

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE  
DONALD MARSHALL, JR.  
PROSECUTION

FINAL BRIEF  
ON BEHALF  
OF

WILLIAM ALEXANDER URQUHART

Donald C. Murray,  
Stewart, MacKeen & Covert  
Suite 900,  
1959 Upper Water Street,  
Halifax, Nova Scotia  
B3J 2X2

Counsel for  
William Alexander Urquhart

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>	
1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
2.0	THE APPROACH OF THIS BRIEF	3
3.0	INITIAL INVOLVEMENT	
3.1	:May 31 and June 1, 1971	6
3.7	:June 2, 1971	6
3.15	:Urquhart's Notes	9
3.19	:June 3, 1971	13
		15
4.0	JUNE 4, 1971 - THE PRATICO STATEMENT	
4.1	:The Background on Pratico	17
4.3	:Pratico's Position	17
4.5	:The Role of Urquhart	17
4.9	:Urquhart's Duty	19
4.16	:Conclusion	21
		26
5.0	JUNE 4, 1971 - THE CHANT STATEMENT	27
5.1	:The Background on Chant	27
5.3	:What the People Who Were There Say	28
5.26	:Urquhart's Role	40
5.30	:The Issue	43
5.36	:Urquhart's Duty	45
5.50	:Conclusion	54
6.0	JUNE 4, 1971 - MARSHALL ARREST	59
6.1	:Authority to Arrest	59
6.2	:Arresting Marshall	59
6.8	:The Exculpatory Utterance	61
6.10	:Analysis	62
7.0	JUNE 1971 - POST-CHARGE INTERVIEWS GENERALLY	64
7.1	:June 4-13, 1971	
7.2	:June 14, 1971	64
7.4	:Robert Patterson	64
7.17	:June 23, 1971	65
7.19	:Subsequent Events	72
		73
8.0	JUNE 17-18: THE HARRISS, GUSHUE AND O'REILLY STATEMENTS	74
8.1	:Patricia Harriss: Going to the Police Station	74
8.5	:Uncontested Facts about Patricia Harriss	75
8.9	:The Allegations of Patricia and Eunice Harriss	77

8.12	:The Issue	78
8.17	:The Statements Themselves	81
8.43	:Analysis of Related Evidence	98
8.57	:What Urquhart Did	106
8.59	:Identifying Urquhart:Harriss	107
8.67	:Conclusion on Harriss	111
8.68	:Terry Gushue Statement	112
8.70	:O'Reilly Statements	113
8.73	:Conclusion	115
9.0	NOVEMBER 15, 1971: REINVESTIGATION	118
9.1	:The Conviction	118
9.3	:John Joseph MacNeil	119
9.8	:The Results	121
9.11	:The Ebsarys	123
9.13	:Conclusion	124
10.0	FURTHER PRATICO CONTACT	126
10.1	:Nova Scotia Hospital Transportation	126
10.2	:Transporting John Pratico	126
10.5	:Significance of the Encounter	128
10.8	:Conclusion	129
11.0	1974: RATCHFORD/EBSARY/GREEN CONTACT	132
11.1	:The Nature of the Story	132
11.4	:Ratchford's Version to this Commission	133
11.8	:Ratchford's Version to the R.C.M.P.	135
11.14	:Gary Green's Version	138
11.24	:Donna Ebsary's Version	144
11.28	:Conclusion	146
12.0	1975 - 1980: PAROLE CONTACTS	148
12.1	:Contact With Correctional Officials	148
12.11	:Other Issues	153
12.15	:Conclusion	156
13.0	AUGUST OF 1981 MESSAGE FROM DAN PAUL	157
13.1	:Receipt of Information	157
13.4	:Urquhart's Response	158
13.9	:Native Reaction	161
13.11	:Points of Criticism	162
13.15	:Conclusion	164
14.0	FEBRUARY-JULY, 1982 - THE R.C.M.P. REINVESTIGATION	166
14.1	:Contact With Staff Sergeant Harry Wheaton	166
14.15	:Contact With Frank Edwards	173
14.23	:July 12, 1982	176
15.0	CONCLUSION	181

FINAL BRIEF ON  
BEHALF OF  
WILLIAM ALEXANDER URQUHART

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1           When this Royal Commission into the Prosecution of Donald Marshall, Jr. was appointed in October, 1986, it was suspected that much of the blame for the wrongful conviction of Donald Marshall, Jr., would be brought home to the Sydney City Police and the Sydney City Police investigators particularly. This Honourable Commission, in recognition of this suspicion, felt it to be in the public interest to grant funding for Mr. Urquhart's representation at the hearings. With over eighty days of evidence having been received for consideration by the Commissioners, it is now possible to conclude that no serious allegation against William Urquhart has been substantiated.

1.2           It will not be asserted that there were no errors of judgment or misconceptions on the part of Mr. Urquhart. However, it is respectfully submitted that errors of judgment and misconceptions are one thing, misbehaviour and wilful misconduct are quite another. The submissions which follow are directed to one overriding conclusion with respect to the involvement of William Urquhart in this whole unfortunate matter: that William Urquhart performed his tasks with respect to this investigation to the best of his ability, in a spirit of fairness towards those with whom he came into contact, but also with all reasonable vigour to ensure that the public interest in the efficient and

effective detection of crime was satisfied to the extent of his appropriate role as a police officer.

2.0 THE APPROACH OF THIS BRIEF

2.1 Although William Urquhart's involvement in the Marshall matter occurred over a period of about eleven years, his connection with the case was really through a series of independent and primarily unrelated events. It is submitted that this Commission's assessment of William Urquhart's involvement and his contribution if any to this whole unfortunate matter ought to be assessed in that way as well.

2.2 It is respectfully submitted that the incidents to which this Commission will be directing its attention and which involve William Urquhart are as follows:

1. May 31-June 3, 1971 - Initial Involvement;
2. June 4, 1971 - The Pratico Statement;
3. June 4, 1971 - The Chant Statement;
4. June 4, 1971 - Marshall Arrest;
5. June, 1971 - Post-charge Interviews Generally;
6. June 17-18, 1971 - Harriss, Gushue and O'Reilly Statements;
7. November 15, 1971 - Reinvestigation
8. Further Pratico Contact
9. 1974 - Ratchford/Ebsary/Green Contact
10. 1971-1980 - Parole Contacts
11. August 26, 1981 - Contact with Dan Paul;
12. February-July, 1982 - The R.C.M.P. Reinvestigation.

Upon review of each of these incidents, it is respectfully submitted that this Commission will conclude that William Urquhart's conduct was appropriate in all the circumstances given his legal duties and even his moral obligations.

2.3           It is respectfully submitted that William Urquhart's testimony in most circumstances was and remains unnecessary to demonstrate that he conducted himself properly in relation to this case. In order to avoid undue repetition, this brief will rely primarily on the testimony of others - not that of William Urquhart himself. It is respectfully submitted that this approach will show how striking the difference is between the allegations made about William Urquhart and the facts which arise as a result of the evidence actually given before this Honourable Commission.

2.4           The list of William Urquhart's involvements in the Marshall matter set out above demonstrates that he was only associated with incidents which themselves were part of a much larger chronology of activity and events. Certainly some of the events with which William Urquhart was involved were significant in the chronology, but there is no real continuity to his involvement. In order to make the submissions contained in this brief comprehensible, Urquhart's involvements will, from time to time, need to be placed in context. Therefore, this brief may from time to time refer to other events not directly involving William Urquhart. This is done not in submission as to what those contextual facts should be if some other party contests the

appropriateness of such factual findings. The position taken on behalf of William Urquhart is that we are urging specific findings of fact only in relation to William Urquhart's activities - not of the larger series of events.



### 3.0 INITIAL INVOLVEMENT

May 31 and June 1, 1971

3.1 William Urquhart first became acquainted with the Sandy Seale murder investigation on Sunday evening, May 30, 1971 through a discussion with Patrolmen Walsh and McDonald (T. v. 8, p. 1330; T. v. 7, pp. 1130, 1205). On Monday, May 31, 1971, William Urquhart went to work on dayshift and was briefed by John MacIntyre about what had been done (T. v. 52, pp. 9491-9492, 9493-9494, 9496-9504). There is evidence that Urquhart also received information from Constable McDonald about an informal conversation held with Donald Marshall, Jr. the previous day in which Marshall had talked about kicking the short man with the knife (T. v. 7, pp. 1135-1136, 1180, 1207, 1253). Urquhart does not recall doing too much on the case on Monday or Tuesday, May 31 and June 1, 1971 (T. v. 52, pp. 9504-9505), and this appears to be substantiated by the documentation available (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 26-27).

3.2 Testimony at the Commission Hearings suggested two possible involvements by William Urquhart on the Monday and Tuesday of the week following the stabbing. R.C.M.P. Identification Officer John Leon Ryan testified that after returning to work himself on the Monday morning following the stabbing he made several efforts to contact Detective MacIntyre or Urquhart (T. v. 7, p. 1258). Ryan testified that MacIntyre was out for several calls, but that eventually contact was made

with either MacIntyre or Urquhart. Whether it was still Monday is unclear. Ryan's offer of assistance was declined (T. v. 7, p. 1259).

3.3 It is respectfully submitted that this being his only evidence on the point, it is not possible for this Commission to determine with whom contact was made by Ryan, nor on what day contact was made. It is respectfully submitted that the important conclusion for this Commission to draw from John Leon Ryan's evidence with respect to future investigations is that identification services were not secured at the earliest opportunity - most effectively the night of the stabbing. Much less weight should be attributed to any declining of identification services on the Monday or Tuesday, even if that refusal could be brought home specifically to William Urquhart, which of course it cannot.

3.4 The second suggestion about the Monday or Tuesday was that Urquhart visited the crime scene with Richard Walsh, one of the first officers on the scene the night of the stabbing, and Ambrose McDonald. This was put forward by Commission Counsel (T. v. 52, p. 9505). Ambrose McDonald indicated that a visit to the scene with Urquhart occurred some time after Walsh and McDonald had conducted their own impromptu search of the scene on the Monday or Tuesday following the stabbing (T. v. 7, pp. 1137, 1183-1184). McDonald was testifying without notes to assist his recollection. Richard Walsh indicated that the search with McDonald had occurred on the Sunday or Monday afternoon (T. v. 8,

p. 1350). Walsh also made no notes (T. v. 8, p. 1411). Urquhart had no memory of visiting the Park Tuesday but could have done so (T. v. 52, p. 9505).

3.5 It is respectfully submitted that the sum of this evidence is that at some time Urquhart visited the scene with Walsh and McDonald. A probability exists that such a visit to the scene occurred much later in the week - such as Thursday. It was the evidence of Richard Walsh - who did not speak about visiting the Park with Urquhart - that the Tuesday and Wednesday of that week would have been days off for the shift being worked by Walsh and McDonald (T. v. 8, pp. 1339-1340, 1352). Thursday would also be consistent with being after Urquhart's first proven involvement with respect to statements (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 28-30). Further support for this probability may be found in the fact that Walsh and McDonald had been on midnight shift the previous Saturday, switched to afternoon shift on Sunday and had days off on Tuesday and Wednesday. Walsh and McDonald would be coming into work on dayshift on Thursday - which was the shift Urquhart was working.

3.6 A further basis for concluding that the visit to the Park and crime scene was probably on the Thursday is that by Thursday the progress of the investigation needed to be re-assessed. The reason for this was that by Thursday the white Volkswagon theory could not be substantiated and the evidence being turned up from people in the Park was inconclusive about what occurred at the time of the crime itself. Obviously, it

would be appropriate for a police officer who had begun to be involved in a murder investigation to visit the scene and to consider where matters stood in relation to the evidence gathered through statements and interviews up to that point.

June 2, 1971

3.7           The first documented activity of William Urquhart with respect to the investigation of the Seale stabbing occurred on Wednesday, June 2, 1971 in the late afternoon (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 28-30). William Urquhart took a statement from Frankie French. Essentially this statement elicited French's knowledge of the activity of Donald Marshall, Jr. and Sandy Seale on the Friday night. It was not a significant statement. The absence of a witness on the statement was unusual given Urquhart's expressed practice of having a witness present (T. v. 52, pp. 7481-7485). Urquhart postulated that there was no witness either because the statement was taken at close to shift change or because it was anticipated that it would just be "an information statement from a witness" (T. v. 52, p. 9510). This latter possibility is borne out by the statement itself, which appears simply to contain background information on the movements of individuals on the night of the stabbing.

3.8           Ambrose McDonald testified that a young girl approached him on Wednesday, June 2, 1971, indicating that a witness from the Westmount area might shed some light on the Seale stabbing case. McDonald gave the girl's name to William Urquhart, and the witness Scott MacKay was discovered (T. v. 7,

p. 1138). The girl was likely Debbie MacPherson (now Timmins). She testified that a police officer asked her to go down to the police station on a school day when she was home sick. MacPherson agreed to go the next day - a Thursday morning (T. v. 4, pp. 712, 728). MacPherson does not recall who the police officer was who saw her at her home (T. v. 4, p. 712). It is not unreasonable to presume that William Urquhart may have been the officer who had this initial contact with Debbie MacPherson on Wednesday, June 2, 1971.

3.9 Scott MacKay's evidence was that on the Wednesday he was picked up at his home by William Urquhart and taken to the police station. There he met with three officers - MacIntyre, Urquhart, and another unknown officer (T. v. 4, p. 653). After being at the police station for four hours, MacKay was taken home by Urquhart (T. v. 4, p. 690). Urquhart was described as "genuine" and concerned, assisting with the transportation and also offering coffee and a cigarette according to MacKay's recollection (T. v. 4, pp. 689-690). With respect to his statement (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 31-33), MacKay indicated that the questioning for it was mostly done by MacIntyre and Urquhart (T. v. 4, pp. 653-683). MacKay found the questioning process difficult.

3.10 It is respectfully submitted that the Commission can take from MacKay's evidence that there was reason for him to remember William Urquhart as Urquhart was the officer who picked him up and returned him home on the night of June 2, 1971.

MacKay's evidence and the written statement produced (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 31-33) demonstrate that MacKay was questioned by John MacIntyre. This Commission can also accept that there was a third officer involved in dealing with Scott MacKay that evening. Assuming that the times on written statements are correct, MacIntyre could not have been with MacKay throughout MacKay's stay at the police station (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 34-37). It would also be reasonable, we submit, for this Commission to take the view that William Urquhart was in fact present at the police station while Scott MacKay was there, and perhaps even that William Urquhart participated in the process of police officer identification described by Scott MacKay (T. v. 4, pp. 654, 666, 668). However, Scott MacKay's reference to the involvement of some third unknown officer without ascribing a particular role to that officer during the evening, leaves it open that that other officer and not Urquhart was in on the questioning of MacKay.

3.11 It is respectfully submitted that William Urquhart was not a witness to the taking of the statement from Scott MacKay, given Urquhart's signing practice (T. v. 52, pp. 9486-9487, 9511-9512). Urquhart therefore did not participate in questioning MacKay for the statement. Instead, it was during the breaks when MacIntyre was not interviewing MacKay that there were intermittent and informal opportunities for MacKay to speak with Urquhart. This is a reasonable view for the Commission to adopt because the nature of the contact with Urquhart is described in a

different way qualitatively than the nature of the contact with the questioning officers (T. v. 4, pp. 689-690). This leads to an inference that different officers were involved in the questioning than those named by MacKay - at least so far as Urquhart is concerned.

3.12           The surviving impression of William Urquhart in Scott MacKay's mind is fundamentally different than the surviving impression of his emotions while being interviewed. While MacKay had reason to remember Urquhart, we suggest it was not because William Urquhart had taken part in obtaining any statement from MacKay. Instead, MacKay actually remembers Urquhart we submit because Urquhart was not involved in taking the statement. We suggest that the passage of sixteen years may well have blurred the roles of different police officers in MacKay's mind. The surviving impressions sort out the roles. MacKay remembers MacIntyre because MacIntyre took the statement, Urquhart because Urquhart was distinct from that statement, and the unknown officer remains unknown because he was a witness to the statement and participated little.

3.13           If one was permitted to speculate about events where the recollection of witnesses is uncertain or incomplete, a reasonable suggestion might be that the third unidentified police officer was "Red" M. R. MacDonald. A reasonable approach would be this. If one were planning to interview a witness who might speak about the crime scene shortly after the crime, surely the most relevant officer besides the chief investigator would be the

detective who knew most about conditions on the Friday night. That would be "Red" MacDonald. Also, regardless of who the officer witnessing the statement was, and unfortunately the evidence does not arrive at any independent confirmation of who this was, if this third officer witnessed MacKay's statement the evidence of MacKay and Urquhart before this Commission would be generally consistent with that of the other.

3.14 Urquhart picked up MacKay. MacKay was interviewed by MacIntyre and the "unknown" officer - perhaps "Red" MacDonald. Urquhart did not interview Scott MacKay but had intermittent contact with him. Urquhart took MacKay home. It is respectfully suggested to this Commission that this consistent theory of the evidence is the most probable to adopt here.

#### Urquhart's Notes

3.15 It appears reasonable to conclude that it was on Wednesday night, June 2, 1971, that William Urquhart wrote most of his notes which appear in Exhibit 16 (R. v. 16, pp.135-139). On their face, these notes appear to list the names of potential witnesses, whose names arose prior to or on the night of June 2, 1971. Lawrence Paul's statement indicated that he and Maria Sophocleous had been in Wentworth Park (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 34). Debbie MacPherson was identified in Scott MacKay's statement (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 31), although she may have also been identified by Ambrose McDonald (T. v. 7, p. 1138). The inclusion MacPherson's name is significant because she was interviewed on Thursday, June 3, 1971 (T.v.4, p. 712, 728). The



name of no other potential witness is identified in Urquhart's notes who was interviewed on or before June 3, 1971. If these notes had been made after June 2, 1971, there would have been no purpose in including Debbie MacPherson's name as someone to interview. Also, any references in the notes to the source of the names are all references to statements prior to June 3, 1971. The presence of a note about George Wallace MacNeil and Roderick Alexander MacNeil (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 138), in conjunction with Exhibit 40, and Roderick Alexander MacNeil being contacted sometime after May 30, 1971, appears to lend support to the view that the notes were made prior to June 3, 1971 (T. v. 11, pp. 1924-1925,1929).

3.16           The notations which are made on different types of paper (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 141-143), which are in William Urquhart's hand, should be considered separately. The remaining notes (Exhibit 16, p. 140) are dated June 14, 1971. This Commission may therefore assume that they were made no earlier than that date, and probably on that date.

3.17           The notes on different types of paper than those previously discussed (Exhibit 16, R. v. 16, pp. 141-143) should be examined in the original. Because of the presence of a note about Barbara Vigneau, it appears that at least that note was made sometime prior to June 23, 1971, when William Urquhart took a statement from her. The notes as to the O'Reilly's would only reasonably have been made prior to Catherine and Mary being interviewed on June 18, 1971.

3.18 A final point about William Urquhart's notes which is evident from the documentation available is that even though he prepared this general list of potential witnesses to be interviewed, the list was not used by him exclusively. For example, the notes concerning Dr. Virick and Merle Davis (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 137) demonstrate that William Urquhart knew what these people might have to say, but he did not end up taking formal statements from them (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 88). Also, the handwriting of persons other than William Urquhart does appear on the notes (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 136, 139).

June 3, 1971

3.19 This Commission has evidence that a few days after May 31, 1971, a police officer brought photographs of three white men to show Roderick Alexander MacNeil for the purpose of seeing whether or not he could identify any of those individuals as the individuals who had been seen in the Park on May 28, 1971 (T. v. 11, pp. 1924-1925, 1929). At least one of the photographs may have come from the R.C.M.P. (Exhibit 40). Sandy MacNeil thought that the officer who had come out was Ed MacNeil because the officer who came out had the same name as he did. Ed MacNeil did not recall ever taking any photographs to Sandy MacNeil. William Urquhart's middle name is Alexander, the same as Roderick Alexander MacNeil's. Further support for Urquhart's involvement here is found in his handwritten note about the MacNeils (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 138).

3.20 Urquhart may have been the man with the

photographs. Urquhart neither took, nor witnessed, any formal statements on June 3, 1971 (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 38-40). Debbie MacPherson was interviewed this day by MacIntyre and another gentleman whose name or looks she could not recall (T. v. 4, pp. 713-714). It appears to be of no real significance whether or not William Urquhart participated in this meeting with Debbie MacPherson and her brother and uncle (T. v. 4, p. 721). She steadfastly refused to indicate that there was someone in the Park generally answering Donald Marshall, Jr.'s description of his assailants (T. v. 4, p. 714). Thursday was also the probable day for Urquhart's visit to the scene with Walsh and McDonald (Paragraphs 3.4-3.6, supra).

3.21 By the end of Thursday, June 3, 1971, the evidence before this Commission indicates that William Urquhart had been briefed about the investigation by John MacIntyre, had interviewed and taken a statement from one witness - Frankie French, had met and spoken with Scott MacKay, possibly had spoken with Debbie MacPherson and Sandy MacNeil, and then visited the scene. The evidence also appears to indicate that the exhibits of clothing and the tissue from the Park had been collected, but not by Urquhart. The initial avenues of investigation had apparently been unsuccessful at this point. William Urquhart had not really been closely involved in this first week of the investigation.

#### 4.0 JUNE 4, 1971 - THE PRATICO STATEMENT

##### The Background on Pratico

4.1 In 1971 John Pratico lived on Bentinck Street in the City of Sydney with his mother and sister, a few short blocks from the Police Station. Once John MacIntyre had determined that it was necessary to re-interview the only two witnesses who apparently had seen some activity which could reasonably be connected to the stabbing which occurred, it would have been natural to make contact first with the witness who lived nearby rather than the witness who lived in Louisbourg. John Pratico was probably not in school in June, 1971 (T. v. 10, p. 2001). Pratico would therefore have been available on that Friday morning of June 4, 1971.

4.2 From the perspective of assessing the activity and conduct of William Urquhart with respect to Pratico's interview it is unnecessary initially to decide how much of John Pratico's evidence should be accepted, if any, or what level of cogency should be ascribed to it. So far as William Urquhart's interest is concerned, we invite this Commission to accept, for the moment, John Pratico's evidence at face value.

##### Pratico's Position

4.3 It was John Pratico's position before this Commission that he was in Wentworth Park on the night of May 28, 1971, just before he went home, and he may have seen Sandy Seale and Junior Marshall at that time (T. v. 11, p. 2033). However,

at the Commission hearings he was quite sure that that night he saw no stabbing incident (T. v. 11, p. 2033). Pratico went to the police station on Sunday May 30, and sat on a bench with Maynard Chant (T. v. 11, pp. 2038, 2043-2044). At that time John Pratico was called into a room by unidentified police officers whom he does not know to this day (T. v. 11, p. 2045). In the interview room were John MacIntyre and Sergeant "Red" MacDonald (T. v. 11, p. 2046). Today Pratico is unable to recall the May 30, 1971 statement or the facts related in it (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 22-23; T. v. 11, p. 2053). Pratico was unsure if the officers he had contact with knew that he was taking medication at that time (T. v. 11, p. 2054). Pratico's impression of the first interview was that John MacIntyre was asking questions in a "kind of roughish" way, conveying to Pratico that he was not being believed and that the officers felt that he knew more than he actually did (T. v. 11, pp. 2055-2056).

4.4           When John Pratico was taken to the police station on June 4, 1971, he only waited on the bench a few minutes before being taken in to give his second statement (T. v. 12, p. 2062). Pratico recalls that he was interviewed again by John MacIntyre and:

I believe Sergeant Urquhart was there.  
(T. v. 12, p. 2063).

MacIntyre told Pratico:

All we want is the truth. (T. v. 12, p. 2064).

Pratico says that there was further discussion until he was told

that he "could be going to goal" (T. v. 12, p. 2064). More discussion followed, with MacIntyre indicating that there was a witness who had identified Pratico as being in the Park that night. This was followed by more discussion concluded by MacIntyre saying:

All we want is the truth. If we get the truth, that would be just fine. (T. v. 12, p. 2065).

A discussion took place about what had happened in the Park. Pratico says that MacIntyre told him what happened in the Park:

In around about way. [sic] (T. v. 12, p. 2065).

Pratico ultimately gave his June 4, 1971 statement, knowing that it was not based on what he had seen, but given because he was scared, his mind was not clear, he had emotional problems, and he felt that he could not take the pressure (T. v. 12, p. 2066).

#### The Role of Urquhart

4.5 In his evidence to this Commission, John Pratico made no mention of the role of William Urquhart during the course of taking the June 4th statement until he was referred to the fact that in his 1982 Affidavit he had said that MacIntyre and Urquhart had told Pratico what he had "purportedly witnessed of the murder" (Exhibit 12 - R. v. 12, p. 272). John Pratico indicated that the only reason he had mentioned both names was because both MacIntyre and Urquhart were in the room where the interview took place. Urquhart was behind and to the side of Pratico "to witness to what I was saying, type thing, eh." (T. v. 12, pp. 2117-2118). Urquhart said nothing and did nothing except

introduce himself. Pratico felt that Urquhart's presence was not "of much significance" and had no reason to tell Corporal Carroll of the R.C.M.P. about Urquhart when interviewed in 1982 (T. v. 12, pp. 2217-2219).

4.6 John Pratico said nothing more about William Urquhart. William Urquhart was present but neither said nor did anything throughout. As John Pratico says, Urquhart was there to witness what was said. Assuming that what Pratico says is true about William Urquhart, and assuming that everything else he says about his interview with John MacIntyre is true, what comment is it possible to make about William Urquhart's role in the taking of this statement?

4.7 John Pratico did not think that William Urquhart's presence at the statement on June 4, 1971 was "important", and certainly not "significant". These are John Pratico's own words. John Pratico does not talk about any "good guy/bad guy" interrogation. John Pratico does not say that William Urquhart's presence caused him any fear or a whit of concern. Pratico indicates that his fear was not based on anything that any police officer did, but rather what was said about jail. However, this is the nub of the difficulty for John Pratico and, with respect, the nub of the difficulty for this Commission in determining what actually happened.

4.8 John Pratico's evidence to this Commission appears to be that he understood in 1971 that William Urquhart was present at the June 4th interview to witness what was said (T. v.

12, pp. 2117-2118). In his evidence John Pratico made no suggestion that William Urquhart at any time had any reason, motive or inclination to do other than tell the truth about what was said during the course of that interview. It is respectfully submitted that for counsel or this Commission to speculate about some ulterior role for William Urquhart than that ascribed by John Pratico would stretch his evidence beyond the point to which he was prepared to go. Chant, by contrast, indicated that he saw William Urquhart as part of a coercive "team" (T. v. 6, pp. 964-965). Chant's statement is dealt with below, but here it is sufficient to state that Chant's view was a view which John Pratico did not share.

#### Urquhart's Duty

4.9 It is respectfully submitted that these considerations leave this Commission with a determination, still accepting every word of John Pratico's evidence for this purpose, of whether or not there was some positive obligation on William Urquhart to intervene from his position as statement witness when certain remarks were made. The particular remarks which conceivably could prompt an intervention were that Pratico "could go to jail", or when John Pratico was apparently discussing with John MacIntyre what took place in the Park "in a round about way". Was it Urquhart's duty to intervene?

4.10 This Commission could make the assumption, listening only to Pratico's evidence, that a threat of jail unless a witness adopts a story not known by the witness to be



true, involves criminal conduct in the nature of counselling perjury. The Criminal Code, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-34, s. 21 (1) provides that:

Every one is a party to an offence who

...

(b) does or omits to do anything for the purpose of aiding any person to commit it, or

(c) abets any person in committing it.

John Pratico never suggests that William Urquhart told him what had happened in the Park or threatened him with jail. Therefore, Urquhart must be dealt with as a party under s. 21 (1) (b) or (c).

4.11 In the case of R. v. Hoggan (1965), [1966] 3 C.C.C. 1 (Alta. S.C., A.D.) the accused was charged with attempting to defeat the course of justice by attempting to dissuade a witness by threats from giving evidence. The two accused persons in the case, with others, went to the home of a potential witness. While both accused persons were seated in the same car, one made the threat to the witness. The other accused said and did nothing. The conviction of this second accused person was quashed on the basis that he could not have been a party to the offence. As Mr. Justice Johnson stated at p. 5:

There are two things that must be proved before an accused can be convicted of being a party by aiding and abetting. It must first be proved that he had knowledge that the principal intended to commit the offence and that the accused aided and abetted him. Where there is no knowledge that an offence is to be

committed, the presence of an accused at the scene of a crime cannot be a circumstance which would be evidence of aiding and abetting.

Presence alone will not make someone a party to a criminal offence, unless there is understanding about what is taking place and the party remains to encourage or assist the principal in his design: Dunlop and Sylvester v. The Queen, [1979] 2 S.C.R. 881; 47 C.C.C. (2d) 93.

4.12 This is a well-established principle. In the oft-cited case of R. v. Coney, 8 Q.B.D. 534, at pp. 557-558, Mr. Justice Hawkins stated that:

In my opinion, to constitute an aider and abettor some active steps must be taken by word, or action, with the intent to instigate the principal, or principals. Encouragement does not of necessity amount to aiding and abetting, it may be intentional or unintentional, a man may unwittingly encourage another in fact by his presence, by misinterpreted words, or gestures, or by his silence, or non-interference, or he may encourage intentionally by expressions, gestures, or actions intended to signify approval. In the latter case he aids and abets, in the former he does not. It is no criminal offence to stand by, a mere passive spectator of a crime, even of a murder. Non-interference to prevent a crime is not itself a crime. But the fact that a person was voluntarily and purposefully present witnessing the commission of a crime, and offered no opposition to it, though he might reasonably be expected to have prevented it and had the power so to do, or at least to express his dissent, might under some circumstances, afford cogent evidence upon which a jury would be justified in finding that he wilfully encouraged and so aided and abetted.

There is no evidence from any source about some expectation on the part of William Urquhart of criminal activity in taking Pratico's statement. There is also no evidence of any intentional or unintentional encouragement. We further suggest that John Pratico's evidence does not even go so far as to indicate that the alleged counselling would have been apparent to William Urquhart. What did Pratico say to prompt any comment about jail? What did MacIntyre say "in a round about way"?

4.13 Mr. Justice Cave in the same case of Coney, supra, perhaps put the whole issue more colourfully quoting from Foster's Crown Law, at p. 539:

If A. happeneth to be present at a murder, for instance, and taketh no part in it, nor endeavoureth to prevent it, nor apprehendeth the murderer, nor levyeth hue and cry after him, this strange behaviour of his, though highly criminal, will not of itself render him either principal or accessory.

Mr. Justice Kellock in Preston v. The King (1949), 93 C.C.C. 81 (S.C.C.), at p. 90, commented on this citation as follows:

I take it that the word "criminal" is here used in the sense of "morally reprehensible".

It is thus respectfully submitted that even if everything John Pratico says is true, cogent, and reliable, and this Commission assumes that Pratico was obviously counselled to commit perjury during the taking of the statement, the most that can be said about William Urquhart's role is that his passive presence was "morally reprehensible". Urquhart would have no legal duty to intervene.

4.14 We respectfully submit that of course William Urquhart's inactivity cannot even be described as being on so low a moral level. An assessment of Pratico's evidence as a whole must be made. Pratico gave evidence at this Commission that he had visited Wentworth Park in the company of only John MacIntyre before giving the statement (T. v. 12, pp. 2126-2128, 2221). This finds some support in his statement - "I stopped where I showed you" (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 41, 43). However, that comment in the statement is consistent with Pratico being at the Park with MacIntyre and others. At other times before this Commission Pratico testified that he went to Wentworth Park after the June 4 statement but before the Preliminary Hearing, and went with both John MacIntyre and the Crown Prosecutor (T. v. 12, pp. 2078, 2220). John Pratico never was in Wentworth Park with William Urquhart so far as anyone knows. Maynard Chant suggested he had been with Pratico in the Park (T. v. 5, pp. 846-847; T. v. 6, pp. 971-972).

4.15 This Commission may well wish to consider, if as appears likely that there was a visit to the Park before the June 4 statement, when any alleged discussions and alleged threats would reasonably have taken place - in the Park or at the Police Station? If John Pratico was walking MacIntyre through events at the Park, why would Pratico have to be pressured later to repeat what he had already shown MacIntyre? If Pratico had already given MacIntyre a narrative on the scene which was important enough to commit to writing, and which Pratico might be able to

expand upon, why would Pratico need to find out in a round about way later what had happened in the Park?

Conclusion

4.16 It is respectfully submitted that if any alleged discussions and threats occurred, the probability is that they did not occur at the Police Station, which is the only location that William Urquhart had any contact with John Pratico. The statement as it appears in Exhibit 16 (R. v. 16, pp. 43-45) in fact accurately reflects everything that was said from the beginning of the interview when William Urquhart was present until the end. Nothing in the statement itself would give any suggestion that the information being related by John Pratico was known to be false by Pratico or by MacIntyre. The statement itself is internally consistent. There is no recorded statement of hesitation, complaint or fear. Unlike R.C.M.P. statements, there was no free-wheeling unrecorded discussion first. It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that on the whole of the evidence there was no reason for William Urquhart to think that John Pratico's June 4 statement was anything other than a true recounting of what Pratico had observed on Friday, May 28, 1971. As a police officer, it was William Urquhart's duty to receive this kind of information and to act upon it: Chartier v. Attorney General for Quebec (1979), 27 N.R. 1, at pp. 26-27 (S.C.C.). It is respectfully submitted that this should be the conclusion of this Commission as well.

5.0 JUNE 4, 1971 - THE CHANT STATEMENT

The Background on Chant

5.1 Maynard Chant was the witness who was found hitchhiking out of Sydney in the early morning hours of Saturday, May 29, 1971, a blood-drenched shirt in his hands and the comment for the patrolling police officers that "he had seen what happened" (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 6-7), or to go by Chant's own recollection:

I seen it all (T. v. 5, p. 787).

Maynard Chant was taken to the Sydney City Hospital to meet M.R. MacDonald, went to the Police Station, and was picked up by his father there much later in the morning. At the time Chant was 14 years old and lived in Louisbourg.

5.2 On Sunday, May 30, 1971, Chant gave a written statement to John MacIntyre about witnessing a stabbing in the Park by two men both of whom were about six feet tall (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 18-21). Chant gave this statement after sitting on a bench at the Police Station with John Pratico for a considerable length of time, and after having had two encounters with Donald Marshall, Jr. - one that afternoon and one on the night of the stabbing. Other than Donald Marshall, Jr., Maynard Chant was the only eyewitness that the Sydney City Police had until John Pratico gave his second statement on Friday, June 4, 1971. John Pratico's June 4 eyewitness statement did not fit with Maynard Chant's eyewitness statement of May 30, 1971. By

11:30 a.m. on Friday, June 4, it was imperative that the City Police speak again with Maynard Chant (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 42, 43, 44).

What the People Who Were There Say

5.3 Maynard Chant said that having signed the false statement on May 30, 1971, bothered him quite a bit. Even at that, he never really understood, so he says, the impact of what was happening at the time and his first priority was to ease the tension upon himself (T. v. 5, p. 843). However, between May 30 and June 4, 1971, Chant had not discussed his concern with any member of his family (T. v. 5, pp. 846-848). In any event, by June 4, 1971, his parents certainly understood the seriousness of speaking to the police and had admonished Maynard to tell the truth (T. v. 5, p. 849). This was confirmed by Beudah Chant (T. v. 20, pp. 3532-3533).

5.4 Chant does not recall whether he would have still been in school on June 4, 1971, nor does he really recall how he got to the Louisbourg Town Hall that day (T. v. 5, pp. 851-852). Wayne Magee says he alone picked up Maynard and requested his mother to come as well (T. v. 20, p. 3628). Both of Maynard's parents were home at the time and his mother came - but Chant is not able to indicate whether she came of her own initiative or as a result of being asked (T. v. 5, pp. 851-853). Beudah Chant says she was informed that there was an eyewitness to prove Maynard had been there and that Maynard was lying (T. v. 20, p. 3534).

5.5           The interview took place in a big room in the Town Hall with a long table (T. v. 5, p. 853). Louisbourg Police Chief Wayne Magee was there (T. v. 5, p. 853 - Maynard; T. v. 20, p. 3536 - Beudah; T. v. 20, p. 3629 - Magee). Chant's probation officer Larry Burke was there (T. v. 5, p. 853 - Maynard; T. v. 20, p. 3564-3565 and Exhibit 14 - R. v. 14, pp. 1-2 - Beudah; T. v. 20, pp. 3629 - Magee). Two detectives were there dressed in plain clothes - one was MacIntyre and "I still to this day can't recall who the other one was" (T. v. 5, p. 854 - Maynard). Chant's mother went into the big room with him (T. v. 5, p. 853 - Maynard). Larry Burke sat opposite Chant, while Chant's mother sat beside Maynard (T. v. 5, pp. 854-855 - Maynard; T. v. 20, p. 3537 - Beudah) or behind him (T. v. 20, p. 3632 - Magee). The unknown detective sat at the head of the table while MacIntyre was standing (T. v. 5, p. 855) six to eight feet away from Maynard (T. v. 5, pp. 858-859 - Maynard). Magee says Chant was at the head of the table, MacIntyre to one side and Magee on the other (T. v. 20, pp. 3632-3633). Magee say MacIntyre never stood (T. v. 20, p. 3633, 3643) but Urquhart and Burke stood throughout (T. v. 20, p. 3633). Chant does not recall whether Magee was sitting or standing (T. v. 5, pp. 854-855). Burke does not know whether or not he was present and personally believes that he was not (T. v. 20, pp. 3584-3587, 3593).

5.6           Maynard Chant says MacIntyre explained that the statement given on May 30 was believed not to be true and asked whether Chant knew anything else. Chant's mother then told



Maynard to tell the truth. Chant's laconic reply was that:

I didn't see anything (T. v. 5, p. 856),  
meaning or trying to get across that he had not seen anything at  
all. The police reply was:

You must have saw something (T. v. 5, p.  
856).

Wayne Magee says MacIntyre began by advising Beudah Chant that  
they wanted the truth from Maynard Chant which prompted Beudah to  
exhort her son to tell the truth (T. v. 20, pp. 3630-3631).

Magee does not recall any denial of seeing anything (T. v. 20, p.  
3648).

5.7 Chant says he persisted in saying that he had not  
seen anything "more or less to say that I just didn't want  
anything to do with it anymore and I didn't see anything" (T. v.  
5, p. 856). It was MacIntyre's voice that Chant recalled - "very  
hyped" and very loud. Chant said "it was to that probably  
threshold of very frustrated and very persisting that I seen  
something" (T. v. 5, pp. 858-859). Magee recalls no raising of  
voices by anyone (T. v. 20, pp. 3635, 3644-3645).

5.8 Chant states that he was never asked for an  
explanation, nor did he offer one, as to why he had given the  
first untrue statement:

I knew the first statement wasn't true,  
so I had no problem with that. And it  
was evident that they probably had no  
problem with that neither, but I'd never  
even considered saying that the or never  
even considered going into detail that I  
wasn't even there in the Park when the  
thing happened. (T. v. 5, p. 859).

Chant did say that he was probably ashamed at the time about having given the first false statement (T. v. 5, p. 860). Magee says that MacIntyre began by seeking clarification of the first statement in view of discrepancies that had come to light (T. v. 20, pp. 3634-3635).

5.9 After the alleged back and forth about whether Chant had seen anything, MacIntyre is alleged to have told Chant that the police had a witness who had told a story which said that Chant had been at the Park and Chant had seen what that witness had also seen. Chant was reminded that he was on probation, that by lying he was in serious trouble and could go to jail - and it was suggested that Chant could get two to five years for this (T. v. 5, pp. 860-862). Magee did not recall any of this (T. v. 20, pp. 3650-3651). Beudah Chant did not remember any two to five years, but after a leading question about Maynard's probation did state that it was mentioned that Maynard could be charged "if he was lying" (T. v. 20, pp. 3541-3542).

5.10 Chant's mother kept telling him to make sure that Maynard told the truth and was getting upset. Beudah Chant doesn't say she was upset, nor does Magee (T. v. 20, p. 3638). Chant was "just about in tears" himself (T. v. 5, pp. 855-857), or actually had begun to cry (T. v. 5, pp. 862-863). According to Chant, his mother had seen him cry, but only wanted to make sure that he was telling the truth (T. v. 5, p. 863). However, Chant's mother said that if Maynard had been that upset she would not have left (T. v. 20, p. 3541), nor would she have left if she

believed the police were scaring Maynard into a story (T. v. 20, pp. 3555-3556). Magee could only recall that Maynard Chant appeared co-operative (T. v. 20, p. 3637). Magee certainly did not recall any crying (T. v. 20, pp. 3638, 3646).

5.11 As far as his parents were concerned, it had come to the point in Maynard's relationship with them "that I was doing a lot of wrong and I was more or less concealed within myself at that time" (T. v. 5, p. 860). Chant stated to counsel for Donald Marshall, Jr. that if his mother had stayed he would have continued to say that he had not seen anything:

I would just use those words, "I didn't see nothing" (T. v. 6, p. 964).

Maynard Chant's mother recalls nothing of what Maynard said had happened to this point except perhaps what Commission Counsel drew out by leading questions (paragraphs 5.6-5.10, supra):

I know we went in the room and they had talked to him for a bit, but they thought they weren't getting anywheres with him; so they asked me if I would leave. (T. v. 20, pp. 3535, and 3538).

To that point Maynard had "maintained his story that he hadn't seen anything...hadn't seen nothing." (T. v. 20, p. 3539).

5.12 Eventually Maynard Chant's mother left the room when MacIntyre apparently told her that perhaps if she left the room Maynard would say more (T. v. 5, p. 857 - Maynard; T. v. 20, p. 3539 - Beudah). Maynard had no knowledge of any objection by his mother to this (T. v. 5, p. 863). She made none (T. v. 20, p. 3538), and believed Maynard would open up (T. v. 20, pp. 3539-

3540). Beudah Chant is positive that she left (T. v. 20, pp. 3539-3540, 3547). Magee does not recall her leaving (T. v. 20, p. 3633-3634, 3644).

5.13 Chant says that after his mother left, MacIntyre remained standing up, and moving around (T. v. 5, pp. 865-866). Sometimes MacIntyre leaned over the head of the table (T. v. 6, pp. 960-961). MacIntyre repeated that Chant was in an awful lot of trouble, the statement given the first time was not true, that he was on probation, and that Maynard could do time as a result of that (T. v. 5, p. 866).

5.14 Chant said that the mention of perjury and getting two to five years came up, he believed, after his mother left (T. v. 5, p. 862). Still in his direct examination by Commission counsel, Chant retreated and said that the actual word "perjury" had not been literally said at all by the police at the time of the second statement (T. v. 5, p. 865). However, Chant's mother now attributes Maynard's delay in recanting to a fear of perjury impressed upon him at the Town Hall (T. v. 20, p. 3555). That would have to be based on something she has been told since, which casts doubt too on the reliability of any personal knowledge on her part about a mention of probation that day.

5.15 Chant, according to his own evidence, sat back, took in the situation and then said:

Well, what did he say that I seen referring to the person whom the police had said had seen Chant at the Park (T. v. 5, p. 866). Chant is unable to remember any

response from the police (T. v. 5, p. 870).

5.16 Chant described what motivated and directed the statement which he then gave:

At that point in time I just wanted to give a story. ...I just really didn't care anymore (T. v. 5, p. 867).

MacIntyre sat down and:

...from there on in I just give the statement. (T. v. 5, p. 868).

Chant's position was he started to give a statement basically following the lines of the first statement that he had given and figured out for himself where he would have had to be in the Park to see what was going on on the other side of the Park (T. v. 5, pp. 871-873). Chant continued:

I didn't really see what I was doing as being so terribly wrong. I knew I was doing wrong but I thought that I was - at that point in time, it had come into my mind that Marshall was guilty. I don't know where I gathered that information from. Probably because of I heard that....(T. v. 5, pp. 879-880).

Magee testified that questioning with answers commenced immediately after the introductions (T. v. 20, p. 3639).

5.17 Chant introduced material to the statement, such as knowing the dark-haired fellow from dances in Louisbourg "to make the story believable" (T. v. 5, p. 878). Chant said he could have sought some help on the detail, but possibly could have dreamed it up as well (T. v. 5, p. 878). Chant could not remember at the Commission hearings where the detail in the statement actually came from - he could have imagined some of it,

and the rest he could have picked up from his visit to the Park with Pratico (T. v. 5, pp. 846-847; T. v. 6, pp. 971-972) - if that was before the June 4 statement (T. v. 5, pp. 847, 880-882, 884).

5.18 Chant recalls that the giving of this second statement at the Town Hall did not seem to take very long. Beudah Chant says she was only in the hallway about 20 minutes before Maynard came out (T. v. 20, p. 3453). Chant may have looked the statement over but was not a very good reader, leaving aside the fact that he probably could not have read the writing. Chant certainly acknowledged signing the statement and realizing in 1971 that pretty well the whole statement was false (T. v. 5, pp. 892-893). Chant does not recall how he got home, or if his mother had waited for him (T. v. 5, p. 894). She had (T. v. 20, p. 3453).

5.19 Cross-examination by counsel for Donald Marshall, Jr., suggested to Chant that what the police did throughout the statement taken at Louisbourg was to suggest facts and assist Chant in giving a statement that had a ring of truth about it. These points were suggested on the basis that if Chant had not seen the events that he was describing, those facts must have come from the police (e.g., T. v. 6, pp. 967ff.). However, Chant never made a definitive statement that any of the information had come from the police. On some issues Chant pointed out that he did not remember where the information came from (T. v. 6, p. 968), on others that it came from observation in the Park area

when he was there with the police and Pratico (T. v. 6, pp. 969-970), other details were based on his general familiarity with the Park (T. v. 6, p. 971), still other details could have been made up (T. v. 6, p. 973). At times Chant simply did not answer counsel's question as to the source of the detail (T. v. 6, p. 976).

5.20 The exceptions to Chant not linking the details in the statement to the police were in relation to two questions. The first deserves quotation:

Q. Would you have known him [Pratico] if you'd have seen him?

A. Not knowing him, I wouldn't.

Q. That's my point. You're sitting in a meeting in Louisbourg right, and they're telling you about a dark haired fellow, you wouldn't have known whether he was in the police office in Sydney or not that particular dark haired fellow unless the police told you he was there, correct?

A. Yes. (T. v. 6, p. 974).

Pratico's evidence before this Commission was that he sat on a bench with Maynard Chant at the police station on Sunday, May 30, 1971, for a considerable period of time (T. v. 11, pp. 2038, 2043-2044). Chant at the Commission hearings, did not remember if Pratico was at the police station and whether or not Chant saw Pratico there (T. v. 6, p. 974). Chant had also stated on examination by Commission counsel that he did not know John Pratico at all in 1971 (T. v. 5, p. 877) but Chant was with Pratico in the Park (T. v. 5, pp. 846-847; T. v. 6, pp. 971-972).

5.21 Chant did not need to identify the "particular dark haired fellow" as John Pratico in the statement of June 4, 1971. Maynard Chant was in the process of lying, using facts which were culled from his imagination and other sources unknown today. If Pratico's evidence can be believed that he in fact was sitting on a bench with Maynard Chant for some considerable time on the Sunday afternoon, and Chant had seen Pratico again in the Park, there is no reason why Maynard Chant did not choose to simply put this dark-haired person into his statement - just as he put Donald Marshall, Jr. in the position of Seale's killer. It is thus respectfully submitted that upon consideration of these factors alone, Chant's "yes" answer to counsel's assertion that the police had told him the dark haired fellow at the police station was Pratico hiding in the bushes can only be taken as an agreement to the proposition if all of these considerations are proven to be false. It is respectfully submitted that these negatives have not been established in the evidence.

5.22 On the second alleged agreement with the police being Chant's source, Chant "guessed" that the information had come from the police about Pratico hiding in the bushes (T. v. 6, pp. 970, 972). The "yes" answer to the police being the only source came after Chant indicated that he did not know where the information came from if it did not come from the "re-enactment". Given these qualifications by the witness it is respectfully submitted that weight can only be given to this answer once it has been concluded that the so-called "re-



enactment" took place after the June 4, 1971, statement. This Commission has no real evidence from Chant as to when his visit to the Park with Pratico took place. The Commission does have John Pratico's evidence which puts it before Maynard Chant's second statement (T. v. 12, pp. 2126-2128, 2221), and John MacIntyre's evidence that it happened on May 30 (T. v. 32, p. 5996).

5.23 Beudah Chant could not say when it was or where it was but one of the police officers told Maynard that he could not say he saw a knife, only what looked like a knife (T. v. 20, pp. 3558-3559). In doing so, Beudah Chant adopted what she had told the R.C.M.P. in 1982 (Exhibit 14 - R. v. 14, pp. 1-2). However, Beudah Chant did not take this amiss because she thought that Maynard was only young and had never done anything like that before and this person was "just telling him the proper procedure" (T. v. 20, p. 3559). However, there is no different comment about a knife in the second Chant statement than there had been in the first (Compare Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 19, 47).

5.24 Wayne Magee testified that during the question and answer of the statement:

I think perhaps the answer wasn't written down immediately, but they would - they would - they would quiz each other so to speak and for clarification and they would - this is the way the statement was conducted. (T. v. 20, p. 3635).

In phrasing his answer to Commission counsel in this way, Magee had intended to convey questioning as he had described it on a

previous occasion under oath (Exhibit 13 - R. v. 13, pp. 191-192; T. v. 20, pp. 3636-3637). In Magee's view there was nothing unusual about the taking of this statement, again consistent with his evidence previously given under oath (T. v. 20, pp. 3639-3640). Some of the questioning "pertained to events that they had learned after taking the first statement. And he was quizzed on that." (T. v. 20, p. 3645). While a "scene" was not painted, Chant was advised about the location of certain things such as the bridge and the bandshell (T. v. 20, p. 3648). Magee explained:

I believe that Maynard was - he might have been getting confused and he was given advice as to well, you know, this one in this statement didn't say that. You know, what's the situation here or there. It's - I can't recall the specifics of it but I'm - you know, that was the gist of it. They were - there may be five minutes or two minutes or a minute and a half of questioning before an answer was written down. (T. v. 20, p. 3649).

Magee could not recall any references made to specific individuals, names, or their statements. Magee recalled no other statements being produced. No suggestions were made to Maynard by Detective MacIntyre about what Maynard had seen. If Detective MacIntyre did not feel that the answer was correct, he might only ask the question again (T. v. 20, pp. 3649-3650). It was very straightforward in Magee's opinion and there was certainly no arguing (T. v. 20, p. 3650). Wayne Magee's final opinion was that at the conclusion of the interview he had no reason to believe that Maynard Chant had misled the police (T. v. 20, p.

3651):

It is my recollection that the statement was taken in a proper manner. I do not recall any unusual situations occurring as to raising of voices or threatening of perjury or people leaving the room. I - as far as Maynard is concerned I'd known him for a number of years, nothing sticks out in my mind that would lead me to believe that he was in fact lying that day. In my opinion everything was very, very cordial and easy going. (T. v. 20, p. 3657).

5.25 During cross-examination by counsel for Donald Marshall, Jr. Wayne Magee agreed that while every word that was said in the Town Hall may not have been written down, John MacIntyre did not give Chant information about the crime other than with respect to locations of things at the scene, such as the Bandshell (T. v. 20, pp. 3648-3649, 3664-3665, 3671). This was confirmed in later cross-examination (T. v. 20, pp. 3681-3683, 3688-3689).

#### Urquhart's Role

5.26 In relation to Chant's second statement which was taken at the Louisbourg Town Hall on June 4, 1971 (Exhibit 31), Chant indicated that besides his mother, Burke, Magee, and MacIntyre, there was another detective sitting at the head of the table (T. v. 5, pp. 854-855). To the date of these Commission hearings, Chant could not say who this unknown policeman was, except that he wore a suit (T. v. 5, p. 854). Beudah Chant does not know Urquhart (T. v. 20, p. 3537).

5.27 In his 1982 Affidavit (Exhibit 12 - R. v. 12, p. 53) Chant had said that he gave the statement to MacIntyre and

Urquhart because of pressure from MacIntyre and Urquhart. Chant explained at the Commission hearings that the pressure referred to was MacIntyre saying that Chant must have seen something (T. v. 5, p. 943). As for Detective Urquhart, Chant stated that:

I just - I'm very sorry for implicating him there. I just - I don't - I just - I was categorizing them as one in the same as far as them both being - feeling a sense of fear from both of them as just as far as them being "The Law" and me being - and just as far as me being - them being "The Law" and me being the -

Q. Did you, in fact, feel any pressure exerted on you by Detective Urquhart?

A. I don't know. I can't remember. Even though I had given a statement to reference to it I was - (T. v. 6, pp. 943-944).

5.28

In relation to a further paragraph in that 1982 Affidavit about having been told that he was seen in the Park by another witness, the following exchange took place between Commission counsel and Maynard Chant:

Q. Did Sergeant Urquhart tell you that you had been seen by another witness?

A. I don't really know. I know I've given a statement to that he did. Possibly when the interview was being - or when the statement was being taken - only up to this point do I recognize the other name as being - Mr. Urquhart as being one of the ones that was with Mr. MacIntyre. Only now do I realize in the statement that I'm giving that I'm implying him and -

Q. Can you tell us how that statement came about in the Affidavit?

A. It's - Well, I just - I was just

giving a general statement, to the both of them. I should have been a little more specific. I wasn't being really specific to who was applying the pressure. I was - I've always had an opinion that they were both - Growing up I've always had the opinion that they were both applying the pressure. Maybe that's why the statement occurred that way.

BY MR. CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do I understand you've changed your opinion now?

A. Pardon me, sir.

Q. Do I understand you have changed your opinion now?

A. Yes.

Q. Is this the first time you've changed your opinion, today?

A. I believe so.

Q. Why have you changed your opinion today?

A. Simply because looking back on it I don't remember the other officer really applying any - really - I remember being - Mr. MacIntyre being the dominant one as far as doing all the talking and stuff like that. (T. v. 6, pp. 944-945).

In 1982 Chant did not even know Urquhart's name until he was told (T. v. 6, p. 946). The "other" police officer was simply there (T. v. 5, pp. 854-855, 1056).

5.29 On cross-examination by counsel for Donald Marshall, Jr., Chant did confirm that back in 1971 he viewed MacIntyre and Urquhart as being a team and "I didn't distinguish the difference" (T. v. 6, pp. 964-965). However, Chant followed

this up by saying that MacIntyre did most of the talking - and in his entire evidence to this Commission the only other person he identifies as speaking during this time at the Town Hall is his mother. Wayne Magee's evidence was the same (T. v. 20, pp. 3630-3631, 3635).

### The Issue

5.30 William Urquhart had never met Maynard Chant prior to June 4, 1971, and Chant had no knowledge of who Urquhart was. What Urquhart would have known and must have known was that Chant had given an eyewitness statement of the stabbing which, so far as identifying an accused, was not specific. After the Pratico statement on June 4, 1971, it was obviously necessary to speak with Chant again as the statement he had given on May 30 did not sit with the statement of John Pratico on June 4, 1971.

5.31 If Chant had been telling the truth on May 30, what Pratico had said on June 4 was not correct. If what Pratico had said on June 4 was correct, then Chant must not have told the truth. While there is always the possibility that the statements of witnesses do not fit together because neither of them is telling the truth, a police officer has an obligation only to reject evidence which he knows to be unreliable: Chartier v. Attorney General for Quebec (1979), 27 N.R. 1, at pp. 26-27 (S.C.C.). It was incumbent upon William Urquhart as an assisting police officer to attempt to uncover the truth - what was reliable - and this entailed interviewing Maynard Chant a second time. Urquhart's role was to participate as a silent observer.

5.32 Chant says his first approach at the Louisbourg Town Hall was to say that he did not see anything. Chant acknowledged in evidence before this Commission that he had indeed been involved in some of the events that took place on that evening, so to say that he had not seen anything was not entirely correct. What Chant meant by telling the police in Louisbourg that he had not seen anything was that he had not seen anything about a knife going in (T. v. 6, p. 1054). Chant acknowledged that the officers questioning him in Louisbourg would have had no idea from what he was saying (when he said he had not seen anything) that he was referring to the stabbing as opposed to the general scene of events in which he was known to have been involved (T. v. 6, p. 1054). These officers knew Chant had originally offered himself as an eyewitness. If Chant indeed had seen nothing, why had he taken the initiative to say he had seen a stabbing?

5.33 Chant's real motive in stating that he had seen nothing was to avoid involvement in the case at all (T. v. 6, p. 1055), perhaps a not unusual reaction for a witness (Compare T. v. 30, p. 5618). This pressure on him to avoid involvement came primarily from within himself (T. v. 6, pp. 1055-1056). This would have been no reason for the police to simply abandon questioning Chant - who had taken the initiative on May 30 to proffer himself as an eyewitness.

5.34 It is known in light of all of the evidence that during the taking of the Louisbourg statement from Maynard Chant,

William Urquhart conducted himself appropriately as any witnessing officer would on any statement from a witness as special and crucial to an investigation as Maynard Chant had made himself out to be. William Urquhart remained silent and effectively detached from the statement-taking itself.

5.35 Thus, it is respectfully submitted that if any criticism is to be made of William Urquhart's participation in this statement, it would have to be on the basis that improprieties were obvious and apparent to William Urquhart which are not reflected in the statement which William Urquhart signed. As with the Pratico statement of June 4, 1971, it is respectfully submitted that William Urquhart had no legal duty to intervene unless some illegality was anticipated by him which became apparent in the course of taking the statement: (Paragraphs 4.10 - 4.13, supra). The real question for this Commission is whether there was anything morally or ethically wrong in the conduct of William Urquhart which led to the securing of this statement from Maynard Chant.

#### Urquhart's Duty

5.36 In 1971 just as today the law is clear that an out of Court statement by a witness, oral or written, sworn or not sworn, is not admissible upon a trial of a criminal offence for the truth of the assertions contained in it: Deacon v. The King (1947), 89 C.C.C. 1 (S.C.C.). [Statutory exceptions to this rule do exist which do not apply here: e.g., Criminal Code, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-34, s. 643.] Some of the reasons for this were



explained by Mr. Justice Rand in Deacon, supra, at p. 7 as based on "the long experience of the Courts" that such out of Court statements are made under circumstances where there is not opportunity for cross-examination and free rein may exist for omission or fabrication given the context of circumstances which exists at the time when the out of Court statement was made. To permit an out of Court statement to be admitted for the truth of its contents would expose an accused person to an entirely fabricated account of events. However, to not permit such statements to be admitted to test the credibility of a witness would similarly expose an accused to an account of events fabricated for the first time at trial. Thus, the use of such statements must be limited in Court to the question of the reliability of the witness who is asserting a certain account of events - in other words, credibility.

5.37 That is the rule which the Courts have chosen to use as the most practical in the truth seeking process. The same rule applies today: R. v. Gillingham, (1981), 65 C.C.C. (2nd) 42 (N.S.S.C., A.D.). This is the critical difference between a statement made orally or in writing by an accused person and that made by an ordinary witness (see generally: Kaufman, F.; The Admissibility of Confessions (3d ed.), The Carswell Company Limited (Toronto, 1979) ).

5.38 If a witness gives a different account of events before the Court than he had earlier given out of Court, the witness may be questioned about the previous statement for the

purpose of either refreshing memory, expanding the evidence of the witness, or contradicting the witness for the purpose of credibility. Clearly the opportunity exists when such questioning occurs in the course of a trial for the witness to deny ever having made the statement, or to explain, modify and contradict in turn important particulars of the contents of the written statement. The witness may, when the statement is put to him, acknowledge that it is the truth even though he had already testified to the contrary or omitted to say things contained in the statement. In the latter case the witness adopts as the truth previous statements made by him and recorded. The witness' adoption of the previous statement makes the previous statement evidence given under oath - which will be subject to the full rigours of cross-examination.

5.39 One example of witnesses going both ways on previous statements is the case of R. v. Antoine (1949), 94 C.C.C. 106 (B.C.C.A.). The only conclusion which may be reached applying to all out of court statements from witnesses who are not accused persons is that the statement has no practical or direct effect upon the guilt or innocence of an accused person unless the witness adopts the account given as the truth.

5.40 In addition to statements being available for use in criminal trial proceedings for these various purposes, depending upon the response of the witness once he gets to Court, a statement is primarily an investigative aid as to what a particular person may say if called to give evidence under

oath. No witness can ever be compelled to assert as the truth something that he has told the police or some other third party, but there should be tis memorandum of what a witness has said he can say.

5.41 It follows from these comments that the police investigating a crime have a responsibility to get the most complete and reliable account possible from a witness. If the police do not pursue the lead which produces an initially reluctant witness, then the police could properly be criticized for not discharging their duty to detect crime and apprehend those responsible, as well as to test the reliability of other evidence which may have been gathered in the course of the investigation. The police also have a responsibility to the witness and the judicial process to ensure that a witness statement is as complete as possible so that apparently reliable evidence is not discredited unfairly.

5.42 For example, in R. v. Coll (1889), 24 L.R.Ir. 522, the witness had made a deposition giving an account of the alleged crime without connecting Coll's name with it, and on cross-examination this was emphasized. The Crown then tendered in evidence another statement made by the same witness in which Coll was mentioned as taking part in the alleged crime. Mr. Justice Holmes stated, at p. 542 that:

Now, this is consistent with a casual omission, arising from momentary oversight, or with the view that the witness had afterwards invented the charge against Coll, under the influence of some wicked motive. I presume that if

the cross-examining counsel had expressed this imputation in a direct question the witness would not merely been at liberty to deny it, but also to have shown that it was not the true inference to be drawn from the passage in the deposition, by proving that he had previously told how Coll was a party to the attack. But skillful counsel do not always deal in direct imputation. The same effect can be produced in even a more striking way by delicate suggestion. The cross-examination of the previous day; the renewal of it on the apparent inconsistency, the three questions that followed, and the subsequent attempt to show that the witness, when before the magistrates, had shaped his evidence in accordance with the suggestion of others, all taken together, convey as clearly as any language could, that Varilly had, subsequent to the month of March, fabricated the story about Coll. This was the opinion of the Judge, who had the opportunity of hearing and seeing all that happened at the trial; and it is impossible for me to come to any other conclusion. That being so, I am of the opinion that the evidence to show that Varilly had made the charge against Coll at an earlier date was clearly legitimate.

as quoted in R. v. St. Lawrence (1949), 93 C.C.C. 376, at pp. 379-380.

5.43           Indeed, a very similar situation had arisen in St. Lawrence, supra, where the Crown sought to introduce evidence that an eyewitness had identified the accused shortly after the event. This evidence was opposed by the Defence. Mr. Justice McRuer explained the matter this way:

The crime was committed on Saturday night. The witness Parrington was cross-examined at considerable length to show that when the police interviewed him on Sunday he denied knowing anything about

it. On Monday, an item appeared in the morning paper indicating that the accused, who had been detained for questioning, had been released, and stating that one Cox had told the police that he had seen Parrington leaning over the deceased. Counsel for the accused asked Parrington a question of this character: "Why did you change your tune?" and directed the witness's attention to the item that appeared in the morning newspaper and suggested to him that he had become afraid that the crime might be "pinned on him". He then put to the witness the question: "Then you thought you had better tell a different story?" a portion of the transcript of the evidence was given at the preliminary hearing was read and the witness was asked to state whether he had been asked these questions and made these answers. The important ones read as follows:

"Q. Why you became frightened they might pin it on you?

A. That is right.

Q. It was then you decided the man running across that distance was St. Lawrence. Is that right?

A. That is right."

It is clear to me that the cross-examination was intended to suggest that the witness did not have it in his mind until Monday that the accused man was the man he saw on the night of the crime, and that his failure to identify him with the crime earlier, or to acknowledge that he had seen him at or near the scene of the crime, was because such was not the fact, and the story was a fabrication.

I think if the case were left in its present position it would be clearly open to argue to the jury that Parrington's story, insofar as it implicated the accused, was an after thought and concocted for the purpose of shielding

himself.

The evidence is admissible, not as proof of the fact stated but merely as proof that the witness connected the accused with the crime on Saturday night, notwithstanding that he did not disclose this information to the police when interviewed on Sunday. (Emphasis added)

R. v. St. Lawrence, supra, at pp. 380-381. If the previous identification was adopted by Parrington, that would be evidence, which now given under oath, would destroy an insinuation of recent invention. If not adopted as the truth, it would cast doubt on the reliability and significance of the omission.

5.44 It is respectfully submitted that the police would be doing the pursuit of justice and the witness' own reliability a disservice if they were not complete in determining what exactly the witness recollection of events was. Failure to be complete with respect to all critical aspects of the witness' personal knowledge could serve to expose a witness and the Court to a misrepresentation of the reliability of the witness.

5.45 It is worthwhile referring to one further case: R. v. Pelletier (1973), 13 C.C.C. (2nd) 266 (B.C.C.A.). That case involved a situation where a witness admitted telling the police everything that the police had recorded that he had said. The Court explained at p. 273:

In effect, his earlier statements were accepted by him and were admitted as true under oath. However, although testifying that all the way through his statements to the police he had referred to the second man who drove the pick-up truck as "Pelletier", he hastened to add that he had used that name only because Corporal

MacDougall had mentioned it as the name of the second man while they were driving to the airport in Montreal, and not because he knew or had known the second man by that name. He pointed out that he had had the Corporal record in the notebook in which the conversation was recorded that he had been using the name "Pelletier" only because he had been told that that was the name of the man he was discussing. It is clear that this so as such a note was found, and initialled, in the officer's notebook.

The legal effect of this evidence was summarized:

Having regard to the five years that had passed since the occurrence and four years in the case of the statements there was amazing consistency. Really all that was new that was elicited from the cross-examination on the statements was the use of the name "Pelletier". The witness explained that use and that explanation was the subject of rebuttal. If the jury accepted the officer's evidence that he did not mention the name "Pelletier", then they could only conclude that the witness' explanation of the use of the name was untrue or he got the information elsewhere or he did in fact know the man's name. I think the Judge should have told the jury that, if they disbelieved Corbin's explanation, the fact that he had used the name "Pelletier" in the statement adopted under oath did not prove that he appellant was the man who did the things that the witness said were done. But, by the same token, I cannot conceive of the jury failing to reach that conclusion without any instruction. It would be completely obvious to them that the issue or dispute as to the explanation so rebutted involved nothing more than the credibility of Corbin and whether he was or was not telling the truth when he said he did not know Romeo Pelletier and the appellant was not the man whom he called Pelletier and who was involved in the crime.

5.46           Applying these principles to the Chant statement of June 4, 1971, it is obvious that "evidence" was not being manufactured. What was being recorded as Maynard Chant's answers was not even "evidence". All that the June 4, 1971 statement would be, was, and remains, a record of Maynard Chant's responses on a given day to certain questions which at the time were to be taken as indications of the evidence which he might give at a trial. There was no obligation on Maynard Chant at any time just as there was no obligation on John Pratico or any other witness, to adhere to an unsworn statement to the police. The only obligation which rested upon Maynard Chant and Maynard Chant alone on June 4, 1971, was to not mislead the police and thereby set on foot a criminal proceeding.

5.47           When John MacIntyre and William Urquhart went to Louisburg on June 4, 1971 they were entitled to the truth from Maynard Chant, just as John MacIntyre had been entitled to the truth from Maynard Chant on May 30, 1971. The police were under an obligation to ensure that any statement that Maynard Chant gave would reflect accurately the statement he was willing to give at that time and which contained Chant's recollection of events in as complete a way as possible.

5.48           It is respectfully submitted that when John MacIntyre and William Urquhart went to Louisburg on June 4, 1971 it would have been irresponsible of them, without making some firm inquiry, to accept Maynard Chant's initial reaction that he had seen nothing. Chant on two previous occasions had told a



total of at least three members of the Sydney City Police that he had seen everything - first the very night of the stabbing, and second when he described his apparent recollection in more detail on May 30, 1971.

5.49 William Urquhart's duty given his role as statement witness would have been to observe what Maynard Chant wished to say and did say, ensure that the statement reflected what Chant asserted as to what he saw, and that the final statement contained what William Urquhart honestly believed was the true and most complete possible recounting of Maynard Chant's personal knowledge of the events of Friday, May 28, 1971. It is respectfully submitted that William Urquhart fulfilled his duty and never had any legal or moral obligation, or indeed reason, to intervene in the taking of Maynard Chant's June 4, 1971 statement.

#### Conclusion

5.50 It is respectfully submitted that this Commission in assessing the June 4, 1971 statement of Maynard Chant should accept the evidence of William Urquhart, John MacIntyre, Wayne Magee, and Beudah Chant that the commencement of the taking of the statement from Maynard Chant was not the great trauma described in Maynard Chant's evidence. Whatever Maynard Chant may have felt within himself as a result of his recent history of dealing with the "Law" and the shame of even having his own mother admonishing him to tell the truth when he knew that he had lied in his first statement, William Urquhart cannot be held

responsible for these internal and unexpressed feelings.

5.51 Contrary to what Maynard says, there was no crying or near crying while his mother was present (T. v. 20, p. 3541), and while Beudah Chant was present the police were not intimidating Maynard into a story (T. v. 20, pp. 3555-3556). Even Maynard Chant says that there were no threats of perjury at any time, nor any mention of jail for two to five years while his mother was present (T. v. 5, pp. 862-865). That this statement taking was not a traumatic event maybe inferred also from the total absence of recollection displayed by Larry Burke. Everyone who was present at the Louisburg Town Hall on June 4, 1971 testified that Larry Burke was present for the taking of Maynard Chant's statement - with the exception of Larry Burke. No one testified that Larry Burke left the room where the statement was being taken at any time. The fact that Larry Burke has no recollection, even though he was just new to his position as a Probation Officer and who would not in any event have many opportunities to sit in on a witness statement taken in the course of a criminal investigation, strongly suggests that the statement was as Wayne Magee described it - "everything was very, very cordial and easy going" (T. v. 20, p. 3657).

5.52 Should this Commission prefer the evidence of Maynard Chant and Beudah Chant to that of John MacIntyre and William Urquhart on the point of whether or not Beudah Chant left the room, it is respectfully submitted that it becomes more difficult for this Commission to reasonably conclude that there

was any wrong doing with respect to the statement. Beudah Chant says she was only out of the room for approximately twenty minutes before Maynard was finished, and Chant himself recalled that the giving of the second statement did not seem to take very long. The statement itself is in excess of three full hand written legal size pages. Chant has not alleged that anything was written down which he did not say or that questions were written down which were not asked. Given what this Commission may conclude about the time it takes to write out by hand a dictated statement there would not be much, if any, time left for suggestions or promptings or threats of jail. We respectfully submit that for this reason this Commission must have extreme doubt that any threats of any kind occurred. Certainly no one who is alleged to have remained in the room (other than Maynard) recalls such threats.

5.53           With respect to alleged prompting, Chant's evidence is that when he finally asked the police what this other witness said that Chant had seen there was no response so far as Maynard Chant could recall (T. v. 5, p. 870). Chant's evidence did not categorically indicate that any of the information in the statement came from the Sydney City Police. Wayne Magee's evidence was that Maynard Chant was assisted with locations but not with respect to the substance of the crime in issue. Certainly no one has suggested in evidence that John MacIntyre suggested or prompted that Donald Marshall, Jr. was the perpetrator of the offence.

5.54           The Commission may ask what it is to make of Wayne Magee's recollection that at times an answer would not be written down immediately, and the fact that there may be "five minutes of two minutes or a minute and a half of questioning before an answer was written down". Magee did say that that sometimes John MacIntyre would simply repeat the question that he had asked, indicating that there was an uncertain or delayed response from Maynard.

5.55           It is respectfully submitted that even if this Commission goes the step of finding that there were discussions about locations in the Park, and that these obviously are not written down, there is still no cause to criticize William Urquhart' position with respect to this statement. Maynard Chant had been Wentworth Park before, and may well have been there with John MacIntyre some time between the day of the stabbing and the date of the June 4, 1971 statement, as Pratico's evidence indicates. If Chant was at times apparently confused about the physical locations involved it would be appropriate for the police to have corrected any misapprehension which was not an indication of lack of personal knowledge. The only fault that could be found with William Urquhart in that event would be that his recollection of the Maynard Chant statement has been influenced by too high a standard for a witness statement - that every word was written down. Urquhart's recollection holds him to a higher duty than did the law - then or now.

5.56           In the result, it is respectfully submitted that

this Commission should disbelieve Maynard Chant when he says that he was openly threatened with jail at the time his second statement was taken by the Sydney City Police. One might speculate why that particular allegation never surfaced until the second time that the R.C.M.P. took a statement from Maynard Chant in April, 1982 (Exhibit 99 - R. v. 34, pp. 47-48, 81-83). It is sufficient to conclude here without making any further allegations that no wrong doing with respect to William Urquhart's participation in the June 4, 1971 statement has been made out to the extent of the slightest probability - whether or not Maynard Chant regarded John MacIntyre and William Urquhart as a team or not.

6.0 JUNE 4, 1971 - MARSHALL ARREST

Authority to Arrest

6.1 On completion of the Maynard Chant statement of June 4, 1971 at Louisbourg which, like the Pratico statement of earlier in the day, identified Donald Marshall as the killer of Sandy Seale, the police had two eyewitness statements pointing to one accused person. These statements were taken to the Crown who directed the laying of a charge, which John MacIntyre did. A warrant for the arrest of Donald Marshall, Jr., was sworn, so MacIntyre and William Urquhart proceeded to execute it.

Arresting Marshall

6.2 MacIntyre and Urquhart first went to Membertou. Donald Marshall, Jr.'s brother indicated that Donald was at Baddeck (T. v. 54, p. 9886). Arriving at the Baddeck R.C.M.P. Detachment, MacIntyre and Urquhart saw the officer in charge in relation to assistance which might be given in locating Donald Marshall, Jr. (T. v. 52, p. 9540).

6.3 Corporal Stan Clarke testified before this Commission and recalled assisting MacIntyre and Urquhart arrest Donald Marshall at Whycocomagh (T. v. 38, p. 7004). Based upon his notes (Exhibit 87), Clarke testified that the Marshall family had been staying at the home of John Googoo who had died a few weeks previously. It appears from Constable Clarke's evidence that MacIntyre and Urquhart explained to him something about the case in view of the fact that Clarke had notes about the

statement which Donald Marshall had originally given to the police.

6.4 Clarke, MacIntyre and Urquhart went to Whycocomagh in an R.C.M.P. vehicle and were directed to the Googoo home. MacIntyre and Clarke got out of the vehicle, Donald Marshall, Jr. was contacted, asked to get a jacket, and then escorted to the police vehicle. Clarke held open the back door for Donald Marshall, Jr. (T. v. 38, pp. 7004-7007). Clarke does not recall that Urquhart got out of the R.C.M.P. vehicle at Whycocomagh at any time (T. v. 38, p. 7012).

6.5 Urquhart was sitting in the rear seat of the R.C.M.P. vehicle behind the driver. Just after Marshall got into the car Detective Urquhart helped Marshall to re-bandage his arm (T. v. 38, p. 7010).

6.6 The four drove to the highway at which time the "standard police caution" and the warrant were read to Donald Marshall by John MacIntyre (T. v. 38, pp. 7007-7008). At that point William Urquhart handcuffed Marshall in accordance with standard practice for the safety of all occupants (T. v. 38, pp. 7008, 7012). The R.C.M.P. vehicle would not have had a screen between front and back seats and the rear doors would have been operable from inside the vehicle (T. v. 38, p. 7012). Donald Marshall hunched himself over, sobbed, and when he was told to sit up by John MacIntyre, Marshall made his only statement of that trip:

I did not do it. (T. v. 38, p. 7009)

6.7 Upon arriving back at the Baddeck Detachment, Clarke searched Marshall (T. v. 38, pp. 7009-7010). MacIntyre and Urquhart left Baddeck with Marshall at approximately 8:50 p.m. (T. v. 38, p. 7010). Upon the return of MacIntyre, Urquhart and Marshall to Sydney, Marshall was placed in the care of Wyman Young in the Courtroom at the old Sydney Police Station (T. v. 17, p. 3099) before being remanded to the County Jail over the weekend. There is no further comment in the evidence about any involvement of William Urquhart at this time.

#### The Exculpatory Utterance

6.8 It has been suggested by counsel for Donald Marshall, Jr. - perhaps more so with respect to John MacIntyre than William Urquhart - that some notation ought to have been made of the exculpatory statement made according to the notes of Corporal Clarke (T. v. 38, p. 7009) but which William Urquhart could not recall (T. v. 52, p. 9541). The assertion by counsel for Donald Marshall, Jr., which was agreed by Corporal Clarke, was that "an honest police officer" would be expected "to note any statements protesting innocence", "and to write them down so that they could be available for trial later if required" (T. v. 38, p. 7011). Donald Marshall, Jr., had already given one exculpatory statement (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 17). Doubtless such a comment as was reported by Corporal Clarke is common for persons suddenly charged with a serious, or any, offence.

6.9 The legal position was clear in 1971 and remains so today. An exculpatory statement given by an accused person some



time after the alleged offence need not be produced in evidence by the prosecution: e.g., R. v. Adams, MacAllister and Stables (1956), 117 C.C.C. 93 (N.S.S.C.), nor may it be introduced into evidence simply at the motion or on questioning by the Defence: e.g., R. v. Blondin (1970), 2 C.C.C. (2d) 118 (B.C.C.A.). A more recent application appears in R. v. Simpson and Ochs (1983), 6 C.C.C. (3d) 516 (B.C.C.A.). A self-serving statement upon arrest is nothing more than an early plea of not guilty. There are of course exceptions which would not apply here - for example, to rebut an argument of recent fabrication. Whether this evidentiary rule is for good or ill is a question for the Courts or perhaps this Commission to consider. With respect to William Urquhart, it cannot be said that there was any obligation upon him to note or remember this comment by Donald Marshall, Jr. Indeed, it appears John MacIntyre made a note about Clarke's involvement which could have led to discovery of the exculpatory utterance if someone had thought it relevant in 1971 (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 133-134).

### Analysis

6.10 It is respectfully submitted that the arrest of Donald Marshall, Jr. is a clear example of William Urquhart assisting in the investigation of the Seale murder to the best of his ability, in a spirit of fairness towards those with whom he comes into contact, but also exercising all reasonable vigour to ensure that the public interest in the effective enforcement of the law is achieved. While this incident has no real continuing

significance in the wrongful conviction of Donald Marshall, Jr., it does give this Commission an independent perspective of William Urquhart's approach to his duties. It is respectfully submitted that this Commission will want to weigh Corporal Clarke's detailed notes heavily in considering the probabilities of how William Urquhart conducted himself where independent evidence is not so available. William Urquhart's conduct was appropriate and fair given the role which he was expected to perform at the time.

7.0 JUNE - 1971: POST-CHARGE INTERVIEWS GENERALLY

June 4-13, 1971

7.1 On the evening of June 4, 1971, there was a incident involving John Pratico, Tom Christmas and Howard Hawkins. As a result of a complaint received from Mrs. Practico, the Police became involved on the understanding that John Pratico had been threatened during this encounter with Tom Christmas. Ambrose McDonald testified that on June 4 he and Richard Walsh were told to be on lookout for Tom and John Christmas as well as Lawrence Paul for the purpose of arresting them on the offence of obstruction of justice (T. v. 7, pp. 1140-1141; and Exhibit 33). Tom Christmas testified that the next morning he was picked up at home by William Urquhart and John MacIntyre, and then released to appear in court the next Monday, June 7, 1971 (T. v. 23, pp. 4180-4183). A notation confirming this appears in McDonald's notes (Exhibit 33).

June 14, 1971

7.2 It appears from the documentary evidence available that William Urquhart continued to have some involvement in identifying potential witnesses and interviewing them over the next several weeks. The only date which can be fixed in William Urquhart's notes (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 135-143) appears to be June 14, 1971 (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 140). That evening it would appear that he arranged to interview Maria Sophocleous

who was the third one on the list which we have suggested was made up on Wednesday, June 2, 1971 (Paragraphs 3.15 - 3.18, supra; Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 135). It appears that while Sophocleous was in the park at about 11:50 p.m., she saw nothing. However, she identified people that she was with, and brought to the attention of the Police the names of other persons - including Patricia Harriss.

7.3 After interviewing Maria Sophocleous at 7:15 p.m. there is further documentation to indicate that William Urquhart went to interview Brian Doucet who lived on Crescent Street and who had gone to the hospital with Leo Curry. Doucet's was the fifth name on Urquhart's list of potential witnesses (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 136). There is a notation beside Doucet's name of "745 P.M.", and Doucet's formal statement is indicated as beginning on June 14, 1971 at 7:55 p.m. (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 61-62). That statement was completed at 8:20 p.m. The timing of the Sophocleous interview and Doucet statement indicate that the other time notations in Urquhart's notes for potential witnesses Margaret McDonald, Patricia Ware and Karen McDonald must have related to at least two other evenings of work (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 135, 136).

#### Robert Patterson

7.4 At some point after the stabbing incident the Sydney City Police must have determined that it was important to talk to Robert Patterson, who originally had been described in Donald Marshall Jr.'s May 30 statement as drunk and in the Park:

We met Bob Patterson. He was drunk. We asked him if he knew us and he called us by name. We told him to sit down. (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 17).

John Pratico's first statement had also referred to "Bobby Robert Patterson" identifying the two people running from the direction of the screaming being from "Toronto Saints Choice Bike Gang" (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 22). Patterson's name was initially not included on the numbered list of individuals whose names appeared from earlier statements (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 135 - 136, 139). Given the lack of fruitfulness of the statements taken on the afternoon and evening of June 2, and those taken on June 3, 1971, a judgment must have been made to speak with Patterson to see whether he could provide any information at all. Urquhart added Patterson's name at the top of the list of names of potential witnesses. The absence of a first name could indicate that Urquhart was familiar with who Patterson was.

7.5 There is no notation or other documentation indicating that Robert Patterson was ever interviewed by the Sydney City Police and indeed the evidence before this Commission is that the Sydney City Police were unable to locate him in 1971 (T. v. 33, pp. 6010-6021; T. v. 52, pp. 9548-9563; 9565-9567). Incidentally, this Commission also has evidence that Robert Patterson could not be found in 1982 by the R.C.M.P. even though witnesses were found in such far places as Boston and Calgary (T. v. 41, pp. 7520, 7544-7546).

7.6 Robert Patterson was found by the investigators for this Commission. Patterson testified that he left school in

1970 or 1971, and during 1971 was delivering for Davis Market in Sydney, spending most of the rest of his time in Wentworth Park or at the Pool Hall on Charlotte Street (T. v. 55, pp. 10009, 10012-10013). On the night of May 28, 1971, Patterson describes himself as having been "pretty loaded" (T. v. 55, p. 10016). Despite being around Sydney as he says, and being close friends with Patricia Harriss, Terry Gushue, Donald Marshall Jr., Frankie French, Artie Paul and others, Patterson did not hear about the stabbing or the death of Sandy Seale until after Donald Marshall Jr., was charged (T. v. 55, p. 10018). Patterson had gone to sleep on one of the benches in the Park and had seen nothing (T. v. 55, p. 10014).

7.7 At some point two uniformed Police Officers picked up Patterson and took him to the Police Station. At the Police Station Patterson was met in the Detective Office by William Urquhart and John MacIntyre (T. v. 55, p. 10019). Patterson described the Detective's office as one room without a stenographer (T. v. 55, p. 10052).

7.8 Patterson says that the first thing that happened was that he was handcuffed to a chair and then MacIntyre began questioning him (T. v. 55, p. 10020). One or two sets of handcuffs were used (T. v. 55, pp. 10062-10064). "Bill Urquhart meanwhile had gotten up and left the room." (T. v. 55, p. 10021). About 10 or 15 minutes later William Urquhart came back into the room with "a statement already typed out". Nothing was ever handwritten (T. v. 55, p. 10059):

Bill Urquhart said to me, he says, "Okay, sign this." And I said "What is it?" And he said, "Just a statement saying that you've...you were with Jr., and you saw Jr., doing the stabbing." And I said, "I'm sorry, but I'm not signing that." I said "because I wasn't even with Jr., that night, I didn't even see him." Like I said I don't even remember seeing him that night. (T. v. 55, pp. 10021-10022).

The statement was 2 or 3 pages long (T. v. 55, pp. 10059).

Urquhart refused to let Patterson read it (T. v. 55, pp. 10060).

7.9 At that point Urquhart and MacIntyre both went outside, leaving Patterson handcuffed to the chair. Later they both came back in and Urquhart watched as MacIntyre was "slapping" Patterson around again (earlier beating had occurred out of Urquhart's presence) for two or three hours, "maybe a little longer" (T. v. 55, p. 10022). However, later he revised this estimate to total time of 15 minutes of being slapped around (T. v. 55, p. 10061). Urquhart played the "sympathy copy" (T. v. 55, p. 10058).

7.10 As Patterson persisted in his refusal to sign, eventually the handcuffs were unlocked and Patterson was told to "get the hell out" (T. v. 55, pp. 10022-10023). Patterson estimated that he had been taken to the Police Station just after getting up in the morning before breakfast and not was released until sometime after lunch at about two o'clock (T. v. 55, p. 10028).

7.11 Patterson made no complaint about this incident, not to his mother, nor to Donald Marshall, Jr. when they were both in the County jail later that year (T. v. 55, pp.

10067,10071-10072). Patterson could not recall ever having been physically abused at any other time, either by the Sydney Police or any other Police (T. v. 55, p. 10023). On cross-examination, Patterson went back on his earlier assertion that he had never been manhandled by either the Sydney Police or any other Police (T. v. 55, pp. 10046-10051, 10072). Indeed, he said he had been manhandled on many occasions.

7.12 On an initial level, the identification of William Urquhart as a participant in the events described by Robert Patterson is insufficiently grounded in objectively verifiable characteristics. We submit that it would be unsafe for this Commission to conclude that William Urquhart was involved in such events even assuming that everything Patterson has to say is true (T. v. 55, pp. 10075-10076). Robert Patterson's story is, however, also highly improbable in many of its details. Indeed, Patterson's story is so replete with errors that we submit that the whole of his evidence should be swept away like a house of cards.

7.13 For example, Robert Patterson described the Detective's Office as one room without a stenographer (T. v. 55, p. 10052). The evidence is that Patterson had reason to be familiar with the Detective Office anyway (Exhibit 120). Kay O'Handley worked in the Detective Office as the stenographer. Patterson says there was no stenographer. Perhaps Patterson was talking about a weekend. However, if Patterson's alleged ordeal had taken place on the weekend, there would have been no



stenographer to type up a two or three page statement. Some may say that all that typing could have been done beforehand. However, and this is perhaps the most critical error that Patterson made in testifying before this Commission, neither John MacIntyre nor William Urquhart would have had any reason to force Robert Patterson to sign a typed statement. It would have been highly unusual to have a handwritten signature on a typed sheet. No witness statement taken in the Marshall matter by the Sydney City Police involved the typed version being signed. The documents before this Commission indicate that with respect to the Sydney City Police at least statements were always taken in handwriting first and then signed or not signed as the witness may have wished. It is respectfully submitted that Patterson's story falls apart on the basis of this exuberant detail alone.

7.14           It is respectfully submitted that this Commission might well not hold such errors on the part of other witnesses as being so fatal. However, Robert Patterson's evidence contains severe allegations which justify fact-finders giving Patterson's kind of evidence extremely close scrutiny and regarding it with great suspicion. It is respectfully submitted that this Commission ought to be on its guard to accept any of the evidence of Robert Patterson who has a lengthy history of dishonesty both in relation to property (over a dozen theft and fraud charges) and with respect to authority by virtue of convictions for failures to appear in Court, failures to obey Probation Orders and violations of terms of mandatory supervision. It is

respectfully submitted that this witness has a demonstrated history of dishonesty and that this Commission ought not to repose any trust in him.

7.15           Regardless of Robert Patterson's evidence about being interviewed by the Sydney City Police, it appears that Detective Urquhart did find Robert Patterson in September, 1971 with respect to a charge of property damage (Exhibit 120, p. 11). Obviously this would have been an opportunity for William Urquhart and John MacIntyre to interview Robert Patterson. We know in hindsight that Robert Patterson had no evidence of relevance to give with respect to Ebsary, MacNeil, Seale, or Marshall. Patterson's name had originally been left off the list of potential witnesses, perhaps on the strength of what Donald Marshall, Jr. had to say about him (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 17). Patterson's name was later put on the list. However, between the time of Patterson's name being inserted on the list of potential witnesses and September 1, 1971, Patricia Harriss had given a statement which confirmed Marshall's that Patterson would have been in no condition to provide anything of assistance (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 64, 67).

7.16           It is respectfully submitted that the necessity of speaking to Patterson was less acute in September than had appeared when his name was added to the list (Paragraph 3.21, supra). If William Urquhart even adverted to the fact that he had earlier wanted to speak with Patterson about the Seale stabbing, but decided not to interview Patterson, there appears

to be no basis upon which to criticize this judgment. If Urquhart made the decision not to interview Patterson in September 1971 there would be no reason for him now to even recall that he had come across Patterson. Of course, it may have put more minds at ease in 1987 and 1988 if there had been a notation about talking to Patterson on the Seale case or deciding not to talk with him, but on the whole of the initial investigation and subsequent reinvestigations, the failure to speak with Patterson contributed nothing to Donald Marshall, Jr.'s misfortune.

June 23, 1971

7.17 William Urquhart has a note on a small sheet of paper (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 142) giving the address and telephone number of Barbara Vigneau. There is also a handwritten statement written by William Urquhart and witnessed by "Red" M.R. MacDonald taken from Barbara Ellen Vigneau on Wednesday, June 23, 1971 (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 83-84). Like the Frankie French statement which signalled William Urquhart's first formal involvement with respect to the Seale murder investigation (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 29-30), the Barbara Ellen Vigneau statement appears to be the recounting of an interview seeking background information, but with little assistance being provided.

7.18 It is respectfully submitted that Barbara Vigneau's statement does signify that William Urquhart's approach to interviewing and taking statements from witnesses was a normal

habit. Urquhart did not limit formal statements to the crucial witnesses. One might suppose that there is less information of interest in the Barbara Vigneau statement which was taken than there would be in the information which might have been disclosed had a more formal statement been taken during the Maria Sophocleous interview on June 14, 1971 (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 140). It may well be an aberration that a statement was not taken in Sophocleous' case. In any event, the taking of Barbara Vigneau's statement concluded William Urquhart's involvement in the initial investigation of the Seale stabbing.

Subsequent Events

7.19 Donald Marshall, Jr. was put through a Preliminary Hearing on July 5, 1971, and remanded to stand trial in November (Exhibit 1 - R. v. 1). In August William Urquhart went to Wentworth Park to assist John Leon Ryan photograph the scene, as had been requested by the Crown Prosecutor (T. v. 7, pp. 1261, 1264, 1269-1270; and Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 96). This event occurred sometime between August 14 and August 24, 1971. William Urquhart did not attend the Preliminary Hearing or the trial, which was held between November 2 and 5, 1971.

8.0 JUNE 17-18, 1971 - THE HARRISS, GUSHUE AND O'REILLY  
STATEMENTS

Patricia Harriss: Going to the Police Station

8.1 Patricia Harriss was contacted for questioning on June 17, 1971 by the Sydney City Police through her mother, Eunice Harriss, who brought Patricia to the Police Station (T. v. 16, pp. 2951-2953). Eunice Harriss was unsure what police officer telephoned, but guessed that it might have been William Urquhart (T. v. 16, p. 2952). Evidence indicated that this contact would have occurred shortly before the time for the first movie show, as that is where Patricia had planned to go that evening (T. v. 16, p. 2953). No evidence was led to indicate what the showtimes were in Sydney theatres in June, 1971.

8.2 In June, 1971, Patricia Harriss was 14 years old. Patricia testified at this Commission that when she was questioned by the police in June, 1971, she did not know by whom she was being questioned (T. v. 16, p. 2796). However, she also recalled that William Urquhart introduced himself to her on June 17, 1971, by saying:

You know me, I'm a friend of yours (T. v. 16, p. 2915)

Harriss based this remark, and an acknowledgment that she knew Urquhart, on the fact that she had had a "run-in" with Urquhart prior to 1971 (T. v. 16, p. 2915).

8.3 While we propose to deal with this issue in more

detail later, it is worthwhile noting that these Commission hearings were the first time that Patricia Harriss ever spoke of a specific run-in with William Urquhart prior to 1971. Her evidence on Discovery in the C.B.C. civil action was that from getting into trouble and being young "I knew of him" (Exhibit 13 - R. v. 13, p. 166). Leaving aside any question raised in the Commission's mind about how a "run-in" becomes a basis for Urquhart indicating friendly prior knowledge, it is reasonable to conclude that prior to Patricia's arrival at the police station on June 17, 1971, she did not know the police officers well or, except perhaps for Urquhart, at all.

8.4 Patricia's mother, Eunice, had known John MacIntyre from when she and he had both been young people (T. v. 16, pp. 2955, 2983). Eunice Harriss did not know "Red" M.R. McDonald, and June 17, 1971 was the first and only time she has ever met William Urquhart personally (T. v. 16, p. 3000).

#### Uncontested Facts about Patricia Harriss

8.5 While there are a number of facts surrounding the obtaining of statements from Patricia Harriss which are contested, there are a greater number from William Urquhart's perspective which are not in dispute. The following undisputed facts may be drawn from the evidence of Patricia and Eunice Harriss.

8.6 During the evening of June 17-18, 1971, Harriss was questioned for a period of time by William Urquhart and for another period of time by John MacIntyre. Patricia, like her

mother, remembers two officers being present while giving her first 8:15 p.m. statement (T. v. 16, pp. 2924, 2954). Obviously, Eunice Harriss was present at that time (T. v. 16, pp. 2925, 2953, 2954). Patricia gave her first 8:15 p.m. statement to William Urquhart (Exhibit 55; Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 63). Patricia maintained this story as related in the first statement for a few hours (T. v. 16, pp. 2799, 2954, 2956). Eunice Harriss recalled that Detective Urquhart began the questioning by asking Patricia whom she had seen in the Park on May 28, 1971, whether they were young or old, what they were wearing, where she had seen them, and who was at the dance (T. v. 16, pp. 2954-2955). Detective Urquhart was making notes (T. v. 16, p. 2955).

8.7 Patricia recalls that during the interviews on June 17-18, 1971, some detectives whom she now cannot identify came in while others left (T. v. 16, p. 2926). More than an hour after the questioning had first begun Eunice Harriss left the room where the questioning was taking place (T. v. 16, pp. 2956, 2959). At some later point Patricia left the interview room to see her mother who was sitting outside (T. v. 16, pp. 2799, 2817, 2867, 2913). At some point Terry Gushue, Patricia's boyfriend, spent some time in the interview room alone with her (T. v. 16, pp. 2819, 2862-2865, 2913).

8.8 Patricia gave a statement beginning at 12:07 a.m. on June 18, 1971 which she signed (Exhibit 56; Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 65; T. v. 16, pp. 2801-2802). At the conclusion of this statement, Patricia was taken home by her mother who was still at

the Police Station (T. v. 16, pp. 2805, 2868; cf., 2963, 2986).

The Allegations of Patricia and Eunice Harriss

8.9 Eunice Harriss has alleged that whenever Patricia related that part of her recollection involving the "two men" as described in Exhibit 55, William Urquhart would crumple the notepaper and toss it to the floor. This happened approximately twelve times (T. v. 16, pp. 2955, 2957, 2959). In addition, Detective Urquhart would say:

"There wasn't two men there, Patricia."; or

"Come on now you didn't see two men."; or

"Tell us now, who else did you see."; or

"Well, you didn't; you couldn't have."

(T. v. 16, pp. 2957-2958).

8.10 For her part, Patricia was not able to be as specific as her mother. Patricia related that the police officers told her that the "two men" was not proper (T. v. 16, pp. 2798, 2875) or:

Patricia, you didn't see that. There wasn't two men there, was there, Patricia. (T. v. 16, p. 2799).

Patricia Harriss felt that she was under a lot of pressure throughout the evening and described herself as angry in addition to emotions of fear (T. v. 16, pp. 2799, 2880). Both Patricia and Eunice Harriss testified that Patricia cried during her interviews with the Sydney Police (T. v. 16, pp. 2799, 2880, 2956, 2959, 2991-2992).



8.11 Eunice Harriss could not recall any pounding of the table, though Urquhart may have had his hand come down on the table (T. v. 16, p. 2991). Patricia testified that at some point during the evening a fist was pounded on the table, but does not think it took place at the very end of the evening and does not imagine that it took place from the moment she went into the interview room for the first time (T. v. 16, pp. 2880, 2927). The questioning was virtually continuous until the 12:07 a.m. statement was completed.

#### The Issue

8.12 From William Urquhart's point of view the primary issue is whether or not he has been reliably identified as being involved in the activities which form the subject-matter of the allegations related above. We respectfully submit that William Urquhart has not been reliably identified first according to criminal standards of proof, and second, not even upon the basis of probabilities. It is respectfully submitted that upon a review of the whole of the evidence given some sixteen years after the event, this Commission should find that William Urquhart took no part in questioning Patricia Harriss after taking down in writing everything Patricia first told him at 8:15 p.m.

8.13 We would note that this is a particularly important factual issue for this Commission to sort out with respect to William Urquhart - perhaps the most important of any events which appear to involve William Urquhart and which are before this

Inquiry. It is this interviewing of Patricia Harriss which led Staff Sergeant Harry Wheaton of the R.C.M.P., and numerous others who appear to have accepted Wheaton's assumptions, to say that Urquhart's conduct here was most improper and led to the unethical presentation of evidence before the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia. (Exhibit 20 - R. v. 20, pp. 34-35). Wheaton did not take the step of suspecting Urquhart's involvement was criminal. Short of accusing William Urquhart of an actual criminal offence, no greater criticism or charge could possibly be made against a police detective. For this reason, we would ask the Commissioners to give particularly close consideration to the necessary findings of fact in relation to Patricia Harriss.

8.14 It is respectfully submitted that the evidence surrounding Patricia Harriss' contact with the police does not reliably identify William Urquhart as involved after the 8:15 p.m. statement because of the following reasonable inferences from the evidence. First, it is reasonable to conclude from a syntactical and content analysis of the statements that:

- (a) Patricia Harriss' 8:15 p.m. statement demonstrated some uncertainty in her mind about what she was relating to the police;
- (b) Patricia Harris' 8:15 p.m. statement was not limited to personal knowledge but included references which must have been secondhand information; and
- (c) Further information was received from Patricia Harriss than appears in the page which still exists from the 8:15 p.m. statement, based on the probable fact that a second page existed as part of this statement at some time.

Second, evidence related to the circumstances of the securing of a statement from Patricia Harriss by the Sydney City Police supports the conclusions on the first ground that Patricia Harriss related at the time of her first statement information which was secondhand and that this could have come from conversations at school generally or with specific individuals. Third, documentary evidence exists which had to have been in existence on or before June 18, 1971, and the only logical source for that information would have been Patricia Harriss - information which creates real grounds for suspicion that the first statement of Patricia Harriss was not based entirely on personal knowledge. Finally, evidence exists which suggests that Patricia Harriss' secondhand information related to the most critical aspect of her 8:15 p.m. statement.

8.15           It is respectfully submitted that as a result of all of this evidence which existed in June, 1971, it is reasonable to infer that the Sydney City Police, and particularly William Urquhart, would have been aware at some point of Patricia Harriss' confusion of personal and secondhand knowledge. Based on Patricia Harriss' evidence at the Preliminary Hearing in 1971 and evidence given by Staff Sergeant Harry Wheaton about his knowledge and experience of William Urquhart's method and approach in taking statements, a reasonable basis of fact exists to infer that he went out of the presence of Patricia Harriss after becoming apprised of the possible secondhand nature and source of Patricia Harriss' 8:15 p.m. statement to pursue

investigation of that while other officers continued to interview Patricia Harriss to determine what she did know strictly from her own personal knowledge.

8.16 It is respectfully submitted that if this Commission considers this scenario as a reasonable possibility (at minimum) then this Commission would not be able to conclude that William Urquhart has been reliably identified as an officer who interviewed Patricia Harriss continuously between 8:15 p.m. and 12:25 a.m. It is respectfully submitted that such a conclusion would preclude this Commission from supporting any allegation that William Urquhart refused to listen to Patricia Harriss about two men, that he crumpled up a dozen or so statements, that he pounded his fist on the desk, or persisted in questioning Patricia Harriss out of the presence of Patricia's mother for several hours until the statement he wanted had been secured.

#### The Statements Themselves

8.17 Patricia Harriss' first statement is intriguing from a syntactical as well as from a content point of view. It is respectfully submitted that the wording used indicates the recounting of a story with a sense of uncertainty. This could either be due to difficulty in recalling events some three weeks previously which Patricia had otherwise not had cause to recall, or that she was consciously or unconsciously trying to fit her own recollection with what she may have heard had occurred.

8.18 Dealing with the statements first from a

syntactical point of view, Patricia begins the statement with a positive assertion about leaving the dance with her boyfriend at 11:45 p.m. Patricia then indicates that she and Terry sat on a bench near the "Grandstand" (Exhibit 55) or "Bandstand" (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 63):

We sat on a bench near the Grandstand.

Patricia then apparently repeated that statement in shortened form, perhaps to fill a pause while she reassured herself in her mind about what came next:

We sat on a bench.

Patricia then put together three complete sentences which, however, each became progressively shorter:

Robert Patterson was on the grass sick  
throwing up. We smoked a cigarette.  
Terry and I left.

The punctuation for the next sentence is unclear in the handwritten version (Exhibit 55), but has been supplied in the typewritten version (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 63). The three phrases involved each deal with locations:

Walked back of the bandshell

on to Crescent St.

in front of the big Green building

It appears that Patricia stated each of these locations without attributing or providing a subject in the grammatical sense. The only phrases which could begin with capital letters are the first and second, but perhaps only the first on "walked". An

examination of the word "bandshell" in Exhibit 55 as compared with the earlier "grandstand" suggests that there may have been a break between the "band" and the "shell" as has in fact been made in the typewritten version (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 63). It is respectfully submitted that all of these factors indicate a lack of flow to what was being stated, in turn leading to an inference of possible uncertainty, or a calculated effort to ensure that each step of the events of that evening which were being written down coincided with the narrative which Patricia had in her mind. To this point there had been no questions.

8.19 After the three location phrases, Patricia again makes another complete statement:

We saw and talked to Jr. Marshall.

Then with incorrect grammar which suggests that the phrase was added as an afterthought:

With Marshall was two other men.

At this point there would have been sufficient pause by Patricia for William Urquhart to ask his first question:

Describe the other men to me?

Patricia's response is at first quite definite:

One man was short with a long coat.

Patricia then adds two phrases, one of which is repetitive of the initial statement, again indicating some hesitation as she ensured that key aspects of the description would be given to the

Police:

Gray or White hair. [or a comma after  
"hair"]

With a long coat.

There may well have been another pause because the next sentence in Patricia's statement goes back to repeat what she had already said before William Urquhart's first question:

I was talking to Jr.

8.20 The narrative then continues without reference to a description of the second man:

Terry got a match from.

It appears that there was a pause, and then:

Jr.

Patricia then comes to the point of bringing the narrative back to what she wanted to say about talking with Marshall:

And Jr. said they are crazy, they were asking him Jr. for a cigarette.

After this it is reasonable to believe that there was a pause, as William Urquhart was permitted to ask his second question:

Did you see Sandy Seale in the park?

Patricia simply answers "No", suggesting that she had said what she felt it important to say. William Urquhart asked a third question:

Was there anyone else in the Park?

Patricia's answer could indicate that this question was somewhat off the point of what she had been expecting to talk about. It was a second opportunity to describe the second man. Her answer is at first entirely general:

Yes, boys and girls walking through the park.

After an apparent pause, Patricia added:

Gussy Dobbin.

There is a further apparent pause, and then Patricia adds:

And Kenny Barrow.

Patricia Harriss concluded her answer to Urquhart's third question with one of her most complete sentences of the statement:

They left while we were still on the bench.

8.21 In comparison with the statement taken immediately upon Patricia Harriss' arrival at the police station by William Urquhart, the statement taken from Patricia Harriss at 12:07 a.m. on June 18, 1971 (Exhibit 56; Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 67-68) has a much more assertive and confident syntactical structure. Most sentences are longer, and they are complete sentences. Answers are direct and to the point. It is respectfully submitted that this later statement on its face indicates a full appreciation about what is being asked, and answers which arise spontaneously from personal recollection or non-recollection.



8.22 In the preceding paragraphs the actual words and phrases used by Patricia Harriss in her statements have been examined, to the extent that the first statement survives. There are further inferences to draw from how the first statement is written. Does the absence of any writing on the last line of Exhibit 55 indicate that Patricia Harriss' statement was stopped at that point? It is respectfully submitted that the answer to this question is unclear. On the one hand, if the statement had been completed and signed signatures would be expected at the bottom of the first page, as appears from the statement Urquhart took from John Joseph MacNeil on November 15, 1971 (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 172). However, William Urquhart did not sign the front page of the statement which he took from Frankie French (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 29). Frankie French did. The statement could have been continued but still not signed on any page by Harriss. If she continued the statement but declined to sign it, Urquhart's notation to this effect could have been noted at the end only. However, this Commission can only consider this possibility by comparison with a one-page statement (Exhibit 48 - R. v. 22, p.8).

8.23 Another transcription factor to consider is whether or not the non-use of the final line of the page is significant. Was further information given by Patricia Harriss on a second page which has now been lost? In no statement which William Urquhart took in this investigation did he begin writing a question on the last line of a page, as would have been required

with Harriss' statement (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 29, 61, 83, 172). A comparative review of statements taken by John MacIntyre during this investigation shows that he did not begin questions on the last line either, and rarely on the second to last line of a statement - the only exception being Jimmy MacNeil's November 15, 1971 statement (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 20, 32, 39, 57, 67, 72, 76, 80, 175, 183, 184, 189, 193, and the one exception at p. 178).

8.24 Another syntactical factor for consideration is that the statement of Patricia Harriss at 8:15 p.m. does end with a complete thought. However, unlike all other statements from major witnesses this statement relates an incomplete narrative by Patricia Harriss. The statement does not indicate what she or Terry Gushue said, did, or anything else that happened after Marshall is alleged to have said that these two men were crazy asking him for a cigarette. It is respectfully submitted that this is a valid consideration when dealing with the structure of the statement because in order for there to be a complete statement from a witness there ought to be a full recounting from the first involvement until the end of involvement - as appears in other statements actually taken by William Urquhart (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 28, 60, 82, 171).

8.25 It is respectfully submitted that while the evidence does contain some uncertainty, the copying down of the first statement and its syntactical structure both support to there having been a second page which between 1971 and 1987

became lost in some way. There is no positive evidence of destruction, just as there is no positive evidence of a second page ever having existed. It is uncertain whether microscopic examination now of Exhibit 55 would be able to disclose in some positive way whether or not it had ever been fastened to some other piece of paper. There is also no way to know what that other piece of paper would be if there was one. Perhaps this is one of those factual issues which must now always remain unknown due to the ambivalence of the available evidence.

8.26           Turning to a content analysis of Patricia Harriss' 8:15 p.m. statement, the narrative which is disclosed is that she and Terry Gushue left the dance shortly before midnight, went to the Park, sat on a bench, went to go home via Crescent Street, where she and Terry Gushue met Donald Marshall and got a light for a cigarette. Patricia Harriss described one of the two men that Donald Marshall was with at the time. It is respectfully submitted that the crucial factual issues to deal with in this 8:15 p.m. statement are:

- (a) The identification of the two men;
- (b) The men asking Marshall for a cigarette; and
- (c) The route taken by Patricia Harriss and Terry Gushue.

8.27           The extent of Patricia Harriss' description of one of the men she saw with Marshall was that he was short, with grey or white hair, and was wearing a long coat (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 64). This was consistent on each of the three points with

the description given by Donald Marshall to John MacIntyre on May 30, 1971 (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 17). There was one common point of shortness with the May 30 statement of John Pratico (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 22). Patricia Harriss' description had perhaps three points in common with the statement of George Wallace MacNeil and Roderick Alexander MacNeil (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 26). Two of Patricia Harriss' points of description were referred to by Arthur Paul in his statement of June 2 (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 36), by Mary Patricia O'Reilly (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 74), by Catherine Ann O'Reilly (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 78), and by Rudolph Poirier (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 85). It is worth noting that Paul, the O'Reillys, and Poirier all emphasized the old man with grey hair - though Paul spoke of grey or white hair.

8.28           Although hardly specific, Patricia Harriss' description is more complete than that related in the statements of Paul, the O'Reillys, and Poirier. An obvious inference to take from that is that Harriss had first-hand knowledge from seeing the old man in the long coat, while others such as Pratico, Poirier, Paul, and the O'Reillys did not. However, these last five got their descriptions from the eyewitness Marshall and simply may not have included in their statements to the police all of the communicated points.

8.29           It is respectfully submitted that if Patricia Harriss had indeed seen the particular man whom she described she would have noticed more than the three points of description

which she relates without interruption in the 8:15 statement. After all, only three weeks had passed since the event. A more telling point of significance is her weakness of description in that she is the only person who says she came into direct contact with Ebsary and the person who must be MacNeil who says absolutely nothing about MacNeil.

8.30 George and Sandy MacNeil had cogently and simply described a man who could be Jimmy MacNeil (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 26). Maynard Chant in his first statement after speaking with Marshall describes someone with a description that could fit MacNeil, as does Pratico (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 18, 22). Poirier, who got his description from Marshall, also conveys in his statement a description of two men, possibly fitting both Ebsary and MacNeil (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 85). Paul talks about a second man but gives no description (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 36). The O'Reillys are the only witnesses other than Patricia Harriss to omit any description of the second man despite being given an opportunity to speak of him. This Commission will want to consider why Patricia Harriss leaves out any description of the second man when she, and not the O'Reillys, was supposed to be present. Marshall was stated to be the source for all of the witnesses referred to except Patricia Harriss. However, on this point, her "personal knowledge" evidence is not as good as much of the hearsay.

8.31 One further point with respect to these omissions of the second man's description must be made and not lost sight

of in assessing Patricia Harriss' 8:15 p.m. statement. That fact is that after giving the description of the short old man with grey or white hair and a long coat, Patricia Harriss appears to have changed the subject. Harriss began taking the narrative forward rather than providing a complete answer to William Urquhart's question:

Describe the other men to me? (emphasis added) (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 64)

Today Harriss has no positive recollection of what the two men with Marshall looked like (T. v. 16, pp. 2792, 2835-2836, 2897). This Commission must therefore rely upon her recorded recollection so far as it may appear in Exhibits 55 and 56. Nothing, exists today with respect to the second man. The second description may never have been written down, it may have been destroyed, or it may never have been given. It was not given in the appropriate sequence in the 8:15 p.m. statement.

8.32           The second factual content point worth noting in Patricia Harriss' 8:15 p.m. statement is the narrative she chose to insert rather than the description of the second man with Marshall. According to Harriss, Donald Marshall indicated to her that the two men were crazy because they were asking him for a cigarette (Exhibit 55). Mary Patricia O'Reilly's version was apparently that Seale and Marshall were asked for a cigarette and Marshall said that at least Seale did not have a cigarette (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 74). Catherine O'Reilly indicated that she had spoken with Marshall and Marshall had told her that

the two men asked for a cigarette and "they" - Seale and Marshall - said no (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 78). Catherine O'Reilly maintained that position before this Commission (T. v. 19, pp. 3368, 3370-3371). Mary O'Reilly could no longer recall ( T. v. 18, p. 3301). The story related by Poirier was that the two men had asked Seale for a cigarette and a match, and when Seale said that he did not smoke, Seale was stabbed (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 85). Poirier and the O'Reillys thus identified the refusal of a cigarette as the cause for the stabbing of Sandy Seale.

Patricia Harriss' point was that asking Marshall for a cigarette simply demonstrated the foolishness of the two men. One might be tempted by this to postulate that Patricia Harris had personal knowledge of the issue.

8.33 Donald Marshall's statement on May 30, 1971, however, is to the completely opposite effect of Harriss and the admitted hearsay witnesses. Marshall clearly indicated that he gave Ebsary and MacNeil the cigarettes which they asked for:

They asked us for two cigarettes. I gave them to them; also a book of matches.  
(Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p 17).

This is also the version reported to this Commission by Artie Paul (T. v. 23, pp. 4159, 4162-4163, 4220). It is respectfully submitted that wherever Poirier and the O'Reillys got their story, it is highly unlikely that Patricia Harriss got hers from personal observation if Marshall's May 30, 1971 statement is to be believed. The problem with Patricia Harriss' 8:15 p.m. statement is that if she did not get the cigarette information

from personal observation, where did it come from? There is no evidence that Patricia Harriss ever spoke with Poirier. There is some evidence that Patricia Harriss did have contact with the O'Reillys, or one of them.

8.34 Mary Patricia O'Reilly's statement indicates that she discussed the matter with Patricia Harris and told her that there was supposed to be a grey haired man, and that Harriss should tell the police about the grey haired man if questioned (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 75). We will deal with the O'Reilly's statements further below, but accepting for the moment that what Mary Patricia O'Reilly's statement says is true, and Patricia Harriss was told to talk about the grey haired man, it is also reasonable to conclude that Mary Patricia O'Reilly would have indicated how the grey haired man was supposed to be involved - stabbing Sandy Seale when Marshall said that they didn't have a cigarette as had apparently been related to Mary O'Reilly's sister.

8.35 Patricia Harriss' problem was that if the refusal of a cigarette had caused the stabbing, what were Marshall and the old man supposed to be doing still standing around when Harriss and Gushue came along? In what way could she still give a statement dealing with seeing the grey haired man but also with the refusal of a cigarette when there had not yet been any stabbing? Harriss' 8:15 p.m. statement forecloses any argument that personal contact by her was before cigarettes were mentioned.



8.36           The assertion by Harriss that there was a refusal or inability to supply the old man with a cigarette is also inconsistent with other evidence that was available in 1971. George Wallace MacNeil and Roderick Alexander MacNeil had both given a statement on May 31, 1971 identifying persons who could have been Ebsary and MacNeil walking through the Park asking for a cigarette (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 26). Terry Gushue had cigarettes and got a light from Marshall in the presence of this old man, according to Patricia Harriss (Exhibit 55). If the old man was looking for a cigarette and had been unable to obtain one from Marshall, why is there no narrative of the old man at least asking Gushue for a cigarette when they were in quite close proximity? It is respectfully submitted that the most reliable inference is that Marshall did in fact supply Ebsary and MacNeil with cigarettes, and that Patricia Harriss' assertions, like those of the O'Reillys and Poirier, are to some extent secondhand.

8.37           The final point of substance in Patricia Harriss' 8:15 p.m. statement is with respect to the route which she states that she and Gushue followed to get from the Park to her home on Kings Road. Harriss states that she and Gushue came from the dance at St. Joseph's to a bench near the Grandstand. The next movement on the way to Patricia Harriss' home on Kings Road at its intersection with Byng Avenue was, according to her 8:15 p.m. statement, that she and Gushue "walked back of the Bandshell" (Exhibit 55). Whether Harriss and Gushue walked back around via

Pollett's Drug Store at the corner of George and Argyle, and then around to Crescent Street, or took the walkway closest to the Bandshell which goes directly to Crescent Street, either route has the inherent improbability of leading away from Patricia Harriss' home (Exhibit 22). In examining Maynard Chant before this Commission, Commission counsel laid great stress upon the improbability of Maynard Chant having walked in circles according to his statements (e.g. T. v. 5, pp. 824-829, 871-873). It is respectfully submitted that the same improbability must be considered with respect to Patricia Harriss, as was raised in a question from counsel for Donald Marshall, Jr. (T. v. 16, p. 2843).

8.38 In any event, Patricia Harriss ultimately arrived on Crescent Street in front of the green apartment building, which is the sixth lot from the east end of Crescent Street. According to Harriss' 8:15 p.m. statement this is where she met Marshall and the two men. This makes Patricia Harriss' comments about heading behind or back of the Bandshell more puzzling as to get to the green apartment building from anywhere in the Park it is unnecessary to go "back of the Bandshell", or indeed to go anywhere near the Bandshell.

8.39 The walkways around the first pond meet at the bridge and lead on to a pathway which arrives at Crescent Street three houses from the green apartment building. As can be seen from Exhibit 22, the pathway leading up to Crescent Street closest to the green apartment building forms a "V" with another

walkway leading towards the Argyle Street end of Crescent Street. Both pathways flow from the bridge. Donald Marshall and Sandy Seale had been called up from that bridge to Crescent Street by Ebsary and MacNeil (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 17). It is unclear which of the two possible pathways Marshall and Seale used to get to Ebsary and MacNeil.

8.40 Patricia Harriss would have been familiar with the Park. If Patricia Harriss and Terry Gushue had been taking the most direct route home through Wentworth Park to Crescent Street while Marshall and Seale had taken the pathway up to Crescent Street closest to Argyle Street, then Harriss and Gushue could have missed Marshall, Ebsary, and MacNeil by a full sixty feet on a dark, poorly lit street at about midnight. That would hardly permit Patricia Harriss to observe a short old man with grey or white hair with Marshall. The only way that Patricia Harris could be sure that her statement to the police would be consistent with where Donald Marshall had told the police he and the old man were would be to describe her movements in such a way that on her way home with Gushue she covered the full length of Crescent Street from the Argyle Street end down to the green apartment building. Assuming that Marshall and the old man were on Crescent Street, Harriss and Gushue would have had to run into them at some point.

8.41 It is respectfully submitted that this movement analysis aspect of the 8:15 p.m. statement represents a further indication that Patricia Harriss was attempting to tell more than

she knew from personal observation in a plausible context. It led her into improbabilities. While there can be no doubt that Harriss and Gushue did in fact meet Marshall, and this may have been on Crescent Street, the encounter took place according to Donald Marshall, Jr. some sixty feet away from where Seale, Ebsary and MacNeil were (Exhibit 99 - R. v. 34, p. 53). No one has suggested any reason for Marshall to have embellished this fact in 1982. At trial in 1971 Marshall could not recall where on Crescent Street he met with Gushue and Harriss (Exhibit 2 - R. v. 2. pp. 14024) but did state that after giving Gushue a light, he [Marshall] "came back" to the two men (Exhibit 2 - R. v. 2, p. 24).

8.42 From this exhaustive syntactical and content assessment of the 8:15 p.m. statement, it is respectfully submitted that that statement was not a recounting of events which Patricia Harris knew from her own personal observation. While there were aspects of the statement which could be confirmed through the evidence of others, the apparent hesitations and repetitions, the improbabilities and the misstatements which are at variance with Donald Marshall, Jr.'s account given within days of the incident, all indicate that Patricia Harriss was attempting to tell the police more than she knew. It is not submitted that Patricia Harriss did this in any deliberate way to shore up or assist Donald Marshall, Jr.'s story. There is only scant basis upon which to make such an assertion. It is respectfully submitted that there is a more

probable and reasonable interpretation to be placed upon all of the circumstances involved here.

Analysis of Related Evidence

8.43 Patricia Harris acknowledged to this Commission that she was a very confused fourteen year old at the time of these events (T. v. 16, p. 2926). When she was called upon by the police she intended to be helpful. However, in doing so there appears to be a probability that she not only related her personal knowledge but also information from others which she incorporated in her story.

8.44 When Patricia Harris went to give her statement to the police on June 17, 1971, we suggest she knew sufficient background about the case, at least from Donald Marshall, Jr.'s point of view, to speak about more than she actually knew herself from her own personal observations on May 28, 1971. She advised Frank Edwards in 1982 that prior to the Preliminary Hearing she knew what Donald Marshall's defence was going to be (Exhibit 17 - R. v. 17, pp. 5, 30; T. v. 66, pp. 11757-11758). Harriss acknowledges speaking with her friends Catherine and Mary O'Reilly about the case (T. v. 16, pp. 2787, 2813, 2928). Harriss knew, and this Commission may take as fact, that Mary O'Reilly knew Donald Marshall (T. v. 16, p. 2928). Harriss acknowledged that she could have discussed Donald Marshall's involvement in the events at the Park with Mary O'Reilly prior to her interviews with the police although no big discussion was made about it (T. v. 16, pp. 2928, 2845). Mary O'Reilly now

takes the extreme position that what Patricia Harriss says about discussing the case was "not possible" (T. v. 18, p. 3309).

8.45 William Urquhart's notes indicate that the stabbing was a subject of discussion at Sydney Academy (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 139). There is no reason to suspect that Central School which Harriss attended was any different (T. v. 16, p. 2786). According to Staff Sergeant Harry Wheaton, Donna Ebsary says the stabbing and the old man were discussed at school (T. v. 42, pp. 7738-7740; Exhibit 99 - R. v. 34, p. 78). Also it is respectfully submitted that if this stabbing electrified the citizens of Sydney, and caused as much public concern as counsel for Donald Marshall, Jr. asserts, then certainly it would have been a prime subject for discussion among associates, acquaintances, and others in the same general age group as Donald Marshall, Jr. and Patricia Harriss.

8.46 The disclosure of the possibility that Harriss' recollection had a source in addition to personal knowledge - which could have been disclosed as innocently as in Poirier's statement - would have raised a justifiable concern with the Police (Consider: T. v. 11, pp. 1894-1896). The process of separating Harriss' personal knowledge from the hearsay would have been a necessary task. So would finding the sources of some of Harriss' information. It is respectfully submitted that at some point the disclosure of a secondhand source occurred between Harriss and the police. William Urquhart immediately assumed the latter task of seeking out Harriss' source or sources of

secondhand information.

8.47 A note in John MacIntyre's handwriting exists which indicates essentially the same information as appears in the June 18, 1971 statement of Mary Patricia O'Reilly (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 129). This note is written on different, smaller paper than other notes written by John MacIntyre (e.g., Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 127-128). Mary O'Reilly's name had surfaced in the June 3, 1971 statement of Gary Vincent Tobin as being in the company of some people at the dance whom Tobin wished to see (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 38).

8.48 MacIntyre's note is different in that it indicates that Mary O'Reilly might know something about the circumstances of the stabbing. The first point of information had nothing to do with the stabbing but dealt with Sandy Seale's movements at some point during the evening - movements that had been difficult to trace. Mary O'Reilly, as things turned out, didn't know Sandy Seale (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 74), but the police would not have known that until June 18, 1971. This is a circumstance which suggests that some information, albeit incorrect, about Mary O'Reilly must have been brought to the attention of the police by someone before June 18, 1971. The most logical and indeed only apparent source would be Patricia Harriss - and that is consistent with the second half of the notation.

8.49 Another circumstance to consider about the notation written by John MacIntyre (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 129) is that it slips back and forth between the third person and the first

person. This is not consistent with the note being made as a result of actually speaking with an individual witness, as an individual witness would use the word "I" instead of a name. Instead, the note is consistent with information being related to John MacIntyre - as he is the one who wrote the note - and during the conveying of this information phrases and sentences are quoted from some other source, such as a written statement:

The Reilly twins told me....

Mary told me that....(Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p.129).

John MacIntyre testified that this note could have been made as a result of information given to him over the telephone (T. v. 35, pp. 6578-6579).

8.50 As indicated above, Mary O'Reilly gave a statement to John MacIntyre on June 18, 1971 first thing in the morning (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 76-77). Incidentally, William Urquhart's name does not appear on the handwritten version of this statement but it does appear on the typed version (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 75). In her June 18, 1971 statement Mary O'Reilly indicates that after discussions with Donald Marshall, Jr. about what happened at the Park she discussed the matter with Patricia Harriss and took it upon herself to say:

I told her there was supposed to be a grey haired man there. I told her if she was questioned by the police, she should tell about the grey haired man that Jr. told me about. (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 77)

If believed, this statement would be significant evidence to consider in assessing whether or not Patricia Harriss'



description of the grey haired man to the Police on June 17, 1971 had in fact been her own personal knowledge. If known in some form on June 17, 1971, it further supports the theory that Urquhart would have had reason to believe he was getting more than personal knowledge in the 8:15 p.m. statement.

8.51 At these Commission hearings Mary O'Reilly (now Csernyik) took the position that while she did not remember a number of aspects of giving her statement to the police, she could be categorical that she had not said the part about the grey haired man, and that the police must have mixed up some statements (T. v. 18, pp. 3302-3308). When Commission Counsel proposed three other alternatives to her about how material got into her statement, Mary O'Reilly did not hesitate at all to indicate that she had not made the statement at all. Someone inserted the grey haired man material:

...somebody must have put it there because I didn't.

Q. Why do you say that?

A. Because I don't recall saying that at all. If I did, I did, but - ....(T. v. 18, p. 3308).

8.52 It is respectfully submitted that Mary O'Reilly's assertion with respect to her June 18, 1971 statement is not credible, and certainly it cannot be regarded as conclusive. Her evidence before this Commission demonstrates a willingness to shift responsibility entirely away from herself despite the fact that she is unable to recall everything that took place in that room or even all the conversation that took place during the

giving of the statement (T. v. 18, pp. 3328-3329). Mary O'Reilly could not come up with any reason why another alleged insertion would have been made in the statement relating an account of the event consistent with Donald Marshall, Jr.'s innocence (T. v. 18, pp. 3334-3335). Also, if one were to accept Mary O'Reilly's speculation as true, it would mean that the Sydney City Police had worked out a memorandum of imaginary evidence (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p.129) in anticipation of interviewing two people who had not otherwise been identified to them as being anywhere near the Park on Friday, May 28, 1971, knowing that they would insert into the statement of one of these witnesses some evidence about discussions with other actors in the investigation. For such an evil scenario to hold water, this Commission would also have to assume that the police would be able to control where the witness signed, since no such insertion would be possible given how Roy Gould and Barbara Vigneau signed their statements (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 57-58, 84). The evidence can certainly not support so much fabrication as would have been necessary.

8.53           The criminal law approach in this circumstance would simply be to conclude that Mary O'Reilly's June 18, 1971, statement is nothing because it is only recorded hearsay which has not been subsequently adopted: R. v. Gillingham (1981), 65 N.S.R. (2d) 42 (N.S.S.C., A.D.). However, taking away the statement still leaves Mary O'Reilly's evidence that she knew Patricia Harriss and was in the same Grade 7 class at Central High in 1971 (T. v. 18, p. 3304). O'Reilly says now that to have

discussed the Seale stabbing in any aspect with Patricia Harriss was "not possible" (T. v. 18, p. 3309). Counsel for Donald Marshall, Jr. established that Mary O'Reilly and Patricia Harriss would see each other regularly and would talk (T. v. 18, pp. 3321-3322). This is generally consistent with Patricia Harriss' position (T. v. 16, p. 2813), although Harriss has conceded that "probably the odd mention was made of it without any big discussion" (T. v. 16, p. 2928), and this could have occurred prior to her interviews with the police (T. v. 16, p. 2945). It is respectfully submitted that O'Reilly's denials cannot be regarded as definitive on the issue of whether or not there was any such discussion given the fact that this Commission is dealing with recollections of 16 and 17 years previously.

8.54 The circumstance which we submit this Commission ought to take from Mary O'Reilly's evidence, and indeed from Patricia Harriss' evidence, is that these two girls knew each other in 1971. They had some knowledge about each other in 1971 (T. v. 18, p. 3307). They had the opportunity and possibility existed that they would have had some conversation about the Seale stabbing.

8.55 Another indication that Harris was not speaking from personal knowledge in the giving of her first statement at 3:15 p.m. on June 17, 1971, would have been the information supplied by Terry Gushue to the police which was significantly different than that of Harriss. Staff Sergeant Harry Wheaton and others have written off Gushue as a drunk - both in 1971 and in

1982. Unlike Staff Sergeant Harry Wheaton, Patricia Harriss was with Terry Gushue on the night of May 28, 1971 and testified that Gushue was not "half-in-the-bag" but rather was in a fine enough condition to walk her home and was neither staggering nor obnoxious or anything else of that nature (T. v. 16, pp. 2876-2878). It will be recalled that Gushue's name appears to have come to the attention of William Urquhart during his June 14, 1971, meeting with Maria Sophocleous (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 140). Gushue initially told the Sydney Police that he had not been in Wentworth Park and knew nothing about the stabbing - because he did not want to be involved in any way (T. v. 15, p. 2708). Although Harriss does not confirm this, Gushue later asked Patricia Harriss to go along with seeing nothing (T. v. 15, p. 2709). Gushue eventually relented and gave a statement about his contact on May 28, 1971, with Donald Marshall, Jr. (Exhibit 54; Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 72-73). Gushue's recollection as related in that statement is not different today (T. v. 15, p. 2724). Gushue was with Harris throughout and therefore he and she must have generally seen what the other saw. Gushue saw Donald Marshall, Jr. on Crescent Street with another man whom Gushue did not know.

8.56           It is respectfully submitted that in her 8:15 p.m. statement it is reasonable to conclude that Harriss incorporated facts as she understood them, no doubt honestly endeavouring to be as complete as possible, as helpful as possible - and as consistent as possible with the story as she understood it

through the grapevine. It is respectfully submitted upon the basis of the analysis conducted above that it is logical to conclude that at some point in the course of William Urquhart taking the 8:15 p.m. statement, information came to light which disclosed that Patricia Harriss was indeed telling the police more than what she could actually say of her own personal knowledge. As stated above, it may have occurred as innocently as in the Rudy Poirier statement on July 2, 1971 (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 85). Harriss could well have replied at any time when she was with the police something to the effect that "Mary O'Reilly said that" such and such had happened. This is not an unreasonable proposition to put forward in light of the documentary evidence which exists.

#### What Urquhart Did

8.57 William Urquhart would have had no personal knowledge to rebut anything in the 8:15 p.m. statement which Patricia Harriss asserted as her personal knowledge. That is why William Urquhart dutifully copied down Patricia Harriss' 8:15 p.m. statement through each hesitation and change of subject. This statement was not crumpled up, ripped up, or otherwise destroyed. The evidence of Eunice Harriss that Urquhart crumpled up the first and some 11 other statements when Patricia began to speak of the two men is not accurate with respect to the one statement this Commission knows was transcribed by William Urquhart.

8.58 As indicated above, it is likely given all of the

considerations referred to above that it became evident at some point while the first 8:15 p.m. statement was being taken that Patricia Harris was giving more than her personal knowledge to the Sydney Police. At that point, William Urquhart took whatever that information was (probably the O'Reilly information: Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 129) and set out to find the O'Reillys. Staff Sergeant Harry Wheaton expressed the opinion, having worked with William Urquhart and having discussed William Urquhart's investigative practice that:

Mr. Urquhart from my experience with him is an [sic] intuitive type. He is a hard worker and would follow up leads and be a type to...he's a very good worker.

Q. Hum - now, if on the 17th of June he had suddenly been confronted with information after speaking with Patricia Harriss that Harriss had spoke to the O'Reilly girls, it would be perfectly consistent for Mr. Urquhart to have rushed out at that time and try to find the O'Reilly girls.

A. Yes, sir. (T. v. 45, pp. 8346-8347)

Also consistent with that scenario is the fact that the only statement known to have been started, taken or completed in Mr. Urquhart's handwriting is the one taken when Patricia Harriss first arrived at the Police Station at 8:15 p.m.

#### Identifying Urquhart:Harriss

8.59 It does not appear that any of the intervening crumpled up statements after the 8:15 p.m. but before the 12:07 a.m. have survived, if they ever existed. Thus, it is not possible to independently verify William Urquhart's

participation or non-participation with those through handwriting analysis or otherwise. William Urquhart's name does not even appear on the handwritten versions of the Gushue and Harriss statements taken later that night (Exhibits 56 and 74). On the typewritten versions of the same statements he is indicated as a witness (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 65-66, 69-70). William Urquhart testified that if he was there he would have signed the original (T. v. 52, pp. 9486-9487), and that this was an invariable practice on his part (T. v. 52, p. 9531).

8.60 The lengthy review which we have undertaken of the Patricia Harriss' statements has been to demonstrate that there was reasonable cause for the statement-taking which was commenced by William Urquhart to have been interrupted at some point. The evidence must then be regarded as ambivalent about the presence of William Urquhart continuing to interview Patricia Harris for the next four hours, virtually continuously according to her evidence.

8.61 The difficulty for this Commission comes from the fact that Patricia Harriss testified that the best of her recollection is that she was mainly interviewed by William Urquhart (T. v. 16, pp. 2796, 2829-2833, 2879). Patricia Harriss indicates that in 1971 she was not particularly familiar with any of the police officers although she had known William Urquhart to some extent prior to 1971 (T. v. 16, pp. 2796, 2915). At the preliminary Hearing in 1971 Patricia Harriss was questioned about the interview she had had with the Sydney City Police (Exhibit 1

- R. v. 1, pp. 26-27). Harriss identified "Red" Michael MacDonald who was actually sitting in the court room as involved when she first told the story about having met Donald Marshall, Jr. Harris said that she talked to "Red" Michael R. MacDonald about two times. The second time that Harriss was interviewed it was in the presence of John MacIntyre - also present in the court room when Harris was testifying - and "Red" MacDonald. That was the time she gave a written statement.

8.62           The Preliminary Hearing transcript also contains the statement by Harriss that she had in fact met with a total of three Detectives. This Commission knows that this third officer - Urquhart - was involved in writing out an initial but apparently unsigned statement. It is respectfully submitted that this Commission should weigh strongly the evidence of Patricia Harriss at the Preliminary Hearing, two weeks after June 18, 1971 when she gave her second statement, and find that she gave that second statement to "Red" Michael MacDonald and Sergeant MacIntyre as she says. After all, if Patricia Harriss is to be believed that her concern was about what was contained in the second statement (or rather not contained in it - the two men) this is certainly the one she would have had in mind when testifying at the Preliminary Hearing. No one has ever suggested that all three officers - MacIntyre, "Red" MacDonald and Urquhart - were present for Patricia Harriss' second statement. Harriss says she knew Urquhart in 1971, but she never mentioned him by name in connection with any of the discussions she says she had



with the police on the statement she was concerned about - the one without the two men. If the Commission feels able to make that finding, this Commission will need to consider when Urquhart was out of the picture.

8.63 Patricia Harriss did not recall mentioning Urquhart by name when she spoke with Staff Sergeant Harry Wheaton in 1982 (T. v. 16, p. 2916). Frank Edwards notes that when Harriss spoke with him shortly after speaking with Wheaton that it was fair to say that Patricia Harriss did not specifically recall William Urquhart's participation in the statement-taking of June 17-18, 1971. Instead what Harriss did remember was Urquhart's name from that era (T. v. 69, pp. 12245-12246; Exhibit 17 - R. v. 17, pp. 5, 30).

8.64 Some of these points were confirmed with Patricia Harriss before this Commission. Harriss acknowledged that she could not dispute that Urquhart had been present early in the evening but left and was not there through the middle of the evening (T. v. 16, pp. 2927-2928), and Harriss does not recall Mr. Urquhart personally being present for the last statement (T. v. 16, p. 2926).

8.65 Finally, much as with the Scott MacKay statement described earlier (paragraphs 3.9-3.14, supra), Patricia Harriss did distinguish between her general experience of the evening, which was bad, and some other time during the course of the evening:

There would be times where it'd be very comfortable and I would calm down and

then it would get very flared up again and bringing me something to drink pounding their fists on the table and saying I wasn't telling the truth...not that hard...[but] Hard enough to upset me. (T. v. 16, pp. 2800-2801).

It is respectfully submitted that this too would be consistent with an unchallenging interview early on with a nervous witness, later deteriorating as interviewing continued with less familiar officers.

8.66 Patricia Harriss does not recall and did not know who Sergeant MacDonald was (T. v. 16, p. 2924) though when she saw him in July, 1971 she identified him. Neither did her mother know who Sergeant M.R. MacDonald was (T. v. 16, p. 3000). Eunice Harriss was present for the first statement, and therefore would have been observing a statement being taken by two officers. Eunice Harriss had been introduced and thus knew that one of the officers was a Mr. Urquhart. Eunice Harriss was meeting Urquhart for the first and only time.

#### Conclusion on Harriss

8.67 It is respectfully submitted, based on all of the factors set out at length above, that Patricia Harriss has misidentified William Urquhart. In the course of a stressful night of June 17, 1971, and in discussions which Eunice Harriss and Patricia Harriss have held on the subject since, the name Urquhart has likely been an habitual reference point. There is nothing which prevents the reasonable inference that while Patricia and Eunice Harriss may have used the name Urquhart as a convenient label for one of the police officers with whom

Patricia feels she had difficulty in 1971, the probabilities are that she has attributed the Urquhart name to the person who is actually "Red" MacDonald - not the man before this Commission named William Urquhart. "Red" MacDonald is the officer identified in 1971 as being in on all tellings of the story. Urquhart, though known in 1971 by Harriss, is not mentioned at all. It is respectfully submitted that this Commission may conclude that Patricia Harriss' memory may simply have played a trick on her which has run unchecked through various hearings until the hearings before this Commission.

Terry Gushue Statement

8.68 Terry Gushue was Patricia Harriss' boyfriend in 1971 and his statement has been discussed above (Paragraph 8.55, supra). The only issue with respect to Gushue's statement (Exhibit 74) is whether or not William Urquhart was a witness on the statement, and thus present at the Sydney Police Station shortly before Patricia Harriss' second statement was taken. Terry Gushue testified that he had no independent recollection of the names of the officers by whom he was interviewed (T. v. 15, p. 2716). Gushue mentioned MacIntyre, and then after a mention by Commission counsel of the name Urquhart, Gushue indicated that he recalled the name, and he was satisfied that those were the two (with the addition of MacIntyre) who were present the night of June 17, 1971 (T. v. 15, pp. 2716-2717). However, Gushue in 1987 did not even remember the name of Staff Sergeant Harry Wheaton from 1982 (T. v. 15, pp. 2727-2728).

8.69 Given William Urquhart's signing practice with respect to statements, and the absence of evidence as to how his name came to be typed on this particular statement (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 69-71), we would respectfully submit that there is insufficient identification of William Urquhart to come to a positive conclusion that he indeed sat in on this statement as a witness. It is respectfully submitted that the most that can be taken from Gushue's evidence on the point of who took the statement is that he recalls two people in the room, one doing the questioning and the other just sitting witnessing the statement (T. v. 15, p. 2766).

#### O'Reilly Statements

8.70 The statements of Mary Patricia O'Reilly and Catherine O'Reilly were taken on the morning of June 18, 1971. Again, William Urquhart's name appears on the typed version of the Mary Patricia O'Reilly statement but not on the handwritten (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 74-75, 76-77). Mary O'Reilly does recall that there were two police officers, one of whom was John MacIntyre (T. v. 18, p. 3295). Mary O'Reilly did not know who the other person was (T. v. 18, p. 3326). Mary O'Reilly's sister gave a statement the same morning, about a half hour after Mary O'Reilly's statement was completed. Mary O'Reilly indicated that her mother had taken her from school to the police station (T. v. 18, p. 3293). Mary O'Reilly's sister came separately and walked in on the statement being taken from Mary O'Reilly (T. v. 18, pp. 3293-3294).

8.71 Catherine O'Reilly (Soltesz) confirmed much of what her sister said. She was met at school by a police officer and taken down to the police station (T. v. 19, pp. 3375-3376).

Catherine O'Reilly knew John MacIntyre and testified that she was questioned by MacIntyre. She recalls the other officer present during the taking of the statement but did not believe that it was the same as the police officer who had picked her up. The officer she recalled as witnessing the statement wore a uniform and was "tall, thin, just like", apparently, Commission counsel Orsborn (T. v. 19, p. 3376). There is no doubt that Catherine O'Reilly's statement on June 18, 1971 was witnessed by William Urquhart, as can be seen by reference to the original of the statement itself (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, pp. 80-81).

8.72 It is respectfully submitted that this Commission had William Urquhart before it during two days of testimony, and whatever else William Urquhart can claim, it is doubtful that he could ever have been described as tall and thin. It is respectfully submitted that if Catherine O'Reilly's recall is lacking to the extent of being able to identify someone of Urquhart's type as a result of being in his presence during the taking of the statement, and being the only witness who would put Urquhart in a uniform it is reasonable to conclude that Catherine O'Reilly could also be wrong about who picked her up at the school. It is respectfully submitted that it is as reasonable to consider that William Urquhart was out getting Catherine O'Reilly at the time of Mary O'Reilly's statement, as it is to assert that

William Urquhart was present during the taking of Mary O'Reilly's statement. Indeed, given the significance of what Mary O'Reilly would be expected to say, given advice which had previously been received (Exhibit 16 - R. v. 16, p. 129), it would be more reasonable to expect that the same officers to whom Patricia Harriss gave her second statement would be the appropriate officers to take Mary O'Reilly's statement. That did not include Urquhart.

### Conclusion

8.73 The submissions made with respect to the Patricia Harriss, Terry Gushue, and O'Reilly statements have been couched primarily in terms of identification because without identification of William Urquhart in relation to these statements there can be no valid ground to direct criticism at him personally, just as it would be impossible to convict him of a criminal offence or hold him liable in a civil proceeding. Identification is fundamental, and no recitation needs to be made of authorities which hold that the mere recitation of a name or something akin to a dock identification is insufficient. Some distinguishing characteristic or history of familiarity must accompany and constitute part of the identification or it will be valueless: e.g., R. v. Sophonow (No. 2) (1986), 25 C.C.C. (3d) 415, at pp. 438-453 (Man.C.A.).

8.74 In the context of these hearings, Terry Gushue's only identification of William Urquhart was brought out through a leading question and there is contrary evidence in the absence of

William Urquhart's signature on the original of his June 17, 1971 statement. We respectfully submit that that identification is valueless. Catherine O'Reilly demonstrated an inability to recall and identify William Urquhart even though other evidence clearly establishes that he was present for the taking of her statement. Mary O'Reilly did not know who the other person was on the statement she gave, and without any evidence as to how William Urquhart's name appeared on only the typewritten version of her statement, it is respectfully submitted that there is no identification here as well. Finally, with respect to Patricia Harriss, her own evidence establishes that she has no independent recollection of the person she now recalls as William Urquhart being present at the final statement. The characteristics she describes in relation to the person she calls William Urquhart are inconsistent not only with the one written statement we know was taken by William Urquhart, but also inconsistent with the type of police officer which William Urquhart has been demonstrated to be through other independent evidence. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the Patricia Harriss identification of William Urquhart is unreliable and improbable to the extent that she connects him with any of the alleged improprieties of June 17-18, 1971.

8.75 In the event that this Commission should disagree with the submissions and find that a cogent and reliable and trustworthy identification of William Urquhart has been made by any of these witnesses, the nature of the allegations made by

some of them are such that this Commission should be hesitant to accept their evidence without qualification. However, for purposes of this submission the uncertainties and contradictions and contrary contextual factors will not be recited. That we leave to the close consideration of the Commissioners.