SDS Case Number 87-312

EDIA POST COPY

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE DONALD MARSHALL, JR., PROSECUTION

VOLUME I

Held:

September 9, 1987

At:

St. Andrew's Church Hall

Bentinck Street Sydney, Nova Scotia

Before:

Chief Justice R. A. Hickman, Chairman

Assoc. Chief Justice L. A. Poitras, Commissioner

Hon. G. T. Evans, Commissioner

Counsel:

George MacDonald, Q.C., Wylie Spicer, & David Orsborn: Commission Counsel

Clayton Ruby, Ms. Marlys Edwardh, & Ms. Anne S. Derrick:

Counsel for Donald Marshall, Jr.

Michael G. Whalley, Q.C.: Counsel for City of Sydney

Ronald N. Pugsley, Q.C.: Counsel for John F. Urguhart

Donald C. Murray: Counsel for William Urguhart

Frank L. Elman, Q.C., & David G. Barrett:

Counsel for the Donald MacNeil estate

Jamie W. S. Saunders, & Darrel I. Pink:

Counsel for Attorney General

James D. Bissell: Counsel for the R.C.M.P.

Al Pringle: Counsel for Correctional Services Canada

William L. Ryan: Counsel for Evers, Green and McAlpine

Charles Broderick: Counsel for Carroll

S. Bruce Outhouse: Counsel for Wheaton & Scott

Guy LaFosse: Counsel for Davies

Bruce H. Wildsmith: Counsel for Union of N. S. Indians Assisted by Daniel Christmas

E. Anthony Ross, & Kevin Drolet: Counsel for Oscar N. Seale

E. Anthony Ross, & Jeremy Gay: Counsel for Black United Front

Court Reporters: J. Graham Robson, & Judith M. Robson, OCR, RPR

INDEX - VOLUME I

OPENING REMARKS, by the Chairman	1
OPENING REMARKS, by Mr. MacDonald	6
Roy Newman Ebsary	
By Mr. MacDonald	25
Video transcript	80
By Mr. Ruby	143
COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	AA

INQUIRY OPENED AT 10:03 o'clock in the forenoon on Wednesday, the 9th day of September, A.D., 1987 at Sydney, County of Cape Breton, Province of Nova Scotia

Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, Counsel, Ladies and Gentlemen,

THE CLERK:

the following is the Notice of Inquiry:

The Royal Commission on the Donald Marshall, Junior, Prosecution will commence public hearings at ten o'clock a.m. on Wednesday, September the 9th, 1987, in the lower hall, St. Andrew's Church Hall, on Bentinck Street, in the City of Sydney, in the Province of Nova Scotia. This Notice of Inquiry is issued pursuant to the Rules of Practices and Procedures adopted by the Royal Commission on the Donald Marshall, Junior, Prosecution.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Good morning ladies and gentlemen. I welcome you to the first day of the public Hearings of the Royal Commission on the Donald Marshall, Junior, Prosecution. I would like to introduce my fellow Commissioners. Seated to my right is Associate Chief Justice Lawrence Poitras from the Superior Court of Quebec and on my left is the Honourable Mr. Justice Gregory T. Evans of the High Court of Ontario.

In Sydney, Nova Scotia, we will hear a large number of witnesses who will testify concerning the circumstances surrounding the death of Mr. Sanford William Seale on May 28th, 1971, and subsequent charging, prosecution and conviction of Donald Marshall, Junior of the non-capital murder of Sanford Seale.

We intend to conduct all the public hearings while in Sydney at St. Andrew's United Church during weekdays from ten a.m. to

five p.m. It is likely that the hours of sittings on Fridays will be from eight a.m. until eleven-thirty a.m. in order to accommodate travel arrangements. Thirty-two hearing days are scheduled for Sydney which will take us to mid-November. A daily recess of the Hearings is scheduled from twelve-thirty p.m. until two p.m., although some flexibility may be exercised when it is deemed necessary to give counsel the opportunity to complete questioning of a witness. After the conclusion of the Sydney sittings, we will hear further evidence in Halifax, the precise particulars of which will be available before the conclusion of the Sydney hearings. We anticipate, however, that the Halifax sittings will begin in late November.

Since the Commission was created in October, 1986, Commission staff have been actively engaged in collecting information relevant to our Terms of Reference, much of which will be presented today and as the Hearings progress in the form of exhibits.

We do recognize the complexity of the job that we have been given and it is our profound wish that our findings and recommendations be timely and based on the most expert advise available. To that end, we are conducting research on issues which we have judged to be crucial to properly completing the task before us.

While it is extremely important there be a public airing of the evidence, we are mindful that this matter has already been tried several times. It is not our intention to hold yet another

trial but in order to make meaningful recommendations to Government, the Commission must necessarily review the actual circumstances of the Donald Marshall case.

As stated in the Order in Council by which we were established, we are to make

"... recommendations to the Governor in Council respecting the investigation of the death of Sandford William Seale on the 28th-29th day of May, 1971; the charging and prosecution of Donald Marshall, Jr., with that death; the subsequent conviction and sentencing of Donald Marshall, Jr., for the non-capital murder of Sandford William Seale for which he was subsequently found to be not guilty; and such other related matters which the Commissioners consider relevant to the Inquiry".

These Terms of Reference, therefore, include the murder investigation, the charging of Mr. Marshall, the conduct of the trial and the appeal, Mr. Marshall's years in prison, the eventual acquittal by the Nova Scotia Court of Appeal and the process through which compensation was granted to him in 1984. The R.C.M.P. reinvestigations of Mr. Seale's murder will also be reviewed. This will cover the period from the time the date of Mr. Seale's death in 1971 to the time this Royal Commission was appointed.

In order to develop meaningful recommendations, all contributing factors must be carefully and critically examined in the context of the current state of administration of justice in Nova Scotia. As I indicated in my opening statement at the Hearings held in May, to consider the matter of funding, we will

2

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

also examine among other things, the role of the Attorney General as a member of Cabinet, the relationship of Crown prosecutors with defense counsel and with the police, as well as related matters. In addition, I advised that we intend to give consideration to the allegations that minorities of this Province are not treated equitably by the Justice system. It is our ultimate aim to make recommendations which will ensure that the unfortunate events surrounding Mr. Marshall will not be repeated; to do this we must satisfy ourselves that the present state of the administration of criminal justice in Nova Scotia is sound. We will not avoid a discussion of these issues.

The Commission has given full standing to the following parties to appear in these Hearings:

Donald Marshall, Junior John F. MacIntyre William Urquhart City of Sydney Police Commission The Estate of Donald C. MacNeil, Q.C. Royal Canadian Mounted Police Correctional Service of Canada, National Parole Board (Department of Solicitor-General of Canada) Attorney General of Nova Scotia and the Department of the Attorney General Oscar Nathaniel Seale and Black United Front of Nova Scotia Union of Nova Scotia Indians R.C.M.P. Officers Adolphus Evers, Richard McAlpine and Gary Green Staff Sergeant James Carroll, R.C.M.P. Staff Sergeant H. F. Wheaton, R.C.M.P. Inspector D. B. Scott, R.C.M.P. Sergeant Herb Davies, R.C.M.P.

Observer status has been granted to the Police Association of Nova Scotia and to the Nova Scotia Branch of the Canadian Bar

2 3

 Association. Because of the necessity of having a full and fair inquiry into the issues before us, the Province of Nova Scotia has agreed to pay the legal fees of several of the parties who have been granted standing.

The Royal Commission has adopted Rules of Procedure which will be followed throughout. The Rules require that counsel for the Commission will be responsible for the calling of witnesses and the order in which witnesses will be called. Counsel for the Commission will conduct examination—in—chief, while counsel for interested parties may cross—examine all witnesses. The order of appearance by other counsel has been established. Commission counsel will also have the right to re—examine witnesses. While the Rules of Procedure in a court of law may not apply to the same degree before this Commission, I will, as Chairman, endeavour to ensure that a witness's evidence is relevant and that there is no unnecessary repetition.

Extremely important public issues will be aired at these
Hearings and it is our intention to air them fully but fairly.
However, we must all remember, particularly in the Sydney phase
of the Hearings which is dealing almost exclusively with the
1971 incident, that this incident took place many years ago.
Many of the witnesses who will be appearing before us are
unaccustomed to the glare of publicity and may find it an
extremely trying experience. Their privacy and their difficulties
should be respected. I direct these comments particularly to

representatives of the media.

Before I ask counsel for the Commission to begin his opening statement, I would like to thank, in particular, the people at St. Andrew's United Church for their cooperation and continuing assistance in allowing us to use their Church Hall for these Hearings. Their help is very much appreciated.

Mr. MacDonald.

MR. MacDONALD:

Thank you, My Lord. I'm wired for sound. You'll have to remind me now and then that there's a switch here I have to turn on.

Mr. Chairman, and Commissioners, as the Chairman indicated in the statement which he just read, this Commission is required to make recommendations to the Govenor of Counsel of the province respecting the investigation and death of Sanford William Seale. The charging, prosecution, conviction and sentencing of Donald Marshall, Junior as a result of that death and such other related matters which you consider relevant. In the opening statement of the commissioners which was read by the chairman at the funding application heard in Halifax on May 13th of this year. You set out in general terms your interpretation of the mandate given to you and summarized your views as follows and I quote from that eariler statement:

"On the basis of the understanding what happened to Donald Marshall, Junior, and after having analyzed the present functioning of the Criminal Justice system in Nova Scotia, we will make recommendations for the future which are designed to increase the confidence of

all Nova Scotians in the system of administration of Justice."

In performing our task as Commission Counsel today, we have directed our attention to gathering the necessary evidence, to place before you to enable you to answer the following questions:

First, why did Donald Marshall, Junior, spend eleven years in prison for a crime for which he was subsequently found to be not guilty, and

Second, what if any changes must be made to the system of administration of justice in this Province to prevent the reoccurrence of such an event.

The tragic event which took place in Wentworth Park on the night of May 28th, 1971, occupied but a few minutes but within the legal system, that event spawned an incredible response which has continued to the present day. From those few minutes have come four trials, three appeals, a reference to the Nova Scotia Court of Appeals and two Royal Commissions.

However, the magniture of the legal response can in no way match the human tragedies that have been caused, both by the event itself and by the seemingly endless questioning and re-questioning of those involved both directly and indirectly.

Commission Counsel have during the course of our investigation become painfully aware of the hurt that has been suffered by various people and of the natural reluctance of witnesses to testify yet again.

We have also heard frequent statements which lead us to conclude that there is a perception among many people that problems and flaws exist within the justice system and the system of administering justice in Nova Scotia.

As we embark on these Hearings, therefore, it seems appropriate to remind ourselves of two of the fundamental principles which have been and must continue to be cornerstones of our justice system. These are quotations, My Lord, taken from cases I'm sure you are very familiar with and I — given a few moments, you'd probably find cases of your own where you have quoted statements — these particular statements. The first is taken from a decision in 1924 when Lord Heward, the Chief Justice, said this:

"A long line of cases shows that it is not merely of some importance but is of fundamental importance that justice should not only be done but should manifestly and undoubtedly be seem to be done. Nothing is to be done which creates even a suspicion that there has been an improper interference with the course of justice."

And the second quotation is from the Supreme Court of Canada in a very famous case dealing with the Bill of Rights and dealing with a native Indian of Canada, the very famous "Dry Bones" case and in that case, interpreting what was said in the

"The right which is here at issue is 'the right of the individual to equality before the law and the protection of the law.'"

He then referred to a judgement in the Court of Appeal of British Columbia where these words were interpreted to mean

Bill of Rights, Mr. Justice Ritchie noted:

"a right of every person to whom a particular law relates or extends, no matter what may be a person's race, national origin, colour, religion, or sex, to stand on an equal footing with every other person to whom a particular law relates or extends and the right to protection of the law."

Subsequently, My Lord, this principle has been enshrined in our Charter of Rights, of course, in Section 15.1 which reads:

"Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and in particular without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability."

Commission Counsel have been given the responsibility of ensuring that all issues are considered by the Commission and that all relevant and necessary evidence is presented to the Commission. We have concluded that in order for you to appreciate fully the issues and the individuals involved, it is necessary to commence by reviewing in detail the May 28th, 1971, incident itself. Hopefully this will be the last time such an examination will be necessary. We believe that only after a critical examination of the incident itself will all the later events be able to be properly placed in perspective.

Having considered the events, evidence will then be lead of the subsequent events and activities which occurred culminating with the conviction of Donald Marshall, Junior, of the murder of

Sandy Seale. For the first time, evidence of some of the key players in this tragedy will be given publically and be subject to scrutiny.

It must be appreciated that witnesses will be testifying to circumstances over sixteen years old. Human memory being what it is many details will have been forgotten and over time, the mere repetition of certain facts may have lead to their acceptance as truth. In addition to the lapse of time, the age and emotional maturity in 1971 of many of the witnesses must be considered when assessing the testimony given by them at that time.

Further we anticipate that on some points, although memories may be clear, there will be obvious conflict in the testimony to be presented. All of these facts will make your task as the finders of fact extremely difficult.

As the evidence will disclose, a very short time after Donald Marshall, Junior, was convicted, the Sydney Police were contacted by an eye witness to the event and advised that Mr. Marshall had not committed the murder. Evidence of the subsequent activities of the Sydney Police and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police following this startling conclusion will be presented to you.

At the conclusion of this evidence, the Sydney phase of the hearings will come to an end. We anticipate the evidence to be lead during the Sydney phase and we'll require approximately twenty-five to twenty-eight sitting days, and that with

3.

 necessary adjournments, this phase of the Hearing is likely to last until approximately mid-November.

At the present time we plan to call forty-six witnesses in this phase of the Hearing and this number may be increased or reduced as necessary. In the event changes are made, we will provide as much advance knowledge as possible to all counsel. I should add, My Lord, a list of all witnesses and a proposed chronology of calling those witnesses has been provided to all counsel for the various parties.

Included among the witnesses to be called during the Sydney phase are at least two persons who reside beyond the jurisdiction of Nova Scotia and who are not willing to come to Sydney to testify. We are planning to arrange for their testimony to be taken by means of a video hook-up which will allow for full visual cross-examination of those people by all counsel for interested parties.

When the hearings resume in Halifax, evidence will be introduced dealing with the events which took place after December, 1971. This will include an examination of Mr. Marshall's experiences in prison, subsequent attempts to have the Sydney Police and the R.C.M.P. re-investigate the events leading to his conviction and the ultimate re-investigation by the R.C.M.P. which lead to the Minister of Justice for Canada ordering the Nova Scotia Supreme Court, Appeal Division, to conduct a rehearing. The events surrounding the re-hearing and the

 circumstances leading to payment of compensation to Mr. Marshall will be examined in detail.

During the Halifax phase of the Hearing, a review of the administration of justice system in Nova Scotia from the time of the occurrence to the present will be carried out. At the Halifax Hearing evidence of various expert witnesses may be presented; indeed, throughout the Hearings, evidence of expert witnesses may be presented.

A statement detailing the evidence to be introduced during the Halifax phase of the Hearing will be presented by Commission Counsel at the opening of those Hearings.

While generally we have attempted to organize the evidence in a chronological order, you will appreciate that the involvement of some witnesses spans a long period of time. To avoid recalling such witnesses, we have decided that each witness will present all relevant evidence when called. While this will distort to some extent the flow of the story, we consider it will be less disruptive over-all than repeated recalling of those witnesses.

Insofar as possible, it is our intention to put to each witness any evidence of which we are aware that will be presented by subsequent witnesses and which may conflict with the testimony of the witness giving evidence. If conflicting evidence of which we were not previously aware is introduced following the testimony of any witness, we will be prepared with your permission

 to recall that witness and provide a full opportunity to address any conflict which arises.

I would be remiss if I did not, at the commencement of these Hearings acknowledge the cooperation and courtesy which has been afforded to us by those parties who have been granted standing and their counsel. With very few exceptions, witnesses and documents have been made available to Commission Counsel and this has greatly facilitated the task of preparing for these Hearings.

Of some disappointment to us is the fact that our requests to interview Staff Sergeant Harry Wheaton and Corporal Gary Green of the R.C.M.P. have been denied. We understand that refusal is based on legal advise given to these individuals by their own counsel to the effect that they are not legally obliged to meet with us prior to their giving evidence at the Hearing. Fortunately no other person who we asked to see relied on such a technicality. Staff Sergeant Wheaton played a major role during the 1982 R.C.M.P. re-investigation which lead to the ordering of the re-hearing and the ultimate release of Mr. Marshall. In the mid-1970's Corporal Green met with Donna Ebsary and subsequently with Sydney Police representatives and his superiors but no formal re-investigation occurred at that time.

While we have some idea of the evidence which is likely to be given by these two witnesses at the Hearing, we consider it

 conduct direct examination of them without the benefit of having had preliminary interviews and thereby obtain precise details of the evidence to be given.

I must express my appreciation also to all those individual

unfortunate that we will not be -- that we will be required to

I must express my appreciation also to all those individuals who are not parties to these proceedings but who as witnesses and prospective witnesses have willingly met with us on one or more occasions. Many of these people have repeated their stories on numerous occasions in the past and to subject them to interviews and testifying yet again was almost too much to ask; nonetheless, they have fully cooperated with Commission Counsel.

I would like to mention also the efforts of the Commission staff in organizing and compiling the various volumes of exhibits which will be filed with you. I'm sure you'll appreciate when you see the volumes that such a task involves many hours of effort and I hope the manner in which they have been organized will facilitate your task.

Our preparation for these hearings has been enhanced also by the work of our investigators, Jim Maloney and Fred Horne. They've located and interviewed numerous individuals particularly in the Sydney area and assisted counsel in identifying those witnesses whose evidence would be relevant to these proceedings.

I mentioned earlier the human cost of this tragic incident and it's long history of proceedings. We have been made aware

16 17

15

19

20

18

21

22 23

24

25

in stark terms of the hardships suffered by some individuals and have been requested by some witnesses not to add to their suffering if at all possible. Accordingly and in a very limited number of cases, we will be asking you that the evidence of a witness be heard in a closed session with all counsel and parties being present but without the public and without the media. our opinion, the granting of such a request will not unduly affect the public nature of these Hearings and will recognize the high personal costs already paid by the individuals involved.

It will take many days of Hearings to present all the relevant evidence to the Commission. I have no doubt that at times the Hearings will become trying. At times, they'll probably even become tedious. There are great expectations, however, that ultimately you will be able to publish your findings and proposed recommendations to answer questions which have been asked many years including the following questions:

Are there deficiences in the investigative process followed by police and in particular, the procedures followed when dealing with juveniles?

Is it time for reconsideration of and perhaps reform of the current complex Rules of Evidence which govern the conduct of criminal proceedings?

Do racism and discrimination influence the administration of justice in Nova Scotia and if so, what safeguards can be implemented to overcome this influence?

What are the duties and obligations of Crown Prosecutors?

What are the duties and obligations of defense counsel?

Are there any conflicts created because the chief law officer of the Crown, the Attorney General, is also an

1

3 4

6

5

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

John F. MacIntyre.

MR. PUGSLEY:

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Ronald Pugsley appearing for John MacIntyre.

elected politician, and if so, how may these be lessened or eliminated?

This is not intended to be an exhaustive list of questions that you will be answering but illustrative only.

I am confident that Your Lordships and all counsel and parties present will give careful consideration and assistance in the coming weeks to the investigation of these important issues. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. MacDonald, I propose for the record to have counsel indicate -- to receive an indication from counsel present. So before we proceed with the hearing of evidence, if you would indicate to me and to us for the record who's appearing as counsel for the Commission.

MR. MacDONALD;

·Mr. Chairman, I'm, of course, appearing as Counsel for the Commission and with me is Wylie Spicer and David Orsborn.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Who is appearing for Donald Marshall, Jr.?

MR. RUBY:

I'm Clayton Ruby. This is Marlys Edwardh, and our counsel required by the Rules of Nova Scotia Law Society for the opening day is Anne Derrick. She also will be joining us throughout.

Populd Dugalov approving for T.L. W. T.

Sydney Discovery Services, Official Court Reporters Sydney, Nova Scotia

1 MR. CHAIRMAN: 2 And William Urguhart. 3 MR. MURRAY: 4 Donald Murray appearing on behalf of William Urquhart. 5 MR. CHAIRMAN: 6 The City of Sydney Police Commission. 7 (NO RESPONSE) 8 The estate of Donald C. MacNeil, Q.C. 9 MR. ELMAN: 10 Frank Elman and I'm assisted here by David G. Barrett. 11 MR. CHAIRMAN: 12 The Royal Canadian Mounted Police. 13 MR. BISSELL: 14 James Bissell and I'm assisted by Al Pringle 15 as well for the Correctional Services of Canada and the National 16 Parole Board. 17 MR. CHAIRMAN: 18 The Attorney General of Nova Scotia and the Department of the 19 Attorney General. 20 MR. SAUNDERS: 21 Yes, Mr. Chairman, Jamie Saunders and Darrel Pink. 22 MR. CHAIRMAN: 23 Oscar Nathaniel Seale and Black United Front of Nova Scotia. 24 MR. ROSS:

Anthony Ross appearing for Oscar Nathaniel Seale and with me is

- 1 | Kevin Drolet and with reference to the Black United Front with
- 2 me is Jeremy Gay.
- 3 | MR. CHAIRMAN:
- 4 The Union of Nova Scotia Indians.
- MR. WILDSMITH:
- 6 I'm Bruce Wildsmith and with me today is Mr. Dan Christmas. Mr.
- 7 Christmas is not a lawyer. He is the executive assistant to the
- 8 | President of the Union of Nova Scotia Indians and he will on occasion
- 9 | be sitting in my absence.
- 10 | MR. CHAIRMAN:
- 11 The R.C.M.P. officers, Aldophus Evers, Richard McAlpine, and Gary
- 12 | Green.
- 13 (NO RESPONSE)
- 14 | Staff Sergeant James Carroll, R.C.M.P.
- 15 | MR. BRODERICK:
- 16 | Charles Broderick, My Lord, representing James Carroll.
- 17 MR. CHAIRMAN:
- 18 Staff Sergeant H. F. Wheaton, R.C.M.P.
- 19 (NO RESPONSE)
- 20 Inspector D. B. Scott, R.C.M.P.
- 21 (NO RESPONSE)
- 22 | Sergeant Herb Davies, R.C.M.P.
- 23 (NO RESPONSE)
- 24 MR. MacDONALD:
- 25 | My Lord, I would also like to introduce to you sitting with Counsel

this morning, Allan Nicholson, who's at the back of the room.

Mr. Nicholson is representing Roy Ebsary while Mr. Ebsary is
giving evidence.

I would like to advise the Commission of the order of Examination that is going to be followed so that you will be aware of that. A meeting was held some time ago of all Counsel and parties in an attempt to agree on the order to be followed, recognizing that there's no necessarily logical procedure to be followed and -- but having to have something. A consensus was reached Mr. Chairman and I'll read that into the record if I may:

As you indicated in your statement, the Direct Examination of all witnesses will be conducted by Commission Counsel.

Following that the order of Cross-Examination will be as I'm to read it to you with this exception:

In the event any party is giving evidence, the Counsel representing such party at his or her option will have the election of going last.

Now with that exception, here is the order that is going to be followed: Following Direct Examination by Commission Counsel, Counsel for Donald Marshall, Jr., will Cross-Examine, next will be the City of Sydney Police Commission, then Counsel for John F. MacIntyre, Counsel for William Urquhart, Counsel for the Estate of Donald C. MacNeil, Counsel for the Department of the Attorney General, Counsel for the R.C.M.P., and the Correctional Services of Canada, Counsel for the individual R.C.M.P. Officers and we've written them

in this order: Carroll, Wheaton, Scott, Davies, Evers, McAlpine, and Green, and you will appreciate that on some occasions one lawyer is representing two or three of those individuals, then Counsel for Oscar Seale and The Black United Front, and finally the Union of Nova Scotia Indians. Following which Commission Counsel, if they wish, would have the opportunity to re-examine.

Now Mr. Chairman, we have filed and marked various Exhibits. They have been bound in volumes and I would just read into the record again what is obtained in each volume. I believe a copy of each volume is made available to each of Your Lordships. Volume 1 which which would be Exhibit one—So we've started the Exhibits with Volume one. Volume one would contain the transcripts of the evidence given at the Donald Marshall preliminary inquiry, a statement of facts which was filed by the Crown Prosecutor at the —— prior to the trial of Mr. Marshall, and the commencement of the transcript of the trial of Mr. Marshall, that's in Volume one.

In Volume two the concluding evidence from the Marshall trial and the transcript of the Marshall Appeal that was heard in January of 1972.

Volume three contains the reference and as does Volume four which does contains factums filed by Counsel on the reference and the reason for judgement of the Nova Scotia Court of Appeal. Volume four also contains the transcript of the preliminary inquiry for Mr. Ebsary.

Volume five contains the transcript of the evidence of the first trial of Mr. Ebsary.

Volume six contains the transcript of his second trial in part and Volume seven continues with the second trial.

Volume eight contains the third Ebsary trial as does Volume nine,

Volume eight contains the third Ebsary trial as does Volume nine, continued on, as does Volume ten in part, and Volume ten also refers to the Ebsary Appeal.

Following that there are various volumes which have evidence of documents that will be referred to with various witnesses and that is organized in the same fashion as the witnesses are to be called.

So Volume 11 contains documents referenced to Roy Ebsary,

James MacNeil, Robert MacKay, and Marvel Mattson. Those would be
the -- As presently advised those would be the first four witnesses
in that order.

Volume 12 contains documents referenced to Maynard Chant, Richard Walsh, John Mullowney, Howard Dean, Michael MacDonald, John Pratico, Raymond Poirier, and Doctor Mian.

Volume 13 contains evidence for Doctor Naqvi, Terrance Gushue, Patricia Harris, Mary Csernyik, Catherine Soltesz, Barbara Floyd, Sandra Cotie, Wayne Magee, and Lawrence Burke.

Fourteen is Beudah Chant, Roy Gould, Mary Ebsary, Gregory Ebsary, Eugene Smith, and William Urquhart.

Fifteen is John MacIntyre and Donna Ebsary.

Volume 16 is a volume containing documents contained in the City of Sydney Police vault.

Volume 17 contains notes that were made by the Crown Prosecutor Mr. Edwards and clippings taken from the Eskasoni Press.

OPENING REMARKS, by Mr. MacDonald

Volume 18 contains documents relating to the 1971 R.C.M.P. investigation and documents relating to Roy Ebsary.

Nineteen contains the documents relating to the review and re-investigation from January, 1982, to March, 1983.

Twenty contains the documents relating to the review and re-investigation of May, 1983, to August, 1986.

Twenty-one is the document containing all those documents that are compiled by Staff Sergeant Wheaton in 1982, and those have been introduced as Exhibits one through twenty-one.

Also marked as an Exhibit (I think it's Exhibit 22.) is this large plan to my left, to your right, which is a plan prepared by Carl MacDonald, a local surveyor. Mr. MacDonald prepared the plan that was used in the original trial of Mr. Marshall, and he had access to the original document. At our request he has added to that to show certain information that was not contained on the original plan, for example, we have added the location of St. Joseph's Church, rear Argyle Street, the Acadian Lines Bus Terminal and a couple of other points that will become obvious as we go through the evidence. Those are names that will come up from time to time. That has been marked as Exhibit 22. Those are all of the Exhibits.

The first witness to be called, Mr. Chairman, is Roy Ebsary.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Before you go on to that, copies of these Exhibits have been distributed to all Counsel.

MR. MacDONALD:

Yes, My Lord, I believe so.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Fine.

MR. MacDONALD:

Now Mr. Ebsary is in rather frail health and if we could perhaps take a break for a few minutes so that I can get him comfortably seated at the witness table and resume at that time and perhaps press on until twenty-thirty or so. I should also say, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ebsary is, I believe, seventy-five or seventy-six and if we could restrict any examination of him until-between an hour and a half and two hours at a stretch I think that would be very helpful for him.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

We'll do our best to accommodate.

MR. MacDONALD

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Before we adjourn for ten minutes I -- simply for the record we admit Exhibits one to twenty-one as filed by Commission Counsel and Exhibit 22 the plan of Wentworth Park vicinity. So we'll rise and you'll let us know when you're ready to continue.

HEARING ADJOURNED AT: 10:48 a.m., AND RECONVENED, 10:58.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. MacDonald.

MR. MacDONALD:

Perhaps it would be inappropriate for me to suggest that if

Counsel wanted they could remove their jackets. It's very hot in this room. MR. CHAIRMAN: I suspect that that's so. We'll put it this way, dress is optional. MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, the first witness to be called will be Roy Ebsary.