

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE
DONALD MARSHALL, JR., PROSECUTION

RG44
Vol. 252
#7

Volume 46

Held: January 27, 1988, in the Imperial Room, Lord Nelson Hotel,
Halifax, Nova Scotia

Before: Chief Justice T.A. Hickman, Chairman
Assoc. Chief Justice L.A. Poitras and
Hon. G. T. Evans, Commissioners

Counsel: Messrs. George MacDonald, Q.C., Wylie Spicer, and David
Orsborn: Commission counsel

Mr. Clayton Ruby, Ms. Marlys Edwardh, and Ms. A. Derrick:
Counsel for Donald Marshall, Jr.

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

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

Mr. Donald C. Murray: Counsel for Mr. William Urquhart

Messrs. Frank L. Elman, Q.C., and David G. Barrett: Counsel for
Donald MacNeil estate

Messrs. Jamie W.S. Saunders and Darrel I. Pink: Counsel for the
Attorney General of Nova Scotia

Mr. James D. Bissell & Mr. A. Pringle: Counsel for the R.C.M.P.
and Counsel for the Correctional Services of Canada

Mr. William L. Ryan, Q.C.: Counsel for Officers Evers, Green and
MacAlpine

Mr. Charles Broderick: Counsel for Sgt. J. Carroll

Messrs. S. Bruce Outhouse, Q.C. and Thomas M. Macdonald: Counsel
for Staff Sgt. Wheaton and Insp. Scott

Mr. Guy LaFosse: Counsel for Sgt. H. Davies

Messrs. Bruce H. Wildsmith and Graydon Nicholas: Counsel for
the Union of Nova Scotia Indians

Mr. E. Anthony Ross: Counsel for Oscar N. Seale

Mr. E. Anthony Ross and Jeremy Gay: Counsel for the Black
United Front

Court Reporting: Margaret E. Graham, OCR, RPR

MEDIA POOL COPY

PRESS

INDEX - VOLUME 46

Witness

Staff Sgt. H. Wheaton

Examination by Mr. Saunders 9:55.....	8388
10:15.....	8406
10:45.....	8429
11:04.....	8445
11:50.....	8461
Examination by Mr. Broderick.....	8466
12:11.....	8475
Examination by Mr. LaFosse 2:06	8483
Examination by Mr. Ross.....	8493
2:47.....	8513
3:02.....	8524
4:00.....	8549

EXHIBIT LIST

<u>Exhibit</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Volume</u>
92	Four pages of Mr. Smith's handwritten	6833	37
93	Mr. Smith's record of polygraph examinations	6833	37
94	Copy of Donald L. Burgess' job description dated 1983	7134	38
95	A-5 with related notes and RCMP correspondence	7150	38
96	Copies of pages of Sgt. Cole's notebook	7225	39
97	Copy of Melinda MacLean's file	7243	39
98	Volume 29	7484	41
99	Volume 34	7484	41
90A	Photocopy of handwritten notes by Staff Sgt. Wheaton (typed version in Exhibit 90)	7490	41
90B	Original of Staff Sgt. Wheaton's notes (original in Exhibit 90)	7491	41
100	Statement of G.A. Ebsary dated April 19, 1982	7492	41
101	Statement of Donald Marshall, Jr. to Cpl. Carroll dated Feb. 18, 1982, taken at Dorchester Penitentiary	7493	41
102	Affidavit dated September 1982 of Staff Sgt. Wheaton	7495	41

<u>Exhibit</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Volume</u>
103	Statement of Roy Newman Ebsary February 23	7574	41
104	Cpl. Carroll's handwritten notes	7581	41
105	six excerpts from <u>Cape Breton Post</u> dated May 29, 31, and June 1, 2, 3, and 5, 1971	7656	42
106	Volume 37. Transcript of June, 1984 examination for discovery of Heather Matheson, <u>John F. MacIntyre v. Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.</u>	7656	42
100A	Original of Greg and Mary Ebsary's state- ment	8014	44
88A	Copy of Staff Sgt. Wheaton's written notes	8163	44
107	Calender for years 1800 to 2500	8229	45
108	Photocopy of Staff Sgt. Wheaton's notes	8230	45
109	Diagram drawn by Staff Sgt. Wheaton of John MacIntyre's office with seating plan of meeting of April 26, 1982	8231	45
110	Three pages from discovery evidence of Heather Matheson	8277	45
111	RCMP guide for contact with media	8280	45
112	Correctional Services records of Donald Marshall, Jr. (Volume 35)	8516	46
113	Stephen Aronson's correspondence re fees (Volume 27)	8530	46

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 JANUARY 27, 1988 - 9:30 A.M.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN

3 Mr. Saunders?

4 MR. SAUNDERS

5 Thank you, My Lord.

6
7 HAROLD FRANCIS WHEATON, still sworn, testified as follows:

8
9 EXAMINATION BY MR. SAUNDERS

10
11 Q. Staff. Sgt. Wheaton, I'm Jamie Saunders and I'm appearing on
12 behalf of the Attorney General. I'd like to begin, Staff. Sgt.
13 Wheaton, with respect to the area of disclosure of information
14 by the RCM Police to people not connected with an
15 investigation. You said something last day which troubled me
16 and that was in answer to a question put to you by Chief
17 Justice Hickman. You said that it would not be appropriate
18 for you to seek out a member of the press in a case where
19 someone had been acquitted. But if a journalist approached
20 you in such a case, it would be okay for you to provide an
21 opinion to that journalist. Do you recall that evidence, sir?

22 A. Yes, sir.

23 Q. Having regard to the guidelines, Exhibit 111, that were
24 introduced yesterday.

25 A. Yes, sir.

- 1 Q. You will see on page one of that exhibit, sir, "F1A, No.2."
- 2 A. Yes, sir.
- 3 Q. And you'll see that by Item No. 2, "Where there is a need for
4 a public statement via the media, confine comments to who,
5 what, where, when, and why."
- 6 A. Yes, sir.
- 7 Q. So it's apparent from this directive from the RCM Police that
8 even in a need-to-know situation, a member of the RCMP is to
9 confine himself or herself to the facts, the five W's, correct?
- 10 A. If I may, sir, maybe I misunderstood your question from the
11 beginning. In this operational instruction, F1 is in relation to
12 the release of information to media.
- 13 Q. Yes.
- 14 A. F1A-2 deals with where there is a need for a public statement;
15 i.e., a need for a release to the media.
- 16 Q. Exactly right.
- 17 A. That would be dealing with a press release.
- 18 Q. Yes.
- 19 A. In the form of a written press release.
- 20 Q. What would an example of that be, Staff Sgt. Wheaton?
- 21 A. This would be in relation to perhaps, I'm just trying to think
22 of an example.
- 23 Q. Let me give you one.
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. And you tell me whether it might be an example. If a group

1 of young people and their counsellors went missing on a
2 weekend trip and there was an inquiry as to their
3 whereabouts and no one knew where they were. And
4 because of the obvious questioning among members of the
5 public, the police might very well issue a statement on the
6 facts of the disappearance. Would that be an example, sir?

7 A. Yeah, well, yes, that's very close to, say, for example, the
8 Warburton situation.

9 Q. Exactly.

10 A. Which I worked on.

11 Q. Yes. But I take it from this, sir, that it would be expected that
12 a police officer would not give an opinion as to the cause of
13 the disappearance, he would confine himself to the facts.
14 That is, the when and the why and who was missing and
15 those sorts of things, correct?

16 A. Well, to go back to your example, Mr. Saunders. In that case
17 of a missing child, it was expanded far beyond the five W's.
18 Opinions were given as to the possibility of why he was
19 missing or opinions as to where he could be or opinions...And
20 opinions are given to the press, sir.

21 Q. But it's clear from this directive, No. 2, that in a need for the
22 public statement via the media that the remarks ought to be
23 confined to the who, what, where, when, and why, correct?

24 A. Yes, sir, when making an official press release of information
25 to media.

1 Q. And do you recall your evidence last day that, and the Chief
2 Justice's observation, that a police officer ought not to make
3 off-the-record comments to members of the media.

4 A. That's right, sir.

5 Q. And, indeed, if we turn to page three of the exhibit, one sees
6 that Item #12, "That the force itself frowns on off-the-record
7 comments by members of the force," correct?

8 A. Yes, it says that they "do not provide immunity."

9 Q. Yes.

10 A. And really aren't off the record.

11 Q. Now if I could get you to turn to page four of the exhibit,
12 Staff, and under the heading, "Information to the News Media
13 General," and then Item No. 2, "Shall ensure insofar as
14 possible that any information released to the news media will
15 not..." and then four things are specified.

16 A. Yes, sir.

17 Q. "Shall not interfere with an investigation or arrest," and so
18 forth. I take it, sir, that that is really sound advice to any
19 investigating officer in imparting information to anyone
20 outside an investigation, let alone members of the press.

21 A. Yes, sir.

22 Q. Indeed, you would not want any officer of the RCM Police to
23 speak to anyone outside an investigation about things that
24 might interfere with an investigation or an arrest?

25 A. These are a wise man's guide, sir.

1 Q. Yes, sir, and as NCO at the Cole Harbour Detachment, I take it
2 that you would be giving such instructions to women and men
3 under your direction.

4 A. Basically, yes, sir.

5 Q. Tell me, Staff Sgt. Wheaton, how many times it was that you
6 met with Mr. Marshall's solicitor, Stephen Aronson?

7 A. I don't have any specific notes of it, sir, but I believe two or
8 three.

9 Q. Do you recall when those meetings took place?

10 A. I can't say absolutely for sure. Do I recall when they were?

11 Q. Yes.

12 A. There was one near the first of the investigation.

13 Q. Some time in February of 1982?

14 A. Yes, sir.

15 Q. Where was that meeting, sir?

16 A. That would have been at my office in Sydney.

17 Q. Yes?

18 A. I would recall a second meeting again with Mr. Aronson, again
19 in Sydney. It seems to me he was down in Whycomomagh
20 with Donald Marshall fishing or something because he was
21 wearing older clothes, later on in the investigation. And there
22 may have been a third, I just can't honestly recall.

23 Q. You attended at the reference, that is the argument and
24 evidence presented in December of 1982?

25 A. Yes, I did, sir.

1 Q. Were you stationed still in Sydney in December of 1982?

2 A. December?

3 Q. Yes.

4 A. Of 1982. December of 1982?

5 Q. Yes.

6 A. I would have been in Sydney in December, yes.

7 Q. Did you meet with Mr. Aronson around the time of the
8 reference, sir, in December of 1982?

9 A. I don't believe the reference was in '82. I may have my dates
10 wrong.

11 Q. Yes.

12 A. Was it?

13 Q. The argument before the Court of Appeal was in December of
14 1982. That is the evidence was presented on two days in
15 December, I believe December 1st and December 2nd.

16 A. I take your word for it, sir, yes. I don't have any independent
17 recall. Now your question is what, sir?

18 Q. You attended at the reference, sir?

19 A. Yes, I did.

20 Q. And you heard the evidence presented during two days
21 before the Nova Scotia Court of Appeal?

22 A. I did, sir.

23 Q. I take it you stayed in Halifax during the course of those two
24 days?

25 A. Yes, I remember doing that.

1 Q. Did you meet with Mr. Aronson at that time, sir?

2 A. I know I had conversation with Mr. Aronson probably at the
3 courthouse. I don't recall, like when you say "meet," do I
4 assume correctly like a formal meeting going to his office or
5 him coming to my room?

6 Q. Or any place where you would sit down and have a discussion
7 with Mr. Aronson.

8 A. I met with Mr. Aronson, sir, yes.

9 Q. Is it possible you met with Mr. Aronson at the time of the
10 reference hearing in December of 1982?

11 A. Yes, it is possible, sir.

12 Q. The affidavit that was prepared for submission to the Court of
13 Appeal; that is, your affidavit, who prepared that, sir?

14 A. I believe Mr. Edwards prepared that. I'm not sure, maybe
15 Mr. Aronson did. I recall the affidavit.

16 Q. Did you keep any notes, Staff, of your meetings that you had
17 with Stephen Aronson?

18 A. If it's in my notes, that would be the only notes I have. I
19 kept no other notes of meetings.

20 Q. I have not seen any reference in your notes to meetings with
21 Mr. Aronson.

22 A. I would have no reference then, sir.

23 Q. You had no compunction, according to your evidence, in
24 talking with Mr. Aronson and appraising him of our
25 investigation because you said he was the complainant,

1 correct?

2 A. That is correct, sir, yes.

3 Q. Did you talk to Mr. Aronson about your view that John F.
4 MacIntyre should be charged with counseling perjury?

5 A. I don't know if I had determined that view at that time when
6 I had my meetings with Mr. Aronson. I felt probably at that
7 time I was still in the investigation stage, that he had
8 ethically and morally probably done wrong but I don't know
9 if I firmed up a state of criminally [sic] at that point.

10 Q. Certainly after April 26th, 1962, by your evidence, you had
11 formed that view.

12 A. Yes, sir.

13 Q. And if you had discussions with Mr. Aronson after April 26th,
14 1982 is it likely you would have told him that?

15 A. Yes, I would have, yes.

16 Q. Did you also discuss with Mr. Aronson your view that John F.
17 MacIntyre should be charged with deliberately hiding the
18 Patricia Harriss June 17th statement from you and Corporal
19 Davies?

20 A. To be quite frank, sir, that never occurred to me until it was
21 just mentioned here before this Commission that it was
22 actually an offence under the Act.

23 Q. I see. It never occurred to you until this hearing.

24 A. No, I was thinking more that it, the fact that a person hides
25 something from you is not necessarily a criminal offence, but

1 it was apt...correctly pointed out.

2 Q. Did you review with Mr. Aronson the fact, according to your
3 evidence, that John F. MacIntyre deliberately and willfully, to
4 use your words, concealed that June 17th Patricia Harriss
5 statement from you?

6 A. I have no independent recall whether I did or didn't. I could
7 have, sir.

8 Q. And is it likely that you did?

9 A. I don't know.

10 Q. You certainly knew of that after April 26th, 1982 according to
11 your evidence.

12 A. I certainly did, sir, yes.

13 Q. Did you know, sir, that Mr. Marshall was commencing a
14 lawsuit against the City of Sydney and Messrs. MacIntyre and
15 Urquhart?

16 A. Yes, sir, I believe I read that in the paper.

17 Q. Did you discuss with Mr. Aronson the contents of the
18 statement of claim and originating notice filed on Mr.
19 Marshall's behalf?

20 A. No, sir, I don't believe Mr. Aronson discussed that with me.

21 Q. At any time, did you review with Mr. Aronson what it was
22 that he was putting in by way of allegations in the statement
23 of claim?

24 A. No, sir.

25 Q. Did you play any role in the preparation of that statement of

1 claim?

2 A. I played no role in the preparation of that statement of claim.

3 Q. Did you know that Mr. Marshall had filed an action against
4 the City of Sydney and Messrs. MacIntyre and Urquhart in
5 January of 1983, sir?

6 A. Again, I have no independent recollection of the date. I
7 believe I read it in the news or something, heard it in the
8 press.

9 Q. Would it be proper police procedure for a police officer to
10 meet with a defence lawyer during the course of a criminal
11 investigation and appraise him of evidence useful to a person
12 in a civil action against the authorities?

13 A. One would have to have a crystal ball to know that, I would
14 suggest to you, sir. I appraised the complainant of the action
15 taken on the investigation I did into his complaint. I did not
16 help Mr. Aronson in any way to the best of my knowledge in
17 any civil action against anyone or any criminal, subsequent
18 criminal action against anyone.

19 Q. And at no time, according to your evidence, did Mr. Aronson
20 review with you the contents of the statement of claim
21 prepared by him?

22 A. No, sir.

23 Q. All right. Is it the duty of a police officer, Staff Wheaton, to
24 investigate crime or suspected crime?

25 A. Yes, sir.

1 Q. And if a police officer is satisfied that he has reasonable and
2 probable grounds to charge, is it the officer's duty to charge?

3 A. Yes, sir.

4 Q. And a crown prosecutor may not agree with the decision
5 taken by a police officer and if that is the case, the crown
6 would withdraw the charge in court?

7 A. The crown, as I understand it, I've never had that happen, sir,
8 but the crown, as I understand it, would then not prosecute
9 the matter.

10 Q. Would not proceed with the prosecution.

11 A. Null the pros...

12 Q. It's never happened in your evidence...

13 A. No prosecution.

14 Q. In your experience, but that is your understanding?

15 A. That would be my understanding, Mr. Saunders, yes.

16 Q. You mentioned a few days ago in your evidence that in the
17 case of a police officer in the RCMP investigating a person of
18 some celebrity and deciding to charge that person, that the
19 officer is obliged to submit a telex to some superior officer
20 notifying him of that, is that correct?

21 A. That is correct. That's part of our instructions.

22 Q. And the officer in the field sends the telex to whom?

23 A. He would send a telex to his officer commanding.

24 Q. And the officer commanding to an officer in the field, what
25 does that mean, someone in "H" Division in Nova Scotia?

- 1 A. Yes, sir.
- 2 Q. All right.
- 3 A. Or it could mean to notify, if you were, say, in Sydney or
4 Yarmouth or Truro Subdivision, to notify your officer
5 commanding at that point, who in turn, we are a tiered type
6 of structure.
- 7 Q. I understand. So the officer who has decided to charge would
8 inform his superior at the local level and still be obliged to
9 send a telex to "H" Division in Halifax, correct?
- 10 A. That could done one of two ways, either the officer himself or
11 his officer commanding might choose to do it.
- 12 Q. The officer would have already decided to charge. He or she
13 is merely informing his superiors that that has been done so
14 that they can deal with any questions raised as a
15 consequence?
- 16 A. It would depend on the type of investigation. Every
17 investigation is different, sir.
- 18 Q. Yes. While you spoke of the investigation of a person of some
19 celebrity, and you mentioned that a telex would have to be
20 sent to superiors to notify them of that occurrence, correct?
- 21 A. Well, I don't think a celebrity, yes, a celebrity, perhaps. If it
22 were to appear in the morning paper, a commanding officer
23 might like to know about it, if it were a person of, you know,
24 of stature in the community.,
- 25 Q. So that questions could be fielded by someone in the know,

1 correct?

2 A. That's correct, sir, yes.

3 Q. But you would not telex "H" Division to seek authority to
4 charge in the first place. That would be the duty of the
5 investigating officer, correct?

6 A. Well, it would depend on the charge, sir.

7 Q. Why would it depend on the charge?

8 A. Well, if it were, say, an impaired driving or speeding offence,
9 which a prominent person, he would be treated like any other
10 person. He would be given a ticket and what not. And you
11 might advise your officer commanding, if you thought it
12 would catch the attention of the press. If it were, say, a
13 complicated ongoing investigation which required
14 instructions. As I say, we are a tiered layer authority
15 structure within the RCMP. Then you would not only send a
16 telex, you would follow it, you would put a note on it
17 probably "report to follow," and then you would go forward
18 with a report outlining all the circumstances of the case and
19 you may very well ask for instructions to come back to you.

20 Q. But I take it, Staff Wheaton, that one wouldn't need that kind
21 of instruction from a superior to continue the investigation.

22 A. Yeah, you're taking all charges with a broad brush treatment,
23 sir.

24 Q. Yes.

25 A. And I'm saying you cannot take all charges with a broad

1 brush treatment.

2 Q. Well, let's just deal with the case that may have some
3 celebrity to it.

4 A. Yes, sir.

5 Q. I take it you're not suggesting that a police officer who is
6 suspicious and has reasonable and probable grounds that a
7 crime is being committed, that officer does not have to check
8 with headquarters for permission to continue the
9 investigation.

10 A. That's exactly my point, sir. It would depend on the
11 circumstances of the investigation, the type of charge to be
12 laid.

13 Q. Are you saying that an officer in the field who has those
14 suspicions and thinks there are reasonable and probable
15 grounds to investigate has to wait for some higher authority
16 to tell him that he could do it?

17 A. It would depend on the charge and circumstances, sir, yes.

18 Q. Well, can you give me an example of a charge where an
19 officer in the field would have to sit and wait for that kind of
20 instruction?

21 A. Yes, sir. Say, for instance, you had a situation where you had
22 information to the effect that an ongoing fraud was going on
23 with, say, the minister of highways getting a kickback on all
24 the guard rails sold in the province of Nova Scotia. And you
25 had information come in to that effect. This would be a

1 highly sensitive matter. You would then submit a report
2 outlining all the information you had. You would send it to
3 Halifax and you would ask for instructions. You would
4 continue, you wouldn't stop but you would advise. Probably
5 it would be even done via phone.

6 Q. So that no time is wasted.

7 A. It could be done that way, yes, sir.

8 Q. One would not, who is a police officer, one would not risk the
9 chance that evidence would be lost...

10 A. That's exactly, yes.

11 Q. Or that people would get away, correct?

12 A. That is correct, yes.

13 Q. So you would expect the officer who is doing the investigating
14 to continue the investigation, but at the same time, keep his
15 superiors advised.

16 A. Well, let's say there would be a pregnant pause until your
17 boss told you to go ahead.

18 Q. Which may only be the time to make a phone call.

19 A. Exactly, sir.

20 Q. All right. Am I clear, Staff Wheaton, that you never told
21 Frank Edwards that John F. MacIntyre should be charged?

22 A. No, you're not, sir.

23 Q. I'm not clear on that.

24 A. No, you're not.

25 Q. I thought you had said a few days ago that you never

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 indicated to Mr. Frank Edwards that John F. MacIntyre should
2 be charged with any offence.

3 A. I really, you know, don't quibble with what you're saying
4 maybe in the transcript, but if I could, I'd give you my
5 recollection of the conversations between Mr. Edwards and
6 myself and Mr. Edwards will, of course, take the stand. Mr.
7 Edwards and I discussed what action John MacIntyre had
8 done here. Had he committed a criminal offence? We
9 discussed the evidence. Where did the evidence fit? Is this
10 an obstruction? Is it a misuse of public office? Is it
11 counseling perjury? Frank Edwards and I had discussions of
12 this nature.

13 Q. Did you ever, Staff Wheaton, tell Frank Edwards that in your
14 view John MacIntyre should be charged with a criminal
15 offence?

16 9:55 a.m. *

17 Q. Any criminal offence.

18 A. Yes, sir.

19 Q. When did you tell him that and...

20 A. I felt that John MacIntyre had committed a criminal offence
21 and I was discussing it with my Crown, who is a lawyer, and
22 who is a representative of the Attorney General's Department,
23 of course, who has the expertise in that area.

24 Q. Yeah. Expertise to advise. And I wish to know from you,
25 Staff Wheaton, when you told Mr. Edwards that John

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 MacIntyre should be charged with any offence?

2 A. I really don't have a note on it. You can refer to Mr. Edwards'
3 notes. I think you can see where we had conversations in
4 that area or conversations, I note somewhere he said "set up",
5 you know, sort of thing.

6 Q. There is much in Mr. Edwards' notes about conversations that
7 you and he had, sir.

8 A. Yes, sir.

9 Q. My question is the specific one, when did you tell Mr.
10 Edwards...

11 A. Oh, I can't...

12 Q. ...that John MacIntyre should be charged with a criminal
13 offence?

14 A. I have no independent recollection of the date, sir.

15 Q. Do you have any independent recollection of, in fact, telling
16 him such a thing?

17 A. Yes, sir.

18 Q. You do.

19 A. Yes, sir.

20 MR. CHAIRMAN

21 You say you discussed with Mr. Edwards the question of
22 evidence that might indicate obstruction.

23 STAFF SGT. WHEATON

24 Yes, My Lord.

25

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 MR. CHAIRMAN

2 What was the obstruction?

3 STAFF SGT. WHEATON

4 The obstruction would be misleading a peace officer in the
5 execution of his duty, My Lord.

6 MR. CHAIRMAN

7 In what regard, in what area?

8 STAFF SGT. WHEATON

9 In that he told me, for instance, in the...on the 4th of February
10 meeting that Pratico and Chant were fine unshakable witnesses.
11 Later on I found that they were witnesses who had to
12 be....declared Chant hostile, and in Pratico's case there was some
13 mental problems. I feel he mislead me in that regard, My Lord,
14 just as one area. Whether it would substantiate a charge or not, to
15 me the most solid area was the counseling perjury. But Mr.
16 Edwards and I discussed that as to where would one go with this.

17 MR. SAUNDERS

18 Q. After the April 26th visit that you and Corporal Davies say
19 you made on that date to John F. MacIntyre's office did you
20 tell Mr. Edwards that in your view Mr. MacIntyre ought to be
21 charged with an offence?

22 A. I don't have a specific recall of the date we discussed what
23 offence.

24 MR. CHAIRMAN

25 You're not answering the question.

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 STAFF SGT. WHEATON

2 I'm sorry, My Lord, what...

3 MR. SAUNDERS

4 Q. Did you discuss and did you tell Mr. Edwards after April 26th,
5 1982, that Mr. MacIntyre should be charged with a criminal
6 offence?

7 A. I may well have. I can't...I have no independent recall of it,
8 sir.

9 Q. I take it you're not sure whether you did or not?

10 A. I'm not sure of the date, sir.

11 Q. My question, sir, is did you tell Mr. Edwards after April 26,
12 1982, that John MacIntyre should be charged with an
13 offence?

14 A. I don't know.

15 Q. You don't know. All right.

16 MR. OUTHOUSE

17 My Lord, in fairness to the witness I don't know whether Mr.
18 Saunders is saying at any time after April the 26th or is he saying
19 immediately on April 26th or thereabouts, maybe...

20 MR. CHAIRMAN

21 My interpretation is that he was saying any time.

22 MR. SAUNDERS

23 Any time.

24 MR. OUTHOUSE

25 Any time after April 26th, okay.

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERSSTAFF SGT. WHEATON

1
2 A. I'm sure that there were conversations to that effect. I can't
3 give you the date of them though. There must have been...I
4 know there were conversations after...it was certainly an
5 important thing to me and there were conversations and
6 there were conversations relative to charges.

7 Q. Yes.

8 A. I can't give you a date, Mr. Saunders.

9 Q. I...Staff Wheaton, I'm not talking about conversations you
10 may have had with Crown Prosecutor Edwards...

11 A. Relative to charges.

12 Q. ...about varying matters.

13 A. No, I'm...you're referring to relative to charges.

14 Q. Specifically.

15 A. Yes, sir.

16 Q. Whether or not you told Mr. Edwards after April 26th, 1982,
17 that John F. MacIntyre should be charged with a criminal
18 offence.

19 A. No, sir. I cannot say that I told the Crown Prosecutor what to
20 do.

21 Q. Thank-you. Now, you mentioned, sir, that in another
22 investigation involving a police department in which you
23 were involved you sat down with members of the Attorney
24 General's Department and prepared a search warrant to look
25 into the files and affairs of the particular police department.

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 A. Yes, sir.

2 Q. Yes. And you said that that was your basis for saying that
3 you expected to get some instruction from the Attorney
4 General's Department before you investigated the Sydney
5 Police Department, correct?

6 A. Yes, sir.

7 Q. Yeah. I suggest to you Staff Wheaton that the example you
8 gave of that other police force is a little different and
9 different in this way. You were involved in a murder
10 investigation in 1982, correct?

11 A. Yes, sir.

12 Q. And during the course of that murder investigation you had
13 reasonable and probable grounds to believe that the Sydney
14 Police Department had information material to that
15 investigation, correct?

16 A. Could you just repeat that so I have it straight.

17 Q. Yes. During the course of this murder investigation which you
18 were conducting in 1982 you had reasonable and probable
19 grounds to believe that the Sydney Police Department had
20 information useful to the case, material to the case.

21 A. That is correct, sir, yes.

22 Q. Yes. And was it not your duty as an investigating officer to go
23 and find out whether the Sydney Police Department had
24 information material to the case?

25 A. It was my duty as an investigating officer to do exactly what

1 I did.

2 Q. Yes.

3 A. Report it to my superiors and go up the line of authority to
4 either get a search warrant.

5 Q. Yes.

6 A. As was done in the previously mentioned case. Or in this case
7 we received an order from the Attorney General.

8 Q. Indeed, to use your phrase "search warrant", Staff Wheaton,
9 Mr. Edwards urged that you get a search warrant, did he not?

10 A. Mr. Edwards recommended that, yes, sir.

11 Q. Yes, and I say...suggest to you he recommended it strongly.

12 A. Yes, that's correct, sir.

13 Q. Yes. He asked you on a number of occasions to go and get the
14 file.

15 A. It was mentioned, sir, I don't know how many times.

16 Q. Well, Mr. Edwards' notes...

17 A. But it was mentioned.

18 Q. ...reflect...

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. ...that he told you...

21 A. Yes, sir.

22 Q. ...several times...

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. ...to go and get the file.

25 A. I don't recall Mr. Edwards ordering either myself or Inspector

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 Scott around as such.

2 Q. Oh, quite so. But he urged and strongly recommended that
3 you go get a warrant.

4 A. He recommended that we go get a warrant.

5 Q. Inspector Scott had some difficulty with that.

6 A. That's right, sir.

7 Q. And you say that you were caught between the two.

8 A. Yes, sir.

9 Q. All right. You mentioned an analogy a few days ago, sir, of
10 investigating and the proper method of investigating a crime
11 where you think you know who may be the author of that
12 particular crime, signature crime.

13 A. Yes, sir.

14 Q. You used the example of a safe cracker.

15 A. Yes, sir.

16 Q. Yeah. Now, if I could just suggest to you if you were
17 investigating a safe cracking case, Staff Wheaton, and you
18 found the person that you believed to have been the author
19 of that crime.

20 A. Yes, sir.

21 Q. And during the course of your discussions with that
22 individual he indicated to you that the things taken during
23 that safe cracking were on the premises of some fence,
24 somebody that he had sold the items to.

25 A. You're saying that the alleged culprit confessed to me and told

1 me that the safe packing or the stuff out of the safe was at his
2 friend's home, is that...

3 Q. Exactly.

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Yes. I suggest to you, Staff, that you would continue your
6 investigation, get a search warrant and attend on the
7 premises to see if what was said were true.

8 A. That is correct, sir.

9 Q. And to see if another crime had been committed, that is,
10 possession of stolen property.

11 A. That is correct, sir, yes.

12 Q. You would not wait for permission or blessing of the Crown
13 before continuing you investigation and getting a warrant.

14 A. No, sir.

15 Q. All right. Now, did you ever suggest on any occasion, Staff
16 Wheaton, that you required the direction of the Attorney
17 General's Department simply because John MacIntyre was the
18 Chief of Police?

19 A. Could you...I just want to get it framed right again, sir.

20 Q. Yes. Did you ever on any occasion tell Mr. Edwards that you
21 required a direction from the Attorney General's Department
22 simply because MacIntyre was the Chief of Police?

23 A. Not simply because. I...yes, yes. My answer to you question
24 would be yes, sir.

25 Q. And was your reason for saying that just because John

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 MacIntyre was the Chief of the Sydney Police?

2 A. The reason for my saying that, sir, was because and we're
3 referring here to a search warrant now, is it?

4 Q. Yes.

5 A. Because I felt authorization should come down from the top.
6 I was advised that way by my officer commanding and I have
7 to follow the instructions of my officer commanding.

8 Q. Do I take from that you weren't prepared to rely upon Mr.
9 Edwards' strong recommendation and urging that you get a
10 warrant?

11 A. No, sir, because there seemed to be a conflict throughout.
12 There seemed to be a conflict between Mr. Edwards and the
13 Attorney General's Department in Halifax on the conduct of
14 the...where we should go.

15 Q. We'll get to that. My question of you at this time is whether
16 you ever said to Mr. Edwards, "Look, I need something more
17 than just your telling me to go get a warrant."

18 A. Words to that effect, yes, sir.

19 Q. Do you know when you said those things to Mr. Edwards, sir?

20 A. I don't have it recorded in a notebook, no, sir.

21 Q. Fine. Did you know, Staff Wheaton, during the course of your
22 investigation in 1982 that Mr. Gordon Gale was anxious to
23 receive the final report from Sydney Police on your
24 enquiries?

25 A. From Sydney Police.

1 Q. Yes. No, from...

2 A. Sydney City Police.

3 Q. From Sydney Detachment of the RCMP.

4 A. I don't know, sir.

5 Q. Yeah. Did you know that Gordon Gale of the Attorney
6 General's Department was anxious to receive from the Sydney
7 Detachment of the RCMP the results of your investigation?

8 A. Mr. Gale never spoke to me and I never spoke to Mr. Gale. So,
9 I...

10 Q. I heard you say that. But did you understand that he was
11 anxious to receive from the Sydney Detachment a report on
12 your investigation?

13 A. At what stage are we referring to? At the end of the
14 investigation, sir.

15 Q. Spring and summer of 1982.

16 A. I don't know, sir. There were...there were memos that came
17 down from Superintendent Christen asking me this or that.

18 Q. Yes.

19 A. And I answered those memos. As to what was in Mr. Gale's
20 mind it was never discussed with me by my superiors, vis-a-
21 vis the Force side.

22 Q. Yes.

23 A. And I couldn't answer.

24 Q. Did you know from press releases, and you spoke of this a
25 couple of days ago, that there was considerable question as to

1 what to do with the Marshall case? Obviously get him out of
2 the penitentiary and into a halfway house and then how to go
3 about dealing with the situation in court was in the press, was
4 it not? Whether or not a full pardon would be the
5 appropriate route, or whether a reference or an appeal. You
6 read of those things.

7 A. Yes, sir.

8 Q. All right. And you knew that those considerations were being
9 taken by members in government.

10 A. Yes, sir.

11 Q. All right. And did you understand, sir, from what you read in
12 the press that the decision would be made by the Minister of
13 Justice in Ottawa and that they were waiting for a report from
14 the Attorney General's Department in Halifax?

15 A. I can answer that neither yes or no. I know there was
16 considerations at the time, but I wasn't privy to them close
17 enough to say.

18 Q. All right. Did you know that the Attorney General's
19 Department did not want the RCMP to hold up its final report
20 pending these enquiries of the investigating Sydney Police
21 officers?

22 A. To hold them up...

23 Q. Yes.

24 A. ...for what, sir?

25 Q. To hold up the final report submitted to Halifax pending

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 enquiries of the officers of the Sydney Police Department by
2 the RCMP.

3 A. I would have no knowledge at my level of that, sir.

4 Q. All right. If I could get you to turn to Exhibit Volume 19,
5 Staff Wheaton, please, page 112. It's the conclusion of a
6 report by Inspector Scott dated May 5, 1982, and at page 112
7 you see the final paragraph of Inspector Scott's letter.

8 A. Yes, sir.

9 Q. And do you see his statement "There are still avenues of
10 investigation we are exploring, however, none of them are
11 critical to the decision-making process as to Marshall's guilt or
12 innocence in this case."?

13 A. Yes, sir.

14 Q. Yes. And the avenues that were being explored, these
15 avenues of investigation were enquiries of the Sydney Police
16 officers who were involved in the 1971 investigation and an
17 interview with Dr. Naqvi with respect to an autopsy. Do you
18 recall that, sir?

19 A. This is Inspector's Scott forwarding minute, sir, and I'm just
20 trying to get myself chronologically together here.

21 Q. Sure.

22 A. This is in answer to a memorandum from Superintendent
23 Vaughan, I take it, and a request for a booklet containing a
24 summary of events.

25 Q. That's right. The full report.

1 A. Um.

2 Q. And did you know that according to Inspector Scott that there
3 were still avenues of investigation that were still being
4 explored?

5 A. Yes, sir.

6 Q. Yes. And those avenues, I suggest to you, were enquiries of
7 the investigating police in Sydney in 1971 and an interview
8 with Dr. Naqvi, correct?

9 A. And probably in May we were preparing the Ebsary file for
10 court as well.

11 Q. Yes. Now, if I could get you to turn to page 115 you'll see
12 Christen's letter to Gordon Gale in which he identifies what
13 those avenues of investigation are. And I direct your
14 attention to the last paragraph of the letter, the mid-portion
15 of the paragraph.

16
17 As indicated by Inspector Scott there are
18 minor avenues of investigation to be
19 explored, such as interviewing members of
20 the Sydney City Police who were involved
21 in the original investigation, and also to
22 interview Dr. F. M. Naqvi.

23 A. Yes, sir.

24 Q. Yes. And Mr. Christen says that those are minor avenues of
25 investigation, correct?

A. Yes, sir.

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 Q All right. Now, at page 123 we'll see Christen's letter to Mr.
2 Gale dated June 3, 1982, and you'll see that Superintendent
3 Christen closes with the words, "As this completes our
4 investigation into this matter, your further direction will be
5 awaited." So, according to Superintendent Christen the
6 investigation was now complete, correct?

7 A. Yes, sir, and he was awaiting the direction of the Attorney
8 General's Department.

9 Q. Yes. And you were directed earlier in your evidence to the
10 comment made to you by prosecutor Edwards that there
11 should be certain matters held in abeyance for that time
12 being pending submission of the final report to the Attorney
13 General's Department. Do you recall that evidence, sir?

14 A. Yes, sir. We're into the 3rd of June area now.

15 Q. Yes.

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. You'll recall Mr. Edwards telling you that he was told by Mr.
18 Gale that the inquiries of the Sydney police officers ought to
19 be held in abeyance for the time being and the final report
20 not held up pending those enquiries, correct?

21 A. No, sir.

22 Q. You were told that.

23 A. I wasn't told that.

24 Q. I see. I thought you said the last day in your evidence in
25 question...

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 A. That is one portion of it.

2 Q. Yes.

3 A. But the following portion of it is that our investigation into
4 the Sydney City Police would be held in abeyance, i.e....

5 Q. Yes.

6 A. ...as I've said before there was the Marshall portion, the
7 Ebsary portion and the third portion never touched, the
8 MacIntyre investigation.

9 Q. Yes. And it was the view expressed to you of Mr. Edwards
10 that they didn't want the report on Marshall held up pending
11 the enquiries about the Sydney Police Department.

12 A. That is correct, sir.

13 Q. Yeah. You understood that from Mr. Edwards.

14 A. Maybe I misunderstood your question.

15 Q. You understood that from Mr. Edwards.

16 A. That's correct, sir, yes.

17 Q. All right. And you understood that he was imparting to you a
18 view expressed by Mr. Gale, correct?

19 A. That is correct, sir.

20 Q. Yeah. And you knew that the Attorney General's Department
21 was waiting for the final report of the RCMP on the Marshall
22 matter.

23 A. Yes, sir.

24 Q. All right. And you took nothing sinister from the fact that
25 they wanted the report without hanging on or waiting for the

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 enquiries into the Sydney police.

2 A. That is correct, sir, yes.

3 Q. Thank-you. Now, I'd like to review with you next, Staff
4 Wheaton, the meeting of April 16th or 26th.

5 A. Yes, sir.

6 Q. Okay. When was it that you first received the Frank Edwards'
7 notes, that is the typed notes that are compiled in Exhibit
8 number 17.

9 A. These were provided to me by my solicitor maybe three
10 weeks, a month ago, something like that.

11 Q. Yes. And you went through the notes, of course.

12 A. I went through them at the time I received them. I haven't
13 really, other than at this Commission Inquiry various excerpts
14 of them have been brought to my attention, haven't read
15 them of late.

16 Q. But you read them when you received them from counsel.

17 A. Yes, I did, sir.

18 Q. Yeah. And would you agree, Staff Wheaton, that Mr. Edwards'
19 notes are very detailed?

20 A. Yes, sir.

21 Q. And, have his notes assisted you in refreshing your own
22 memory as to what happened six years ago?

23 A. The thing that struck me about Mr. Edwards' notes, as I read
24 them when I first received them, was I recall they were...just
25 about everything he had in here...

1 Q. Yeah.

2 A. ...was happening then.

3 Q. So, it brought it back for you.

4 A. Yes, it did, sir.

5 Q. So, and Mr. Edwards' notes then assisted in refreshing your
6 memory as to what happened six years ago?

7 A. Yes, sir.

8 Q. Now, I'll get you to turn to page 9 of Exhibit 17, please. Are
9 you with me?

10 A. Yes, sir.

11 Q. Yes. And the point you dispute in Mr. Edwards' notes is the
12 comment on page 9, Exhibit 17, where he begins to describe
13 at paragraph, "While on the phone told me he and Herb
14 Davies had gone down to see Chief MacIntyre late Friday
15 p.m." Are you with me?

16 A. I've got the wrong...

17 Q. No. You're in the...

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. You need Exhibit 17, red book.

20 A. Sorry, about that.

21 Q. No, it's all right.

22 A. Page 9.

23 Q. Page 9.

24 A. Yes, sir, which....

25

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

10:15 a.m.*

Q. Page nine, and you see the sentence six lines from the top,
"While on the phone told me he and Herb Davies had..."

A. Yes.

Q. And in the next four or five paragraphs of Mr. Edwards' notes,
down to and including "...left with only statement and a few
other papers, still did not demand full file and all information
from Chief."

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is Mr. Edwards' description of what he says you told him
on Saturday, April 17, 1982.

A. That's correct, sir, yes.

Q. And according to Mr. Edwards' notes, he said you told him
that this transpired the day before; in other words, on Friday,
April 16th, 1982.

A. That's correct, sir.

Q. And that's the part of Mr. Edwards' notes that you dispute.
It's your evidence that he erred by describing that as April
16th and ought to instead have said it was April 26th.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is that correct?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now if we look at page nine, Staff Wheaton, it's a fact, is it not,
that you and Donna Ebsary attended at Mr. Edwards' office on

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Saturday, April 17, 1982?

A. That is correct, sir, yes.

Q. And it's a fact that the appointment that you had with Mr. Edwards and Miss Ebsary started at 2:30 Saturday afternoon, April 17th?

A. To the best of my knowledge, yes, sir.

Q. You'll see that at the beginning of his notes at the top of page nine, Mr. Edwards says that you called him at his house at 1:45 Saturday afternoon to say that you were almost finished taking the statement from Donna.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that you agreed to meet at 2:30, correct?

A. Yes, sir, that's correct, sir, yes.

Q. And the statement, in fact, that you obtained from Donna Ebsary, which is in Exhibit 34.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is dated Saturday, April 17, 1982.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And, for the record, that's Volume 34, Exhibit 98, page 78.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And I take it, sir, that you had taken the statement from Donna Ebsary before attending with her at Mr. Edward's office.

A. Yes, sir.

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 Q. And if you follow with me towards the bottom of page nine,
2 you'll see Mr. Edwards' comment at the bottom paragraph,
3 "Gave written statement to Wheaton," that would be Donna
4 Ebsary gave written statement to you, "which I read as I
5 interviewed her." So I take it that you attended with Miss
6 Ebsary, provided Mr. Edwards with the statement that you
7 had previously obtained that same day from Donna Ebsary.
8 Mr. Edwards proceeded to read it and then proceeded to
9 interview himself Donna Ebsary. Correct?

10 A. That is correct, sir, yes.

11 Q. So the description given by Mr. Edwards on page nine at the
12 top of the page and the bottom of the page with respect to the
13 meeting you had with Miss Ebsary in his office is correct.

14 A. Yes, sir.

15 Q. I'll get you to turn page 11 of the same exhibit booklet,
16 please, Staff, and you'll see this note made by Mr. Edwards,
17 Monday, April 19, 1982, begins:

18
19 Inspector Scott called just as Wheaton was
20 leaving and said he was concerned about
21 Harriss statement and fact that MacIntyre
had been holding back.

22 Are you with me?

23 A. Yes, I am, sir.

24 Q. The first two lines.

25 A. Yes.

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1
2 Q. So it's apparent from Mr. Edwards' notes that Inspector Scott
3 told Edwards that he, Scott, was concerned about Patricia
4 Harriss' statement and the fact that MacIntyre had been
5 holding back.

6 A. Yes, sir.

7 Q. And it was your evidence that as soon as you and Corporal
8 Davies left Chief MacIntyre's office, you drove to the
9 detachment and briefed Inspector Scott, correct?

10 A. That's my recollection, sir, yes.

11 Q. And you would have briefed Inspector Scott on the June 17
12 Patricia Harriss, which you say you only got from Chief
13 MacIntyre at that time.

14 A. Yes, sir.

15 Q. I suggest it's true, is it not, Staff Wheaton, that Inspector Scott
16 could only have developed an anxiety and concern after you
17 briefed him on the meeting that you and Davies and
18 MacIntyre had had about the paper on the floor, correct?

19 A. It would be a reasonable conclusion.

20 Q. Yes, he could not be concerned on the 19th of April about
21 something that you say only occurred on the 26th.

22 A. That's right, sir.

23 Q. Having regard to the accuracy of Mr. Edwards' notes on page
24 nine, which begin the top of the page and end the page, and
25 having regard to his comments describing what he was told

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 by Inspector Scott on Monday, April 19th, do any of those
2 facts which I have directed your attention to, sir, cause you to
3 doubt the strength of your assertions regarding the date?
4

5 A. Again, sir, as I have stated previously in this Inquiry, I would
6 like to be able to clarify it for the Commission. I can't. I can
7 remember what I did when I went to the Chief's office and I
8 know I had a copy of the letter from the Attorney General.

9 Q. Has anything this morning I have suggested to you caused
10 you to doubt the strength of the assertions that you've made
11 to this Commission?

12 A. On the date?

13 Q. Yes.

14 A. Like I say, I can only recall the specifics of what I did. There
15 is a doubt about the date, yes, sir.

16 Q. Turning now, Staff Wheaton, to the suggestion made by many
17 that Junior Marshall was, to some extent at least, the author
18 of his own misfortune.

19 A. We're finished with this, are we, sir?

20 Q. Finished for now with Exhibit 17.

21 A. Yes, sir.

22 Q. You attended at the reference in December of 1982 and
23 observed the various witnesses give their testimony.

24 A. Yes, sir.

25 Q. And included among those witnesses was Junior Marshall.

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You introduced an exhibit yesterday which were handwritten notes you took during your sitting there watching the evidence unfold.

A. Yes, I either did it at the time or back at my motel room afterwards, I can't...

Q. Yes, sir.

A. Yes.

Q. And you made a specific note on Exhibit 108.

A. Yes, sir, I have it.

Q. About three-quarters of the way down the page, Staff Wheaton, Exhibit 108, you made the note:

Donald Marshall poor witness. Wouldn't speak up. Robbery versus rolling.

A. Rolling, yes, sir.

Q. And so it was clear to you, observing Junior Marshall, that he just didn't make a good witness.

A. It's just the nature of the man, sir.

Q. His demeanour was poor.

A. Yes.

Q. And you read the transcripts of evidence given during the November 1971 trial, sir?

A. Yes, I had.

Q. Was it apparent easily to you in the reading of the transcript

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 that he did not make a good witness at that trial either?

2 A. That is correct, yes.

3 Q. And he was admonished on countless occasions by his own
4 counsel and the crown and the trial judge to speak up, as you
5 have noted here.

6 A. Yes, sir.

7 Q. In your experience as a police officer, sir, do you agree that
8 demeanour of a witness, particularly accused, is a very
9 important factor in the ultimate disposition of a trial?

10 A. Yes, it is, sir.

11 Q. So my question of you, Staff Wheaton, about Mr. Marshall
12 admitting to being intent on robbing in the park in 1971, is
13 not directed to whether it would have made a difference to
14 the investigating police office but rather it would have made
15 a difference to the lawyers who were looking after Mr.
16 Marshall's defence.

17 A. What is your question, sir?

18 Q. I'm just directing you to my point, and I'll ask the question.
19 Did you ever consider, Staff Wheaton, whether it would have
20 made a difference in the conduct of Mr. Marshall's defence
21 whether his lawyers were informed of the whole story by Mr.
22 Marshall?

23 A. It may have, sir, yes.

24 Q. And would it concern you as the investigating officer that Mr.
25

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Marshall had held back information from his own lawyers who were charged with his defence?

A. You mean an investigating officer in 1971 or...

Q. No, you investigating the case in 1982.

A. Me investigating it in 1982?

Q. Yes.

A. Now at what point would it concern me?

Q. I'm asking you whether you gave any thought in your investigation in 1982 to the fact that Mr. Marshall's lawyers were unaware that Mr. Marshall was robbing or intent on robbing someone in the park? Did you give that any thought?

A. It cro...Yes, sir, yes.

Q. Did it cross your mind when you heard Mr. Marshall give his evidence at the reference?

A. Yes. Well, if I could, and I'm sure the transcripts of the references are available. To my memory, and as I wrote it down here, in the reference, Mr. Marshall would not say he was robbing anyone. He was saying he wanted to get some money or rolling someone and I think that's why I wrote it is that...

Q. And, in fact, he had told you both stories...

A. Yes.

Q. In the statements that you obtained from him, correct?

A. All the way, yes.

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 Q. On one occasion he said that he was robbing someone.

2 A. Yes, sir.

3 Q. And on another occasion, he said that he was rolling
4 someone.

5 A. Yes, or wanted to get some money.

6 Q. And at the reference in December of 1982, I take it, and the
7 transcript will verify this, that you heard Mr. Marshall say he
8 wasn't robbing someone but was rolling someone.

9 A. That's right, and it became quite a heated point at the
10 reference.

11 Q. Are you aware, sir, that Mr. Marshall's lawyers had no
12 knowledge that Mr. Marshall was either robbing or rolling
13 someone in the park that night?

14 A. You mean going back now, not Mr. Aronson, but Mr. Khattar
15 and Rosenblum?

16 Q. Correct, Messrs. Khattar and Rosenblum.

17 A. That is correct, yes, sir.

18 Q. You know that?

19 A. Well, I was advised that by Mr. Marshall, and yes, sir.

20 Q. That he had withheld that information from his counsel.

21 A. Yes, sir.

22 Q. And did you ever think, sir, that that withholding of
23 information may well have affected the way in which his
24 defence lawyers conducted the defence in 1971?

25

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 A. Yes, sir.

2 Q. Did you ever see fit to question Mr. Simon Khattar or Mr. Moe
3 Rosenblum about their knowledge of Mr. Marshall and what
4 he was doing that night in the park?

5 A. I spoke to Mr. Rosenblum but it wasn't an in-depth type of
6 interview and I never spoke to Mr. Khattar, no, sir.

7 Q. And never asked them whether the handling of his defence
8 would have been any different had they had that information
9 disclosed to them by their client.

10 A. I can't recall specifically asking Mr. Rosenblum that, sir.

11 Q. I suppose Mr. Khattar would be the best person to say
12 whether it would have made a difference.

13 A. Most definitely, yes.

14 Q. To their defence of Mr. Marshall.

15 A. Yes, sir.

16 Q. You hold the view that it's wrong to suggest that Mr. Marshall
17 is, to some extent, the author of his own misfortune.

18 A. I do, sir.

19 Q. But I suggest to you, sir, that your superiors hold a contrary
20 view, don't they?

21 A. That's correct, sir, yes.

22 Q. Indeed, if we look at the remarks of Superintendent Christen
23 in Volume 19, page 43, you'll see in the first paragraph of this
24 letter from Mr. Christen to Mr. Gale, written in 1982,
25

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 Superintendent Christen says:

2
3 The fact the stabbing resulted from
4 resistance offered at a robbery attempt
5 appears to be much more plausible than
6 the suggestion an argument ensued
7 between Marshall and Seale which resulted
8 in the stabbing.

9 A. Yes, sir.

10 Q. So obviously from Mr. Christen's standpoint, Superintendent
11 Christen's standpoint, it did make a difference.

12 A. Yes, sir.

13 Q. Correct? I'll get you to turn to Volume 20, at page 23. Do
14 you have page 23?

15 A. Yes, sir.

16 Q. And you'll see towards the bottom of the page, Staff Wheaton,
17 this comment, and this is from Inspector Scott and it's written
18 in 1983:

19 Marshall himself by lying certainly did not
20 help his situation.

21 A. Yes, sir.

22 Q. Do you see that, sir? That was the view held by Inspector
23 Scott in 1983, correct?

24 A. Yes, around the middle of the paragraph.

25 Q. Yes.

A. Yes.

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Q. Now I'll get you to turn to page 67 of the same volume.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Volume 20, page 67. Do you have that before you, Staff Wheaton?

A. Yes, I do, sir.

Q. Third paragraph, you'll see Superintendent Vaughan state:

I also do not totally agree that Donald Marshall was not the author of his own misfortune. It is mentioned numerous times throughout the file that Marshall refused to admit he was planning to commit a robbery at the time of death. If he had told the truth from the beginning, the case may have been handled completely different.

That was the view expressed by Superintendent Vaughan in 1986, correct?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Just before we leave that page, Staff Wheaton, this memorandum resulted from your inquiry with respect to being interviewed by a Mr. Bill, correct?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And was Superintendent Vaughan your officer commanding in 1986?

A. No, he wasn't, sir.

Q. Was he a senior officer to you?

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A. Yes, he was, sir.

Q. Was he in a position to direct and give orders to you, sir?

A. Yes, he was, sir.

Q. It's clear from the final paragraph of Superintendent Vaughan's memorandum that he did not want you anywhere near journalists discussing any aspect of the case because the matter was still before the courts, correct?

A. That is correct, sir.

Q. And did you take that to be an order from Superintendent Vaughan?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the matter under appeal and it should not be discussed was obviously the matter of the Ebsary appeal and seeking leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, correct?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you know that leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada was denied in September of 1986, Staff Wheaton?

A. I knew it was denied. I don't have a recollection of the date, sir.

Q. And did you know that the Order-in-Council establishing this Royal Commission was prepared and granted in October of 1986?

A. Again, I don't know the date, I know it would be in that time frame, sir.

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 Q Did you know, Staff Wheaton, that the advice and decision
2 taken by Superintendent Vaughan, which I've just put to you,
3 was reviewed and confirmed by Chief Superintendent Reid
4 and Deputy Commissioner Schram of the RCM Police?
5

6 A. No, sir.

7 Q Have you reviewed the final report from Superintendent
8 Vaughan to Mr. Gordon Gale which appears at page 93 of
9 Volume 20?

10 A. Yes, sir, I have that.

11 Q You're read that?

12 A. Yes, sir.

13 Q Prior to giving evidence at this hearing?

14 A. Yes, sir.

15 Q And the penultimate paragraph of Superintendent Vaughan's
16 writing at page 96 says that it's his view that no useful
17 purpose would be served in initiating a further investigation
18 into the allegations of counseling perjury?

19 A. Yes, sir.

20 Q Did you know that that expression of Superintendent
21 Vaughan's was sent to Ottawa and reviewed and confirmed
22 by his superiors?

23 A. I would not be privy to that, sir.

24 Q All right. I'd like to take you now, Staff Wheaton, to your
25 evidence given a few days ago with respect...

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A. Are you finished?

Q. Yes, we're finished with that volume. With respect to a fire in 1982 in Port Hawkesbury.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you recall my objection taken when you started to mention names.

A. That's correct, sir.

Q. And you'll recall the direction given by Their Lordships to protect the innocent?

A. That's correct, sir.

Q. And that we want to insure that no further injustice is done and the one we're all here investigating.

A. That is correct, sir.

Q. Bearing in mind my objection and the decision taken by Their Lordships, I'd like you to be as careful and deliberate in the answers you give to my questions as I will try to be in the way that I frame the questions to you, all right?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You said that you were called in to investigate in March of 1982?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. It was not a March loss, was it, Staff Wheaton?

A. I beg your pardon?

Q. It was not a loss that occurred in March.

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 A. I don't know, sir.

2 MR. OUTHOUSE

3 My Lord, if I can, I'm not quite sure where the examination is
4 going, but it's not just a question of names, as I understand it. If
5 we're going to get into the details of this investigation, then that's
6 got to be a matter that's open, the details of it as opposed to
7 names, as I understand it.

8 MR. CHAIRMAN

9 [Commissioners conferring] Yes, Mr. Outhouse?

10 MR. OUTHOUSE

11 My concern is, and I don't know where Mr. Saunders is going and
12 he can enlighten us on this, but my only concern is that if he
13 examines Staff Sgt. Wheaton on the details of the investigation,
14 what statements he took, what things he did, and he, from his
15 questioning wants to imply criticism of that, then it's surely open
16 to us to bring before the Commission all the facts relevant to that
17 investigation, so that the Commission can judge whether the
18 criticism is fair or not. And that's what I'm concerned about, how
19 far we're going to get into those details.

20 MR. CHAIRMAN

21 Your comment is an appropriate one, that there should be an
22 indication by Mr. Saunders as to where this is going.

23 MR. SAUNDERS

24 Yes, My Lord.
25

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERSMR. CHAIRMAN

1
2 The nature of the question, the purpose of it, because we don't
3 want witnesses, this witness answering a question before the
4 question is completed.

MR. SAUNDERS

5
6 Exactly right, My Lord. My purpose is confined to this. Staff
7 Wheaton made some very serious allegations last week with
8 respect to the Attorney General's Department in this case and I
9 wish to find out from Staff Wheaton the basis of those allegations.
10 I wish to test his memory on the things he did, not with respect to
11 identifying individuals. I certainly intend to steer clear of that.
12 But rather the process; that is, what he did, when he did it, with
13 whom he spoke within his own RCM Police. I intend to confine it
14 to that and not pursue any of those avenues in any detail but I
15 wish to cross-examine this witness on his role and his basis for
16 making the assertions he made last week with respect to my
17 client department.

COMMISSIONER POITRAS

18
19 But, Mr. Saunders, how can he do that and not be subjected to
20 further cross-examination or re-examination with respect to
21 persons involved? My fear is that by delving into it at this stage,
22 it may pave the way for further questions, and some of those
23 questions may go to the very details of the case.

MR. SAUNDERS

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 My difficulty as well, My Lord, and I cannot forestall and certainly
2 would never intend to forestall re-examination or re-direct
3 examination by counsel ahead of me or behind me. By the same
4 token, I think it's unfair to leave the aspersions cast last week
5 unchallenged, and I will try to be very careful and deliberate in
6 the questions that I ask. And I know that counsel with me will do
7 the same. And I think we almost have to take it on a question by
8 question basis.

MR. CHAIRMAN

10 That's fair, but the aspersion that you're referring to, as I recall it,
11 was a statement by this witness that a suspected crime that he
12 was committing, that he was investigating, that the report of the
13 RCMP had been given to the suspect.

MR. SAUNDERS

15 Exactly right.

MR. CHAIRMAN

17 Now I don't see, and you have every right to test his memory on
18 that accusation.

MR. SAUNDERS

20 Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN

22 And to see how that can be, you know, if it is correct or not. But it
23 seems to me that that doesn't require going into the details of the
24 investigation.
25

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 MR. SAUNDERS

2 Oh, I don't intend to get into the details of the investigation, My
3 Lord, except in the testing of his memory as to what his role was.
4 I don't profess to be asking the Staff Sgt. Wheaton questions about
5 things said to him by people who may have been interviewed,
6 what was contained in statements, anything of that kind.

7 MR. CHAIRMAN

8 Or what he found.

9 MR. SAUNDERS

10 Or what he found.

11 MR. CHAIRMAN

12 As a result of the investigation

13 MR. SAUNDERS

14 I want to know the basis for his assertions made Wednesday last.

15 MR. MACDONALD

16 There's one other point, My Lord. This witness has testified for
17 the Commission that in an investigation that he carried out, a
18 particular person was placed at a particular spot at a particular
19 time. That's a statement that this man has made and I think it
20 would be perfectly appropriate to test him on that particular
21 statement. If that statement is not correct, then it goes to the
22 witness's credibility.

23 MR. CHAIRMAN

24 I don't quarrel, again, we have no problem with that, but I don't
25

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 want nor should we, because it's not relevant to this Inquiry for
2 this witness to start telling us about his investigation, generally.

3 Yes, Mr. Outhouse?

MR. OUTHOUSE

4 Well, My Lord, I'm as confused as ever as to where we stop.

MR. CHAIRMAN

5 Oh, we'll stop you when we...

MR. OUTHOUSE

6 If Mr. Saunders is saying that I want to test this witness's
7 knowledge of his assertion that this report was leaked to someone,
8 to the accused, which is the accusation that may be relevant, is
9 relevant to Mr. Saunders' client, I have no difficulty with that. I
10 thought the witness said it last week what his basis of knowledge,
11 or lack of personal knowledge was. But I have no difficulty with
12 him testing that. As soon as we got to the details of the
13 investigation, then it seems to be where do we stop?

COMMISSIONER EVANS

14 You stop when we tell you.

MR. OUTHOUSE

15 I appreciate that, My Lord.

COMMISSIONER EVANS

16 I think you have to deal with it, really, on a question by question
17 as it comes up. We're not interested in the whole exposé of this
18 matter but there may be questions dealing with the credibility of
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 this witness and properly be explored. But we'll have to take it
2 on, I think, on a question by question. All I would ask is that
3 Sergeant Wheaton, before he answers, hears the question and sees
4 whether there is an objection being raised to the objection. And
5 not fire off and answer before counsel have a chance to get on
6 their feet and object and before we can rule on it.
7

MR. OUTHOUSE

8 I think Staff Sgt. Wheaton has been listening and we'll await, we'll
9 caution him to take the "pregnant pause" he was talking about
10 earlier.
11

MR. CHAIRMAN

12 As long as it doesn't result in a miscarriage.
13

MR. SAUNDERS

14 Thank you, My Lords.
15

BY MR. SAUNDERS

16 Q. You'll try, as I've suggested, to be as deliberate and cautious
17 in your answers as I will be in my questions, sir?
18

19 A. You have my complete assurance, Mr. Saunders.
20

21 Q. Thank you. I take it you were brought in in March of 1982
22 with respect to the case.
23

24 A. Yes, sir.
25

Q. Do you know when the loss occurred?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you know that the loss was two and a half months old,

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

that is the loss occurred two and a half months before you were called in to investigate?

A. I knew it was a period of time prior to when I had been called in.

Q. Did you know it was several weeks, sir?

A. I have no independent recollection if it was one week, two weeks, or a month, two months. I knew it was a period of time before that I was called in.

Q. You took a statement from someone whom you considered to be a suspect?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You were not the investigating officer in the case.

A. Not the principal investigating officer in the case.

Q. You identified last day in your evidence that the investigating officer was Constable Gaudet?

A. Constable Joseph Gaudet, yes, sir.

Q. The officer commanding the detachment was Staff Sgt. Dole?

A. That is correct, sir, yes.

Q. You identified him in your evidence last day.

A. That is correct, sir.

Q. Is he a senior officer to you?

A. No, sir, we're of equal rank.

Q. Were you aware that there were numerous other investigators looking into the loss apart from the RCM Police?

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A. Apart from the RCM Police?

Q. Yes.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You're aware that insurance adjusters were investigating the loss.

A. I had never met with insurance...

Q. You were aware that insurance adjusters were investigating the loss?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were you aware that the fire marshall's office was investigating the cause of the loss?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were you aware that investigators from the Insurance Crime Prevention Bureau were investigating the loss?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were you aware that a considerable number of people were interviewed and statements obtained?

A. At the time I was called in?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you agree that it's not uncommon for word to get around a community that police have been around seeking information and statements?

A. Yes, sir.

1 Q. Do you agree that it's not uncommon for consulting
2 investigators on a loss to share information between and
3 among themselves?

4 A. Yes, sir.

5 Q. If, Staff Wheaton, in a hypothetical criminal investigation, a
6 suspect says something about his whereabouts at a material
7 time and investigators are informed that someone else will
8 say the suspect was elsewhere at that stated time, is it not
9 prudent and proper police practice to secure a statement from
10 the second individual in order to impugn and discredit the
11 first?

12 10:45 a.m.*

13 A. That would be a good avenue of police investigation.

14 Q. Yes. Can you confirm, Staff Wheaton, that the RCM Police and
15 the Crown concurred that there was no prima facie case and
16 the file was closed?

17 A. I was not present at the termination of this file, sir. I was
18 present in one meeting with a Crown attorney in Sydney on
19 this file.

20 Q. Are you aware that the RCM Police and the Crown concurred
21 that there was not a prima facie case and the file be closed?

22 A. I have not read this file in completion...

23 MR. CHAIRMAN

24 That's a simple question.

25

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERSSTAFF SGT. WHEATON

Could I have it again then so I could answer it simply?

MR. SAUNDERS

Q. Yes. Are you aware that the RCM Police and the Crown concurred that there was no prima facie case and the file be closed?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you confirm that no information was ever laid?

A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. No prosecution was ever instituted.

A. That's correct, sir.

Q. The claim under the various insurance policies were honoured and paid out.

A. I knew of that via the press just recently.

Q. Is that so?

A. That's correct.

Q. You didn't know that the insurance policy claims were paid out?

A. No, sir.

Q. Back in 1982.

A. No, sir.

Q. Now, last Wednesday, Staff Wheaton, you boldly asserted that you had personal and direct knowledge of a release of a RCM Police report by the Attorney General's Department to the person suspected.

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERSMR OUTHOUSE

1 Well, My Lord, I think that the question is unfair. That is not
2 what the witness stated, as I recall. My recollection is his answer
3 was where did he find that out from and he said, "From Staff
4 Sergeant Dole."
5

MR. SAUNDERS

6 Well, we'll get to that, My Lord. That's not what the witness
7 said initially.
8

COMMISSIONER EVANS

9 One at a time.
10

MR OUTHOUSE

11 That's certainly my recollection of the evidence. When he
12 was asked the basis of his knowledge he said Staff Sergeant Dole
13 and it seems to me that it's perfectly proper for Mr. Saunders to
14 put to him what knowledge did he have, is that all he had. I have
15 no problem with that.
16

COMMISSIONER EVANS

17 Do we have the evidence?
18

MR. SAUNDERS

19 Yes, I have the transcript, My Lord, and I'm going to put it to
20 the witness, Volume 43.
21

22 Q. I suggest to you, Staff Wheaton, that when you first raised
23 this matter Wednesday last with Commission counsel.

24 A. Yes, sir.

25 Q. You first asserted that you had personal and direct knowledge

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 of a release of an RCM Police report by my client department
2 to the person suspected. I direct your attention to page 7952,
3 Volume 43 of the daily transcript.

4 COMMISSIONER EVANS

5 I do not have that.

6 MR. SAUNDERS

7 The page reference, My Lord.

8 COMMISSIONER EVANS

9 No, no, I have.

10 MR. SAUNDERS

11 Yes.

12 COMMISSIONER EVANS

13 The evidence.

14 MR. SAUNDERS

15 Yes, I'm going to put...

16 COMMISSIONER EVANS

17 ...get it down exactly.

18 MR. SAUNDERS

19 Yes. Page 7952.

20 Q. Are you with me there, Staff Wheaton?

21 A. Yes, I have it here.

22 Q. Yes. And this records what you said as Mr. Orsborn, my
23 friend ahead, was about to sit down.

24 A. That's correct, sir.

25 Q. Yes. And you begin by saying,

1 My Lord, if I might come back to Mr.
2 Orsborn for one minute. He's asked me a
3 number of times throughout the day do I
4 have any independent recollection of
5 anything new between here and here and
6 here. You asked me this morning, and I've
7 been thinking it over at the lunch period
8 of...do I know of any instances where files,
9 Mounted Police files, were brought forth
10 that went to the Attorney General's
11 Department.

12 And so on,

13 MR. ORSBORN

14 Uh-hum.

15 STAFF SGT. WHEATON

16 You have not come back to other cases and
17 I would feel it remiss if some other lawyer
18 should pick up this item later and you
19 think that I was hiding things from this
20 Commission, which I assure you, My Lords,
21 I'm not doing. So, that's why I take this
22 opportunity to go back to that question if I
23 may.

24 MR. ORSBORN

25 Q. Do you know of any such releases of
reports?

A. The only one that I can speak to on my
own personal knowledge was again in
1982.

Did you say that last Wednesday, sir?

A. Yes, as...I would think that an accurate...

1 Q. Yes. Page 7953. The next page, between line 7 and 10.

2 A. Yes, sir.

3 Q. "In this investigation we were able to place Mr. MacLean at
4 the front door of the restaurant in a blinding snow storm at
5 approximately four to five o'clock in the morning."

6 A. Yes, sir.

7 Q. Did you say that Wednesday last?

8 A. Yes, sir.

9 Q. Yes.

10 A. I don't quibble with the transcript, but...

11 Q. Now, I'm going to get you...sorry, I didn't mean to cut you off.

12 A. No. The only thing that I see there that I don't agree with is I
13 wasn't...I did say four or five o'clock in the morning but to my
14 own recollection I don't know what time it was.

15 Q. Well, why did you say last Wednesday that it was between
16 four and five o'clock in the morning?

17 A. I don't believe, that's why I brought it up. I don't believe I
18 was that definite on that, but if I was...I don't have the time
19 and I haven't refreshed my memory from the file.

20 Q. You're not suggesting that you were anything less than
21 definite Wednesday last, are you, Staff Wheaton, about what
22 you said with respect to this suspect?

23 A. No, sir. I stick with what I said last Wednesday.

24 Q. Yes. You said, according to this transcript, and I'm sure
25 everyone who was here at the time will recall it, the sentence

1 that I've just referred you to.

2 A. Yes, sir.

3 Q. And you're telling the Commission now that you don't recall
4 being so definite last Wednesday.

5 A. No, I'm not saying that at all. All I'm saying now is that there
6 was a blinding snow storm and I'm not sure of the time.

7 Q. How did you ever come up with the time that you said under
8 oath last week?

9 A. To me it was early in the morning.

10 Q. Early in the morning indeed.

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. You said last week approximately four to five o'clock in the
13 morning, didn't you?

14 A. Yes, sir.

15 Q. Yes. Specific reference to the time and the weather conditions
16 and the suspect.

17 A. Yes, sir.

18 Q. And today what are you telling this commission?

19 A. Today I'm telling this commission that I agree with what I
20 said here and I'm not...I can't be specific about what time it
21 was.

22 Q. Do you know what time of day at all it was?

23 A. I know it was early in the morning to my recollection.

24 Q. Might it have been ten o'clock, sir.

25 A. I don't know, sir.

1 Q. Could it have been ten o'clock?

2 A. Could have, yes.

3 Q. Yes. Page 7956.

4 A. 7956.

5 Q. Yes. Line 7, question by Mr. Orsborn,

6

7 Q. The question, Staff Sergeant, is to your
8 knowledge and related to this comment
9 in the report here are there any releases
of reports, RCMP reports, to your
knowledge, number one by the RCMP..."

10 et cetera, et cetera. It's clear from the way Mr. Orsborn
11 phrased the question, is it not, that he was referring to your
12 personal knowledge?

13 A. Well, to me it meant, is there anything I know about to my
14 knowledge.

15 Q. His question is "to your knowledge".

16 A. Yes, sir.

17 Q. Did you say last Wednesday that you had personal and direct
18 knowledge of a release of an RCM Police report by my client
19 department to a person suspected?

20 A. Could you give me a reference, sir?

21 Q. I've already given you two.

22 A. Where it says that I had personal and direct knowledge.

23 Q. Your answer at the bottom of page 7952 was that you had
24 personal knowledge. We've already talked about that one.
25 And the question on page 7956 directed by my friend

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 Mr.Orsborn speaks of "your knowledge," does it not?

2 A. Speaks of my knowledge, yes, sir.

3 Q Yes. And were you trying to leave the impression with this
4 Commission last Wednesday that you had personal knowledge
5 that the Attorney General's Department released an RCM
6 Police report to a suspect in this case?

7 A. I would...

8 MR. CHAIRMAN

9 Go ahead. Yes, that's an appropriate question.

10 STAFF SGT. WHEATON

11 A. I was...my...what I said last Wednesday to the best of my
12 recollection and what I will say again now is as a result of
13 conversation with Staff Sergeant Cecil Dole I was left with the
14 impression that a report had been released by the Attorney
15 General to a person...

16 Q Do you have any personal knowledge, Staff Wheaton?

17 A. But I do not...I do not know myself, it would be hearsay.

18 Q You have no personal knowledge...

19 A. ...from another person.

20 Q You have no personal knowledge. Oh, I'm sorry.

21 MR. BISSELL

22 My Lord, I think in fairness to the witness he should be
23 referred to page 7957.

24 MR. SAUNDERS

25 I intend to take the witness to the next page, My Lord. But

1 my question now is...

2 COMMISSIONER EVANS

3 I think one of the problems...

4 MR. SAUNDERS

5 Sorry.

6 COMMISSIONER EVANS

7 You're a little fast on...I'm sure you're not doing it
8 intentionally but the witness seems to get...he takes a little...he
9 takes advantage of the pregnant pause that we talked about, but
10 you don't seem to. You're right back at him again. And, I would
11 be particularly interested in something I asked before. I think it
12 was at the bottom of 7952, what exactly was the quote. "I can
13 only speak of my own personal and direct knowledge," is that
14 what it says?

15 MR. SAUNDERS

16 I'm sorry. Where are you, My Lord.

17 COMMISSIONER EVANS

18 Oh, I thought it was at the bottom of 7952, let's see.

19 MR. SAUNDERS

20 Yes. Line 23. You have it now, My Lord.

21 MR. CHAIRMAN

22 Yes,

23 The only one that I can speak to on my
24 own personal knowledge was again in
25 1982, in March of 1982, and I was
requested to assist our Port Hawkesbury
detachment in the investigation of a

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS
suspicious fire at the Voyageur Motel...

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

COMMISSIONER EVANS

He says there it was of his own personal knowledge.

MR. SAUNDERS

Yes, clearly.

COMMISSIONER EVANS

All right.

MR. SAUNDERS

Thank-you.

MR. CHAIRMAN

That question is in order. I'm waiting for the answer.

STAFF SGT. WHEATON

A. By my own personal knowledge I meant and I mean that I was advised...

Q. No, Staff Sergeant Wheaton, that's not my question on what you mean. My question is and was do you have personal knowledge of a release of a RCM Police report by the Department of the Attorney General to the person suspected in this case?

A. I was not present when a report was...

Q. Do you have personal knowledge of that, sir?

A. It would depend on the semantics of the question or the interpretation of it, in my interpretation of it if another person tells me something I have knowledge of what that

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 person tells me. Now, I have personal knowledge of that. I
2 do not have personal knowledge nor was I ever present when
3 any report was released by the Attorney General's
4 Department.

5 Q. Staff Wheaton, you're a trained RCM Police investigator with
6 some twenty-eight years experience.

7 A. Twenty-six years, seven months, sir.

8 Q. You know what personal knowledge is, do you not?

9 A. As I say it would...if it means that I was present, no, I was
10 not. If it means that I heard it from someone else, I did, and
11 I'm advising that to the Commission and they can judge from
12 there.

13 Q. You, sir, have no personal knowledge yourself of such a thing.

14 A. If you interpret personal knowledge as being there and
15 seeing it done, I have none, sir.

COMMISSIONER EVANS

17 What you're saying is that as a result of hearsay.

STAFF SGT. WHEATON

19 That is correct, My Lord. I was told by another person which
20 would be hearsay.

MR. SAUNDERS

22 Q. You said, Staff Wheaton, in answer to my friend Mr. Orsborn's
23 question when he asked you whether it might have come
24 from the RCM Police, you said, "No," not to the best of your
25 knowledge. Do you remember that answer?

- 1 A. Yes, sir.
- 2 Q. For the record it's line 17, page 7956. What does, "No, not to
3 the best of my knowledge," mean, Staff Wheaton?
- 4 A. I want to phrase my answer carefully in that I don't want to
5 overstep any boundaries here. But after I would...I was told
6 of this incident by Staff Dole I questioned Staff Dole. "Are you
7 sure?" and he told me that the person was able to repeat
8 portions of the report to him.
- 9 Q. Did you check to see whether if there was a release that it
10 may well have been released by someone connected with the
11 RCM Police?
- 12 A. I believe I made a call to the reader's section at that time,
13 who would be responsible for releases and so on. I'm not
14 sure if I talked to Staff Burgess or Sergeant Bentley. But I
15 believe I did...I made an enquiry, yes, sir.
- 16 Q. Did you enquire at the detachment level?
- 17 A. I was talking to the detachment level. I was talking to the
18 NCO, Staff Dole was in charge of the detachment.
- 19 Q. Did you make enquiries, sir, of stenographers working at the
20 detachment?
- 21 A. No, I did not.
- 22 Q. Did you make enquiries of other RCM Police officers working
23 at that detachment?
- 24 A. No, I did not, sir.
- 25 Q. Was your statement in answer to Mr. Orsborn's question, "Not

1 by the Mounted Police to the best of my knowledge" anything
2 more than wishful thinking on your part?

3 A. It was to the best of my knowledge, sir. That's not to say it
4 couldn't be.

5 Q. Pardon me.

6 A. That's not to say, I suppose, it couldn't be released from the
7 RCMP.

8 Q. Thank-you. You say that you were told this by Staff Sergeant
9 Dole.

10 A. That's correct, sir.

11 Q. I take it he told you that when you were there in March,
12 1982.

13 A. It was shortly after I finished my portion of this
14 investigation.

15 Q. Yes. In March of 1982.

16 A. Yes, sir.

17 Q. So, then obviously any suspected release of RCM Police
18 reports had to have occurred prior to your discussion with
19 Staff Sergeant Dole in March of 1982. Correct?

20 A. Yes, sir. I'm not positive on dates, sir, because I haven't
21 looked at that file since I was there.

22 Q. Yeah.

23 A. Some five or six years ago.

24 Q. Well, you say you spoke to Staff Sergeant Dole in March when
25 you were there.

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 A. Sometime later after I had gone back to Sydney I had
2 conversation with Staff Sergeant Dole and he told me this.

3 Q. Was it in March, 1982, sir, when you were there?

4 A. I...I...when I was there?

5 Q. Yes.

6 A. Yes, sir, as best to my recollection.

7 Q. Thank-you. So, it had to have been if there were ever any
8 release, it had to have occurred before the discussion you had
9 with Staff Sergeant Dole in March of 1982, correct?

MR. OUTHOUSE

11 My Lord, he's...several different times he's asked the question.
12 The witness has said, "I don't know when I talked to Staff
13 Sergeant Dole. It was shortly after I was there." My learned
14 friend keeps insisting it had to be in March. And I don't...I don't
15 see why he's entitled to do that on the evidence.

MR. CHAIRMAN

17 If it's shortly after he was there then...

MR. SAUNDERS

19 I'm prepared to...

MR. CHAIRMAN

21 ...I can see the implication that it was in March, 1982, that would
22 seem to me to be the answer to the...the first answer to that
23 question. Now, Staff Wheaton says he's not quite sure how long
24 after it was. I assume what Mr. Saunders is trying to do is to see
25 how specific he can be in fixing the time.

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 MR. SAUNDERS

2 Exactly, My Lord.

3 Q. My question of you, Staff Wheaton, is was it in March 1982
4 when you were there that Staff Sergeant Dole told you what
5 you say he did?

6 A. It could have been in March, it could have been in April, sir.
7 I don't know.

8 Q. No later than April of 1982.

9 A. Not to the best of my recollection.

10 Q. My instructions, Staff Wheaton, are that no RCM Police reports
11 were received by the Attorney General's Department until
12 December of 1982 when furnished by RCMP Inspector Zinck.
13 Do you know anything about that, sir?

14 A. I don't know anything about that, sir.

15 Q. If that were true would that cause you to question the merits
16 of your accusation?

17 A. It certainly would, sir.

18 COMMISSIONER EVANS

19 Mr...

20 MR. SAUNDERS

21 Yes, My Lord.

22 COMMISSIONER EVANS

23 I assume there's going to be evidence...

24 MR. SAUNDERS

25 That's certainly my expectation, My Lord, certainly my

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 expectation that evidence will be called some time subsequent to
2 this witness on that very point.

3 COMMISSIONER EVANS

4 That's all I wanted to ask.

5 MR. CHAIRMAN

6 Are you moving to another area?

7 MR. SAUNDERS

8 Yes, I am, My Lord.

9 INQUIRY ADJOURNED - 11:04 a.m. *

10 11:25 a.m.

11 CHAIRMAN

12 Mr. Saunders.

13 MR. SAUNDERS

14 Q. Staff Wheaton before we leave the subject of the 1982 Port
15 Hawkesbury investigation, in fairness to you I point out page
16 7957 of the transcript, Volume 43, that transcript, where you
17 said at the conclusion of your evidence on the matter, at line
18 9, that it was your understanding that had come to your
19 attention from your discussions with Staff Sergeant Bill.

20 A. Yes, sir.

21 Q. Now Staff Wheaton, you said before we broke that you may
22 well have been mistaken when you said Wednesday last that
23 you could place the suspect at the premises between 4 and 5
24 o'clock in the morning in the midst of a raging snowstorm.

25 A. Insofar as times, I don't know. Dates, I don't know. I have

1 not seen the file to refresh my memory, sir.

2 Q. Do you have any explanation as to why you would have said
3 "4 and 5 in the morning", Wednesday last?

4 A. I know it was early in the morning. I know there was a
5 blinding snowstorm. In that area of the country the wind
6 blows very hard down the Strait there and often traffic is
7 stopped in this type of thing and I think that occurred at that
8 time and it sticks in my mind that it was more early morning
9 and there was a blinding snowstorm.

10 Q. Is the time of 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning more suspicious
11 than a time closer to 10 o'clock in the morning?

12 A. I would think so, yes, sir.

13 Q. I'm advised, Staff Wheaton, that there's not the slightest
14 reference or evidence anywhere of the suspect being seen
15 between 4 and 5 o'clock in the morning at the premises. I ask
16 you whether you wish today to retract your statement made
17 Wednesday last about the time.

18 A. About the time?

19 Q. Yes.

20 A. As I've already told you, yes, I don't know specific times.

21 Q. You wish to retract what you said last day with respect to the
22 times? That that was...

23 A. Yes, sir, I guess so.

24 Q. Inaccurate and incorrect?

25 A. Yes, sir.

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 Q As a matter of housekeeping, Staff Wheaton, I asked you who
2 prepared the affidavit of yours filed before the Court of
3 Appeal, your affidavit being Exhibit 102, and if you look at
4 Exhibit 99, which is red volume 29...

5 REGISTRAR

6 98.

7 Q Red volume number 29.

8 REGISTRAR

9 98.

10 Q Oh, it's 98, is it?

11 A. 98.

12 COMMISSIONER POITRAS

13 They have two appellations.

14 MR. SAUNDERS

15 Thank you, My Lord.

16 A. I'm finished with this one now, am I, Mr. Saunders?

17 Q Yes, we are. Do you have the red volume that...

18 A. 98?

19 Q That's at least numbered Volume 29?

20 A. Yes, sir.

21 Q Yes.

22 A. Typed.

23 Q Thank you.

24 A. Page?

25 Q Page 30. And you see the notes of Mr. Aronson with respect

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 to affidavits to be obtained, affidavits to be given, re
2 evidence to be given. Do you see that?

3 A. On that page 30 I see A.J. Evers, Hair and Fibre, on top of
4 page.

5 Q. Yes. And then about two inches down, Stephen J. Aronson,
6 affidavits to be obtained, affidavits re evidence to be given.

7 A. Yes, sir.

8 Q. And then your name and Corporal Carroll's name listed.

9 A. Yes, sir.

10 Q. Does that help in refreshing your memory that it was Mr.
11 Aronson who prepared your affidavit, sir?

12 A. Yes, sir. Yes, I would believe it to be Mr. Aronson.

13 Q. Thank you.

14 COMMISSIONER EVANS

15 Can you tell me what that reads?

16 MR. SAUNDERS

17 That is the wording on page 30, My Lord?

18 COMMISSIONER EVANS

19 Yeah, after Stephen J. Aronson.

20 MR. SAUNDERS

21 I read it as "Stephen J. Aronson. Other affidavits to be
22 obtained. Aff. re evidence to be given."

23 COMMISSIONER EVANS

24 To be obtained but not necessarily prepared, is that...

25 MR. SAUNDERS

1 No, it says obtained.

2 COMMISSIONER EVANS

3 The question you put to the witness was, "Who prepared it?"

4 MR. SAUNDERS

5 There's another reference that might be helpful, page 27, My
6 Lord, about eight lines down, appears to be a checklist and on the
7 left-hand margin you have the word, which I take to be "Need"
8 and then "Wheaton" and beside the word "Wheaton", "Drafted" Do
9 you see that, My Lord?

10 COMMISSIONER EVANS

11 Yes, I do.

12 MR. SAUNDERS

13 Yes.

14 Q. And that leads me to conclude, Staff Wheaton, and you can
15 agree with me if you like, that it was Steve Aronson who
16 prepared your affidavit.

17 A. I have no independent recollection, Mr. Saunders, but it
18 would appear from this checklist that it would appear that
19 way, yes.

20 Q. Thank you. The only other person I guess, Staff Wheaton,
21 who would have prepared an affidavit for you, if it wasn't Mr.
22 Aronson, would be Mr. Edwards.

23 A. That's, to the best of my knowledge, sir.

24 Q. I'd like to turn finally, Staff Wheaton, to the various reports
25 that you filed to your superiors in the RCM Police with respect

1 to your investigation commencing February of 1982. And
2 most of these reports are found in red volume number 34,
3 Exhibit 98.

4 A. 99?

5 Q. That's 99, is it?

6 A. Page?

7 Q. It's like inflation. Exhibit 99 and beginning at page 5. This is
8 an occurrence report dated February 3, 1982, and I take it
9 this is the first report prepared by the RCMP in Sydney with
10 respect to the investigation commenced that month, sir,
11 correct?

12 A. Yes, sir. This is an in-house report, sort of a running
13 chronology...

14 Q. Indeed. And you identified it, that is to say the reports that
15 you as an officer filed with your superiors up the ladder, as
16 being a Form C-237?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. That's the standard form?

19 A. It's a more formal...

20 Q. More formal?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And if we turn to page 9 of this exhibit book we see the first
23 of your C-237s?

24 A. Yes, that, to the best of my knowledge.

25 Q. Yes. And that's dated February 25, 1982, correct?

- 1 A. Yes, sir.
- 2 Q. Yes. And you described the RCM Police as a military or para-
3 military organization in a sense that officers reported up the
4 line or up the ladder to superior officers as to what they were
5 doing in an investigation.
- 6 A. That is correct, sir, yes.
- 7 Q. And the C-237s were the reports that you were preparing as
8 the chief investigator and filing for review by your superiors,
9 sir?
- 10 A. That is correct, sir, yes.
- 11 Q. And it was your expectation that your reports would be
12 passed up the line and reviewed by your superiors.
- 13 A. If at any level my reports were not satisfactory they would
14 come back to me and then I would amend them or any
15 inquiries I would expand on them.
- 16 Q. Yes. And would it also be your expectation that if the
17 Attorney General's Department was anticipating information
18 from the force as to the investigation, that they would be
19 reviewing the reports that you prepared and submitted.
- 20 A. Yes, sir.
- 21 Q. Pardon me?
- 22 A. Yes, sir.
- 23 Q. Yes. And has it been your evidence that you have never once
24 met with Gordon Gale about this case?
- 25 A. Not to my knowledge, no, sir.

1 Q. And is it also your evidence that you have never met with
2 Gordon Coles about this case?

3 A. Yes, sir.

4 Q. So whatever those gentlemen knew about your reports would
5 have to come from those reports themselves?

6 A. Yes, sir.

7 Q. Yes. Now let me take you through these various C-237s. The
8 next one is at page 58 of the same exhibit.

9 A. Yes, sir.

10 Q. Dated 82/3/22, March 22, 1982?

11 A. Yes, sir.

12 Q. And was it standard procedure that you, as the investigator,
13 would prepare such a report and then it would be passed to
14 your officer commanding for his review and annotations or
15 whatever he wished to add to it?

16 A. Yes, sir.

17 Q. And, indeed, on this one we see that Inspector Scott has
18 added a few paragraphs of his own.

19 A. Yes, sir.

20 Q. At the bottom of page 58 and the top of page 59, correct?

21 A. That is correct, sir.

22 Q. And it would be your understanding that such a report as this
23 would be continued up the line to Halifax and reviewed by
24 superiors to Inspector Scott, is that right?

25 A. That is correct.

- 1 Q The next C-237 is at page 64 of this exhibit book, sir.
- 2 A Yes, sir.
- 3 Q And this one happens to be dated the 6th of April 1982?
- 4 A Yes, sir.
- 5 Q Thank you. And once again we see that at page 67 it's been
6 reviewed by Inspector Scott and he has added some
7 comments of his own.
- 8 A Yes, sir.
- 9 Q The next C-237, sir, is at page 72 of this book.
- 10 A Yes, sir.
- 11 Q And that is dated 82/4/7.
- 12 A Yes.
- 13 Q I'll get you to turn the page and this is a subsequent C-237 of
14 yours that is filed April 19th, or at least is dated April 19th,
15 1982.
- 16 A Yes, sir.
- 17 Q And I'll take you now to page 88 of the same exhibit book
18 which is your next one, and that is dated the 20th day of May
19 1982.
- 20 A Yes, sir.
- 21 Q And I suggest to you, Staff Wheaton, that nowhere in any of
22 these 237 reports that I have referred you to is it ever said
23 that John MacIntyre deliberately dropped paper behind the
24 desk and concealed paper, whatever was on the paper, from
25 you and Corporal Davies, is that not so?

1 A. That's been brought to my attention, yes, sir.

2 Q. Yes. Now, you said to my friend, I think Mr. Pugsley, that you
3 had your suspicions of Mr. MacIntyre up till the meeting in
4 his office with Corporal Davies, but the first physical overt act,
5 if I've quoted you properly, was this dropping of paper
6 behind the table which you took to be a deliberate action on
7 his part to conceal that information from you. Correct?

8 A. Yes, sir.

9 Q. And do you not think, Staff Wheaton, that that physical overt
10 kind of act is something important to put into a written
11 report?

12 A. Yes, sir.

13 Q. And would you agree that it was one of the most significant
14 things in your investigation of the case?

15 A. Yes, sir.

16 Q. Because by your...

17 A. Insofar as Chief MacIntyre is concerned.

18 Q. Yes.

19 A. Yes, sir.

20 Q. Because by your evidence it was only then that you knew of
21 the existence of a June 17th Patricia Harriss statement.

22 A. That is correct, sir.

23 Q. And by your evidence that concealment was in the face of a
24 direct order from the Attorney General of Nova Scotia.

25 A. That is right, sir.

1 Q. And did you not think that complete and full details of that
2 concealment ought to go forward to the Department of the
3 Attorney General?

4 A. Yes, I did, sir.

5 Q. And would you agree with me, Staff Wheaton, that silence on
6 your part in respect to that caused Superintendent Vaughan
7 some difficulty in 1986?

8 A. I was not silent. I verbally advised my officer commanding
9 immediately upon returning from the Sydney City Police. I
10 later had conversations with Frank Edwards sometime
11 relative to it. As I've said, it's not here in a written report.
12 The paper correspondence on this file is really quite large and
13 I find it...

14 Q. Would you agree with me, Staff Wheaton, that the fact you
15 never indicated that at any time, in any written report,
16 caused Superintendent Vaughan some difficulty in 1986?

17 A. Oh, yes. Yes.

18 Q. Correct?

19 A. Yes, sir. I would, correct, yes, sir.

20 Q. Yes. And I'll get you to turn to Book 20. Do you have Book
21 20, page 80?

22 A. Yes, I do, sir. Page 80?

23 Q. Page 80. Do you have that before you, Staff Wheaton?

24 A. Yes, I do, sir.

25 Q. And this is the memorandum from Superintendent Vaughan

1 dated, that would be June 12th, 1986?

2 A. Yes, sir.

3 Q. And this is in response to your memorandum seeking his
4 advice, or at least the advice of a superior, as to whether you
5 had their authority to consult with a journalist.

6 A. Yes, sir.

7 Q. And you'll see that Superintendent Vaughan expresses his
8 concern with the contents of paragraph number 4 of your
9 memo...

10 A. Yes, sir.

11 Q. And he says that he wonders why,

12 He (being you) would now make a
13 recommendation that Chief MacIntyre
14 should be charged criminally with
15 counselling perjury as over three years
16 have elapsed and any prosecution action
 could fail due to the Charter of Rights.

17 A. Yes, sir.

18 Q. And he asks this question. "Why, if he felt prosecution
19 should be entered, did he not make the recommendation in
20 his report dated April 3, 5:30."

21 A. Yes, sir.

22 Q. And he asks for a reply from you and he asks for your
23 reference to materials in support of that submission on your
24 part, as well as any other new or concrete evidence in support
25 of the view you held. Correct?

1 A. Yes, sir.

2 Q. Essentially, I take it, from Superintendent Vaughan's memo
3 that he just couldn't tell what you were talking about in your
4 earlier submission, is that right?

5 A. Yes, sir.

6 Q. And he asks for your explanation and references.

7 A. That's correct, sir.

8 Q. And your response as at page 76 of the same booklet, is it?
9 And this is a 3-page memorandum from pages 76 through 78
10 inclusive in response to Superintendent Vaughan's request,
11 correct?

12 A. Yes, sir.

13 Q. And that's how you begin. You acknowledge receipt of his
14 memorandum. And was it your intent to answer
15 Superintendent Vaughan's questions?

16 A. Yes, sir.

17 Q. Specifically, one of the things he asked in his memorandum
18 was, "Just why Staff Sergeant Wheaton feels he would cast the
19 Attorney General's Department in a bad light."

20 A. Yes, sir.

21 Q. And I see nothing in your response, in those three pages, Staff
22 Wheaton, answering that question posed by Superintendent
23 Vaughan.

24 A. I agree with you, sir, taking a quick look at it.

25 Q. You have not answered his question, correct?

1 MR. OUTHOUSE

2 Perhaps, My Lords, in fairness to the witness. the first
3 paragraph of that reply should be pointed out to him where he
4 says what he's undertaking to do further to conversations with
5 the CIBO, as I understand it.

6 MR. SAUNDERS

7 What page were you on, Mr. Outhouse?

8 MR. OUTHOUSE

9 Page 76.

10 MR. SAUNDERS

11 Yes.

12 MR. OUTHOUSE

13
14 I will deal with paragraph 4 of my
15 memorandum as per conversation with
16 yourself and the CIBO, the main point at
17 issue being what evidence is there to
18 support a charge and/or further
19 investigation of former Chief of Police for
20 the City of Sydney, John MacIntyre.

21 So clearly there is telephone communication between Staff
22 Sergeant Wheaton and others, including the CIBO, prior to drafting
23 this, and the main issue he's addressing, as he says, is what
24 evidence is there, pardon me, what evidence is there to support a
25 further charge or a charge or an investigation against Chief
MacIntyre. Nothing to do with the Attorney General's
Department.

1 MR. SAUNDERS

2 Q. Yes. So my question of you, Staff Wheaton, is there's nothing
3 in your written reply which answers the question posed of
4 you by Superintendent Vaughan.

5 A. No, sir. Further to our conversation I dealt with, as I say, the
6 evidence.

7 Q. Yes. And I take it from the answers that you gave last day
8 that what it was that you were prepared to say to the
9 reporter with respect to something embarrassing about the
10 Department was delay on the Department's part in proceeding
11 with the investigation of the Sydney Police Department.

12 A. That is correct, sir.

13 Q. And were you aware of press releases throughout 1982,
14 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, that nothing would be done with
15 respect to any investigation of the police department in
16 Sydney until all of the Ebsary matters had been concluded.

17 A. Yes, sir. There were...

18 Q. You knew that to be so.

19 A. There were numerous press releases, yes.

20 Q. Yes. And can you confirm, sir, that the Ebsary trials and
21 appeals and leaves to appeal ran from September 1983
22 through September 1986?

23 A. I don't have the dates in my mind, sir, but it was, there was
24 three Supreme Court trials in the matter and it was rather
25 lengthy, yes.

1 Q. Yes. My information is that the first trial resulted in a hung
2 jury before Mr. Justice Clarke, as he then was, in September
3 1983.

4 A. Yes, sir.

5 Q. That there was a second trial in November of 1983.

6 A. Yes, sir.

7 Q. That there were, or was an appeal in September of 1984
8 following the second trial.

9 A. Yes, sir.

10 Q. That a third trial was held in Sydney before Mr. Justice Nunn
11 in January of 1985.

12 A. Yes, sir.

13 Q. That there was an appeal heard in May of 1986 in Halifax
14 with respect to that third trial.

15 A. Yes, sir.

16 Q. And that leave to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada was
17 made in September of 1986 and refused on October 9, 1986.

18 A. Yes, sir.

19 Q. All right. Still in Volume 20, Staff Wheaton, page 21. This is
20 a memorandum prepared by T.E. Barlow who, I guess, was
21 your replacement, perhaps I'm not right in that. You had
22 been Plainclothes Coordinator in Sydney and Barlow came and
23 later occupied that position in Sydney, correct?

24 A. He replaced me, yes, sir.

25 Q. Yes. And this is a memorandum prepared in 1983 by Staff

Sergeant Barlow to his superiors, is it not?

A. Yes, sir. It's to the OC, Sydney Subdivision.

Q. Yes. And there's nothing in that report referring to any willful concealment of paper by John F. MacIntyre.

A. I haven't read that report, sir, but if you say that, I would agree with you.

Q. Thank you. The same volume, page 23. This happens to be a report from Inspector Scott, 1983, to his superior officer, and once again, this written report is silent with respect to any willful concealment of documentation by Mr. MacIntyre, correct?

A. Yes, sir. I haven't, again, read it, but if you say so, I would not argue.

Q. Thank you. And in 1986, if you turn to page 26 of the same volume, we have Superintendent Christen's report, I'm sorry, not 1986, 1983, to Gordon Gale and there's nothing contained in that report in writing from Superintendent Christen to Mr. Gale about any willful concealment of information, correct?

A. Again, I would take, give you the same undertaking.

11:50 a.m.

Q. Yes. I'm just going to take a moment, Staff Wheaton, and find a particular note. Pardon me, My Lord, for a moment. I just wish to find a note to specifically question Staff Wheaton on it. Perhaps Commission counsel can assist me. I'm looking for your...one of your latest written reports to your superiors,

1 Staff Wheaton, where you describe your review of the
2 Patricia Harriss June 17, 1971, statement.

3 MR. ORSBORN

4 1986 review.

5 MR. SAUNDERS

6 Pardon me.

7 MR. ORSBORN

8 The 1986 review.

9 MR. SAUNDERS

10 Yeah, yeah, I think so.

11 MR. ORSBORN

12 Perhaps page 65 of Volume 20.

13 MR. SAUNDERS

14 Okay. No. Excuse me, My Lord. I have suggestions from all
15 quarters, My Lord. I've got pages 11 and...

16 Q. Yeah. Volume 20, page 11, Staff Wheaton, and this is a report
17 that you submitted in 1983 to the officer in charge, CIB. And
18 three-quarters of the way down the page 11, you begin,

19
20 In reviewing the Sydney City Police file
21 after the order had been made by the
22 Attorney General that they turn over all
23 documentation, I found a partially
24 completed statement dated 17 June '71,
25 8:15 p.m..

Do you see that, sir?

A. Yes, I do.

1 Q. Yes. Were you being circumspect, Staff Wheaton, in the way
2 you wrote that?

3 A. I don't believe I was.

4 Q. Was there any reason why you did not state in the writing of
5 that report that in your view MacIntyre deliberately
6 concealed that statement from you and Davies when you were
7 in his office?

8 A. Superintendent Christen would have known that.

9 Q. How would anyone above Superintendent Christen have
10 known that?

11 A. It really didn't occur to me as I wrote that report, sir.

12 Q. It did not.

13 A. No, sir.

14 Q. How would you expect someone sitting in an office in Halifax
15 who might be reviewing your report to deduce from that
16 statement on your part that MacIntyre had willfully
17 concealed paper from you and Davies on April 26, 1982?

18 A. I was writing to Superintendent Christen in that report, sir,
19 and he was aware of it.

20 Q. Reports may have gone elsewhere, sir, I suggest.

21 A. Well, I would assume if I erred normally Superintendent
22 Christen would write back to me and ask me for a further
23 report or some clarification, another memo.

24 Q. And that's your reason for...

25 A. Or he could have in his letter to whoever he was sending the

STAFF. SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. SAUNDERS

1 report to if he felt there was an omission he would clarify it
2 himself.

3 Q. If you really wanted action to be taken and a charge to be
4 laid against John F. MacIntyre with respect to obstruction of a
5 police officer or disobedience or disobeying an order of the
6 Attorney General, why didn't you say that in that report?

7 A. In that report I was asked to comment by...as I recall it, Mr.
8 Saunders, to comment on the proper and improper police
9 practises and that no investigation was to be continued or
10 started by the Superintendent Vaughan. And, I may have my
11 reports mixed up here, and I answered that.

12 Q. Well, surely you would say that wilful concealment of
13 important and material information is improper police
14 practise.

15 A. Yes, sir.

16 Q. And that's what you were commenting on.

17 A. Yes, sir.

18 COMMISSIONER EVANS

19 What it says is that in reviewing the Sydney City Police file
20 after the order had been made by the AG the turnover...

21 MR. SAUNDERS

22 Yes.

23 COMMISSIONER EVANS

24 "I found a partially completed statement."

25 MR. SAUNDERS

1 Exactly right.

2 COMMISSIONER EVANS

3 If I were reading that, I'd think he found it in the file.

4 MR. SAUNDERS

5 Well, that's my reading of it as well.

6 Q. And, I'm asking Staff Sergeant Wheaton why he didn't say in
7 the report that you found it on the floor?

8 A. I did not say it in the report. I cannot go any further, sir.

9 Q. Well, did you not think it was misleading to anyone who may
10 have cause to read this report to say that you found it after
11 reviewing the file?

12 A. Not at the time I wrote it, sir.

13 Q. Do you agree that it's a reasonable impression to take from
14 the way you wrote it that the statement was contained in the
15 police file after you got the file?

16 A. That could be one interpretation, yes, sir.

17 Q. Okay. Those are my questions, Staff Wheaton. Thank you.

18 MR. CHAIRMAN

19 Now, we've got... I presume that as Mr. Outhouse is appearing
20 as counsel for the...for this witness that he will make his cross-
21 examination at the end.

22 MR. BISSELL

23 ...just before Mr. Outhouse.

24 MR. CHAIRMAN

25 I see. So, counsel has prudently worked out between them

1 the grouping of... Who goes...whose to go next?

2 MR. ROSS

3 I guess it might be me.

4 MR. CHAIRMAN

5 Mr. Ross.

6 MR. ROSS

7 I've been overruled.

8 MR. CHAIRMAN

9 Mr. Broderick, you appear on behalf of...

10 MR. BRODERICK

11 On behalf of Sergeant Wheaton, My Lord, Sergeant Carroll.

12 Sorry. Not representing the RCMP, just Sergeant Carroll.

13 MR. CHAIRMAN

14 Oh, I just want to be sure because the questions put to this
15 witness have to relate to your client.

16 MR. BRODERICK

17 Well, My Lord, since my client was involved in the
18 investigation with Sergeant Wheaton there's a very good chance of
19 a tie that binds.

20 MR. CHAIRMAN

21 I realize that, yes.

22 EXAMINATION BY MR. BRODERICK

23 Q. Staff Wheaton, just to clarify things, you are aware that I
24 represent Sergeant Carroll.

25 A. Yes, sir.

1 Q. That I do not represent the RCMP.

2 A. That's correct, sir.

3 Q. During your direct and cross-examination you've testified that
4 you like to do research, if possible, find out what a witness is
5 like, what they may say, whether it be an accused or whether
6 it just be a witness to an offence.

7 A. Yes, sir.

8 Q. Now, do you find that that gives you a particular control of
9 the situation when you do go to interview the person?

10 A. Yes, sir.

11 Q. Now, with that in mind, I direct your attention to the first
12 statement that was taken of Maynard Chant.

13 A. Yes, sir.

14 Q. You don't have to look at the statement, we won't be getting
15 into the actual facts of the statement, but rather the
16 circumstances.

17 A. Yes, sir.

18 Q. I believe that you testified that with Chant your expectation
19 was you would go there, show him your statement or the
20 statement that he had first given to Chief MacIntyre and that
21 he would confirm that that was in fact what had happened.

22 A. In our original meeting at the fish plant, yes, sir.

23 Q. Would you say that you were slightly surprised at the
24 statement that he did give at that time?

25 A. Yes, I was, sir.

- 1 Q. There was also evidence that that statement was given in the
2 home of the Chant's parents, is that correct?
- 3 A. That is correct, sir, yes.
- 4 Q. Do you recall what, if any, other purpose that home may have
5 been used for at that particular time?
- 6 A. The front of the home was a funeral parlour, sir.
- 7 Q. Do you recall whether or not at that particular time it was
8 actually being used for that particular purpose?
- 9 A. Yes, sir. When we entered the home there were a group of
10 people in the kitchen. We were taken to a parlour and I
11 believe that there was a wake beginning or going to begin for
12 a person who had passed away.
- 13 Q. Preferably for one who had passed away. Do you recall the
14 proximity between the parties that you were dealing with
15 and the people who were involved in the wake?
- 16 A. As I recall the home there was a hallway and the front half,
17 that was the funeral home and then there was a wall, sort of,
18 and then a living room or a parlour.
- 19 Q. So, would it be safe to assume that this was not, based upon
20 your desired scenario for interviewing, would you suggest
21 that this was not the most desired time or sequence of events
22 to take a statement from a person?
- 23 A. Well, there was...as we got into it after the narrative there
24 were people arriving and it did become...yes.
- 25 Q. Would not then the circumstances at that time not only make

1 it necessary, but imperative that another statement be taken
2 under different circumstances from Mr. Chant?

3 A. Yes, sir.

4 Q. Would you say that that...that the circumstances rather than
5 the content of Mr. Chant's first statement would lead to the
6 second statement?

7 A. There was more clarification needed and we didn't have time
8 to do it in the first instance.

9 Q. Do you recall...now, in light of the circumstances of the taking
10 of that statement, is it not possible that some of the more
11 salient comments made in the narrative prior to reducing it to
12 writing may not have been put down or checked as closely as
13 it should have been?

14 A. Yes, sir.

15 Q. You have testified, I believe, that Chief MacIntyre's name was
16 mentioned on that evening in question of the taking of the
17 first statement.

18 A. Yes, sir.

19 Q. That did not appear in the written version of the statement.

20 A. No, sir.

21 Q. Now, I want to move away from that for a moment. We've
22 covered those circumstances. I would like to move to Chief
23 MacIntyre's testimony. First, were you present in Sydney
24 when Chief MacIntyre testified?

25 A. Yes, I was, sir.

1 Q. Do you recall him stating in answer to the questions regarding
2 banging on the desk or thumping the desk, that he said that
3 this was not his style?

4 A. I recall words to that effect.

5 Q. Well, if you cannot remember the words, did you form an
6 impression from his testimony that this was not the type of
7 behaviour that he exhibited?

8 A. Yes, sir.

9 Q. Okay. Now, you've testified that there was a meeting
10 between yourself, Frank Edwards, Mike Whalley, who was the
11 City Solicitor at that time for the City of Sydney and Chief
12 MacIntyre.

13 A. Yes, sir.

14 Q. You also recall that at one point that the Chief seemed to
15 become visibly upset.

16 A. Toward the end of the meeting, yes, sir.

17 Q. And you stated, as well, I believe that during this period he
18 did, in fact, bang the desk that was in front of him at that
19 time.

20 A. Yes, sir.

21 Q. Now, is this one of the only times, if not the only time during
22 the course of your investigation that you had an opportunity
23 to observe the Chief when he would be, to use the term,
24 aggressive?

25 A. He was upset after the finding of the statement on the floor

1 incident. Other times he was not upset to my knowledge. He
2 didn't appear to be.

3 Q. So, other than the finding of the statement on the floor, this
4 was perhaps the only time you had seen him visibly upset.

5 A. That's correct, sir, yes.

6 Q. When he was questioned about the statement on the floor,
7 was he sitting behind a desk at that time or was he standing?

8 A. No, he was standing, sir.

9 Q. All right. So, the only time that you saw him visibly upset in
10 the...and in the proximity of a desk, he did proceed to bang on
11 the desk.

12 A. Yes, sir.

13 Q. Now, you say that Frank Edwards was there at that time.

14 A. Yes, sir.

15 Q. Well, perhaps Mr. Edwards would be questioned on that later
16 on I'm sure. Now, some of my learned friends were
17 concerned about the matter of collusion between Sarson and
18 Marshall, is that correct? You were questioned on that.

19 A. Yes, sir.

20 Q. It seems to me that you took a statement, two statements
21 from Chant.

22 A. Yes, sir.

23 Q. And then shortly afterwards a statement from Pratico.

24 A. Sergeant Carroll took the second statement from Chant and
25 also the statement from Pratico.

- 1 Q. You were aware of the contents of those statements.
- 2 A. Yes, sir.
- 3 Q. Would not the contents of those statements make any
4 question of whether there had been collusion between Sarson
5 and Marshall irrelevant by that point?
- 6 A. By that point, yes.
- 7 Q. All right. So, I believe the statement from Pratico was, I
8 could be wrong, do you recall the date of the statement from
9 Pratico?
- 10 A. No, I don't. It was after the visit to Pictou.
- 11 Q. Okay. So, from that point on then collusion was not a relevant
12 consideration.
- 13 A. It was put on a back burner in my mind I suppose.
- 14 Q. Now, the last item that I'd like to discuss with you and rather
15 than do it the way I have here, perhaps I'll refer you to my
16 learned friend Mr. Saunders' questioning. And, when he was
17 talking this morning he asked you whether or not you
18 recalled that the direction from, I believe it was, Mr. Gale, was
19 that the file be put in abeyance and the two of you, I believe,
20 established that the reason for that was so as not to delay the
21 Marshall investigation, is that correct?
- 22 A. That's what the direction or thrust as I took it of Mr. Saunders
23 questioning.
- 24 Q. Would you form an opinion from that that neither my learned
25 friend or yourself is doubting that there was input,

1 interference, suggestion, direction from the Attorney General
2 but rather the motive is what they found to be important
3 today, and what you discussed was the motive?

4 MR. SAUNDERS

5 My Lord, I'm sorry, I don't understand the question.

6 MR. CHAIRMAN

7 I don't either. Would you try that all over, again? Yeah, see
8 if you can break it up in...

9 MR. BRODERICK

10 Q. Mr. Saunders asked you whether or not you were aware of
11 the reason why Mr. Gale suggested that the Chief MacIntyre
12 aspect of the investigation of the Sydney Police be put in
13 abeyance. Now, are we okay to that point?

14 COMMISSIONER EVANS

15 I'm okay.

16 MR. CHAIRMAN

17 I'm okay. I'm not sure that's what Mr. Saunders said.

18 MR. BRODERICK

19 Q. Okay. All right. You then you said, yes, you did know that
20 there was a suggestion through Mr. Edwards that...

21 A. To hold the matter in abeyance, yes, sir.

22 Q. Pardon me?

23 A. To hold the matter in abeyance.

24 Q. Right. Mr. Saunders then said to you was not the reason for
25 that that they didn't want to delay the Marshall Inquiry

1 aspect. Do you remember him saying that? They wanted that
2 investigation completed.

3 A. Yes, words to that effect, sir, yes.

4 Q. Well, the point I'm trying to make or trying to convey is that
5 there is an acknowledgement that there was input from Mr.
6 Gale.

7 A. Yes, sir.

8 Q. And that didn't seem to be the issue of this morning's
9 questioning, but rather the issue was the motive, the fact that
10 it was not for any hidden reason other than to hurry up the
11 Marshall Inquiry, the Marshall investigation. Is that correct?

12 A. I...I...

13 MR. SAUNDERS

14 My Lord, I'm not sure whether my friend behind me is
15 questioning my motive in asking the witness the question or
16 whether he is getting at or trying to get at the witness'
17 understanding if he has any about the basis for the department
18 taking that view. I just remind my learned friend that it was
19 learned counsel for the Commission, Mr. Orsborn, who first raised
20 it, that is that nothing sinister be taken of the holding in abeyance
21 phrase, and the witness confirmed last week some day and also
22 today that that was the explanation he got and that's the one he
23 took from it. But I must say I don't know where...what my friend
24 is trying to import by the question he's asked.

25

1 MR. CHAIRMAN

2 The questions that were put by Mr. Saunders this morning
3 seem to be aimed at indicating that what the official concerned in
4 the Department of the Attorney General was insisting on is that as
5 soon as there was sufficient evidence to enable the Attorney
6 General to make a meaningful recommendation, I guess, to the
7 Minister of Justice in Ottawa concerning Marshall's conviction and
8 imprisonment, that that come forward.

9 MR. BRODERICK

10 Yes.

11 MR. CHAIRMAN

12 That's slightly different from holding further investigation in
13 abeyance. I would interpret that as meaning "Send us what you
14 have but that doesn't preclude you from continuing with your
15 investigation." Now, I...I don't know if my interpretation of what
16 has transpired earlier this morning is correct or not. But I...
17 That's what I gleaned from the line of questioning earlier. But
18 what's the point of your question?

19 12:11 p.m.

20 MR. BRODERICK

21 To get to the point, I think it's important to ask what the
22 witness thought the effect of putting an abeyance was at that
23 time, which would lead to the next question about his testimony
24 as to military command and chain of command, like in the
25 military, the RCMP is, which would then again...

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. BRODERICK

1 MR. CHAIRMAN

2 The question that you're putting to Staff Sgt. Wheaton is,
3 given his earlier answers particular this morning, that he
4 understood the anxiety of the Attorney General's Department to
5 get, that the investigation of the Marshall case not be held up
6 while they were going into some other areas.

7 MR. BRODERICK

8 Yes.

9 MR. CHAIRMAN

10 Whether he interpreted that as meaning that they were not to
11 proceed, an abeyance means don't.. you're not to proceed any
12 further with any other investigation without further instruction, is
13 that what you're saying?

14 MR. BRODERICK

15 Yes, My Lord.

16 MR. CHAIRMAN

17 Is that your understanding?

18 STAFF SGT. WHEATON

19 That would have been my interpretation, My Lord, that I was
20 not to proceed in regards to an investigation into Mr. MacIntyre at
21 that time.

22 MR. CHAIRMAN

23 Or the Sydney Police Department.

24

25 STAFF SGT. WHEATON

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. BRODERICK

1 Or the Sydney City Police Department.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN

3 Or any any other suspected irregularities that you came upon
4 during your investigation of Mr. Marshall.

5 STAFF SGT. WHEATON

6 That is correct.

7 MR. CHAIRMAN

8 Or to the Marshall case, rather.

9 STAFF SGT. WHEATON

10 To put it in abeyance, possibly to be opened at a later date.

11 MR. BRODERICK

12 I don't know, My Lord. I was with you until that last
13 comment and I don't know if the witness heard it. I believe his
14 testimony was anything to do with the Sydney Police or Chief
15 MacIntyre. If we directed him specifically to the last comment
16 you made "Or any other irregularities in the Marshall case," I don't
17 know if that would be...

18 MR. CHAIRMAN

19 Any other irregularities.

20 STAFF SGT. WHEATON

21 Or other irregularities in the Marshall case, My Lord?

22 MR. CHAIRMAN

23 Not in the Mars...arising out of your investigation.

24 STAFF SGT. WHEATON

25 Arising out of, yes, that would be an encompassing thing, I

1 would think.

2 MR. CHAIRMAN

3 Carry on.

4 MR. BRODERICK

5 Thank you, My Lord.

6 BY MR. BRODERICK

7 Q. Now you testified that the RCMP is a military-type
8 organization.

9 A. That's correct.

10 Q. In that they are chains of command.

11 A. That's correct, sir.

12 Q. And I believe you said "very strict chains of command."

13 A. That's correct, sir.

14 Q. Like it would not be the place of a constable to jump over the
15 head of his corporal and go to the staff sergeant with a
16 particular complaint or a problem, is that right?

17 A. It would not be his place.

18 Q. Staff, you testified that if there were people of, let's say, a
19 high public profile and in the course of investigation of a
20 serious matter, not of your speeding or your breathalyser,
21 which you discounted as being serious, but of a serious nature
22 that prior to laying of a charge, you would discuss the
23 contents of your file with an immediate senior officer, is that
24 correct?

25 A. That is correct, sir.

1 Q. Now if you had the reasonable and probable grounds to lay a
2 charge, one of a person whether it be a politician, a senior
3 man in your outfit, a judge of Upper Canada origin
4 perhaps...No, further than that, maybe perhaps, My Lord. But
5 would you not, if you were advised that that matter is to be
6 put in abeyance or, "Conclude your file, Staff," bearing in mind
7 the chain of command and your position, what would happen
8 at that point?

9 A. Advised by whom? My officer commanding?

10 Q. Your officer commanding.

11 A. It is my duty to follow the wishes of my officer commanding.

12 Q. If you went to the crown prosecutor's office and you were
13 advised through him that a person from the Attorney
14 General's department advised you to put a file in abeyance or
15 to conclude that particular aspect of your investigation, what
16 would you do?

17 A. I would submit a report through my officer commanding. I'd
18 first discuss it with my officer commanding and with his
19 agreement, I would submit a report to Halifax to the Criminal
20 Operations Officer.

21 Q. If the...Did you submit a report that your file was to be put in
22 abeyance on the further investigation of the Sydney Police or
23 of Chief MacIntyre?

24 A. Yes, I did, sir.

25 Q. All your reports after that point were very controlled or

1 framed with the thought in mind that there is to be no
2 further investigation at this particular time of John MacIntyre
3 or the Sydney Police.

4 A. That was my feeling, sir.

5 Q. If you had included in those reports statements saying, or
6 insinuating, inferring, pointing to a possible offence by the
7 Sydney Police or by Chief MacIntyre, would that or could that
8 be conceived as disobeying or flaunting an order not to get
9 involved any further in an investigation of the chief or the
10 City Police?

11 A. It could be, sir.

12 Q. Is it safe to assume, Staff, that there is a very close liaison
13 between the Attorney General's Department and the RCMP
14 who are your superiors?

15 A. I am not at that level, sir. All I can comment on is the fact
16 that I have submitted hundreds of reports probably over my
17 day and received copies of correspondence back from the
18 Attorney General's Department. So I would assume they're in
19 liaison.

20 Q. I see. Staff, I would ask you to bear with me for the next
21 couple of minutes. It won't take any longer. But it's things
22 that have arisen from what my learned friend has said.

23 Regarding this fire that took place in the Port Hawkesbury
24 area.

25 MR. CHAIRMAN

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. BRODERICK

1 What does that have to do with your client?

2 MR. BRODERICK

3 Well, nothing other than the fact that...Well, absolutely
4 nothing except it may give the Commission a bit of information
5 that may help them. It's not relevant to...

6 MR. CHAIRMAN

7 You have to restrict your questions, Mr. Broderick, to matters
8 that relate to your client, Corporal Carroll. And if you can show
9 me how that in any way, even your last line of questioning was
10 getting somewhat removed from the involvement or interest of
11 your client.

12 MR. BRODERICK

13 Perhaps, My Lord, other than the fact that what constraints
14 are put on this witness in his past dealings would also be put on
15 my client as well as being his immediate junior officer.

16 MR. CHAIRMAN

17 Well, you can't anticipate that. We will deal with Corporal
18 Carroll's evidence when and as it evolves.

19 MR. BRODERICK

20 Quite often, My Lord, it may be safer to elicit certain
21 information from...

22 MR. CHAIRMAN

23 But it's got to be relevant and I gather, well, you've told me
24 that the questions you're about to put now with respect to Port
25 Hawkesbury are not relevant to Corporal Carroll.

STAFF SGT. WHEATON, EXAM. BY MR. BRODERICK

1 MR. BRODERICK

2 No, no direct contact with Corporal Carroll at all.

3 MR. CHAIRMAN

4 Well, then don't put them.

5 MR. BRODERICK

6 Okay. Thank you, My Lord. Just one moment, My Lord, and I
7 think then that will be all the questions I have, but I want to
8 check my notes if I may. No, My Lord, those are the questions
9 except thank you for your patience, Staff Wheaton, and, My Lord,
10 that's all that I have.

11 MR. CHAIRMAN

12 I take it you're next, Mr. Ross.

13 MR. ROSS

14 Yes, My Lord.

15 MR. CHAIRMAN

16 Are you likely to conclude in five minutes?

17 MR. ROSS

18 Very unlikely.

19 MR. CHAIRMAN

20 All right, we'll adjourn until two.

21
22 12:22 INQUIRY ADJOURNED UNTIL 2:00 p.m.
23
24
25