter. We have agreed, I think, that Mr.
3	Horn will follow me in the lineup on behalf of his client.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Fine, thank you.
5	HELEN DUNLOP, Resumed/Sous le même serment:
6	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR.
7	WARDLE:
8	MR. WARDLE: Mrs. Dunlop, my name is Peter
9	Wardle, and I act for a group called Citizens for Community
10	Renewal, which is an organization of concerned Cornwall
11	citizens determined to promote needed institutional reforms
12	so as to ensure the protection of children and justice for
13	all. I think you are aware of my group?
14	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, sir.
15	MR. WARDLE: I want to start if I can by
16	asking you some questions about the fall of 1995, and I
17	want to talk about some personal events in your life that
18	you spoke to my friend Mr. Engelmann about and then some
19	community events.
20	Just to take you back to that time period,
21	first of all, I think we've already established that Perry
22	was on sick leave from his employer, the Cornwall Police
23	Service. Correct?
24	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, sir.
25	MR. WARDLE: And you have already described

1	that there was hostility towards your family and
2	particularly towards him within the Police Force. Correct?
3	MS. DUNLOP: It felt that way. Yes sir.
4	MR. WARDLE: You described the police
5	discipline matter which, by this point, the fall of 1995,
6	you had been Perry had been successful at the hearing
7	stage, and it had been appealed higher?
8	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
9	MR. WARDLE: All of that was in the public
10	domain; right? So it was all in the press.
11	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
12	MR. WARDLE: Every time there was one of
13	these appearances, it was in the press. Correct?
14	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
15	MR. WARDLE: Just to touch on a number of
16	matters in the community, in January 1994, a year and a
17	half earlier, there had been all the publicity about the
18	David Silmser settlement by the Diocese. Correct?
19	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
20	MR. WARDLE: So the community knew about the
21	settlement and the release. Correct?
22	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
23	MR. WARDLE: And the community knew about
24	Perry's role in giving the statement, the Silmser
25	statement, to the Children's Aid Society. Correct?

1	MS. DUNLOP: I believe so, yes.
2	MR. WARDLE: There had also been a number of
3	police investigations. You may recall, I'm sure you do,
4	there was the very short Ottawa Police investigation.
5	Correct?
6	MS. DUNLOP: The drive-by, yes.
7	MR. WARDLE: Correct. Then, there was a
8	longer investigation by the Ontario Provincial Police and,
9	at the end of that investigation, the police announced that
10	there would be no charges laid against the priest.
11	Correct?
12	MS. DUNLOP: December 24 th , yes.
13	MR. WARDLE: These are all things that were
14	out in the community by the fall of 1995; right?
15	MS. DUNLOP: That sounds about right.
16	MR. WARDLE: You may also recall, and this
17	didn't come out in my friend's testimony, that there had
18	been an investigation into allegations of obstruction of
19	justice against a Cornwall lawyer, Malcolm MacDonald, and
20	by the fall of 1995, he had pleaded guilty and had obtained
21	an absolute discharge. Correct?
22	MS. DUNLOP: That's correct.
23	MR. WARDLE: And that was also something
24	that was known in the community and people weren't happy
25	about it.

1	MS. DUNLOP: That's correct.
2	MR. WARDLE: So if I suggested to you that
3	in the fall of 1995, there was a sense within the people
4	that you talked to in the community that there was a
5	profound level of distrust with the way these various
6	investigations had been handled, would that be fair?
7	MS. DUNLOP: Absolutely.
8	MR. WARDLE: When I'm thinking of the
9	various investigations, the original Silmser investigation
10	first of all; the settlement and the release; the charges
11	against Malcolm MacDonald; the OPP investigation of Father
12	Charlie MacDonald and, of course, the police discipline
13	charges involving your husband; correct?
14	MS. DUNLOP: And one other.
15	MR. WARDLE: And one other, and I've
16	forgotten one then. What's the other one?
17	MS. DUNLOP: The Cornwall Police did their
18	own internal investigation and found no wrongdoing.
19	MR. WARDLE: Correct. So all of those
20	things were in the public domain and everyone could read
21	them in the newspapers; right?
22	MS. DUNLOP: Except the Ottawa Report was
23	never made public, yes.
24	MR. WARDLE: That's right. But people
25	certainly knew that all of these things had gone on?

1	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, sir.
2	MR. WARDLE: Is it fair to say that at that
3	point from the people you talked to in the community, there
4	was a level of distrust with a number of institutions
5	within the community and I'm thinking of the Cornwall
6	Police, the Diocese, and probably Mr. Seguin's employer,
7	Corrections, and the OPP. Is that fair?
8	MS. DUNLOP: That's fair.
9	MR. WARDLE: There had been a CAS
10	investigation as a result of what your husband did, but
11	nobody knew what had happened to that investigation.
12	Right?
13	MS. DUNLOP: Correct.
14	MR. WARDLE: So it's at this point, as I
15	understand it, that victims begin to come to you and your
16	husband roughly the fall of 1995; correct?
17	MS. DUNLOP: I can't be sure of the exact
18	date.
19	MR. WARDLE: Okay, well, we have them in all
20	the documents.
21	MS. DUNLOP: Okay.
22	MR. WARDLE: But I'm thinking, for example,
23	of John MacDonald,
24	MS. DUNLOP: Okay.
25	MR. WARDLE: Albert Roy and other people

1	who start to come forward at this time and they either meet
2	your husband or they have telephone discussions with him.
3	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Let's just situate I
5	use W-FIVE thing as a demarcation point, maybe I'm wrong.
6	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: But that was in December
8	of 1995?
9	MS. DUNLOP: Ninety-five ('95), yes.
10	MR. WARDLE: I think we'll see, Mr.
11	Commissioner, from some of Mr. Dunlop's notes, which I hope
12	will be entered into evidence at some point that the
13	contacts actually begin before that television program.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Fine, okay.
15	MS. DUNLOP: That's true.
16	MR. WARDLE: Is it fair to say that the
17	reason people are coming forward to Perry is because,
18	number one, they distrust local institutions, particularly
19	the police?
20	MS. DUNLOP: That is one possible answer,
21	yes.
22	MR. WARDLE: And they felt that he had done
23	the right thing in going forward in the way he had and
24	going to the CAS; correct?
25	MS. DUNLOP: That's another possible answer,

1	yes.
2	MR. WARDLE: And that he had a reputation of
3	being a very trustworthy individual; correct?
4	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
5	MR. WARDLE: And that he had he was one
6	of the only people who had stood up to the authorities, if
7	I can put it that way?
8	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
9	MR. WARDLE: Okay. As I understand what
10	happened, you and your husband became sort of support
11	persons for this group of victim. Isn't that what really
12	happened?
13	MS. DUNLOP: Unofficially, yes.
14	MR. WARDLE: Yes. And so, you know, you've
15	described, and I think other witnesses have described, that
16	they could come over to your house, you'd give them dinner,
17	you'd make them a cup of tea. You could give them some
18	kind of caring and support that they didn't feel they could
19	get from official sources. Is that fair?
20	MS. DUNLOP: You'd have to ask them but,
21	yes, they were most welcome.
22	MR. WARDLE: Okay. And over the years,
23	obviously you've become very close to some of these people
24	because they continue to support you right up to the
25	present?

1	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
2	MR. WARDLE: Now, I don't know if you
3	understand this, Mrs. Dunlop, but one of the issues the
4	Commissioner has to look at in making recommendations is
5	when a situation like this arises in a community, you know,
6	where do victims go to to get support and encouragement,
7	and so the Commissioner is obviously interested in why
8	people came forward and what you and your husband were able
9	to do for them. And that's really why I am asking these
10	questions.
11	MS. DUNLOP: Okay.
12	MR. WARDLE: And you would agree with me, I
13	take it, that it's important for us to find a way to ensure
14	the people like this group of victims are able to come
15	forward and tell their story in a non-threatening sort of
16	situation, if I can put it that way?
17	MS. DUNLOP: That would be nice, yes.
18	MR. WARDLE: Now, can I just move forward a
19	little bit past the Fifth Estate program, and I want to
20	talk about some events that just took place in the spring
21	of 1996 for a minute.
22	And, first of all, I'm just going to show
23	you some documents, and I want to start, if I may, 731764.
24	It's not one you have? Just a moment. It's
25	a letter dated February 9, 1996 from the Cornwall Police

1	Service to Constable Dunlop, and it's one of the documents
2	we gave notice on.
3	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
4	MR. ENGELMANN: Perhaps we could just work
5	off the screen. There are going to be some technical
6	difficulties I can I guarantee it. Documents were
7	prepared for Mr. Dunlop in some order. So let's just work
8	on screen and we'll get the documents as quickly as we can
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Is that all right Mr
10	MR. WARDLE: It's fine with me.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
12	MR. ENGELMANN: I apologize, Mrs. Dunlop,
13	for some documents you're going to have work on the screen
14	We'll get you copies as soon as we can.
15	MS. DUNLOP: Okay.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: And I think you can move
17	the screen around. There you go.
18	So what I will want to do though is make a
19	notation of when it comes on the screen, that exhibit
20	number we will give it once we get to it.
21	MR. WARDLE: Thank you. I thought for a
22	minute that I had the document numbers screwed up but I
23	didn't.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Before we continue on, I
25	know that there are more people than usual in the body of

1	the hearings room, and sometimes there are some little
2	rules that we have to follow.
3	And so just a reminder that other than
4	water, that's about all you should be able to be drinking;
5	hats are off; sunglasses are off unless they are needed for
6	health reasons; that kind of thing. And I don't take
7	offence at it now, I just want to point that out as a
8	little bit of decorum.
9	Mr. Wardle? Thank you.
10	MR. WARDLE: Thank you, sir.
11	Now, Mrs. Dunlop, I think you actually
12	referred to this letter indirectly in your testimony the
13	other day because you told us that, at various points in
14	time, your husband was having difficulty with his
15	disability benefits?
16	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
17	MR. WARDLE: And this is a letter from the
18	Cornwall police. You'll see it's from the deputy chief if
19	you turn to the second page. Do you recall this letter?
20	MS. DUNLOP: I didn't get to read the first
21	page.
22	MR. WARDLE: That's okay, it's hard to read
23	when we're flipping it from page-to-page. Let's go back
24	we can go back to page 1 and let Mrs. Dunlop read it.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: We'll have a hard copy I

1	think. The hard copy is here now. There it is.
2	So the next exhibit which is exhibit number
3	give me that, February $9^{\rm th}$, 1996. It's a letter to
4	Constable Perry Dunlop from the Cornwall Police Service.
5	So Exhibit 66 what's that number, Madam Clerk?
6	THE REGISTRAR: Six-six-eight (668).
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Six-six-eight (668).
8	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE NO P-668:
9	(731764) Helen Dunlop - Letter from Deputy
10	Chief of Police Joseph G. St-Denis to Cst.
11	Perry Dunlop - February 9, 1996
12	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
13	THE COMMISSIONER: I think we're just trying
14	to get ahead on the paperwork.
15	MS. DUNLOP: Sure.
16	MR. WARDLE: All right. Mrs. Dunlop, my
17	apologies for the delay.
18	But just to orient you, starting in around
19	this time, there were continued issues coming up with your
20	husband's employer and with the long-term disability
21	insurer that were causing great stress and anxiety for your
22	family; correct?
23	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
24	MR. WARDLE: And this is one of the letters
25	your husband received that would have caused some

1	consternation; correct?
2	MS. DUNLOP: I believe so, yes.
3	MR. WARDLE: And I'm just going to show you
4	one other letter. I'm not going to spend a lot of time on
5	this, but if the witness could be shown 731761. I'm sorry,
6	731781.
7	No doubt Mr. Callaghan will let me know if I
8	get bingo.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Callaghan's not here.
10	All right. This is a letter dated April
11	$12^{ m th}$, 1996, Mr. O'Brien to Chief St-Denis. We'll get you a
12	hard copy of that. Exhibit 669.
13	So, Madam Clerk, could you coordinate
14	because we don't have a hard copy of that. All right,
15	could you coordinate with Mrs. Dunlop so that she can read
16	through it so that we can scroll it up as we go.
17	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-669:
18	(731781) Helen Dunlop - Letter from Allan R.
19	O'Brien to Deputy Chief St. Denis re: LTD
20	Claim - April 12, 1996
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Here's the hard copy then
22	of 669.
23	MS. DUNLOP: Thank you.
24	MR. WARDLE: Now, you'll see, Mrs. Dunlop,
25	that this letter is from your husband's lawyer to the

1	deputy chief and it's copied to him. I'm assuming he got
2	it and you may have had a chance to review it?
3	MS. DUNLOP: It looks familiar.
4	MR. WARDLE: And just to bring these events
5	back to your mind and without I'm not sure we need to
6	get into the details, but there was a huge issue as to
7	whether your husband should continue to get long-term
8	disability benefits, and for a period of time in early 1996
9	he wasn't receiving anything as I understand it?
10	MS. DUNLOP: That's true.
11	MR. WARDLE: Okay. Eventually, with some
12	pushing from your lawyer, it did get resolved in your
13	favour but not until some months later; correct?
14	MS. DUNLOP: We had to work pretty hard,
15	yes.
16	MR. WARDLE: And eventually those benefits
17	were reinstated and he went back on them for a period of
18	time?
19	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
20	MR. WARDLE: So this was one of the stresses
21	that your family had to deal with in the spring and into
22	the summer of 1996; correct?
23	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
24	MR. WARDLE: And we also know from the
25	evidence you gave yesterday that this was the period where

1	your daughter received the threat from the neighbour and
2	you were dealing with that as well; correct?
3	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
4	MR. WARDLE: And I think it's also true,
5	isn't it, that your husband also got threats and anonymous
6	calls and things like that on a regular basis throughout
7	this period?
8	MS. DUNLOP: Sometimes, yes.
9	MR. WARDLE: And it's also true that, as I
10	understand it, that from your perspective you felt that the
11	police association wasn't helping or assisting you and your
12	family; correct?
13	MS. DUNLOP: That's correct.
14	MR. WARDLE: Can I ask you to look at one
15	other document and that is 718490.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: This is a hand-delivered
17	letter dated March $21^{\rm st}$, 1996 to the Cornwall Police
18	Association. I take it it's from Mr. Dunlop?
19	MR. WARDLE: If you turn to the final page,
20	it is from Mr. Dunlop.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, so go back, Madam
22	Clerk, so we can start reading.
23	Exhibit 670 will be the number for this
24	letter.
25	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-670:

1	(718490) Helen Dunlop - Letter from Cst.
2	Perry Dunlop to The Cornwall Police
3	Association - March 21, 1996
4	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
5	MR. WARDLE: You saw it, and I take it you
6	saw it because this letter is bringing some unpleasant
7	events back to you?
8	MS. DUNLOP: Yes. I had forgotten about
9	some of this.
10	MR. WARDLE: I don't want to touch on
11	painful memories, but as I understand it the association
12	around this time met with your husband and was not prepared
13	to offer him any additional financial assistance?
14	MS. DUNLOP: It was unbelievable.
15	MR. WARDLE: And one of the things that is
16	mentioned in this letter and by the way, I don't know,
17	but did you have a hand in helping your husband write this
18	letter?
19	MS. DUNLOP: I often did.
20	MR. WARDLE: Okay. One of the things that's
21	mentioned in this letter is that your husband was asking
22	for assistance with a possible civil suit. Do you recall
23	that?
24	MS. DUNLOP: It's in here, so probably.
25	MR. WARDLE: Towards the bottom of the first

1	page?
2	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: And the association was not
4	prepared, as I understand it, to underwrite the cost of
5	that; correct?
6	MS. DUNLOP: Correct.
7	MR. WARDLE: And then a few months later
8	your husband did initiate a civil lawsuit; correct?
9	MS. DUNLOP: I don't - I'm not sure of the
10	date, but we did, yes.
11	MR. WARDLE: I'm going to turn up a
12	document, it's 717336.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Exhibit Number 671 is a
14	Statement of Claim with Perry Dunlop as plaintiff and
15	Claude Shaver et al as defendants. The date of that
16	document is June 7 th , 1996.
17	MR. WARDLE: To be accurate, Mr.
18	Commissioner, it's a Notice of Action.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry. You're right.
20	It just dates me a little bit.
21	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-671:
22	(717336) Helen Dunlop - Notice of Action -
23	June 7, 1996
24	MR. WARDLE: So this was a big step, if I
25	can put it that way, for your family. You did this without

1	any outside financial assistance; correct?
2	MS. DUNLOP: Correct.
3	MR. WARDLE: Can you help us a little bit
4	with the thinking that went behind starting a civil action
5	at this time?
6	MS. DUNLOP: Well, we had been taking some
7	pretty tough blows from the police department. The
8	association wasn't stepping to the plate to help us.
9	We strongly felt there was a lot of abuse of
10	process and abuse of power at the Cornwall police station,
11	specifically due to those charges they trumped up on Perry.
12	We felt we had to put them on notice that we
13	weren't just going to be a punching bag and we had a right
14	to defend ourselves and that they should come to the party
15	with damages.
16	MR. WARDLE: Now, just after this point
17	if you look at this document and perhaps we can just turn
18	to the last page, you'll see this is dated June $7^{\rm th}$, 1996.
19	And it's just after this time that your husband first met
20	with the individual who we're calling C-8?
21	MS. DUNLOP: I'm not sure of the exact time.
22	MR. WARDLE: Okay. But we have documents
23	_
24	MS. DUNLOP: Okay.
25	MR. WARDLE: that establish when that

1	meeting took place. And that's really the first time your
2	husband, while he was on sick leave, became involved in an
3	investigation of these matters; correct?
4	MS. DUNLOP: I'm not sure.
5	MR. WARDLE: Up to this point, you and your
6	husband had met with people like John MacDonald, Albert
7	Roy, some others, but he hadn't actually taken any
8	statements from anyone or done any type of investigating.
9	Is that fair?
10	MS. DUNLOP: I'm unsure. I can't remember,
11	honestly.
12	MR. WARDLE: All right. But do you remember
13	that around this time, first with C-8 and then with Mr.
14	Leroux, your husband began what we could call an active
15	investigation of sexual abuse in the Cornwall area?
16	MS. DUNLOP: It seems that it was in the
17	summer that he met C-8, yes, and then met with Ron Leroux,
18	but I'm not positive of the timeline again.
19	MR. WARDLE: And the purpose for that
20	investigation is something that we could use your help on,
21	just, you know, why did Perry decide that he needed to take
22	that step.
23	Can you help us with that?
24	MS. DUNLOP: What step?
25	MR. WARDLE: Actually investigating on his

1	own while on sick leave, investigating allegations and
2	going and taking statements from people.
3	Why did he do that?
4	MS. DUNLOP: Because he cared about what was
5	happening and he cared that it wasn't going to be paid
6	attention at the Cornwall Police Service or the OPP, and
7	that people wanted to speak to him because they trusted
8	him.
9	MR. WARDLE: And from your vantage point,
10	did you understand that he was going to investigate and
11	then whatever result of his investigation was he was going
12	to turn it over to law enforcement authorities.
13	Was that the plan that he would turn that
14	over to someone so that people could be charged?
15	MS. DUNLOP: That was probably the game
16	plan. I mean, we didn't have a road map. We had nobody to
17	tell us where to turn, what to do. We had no one guiding
18	us through this.
19	MR. WARDLE: Right.
20	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
21	MR. WARDLE: He was on his own effectively?
22	MS. DUNLOP: Absolutely.
23	MR. WARDLE: All right. And because he was
24	off on sick leave and because he was really doing this on
25	his own he wasn't doing this in uniform obviously?

1	MS. DUNLOP: No.
2	MR. WARDLE: And he wasn't part of a team;
3	correct?
4	MS. DUNLOP: No team, just me and Perry.
5	MR. WARDLE: And he didn't have any fellow
6	officers to talk to about this?
7	MS. DUNLOP: He wasn't discussing any of the
8	victims with
9	MR. WARDLE: Nor did he have any ability to
10	go into the police station and, you know, get information
11	from other officers or from any police databases; correct?
12	MS. DUNLOP: Correct.
13	MR. WARDLE: And he didn't have any
14	supervision; correct?
15	MS. DUNLOP: What do you mean by that?
16	MR. WARDLE: Didn't have anybody looking
17	over his shoulders. He was really effectively on his own?
18	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
19	MR. WARDLE: And the first person that Perry
20	spoke to at this time was C-8, and I think you've already
21	told us that there was a number of meetings with C-8 and
22	you had a role, not an investigatory role, but you played
23	some part in the various meetings?
24	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
25	MR. WARDLE: Okay. And he came to your

1	house a number of times?
2	MS. DUNLOP: A few times.
3	MR. WARDLE: Okay.
4	MS. DUNLOP: I remember him coming
5	specifically for Easter one year.
6	MR. WARDLE: Okay. And you gave him support
7	and encouragement?
8	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
9	MR. WARDLE: And you treated him, I would
10	suggest, as you treated all the other victims up to that
11	point?
12	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
13	MR. WARDLE: And you believed his story and
14	you made sure that he knew that you believed it. Is that
15	fair?
16	MS. DUNLOP: Absolutely.
17	MR. WARDLE: And is it also fair to say,
18	Mrs. Dunlop, that you never doubted C-8's story?
19	MS. DUNLOP: No, I did not.
20	MR. WARDLE: So just pausing and talking
21	about C-8 for a moment, can I suggest to you that there
22	were two things going on at the same time. Your husband
23	was investigating C-8's allegations and you and your
24	husband were offering him whatever support and
25	encouragement you could?

1	MS. DUNLOP: That's fair.
2	MR. WARDLE: And I take it that you didn't
3	see any conflict there in pursuing those two things at the
4	same time, in pursuing an investigation and in pursuing
5	support and encouragement for the victim?
6	MS. DUNLOP: I did not see a conflict there.
7	MR. WARDLE: Now, let's just talk if we can
8	for a minute about Mr. Leroux. We know already, because I
9	think you've said that in response to questions from my
10	friend, Mr. Engelmann, C-8 led your husband to Mr. Leroux
11	and your husband then got in touch with Mr. Leroux and went
12	down to see him.
13	MS. DUNLOP: I'm pretty sure that's how it
14	went down, yes.
15	MR. WARDLE: Okay. And there was a number
16	of meetings with Mr. Leroux in Maine and there were a
17	number of meetings here in Canada?
18	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
19	MR. WARDLE: And you went down on, it
20	sounded to me like, one or two occasions?
21	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
22	MR. WARDLE: And you met Mr. Leroux's wife?
23	MS. DUNLOP: Cindy, yes.
24	MR. WARDLE: And her son?
25	MS. DUNLOP: Dusty, yes.

1	MR. WARDLE: Okay. And, again, you became
2	social acquaintances with them. Fair enough?
3	MS. DUNLOP: Traded recipes.
4	MR. WARDLE: And you gave the family
5	whatever support and encouragement you could?
6	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, sir.
7	MR. WARDLE: And at the same time, your
8	husband was investigating what Mr. Leroux had to say?
9	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, sir.
10	MR. WARDLE: And is it also fair to say that
11	you and your husband treated Mr. Leroux the same way you
12	treated all the other victims who came to you?
13	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, sir.
14	MR. WARDLE: And you made it clear to him
15	that you believed everything he had to say?
16	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, sir.
17	MR. WARDLE: And you would support him and
18	you would stick up for him. Is that fair?
19	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, sir.
20	Can I add something?
21	MR. WARDLE: Yes.
22	MS. DUNLOP: Just because there had been a
23	long timeframe sometimes where we wouldn't see Ron, and I
24	just wanted to be sure in my head and in my heart that what
25	he was saying was true, I would purposely try to trip him

1	up in questions about what he had told us before, or see if
2	he was changing his story in any way, or the names, or the
3	dates, or the places were skewed. It never happened. It
4	was always the same. So, yes, I believed what he was
5	saying.
6	MR. WARDLE: Okay. And is it fair to say
7	that the information that Ron Leroux gave your husband and
8	that you learned about was very powerful information?
9	MS. DUNLOP: Scary.
10	MR. WARDLE: Very scary. You'd agree with
11	that?
12	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, sir.
13	MR. WARDLE: If that information was true it
14	would make the Silmser story look small in comparison. Is
15	that fair?
16	MS. DUNLOP: That's fair.
17	MR. WARDLE: And I'm not going to go through
18	all of the allegations but I want to go through a few of
19	them just with you.
20	Mr. Leroux alleged that there was a clan of
21	pedophiles operating in Cornwall; correct?
22	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, sir.
23	MR. WARDLE: That there were a number of
24	prominent people who were part of that clan, including the
25	bishop and the chief of police?

1	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, sir.
2	MR. WARDLE: And that the Crown attorney was
3	one of the people who had been seen with a number of these
4	individuals; correct?
5	MS. DUNLOP: At some point, yes.
6	MR. WARDLE: That there were large numbers
7	of people who attended parties at Mr. Seguin's house?
8	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
9	MR. WARDLE: At Malcolm MacDonald's summer
10	residence, and at St. Andrews Parish; correct?
11	MS. DUNLOP: That's correct.
12	MR. WARDLE: And those people included the
13	chief of police, the Crown, the Chair of the Police
14	Services Board and the bishop, right?
15	MS. DUNLOP: Well, I don't know all the
16	names but that sounds about right.
17	MR. WARDLE: Okay. And that clan of
18	pedophiles had been involved in sexual improprieties with
19	minors in Florida and a number of places including the Salt
20	Air Motel?
21	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
22	MR. WARDLE: And the police had seized
23	videotapes from Mr. Leroux's house belonging to Mr. Seguin,
24	and that by implication there were things on that videotape
25	which would have showed Mr. Seguin and possibly others

1	involved in sexual abuse of minors; correct?
2	MS. DUNLOP: That's true.
3	MR. WARDLE: That there was a meeting at a
4	cottage on Stanley Island, Malcolm MacDonald's cottage,
5	just before the Silmser settlement, which was attended by a
6	number of people including the bishop, the chief of police,
7	the Chair of the Police Services Board, Father Charles
8	MacDonald, Malcolm MacDonald, and a number of other people,
9	right?
10	MS. DUNLOP: That's correct.
11	MR. WARDLE: Okay.
12	And I think you've told us about this, that
13	there was a planned hit on the Dunlop family by a group of
14	individuals including Father Charles MacDonald, Ken Seguin
15	and Malcolm MacDonald; correct?
16	MS. DUNLOP: That's true.
17	MR. WARDLE: And finally, that Mr. Leroux
18	claimed to have seen ritual abuse at Cameron's Point by a
19	number of priests, when he was a young man.
20	MS. DUNLOP: That's true.
21	MR. WARDLE: Okay. Now I don't I'm not
22	trying to describe everything Mr. Leroux said, but those
23	are some of the more explosive things he had to say;
24	correct?
25	MS. DUNLOP: That's true.

1	MR. WARDLE: Okay. And some of the things
2	that Mr. Leroux said only he said. He was the only person
3	to have witnessed some of these events. Correct?
4	MS. DUNLOP: No there was other individuals
5	who knew of people and parties at Ken Seguin's house.
6	MR. WARDLE: But some of the central
7	allegations, the VIP meeting at the island, Mr. Leroux is
8	the only person who's ever said that; correct?
9	MS. DUNLOP: To my knowledge, yes.
10	MR. WARDLE: Okay. And you were comfortable
11	and confident in your husband's ability as an investigator,
12	that if he thought these things were true and Mr. Leroux
13	was saying them, they must be true. Correct?
14	MS. DUNLOP: Fair.
15	MR. WARDLE: And that's still your view
16	today, you still believe all these things are true, don't
17	you?
18	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, I do.
19	MR. WARDLE: Okay.
20	MS. DUNLOP: Perry has a sixth sense for
21	police work.
22	MR. WARDLE: And your view on that hasn't
23	changed over the last what
24	MS. DUNLOP: Fourteen (14) years.
25	MR. WARDLE: Fourteen years.

1	So, your view, as your telling the
2	Commissioner today, is that all of these things in Mr.
3	Leroux's affidavit, in his various statements, they're all
4	true?
5	MS. DUNLOP: I believe they are.
6	MR. WARDLE: Okay. Now, one of the things
7	the Commissioner touched on a couple of days ago, in his
8	questioning about you, was the fact that you and your
9	husband obviously knew that C-8 alleged that he had been
10	sexually abused by Mr. Leroux; correct?
11	MS. DUNLOP: Correct.
12	MR. WARDLE: Okay. And your husband also
13	has described Mr. Leroux in his will say as the inside man,
14	if I can put it that way.
15	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
16	MR. WARDLE: In other words, he was somebody
17	who was an alleged perpetrator, himself.
18	MS. DUNLOP: True.
19	MR. WARDLE: Right?
20	And do I take it Mrs. Dunlop, that because
21	of your faith in your husband's investigatory powers, and
22	your observations of Mr. Leroux himself, you didn't think
23	any of that mattered; you thought his story was true?
24	MS. DUNLOP: Well, I wouldn't say I didn't
25	think it mattered, but I thought his story was true and,

1	like you said, he was the inside man so, just as much as
2	police officers need snitches on the street that they don't
3	necessarily like, they have to work with them.
4	MR. WARDLE: Right. And you also know
5	though, I take it, that when police officers work with
6	snitches they have to be very careful that they're being
7	given the right information, right?
8	MS. DUNLOP: Absolutely.
9	MR. WARDLE: Now, Mr. Leroux has testified
10	in this inquiry, and I'm sure you know about that.
11	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
12	MR. WARDLE: Did you watch his testimony?
13	MS. DUNLOP: I read the transcript part
14	of the transcript.
15	MR. WARDLE: All right.
16	And what he told us about these allegations
17	was that many of them were false. He said there was no
18	clan, there was no VIP meeting, there was no planned hit on
19	the Dunlop family, there was no ritual abuse and that he
20	witnessed, "little, if anything" in Florida.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Well it can I stop
22	there?
23	I don't think he said there was no planned
24	hit.
25	MR. WARDLE: He said there was one comment

1	made by you're correct, Mr I'll take them one by
2	one.
3	If you're familiar with the transcripts,
4	Mrs. Dunlop, Mr. Leroux certainly said that there was no
5	clan of pedophiles. In fact, he said that he didn't
6	that he never used the word "clan" in that capacity.
7	MS. DUNLOP: That's not true.
8	MR. WARDLE: And he also said that there was
9	no VIP meeting.
10	MS. DUNLOP: That's not true.
11	MR. WARDLE: He said that I'm really, at
12	the moment, just asking you what Mr. Leroux said at this
13	hearing.
14	MS. DUNLOP: Oh, then if he said that, that
15	is true.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
17	MR. WARDLE: It's my fault, Mr.
18	Commissioner.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: No, no.
20	MS. DUNLOP: I'm just unclear if you want me
21	to say that what he said first was true or what he is
22	saying now is.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, you see, I don't
24	know that you can tell me whether it was true or not.

69

You can tell me whether Mr. Leroux said this

1	in the inquiry, because it's in the transcript.
2	MS. DUNLOP: Okay.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: On the back end of it, I
4	don't know that you can really tell me whether it was true
5	or not, what he told you. You can tell me that what he
6	told you was different, but I don't know that.
7	MS. DUNLOP: Oh, I understand.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: You see?
9	MS. DUNLOP: Yeah. No problem.
10	MR. WARDLE: But perhaps what I can just
11	start by doing is telling you what giving you a summary
12	of what he said at this inquiry
13	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm, right.
14	MR. WARDLE: and then we can go from
15	there.
16	MS. DUNLOP: Certainly.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
18	MR. WARDLE: So Mr. Leroux clearly said at
19	this inquiry that there was no clan of pedophiles. He also
20	said there was no VIP meeting on this island. And, just
21	stopping there, have you seen the transcripts where he says
22	those things?
23	MS. DUNLOP: No, I heard about the
24	transcript.
25	MR. WARDLE: All right.

1	He also said that, except for one comment by
2	Father Charles MacDonald there was never a planned hit on
3	the Dunlop family.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Well you know, I don't
5	know how what turns on this, but he did talk about the
6	fellow that came over to the house and he was supposedly a
7	real estate agent so there were more elements that might be
8	attributed
9	MR. WARDLE: Right.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: to it. So I don't
11	want to become nit-picky on it, Mr. Wardle, but
12	MR. WARDLE: All right, so I'll be careful.
13	But he certainly didn't stand behind the story about the
14	hit that was in his affidavit that was filed and that he
15	swore to originally, if I can put it that way.
16	And then, he told us that there was no
17	ritual abuse that he ever witnessed
18	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
19	MR. WARDLE: and that he never knew what
20	was on the videotapes that were seized by the Ontario
21	Provincial Police.
22	And I think it's fair to say that Mr. Leroux
23	backed away very substantially from what was in his
24	original statement taken by your husband and from the
25	affidavit that he eventually swore.

1	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
2	MR. WARDLE: Now you're you've heard
3	about all of this.
4	MS. DUNLOP: Yeah.
5	MR. WARDLE: And one of the things he said
6	was that he said he "made up" a lot of this to satisfy your
7	husband.
8	And I can see you smiling and I'm going to
9	ask you for your reaction in a minute but, what he said was
10	that he had been manipulated. And I'm assuming you're
11	going to tell me that Perry, your husband, would never
12	manipulate a witness; correct?
13	MS. DUNLOP: That's true.
14	MR. WARDLE: And that Perry Dunlop would
15	never threaten a witness; correct?
16	MS. DUNLOP: He never has.
17	MR. WARDLE: And that he would never
18	pressure a witness?
19	MS. DUNLOP: No, he would not.
20	MR. WARDLE: But, I want to ask you this
21	question, and I think I know what your answer's going to be
22	but I have to ask it. Looking back, Mrs. Dunlop, given
23	your relationship with Mr. Leroux, the number of hours your
24	husband and you spent with the family, the time you had
25	together, is it possible, do you think, that Mr. Leroux may

1	have manipulated you and your husband rather than the other
2	way around?
3	MS. DUNLOP: To be honest with you, I think
4	when he first told us everything he was telling us the
5	truth.
6	MR. WARDLE: Okay. So your position today
7	and your belief is that everything he said at the outset
8	was true and that what he's told us recently in this
9	inquiry is false?
10	MS. DUNLOP: That's true.
11	And, Mr. Wardle, there was other things that
12	Ron said I don't know if they ever made it into
13	videotapes or statements that just hit you as
14	legitimate. Like, when he told about first going down to
15	the cottage at Cameron's Point when he was a young lad and
16	his best friend was with him. I don't know if that's in
17	the transcript or not, who the best friend was. I won't
18	mention his name. That the best friend ended up committing
19	suicide. He died down the road and he feels that that
20	could somehow have been attributed to the abuse.
21	I have a hard time believing that he was
22	making that up. And when he spoke about the ritualistic
23	abuse he was very descriptive. It was not off the cuff.
24	MR. WARDLE: Right.
25	MS. DUNLOP: When he spoke about the death

1	threats, it was very descriptive. He used exact language.
2	It was not off the cuff. It did not sound rehearsed. When
3	he spoke about the other perpetrators, the people at the
4	parties, the video tapes, how mad he was when he got back
5	from Florida to find that Ken had not taken care of his
6	house and that the police had been there and what he went
7	through down at the Lancaster OPP Detachment and refusing
8	to take ownership of the tapes, that was not rehearsed.
9	MR. WARDLE: M'hm.
10	MS. DUNLOP: That was the true Ron Leroux
11	stating the truth.
12	So to this day, I still believe what he told
13	us was the truth.
14	MR. WARDLE: What Mr. Leroux told your
15	husband was a very, very detailed and vivid description of
16	events, some going back right to his childhood. Right?
17	MS. DUNLOP: Yes sir.
18	MR. WARDLE: And he gave those versions of
19	events to you on a number of occasions over a significant
20	period of time and you and your husband both thought that
21	he was telling the truth.
22	MS. DUNLOP: In fact, he would bring family
23	pictures and point out "That's my mom; that's my dad; those
24	are my uncles; this was a wedding I was at". Yes, he was
25	telling the truth.

1	MR. WARDLE: He was a very convincing
2	individual; would you agree?
3	MS. DUNLOP: I would agree.
4	MR. WARDLE: All right.
5	And can I ask you this, and ask you to think
6	about it; if you're wrong and his original story to you and
7	your husband is false, then you were manipulated by him.
8	Isn't that logical?
9	MS. DUNLOP: That's a big "if" but you have
10	a point.
11	MR. WARDLE: That's a big "if". But you
12	take my point?
13	MS. DUNLOP: I take your point.
14	MR. WARDLE: And if that story was false,
15	that story eventually made its way to a number of places;
16	didn't it?
17	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, it did.
18	MR. WARDLE: It made its way into the media;
19	correct?
20	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
21	MR. WARDLE: It made its way onto websites;
22	correct?
23	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
24	MR. WARDLE: And it made its way right
25	around this community.

1	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
2	MR. WARDLE: And there are many people in
3	Cornwall today who still believe every word of what's in
4	Mr. Leroux' statements and affidavits; correct?
5	MS. DUNLOP: I don't know what they believe.
6	MR. WARDLE: Okay. And would you agree with
7	this much, that if those stories were false then Mr. Leroux
8	may have caused damage to innocent reputations in this
9	community?
10	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
11	MR. WARDLE: Those are all my questions for
12	this witness. Thank you sir.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
14	Mr. Horn?
15	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR.
16	HORN:
17	MR. HORN: The
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Horn, the protocol or
19	the tradition here
20	MR. HORN: Oh, I'm sorry.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: is that you introduce
22	yourself, and given that it's your first time cross-
23	examining, that you identify who you are.
24	MR. HORN: My name is Frank Horn. And I am
25	representing the Coalition for Action and you know, your

1	brother Carson is one of the driving forces of that
2	organization and quite a number of the members have been
3	here for the last few days in support of Carson and the
4	group and yourself and your husband.
5	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
6	MR. HORN: And you've been involved with
7	this organization or this group of people for some time
8	now.
9	MS. DUNLOP: We've known about the group,
10	yes.
11	MR. HORN: Yes. And from what I understand,
12	they were very instrumental in going out and getting the
13	petition signed back initially when all of this began back
14	in 1993 and '94 where there was 10,000 signatures that were
15	gotten by this group. They may have been called something
16	else then but the same core group always were involved.
17	You know that group; do you?
18	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, and the petition to
19	support Perry.
20	MR. HORN: So that when we're looking back
21	at when this first began, I know that you and your husband
22	have been basically isolated. But how did it feel when you
23	knew that there was 10,000 people on one occasion and
24	13,000 people on another occasion signed petitions
25	basically supporting your husband and yourself and what you

1	were doing?
2	MS. DUNLOP: Well, it sticks out to me that
3	a lot of people in Cornwall were interested in what was
4	going on and what Perry was doing and the fact that
5	children needed to be protected.
6	MR. HORN: Now, were there any other areas,
7	let's say, organizations or institutions that were in
8	support of what you were doing? Did the church, any part
9	of the church, ever come forward? I am talking about the
10	Roman Catholic Church.
11	MS. DUNLOP: No.
12	MR. HORN: Did any part of the Cornwall
13	Police Services come forward to show any support;
14	individuals or groups within the police services?
15	MS. DUNLOP: We had one or two police
16	officers that were supportive of Perry.
17	MR. HORN: Okay. Now, how did they how
18	did the police officers that you knew and talked to, how
19	did they reconcile the fact that Perry was doing this in
20	order to protect their children?
21	MS. DUNLOP: I don't know how they
22	reconciled it but it's interesting that he didn't get
23	support from fellow officers who had children. I think a
24	lot of them felt guilty that they didn't step to the plate.
25	I think

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Is that something that
2	have they told you that or you just or you're surmising
3	that that's how they thought?
4	MS. DUNLOP: I am surmising that how I felt.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Mr
6	MR. HORN: Yes.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: I don't know that that's
8	a relevant question then if she is just surmising.
9	MR. HORN: Okay. Were there any of them
10	that came forward let's say, on the side, and say "I want
11	to talk to you and I want to discuss my true feelings but
12	it's not off the record and I just want to talk to you".
13	MS. DUNLOP: Well, there was one officer I
14	mentioned the other day who came and said "I agree with
15	what you're doing but I could never do it".
16	And another officer who tried to warn us
17	that "To leave it alone; they're going to take a round out
18	of you".
19	There was another officer who gave some bad
20	advice and suggested Perry blow his head off.
21	There wasn't a great ground swell of support
22	otherwise, good or bad.
23	MR. HORN: So it would be fair to say that
24	your main support was the public; the public that are in
25	the community and who knew what was going on and what you

1	were doing?
2	MS. DUNLOP: We did have support from a lot
3	of members in the community, yes.
4	MR. HORN: And it didn't take long to get
5	10,000 signatures really; was it?
6	MS. DUNLOP: No, I don't believe so.
7	MR. HORN: And the second petition that took
8	place was really in regards to the Public Inquiry. Did you
9	participate very much in gathering those signatures?
10	MS. DUNLOP: No, I believe we'd already
11	moved to British Columbia by then.
12	MR. HORN: And what about the 10,000
13	signatures initially when they were supporting what you had
14	done by going when Perry had gone to the Children's Aid
15	Society?
16	MS. DUNLOP: I was involved in that
17	petition.
18	MR. HORN: And you and your brother Carson
19	and I guess some other
20	MS. DUNLOP: Several other people, yes.
21	MR. HORN: And do you remember the nature of
22	the gathering of that information or those signatures? Was
23	it in public places or was it going person to person?
24	MS. DUNLOP: It was generally outside
25	businesses here in Cornwall. The group would just

1	disseminate, take a bunch of the forms and if they needed
2	to explain the situation to people, they did, but most
3	people knew what was going on and that's how we collected
4	the signatures.
5	MR. HORN: And these people that have
6	supported you, they gathered a lot of the information
7	regarding what was going on through who; yourself or
8	through Perry or the media or do you have any idea how?
9	MS. DUNLOP: I would say all of the above.
10	MR. HORN: All of them?
11	And the thrust of what it is that they were
12	interested in doing was they understood that there was a
13	major problem in the Cornwall area regarding allegations of
14	a group of pedophiles that were basically above the law and
15	were getting away with it and that the people should do
16	something about it.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Engelmann?
18	MR. ENGELMANN: I
19	THE COMMISSIONER: You have to push over a
20	little bit and let him have the microphone.
21	MR. ENGELMANN: I don't know if it is very
22	helpful. On a couple of occasions, Mr. Horn is asking Mrs.
23	Dunlop what is in other people's minds.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: I don't think it's that

1	helpful.
2	MR. HORN: Okay.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: If people say something to
4	her or if she has direct knowledge, then obviously it is
5	easier for her to answer the question.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Right. Mr. Horn.
7	MR. HORN: Did you have public meetings
8	besides the petition?
9	MS. DUNLOP: Not that I can recall.
10	MR. HORN: Do you know if there were any
11	groups that got together and discussed these matters, like
12	groups at homes?
13	MS. DUNLOP: Are you talking about the first
14	petition?
15	MR. HORN: Yes, the first petition.
16	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, there were a couple of
17	ladies that had meetings in their homes. I did not attend.
18	MR. HORN: Pardon?
19	MS. DUNLOP: I did not attend.
20	MR. HORN: You did not attend.
21	So what you can say then about the feeling
22	in the community is based upon what?
23	MS. DUNLOP: That they didn't want Perry
24	punished for what he had done in following the law to
25	protect children. That was the thrust behind the petition.

1	MR. HORN: Okay, now they know that the
2	fact that he had been punished was generally known in the
3	community then at that time?
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, what do you mean
5	"that he was punished"?
6	MR. HORN: That he was being dealt with by
7	the police pervices by being reprimanded by the police.
8	Was that known in the community?
9	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, it was.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I'm sorry. Was he
11	really reprimanded?
12	MR. HORN: Pardon?
13	THE COMMISSIONER: He was charged
14	MR. HORN: He was
15	THE COMMISSIONER: and ultimately
16	vindicated.
17	MR. HORN: Yes, that is true, but that
18	knowledge was in the community at the time when they were
19	getting this petition going.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Sure, and they knew he
21	was charged.
22	MR. HORN: Yes, he had been charged.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
24	MR. HORN: And that information would have
25	been in the community. It would have been in the public.

1	MS. DUNLOP: It was well known.
2	MR. HORN: Pardon?
3	MS. DUNLOP: It was well known.
4	MR. HORN: And so when the people were
5	signing the petitions, most of them were aware of the
6	background of what had happened, what had occurred.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Again, Mr. Horn, how
8	would she know if most of them knew the background?
9	MR. HORN: Well, okay, was it in the public
10	was in it the media? Was it in the
11	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
12	MR. HORN: Was it out there in the
13	newspapers? And was it in the public?
14	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
15	MR. HORN: At that time?
16	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, it was.
17	MR. HORN: Okay, so the people who were
18	coming forward and signing the petitions at that time would
19	have been it would be fair to say that they were aware
20	of what the issues were?
21	MS. DUNLOP: If they were reading the
22	newspapers, yes.
23	MR. HORN: And when the petitions were being
24	signed, was there very much did you ever get a chance to
25	look at the petition and the wording of the petition?

1	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
2	MR. HORN: What was it? Do you remember
3	what it said?
4	MS. DUNLOP: It's a long time ago.
5	Something to this effect, "That we, the undersigned,
6	support Perry Dunlop in his efforts to protect children in
7	the community and that he should not be punished for
8	disclosing the information". Something along that effect.
9	MR. HORN: And does it mention going to the
10	Children's Aid Society?
11	MS. DUNLOP: I don't I can't remember.
12	It's too long ago.
13	MR. HORN: Okay. Now, the fact that you had
14	a your husband was basically the person within the
15	police department who had disclosed this cover-up, the fact
16	that there was nothing going to be done about this, and his
17	ostracism, and the fact that he was within his own police
18	department made to feel that he was alone, did that
19	surprise you at all?
20	MS. DUNLOP: Floored me; absolutely floored
21	me.
22	MR. HORN: What did you expect the other
23	police officers to do?
24	MS. DUNLOP: Well, I guess I expected what
25	Perry expected them to do. You do the right thing, and

1	good things will happen. And you report a crime or a
2	suspected crime, an investigation will follow, and charges
3	will be laid, and the rest you know, people will have to
4	go to court and ante up. That didn't happen. So that
5	surprised us a great deal.
6	MR. HORN: I know that the mandate is in
7	regards to institutional response, but do you feel that an
8	individual like Perry who, in the future, comes across a
9	very similar situation, that this Inquiry should make
10	recommendations in regard to giving them protection and an
11	ability to be able to do something so that they are not
12	going to go through what Perry went through?
13	MS. DUNLOP: I think if this Inquiry doesn't
14	make a recommendation to that effect, that it will send a
15	very strong message to every police officer in Canada, that
16	when you stand up for children, you are going to get
17	nailed.
18	So, yes, I believe the institutions have to
19	provide protection for whistleblowers.
20	MR. HORN: Okay, when a police officer is in
21	a police department, what are his are you aware what
22	avenues does he have in order to deal with these sorts of
23	issues when he confronts it?
24	Now, do you know what they are?
25	MS. DUNLOP: Well I can take a stab at it.

1	fou mean present day or when Perry
2	MR. HORN: A present-day police officer who
3	is caught in the same situation as your husband?
4	MS. DUNLOP: Well, I can't say positively,
5	but I don't think there would be a police officer in
6	Cornwall willing to go down the road that Perry went down.
7	MR. HORN: What about his union? Is there a
8	mandate there to protect him?
9	MS. DUNLOP: I don't know if there is a
10	mandate in place today, but there wasn't a mandate in 1993
11	to protect Perry.
12	MR. HORN: What about his superior officers?
13	Do you know if there is any protocol that exists within the
14	police department to have to come to bat for somebody
15	underneath them in that they have a mandate of some sort
16	to make sure that they are able to carry out their job as a
17	police officer without being intimidated or pressured?
18	MS. DUNLOP: I don't think the senior
19	officers are in the same union as the rank-and-file, and I
20	doubt very much that the junior officers would get support
21	from senior officers on such a situation.
22	MR. MANDERVILLE: Mr. Commissioner, if I may
23	interrupt for a moment.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
25	MR. MANDERVILLE: Mrs. Dunlop, my name is

1	Peter Manderville. I am counsel for the Cornwall Police.
2	To my knowledge, Mr. Dunlop has not been a
3	police officer for seven years now, and Mrs. Dunlop has
4	never been. I am not sure how helpful this evidence could
5	possibly be.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: I don't either.
7	MR. HORN: Well, I think that there's police
8	officers and then there's their wives and their family who
9	go through what Mr. Dunlop goes through. He doesn't go
10	through this alone.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
12	MR. HORN: And so as I think that if a
13	police officer can't discuss these kinds of issues with
14	anybody within his home, then he's very isolated, and I
15	think that the fact that there was so much communication
16	that was going on between Mr. Dunlop and his wife regarding
17	these issues, that was his only avenue that existed for
18	him.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I don't disagree
20	with that, but
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes, and neither do I, and I
22	think the issue is important. It's a question of who the
23	question is put to.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: We have already put some of

1	these questions to some members of the Cornwall police, and
2	believe me we will be putting some of these questions to
3	members of the Cornwall police again when we get to their
4	institutional response.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Right.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: But we have the policies and
7	procedures already in. I know Mr. Horn wasn't here then,
8	but that was in a different part of this hearing, and we
9	will be examining them on those policies.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: So I think that's where we
12	should deal with this.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. So Mr. Horn, what
14	you are asking this witness is, "Do you know what policies
15	are in effect at Cornwall police if someone was going to
16	have to deal with this today?"
17	Well, as was said, I don't know that we can
18	expect Mrs. Dunlop to know what is going on in the Cornwall
19	police seven years since she's last come to Cornwall.
20	So the point is, we will be examining that
21	point, but I don't think it's fair to ask this lady what's
22	going on in the Cornwall police today.
23	MR. HORN: Okay. I understand that, but
24	okay, then we are going to go back to when she was there
25	when they were here. This was a time when they were going

1	through it. They've lived it; she was in it; she was very,
2	very close to her husband. We are going back to the time
3	when these issues were being dealt with.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Ask the question.
5	MR. HORN: Okay.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: And we'll see where we
7	go.
8	MR. HORN: So let's not talk about today.
9	We are talking about when you were going through this. You
10	were very close to your husband. You and your husband were
11	close in regards to a lot of these issues.
12	This Public Inquiry is going to be making
13	recommendations. You, as a wife who is that close to these
14	things, knows what the turmoil a police officer goes
15	through.
16	What recommendations would you be able to
17	make to a police officer and the associations or the police
18	departments to protect them so that they will not go
19	through what he went through. What are some of your views
20	on that?
21	MS. DUNLOP: Well, I would hope that through
22	the recommendations from the Commissioner, that we will get
23	some substantial whistleblower protection in general that
24	has some backbone. That would go a long way to protecting
25	not only police officers but anyone else who finds

1 themselves in a similar situation. 2 I would hope that the police association 3 would conduct their own internal investigation, decide amongst their members if they are going to help a 4 5 particular member. I don't believe that that should be done in a general meeting with a show of hands, as was done 6 7 at Perry's. It should be done by individual private 8 ballot, so that no members feel forced to vote one way or 9 another in the presence of their superiors. 10 Those would be two of my recommendations. 11 MR. HORN: Okay, now I know that one of the 12 things that happened many years ago -- I'm talking, this is 13 not to do with policing, but in a very similar situation in regards to how a small group of individuals were able to 14 15 gain control over policing and were able to use the 16 policing as an instrument of tyranny. 17 How can we ---18 THE COMMISSIONER: Wait, wait MR. HORN: --- stop that? We are talking 19 20 about the Nuremberg trials in which the Nazis were brought 21 in at the end of the War because they were using the 22 instruments of the German Reich in order to gain control 23 over the policing and over the people. 24 What we are really dealing with here is

there's allegations that a small group of individuals had

1	gained control and were using the policing in order to
2	intimidate this person, her husband and family and had the
3	arm to be able to reach all the way across Canada, into
4	British Columbia, and go in there and terrorise this
5	family. That cannot happen in Canada.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Whoa, whoa.
7	Mr. Horn, a couple of things. First of all,
8	that is not a question. Second of all, I don't think it
9	has a place here.
10	MR. HORN: Pardon?
11	THE COMMISSIONER: It is not a question and
12	I don't think that that kind of comment has a place here.
13	MR. HORN: Okay. Now, when the Cornwall
14	Police Department did not take the proper steps in
15	protecting your daughter on that one occasion when she was
16	being threatened, and you went through the procedures in
17	order to deal with it and you didn't get an adequate
18	answer, do you think that there should have been some other
19	avenue for you to deal with that?
20	MS. DUNLOP: I think they had the ability at
21	the time to deal with it. They just didn't deal with it
22	properly as far as I was concerned.
23	MR. HORN: Did you feel that it was
24	deliberately being done to you and your family in order to
25	intimidate you?

1	MS. DUNLOP: I'm unsure of that.
2	MR. HORN: Did you feel that what happened
3	when the two OPP officers were sent out to British Columbia
4	was intending to intimidate you?
5	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
6	MR. HORN: Now, this is the kind of thing
7	that cannot be allowed to happen in the future. What are
8	your recommendations to say that nothing like this should
9	ever happen again?
10	These are two separate incidences we are
11	talking about, where police officers did not do their job
12	in order to protect you as a citizen from someone who had
13	mental problems, and didn't have any idea what that
14	individual would do.
15	And then the other one is having the police
16	sent all the way to British Columbia in order to intimidate
17	you.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, just a second.
19	MR. MANDERVILLE: I am sorry to interrupt my
20	friend, Mr. Commissioner.
21	If he is going to pose a question to Mrs.
22	Dunlop, I think it should at least be factually accurate.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
24	MR. MANDERVILLE: Insofar as it concerns my
25	client.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Horn well, Mr.
2	Engelmann?
3	MR. ENGELMANN: If Mr. Horn could simply ask
4	the question. He is not giving the evidence.
5	MR. MANDERVILLE: Right.
6	MR. ENGELMANN: And what is happening here
7	is he's mixing up his own views with his questions. He
8	should just ask the question.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Right. Mr. Horn, I know
10	it's difficult for you, given that you have just joined us,
11	but when asking the question, you really have to make sure
12	that you have the facts correct to be fair to the witness
13	and to be fair to the people that are listening.
14	And so while it is cross-examination, I
15	think that you are going beyond the bounds of fairness I
16	guess.
17	MR. HORN: Okay.
18	THE COMMISSIONER: In posing those
19	questions.
20	MS. DUNLOP: Mr. Commissioner?
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes?
22	MS. DUNLOP: Can we take a break?
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Sure can. Why don't we
24	take the lunch break and come back at 1:45?
25	MR. HORN: Yes, sir.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
2	THE REGISTRAR: Order. All rise. À
3	l'ordre. Veuillez vous lever.
4	This hearing will resume at 1:45 p.m.
5	Upon recessing at 12:20 p.m./
6	L'audience est suspendue à 12h20
7	Upon resuming at 1:46 p.m./
8	L'audience est reprise à 13h46
9	THE REGISTRAR: This hearing is now resumed.
10	Please be seated. Veuillez vous asseoir.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Have you canvassed
12	counsel with respect to you haven't been able to. Okay.
13	MR. ENGELMANN: No. I did earlier, sir.
14	I had no indication from Mr. Horn how long
15	he would be and I don't know where he is. So I can't I
16	wasn't sure if he was finished or not.
17	Mrs. Dunlop, we will just be a minute.
18	MS. DUNLOP: Sure.
19	(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)
20	MR. ENGELMANN: Apparently, Mr. Horn is not
21	in the building.
22	Sir, we could either
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Set him down and get
24	someone else to start.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: Then let's just go back to

1	our list.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
3	MR. ENGELMANN: Yes.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Lee?
5	MR. LEE: Mrs. Dunlop, my name is Dallas
6	Lee. I represent the Victims Group here at the Inquiry.
7	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
8	MR. LEE: A number of my clients have asked
9	me to publicly thank you for the evidence you've given
10	here, and I have no questions for you.
11	MS. DUNLOP: Thank you.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Mr. Bennett?
13	MR. LEE: Mrs. Dunlop, my name is Dallas Lee
14	and I represent the Victims Group here at the Inquiry.
15	A number of my clients have asked me to
16	publicly thank you for the evidence you've given here and I
17	have no questions for you.
18	MRS. DUNLOP: Thank you.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Mr. Bennett?
20	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR.
21	BENNETT:
22	MR. BENNETT: Good afternoon, Mr.
23	Commissioner. Good afternoon, Mrs. Dunlop.
24	My name is David Bennett and I'm counsel for
25	the Men's Project. I introduced myself outside the

1	courtroom and she is aware of who my criteric is.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
3	MR. BENNETT: This morning, you made a
4	number of very helpful recommendations but I would just
5	like to ask you about one in particular and I'd like you to
6	elaborate.
7	You made a recommendation, and I'm not sure
8	if I have your words exactly so excuse me, but about more
9	therapy centres for male survivors of sexual abuse and,
10	again, I may be paraphrasing.
11	Could you elaborate on what, in your
12	experience, brought you to that recommendation?
13	MRS. DUNLOP: I believe when Rick Goodwin
14	from the Men's Project first came to Cornwall, and I'm not
15	certain of the exact year, I spoke to him at length and he
16	wanted to know what, if any, resources were available here
17	in Cornwall for men suffering from historical sexual abuse.
18	I didn't know of any other than if they
19	cared to visit the emergency departments of either of the
20	hospitals. We sat down and sort of brainstormed how he
21	could get the project rolling in Cornwall and how to get
22	the news out that men could access, and how could you get
23	men to access the Men's Project here.
24	Out of that, I came to find out through
25	literature in the media that there was only one, I believe,

1	funded government funded men's centre for therapy and
2	healing for men in Ontario.
3	I simply think that's wrong given the high
4	numbers of male sexual abuse survivors that there are.
5	MR. BENNETT: You indicated people came and
6	talked to you and you were like a support system. Do you
7	think this was because there was a lack of services for
8	these men who were coming forward?
9	MRS. DUNLOP: I think there was a lack of
10	services and it's not like going through Tim Hortons. You
11	actually have to build a rapport with people.
12	From my experience and Perry's experience
13	well I can't speak for Perry but from my experience from
14	what I've seen, it takes a long time to build-up that trust
15	and these centres would certainly have to have
16	professionals who are well versed in dealing with victims
17	of abuse.
18	MR. BENNETT: Thank you very much. Those
19	are my only questions.
20	MRS. DUNLOP: Thank you very much.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
22	Mr. Horn?
23	MR. HORN: Yes?
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Can you advise how long
25	you're going to be how much longer you'll be?

1	MR. HORN: Not much longer.
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
3	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF/INTERROGATOIRE EN-CHEF PAR MR.
4	HORN (Continued/Suite):
5	MR. HORN: There was one issue that I
6	thought should be canvassed and that's the question of the
7	motivation.
8	That's an issue that's been brought forth
9	during the Inquiry and that's about a \$70 million lawsuit,
10	and that really what has motivated the things that you
11	Perry are doing?
12	Is it monetary gain that you're going to
13	get? Is that what was motivation to do the investigation
14	and so forth?
15	MRS. DUNLOP: Are you asking me about the
16	number?
17	MR. HORN: Yes, that number, the \$70 million
18	lawsuit?
19	MRS. DUNLOP: That was on the advice of
20	counsel we had at the time, and he thought that it would
21	certainly get everybody's attention, which it certainly
22	did.
23	No, our intention was not huge monetary gain
24	as you can clearly see from the past 14 years.
25	MR. HORN: Okay. Now the other thing that I

1	was interested in in asking you about is the fact that
2	there were four investigations that you were you and
3	your husband were the ones that initiated and eventually it
4	resulted in the 115 charges being laid.
5	Do you feel that if you hadn't done what you
6	did and your husband did do you think that there
7	would have been any charges ever laid?
8	MRS. DUNLOP: No, I think a cover-up would
9	have continued to this day.
10	MR. HORN: Do you feel that the fact that
11	there were charges laid in any way vindicates the efforts
12	that you put in and what your husband put in?
13	MRS. DUNLOP: Well, I wouldn't say
14	vindicates because nobody has done any jail time, but it
15	certainly has raised the awareness in the community and
16	throughout Canada that we need to out these types of
17	secrets in communities.
18	MR. HORN: The charges that were laid and
19	when they were laid, did you pay particular attention to
20	who they were and what happened to them?
21	MRS. DUNLOP: We followed them, yes.
22	MR. HORN: And how did you feel about the
23	final outcome?
24	THE COMMISSIONER: The final what?
25	MR. HORN: The final outcome of those.

1	MRS. DUNLOP: I felt let down for the
2	victims; disappointed in our justice system; disappointed
3	in the procedures that led to the non-convictions. Just
4	general frustration.
5	MR. HORN: It would we argued that once it's
6	gone to court and there's a decision then it should end
7	there. It's all over. There's a judgment. The decision
8	has been made.
9	Do you think that this Public Inquiry is so
10	that that perception wouldn't be there?
11	What I'm saying is, when a decision is made
12	by a court of law on the guilt or innocence of someone,
13	then it should end. That should be the end of it.
14	MRS. DUNLOP: Well, unfortunately that's the
15	system we have. I would kind of hope that it wouldn't get
16	to that point. I was hoping that there would be
17	convictions, but that didn't happen.
18	MR. HORN: This Inquiry is subsequent to the
19	decisions that have been made. Those people have been
20	acquitted.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: No, no, no.
22	MR. HORN: Except for one individual.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Matters have been stayed.
24	Some were
25	MR. HORN: Some were stayed. There's been

1	acquittals and as a result of that, there was still public
2	pressure and there's an Inquiry been established, this
3	Inquiry here.
4	Do you think that it answers the questions
5	that were still in the air as a result of those acquittals?
6	MRS. DUNLOP: Well, that remains to be seen
7	from the outcome of the Commissioner's recommendations, but
8	I certainly hope that most of the problems and questions
9	will be rectified and answered or the cloud will still hang
10	over Cornwall for many years.
11	MR. HORN: Now, there's just one last
12	question that I have.
13	There are public institutions that are there
14	and their purpose is to protect the public the police
15	departments, the Children's Aid Societies and other
16	institutions that are there like hospitals and so forth,
17	but they're there and there's a question as to their
18	response to these allegations that's before this Inquiry.
19	Do you think that if a situation like this
20	ever happened again, that you would be willing to go again
21	and do this again and try to gather the petitions and get
22	names to force this kind of an issue again?
23	MRS. DUNLOP: Wow.
24	MR. HORN: Would you do it again?
25	MRS. DUNLOP: Would I stand up to protect

1	children again? Yes. Would I do it a little differently?
2	Absolutely. Yes, children definitely need to be protected
3	and we all have that moral obligation.
4	MR. HORN: Okay. Because of the publicity
5	as to what happened to Perry because he was a
6	whistleblower, and the fact that this is what happens to
7	anybody who tries to stand up and do something right
8	THE COMMISSIONER: That's not true. I don't
9	know
10	MR. HORN: I'm just suggesting that.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: No, no. But in this case
12	this is what happened to a whistleblower.
13	MR. HORN: That's right. It happened to the
14	whistle-blower what happened to him?
15	Do you think that it sends a message out
16	into the community that says you better not do anything if
17	you catch a pedophile or you see somebody doing this kind
18	of wrong in the future?
19	Is it going to stifle people from going
20	forward and doing anything because of what happened to
21	Perry?
22	MS. DUNLOP: Well, the door isn't closed;
23	our case isn't closed. We don't have recommendations yet
24	from Mr. Glaude that have been put into place, but I can
25	tell you this: What Perry did was right. The consequences

1	of what Perry did were very hard on us and they were wrong,
2	and I do believe that it sent a clear message to any police
3	officer in this country that they did not want to be in
4	Perry Dunlop's shoes.
5	It's pretty much toe the line, follow what
6	your superiors tell you; too bad if it goes against the
7	rules because that's what happened in this case.
8	MR. HORN: So you would suggest that there
9	be some protection
10	MS. DUNLOP: Absolutely.
11	MR. HORN: for someone like Perry?
12	MS. DUNLOP: Absolutely. I have already put
13	that in our recommendations.
14	MR. HORN: Okay. Thank you.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
16	MS. DUNLOP: Thank you.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Neville?
18	MR. NEVILLE: I have no questions sir.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
20	Mr. Chisholm?
21	MR. CHISHOLM: Good afternoon sir.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Good afternoon.
23	MR. CHISHOLM: Good afternoon, Mrs. Dunlop.
24	I don't believe I need to introduce myself to you.
25	MS. DUNLOP: No, Peter.

1	MR. CHISHOLM: I act for the CAS. I don't
2	have any questions for you, but I would like to thank you
3	for coming and spending the week with us. I know that you
4	came here against your will, and I know that you've left
5	your three little girls back home. That was undoubtedly a
6	very hard part for you and Mr. Dunlop, and we appreciate
7	what you did in coming here to share your evidence with us.
8	Thank you.
9	MS. DUNLOP: Thank you, Peter.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Maître Rouleau?
11	MR. ROULEAU: No questions, thank you.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
13	Mr. Kloeze?
14	MR. KLOEZE: Good afternoon, Mrs. Dunlop.
15	My name is Darrell Kloeze. I represent the Ministry of the
16	Attorney General. Thank you for coming here this week, I
17	have no questions.
18	MS. DUNLOP: Thank you sir.
19	THE COMMISSIONER: Mrs. Henein?
20	MS. HENEIN: No questions.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
22	Mr. Sherriff-Scott?
23	MR. SHERRIFF-SCOTT: I have no questions for
24	you, Mrs. Dunlop, thank you.
25	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

105

1	Mr
2	MS. DUNLOP: I am disappointed, Your Honour.
3	THE COMMISSIONER: I'm sorry?
4	MS. DUNLOP: I'm a little disappointed.
5	(LAUGHTER/RIRES)
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Manderville?
7	MR. MANDERVILLE: Good afternoon, Mr.
8	Commissioner.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Good afternoon.
10	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY/CONTRE-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR.
11	MANDERVILLE:
12	MR. MANDERVILLE: Good afternoon, Mrs.
13	Dunlop. I introduced myself to you shortly before the
14	lunch break. My name is Peter Manderville, and I act for
15	the Cornwall Police. I suspect it's been a rather long
16	week for you, and I will try to be brief.
17	MS. DUNLOP: Thank you.
18	MR. MANDERVILLE: Now, you recall on Tuesday
19	afternoon, we all watched that Fifth Estate videotape and,
20	at one point in the videotape, and you and your husband are
21	speaking of your concerns that there had been a cover-up in
22	the community; and I quoted you that you stated, "It's just
23	the facts we are missing at this point". That is back in
24	December 1995 when that videotape was recorded; wasn't it?
25	MS. DUNLOP: I'm not sure of the date. That

1	sounds about approximate.
2	MR. MANDERVILLE: Is it fair to say late
3	fall 1995 perhaps?
4	MS. DUNLOP: I'm not sure of the date, but
5	that sounds about right.
6	MR. MANDERVILLE: Okay. And at that point,
7	you and your husband felt that you and the community were
8	lacking facts; correct?
9	MS. DUNLOP: There were a lot of them
10	missing.
11	MR. MANDERVILLE: And as Mr. Wardle, my
12	friend to the right, established with you earlier today,
13	and it was made Exhibit 671 on June 7, 1996, your
14	husband issued his Notice of Action against my client and
15	the Diocese and a number of individuals. Do you recall Mr.
16	Wardle showing you that?
17	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
18	MR. MANDERVILLE: And we have heard the
19	evidence of C-8, and you remember who C-8 is?
20	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
21	MR. MANDERVILLE: We've heard evidence from
22	him to the effect that he and your husband established
23	contact with one another on June 9, 1996. And I suggest to
24	you that is the point at which your husband starts to try
25	and gather facts. Is that fair?

107

1	MS. DUNLOP: You can suggest that.
2	MR. MANDERVILLE: Is that a fair suggestion?
3	MS. DUNLOP: I'm not sure if it's a fair
4	suggestion.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, do you is it
6	because you don't know? Like he is saying it's about in
7	June that you met with that Mr. Dunlop met
8	MS. DUNLOP: Well, that would be something
9	between C-8 and Perry.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Right. Okay. Right,
11	yes, but do you know when they met?
12	MS. DUNLOP: No.
13	MR. MANDERVILLE: So that's something we
14	would have to ask Mr. Dunlop?
15	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, it would be.
16	MR. MANDERVILLE: And I suggest to you that
17	the facts that your husband is beginning to gather at that
18	point are facts in support of his lawsuit. Is that fair?
19	MS. DUNLOP: No, that's not fair.
20	MR. MANDERVILLE: You disagree with that
21	suggestion?
22	MS. DUNLOP: I disagree with that
23	suggestion.
24	MR. MANDERVILLE: Now, in the fall of 1996,
25	you and your husband, at various times, met with Mr. Leroux

1	in Maine; correct?
2	MS. DUNLOP: I am not sure of the dates, but
3	yes, I attended Maine with my husband.
4	MR. MANDERVILLE: I would like to refer Mrs.
5	Dunlop to Exhibit 651, which was the interview report, the
6	interview statement you gave to the OPP in March 1997. Do
7	you recall looking at that the other day, Mrs. Dunlop?
8	THE COMMISSIONER: Do you want to refer to
9	it?
10	MR. MANDERVILLE: Yes please, sir.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: I believe in the black
12	binder, do you want to look to see if Exhibit 651 is in
13	there? Madam Clerk, could you assist a little bit there?
14	Parce qu'elle a mal au dos.
15	MS. DUNLOP: Okay, I've got the page.
16	MR. MANDERVILLE: Do you have it, Mrs.
17	Dunlop?
18	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, I do.
19	MR. MANDERVILLE: Now, it is fair to say,
20	isn't it, that through Mr. Leroux, your husband and you
21	were provided with many, many alleged facts; correct?
22	MS. DUNLOP: He alleged facts, yes.
23	MR. MANDERVILLE: A number of them?
24	MS. DUNLOP: Qualify "a number".
25	MR. MANDERVILLE: Can we agree a large

110

1	number of facts?
2	MS. DUNLOP: More than three.
3	MR. MANDERVILLE: Bigger than a breadbox?
4	And as you discussed with Mr. Wardle, a number of the facts
5	Mr. Leroux alleged were, I think you agreed with the use of
6	his term "explosive". Correct?
7	MS. DUNLOP: I can't remember if he used the
8	term "explosive".
9	MR. MANDERVILLE: They were breathtaking,
10	shocking?
11	MS. DUNLOP: Oh, they were.
12	MR. MANDERVILLE: And you also know that Mr.
13	Leroux has now recanted a certain number of those alleged
14	facts; correct?
15	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
16	MR. MANDERVILLE: Now, this statement you
17	gave to the OPP, Exhibit 651, you have that in front of
18	you, Mrs. Dunlop?
19	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
20	MR. MANDERVILLE: Right after the first
21	paragraph on page 1 where you indicate you've been married
22	to Mr. Dunlop since May 1989, you state:
23	"In November 1996, Perry was doing
24	interviews for a civil case and
25	contacted Ron Leroux in the State of

1	Maine, USA. I can't remember the name
2	of the little town. My husband, Perry,
3	and our solicitor, Charles Bourgeois,
4	went down to Leroux' residence to
5	interview him in regards to the civil
6	matter."
7	Do you see that, Mr. Dunlop?
8	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, I do.
9	MR. MANDERVILLE: And I would ask you to
10	turn to page 2 of that statement. And the second paragraph
11	that begins "After this meeting with Leroux"; do you see
12	that?
13	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, I do.
14	MR. MANDERVILLE: It states:
1.	MR. MANDERVILLE. It states.
15	"After this meeting with Leroux, Perry
15	"After this meeting with Leroux, Perry
15 16	"After this meeting with Leroux, Perry continued to work on the civil matter.
15 16 17	"After this meeting with Leroux, Perry continued to work on the civil matter. He took Leroux' statement to Ontario to
15 16 17 18	"After this meeting with Leroux, Perry continued to work on the civil matter. He took Leroux' statement to Ontario to get it into affidavit form. Our lawyer
15 16 17 18 19	"After this meeting with Leroux, Perry continued to work on the civil matter. He took Leroux' statement to Ontario to get it into affidavit form. Our lawyer was in Newmarket."
15 16 17 18 19 20	"After this meeting with Leroux, Perry continued to work on the civil matter. He took Leroux' statement to Ontario to get it into affidavit form. Our lawyer was in Newmarket." Again, Mrs. Dunlop, I'm going to suggest to
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	"After this meeting with Leroux, Perry continued to work on the civil matter. He took Leroux' statement to Ontario to get it into affidavit form. Our lawyer was in Newmarket." Again, Mrs. Dunlop, I'm going to suggest to you that the reason your husband was gathering this
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	"After this meeting with Leroux, Perry continued to work on the civil matter. He took Leroux' statement to Ontario to get it into affidavit form. Our lawyer was in Newmarket." Again, Mrs. Dunlop, I'm going to suggest to you that the reason your husband was gathering this information from Mr. Leroux was in support of his civil

1	MS. DUNLOP: To my recollection, it was to
2	get information that Ron Leroux had about pedophiles.
3	MR. MANDERVILLE: And when you tell the OPP
4	here that it was in regards to the civil matter, that's
5	incorrect?
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, a civil case; civil
7	matter on the other side, sorry.
8	MR. MANDERVILLE: Yes.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
10	MR. MANDERVILLE: Civil case in one
11	reference; civil matter in another.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm. I guess the
13	question, Mrs. Dunlop, is what did you mean by work on the
14	civil matter or the civil case?
15	MS. DUNLOP: Well, I might have had civil or
16	criminal confused at the time.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.
18	MR. MANDERVILLE: You're not suggesting your
19	husband was carrying out a criminal investigation; are you?
20	MS. DUNLOP: No, but I said I might have had
21	civil and criminal confused at the time.
22	MR. MANDERVILLE: Then you would agree with
23	me your husband was not doing a police investigation at
24	that time; correct?
25	MS. DUNLOP: You would have to ask him.

1	Mr. Glaude?
2	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes?
3	MS. DUNLOP: I'm getting the feeling of this
4	kind of hostile harassment questioning. I'm uncomfortable
5	with it.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Right. Okay.
7	MS. DUNLOP: Perhaps you could do you
8	hear what I'm saying?
9	THE COMMISSIONER: I hear what you're
10	saying, and what I can tell you is that in my experience,
11	he's asking you to explain words that presumably you have
12	used.
13	MS. DUNLOP: Okay.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: And so I don't see
15	anything in his manner that I mean, it is cross-
16	examination. I've indicated to counsel on numerous
17	occasions that they can ask hard questions, and a hard
18	question might be, "Well, you said civil, what did you mean
19	by that?"
20	MS. DUNLOP: And I explained that.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Well, then he can
22	continue to ask I don't know what his next question is
23	but we'll see where we go.
24	
	But so far all I'm saying is that if there

1	him. All right?
2	So let's see where he goes with the next
3	question.
4	MS. DUNLOP: Okay.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
6	MR. MANDERVILLE: I can assure you, Mrs.
7	Dunlop, I don't intend to be hostile.
8	Now, as you mentioned in your OPP statement,
9	your husband was doing interviews with Mr. Leroux in
10	November 1996; correct?
11	MS. DUNLOP: Say again?
12	MR. MANDERVILLE: As you mention in your OPP
13	statement, the one we've just been looking at, and in
14	particular I'd ask you to look at the second paragraph on
15	the first page?
16	MS. DUNLOP: Okay.
17	MR. MANDERVILLE: The paragraph that begins,
18	"In November, 1996".
19	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
20	MR. MANDERVILLE: So your husband met with
21	Mr. Leroux in Maine in November, 1996 and you felt that
22	perhaps on at least one occasion you were there as well;
23	correct?
24	MS. DUNLOP: I went down to Maine, yes.
25	MR. MANDERVILLE: And subsequent to meeting

1	with Mr. Leroux, your husband issued an amended Statement
2	of Claim. He changed the allegations in his Statement of
3	Claim by way of an amendment. Do you recall that?
4	MS. DUNLOP: No.
5	MR. MANDERVILLE: I'd ask that Mrs. Dunlop
6	be shown document 703633.
7	And, Mr. Commissioner, this document is not
8	yet an exhibit.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm. All right.
10	So Exhibit number 672 is an amended
11	Statement of Claim in the Ontario Court General Division,
12	Perry Dunlop v. Claude Shaver et al. Let's see, is there
13	any date here? November 15 th , 1996.
14	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. P-672:
15	(703633) Helen Dunlop - Amended Statement of
16	Claim (Action commenced by Notice of Action)
17	- November 15, 1996
18	MR. MANDERVILLE: Mrs. Dunlop, you can read
19	that cover-to-cover if you wish to.
20	My only real question in connection with it
21	is to suggest to you that the amendments to the Statement
22	of Claim repeat many of the alleged facts given to your
23	husband by Mr. Leroux. Do you accept that?
24	MS. DUNLOP: I don't know that.
25	MR. MANDERVILLE: Okay. If you want to read

1	it, by all means. I suggest to you it does. And you can
2	accept that or disagree and read it.
3	MS. DUNLOP: You can suggest that.
4	MR. MANDERVILLE: Do you wish to read the
5	document?
6	MS. DUNLOP: Not really.
7	MR. MANDERVILLE: I don't blame you and
8	you're not obliged to.
9	I am simply suggesting to you, and you can
10	take my word for it or not, that a number of the
11	allegations made by Mr. Leroux to your husband are put into
12	this amended Statement of Claim as of November 15, 1996.
13	Do you accept that idea? Do you accept that
14	statement from me?
15	MS. DUNLOP: I have no way of knowing that.
16	THE COMMISSIONER: First of all, Mrs.
17	Dunlop, if you look at the document, the amended parts are
18	the ones that are underlined in black.
19	If your question is, "Do you agree with me
20	that number of the amendments deal with matters that have
21	dealt with Mr. Leroux's declaration" that might be well,
22	but it's not all of them. I've just perused a couple of
23	them, Mr. Manderville, and
24	MS. DUNLOP: I would have to see the
25	original and then compare it to this one.

1	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, that's the easy
2	part is that in a Statement of Claim what they do to amend
3	it is that they reproduce the original
4	MS. DUNLOP: Okay.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: and the stuff that is
6	added or amended is underlined.
7	Ms. DUNLOP: Okay.
8	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. So that's why
9	I'm saying if you look at the underlined material, that's
10	what was added.
11	MS. DUNLOP: So what is it you exactly want
12	to know?
13	MR. MANDERVILLE: What I have proposed to
14	have you agree with me on is that a number of the
15	allegations or facts told to your husband by Mr. Leroux in
16	the fall of 1996 have made there way into this amended
17	Statement of laim issued November 15, 1996?
18	MS. DUNLOP: I'm still not getting this
19	part.
20	MR. MANDERVILLE: Okay. I'll put it to you
21	this way, is this something perhaps we would better ask Mr.
22	Dunlop?
23	MS. DUNLOP: That might be an idea.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
25	MR. MANDERVILLE: I'll move on, Mrs. Dunlop.

1	You learn you told us yesterday I believe
2	that you learn at some point in 1996, and C-8 said it, it
3	was in July 1996 that he told your husband. But you learn
4	at some point in 1996 that C-8 alleges that Mr. Leroux
5	sexually abused him starting when C-8 was 15 years old. Do
6	you recall that?
7	MS. DUNLOP: Not specifically.
8	MR. MANDERVILLE: Do you recall telling us
9	that you knew about it but you aren't sure whether you knew
10	about it before or after you went to Maine?
11	MS. DUNLOP: I'm not sure.
12	MR. MANDERVILLE: Do you agree with me that
13	at some point in 1996 you did become aware of that
14	allegation by C-8?
15	MS. DUNLOP: I am not sure of the time.
16	MR. MANDERVILLE: Let me try to orient you.
17	Would it have been would you have been
18	aware of it before C-8 pled guilty to sexual assault on his
19	own part in January 1997?
20	MS. DUNLOP: I have no idea.
21	MR. MANDERVILLE: That's something else we
22	should ask your husband?
23	MS. DUNLOP: I said I have no idea.
24	MR. MANDERVILLE: When you did become aware
25	of the allegation by C-8 that Mr. Leroux had sexually

1	abused him at the age of 15, were you concerned?
2	MS. DUNLOP: It was a concern.
3	MR. MANDERVILLE: And you knew that Mr.
4	Leroux was at large in his community in Maine?
5	MS. DUNLOP: At large?
6	THE COMMISSIONER: Free.
7	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
8	MR. MANDERVILLE: And did you report C-8's
9	allegations to a child protection agency in Maine?
10	MS. DUNLOP: No.
11	MR. MANDERVILLE: To your knowledge, did
12	your husband report those allegations?
13	MS. DUNLOP: Not that I know of.
14	MR. MANDERVILLE: Did you report those
15	allegations to a police service in the State of Maine?
16	MS. DUNLOP: No.
17	MR. MANDERVILLE: Did you report those
18	allegations by C-8 to any authority in Ontario?
19	MS. DUNLOP: No.
20	MR. MANDERVILLE: To your knowledge, did
21	your husband report those allegations to any authority in
22	Ontario?
23	MS. DUNLOP: Not to my knowledge.
24	MR. MANDERVILLE: Can you tell me why not?
25	MS. DUNLOP: Why should I have?

1	MR. MANDERVILLE: You weren't concerned
2	about the allegations?
3	MS. DUNLOP: He was an adult.
4	MR. MANDERVILLE: C-8 was an adult you mean?
5	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
6	MR. MANDERVILLE: Like Mr. Silmser was?
7	MS. DUNLOP: Mr. Silmser was an adult.
8	MR. MANDERVILLE: I suggest to you that it
9	may have been because your husband needed Mr. Leroux for
10	the civil suit?
11	MS. DUNLOP: You can suggest what you like,
12	sir.
13	MR. MANDERVILLE: And do you agree with my
14	suggestion?
15	MS. DUNLOP: No, I do not.
16	MR. MANDERVILLE: Now, were you aware that
17	C-8 sexually assaulted his niece in August of 1996 and pled
18	guilty to that offence in January, 1997?
19	MS. DUNLOP: I'm not sure of the dates.
20	MR. MANDERVILLE: And, in fact, your husband
21	arranged for Mr. Bourgeois to attend in court with C-8 on
22	the occasion when he pled guilty. Were you aware of that?
23	MS. DUNLOP: Pardon me?
24	MR. MANDERVILLE: Your husband arranged for
25	Mr. Bourgeois to attend in court with C-8 in January, 1997.

1	MS. DUNLOP: I'm not sure of the date.
2	MR. MANDERVILLE: Okay. Do you recall that
3	your husband arranged for Mr. Bourgeois to attend in court
4	
5	MS. DUNLOP: I don't know if he arranged
6	that.
7	MR. MANDERVILLE: Okay. Were you aware that
8	C-8 was indeed convicted of sexually assaulting his niece?
9	MS. DUNLOP: I'm not sure if he was totally
10	convicted.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: But you know he was
12	charged?
13	MS. DUNLOP: I heard he was charged.
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. The evidence that
15	we have is that he
16	MR. MANDERVILLE: He pled guilty.
17	THE COMMISSIONER: that he pleaded
18	guilty to it.
19	MS. DUNLOP: Okay. Show me something.
20	MR. MANDERVILLE: You knew he was charged?
21	MS. DUNLOP: Pardon me?
22	MR. MANDERVILLE: You knew he was charged
23	with sexually assaulting his niece?
24	MS. DUNLOP: I heard that. I didn't know it
25	for positive fact.

1	MR. MANDERVILLE: And did that cause you
2	concern, Mrs. Dunlop?
3	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
4	MR. MANDERVILLE: And again, you knew that
5	C-8 was free in the community?
6	MS. DUNLOP: He was free in the community
7	he had been charged.
8	MR. MANDERVILLE: Correct.
9	MS. DUNLOP: Well, the police were
10	MR. MANDERVILLE: He wasn't imprisoned
11	during the time these charges were pending to your
12	knowledge, was he?
13	MS. DUNLOP: I have no idea.
14	MR. MANDERVILLE: Did you report the
15	allegations to the Children's Aid Society?
16	MS. DUNLOP: And my obligation under that
17	would be
18	MR. MANDERVILLE: I'm not asking if you were
19	obliged to, Mrs. Dunlop. I'm asking you if you did.
20	MS. DUNLOP: Well, I figure you're trying to
21	get put words in my mouth, and I'm not going there.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: No, no, no, no.
23	Mrs. Dunlop, I can tell you that he's not
24	trying to put words in your mouth. Well, I don't know
25	about that, but I'm not going to take that.

1	What <mark>Ollie's</mark> asking you is, did you report -
2	- once you found out that C-8 well, well, what did you
3	find out first? Did you find out that C-8 had done this or
4	did you find out he was charged with it, first? Like,
5	which came first?
6	MS. DUNLOP: That he was charged with it.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. So
8	MR. MANDERVILLE: My question to you, Mrs.
9	Dunlop, was simply, on finding out about the charge, did
10	you report your concerns to the Children's Aid Society?
11	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I don't know that
12	that's a fair question.
13	Because if he's been charged, right, it
14	becomes a matter of police knowledge and the charge and
15	becomes public. And so I don't know that anyone would
16	that it's relevant to consider whether or not they report
17	it to Children's Aid Society.
18	MR. MANDERVILLE: Fair enough, Mr.
19	Commissioner.
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay`.
21	MR. MANDERVILLE: C-8 testified that you and
22	your husband were very supportive and welcoming of him. Is
23	that correct?
24	MS. DUNLOP: If that's what he said, yes.
25	MR. MANDERVILLE: And I believe you

1	testified earlier that you were indeed supportive of him?
2	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
3	MR. MANDERVILLE: And, again, Mrs. Dunlop, I
4	suggest to you that the reason you were so supportive of C-
5	8, like your support of Mr. Leroux, is you needed them both
6	for the purposes of a lawsuit. Is that fair?
7	MS. DUNLOP: No, that's not fair.
8	MR. MANDERVILLE: Thank you very much, Mrs.
9	Dunlop. You've been very patient.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Kozloff?
11	MR. KOZLOFF: I have no questions, thank
12	you.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Mr. Carroll?
14	MR. CARROLL: No questions, thank you.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Is there
16	anyone from the school board? No.
17	Mr. Horn. So, Mr. Engelmann?
18	RE-EXAMINATION BY/RÉ-INTERROGATOIRE PAR MR. ENGELMANN:
19	MR. ENGELMANN: If I could just have a
20	minute, sir?
21	THE COMMISSIONER: Sure.
22	(A SHORT PAUSE/COURT PAUSE)
23	MR. ENGELMANN: I'll just be a moment.
24	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
25	(A SHORT PAUSE/COURT PAUSE)

1	MR. ENGELMANN: Mrs. Dunlop, you were asked
2	some questions about a lawsuit
3	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
4	MR. ENGELMANN: and then an amendment to
5	the lawsuit?
6	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: Who was your husband's
8	lawyer at that time?
9	MS. DUNLOP: I believe it was Charles
10	Bourgeois.
11	MR. ENGELMANN: Did that relationship end at
12	some point in time?
13	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: And did your husband engage
15	another lawyer?
16	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
17	MR. ENGELMANN: And was that a lawyer by the
18	name of John Morris?
19	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
20	MR. ENGELMANN: If the witness could be
21	shown Document Number 718931.
22	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
23	Exhibit number 673 is it says "Draft" on
24	it, in any event, so, Ontario Court General Division, the
25	fresh amended Statement of Claim with Perry Dunlop as the

1	plaintiff, Claude Shaver et al as defendants.
2	MR. ENGELMANN: I'm sorry sir, I missed the
3	number.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: Six-seven-three (673) and
5	that's from the firm of Borden and Elliot, J.J. Morris.
6	EXHIBIT NO./PIÈCE No. 673
7	(718931) Helen Dunlop - Fresh Amended
8	Statement of Claim (Action commenced by
9	Notice of Action) - 15 Jan, 97
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Mrs. Dunlop, we have an
11	original notice of action from June of '96. I think you
12	saw that document earlier?
13	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
14	MR. ENGELMANN: We have an amended Statement
15	of Claim in November; Mr. Manderville just showed it to
16	you?
17	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
18	MR. ENGELMANN: And this appears I don't
19	have anything but this draft. It appears that by January
20	of '97, there have been other changes to the Statement of
21	Claim.
22	Were you aware of when your husband's
23	relationship with Mr. Bourgeois ended?
24	MS. DUNLOP: I'm not sure of the date.
25	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. And, again, if

1	you don't know, that's fine, but were you aware if this
2	third document, if in fact this third document was filed
3	with the court, or something very similar to it?
4	MS. DUNLOP: Yes, I believe it was.
5	MR. ENGELMANN: And that was by Mr. Morris?
6	MS. DUNLOP: Yes.
7	MR. ENGELMANN: All right. Those are all my
8	questions.
9	Thank you very much, Mrs. Dunlop.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
11	MS. DUNLOP: Mr. Glaude?
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes?
13	MS. DUNLOP: May I say something?
14	THE COMMISSIONER: Sure.
15	MS. DUNLOP: Is that the end of the
16	questioning from cross?
17	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, it depends on what
18	you say, you know.
19	The rules are that you know, if you come
20	up with something that somebody has questions about, I will
21	listen to them and see whether or not they'll be permitted
22	to ask questions only about what you're about to say now.
23	Those are the rules.
24	But I encourage you. If you want to say
25	something, say it.

1	MS. DUNLOP: Well, I'd just like to make an					
2	observation.					
3	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.					
4	STATEMENT BY/DÉCLARATION PAR MS. HELEN DUNLOP:					
5	MS. DUNLOP: About these proceedings, and					
6	how I feel as a witness and how many other people that have					
7	walked up here must have felt.					
8	I've been involved in this for a very long					
9	time and I can see spin coming a 100 miles away. And it					
10	doesn't matter what spin any of you people put on the					
11	truth, it is still going to come out. Never mind if you					
12	don't want to call it a "clan". It doesn't matter if you					
13	want to erase Ron Leroux's statement. It doesn't matter					
14	what C-8 said.					
15	There are a lot of dead people. There are					
16	hundreds of victims. There are institutions that have let					
17	us down and nothing you can say is going to make that go					
18	away by putting a spin on it.					
19	That is what I wanted to say, Mr. Glaude.					
20	THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.					
21	I want to tell you, Mrs. Dunlop, that I do					
22	appreciate and I want to thank you for a lot of reasons.					
23	First of all, not only because of the very					
24	thoughtful considerations and recommendations that you've					
25	made, not only with sharing with us your story and those of					

1	your children, I want to tell you that the decision to ask							
2	you to come here in a formal way, the subpoena, was mine,							
3	and so if you have any ill will it's towards me and no one							
4	else.							
5	Sometimes we have to make difficult							
6	decisions and I think you know what difficult decisions are							
7	from what I hear of your story, and that is one of the							
8	difficult decisions I had to make.							
9	Having said that, I want to thank you for -							
10	I know how you feel about me and this Inquiry. I know that							
11	your beliefs are heartfelt, that you came here and answered							
12	the questions without rhetoric in a civilized and							
13	respectful manner and this is a reflection of the strength							
14	of character that you have. And I can tell you that							
15	whatever spin anyone puts on it, whether it be the							
16	newspapers or people who are dead against this Inquiry							
17	it works both ways sometimes I guess, eh? and whatever							
18	comments they say about me or about you, that I really do							
19	appreciate what you've done here.							
20	Thank you.							
21	Let's take a break and we will come back in							
22	20 minutes.							
23	THE REGISTRAR: Order. All rise. À							
24	l'ordre. Veuillez vous lever.							
25	This hearing will resume at 2:45 p.m.							

PUBLIC HEARING AUDIENCE PUBLIQUE

1	Upon recessing at 2:29 p.m./
2	L'audience est suspendue à 14h29
3	Upon resuming at 3:48 p.m./
4	L'audience est reprise à 15h48
5	THE REGISTRAR: This hearing is now resumed.
6	Please be seated. Veuillez vous asseoir.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: Good afternoon, Mr.
8	Engelmann.
9	Yes, sir?
10	MR. ENGELMANN: Mr. Commissioner, the next
11	witness I would like to call back would be Mr. Dunlop, but
12	before I do that, I would like to make a suggestion if I
13	might, that is I had a brief discussion with Mrs. Dunlop
14	who has now finished her evidence.
15	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
16	MR. ENGELMANN: What I am proposing is that
17	we give Mr. Dunlop the evening to reflect on his situation
18	and that we ask him in the morning, first thing, if he is
19	prepared to proceed either tomorrow or at some other time
20	with answering questions.
21	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.
22	MR. ENGELMANN: Or if he is not prepared to
23	do that. I would also like an opportunity, Mr.
24	Commissioner, to speak to counsel
25	THE COMMISSIONER: M'hm.

PUBLIC HEARING AUDIENCE PUBLIQUE

1	MR. ENGELMANN: with respect to a number				
2	of matters, and I was hopeful that I might be able to do				
3	that now as well.				
4	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.				
5	MR. ENGELMANN: So unless there's any				
6	objection, what I would propose is that we adjourn now				
7	until 9:30 tomorrow morning, if that is acceptable to you				
8	and to others.				
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I would prefer a				
10	little later tomorrow. So how about at 10:30?				
11	MR. ENGELMANN: At 10:30?				
12	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, and so that will				
13	give people a chance to get organized and on the go.				
14	MR. ENGELMANN: Okay.				
15	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.				
16	Ten-thirty tomorrow, Mr. and Mrs. Dunlop?				
17	Well, Mrs. Dunlop you are finished but, Mr. Dunlop, if I				
18	could see you tomorrow morning at ten-thirty so that we can				
19	resolve the issue one way or the other? All right.				
20	Thank you very much.				
21	MR. ENGELMANN: Thank you, sir.				
22	THE REGISTRAR: Order. All rise. À				
23	l'ordre. Veuillez vous lever.				
24	This hearing is adjourned until tomorrow				
25	morning at 10:30 a.m.				

PUBLIC HEARING AUDIENCE PUBLIQUE

1		Upon	adjoui	rnıng	g at	3:49	p.	m./
2		L'au	dience	est	ajou	ırnée	à	15h49
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								
13								
14								
15								
16								
17								
18								
19								
20								
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								

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