

Date: Wed, 08 Aug 2007 13:37:49 -0700  
From: "Heaslet" <heaslet@heaslet.com> [View Contact Details](#)  
To: "Bill McKenzie" <lawyerbill@rogers.com>  
Subject: PS conversation 080807

Bill,

Given the nature of my conversation with Peter Simmons today that I believe might directly affect your personal safety in Barbados, here are my personal notes of a conversation I had with him within the past 2 hours:

-----  
Conversation between Stuart Heaslet and Peter Simmons, Wednesday 8 August 2007.

Peter Simmons called me, left a message this morning, and I called him back at about noon, Pacific Time:

1.

Simmons wanted me to know that there were "bizarre developments" in Barbados in the last few days, and that the mood in government and of those affected by the Kingsland lawsuit has been degrading rapidly. Simmons referred a couple of times to a "conspiracy theory" that is increasing in momentum in Barbados and that there is increasing speculation that the negative stories about the Chief Justice and others in government in the Barbados Free Press have been cooperatively orchestrated by Peter Allard and Bill McKenzie. Simmons said that there were "a lot of angry people" in this country (Barbados) who feel that there is "no distance" between McKenzie and Allard, and that Allard and McKenzie are working together to extract money from Barbados, and that in regard to government and those not necessarily associated with the lawsuit, there has been "a complete breakdown in trust" associated with Allard.

2.

Simmons said that he believed the mood in the country was so bad that "McKenzie has to be very careful when he walks the streets of this country." On two occasions he mentioned this, and I interpreted this as his way of letting me know that he believed there could be a threat to McKenzie's physical well-being in Barbados.

3.

I asked Simmons if I should be concerned (about my physical safety) too when I came to Barbados, and he said no, "you're okay."

4.

Simmons maintained that the allegations in the affidavit(s) by John Knox are "patently untrue" and that "the lawyers" have said that the affidavit(s) by John Knox will "cost him his job at the University (University of the West Indies)". On another occasion in reference to John Knox, Simmons said that "something is going to happen." at the University of the West Indies, referring to Knox's position at the University as being a (possibly negative) influence on young people.

5.

Simmons also said he heard a story that "a man" was offered money to tell a false story about SBG and the Deane family. He did not offer specifics, except to mention that he heard it recently in a lawyer's office.

6.

Simmons acknowledged the next court date was August 10, 2007, but did not offer specifics.

7.

According to Simmons, the National Park issue has been "killed off" "for selfish reasons" by those affected by the lawsuit, and that since more and more people are being affected by the lawsuit there will not be any politicians stepping forward to counter the upcoming Graeme Hall land use rezoning within the proposed 2003 (Amended) National Physical Development Plan. I asked why the government would shoot themselves in the foot by denying themselves a national park that has really nothing to do with the lawsuit, and Simmons said that the anti-Allard feeling is running strong and overwhelming any logical argument. Simmons and I discussed the effects of the lawsuit on the national park agenda, and he reiterated that since he was personally being sued that he could not continue as leader of the Friends of Graeme Hall.

8.

I told Simmons that I was concerned on two levels. One was that I believed the national park agenda will be remembered long after any disagreements or litigation are resolved, and that combining the two issues is not in the best long-term interest of the

nation. Secondly, I was concerned for Simmons on a personal level, that the lawsuit is having a chilling effect on his ability to be self-expressed, be a leader for the national park, and on his finances. I told him I felt helpless about all of these things.

He was appreciative of my concern. We discussed the fact that my own ability to help the national park agenda has been nullified, and that there currently is no point in spending much time in support of a government-led initiative for the new Park. I reiterated that

I wished people would see that by killing off their own national park it does nothing to resolve the Kingsland issue, in fact it seems like "shooting yourself." Simmons acknowledged the anomaly, but said that emotions were running high, and it was about survival. I also said that I had considered "resigning" but that

I decided that would have absolutely no effect on the outcome of the national park agenda, and that the Sanctuary still needed oversight services. I said that I knew I had been a "messenger" for both sides before, that I didn't care how that was perceived, and that if there was anything I could do to help a resolution,

to please let me know. I reminded Simmons again that long after the dispute is resolved, the national park, or lack of one, will be what people remember. Simmons was sympathetic to the comment.

9.

Simmons and I agreed to keep this "back door" communication open and inform each other of developments.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Stuart Heaslet

Date: Tue, 14 Aug 2007 17:24:14 -0700  
From: "Heaslet" <heaslet@heaslet.com> [View Contact Details](#)  
To: "Peter Allard" <pallard1495@yahoo.com>, "Bill McKenzie"  
<lawyerbill@rogers.com>  
Subject: Peter Simmons call

I got another call from Peter Simmons today, but I think I messed up on the recording. Until I fix it, the gist was:

1. He met with defendants today, who criticized PS comments on talk radio yesterday and today which supported the idea of a sluice gate for Sandy Beach. PS said that these defendants said that it appears PS is supportive of Allard and the Sanctuary, and were very upset by that.
2. PS seemed overwhelmed. He mentioned he had recently seen the legal filing claiming "one billion Barbados dollars" and said that he was told a reporter had been given the names and details of the suit, and that it would soon be public. PS said that he feels he is between a rock and a hard place, wanting to say and do what is right for the Graeme Hall area, but is being pressured to withdraw from FOGH and become silent.
3. He said he appreciated me being straight with him.
4. He said that at first he characterized the lawsuit as 'vexatious' and 'frivolous' but he no longer has that opinion, saying that it is now very serious.

I'll do what I can to see if I can salvage the .wav file, and won't let this happen again.

Stuart

## Sunny Ware

---

**From:** Heaslet [heaslet@heaslet.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 08, 2007 4:38 PM  
**To:** KWM EXTERNAL - Rogers  
**Subject:** PS conversation 080807

Bill,

Given the nature of my conversation with Peter Simmons today that I believe might directly affect your personal safety in Barbados, here are my personal notes of a conversation I had with him within the past 2 hours:

-----  
Conversation between Stuart Heaslet and Peter Simmons, Wednesday 8 August 2007.

Peter Simmons called me, left a message this morning, and I called him back at about noon, Pacific Time:

1.

Simmons wanted me to know that there were "bizarre developments" in Barbados in the last few days, and that the mood in government and of those affected by the Kingsland lawsuit has been degrading rapidly. Simmons referred a couple of times to a "conspiracy theory" that is increasing in momentum in Barbados and that there is increasing speculation that the negative stories about the Chief Justice and others in government in the Barbados Free Press have been cooperatively orchestrated by Peter Allard and Bill McKenzie. Simmons said that there were "a lot of angry people" in this country (Barbados) who feel that there is "no distance" between McKenzie and Allard, and that Allard and McKenzie are working together to extract money from Barbados, and that in regard to government and those not necessarily associated with the lawsuit, there has been "a complete breakdown in trust" associated with Allard.

2.

Simmons said that he believed the mood in the country was so bad that "McKenzie has to be very careful when he walks the streets of this country." On two occasions he mentioned this, and I interpreted this as his way of letting me know that he believed there could be a threat to McKenzie's physical well-being in Barbados.

3.

I asked Simmons if I should be concerned (about my physical safety) too when I came to Barbados, and he said no, "you're okay."

4.

Simmons maintained that the allegations in the affidavit(s) by John Knox are "patently untrue" and that "the lawyers" have said that the affidavit(s) by John Knox will "cost him his job at the University (University of the West Indies)". On another occasion in reference to John Knox, Simmons said that "something is going to happen." at the University of the West Indies, referring to Knox's position at the University as being a (possibly negative) influence on young people.

5.

Simmons also said he heard a story that "a man" was offered money to tell a false story about SBG and the Deane family. He did not offer specifics, except to mention that he heard it recently in a lawyer's office.

6.

Simmons acknowledged the next court date was August 10, 2007, but did not offer specifics.

7.

According to Simmons, the National Park issue has been "killed off" "for selfish reasons" by those affected by the lawsuit, and that since more and more people are being affected by the lawsuit

there will not be any politicians stepping forward to counter the upcoming Graeme Hall land use rezoning within the proposed 2003 (Amended) National Physical Development Plan. I asked why the government would shoot themselves in the foot by denying themselves a national park that has really nothing to do with the lawsuit, and Simmons said that the anti-Allard feeling is running strong and overwhelming any logical argument. Simmons and I discussed the effects of the lawsuit on the national park agenda, and he reiterated that since he was personally being sued that he could not continue as leader of the Friends of Graeme Hall.

8.

I told Simmons that I was concerned on two levels. One was that I believed the national park agenda will be remembered long after any disagreements or litigation are resolved, and that combining the two issues is not in the best long-term interest of the nation. Secondly, I was concerned for Simmons on a personal level, that the lawsuit is having a chilling effect on his ability to be self-expressed, be a leader for the national park, and on his finances. I told him I felt helpless about all of these things. He was appreciative of my concern. We discussed the fact that my own ability to help the national park agenda has been nullified, and that there currently is no point in spending much time in support of a government-led initiative for the new Park. I reiterated that I wished people would see that by killing off their own national park it does nothing to resolve the Kingsland issue, in fact it seems like "shooting yourself." Simmons acknowledged the anomaly, but said that emotions were running high, and it was about survival. I also said that I had considered "resigning" but that I decided that would have absolutely no effect on the outcome of the national park agenda, and that the Sanctuary still needed oversight services. I said that I knew I had been a "messenger" for both sides before, that I didn't care how that was perceived, and that if there was anything I could do to help a resolution, to please let me know. I reminded Simmons again that long after the dispute is resolved, the national park, or lack of one, will be what people remember. Simmons was sympathetic to the comment.

9.

Simmons and I agreed to keep this "back door" communication open and inform each other of developments.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Stuart Heaslet



## Sunny Ware

---

**From:** Peterco Holdings [peterco@shawbiz.ca]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 13, 2007 5:43 PM  
**To:** Stuart Heaslet  
**Cc:** Sunny Ware  
**Subject:** Revised transcription  
**Attachments:** HeasletSimmonsTranscript 081307.doc

Dear Stuart:

Attached is the revised 8/13/07 transcription with the signature line on the last page.

Sincerely,

Barbara Dortch

*Peterco Holdings Ltd.*  
881 Helmcken Street  
Vancouver, BC V6Z 1B1  
Phone: 604-683-2925  
Fax: 604-683-2931  
Email: Peterco@shawbiz.ca

No virus found in this outgoing message.

Checked by AVG Free Edition.

Version: 7.5.476 / Virus Database: 269.11.17/951 - Release Date: 8/13/2007 10:15 AM

8/14/2007

**Transcript of conversation between Peter Simmons & Stuart Heaslet –  
August 13, 2007 between 7:34 a.m. PST and 7:56 a.m. PST**

---

??? = unintelligible

This is Stuart Heaslet, August 13, 2007 at 7:34 a.m. (PST) and I am getting ready to call Peter Simmons in Barbados.

Peter: Hello.

Stuart: Hi Peter, this is Stuart, how are you.

Peter: Not too bad, how are you.

Stuart: I am doing fine – I just got up a while ago. I wanted to call you and just tell you what transpired over the weekend. I had a chance to meet with Peter Allard and I delivered the message to him. I also delivered the message to Bill McKenzie so they have the message and as far as the law suit is concerned I am available to continue to deliver messages – I available for that but I really do need to stay out of the intricacies of the law suit because I'm the park guy and I am the guy that is supposed to be doing the philanthropic work and so forth, so my request at this point is to – I am of course wide open to talking with you and doing what I need to do to facilitate communications but at this point I have to kind of stop it there and not get my personal opinions involved or anything like that – the only thing I will say is that I wish you would all get into a room and just solve this thing because it has put a tremendous agenda at risk meaning the National Park agenda and I'm just sorry to see it happen. It's also affected my involvement in Barbados. I have been directed to focus on the disposition of Seaview estate and to continue with the work at Graeme Hall as necessary to get it sold but to keep operations going for time being. I was also directed to – not directed – we discussed other projects of course the Maji Mazuri project in Africa which I am getting increasingly involved with and also – which may be a matter of interest to you sometime down the road – I am getting involved in some media development projects. The Maji Mazuri media development project is the first one which I am very excited about but that's basically it. I was really uncomfortable with the last conversation and it seems like it sort of took a turn and I just need to focus on what

**Transcript of conversation between Peter Simmons & Stuart Heaslet –  
August 13, 2007 between 7:34 a.m. PST and 7:56 a.m. PST**

---

I do which are parks and arts and cultural development under the philanthropic umbrella and so forth. I just want to relay that to you.

Peter: Yes. I had a quick chat with Andrew Alleyne yesterday. I'm going to be meeting with him and Allan (Marshall) on Thursday just to update them on developments as far as I am concerned, my relationship with FOGH (Friends of Graeme Hall). Andrew is also quite concerned, actually, about the whole turn of events, legal stuff going on. I will meet with them Thursday.

Stuart: It is unfortunate that the National Park appears to be a casualty of this.

Peter: Yeah. And I told them yesterday briefly that there is no goodwill whatsoever at the governmental level for the National Park. All that has evaporated as a result of this legal thing.

Stuart: So they have made them one and the same?

Peter: I didn't hear that Stuart.

Stuart: So they have made the National Park agenda and the lawsuit all one and the same big hairball.

Peter: Yes, everything has been thrown into the same pot. Everything is part of the same thing. Very difficult for anybody to separate out the National Park from what is going with Bill McKenzie.

Stuart: Even if I worked for another foreign NGO that was seeking to bring resources to Barbados it would still be impossible to work on the National Park agenda because of the circumstances. What concerns me again is the almost suicidal attitude that everybody seems to have about the National Park when in fact you and I both know that the National Park really has absolutely nothing to do with - whether or not Allard was involved in the National Park or not, the National Park idea is still a good one in my view and because it is the last place on the South Coast - I mean that's it.

Peter: Yes. While that is generally recognized, people are saying they don't want to see in the short term Peter Allard and Bill McKenzie being beneficiaries of anything which is in Barbados. McKenzie's agenda is so much based on things

**Transcript of conversation between Peter Simmons & Stuart Heaslet –  
August 13, 2007 between 7:34 a.m. PST and 7:56 a.m. PST**

---

like greed and avarice, which are obnoxious to the average Barbadian. If he says that he is going to pursue his agenda to get money out of Barbadians by going to the law courts in Canada then let him do that. Let him see what he gets legally and everything else takes a back seat until that matter is resolved.

Stuart: I am available to you and to Barbados in the future if the situation should change. If any of you want to have Stuart Heaslet involved in the National Park development, I would be happy to come down and help. I don't know if or when that might happen but I'm going to leave it open. I am also available to continue to facilitate any communications that you feel necessary should be done.

Peter: Stuart, my difficulty is I don't know whom we can talk to who can make a difference at this stage as far as the National Park is concerned. Everybody seems up in arms and very, very angry. I think people who will be making decisions are not going to be prepared to talk with (sic) anything even the National Park at this stage. I really now feel that, you know, we've been shot in the foot.

Stuart: Well, you already know my feeling about it. I think there is a distinction between the National Park and everything else, at least on paper there should be, but clearly emotions and everything are dictating otherwise, and that's truly unfortunate.

Peter: Yeah, yeah.

Stuart: But as I said I am available – I'm going to continue to come to Barbados not as frequently because I don't need to but I will be working with Harry on the Sanctuary issue and I will be working to help dispose of the Seaview property as well as some other nuts and bolts issues. My guess is that I will probably be down there sometime around the first week or so of September. I have a doctors (well actually two of them) – the last one is on the 4<sup>th</sup> of September, so I kind of want to meet that one and then maybe right after that I will go down and we will go from there.

Peter: Yeah. I'm going to speak to Harry. I spoke to him briefly yesterday from the beach because I was on the beach yesterday and nobody could go into the sea because of the water coming out of the Graeme Hall Swamp and running into the water, in fact was a picture of an ??? I called Harry (Roberts) from the beach to say, you know, people were pointing their fingers at the Sanctuary, and he made

**Transcript of conversation between Peter Simmons & Stuart Heaslet –  
August 13, 2007 between 7:34 a.m. PST and 7:56 a.m. PST**

---

the point to the other people who spoke to him (Harry) that the Sanctuary wasn't responsible for that. Somebody opened the sluice gate and left the door open. Nobody could enjoy that. I was there from 10 o'clock until 1 o'clock and nobody could go in the water. All sorts of things were being said on the beach. People were really, really, really angry so, I just needed to tell Harry that he needs to make a point to the press that the Sanctuary is not responsible for that.

Stuart: Well you know it's the lake that is the confluence of that entire 1158 acre water shed and water levels had to be reduced and our original offer to assist with the technical design and installation of a control mechanism so that releases could occur perhaps from 8 at night to say 4 in the morning or 3 in the morning could occur electronically and then that way the beaches would be clear by the following morning but we again it is just another example of getting no response to....(our offer).

Peter: Yeah, I told some of the people who came out and were very vocal at the beach that I know an offer had been made to get an automated sluice gate but it (the offer) hadn't been taken up on (by Government). All of us suffered yesterday by not being able to get our regular weekly sea bath on the beach. There is a fairly long article today captioned "Dirty Runoff Soils Sandy Beach ???...." and a picture of all sorts of things in the water.

Stuart: The developers would have an answer for that. Let us paved it over and we'll put in a retention pond and everybody will be happy. Another answer would be let's put in a half mile / one-third mile outfall from that (the sluice gate location).

Peter: Yeah, that was one of the suggestions that somebody made in the paper that there should be an out pipe running far past the reef and dumping everything out there rather than having it there in the lagoon where people swim.

Stuart: You know that is possible.

Peter: It was very smelly – it's the first time I ever picked up that type of smell.

Stuart: Was it like rotten eggs or...?

**Transcript of conversation between Peter Simmons & Stuart Heaslet –  
August 13, 2007 between 7:34 a.m. PST and 7:56 a.m. PST**

---

Peter: Yeah, it was really awful and, you know, I had some friends that were here who were staying at Coral Sands, and they were lamenting the fact that they were trying to get into the water the water from 7 o'clock in the morning and just couldn't get in, then they had to leave and go to Miami Beach (near Oistins) to get a swim. But I think that in terms of maintaining the good name of the Sanctuary I (would) like Harry to say something and make it clear that the Sanctuary was not responsible for that because I know people picked up the phone and called Harry yesterday.

Stuart: Well, Harry is between a rock and a hard place because when he calls up (the Ministry of) Public Works and he asks to have the water level reduced, or lowered rather, and he will get an answer like "okay we will do it, but we will do it during regular business hours" so it is a response but it's a rather unfeeling response as to what's really needed. I mean the answer ultimately is a re-engineering of the sheet flow that comes off of the swamp into the lake and putting in a series of detention and retention berms so that water is delayed as it flows downhill from the ABC highway and other areas. And if you can slow the water down, coming down the hill, and keep it in one place, it will percolate more which means it will reduce the total discharge off the beach. That's segment # 1. Segment #2 is during times of catastrophic releases where in both releases when water has gotten really high, even in spite of those detention facilities or detention infrastructure, having a gate that then can be controlled so that controlled releases can occur at night. But again it has to be – it can be electronic, it can be connected by computer and programmed to (Ministry of) Public Works, but (what) a lot of people don't know and we have made it a point not to publicize, is that under the terms of our land purchase at Graeme Hall, we have an easement to control that (discharge) water, but we have never opted to take that because we feel that release of (discharge) water is a public issue and it should be controlled by government which represents the people. That it should not be controlled in any way by a private company because it would be placing at risk – having a private company making a public issue decision, number one, but it would also be affecting public health and that would be a liability issue so we have never, while we have the right, we don't have the authority to do it when you look at it from a public point of view. So that is why we have always tried to go to government and say "here's our offer, we know you need help, let us know what you want to do and where you want the control points and what do you think is best." And the response we have gotten over the years has been to send low-level employees to engineer solutions, which are not, in my mind, not sufficient. So, my concern is that this takes a civil

**Transcript of conversation between Peter Simmons & Stuart Heaslet –  
August 13, 2007 between 7:34 a.m. PST and 7:56 a.m. PST**

---

engineering study, which should be comprehensive, and it should incorporate the entire watershed. Although the bulk of the study would be occurring in the – I guess – the Ramsar Site.

Peter: Yeah, well we will see what this brings forth, Stuart.

Stuart: Yeah, I guess we will.

Peter: I will speak to these guys (Alleyne and Marshall) on Thursday, update them on developments. I was really quite disappointed to hear that the lawsuit was still going ahead. He (Alleyne) appreciates that that will undermine what we're trying to do in terms of the National Park. He (Alleyne) was speaking about calling Peter Allard but I said that I don't know what difference that would make and he (Alleyne) said the last time he spoke to him (Allard) he explained to him that having the lawsuit going was not helping our cause. I told him that that may now be out of Allard's hands, and it's Bill McKenzie....???, but we'll ?????....

Stuart: I just hope that some day that calm heads will prevail and the National Park and everything else will be seen as separate and distinct issues.

Peter: Yeah, I had hoped that that would be the case, but that's not the way it is shaping up at all, which is very unfortunate for?? But that's the real???

Stuart: I am available – you know my personal feelings on this.

Peter: I know.

Stuart: I'm 54 years old. I am going to be starting some other long term projects which necessarily will affect my time if I were to get a call say five years from now or four years from now or whatever assuming that I am still kicking and if – there's always that – and if you and Barbados wants me to come and assist with putting together a great park then I am certainly available. I can't let it go – you know that I have 10 years in the Sanctuary already so it's very difficult for me to let this go. It's kind of like a baby to me so and I think I have probably put in more time than anybody else combined, even Harry, I mean Harry has been there what three plus years now but it took a lot more years than that to develop it to where it is now so in any case I will let you know when I am down there and maybe we can see what happens.

**Transcript of conversation between Peter Simmons & Stuart Heaslet –  
August 13, 2007 between 7:34 a.m. PST and 7:56 a.m. PST**

---

Peter: If there are any significant developments I will give you a call.

Stuart: Yeah, just stay in touch.

Peter: Good. Okay, and thanks for calling.

That concludes my conversation with Peter Simmons – August 13, 2007 at 7:56  
a.m. (PST)

Signed,

---

Stuart Heaslet

---

Date



## Sunny Ware

---

**From:** Peterco Holdings [peterco@shawbiz.ca]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 13, 2007 5:26 PM  
**To:** Stuart Heaslet; Sunny Ware; Peter Allard(yahoo) (Peter Allard(yahoo))  
**Subject:** Conversation - Heaslet/Simmons - 8/13/07  
**Attachments:** HeasletSimmonsTranscript 081307.doc

Attached please find the above captioned document.

Sincerely,

Barbara Dortch

*Peterco Holdings Ltd.*  
881 Helmcken Street  
Vancouver, BC V6Z 1B1  
Phone: 604-683-2925  
Fax: 604-683-2931  
Email: Peterco@shawbiz.ca

No virus found in this outgoing message.

Checked by AVG Free Edition.

Version: 7.5.476 / Virus Database: 269.11.17/951 - Release Date: 8/13/2007 10:15 AM

8/14/2007

**Transcript of conversation between Peter Simmons & Stuart Heaslet –  
August 13, 2007 between 7:34 a.m. PST and 7:56 a.m. PST**

---

??? = unintelligible

This is Stuart Heaslet, August 13, 2007 at 7:34 a.m. (PST) and I am getting ready to call Peter Simmons in Barbados.

Peter: Hello.

Stuart: Hi Peter, this is Stuart, how are you.

Peter: Not too bad, how are you.

Stuart: I am doing fine – I just got up a while ago. I wanted to call you and just tell you what transpired over the weekend. I had a chance to meet with Peter Allard and I delivered the message to him. I also delivered the message to Bill McKenzie so they have the message and as far as the law suit is concerned I am available to continue to deliver messages – I available for that but I really do need to stay out of the intricacies of the law suit because I'm the park guy and I am the guy that is supposed to be doing the philanthropic work and so forth, so my request at this point is to – I am of course wide open to talking with you and doing what I need to do to facilitate communications but at this point I have to kind of stop it there and not get my personal opinions involved or anything like that – the only thing I will say is that I wish you would all get into a room and just solve this thing because it has put a tremendous agenda at risk meaning the National Park agenda and I'm just sorry to see it happen. It's also affected my involvement in Barbados. I have been directed to focus on the disposition of Seaview estate and to continue with the work at Graeme Hall as necessary to get it sold but to keep operations going for time being. I was also directed to – not directed – we discussed other projects of course the Maji Mazuri project in Africa which I am getting increasingly involved with and also – which may be a matter of interest to you sometime down the road – I am getting involved in some media development projects. The Maji Mazuri media development project is the first one which I am very excited about but that's basically it. I was really uncomfortable with the last conversation and it seems like it sort of took a turn and I just need to focus on what I do which are parks and arts and cultural development under the philanthropic umbrella and so forth. I just want to relay that to you.

Peter: Yes. I had a quick chat with Andrew Alleyne yesterday. I'm going to be meeting with him and Allan (Marshall) on Thursday just to update them on developments as far as I am concerned, my relationship with FOGH (Friends of

**Transcript of conversation between Peter Simmons & Stuart Heaslet –  
August 13, 2007 between 7:34 a.m. PST and 7:56 a.m. PST**

---

Graeme Hall). Andrew is also quite concerned, actually, about the whole turn of events, legal stuff going on. I will meet with them Thursday.

Stuart: It is unfortunate that the National Park appears to be a casualty of this.

Peter: Yeah. And I told them yesterday briefly that there is no goodwill whatsoever at the governmental level for the National Park. All that has evaporated as a result of this legal thing.

Stuart: So they have made them one and the same?

Peter: I didn't hear that Stuart.

Stuart: So they have made the National Park agenda and the lawsuit all one and the same big hairball.

Peter: Yes, everything has been thrown into the same pot. Everything is part of the same thing. Very difficult for anybody to separate out the National Park from what is going with Bill McKenzie.

Stuart: Even if I worked for another foreign NGO that was seeking to bring resources to Barbados it would still be impossible to work on the National Park agenda because of the circumstances. What concerns me again is the almost suicidal attitude that everybody seems to have about the National Park when in fact you and I both know that the National Park really has absolutely nothing to do with - whether or not Allard was involved in the National Park or not, the National Park idea is still a good one in my view and because it is the last place on the South Coast - I mean that's it.

Peter: Yes. While that is generally recognized, people are saying they don't want to see in the short term Peter Allard and Bill McKenzie being beneficiaries of anything which is in Barbados. McKenzie's agenda is so much based on things like greed and avarice, which are obnoxious to the average Barbadian. If he says that he is going to pursue his agenda to get money out of Barbadians by going to the law courts in Canada then let him do that. Let him see what he gets legally and everything else takes a back seat until that matter is resolved.

Stuart: I am available to you and to Barbados in the future if the situation should change. If any of you want to have Stuart Heaslet involved in the National Park

**Transcript of conversation between Peter Simmons & Stuart Heaslet –  
August 13, 2007 between 7:34 a.m. PST and 7:56 a.m. PST**

---

development, I would be happy to come down and help. I don't know if or when that might happen but I'm going to leave it open. I am also available to continue to facilitate any communications that you feel necessary should be done.

Peter: Stuart, my difficulty is I don't know whom we can talk to who can make a difference at this stage as far as the National Park is concerned. Everybody seems up in arms and very, very angry. I think people who will be making decisions are not going to be prepared to talk with (sic) anything even the National Park at this stage. I really now feel that, you know, we've been shot in the foot.

Stuart: Well, you already know my feeling about it. I think there is a distinction between the National Park and everything else, at least on paper there should be, but clearly emotions and everything are dictating otherwise, and that's truly unfortunate.

Peter: Yeah, yeah.

Stuart: But as I said I am available – I'm going to continue to come to Barbados not as frequently because I don't need to but I will be working with Harry on the Sanctuary issue and I will be working to help dispose of the Seaview property as well as some other nuts and bolts issues. My guess is that I will probably be down there sometime around the first week or so of September. I have a doctors (well actually two of them) – the last one is on the 4<sup>th</sup> of September, so I kind of want to meet that one and then maybe right after that I will go down and we will go from there.

Peter: Yeah. I'm going to speak to Harry. I spoke to him briefly yesterday from the beach because I was on the beach yesterday and nobody could go into the sea because of the water coming out of the Graeme Hall Swamp and running into the water, in fact was a picture of an ??? I called Harry (Roberts) from the beach to say, you know, people were pointing their fingers at the Sanctuary, and he made the point to the other people who spoke to him (Harry) that the Sanctuary wasn't responsible for that. Somebody opened the sluice gate and left the door open. Nobody could enjoy that. I was there from 10 o'clock until 1 o'clock and nobody could go in the water. All sorts of things were being said on the beach. People were really, really, really angry so, I just needed to tell Harry that he needs to make a point to the press that the Sanctuary is not responsible for that.

**Transcript of conversation between Peter Simmons & Stuart Heaslet –  
August 13, 2007 between 7:34 a.m. PST and 7:56 a.m. PST**

---

Stuart: Well you know it's the lake that is the confluence of that entire 1158 acre water shed and water levels had to be reduced and our original offer to assist with the technical design and installation of a control mechanism so that releases could occur perhaps from 8 at night to say 4 in the morning or 3 in the morning could occur electronically and then that way the beaches would be clear by the following morning but we again it is just another example of getting no response to....(our offer).

Peter: Yeah, I told some of the people who came out and were very vocal at the beach that I know an offer had been made to get an automated sluice gate but it (the offer) hadn't been taken up on (by Government). All of us suffered yesterday by not being able to get our regular weekly sea bath on the beach. There is a fairly long article today captioned "Dirty Runoff Soils Sandy Beach ???...." and a picture of all sorts of things in the water.

Stuart: The developers would have an answer for that. Let us paved it over and we'll put in a retention pond and everybody will be happy. Another answer would be let's put in a half mile / one-third mile outfall from that (the sluice gate location).

Peter: Yeah, that was one of the suggestions that somebody made in the paper that there should be an out pipe running far past the reef and dumping everything out there rather than having it there in the lagoon where people swim.

Stuart: You know that is possible.

Peter: It was very smelly – it's the first time I ever picked up that type of smell.

Stuart: Was it like rotten eggs or...?

Peter: Yeah, it was really awful and, you know, I had some friends that were here who were staying at Coral Sands, and they were lamenting the fact that they were trying to get into the water the water from 7 o'clock in the morning and just couldn't get in, then they had to leave and go to Miami Beach (near Oistins) to get a swim. But I think that in terms of maintaining the good name of the Sanctuary I (would) like Harry to say something and make it clear that the Sanctuary was not responsible for that because I know people picked up the phone and called Harry yesterday.

**Transcript of conversation between Peter Simmons & Stuart Heaslet –  
August 13, 2007 between 7:34 a.m. PST and 7:56 a.m. PST**

---

Stuart: Well, Harry is between a rock and a hard place because when he calls up (the Ministry of) Public Works and he asks to have the water level reduced, or lowered rather, and he will get an answer like “okay we will do it, but we will do it during regular business hours” so it is a response but it’s a rather unfeeling response as to what’s really needed. I mean the answer ultimately is a re-engineering of the sheet flow that comes off of the swamp into the lake and putting in a series of detention and retention berms so that water is delayed as it flows downhill from the ABC highway and other areas. And if you can slow the water down, coming down the hill, and keep it in one place, it will percolate more which means it will reduce the total discharge off the beach. That’s segment # 1. Segment #2 is during times of catastrophic releases where in both releases when water has gotten really high, even in spite of those detention facilities or detention infrastructure, having a gate that then can be controlled so that controlled releases can occur at night. But again it has to be – it can be electronic, it can be connected by computer and programmed to (Ministry of) Public Works, but (what) a lot of people don’t know and we have made it a point not to publicize, is that under the terms of our land purchase at Graeme Hall, we have an easement to control that (discharge) water, but we have never opted to take that because we feel that release of (discharge) water is a public issue and it should be controlled by government which represents the people. That it should not be controlled in any way by a private company because it would be placing at risk – having a private company making a public issue decision, number one, but it would also be affecting public health and that would be a liability issue so we have never, while we have the right, we don’t have the authority to do it when you look at it from a public point of view. So that is why we have always tried to go to government and say “here’s our offer, we know you need help, let us know what you want to do and where you want the control points and what do you think is best.” And the response we have gotten over the years has been to send low-level employees to engineer solutions, which are not, in my mind, not sufficient. So, my concern is that this takes a civil engineering study, which should be comprehensive, and it should incorporate the entire watershed. Although the bulk of the study would be occurring in the – I guess – the Ramsar Site.

Peter: Yeah, well we will see what this brings forth, Stuart.

Stuart: Yeah, I guess we will.

Peter: I will speak to these guys (Alleyne and Marshall) on Thursday, update them on developments. I was really quite disappointed to hear that the lawsuit was still

**Transcript of conversation between Peter Simmons & Stuart Heaslet –  
August 13, 2007 between 7:34 a.m. PST and 7:56 a.m. PST**

---

going ahead. He (Alleyne) appreciates that that will undermine what we're trying to do in terms of the National Park. He (Alleyne) was speaking about calling Peter Allard but I said that I don't know what difference that would make and he (Alleyne) said the last time he spoke to him (Allard) he explained to him that having the lawsuit going was not helping our cause. I told him that that may now be out of Allard's hands, and it's Bill McKenzie....???, but we'll ????.

Stuart: I just hope that some day that calm heads will prevail and the National Park and everything else will be seen as separate and distinct issues.

Peter: Yeah, I had hoped that that would be the case, but that's not the way it is shaping up at all, which is very unfortunate for?? But that's the real???

Stuart: I am available – you know my personal feelings on this.

Peter: I know.

Stuart: I'm 54 years old. I am going to be starting some other long term projects which necessarily will affect my time if I were to get a call say five years from now or four years from now or whatever assuming that I am still kicking and if – there's always that – and if you and Barbados wants me to come and assist with putting together a great park then I am certainly available. I can't let it go – you know that I have 10 years in the Sanctuary already so it's very difficult for me to let this go. It's kind of like a baby to me so and I think I have probably put in more time than anybody else combined, even Harry, I mean Harry has been there what three plus years now but it took a lot more years than that to develop it to where it is now so in any case I will let you know when I am down there and maybe we can see what happens.

Peter: If there are any significant developments I will give you a call.

Stuart: Yeah, just stay in touch.

Peter: Good. Okay, and thanks for calling.

That concludes my conversation with Peter Simmons – August 13, 2007 at 7:56 a.m. (PST)

TCF KWM

August 13, 2007.

After revelation at partner's meeting yesterday, KWM agrees that we need to evaluate the statements received last week. He's obtained the name and contact info for a gentleman with expertise in security and protection issues through his contacts.

He's e-mailing me the expert's contact info. I'm to call him and confirm meeting tomorrow if possible. – Sheraton at Leslie and Highway 7 on 9<sup>th</sup> floor lounge is best. Bill's contacts may already have set this up for us.

I know nothing about the case or the background so I've asked KWM to provide me with the background to put in a letter.

We need him to confirm whether there is a threat in the message provided for KWM, whether this threat is credible, what risks are inherent in sending KWM or our staff to Barbados to deal with the case.

As always, be very careful to avoid tampering with the expert. Don't tell him what opinion to have, don't tell him what to say – need to be more cautious than usual because there is a potential international incident here in addition to threat to KWM, so we need to handle this very carefully.

TCT Expert: Bill Henderson at OBN Security & Investigative Services

416-213-7416, X236

Left VMM at 11:13 a.m.

He called back at 2:53 a.m.. Confirmed meeting for Thursday in Toronto. confirmed location. I asked if he needed a retainer he said he'll discuss that there. He says he will bring the investigator he hopes to work with if possible.

Sent e-mail to KWM confirming meeting.

Am reviewing information from KWM to go into retainer letter for Henderson.



## Sunny Ware

---

**From:** Bill McKenzie [lawyerbill@rogers.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 13, 2007 6:24 AM  
**To:** Sunny Ware  
**Subject:** RE: Heaslet-Simmons transcript 081007

Yeah presently I am not going to go back and do have a security firm looking at this. In a way it is a blessing because how is a judge ever going to order us to go to Barbados? I was hired to do a job and it appears these foolish people have helped in ways they still don't understand.

Bill

--- Sunny Ware <sware@mclaw.ca> wrote:

- > I think you have more dangerous enemies than you ever had in the
- > satellite piracy files, including our pal Marty in FL.
- >
- > I think you should take Peter Simmons's comments very seriously.
- >
- > I don't suppose there's any way Nathan & Co. can infiltrate and get a
- > handle on which angry person(s)
- > is(are) angry enough to actually think about carrying out some kind of
- > nefarious 'plan' if you were to go back?
- >
- > I'm sure you're not inclined to put yourself in harm's way but on the
- > other hand, why should an ordinary Canadian citizen be 'afraid' to go
- > to a wonderful, Commonwealth country and have a great holiday like any
- > other Canadian could do?
- >
- > I think you should take whatever steps necessary and push as hard as
- > possible to have cross-exams held elsewhere than in Barbados, even if
- > it's in Florida or wherever, rather than Ontario.
- >
- > I think John is going to be in for a very rough time. What a shame!
- > But then, what a disgrace that these 'big shots' have trod so shabbily
- > over his family and the business for so many years. It may be that
- > John is not in the same kind of physical danger that you may be, but
- > I'm sure life can be made awfully difficult for him, including his job
- > (I don't imagine he's of an age to take retirement)
- >
- > And what a sad way to have the hopes for a national park likely
- > dashed, probably for many years to come.
- >
- > I think if/when I go back to Barbados, I never heard of anyone called

> McKenzie...

>

> I might have more 'thoughts' after mulling over it all a bit.

>

> Sunny

>

>

>

>

> From: Bill McKenzie [mailto:lawyerbill@rogers.com]

> Sent: Sun 12/08/2007 7:09 PM

> To: Sunny Ware; Krista McKenzie

> Subject: Fwd: Heaslet-Simmons transcript 081007

>

>

>

> So what do you think?

>

> Bill

>

>

>

## Sunny Ware

---

**From:** Sunny Ware  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 12, 2007 8:43 PM  
**To:** Bill McKenzie; Krista McKenzie  
**Cc:** Sunny Ware; sunnyware@rogers.com  
**Subject:** RE: Heaslet-Simmons transcript 081007

I think you have more dangerous enemies than you ever had in the satellite piracy files, including our pal Marty in FL.

I think you should take Peter Simmons's comments very seriously.

I don't suppose there's any way Nathan & Co. can infiltrate and get a handle on which angry person(s) is (are) angry enough to actually think about carrying out some kind of nefarious 'plan' if you were to go back?

I'm sure you're not inclined to put yourself in harm's way but on the other hand, why should an ordinary Canadian citizen be 'afraid' to go to a wonderful, Commonwealth country and have a great holiday like any other Canadian could do?

I think you should take whatever steps necessary and push as hard as possible to have cross-exams held elsewhere than in Barbados, even if it's in Florida or wherever, rather than Ontario.

I think John is going to be in for a very rough time. What a shame! But then, what a disgrace that these 'big shots' have trod so shabbily over his family and the business for so many years. It may be that John is not in the same kind of physical danger that you may be, but I'm sure life can be made awfully difficult for him, including his job (I don't imagine he's of an age to take retirement)

And what a sad way to have the hopes for a national park likely dashed, probably for many years to come.

I think if/when I go back to Barbados, I never heard of anyone called McKenzie...

I might have more 'thoughts' after mulling over it all a bit.

Sunny

---

**From:** Bill McKenzie [mailto:lawyerbill@rogers.com]  
**Sent:** Sun 12/08/2007 7:09 PM  
**To:** Sunny Ware; Krista McKenzie  
**Subject:** Fwd: Heaslet-Simmons transcript 081007

So what do you think?

Bill

**Sunny Ware**

---

**From:** Bill McKenzie [lawyerbill@rogers.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 12, 2007 7:10 PM  
**To:** Sunny Ware; Krista McKenzie  
**Subject:** Fwd: Heaslet-Simmons transcript 081007

**Attachments:** Heaslet-Simmons transcript 081007



Heaslet-Simmons  
transcript 081...

So what do you think?

Bill

**Sunny Ware**

---

**From:** heaslet@heaslet.com  
**Sent:** Friday, August 10, 2007 7:52 PM  
**To:** KWM EXTERNAL - Rogers  
**Cc:** pallard1495@yahoo.com; peterco@shawbiz.ca; heaslet@heaslet.com  
**Subject:** Heaslet-Simmons transcript 081007

**Attachments:** HeasletSimmonsTranscript 081007.doc



HeasletSimmonsTra  
nscript 08100...

Confidential material attached:

Transcript from this morning is attached.

**Sunny Ware**

---

**From:** Bill McKenzie [lawyerbill@rogers.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 12, 2007 2:50 PM  
**To:** Sunny Ware  
**Subject:** Fwd: Personal and Confidential [Fwd: PS conversation 080807]

**Attachments:** Fwd: Personal and Confidential [Fwd: PS conversation 080807]



Fwd: Personal and  
Confidential...

Note: forwarded message attached.

## Sunny Ware

---

**From:** Peter Allard [pallard1495@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 12, 2007 12:17 PM  
**To:** Sean Moore  
**Subject:** Fwd: Personal and Confidential [Fwd: PS conversation 080807]

**Attachments:** Personal and Confidential [Fwd: PS conversation 080807]



Personal and  
Confidential [Fw...

Note: forwarded message attached.

Dear Sean,

No suprise here but I obviously have concerns for these people's safety who have been victimized for over 20 years.

The Chief Justice apparently threatened Bill McKenzie in his court room office with Bills brother present.

It was a without prejudice meeting so I don't know what happened but Bill did say he made rascist comments as well as threaten him personally.

Stuart Heaslet is very upset that all his efforts to try and help establish a National Park are being linked to a totally unrelated legal matter and that Peter Simmons has been put under extreme pressure to carry messages of threats obviously from his brother the Chief Justice amd probably the Prime Minister.

We always knew he was working in concert with the PM and was a thug in Chief Justice robes ( The Nitin/South Sea Cotoon case ) but now that they are ratcheting up the threats and now that they can't control or delay the legal process their true colors are coming to the fore.

I am very doubtful that Bill should do six weeks of examination in Barbados. These people are not use to the rigors of having to answer tough questions that can only point to one conclusion.

What do you recommend we do from an international law process?

regards,

Peter A Allard

**Sunny Ware**

---

**From:** Heaslet [heaslet@heaslet.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 08, 2007 4:40 PM  
**To:** Peter Allard  
**Subject:** Personal and Confidential [Fwd: PS conversation 080807]

**Attachments:** PS conversation 080807



PS conversation  
080807

**PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL**

-----



## Sunny Ware

---

**From:** heaslet@heaslet.com  
**Sent:** Friday, August 10, 2007 8:43 PM  
**To:** KWM EXTERNAL - Rogers  
**Cc:** pallard1495@yahoo.com; peterco@shawbiz.ca; heaslet@heaslet.com  
**Subject:** REVISED COMMENTS - Heaslet-Simmons conversation

Bill,

Here are some clarifications to the transcript of my conversation with Peter Simmons this morning, August 10, 2007:

1. I was in Peter Allard's condominium at One Wall Centre in Vancouver when I made the call to Peter Simmons.
2. The conversation was made on a microcassette tape. Side A contains one missed call to Peter Simmons, and a conversation between Heaslet and Harry Roberts, General Manager of Graeme Hall Nature Sanctuary. Side B contains the conversation between Heaslet and Peter Simmons. Only Side B has been transcribed to date.
3. In regard Simmons' view that there could be a personal safety threat against Bill McKenzie, Simmons acted more vehement on August 8, 2007 compared to the followup conversation on Wednesday, August 10, 2007.
4. Simmons acted more vehement on August 8, 2007 when he described potential consequences to the the livelihood and career of John Knox. During the August 10, 2007 conversation, Simmons softened his tone, suggesting that John Knox was being victimized by McKenzie and Allard.

Stuart Heaslet

**Sunny Ware**

---

**From:** Peter Allard [pallard1495@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, August 11, 2007 5:32 PM  
**To:** KWM EXTERNAL - Rogers  
**Subject:** Re: Comments on Heaslet-Simmons conversation 081007

You may want to notify foreign affairs and see where that goes. Normally they would ignore us but if they get a registered letter or something similar I don't think they can.

Peter

--- Bill McKenzie <lawyerbill@rogers.com> wrote:

> The reason I am thinking about this over the weekend is to recall each  
> incident involved commencing when Stuart was summonsed to PS house  
> where DS remonstrated with him. This was shortly after DS had been  
> served.  
> Things have ratcheted up since then.

> I think if we match timing of service of documents with the messages  
> we are getting they all point back to David Simmons and perhaps those  
> behind him.

> I am of mixed views whether PS was a pawn left in place around friends  
> of GH to keep an eye on it for DS and OE. Maybe in part and to keep  
> close to Stuart as well.

> I am saddened that these people have to resort to this kind of  
> strategy to keep themselves in power rather than having to prove  
> themselves in a competitive world.

> Bill

> --- Peter Allard <pallard1495@yahoo.com> wrote:

>> A genuine sense of outrage and shock should come relatively soon  
>> after you get the message  
> otherwise

>> it

>> will look like manipulation,

>> There is no doubt that Peter Simmons has been used by his brother to  
>> deliver the message and that his brother has made him the  
>> sacrificial lamb once again.

>> Its really quite sad but I firmly believe David Simmons was put into  
>> the highest position of the land to inter alia get legal revenge as  
>> Matjorie Knox  
> was  
>> the main preventer of the SBG deal from happening.  
>  
>>  
>> This was to be his revenge and she is till in his way.  
>> The anger is palpable.  
>>  
>>  
>> Peter  
>> --- Bill McKenzie <lawyerbill@rogers.com> wrote:  
>>  
>>> thanks now need to think about how to deal with  
>> this  
>>> so will ponder over the weekend-  
>>>  
>>> several (digital) copies should be made of the  
>> tape  
>>> and please email me one  
>>>  
>>> Thanks Bill  
>>> --- heaslet@heaslet.com wrote:  
>>>  
>>>> Bill,  
>>>>  
>>>> Here are some clarifications to the transcript  
>> of  
>>> my  
>>>> conversation with  
>>>> Peter Simmons this morning, August 10, 2007:  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> 1. I was in Peter Allard's condominium at One  
>>> Wall  
>>>> Centre in Vancouver  
>>>> when I made the call to Peter Simmons.  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> 2. The conversation was made on a  
> microcassete  
>>>> tape. Side A contains one  
>>>> missed call to Peter Simmons, and a  
> conversation

>>>> between Heaslet and Harry  
>>>> Roberts, General Manager of Graeme Hall Nature  
>>>> Sanctuary. Side B  
>>>> contains the conversation between Heaslet and  
>>>> Peter  
>>>> Simmons. Only Side B  
>>>> has been transcribed to date.  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> 3. In regard Simmons' view that there could  
> be  
>> a  
>>>> personal safety threat  
>>>> against Bill McKenzie, Simmons acted more  
>> vehement  
>>>> on August 8, 2007  
>>>> compared to the followup conversation on  
>>> Wednesday,  
>>>> August 8, 2007.  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> 4. Simmons acted more vehement on August 8,  
>> 2007  
>>>> when he described  
>>>> potential consequences to the the livelihood  
> and  
>>>> career of John Knox.  
>>>> During the August 10, 2007 conversation,  
> Simmons  
>>>> softened his tone,  
>>>> suggesting that John Knox was being victimized  
>> by  
>>>> McKenzie and Allard.  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>> Stuart Heaslet  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>  
>>>  
>>  
>>  
>  
>

**Sunny Ware**

---

**From:** heaslet@heaslet.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 12, 2007 9:32 AM  
**To:** KWM EXTERNAL - Rogers  
**Cc:** pallard1495@yahoo.com  
**Subject:** Re: Peter Simmons conversation

I'm taping conversations from now on.

Stuart

- > Shouldn't this be taped? I am now worried that there will be threats
- > made against you. You may recall that earlier on a threat was related
- > to me from Turney through Alair S that PA had better watch his back
- > but McKenzie is ok. Seems things have escalated since then and I am
- > now on the endangered species list as well and I wonder if you may be next?
- >
- > It would not surprise me if PS realizes that he may have gone too far
- > in actually delivering the threats and will now try to soften.
- >
- > Bill
- >
- >
- > ----- Original Message -----
- > From: "heaslet@heaslet.com" <heaslet@heaslet.com>
- > To: Bill McKenzie <lawyerbill@rogers.com>
- > Cc: Peter Allard <pallard1495@yahoo.com>; Stuart Heaslet
- > <heaslet@heaslet.com>
- > Sent: Saturday, August 11, 2007 8:55:36 PM
- > Subject: Peter Simmons conversation
- >
- >
- > Bill,
- >
- > I will be talking with Peter Simmons on Monday, August 13, 2007 to
- > discuss his impending disassociation with FOGH, our philanthropic
- > relationship with FOGH and other wrap-up details on the national park.
- > Also, because of my relationship with him, I feel I need to mention
- > the reaction I received from you (and Peter Allard) when I delivered
- > his message warning that your personal safety in Barbados could be compromised.
- >

Stuart

**Sunny Ware**

---

**From:** Bill McKenzie [lawyerbill@rogers.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 12, 2007 7:47 AM  
**To:** heaslet@heaslet.com  
**Cc:** Peter Allard; Stuart Heaslet; Sunny Ware  
**Subject:** Re: Peter Simmons conversation

Shouldn't this be taped? I am now worried that there will be threats made against you. You may recall that earlier on a threat was related to me from Turney through Alair S that PA had better watch his back but McKenzie is ok. Seems things have escalated since then and I am now on the endangered species list as well and I wonder if you may be next?

It would not surprise me if PS realizes that he may have gone too far in actually delivering the threats and will now try to soften.

Bill

----- Original Message -----

**From:** "heaslet@heaslet.com" <heaslet@heaslet.com>  
**To:** Bill McKenzie <lawyerbill@rogers.com>  
**Cc:** Peter Allard <pallard1495@yahoo.com>; Stuart Heaslet <heaslet@heaslet.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, August 11, 2007 8:55:36 PM  
**Subject:** Peter Simmons conversation

Bill,

I will be talking with Peter Simmons on Monday, August 13, 2007 to discuss his impending disassociation with FOGH, our philanthropic relationship with FOGH and other wrap-up details on the national park. Also, because of my relationship with him, I feel I need to mention the reaction I received from you (and Peter Allard) when I delivered his message warning that your personal safety in Barbados could be compromised.

Stuart

## Sunny Ware

---

**From:** Bill McKenzie [lawyerbill@rogers.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, August 11, 2007 10:12 AM  
**To:** Sunny Ware  
**Subject:** Fwd: Comments on Heaslet-Simmons conversation 081007

**Attachments:** Comments on Heaslet-Simmons conversation 081007



Comments on  
Heaslet-Simmons co.

Note: forwarded message attached.



## Sunny Ware

---

**From:** heaslet@heaslet.com  
**Sent:** Friday, August 10, 2007 8:10 PM  
**To:** KWM EXTERNAL - Rogers  
**Cc:** pallard1495@yahoo.com; peterco@shawbiz.ca; heaslet@heaslet.com  
**Subject:** Comments on Heaslet-Simmons conversation 081007

Bill,

Here are some clarifications to the transcript of my conversation with Peter Simmons this morning, August 10, 2007:

1. I was in Peter Allard's condominium at One Wall Centre in Vancouver when I made the call to Peter Simmons.
2. The conversation was made on a microcassette tape. Side A contains one missed call to Peter Simmons, and a conversation between Heaslet and Harry Roberts, General Manager of Graeme Hall Nature Sanctuary. Side B contains the conversation between Heaslet and Peter Simmons. Only Side B has been transcribed to date.
3. In regard Simmons' view that there could be a personal safety threat against Bill McKenzie, Simmons acted more vehement on August 8, 2007 compared to the followup conversation on Wednesday, August 8, 2007.
4. Simmons acted more vehement on August 8, 2007 when he described potential consequences to the the livelihood and career of John Knox. During the August 10, 2007 conversation, Simmons softened his tone, suggesting that John Knox was being victimized by McKenzie and Allard.

Stuart Heaslet