

Commission of Inquiry into Certain Allegations
Respecting Business and Financial Dealings
Between Karlheinz Schreiber and
the Right Honourable Brian Mulroney



Commission d'enquête concernant les allégations
au sujet des transactions financières et
commerciales entre Karlheinz Schreiber et
le très honorable Brian Mulroney

Commissioner

L'Honorable juge /
The Honourable Justice
Jeffrey James Oliphant

Commissaire

Held at:

Bytown Pavillion
Victoria Hall
111 Sussex Drive
Ottawa, Ontario

Thursday, January 22, 2009

Tenue à :

pavillion Bytown
salle Victoria
111, promenade Sussex
Ottawa (Ontario)

le jeudi 22 janvier 2009

Appearances/Comparutions

Mr. Richard Wolson	Lead Commission Counsel
Ms. Nancy Brooks	Counsel
Mr. Evan Roitenberg	
Mr. Giuseppe Battista	
Mr. Gilles Brisson	Registrar
Mr. Richard Auger	Mr. Karlheinz Schreiber
Mr. Paul B. Vickery	Attorney General of Canada
Mr. Yannick Landry	
Mr. Philippe Lacasse	
Mr. Duff Conacher	Democracy Watch

Table of Contents / Table des matières

	Page
Opening remarks by/Remarques D'ouvertures par Mr. Richard Wolson	1
Submissions on request for standing by/ Représentations pour demande de participation par Mr. Richard Auger	2
Submissions on request for standing by/ Représentations pour demande de participation par Mr. Duff Conacher	21

1 Ottawa, Ontario / Ottawa (Ontario)

2 --- Upon commencing on Thursday, January 22, 2009

3 at 9:31 a.m. / L'audience débute

4 jeudi le 22 janvier 2009 à 9h31

5 THE REGISTRAR: All rise.

6 Veuillez vous lever.

7 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Good

8 morning, counsel. Mr. Wolson.

9 --- OPENING REMARKS BY/DÉCLARATION D'OUVERTURE PAR
10 MR. WOLSON:

11 MR. WOLSON: Good morning,
12 Mr. Commissioner. This is the second day of
13 scheduling for applications for standing to Part
14 2. I can advise you that one of the parties that
15 we are waiting for is Mr. Conacher on behalf of
16 Democracy Watch. He is not here yet. We
17 attempted to contact him without success.

18 I can, by way of summary, relate
19 that there were two applications heard yesterday.
20 You granted standing to the Attorney General for
21 Canada, and Mr. Jefford who made a submission on
22 behalf of Jefford Industries Ltd. and Arthur
23 Jefford, you have reserved on his application for
24 standing and funding.

25 We chose to do this process in two

1 days only because two of the applicants were
2 unavailable yesterday and you may wish to ask them
3 why, and that was the reason. It wasn't because
4 we had a huge number of applications, because we
5 haven't. We've only had four to this date.

6 With that said, Mr. Auger is here
7 on behalf of Mr. Schreiber -- Mr. Schreiber is
8 also here this morning -- and he's ready to
9 proceed. He has advised me that he has a court
10 commitment and will ask you to excuse him at the
11 end of his submission this morning and, with that
12 said, subject to any comments that you have, you
13 may wish to invite Mr. Auger to address you.

14 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Just in
15 the event that Mr. Auger forgets to ask to be
16 excused, he is excused if he has to leave. I
17 would hate to see him get in trouble with the
18 judge.

19 --- SUBMISSIONS BY/REPRÉSENTATIONS PAR MR. AUGER:

20 MR. AUGER: Thank you very much,
21 Mr. Commissioner. I first of all do want to thank
22 you and your counsel for accommodating my
23 appearance today. I had a trial matter scheduled
24 yesterday in the Ontario Court of Justice that
25 ultimately ended up proceeding actually, and I

1 thank you for accommodating me today.

2 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: That's
3 fine. Thank you.

4 MR. AUGER: As a starting point,
5 you have Mr. Schreiber's written application in
6 relation to Part 2 before you.

7 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: I do.

8 MR. AUGER: And today I don't wish
9 to repeat anything that's in that application. I
10 simply want to supplement.

11 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Yes. You
12 can rest assured I've read the materials.

13 MR. AUGER: Thank you very much.

14 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: I should
15 say I've read some in a little more detail than
16 others because I got some material from you this
17 morning. I've had a look at it, but I haven't
18 read it to the extent that I read the materials
19 filed with the application itself.

20 MR. AUGER: Thank you. Thank you
21 very much.

22 And I think it's clear from the
23 materials, as a starting point, Mr. Schreiber is
24 not applying for funding ---

25 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Right.

1 MR. AUGER: --- in relation to
2 Part 2. This is purely a standing application and
3 I want to start by asking you to consider some
4 general principles in making your decision about
5 standing, and that's why I have offered for your
6 consideration, and I don't propose to spend a lot
7 of time on them, but really two rulings on
8 standings in other public inquiries.

9 The first one is Commissioner
10 Gomery's decision in his ruling on standing on
11 July 5th of 2004. I don't know if you have a copy
12 before you.

13 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: I do.

14 MR. AUGER: But just by way of
15 general principles, it's my submission that, as a
16 starting point, in terms of Mr. Schreiber's
17 application for standing for Part 2, it's
18 important to keep in mind some of the general
19 principles that Commissioner Gomery outlined on
20 page 2 of his standing decision. And the starting
21 point, in my submission, is that at about the
22 middle of the page on page 2, Commissioner Gomery
23 turns his mind to guiding principles and he says
24 that:

25 "I am committed to ensuring

1 that the Inquiry is both fair
2 and thorough, and in that the
3 course of the Inquiry obtain
4 and consider all relevant
5 information relating to the
6 issues identified in the
7 Terms of Reference."

8 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Was this
9 ruling in respect of the factual part of Justice
10 Gomery's inquiry or the policy part?

11 MR. AUGER: I believe it was in
12 relation to the factual part. The factual part,
13 as you probably know, was broken down into two
14 branches. The second branch related to the source
15 or the tracing of monies. But just by way of
16 general principles, I wanted to offer this for
17 your consideration because it's my submission that
18 it would be important to have Mr. Schreiber
19 participate in Part 2, and I do fully appreciate
20 that Part 2 is different. It's a policy review by
21 way of expert input and less of a factual inquiry,
22 but I'll deal with that later in my submissions,
23 if I may.

24 And then the other principle that
25 Commissioner Gomery referred to in his ruling

1 decision was on page 3, and he talks about the
2 tests that we are dealing with today, just below
3 the middle of the page:

4 "What constitutes a
5 'substantial and direct
6 interest in the subject
7 matter of the Inquiry?'
8 Based upon what has been
9 decided in comparable cases,
10 the interest of the applicant
11 may be the protection of a
12 legal interest in the sense
13 that the outcome of the
14 Inquiry may affect the legal
15 status or property interests
16 of the applicant, or it may
17 be as insubstantial as the
18 applicant's sense of
19 wellbeing or fear of an
20 adverse effect upon his or
21 her reputation. Even if such
22 a fear proves to be
23 unfounded, it may be serious
24 and objectively reasonable
25 enough to warrant party or

1 intervenor status in the
2 Inquiry."

3 In my submission, those general
4 principles are a good starting point because that
5 language that I just took you to is quite broad in
6 nature and ultimately, on page 4, Commissioner
7 Gomery concluded by stating that he -- he says on
8 the top of page 4:

9 "...leave me with a certain
10 degree of discretion, which
11 must be exercised
12 judiciously."

13 And in my submission, that
14 summarizes quite accurately the nature of the
15 exercise today and that the test to be applied is
16 quite broad, and so with that starting point, I do
17 want to move to Commissioner O'Connor's decision
18 in the Walkerton Inquiry, again just for a couple
19 of principles that I'd ask you to consider, and it
20 may be that the Walkerton ruling on standing might
21 be more applicable because, as you can see on the
22 second page of the Walkerton ruling on standing,
23 there's a description of the Part 2 process.

24 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: M'hm.

25 MR. AUGER: And as I'm sure you

1 are aware that, in my submission ---

2 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: That's
3 shown as page 62. It's obviously an extract of
4 the report.

5 MR. AUGER: That's right.

6 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Yes.

7 MR. AUGER: And when I said page
8 2, I meant the second ---

9 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: No, I know
10 that. I just want for the record though ---

11 MR. AUGER: That's correct. Thank
12 you.

13 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: --- it's
14 page 62 in the document you provided.

15 MR. AUGER: Thank you very much.
16 It is an excerpt.

17 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Yes, okay;
18 Part 2.

19 MR. AUGER: And so this too might
20 assist you because the nature of Part 2 in the
21 Walkerton Inquiry, as you can see, includes
22 Commission papers, includes public submissions and
23 public meetings and then, using the page numbers
24 in the top left-hand corner, page 62, Commissioner
25 O'Connor in that decision also refers to general

1 principles for standing. In the first bullet
2 point he too makes the point:

3 "It is essential that the
4 Inquiry be full and complete
5 and that I consider all
6 relevant ---"

7 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Where are
8 you at now?

9 MR. AUGER: I'm sorry.

10 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: What page
11 are you at? You said page 62.

12 MR. AUGER: I'm sorry; page 66.

13 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Sixty-six
14 (66), okay, thanks. Go ahead, I'm with you.

15 MR. AUGER: Which is the sixth
16 piece of paper in.

17 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Yes.

18 MR. AUGER: At the top it says
19 "Principles".

20 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Yes, I
21 have it.

22 MR. AUGER: Thank you very much.
23 The first bullet is:

24 "It is essential that the
25 Inquiry be full and complete

1 and that I consider all
2 relevant information in a
3 variety of perspectives on
4 the issues raised in the
5 Order-in-Council."

6 And again, it's that general
7 principle that, in my submission, is important
8 today, that because this Inquiry that you are
9 presiding over is divided into two parts the first
10 part being factual, of course, that you'll hear
11 viva voce evidence and consider documentary
12 evidence.

13 And then we move to Part 2, which
14 is, of course, policy in nature but, in my
15 submission, ultimately you'll be making your own
16 findings of fact and, secondly, you'll ultimately
17 be preparing your own report, which I think now is
18 due to be delivered at the end of December.

19 And so in that process, the final
20 report process, it's my submission that in order
21 to have a full, complete and thorough Inquiry on
22 all parts, as a matter of fairness to Mr.
23 Schreiber, he ought to be permitted to participate
24 in making final submissions not only in terms of
25 the factual exercise in Part 1 but to also be able

1 to participate in final submissions in relation to
2 Part 2. And in order to do that properly,
3 completely, thoroughly and in a meaningful way,
4 it's my submission that he needs to participate in
5 Part 2.

6 The final reference to the
7 Walkerton Standing Decision that I want to ask you
8 to consider -- it might be easier to go to the
9 back of the package and move four pages in from
10 the back, which is entitled "Page 96".

11 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: I'm there.

12 MR. AUGER: Thank you.

13 And Justice O'Connor summarizes
14 his ruling and refers to general principles. In
15 the middle of the page he says:

16 "I have dealt with standing
17 so as to ensure that all the
18 relevant interests and
19 perspectives are fully
20 represented."

21 And this is what, I submit, is
22 important, Commissioner:

23 "My first criterion has been
24 to ensure the Inquiry is
25 thorough."

1 I've dealt with that.

2 "When in doubt, I have opted
3 in favour of inclusion. In
4 doing so, I recognize that
5 there will be overlapping
6 positions and a potential for
7 duplication."

8 So in my submission, that
9 principle of opting in favour of inclusion is
10 important in considering Mr. Schreiber's
11 application for standing on Part 2.

12 And the next point that is
13 important as well, in my submission -- because of
14 course you have to consider efficiency and economy
15 in Part 2 in making your decision on standing --
16 given that the number of parties that have
17 standing for Part 1 and, indeed, as we speak now,
18 there's only one party that's been granted
19 standing for Part 2, it's my submission, having
20 regard to all of the principles, it would still be
21 efficient and ensure the smooth operation of Part
22 2 to include Mr. Schreiber, given that the number
23 of parties involved is not extensive.

24 I don't propose to take you
25 through all of the ultimate findings in the

1 Walkerton Standing Decision, but a number of -- a
2 large number of parties were granted standing for
3 both Part 1 and 2, having regard to those general
4 principles.

5 Now, dealing with what may be a
6 consideration or a concern of the Commission is
7 the actual participation that Mr. Schreiber,
8 through his counsel, may assist in in Part 2, and
9 it's my submission that you'll hear evidence on
10 Part 1 but ultimately, as I've already pointed
11 out, it will be your decision to determine the
12 facts.

13 You, as an experienced trial
14 judge, know that one party's interpretation of
15 what the facts were in Part 1 may differ from
16 other parties' interpretation of the facts.

17 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: I suspect,
18 based on what I know, that that might just happen
19 in this Inquiry.

20 MR. AUGER: Precisely, and so
21 given that, that is at least one area that Mr.
22 Schreiber, through his counsel, can assist in Part
23 2 because if you're going to deal with expert
24 evidence and expert opinion and expert reports,
25 obviously the foundation of those opinions will be

1 based on an interpretation of facts.

2 Obviously, an interpretation of
3 facts will include, or may include, nuance,
4 argument and debate. It's my submission, in order
5 to be fair to Mr. Schreiber and to ensure a
6 thorough, complete Inquiry as a whole, it would be
7 important that Mr. Schreiber be permitted to make
8 submissions throughout Part 2 in terms of
9 interpretation, nuance or the evidence that was
10 heard in Part 1.

11 One major component of Part 2 will
12 study, by way of example, the handling of
13 correspondence in the Prime Minister's Office. I
14 anticipate that there will be evidence that Mr.
15 Schreiber delivered correspondence to the Prime
16 Minister's Office, and of course that could
17 generate a multitude of questions by way of fact
18 and by way of policy: What replies, if any, were
19 received; how did the recipient receive those
20 replies; were they sufficient? A whole host of
21 questions can arise.

22 It's my submission that if, on a
23 policy level, experts are dealing with the current
24 status of those procedures, but the underlying
25 foundation is what happened in terms of Mr.

1 Schreiber's correspondence, that's all subject to
2 debate, interpretation and nuance and, again, by
3 way of example, it may assist you to have Mr.
4 Schreiber participate in that process.

5 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: I just
6 want to make sure of something. The application
7 for standing is for full standing with respect to
8 both the ethical issues and those that revolve
9 around the handling of correspondence by the Prime
10 Minister's Office or the Privy Council Office?

11 MR. AUGER: Correct.

12 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Okay.

13 MR. AUGER: Correct, and it is my
14 understanding there are those two branches of Part
15 2.

16 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Yes.

17 And Mr. Schreiber's interest is
18 relative to both?

19 MR. AUGER: Correct.

20 The other practical consideration
21 might be that as we stand here today in making
22 this application, we of course don't know any of
23 the facts because you haven't heard any evidence,
24 and it could be foreseeable that you could
25 conclude Part 1 and an issue could arise during

1 Part 2, whereby you may want to hear a submission
2 on a fact that wasn't necessarily determined in
3 whole or in part, and it may be that you could be
4 assisted by Mr. Schreiber's counsel for that
5 reason, in Part 2, as a practical matter.

6 And just by way of conclusion,
7 again, to the extent that there's going to be
8 factual findings in your final report and
9 recommendations to assist the public going
10 forward, it's my submission that Mr. Schreiber
11 needs to participate in all of the parts that lead
12 up to your considerations and your final report.

13 So on balance over all, having
14 regard to the general principles -- some of the
15 general principles that I've asked you to
16 consider, including favouring inclusion, having
17 regard to the nature of this proceeding and that
18 quite frankly, there's not a large number of
19 participants either for Part 1 or for Part 2, you
20 ought to consider granting full standing to Mr.
21 Schreiber for Part 2.

22 And so subject to any questions,
23 those are my submissions at this point.

24 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: As you
25 know, Mr. Auger, in addition to granting standing

1 as a party, I can also grant standing as an
2 intervenor. In the event that I decide not to
3 grant standing as a party, is Mr. Schreiber
4 seeking standing as an intervenor?

5 MR. AUGER: Yes.

6 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Okay.

7 MR. AUGER: Of course, the first
8 position is ---

9 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Oh no, I
10 appreciate that, yes.

11 MR. AUGER: --- to request full
12 standing. But in my submission on that point, of
13 course, there are two categories of standing.

14 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: And the
15 tests are different, too ---

16 MR. AUGER: Correct.

17 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: --- for
18 the granting of standing.

19 MR. AUGER: Correct. And that
20 corresponds with limited rights ---

21 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: I'm
22 talking about the tests that are set forth in the
23 *Rules of Procedure* of this Commission.

24 MR. AUGER: Yes.

25 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: For

1 example, in order to grant standing, the person
2 applying must show to my satisfaction that he, she
3 or it is directly and substantially affected by
4 the mandate. That's the policy review mandate.
5 And then, in terms of intervenor status, there
6 must be a demonstration, again to my satisfaction,
7 of a genuine concern about the issues and -- and
8 this is conjunctive -- the person applying must
9 demonstrate a particular perspective or expertise.

10 And you would say, I take it -- I
11 don't want to put words into your mouth or make
12 your argument -- that there may not be expertise
13 but certainly a particular perspective.

14 MR. AUGER: Point number one is
15 certainly a perspective, and I think I've taken
16 you through a couple of examples as a practical
17 matter.

18 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: M'hm.

19 MR. AUGER: Dealing with your
20 second inquiry, in terms of expertise, I read the
21 transcript from yesterday, and I noted that one of
22 the components of the expert forum to be held in
23 June includes that parties with standing will be
24 entitled to ask questions of the experts.

25 And so if a party with standing is

1 entitled to ask questions of experts, it may be
2 that that party with standing could be equipped --
3 could be equipped with a particular line of
4 questioning in order to explore or challenge or
5 test that expert panel's opinions, findings ---

6 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Or perhaps
7 have his own expert.

8 MR. AUGER: Precisely. And when I
9 say counsel could question the panel on that
10 panel's opinions, counsel would of course want to
11 be educated ---

12 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Yes.

13 MR. AUGER: --- hypothetically
14 through is own expert -- his or her own expert.
15 And so it might be -- and of course we haven't --
16 we're not offering any expert evidence at this
17 juncture but ---

18 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: No, no,
19 no, and I'm not asking for any kind of an
20 undertaking.

21 MR. AUGER: But foreseeably, if
22 the nature of the exercise is that counsel or
23 parties with standing are entitled to question the
24 expert panel, my submission would be that it could
25 very well assist you in that questioning, if

1 counsel has his or her own expert opinion to put
2 propositions to that expert panel.

3 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: What time
4 is your court case, Mr. Auger?

5 MR. AUGER: At 10:00 o'clock.

6 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: You'd
7 better get going.

8 MR. AUGER: If I may be excuse.

9 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Thank you.

10 MR. AUGER: I thank you for your
11 attention today.

12 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Thank you.
13 Don't get a speeding ticket on the way; okay?

14 MR. AUGER: Thank you.

15 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Mr.
16 Wolson?

17 MR. WOLSON: Commissioner, Mr.
18 Conacher is here on behalf of Democracy Watch. He
19 has filed materials. I know that you have read
20 them and considered them, and he's here this
21 morning to make a further submission. We have
22 tried to keep the submissions in the range of
23 about 15 minutes. With that in mind, you may wish
24 now to hear from Mr. Conacher.

25 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Sure.

1 Are you ready to proceed, Mr.
2 Conacher? Yes, just come on up to the podium
3 please. Good morning.

4 Mr. Conacher, you were scheduled
5 to be heard yesterday and asked for permission to
6 have your submissions set over to today. But just
7 for the record, could I just ask you please to
8 elaborate on the reason that you were not able to
9 be here yesterday?

10 MR. CONACHER: Yes. I was
11 actually in the Federal Court of Appeal ---

12 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: All right.

13 MR. CONACHER: --- on a case ---

14 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: That's
15 fine.

16 MR. CONACHER: --- for judicial
17 review.

18 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: And your
19 attendance was required there?

20 MR. CONACHER: Yes, to advise our
21 counsel.

22 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Okay,
23 that's fine. Thank you. Go ahead, please.

24 --- SUBMISSIONS BY/REPRÉSENTATIONS PAR MR.

25 CONACHER:

1 MR. CONACHER: Thank you very
2 much. As I told one of your team of counsel, I do
3 not actually have further submission beyond what
4 we've submitted in writing.

5 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Okay.

6 MR. CONACHER: I would just like
7 to make a few points of clarification and then I
8 welcome your questions.

9 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Sure. You
10 feel free to say whatever you want, Mr. Conacher.

11 MR. CONACHER: The first point of
12 clarification with regard to our submission is
13 that the heading of the last section, I notice
14 that I made a typographical error, and it says
15 "Application for Standing as a Party". That last
16 section and the points within it are actually
17 addressing the application in the alternative as
18 an intervenor.

19 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: So you've
20 got an application for full standing and for
21 intervenor status should that full standing not be
22 granted?

23 MR. CONACHER: Yes.

24 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Okay.

25 MR. CONACHER: And you'll see this

1 last section on the third page. It says,
2 "application for standing as a party". That
3 should have said "application for standing as an
4 intervenor".

5 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: All right,
6 thank you.

7 MR. CONACHER: So those points are
8 to -- that in the alternative.

9 I believe, as the submission
10 states, that the public is directly and
11 substantially affected by the policy review and
12 that Democracy Watch, of any organization in
13 Canada, is best positioned to be a public interest
14 representative. But, as well, we definitely can
15 provide expertise and a perspective as an
16 intervenor.

17 The second point of clarification,
18 in the interest of full transparency and
19 government ethics, I would like to make public
20 that I do have a past association with your
21 Director of Policy Research. He was a founding
22 Board member of Democracy Watch. He has not been
23 a Board member for more than 10 years, if I
24 remember correctly, or just about 10 years.

25 We have not had associations since

1 that time to any degree other than -- certainly
2 not in the last five, six years -- in any direct
3 way, except possibly running into each other
4 occasionally. So I do not see any live issue
5 there at all in terms of conflicts.

6 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: I really
7 appreciate your putting that on the record, Mr.
8 Conacher. I can assure you that someone else
9 disclosed the same thing, and that was considered
10 before Professor Forcese was retained by the
11 Commission. But I thank you for your candour.

12 MR. CONACHER: Yes. And other
13 than that, I welcome your questions in terms of
14 our submission.

15 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: I really -
16 - I've read your materials and I know, just from
17 life experience, what Democracy Watch does in
18 terms of its work, and I really don't feel the
19 need to ask any questions. I thank you for
20 coming.

21 MR. CONACHER: My pleasure.

22 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: All right;
23 thank you.

24 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: I have
25 heard thus far four applications for standing.

1 Yesterday, I heard applications on behalf of the
2 Attorney General of Canada and by Arthur Jefford
3 on his own behalf and on behalf of a corporation,
4 Jefford Industries Limited.

5 This morning, I have heard
6 applications on behalf of Mr. Schreiber, who has
7 been granted standing with respect to Part 1, and
8 I have heard as well from Mr. Conacher on behalf
9 of Democracy Watch.

10 Yesterday, I reserved my decision
11 with respect to Mr. Jefford's application, and I
12 feel the need to do the same with respect to each
13 of Mr. Schreiber's applications and that of
14 Democracy Watch. Particularly with respect to Mr.
15 Schreiber's application, I received materials this
16 morning that I didn't have the opportunity to read
17 in the kind of detail that I would like to read,
18 and I'm reserving for that purpose.

19 So that with respect to each of
20 the applications by Mr. Jefford, Mr. Schreiber and
21 Democracy Watch I will reserve. I will be writing
22 rulings with respect to each of those
23 applications. They will be delivered to each of
24 the parties and, after translation, posted on the
25 website of the Commission.

1 Mr. Wolson, is there any other
2 business to be conducted by the Commission this
3 morning or does that complete our work for today,
4 at least as far as this part of the work of the
5 Inquiry is concerned?

6 MR. WOLSON: Mr. Commissioner,
7 there are no other applications or other business.
8 As to our work, that will go on for many, many
9 hours over many days.

10 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: That's why
11 I said "at least at this part of the work of the
12 Inquiry".

13 MR. WOLSON: Yes.

14 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: I don't
15 want people to think we are going golfing or
16 anything, but we are in Ottawa in any event.

17 MR. WOLSON: Good morning, sir.
18 That completes my matters at least.

19 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Thank you.
20 Thank you, Counsel. Good morning.

21 MR. WOLSON: Good morning.

22 THE REGISTRAR: All rise.
23 Veillez vous lever.

24 The hearing is adjourned.

25 --- Upon adjourning at 10:02 a.m./

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

L'audience est ajournée à 10h02

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

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Sean Prouse a certified court reporter in the Province of Ontario, hereby certify the foregoing pages to be an accurate transcription of my notes/records to the best of my skill and ability, and I so swear.

Je, Sean Prouse, un sténographe officiel dans la province de l'Ontario, certifie que les pages ci-hautes sont une transcription conforme de mes notes/enregistrements au meilleur de mes capacités, et je le jure.



Sean Prouse, CR