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

Public Hearing

Audience publique

Commissioner

L'Honorable juge / The Honourable Justice Jeffrey James Oliphant

Commissaire

Held at: Tenue à :

Bytown Pavillion Victoria Hall 111 Sussex Drive Ottawa, Ontario

Monday, May 4, 2009

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

le lundi 4 mai 2009

APPEARANCES / COMPARUTIONS

Mr. Guy Pratte The Right Honourable Brian Mulroney

Me François Grondin

Mr. Harvey W. Yaronsky, Q.C.

Mr. Jack Hughes

Mr. A. Samuel Wakim, Q.C.

Ms Kate Glover

Mr. Richard Auger Mr. Karlheinz Schreiber

Mr. Paul B. Vickery Attorney General of Canada

Mr. Yannick Landry Me Philippe Lacasse

Mr. Robert E. Houston, Q.C. Mr. Fred Doucet

Mr. Richard Wolson Counsel for the Commission

Mr. Evan Roitenberg Ms Nancy Brooks Mr. Guiseppe Battista Ms Myriam Corbeil Ms Amy Joslin-Besner

Ms Marie Chalifoux Registrar

Ms Anne Chalmers Commission Staff

Ms Mary O'Farrell

TABLE OF CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIÈRES

	PAGE
Hearing commences at 9:30 a.m. / L'audience débute à 9 h 30	2677
Sworn: Luc Lavoie Assermenté: Luc Lavoie	2677
Examination by Mr. Battista / interrogatoire par Me Battista	2678
Recess taken at 10:50 a.m. / Suspension à 10 h 50 Hearing resumes at 11:15 a.m. / Reprise à 11 h 15	2751
Examination by Mr. Grondin / interrogatoire par Me Grondin Examination by Mr. Battista / interrogatoire par Me Battista	2764 2787
Recess taken at 12:09 p.m. / Suspension à 12 h 09 Hearing resumes at 1:30 p.m. / Reprise à 13 h 30	2801
Affirmed: The Honourable Elmer MacKay Déclararion solennelle: L'honorable Elmer MacKay	2802
Examination by Mr. Roitenberg / interrogatoire par Me Roitenberg	2803
Recess taken at 2:50 p.m. / Suspension à 14 h 50 Hearing resumes at 3:10 p.m. / Reprise à 15 h 10	2860
Examination by Mr. Auger / interrogatoire par Me Auger	2913
Hearing adjourns at 4:20 p.m. / L'audience est ajournée à 16 h 20	2922

EXHIBITS / PIÈCES JUSTIFICATIVES

No.	Description	PAGE
P-35	Cahier de documents au soutien du témoignage de monsieur Lavoie	2678
Н	Résumé de l'entrevue de monsieur Lavoie November 2, 1990	2678
P-36	Transcript of a press conference	2764
P-37	Binder entitled "Documents in Support of The Honourable Elmer MacKay's Testimony"	2810

1	Ottawa, Ontario / Ottawa (Ontario)
2	Upon resuming on Monday, May 4, 2009 at 9:30 a.m. /
3	L'audience reprend le lundi 4 mai 2009 à 9 h 35
4	27267 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Good morning,
5	counsel. Be seated, please.
6	27268 Mr. Lavoie
7	MR. LAVOIE: Good morning.
8	MR. BATTISTA: Mr. Commissioner, Mr.
9	Lavoie wishes to be sworn in on the Bible.
10	27271 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Yes, the
11	Bible, please.
12	SWORN: LUC LAVOIE
13	ASSERMENTÉ: LUC LAVOIE
14	27272 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Thank you.
15	MR. GRONDIN: So, Mr. Commissioner, I
16	would like to first submit the binder of documents in
17	support of Mr. Lavoie's testimony as an exhibit.
18	I believe that we are up to exhibit
19	P-35?
20	27275 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Thirty-five,
21	is that right? Yes?
22	27276 Mr. Vickery, no problem?
23	Mr. VICKERY: (Off microphone).
24	27278 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Mr. Houston?
25	MR. HOUSTON: (Off microphone).

1	27280 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Mr. Auger?
2	MR. AUGER: (Off microphone).
3	27282 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Yes.
4	EXHIBIT NO. P-35: Binder of
5	documents in support of Mr.
6	Lavoie's testimony.
7	27283 MR. BATTISTA: And I would also like
8	to submit, as an exhibit for identification purposes
9	the summary of the interview of Mr. Lavoie under
10	number "H".
11	27284 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Again? No
12	problem?
13	27285 Exhibit "H"
14	EXHIBIT NO. H: Summary of Mr
15	Lavoie's interview.
16	MR. BATTISTA: That's fine.
17	EXAMINATION: LUC LAVOIE BY MR. BATTISTA
18	INTERROGATOIRE: LUC LAVOIE PAR Me BATTISTA
19	27287 MR. BATTISTA: So, good morning, Mr.
20	Lavoie.
21	MR. LAVOIE: Good morning.
22	27289 MR. BATTISTA: So, now, to start I
23	will begin with a little introduction of your C.V.
24	So, you had a career as a journalis
25	from 1976 to 1986, is that right?

1	27291 M	R. LAVOIE: Yes.
2	27292 M	R. BATTISTA: You were a
3	correspondent with	the Canadian Press and the TVA
4	network?	
5	27293 M	R. LAVOIE: Yes.
6	27294 M	R. BATTISTA: You also collaborated
7	with other news med	lia, including L'actualité, CTV,
8	Global, CNN, Le Soi	r de Bruxelles, as well?
9	27295 M	R. LAVOIE: Yes.
10	27296 M	R. BATTISTA: You were also elected
11	president of the Ca	nadian Parliamentary Press Gallery,
12	is that correct?	
13	27297 M	R. LAVOIE: Yes.
14	27298 M	R. BATTISTA:during those years?
15	27299 M	R. LAVOIE: Twice, yes.
16	27300 M	R. BATTISTA: After that, you worked
17	for Minister Marcel	Masse?
18	27301 M	R. LAVOIE: Yes.
19	27302 M	R. BATTISTA: Is it Masse or Massé?
20	Pardon me.	
21	27303 M	R. LAVOIE: Masse.
22	27304 M	R. BATTISTA: Masse.
23	27305 C	hief of Staff, while he was Minister
24	of Energy, Mines ar	d Resources, is that right?
25	27306 M	R. LAVOIE: That's correct.

1	27307 MR. BATTISTA: And you were chief of
2	staff of the Secretary of State when he held that
3	position as well?
4	27308 MR. LAVOIE: Excuse me?
5	27309 MR. BATTISTA:staff. Chief of
6	staff of the Secretary of State, when he held that
7	position?
8	27310 MR. LAVOIE: Yes. On an acting
9	basis, yes.
10	27311 MR. BATTISTA: You also worked for
11	the Prime Minister's Office, when Mr. Mulroney was
12	Prime Minister?
13	27312 MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
14	27313 MR. BATTISTA: You joined the Prime
15	Minister's Office in January 1988 and you remained
16	there until 1991?
17	27314 MR. LAVOIE: Until July '91, as a
18	matter of fact.
19	MR. BATTISTA: July '91, thank you.
20	27316 And you held the position of Deputy
21	Chief of Staff of Canada's Prime Minister?
22	MR. LAVOIE: Exactly, yes.
23	27318 MR. BATTISTA: After leaving the
24	Prime Minister's Office, you held the position of
25	Canada's Commissioner General at the Seville World

1	Exposition in Spain?
2	MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
3	MR. BATTISTA: After that, you
4	entered the private sector with NATIONAL, a public
5	relations firm, where you were executive vice-president
6	from 1991 to 2000 in Ottawa, and then in Montreal?
7	MR. LAVOIE: That's correct.
8	MR. BATTISTA: You're back in the
9	journalist's life these days?
10	MR. LAVOIE: "In a manner of speaking
11	"(laughter).
12	MR. BATTISTA: I want to ask you a
13	few questions regarding the years that you spent in the
14	Prime Minister's Office.
15	27325 Can you tell us about your years and
16	your duties and tasks when you were there between 1988
17	and 1991?
18	MR. LAVOIE: Well, at the beginning,
19	when I started with the Prime Minister's Office in
20	January '88, I had the title of "senior advisor"
21	communications. It was a job that was not clearly
22	defined, but it consisted of supporting the Prime
23	Minister's communication activities.
24	27327 But very soon thereafter, the Prime
25	Minister called the Canadian ambassador, Mr. Bouchard,

1	back from Paris to appoint him Secretary of State. And
2	he delegated me to Mr. Bouchard to become his chief of
3	staff on an acting basis, a position that I held, I
4	would say, from April in fact, I remember that it
5	was the Easter weekend, it must have been April '88
6	to September 1 '88.
7	27328 So, I was holding down both
8	positions. I was still with Mr. Mulroney's office, I
9	still had an office, and I was also the chief of staff
10	of the Secretary of State, Mr. Bouchard.
11	27329 Afterwards, I returned to the Prime
12	Minister's Office, still in the same position.
13	27330 And the election campaign was
14	started, October 1 '88, the election that took place
15	November 21, '88 and it was in January '89 that I was
16	first appointed tour and special events director for
17	the Prime Minister. And I would say that a year later,
18	around January '90, I was appointed deputy chief of
19	staff, in charge of operations.
20	27331 Operations, that obviously involves
21	travel, tours, major international trips, the Prime
22	Minister's Office's correspondence unit, translation
23	bureaus, liaison with security, transport and logistics
24	departments. And as well, in a way, a position of
25	it was a rather senior position after all, in the Prime

1	Minister's entourage.
2	27332 So I was involved in the operations
3	committee of the Prime Minister's Office and involved
4	in various matters on an ad hoc basis, when I was asked
5	to do so. There you go!
6	27333 MR. BATTISTA: When you say that you
7	were involved in various matters on an ad hoc basis,
8	what do you mean by that?
9	MR. LAVOIE: When, on occasion, a
10	matter was deemed to require involvement of the Prime
11	Minister's Office and when I was, in the opinion of
12	those who entrusted me with the assignment, the right
13	person to do the work, I was the one who would receive
14	the assignment.
15	27335 Was it sometimes because they wanted
16	a particular issue to make faster progress? Was it
17	because they wanted to convince those responsible for
18	caucus organization that they wished to I don't
19	know, that well, here is one example.
20	They wanted a caucus meeting in the
21	summer and thought that it should be in one region
22	instead of another. It could have been any number of
23	things. Day-to-day life of a government is made up of
24	many, many, many events and actions.
25	27337 MR. BATTISTA: You used the

2684

1	expression "trouk	ole fixer" or "troubleshooter," when we
2	met	
3	27338	MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
4	27339	MR. BATTISTA:what did you mean
5	by that?	
6	27340	$\ensuremath{MR}\xspace$. LAVOIE: It means that when there
7	were problems tha	t had to be solved, I was sometimes
8	called upon.	
9	27341	MR. BATTISTA: OK. The Prime
10	Minister himself?	
11	27342	MR. LAVOIE: The Prime Minister
12	himself or the ch	nief of staff, who was my superior.
13	27343	MR. BATTISTA: OK.
14	27344	Were you involved in the Bear Head
15	file when you wer	re in the Prime Minister's Office?
16	27345	MR. LAVOIE: No, not at all.
17	27346	MR. BATTISTA: Had you heard of it?
18	27347	MR. LAVOIE: Frankly, very, very,
19	very little. I w	rould say that I heard about it in two
20	ways. First of a	all, because in a Prime Minister's
21	Office operations	committee meeting that took place in
22	the morning, it w	vas brought up that there was that
23	there would be an	event where there would be a signing.
24	And me, I didn't	pay much attention to that, honestly.
25	27348	And I remember reading about it in

1	the newspapers, bu	t my my My knowledge of that
2	was extremely limi	ted.
3	27349 N	MR. BATTISTA: OK.
4	27350 I	Did you know Mr. Schreiber when you
5	were with the Prim	e Minister's Office?
6	27351 N	MR. LAVOIE: No.
7	27352 N	MR. BATTISTA: Did you know Mr.
8	Doucet when you we	re with the Prime Minister's Office?
9	27353 N	MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
10	27354 N	MR. BATTISTA: What can you tell us
11	about him?	
12	27355 N	MR. LAVOIE: Well, I met I
13	believe that I met	Mr. Doucet when I was still a
14	journalist and whe	n he came to Parliament Hill as chief
15	of staff of the ne	w leader of the opposition, Mr.
16	Mulroney.	
17	27356	I barely knew him; I knew him
18	socially. I knew	him because I would see him, because
19	we passed through	the same corridors. So I knew him in
20	those circumstance	s.
21	27357	Then I met him (when I was still a
22	journalist) when h	e was with the Prime Minister's
23	Office, but again,	we didn't associate with one other.
24	27358 A	And then when I was with the Prime

Minister's Office myself, he was already getting

25

1	involved in was preparing to leave to go work in the
2	organization of the three summits. There were three
3	summits taking place in Canada: Commonwealth,
4	Francophonie and G7, in a period of, if I remember
5	correctly, of about twelve months or perhaps less.
6	So, I never really worked with him in
7	the Prime Minister's Office, no.
8	27360 MR. BATTISTA: OK. When you were
9	with the Prime Minister's Office, did you regularly
10	need to meet him or did he meet with the Prime Minister
11	regularly, to your knowledge?
12	MR. LAVOIE: I didn't need to meet
13	him, no.
14	Did he meet the Prime Minister?
15	You know, the schedule the Prime Minister's agenda
16	was coordinated through my office and the Prime
17	Minister's schedule was something that was rather
18	formal, rather strict, except for one period, which was
19	the period after Question Period, when Parliament was
20	in session, obviously, between 3 p.m. and 4 p.m., $4:15$
21	p.m. more or less. That slot in his agenda was
22	generally left open because it was the time where there
23	would be all kinds of meetings, often very brief,
24	sometimes with visitors from his riding, sometimes with
25	people that other MPs would bring, sometimes with

1	visiting students, sometimes, well	
2	27363 So that whole aspect, that would last	
3	around an hour, an hour and fifteen minutes every day,	
4	I had no control nor any knowledge and I wasn't	
5	involved in how those things went, except if he called	
6	on me for specific things.	
7	MR. BATTISTA: Who managed that time	
8	slot, the hour and fifteen minutes?	
9	27365 MR. LAVOIE: I would say that it was	
10	the person with the title of "executive assistant."	
11	27366 MR. BATTISTA: OK.	
12	27367 MR. LAVOIE: There were various	
13	people, who There were various people who held that	
14	position.	
15	27368 MR. BATTISTA: OK.	
16	27369 And during your mandate, do you	
17	remember having organized or planned meetings between	
18	Mr. Doucet and the Prime Minister? Do you have a	
19	recollection of that?	
20	MR. LAVOIE: No, not at all.	
21	27371 MR. BATTISTA: You were Mr.	
22	Mulroney's spokesperson (if I can use that expression)	
23	with varying intensity between the years 1995 to 2007,	
24	is that correct?	
25	MR. LAVOIE: That's correct.	

1	27373 MR. BATTISTA: There were years where	
2	it can be said that you devoted a good deal of your	
3	energy to this. This was full-time work for you,	
4	particularly between the years 1995 and 1997, is that	
5	so?	
6	MR. LAVOIE: That's correct, yes.	
7	27375 MR. BATTISTA: And this was in the	
8	context of proceedings that Mr. Mulroney instituted	
9	against the Government of Canada regarding the request	
10	for assistance from Swiss authorities, is that correct?	
11	MR. LAVOIE: Right!	
12	27377 Even though when you say "full-time,"	
13	it was never full-time, because I was a consultant in a	
14	public relations firm, but I must say that there were	
15	times when it was full-time and more, yes.	
16	27378 MR. BATTISTA: Meaning, during those	
17	years, you gave a great number of interviews?	
18	27379 MR. LAVOIE: A great number of	
19	interviews and a great deal of time. But I had other	
20	clients, as well.	
21	27380 MR. BATTISTA: Yes OK.	
22	27381 From '95 to '97, when you were	
23	working for him, were you paid at that time?	
24	MR. LAVOIE: Yes.	
25	27383 MR. BATTISTA: On what basis?	

1	27384 MR. LAVOIE: Hourly.
2	27385 MR. BATTISTA: So, you had an hourly
3	rate and were paid based on the hours you worked?
4	27386 MR. LAVOIE: An hourly rate plus the
5	related services provided by the NATIONAL Public
6	Relations office, such as "media monitoring," if I may
7	call it that, a type of logistical support, arranging
8	any news conferences. There were two, I think. And,
9	obviously, my hourly rate.
10	27387 MR. BATTISTA: Can it be said that you
11	had a very close working relationship with Mr. Mulroney
12	during those years?
13	27388 MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
14	27389 MR. BATTISTA: Would it be accurate to
15	say that you were the spokesperson and, in fact, the
16	face of the Mulroney team for the press and for the
17	general public?
18	27390 MR. LAVOIE: I was the spokesperson.
19	And I think that meant the face, yes.
20	27391 MR. BATTISTA: Yes (laughter).
21	27392 Tell us about your relationship with
22	Mr. Mulroney. How long have you known him?
23	27393 MR. LAVOIE: I've known
24	Mr. Mulroney I arrived on Parliament Hill in Ottawa
25	this will give away my age in 1976. And at the

1	time, Mr. Mulroney had just been He had been a
2	candidate in a leadership race to succeed Robert
3	Stanfield. He had lost and returned to the private
4	sector.
5	27394 And I would say that from '78 to '80,
6	I talked to him a few times, but we weren't friends. I
7	was a reporter and he was interested in the political
8	scene. And I was one of a number of reporters that he
9	talked to occasionally about politics.
10	27395 So that's how I met him. Then, as a
11	reporter, I covered his 1983 leadership campaign during
12	the leadership race. So, the convention itself, where I
13	remember spending the day, as a reporter It was
14	held at the Civic Centre and we were just below, in
15	front of his box for 12, 13, 14, 15 hours I don't
16	remember how long.
17	Then there was his 1984 election
18	campaign. I I covered the campaign on his airplane.
19	I wasn't always with him, but I spent some time on
20	Mr. Turner's plane and some time with Mr. Mulroney.
21	Then he became Prime Minister, and I
22	was a reporter. So he knew me as a reporter, but we
23	didn't hang out together, we weren't friends.
24	Then I worked in the office of the
25	Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources as the

1	Minister's chief of staff. But obviously, there was a	
2	direct reporting relationship, so to speak, with the	
3	Prime Minister's chief of staff who was at the time,	
4	when I started with Mr. Masse, I think it must have	
5	been Bernard Roy, and later, Derek Burney.	
6	27399 And so I saw Mr. Mulroney a little	
7	more often, because I was now involved in political	
8	activities and part of a government team	
9	27400 I later came to work in his office,	
10	so I worked for him, but our relationship was well!	
11	It was basically a working relationship. Very	
12	friendly; he's a very friendly man, very warm. He's	
13	very pleasant to work with and to work for.	
14	27401 But we weren't friends who saw each	
15	other outside of work. Obviously, during my years in	
16	the Prime Minister's Office, it was also a very active	
17	period internationally. A lot of things were happening,	
18	from the fall of the Berlin wall to the release of	
19	Nelson Mandela, and the role Canada, and Mr. Mulroney	
20	personally, played in it.	
21	27402 And it was the period of the Sommet	
22	de la Francophonie's inception, creation, development	
23	and growth.	
24	Those years were extremely busy	
25	internationally, and I think they were some of the most	

1	important years of the 20th century.
2	27404 So I travelled a great deal back
3	then, preparing for the visits Mr. Mulroney had to
4	make. I was quite involved in this respect. And of
5	course, when we travelled abroad, on long trips like
6	that, we got to know each other better. We ate togethe
7	more often, and spent more time together getting ready
8	for his trips.
9	27405 But I repeat what I said at the
10	beginning: our relationship was a working relationship
11	and very friendly.
12	27406 MR. BATTISTA: OK. But you got to know
13	each other and he got to know you as well?
14	27407 MR. LAVOIE: Yes, we got to know each
15	other. And I certainly developed a high regard for him
16	(which has not changed).
17	27408 MR. BATTISTA: OK.
18	27409 And you told us earlier that during
19	those years, when you were in the Prime Minister's
20	Office, the Prime Minister could rely on you to deal
21	with the occasional problem or difficult situation tha
22	arose, for example, within the office. When the term
23	"trouble fixer" was used earlier
24	27410 MR. LAVOIE: I was totally loyal to
25	the Prime Minister. He was my boss and yes, he could

1	count on me; that's for sure.
2	27411 MR. BATTISTA: OK.
3	27412 And the Prime Minister? He understood
4	that as well?
5	27413 MR. LAVOIE: I guess so. You should
6	ask him.
7	MR. BATTISTA: Yes. But what do you
8	think?
9	27415 MR. LAVOIE: If you ask me, the answer
10	is yes.
11	27416 MR. BATTISTA: OK.
12	27417 And so, you were paid for your
13	services between 1995 and 1997. You continued to act as
14	Mr. Mulroney's spokesperson from 1997 until around 2000
15	until 2007. Correct?
16	27418 MR. LAVOIE: Until until
17	December 2007, yes.
18	27419 MR. BATTISTA: OK.
19	27420 And during those years, from 1997 to
20	2007, were you paid for your services?
21	27421 MR. LAVOIE: No.
22	27422 MR. BATTISTA: Between 1997 and
23	December 2000, were you still at the NATIONAL Public
24	Relations office?
25	27423 MR. LAVOIE: Yes.

1	MR. BATTISTA: You were still one of
2	the directors of this company
3	27425 MR. LAVOIE: I was executive
4	vice-president, yes of the NATIONAL Public Relations
5	office.
6	27426 MR. BATTISTA: So, were you still
7	working specifically in public relations at the time?
8	27427 MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
9	27428 MR. BATTISTA: Nevertheless, you
10	worked for Mr. Mulroney during those years without pay?
11	27429 MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
12	27430 MR. BATTISTA: Can it be said that you
13	worked for Mr. Mulroney without pay for reasons of
14	loyalty?
15	27431 MR. LAVOIE: That was the only and
16	real reason. Friendship, loyalty, affection, respect
17	and any other synonyms.
18	27432 MR. BATTISTA: OK. Now I'm going to
19	address some documents that were submitted to you.
20	27433 I draw your attention to Tab 1.
21	So, this is an article by Mr. Mathias
22	that appeared in the National Post on August 20, 1999.
23	Do you have it in front of you?
24	27435 MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
25	27436 MR. BATTISTA: So, I draw your

1	attention, afte	er the "full text 830 words"
2	27437	MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
3	27438	MR. BATTISTA: First paragraph:
4		"Brian Mulroney, the former
5		Prime Minister, has stepped up
6		efforts to persuade Karlheinz
7		Schreiber, the man at the centre
8		of the Airbus affair, to release
9		his confidential Swiss bank
10		accounts to the Canadian
11		Government, so the matter can
12		finally be put to rest."
13	27439	Third paragraph:
14		"'Nothing would make Mr.
15		Mulroney happier than to have
16		these documents opened up, so
17		that his innocence would be
18		clear forever', Mr. Luc Lavoie,
19		Mr. Mulroney's spokesman, said
20		yesterday."
21	27440	And lastly, on the third page, last
22	paragraph:	
23		"Mr. Lavoie confirmed that
24		Mr. Mulroney has asked
25		Mr. Schreiber to release the

1	bank accounts, but denies
2	Mr. Mulroney is applying any
3	pressure. He does not want to
4	infringe on anybody's right to
5	go to court seeking justice."
6	27441 That was Mr. Mulroney's position at
7	the time. Did he want Mr. Schreiber to release his
8	bank accounts in relation to the allegations concerning
9	the request to the Swiss authorities?
10	MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
11	27443 MR. BATTISTA: Yes?
12	MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
13	27445 MR. BATTISTA: And that was fine?
14	Do your remarks really reflect that perspective?
15	MR. LAVOIE: Absolutely, yes.
16	Absolutely.
17	MR. BATTISTA: You had some telephone
18	conversations with Harvey Cashore in October 1999. We
19	have copies of these conversations in Tabs 2, 3 and 4 .
20	27448 Can you give us some background on
21	the conversations with Mr. Cashore?
22	27449 MR. LAVOIE: On the Friday before
23	Thanksgiving, the Thanksgiving weekend in 1999, while I
24	was rushing to get ready to leave for for an
25	assignment in South America, specifically in Ecuador,

1	for a client in the oil industry, a crisis (beca	ause I
2	was very involved in crisis management), I rece	ived a
3	call from Mr. Mulroney around five or six o'clo	ck on
4	Friday. He told me that he had gotten a letter	from
5	Harvey Cashore, from the CBC, asking him to meet	with
6	him, if I remember correctly, and referring to	some new
7	information he wanted to discuss with Mr. Mulron	ney.
8	Mr. Mulroney asked me to contact Harvey Cashore	to try
9	to find out what new information he had.	
10	27450 So that's what I did.	
11	27451 MR. BATTISTA: OK.	
12	27452 During these conversations	correct
13	me if I'm wrong you tried to obtain informat:	ion from
14	Mr. Cashore so that you could relay it to Mr. M	ılroney,
15	get answers from Mr. Mulroney as the case may be	e, and
16	relay them to Mr. Cashore. Is that correct?	
17	27453 MR. LAVOIE: Could you rephrase	the
18	question?	
19	27454 MR. BATTISTA: Yes, of course.	I'11
20	break it down.	
21	27455 You had discussions with Mr. C	ashore
22	at the time	
23	27442 MR. LAVOIE: Yes.	
24	27457 MR. BATTISTA:correct?	
25	27458 MR. LAVOIE: Yes.	

1	27459 MR. BATTISTA: Mr. Cashore wanted to
2	speak directly to Mr. Mulroney?
3	27460 MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
4	27461 MR. BATTISTA: Correct.
5	27462 That was not, if I can use the
6	expression, "an option" at the time. Is that correct?
7	27463 MR. LAVOIE: That's correct.
8	27464 MR. BATTISTA: So, you explained to
9	Mr. Cashore that what you hoped to do, or what you were
10	asked to do, was to obtain information, presumably as
11	much as possible, convey it to Mr. Mulroney, get
12	answers from Mr. Mulroney and then convey them to
13	Mr. Cashore. Correct?
14	27465 MR. LAVOIE: That is correct.
15	27466 MR. BATTISTA: OK.
16	27467 And that is how you proposed to Mr.
17	Cashore that you would work, if I Have I explained
18	it correctly?
19	27468 MR. LAVOIE: Yes. According to the
20	transcript, yes.
21	27469 MR. BATTISTA: And this happened more
22	than once. May I say that you proposed this during
23	almost every telephone discussion?
24	27470 MR. LAVOIE: That is a fact, yes.
25	27471 MR. BATTISTA: OK.

1	Did you know the name on Mr.
2	Schreiber's Swiss bank account at the time
3	MR. LAVOIE: No, not at all.
4	MR. BATTISTA:the one Mr. Cashore
5	referred to?
6	27475 MR. LAVOIE: No, not at all.
7	27476 MR. BATTISTA: Because the situation,
8	as you explained it, was that Mr. Mulroney had received
9	a letter from Mr. Cashore and Mr. Cashore's information
10	was that Mr. Schreiber had a bank account with under
11	a name that could suggest that Mr. Mulroney was
12	involved. Is that correct?
13	27477 MR. LAVOIE: That's what I learned
14	during the conversation with him, actually.
15	27478 MR. BATTISTA: Is that correct?
16	But at the time, he never told you
17	the name on the account
18	27480 MR. LAVOIE: Never, no.
19	27481 MR. BATTISTA:during this
20	conversation?
21	27480 MR. LAVOIE: Never.
22	27483 MR. BATTISTA: Did Mr. Mulroney speak
23	to you about this bank account during your discussion
24	with him at the time?
25	27484 MR. LAVOIE: No, not at all. I talked

1	to him about it.	
2	27485	MR. BATTISTA: OK.
3	27486	And did he tell you anything about
4	it?	
5	27487	MR. LAVOIE: No. I told him I gave
6	him the news	•
7	Pause	
8	27488	MR. LAVOIE: Because I'm trying to be
9	nice.	
10	27489	what it was, CBC's new approach.
11	27490	MR BATTISTA: OK.
12	27491	During this broadcast your remarks on
13	the topic of Mr.	Schreiber were made public.
14	27492	I am going to draw your attention to
15	Tab 3, page 32	Tab 3page 32.
16	27493	Do you have it in front of you, Mr.
17	Lavoie?	
18	27494	MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
19	27495	MR. BATTISTA: Listen. Just to I
20	am going to ask y	ou to explain it but I am just going
21	to read it so tha	t it's clear.
22	27496	So, you said: "We believe"
23	27497	MR. LAVOIE: You're not censoring,
24	eh?	
25	27498	MR. BATTISTA: Excuse me?

1	27499	MR. LAVOIE: Don't censor anything
2	you read.	
3	27500	MR BATTISTA: No, that's fine. So:
4		"We believe, but we don't want
5		this to be spread around in any
6		way, shape or form, that
7		Karlheinz Schreiber is the
8		biggest fucking liar the world
9		has ever seen. You know what I
10		mean. That's what we believe
11		and we are very afraid that this
12		man was quite capable of using
13		anybody's name to get money from
14		somebody else.
15		We have no proof of that; we
16		have no evidence to that, that
17		would lead us to believe that.
18		But this is the way we feel
19		about it. And that is certainly
20		why Mr. Mulroney is so nervous."
21	27501	Can you explain the context of this
22	particular state	ement? Why did you say that and to whom
23	were you referri	ing?
24	27502	MR. LAVOIE: At that time, it must be
25	understood that	this conversation is still in the

2702

1	context that we were still in the aftermath, in the
2	wake of the letter sent to Switzerland in September
3	195.
4	27503 And everything that followed, and
5	everything that ensued and everything that was said,
6	everything that was written, that was the context these
7	conversations have to be understood in.
8	27504 Personally, when I was talking to
9	thatto thatto that individual, I always spoke in
10	the spirit of the letter sent to Switzerland that
11	described Mr. Mulroney as a criminal having been
12	involved in criminal activity, in a criminal plot to
13	defraud, to rob the Canadian government and to get \$5
14	million in "kickbacks," in Swiss bank accounts and all.
15	27505 Well. We had learned through
16	thisthis circus that a certain Mr. Pelossi whom I
17	never met and whom, moreover, I really had no intention
18	of meeting had said on numerous occasions that a
19	portion of the moneythat he had been informed that a
20	portion of the money received in the sale of the Airbus
21	airplanes was intended for Mr. Mulroney.
22	27506 We had deduced from that- I had
23	certainly deduced, since it was a time when, although I
24	am not an expert in German law, Schmiergelder, "grease
25	money" was tax deductible

1	27507	So, there was a theory that had
2	currency and whic	ch I had certainly discussed myself
3	with Mr. Mulroney	7
4	27508	It could even be that it was my own
5	theory; I no long	ger remember because it'sthere were
6	so many, so many	discussions about it.
7	27509	that Mr. Schreiber perhaps used
8	other people's na	ames to pass off what was income for
9	something that it	wasn't, so thatdoing this so that
10	he could take adv	vantage of tax breaks that went along
11	with that sort of	action.
12	27510	So, it was in that sense that this
13	answer was given	
14	27511	MR. BATTISTA: You indeed say "it's a
15	theory." You had	no basis for stating that?
16	27512	MR. LAVOIE: Well, I say so,
17	moreover, in the	excerpt you just quoted, that I have
18	no basis to suppo	ort it.
19	27513	MR. BATTISTA: OK.
20	27514	MR. LAVOIE: I also had an overall
21	impression. I al	lso had an overall impression which was
22	unfounded, in fac	ct, that was more based on an
23	instinctive perce	eption of the individual we were doing
24	business with, wh	nich led me to say that.
25	27515	And when I met with you, Mr.

1	Battista, in preparation for this examination, I	
2	specifically asked you if, when we were before a	
3	commission like this one, if we enjoyed the same	
4	immunity as when we appeared before a parliamentary	
5	committee and you explained to me that we didn't.	
6	So, I must therefore be extremely	
7	cautious in the remarks that I am going to give, bu	t I
8	would just like to tell you that I listened to Mr.	
9	Schreiber's examination by your colleague Mr. Wolso	n
10	and I can deduce one thing from it: it's that my	
11	instinct was not so stupid.	
12	MR. BATTISTA: OK.	
13	You have spoken about Mr. Pelossi	
14	How did you learn about his existence and his	
15	allegations?	
16	27519 MR. LAVOIE: By listening to that	CBC
17	"soap opera" the Fifth Estate.	
18	27520 MR. BATTISTA: OK. So that's how	you
19	found out about him?	
20	27521 MR. LAVOIE: Yes.	
21	27522 MR. BATTISTA: Did you share this	
22	information with Mr. Mulroney at the time?	
23	27523 MR. LAVOIE: Well, he had found on	ıt
24	about it like I had.	
25	27524 MR. BATTISTA: OK.	

2705

1	27525 Later, in the same conversation - and
2	I draw your attention to page 45
3	27526 MR. LAVOIE: Page 45?
4	MR. BATTISTA: Yes, still in Tab 3.
5	Starting at the third line:
6	"But if ever there is the name
7	of Brian Mulroney anywhere, it
8	has to be that because there
9	never was any money." (As read)
10	When you say "It has to be that
11	because there never was any money," are you referring
12	to what you just explained, that is that someone used
13	his name to derive a personal benefit?
14	27529 MR. LAVOIE: I am always referring
15	(and I stress this; the context must be understood
16	properly) to a letter sent to Switzerland in which it
17	was said that between 1984 and 1993 Brian Mulroney,
18	Frank Moores and Karlheinz Schreiber conspired to
19	defraud the Canadian government and the Canadian people
20	and that a portion of the money that was received in
21	kickbacks or commission, I am not too certain about the
22	expression (there was a time when I almost knew the
23	text by heart), there was a portion that is, \$5
24	million - that had been deposited
25	27530 It was stated in the letter. It

1	wasit was unconditional. It appeared to be stated as a
2	fact in the letter that \$5 million had been deposited
3	in a bank account at the Société des Banques Suisses in
4	Zurich in an account that was hidden under the code
5	name "Devon."
6	So, it was 1999. Between the sending
7	of this wild letter and 1999, many things were learned.
8	Among other things, we learned in a letter sent by the
9	Swiss Minister of Justice, who later became famous
LO	because she was chief prosecutor of the International
l1	Criminal Tribunal, Carla Del Ponte, that Brian Mulroney
12	had never had a bank account in Switzerland under a
13	code name or otherwise.
L4	So, all the theory contained in this
15	particular letter and all that this letter maintained
16	was completely false. There was nothing in it that
L 7	could stand up to the slightest analysis. The account
18	had never existed; the millions had never existed and
19	the whole affair was a pure fabrication, based on
20	information provided by a journalist who had become a
21	police informant.
22	So, when you read that, you have to
23	always remember: it was the fall of '99, four years
24	after this letter was sent and everything that had
2.5	happened in the meantime. And this is the context in

1	which these comments must be read.
2	27534 MR. BATTISTA: OK.
3	27535 So, I was indeed correct when I said:
4	"It has to be that because there
5	never was any money."
6	When you say "It has to be that," do
7	you mean the explanations that you just gave us? So,
8	when you say that, are you referring to these
9	statements or to theories?
10	27537 MR. LAVOIE: "There never was any
11	money," he never had any money in a Swiss account, \$5
12	million in kickbacks on airplanes, helicopters and I
13	don't know what all. This never existed. It was
14	fiction.
15	27538 MR. BATTISTA: And you said:
16	"And to think otherwise is
17	really not to know Mulroney."
18	27539 Is that right?
19	27540 MR. LAVOIE: That's right.
20	27541 MR. BATTISTA:
21	"He is too smart to do something
22	like that." (As read)
23	27542 Is that right?
24	27543 MR. LAVOIE: Totally.
25	27544 MR. BATTISTA: OK.

1	27545	You did not know at that time (at the
2		ussion in October 1999), that Mr.
		• •
3		fact paid sums of money to Mr.
4	Mulroney in 1993	and 1994, correct?
5	27546	MR. LAVOIE: Correct.
6	27547	MR. BATTISTA: Did Mr. Mulroney tell
7	you in the conte	xt of your interviews with the
8	journalist from	the Fifth Estate broadcast in October
9	1999, at the tim	e of the broadcast or immediately
10	afterwards, that	he had indeed received payments from
11	Mr. Schreiber af	ter his return to private life?
12	27548	MR. LAVOIE: Do you mean in the fall
13	of \99?	
14	27549	MR. BATTISTA: Yes.
15	27550	MR. LAVOIE: No.
16	27551	MR. BATTISTA: Now, you learned that
17	Mr. Mulroney had	received payments in cash from Mr.
18	Schreiber throug	h one of Mr. Mulroney's lawyers. Is
19	that correct?	
20	27552	MR. LAVOIE: That is correct, yes.
21	27553	MR. BATTISTA: Was this Mr. Tremblay?
22	27554	MR. LAVOIE: Mr. Gérald Tremblay,
23	yes.	
24	27555	MR. BATTISTA: When did you learn
25	this?	

1	27556 MR. LAVOIE: In the spring of 2000.
2	27557 MR. BATTISTA: And can you give us
3	the context of how you learned this bit of news?
4	27558 MR. LAVOIE: I received a telephone
5	call from Mr. Tremblay. Itit was at my home, it was
6	10 in the morning. In and of itself it was nothing
7	unusual, because Mr. Tremblay and I had become great
8	buddies so we spoke to one another nearly every day at
9	about that time.
10	27559 And when he called me that morning,
11	his tone was a bit different. He called to tell me that
12	he had something tohe had some information to give
13	me. He announced to me that Mr. Mulroney had had a
14	business relationship with Mr. Schreiber and that he
15	had received some money as a consultant for Mr.
16	Schreiber. That's it!
17	27560 MR. BATTISTA: I am going to list the
18	items of information that you have communicated to
19	us
20	27561 MR. LAVOIE: Of course.
21	27562 MR. BATTISTA:perhaps with more
22	detail and you will correct me if I am wrong.
23	27563 He had told you that he had a
24	contractual relationship with Mr. Schreiber after his
25	return to private life?

1	27564 MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
2	27565 MR. BATTISTA: That Mr. Mulroney had
3	acted as a consultant
4	27566 MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
5	27567 MR. BATTISTA:for Mr. Schreiber?
6	27568 MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
7	27569 MR. BATTISTA: That the money was, in
8	the English term, a "retainer"?
9	27570 MR. LAVOIE: Yes, it was a,
10	"retainer," yes.
11	27571 MR. BATTISTA: You took it to mean
12	that this was an advance of funds for professional
13	services?
14	27572 MR. LAVOIE: I had not I took it
15	to mean it was a "retainer."
16	27573 MR. BATTISTA: Yes, but "retainer,"
17	for you, this means an advance of funds
18	27574 MR. LAVOIE: Well, I myself, was
19	still a public relations consultant at that time and I
20	personally had "retainers" with a certain number of
21	clients. So, my understanding was that there was a
22	client who gave him money in order to have his advice.
23	27575 MR. BATTISTA: OK.
24	27576 And that he had been paid in cash,
25	had you learned that?

1	27577 MR. LAVOIE: Yes.	
2	27578 MR. BATTISTA: That it was in three	
3	payments?	
4	27579 MR. LAVOIE: I I recall having	
5	asked Gérald: Did that go on for a long time, did	?
6	Well, I no longer recall any	
7	27580 He told me: There were three	
8	payments in tens of thousands of dollars.	
9	27581 MR. BATTISTA: OK.	
10	27582 And that was correct? It was tens of	of
11	thousands of dollars?	
12	27583 MR. LAVOIE: Yes. And I asked him:	
13	Have his taxes been paid?	
14	Then he told me yes.	
15	27585 MR. BATTISTA: OK.	
16	27586 Did you ask Mr. Tremblay why he was	
17	telling you about these facts now?	
18	27587 MR. LAVOIE: Well, it's Yes, I	
19	didn't have to ask him; he told me right off. He told	
20	me that the client wanted to tme to be informed abo	ut
21	this because I was being sued for I no longer recall	
22	how much, an outrageous amount, byby the charming	
23	Mr. Schreiber.	
24	27588 MR. BATTISTA: At that particular	
25	moment you had learned that the money had been paid i	n

1	cash, is that correct?
2	27589 MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
3	27590 MR. BATTISTA: And it was in this
4	specific context that you asked the question "Have the
5	taxes been paid?"
6	27591 MR. LAVOIE: Right!
7	27592 MR. BATTISTA: Did you try to find
8	out how much money Mr. Mulroney had received?
9	27593 MR. LAVOIE: No. But three payments
10	in tens of thousands of dollars, that's what he told me
11	and I didn't ask anything more.
12	27594 MR. BATTISTA: Did Mr. Mulroney
13	himself contact you at that time, to give you any
14	details?
15	27595 MR. LAVOIE: No.
16	27596 MR. BATTISTA: How did you react?
17	27597 MR. LAVOIE: Coldly.
18	27598 MR. BATTISTA: At the time of the
19	interview with Mr. Corbeil and myself, you said you
20	were icy, your terms you say "coldly"
21	27599 MR. LAVOIE: Cold ice, yes.
22	27600 MR. BATTISTA: Yes. No, it's
23	completely And that you were
24	27601 MR. LAVOIE: It's a question of
25	degree.

1	MR. BATTISTA: Yes, yes. No, but
2	27603 And you were surprised, is that
3	correct?
4	27604 MR. LAVOIE: Surprised, but very
5	cold.
6	27605 MR. BATTISTA: OK.
7	You also told us that you noted a
8	certain embarrassment on the part of Mr. Mulroney in
9	your regard, after this revelation. Is that correct?
10	27607 MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
11	27608 MR. BATTISTA: What can you tell us
12	about this?
13	27609 MR. LAVOIE: These are impressions,
14	you know
15	Is this really very relevant or if
16	you really want me to, I can try
17	MR. BATTISTA: Meaning that this is
18	the impression that you had, after that?
19	MR. LAVOIE: I had the impression, in
20	fact, in the weeks following that he was a bit less at
21	ease with me than he had been formerly. There!
22	MR. BATTISTA: OK.
23	You spoke about this with Mr. Kaplan,
24	William Kaplan. I am going to refer you to Tab 7, and
25	specifically, to the last page of Tab 7. So, during

1	the interview that we had on March 14 $^{\rm th}$, you explained		
2	that you had learned of the existence of some payments		
3	a few months before	Mr. Kaplan himself had found out.	
4	27615 Is	that correct?	
5	27616 MR.	. LAVOIE: Uh I never found out	
6	exactly what, but I	found out before him but not months	
7	before him.		
8	27617 MR.	. BATTISTA: That's fine.	
9	27618 And	d you, you learned this some time	
10	during the spring of	2000	
11	27619 MR.	. LAVOIE: Right!	
12	27620 MR.	. BATTISTA:and him, towards	
13	the end of 2000 or 2	001?	
14	27621 MR.	. LAVOIE: It seems to me that he,	
15	I was of the impress	ion that it was in the spring of	
16	2001 but you'd have	to ask him.	
17	27622 MR.	. BATTISTA: OK.	
18	27623 I a	am going to refer you here to his	
19	note. So, on the las	t page:	
20		"We had some discussion about	
21		when he found out about Mulroney	
22		and the cash. He told me that	
23		he found out several months	
24		before I did. However, he is a	
25		professional used to dealing in	

1		all sorts of complicated
2		situations, including
3		negotiating hostage retrievals
4		in South America. However, he
5		told me both in the middle of
6		the dinner and at the end of the
7		evening that he was quite pissed
8		off to find out about the cash
9		but didn't take it personally."
10	27624	You recall this particular meeting
11		with Mr
12	27625	MR. LAVOIE: Yes. Definitely.
13	27626	MR. BATTISTA: Are his remarks
14		accurate, meaning is his summary accurate of what
15		happened?
16	27627	MR. LAVOIE: They're accurate,
17		they're That is very precise, very accurate and
18		reflects my thoughts very well.
19	27628	MR. BATTISTA: OK.
20	27629	You then, Mr. Lavoie, had a
21		discussion with Mr. Mulroney where you made him a
22		proposal about the option of making a public
23		acknowledgement about the payments; is that accurate?
24	27630	MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
25	27631	MR. BATTISTA: Tell us about the

1	context.
2	27632 MR. LAVOIE: The context is fairly
3	simple. Now that I was aware of the existence of this
4	contractual and business relationship, I was convinced,
5	because that was my profession, this type of thing,
6	that this was going to become public, and PR101 teaches
7	us that when something is going to become public, even
8	if it's disastrous and catastrophic and bad and
9	negative and whatever, you are always better off to
10	bring it out yourself if you're certain that it will
11	come out one day, because if you bring it out yourself,
12	you're going to be able to reduce the damage a bit by
13	putting it in context, whereas if you don't bring it
14	out yourself, you're going to be in reaction mode and
15	defensive, and you may not be able to put it in the
16	context that you might have been able to in other
17	circumstances.
18	So, I said the same thing to him that
19	$\ensuremath{\text{I'm}}$ telling you today. I recall that he was interested
20	in what I was saying. He asked me, for example, what
21	form I thought such a public revelation could be made
22	in.
23	27634 I suggested the possibility, for
24	example, of a text, known as an op-ed piece in English,
25	a text to the editor, signed by him or by someone close

2717

1	to him, me, for ex	cample, putting things in context.
2	27635	He didn't say no. He even seemed very
3	interested in it k	pecause I, frankly, was very insistent
4	on the fact that:	Mr. Mulroney, my experience in the
5	field has taught m	me that this is going to come out. I
6	don't know who or	how but because this exists, it is
7	going to come out.	
8	27636	MR. BATTISTA: This is in the
9	context if we s	situate ourselves a bit in time, is it
10	more or less at th	ne time when you yourself had learned
11	of the existence of	of these payments, to the effect that
12	journalists were s	starting to talk about them?
13	27637	MR. LAVOIE: No, it was before the
14	journalists were t	alking about it. No, no. It's
15	entirely before th	ne journalists spoke about it.
16	27638	MR. BATTISTA: Before the journalists
17	spoke about it?	
18	27639	MR. LAVOIE: Yes, yes. I'm talking
19	about the summer of	of 2000.
20	27640	MR. BATTISTA: OK.
21	27641	And Mr. Mulroney never followed up on
22	this proposal?	
23	27642	MR. LAVOIE: We spoke about it again
24	four or five times	s, always on the same theme, without
25	going much further	r. I felt that there was interest in

2718

1	doing it, but that, on the other hand
2	27643 Listen, I've had many clients in the
3	public relations field and clients who find themselves
4	with bad news and who call on a public relations
5	professional, and the first reaction they have if
6	they've had some news they don't think will do them any
7	good if it comes out, is to say that we have to do
8	everything to smother this business, which Mr. Mulrone
9	did not say, by the way.
L O	27644 But it's the I'm telling how
11	people usually think who are in a situation where they
12	know that there is the risk that they could be
13	implicated in one way or another and what the public
L4	relations professional well, it's certainly what I
15	did when I was working in that profession will say:
16	That's going to come out because history shows us that
L 7	everything ends up coming out. So, you have to take a
18	proactive approach and bring it out yourself in a
19	context where at least you can manage to give a bit
20	more understanding of the affair, a betterwhere the
21	nuances will be there, too.
22	27645 And, incidentally, the clients'
23	reaction to that is often that they do not want
24	something to come out so much that they would rather
25	believe that it's possible that it will not come out.

1	27646	Well, I have often used the
2		expression with clients, in Mr. Mulroney's case, and
3		others' alike, even if the philosopher said that the
4		worst is never a sure thing, in cases like these, the
5		worst is generally a sure thing. So, you are better off
6		taking a proactive approach and doing it quickly
7		because a mistake that is admitted is already half
8		forgiven, if indeed a mistake has been made. I am not
9		claiming that any mistake had been made here.
10	2764	MR. BATTISTA: Your advice, Mr.
11		Lavoie, was not that there had been a mistake, but
12		your advice was: Listen, there are journalists asking
13		questions, there's talk about a bank account, you told
14		me that there is cash that was paid, you know that the
15		taxes have been paid, you've been told that this was
16		for legitimate work, you should go public with this to
17		put payment in cash in the right context; is that
18	27648	MR. LAVOIE: You are right overall,
19		except one thing. It is not so much that there were
20		journalists poking around because journalists poking
21		around were doing their job. It's that there were
22		journalists who were being fed by one source, and this
23		source's behaviour was not compatible with Is the
24		word "compatible" the right choice?
25	27649	There was an individual

1	personally, I had recalled with how shall I say -
2	- a certain feeling of horror what had happened in the
3	fall of '99 when this charming German-Canadian
4	businessman found himself in prison and that he had, by
5	telephone, set off a political-media war in Germany
6	which ended up costing Helmut Kohl his reputation, one
7	of the great German politicians of the post-war, a
8	great re-unifier of Germany, and who had the title of
9	Chairman emeritus of the Christian Democrat party, who
10	resigned from his duties following the remarks of this
11	charming individual.
12	There was someone else who committed
13	suicide, and someone else who was in the plot. And it
14	was always the same story, and there were words which
15	made my blood run cold when I read them. He said: I'm
16	like a cat standing over a cage full of mice and
17	wondering which mouse I'm going to eat next.
18	So, personally, when I am
19	instinctively when I am faced with this type of evil
20	being, I have learned to be on my guard.
21	27652 MR. BATTISTA: But going back, Mr.
22	Lavoie, the question I asked you: Did Mr. Mulroney
23	follow up on your proposal; is that correct?
24	27653 MR. LAVOIE: He hesitated but he
25	didn't take any action

2721

1	27654 MR. BATTISTA: OK. And the context of
2	your proposal was that there had been, in fact, some
3	payments between Mr. Schreiber and Mr. Mulroney but no
4	as how it was alleged in the context of the request to
5	the Swiss authorities; is that correct?
6	27655 MR. LAVOIE: Obviously. It's obvious.
7	There were there were like two worlds here and I
8	acknowledge to you that with all these years, I am no
9	longer involved in the issue.
10	I was always, how shall I say it,
11	upset by the fact that there was no comparison. The
12	scandal that the media themselves baptized the Airbus
13	Scandal was based on an extremely libellous letter sent
14	following a trial that was since re-opened because it
15	was odious, which described a former prime minister of
16	Canada as a criminal, which never mentioned
17	allegations, and throughout all the preliminary
18	proceedings for the trial, which in the end never took
19	place, we learned how this system worked.
20	27657 Personally, as a citizen, I was
21	outraged by all that. The bank account never existed.
22	The five million dollars never existed. All that was a
23	fabrication behind which was a police informant who
24	ended up being revealed as a journalist who had made a
25	career out of attacking Brian Mulroney. I found that

1	amazing.	
2	27658	So, you take this, you suppose that,
3	then you learn t	hat there was a consultancy
4	relationship wit	th the same businessman, who, at the
5	time was someone	whoagainst whom no accusations had
6	been made, nor h	and there been any extradition
7	applications, ar	nd it was two completely different
8	situations.	
9	27659	What he was accused of, was when he
LO	was prime minist	er of Canada. The matter, the payments,
11	was something he	e had done after leaving his job as
12	prime minister,	as part of a consultation mandate which
13	was completely i	n line with consultation mandates that
14	are given every	day in our modern society.
15	27660	MR. BATTISTA: OK. But what was
16	particular here,	Mr. Lavoie, is that the money was paid
L7	in cash; you had	had this information, correct?
18	27661	MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
19	27662	MR. BATTISTA: Did you receive this
20	information afte	er having publically said: "There never
21	was any money?"	
22	27663	MR. LAVOIE: Excuse me, Mr. Battista.
23	"There never was	any money" is in the same
24	conversation. If	this were to recur today, I would say
25	that "There neve	er was any money" because we were

2723

1	talking about a letter to Switzerland, which said that	
2	there were kickbacks on airplanes, on helicopters,	
3	which had been paid into an account that didn't exist.	
4	So there was any money.	
5	MR. BATTISTA: That's correct, Mr.	
6	Lavoie. However, you thought it was important that this	
7	information be publicized by Mr. Mulroney himself?	
8	MR. LAVOIE: Yes, because in the	
9	atmospherelisten, when you haveyou have to	
10	understand that. When you have a Crown Corporation	
11	receiving more than a billion dollars in subsidies per	
12	year and which decides to devote nearly the entire	
13	career of an individual, Mr. Cashore, who himself,	
14	before joining CBC, was a researcher for a biography of	
15	Mr. Mulroney which was not exactly flattering, far from	
16	it, when you have a situation like that, that you know	
17	you have people in front of you who are literally	
18	obsessed, obsessed, by the idea that they're	
19	going to get him, because there must be something,	
20	surely he'll be caught on something, and they have	
21	absolutely unlimited resources, when you're faced with	
22	that, you have every reason to pay close attention.	
23	MR. BATTISTA: OK.	
24	MR. LAVOIE: And you know very well	
25	when you are faced with that because that,	

2724

1	that'sThere are two things in life: there is
2	journalism, and then there is the other thing and when
3	you are in the other thing, you have to conduct
4	yourself as if you are dealing with the other thing.
5	27668 MR. BATTISTA: And it was in this
6	particular context that your advice was given?
7	27669 MR. LAVOIE: It was in this particular
8	context that my advice was given because I knew that is
9	this Crown Corporation and its worthy representative
LO	got their hands on that particular information, they
11	were going to start up again. There was no comparison
12	between the two things, none.
13	27670 MR. BATTISTA: OK.
L4	I am going to draw your attention to
15	Tab 6. This is the April $18^{\mbox{\tiny th}}$ edition of the magazine
16	Frank. In the middle of the page you have
17	27672 MR. LAVOIE: That's where they call me
18	a "fart catcher."
19	27673 MR. BATTISTA: Right! In this
20	particular piece, it says:
21	"Now there are rumours that
22	Schreiber paid over \$300,000 to
23	Mulroney's Montreal law firm
24	Ogilvie Renault."
25	27674 And then, in the column directly

1	across:
2	"There were previous reports
3	that Schreiber set up several
4	bank accounts, one under the
5	code name Britain which had
6	\$500,000 in it from 1993, then
7	was depleted by some \$300,000 at
8	a later date."
9	This article or this document was
10	published on April 18, 2001.
11	27676 Two questions. Were you informed
12	about this particular fact? Did Mr. Mulroney speak to
13	you about it?
14	27677 MR. LAVOIE: Informed about the
15	publication, Mr. Battista?
16	MR. BATTISTA: Yes. Yes.
17	MR. LAVOIE: I was informed that no,
18	Mr. Mulroney did not have a subscription to Frank.
19	27680 MR. BATTISTA: I understand, but were
20	you informed about that or did he inform you about it?
21	27681 MR. LAVOIE: I was informed about it
22	by the journalist Phil Mathias who had called me to as
23	me if I had seen that. Answer: No. And he faxed me a
24	copy of it.
25	27682 MR.BATTISTA: Did you speak to Mr.

1	Mulroney about the fact that this particular
2	document
3	27683 MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
4	MR. BATTISTA:had been published?
5	27685 MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
6	27686 MR. BATTISTA: So, he had been
7	informed about it?
8	27687 MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
9	27688 MR. BATTISTA: By you?
10	27689 MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
11	27690 MR. BATTISTA: OK.
12	Tab 9, you have an article from the
13	Globe and Mail of November 10, 2003. I am going to read
14	you the headline:
15	"Shortly after left office [or
16	he left office, it's written
17	incorrectly] the former Prime
18	Minister accepted some \$300,000
19	in retainers from the
20	controversial German
21	businessman. In the final part
22	of the series William Kaplan
23	unravels the tale."
24	27692 That's the article that put forward
25	this figure in a major newspaper for the first time; is

1	that correct?
2	27693 MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
3	MR. BATTISTA: So, Mr. Mathias had
4	verified a piece of information with you which had
5	circulated in Frank; is that correct?
6	27695 MR. LAVOIE: No, he had not verified
7	that with me. He informed me
8	27696 MR. BATTISTA: He informed you
9	27697 MR. LAVOIE:about the existence of
10	this article in the Frank magazine.
11	27698 MR. BATTISTA: OK. Did you ask any
12	questions about this?
13	27699 MR. LAVOIE: No, because Mr. Mathias
14	had worked on this same
15	27700 MR. BATTISTA: Story?
16	27701 MR. LAVOIE:information, this same
17	story, of his own initiative, and so, he wasn't calling
18	me to ask me questions on what was in Frank, which had
19	its own sources. He was calling me to tell me that it
20	was in Frank.
21	27702 MR. BATTISTA: OK.
22	27703 Had he previously verified these
23	figures with you and this particular information?
24	MR. LAVOIE: He had checked with me,
25	he had called me at some time, but I am not sure about

1	the e	xact chronology,	about when he had called me,
2			the publication of Frank because
3	he wa	s working on a s	tory about how Mr. Mulroney had
4	recei [.]	ved payments, as	a consultant, for Mr. Schreiber
5	after	having left his	job as prime minister.
6	27705	-	BATTISTA: OK. So, we now know
7	that 1		3, was the first time that a major
8			he news that Mr. Mulroney
9	_	_	yments, 300,000 dollars in cash;
10		at correct?	
11	27706	MR.	LAVOIE: Yes.
12	27707	MR.	BATTISTA: Did Mr. Mulroney not
13	ask y	ou at that time	to make a public statement to
14	corre	ct this informat	ion after it was published?
15	27708	MR.	LAVOIE: No.
16	27709	MR.	BATTISTA: You had some
17	discu	ssions with Mr.	Kaplan prior to the publication of
18			es and his book The Secret Trial;
19	is th	at correct?	
20	27710	MR.	LAVOIE: I had a great many
21			Kaplan for his first and second
22			we continue to have discussions at
23	this		
24	27711		BATTISTA: OK.
25	27712		I draw your attention to Tab 7.
45	Z 1 1 1 Z	50,	i draw your accentron to lab /.

1	Did you have a te	elephone discussion with Mr. Kaplan on
2	January 4, 2002?	
3	27713	MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
4	27714	MR. BATTISTA: Does Mr. Kaplan note
5	that you told hir	n that Mr. Mulroney had received a
6	great deal less t	than the alleged 300,000?
7	27715	MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
8	27716	MR. BATTISTA: Is that correct?
9	27717	MR. LAVOIE: Yes, it's correct that
10	it's written them	ce, yes.
11	27718	MR. BATTISTA: Yes. But is it correct
12	that you had said	d it to him?
13	27719	MR. LAVOIE: I am going to repeat to
14	you what I told y	you on March 14th.
15	27720	MR. BATTISTA: Yes.
16	27721	MR. LAVOIE: I have no particular
17	recollectionar	nd believe me, I have no desire to fall
18	into the category	y of memory problems, but I have no
19	particular recoll	lection about this particular
20	conversation, but	I don't deny that it occurred.
21	27722	MR. BATTISTA: Meaning that you accept
22	the note as relia	able
23	27723	MR. LAVOIE: Yes, absolutely.

MR. BATTISTA: ...that Mr. Kaplan

24 27724

gave.

25

1	27725	MR. LAVOIE: Yes, yes.
2	27726	MR. BATTISTA: If Mr. Kaplan said that
3	you told him that,	you agree that you told him on that
4	day?	
5	27727	MR. LAVOIE: I consider Bill Kaplan a
6	very straightforwa	ard person. I have no doubt that this
7	particular convers	sation took place. I do not
8	specifically recal	l this particular conversation. I
9	take note of the f	Eact that it took place on January 4,
L 0	2002. I would say	that the reason for the conversation
11	was to wish each o	other a happy new year and during the
12	conversation, Mr.	Kaplan had undoubtedly expressed his
13	profound disappoir	ntment in learning about the existence
L4	of these payments,	that he perceived that this had been
15	hidden from him ar	nd so on.
16	27728	I would imagine, because, quite
17	honestly, I have r	no recollection, because Let me
18	just remind you he	ere that this took place in 2002. At
19	that time, I was e	executive vice-president of a rather
20	large company call	ed Quebecor, and this job took up 130
21	percent of my time	e. The Airbus affair, blah, blah,
22	blah, and everyth	ng that resulted from it was not
23	exactly my biggest	concern. I wouldn't even say that it
24	was high on my lis	st of priorities. I would say that I
25	was doing this to	help. So I wasn't deep into it the

2731

1	way I was from '95 to '97. So that kind of conversation
2	was much more casual in nature than was the case, say,
3	in the preceding period.
4	27729 So this conversation, I would
5	imagine Maybe I shouldn't do this, but I could
6	easily imagine that Kaplan called me and that I told
7	Mr. Mulroney on the phone that Kaplan called me, and
8	that he's pretty unhappy about all this, and that he's
9	not really happy and that he said this and that, and I
10	would imagine that Mr. Mulroney must have slipped in,
11	it's less than 300,000.
12	27730 But quite frankly, it's all
13	this I see that Bill I had never seen this side
14	of him, although I'm not surprised. Now I see that
15	when we talked, he immediately made a note. I didn't
16	do that. I'm not criticizing him for doing that.
17	Maybe this is even a credit to him, it means he's very
18	meticulous.
19	27731 I have no particular memory of that
20	conversation. I am not denying that it happened. It
21	might have lasted four minutes, I don't know. I don't
22	know, and maybe if I told him in this conversation that
23	it was less than 300,000, it's because Mr. Mulroney
24	must have told me that, and if it went right over my
25	head, it's because it really must not have seemed all

1	that important to m	me.
2	27732 M	r. BATTISTA: Okay.
3	27733 Y	ou also told him that Mr. Mulroney
4	had provided servi	ces in exchange for payments? That's
5	what Mr. Kaplan sa	ys you told him.
6	27734 M	r. LAVOIE: Yes.
7	27735 M	r. BATTISTA: That's information that
8	you were aware of a	at the time?
9	27736 M	r. LAVOIE: Well, it must have been
10	information that M	r. Mulroney had given me in the same
11	spirit as what I j	ust told you.
12	27737 M	r. BATTISTA: OK.
13	27738 Y	ou also said that he was organizing
14	meetings with manag	gers from Archer Daniels Midland
15	regarding Mr. Schr	eiber's pasta businesses; did you
16	have this discussion	on with him?
17	27739 M	r. LAVOIE: Yes.
18	27740 M	r. BATTISTA: Giving him advice
19	regarding internat	ional transactions; that's what he
20	said?	
21	27741 M	r. LAVOIE: Yes.
22	27742 M	r. BATTISTA: You had also told
23	Mr. Kaplan that the	e relation between Mr. Schreiber and
24	Mr. Mulroney was p	rofessionally privileged, these were
25	terms that you used	d, "privileged," "attorney

1	<pre>privilege;" correct?</pre>	
2	27743 Mr. LAVOI	E: "Privileged," yes. I
3	have used the expression "	orivileged."
4	27744 Mr. BATTI	STA: He says:
5	"Adv	rising Schreiber on
6	inte	rnational business
7	tran	sactions. Essentially that
8	was	it. Anything else that was
9	said	l was covered by
10	clie	ent/attorney privilege."
11	27745 Is that r	ight?
12	27746 Mr. LAVOI	E: I think so. I am telling
13	you that I don't remember	this conversation exactly
14	27747 Mr. BATTI	STA: OK.
15	27748 Mr. LAVOI	E:but I am not disputing
16	its content.	
17	27749 Mr. BATTI	STA: OK.
18	27750 And when	you said "attorney
19	privilege," "client/attorn	ey privilege," it's that you
20	understood that Mr. Mulron	ey was acting as counsel for
21	Mr. Schreiber?	
22	27751 Mr. LAVOI	E: I understood that he was
23	an attorney and that Mr. S	chreiber was a client.
24	27752 Mr. BATTI	STA: Very well.
25	27753 One last	thing regarding your

1	statements. So, you at least reread the interviewyou
2	referred to it earlierthat Mr. Kaplan had taken down?
3	27754 Mr. LAVOIE: Yes.
4	27755 Mr. BATTISTA: You reread it all? You
5	reread it before we met and you reread it again today?
6	27756 Mr. LAVOIE: Yes.
7	27757 Mr. BATTISTA: And you do not dispute
8	its thoroughness, or its accuracy?
9	27758 Mr. LAVOIE: You are correct.
10	27759 Mr. BATTISTA: I will now draw your
11	attention to Tab 21. It's an excerpt from his book, on
12	page 19. We had seen this passage at our meeting in
13	Montréal. I will read it to you:
14	"The real examination on
15	discovery began April 17th,
16	1996."
17	27760 So, just to situate the context,
18	it's yes, page 19, Tab 21.
19	27761 Mr. LAVOIE: Tab 21, page 19.
20	27762 Mr. BATTISTA: Halfway down the page.
21	27763 Mr. LAVOIE: Yes, here it is, 19,
22	halfway down the page. Yes.
23	27764 Mr. BATTISTA: "The real"
24	27765 Mr. LAVOIE: "The real examination on
25	discovery"

1	27766 Mr. BATTISTA: Yes. So here he ta	lks
2	about the time when Mr. Mulroney was being question	ied
3	by the Government of Canada's prosecutors; correct?	
4	27767 Mr. LAVOIE: Uh-huh.	
5	27768 Mr. BATTISTA: And he quoted you a	S
6	saying:	
7	"The real examination on	
8	discovery began April 17, 19	96
9	at the Montréal Palais de	
10	Justice. Before entering the	Э
11	courtroom, Mulroney turned to	Э
12	Lavoie and said, 'Luc, do yo	u
13	know what [chief government	
14	lawyer Claude-Armand] Sheppa	rd's
15	problem is going to be today	? '
16	'No, boss,' Lavoie repli	ed.
17	'He is going to ask me	
18	questions and he expects me	to
19	answer them."	
20	27769 That is what you said to Mr. Kapl	an?
21	27770 Mr. LAVOIE: Yes.	
22	27771 Mr. BATTISTA: That is also what	
23	Mr. Mulroney said to you?	
24	27772 Mr. LAVOIE: Yes, but it was a jok	≘,
25	eh!	

1	27773	Mr. BATTISTA: I understand.
2	27774	Mr. LAVOIE: Everyone was laughing
3	about it.	
4	27775	Mr. BATTISTA: Very well.
5	27776	Mr. LAVOIE: For those who know him,
6	he has a pretty	good sense of humour.
7	27777	Mr. BATTISTA: I will now move on to
8	something else.	
9	27778	Mr. LAVOIE: It was very funny, in
10	fact.	
11	27779	Mr. BATTISTA: OK.
12	27780	I will now move on to something else.
13	Tabs 18 and 19.	
14	27781	Mr. LAVOIE: Eighteen and 19.
15	27782	Mr. BATTISTA: So, these are two
16	articles publish	ed in 2007, on November 22, 2007, in
17	both cases, wher	e you are quoted.
18	27783	Tab 18, page 2, third full paragraph,
19	so to speak:	
20		"A spokesman for Mr. Mulroney,
21		Luc Lavoie, said this week that
22		the former Prime Minister sees
23		accepting cash as a 'colossal
24		mistake'. Mr. Mulroney was in
25		financial straits and worried

1			about his future when he
2			accepted the \$100,000 cash
3			payment while still a Member of
4			Parliament in August 1993, Mr.
5			Lavoie said."
6	27784	Furth	ner down, three or four
7	paragraphs later:		
8			"Mr. Lavoie said Mr. Schreiber
9			met Mr. Mulroney at the Château
10			Mirabel to pitch a job to the
11			former Prime Minister as a
12			consultant on projects with an
13			'international dimension'
14			including a military vehicle
15			plant in Montreal and a pasta
16			business."
17	27785	Skipp	ping a paragraph:
18			"Mr. Lavoie also suggested in an
19			interview with the Ottawa
20			Citizen that Mr. Mulroney was
21			surprised when Mr. Schreiber
22			pulled out cash."
23	27786	Last	paragraph:
24			"'Then he said, 'I would give
25			you \$100,000 a year' and then he

1	pulled out an envelope with
2	\$100,000 and Mr. Mulroney said,
3	'what is that?' He said, 'Well,
4	I want to pay you in cash.' So
5	Mr. Mulroney asked a few
6	questions. 'Why would you do do
7	this in cash?' and all that,'
8	Mr. Lavoie said. 'Mr. Mulroney
9	admits today that he made a
10	colossal mistake.'"
11	27787 And if we go to November 22, still in
12	2007, Tab 19. So, Tab 18 is an article taken from the
13	Globe and Mail, and Tab 19, TheStar.com. First
14	paragraph:
15	"Brian Mulroney's admission
16	through a spokesperson that it
17	was a 'colossal mistake' to take
18	\$300,000 in cash from Karlheinz
19	Schreiber doesn't suffice to
20	clear the former prime minister
21	of suspicion of wrongdoing,
22	Liberals charged yesterday."
23	27788 If we go to the third paragraph from
24	the end:
25	"Lavoie told Sun News Service

1	columnist Greg Weston last week
2	that Mulroney considers taking
3	the cash 'the silliest thing
4	I've ever done in my life.'"
5	27789 Then:
6	"Lavoie told the Ottawa Citizen
7	that after Mulroney left office
8	in 1993, he had used up all his
9	savings and worried about how he
10	was going to take care of his
11	young family. While still an
12	MP, he met late that summer with
13	Schreiber, who had retained
14	Mulroney as a business
15	consultant at \$100,000 a year
16	and immediately handed over the
17	first year's instalment in cash,
18	Lavoie said."
19	27790 These are quotes from statements that
20	you had made, correct?
21	27791 Mr. LAVOIE: Yes. Yes.
22	27792 Mr. BATTISTA: You had mentioned the
23	figure of 300,000 at that time; correct?
24	27793 Mr. LAVOIE: It's possible. I'm
25	trying to see. It's very possible, yes.

1	27794 Mr. BATTISTA: They quoted you. They
2	quoted you when you were giving explanations.
3	27795 Mr. LAVOIE: That's what I see. Yes.
4	Yes.
5	27796 Mr. BATTISTA: And they quoted you,
6	you mentioned 100,000 dollars as well; correct?
7	27797 Mr. LAVOIE: Yes. Yes.
8	27798 Mr. BATTISTA: OK. I would like to
9	draw your attention to Tab 14 as well.
10	27799 So, Tab 14 is an exchange of e-mails
11	between you and Mr. Bruce Campion-Smith from
12	November 5, 2007. Do you follow?
13	27800 Mr. LAVOIE: Yes.
14	27801 Mr. BATTISTA: On page 2, first full
15	paragraph:
16	"You say that Mr. Mulroney never
17	'revealed' the \$300 000.
18	Indeed, he never revealed it.
19	He was never asked about it. It
20	was 'revealed' by the Globe and
21	Mail in 2004, not by the Fifth
22	Estate this year as the CBC
23	stated last Wednesday night.
24	And it had nothing to do with
25	the scheme described in the 1995

1		Letter of Request. This
2		retainer was paid after Mr
3		Mulroney left office and was in
4		no way connected with the Airbus
5		transaction. As to the question
6		that is often asked 'What was
7		the \$300 000 for'?, the answer
8		is very simple. You will find
9		it in the transcript of the
10		testimony under oath of
11		Karlheinz Schreiber in the
12		Eurocopter trial (part of the
13		public record) and in a lot more
14		details in the Statement of
15		Claims and sworn Affidavit filed
16		by Karlheinz Schreiber in a
17		litigation he undertook this
18		year against Mr Mulroney."
19	27802	Further down:
20		"Two more points:
21		- When the RCMP informed Mr
22		Mulroney in a 2003 letter
23		that they had closed the
24		Airbus investigation and
25		found no wrongdoing on his

1	part, they had known for a
2	full 2 years about the
3	\$300 000 retainer."
4	27803 Are these your words, Mr. Lavoie?
5	27804 Mr. LAVOIE: Yes.
6	27805 Mr. BATTISTA: You keep referring to
7	the sum of 300,000 dollars in that document; correct?
8	27806 Mr. LAVOIE: Yes.
9	27807 Mr. BATTISTA: You also say that
10	Mr. Schreiber's testimony in the Eurocopter trial and
11	the affidavit he produced as part of his case against
12	Mr. Mulroney explained the reasons for the payments;
13	correct?
14	27808 Mr. LAVOIE: Yes. In any case, his
15	version.
16	27809 Mr. BATTISTA: You were still in
17	contact with Mr. Mulroney at that time; correct?
18	27810 Mr. LAVOIE: Yes. In fact, I still
19	am.
20	27811 Mr. BATTISTA: I understand. But as
21	spokesperson, you were still a spokesperson for
22	Mr. Mulroney at the time?
23	27812 Mr. LAVOIE: Yes. Yes.
24	27813 Mr. BATTISTA: You ended your e-mail
25	with this sentence, second to last paragraph:

1	"I know all these facts to be
2	totally true."
3	When you said that, you were telling
4	the truth?
5	27815 Mr. LAVOIE: Yes. This one wasn't an
6	affidavit, it was an e-mail.
7	27816 Mr. BATTISTA: I understand. But you
8	were telling the truth when you said that?
9	Mr. LAVOIE: Of course.
10	27818 Mr. BATTISTA: I will suggest to you
11	that in 2004 as well, at Tabs 10 and 11, if you go
12	there, in an article published in The Globe and Mail or
13	October 8, 2004, and then, another in The Globe and
14	Mail of October 16, 2004, if you go to the middle, "In
15	an interview," then
16	27819 Mr. LAVOIE: At Tab 11, eh, you said?
17	27820 Mr. BATTISTA: Yes Tab 10, first,
18	excuse me.
19	27821 Mr. LAVOIE: Tab 10. Tab 10, yes.
20	27822 Mr. BATTISTA: So, in the middle of
21	the page, "In an interview," then, fifth paragraph:
22	"In an interview, Luc Lavoie,
23	spokesman for Mr. Mulroney, said
24	the former prime minister did
25	nothing wrong. 'There was

1		nothing illegal about (the
2		payments),' Mr. Lavoie said,
3		'taxes were paid, it was a
4		commercial transaction and he
5		had left office. It was all
6		proper.'"
7	27823	Is this correct?
8	27824	Mr. LAVOIE: Yes.
9	27825	Mr. BATTISTA: And at 11
10	27826	Mr. LAVOIE: Tab 11?
11	27827	Mr. BATTISTA: Tab 11, sorry, the
12	second to last pa	aragraph:
13		"Nevertheless, Mr. Mulroney has
14		refused to discuss the affair at
15		length, instead relying on his
16		official spokesman, Luc Lavoie,
17		to repeat a simple mantra: The
18		payments were legal, no rules or
19		laws were broken, all income
20		taxes were paid, end of story."
21	27828	Is that right?
22	27829	Mr. LAVOIE: Excellent quote, but it's
23	very good.	
24	27830	Mr. BATTISTA: Is this exact?
25	27831	Mr. LAVOIE: That is exact.

1	27832 Mr. BATTISTA: That was your mandate?
2	Mr. LAVOIE: Absolutely.
3	Mr. BATTISTA: OK. There was never
4	any question at that time of correcting the figure of
5	300,000 dollars; correct?
6	27835 Mr. LAVOIE: No, that wasn't an issue,
7	no. But he had never said to me 300,000 dollars, you
8	understand.
9	27836 Mr. BATTISTA: I understand,
10	Mr. Lavoie.
11	27837 If you would give me a moment.
12	Pause
13	27838 Mr. BATTISTA: Commissioner, I have
14	one last thing that I don't think will take very long.
15	Maybe it would be appropriate to take a break now, and
16	then we can come back, and my colleagues I will
17	finish what I have to do, and my colleagues will take
18	over.
19	27839 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: You would like
20	to take a break now?
21	27840 Mr. BATTISTA: Yes, that's what I am
22	proposing.
23	27841 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: No problem, 15
24	minutes.
25	27842 THE REGISTRAR: All rise. Veuillez

1	vous lever.
2	Upon recessing at 10:50 a.m. / Suspension à 10 h 50
3	Upon resuming at 11:15 a.m. / Reprise à 11 h 15
4	27843 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Be seated,
5	please.
6	Monsieur Battista, before we
7	commence, there was an issue that we were going to deal
8	with, but I see from Mr. Wolson that we are not ready
9	to deal with the issue.
LO	27845 MR. WOLSON: Yes. I can advise you,
11	Mr. Commissioner, that I'm waiting to hear from at
12	least one of the parties and I should know the issue
13	that I think you're talking about is the order of
L4	examination of Mr. Mulroney.
15	27846 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Yes.
16	27847 MR. WOLSON: And an application that
17	has been made and I'm waiting to hear from all of the
18	parties. I haven't heard from them on their positions
19	yet and I wonder if we can defer that until tomorrow.
20	27848 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: All right.
21	My concern, of course, is that if the matter can't be
22	resolved on a consensual basis, we'll need to set a bit
23	of time aside for a hearing and Mr. Mulroney is
24	scheduled to testify just a little bit later in the
25	inquiry and every day we lose we're more pressed for

1	time.
2	So, if we can either get it resolved
3	by tomorrow or set a date tomorrow, I would appreciate
4	it.
5	MR. WOLSON: Yes. Thank you.
6	27851 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Thank you.
7	All right. Mr. Battista.
8	27852 Mr. BATTISTA: Yes. Thank you.
9	So
10	27853 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: You have no
11	more questions?
12	27854 Mr. BATTISTA: Yes, a few more
13	questions, Commissioner, just a few things.
14	27855 Mr. Lavoie, I would like to come back
15	to Tab 14 with you, the e-mail you had sent to
16	Mr. Bruce Campion Smith, just to draw your attention to
17	an excerpt, I read rather quickly and I did not read
18	the entire excerpt.
19	So, I will ask you to go to page 2 of
20	this document, in the middle of the paragraph, the
21	question: What was the \$300,000 for? You say:
22	"The answer is very simple, you
23	will find it in the transcript
24	of the testimony under oath of
25	Karlheinz Schreiber in the

1		Eurocopter trial (part of the
2		public record) and in a lot more
3		detail in the Statement of
4		Claims and sworn Affidavit filed
5		by Karlheinz Schreiber in a
6		litigation he undertook this
7		year against Mr. Mulroney."
8	27857	At that time, you referred to the
9	content of t	the Mr. Schreiber's statements. Correct?
10	27858	Mr. LAVOIE: In the Statement of
11	Claims	
12	27859	Mr. BATTISTA: Yes?
13	27860	Mr. LAVOIE: most probably
14	presented ir	n winter 2007.
15	27861	Mr. BATTISTA: OK. What I just
16	read, what I	just read, you are referring to either
17	to Mr. Schre	eiber's testimony or to what he claims is
18	the reason f	for the dissension, if you like, regarding
19	the \$300,000)?
20	27862	Mr. LAVOIE: Yes.
21	27863	Mr. BATTISTA: You go on to say:
22		"The litigation has to do with
23		whether or not the services he
24		paid for were rendered and the
25		Court has yet to hear the case.

1	However, the Statement of Claims
2	is very clear. The money was to
3	get Mr. Mulroney's help in
4	building a light armoured troop
5	carrier factory for Thyssen, a
6	major German corporation in the
7	region of Montreal and to launch
8	a chain of pasta restaurants in
9	North America."
10	This was, for you, how you would
11	summarize Mr. Mulroney's mandate?
12	27865 Mr. LAVOIE: Indeed.
13	27866 Mr. BATTISTA: Thank you. Now, I
14	will bring you to a last point, the issue of the
15	Mr. Mulroney's financial situation.
16	We saw in the excerpts that you
17	quoted at tabs 19 and 20, where you referred to Tab 18,
18	you referred to the fact that Mr. Mulroney was in
19	financial straits and worried about his future.
20	27868 At 19, you had said, you were quoted
21	in the Ottawa Citizen:
22	"After Mr. Mulroney left office
23	in 1993, he had used up all his
24	savings and worried about how he
25	was going to take care of his

1	young family."
2	27869 I draw your attention also to Tab 17
3	in an article published in the Globe & Mail.
4	27870 Mr. LAVOIE: At Tab 17?
5	27871 Mr. BATTISTA: Yes.
6	27872 Mr. LAVOIE: Canwest News Service.
7	27873 Mr. BATTISTA: I'm sorry; my
8	mistake. Yes, at Tab 17, i.e., canada.com. Are you
9	following me?
10	27874 Mr. LAVOIE: Yes.
11	27875 Mr. BATTISTA: I'm sorry. I'm the
12	one I'm the one who is not directing you properly,
13	but you did go to Tab 17.
14	So, second paragraph:
15	"Luc Lavoie told Canwest News
16	Service that when Mulroney left
17	politics in 1993, he had money
18	pressures, he was the head of a
19	young family with certain
20	lifestyle expectations and not a
21	rich man."
22	You were not misquoted. Is this
23	correct?
24	27878 Mr. LAVOIE: I was not misquoted. I
25	am not part of the misquoted club, no.

1	27879 Mr. BATTISTA: And you explained to
2	us at our meeting in Montréal that you had obtained
3	this information, this vision of things, by reading
4	excerpts from Mr. Mulroney's Memoirs, but in the drafts
5	that preceded the final version.
6	27880 Am I right?
7	27881 Mr. LAVOIE: Actually, I read
8	Mr. Mulroney's Memoirs in a version that was
9	subsequently edited because this is the normal process
10	when preparing a book like this, and he used this
11	phrase:
12	"I had used all the savings I
13	had accumulated before I came
14	into politics"
15	27882 something like that.
16	27883 Mr. BATTISTA: OK.
17	27884 Mr. LAVOIE: And I also note when I
18	read your Tab 21 that Mr. Kaplan quoted him saying the
19	exact same thing. That being said, I think it's
20	important to establish a little context behind this.
21	27885 I never said and I never intended to
22	say, and the fact is that I left the opposite
23	impression, which I find very unfortunate, but the
24	context in which this was said in the fall of 2007,
25	everything was blown out of proportion.

1	27886 What I was saying, and I say it again
2	here, is that in Canada's recent history, there have
3	been prime ministers, Mr. Trudeau, for exampleand I'm
4	not criticizing them, I am only making an observation
5	Mr. Trudeau, for example, Mr. Martin, for example, were
6	people who were very well off before they went into
7	politics and who left politics still very well off.
8	That was not the case for Mr. Mulroney, first of all.
9	27887 Second, I myself have witnessed,
10	among other things, after the 1988 election, when
11	certain ministers were defeated in the election, and as
12	a journalist I also saw it in others who experienced
13	the same thing and myself, when I stopped working for
14	the Government of Canada, when you're working in jobs
15	such as these, you tend to, even if you try to reason
16	with yourself not to think that way, you tend to
17	believe that the fact that the most powerful men in the
18	country return your call within three minutes of your
19	call, and the fact that you have the general-in-chief
20	commander of the Canadian armed forces on the phone
21	within 30 seconds and the fact that you have the most
22	powerful businessmen wanting to see you right away and
23	that this is very, very important, you tend to think
24	it's personal.
25	27888 But, when you leave politics, which

1	is a very harsh environment, you always get a shock,
2	even if you prepared yourself for it because others
3	told you about it, the shock is this one: the phone
4	doesn't ring any more. You go into consulting, as I
5	did, and you dream that the phone is going to ring and
6	even if you have confidence in your talents and the
7	future, you suffer from true anxiety.
8	I have known and I know other former
9	prime ministers who built up a new career, often in
10	legal firms, and the most talented among thembecause
11	these are generally very talented peoplewill tell you
12	that they went through the exact same thing.
13	When you leave office and you try to
14	rebuild your life and you wake up one day and there is
15	no longer this huge logistical team with a driver and
16	bodyguard and secretary and private plane and all the
17	rest, and you have to make a living, you tell yourself:
18	I will join a legal firm and I am sure that clients
19	will come to me, and you quickly realize that the
20	clients don't automatically come to you.
21	27891 And what I was referring to and,
22	obviously, I am not denying the statements that are
23	there, but that was placed in a context, and it was
24	probably clumsy of me to do so, that implied that the
25	guy was scared like that. That is not at all what I

1	war	ited to say.
2	27892	What I wanted to say is that when you
3	lea	ave politics and you want to start a new career after
4	hav	ring lived in the fast lane seven days a week for
5	nin	ne years, you get a little scared at the thought
6	tha	at: I hope it's going to work as well as I want and
7	God	d I can't wait to have my first client.
8	27893	That is all that I wanted to say.
9	27894	Mr. BATTISTA: So, if I understand
10	cor	rectly, in short, it was still a situation of
11	con	ncern for him at that time when With all that you
12	jus	st said, you just explained
13	27895	Mr. LAVOIE: His words confirm it in
14	Kap	plan's book.
15	27896	Mr. BATTISTA: Correct.
16	27897	Mr. LAVOIE: He says exactly that
17	and	d in the version of the book that I had seen and that
18	was	expurgated because as far as I know, it wasn't
19	exp	ourgated because it was compromising, it was
20	exp	ourgated because the book had 200 pages too many.
21	So,	there are 200 pages that were cut and I see today
22	bec	cause myself, I had read the preliminary version, I
23	did	not read the final version.
24	27898	Mr. BATTISTA: Un-huh.
25	27899	Mr. LAVOIE: In preparation for my

1	meeting with you, Mr. Battista, and last March, I went
2	back to the book and I noted that it was no longer
3	there and I spoke to the book's editor who told me:
4	No, that was part of the 200 pages that were cut.
5	27900 Mr. BATTISTA: OK. But you were
6	still certain that you had read that in a previous
7	version?
8	27901 Mr. LAVOIE: Absolutely.
9	Absolutely.
L 0	27902 Mr. BATTISTA: And the fact that
11	Mr. Kaplan also has this quote supports what you are
12	saying?
13	27903 Mr. LAVOIE: Quotes him, in
14	quotation marks, saying the same thing.
15	27904 Mr. BATTISTA: Very good?
16	27905 Mr. LAVOIE: And in fact, it doesn't
17	seem all that important to me. It seems to me very much
18	in line with the pattern of people who leave politics
19	when they are not wealthy because of an inheritance or
20	wealthy because like Mr. Martin, for example, and I
21	say this with admiration, had built up a formidable
22	fortune before going into politics.
23	27906 Mr. BATTISTA: But Mr. Lavoie, why
24	did you say that then? Why did you say these things?
25	27907 M LAVOTE: Recause it was my

1	attempt, a very clumsy one, I repeat, at explaining why
2	he had been so careless, because he himself admitted
3	that he had been careless, to agree to be paid in cash.
4	27908 Mr. BATTISTA: So for you it was
5	important to explain why
6	27909 Mr. LAVOIE: The atmosphere was
7	that
8	27910 Mr. BATTISTA: a former prime
9	minister had allegedly agreed to take cash at that
10	time. Correct?
11	27911 Mr. LAVOIE: That is in fact what I
12	was trying to explain.
13	27912 Mr. BATTISTA: Thank you. I have no
14	more questions.
15	27913 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Thank you,
16	Mr. Battista. Mr. Grondin, good morning.
17	27914 MR. GRONDIN: A few questions for
18	Mr. Lavoie, but you will understand that with surnames
19	like Grondin and Lavoie, I will do it in French also.
20	27915 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: I am not
21	surprised.
22	27916 MR. GRONDIN: But I know you

understand very well. You don't even have the head

25 27917 Mr. LAVOIE: No. The Judge seems to

2324

phones.

1	understand French perfectly.		
2	27918 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: We speak		
3	French.		
4	27919 Mr. LAVOIE: In Manitoba		
5	27920 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Yes. And my		
6	wife is also francophone.		
7	27921 Mr. LAVOIE: As well; St-Boniface.		
8	27922 MR. GRONDIN: I would like to file		
9	an exhibit before questioning Mr. Lavoie.		
10	27923 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Yes.		
11	27924 MR. GRONDIN: It's the transcript of		
12	the press conference that was given on November 18,		
13	1995, prior to the release of the lawsuit by		
14	Mr. Mulroney against the Canadian Government and I know		
15	it has been distributed to other parties and I believe		
16	the next reference is P-36, if I'm		
17	27925 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: That's		
18	correct.?		
19	27926 MR. GRONDIN: following well.		
20	27927 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Does anyone		
21	have a problem with this transcript going in as an		
22	exhibit? Mr. Vickery?		
23	27928 MR. VICKERY: No, I don't.		
24	27929 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Mr. Houston?		
25	27930 MR. HOUSTON: No, sir, I don't.		

1	27931 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Mr. Auger?			
2	27932 MR. AUGER: No, sir.			
3	27933 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Mr.			
4	Battista, no problem with that? All right then, the			
5	transcript of the press conference will be received and			
6	marked as Exhibit P-37, la pièce, en français			
7	EXHIBIT NO. P-36: Transcript of			
8	a press conference			
9	27934 Mr. BATTISTA: Commissioner, I			
10	believe we are now at P-36.			
11	27935 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Thirty-seven			
12	(37)?			
13	27936 MR. GRONDIN: Thirty-six (36), I			
14	think, yes.			
15	27937 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Thirty-six			
16	(36), yes.			
17	27938 Mr. BATTISTA: Thirty-five (35),			
18	excuse me.			
19	27939 MR. GRONDIN: It's my way of having			
20	my name on the record, filing documents. So			
21	EXAMINATION: LUC LAVOIE BY MR. GRONDIN			
22	INTERROGATOIRE: LUC LAVOIE PAR Me GRONDIN			
23	27940 Mr. GRONDIN: So, Mr. Lavoie, a few			
24	questions for you, a few clarifications following your			
25	testimony, your responses to Mr. Battista's questions.			

1	You referred to your job at Québécor
2	as executive vice-president. Can you explain to the
3	Commissioner starting on what date you were began in
4	this position?
5	27942 Mr. LAVOIE: December 18, 2000.
6	27943 Mr. GRONDIN: And until what date,
7	Mr. Lavoie?
8	27944 Mr. LAVOIE: Formally, I wait.
9	My departure was announced on August 30, 2008.
10	27945 Mr. GRONDIN: And I imagine that I
11	would be right in saying that this was a full-time job?
12	27946 Mr. LAVOIE: And more.
13	27947 Mr. GRONDIN: So, did I understand
14	correctly from your testimony that there were actually
15	two very distinct periods in the role you may have
16	played for Mr. Mulroney, that is to say, first from
17	November 1995 to February 1997, while it was your
18	primary mandate when you were at National. Correct?
19	27948 Mr. LAVOIE: Oh, yes. It was it
20	was my job.
21	27949 Mr. GRONDIN: And you were
22	27950 Mr. LAVOIE: That was what I did.
23	That's what I was doing for a living, as they say.
24	27951 Mr. GRONDIN: And you were in fact
25	paid to do it?

1	27952 Mr. LAVOIE: Absolutely, yes.
2	27953 Mr. GRONDIN: While afterwards it
3	was a bit more to help piy, if I understand correctly,
4	Mr. Mulroney, and out of loyalty, friendship, as you
5	explained?
6	27954 Mr. LAVOIE: It was out of
7	friendship, to help him out, that's all.
8	27955 Mr. GRONDIN: And I understand that
9	in late November 2007, early December 2007, you stopped
10	representing him or doing such favours for him,
11	precisely because you had time issues and because you
12	had realized that you could no longer provide him with
13	adequate services given your lack of time?
14	27956 Mr. LAVOIE: Well
15	27957 Mr. GRONDIN: Is that correct?
16	27958 Mr. LAVOIE: Well, no. It's because
17	during the 2000s, it was on the occasioncall it a
18	pop, you know? It was like a "boom" and then you were
19	busy for two days with a few phone calls, a few letters
20	exchanged, and life went on.
21	27959 But come the fall of 2007 it became
22	completely, completely full time, which I really
23	couldn't commit to. At that time Quebecor was involved
24	in an issue that had important implications for the
25	future of the company, namely, their bid to obtain

1	frequencies for third-generation mobile phone
2	technologies.
3	27960 On the one hand I didn't have the
4	time, and on the other hand — and as I told him at the
5	time — I $\operatorname{didn't}$ think I was the right person for the
6	job. The way things stood, they needed someone who
7	could really devote themselves to the issue, and
8	I wasn't in a position to do that, it wasn't my job.
9	27961 MR. GRONDIN: You didn't always have
10	time to conduct the necessary checks, and I also
11	understand that you might occasionally speak to the
12	media without checking first with Mr. Mulroney, on the
13	basis of your general knowledge of the issue. Is that
14	correct?
15	27962 MR. LAVOIE: It's true, but no,
16	I didn't check with him.
17	27963 MR. GRONDIN: I would now draw your
18	attention, Mr. Lavoie, to Tab 7, that is, the notes
19	what Mr. Kaplan calls his "interview notes. "
20	27964 On the first page, we read: "Interview
21	with Luc Lavoie, Friday,
22	January 4, 2002."
23	27965 I know that Mr. Battista has asked
24	you some questions about this.
25	27966 So as I understand it, when you

Τ	contacted Mr. Kapian in 2002, you acknowledged the		
2	payments received by Mr. Mulroney?		
3	27967 MR. LAVOIE: I don't deny the		
4	payments.		
5	27968 MR. GRONDIN: Mr. Mulroney never		
6	asked you to deny the payments?		
7	27969 MR. LAVOIE: Mr. Mulroney never		
8	asked me anything like that, no.		
9	27970 MR. GRONDIN: And we see that as of		
10	January 4, 2002, you say — and this is mentioned twice		
11	in Mr. Kaplan's note:		
12	"He said the amount was much		
13	less than \$300,000."		
14	27971 And you have explained that this		
15	information came to you in January 2002 from		
16	Mr. Mulroney, who told you		
17	27972 MR. LAVOIE: I assume I assume.		
18	27973 MR. GRONDIN: that the amount		
19	was less than the \$300,000 put forward by Mr. Kaplan?		
20	27974 MR. LAVOIE: I will tell you again		
21	that I do not recall that particular conversation, but		
22	I'm certain that it was after a conversation with him		
23	that I said that.		
24	27975 MR. GRONDIN: Very well. We also		
25	read in the middle of the note, on the first page, and		

1	here it refers "he" refers to you:
2	"He said that Mulroney never
3	lobbied for Schreiber and so,
4	never had to register as a
5	lobbyist. "
6	Do you remember saying that to
7	Mr. Kaplan?
8	27977 MR. LAVOIE: I don't recall that
9	conversation, but I said it in there and you will find
10	that in other parts of that binder I say the same
11	thing.
12	27978 MR. GRONDIN: So you don't disagree
13	with the note's account of what you said on this
14	subject?
15	27979 MR. LAVOIE: Certainly not, because
16	I said it elsewhere and I say it again today.
17	27980 MR. GRONDIN: Very well. And turning
18	to the next page, the second page, Mr. Lavoie, it says
19	"The truth was that Mulroney had
20	nothing to do with Airbus,
21	nothing to do with MBB and he
22	had nothing improper to do with
23	Bear Head. Being hired as an
24	international adviser after he
25	left office was entirely

1	consistent with the practice he
2	was setting out to establish. "
3	So, again, you have no reason to
4	challenge Mr. Kaplan's account of this matter in his
5	notes?
6	MR. LAVOIE: That one I remember
7	very well. I remember that dinner very well. It's much
8	more recent. I think it was in 2006.
9	27983 MR. GRONDIN: No, it seems to be
10	part of the same entry, for January 4, 2002.
11	MR. LAVOIE: Ah! You're right.
12	You're absolutely right. I apologize. But, no, I don't
13	disagree with it at all.
14	27985 MR. GRONDIN: So as of January 2002,
15	during your conversation with Mr. Kaplan, we see that
16	you mention that Mr. Mulroney had provided services to
17	International in connection with the Bear Head Project.
18	Correct?
19	27986 MR. LAVOIE: I realize that yes,
20	absolutely.
21	27987 MR. GRONDIN: Earlier, when you told
22	us that you had already said Mr. Mulroney never did any
23	lobbying for Mr. Schreiber, as the latter alleges,
24	I now draw your attention to Mr. Kaplan's book, found
25	at Tah 21 nage 18

1	27988	MR.	LAVOIE: Yes.
2	27989	MR.	GRONDIN: And we'll begin with
3	the section right	aft	er "Fair enough", where it says:
4			"But had Mulroney retained to
5			lobby for Bear Head, at the very
6			least, he would have had to
7			register as a lobbyist under
8			Legislation passed by Parliament
9			under his government, which he
10			did not. "
11	27990	This	is still Mr. Kaplan speaking:
12			"There might also have been
13			conflict of interest issues,
14			given that he had recently been
15			Prime Minister and did not step
16			down as sitting MP until the
17			general election on October
18			25th, 1993.
19			So, perhaps I thought
20			Mathias got that part of the
21			story wrong and the truth was
22			that he received proper and
23			appropriate payments for
24			assisting Schreiber's other
25			business interests in Canada and

1		overseas. "
2	27991	And here you are quoted as saying:
3		"That is exactly what happened
4		insisted Lavoie. Mulroney never
5		lobbied for Schreiber, so he
6		never had to register as a
7		lobbyist."
8	27992	So, again, you agree that this is an
9	accurate repor	t of what you said?
L O	27993	MR. LAVOIE: Absolutely. It's the
11	same passage.	
12	27994	MR. GRONDIN: And you mentioned the
13	fact that Mr. 1	Mulroney had spoken to you about his
14	involvement wi	th Mr. Schreiber for the in connection
15	with Bear Head	, and if I understand correctly, he
16	had there	are references to services to
17	International,	and you referred to the fact that he
18	would be promo	ting those vehicles to International.
19	Correct?	
20	27995	MR. LAVOIE: Yes, yes, he did, yes.
21	27996	MR. GRONDIN: This is what you
22	mentioned earl	ier, that you referred to "so-called
23	peace keeping	vehicles"?
24	27997	MR. LAVOIE: That's right.
25	27998	MR GRONDIN. I now draw your

1	attention to Tab 9, which is an article by
2	Mr. Bill Kaplan dated November 10, 2003, in which he
3	refers to a proposed article by Mr. Phil Mathias.
4	MR. LAVOIE: Uh-huh.
5	28000 MR. GRONDIN: And I draw your
6	attention to page 3, beginning at the second paragraph,
7	which reads:
8	"Award-winning National Post
9	reporter Philip Mathias got the
10	story first, nailing it down in
11	late 2000 and early 2001:
12	'Brian Mulroney was paid
13	\$300,000 in cash by German
14	businessman Karlheinz Schreiber,
15	the man at the centre of the
16	Airbus affair, over an 18-month
17	period beginning soon after
18	Mulroney stepped down as prime
19	minister in 1993.'
20	The story made it clear that
21	the payments had nothing to do
22	with Airbus, or any of the other
23	wrongdoing asserted in the 1995
24	letter of request. The story
25	noted that, at the time the

1		payments were made, Mulroney was
2		re-establishing himself in the
3		private sector and there was no
4		reason not to do business with
5		Schreiber, who was not, at the
6		time, embroiled in the various
7		legal proceedings and political
8		scandals that would soon
9		overtake him. "
LO	28001 We c	an skip the next paragraph; the
L1	one after that reads:	
12		"Mulroney apparently declined to
13		comment for a story, as did his
L4		lawyers. However, Mathias did
15		get to speak to a 'Mulroney
16		confidant' who told him that
L 7		'the former prime minister
18		earned the fee in full' by
19		performing services for
20		Schreiber after the fee was
21		paid. The Post was not told the
22		nature of the work or when it
23		was done. Asked why Mulroney had
24		not made this matter public
25		sooner, the confidant replied

1	that Mulroney was fearful of
2	creating a false impression in
3	the middle of what he described
4	as 'a witch hunt over the
5	so-called Airbus affair.'"
6	28002 So my first question is, are you the
7	"Mulroney confidant" to whom Mr. Mathias refers?
8	28003 MR. LAVOIE: I am. I am.
9	MR. GRONDIN: So that also means
10	that as of late 2000 or early 2001, during a
11	conversation with Mr. Mathias, you acknowledged the
12	payments by Mr. Schreiber to Mr. Mulroney. Is that
13	correct?
14	MR. LAVOIE: I didn't deny them.
15	28006 MR. GRONDIN: And Mr. Mulroney never
16	asked you to deny them?
17	28007 MR. LAVOIE: He never asked me to
18	deny them.
19	28008 MR. GRONDIN: And so when we when
20	we read the last sentence of the last paragraph, the
21	passage I just read, where it says:
22	"Asked why Mulroney had not made
23	this matter public sooner, the
24	confidant replied that Mulroney
25	was fearful of creating a false

1	impression in the middle of what
2	he described as 'a witch hunt
3	over the so-called Airbus
4	affair.'"
5	I take it that this is what you were
6	referring to this morning, that people were confusing a
7	perfectly legitimate, post-Prime Ministerial business
8	relationship with the allegations of criminal activity
9	contained in the September 1995 letter requesting
10	assistance while Mr. Mulroney was still Prime Minister.
11	Is that correct?
12	28010 Is that the false impression that
13	28011 MR. LAVOIE: Yes, of course that is
14	correct, and at the risk of repeating myself I will say
15	it again now. As someone who is no longer involved in
16	this matter, I am still stunned and amazed to see that
17	once it was established that the contents of that
18	odious letter sent to Switzerland, which was woven out
19	of nothing but lies, falsehoods and exaggerations based
20	on nothing but the idle gossip of a second-rate
21	reporter when all that was proved to be false, and
22	it came out that afterwards, afterwards, when he was no
23	longer prime minister, he entered into a business
24	relationship as a consultant to a businessman, then
25	everybody said, "Aha! Now we've got him."

1	28012	Personally, I find that It was
2	enough to gi	ve me migraines that sent me to the doctor.
3	28013	MR. GRONDIN: Because this morning,
4	in response	to some of Mr. Battista's questions, you
5	talked about	the fact that there were discussions about
6	whether Mr.	Mulroney should have taken a proactive
7	approach and	d gone public
8	28014	MR. LAVOIE: But he didn't want to
9	do that	
LO	28015	MR. GRONDIN: The existence
11	28016	MR. LAVOIE: I'm interpreting.
12	I think I ca	an explain his reluctance. If he did that,
13	that faithfu	al defender of freedom and civilization,
14	Harvey Casho	ore, would rear up and say, "Aha! The
15	\$300,000 mus	st come from a bank account somewhere in
16	Liechtenstei	n," and then all kinds of conspiracy
L7	theories wou	ald surface, all
18	28017	When you're caught up in something
19	like that, y	you know, you think that sooner or later
20	Canada will	produce a worthy successor to Franz Kafka.
21	It's unbelie	evable.
22	28018	MR. GRONDIN: So I understand from
23	your testimo	ony that at no time did Mr. Mulroney or you,
24	in response	to any request whatsoever, ever deny the
2.5	payments?	

1	28019	MR. LAVOIE: Never.
2	28020	MR. GRONDIN: Which leads me to draw
3	your attentio	n to a document you will find at Tab 9 —
4	this is again	Mr. Kaplan's article in the Globe and
5	Mail of Novem	ber 10, 2003. This time I'd like to draw
6	your attentio	n to the penultimate paragraph on page 7.
7	28021	At this point Mr. Kaplan is talking
8	about the pay	ments, and he says:
9		"What is also very surprising
10		about it all, and arguably
11	ı	telling of their legitimacy and
12		Mulroney's innocence, is that
13		Mulroney did not just deny the Deleted:,
14		payments. Doing so presumably
15	l	would have been the easiest
16		course, as there were by all
17	ı	accounts no witnesses to the
18		exchanges.
19		Mulroney did admit them
20		because the payments were above
21		board."
22	28022	Do you agree with Mr. Kaplan's
23	statement?	
24	28023	MR. LAVOIE: Yes, absolutely.
25	28024	MR. GRONDIN: You also talked about

1	the question of the amount, of the sums paid. As we
2	have seen, as of January 2002 Mr. Kaplan's notes
3	indicate that you told him the amount was "less than
4	\$300,000". But is it not true that at that time, in
5	2007, the newspapers were still referring to payments
6	of \$300,000? That was the amount reported in the
7	newspapers, in the media?
8	MR. LAVOIE: On the one hand, that
9	was the amount reported in Bill Kaplan's article in the
10	Globe and Mail in the fall of 2003. On the other hand,
11	in Bill Kaplan's 2002 notes about a conversation I do
12	not specifically recall, I don't say it was \$225,000,
13	I don't say it was \$262,000; I say it was less; but in
14	all the confusion, the \$300,000 figure was the one that
15	stuck.
16	28026 And in all honesty, in my own mind,
17	the difference between \$225,000 and \$300,000, when it
18	came right down to it, I didn't quite see why it
19	mattered. And it was only in the fall of 2007 that
20	Mr. Mulroney told me, "By the way, Luc, it's not 300,
21	it's 225." That was the only time it was put like that,
22	flat out like that.
23	MR. GRONDIN: Because when you
24	learned, in the spring of 2000, about certain things
25	through Mr. Gérald Tremblay, at that time no specific

1		amount was mentioned. Correct?
2	28028	MR. LAVOIE: The expression used was
3		"three times tens of thousands."
4	28029	MR. GRONDIN: And you, before the
5		event you have just described, you never asked
6		Mr. Mulroney the exact amount of the payments?
7	28030	MR. LAVOIE: No, no.
8	28033	MR. GRONDIN: And you referred to
9		your conversation with ${\tt Mr.}$ ${\tt Mulroney,}$ which you say took
L 0		place in 2007, when he first told you that it was
11		\$225,000 and not \$300,000?
12	28032	MR. LAVOIE: That's right.
13	28033	MR. GRONDIN: And am I to believe
14		that it was after one of the articles to which
15		Mr. Battista referred you, in which you seemed to
16		indicate that the amount was \$300,000?
17	28034	MR. LAVOIE: It was clearly after an
18		article in which I made I appeared to confirm
19		\$300,000.
20	28035	MR. GRONDIN: And am I also to
21		believe that at that time, in spite of the fact that
22		the amount mentioned was not the correct one, that is,
23		\$300,000 instead of \$225,000, it was agreed not to
24		specify that amount publicly, at that particular time,
25		because of the climate that then prevailed in the

1	media?	
2	28036 MR. LAVOIE: That conversation was	
3	an extremely brief one, and it took place in the	
4	following context: I was accompanying Mr. Mulroney to	
5	some events in connection with the launch of his	
6	Memoirs. We had just landed in Toronto, we were in a	
7	car going downtown for an event, when that conversation	
8	took place, and it lasted no longer than 30 seconds:	
9	"By the way, Luc" — I remember his words clearly —	
10	"By the way, Luc, it's not \$300,000, it's \$225,000."	
11	So after that, it wasn't You'd	
12	have to correct that, and when would you correct it?	
13	No, no, no. That's all that was said.	
14	28038 MR. GRONDIN: Mr. Battista also	
15	asked you some questions about an e-mail you will find	
16	at Tab 14, your e-mail dated November 5, 2007 to	
17	Mr. Campion Smith. Can you explain to the Commissioner	
18	the context in which you wrote that e-mail? Where were	
19	you when you wrote it?	
20	28039 MR. LAVOIE: I was on holiday in	
21	Paris with my daughter, who was living there at the	
22	time. Although it was November, it can be beautiful in	
23	Paris in November. I was sitting outdoors at a café on	
24	the Place Vendôme in Paris. Bruce Campion Smith had	
25	sent me an e-mail or left me a telephone message, or	

1	both.	
2	28040	I should point out that this was in
3	the days follo	wing the 49th episode of the soap opera
4	called the fif	th estate, and to my knowledge
5	Bruce Campion	Smith had never covered the
6	aforementioned	Airbus affair.
7	28041	That affair is so complex, when you
8	start looking	at it in its entirety, that I gathered
9	from my conver	sation with him or from his voice mail
LO	message that h	e wasn't clear on the chronology — and
11	I say that wit	hout malice — besides, you can see from
12	the tone of my	e-mail that I thought perhaps he should
13	put the matter	in context as objectively as possible.
L4	28042	So that e-mail was written on a
15	Blackberry whi	le sitting at a café, and those are the
16	circumstances	in which it was sent.
17	28043	MR. GRONDIN: And am I also to
18	understand tha	t you did not communicate with
19	Mr. Mulroney b	efore sending the e-mail?
20	28044	MR. LAVOIE: No.
21	28045	MR. GRONDIN: If you will allow me,
22	Mr. Commission	er, I will just confer with my
23	colleagues.	
24	Pause	
25	28046	MR. GRONDIN: It's always good to

1	have older friends.
2	28047 MR. YAROSKY: We'll find out,
3	Mr. Commissioner.
4	28048 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: It's your
5	way to come to the podium, Mr. Yarosky.
6	28049 MR. GRONDIN: Yes. That's
7	maître Wolson's mission, I heard.
8	28050 Mr. Lavoie, Mr. Battista referred to
9	excerpts from the e-mail you sent to Mr. Campion Smith
10	Are we to understand that when you refer to the nature
11	of the services, you are suggesting that Mr. Mulroney
12	was lobbying for Mr. Schreiber?
13	28051 MR. LAVOIE: Absolutely not.
14	Absolutely not. Mr. Mulroney My understanding was
15	that he had been retained as a strategic advisor.
16	28052 You know, when I was working for
17	National Public Relations, Canada's largest public
18	relations firm, I personally never accepted a lobbying
19	retainer. You have to know what lobbying is all about.
20	28053 Lobbying, or <i>démarchage</i> as we say in
21	French, consists of making phone calls on behalf of a
22	client, or going in person to meet a politician, an
23	elected representative or a civil servant to put
24	forward an idea, a proposal or a point of view.
25	I've never done that.

1	28054	On the other hand, I was responsible
2	fo	or many projects where lobbyists were part of the team
3	an	nd I acted as a strategic consultant, and my own
4	mc	dest contribution was that, having worked at the
5	hi	ghest level of the machinery of Canadian government,
6	I	knew how to position things.
7	28055	My understanding of Mr. Mulroney's
8	fu	unction was that he was there as a strategic
9	CC	onsultant, and I've done that in my own consulting
10	са	areer, I've been paid a monthly fee without any
11	wi	th no specific job description aside from "Stay on
12	to	op of such and such a file, and if it's OK with you
13	I'	ll call you every now and then to see what you
14	th	nink." And that's not at all unusual.
15	28056	And it was my understanding that
16	Mr	r. Mulroney had that kind of mandate.
17	28057	It had nothing to do with lobbying.
18	Ве	esides, the very idea of Brian Mulroney lobbying
19	Je	ean Chrétien seems ridiculous to me. It's just not
20	λc	ou know
21	28058	MR. GRONDIN: And when you spoke of
22	th	ne mandate your understanding of Mr. Mulroney's
23	ma	andate, as you stated earlier, which also part of
24	it	was to carry out promotion to International to
25	ad	dvance

1	28059 MR. LAVOIE: Promotion to
2	International, yes, absolutely.
3	28060 MR. GRONDIN:to advance the
4	interests of Thyssen.
5	MR. LAVOIE: Yes, that's right.
6	MR. GRONDIN: Thank you, Mr. Lavoie.
7	No further questions.
8	28063 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Thank you
9	very much.
10	Mr. Vickery, do you have any
11	questions for Mr. Lavoie?
12	28065 MR. VICKERY: No, I do not. Thank
13	you.
14	28066 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Thank you.
15	Mr. Houston?
16	MR. HOUSTON: No. Thank you, Mr.
17	Commissioner.
18	28068 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Thank you.
19	Mr. Auger?
20	MR. AUGER: No. Thank you.
21	28070 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: All right.
22	Any re-direct, maître Battista?
23	MR. BATTISTA: Just a couple of

COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: No? Yes.

24 questions.

25 28072

1	EXAMINATION: LUC LAVOIE BY MR. BATTISTA
2	INTERROGATOIRE: LUC LAVOIE PAR Me BATTISTA
3	MR. BATTISTA: I said, just a couple
4	of questions.
5	So, Mr. Lavoie, just to clarify your
6	testimony a little. You said that it was in the fall of
7	2007 that Mr. Mulroney told you that he had received
8	not \$300,000, but \$225,000 — is that right?
9	MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
10	28076 MR. BATTISTA: And that a decision
11	was made at that time not to specify that amount?
12	28077 MR. LAVOIE: There was no decision,
13	it wasn't about that. He just told me, that's all.
14	28078 MR. BATTISTA: OK.
15	MR. LAVOIE: It lasted 30 seconds.
16	28080 MR. BATTISTA: And did you discuss
16 17	28080 MR. BATTISTA: And did you discuss it? Did you say, "But maybe we should clarify, maybe we
17	it? Did you say, "But maybe we should clarify, maybe we
17 18	it? Did you say, "But maybe we should clarify, maybe we should correct that"?
17 18 19	<pre>it? Did you say, "But maybe we should clarify, maybe we should correct that"? 28081</pre>
17 18 19 20	it? Did you say, "But maybe we should clarify, maybe we should correct that"? 28081 MR. LAVOIE: No. 28082 MR. BATTISTA: You didn't discuss
17 18 19 20 21	<pre>it? Did you say, "But maybe we should clarify, maybe we should correct that"? 28081</pre>

25 of 2007?

1	28085 MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
2	28086 MR. BATTISTA: We saw earlier that
3	in 2001-2003-2004 and at other times, you were still a
4	spokesperson and that number was still circulating.
5	28087 MR. LAVOIE: \$300,000.
6	28088 MR. BATTISTA: The amount of
7	\$300,000?
8	28089 MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
9	28090 MR. BATTISTA: You were in regular
10	contact with Mr. Mulroney during those years?
11	28091 MR. LAVOIE: Yes.
12	28092 MR. BATTISTA: You exchanged
13	I'm going to suggest to you that every time
14	Mr. Mulroney received a request for a live media
15	interview, his secretary would forward the letters to
16	you?
17	28093 MR. LAVOIE: In fact
18	28094 MR. BATTISTA: The letters
19	Mr. Mulroney received?
20	28095 MR. LAVOIE: Yes, though the
21	requests rarely arrived in the form of a letter, and
22	they generally came directly to me.
23	28096 MR. BATTISTA: Yes, but when they
24	were sent to Mr. Mulroney, it was not unusual that they
25	be forwarded to you. Is that correct?

1	28097 MR. LAVOIE: That's what generally
2	happened, yes.
3	MR. BATTISTA: Here, for instance,
4	at Tab 12, we have a letter written by you to
5	Mr. Linden MacIntyre.
6	M. LAVOIE: Uh-huh.
7	28100 MR. BATTISTA: And in it you say:
8	"As a follow-up to our
9	conversations of last week
10	regarding the letter sent to
11	The Right Honourable
12	Brian Mulroney by your colleague
13	Harvey Cashore "
14	28101 Is that correct?
15	28102 MR. LAVOIE: Uh-huh.
16	28103 MR. BATTISTA: So you were doing a
17	follow-up. Requests would come in to Mr. Mulroney, the
18	letters would be forwarded to you, and you would act as
19	the media spokesperson. Is that right?
20	28104 MR. LAVOIE: The written
21	communications involved only the Crown corporation.
22	28105 MR. BATTISTA: I see, but So,
23	from the Crown corporation that is, Radio-Canada and
24	the English network, CBC the requests were in
25	writing?

1	28106 MR. LAVOIE: Yes, it did happen,
2	yes.
3	28107 MR. BATTISTA: And from the other
4	media they were by telephone?
5	28108 MR. LAVOIE: Yes, yes.
6	28109 MR. BATTISTA: And the requests for
7	Mr. Mulroney were forwarded to you?
8	28110 M. LAVOIE: Yes.
9	28111 MR. BATTISTA: And the figure of
10	\$300,000 was still around, was still circulating at
11	that time, is that right?
12	28112 MR. LAVOIE: Well, the amount
13	well, listen. What you're saying is that all the
14	written communications I received from Mr. Mulroney's
15	office
16	28113 MR. BATTISTA: Yes?
17	28114 MR. LAVOIE:contained the figure
18	of \$300,000. No, that's not true.
19	28115 MR. BATTISTA: No. What I'm saying is
20	that the amount of \$300,000, as we have seen, was
21	mentioned in 2001, in 2003, it was referred to in 2004
22	and 2007?
23	28116 MR. LAVOIE: Yes, yes.

28117 MR. BATTISTA: And at no time during

that period did Mr. Mulroney ask you to correct it, nor

24

25

1	did he say, "That amount is not \$300,000, it's
2	\$225,000"?
3	28118 MR. LAVOIE: It seems to me that he
4	told me that in January 2002, but apart from that, no,
5	I don't recall, no.
6	28119 MR. BATTISTA: And what exactly did
7	he tell you in January 2002?
8	28120 MR. LAVOIE: Well, it's as I see
9	here in Mr. Kaplan's notes.
10	28121 MR. BATTISTA: And what was it he
11	said?
12	28122 MR. LAVOIE: It's less than
13	\$300,000.
14	28123 MR. BATTISTA: Exactly. He never
15	said \$225,000?
16	28124 MR. LAVOIE: No.
17	28125 Me BATTISTA: And he never asked you
18	to correct the figure that was circulating for all
19	those years?
20	28126 MR. LAVOIE: No. No, but, excuse me,
21	no, it wasn't as if You have to put these things in
22	context; it was
23	28127 MR. BATTISTA: Mr. Lavoie, just, if

25 28128 MR. YAROSKY: Mr. Commissioner, I

24 I may...

2785

1	1	think that Mr. Battista should allow the witness to
2	(complete his answer.
3	28129	Me BATTISTA: Mr. Commissioner, if I
4	r	may, I would like the witness to complete his answer,
5	3	but the question was very simple. Was he told what the
6	č	amount was and was he ever told to correct what was
7	(circulating.
8	28130	COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: All right.
9	28131	MR. YAROSKY: I don't think
10	I	Mr. Battista really wants to prevent the witness from
11	•	explaining and answering the questions fully. I don't
12	-	like to object, but in all fairness, and I think
13	I	Mr. Battista has been very fair, but I think in all
14	1	fairness, he should allow the witness to complete his
15	ć	answer.
16	28132	COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: And I think
17	7	we'll hear the answer now.
18	28133	MR. LAVOIE: As I was saying, the
19	(context was that the story wasn't getting intense media
20	(coverage. In fact, to put it euphemistically, it was
21	\$	sporadic, and it was always from the same source.
22	28134	And that source was the CBC and there
23	7	was no way to establish a dialogue with them, no way to
24	•	explain anything whatsoever to them. Those people were
25	(obsessed with the idea that "we will get the guy."

1	2813	So to argue with them about whether
2		it was \$225,000 or \$265,000 or \$300,000 would have been
3		a complete waste of time, because anything we told them
4		they would turn against us. Everything we said was
5		turned against us.
6	2813	They tried at various times to catch
7		me out, and they also tricked me, Mr. Battista. The
8		famous conversation they aired and which earned \ensuremath{me} a
9		lawsuit from the charming German fellow you see over
L 0		there was an interview which I was never told was
11		being recorded.
12	2813	No one ever told me I was being
13		recorded.
L4	28138	Secondly, there was a clear
15		understanding that it was off the record.
16	2813	These people believe they are
L7		untouchable, and if anyone should decide to go after
18		them they'd better have deep pockets, because the CBC
19		has a billion dollars in funding.
20	2814	So, in that context, how could I ask
21		anyone to try to persuade these people, bent as they
22		were on their destructive mission? And I saw the
23		Mulroney family suffer for it. They were on a mission
24		of systematic destruction: from show to show it just
25		got crazier and crazier. Anything went. You'd watch

1	them and you'd go, "Ah! my God, what's next?"
2	Nothing could have convinced those
3	people that it was \$225,000, \$240,000; and besides,
4	I didn't know.
5	In that context, there was no point
6	in considering correcting the amount, telling the CBC
7	that maybe it wasn't \$300,000 but \$225,000 — they
8	would have used that to put another bullet in our head
9	"Aha! You lied!" There was nothing to be done with
10	those people.
11	28143 MR. BATTISTA: So to get back to my
12	question, Mr. Lavoie: Mr. Mulroney never told you the
13	amount was \$225,000 when the amount of \$300,000 was
14	mentioned yes or no?
15	MR. LAVOIE: He never told me to
16	correct it? No, he never told me that, no.
17	28145 MR. BATTISTA: OK. So as for the
18	\$300,000, he never told you it was \$225,000 until the
19	fall of 2007?
20	28146 MR. LAVOIE: He never told me it was
21	\$225,000, but clearly, in January 2002 he told me it
22	was less than \$300,000.
23	28147 MR. BATTISTA: I understand,
24	Mr. Lavoie, but my question was: Before the fall of
25	2007, he never told you the amount was \$225,000. Is

1	that right?	
2	28148	MR. LAVOIE: He never told me that,
3	but in January 20	002 he told me it was less than
4	\$300,000.	
5	28149	MR. BATTISTA: OK, now we're on the
6	same page. And w	ith regard to the amount of \$300,000,
7	when that figure	was circulating, he never told you to
8	declare or annour	nce publicly that that amount was
9	incorrect. Is the	at right?
LO	28150	MR. LAVOIE: That's right, and also
11	there was the art	cicle by Bill Kaplan that appeared in
12	the Globe and Ma	il in the fall of 2003.
13	28151	I will conclude my answer if you
14	will allow me, Yo	our Honour with an anecdote I used
15	to tell my client	es, and which I also told Mr. Mulroney
16	28152	When that article appeared, reporting
17	the amount of \$30	00,000, on reading the whole article
18	I have to acknow	ledge that Mr. Kaplan was extremely
19	thorough in cover	ring all the angles; he was objective,
20	and he didn't try	y to ascribe motives where none
21	existed. I re-rea	ad it yesterday as I was preparing for
22	this appearance.	The article was, to use the English
23	expression, very	carefully crafted. I can see the
24	effort that went	into it.
25	28153	But if under those circumstances

1	Mr. Mulroney had said to me, "We have to correct the	
2	\$300,000, it should be \$225,000," it would it wou	ld
3	have been a way to make the front page again the nex	t
4	day, and here's the anecdote — it's very typical of	
5	Ottawa, I love this story, I've used it many times t	0
6	help clients.	
7	One day, a delegation of Canadian	
8	parliamentarians went to Paris for a meeting of the	
9	International Association of French-Speaking	
10	Parliamentarians. The Parti Québécois had just been	
11	elected in Quebec, and the delegation included Parti	
12	Québécois MNAs, who were separatists, and Liberal MP	s,
13	who were federalists, and in Paris there was the who	le
14	confused question of the France-Quebec-Canada	
15	relationship, and the French delegates had decided t	0
16	treat the Quebec MNAs better than the MPs. And the ${\tt M}$	PS
17	were extremely frustrated by this.	
18	28155 And so one evening there was a gala	ì
19	dinner at the Élysée Palace, and one MP, whom out of	
20	Christian charity I shall not name (especially as he	is
21	no longer with us), did something. The next day, the	
22	newspaper Le Devoir reported that "Mr. XYZ, MP was s	0
23	irritated that he blew his nose on the drapes at the	
24	Élysée.	
25	The MP's wife he was from an	

2790

1	isolated region called him and said, "It can't be
2	true, the whole family is ashamed, did you really blow
3	your nose on the drapes at the Élysée?" "No, no," he
4	replied, "I did no such thing. Of course not." "Well,
5	if you didn't do it, you have to call the paper and get
6	them to print a retraction."
7	28157 So he called the paper, and <i>Le Devoir</i>
8	ran a correction the next day: "Le Devoir apologizes.
9	We reported that Mr. So-and-so, MP, blew his nose on
LO	the drapes at the Élysée. We were completely wrong, and
11	we regret the error. In fact he blew his nose on a
12	table napkin at the Élysée."
13	28158 So you see, trying to say it's not
14	\$300,000, it's \$225,000, at some point it becomes
15	meaningless. The news is out, that's the way it goes.
16	The news is out, it's presented accurately, with
17	attention to detail and with whatever fine distinctions
18	are required let it go!
19	28159 MR. BATTISTA: Did Mr. Mulroney tell
20	you to let it go?
21	28160 MR. LAVOIE: I told him.
22	28161 MR. BATTISTA: OK. That was your
23	personal opinion?
24	28162 MR. LAVOIE: That was my personal
25	opinion.

1	28163 MR. BATTISTA: And Mr. Mulroney
2	didn't he took your advice?
3	28164 MR. LAVOIE: Apparently.
4	28165 MR. BATTISTA: Now, you referred to
5	a witch hunt as the reason you didn't correct the
6	amounts that were circulating and didn't clarify
7	certain facts.
8	Did Mr. Mulroney tell you that, or
9	was that your own interpretation?
10	28167 MR. LAVOIE: Sometimes great minds
11	think alike. I believe we had the same idea at the same
12	time.
13	28168 MR. BATTISTA: All right, but in
14	your reply to my colleague you said you were being
15	subjective. My question for you is this: Did
16	Mr. Mulroney say to you: This is a witch hunt, it's
17	going to get nasty, let's not correct it. Did he say
18	that to you?
19	28169 MR. LAVOIE: No, he did not.
20	28170 MR. BATTISTA: Thank you. No further
21	questions.
22	28171 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Mr. Lavoie,
23	thank you very much for your testimony.
24	28172 MR. LAVOIE: Thank you, Your Honour.
25	28173 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: That's all.

1	M. LAVOIE: Thank you.
2	28175 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: I understand
3	that this afternoon we will be hearing from Mr. MacKay
4	and that he will be giving his evidence by interactive
5	video and that we will commence à 1330, Ottawa time.
6	Is that correct?
7	28176 MR. WOLSON: It's all that is so.
8	28177 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: All right.
9	Is there any reason why we ought not to take the break
10	for lunch now?
11	28178 MR. WOLSON: And excuse the witness
12	first.
13	28179 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Yes, I'm
14	sorry. I thought I had done that. Thank you very
15	much, monsieur Lavoie. Merci beaucoup.
16	28180 MR. LAVOIE: Thank you very much,
17	Your Honour. Thank you.
18	28181 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Well, it's
19	ten after twelve, we'll break for lunch and come back
20	at 1330 for the evidence of Mr. MacKay.
21	Upon recessing at 12:09 p.m. / Suspension à 12 h 09
22	Upon resuming at 1:30 p.m. / Reprise à 13 h 30
23	28182 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Good
24	afternoon. Be seated, please.
25	28183 Mr. Roitenberg?

1	MR. ROITENBERG: Good afternoon,
2	Mr. Commissioner.
3	28185 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Good
4	afternoon.
5	28186 MR. ROITENBERG: I am hoping that
6	once the screen changes to focus on a witness that
7	Mr. MacKay is there. And he is.
8	28187 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Good
9	afternoon, Mr. MacKay.
10	28188 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Good
11	afternoon, sir
12	28189 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Can you hear
13	me all right?
14	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, I can.
15	28191 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: All right.
16	Mr. MacKay, I don't know whether you wish to be sworn
17	or affirmed; and if you wish to be sworn, I don't know
18	whether you have a Bible handy.
19	28192 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I do have a
20	Bible handy, Mr. Roitenberg.
21	28193 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Would you
22	prefer to be sworn or to affirm, Mr. MacKay?
23	28194 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I will
24	affirm.

25 28195 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: It doesn't

1	matter to you?	
2	28196	MR. ROITENBERG: I believe he said he
3	will affirm.	
4	28197	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: It doesn't
5	really matter.	If it matters to you, sir, then I will
6	be glad to	
7	28198	COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: You will
8	affirm. All r	right, then.
9	AFFIRMED: THE	E HON. ELMER MacKAY /
10	DÉCLARATION SO	DLENNELLE : L'HON ELMER MacKAY
11	28199	COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Are you
12	standing, Mr.	MacKay?
13	28200	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, sir, I
14	am.	
15	28201	COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: I have no
16	problem if you	wish to be seated as long as you remain
17	within sight o	of the camera.
18	28202	Do you have a chair there, sir?
19	28203	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I don't mind.
20	I think I woul	d prefer to stand for a while.
21	28204	COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Oh, well OK.
22	Stand as long	as you wish, but if you feel that you
23	want to sit do	own, that's fine with me.
24	28205	If, Mr. MacKay, at any time you feel
25	the need for a	a break, please just indicate that and we

1	will give you the break that you ask for. OK?
2	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: All right,
3	sir.
4	28207 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Thank you.
5	28208 Mr. Roitenberg?
6	28209 MR. ROITENBERG: Thank you, sir.
7	EXAMINATION: THE HON. ELMER Mackay BY MR. ROITENBERG /
8	INTERROGATOIRE : L'HON. ELMER MacKAY PAR Me ROITENBERG
9	MR. ROITENBERG: Mr. MacKay, good
10	afternoon.
11	28211 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Good
12	afternoon, sir.
13	28212 MR. ROITENBERG: You can hear me all
14	right?
15	28213 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I can, thank
16	you.
17	28214 MR. ROITENBERG: Very well.
18	28215 I understand, sir, that you served as
19	a Member of Parliament and a Minister during the
20	Mulroney governments from 1984 to 1993.
21	28216 Am I right?
22	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, sir.
23	28218 MR. ROITENBERG: Prior to the
24	formation of that government, you had sat as a Member
25	of Parliament for a number of years?

1	28219	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That's
2	correct.	
3	28220	MR. ROITENBERG: And you held a
4	number of ministe	rial posts during your tenure. Is
5	that correct?	
6	28221	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That is true.
7	I was a Minister	with Mr. Clark's government as well.
8	28222	MR. ROITENBERG: That would have been
9	the Minister of R	egional Economic Expansion back in the
10	government of Mr.	Clark?
11	28223	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
12	28224	MR. ROITENBERG: In the Progressive
13	Conservative gove	rnment of 1984 you were appointed as
14	Minister excus	e me, you were appointed as Solicitor
15	General of Canada	
16	28225	Is that right?
17	28226	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, sir.
18	28227	MR. ROITENBERG: Following that you
19	served as the Mir	ister of National Revenue?
20	28228	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
21	28229	MR. ROITENBERG: We won't hold that
22	against you.	
23	28230	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I appreciate
24	that.	
25	28231	MR. ROITENBERG: Following that you

1	were the Minister of Public Works.
2	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, sir.
3	28233 MR. ROITENBERG: And then the
4	Minister for the purposes of the Atlantic Canada
5	Opportunities Agency Act or ACOA.
6	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
7	28235 MR. ROITENBERG: Actually, that was
8	at the same time as Minister of Public Works; correct?
9	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
10	28237 MR. ROITENBERG: Then you were the
11	Minister Responsible for Canada Mortgage and Housing
12	Corporation and that was the last portfolio that you
13	held.
14	28238 Is that right, sir?
15	28239 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, I
16	believe that's correct.
17	28240 MR. ROITENBERG: Now, in 1983
18	Mr. Mulroney was elected the Leader of the Progressive
19	Conservative Party and thus the Leader of the Official
20	Opposition.
21	28241 Is that right?
22	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
23	28243 MR. ROITENBERG: But as I understand
24	it, as not having a constituency and not being an
25	elected Member of Parliament, Mr. Mulroney needed a

1	seat in the House of Commons.
2	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
3	28245 MR. ROITENBERG: And if my
4	information is correct, you graciously stepped down as
5	the sitting Member of Parliament for Central Nova, thus
6	allowing a by-election to occur and Mr. Mulroney to run
7	in your stead.
8	28246 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I wanted him
9	to have a really good seat.
10	28247 MR. ROITENBERG: Now, my
11	understanding was while you were a member of government
12	and a member of Cabinet in the first Mulroney
13	government, an issue arose involving a German company
14	called Thyssen potentially creating a manufacturing
15	concern in Cape Breton.
16	28248 Is that right?
17	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, sir.
18	28250 MR. ROITENBERG: And I understand
19	that you were supportive of such a project right from
20	the get-go?
21	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
22	28252 MR. ROITENBERG: And this was before
23	you took over as the Minister for ACOA, but just as a
24	Minister within the region.
25	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.

1	28254	MR. ROITENBERG: In 1988 there were
2		negotiations under way about a potential Understanding
3		in Principle or Memorandum of Understanding as between
4		the government and this corporation from Germany,
5		Thyssen, in terms of the setting up of a manufacturing
6		plant in Cape Breton.
7	28255	Is that right?
8	28256	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, sir.
9	28257	MR. ROITENBERG: My understanding is
10		that you did not take part in the negotiations of that
11		Understanding in Principle in 1988, but you were aware
12		of them.
13	28258	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That's
14		correct.
15	28259	MR. ROITENBERG: Were you aware, upon
16		the signing of that Understanding in Principle, that
17		the signing of the document itself triggered a million
18		dollars' worth of commissions to certain individuals?
19	28260	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: No, I was
20		not.
21	28261	MR. ROITENBERG: When did you become
22		aware of that?
23	28262	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: To the best
24		of my knowledge, I became aware of it in a court
25		proceeding in Toronto in 1999.

1	MR. ROITENBERG: Hopefully before
2	you, sir, you have a binder of documents.
3	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, sir, I
4	do.
5	28265 MR. ROITENBERG: I understand that we
6	had attempted a couple of weeks ago to get you a binder
7	of documents, but that was somewhat delayed and you
8	eventually received that book of documents.
9	28266 Is that correct?
10	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, sir.
11	28268 MR. ROITENBERG: And that we have
12	subsequently sent you a revised book of documents which
13	I'm led to believe you received late last week.
14	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That's
15	correct.
16	28270 MR. ROITENBERG: Do you have that
17	revised book of documents with you?
18	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I do.
19	28272 MR. ROITENBERG: And you have had a
20	chance to look at it before your testimony today?
21	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
22	28274 MR. ROITENBERG: I'm going to ask,
23	Madam Registrar, that that be marked as the next
24	exhibit, Exhibit P-27.
25	28275 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Any objection

1	to that book of documents going in as an exhibit?
2	28276 Mr. Vickery?
3	MR. VICKERY: No.
4	28278 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Mr. Auger?
5	28279 MR. AUGER: No.
6	28280 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Mr.
7	Houston?
8	28281 MR. HOUSTON: No.
9	28282 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Thank you
10	very much.
11	The book of documents with respect to
12	the evidence of Mr. MacKay will be received and marked
13	as Exhibit P-37.
14	I'm sorry, I didn't have the
15	microphone on.
16	The booklet of documents, then, in
17	support of Mr. MacKay's evidence will be received and
18	marked as Exhibit P-37.
19	EXHIBIT NO. P-37: Binder
20	entitled "Documents in Support
21	of The Honourable Elmer MacKay's
22	Testimony"
23	28286 MR. ROITENBERG: Thank you,
24	Mr. Commissioner.
25	28287 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Mr.

2802

1	Roitenberg, may I say something?
2	MR. ROITENBERG: Absolutely, sir.
3	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I may have
4	inadvertently referred to you, sir, instead of the
5	Commissioner when I was first being addressed. If I
6	misspoke and called Commissioner Oliphant, if I called
7	him your name, it was inadvertent. I didn't
8	understand.
9	28290 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: That's OK,
LO	Mr. MacKay. I have been treated worse than that lots
11	of times. But thank you.
12	MR. ROITENBERG: Mr. MacKay, in
13	January of 1989, a few months after this Understanding
L4	in Principle was signed and we have had information
15	and evidence before this Commission that it was signed
16	in late September of 1988 you were sworn in as the
L7	Minister Responsible for ACOA.
18	That's the end of January 1989;
19	correct?
20	28293 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I believe
21	that is correct.
22	28294 MR. ROITENBERG: I take it shortly
23	around that time you would have received a briefing or
24	briefings pertaining to the status of the Thyssen Bear
25	Head proposal

1	28295 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, I'm sure
2	I did.
3	28296 MR. ROITENBERG: If I could ask you,
4	sir, to turn to Tab 6A of the book of documents that we
5	now have before the Commission as Exhibit P-37
6	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, 6A. I
7	have 6 and is this an Understanding in Principle?
8	28298 MR. ROITENBERG: Six is the
9	Understanding in Principle, but there should be a Tab i
10	following it.
11	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
12	28300 MR. ROITENBERG: Which is first a
13	cover sheet followed by a memorandum from Mr. McPhail
14	to yourself.
15	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
16	MR. ROITENBERG: In this memorandum
17	information was shared with you that there was going to
18	be, as of June of 1989, a request forthcoming to
19	Cabinet I am at the very top of the first page of
20	the memorandum a request brought to Cabinet by the
21	Minister of National Defence to award a sole-source
22	contract to General Motors and the need to review the
23	implications of such a decision for Bear Head
24	Industries.
25	28303 Do you see that, sir?

1	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I see that.
2	MR. ROITENBERG: You were made aware
3	in and around that time that there was this issue on
4	the horizon of a sole-source contract being awarded to
5	General Motors and that that might have some
6	implications for Bear Head's proposal?
7	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That's true.
8	There were other sole-source contracts as well in that
9	general time, but this was the one that I remember
LO	most.
11	28307 MR. ROITENBERG: If you go to the
12	very last paragraph on that page, it is a comment that
13	" as you are aware, the much
14	larger light armoured vehicle
15	contract for which Thyssen had
16	been bidding has effectively
L 7	been canceled as a result of the
18	Budget."
19	28308 It went on to state that for
20	budgetary concerns there was not going to be an LAV
21	contract in the foreseeable future.
22	28309 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Is that in
23	the last paragraph on page 2, sir?
24	28310 MR. ROITENBERG: Last paragraph page
25	1, into the first paragraph of page 2.

1	28311 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, I see
2	this.
3	28312 MR. ROITENBERG: So at that time
4	there were concerns being addressed or at least brough
5	to your attention that there were difficulties on the
6	horizon for the very contract that Thyssen Bear Head
7	was contemplating building a plant towards bidding on;
8	correct?
9	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
10	28314 MR. ROITENBERG: Now, if I could ask
11	you to go to Tab 9 of this book of documents.
12	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
13	28316 MR. ROITENBERG: It is a letter
14	addressed to you as written by Mr. Schreiber.
15	Now, I pause here simply to ask you
16	when you first became acquainted with Mr. Schreiber.
17	28318 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: When did I
18	first become acquainted with him?
19	28319 MR. ROITENBERG: Yes.
20	28320 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Oh, I have
21	trouble pinpointing an exact date, but it would be
22	after Mr. Mulroney formed the government in 1984, I
23	believe. I'm not
24	28321 MR. ROITENBERG: As you were a Member
25	of the Cabinet right from the formation of the

1	government, any major capital proposals that would have
2	been discussed around the Cabinet table you would have
3	become familiar with; correct?
4	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, I
5	believe that is correct.
6	28323 MR. ROITENBERG: You recall, sir,
7	that you were kind enough to provide a telephone
8	interview with Commission counsel back on the 25th of
9	March 2009; yes?
10	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
11	28325 MR. ROITENBERG: And I believe we
12	forwarded to you a summary of that interview and you
13	approved of the summary provided?
14	28326 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I believe,
15	yes.
16	28327 MR. ROITENBERG: Do you have a copy
17	of the summary with you?
18	28328 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY:
19	Unfortunately, Mr. Roitenberg, I didn't bring it.
20	28329 MR. ROITENBERG: Very well. I just
21	want to share with you a part of what we have recorded
22	here, just to confirm whether that meets with your
23	recollection, sir.
24	28330 For the benefit of counsel in the
25	room, I am referring to the interview summary, the

1	fifth paragraph of t	he first page.
2		"Mr. MacKay first became aware
3		of the Bear Head proposal when
4		Sinclair Stevens raised the
5		proposal either in Cabinet or in
6		a Cabinet Committee. Mr. MacKay
7		advised that he supported the
8		Bear Head proposal from its
9		introduction onwards, including
10		the period during which he was a
11		Minister of the Atlantic Canada
12		Opportunities Agency."
13	28331 I p	pause there. So you first became
14	aware of the proposa	l, at least from what you shared
15	with us back in Marc	h, when it was brought to Cabinet
16	or Cabinet Committee	by your Cabinet colleague at the
17	time, Sinclair Steve	ns.
18	28332 THE	HON. ELMER MacKAY: This is the
19	first clear recollec	tion I have of this project.
20	28333 MR.	ROITENBERG: Would it be fair to
21	say, sir, that in yo	ur role as a Minister from Atlantic
22	Canada and in your r	ole of supporting the Bear Head
23	Project you came to	be acquainted with Mr. Schreiber?
24	28334 THE	HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
25	28335 MR.	ROITENBERG: In the letter at Tab

1	9 that I have asked you to turn to, we find a letter
2	from Mr. Schreiber to you basically outlining a level
3	of frustration on Mr. Schreiber's behalf with the
4	progress, or lack thereof, that the project has had to
5	that point.
6	Would that be fair?
7	28337 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, it seems
8	to be.
9	28338 MR. ROITENBERG: If you go to the
10	very last page of this letter, page 4, in the
11	second-last paragraph Mr. Schreiber writes:
12	"Secondly, as you know, I am
13	duty-bound to inform the Prime
14	Minister of the serious
15	situation the whole matter has
16	reached. Will you want me to
17	write to him directly or would
18	you prefer to do so on my
19	behalf?"
20	I'm sorry, sir, were you with me?
21	28340 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, I'm with
22	you.
23	MR. ROITENBERG: OK. Now, I pause
24	there. My understanding and you can correct me if
25	I'm wrong was ACOA as a proponent of this proposal

Τ	was trying to reach some kind of consensus between the
2	Government of Canada and Thyssen Bear Head as to how to
3	get this done.
4	Would that be fair?
5	28343 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That would be
6	fair.
7	MR. ROITENBERG: ACOA, and you as its
8	Minister, wanted to see the proposal go ahead because
9	you, as in you on behalf of ACOA, felt it was for the
10	benefit of the region.
11	Would that be fair?
12	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, sir.
13	28347 MR. ROITENBERG: And you were
14	negotiating with the company and the person of
15	Mr. Schreiber on behalf of the company to try to make
16	that happen.
17	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
18	28349 MR. ROITENBERG: Would it strike you
19	as odd that Mr. Schreiber would suggest that you write
20	to the Prime Minister on his behalf as a party with
21	whom you are negotiating?
22	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, it does
23	strike me as a bit odd. However, I believe that this
24	project, which had a very high profile, was the subject
25	of contact between Mr. Schreiber and the Drime Minister

2810

1	and possibly others.	
2	So it doesn't entirely surprise me,	
3	but it does seem a little bit irregular.	
4	28352 MR. ROITENBERG: Would it be fair to	
5	say that as you came to be acquainted with	
6	Mr. Schreiber as a result of your contact with him	
7	regarding this proposal, the acquaintanceship grew into	C
8	eventually a friendship?	
9	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That would be	
L 0	fair.	
11	MR. ROITENBERG: Now, I know you were	
12	kind enough to share with us during the interview that	
13	at one point years down the road when you are out of	
14	government, you entered into a business relationship	
15	with Mr. Schreiber by way of being an investor in one	
16	of his other businesses.	
17	28355 Is that right?	
18	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Well, that's	
19	not exactly true, Mr. Roitenberg.	
20	28357 Mr. Schreiber is an entrepreneur par	
21	excellence and he was very interested in starting a	
22	pasta chain of restaurants. I never invested money	
23	directly to Mr. Schreiber, through Mr. Schreiber, but	
24	what I did do was invest in a company that proposed to	
25	start a chain of pasta restaurants that was going to	

2811

1	buy some machinery that Mr. Schreiber's factory
2	produced.
3	28358 MR. ROITENBERG: Do you recall what
4	year that would have been?
5	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I'm thinking
6	maybe in the it was some time after I left public
7	life. I think possibly in maybe 1996-'97 perhaps. But
8	I hasten to say that it's only a guess.
9	28360 MR. ROITENBERG: OK. But as best as
10	you can figure, it was toward the later '90s.
11	Would that be fair?
12	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I believe
13	that's yes, I think that's right.
14	28363 MR. ROITENBERG: OK. Prior to that
15	you had no business relationship with Mr. Schreiber.
16	Correct?
17	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: No, I never
18	had a business relationship with Mr. Schreiber in the
19	classic sense.
20	28365 MR. ROITENBERG: We were at the point
21	of comment that, eventually, shy of your investing in
22	the company that perhaps would have purchased some of
23	the machines that Mr. Schreiber was going to
24	manufacture, your relationship with him, your
25	acquaintanceship with him along the way grew to be a

1	friendship.	Correct?
2	28366	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, correct.
3	28367	MR. ROITENBERG: In fact, in May of
4	1999, Mr. S	chreiber found himself in some difficulties
5	in Switzerl	and, or potential difficulties, and you flew
6	to Switzerl	and and then flew back to Canada with Mr.
7	Schreiber.	
8	28368	Is that right?
9	28369	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That's right.
10	28370	MR. ROITENBERG: Shortly thereafter
11	Mr. Schreib	er found himself in some difficulties in
12	Canada, tow	ard the end of August, the beginning of
13	September,	and you were involved in assisting with
14	making arra	ngements for Mr. Schreiber's judicial
15	interim rel	ease, or bail.
16	28371	Is that correct?
17	28372	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, sir.
18	28373	MR. ROITENBERG: In fact, you acted
19	as a surety	on his behalf.
20	28374	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I did.
21	28375	MR. ROITENBERG: You, over the years,
22	developed a	friendship with Mr. Mulroney, as well.
23	Correct?	
24	28376	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Correct.
25	28377	MR. ROITENBERG: We have already

2813

1	discussed the fact that you stepped aside in 1983 so
2	that he could potentially get a good seat in Central
3	Nova.
4	28378 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That's
5	correct.
6	28379 MR. ROITENBERG: And you consider
7	both gentlemen to be friends of yours.
8	28380 Is that correct?
9	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, that's
10	correct. I regard Mr. Mulroney with the greatest of
11	affection and gratitude for the work that he did as
12	Prime Minister, and particularly the assistance he gave
13	to Atlantic Canada.
14	28382 Mr. Schreiber's acquaintanceship with
15	me is based on a different kind of criteria, but, yes,
16	I do regard them both as friends.
17	28383 MR. ROITENBERG: Would it be fair to
18	say that you have observed, over the years, that while
19	you remained friends with both parties, their
20	relationship seems to have, at times, deteriorated?
21	28384 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, it
22	vacillated. At times they appeared to be quite close,
23	but then, later on, the relationship deteriorated.
24	28385 MR. ROITENBERG: Would it be accurate
25	to say that, at times, you felt yourself placed in the

1	middle as betwee	n the two?
2	28386	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That was my
3	fault, and it's	true.
4	28387	MR. ROITENBERG: I am going to ask
5	you, if you woul	dn't mind, sir, to turn to Tab 49 of
6	the book of docu	ments before you.
7	28388	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
8	28389	MR. ROITENBERG: This is a document
9	that is a newspa	per article, penned by Philip Mathias,
10	of October the 2	Oth, 1999, and it speaks of a
11	suggestion that	Mr. Mulroney had made some approach to
12	Mr. Schreiber to	release certain bank documents, in an
13	effort to clarif	y things for the RCMP during an
14	investigation.	
15	28390	If you go toward the bottom of the
16	first page, the	third paragraph from the bottom, it
17	says:	
18		"This week, Mr. Mulroney
19		telephoned his former chief of
20		staff, Fred Doucet, from South
21		Africa, where the former prime
22		minister is vacationing with his
23		family, and asked him to
24		organize another approach to Mr.
25		Schreiber.

1	Mr. Doucet persuaded a
2	former cabinet minister in Mr.
3	Mulroney's government, a man who
4	knew Mr. Schreiber, to telephone
5	him on Mr. Mulroney's behalf and
6	ask that the documents be
7	released."
8	Now, sir, it doesn't mention your
9	name; I am asking you if, in fact, you were approached
10	by Mr. Doucet in this regard on behalf of the Prime
11	Minister and asked to make such an approach to Mr.
12	Schreiber.
13	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Mr.
14	Roitenberg, that is a possible scenario, but I somehow
15	doubt it. I have no recollection of ever making any
16	request of Mr. Schreiber to ask him to release any
17	documents. I just don't think that happened.
18	28393 MR. ROITENBERG: Very good, sir.
19	28394 Tab 51, if you will
20	28395 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
21	28396 MR. ROITENBERG: This is a letter
22	from Mr. Schreiber to Mr. Mulroney. It states:
23	"From our friend in Nova Scotia
24	I learned that you intended to
25	meet with me

1		I think it is a good idea to
2		improve our way of
3		communication"
4	28397	And it goes on to speak of other
5	matters.	
6	28398	Do you recall making an approach to
7	Mr. Schreiber, a	dvising him in and around January of
8	2004 that Mr. Mu	lroney wanted to contact him, or was
9	thinking of cont	acting him?
10	28399	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: You know, I
11	believe that I $\mathfrak m$	ay have, because Mr. Mulroney, I think,
12	at one point, di	d mention that he I hesitate to say
13	this because I'm	not 100 percent sure, but I think he
14	mused that maybe	he could meet with Mr. Schreiber for
15	lunch, or someth	ing to that effect.
16	28400	But, of course, this never happened.
17	28401	MR. ROITENBERG: My understanding is
18	that you were, p	rior to news breaking in the media,
19	unaware that the	re existed a business relationship
20	between Mr. Schr	eiber and Mr. Mulroney.
21	28402	Is that correct?
22	28403	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That's
23	correct.	
24	28404	MR. ROITENBERG: If I could ask you
25	to turn to Tab 5	2, at Tab 52 is an e-mail sent from the

1	e-mail of "sharonmackay923@hotmail.com", which I
2	understand is your wife's e-mail
3	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, that's
4	right.
5	28406 MR. ROITENBERG: to
6	"Schreiberbarbel@AOL.com", which I believe you
7	understand to have been Mr. Schreiber's wife's e-mail.
8	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
9	MR. ROITENBERG: This is an e-mail
10	suggestive of an outline of a possible letter that
11	would be from Mr. Schreiber to "Dear Brian", which I
12	assume to be Mr. Mulroney.
13	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Right.
14	MR. ROITENBERG: Did you send this
15	e-mail?
16	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I personally
17	did not send it, but I had it sent.
18	MR. ROITENBERG: Were you asked by
19	Mr. Schreiber to provide such an outline of a potential
20	letter to Mr. Mulroney?
21	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: To the best
22	of my recollection, Mr. Schreiber asked me what sort of
23	letter he might write, or what sort of communication he
24	might put forward to Mr. Mulroney to try to repair
25	their relations.

1	28414 MR. ROITENBERG: Had you been asked
2	by Mr. Mulroney to convey to Mr. Schreiber that he
3	required such a letter for a purpose?
4	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: No, Mr.
5	Mulroney never requested any letter.
6	28416 If I might just elaborate a little
7	bit, Mr. Roitenberg
8	MR. ROITENBERG: Please do, sir.
9	28418 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Mr.
10	Schreiber continued to be very upset that he wasn't, i
11	his opinion, getting enough support from Mr. Mulroney
12	with respect to some of the difficulties in which he
13	found himself. I conveyed this in one of my
14	conversations to Mr. Mulroney, and while I don't
15	remember the purport of everything, I came to the
16	conclusion that Mr. Mulroney, who was never loath to
17	help Mr. Schreiber when it was possible to do so
18	support him and so on felt that he couldn't do
19	anything when this fifth estate program and other
20	communications made him look so bad because of what Mr
21	Schreiber was asked to say on TV.
22	So, foolishly, I thought that perhaps
23	some sort of apology might clear the air and, at least
24	if Mr. Mulroney wished to do so, he could do something
25	to support Mr. Schreiber, if he thought it was

1	appropriate.	
2	28420	MR. ROITENBERG: So this was, then, a
3	conclusion that yo	ou drew, that perhaps with a letter of
4	apology from Mr. S	chreiber to assist in the reparation
5	of their relations	hip, Mr. Mulroney might be inclined
6	to assist Mr. Schr	eiber in some way.
7	28421	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, I think
8	that's a fair way	to put it.
9	28422	MR. ROITENBERG: The information
10	contained in this	letter, I understand, in terms of the
11	facts as set out i	n the letter, came from Mr.
12	Schreiber, in term	s of your source of information.
13	28423	Is that correct?
14	28424	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: You speak of
15	this memo that I s	ent?
16	28425	MR. ROITENBERG: Yes, this e-mail.
17	28426	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
18	28427	Well, Mr. Schreiber, I felt I felt
19	that I was conveyi	ng in the second-last paragraph Mr.
20	Schreiber's feelin	gs, which, I must say, to some extent
21	were shared by mys	elf, and I just put that in there as,
22	I suppose	
23	28428	I don't know why I put it in there,
24	but those are my w	ords, of course, not Mr. Schreiber's.
25	28429	MR. ROITENBERG: But if you don't

1	mind, sir, I	would like to go through some of the facts
2	as set out in	the letter, because my understanding,
3	from our inte	rview with you, was that as far as the
4	facts were con	ncerned, your source of those facts was
5	Mr. Schreiber	
6	28430	Is that correct?
7	28431	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, that
8	would be corre	ect. Those feelings that I put in that
9	paragraph woul	ld have been as a result of conversations
LO	that I had wit	ch Mr. Schreiber.
11	28432	MR. ROITENBERG: If we look at the
12	first paragra	ph of this e-mail:
13		"I wish to tender my profuse
14		apologies to you"
15	28433	and I pause there.
16	28434	In terms of this being an apology,
17	the nature of	the letter being an apology, that was
18	because you fe	elt that might be needed to repair the
19	relationship.	Correct?
20	28435	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
21	28436	MR. ROITENBERG: And you advised Mr.
22	Schreiber of	that, and he agreed that it might be
23	helpful.	
24	28437	Would that be fair?
25	28438	THE HON FIMER MackAV. Veg

1	28439	MR. ROITENBERG:
2		"for the misleading,
3		erroneous and unfair
4		characterization of your
5		business relationship with me as
6		depicted on the CBC program 'The
7		Fifth Estate'."
8	28440	I take it that you understood that
9	Mr.	Schreiber viewed the depiction of the business
10	rela	ationship to have been misleading and an unfair
11	char	racterization.
12	28441	Correct?
13	28442	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Correct.
14	28443	MR. ROITENBERG: The second
15	para	agraph:
16		"I was misled by the
17		producers that the program would
18		deal with my complaints about
19		the 'sting'."
20	28444	That's something that Mr. Schreiber
21	had	shared with you, that he felt he had been duped by
22	the	producers of the program. Correct?
23	28445	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, I
24	beli	leve that Mr. Schreiber did not believe that the
25	prim	mary reason for him being on the program was to

1	malign Mr. Mulroney.	
2	28446 MR. ROITENBERG: Your next paragra	ph:
3	"May I state for the record,	
4	that my testimony under oath	in
5	prior legal proceedings is th	ıe
6	only correct description of c	our
7	business arrangement"	
8	That's something you were told by	Mr.
9	Schreiber. Correct?	
LO	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, I	
11	believe he mentioned that, at least in one connection	on,
12	by the testimony he gave in another legal procedure	
13	involving MBB helicopters.	
L4	28449 MR. ROITENBERG: At the end of that	ıt
15	paragraph it is written:	
16	"You were the best advocate I	
L 7	could have ever retained, and	lΙ
18	am grateful for your efforts.	"
19	28450 Was that language you used to try	to
20	convey the apologetic tone of the note, or was that	
21	something told to you by Mr. Schreiber?	
22	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Those were	my
23	words. I guess if I were to say why I put that	
24	phraseology down, I had in mind some of the very kin	nd
2.5	things that Mr. Schreiber had said in the past about	t

1	Mr. Mulroney.
2	28452 MR. ROITENBERG: At the next
3	paragraph you have:
4	"You and I have been the victims
5	for a long time of a vicious,
6	unfounded and totally misleading
7	information."
8	28453 Was that a sentiment that was
9	expressed to you by Mr. Schreiber?
10	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I believe so.
11	I hesitate to put it in the exact words that
12	28455 I am not saying that Mr. Schreiber
13	gave me that phraseology, but that was the feeling that
14	I felt he had.
15	28456 MR. ROITENBERG: Now, I understand
16	from the interview that we conducted with you back in
17	March that at no time prior to your forwarding the
18	suggested e-mail, the suggested letter to Mr.
19	Schreiber, had Mr. Mulroney told you of any pending
20	meeting that he had on the horizon with Prime Minister
21	Harper. Correct?
22	28457 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Not that I
23	recall. Now, it is possible, but I do not recall it,
24	because I believe that Mr. Mulroney had met with Mr.
25	Harper on more than one occasion.

1	28458	But I do not recall conveying any
2		information in that specific regard.
3	28459	MR. ROITENBERG: Following your
4		providing this letter to Mr. Schreiber and the
5		information that we have is that Mr. Schreiber actually
6		sent a letter with much of what you have written here
7		contained therein it is in the same tab, the next
8		two pages following did you ever convey to Mr.
9		Schreiber on Mr. Mulroney's behalf that the letter had
LO		been received, or that the letter and its message had
11		been received by Prime Minister Harper?
12	28460	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: No, I did
13		not, but I may have told Mr. Schreiber that Mr.
14		Mulroney had received a letter from him.
15	28463	To my recollection, the letter was
16		sent some time and I forget, I guess the dates would
L7		indicate after I had sent the memo, and I believe
18		that Mr. Mulroney may have indicated to me that he
19		received such a letter.
20	28462	And I also believe that I told Mr.
21		Schreiber in another conversation that Mr. Mulroney had
22		received the letter.
23	28463	MR. ROITENBERG: This goes all the
24		way to 2006, when you forwarded this e-mail to Mr.
2.5		Schreiber, trying to patch up their relationship. But.

1	č	as you said earlier, their relationship had, on and off
2	(over the years, deteriorated and repaired itself from
3	1	time to time.
4	28464	Is that correct?
5	28465	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I would say
6	1	that's correct, yes.
7	28466	MR. ROITENBERG: In 1999, toward the
8	•	end of 1999, did you ever pick up the phone or run into
9]	Fred Doucet and suggest to him, in an effort to make
10	i	amends, that he contact Mr. Schreiber and invite him
11	(over around the Christmas season of 1999?
12	28467	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Mr.
13	1	Roitenberg, that is something, again, that could have
14]	happened, but I have no reason to believe that it did.
15	:	I don't recall doing that.
16	28468	I can see no reason for me to do
17	1	that, although it's possible.
18	28469	MR. ROITENBERG: So it's something
19	3	you don't recall occurring, but you don't say
20	(definitively that it could not have happened, it's just
21	:	something that you don't believe occurred, from your
22	1	memory.
23	28470	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That's
24	(correct.
25	28471	MR. ROITENBERG: Did you have ongoing

1	contact with Mr. Doucet over the years?
2	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: In a sense I
3	did. I didn't see him often, or talk to him often, but
4	I
5	28473 It was very seldom, but, yes, I had
6	some contact with him over the years.
7	MR. ROITENBERG: I want to go back
8	because I took you forward in time, I want to go back
9	in time to your tenure as the Minister for ACOA.
LO	28475 If I could direct your attention to
11	Tab 12 in the book of documents
L2	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Did you say
13	12?
L4	MR. ROITENBERG: Yes, sir.
15	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
16	MR. ROITENBERG: Following the letter
L 7	that I showed you some time ago at Tab 9, the letter
18	from Mr. Schreiber outlining certain frustrations as to
19	the lack of progress, which was in November of 1989, we
20	now find ourselves in January of 1990, according to
21	this memo and it's a memo from Mr. Peter Lesaux at
22	ACOA, and it is setting out a follow-up to the fact
23	that it looks as though there is not going to be a
24	major light-armoured vehicle procurement in the offing.
2.5	Correct?

1	28480	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
2	28481	MR. ROITENBERG: In fact, at page 2,
3	if you go to the	second full paragraph on the page, it
4	suggests that ACO	A has been informed by the Deputy
5	Minister of DND t	hat the Department of National Defence
6	will not be proce	eding with any LAV contract, or any
7	comparable equipm	ent which could be supplied by Bear
8	Head, for the for	eseeable future.
9	28482	Do you see that, sir?
10	28483	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I do.
11	28484	MR. ROITENBERG: It goes on to
12	comment that a le	tter should be sent to Thyssen Bear
13	Head, and a draft	letter is included with this
14	memorandum, and t	he letter should not, or does not,
15	refer at all to a	military market or contract, but
16	simply notes the	government's interest in seeking to
17	orient the compan	y toward environmental production in
18	Cape Breton.	
19	28485	In essence, because there is no LAV
20	contract coming,	here is another avenue you might wish
21	to pursue to set	up a manufacturing concern.
22	28486	Would that be an accurate
23	characterization?	
24	28487	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
25	28488	MR. ROITENBERG: If you go to the

1	very end of this memorandum, it is like a side note to
2	you:
3	"Minister: Inasmuch as this is
4	a very sensitive file, and has
5	been the subject of much
6	discussion both in cabinet and
7	amongst officials, I believe it
8	imperative that you speak with
9	the Prime Minister and/or Mr.
10	Stanley Hartt"
11	28489 who, I understand, was the Chief
12	of Staff in the PMO at the time:
13	"to apprise them of your
14	intentions. As the letter quite
15	properly states, you are
16	pursuing an important initiative
17	on behalf of the Government of
18	Canada."
19	Do you see that, sir?
20	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I do.
21	28492 MR. ROITENBERG: Why was this file so
22	sensitive?
23	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Mr.
24	Roitenberg, this is, I believe, almost a unique file.
25	There were other projects of equal magnitude the

1	Confederation Bridge, Westray Coal Mine, initiatives in
2	Prince Edward Island between the Irvings and the
3	McCains all of which proceeded, more or less, in a
4	conventional way.
5	This project, to me, smacked of kind
6	of a cloak-and-dagger attitude, that officials in one
7	department DND were concerned about what
8	officials in my agency ACOA were doing. There
9	were ambiguous statements made, I believe, about the
10	true intentions of what might or might not occur in
11	connection with a multifaceted approach in Cape Breton
12	involving perhaps environmental or other concerns,
13	blended or not blended with the military option.
14	28495 I think it was one of the chiefs of
15	staff of the Prime Minister in an earlier procedure who
16	said that this was the project that wouldn't go away,
17	it kept being brought back.
18	28496 I think that was partly because there
19	seemed to be information given back and forth, saying
20	that certain things were true or were not true about
21	the characteristics of these multi-role combat
22	vehicles, the MRCV, which could have been the Fox at
23	one stage, or it could have been the TH 495 at another
24	stage.
25	28497 It wasn't able to be transported in a

1	Hercules aircraft, or, maybe again, it was able to be
2	transported.
3	There was an awful lot of back chat
4	going on between the departments over the years, and it
5	never seemed although in some of these documents it
6	would appear that the matter had been definitively
7	settled, it never really seemed to be clearly
8	terminated.
9	MR. ROITENBERG: There may have been
LO	an awful lot of back chat between the departments, but
11	one thing which seemed clear from much of the
12	information that you saw at the time was that the
13	Department of National Defence didn't seem to want to
L4	purchase this vehicle from Thyssen.
15	Would you agree with that?
16	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I would.
L 7	28502 MR. ROITENBERG: And they would have,
18	at least at that time, been the ultimate consumer of
19	the product, if it had been built. It was a proposal
20	to sell them the vehicle. Correct?
21	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That's true.
22	There were other implications, but the key to the whole
23	project, at least at the beginning, and perhaps
24	throughout, was the military aspect, the acquiring for
25	our soldiers of a state-of-the-art combat vehicle.

1	28504 MR. ROITENBERG: Who better to know
2	what the Army needs than the Army itself, or the
3	Department of National Defence?
4	28505 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That's true,
5	but even there there were conflicting signals sent out.
6	28506 I think it was Major-General Fox, at
7	a parliamentary committee I think it was `87 who
8	gave a
9	28507 I don't want to put words in his
10	mouth, I won't go any further, but the expense
11	28508 I was never Minister of Defence, and
12	I make no pretense of being an expert in military
13	procurement, but from what I learned, I was kind of
14	puzzled. The initial cost for these vehicles was
15	pegged at around \$300 million I am only
16	approximating but in these documents it appears that
17	at one point it was up as high as \$780 million, and
18	there was a \$200 million figure put in there for
19	"inefficiencies" I think was the quote.
20	28509 I wondered at the time about who was
21	quantifying the costs, and whether we were getting the
22	straight goods from DND.
23	28510 But I am digressing now, and I
24	apologize.
25	MR. ROITENBERG: That's quite all

1	right, sir.			
2	28512 We are at this memo, which was			
3	January 4th, 1990, suggesting that you send a letter t	0		
4	Thyssen, advising them that, as the government will not			
5	be engaging in a procurement of the LAVs in the near	be engaging in a procurement of the LAVs in the near		
6	future, they might want to consider an environmental			
7	production centre.			
8	28513 Is that correct?			
9	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.			
10	28515 MR. ROITENBERG: If I could direct			
11	you, then, to Tab 14, if you bypass the first two page	s		
12	within the tab, you will come to a memorandum which wa	s		
13	written on the 19th of January 1990.			
14	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.			
15	28517 MR. ROITENBERG: This memorandum was			
16	written for Stanley Hartt, the Chief of Staff in the			
17	Prime Minister's Office, and it outlines a bit of the			
18	history of the project over the first couple of pages.			
19	28518 If you go to page 3 of the			
20	document this memo, by the way, was written January			
21	the 19th of 1990 if you go to the third page, it			
22	says at the top of the page:			
23	"With ACOA assistance, Thyssen's	3		
24	Canadian company, Bear Head			
25	Industries has retained Price			

1	Waterhouse to look into the
2	market for non-military
3	products. The company
4	apparently has some prospects to
5	sell emission control scrubbers
6	for thermal power plants. This
7	is presumably the `environmental
8	field' referred to in the draft
9	letter from Mr. MacKay to the
10	company. Preliminary results of
11	the Price Waterhouse study may
12	be available informally in
13	February."
14	So it further comments on your
15	draft or the draft letter that has now been
16	forwarded by you to PMO or PCO.
17	28520 It then goes on to talk about issues
18	to be resolved, and the first issue is:
19	"Despite Government disclaimers,
20	there are still concerns that
21	the plant may be ultimately
22	intended for military exports to
23	sensitive areas."
24	28521 And it goes on to speak of some of
25	the concerns in the past about sending to certain

1	countries.	
2	28522	The second issue to be resolved is:
3		"The federal government has
4		tried to keep the onus on
5		Thyssen to develop a business
6		plan and demonstrate the
7		viability of the plant. It
8		would be counter-productive for
9		the Government to appear too
10		eager or to provide too strong a
11		level of comfort to the company
12		before that work is done."
13	28523	So we have a couple of concerns
14	voiced here.	
15	28524	You have proposed a draft letter,
16	directing them	more to the environmental arena, rather
17	than military,	but there are concerns that, ultimately,
18	they want to p	roduce militarily and export to countries
19	of concern; an	d number two, that if we offer too strong
20	a level of com	fort by way of letter, it is going to
21	diminish the b	argaining position, as it were, of the
22	government.	
23	28525	Would that be fair?
24	28526	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, that
25	would be fair	

1	28527	The background of this, Mr.
2	Roitenberg, as	I understand it, is that, initially,
3	Thyssen was str	congly encouraged to come and take their
4	business expert	ise to Canada, and the primary motive,
5	of course, to s	tart this process was the military one,
6	and that always	remained, more or less, part of the
7	suggestion, tha	t they might broaden their business to
8	include other a	reas.
9	28528	MR. ROITENBERG: But the fact is, at
10	this stage, in	any event, for budgetary reasons, the
11	government was	not looking at engaging in the
12	procurement in	question in any event. So what was
13	desired here wa	s a steerage of the company to another
14	manufacturing a	rena, so that they didn't put all of
15	their eggs in t	he basket of the military procurement.
16	Correct?	
17	28529	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Right.
18	28530	MR. ROITENBERG: If we go to Tab 13,
19	it is a memoran	dum from the Operations Committee, and I
20	am led to belie	eve and correct me if I am wrong
21	that the Operat	ions Committee is akin to an inner
22	cabinet amongst	the cabinet.
23	28531	Would that be correct?
24	28532	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
25	28533	This is Tab 13. sir?

1	MR. ROITENBERG: Yes, Tab 13. Are
2	you there, sir?
3	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Oh, yes.
4	28536 MR. ROITENBERG: OK.
5	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, I am.
6	28538 MR. ROITENBERG: So there are a
7	number of issues discussed. If I could get you to go
8	to what is marked at the top as page 2 of these notes.
9	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
10	28540 MR. ROITENBERG: By the way, this
11	took place on January 22, 1990, so we had the
12	memorandum internally at ACOA on January 4th suggesting
13	the letter be sent; January 19th we have the memorandum
14	to Chief of Staff Hartt suggesting that the letter be
15	sent but should be milder in comfort. We now have the
16	Operations Committee memo.
17	28541 And if you go to number four, again
18	there is a highlighting of the fact that before a final
19	decision is made vis-à-vis Thyssen:
20	" the company must complete a
21	viable business plan for
22	non-military products and the
23	Government must resolve the
24	level and source of federal
25	funding."

1	28542	It then is suggestive of a process
2	which includes:	
3		"Mr. McKay proposes to write to
4		the parent company to invite
5		early discussions."
6	28543	That is under number 4 at page 2 of
7	the memo.	
8	28544	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
9	28545	MR. ROITENBERG: So we have gone from
10	the internal ACO.	A memo suggesting a letter be sent, the
11	memo to the Prim	e Minister to the Chief of Staff of
12	the Prime Minist	er's Office suggesting a letter be
13	sent, comment at	the Operations Committee level
14	suggesting that	you are going to send a letter.
15	28546	I will then ask you to turn to Tab
16	14, the first me	mo contained therein, a memo of January
17	24, 1990, which	is a memo again highlighting some
18	recent history.	
19	28547	It has comment on the draft letter,
20	comment on the 1	etter that's the memo that is
21	included, sent to	o the Chief of Staff, Stanley Hartt.
22	28548	And then if you will turn to page 2,
23	January 23rd, th	is is the day after the Operations
24	Committee where	you have suggested sending a letter to
25	the parent compa	ny.

_	005.0	
1	28549	It says:
2		"Mr. MacKay passes a note to P.
3		Tellier"
4	28550	Paul Tellier.
5		" expressing fear that the
6		project will go to the U.S. if
7		Schreiber is not given a letter
8		of comfort. Note is passed to
9		R. Bilodeau, who follows up with
10		ACOA/Lesaux and with PMO to try
11		to determine whether there is an
12		inclination at PMO to provide
13		letter of comfort."
14	28551	Do you see that, sir?
15	28552	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I do.
16	28553	MR. ROITENBERG: It then says:
17		"MacKay places a midnight call
18		to P. Tellier."
19	28554	Do you recall doing that, sir?
20	28555	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: No. As a
21	matter of fact, I	'm quite certain I didn't. I mean
22	there are people	that I might call at midnight, but for
23	no particular rea	son I don't think Paul Tellier is one
24	of them, not beca	use I would be afraid to call him or
25	anything, but he	wasn't the kind of fellow that I think

1	would have appreciated a call over such a matter at
2	midnight.
3	28556 I don't think I did that.
4	28557 MR. ROITENBERG: It might be
5	suggestive
6	28558 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I would like
7	to know where that information came from.
8	28559 MR. ROITENBERG: Well, we will hear
9	from Mr. Tellier, I think as soon as tomorrow.
10	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Oh, good.
11	28561 MR. ROITENBERG: But whether it was
12	actually at midnight, it is suggestive of there being a
13	call of some urgency on the subject.
14	You would agree with that?
15	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Perhaps, yes.
16	MR. ROITENBERG: And it is true that
17	you had some concerns that if a letter of comfort were
18	not provided to Mr. Schreiber that this manufacturing
19	concern for Nova Scotia, which would create hundreds of
20	jobs, might be lost.
21	28565 Is that correct?
22	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Mr.
23	Roitenberg, I didn't have many greater concerns than

losing this industry of whatever kind for Nova Scotia.

The need was desperate there, and that's correct, $\ensuremath{\text{I}}$

24

25

1	would have done all I could, did all I could, to
2	preserve these initiatives.
3	28567 MR. ROITENBERG: If you go to the
4	next note on the same page, January 24th and I
5	mercifully won't read the entire note into the record,
6	but the underlined portion is:
7	that Tellier apparently had
8	convinced MacKay that letter
9	should not go forward."
10	28568 In essence suggesting that there has
11	been a resolution of the matter, there won't be a
12	letter.
13	28569 Have I lost you, sir?
14	28570 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I'm sorry,
15	Mr. Roitenberg, what tab are we on?
16	28571 MR. ROITENBERG: I am still at Tab
17	14. I was still on the same page of the same document
18	we have been looking at.
19	28572 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Oh, I'm
20	sorry. OK. Still on Tab 14.
21	28573 MR. ROITENBERG: Tab 14.
22	28574 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I'm sorry, I
23	
	lost the page.

page of that memo, January 24th notation.

25

1	28576	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I'm very
2	sorry about this.	
3	28577	MR. ROITENBERG: That's all right.
4	Take your time.	
5	28578	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I have we
6	have the midnight	call to Paul Tellier mentioned.
7	28579	MR. ROITENBERG: Right.
8	28580	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That's on
9	page 2.	
10	28581	MR. ROITENBERG: And the very next
11	note, January 24t	h, right under that sentence.
12	28582	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: OK. Yes.
13	28583	MR. ROITENBERG: If you look at the
14	underlined portio	n towards the bottom of the day's
15	notation:	
16		" Tellier apparently had
17		convinced MacKay that letter
18		should not go forward."
19	28584	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
20	28585	MR. ROITENBERG: In essence
21	suggesting a deci	sion has been made. We are not
22	sending a letter.	
23	28586	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
24	28587	MR. ROITENBERG: Correct?
25	28588	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.

1	28589 MR. ROITENBERG: If you will go down
2	to the bottom of the page and the handwriting, it says:
3	"PS: Bob Grauer called back at
4	7:55, to say that MacKay had
5	gone back to the charge with S.
6	Hartt"
7	28590 I'm assuming that's Stanley Hartt,
8	Chief of Staff in the Prime Minister's Office:
9	" only this time to argue for
10	a letter of support for a Bear
11	Head military project, based on
12	a Sept. '88 understanding with
13	Bear Head. Hartt apparently is
14	now inclined to authorize a
15	letter of comfort, as long as it
16	is completely non-committal as
17	to federal support."
18	Do you recall going back to push for
19	a letter in the face of the denial of the environmental
20	one and now pushing for the military aspect to be
21	highlighted?
22	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That's
23	possible. I don't recall it, but it is entirely
24	possible.
25	28593 MP POITFNRFPG. Well I will ack you

1	to turn the page to Tab 15 then.
2	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Fifteen?
3	MR. ROITENBERG: Tab 15, yes.
4	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
5	28597 MR. ROITENBERG: It's a note dated
6	the 25th of January:
7	"We understand that Mr. McKay
8	and Mr. McKnight,"
9	28598 And that is William McKnight who was
LO	then the Minister for National Defence:
11	" with the agreement of PMO,
12	agreed last night that Mr.
13	McKnight would send an anodyne
L4	letter of comfort to Thyssen
15	Industry AG."
16	So following what appears to have
L7	been your going back to Mr. Hartt to push for a
18	military letter, you then met with the Minister of
19	National Defence and hashed out a potential letter to
20	be sent to Thyssen.
21	28600 Would that be accurate, sir?
22	28601 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That seems t
23	be accurate.
24	28602 MR. ROITENBERG: And as it is not
2.5	vour letter

1	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: You are going
2	by these
3	MR. ROITENBERG: Pardon me, sir?
4	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Mr.
5	Roitenberg, I am assuming all these things are correct.
6	If I don't remember precisely the events surrounding
7	them, I certainly believe them to be true.
8	28606 MR. ROITENBERG: Very good, sir.
9	Thank you for the qualification.
10	28607 At Tab 16 and I won't go through
11	it is the letter that was sent under the hand of
12	William McKnight to Mr. Schreiber on behalf of Bear
13	Head Industries.
14	You may recall, sir, that following
15	the negotiations surrounding the provision of a letter
16	of comfort to Thyssen, there were a number of follow-up
17	meetings between yourself, Mr. Schreiber and
18	Mr. McKnight.
19	Do you recall that, sir?
20	28610 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I recall that
21	there probably were some. I don't remember how many,
22	but I think that's true.
23	28611 MR. ROITENBERG: Well, if it assists
24	you, at Tab 20 is a letter to Mr. Hartt from
25	Mr. McKnight, and if I can direct you to page 3 of the

1	letter it comments on, at page 3, a meeting on Februa	ry
2	the 1st that included the presence of Mr. Hartt that	
3	you were present at; as well as, in the last paragrap	h,
4	a meeting of March the 9th between yourself,	
5	Mr. Schreiber and Mr. McKnight.	
6	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, I see	
7	that.	
8	MR. ROITENBERG: So at least those	
9	two are highlighted.	
10	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.	
11	MR. ROITENBERG: You as well became	
12	aware that at the suggestion of Mr. McKnight, a meeti	ng
13	was held between members of his department and	
14	Mr. Schreiber and other individuals from his company	
15	early in February of 1990.	
16	Were you aware of that, sir?	
17	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I'm sure I	
18	was, yes.	
19	28618 MR. ROITENBERG: I'm going to direct	:
20	you to Tab 55. This is a memo to the Prime Minister	
21	from E.M., which I will confess I am operating under	
22	the assumption is you, bringing the Prime Minister up	
23	to date on the Thyssen Bear Head Project.	
24	Now, it's undated, but it refers	
25	directly to a meeting had on February the 5th, if you	

1	go to page 2 of	the letter, sir.
2	28620	If you go to the second full
3	paragraph it sp	eaks of:
4		"A meeting was held on February
5		5, 1990 between Thyssen and
6		Defense. The purpose was to
7		explore the army's need and
8		Thyssen's capacity to produce
9		the vehicle."
10	28621	In the letter you make the suggestion
11	that:	
12		"The Army people appeared
13		muzzled but did admit there was
14		a need, and acknowledged the
15		compatibility of Thyssen's
16		TH 495 in meeting that need."
17	28622	You then say, in the second-last
18	paragraph:	
19		"I have since learned from
20		reliable sources that the Army
21		people present were in fact
22		muzzled. They were told not to
23		openly admit the need."
24	28623	Then you go on to say:
25		"This is very confidential

1	information."
2	28624 I'm curious as to what your source of
3	that information would have been, if you recall.
4	28625 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I wish I
5	could tell you that, Mr. Roitenberg. Can I say
6	parenthetically that there seemed to be a lot of
7	conflicting requirements or needs or wishes within DND
8	It seems hard now to remember or to recall, but at one
9	point DND were pushing very hard to acquire nuclear
L 0	submarines, which sounds completely incongruous, but i
11	happened; it was true.
12	28626 So I wish I could help you with that,
13	but I do know that there were at least I'm fairly
L4	certain there were a lot of conflicting opinions within
15	DND itself.
16	28627 MR. ROITENBERG: Now, ACOA seemed to
17	be uniformly in support of this project. Would you
18	agree with that?
19	28628 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, I think
20	ACOA was kind of mandated we were in effect the tai
21	on the dog.
22	28629 We didn't have we did not have the
23	resources, as you pointed out earlier, to play a major
24	role in the financing of this initiative. We had some
25	money and then the problems the province was an

1	important part of this, too, I might add.
2	28630 With the economic and regional
3	development agreements, the province had the
4	prerogative of designating a major amount of money to
5	be put on a particular priority they had and I believe
6	that they at one point were supportive of this as well.
7	MR. ROITENBERG: But on the federal
8	level
9	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes?
L O	28633 MR. ROITENBERG: ACOA was the best
11	friend this project could have had.
12	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I think
13	that's true.
L4	28635 MR. ROITENBERG: Another incident of
15	note that I wanted to ask you about from 1990. At Tab
16	22 there is a letter from the Chairman and Chief
L7	Executive Officer of Bombardier Incorporated, a letter
18	to Prime Minister Mulroney, suggesting at paragraph 4
19	of the first page that it has come to their attention
20	that Mr. Schreiber, at least in their opinion, seems to
21	be engaged in a campaign of sabotage as to the German
22	government's purchase of a Bombardier product and
23	wishes it to be held up unless and until the Thyssen
24	light armoured vehicle project directed by Thyssen is
25	approved by the Government of Canada.

1	28636	Do you see that, sir?
2	28637	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I do.
3	28638	MR. ROITENBERG: It goes on to state
4	that:	
5		"We have also been told that the
6		Honourable Elmer McKay(sic) has
7		been supporting Mr. Schreiber in
8		these efforts."
9	28639	Now, before we get to that latter
LO	suggestion, were	you aware even that Bombardier was
11	engaged at a simi	lar time with the German government
12	negotiating an ex	port to Germany?
13	28640	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I believe I
L4	was and I think t	hat the information came to me for
15	Mr. Schreiber.	
16	28641	MR. ROITENBERG: Were you aware that
L7	Mr. Schreiber was	trying to utilize the Thyssen
18	proposal as a paw	n with the German government in
19	relation to Bomba	rdier's proposal?
20	28642	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: A bargaining
21	tool as it were?	
22	28643	MR. ROITENBERG: Yes.
23	28644	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, I may
24	have been aware o	f that, Mr. Roitenberg, but certainly
25	I wasn't fermenti	ng it or anything like that.

1	28645	Mr. Schreiber was nothing if not
2	resc	ourceful and determined.
3	28646	It has been suggested I think,
4	perh	maps before this Commission, that Mr. Schreiber was
5	moti	vated largely by money to get this project
6	comp	eleted. From what I saw of Mr. Schreiber and what I
7	know	, money may have been part of it, but it became
8	inte	ensely I don't want to say personal, but
9	Mr.	Schreiber really believed passionately in this
LO	proj	ect for a number of reasons, and he would use every
11	poss	sible bargaining tool that he had, I think, to try
12	to g	get this through.
13	28647	MR. ROITENBERG: This letter,
L4	howe	ever, suggests that you may have been complicit in
15	Mr.	Schreiber's resourcefulness.
16	28648	I'm not going to suggest to you that
L7	you	were. I'm going to ask you to comment, if you
18	don'	t mind.
19	28649	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Well, I was
20	not	complicit in anything that would work against the
21	Gove	ernment of Canada, but I had sympathy with
22	Mr.	Schreiber. But I don't remember suggesting to him
23	that	he try to deprive a Canadian company, particularly
24	a gr	reat Canadian company like Bombardier, of some
25	fore	eign business.

1	28650	The whole idea implicit in all of
2	this was to draw	in German industry and to try to get
3	alternatives. Ca	anada was open for business, as the
4	saying went, and	we weren't going to get anywhere by
5	backstabbing peop	ple trying to take business away from
6	the very country	that we wanted to come and do business
7	in our country.	
8	28651	MR. ROITENBERG: Did anyone from the
9	Prime Minister's	Office or PCO speak with you about
L 0	this particular s	suggestion or allegation contained in
11	this letter?	
12	28652	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: No. The
13	first I ever knew	w of it was the letter that was sent to
14	me.	
15	28653	MR. ROITENBERG: The letter that was
16	sent to you with	our materials?
17	28654	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: With your
18	material, yes.	
19	28655	MR. ROITENBERG: I note that it is
20	quarter to 3:00,	Mr. Commissioner, and Mr. Mackay is
21	standing and answ	wering all my questions. Perhaps we
22	can take a break	now. He could have a short break and
23	then we can come	back and conclude.
24	28656	COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Mr. Mackay,
25	wou heard what M	r Poitenhera just said Would you

1	like to take a break at this point, sir, or continue on
2	for a little while?
3	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Commissioner,
4	it's entirely up to you. I feel quite comfortable in
5	continuing on, but I wouldn't object to a break either.
6	Don't interrupt the flow of the
7	proceedings for me.
8	28659 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Well,
9	Mr. Roitenberg has suggested that perhaps it might be
10	time for a break and that usually means that counsel is
11	at a position, at a point where break is not
12	inconvenient.
13	28660 So I think we will break for 15
14	minutes. OK?
15	Upon recessing at 2:50 p.m. / Suspension à 14 h 50
16	Upon resuming at 3:10 p.m. / Reprise à 15 h 10
17	28661 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Be seated,
18	please.
19	28662 Please proceed, Mr. Roitenberg.
20	28663 MR. ROITENBERG: Thank you,
21	Mr. Commissioner.
22	28664 Mr. MacKay?
23	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Mr.
24	Roitenberg?
25	28666 MR. ROITENBERG: Yes, sir.

1	28667	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: May I just
2	take a moment at	this point to thank the Commissioner
3	and the Commissi	on for permitting me to testify in this
4	fashion while I	am recovering from my operation. I
5	deeply appreciat	e it.
6	28668	COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Thank you
7	very much, Mr. M	acKay. It's no problem at all. The
8	technology seems	to be working perfectly.
9	28669	Thank you very much.
10	28670	MR. ROITENBERG: Following the
11	timeframe within	which there was this letter from
12	Bombardier, May	of 1990, shortly after that a meeting
13	was arranged bet	ween yourself, Mr. Schreiber and
L4	Mr. Tellier, who	was the Chief Clerk of the Privy
15	Council.	
16	28671	Is that correct?
L7	28672	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I believe it
18	to be correct.	
19	28673	MR. ROITENBERG: I believe the
20	meeting took pla	ce early in July of 1990.
21	28674	Is that fair?
22	28675	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I wouldn't
23	deny it. I can'	t remember specifically.
24	28676	MR. ROITENBERG: Were you aware as to
25	what recommendat	ions or observations were shared with

1	the Prime Minister by Mr. Tellier following that	
2	meeting?	
3	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Mr.	
4	Roitenberg, I'm not sure.	
5	28678 MR. ROITENBERG: If I can ask you t	.0
6	turn to Tab 24A. So if you go to Tab 24, there is a	
7	document and following that document is another tab	
8	marked "A".	
9	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Twenty-four	
10	"A".	
11	28680 MR. ROITENBERG: Yes, sir.	
12	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.	
13	28682 MR. ROITENBERG: It's a memorandum	to
14	the Prime Minister from Mr. Tellier.	
15	28683 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, I see	
16	this.	
17	28684 MR. ROITENBERG: And it comments	
18	on it's dated July 12, 1990 and it comments on,	
19	right at the beginning to the Prime Minister:	
20	"As you had requested, I met	
21	recently with Elmer MacKay and	L
22	Karlheinz Schreiber, Chairman	of
23	Bear Head Industries Ltd"	
24	Do you see that, sir?	
25	28686 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I do.	

1	28687	MR. ROITENBERG: Now, I want to take
2	you to "COMMENT	on page 3.
3		"COMMENT
4		An investment of this size, in a
5		depressed region, by a West
6		German company of this stature
7		would be a positive signal about
8		Canada as a place to invest. At
9		a time when Canada is attempting
10		to give a business as usual
11		signal to foreign investors,
12		this would be a reassuring
13		message."
14	28688	And it gives a caution as to what
15	might be some da	ifficulty if the project is less than
16	successful.	
17	28689	Do you see that, sir?
18	28690	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I do.
19	28691	MR. ROITENBERG: Now, at the very
20	bottom of the ne	ext paragraph, about four lines up, it
21	says:	
22		"To make this judgment, a full
23		business plan should be
24		requested from Thyssen, and an
25		analysis of this and the

1		project's costs and benefits
2		would need to be undertaken
3		thoroughly."
4	28692	oo you see that, sir?
5	28693	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I do.
6	28694 M	MR. ROITENBERG: Now, hopefully you
7	will recall from m	uch of the memorandum that I have put
8	to you that there	has been comment on the need for a
9	complete business	plan from the company.
10	28695	o you recall that, sir?
11	28696	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
12	28697 M	MR. ROITENBERG: So here we are in
13	July of 1990 coming	g up to two years after the signing
14	of the Understandi	ng in Principle, which was September
15	of 1988, and there	is still comment on the fact that
16	the company has no	t provided a significant or
17	sufficient busines	s plan.
18	28698 I	s that right, sir?
19	28699	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
20	28700 M	MR. ROITENBERG: And this is the plan
21	that ACOA is suppo	rting and trying to assist in the
22	negotiating between	n the Government of Canada as a whole
23	and Thyssen Bear H	ead.
24	28701 W	Was there some frustration expressed
25	on behalf of ACOA,	some notion of get on with it, to

2857

1	the company through you in terms of it is time to give
2	us what we need to get the job done? Was that
3	something you put to Mr. Schreiber?
4	28702 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I can
5	remember asking Mr. Schreiber about a business plan,
6	and to the best of my knowledge he kind of disclaimed
7	the need for one because they weren't requesting, as he
8	said, a lot of money.
9	28703 But eventually we did, ACOA did
10	commission Peat Marwick, I believe, to prepare such a
11	business plan.
12	28704 But in answer to your question, I do
13	seem to recall that there was some frustration that we
14	didn't have an upfront business plan with which to
15	work.
16	28705 MR. ROITENBERG: In 1990 as the
17	matter was continuing through this negotiating process,
18	you were reporting to the Prime Minister on the
19	progress on behalf of ACOA.
20	28706 Is that fair?
21	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
22	28708 MR. ROITENBERG: In fact, if I can
23	direct you to Tab 28, October 17, 1990, there is a note
24	to the Prime Minister from you basically suggesting:
25	"When you have an opportunity in

1	the next day or so, would you
2	mind if I call you or perhaps
3	you could ask someone to leave
4	word with my staff as to when it
5	might be convenient."
6	28709 Because you wanted to discuss with
7	the Prime Minister certain aspects of the Thyssen
8	project.
9	28710 Is that right?
10	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, sir.
11	Yes.
12	28712 MR. ROITENBERG: Was this something
13	that occurred on a frequent basis, whereby you
14	contacted the Prime Minister to want a meeting, either
15	in person or by telephone, to share with him what is
16	going on with ACOA, what is going on with this project?
17	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Mr.
18	Roitenberg, I wouldn't say that it was a frequent I
19	may have I may have tested the Prime Minister's
20	patience too much, because I did used to sometimes
21	request meetings with him, not just on this particular
22	file but on others. But I tried not to bother him too
23	much.
24	MR. ROITENBERG: You were aware that
25	in the fall of 1990 the then Chief of Staff of the

1	Prime Minister's Office, Norman Spector, wanted to
2	gather all of the players and have them produce a
3	document which would hopefully once and for all answer
4	the outstanding questions as to what is involved in the
5	Thyssen proposal, how much will it cost, is it doable
6	and, if it is, how do we get it done?
7	You were aware that such a gathering
8	was commissioned?
9	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
10	28717 MR. ROITENBERG: And that meeting was
11	to take place on November 1, 1990.
12	I'm going to ask you, if you wouldn't
13	mind, to go to Tab 27. I'm only asking you to go to
14	this document to confirm in your own mind the accuracy
15	that what we are looking at is a November 1st meeting,
16	upcoming.
17	28719 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, sir, I
18	have 27.
19	28720 MR. ROITENBERG: OK. If you go to
20	the second paragraph, it:
21	" is intended for use by MND
22	and senior DND officials"
23	28721 That is the Minister of National
24	Defence and senior Department of National Defence
25	officials.

1		" involved in the 1 Nov 90
2		meeting with the Honourable
3		Elmer MacKay and Mr. Norman
4		Spector."
5	28722 I	am only putting you on this
6	document to orient	you timewise.
7	28723 Do	you see where it says that?
8	28724 TH	E HON. ELMER MacKAY: October
9	'90 yes.	
10	28725 MR	. ROITENBERG: November 1, 1990
11	28726 TH	E HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
12	28727 MR	. ROITENBERG: is the meeting.
13	28728 TH	E HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
14	28729 MR	. ROITENBERG: And you understood
15	that at this meeting	g there was a request made by then
16	Chief of Staff Spec	tor that the parties produce a
17	document cooperative	ely which would set out everybody's
18	position, the costs	, the benefits, so that there could
19	be some finality as	to whether or not this proposal
20	could move forward;	correct?
21	28730 TH	E HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
22	28731 MR	. ROITENBERG: But there was some
23	concern raised along	g the way that ACOA was not willing
24	to wait for this co	operative product but in fact were
25	trying to do an end	run around the process and go

1	directly to the	he Prime Minister's Office.
2	28732	Do you recall that concern being
3	raised?	
4	28733	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I see this in
5	the documenta	tion, but I'm not so sure I can remember
6	it otherwise.	
7	28734	MR. ROITENBERG: OK. Well, let's go
8	to Tab 29, if	you would. This is a memo from
9	Mr. Gillespie	, who my understanding was he was the
10	Assistant Dep	uty Minister Materiel in DND.
11	28735	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
12	28736	MR. ROITENBERG: And he puts forward
13	the proposition	on that:
14		"In arranging this last
15		night"
16	28737	"This" being the preparation of the
17	business plan	by ACOA.
18	28738	He is arranging it with Peter Smith,
19	who my unders	tanding is was the Vice-President of ACOA
20	Ottawa at the	time.
21	28739	Is that right, sir?
22	28740	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I believe
23	that's right.	
24	28741	MR. ROITENBERG:
25		" I was informed that the

1	draft MC (that paper that we
2	have received from ACOA) had
3	been circulated yesterday to at
4	least PCO, TBS and SSC"
5	28742 I know the Commissioner is going to
6	stop me right there with the acronyms and ask if I can
7	get you to identify those organizations, other than
8	PCO, which we know to be the Privy Council Office.
9	28743 So if you could help me with TBS and
10	SSC?
11	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Well, I'm
12	embarrassed, Mr. Roitenberg, I'm not too sure I know
13	all of these acronyms after all these years either.
14	28745 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: You have made
15	my day, Mr. MacKay.
16	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: You have TBS
17	Treasury Board Secretariat.
18	MR. ROITENBERG: I believe it is.
19	28748 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: And DEA,
20	Department of
21	28749 MR. ROITENBERG: External Affairs, I
22	believe.
23	28750 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Privy Council
24	Office. I'm not sure, I thought I had put all these
25	acronyms behind me a long time ago.

1	28751	MR. ROITENBERG: Well, I apologize
2	for bringing bac	k what must have been a recurring
3	nightmare of the	attack of the alphabet.
4	28752	But we have Privy Council Office,
5	Treasury Board S	ecretariat, SSC, which I don't know,
6	and the Departme	nt of External Affairs.
7	28753	It could be Supply and Services
8	Canada, I am adv	ised by my colleague.
9	28754	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: It could be
L O	Supply and Servi	ces, yes.
11	28755	MR. ROITENBERG: OK.
12		"This was done just in case Mr.
13		Mackay(sic) decides to walk the
L4		paper into Cabinet Committee in
15		the 'next week to ten days'
16		without the DND portion."
L7	28756	Suggesting at least a concern that
18	there would be s	ome effort on your behalf to bypass DNI
19	having input and	take it right to Cabinet Committee.
20	28757	But you don't recall that occurring.
21	28758	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: No, I don't.
22	But again, Mr. R	oitenberg, I plead guilty to being very
23	aggressive on th	is project, probably with the benefit
24	of hindsight too	much so.
25	28759	It was never my intention to

1	seriously circumvent the rules that governed these
2	things, but I was conscious of how much time had
3	elapsed and how much we were banking on this down in
4	Cape Breton.
5	28760 So I may have been I may have been
6	overly aggressive, but I don't know.
7	MR. ROITENBERG: All right.
8	28762 If I could ask you to go to Tab 30,
9	Tab 30 is the memorandum for Norman Spector which was
10	prepared by Paul Tellier to accompany the Aide Memoire
11	that was the joint production of the departments
12	involved, which set out everybody's positions in terms
13	of efficiencies, costs, benefits, et cetera.
14	28763 In the covering memo from Paul
15	Tellier he offers comment at page 2:
16	"As you requested, the
17	aide-memoire does lay out what
18	would be necessary for this
19	project to go ahead: the price
20	is very high, with DND
21	purchasing equipment it
22	basically does not want in a
23	time-frame that does not suit
24	its needs."
25	28764 It sets out that there might be an

1	approximate cost per job of \$2 million, that is per job
2	created, and that the government might want to be very
3	sure the plant would succeed.
4	28765 It further suggests an understanding
5	that Mr. Spector will be discussing with you how to
6	proceed on the project as you are:
7	" very anxious to have this
8	matter scheduled for Operations
9	Committee in the near future."
10	28766 I take it your desire to have it
11	dealt with by the Operations Committee in the near
12	future, if that was an accurate statement of your
13	desire, was part and parcel of you aggressively
14	pursuing this on behalf of Nova Scotia?
15	28767 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That's true,
16	Mr. Roitenberg, and I would have had a chance to debate
17	a little bit the additional costs, as mentioned on page
18	1 here:
19	" of \$765 million over and
20	above to fit the Fox into
21	the not-yet-completed defence
22	policy"
23	28768 And so on. It seemed to me and
24	again I plead guilty to being completely ignorant on
25	defence procurement costs, and so on, but that is not

1	unusual for politicians, I guess.	
2	28769 But it seemed to me that the co	sts
3	for this project had been vastly inflated, to my	
4	layman's understanding and, you know, again if I	might
5	be permitted a slight digression, I am filled wi	th
6	ironic thoughts when I think that we lost this p	roject
7	at least in part, because of the ostensible extra	э
8	costs, but yet we wrote off half a billion dolla:	rs,
9	enough to complete half of the bridge to Prince	Edward
10	Island, when we cancelled the helicopter order as	nd the
11	taxpayers got nothing for that.	
12	28770 So I guess I was a little queru	lous
13	about costs.	
14	28771 MR. ROITENBERG: Well, you made	: it
15	known that you were concerned about the cost and	ACOA
16	put forward the position, at your direction, that	t this
17	was an erroneous assessment of costs because in	your
18	view it built in costs for inefficiencies; that	they
19	were going to outfit the Forces with one machine	and
20	then have to retrofit with another.	
21	28772 And that particular concern was	;
22	addressed when DND did a reassessment of its por	tion of
23	the Aide Memoire in early January of 1991.	
24	28773 If I can get you to turn to Tak	36
25	2877/ THE HOM FIMED MackNV, Voc 2	,

1	28775 MR. ROITENBERG: I just want to pause
2	to put us into the appropriate perspective.
3	28776 What had been contemplated on the
4	earlier Aide Memoire was the purchase of the TPz Fox
5	from Thyssen, following which there would be an
6	additional purchase of the TH 495 down the road and
7	some concern about the inefficiencies of doing it in
8	that fashion.
9	28777 So at ACOA's suggestion DND then
10	revisited its numbers premised on a lower purchase of
11	vehicles, of the TH 495 instead of the Fox.
12	28778 That is reflected at the memo at Tab
13	36 you will see.
14	28779 If you go to "Comment" on page 2,
15	again under Mr. Tellier's hand, he says:
16	"The DND amendments in summary
17	argue that the substitution of
18	the TH 495 for the Fox makes no
19	difference to the total cost of
20	the acquisition Although
21	ACOA is of the view that this is
22	overstated"
23	28780 And there is attached correspondence
24	from ACOA suggesting that:
25	" the bottom line is that the

1	Thyssen proposal costs at least	
2	\$500 million (in ball park	
3	terms) more than was budgeted."	
4	Do you see that, sir?	
5	28782 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I do.	
6	28783 MR. ROITENBERG: So even once they	
7	have recosted everything and affording ACOA its view	
8	that there is still an overstatement, there is still	
9	half a billion dollars over budget that would be	
10	required, according to this memo, to go forward with	
11	the project.	
12	But Mr. Tellier goes on and says:	
13	"The bottom line from our	
14	perspective continues to be that	t
15	this project is undesirable	
16	since it would involve DND	
17	acquiring a product that does	
18	not meet its requirements; in	
19	quantities larger than it	
20	requires; at a price higher than	n
21	it can afford; in a time frame	
22	in advance of its needs, and for	r
23	which a source of funds has not	
24	been identified."	
25	That is a pretty steep hill to climb	,

1	you would agree?	
2	28786 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That is	
3	pretty damning indictment of the project.	
4	28787 MR. ROITENBERG: And one which	
5	certain individuals within ACOA started to share.	
6	Would that not be fair?	
7	28788 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That could	l
8	very well be true.	
9	28789 MR. ROITENBERG: I'm going to dire	ect
LO	you to Tab 31, if I may.	
11	28790 This is a memo from Peter Smith to)
12	you. Peter Smith, the Vice-President of ACOA, he is	n
13	fact was the individual at your direction who wrote	to
14	PCO and advised them as to the difficulties that AC	AC
15	had with the costs as set out in the earlier Aide	
16	Memoire.	
L7	28791 But Mr. Smith, writing you a memo	as
18	his Minister, at page 2, the second page of the mem	ο,
19	at the bottom, the very last paragraph, expresses a	s
20	follows:	
21	"In short, the views of all	
22	departments over the years	"
23	28792 Are you there, sir? I don't want	to
24	start without you.	
2.5	28793 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes. I am.	

1	28794 M	R. ROITENBERG:
2		"In short, the views of all
3		departments over the years have
4		not changed, but due to the
5		economic climate and other
6		factors, opposition to the
7		initiative has definitely
8		widened, has solidified and has
9		become even more legitimate."
10	28795 T	The next paragraph:
11		"Without exception, each of the
12		participants, most notably DND
13		who would have to fund the
14		vehicles, DIST who have a
15		mandate for analyzing the impact
16		on the industrial infrastructure
17		in this country and Finance made
18		an appeal to have the company's
19		business plan exposed prior to
20		being able to adequately comment
21		on the viability of the
22		proposal."
23	28796 S	So again comment on the fact that we
24	don't even have a s	substantive business plan from the
25	company such that i	it would afford us the opportunity of

1	comment	ing properly.
2	28797	And if you go to the penultimate
3	paragra	ph starting with "Although":
4		"Although I have only become
5		personally acquainted with this
6		file over the past six months, I
7		have now had ample time to
8		analyze the difficulties
9		associated with approving such a
L O		proposal in the past. Some of
11		these concerns could have at the
12		time been either eliminated or
13		at best minimized, based on
14		Thyssen's reputation and the
15		potential benefit to Atlantic
16		Canada. However, as I analyze
L7		the facts now, in light of all
18		of the factors that must be
19		considered such as our current
20		economic situation, the Defence
21		Agreement with the US, the state
22		of the National Defence budget
23		and the unapproved Defence
24		policy, I would be less than
25		responsible, despite the

1	1 potential positi	ve impact on
2	2 Atlantic Canada,	to advise that
3	3 this initiative	should be
4	4 pursued."	
5	5 28798 This is the Vice-Pres	sident of ACOA,
6	6 the best friend the Thyssen proposal h	ad on the federal
7	7 level, telling you, the Minister, we re	eally shouldn't
8	8 be pursuing it in light of all of these	e factors and all
9	9 of the opposition and the financial ci	rcumstances in
10	0 which the country finds itself.	
11	1 28799 Do you recall seeing	this memo, sir?
12	2 28800 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY	: I do and I
13	would like to just note that on the ver	ry top of the
14	4 page to which you are referring, after	this indictment
15	5 there is the following sentence:	
16	.6 "Notwithstanding	g this
17	opposition, each	n department also
18	.8 offered suggesti	ons as to what
19	9 would have to be	e done to allow
20	this proposal to	proceed."
21	1 28801 So nothing ever seems	ed despite
22	some of the unequivocal language, noth	ing ever seemed
23	entirely definitive.	
24	The justification for	the military
25	5 component solidified, but there was al	so the other side

1	issue which perhaps didn't get enough attention, was
2	that Thyssen, being a huge multinational with a lot of
3	business in the United States and other countries, had
4	some major projects going on and were prepared to
5	supply some of these projects as well as environmental
6	ones from Nova Scotia.
7	Now, this may have been pie in the
8	sky or pipe dreams, but nevertheless I think it was
9	contemplated that sometimes at least that getting a
10	company of this stature into Canada was a good thing.
11	To put it in today's context, I see
12	in the local press we have to make more overtures to
13	the EU. So there are other factors involved here.
14	28805 MR. ROITENBERG: You know, you may be
15	offered a very good deal on some patio furniture, but
16	if you don't have a house to put it in, there is no
17	point in buying it.
18	You would agree with that, sir?
19	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, unless
20	you can get a construction company to build a house.
21	28808 MR. ROITENBERG: So here you have
22	what you thought was a very good deal for Nova Scotia,
23	but the department who would have had to have been
24	willing to buy it was basically saying we don't need
25	it, we don't want it, we can't afford it, we don't know

1	where to put it, we don't know how we will pay for it.
2	And your own department in the memo we have just gone
3	through, or at least the Vice-President of ACOA is here
4	saying they make some good points and we can no longer
5	get over those obstacles. It would be irresponsible to
6	recommend proceeding at this point.
7	You have seen that in terms of what
8	Mr. Smith has written this memo?
9	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I have.
10	MR. ROITENBERG: The very next day,
11	December 11, 1990, Tab 33, in spite of the
12	recommendation that you have received from the
13	Vice-President of ACOA, you send a letter to the Prime
14	Minister:
15	"I am writing to seek your
16	support for the proposal by
17	Thyssen to establish an
18	armoured-vehicle and
19	environmental-industries
20	manufacturing facility in Nova
21	Scotia."
22	28812 And the request further on at page 3:
23	"To conclude, Prime Minister, if
24	you concur"
25	28813 This is the last paragraph:

1	" it would be my intention on
2	Thursday, December 13, to have
3	the entire proposal, including
4	the company's final offer,
5	brought forward for discussion
6	by Operations Ministers."
7	28814 And then if there could be some
8	formal decision, it should go to Cabinet later that
9	morning.
10	How does one do that in the face of
11	the recommendation by the best friend in Ottawa, ACOA
12	and those individuals who have sat down, assessed the
13	proposal, assessed the economic realities and the other
14	departments' arguments against?
15	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: The place to
16	put an end to this debate, if it can be called that, in
17	my view, is in Cabinet and have the various
18	departments, all of whom had some not all, but most
19	of whom had some peripheral interest in this, come to a
20	conclusion that if this was going to happen the way
21	that ACOA had analyzed it, let's put paid to it. Let's
22	finish it off.
23	I am probably guilty, as I said
24	earlier, of being too aggressive vis-à-vis this
25	project, but that's the way I am.

1	28818 MR. ROITENBERG: Now, it never
2	actually went to Operations Committee on the 13th or
3	the 14th, and that Tab 34 is a letter that you
4	forwarded to Norman Spector, Chief of Staff to the
5	Prime Minister, where at the first paragraph you say:
6	"Last week, I received your
7	personal assurances that the
8	Thyssen issue would be
9	considered imminently via an
10	'alternative route', rather tha
11	being discussed at Operations a
12	I and others had wished."
13	Do you have any idea what alternativ
14	route was either mentioned or understood by you?
15	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I'm sorry,
16	Mr. Roitenberg, would you just repeat?
17	I was glancing at another paragraph.
18	MR. ROITENBERG: I apologize. The
19	first paragraph sets out that you had been advised tha
20	the matter "would be considered imminently via an
21	'alternative route'" In fact, it says you received
22	a personal assurance from Mr. Spector.
23	28823 I'm curious as to what alternative
24	route you understood that to be or if one was
25	specifically mentioned.

1	28824	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Well, my
2	present recollec	tion or understanding would be that it
3	would have to be	it would have to be one of the
4	alternatives tha	t Thyssen might be persuaded to bring
5	to Nova Scotia t	hat would less expensive, having to do
6	with for exam	ole, there was a large requirement for
7	coal scrubbers as	nd stuff at the Lingan Coal Mine.
8	There was a need	to do something at Trenton industries
9	in Trenton, Nova	Scotia.
10	28825	It would seem to me and I can't
11	recall specifica	lly but a company this large and
12	this diverse, I	would have hoped that we could have
13	gotten some busi:	ness from them.
14	28826	MR. ROITENBERG: No, sir. This
15	paragraph seems	to be suggestive as an alternative
16	route to the pro-	cess rather than going through the
17	Operations Commi	ttee; that you had received a personal
18	assurance that t	he Thyssen issue would be considered
19	via an alternati	ve route, not to suggest that Thyssen
20	would proceed al	ternatively through a different project
21	but that the gove	ernment would consider it via what
22	would have been	a channel different than the ordinary
23	channels.	
24	28827	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Well, I
25	can't I wish	I could help you with that, Mr.

2878

1	Ro	itenberg, but I don't know what alternative channel
2	it	would be other than having it discussed at Cabinet
3	or	Operations Committee or what have you.
4	28828	COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Maybe the
5	an	swer lies in the second paragraph of that letter.
6		- Pause
7	28829	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, with the
8	Mi	nister of Industry, Michael Wilson.
9	28830	You see, there is always the
L 0	fi	nancial considerations here. As you mentioned
11	be	fore, Mr. Roitenberg, ACOA didn't have the financial
12	mu	scle as DND did to fund or to in any way advance this
13	ex	ccept in a peripheral way. IST did, Finance did, but
L4	sc	ome of the considerations that were put forward by
15	Pe	eter Smith, of course, would be valid.
16	28831	So this particular initiative, if you
17	wa	ant to call it, was very hard to finally terminate.
18	28832	I was responsible in many ways for
19	ke	eping it alive, but there was I think a recognition
20	th	at the benefits that could accrue from this project,
21	if	we could chop it down to size, would have been a
22	ve	ery good thing for Cape Breton, a very good thing for
23	re	egional development.
24	28833	MR. ROITENBERG: Mr. Spector, who
25	+ 0	estified last week testified to the fact that along

2879

1	the way someone had given the Prime Minister the
2	impression that this proposal could proceed at no cost
3	to the taxpayer.
4	28834 We know that you were having ongoing
5	communications with the Prime Minister, either by way
6	of letter or in person or by telephone. You were
7	reporting to him.
8	Did you suggest in any way to the
9	Prime Minister that this matter could proceed at no
10	cost to the taxpayer?
11	28836 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: No, sir, I
12	don't remember ever making such a statement because it
13	would be manifestly absurd. You couldn't get a project
14	of any size up and running without any cost to the
15	taxpayer.
16	There were some offsets not
17	offsets, but there were some special programs involved,
18	Cape Breton Investment Tax Credit and things like that.
19	But all of them will ultimately be a cost to the
20	taxpayer.
21	28838 I said to you earlier and I am
22	probably being obstinate and stupid; I plead guilty to
23	that. But I still am somewhat bemused by the
24	tremendous costs, since we are talking costs, that DND
25	heaped on this project.

1	28839 MR. ROITENBERG: Well
2	28840 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: But that is
3	their affair and I am not an expert in military
4	procurement.
5	MR. ROITENBERG: Your focus wasn't
6	the procurement aspect on behalf of the military; it
7	was the regional developmental benefits
8	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
9	28843 MR. ROITENBERG: for Nova Scotia.
10	Would that be fair?
11	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That's fair.
12	MR. ROITENBERG: The creation of the
13	jobs for Nova Scotia.
14	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
15	28848 MR. ROITENBERG: And I say Nova
16	Scotia, because although the project had started off as
17	a proposal to be based in Cape Breton, it eventually at
18	some point moved outside of Cape Breton to Pictou
19	County; correct?
20	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, in a
21	very transitory way. It never went anywhere, but
22	Lavalin, another large Canadian company, eventually
23	came in and helped to resuscitate a very important
24	industry in Trenton.
25	28850 There was some suggestion that maybe

2881

1	Thyssen could	be of some assistance there as well, but
2	that did not f	ly for very long.
3	28851	MR. ROITENBERG: Now again, in Pictou
4	County there w	rould be a tremendous benefit to the local
5	economy and cr	reation of jobs, and again this was
6	something that	you were championing?
7	28852	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That's true.
8	28853	MR. ROITENBERG: When the discussions
9	occurred way b	eack when, around the time of the
10	Understanding	in Principle, September of 1988, you were
11	aware of all t	the efforts that Senator Lowell Murray,
12	who was then t	the Minister Responsible for ACOA, all of
13	the efforts he	e had engaged in to try to get some
14	consensus, som	ne approval by Cabinet or the Operations
15	Committee or F	Planning and Priorities, some authority to
16	enter into som	ne letter of comfort with Thyssen.
17	28854	Is that right?
18	28855	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
19	28856	MR. ROITENBERG: And you were aware
20	that to enter	into any kind of agreement, there had to
21	be some author	rization granted by the government itself
22	to you on beha	alf of ACOA to sign any agreement with
23	Thyssen; corre	ect?
24	28857	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
25	28858	MR. ROITENBERG: If I can ask you to

1	turn to Tab 29A
2	28859 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I have 29B
3	and
4	28860 MR. ROITENBERG: If you go back,
5	there should be an "A".
6	28861 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: I hate to do
7	this to you, Mr. Roitenberg, but is this the MOU?
8	28862 MR. ROITENBERG: Yes. You are
9	getting more and more comfortable, sir.
10	28863 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I am working
11	my way towards 29B, Mr. Roitenberg, but I don't see
12	29A.
13	28864 MR. ROITENBERG: If you go to Tab 29,
14	sir, there is a memo from the Assistant Deputy
15	Minister, Materiel. It is two pages long.
16	28865 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
17	28866 MR. ROITENBERG: Following that there
18	should be a divider marked "A", which would then have
19	the Memorandum of Understanding
20	28867 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, I have
21	it now.
22	28868 MR. ROITENBERG: Very good.
23	28869 At the top of the page it says
24	"November 1990" in handwriting.
25	Do you see that, sir?

1	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
2	MR. ROITENBERG: If you go to the
3	very end of the document, it appears to be signed on
4	behalf of the Government of Canada, and above the line
5	"Minister Responsible for the Atlantic Canada
6	Opportunities Agency", it appears to be your signature
7	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
8	28874 MR. ROITENBERG: Under the line for
9	Bear Head Industries Limited, "Mr. Karlheinz Schreiber
10	Chairman", there appears to be the signature of Mr.
11	Schreiber.
12	28875 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
13	28876 MR. ROITENBERG: And there seems to
14	be a blank above "Minister of National Defence".
15	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
16	28878 MR. ROITENBERG: I am curious, sir,
17	as to when and from what body you received the
18	authority to sign this document on behalf of the
19	Government of Canada.
20	28879 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: This
21	particular Memorandum of Understanding, to the best of
22	my knowledge and I don't have a lot of recollection
23	of it was probably prepared by ACOA, and I think it
24	had a history of wanting certain undertakings put in
25	this Memorandum of Understanding with respect to the

2884

1	undertakings that	t Thyssen would have not to divest
2	itself of Bear He	ead Industries and to do certain
3	things.	
4	28880	In answer to your direct question, I
5	have no recollect	tion of the actual signing or who
6	prepared this.	It was the second one.
7	28881	The first one, of course, as you
8	know, was signed	by the same parties, only at that
9	time, I think, th	ne Minister of Defence was Perrin
10	Beatty	
11	28882	MR. ROITENBERG: And Robert de
12	Cotret.	
13	28883	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: and Gerry
14	Merrithew.	
15	28884	But this one, subsequently, I really
16	can't help you w	ith that. I would like to, but I
17	can't.	
18	28885	MR. ROITENBERG: Because in all of
19	the documentation	n that we have searched through, there
20	doesn't appear to	b be anywhere where cabinet approval
21	was given, or app	proval by the Operations Committee
22	28886	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: M'hmm.
23	28887	MR. ROITENBERG: but it was signed
24	by you and forwar	rded to Mr. Schreiber for his
25	gianature	

1	28888	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I see.
2	28889	MR. ROITENBERG: Further to that end,
3	maybe I could as	sist in how and when it was prepared.
4	28890	If you go to Tab 25A, this is a memo
5	to you from Pete	r Lesaux of ACOA.
6	28891	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: This is 25A.
7	28892	MR. ROITENBERG: It is 25A, yes, sir.
8	28893	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: "Additions to
9	the Bear Head In	dustries MOU"?
L O	28894	MR. ROITENBERG: Yes.
11	28895	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
12	28896	MR. ROITENBERG: If you go to the
13	second-last para	graph on the first page, there is an
L4	observation offe	red that:
15		"While Mr. Schreiber, the
16		Chairman of BHI, is a proposed
L7		signatory of the MOU, my
18		understanding is that he has no
19		formal relationship with Thyssen
20		Industrie AG, and thereby may be
21		unable to commit the parent to
22		ownership of BHI."
23	28897	If you go to page 2, the second-last
24	paragraph on the	page is a suggestion that you seek
25	some consultation	n with the Minister of National

1	Revenue, and in the last paragraph it says:
2	"Finally, as you instructed"
3	28898 and this is a memo to yourself:
4	"the MOU has not been
5	circulated within ACOA or
6	interdepartmentally, and has had
7	no legal review. Prior to
8	signature, you may wish to seek
9	a final legal review, in order
10	to ensure the agreement binds
11	each party in the way they would
12	wish. Indeed, you may recall
13	that such a review was directed
14	by Cabinet prior to the signing
15	of the 'Understanding in
16	Principle', two years ago."
17	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
18	28900 MR. ROITENBERG: Do you recall this
19	ever receiving any legal review, or you directing it to
20	have any legal review?
21	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: No, I do not.
22	28902 MR. ROITENBERG: Do you recall why
23	you instructed that it not be circulated within ACOA or
24	interdepartmentally?
25	28903 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: No. I do not.

1	28904 MR. ROITENBERG: There was a seco	nd
2	MOU prepared, and that is at Tab 38 of the book of	
3	documents. This is April the 9th, 1991. Again, i	t is
4	sign by you on behalf of the ministry responsible	for
5	ACOA, and signed by Mr. Schreiber as Chairman for	Bear
6	Head Industries.	
7	Do you recall being provided with	ı any
8	authority to enter into any such agreement by cabi	net
9	or the Operations Committee or Planning and Priori	ties?
10	28906 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: No, I do	not.
11	28907 MR. ROITENBERG: Do you recall	
12	offering this to the Minister of National Defence	for
13	their perusal and signature at any time?	
14	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: No.	
15	28909 MR. ROITENBERG: If I could ask y	rou
16	to turn to Tab 44, sir, this is a letter from Mr.	
17	Schreiber to the Hon. Marcel Masse, who was the	
18	Minister of National Defence in the spring of 1992	•
19	This letter follows meetings between Mr. Schreiber	and
20	then Prime Minister Mulroney, and a meeting betwee	n
21	yourself, Minister Masse and Mr. Schreiber, at whi	ch
22	the plan of moving the Thyssen Bear Head proposal	to
23	East Montreal was discussed, and it was followed u	р
24	with meetings with officials of the Province of Qu	ebec.
25	28910 Do you recall the timeframe that	I am

2888

1	referring to, sir?
2	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Not well, but
3	I have it fitted into, you know, a perspective.
4	28912 MR. ROITENBERG: OK. Our
5	understanding is that you were involved in some of
6	these meetings, and in further supporting the proposal,
7	as it was being suggested that it could potentially be
8	moved to Quebec.
9	28913 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I do
10	remember I am pretty certain that I remember meeting
11	with Marcel Masse, and that would be part of that
12	meeting that's mentioned there.
13	28914 And, yes, I do recall supporting the
L4	project. I would have preferred to see it in Nova
15	Scotia, but east end Montreal was also an economic
16	disaster area.
L7	28915 MR. ROITENBERG: But all of this
18	political capital had been spent by yourself and by
19	ACOA championing the jobs for Nova Scotia. Resources
20	of ACOA had been spent championing the boon to the
21	economy for Nova Scotia.
22	28916 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Right.
23	28917 MR. ROITENBERG: Now that there is
24	talk of moving it to Quebec, I would expect hue and
25	outcry from the minister responsible for ACOA, not

1	support in moving	g it to East Montreal.
2	28918	What could the benefit possibly have
3	been for Nova Sco	otia?
4	28919	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: There would
5	be no ostensible	benefit for Nova Scotia, but the last
6	time I checked, (Quebec is part of Canada, and if some
7	of my colleagues	in Quebec thought they needed some
8	assistance, I had	some familiarity with the project,
9	and I was not goi	ng to be a dog in the manger.
LO	28920	MR. ROITENBERG: So rather than
11	folding up your t	ent and going home with talk of it
12	moving to Montrea	al, you were prepared to continue to
13	support a proposa	al in which you believed.
14	28921	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
15	28922	MR. ROITENBERG: Even if it lessened
16	the economic impa	act for the region you had been
L 7	fighting for.	
18	28923	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I am not
19	certain that it w	would lessen the economic impact. I
20	don't recall thir	aking about it in those terms.
21	28924	If Nova Scotia was not able to
22	achieve it, Quebe	ec, a larger province, with more
23	resources perhaps	from their regional development
24	group, backed by	some of my colleagues from that
2.5	province if th	ney could have it, that would be fine

1	with me. It would st	ill be a benefit to Canada.
2	28925 MR.	ROITENBERG: Now, at this point
3	in time you had been w	working for many years on this
4	project with Mr. Schre	eiber.
5	28926 Is t	hat right?
6	28927 THE	HON. ELMER MacKAY: Right.
7	28928 MR.	ROITENBERG: This would have been
8	past your acquaintance	eship and into the time when the
9	two of you had struck	up a friendship.
10	28929 Woul	d that be fair?
11	28930 THE	HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
12	28931 MR.	ROITENBERG: Were you aware at
13	the time that if this	project were to go ahead, Mr.
14	Schreiber was due to p	profit a considerable amount of
15	money?	
16	28932 THE	HON. ELMER MacKAY: I'm sorry,
17	would you repeat that	?
18	28933 MR.	ROITENBERG: Were you aware at
19	this time that if the	project were to go ahead,
20	somewhere Quebec, I	Nova Scotia, Ontario, British
21	Columbia anywhere	if this plant got built, these
22	LAVs got made and got	sold, that Mr. Schreiber was due
23	to profit a rather sub	ostantial amount of money?
24	28934 Were	you aware of that?
25	28935 THE	HON. ELMER MacKAY: It never

1	entered my mind. I wasn't aware of it, as such, no.
2	28936 It was not part of my thinking.
3	MR. ROITENBERG: Well, this is now
4	your friend. He has been pushing for this proposal.
5	He has been pushing hard for the proposal. I imagine
6	you didn't think he was doing this just out of the
7	goodness of his heart.
8	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Mr.
9	Roitenberg, it sounds incredibly naive for me to think
10	that, but I tell you, I watched Mr. Schreiber's
11	dedication and determination to try to get this
12	project, and, as I said to you before, I never equated
13	it with any success fees, or bonus payments, or
14	anything else.
15	28939 I would have liked to have seen
16	Thyssen and Mr. Schreiber achieve their objectives in
17	Canada and bring German industry into this country.
18	28940 MR. ROITENBERG: Sir, I want to take
19	you forward, if I could, to 1994 December of 1994.
20	Now, you have told the Commissioner
21	that you had no business relationship with Mr.
22	Schreiber at any time, that the only time you were tied
23	with Mr. Schreiber in any way in a business
24	relationship was when you made an investment in a
25	company that potentially was looking at purchasing

1	certain pasta machines from Mr. Schreiber. Correct?
2	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, that's
3	true.
4	MR. ROITENBERG: In December of 1984,
5	you are out of government now for about 15 months.
6	Would that be fair?
7	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: 1984 you
8	said?
9	MR. ROITENBERG: 1994, excuse me.
10	December 8th, `94. You are out of
11	government now for about 15 months or so?
12	28948 Is that right?
13	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That would be
14	right.
15	28950 MR. ROITENBERG: You didn't seek
16	re-election in the October 1993 federal election.
17	Correct?
18	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Correct.
19	28952 MR. ROITENBERG: On December 8th,
20	1994, or December 7th, 1994, you find yourself at The
21	Pierre Hotel in New York. Correct?
22	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
23	28954 MR. ROITENBERG: My understanding,
24	from testimony we have heard, is that Mr. Schreiber and
25	his wife, in honour of your recent marriage at the

1	time, invited you and your wife to be their guests in
2	New York and to accompany them to the Atlantic Bridge
3	function in New York on December 7th, 1994.
4	Do you recall that, sir?
5	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I do.
6	28957 MR. ROITENBERG: We have also heard
7	evidence that on December the 8th, 1994, you were
8	invited by Mr. Schreiber and his wife to be their
9	guests for lunch at The Pierre Hotel.
10	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
11	MR. ROITENBERG: We have heard
12	evidence that, unbeknownst to you, a couple of
13	gentlemen were shortly to join your luncheon former
14	Prime Minister Mulroney and Fred Doucet and they
15	did, in fact, join you for lunch. Correct?
16	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Correct.
17	MR. ROITENBERG: You had no idea that
18	they were going to be there, I understand.
19	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That's my
20	understanding. I don't remember them coming.
21	28963 MR. ROITENBERG: They came, and it
22	was a rather brief lunch that they stayed for.
23	28964 Am I correct?
24	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
25	28966 MR. ROITENBERG: In fact, I believe

1	you have said that they ordered something which was
2	quickly prepared, they ate and they left before
3	everybody else was finished their lunch.
4	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That's my
5	recollection.
6	28968 MR. ROITENBERG: They left together,
7	saying something about having to go to the airport.
8	28969 Am I right?
9	28970 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I believe
10	that's correct.
11	MR. ROITENBERG: You had spent, in
12	your last years in government, much time, much
13	political capital, pursuing the Thyssen Bear Head
14	Project.
15	28972 Am I right?
16	28973 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Right.
17	28974 MR. ROITENBERG: We have heard
18	evidence that, prior to that luncheon, Mr. Mulroney,
19	Mr. Doucet and Mr. Schreiber met and perhaps had a
20	discussion that centred around the Thyssen Bear Head
21	Project, its status, whether anything could be done to
22	keep it going or make it happen, and that certain
23	payments were made.
24	Is it your evidence, sir, that you
25	knew nothing of that meeting and nothing of those

1	discussions?	
2	28976 TI	HE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That's my
3	evidence.	
4	28977 MI	R. ROITENBERG: Would you have
5	expected, consideri	ng your involvement over so many
6	years at the forefr	ont of pursuing this proposal, that
7	had such a meeting	taken place, and had such a
8	discussion occurred	surrounding the Bear Head Project,
9	somebody would have	mentioned it to you at this
10	luncheon?	
11	28978 TI	HE HON. ELMER MacKAY: No.
12	28979 MI	R. ROITENBERG: It makes perfect
13	sense to you that t	hese three gentlemen would meet in
14	New York, discuss t	he project that you had worked so
15	hard on, then come	to lunch with you, and nobody would
16	say anything about	the fact that they had just met,
17	discussed this proj	ect, discussed its future?
18	28980 Tl	nat makes perfect sense to you, sir
19	28981 TI	HE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Well, whether
20	it makes perfect se	nse or not, Mr. Roitenberg, my
21	recollection is tha	t that was never mentioned at the
22	luncheon.	
23	28982 MI	R. ROITENBERG: It is your evidence
24	that you never knew	anything of the payments from Mr.
25	Schreiber to Mr. Mu	droney until you read about it in

1	the paper.	
2	28983	Is that correct?
3	28984	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That is my
4	recollection. I	don't remember having any prior
5	knowledge of any	such payments or proposed payments.
6	28985	MR. ROITENBERG: On this date,
7	December the 8th,	, 1994, though, you were in New York,
8	at The Pierre Hot	cel, you had lunch with all the
9	protagonists, and	d had no idea that payments had just
10	occurred. Correc	ct?
11	28986	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Correct.
12	28987	MR. ROITENBERG: Sir, I am going to
13	ask you to turn t	to Tab 45 in your book of documents.
14	28988	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
15	28989	MR. ROITENBERG: These are diary
16	excerpts from Mr.	. Schreiber's diary of 1993.
17	28990	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
18	28991	MR. ROITENBERG: I would ask you to
19	turn to December	the 17th, 1993.
20	28992	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Is that the
21	first page, Sunda	ay the 13th?
22	28993	MR. ROITENBERG: No, sir.
23	28994	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I am into
24	1993 now.	
25	28995	MR. ROITENBERG: Yes. The first page

1	is Sunday, June 13th. I am going to ask you to forward
2	through to Friday, December 17th.
3	28996 It's approximately four pages or
4	three pages from the end.
5	28997 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Friday the
6	20th? No.
7	I'm sorry, but I'm having trouble
8	getting
9	You say three pages from the end of
10	these excerpts?
11	29000 MR. ROITENBERG: Yes.
12	29001 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I am going to
13	the back now. I have December
14	29002 MR. ROITENBERG: December the 20th,
15	the 21st, December the 18th and 19th, and then December
16	the 16th and 17th.
17	29003 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: December the
18	16th and 17th, yes.
19	MR. ROITENBERG: We have heard
20	evidence that on December 17th or December 18th,
21	according to Mr. Schreiber, \$100,000 was paid to Mr.
22	Mulroney in a hotel room in Montreal. On December
23	17th, at approximately 11 a.m., in Mr. Schreiber's
24	diary, is the notation, "Telephone Elmer".
25	29005 Do you see that, sir?

1	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, I do.
2	29007 MR. ROITENBERG: Did Mr. Schreiber
3	advise you that he was going to be seeing Mr. Mulrone
4	that day and providing him with funds in relation to
5	the Bear Head Project, or funds for any reason?
6	29008 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: No.
7	29009 MR. ROITENBERG: If you could keep
8	going backwards in this diary, about six pages from
9	where you are five pages, excuse me
10	29010 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Monday the
11	29th?
12	MR. ROITENBERG: One more page, sir.
13	29012 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Friday the
14	27th
15	29013 MR. ROITENBERG: Friday the 27th of
16	August.
17	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
18	29015 MR. ROITENBERG: We have heard
19	evidence that on this date Mr. Schreiber met with Mr.
20	Mulroney at a hotel near Mirabel and provided him with
21	\$100,000.
22	29016 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
23	29017 MR. ROITENBERG: You will see in the
24	diary that there is the notation, "Telephone Fred.
25	Telephone Brian. Telephone Elmer. Telephone Fred."

1	29018	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
2	29019	MR. ROITENBERG: We have heard of
3	Fred and Brian's	s involvement, but the telephone call to
4	Elmer is what I	wish to ask you about, sir.
5	29020	In this telephone call that Mr.
6	Schreiber may ha	ave made to you on August the 27th of
7	1993, did he ad	vise you that he was going to be meeting
8	with Mr. Mulron	ey later that day and providing him with
9	cash?	
LO	29021	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Not that I
11	remember. Not	at all.
12	29022	MR. ROITENBERG: Did he advise you
13	that he was going	ng to be meeting with Mr. Mulroney in
L4	furtherance of	the Bear Head Project?
15	29023	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: No.
16	29024	MR. ROITENBERG: Do you recall, sir,
17	meeting with Ms	Brooks and Mr. Battista in Halifax
18	toward the end	of 2008?
19	29025	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I do.
20	29026	MR. ROITENBERG: Do you recall
21	advising them a	t that time that you would have expected
22	either Mr. Schr	eiber or Mr. Mulroney to have said
23	something to you	a at that luncheon in New York about the
24	topic of their	meeting that they had just had?
25	29027	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I don't

1	recall making that	remark; I may have.
2	29028 MI	R. ROITENBERG: If you had made that
3	remark, would it ha	ve been true?
4	29029 Ti	HE HON. ELMER MacKAY: No.
5	29030 I,	first of all, didn't expect to see
6	anyone there but Mr	. Schreiber and his wife Baerbel.
7	There was no conver	sation that I can remember involving
8	the meeting that al	legedly took place in that hotel.
9	29031 MI	R. ROITENBERG: We have you at the
10	hotel on December t	he 8th, 1994. We have Mr. Schreiber
11	phoning you on Dece	mber 17th, 1993 and August 27th,
12	1993, all dates tha	t payments were made, allegedly, by
13	Mr. Schreiber to Mr	. Mulroney.
14	29032 I	am going to ask you to keep going
15	back in the diary,	sir, to the 12th of July 1993.
16	29033 TI	HE HON. ELMER MacKAY: This is
17	partly blurred.	
18	29034 It	c's a Monday, is it?
19	29035 MI	R. ROITENBERG: Yes, sir.
20	29036 TI	HE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
21	29037 MI	R. ROITENBERG: Do you see on the
22	right-hand side tha	t it says "Elmer" at the third
23	notation from the t	op?
24	29038 TI	HE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
25	29039 MI	R. ROITENBERG: It says, "ELMER DO.

1	berchen," which is German for books. "Elmer do books."
2	29040 Do you have any recollection of
3	speaking with Mr. Schreiber on that day, or having any
4	conversations with him on that day?
5	29041 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: None
6	whatsoever.
7	MR. ROITENBERG: We are going to hear
8	evidence later this week that on July the 12th a
9	request or a direction was made by Mr. Schreiber of a
10	bank in Switzerland that \$500,000 be transferred from
11	the Frankfurt account to the Britan account.
12	No contact with Mr. Schreiber on that
13	day?
14	29044 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: No.
15	29045 MR. ROITENBERG: If you will turn
16	back, sir, to July the 5th, which is just one page
17	back
18	29046 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Just a
19	moment, I want to get this clear.
20	29047 Mr. MacKay said, at first, that he
21	didn't remember having contact with Mr. Schreiber that
22	day, and then you followed up by saying, "No contact
23	with Mr. Schreiber that day," and he said, "No."
24	29048 Mr. MacKay, I just want this for
25	clarification. Are you saying that no contact

1	occurred, sir, o	r that, if it did, you don't remember
2	it?	
3	29049	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Mr.
4	Commissioner, I	received, as I think these excerpts
5	from Mr. Schreib	er's daytimer will show, a lot of
6	telephone calls,	and I do not remember the specifics of
7	any of the conve	rsations, except I do know that there
8	was nothing in t	here about business or money or
9	anything like th	at.
10	29050	COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: OK, thank
11	you.	
12	29051	MR. ROITENBERG: Thank you, sir.
13	29052	I neglected on July the 12th there
14	is another notat	ion with your name, "MacKay - Thyssen -
15	Massmann", at ab	out 3 p.m 1500 hours.
16	29053	But I take it your answer is the
17	same, that you d	on't recall any communication from Mr.
18	Schreiber that d	ay?
19	29054	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: No. I looked
20	at	
21	29055	I might say, if I may, that I looked
22	at these daytime	extracts I looked at them, and I
23	can't make any s	ense out of them in terms of any
24	specific informa	tion or any of the conversations.
25	29056	MR ROITENRERG. That's fair sir

1	but I have one mor	e question for you.
2	29057	If you could go back a page to July
3	the 5th	
4	29058	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: July the 5th.
5	29059 N	MR. ROITENBERG: Yes.
6	29060	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: This is 1993?
7	29061 N	MR. ROITENBERG: 1993, yes.
8	29062 V	We will hear evidence later this week
9	that this is a day	where Mr. Schreiber contacts his
10	banker in Switzerl	and and asks that a bank account with
11	the rubric "Britan	" be created
12	29063	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Excuse me,
13	Mr. Roitenberg. I	am sorry to be so fumbling here, but
14	this is	
15	29064	Is this July the 5th?
16	29065 N	MR. ROITENBERG: July the 5th, one
17	page back from whe	re you were at July the 12th.
18	29066	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Monday, July
19	the 5th.	
20	29067 N	MR. ROITENBERG: Yes, sir.
21	29068	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes?
22	29069 N	MR. ROITENBERG: At 1300 hours, or 1
23	p.m., on the date	where Mr. Schreiber asks his banker
24	to create the bank	account rubric "Britan"
25	"Telephone Elmer".	

1	29070	Do you recall receiving a phone call
2	from Mr. Schreibe	r on that day?
3	29071	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: No, I do not,
4	but Mr. Schreiber	keeps meticulous notes, obviously,
5	and if he says th	at he phoned me, I am not going to say
6	that he didn't.	But I don't remember getting the call.
7	29072	MR. ROITENBERG: Very well, sir.
8	29073	I am not certain if others have
9	questions of you,	but those are mine. I thank you for
10	your time, sir.	
11	29074	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Thank you,
12	sir.	
13	29075	COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Thank you,
14	Mr. Roitenberg.	
15	29076	Mr. Hughes
16	29077	MR. HUGHES: Thank you, Commissioner,
17	we have no questi	ons.
18	29078	COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: No questions.
19	29079	Mr. Vickery
20	29080	MR. VICKERY: No questions, thank
21	you.	
22	29081	COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Mr.
23	Houston	
24	29082	MR. HOUSTON: No questions, thank
25	you, sir.	

1	29083 C	OMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Mr. Auger
2	29084 M	R. AUGER: Very briefly,
3	Commissioner, pleas	ee.
4	29085 C	OMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Mr. MacKay,
5	Mr. Auger represent	s Mr. Schreiber.
6	EXAMINATION: THE F	ION. ELMER MacKAY BY MR. AUGER /
7	INTERROGATOIRE: L'	HON. ELMER MacKAY PAR Me AUGER
8	29086 M	R. AUGER: Good afternoon, sir. I
9	just have a couple	of brief areas, with your
10	permission.	
11	29087 T	HE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Good
12	afternoon.	
13	29088 M	R. AUGER: The first is, you had
14	told Mr. Roitenberg	that Mr. Schreiber, although it has
15	been suggested that	he stood to profit from the Bear
16	Head Project in	your evidence, I think you were
17	about to list other	reasons for Mr. Schreiber's
18	passion, and I just	wanted to give you an opportunity
19	to do that.	
20	29089 A	re you able to tell the
21	Commissioner, aside	e from Mr. Schreiber's alleged profit
22	in the project, any	thing about other aspects of Mr.
23	Schreiber's interes	t?
24	29090 T	HE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Mr. Auger, I
25	had a chance to hav	re many conversations with Mr.

1	Schreiber, and wh	nen it came to economic projects and
2	military matters,	I would say that he was a bit of an
3	idealist. He war	nted very badly to see Canadian
4	soldiers with top	o-flight equipment. He wanted to see
5	Thyssen make an e	entré into Canada for a multiplicity of
6	purposes.	
7	29091	I got the impression from Mr.
8	Schreiber that, i	n terms of this project, and in terms
9	of his involvemen	nt with Canada, it was more than money.
10	29092	I may not be articulating this very
11	well, but it was	almost a commitment that he felt he
12	wanted to do for	Canada, and he took it very badly when
13	it appeared that	he wasn't going to be able to achieve
14	anything in this	regard.
15	29093	MR. AUGER: You don't have to turn it
16	up, but at Tab 44	, Mr. Roitenberg had taken you to a
17	letter addressed	to Minister of Defence Marcel Masse,
18	at the time, and	there was reference there to meetings
19	with Army general	.s.
20	29094	Go ahead, take your time, sir. It's
21	at Tab 44, just t	to give you the context
22	29095	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: "Four of your
23	senior Army gener	cals"?
24	29096	MR. AUGER: Correct.
25	29097	I just wanted to see if I could

1	refresh your	memory about whether or not you and/or Mr.
2	Schreiber had	participated in meetings with Army
3	generals about	t the status of the equipment at this
4	time.	
5	29098	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Mr. Schreiber
6	had a couple of	of Army generals Canadian Army
7	generals w	nom he consulted, and it is possible that
8	I may have be	en privy to a couple of conversations he
9	had with them	
LO	29099	I don't know whether I should mention
11	their names,	in case I am miscalling them, but the
12	answer to you:	r question is, yes, I believe I had at
13	least one con	versation with a Canadian Army general.
14	29100	MR. AUGER: Does the name Army
15	General Jim Fo	ox, by any chance, refresh your memory?
16	29101	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes.
17	29102	MR. AUGER: Does the name Army
18	General Gordon	n Reay refresh your memory?
19	29103	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: I have spoken
20	with General 1	Reay.
21	29104	MR. AUGER: And again, this is
22	specifically o	on the status of the appropriateness of
23	the equipment	at the time?
24	29105	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: That's my
25	knowledge	thatle to my knowledge. That would be the

1		only subject, yes.
2	29106	MR. AUGER: And a final name to try
3		to refresh your memory, General Jack Vance. Does that
4		assist?
5	2910	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, that is
6		another name with which I am familiar, by association
7		anyway.
8	29108	MR. AUGER: You also touched on your
9		evidence about this issue of the lack of a business
L 0		plan and I just want to ask you briefly. Did
11		Mr. Schreiber at any point indicate that a business
12		plan was unlikely until a startup order was achieved?
13	29109	Does that refresh your memory at all?
14	29110	THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Well, if I
15		could make this comment, Mr. Schreiber, as you may
16		know, is a pretty straightforward and impatient man and $% \left(x\right) =\left(x\right) $
17		I seem to recall he felt that there needed to be some
18		action; that it was a fairly straightforward project
19		and if there was some movement or whatever, a business
20		plan look, I'm getting myself in difficulty here
21		because I don't remember all of the conversations.
22	29111	But I do remember we talked about a
23		business plan.
24	29112	MR. AUGER: Fair enough. Thank you,
25		sir. Those are my questions.

1	29113 Thank you, Commissioner.
2	29114 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Mr. MacKay,
3	did you want to finish that answer? Were you finished
4	when you said we talked about a business plan? Was
5	that the extent of your answer, sir?
6	29115 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Yes, that is
7	the extent of my answer.
8	29116 I think that I raised the issue we
9	need a business plan, or the bureaucrats need a
10	business plan or we should have a business plan. But I
11	don't remember any details following that.
12	29117 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: All right,
13	thank you.
14	29118 MR. AUGER: Thank you, Commissioner.
15	29119 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Thank you,
16	Mr. Auger.
17	29120 Mr. Wolson, I take it that your
18	standing means there is no redirect examination?
19	29121 MR. WOLSON: No.
20	29122 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: No, what?
21	29123 MR. WOLSON: No, there is no
22	re-examination, Mr. Commissioner.
23	29124 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: All right.
24	Thank you.
25	29125 Is there any reason why, then, we

1	can't excuse Mr. MacKay at this time?
2	29126 MR. WOLSON: No.
3	29127 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Mr. MacKay, I
4	would like to, on behalf of the Commission, thank you
5	for your evidence, sir, and wish you well with your
6	health.
7	29128 Thank you very much. You are
8	excused, sir.
9	29129 THE HON. ELMER MacKAY: Thank you
10	very much, Commissioner.
11	29130 MR. WOLSON: We have no other
12	witnesses set for today. It is 4:15.
13	There are two witnesses for tomorrow.
14	29132 Navigant will be testifying Wednesday
15	and Mr. Schreiber on Thursday.
16	29133 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: All right. I
17	take it that that concludes the business for today
18	then?
19	29134 MR. WOLSON: Yes.
20	29135 I might tell you that I have now
21	talked with all counsel, at least on the issue of when
22	Mr. Mulroney testifies next week, Tuesday, that he
23	would go from Tuesday to Friday if necessary as opposed
24	to Tuesday until Thursday and then have him come back
25	after the long weekend.

1	I had raised that with all counsel.
2	All counsel are in agreement on that score.
3	29137 I am waiting still to hear from Mr.
4	Auger as to his position on the request of
5	Mr. Mulroney's counsel, Mr. Pratte, that Mr. Pratte,
6	under our rules, be allowed to question his client
7	first by way of an examination in-chief and I don't
8	know whether
9	29138 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Mr. Auger, i
LO	you are not in a position now to state your position,
11	that's fine, but could you indicate to me perhaps when
12	you might be ready to indicate your position on that
13	request?
14	29139 I just reiterate that if all counsel
15	do not agree to the proposal, we will have to have a
16	hearing where the issue is argued.
17	29140 MR. AUGER: Certainly. And I have
18	indicated to Mr. Wolson that I have one last inquiry t
19	consult with Mr. Greenspan on. Mr. Greenspan was in
20	court today. I did speak to Mr. Pratte and Mr. Wolson
21	We have had a fruitful discussion and I hope to report
22	to Mr. Wolson within the hour on the final decision.
23	29141 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: I see. So
24	that tomorrow morning we should know one way or the
25	other?

1	MR. AUGER: Before tomorrow morning.
2	29143 MR.WOLSON: Just to understand the
3	issue, because it would be slightly different than we
4	have done before with other witnesses, there is a
5	provision in the rules of this inquiry that enable a
6	party representing a party to the inquiry
7	29144 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: It's Rule 36
8	in fact.
9	29145 MR. WOLSON: Yes. Representing a
10	client, may apply to the Commissioner to direct his own
11	witness.
12	29146 So Mr. Pratte would like to therefore
13	direct Mr. Mulroney in an examination in-chief with the
14	rules as it apply to examination in-chief, and we are
15	waiting to get information from all counsel.
16	29147 We have heard from others that they
17	would not be opposed and just for purposes of
18	clarification, then, I accept Mr. Auger's comments
19	29148 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Sure.
20	29149 MR. WOLSON: and we will hear from
21	him in due course today. I will then be in a position
22	to communicate to my friend Mr. Pratte, and we can, if
23	necessary, come back before you and arrange a date for
24	submissions.
25	29150 We don't have a lot of time, but we

1	are working towards resolving the issue.	
2	29151 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: All right.	
3	29152 Just for the record I should perhap	
4	state that Mr. Pratte, in informing the Commission of	
5	his desire to get permission to examine under Rule 36	
6	did so in a timely way.	
7	29153 I received a letter from Mr. Pratte	
8	on the 28th of April, and I appreciate the timeliness	
9	of the request. I might just say that when I received	
10	the letter, I asked Mr. Wolson to explore with all	
11	counsel the possibility of a consensual resolution of	
12	your request so that we could avoid having a hearing.	
13	29154 MR. PRATTE: Thank you,	
14	Mr. Commissioner.	
15	29155 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Fine.	
16	29156 All right, then. We will adjourn now	
17	until 9:30 tomorrow morning.	
18	29157 MR. WOLSON: Good afternoon.	
19	29158 COMMISSIONER OLIPHANT: Good	
20	afternoon.	
21	Whereupon the hearing adjourned at $4:20 p.m.$,	
22	to resume on Tuesday, May 5, 2009 at 9:30 a.m. /	
23	L'audience est ajournée à 16 h 20, pour reprendre	
24	le mardi 5 mai 2009 à 09 h 30	
25		

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	We hereby certify that we have accurately
20	transcribed the foregoing to the best of
21	our skills and abilities.
22	
23	Nous certifions que ce qui précède est une
24	transcription exacte et précise au meilleur
25	de nos connaissances et de nos compétences.

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	Lynda Johansson	Jean Desaulniers
7		
8		
9		
10		
11	Fiona Potvin	Sue Villeneuve
12		
13		
14		
15		
16	Monique Mahoney	Madeleine Matte