1		Vancouver, B.C.
2		April 19, 2012
3		(PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED AT 9:30 P.M.)
4	THE	REGISTRAR: Order. The hearing is now resumed.
5	MR.	VERTLIEB: Mr. Commissioner, the witness today is Mr.
6		Romano, who we've heard was administrative Crown.
7	THE	COMMISSIONER: Yes.
8	MR.	VERTLIEB: That is the scheduled witness for the day, and
9		based on the estimates we've been given it will
10		not be the full day.
11	THE	COMMISSIONER: Okay.
12	MR.	VERTLIEB: And that would leave some time at the end of the
13		day if there's any need to discuss any other
14		issues. So perhaps Mr. Romano could take the
15		witness stand, please, and we can commence his
16		evidence.
17	THE	REGISTRAR: Good morning. Would you just turn on your
18		microphone, please.
19		RICHARD ROMANO: Affirmed
20	THE	REGISTRAR: Would you state your name, please.
21		A Richard Romano, R-o-m-a-n-o.
22	THE	REGISTRAR: Thank you. Counsel. You may be seated.
23	THE	COMMISSIONER: You may have a seat.
24		A Thank you.
25	EXA	MINATION IN CHIEF BY MR. VERTLIEB:

Thank you, Mr. Giles. Mr. Romano, let's deal with 1 0 2 your background in the law. You were called to the bar in 1982. Where did you do your law? 3 May 10th, 1983, I was called to the bar. 4 А Thank you. And where did you study? 5 Ο I articled with a law firm in New Westminster, 6 Α 7 Baumgartel Gould Tretiak, and after I completed my articles I spent five and a half years with them. 8 9 January the 1st, 1989, I commenced work with the 10 Crown counsel office. I was in Langley for a year 11 as a trial Crown. That was followed by a short stint in Maple Ridge for four months as trial 12 Crown. I then went to Whalley, and I was the 13 administrative Crown, the trial Crown. I was the 14 15 only Crown there for the youth court in Whalley. And then when the new courthouse was built in 16 Surrey in 1991 I moved to that courthouse for 17 18 about a year as a trial Crown and an admin. Crown 19 with respect to youth matters. And then in 1992 I 20 went to New Westminster for a couple of years. One was trial Crown, one was admin. Crown and 21 22 trial Crown. August 1994 I went to Port Coquitlam through until the fall of 2003 as administrative 23 Crown, and then I was -- left the administrative 24 25 Crown job and I did some trial work for a few

1 months, and in the beginning of March, middle of 2 March 2004 I went to New Westminster and I was the 3 Acting Deputy Regional Crown through until 4 December 2004 and then the acting title was 5 dropped and I was the Deputy Regional through б until December 2nd, 2005, when I was appointed to the Provincial Court bench in Abbotsford. 7 Thank you. Tell us about the duties of an 8 Q 9 administrative Crown, and you can be specific to 10 what you were doing from '94 till the fall of 11 2003. The vast majority of my time was spent doing 12 А 13 charge approvals and trial scheduling. In addition I frequently went into court and did bail 14 15 hearings. I did the occasional trial. There was also committees that I sat on and meetings that I 16 17 attended to. But as I said, the majority of time 18 was spent doing charge approvals and trial 19 scheduling. And we've discussed charge approval as it exists 20 Q in British Columbia with your colleague, Ms. 21 22 Connor, so I am not going to take you through that. There is written material from the Crown on 23 24 charge approval and what are the principles that apply.

3

1 А Yes. 2 And you have perhaps seen those in your Q preparation to give evidence before Commissioner 3 4 Oppal this morning. 5 I have. Α б And those documents that are here before us are 0 7 consistent with your understanding of the charge approval process and how you applied it in your 8 9 time in that job? 10 Yes. А 11 Thank you. Now, there is a report to Crown that 0 has been marked as an exhibit. I'm referring to 12 the binder of documents that everyone here is 13 familiar with. You have reviewed that report to 14 15 Crown concerning Robert William Pickton, and it 16 was dated April 1 of 1997? 17 Yes. Α And in there there's a handwritten document that 18 0 19 appears to have been written by you where the 20 original three charges were expanded to four 21 charges? 22 That's right. I added the fourth count of А 23 aggravated assault. And you've reviewed that document, and that is 24 0 25 correct as far as your memory is concerned?

1 A Yes.

2 Thank you. Now, I wanted to then ask you about Q the facts that were known to you at the time and 3 4 just cover this very briefly because it's not 5 really material to the terms of reference and the б job the commissioner has been asked to do, but 7 what were the facts, as you understood them, from that report to Crown counsel? 8 9 А I'm not sure of the question. I mean, the facts 10 were as set out in the report to Crown. 11 So that would be part of your normal function, to 0 review the report, as you did, and consider 12 13 whether those charges were appropriate or some other charges needed to be instituted? 14 15 А Exactly. Was there anything about that case back in 1997 16 0 17 that was particularly of importance to you, 18 anything that you specifically recall from the case back in that time frame? 19 20 In terms of the charge approval, it was --Α 21 obviously it was a very serious case. I was well 22 aware of that having gone through the report to Crown. But comparatively speaking, it was one of 23 24 many very serious cases that we had on a 25 consistent basis.

1	Q	And approximately how many charge approval
2		assessments would you make in a year when you were
3		administrative Crown?
4	A	I would say conservatively I would review 2000
5		reports.
6	Q	In a year?
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	Thank you. When you were working on the case in
9		1997 as administrative Crown and considering the
10		charge approval process, did you know the name
11		Robert William Pickton?
12	A	No.
13	Q	Is there anything you knew about that name that
14		made you have special attention to the file?
15	А	No.
16	Q	Now, we've heard about the file being designated a
17		red file.
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	Who designated it as a red file?
20	A	I did.
21	Q	And what's the significance of that?
22	A	The significance of a red file in the offices I
23		was a part of was basically to give anybody that
24		was going to be handling the conduct of the
25		prosecution to be aware from the outset that this

б

1

case needed advance preparation.

2 What does that mean in a practical way? Q Well, each trial Crown has their own approach to 3 А 4 their prosecutions, but I would hope and assume that when they see the red file they're aware that 5 6 they've been assigned this file and they will take the file well in advance of the trial date and 7 review it and make the decisions in terms as to 8 9 how they are going to approach the prosecution, 10 which would be prepare it well in advance of the 11 trial date in contrast to say something as simple as a shoplifting case, which most Crown would be 12 13 quite capable of picking up on the day of the 14 trial and running the trial. 15 So just to help us understand what you mean by 0 16 well in advance, what does that mean to you? Well, I was also responsible for the trial 17 Α 18 scheduling, and as I mentioned earlier, that was a big part of my job, and I would get the judges' 19

rota from the judicial case manager probably three to four months in advance. I'd get these schedules of the judges, and then I would take the courtrooms that were open or scheduled to be open up to four months in advance, and I would draft trial schedules, and on the trial schedules I

would note which Crown had conduct of the trials 1 in which courtroom, and also on the trial 2 3 schedules that the Crown would receive they would 4 see the red files that were noted because I would always note the red file so that the Crown was 5 well aware when they received their schedule and 6 7 looked at their schedule, "I've been assigned this red file," and for the most part I would hope that 8 9 they would have plenty of time to look at it in 10 advance, because the schedules I would draft and 11 distribute would be your next -- your trial assignments for the next four months on average. 12 So on average a Crown who would be assigned a file 13 Q would have on the red files four months advance 14 15 notice to be preparing for that case? 16 Approximately. Α 17 And is that what you mean when you say well in Q advance? 18 19 Well, perhaps I should add that there's -- for Α 20 those types of files, yes. There's another -there's other files that are even a step above 21 22 that that we considered Major Crime files that 23 were prosecuted by the Major Crime Crown that came from New Westminster, and those cases were 24 25 assigned even earlier than -- but they were also

1	red	files

17

18

2	Q	So a Major Crime file might be a gang-related file
3		where there would be complexity?
4	A	Certainly. All murders would be prosecuted by the
5		Major Crime prosecutors from New Westminster, but
6		there was other cases that attracted enough
7		attention that they would have been assigned to
8		some of the senior Crown out of the New
9		Westminster office.
10	Q	Thank you. But in this case the red file would
11		have meant not that heightened sense of
12		preparation, it would be into what you've
13		described as a four-month window, more or less?
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	Now, do you have any recall of the assignment of
16		this file to Crown from the time you approved

charges until Ms. Connor took the file over sometime after October 22 of '97?

19AAll I can say is what I gather from the record of20proceedings that the file made its way through the21normal course at that time, which was to go to22disclosure court in Burnaby and be reviewed by the23Crown at disclosure court in Burnaby, and once24that process was complete and if there were no25admissions or pleas to be had it would be set for

1		trial, and if I recall in reviewing the material,
2		the trial would have been set in September or
3		October for the February date.
4	Q	Ms. Connor has told us that she received the file
5		by way of assignment sometime after October 22 of
6		'97.
7	A	That's I think that's probably accurate.
8	Q	But you have no independent memory of when the
9		file was assigned to her?
10	А	No.
11	Q	Did you have any dealings with the file once it
12		was left your trial assignment schedule?
13	A	I wouldn't have even had dealings with the file at
14		the trial assignment scheduling stage. The
15		dealings I had with the file would have been on
16		April 1st when I approved the charges. I noted in
17		the material that I reviewed that there was
18		correspondence that I sent to the investigating
19		officer from Mr. Ritchie, defence counsel,
20		requesting further disclosure, and I would have
21		included a copy of that correspondence, forwarded
22		it in memo form to the investigating officer
23		saying, "Please be advised, here's a letter from
24		defence counsel requesting the following
25		disclosure. Please provide that disclosure as

2 record of proceedings, the last time I would have 3 looked at that file would have been would have 4 been in and around April 20th, and then that file 5 was off of my desk and on its way to disclosure 6 court, and I would have never looked at the file 7 again. 8 Q Thank you. That's helpful to hear that. In term 9 of the disclosure requests, were they requests 10 that one could consider in the normal course of 11 lawyer's work on behalf of an accused person? 12 A Yes.	
 been in and around April 20th, and then that file was off of my desk and on its way to disclosure court, and I would have never looked at the file again. Q Thank you. That's helpful to hear that. In term of the disclosure requests, were they requests that one could consider in the normal course of lawyer's work on behalf of an accused person? 	
5 was off of my desk and on its way to disclosure 6 court, and I would have never looked at the file 7 again. 8 Q Thank you. That's helpful to hear that. In term 9 of the disclosure requests, were they requests 10 that one could consider in the normal course of 11 lawyer's work on behalf of an accused person?	
6 court, and I would have never looked at the file 7 again. 8 Q Thank you. That's helpful to hear that. In term 9 of the disclosure requests, were they requests 10 that one could consider in the normal course of 11 lawyer's work on behalf of an accused person?	ß
7 again. 8 Q 9 Of the disclosure requests, were they requests 10 that one could consider in the normal course of 11 lawyer's work on behalf of an accused person?	ដ
8 Q Thank you. That's helpful to hear that. In term 9 of the disclosure requests, were they requests 10 that one could consider in the normal course of 11 lawyer's work on behalf of an accused person?	ß
9of the disclosure requests, were they requests10that one could consider in the normal course of11lawyer's work on behalf of an accused person?	IS
10that one could consider in the normal course of11lawyer's work on behalf of an accused person?	
11 lawyer's work on behalf of an accused person?	
12 A Yes.	
13 Q There was nothing unusual about the requests?	
14 A No.	
15 Q Now, let's move then to the actual term of	
16 reference that the commissioner's been asked to	
17 deal with, and that is the facts surrounding the	
18 stay of proceedings that was entered in January c	f
19 1998.	
20 A Okay.	
21 Q And you understand that the record indicates ther	е
22 was a stay entered on January 26 of 1998?	
A Yes.	
Q And the reason we've asked you to come is to have	
25 you give us the best recall you have of the facts	

1 relating to those events.

- A Unfortunately, I don't have an independent
 recollection of the facts.
- 4 Q Let me just ask you some questions around these 5 events just so that we have your best evidence on 6 it.
- 7 A Sure.
- 8 Q Now, if there was going to be a stay of 9 proceedings on a serious case, such as an attempt 10 murder, tell us about the normal practice as it 11 would relate to the Crown on the file and you as 12 administrative Crown.
- 13 Well, a lot of it depends on who the Crown is, but Α 14 in this particular case it was Ms. Connor, who I 15 was very confident in her decision-making ability 16 and judgment, and that's in large part the reason 17 she was assigned this case now that I look back on 18 it. It was a female complainant. I was always concerned when it was a female complainant that if 19 at all possible I assigned a senior female Crown 20 to do the prosecution because in my experience 21 2.2 female complainants are more comfortable with female Crown. So that went into the decision-23 making process when I assigned the file, who's 24 25 best suited to prosecute this file, and it wasn't

1		a difficult decision at all because Ms. Connor was
2		the senior Crown in our office, she was female,
3		and she seemed like she was and in my opinion
4		is a perfect fit to prosecute that case.
5	Q	Was there any requirement that if Ms. Connor as
б		Crown wished to enter a stay that she get your
7		approval?
8	A	No. In terms of the policy, I don't my
9		recollection of the policy is I don't think the
10		Crown is required in that type of case to come to
11		me to get my approval that they're going to stay
12		it, but from a practical point of view the Crown
13		routinely came to me when they were going to stay
14		any kind of charge because the reasoning was
15		twofold: to make sure that I am aware that the
16		case is not proceeding, and also to make sure that
17		I'm liaising with the judicial case managers that
18		the trial time that's been scheduled for these
19		trials is going to be lost and we have to make
20		arrangements as to what trials might be moved as a
21		result of these trials being stayed.
22	Q	So you would be informed because of your
23		administrative duties in making sure the court
24		time is being used properly?
25	А	Yes.

1QIf Ms. Connor wanted to, as it were, pick your2brain, discuss the file with you, was she free to3do that?

A Sure. I had an open-door policy. The Crown routinely came into the office and asked questions and consulted with me, but for the most part the senior Crown, they didn't need any advice or assistance. They were more than capable.

- 9 Q Now, we've heard from Ms. Connor, and the evidence 10 seems to suggest that the meeting with the 11 complainant, Ms. Anderson, was either on January 12 23 of 1998 or January 26 of 1998. Do you have any 13 recall of talking to Randi Connor, the senior 14 Crown, about the Anderson case back in the month 15 of January of 1998?
- 16ANo, I don't have an independent recollection of17talking to her.
- Q And you have gone through the file materials
 carefully with a view to seeing whether or not
 your memory could be --

21 A Yes.

22 Q -- prompted, as it were?

A Yes.

24QMs. Connor says she has spoken with you about it25and discussed the concerns. Do you accept that

2 Yes. Α You mentioned she was senior Crown. We understood 3 0 4 from her that she had been practising for many 5 years, and that's what you refer to when you say б senior Crown? 7 А Yes. In fact, was she senior to you at the bar? 8 Q 9 Α Yes. 10 Did you have any reason to have concern about her Q 11 decision-making ability? No. I was very confident in her decision-making 12 А 13 ability. 14 0 Now, I want to ask you about an area that's 15 emerged here, and that is that the Crown file was destroyed. We've heard evidence from regional 16 17 Crown, who talked about the policy and how it 18 appears there was an error, the policy was not followed. Are you informed about that issue 19 having occurred in the attempt murder case of 20 21 Pickton? 22 T am now. Α 23 Q Did you have any involvement at all in the destruction of the file? 24 I had no involvement in the retention and 25 А

that happened?

1

1		destruction of files. That was the support staff
2		that looked after that. The procedure was in
3		place. Whenever I went to the Crown offices I
4		simply the procedure that was in place remained
5		in place.
6	Q	Now, I wanted to ask you another area. You
7		actually were the Crown who approved the first two
8		charges of murder against Pickton?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	And that was done obviously after the search
11		warrant of February 5, 2002?
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	And we know that there were more charges added.
14		I'm not going to go into that with you. The
15		question I have for you is this. When you came to
16		deal with Pickton on charges of murder, did you
17		connect him back up to this event that had
18		happened in 1997? Did you, in other words, in
19		your memory say, "Oh, I remember him. He's
20	A	No.
21	Q	the person I dealt with in '97"?
22	А	No, I didn't well, I shouldn't say no because I
23		don't know what material I had in front of me in
24		2002. I don't remember if there would have been
25		something in the material I had in front of me

1		telling me that there was a stay of proceedings
2		entered in 1998 with respect to this individual.
3		But on seeing the file, no, I wouldn't have made
4		the connection that this Pickton that was the
5		named accused in 2002 was the accused from 1997.
6		I would need something further to tell me that. I
7		didn't have a memory of it.
8	Q	That's what I was getting at. You had no memory
9		that this is the same person
10	A	No.
11	Q	that you had dealt with in '97?
12	A	No.
13	Q	Are there any other facts that you can assist the
14		commissioner with concerning the stay of
15		proceedings entered by the Crown on January 26 of
16		1998?
17	A	No.
18	MR. VERTLIEB	: Thank you very much, sir.
19	A	Thank you.
20	MR. CHANTLER	: Commissioner, Neil Chantler.
21	THE COMMISSI	ONER: Yes.
22	CROSS-EXAMIN	ATION BY MR. CHANTLER:
23	Q	Mr. Romano, I am counsel for 25 families of
24		murdered and missing women whose disappearances
25		are the subject of this inquiry, and I just have a

1

few questions for you today.

2 A Sure.

I have a few less questions than I might have had 3 0 4 in light of your evidence that you don't have any 5 independent recollection of your meeting with Ms. 6 Connor, but I'd like to ask you a couple of 7 questions about the Crown's retention policy and the destruction of the file. Have you made any 8 9 efforts independently to inquire into the circumstances of the destruction of the file? 10 11 No. Α

- 12 Q Okay. And would you agree that it appears that 13 the Crown's document retention policy has been 14 breached in this case by the destruction of the 15 file?
- 16AI'd have to have the policy in front of me to17confirm that there would have been a breach.
- 18 Q All right.
- A I mean, my -- it appears so from what I've heard.
- 20 Q And do you, Mr. Romano, have any knowledge at all 21 as to why it was destroyed rather than archived in 22 light of the policy?
- 23AOnly what I've read in Andrew MacDonald's24affidavit.
- 25 Q And can you describe for us what that affidavit

1 says on this issue? 2 Well, if I had the affidavit in front of me I Α 3 could read it to you verbatim. 4 All right. I'll leave it aside for now. Now, I 0 5 appreciate that it's been more than 10 years since 6 these events transpired. 7 А 15. Certainly. But this isn't the first time you've 8 Q 9 been called upon to recollect your dealings with Ms. Connor or the file; is that correct? 10 11 Yes, it is. А Were you not in any way consulted after Robert 12 0 13 Pickton's arrest in February 2002 with respect to your recollection and dealings --14 15 No. А 16 -- with the file? 0 17 No. Now, you have given evidence that it was your decision to identify this file as a red file? 18 19 Yes. А You considered this a serious case right --20 Q 21 Yes. А 22 -- off the bat? 0 23 А Yes. Do you feel that more could have been done in 24 0 25 reflection in the preparation stage of the file

1	for trial, and I anticipate an objection, and I'm
2	not asking you to question in any way Ms. Connor's
3	exercise of discretion, I'm merely asking if as a
4	matter of fact you see the amount of preparation
5	that was done as typical or perhaps as less than
6	typical?
7	MR. DOUST: Well, I am objecting to that on the basis of the
8	appeal court's judgment
9	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
10	MR. DOUST: in <i>Davies</i> , Mr. Commissioner. That question has
11	no relevance whatsoever.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: I know that. I know that. In law under the
13	Davies decision of the Court of Appeal you, in
14	fact, are doing that, Mr. Chantler, so I have to
15	agree here with Mr. Doust.
16	MR. CHANTLER: Thank you.
17	Q Mr. Romano, the families we represent are
18	understandably very interested in an analysis of
19	this issue, and by the Criminal Justice Branch's
20	own admission as many as 22 of the women who were
21	ultimately identified to the Pickton property went
22	missing after these charges were stayed. My final
23	question for you is simply whether you think
24	there's anything on reflection that the Criminal
25	Justice Branch can learn from this file and this

1		experience?
2	А	Sorry, can you ask the question again?
3	Q	Is there anything the Criminal Justice Branch can
4		learn from this?
5	А	I don't know.
6	MR. CHANTLER	: All right. Those are my questions. Thank you.
7	THE COMMISSI	ONER: Thank you, Mr. Chantler.
8	CROSS-EXAMIN	ATION BY MR. ROBERTS:
9	Q	Good morning, sir. It's Darrell Roberts, and I
10		appear for Marion Bryce, who lost a daughter to
11		Pickton, and I have a couple of questions for you.
12	А	Sure.
13	Q	Could you turn, please, in the binder which
14		contains that report. I think it's marked as
15		Exhibit 133. My numbering could be incorrect.
16		It's the binder that's entitled "Stay of
17		Proceedings re Pickton 1997 Charges", documents,
18		etcetera.
19	А	Okay. I've got it in front of me.
20	Q	And there's a tab 14.
21	А	Yes.
22	Q	Which is identified in the index as correspondence
23		with Gibbons Ritchie.
24	А	Yes.
25	Q	Could you find a letter that's addressed to you,

1 sir, that's October 22, 1997, by Peter Ritchie to
2 you?

3 A Yes, I've got it.

4 Q Thank you. Now, my note of your evidence in 5 answer to a question or more of my learned friend 6 Mr. Vertlieb was that you last looked at the file 7 April 22, 1997?

8 A Yes.

9 Q This letter is October 22, 1997. It's addressed 10 to you. I must assume, unless you tell me I'm 11 wrong, that you received the letter and looked at 12 it?

I'm not sure whether I would have -- whether the 13 Α support staff would have passed that 14 15 correspondence along to the trial Crown that was 16 assigned the file to respond to it or whether I, 17 in fact, looked at this letter and would have 18 given it to the Crown assigned to the file to 19 respond to the correspondence. That would have 20 been my usual practice. If there was someone 21 assigned to prosecute the file, I would simply 2.2 pass the correspondence along to them. There was nothing unusual for me to receive a lot of 23 correspondence addressed to me simply because I 24 25 was the administrative Crown, but a lot of times

1		the support staff would sort of vet that
2		correspondence if there was Crown assigned to the
3		trials and have them respond to the
4		correspondence.
5	Q	I could understand you having a specified policy
6		to that effect, but in my lifetime normally
7		letters that are addressed to me, I see them. I
8		may get somebody else to deal with them, but I see
9		the letter. Isn't that your policy too?
10 2	A	Well, yes, I assume that that was what happened,
11		that I did see the letter.
12	Q	All right. But wouldn't that put you into the
13		file to have a look at it to see what you are
14		going to do with the letter?
15 2	A	Not necessarily because I would say if someone's
16		been assigned to this file that they can look at
17		the file and respond to the correspondence.
18 9	Q	All right. If you'd take a moment to look at the
19		letter, would you, please, Mr. Romano.
20	A	Sure.
21	Q	Mr. Ritchie is writing this letter about having
22		attended a pre-trial conference. Did you attend
23		that conference as well in front of Judge Holmes?
24	A	No. The only appearance I made on the file was on
25		April 8th.

1	Q	Pardon me?
2	A	The only court appearance I made on the file was
3		on April 8th, 1997, to conduct the bail hearing.
4	Q	All right. So this would have been somebody else?
5	A	There was a number of Crown in disclosure court
6		that appeared on that file.
7	Q	All right. A couple more questions. The next
8		paragraph reads:
9		I am quite hopeful,
10		says Peter Ritchie,
11		that they will be lengthy admissions,
12		he's referring to the judge wanting or suggesting
13		that there be admissions in writing,
14		that they will be lengthy admissions made in
15		this case respecting issues such as medical
16		questions, continuity, photographic evidence,
17		I always fumble this word,
18		toxilogical evidence and other matters.
19		And then he says:
20		Since I understand this file has recently
21		been turned over to you, I am writing to
22		request that the process of making admissions
23		be moved ahead.
24		The question I have for you is it's not an unusual
25		process for both counsel in a serious criminal

1 matter to engage in an endeavour to put some 2 matters in writing so to avoid having to call 3 evidence about them, right?

4 A Yes.

5 0 And the matters covered here are fairly extensive, aren't they? I take it perhaps that requires you 6 7 to have some knowledge of the file, but you have a case here of attempted murder, unlawful 8 9 confinement, a knife is involved, blood is 10 involved, drugs are involved, Corporal Connor or 11 under his supervision there were photographic evidence taken, both still photographs and video 12 13 photographs taken of the interior of Pickton's trailer, and items of evidence would have been, I 14 15 assume by reason of the reference to continuity, 16 been passed perhaps from one person to another, so 17 this would take a reasonable effort of time to 18 write up the admissions; am I not right?

19 A Yes.

20 Q And, of course, the law is that the Crown is to 21 write up the admissions and then seek the 22 statements of fact to be admitted and then seek to 23 see if defence counsel can agree to them; am I not 24 right? That's the law as expressed in *Castellani*, 25 for example. The Crown writes up the admissions.

1		Defence counsel can't write them up to suit
2		themselves and then put them to the Crown?
3	A	Okay.
4	Q	Do you accept that?
5	A	Yeah.
б	Q	All right. So it was the job of Crown counsel to
7		write up these admissions of fact?
8	A	If there were going to be admissions, yes.
9	Q	If they were going to be written up?
10	A	Yes.
11	Q	Well, let's take a moment and turn to another
12		letter from Mr. Ritchie, please. January 13,
13		1998.
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	Do you have that one?
16	A	Yes. It's addressed to Ms. Connor.
17	Q	I can't hear your voice, sir.
18	А	It's addressed to Ms. Connor.
19	Q	I understand that, but the reason for referring to
20		it, turn to page 2. Mr. Ritchie says:
21		I look forward to your draft admissions in
22		this case. I do not anticipate that
23		factually we are far apart and hope that we
24		can move the matter with some dispatch.
25		Now, it's Ms. Connor's evidence here that as of

1		the date of the 13th she had not drawn the
2		admissions of fact and as of the 23rd or 26th of
3		January, 1998, whichever date it was she
4		interviewed Ms. Anderson, she still had not drawn
5		up the admissions of fact. That would leave
б		let's accept her evidence for the moment for the
7		purposes of my question. That leaves about one
8		week to trial, scheduled for February 2nd?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	That's a pretty short period of time to try and
11		get an agreement on the admissions of fact on
12		these various subject matters, is it not?
13	A	No.
14	Q	So you doesn't it often happen that they have
15		to go through two or three drafts?
16	A	I've walked into court the day of trial while
17		we're in the process of completing the admissions.
18	Q	Well, I guess you're much more expeditious than I
19		am. I have found it takes can take a period of
20		time. In any event
21	А	It can. It can, and it depends on the individual
22		Crown and the cooperation you're getting from
23		defence counsel.
24	Q	Surely it's better to start the process sooner
25		rather than later?

Well, I think the process, from what I can gather 1 А 2 from the correspondence, the process was under way on January the 13th, and Ms. Connor would be the 3 4 best -- the only person suited to answer the question because she was responding to the 5 б correspondence. 7 But you red flagged this file? Ο 8 А Yes. 9 Q Which suggests that this process should have 10 started sooner rather than later? 11 No, I can't agree with that. Again, that's the --А the individual Crown that's assigned to prosecute. 12 13 Different prosecutors take different approaches, 14 and I know in hindsight it's very easy to say that 15 everything should have been done well in advance 16 of the trial date, but, unfortunately, sometimes 17 things don't work out that way. 18 0 Well, the red flag, if it means anything, if I understood your evidence, is that the preparation 19 20 should start more quickly in this case than in some other cases? 21 22 Yes. А 23 Q All right. One other area for consideration. Did 24 you know when you approved the charges that the 25 complainant was a feature part of this case?

1 Of course. Α 2 Of course. Did you know the complainant was Q 3 addicted to drugs? 4 Well, when I look at the investigator's comments А in the report to Crown --5 б I'm not asking you now. Did you know at the time 0 7 that the complainant was addicted? MR. ANDREWS: I ask that my friend not interrupt the question. 8 9 He didn't have a chance --MR. ROBERTS: I didn't think I did. 10 11 MR. ANDREWS: -- to finish what he was saying. THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I think he's trying his best to answer 12 13 in putting the -- as to when that happened in 14 the --15 Did I know that she was a drug addict? Α 16 MR. ROBERTS: 17 Yes. 0 18 А No. 19 All right. So whether or not she was a drug 0 20 addict is not a reason for you to red flag the 21 file in terms of an advance preparation? 22 That factor in and of itself, would I indicate if А I had a witness or a complainant or a victim, 23 whatever term you want to use, if that was the --24 25 would I designate a file --

1	Q	I didn't ask you what you would have done. I just
2		wanted to know did you know.
3	А	No.
4	Q	So it wasn't a factor in your red flagging it?
5	A	No.
6	Q	So tell me what it was that caused you to red flag
7		it? Was it simply the seriousness of the charges?
8	А	That was a big part of it.
9	Q	A big part of it?
10	А	Yes.
11	Q	Was there anything else?
12	А	Well, the time that was going to be taken for the
13		trial to be heard was a factor. Because of the
14		length of time that was going to be occupied
15		advance preparation would be required. It wasn't
16		a half-hour or an hour trial. It was going to be
17		scheduled for a number of days. So that was a
18		factor. The length of the trial, the seriousness
19		of the charges, the I anticipated that there
20		were going to be some problems with the
21		complainant.
22	Q	On what basis if you didn't know she was a drug
23		addict?
24	А	Just because of the nature of the complaint.
25	Q	I see. So you knew she was the nature of the

complaint. What are you focusing on there? 1 2 Well --Α That she was a sex trade worker? 3 0 4 Yes, in part. А If you knew she was a sex trade worker, didn't 5 0 б that take you into the realm of knowing she was a 7 drug addict? Well, when you say knowing -- if you're asking me 8 Α 9 to confirm that I knew that she was a drug addict, 10 the answer is no, I didn't know she was a drug 11 addict, but when I read it, of course, I am going to come to the conclusion that it's a strong 12 13 probability that she's a drug addict. 14 0 All right. Normally the witnesses for the items 15 of medical questions, continuity, photographic evidence, evidence about blood and other 16 17 toxicology matters, those matters would have to be 18 addressed by witnesses, some of them expert witnesses? 19 20 Yes. Α They'd have to be lined up in advance for the 21 Q 22 trial date and scheduled for trial? 23 А Yes. 24 Do you know whether or not Ms. Connor had done 0 25 that?

1	А	No.
2	MR. ROBERTS:	I have no further questions. Thank you, sir.
3	A	Thank you.
4	CROSS-EXAMINA	ATION BY MR. GRATL:
5	Q	Mr. Romano, my name is Jason Gratl. We met
6		earlier. I'm counsel for the Downtown Eastside
7	A	Yes.
8	Q	affected individuals and communities. You
9		testified earlier that Ms. Connor came to you
10		or came to you before entering a stay of
11		proceedings and discussed the case?
12	A	I testified that I don't have an independent
13		recollection of Ms. Connor coming to me and having
14		a meeting, but I'm satisfied based on what's been
15		said that she must have come to me. But I don't
16		recall her coming to my office and sitting down
17		and us having a meeting or the details of the
18		meeting.
19	Q	You're saying you don't have any reason to doubt
20		her testimony?
21	A	No.
22	Q	And you prefer her own recollection to yours, in
23		effect?
24	A	Well, that's one way of putting it.
25	Q	It would have been your practice to discuss not

1		only the stay of proceedings of the lead or most
2		severe charge, but also any less severe charges
3		that were set out on the information?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	And then it would have also been your practice to
б		discuss whether the prosecution might be
7		successful on lesser and included offences?
8	A	Are you are you talking about my practice in
9		general or with reference to these specific
10		charges?
11	Q	These types of discussions that you have with
12		Crown, even senior Crown, about entering a stay of
13		proceedings. When they come to you, especially in
14		a context where you initially approved the
15		charges, you would discuss whether a prosecution
16		on a lesser included offence could be successful?
17	A	Yes.
18	Q	And similarly, you would discuss other remedies
19		outside of criminal charges, such as 810 peace
20		bonds, where a complainant has reasonable grounds
21		to fear for their safety?
22	A	Not in this file we wouldn't have.
23	Q	Why do you say that?
24	А	Because it wouldn't have been that wouldn't
25		have been even a remote possibility given the

1		serious nature of these charges, that we would
2		have entertained a section 810 information as
3		opposed to the charges that were approved.
4	Q	Why do you say it would have been a remote
5		possibility?
6	A	I said it wouldn't have been even a remote
7		possibility because it was from our point of
8		view as the Crown, these charges were so serious
9		those would have been the charges that should have
10		been proceeded with.
11	Q	Even if I mean, in order to obtain an 810 peace
12		bond, which is effectively a type of restraining
13		order under the Criminal Code, the Crown doesn't
14		need to show beyond a reasonable doubt that an
15		individual has committed an offence but only
16		reasonable grounds on objective and subjective
17	A	Yes.
18	MR. ANDREWS:	I am going to object here because it appears to
19		me
20	THE REGISTRAN	R: Would you use the microphone, please.
21	THE COMMISSIO	ONER: Sorry?
22	MR. ANDREWS:	Mark Andrews, counsel for the witness. I am
23		going to object here because it appears to me that
24		Mr. Gratl is once again going down that line where
25		he's seeking to essentially engage the witness in

a discussion about the kind of mental processes 1 2 that were or could have been engaged in the course of a discussion about staying the proceedings. 3 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I don't think he's referring specific 4 5 to this case. He's going into policy as to what's done with lesser included charges. 6 7 MR. ANDREWS: Well, nevertheless, the only -- I mean, your terms of reference deal with this particular stay. 8 THE COMMISSIONER: 9 I know that. 10 MR. ANDREWS: The only -- of course you do, sir. The only 11 reference -- the only relevance that this would have is if he's suggesting that it goes to what 12 occurred in this particular case, and it appears 13 to me that he's asking the witness questions with 14 15 respect to the kind of mental processes that could 16 have been engaged in in terms of dealing with this case through using general practice. 17 18 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, with respect, I have to disagree with you, Mr. Andrews. He's asking what the general 19 20 practice is about lesser included charges and what the policy in the Crown office is, and that's 21 22 fine. So he's not second-guessing the Crown here 23 as to what happened in this case. MR. ANDREWS: Well, I think he's suggesting other ways the 24 25 matter could have been proposed -- could have been

1 dealt with. 2 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, that isn't what he said. What he's 3 saying -- so far all he's done is asking about the 4 policy of lesser included charges, and there's 5 nothing wrong with that. So go ahead, Mr. Gratl. б MR. DOUST: May I? 7 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. MR. DOUST: With the greatest respect, Mr. Commissioner, what 8 9 he's really getting at is what should have been 10 done, otherwise what could have been done is 11 irrelevant. 12 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, he hasn't -- he's entitled to ask what 13 the general policy is about lesser included charges. That's all he's asked. He hasn't asked 14 15 -- I don't know what his ultimate purpose is, but when he goes there we'll deal with it. 16 17 But with respect, it isn't relevant unless it's MR. DOUST: there for that. There's no other conceivable 18 19 relevance to that question in relation to your 20 inquiry with respect to this specific incident. 21 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, he's entitled to know what the general 22 policy is as to the background, so I've made the 23 ruling. 24 MR. DOUST: I accept it. 25 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

1	THE	REGISTRA	R: For the record, that was Mr. Doust addressing
2			the bench.
3	MR.	GRATL:	
4		Q	Mr. Romano, I was asking about 810 peace bonds
5			just
6		A	Generally.
7		Q	generally, that a reasonable prosecutor is not
8			required to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that a
9			complainant has an objective
10		A	Basis for fear.
11		Q	basis for fear for her physical or
12			psychological safety.
13		A	Yes.
14		Q	All that's required is the Crown to show
15			reasonable grounds?
16		A	Yes.
17		Q	It's basically easier to get a peace bond?
18		А	Pardon me?
19		Q	It's just easier for a prosecutor to get a peace
20			bond than it is to approve criminal charges? The
21			threshold is lower?
22		A	That's an interesting question. I suppose it
23			depends on the witness, how successful the witness
24			is in conveying her fear.
25		Q	All right. But the threshold, the legal

1		threshold
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	is lower?
4		The strength and credibility of the evidence
5		required to meet the burden is lesser?
6	A	Yes.
7	Q	And it would be standard practice when making
8		charge approval decisions to consider whether a
9		peace bond, section 810 peace bond would be an
10		available option?
11	A	In a case are we specifically talking about
12		this 1997 charge approval?
13	Q	I was just speaking generally. I mean in domestic
14		assault situations, for example, it would be
15	A	Yes, a section 810 is I would hesitate to use
16		the word routinely considered, but it's certainly
17		an option that's available.
18	Q	So in a domestic assault context, for example, if
19		it's proving difficult or there's some doubts
20		about whether or not the prosecution can prove
21		if that beyond a reasonable doubt the husband
22		has beaten his wife and is guilty of assault, a
23		section 810 peace bond would be considered?
24	THE COMMISSI	ONER: So why are we talking about peace bonds here
25		when we've got charges of attempted murder and

1	confinement and all of those? What's the
2	relevance of a peace bond? Peace bonds under
3	section 810 are imposed in different circumstances
4	to keep the peace and all of those factors, but
5	we're into a different scenario here altogether,
6	are we not?
7	MR. GRATL: Well, it's an
8	THE COMMISSIONER: I don't understand.
9	MR. GRATL: assault context.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: I don't understand the point of this.
11	MR. GRATL: It's an assault context where the complainant is
12	afraid for her safety.
13	THE COMMISSIONER: Well, the issue here is whether the stay of
14	proceedings ought to have been granted.
15	MR. GRATL: But I think the Crown counsel policy when
16	considering when charges have to be laid cascades
17	downwards in terms of looking first at the most
18	serious offences where the prosecution can be
19	successful, then looking at lesser offences and
20	lesser included offences, and then looking at a
21	peace bond as the final option in cases involving
22	violence.
23	THE COMMISSIONER: Well
24	MR. GRATL: I'm just exploring
25	THE COMMISSIONER: I don't see where that even arises in the

1	circumstances of	this case. Ms. Connor said that
2	2 the reason she s	tayed the charge, she wasn't
3	3 satisfied under	the guide under the policy
4	guidelines that	they could proceed with this case
5	because of the c	condition of the complainant, so
6	5 where is the iss	ue of peace bonds and lesser
7	7 included charges	? How is that relevant?
8	3 MR. GRATL: All right.	
9	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.	
10) MR. GRATL:	
11	Q I take it then y	rou don't recall having a
12	2 conversation abo	ut peace bonds with Ms. Connor?
13	A No.	
14	Q Now I've got a c	uestion in respect of bail
15	5 matters, and I a	nticipate some objection from Mr.
16	5 Andrews possibly	·.
17	7 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.	Ask the question and we'll deal
18	3 with it.	
19	MR. GRATL: All right.	
20	Q Before speaking	with Ms. Connor about the stay you
21	had already form	ulated in your mind that the
22	2 accused did not	represent a threat to sex workers
23	3 on the Downtown	Eastside; is that correct? That's
24	the question that	t I want to ask.
25	5 MR. ANDREWS: Well, I indicat	ed to my friend that I would

1		object.
2	THE COMMISSI	IONER: Your microphone, please.
3	MR. ANDREWS	: I indicated to my friend that I would object to
4		questions which he indicated yesterday he was
5		going to be asking this witness which related to
6		inquiries into this witness's conduct at the bail
7		proceedings, and if that's where we're going, I do
8		have an objection.
9	THE COMMISSI	IONER: I agree with you that whether or not he was
10		granted bail on the earlier occasion really is not
11		relevant. What we're focused on here is the
12		propriety of the entry of the stay of proceedings.
13		I mean, you know, Pickton was obviously granted
14		bail, and I don't know what the conditions are,
15		and I'm not so sure they're really relevant, but
16		what's important here is why did the Crown enter a
17		stay of proceedings in light of the evidence that
18		they had. That's really what we need to focus on.
19	MR. GRATL:	And just to provide a little background to the
20		questioning, what we have in this situation is
21		RCMP officers who don't arrest Mr. Pickton at the
22		hospital because it's an inconvenience. In my
23		submission, that would be taking a rather cavalier
24		attitude towards the dangers posed by Mr. Pickton.
25		And then at the other end of the charges we have a

Crown who did not apply the exceptional 1 2 circumstances test on the basis that Mr. Pickton 3 did not represent an extreme danger. And in 4 between we have this witness, who has a conversation with Ms. Connor before that stay is 5 entered, and I want to ask this witness firstly б 7 whether he had formulated an opinion about whether Mr. Pickton represented a danger to sex workers on 8 9 the Downtown Eastside at the time -- before he had 10 a conversation with Ms. Connor, and in order to 11 get at that I want to put to him the bail 12 conditions that were imposed ex parte on Mr. Pickton, which don't involve a no-go condition to 13 the Downtown Eastside, which in my submission 14 15 would be a reflection of the level of danger that 16 this witness attributed to Mr. Pickton. 17 THE COMMISSIONER: But that really isn't what we're here for. Prior to his conversation with Connor. 18 MR. GRATL: 19 THE COMMISSIONER: No. MR. GRATL: And I appreciate that the terms of reference do not 20 21 include, I think regrettably -- I think 22 regrettably they don't include the bail 23 conditions, because we know some women lost their 24 lives in that period between the time the charge 25 was laid and the stay of proceedings, so the

1 absence of bail conditions, a no-go condition, is 2 not part of the terms of reference, not something you can look at directly, but in my respectful 3 4 submission the issue of whether Mr. Pickton represented a danger and whether this witness had 5 6 formulated an opinion as to Mr. Pickton's threat 7 to sex workers is highly relevant to your terms of reference. 8

9 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, first of all, he's already said he has 10 no recollection about that at all, and, secondly, 11 the bail hearing really are so remote and so remote from the terms of reference that they're 12 not really admissible. You can argue at the end 13 of the day that the system as a whole let down the 14 15 victims and let down the safety of the general 16 public by allowing him to be loose. That's 17 something you can argue. But, you know, we can't 18 get into whether or not he should have been granted bail after he was arrested. The real 19 20 issue here is why was there a stay of proceedings when he was in the system. That's what we're 21 22 dealing with. 23 MR. GRATL: Those are my submissions. Thank you, Mr.

24 Commissioner.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you.

1	MR. GRATL:	And given your ruling, those are my questions as
2		well.
3	THE COMMISSI	ONER: Thank you, Mr. Gratl. Ms. Narbonne.
4	CROSS-EXAMIN	ATION BY MS. NARBONNE:
5	Q	Thank you. I'm Suzette Narbonne. I'm counsel for
6		the aboriginal interest. I take it in the charge
7		approval process you would have reviewed the
8		report to Crown counsel; is that correct?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	And you still have that book in front of you; is
11		that right?
12	A	I do.
13	Q	I'm wondering if you could just look at tab 3,
14		which is the report to Crown counsel, and tell me
15		if that's the document you would have reviewed.
16	A	Sorry, it's tab 3?
17	Q	Yes. Yes, tab 3.
18	A	You're right.
19	Q	Yes, that's it?
20	A	Yeah.
21	Q	The police provide short "will says"; is that
22		right?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	And I take it that's something that is of
25		assistance to the Crown who's doing the charge

1		approval because it's a quick synopsis of what you
2		can expect from the witnesses; is that right?
3	А	Yes.
4	Q	And that's something you would have reviewed?
5	А	Yes.
б	Q	Okay. So I'm just going to take you to page 7 of
7		35, and that's the "will say" from Anderson. Do
8		you see that right at the very top?
9	A	What I have the page I'm looking at reads
10		it's on the bottom left it says page 19 of 35.
11	Q	Oh, sorry. No. Could you do you have a page 7
12		of 35?
13	A	Oh, you're talking about the "will say" of Ms.
14		Anderson?
15	Q	Yes. Can I just take a look and make sure we're
16		on the same page here.
17	А	Yes. "she is working prostitute in the
18		Vancouver East End"?
19	Q	Yes. And what else does it say about her?
20	A	Well, she says she's a heroin addict.
21	Q	Does that help you refresh your memory about
22		whether or not you knew she was a heroin addict at
23		the time you approved charges?
24	А	No, it doesn't help refresh my memory.
25	Q	Okay. But that is something you would have looked

R. Romano (for the Commission) Cross-exam by Ms. Narbonne

1		at when
2	A	Yes.
3	Q	you approved charges?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	Okay. So would it if I suggest to you that at
6		the time you approved charges you knew she was a
7		heroin addict, do you think that's more likely
8		than not?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	Okay. Now, you've also told us that from your
11		review of the record of proceedings it appears
12		this went through the normal course and then a
13		trial date would have been set sometime in
14		September or October; is that right?
15	A	I'd have to see the date on the trial scheduling
16		memo to know the that would tell me the exact
17		date the trial was set.
18	Q	I know, and we don't have that, and we don't have
19		the trial notice either, right, but you did
20	A	I thought I thought there were
21	Q	Is there something in there? Well, I'll take you
22		to the record of proceedings, and maybe you can
23		find it for us.
24	A	I'd have to I thought in the material I
25		reviewed that there was a trial scheduling memo,

R. Romano (for the Commission) Cross-exam by Ms. Narbonne

1		and it would have had a date on it.
2	Q	Tab 16. My friend has assisted me here.
3	A	Okay.
4	Q	And again we are in Exhibit 133, and looking at
5		the page numbers at the bottom, page
б	A	Sure.
7	Q	42. Does that help?
8	A	Yeah, I've got it.
9	Q	Okay. Can you
10	A	October 16th, 1997, it appears as if there was a
11		pre-trial conference, and then it went over to
12		October 22nd, and that may have been the date that
13		the trial dates were set or set, and then the
14		November 4th appearance date, according to the
15		record of proceedings, indicates that the accused
16		was to confirm the trial date on that date.
17	Q	Okay. So you told us that you would do your trial
18		scheduling some months in advance
19	А	Yes.
20	Q	of course, right?
21		And a file like this is a red-flagged file,
22		and it shows that on the file and on the schedule,
23		right?
24	A	Yeah.
25	Q	Okay. So by October is it most likely that this

file ge	ets assigned to someone?
---------	--------------------------

- 2 A I would have expected so, yes.
- 3 Q All right.

- 4 The schedules -- the trial Crown would have had А their schedules, as I mentioned earlier, three to 5 б four months in advance, so if I was the trial 7 Crown I would have expected to have on my desk in front of me my schedule for the next three to four 8 9 months. So October, November I assume Ms. Connor 10 would have been aware that she had been assigned 11 this trial.
- 12 Q Okay. And in the normal course -- I mean, I'm not 13 familiar with the courthouse where you were 14 working, but does a Crown get assigned to a 15 specific courtroom for a period of time or --
- 16 A No.
- 17 Q Okay.
- 18 A No.

19QBecause this is a longer trial than normal, right?20AThat's right, and in all probability she would21have been scheduled -- the week prior she probably22would have been scheduled to be out of court to23prepare this trial.

24QOkay. And is it also likely that she would have25been -- you would have had to look at it and say,

1		"Okay, I've got a four-day trial coming up. I
2		need to assign a Crown just to those four days"?
3	A	Yes.
4	Q	Okay. And that would probably happen sometime in
5		October after the date's set?
б	A	As soon as I was made aware of the trial date and
7		I had the judges' rota for the month of February I
8		would have done the assignments for February.
9	Q	And then you've also told us I'm not going to
10		take you to the tab unless you want to go back
11		there, but tab 14 was that letter of October 22nd
12		where that someone sends to you.
13	А	Right.
14	Q	And you probably would have given it to the
15		assigned Crown, right?
16	A	Yes.
17	Q	Okay. And it's a letter where specific disclosure
18		is being asked for. It appears that some Crown no
19		longer has conduct of the file, someone new is
20		going to have conduct of the file, right?
21	A	Right.
22	Q	So is it likely that Ms. Connor is the person who
23		would have been given that letter, because we're
24		now looking
25	A	Yeah.

1 -- at October 22nd? 0 2 Likely she would have been given that letter. Α Okay. And you've told us that your view of red 3 0 4 files is that they require some advance 5 preparation, right? б Yes. А 7 And I take it that was common knowledge in your Q office? 8 9 А Yes. 10 Okay. And certainly an experienced prosecutor Q 11 like Ms. Connor at the time would have been aware of that? 12 13 Yes. Α 14 MS. NARBONNE: Thank you. Those are my questions. 15 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms. Narbonne. All right. Who's 16 next? Mr. Doust. 17 I think it's me. I don't have the list in front of MR. DOUST: 18 me. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. DOUST: 19 20 Yes, it's Len Doust, appearing for the Criminal Q 21 Justice Branch. Judge Romano, over the years I 22 take it you had worked fairly extensively with Ms. Connor in the sense that she was in the same 23 office or offices as you and you were familiar 24 25 with what she was doing?

1	А	She I worked during the 1980s is when I was
2		doing some defence work. I had dealt with Ms.
3		Connor while she was doing Crown work. And when I
4		went to the Crown office in 1989 as part of the
5		Fraser Region, that's when I first began working
6		with Randi. The Port Coquitlam office was the
7		first office we worked in together.
8	Q	And you came to know her in terms of her
9		competence?
10	A	Definitely.
11	Q	And what can you say about her competence?
12	A	Very competent.
13	Q	You came to know her in terms of her diligence?
14	A	Very diligent.
15	Q	And can you tell the commissioner maybe on a scale
16		of one to ten based on your experience in dealing
17		with her both as a prosecutor from your point of
18		view and also in dealing with her as a defence
19		counsel what would you say with respect to her
20		aggressiveness in pressing the Crown's cases and
21		the Crown's positions?
22	A	Very aggressive.
23	Q	She had a reputation, as a matter of fact, for
24		being a hard-nosed Crown, didn't she?
25	A	Yes.

1	Q	And she was not a Crown who would easily or
2		readily, from what you had seen of her, easily or
3		readily back away from a case unless she had a
4		very good reason for doing so?
5	A	I agree with that.
6	Q	You assigned this case to her?
7	A	Yes, and I would do it again.
8	Q	I take it that clearly implies that you had
9		absolute confidence in her in terms of her ability
10		to prepare and take this case through to
11		conclusion?
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	And finally, can you comment at all on her
14		judgment from the perspective of the Crown based
15		on your experience with her, including your role
16		as the administrative Crown?
17	A	Sorry, the question again is?
18	Q	Her judgment.
19	A	Sound judgment.
20	MR. DOUST:	Yes. Thank you.
21	THE COMMISSI	ONER: Thank you, Mr. Doust.
22	CROSS-EXAMIN	ATION BY MR. MAKOSZ:
23	Q	Mr. Commissioner, Rory Makosz for the Government
24		of Canada. Mr. Romano, you may be aware that the
25		commissioner has indicated an interest

1		particularly in systemic factors in the course of
2		this inquiry. Are you aware of that?
3	A	To some degree.
4	Q	And you were the admin. Crown at Coquitlam
5		throughout the period of the terms of reference?
6	A	Port Coquitlam.
7	Q	Port Coquitlam. Thank you. And as such I think
8		you're probably well-placed to describe the
9		general context in which the Crown was working at
10		that time.
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	And that's essentially what I want to explore with
13		you. I want to focus essentially on the Crown
14		practices throughout that time and their
15		relationship with the police. My questions are
16		going to be largely general and contextual with
17		some reference to this particular case.
18	MR. ANDREWS:	Excuse me for a moment, but I thought this
19		witness was here to give evidence with respect to
20		the stay, and I'm having some difficulty seeing
21		how the way in which the Crown office functions
22		generally and interactive with the police goes to
23		the issue that is in the terms of reference before
24		you in 4(b).
25	THE COMMISSIC	ONER: Well, here the police officer who had

1		conduct of the file has already made comment about
2		the stay of proceedings, and so it's relevant for
3		me to know what the relationship is between the
4		Crown and the police.
5	MR. ANDREWS:	As concerned with the stay of proceedings or
6		generally, sir?
7	THE COMMISSI	ONER: No. Well, this is by way of background, and
8		I have to have knowledge of what was in the
9		background of the relationship, and obviously the
10		ultimate question here is the stay of proceedings,
11		but I can't decide that in isolation unless I know
12		what the relationship was between them, so I don't
13		I see no difficulty in what he's doing here.
14	MR. ANDREWS:	All right.
15	MR. MAKOSZ:	And if I may, Mr. Commissioner, I think the
16		context of that relationship between the Crown and
17		the police actually transcends this particular
18		investigation because obviously that's something
19		that's ongoing through other parts of the
20		investigation that are the subject of other parts
21		of the terms of reference. And if it sets my
22		friend at ease, I do intend my questions to be
23		quite general. I'm not intending to question the
24		exercise of the discretion in this case.
25	THE COMMISSI	ONER: One of my duties here is to ensure that

1 or to make recommendations where necessary as to 2 future conduct and future policies. MR. ANDREWS: I appreciate that, sir, although it appears to 3 4 me, and I hesitate to stray into these grounds except to the extent they relate to this witness, 5 it does appear to me, sir, that your terms of б 7 reference with respect to recommendations do not extend to the conduct of the prosecution by the 8 9 Criminal Justice Branch or by this witness, with 10 respect. 11 THE COMMISSIONER: You know, I need to know the background. 12 Now, I've made the ruling. 13 I understand that, sir. MR. ANDREWS: 14 THE COMMISSIONER: Go ahead. 15 MR. MAKOSZ: 16 Mr. Romano, you discussed the charge approval 0 17 practices in your office, and I just want to go 18 through that very, very briefly with you. It's 19 fair to say, I think, that the review that you 20 conduct at the charge approval stage is not as in depth a review as you would for preparation for 21 22 trial, for example? 23 Α I agree with you. 24 And when you were doing your charge approval 0 25 reviews, you've said that I think you did about

2,000 a year, if that's right?

2 A Yes.

1

- 3 Q And so you don't really have time to go into the 4 depths of a file, for example, reading lengthy 5 witness statements or informations to obtain that 6 kind of thing?
- A No, I read whatever's been provided. I don't take shortcuts. If the material is in front of me, I review the material in its entirety, including the witness statements. Whatever the police have provided in the report to Crown I read.
- 12 Q And the purpose behind doing that, I take it then, 13 is to look for any problems at the outset that you 14 can basically head off before this thing proceeds 15 on its way through the process, in addition to 16 obviously looking at whether or not the charge 17 will be approved?
- 18 A Well, the first step is to make sure that the
 19 charge approval guidelines are being complied
 20 with.
- 21 Q And that's what I was going to turn to, because I 22 don't need to take you through these in detail, 23 but obviously the admissibility of evidence is a 24 key factor in the charge approval decision? 25 A Yes.

1	Q	And this is something admissibility, of course,
2		is a concern for any prosecution?
3	A	Yes.
4	Q	And it's that's essentially because it's not
5		only what evidence the investigation, the police
б		investigation has produced, it's also how that
7		evidence was obtained that's important?
8	A	Yes.
9	Q	And so essentially the investigative practices of
10		the police can have a direct impact upon the
11		viability of a prosecution?
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	And so I wanted to explore with you the
14		communication that the Crown and police have in
15		general with respect to investigative practices.
16		It's quite common that the police during the
17		course of an investigation will seek and receive
18		legal advice from the Crown's office, for example?
19	A	I'm a little reluctant to say it's quite common.
20		I would say it's it's not a matter routine that
21		the police come looking to the Crown for legal
22		advice. In large part I assume it depends on the
23		nature of the investigation and if they're
24		gathering evidence and they're seeking an opinion
25		as to to making sure that the evidence is going

1		to be admissible.
2	Q	Perhaps a better way of putting it is it wouldn't
3		be unusual for the police to do so?
4	А	No.
5	Q	And in addition, if a case ends up being stayed or
6		fails at trial, the Crown will often debrief with
7		the lead investigator and explain the reasons for
8		that and the background behind what happened?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	And on occasion members of the Crown will put on
11		educational, I suppose seminars for members of the
12		police on specific new issues of law?
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	And so in all these ways the Crown is effectively
15		educating the police but also reinforcing the
16		importance of their investigative conduct?
17	A	Exactly.
18	Q	And in the result the police are conscious not
19		only of what evidence they're getting to build a
20		case but how they go about getting that evidence?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	And there's an example in this case and with
23		respect to a search of Mr. Pickton's trailer. Do
24		you recall that occurring?
25	А	Do I recall the search occurring or do I recall

1		mention being made in the report to Crown of a
2		search of the trailer?
3	Q	Mention in the report to Crown.
4	A	Yes, I do.
5	Q	And in this case, if you'll recall, Sergeant
6		Connor actually initially viewed the trailer with
7		the consent of Mr. Pickton's niece?
8	A	Yes.
9	Q	And rather than engage in a search and collect
10		evidence at that point, he went on to obtain a
11		warrant?
12	A	Yes.
13	Q	And that was how the evidence from the trailer was
14		actually obtained in this case?
15	A	Yes.
16	Q	And this is an important step because when you get
17		to the prosecution stage a search that's conducted
18		under a warrant is presumptively reasonable?
19	A	Yes.
20	Q	And whereas a consent search or a warrantless
21		which is a form of warrantless search, of course,
22		is prima facie unreasonable?
23	A	That's my understanding of the law.
24	Q	So when you're coming to a prosecution, if you
25		have a search that's based on a warrant, the

1		defence faces the burden of successfully
2		challenging that warrant and arguing the evidence
3		should be excluded?
4	A	Yes.
5	Q	Whereas if you only have the consent of a party,
6		the Crown bears an onus of proving the consent was
7		informed?
8	A	Yes.
9	Q	And, of course, the Crown also has to establish
10		that the search didn't exceed the scope and
11		purpose of that consent; is that fair?
12	A	Your analysis is correct.
13	Q	And so is it fair to say that all things being
14		equal it's generally preferable from the Crown's
15		perspective to have a warrant to support a search
16		as opposed to not having a warrant or proceeding
17		by consent?
18	THE COMMISSI	ONER: So where are we going with all of this?
19	MR. MAKOSZ:	Well, in this case, Mr. Commissioner
20	THE COMMISSI	ONER: It's a nice argument on section 8 of the
21		Charter, but tell me how that relates to what
22		we're here for.
23	MR. MAKOSZ:	Well, I was going to come to it, Mr. Commissioner.
24		Just to point out that Mike Connor in taking the
25		tack that he did, in pursuing a warrant even after

1	having already seen the trailer, was clearly aware
2	of this issue and how it could affect the
3	prosecution later on and so took steps
4	accordingly.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I assume that since he sent a report 6 to Crown counsel and the Crown was satisfied that 7 it met the test for the laying of charges that all that was done, and what we're really concerned 8 9 with now is whether or not the stay of proceedings 10 was entered properly, putting it very generally and somewhat crudely, but that's really what we're 11 here for. I mean, I don't know if it helps me to 12 13 know what evidence that Corporal Connor gathered 14 prior to that. We assume that they had enough 15 evidence to lay the charges, so --

Then I'll explain, Mr. Commissioner. I'm not --16 MR. MAKOSZ: 17 I'm simply using this as one example of the police 18 looking forward to the prosecution, because that's 19 something that continues throughout the terms of 20 reference with respect to all the investigations, is the police have to be cognizant of the impact 21 22 of the steps they take at the investigative stage on the ultimate prosecution. 23

24THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I think we know that the -- from what25Connor testified to and what Shenher testified to

1		that they were looking forward to the prosecution
2		because they believed that the Crown had a strong
3		case, so I don't know where that gets us as far as
4		Mr. Romano is concerned. I mean, it's nice that
5		we've got an interesting discussion here going on
б		search and seizure. But, anyway, I want you to
7		move on.
8	MR. MAKOSZ:	I will move on, Mr. Commissioner.
9	Q	I want to change over to a topic in respect to the
10		categorization of this file because at the charge
11		approval stage you're reviewing it, but you're
12		also categorizing the file. It was categorized in
13		this case as a red file?
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	And in your "will say" your "will say" says
16		that this is because it required more advance
17		preparation than is ordinarily the case?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	I wanted to explore with you, is that because of
20		the seriousness of the file or because of the
21		complexity of the file?
22	A	Both.
23	Q	And is that distinct you may be familiar with
24		the Crown policy with respect to serious and
25		sensitive cases.

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	Is a red file in that sense distinct from a
3		serious and sensitive case?
4	А	There's some overlap.
5	Q	So would it be true that all serious and sensitive
б		cases are red files but not
7	А	Yes.
8	Q	all red files are necessarily serious and
9		sensitive cases?
10	А	Exactly.
11	Q	And this was not a serious and sensitive case?
12	A	In terms of the policy?
13	Q	Yes.
14	А	I don't think it would have fallen into that
15		category if we're on the same page in terms of the
16		policy I think you're referring to. Is this the
17		policy where it has to be referred to the regional
18		Crown
19	Q	Yes.
20	А	when a stay is entered?
21	Q	If you need a reference, it's at tab 26 of Exhibit
22		133.
23	А	No, this case wouldn't have fallen into that
24		category in my view. And I think the reason I say
25		that is the policy itself addresses or it says:

	This policy should affect a very small
	percentage of the cases dealt with by Crown
	Counsel,
	and this case wouldn't fall into that very small
	percentage.
Q	Thank you. And there's another categorization,
	and I think you've alluded to it, with respect to
	major crimes, because prosecutions can be
	specially assigned as well almost at the outset,
	can they not?
А	They are, yes.
Q	And this is the reason for not specially
	assigning this file is that it wasn't something
	that was going to require any kind of complex
	contact with the police throughout the course of
	the prosecution?
A	I don't know about that. There always should be
	some ongoing contact with the police. With a file
	of this nature there should be.
Q	Well, let me explore that a little bit just by
	looking at this case, for example. If a case
	isn't specially assigned after the charge approval
	stage, it goes into essentially an administrative
	process where it will go to disclosure court,
	arraignment court, it will be set down on trial
	A Q A

1 lists, it will be handled by different 2 prosecutors, and it won't come into any individual 3 prosecutor's control until that prosecutor is 4 assigned as trial Crown for that file; is that 5 fair? б Α Yes. 7 0 And the only exception to that really would be in the case of a specially assigned file? 8 9 Α Yes. 10 And so essentially no one throughout that period Q 11 is preparing for trial until -- unless and until they are assigned as trial Crown? 12 13 No. When it's making its way through disclosure Α court, the disclosure court Crown are well aware 14 15 of sort of setting up the trial if it's going to 16 happen. 17 And that's perhaps my flaw with my question Q 18 really, is when I mean preparing it for trial I mean looking at it in a very in-depth way in terms 19 of -- I mean, disclosure is one thing. It's 20 21 something that has to happen, and there's a 22 process for it. But an in-depth analysis of the trial and the evidence and its likely 23 admissibility at the trial, that doesn't really 24 25 happen until trial Crown gets a hold of it?

1	A	That's fair.
2	Q	And so in this case it appears that well, let
3		me first just clarify. The trial Crown would
4		obviously not get assigned to the file until a
5		trial date was actually set?
6	A	Yes.
7	Q	And the best that we can do is to guess that a
8		trial date would have been set sometime in late
9		October, early November of 1997 in this case?
10	A	Yes.
11	Q	Which would have given Randi Connor as trial Crown
12		about three months to prepare for trial?
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	And what's complicated by her preparation
15		obviously is going to be complicated by the fact
16		that she has other things on her plate during that
17		three-week period leading up to trial as well?
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	And I think you mentioned that you would try to
20		ensure in your scheduling that a trial Crown would
21		have the week before trial, for example, as time
22		to prepare?
23	A	Yes, and also if the trial Crown came to me and
24		said that they needed additional time over and
25		above what the schedule was providing them for, I

1		would make every effort to make sure they got the
2		additional time they needed.
3	Q	And are there any were there any formal
4		practices or policies in your office with respect
5		to once a file has been assigned to a trial Crown
6		with respect to their having to review it
7		immediately?
8	A	Was there a policy in place that it was incumbent
9		upon them to review the file, review a red file as
10		soon as they came to
11	Q	Yes.
12	А	receive the knowledge that they were
13		prosecuting a red file?
14	Q	Yes.
15	A	No. The approach is entirely up to the individual
16		prosecutor.
17	Q	And this becomes significant in this case,
18		obviously, because if you have a severely addicted
19		witness, you're going to require some time just to
20		rehabilitate them?
21	A	Could you ask that question again, please?
22	Q	Certainly. If you've got a witness who is
23		severely addicted and necessary to your
24		prosecution, you are going to need to take steps
25		to rehabilitate that witness before they testify,

1		and that process is going to take quite some time?
2	А	I think that's fair comment.
3	Q	Because I think I'm sure there would be no
4		disagreement that rehabilitating a seriously drug-
5		addicted witness is not an easy thing to do
б		regardless of how much time you might have to do
7		it?
8	А	That's fair comment.
9	Q	And so if someone has only three months if a
10		trial Crown only has three months with which to
11		prepare the file, they really need to identify the
12		problem with that witness, if there is a problem,
13		as soon as they can?
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	And that would be done by contacting and
16		interviewing the witness?
17	A	And liaising with the Crown-based Victim Services
18		as well as the police-based Victim Services, and
19		the one thing I've noted, that in the police-based
20		Victim Services notes that in May of 1997 the
21		victim didn't want to be involved in with the
22		resources that might have been available to assist
23		her. Her comment to the Victim Services worker
24		according to the material I reviewed is that she
25		only wanted to be notified with respect to court

appearances.

- 2 Q And that's really the point that I'm coming to, is 3 because the challenge that Randi Connor is facing 4 is, one, she's got a three-month time period in 5 which to work, and she's got extreme demands on 6 her time with respect to her other work during 7 that period?
- 8 A You'd have to ask Randi if that's the way she felt 9 at the time.
- 10QYou'd agree this is a busy office that you're11working in at that time?
- 12 A Yes.
- 13QAnd there may be cases where, for example, a Crown14may have multiple trials in the same courtroom on15the same day even?
- 16 A Sorry, the Crown would have multiple trials?
- 17QCertainly if a Crown is assigned to a list in a18courtroom, they may have multiple trials on that19list for the same day?
- A You're right. There was 12 to 16 hours of court time booked every day, and there was probably -in an average courtroom there would be three to four trials set that the Crown would be responsible for.
- 25 Q And so Ms. Connor really has to balance her

1		preparation looking three months into the future
2		with all these current or more pressing duties
3		that are closer in the future?
4	А	And she was very capable of doing that.
5	Q	And what makes it, I think, harder for her is that
6		if she's trying to contact that witness and that
7		witness can't be contacted or doesn't return phone
8		calls or doesn't make meetings, that complicates
9		things for her?
10	A	Definitely.
11	Q	And I take it the police can provide some
12		assistance, if they're requested to, with respect
13		to contacting the witness?
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	But they also can't force the witness to do
16		anything that they don't want to do?
17	A	You're right.
18	Q	And I think it's fair to say, and if you'd agree
19		with me, that reasonably you can't expect any
20		agency to cure a person of a serious drug
21		addiction, you can only ask them to rehabilitate
22		that witness long enough for them to give
23		evidence; is that fair?
24	A	Yes.
25	Q	And this is a process, if that's going to happen,

that would really have to happen before the trial 1 date was set because -- or, sorry, once the trial 2 has been set because otherwise you wouldn't know 3 4 when you need them to be clean and sober to 5 testify? 6 Say that again. Α 7 The process of rehabilitating a witness in that 0 condition would have to begin after a trial date 8 9 has been set because otherwise you wouldn't know 10 when you would need them to be clean and sober and 11 able to testify? 12 А Yes. 13 And the last area I wanted to touch on with you is 0 14 just with respect to what happens with a file 15 after a stay of proceedings has been entered, and 16 in your "will say" it says that the normal 17 practice in your office was for serious files, if 18 a trial Crown was looking at staying them, was to discuss that first with the admin. Crown? 19 20 Prior to entering the stay? Α Prior to entering the stay. 21 Q 22 That was the -- that was the practice pretty much А 23 for all files whenever there was going to be a stay of proceedings. As I mentioned earlier, a 24 25 big part of this is the trial scheduling, which is

1		a daily challenge when cases are being stayed that
2		the court time be utilized and to give me the
3		earliest opportunity to liaise with judicial case
4		managers to move things around that needed to be
5		moved around and to change the schedules of Crown,
6		but also if there was going to be any fall-out
7		from the decision, that I would be aware of it and
8		I wouldn't be taken by surprise by getting a phone
9		call from someone who would say, "I want to speak
10		to you about a charge that was stayed."
11	Q	And by "someone" you're referring to a police
12		investigator?
13	A	Whether it be a police investigator, whether it be
14		the complainant, or anybody for that matter.
15	Q	And you've talked about how the consultation with
16		trial Crown in that respect will help in terms of
17		scheduling, but I think there's also a the
18		admin. Crown plays a sounding-board role
19		effectively with trial counsel?
20	A	More so with the young prosecutors.
21	Q	And did that do you have any recollection of
22		that type of conversation happening with Ms.
23		Connor in this case?
24	A	Just acting as a sounding board?
25	Q	Yes.

1	A	I can't recall the conversation, so I don't know
2		what the details whether it was a situation
3		where Randi was was asking me, bouncing ideas
4		off me as to the other alternatives or whether she
5		was simply explaining to me, "This is the decision
6		I am going to make. This is why I'm making the
7		decision."
8	Q	But at the very least, even if she's not asking
9		for approval, and I understand she doesn't
10		necessarily need it, you would have an
11		understanding of the basis for the stay based on
12		that conversation?
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	And I'm just going to the policy. Tab 25. If you
15		could just turn to that very quickly. There's a
16		policy relating to the appeal of stays of
17		proceedings.
18	A	Yes.
19	Q	Perhaps review would be a better word than appeal.
20	A	No, that's I think that policy relates to
21		appealing the charge approval, where charges
22		haven't been approved the police have a can
23		according to this provision, they can ask for an
24		appeal of the charge approval being reviewed.
25	THE COMMISSI	ONER: This invariably happens when a police

1 officer is not satisfied with a Crown's decision, 2 right? 3 Α Not to approve the charges, yes. 4 THE COMMISSIONER: Right. 5 MR. MAKOSZ: 6 You've predicted my next question as to the scope 0 7 of this particular policy, but I think you've also sort of alluded to the fact that the police might 8 9 call you if they had a complaint with respect to a 10 stay of proceedings. 11 Yes. Α And you would -- if that happened shortly after 12 0 13 the stay of proceedings was entered and the trial Crown had spoken to you about it, you would 14 presumably have some idea of what they were 15 16 talking about? 17 Yes. Α 18 0 And then the final area I wanted to explore with 19 you just with respect to reactivations of stays, it was Ms. Connor's evidence that she had stayed 20 21 hundreds of cases in the course of her career in 2.2 all likelihood and she could only recall having one of them be reactivated. Has it been your 23 24 experience as well that reactivating a stay is 25 extremely rare?

R. Romano (for the Commission) Re-exam by Mr. Vertlieb

2 And there are complications that can arise with Q respect to a reactivated stay or a re-laid charge 3 4 in the form of delay arguments, Charter, etcetera? 5 Α Abuse of process arguments, yes. б And Crown would be cognizant of that if they were 0 7 asked to reopen a stayed file? Yes. 8 Α 9 Q Or to approve a re-laid charge? 10 Α Yes. 11 MR. MAKOSZ: Thank you. Those are my questions. 12 MR. VERTLIEB: That is the list of scheduled questions from 13 cross-examination. I have just one area I wanted 14 to cover in re-exam, please. THE COMMISSIONER: All right. 15 16 **RE-EXAMINATION BY MR. VERTLIEB:** 17 Do you have the binder in front of you there, Q Exhibit --18 19 I do. А -- No. 133? 20 Q 21 Thank you. This arose from Mr. Roberts' 22 question, Mr. Commissioner, just to assist us. Do me a favour, please, turn to tab 16. 23 24 Α Yes. 25 0 And it's the second page, please.

1

А

Yes.

R. Romano (for the Commission) Re-exam by Mr. Vertlieb

1 THE COMMISSIONER: 15 or 16? 2 MR. VERTLIEB: 15, Mr. Commissioner. Second page. 3 А The record of proceedings? 4 MR. VERTLIEB: 5 0 Yes. б Α Yes. 7 So it came to me as a question when I heard Mr. 0 Roberts ask you about your dealings. Look at that 8 9 column that's got "Crown". 10 Yeah. А 11 So the "RR", that would be you? 0 That's me. "RC" is Randi Connor. "VT " 12 А is Vittorio Toselli. 13 Wait. Hold on. Too quick for me. So that seems 14 0 15 to be the only time you have actually dealt with this file? 16 17 The only time I dealt with it in court. А 18 0 In court, yes. So just run through those other 19 initials for us because these would be people that 20 you would be acting as admin. Crown to, please. So "RC"? 21 22 Well, I'd be acting admin. Crown with respect to А 23 the Port Coquitlam appearances. The disclosure court appearances, I was not the administrative 24 Crown for disclosure court. 25

1	Q	Thank you.
2	А	But "RC" would be Randi Connor. "VT" would be
3		Vittorio Toselli.
4	Q	I'm sorry?
5	А	Vittorio Toselli. "BMC" is Bev MacLean.
б	Q	And where is Bev MacLean?
7	A	Bev MacLean is the or back in '97 would have
8		been at disclosure court in Burnaby.
9	Q	Thank you. Keep going, please.
10	A	The last entry that I see on the record of
11		proceedings is Randi's Connor on September 8th,
12		1997, and then I see the October 16th, 1997
13		pre-trial conference, and there's no entries for
14		who was the Crown or the defence, so I don't know
15		whether the scheduled court appearance was struck
16		from the list on that date or not. And then I see
17		over the page on October 22nd, '97, that there's a
18		notation the file was returned to Coquitlam, which
19		tells me that it had run its course in disclosure
20		court and it was returned to Port Coquitlam for
21		Mr. Pickton to appear to confirm his trial date,
22		and that was on November 4th, '97, that "RC",
23		who's Randi Connor, appeared on behalf of the
24		Crown, the accused appeared in person.
25	Q	What does "CTD" mean?

R. Romano (for the Commission) Re-exam by Mr. Vertlieb

1	A	Confirm trial date.
2	Q	And then those dates that have nothing beside them
3		are written in advance by the court clerk just to
4		schedule the trial dates to make it easier for
5		someone to fill in what happened on each of those
б		dates?
7	A	That's right.
8	Q	But, of course, nothing happened because there was
9		no trial?
10	A	That's right.
11	Q	Just go back to the first page of the record of
12		proceedings. You'll see September 8th, '97, at
13		9:30 a.m. Courtroom 3 "CNT" means continuation?
14	A	Yeah. I'm a bit confused by that notation because
15		it may be may represent a continuation of the
16		June 24th, 1997 pre-trial conference, but that
17		doesn't make a lot of sense to me either.
18	Q	Okay. Now, you'll see the reference to "RC",
19		which is Randi Connor?
20	A	Yes.
21	Q	And then there's something stroked out and beneath
22		it looks like "SL"; is that right?
23	A	That's the under the heading of "Results"
24		it's you see in the initials that read down the
25		"Results" column where it says "IBJ". That stands

R. Romano (for the Commission) Re-exam by Mr. Vertlieb

1		for initiated by judge. "IBD" stands for
2		initiated by defence. "IBC" stands for initiated
3		by Crown. The "SL" that appears under the
4		September 8th, 1997 entry, "SL", I'm not sure what
5		that notation stands for.
6	Q	Okay. Let me just see while we're on this. So
7		the disclosure was in Burnaby. You wouldn't have
8		had any involvement with that?
9	А	No.
10	Q	And November 4, '97, confirm trial date.
11		Appearance "P", what does that mean?
12	A	Sorry, which entry are you looking at?
13	Q	November 4, '97.
14	A	Yes, appearance in person. That means the accused
15		made a personal appearance. The clerk was "LM".
16		That was Lila MacDonald. And the "RC" is Randi
17		Connor. Under the "Results" column is initiated
18		by defence. Under the "Custody" column is the
19		letter "N", which means not in custody, and the
20		initials of the judge, "DS", or Dave Stone.
21	Q	Dave Stone. And he was in Port Coquitlam, was one
22		of the judges in that district?
23	A	Yes.
24	Q	Why the star under the column "REP/REC"?
25	А	I don't know.

1	Q So "P" means it was in person, meaning Pickton
2	A Meaning the accused appeared in person.
3	Q Just while we have you here, look at the last
4	page, and this confirms the date the stay was
5	entered, January 26, '98?
6	A Yes, and the counts 1 through 4 were stayed.
7	Q And directed by? That signature, that is
8	A Randi
9	Q Randi Connor?
10	A Connor's signature.
11	MR. VERTLIEB: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate your time going
12	through that for us.
13	A You're welcome.
14	MR. VERTLIEB: So that is the evidence then of Mr. Romano
15	THE COMMISSIONER: All right.
16	MR. VERTLIEB: Mr. Commissioner. Perhaps the witness could
16 17	MR. VERTLIEB: Mr. Commissioner. Perhaps the witness could be excused and we could just
	_
17	be excused and we could just
17 18	be excused and we could just THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you for appearing.
17 18 19	be excused and we could just THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you for appearing. A Thank you.
17 18 19 20	be excused and we could just THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you for appearing. A Thank you. (WITNESS EXCUSED)
17 18 19 20 21	be excused and we could just THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you for appearing. A Thank you. (WITNESS EXCUSED) MR. VERTLIEB: The only other issue that perhaps we could
17 18 19 20 21 22	be excused and we could just THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you for appearing. A Thank you. (WITNESS EXCUSED) MR. VERTLIEB: The only other issue that perhaps we could address for a few moments is this concern around

1 lawyers have weighed in with differing views. 2 There's some talk about having submissions and 3 setting dates and asking -- not from us, though, 4 but from others saying people should come and 5 bring their calendars and set dates. One of the 6 other counsel suggested written argument. And so 7 I just wanted to raise it right now with you. What is your feeling about this issue? It arose 8 9 when Mr. Ward asked you to revisit your ruling 10 that you made --11 THE COMMISSIONER: This has grown like top seed, to use an 12 expression. I didn't realize that this much

13 attention ought to be devoted to this document, but obviously there are people who think it should 14 15 be. But, in any event, initially I was prepared 16 to deal with it a long time ago, and I could never 17 get Mr. Ward or Mr. Crossin in the room at the 18 same time, and so tell me where are we in this. The last time I dealt with it it was my 19 recollection that we were waiting for Mr. Crossin 20 to come back, and he's still not here, so --21 22 MR. VERTLIEB: Mr. Crossin can't be here today. I spoke with 23 him. 24 THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.

25 MR. VERTLIEB: So where it's left is that after Ms. Shenher was

1		brought back for cross-examination
2	THE	COMMISSIONER: Yes.
3	MR.	VERTLIEB: as a result of the manuscript Mr. Ward asked
4		you to reconsider your decision
5	THE	COMMISSIONER: Yes.
6	MR.	VERTLIEB: that you had made in that it not be marked.
7		There are differing views of the differing lawyers
8		here, so the real question is whether it's
9		totally your call, of course do you want to
10		have oral argument or do you prefer to have
11		written argument.
12	THE	COMMISSIONER: Okay. Mr. Gratl, do you want to say
13		something?
14	MR.	GRATL: Yes, Mr. Commissioner.
15	THE	COMMISSIONER: Yes.
16	MR.	GRATL: It appears as though the lines of opposition are
17		fairly clear. Independent counsel for aboriginal
18		interests wants to see the document admitted. I
19		myself on behalf of Downtown Eastside community
20		and individuals who are affected would like to see
21		the document admitted. Counsel for 25 families
22		would like to see the document admitted. I
23		understand that Mr. Woodall for Constable Fell
24		opposes the admission. Obviously Constable Fell
25		is mentioned in the document, and his reputational

1 interest might be affected, and so it's 2 appropriate for him to have views. Counsel for 3 the Vancouver Police Department I'm informed is 4 opposed to the admission of the document. Mr. 5 Crossin is opposed to the admission, but it's not clear whether it's on behalf of Detective 6 7 Constable Shenher or the Vancouver Police Board or which client in particular that he's acting for 8 9 might be opposed. 10 THE COMMISSIONER: What does it matter? What does it matter? 11 MR. GRATL: What does it matter who's opposed? THE COMMISSIONER: Yeah. I mean, he's representing Detective 12 Constable Shenher. He doesn't want the document 13 So whether he's speaking on behalf of someone 14 in. 15 else as well is really of no concern to me or 16 should to anyone else, so I just have to deal with 17 the grounds of his opposition. That's all I'm concerned with here. 18 19 Well, my -- I hear what you're saying, Mr. MR. GRATL: Commissioner, but I think it's ordinary for 20 21 counsel to identify the parties on behalf of whom 22 they're making submissions. I don't know if I'm asking for too much, but -- so we have these 23 differing lines --24 25 THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.

1 MR. GRATL: -- and there's quite a vigorous distance between 2 the two lines. In my submission, there's some 3 public importance to the question of 4 admissibility, there is a very strong demarcation 5 of positions, and it's appropriate to have oral 6 argument here. And I appreciate that Mr. Woodall 7 has suggested written argument, but, in my respectful submission, this is an issue that ought 8 9 to be aired publicly. We shouldn't have a 10 decision based on written submissions that do not 11 form part of the public record. We should have these parties on record as to -- and identify 12 13 which parties are opposed, have these parties on 14 record in public saying why they don't want the public to see these documents. This is -- it's a 15 public forum, and we should have transparency and 16 17 accountability of the participants. 18 THE COMMISSIONER: What makes you think transparency and public 19 accountability can't be achieved by written 20 argument that's filed? MR. GRATL: The public won't have access --21 22 THE COMMISSIONER: It's an open hearing. Why would you say 23 it's not transparent? MR. GRATL: The public doesn't have access to those written 24 25 arguments unless they become marked as exhibits.

1	THE	COMMISSIONER: Well, you know, we can correct that in a
2		hurry.
3	MR.	GRATL: There's a lower level of public scrutiny because
4		the written argument won't be webcast
5	THE	COMMISSIONER: Well, here's
6	MR.	GRATL: and because none of the information will be
7		posted to the commission of inquiry website, and
8		so that's what lends itself to the higher level of
9		transparency and accountability for oral argument.
10	THE	COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you. Is there anyone else
11		that has any views that want to deal with it now?
12	MR.	HERN: I just want to clarify for the record that Mr.
13		Crossin represents Lori Shenher as part of his
14		mandate on behalf of the union. I represent the
15		board and the department. And how this matters
16		gets heard I have no opinion on.
17	THE	COMMISSIONER: Okay. Thank you. Yes.
18	MS.	HATCHER: Mr. Commissioner, it's Claire Hatcher for Fell
19		and Wolthers. Just responding to Mr. Gratl's
20		submission, Mr. Woodall is not here, but my friend
21		has correctly stated that we think it's prudent
22		that it go by written argument. We're not trying
23		to shield anything. I agree with your comments
24		these things can be filed and made available. If
25		we're going to hear it orally, that's fine, we'll

make ourselves available. The dates have been 1 2 circulating amongst counsel. We'll make ourself 3 available. We do respectfully suggest, however, that a notice of application be filed. 4 5 THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry? б MS. HATCHER: A notice of application should be filed by those 7 seeking the admission because I think there has been a prior ruling. So if there's any new basis, 8 9 some law, some grounds, and also some transcript references from Ms. Shenher's evidence on the 4th 10 11 of April to assist us so that we're not scrambling to respond, I think that's appropriate perhaps to 12 13 clear the ice. So that's our position. We'll make ourselves available to hear it, but I think 14 written submissions would be more orderly and more 15 16 efficient and still in the public. THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you. Anyone else? 17 18 MR. GRATL: I think, Mr. Commissioner, I think Ms. Hatcher's 19 suggestion about a written notice of application 20 makes a lot of sense in terms of identifying particularly where Constable Fell is identified in 21 22 the transcript. I think that can be done with a 23 key search term on the publicly posted 24 transcripts. 25 THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. I don't want to spend any more time

1 in the hearings on this. We've sort of beaten 2 this thing to death, and it may be -- I don't know 3 if it's entirely warranted. Having said that, in 4 fairness to everyone here, whether you're pro or 5 con, I am going to order there be written 6 argument, and you're going -- you have to tell me 7 why this document is relevant and what are we going to learn from this document that we already 8 9 haven't learned from her oral evidence that she's 10 already given here, and you might want to deal as 11 well with the rules of evidence. So those are some of the factors that I need to consider. 12 13 They're all relevant as far as I'm concerned as to whether or not the -- this is a manuscript that 14 15 she prepared some time after the arrest of Pickton where she expresses her private views, and they 16 17 were initially going to be public. In any event, 18 she's given various opinions or opinions about the 19 investigation and what the police did and what they didn't do and what her view's are on the 20 personalities of the police officers down there. 21 22 So, anyway, you tell me how that's relevant, and I expect those people who are opposing it will deal 23 with the same issues. All right. 24 25 MR. GRATL: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.

1 MR. VERTLIEB: So that concludes what we can do today. Just to 2 give people an outline for next week, we have Ms. 3 Sandy Cameron and the 911 phone person coming 4 Monday for a day and a half. And, again, not 5 everyone gives estimates. People should read the 6 process directive once again that you issued, Mr. 7 Commissioner, and your desire to hold people strictly accountable to time estimates being 8 9 provided. 10 THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. 11 MR. VERTLIEB: Obviously if the time estimates come in for 12 greater than the time allotted then we will need 13 to make decisions on how much time we are going to 14 allocate. 15 THE COMMISSIONER: All right. 16 MR. VERTLIEB: Which, of course, you can't do until you have 17 people telling you how much time they want. 18 THE COMMISSIONER: All right. 19 MR. VERTLIEB: And then we start the Major Crime panel on Tuesday afternoon, and they're scheduled for the 20 21 rest of the day Tuesday and Wednesday and 22 Thursday, and again we need estimates, and it could be the case that you'll need to make a 23 decision on how much time people will be allotted. 24 25 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

1 MR. VERTLIEB: In doing so I say to you that Karey Brooks and I are doing everything we can to shorten the time 2 that we take. Typically in inquiries, in our 3 4 experience in reading, commission counsel would 5 take the longest time unfolding the narrative for the benefit of the commissioner and the 6 7 participants would have some time allotted. This inquiry has not followed that, and we're not 8 9 critical of that approach. The reality, though, 10 is that we have been trying to minimize our 11 examination in chief out of respect for the participants and giving them maximum time, 12 13 although this next week will have fulsome evidence that needs to be brought before you by commission 14 15 counsel. We will do that as part of our job for 16 you. 17 THE COMMISSIONER: All right. MR. VERTLIEB: So that's the outline for next week, and we're 18 19 at the stage now where we need to be -- all of us 20 need to be disciplined about how we proceed in terms of providing time estimates. 21 22 THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you. Mr. Gratl. MR. GRATL: Mr. Commissioner, there are two other outstanding 23 housekeeping matters. The first is to set a 24 25 schedule for the written submissions.

1 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

2	MR. GRATL: And I'm proposing a notice of application and
3	written submissions by Wednesday of next week.
4	THE COMMISSIONER: What is this for?
5	MR. GRATL: For the Shenher manuscript. What I don't want, Mr.
б	Commissioner, I don't want this application to
7	deal with the Shenher manuscript one way or
8	another, I do not want it to drift interminably,
9	and that's what I think gave rise to the flurry
10	of e-mails.
11	THE COMMISSIONER: You know what, I could have dealt with this
12	two months ago. I was waiting for you not for
13	you, for Mr. Ward and Mr. Crossin. So this thing
14	has been extended by counsel not directing their
15	minds as to whether or not that document ought to
16	be filed. So I'm you want to set the deadline
17	for Wednesday. I'll set it for this afternoon if
18	you want, you know, if you want to get this thing
19	moving. I'm not the cause of the delay here. So
20	you let me know, all of you should let me know
21	when think you can reasonably prepare and file
22	written arguments.
23	MR. GRATL: Well, that's what I'd like to do today
24	THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.
25	MR. GRATL: because we have time. We don't have another

1		witness scheduled, and we still have we still
2		have an hour before the lunch hour.
3	THE	COMMISSIONER: We don't need an hour to set this.
4	MR.	GRATL: No, I know, but we have time right now, and I'd
5		really like to set a schedule.
б	THE	COMMISSIONER: Okay. You say Wednesday. Wednesday is
7		agreeable to you?
8	MR.	GRATL: I'm saying Wednesday for the applicants.
9	THE	COMMISSIONER: Yes.
10	MR.	GRATL: And then the following Monday for the respondents,
11		those who oppose, and then the next Wednesday for
12		any reply.
13	THE	COMMISSIONER: Does anybody have any objection to that time
14		frame?
15	MR.	HIRA: I came down specifically
16	THE	COMMISSIONER: Mr. Hira.
17	MR.	HIRA: Ravi Hira. I came down specifically for this. I
18		have no difficulty with the time frame proposed
19		except for Monday, April the 30th. I need about
20		five to ten minutes. It's a very trite area of
21		law. I just cannot be here on Monday, the 30th.
22		What
23	THE	COMMISSIONER: This is a deadline for filing the documents.
24	MR.	HIRA: That's fine.
25	THE	COMMISSIONER: There's not going to be any more oral

1	argument on this.
2	MR. HIRA: If it's for filing, what I was going to suggest is
3	you could direct me to file a written submission.
4	It's brief. It's trite. It should be pretty
5	straightforward.
6	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Okay. Thank you.
7	MR. GRATL: All right. So that's what I would propose,
8	Wednesday and then Monday and then Wednesday for
9	reply.
10	THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. I'll make that order.
11	MR. GRATL: And then the last housekeeping matter, which has
12	been outstanding for many, many months, is the
13	documents marked for identification as Exhibits A
14	and J. Those are the Lowman materials. I don't
15	know if it's going back a way, but the
16	materials I put to Professor Lowman haven't yet
17	been marked as an exhibit, and I would like to ask
18	Exhibit A that the Lowman materials be marked
19	as an exhibit and also Exhibit J, which is the
20	materials dealing with what I called once, I
21	referred to as the bias
22	THE COMMISSIONER: I don't even know what those documents are.
23	Does anybody know what they are?
24	MR. GRATL: I think they're sitting on the counter there. It
25	took a long time to edit these documents, and I'm

1	asking that those be marked as exhibits, the next
2	two exhibits so that they may be posted to the web
3	for public consumption.
4	MR. VERTLIEB: That's agreeable.
5	THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry?
6	MR. VERTLIEB: That's agreeable. That is agreeable.
7	THE COMMISSIONER: What? I'm not
8	MR. VERTLIEB: We agree.
9	THE COMMISSIONER: They should marked as exhibits. All right.
10	We'll mark them as exhibits.
11	MR. GRATL: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.
12	THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you.
13	THE REGISTRAR: Now, are those to be marked as NR?
14	MR. GRATL: No, no. They've already been edited, I think, by
15	the Vancouver Police Department, and commission
16	counsel have had a look at them, and they've been
17	edited properly for
18	THE REGISTRAR: They've been properly edited. In that case,
19	for identification document marked as A will
20	become Exhibit 145. For identification J will
21	become 146.
22	(EXHIBIT 145: Document entitled: Book of
23	Documents, 220 pages, each containing independent
24	VPD document identification numbers)
25	(EXHIBIT 146: Document entitled: Binder of

1		documents containing 271 pages)
2	THE	COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you. We'll adjourn.
3	MR.	GRATL: Thank you.
4	THE	REGISTRAR: The hearing is now adjourned for the day and
5		will resume on Monday at 9:30.
6		(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 11:20 A.M.)
7		
8		
9		I hereby certify the foregoing to
10		be a true and accurate transcript
11		of the proceedings transcribed to
12		the best of my skill and ability.
13		
14		Leanna Smith
15		Official Reporter
16		UNITED REPORTING SERVICE LTD.
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

INDEX OF PROCEEDINGS

PAGE

RICHARD ROMANO (for the Commission)	
In chief by Mr. Vertlieb	1
Cross-exam by Mr. Chantler	17
Cross-exam by Mr. Roberts	21
Cross-exam by Mr. Gratl	32
Cross-exam by Ms. Narbonne	44
Cross-exam by Mr. Doust	50
Cross-exam by Mr. Makosz	52
Re-exam by Mr. Vertlieb	75

EXHIBITS

NO. DESCRIPTION PAGE (EXHIBIT 145: Document entitled: Book of 93 Documents, 220 pages, each containing independent VPD document identification numbers) (EXHIBIT 146: Document entitled: Binder of 93 documents containing 271 pages)

	1			
•	2003 [2] - 2:23, 3:11	38:15, 38:23, 39:3	66:24, 67:2	ago [2] - 81:16,
	2004 [2] - 3:2, 3:4	8th [5] - 23:25, 24:3,	address [1] - 80:22	90:12
'94 [1] - 3:10	2005 [1] - 3:6	77:11, 78:12, 79:4	addressed [7] -	agree [11] - 18:12,
'97 [10] - 9:18, 10:6,	2012 [1] - 1:2	, ,	21:25, 22:9, 22:24,	20:15, 25:23, 28:11,
16:21, 17:11, 77:7,	20th [1] - 11:4	0	23:7, 26:16, 26:18,	41:9, 52:5, 55:23,
77:17, 77:22, 78:12,	2011 [1] - 1:6	9	31:18	69:10, 70:18, 85:23,
79:10, 79:13		011 / 00.2	addresses [1] -	93:8
	22 [6] - 9:18, 10:5,	911 [1] - 88:3	63:25	agreeable [4] - 91:7,
'98 [1] - 80:5	20:20, 22:1, 22:7,	93 [2] - 2:4, 2:7	addressing [1] - 37:1	93:4, 93:6
	22:9	9:30 [3] - 1:3, 78:13,	••••	,
1	220 [2] - 93:23, 2:5	94:5	adjourn [1] - 94:2	agreement [1] -
	22nd [4] - 47:12,		adjourned [1] - 94:4	27:11
1 [3] - 4:16, 80:6, 1:4	49:11, 50:1, 77:17	Α	Adjourned[1] - 94:6	ahead [3] - 24:23,
10 [1] - 19:5	23 [1] - 14:12		admin [7] - 2:18,	36:5, 55:14
10th [1] - 2:4	23rd [1] - 27:2	Abbotsford[1] - 3:7	2:21, 53:4, 71:19,	aired [1] - 84:9
11:20 [1] - 94:6	24th [1] - 78:16	ability [5] - 12:15,	72:18, 76:20, 76:22	allocate [1] - 88:14
12 [1] - 69:20	25 [3] - 17:23, 73:14,	15:11, 15:13, 52:9,	administrative [13] -	allotted [3] - 88:12,
13 [1] - 26:12	82:21	94:12	1:6, 2:14, 2:23, 2:24,	88:24, 89:7
133 [4] - 21:15, 47:4,	26 [5] - 11:22, 14:12,	able [1] - 71:11	3:9, 6:3, 6:9, 12:12,	allowing [1] - 43:16
63:22, 75:20	17:15, 63:21, 80:5	aboriginal [2] - 44:6,	13:23, 22:25, 52:16,	alluded [2] - 64:7,
13th [2] - 27:1, 28:3	26th [1] - 27:2	82:17	64:23, 76:24	74:8
14 [2] - 21:20, 49:11	271 [2] - 94:1, 2:8	absence [1] - 43:1	admissibility [4] -	almost [1] - 64:9
145 [3] - 93:20,	2nd [2] - 3:6, 27:8	absolute [1] - 52:9	56:23, 57:1, 65:24,	alternatives [1] -
93:22, 2:4	[-] 0.0, 21.0	Abuse[1] - 75:5	84:4	73:4
93:22, 2:4 146 [3] - 93:21,	•		admissible [2] -	altogether [1] - 39:5
	3	accept [4] - 14:25,	43:13, 58:1	amount [1] - 20:4
93:25, 2:7	9 m 4440 4440	26:4, 27:6, 36:24	admission [5] -	analysis [3] - 20:18,
15 [3] - 19:7, 76:1,	3 [4] - 44:13, 44:16,	access [2] - 84:21,	20:20, 82:24, 83:4,	60:12, 65:22
76:2	44:17, 78:13	84:24	83:5, 86:7	Anderson [5] - 14:11,
16 [4] - 47:2, 69:20,	30th [2] - 91:19,	according [3] -	admissions [15] -	
75:23, 76:1	91:21	47:14, 68:24, 73:23	9:25, 24:11, 24:13,	14:14, 27:4, 45:7,
16th [2] - 47:10,	32 [1] - 1:7	accordingly [1] -		45:14
77:12	35 [3] - 45:7, 45:10,	61:4	24:14, 24:22, 25:18,	Andrew[1] - 18:23
17 [1] - 1:5	45:12	accountability [3] -	25:21, 25:25, 26:7,	Andrews [17] - 29:8,
19 [2] - 1:2, 45:10		84:17, 84:19, 85:9	26:8, 26:21, 27:2,	29:11, 34:18, 34:22,
1980s [1] - 51:1	4	accountable [1] -	27:5, 27:11, 27:17	35:7, 35:10, 35:19,
1982 [1] - 2:3	–	88:8	admitted [4] - 25:22,	35:24, 40:16, 40:25,
1983 [1] - 2:4	4 [3] - 79:10, 79:13,	accurate [2] - 10:7,	82:18, 82:21, 82:22	41:3, 53:18, 54:5,
1989 [2] - 2:9, 51:4	80:6	94:10	advance [18] - 7:1,	54:14, 55:3, 55:13
1991 [1] - 2:17	4(b [1] - 53:24	accused [8] - 11:11,	7:7, 7:10, 7:16, 7:21,	answer [4] - 22:5,
1992 [1] - 2:19	42 [1] - 47:7	17:5, 40:22, 47:15,	7:24, 8:10, 8:14, 8:18,	28:4, 29:12, 31:10
1994 [1] - 2:22	44 [1] - 1:8	77:24, 79:14, 80:2	28:15, 29:21, 30:15,	anticipate [3] - 20:1,
1997 [18] - 4:16,	4th [3] - 47:14,	achieved [1] - 84:19	31:21, 47:18, 48:6,	26:22, 40:15
5:16, 6:9, 16:18, 17:5,	77:22, 86:10	Acting[1] - 3:3	50:4, 62:16, 78:3	anticipated [1] -
21:17, 22:1, 22:7,	77.22,00.10	acting [5] - 3:4,	advice [3] - 14:7,	30:19
22:9, 24:3, 38:12,	_	72:24, 76:20, 76:22,	57:18, 57:22	anyway [2] - 62:6,
47:10, 66:9, 68:20,	5	83:8	advised [1] - 10:23	87:22
47:10, 88.9, 88.20, 77:12, 78:16, 79:4	E.u. 40.44	actual [1] - 11:15	affect [2] - 61:2, 64:1	apart [1] - 26:23
1998 [9] - 11:19,	5 _[1] - 16:11	add [1] - 8:19	affected [3] - 32:8,	appeal [4] - 20:8,
	50 [1] - 1:9		82:20, 83:1	73:16, 73:19, 73:24
11:22, 14:12, 14:15, 17:2, 17:16, 26:12	52 [1] - 1:10	added [2] - 4:22,	affidavit [3] - 18:24,	Appeal [1] - 20:13
17:2, 17:16, 26:13,		16:13	18:25, 19:2	appealing [1] - 73:21
27:3	7	addict [10] - 29:15,	Affirmed[1] - 1:19	appear [3] - 21:10,
1st [2] - 2:9, 10:16	-	29:20, 30:23, 31:7,	afraid [1] - 39:12	55:6, 77:21
	7 [2] - 45:6, 45:11	31:9, 31:11, 31:13,	afternoon [2] -	Appearance [1] -
2	75 [1] - 1:11	45:20, 45:22, 46:7	88:20, 90:17	79:11
		addicted [5] - 29:3,	agency [1] - 70:20	
2 [1] - 26:20	8	29:7, 67:18, 67:23,	aggravated [1] - 4:23	appearance [6] -
2,000 [1] - 56:1	Ö	68:5	aggressive [1] - 4.25	23:24, 24:2, 47:14,
2000 [1] - 6:4	8 [1] - 60:20	addiction [1] - 70:21	51:22	77:15, 79:14, 79:15
2002 [4] - 16:11,	810 [8] - 33:19, 34:2,	addition [3] - 3:14,		appearances [3] -
16:24, 17:5, 19:13	34:11, 37:4, 38:9,	56:15, 58:5	aggressiveness [1] -	69:1, 76:23, 76:24
	о т. н, от. т , оо. <i>э</i> ,	additional [2] -	51:20	appeared [4] - 24:6,

77:23, 77:24, 80:2	arraignment [1] -	aware [13] - 5:22,	bias [1] - 92:21	cascades [1] - 39:16
appearing [2] -	64:25	6:25, 7:5, 8:6, 13:15,	big [4] - 7:19, 30:8,	case [61] - 5:16,
50:20, 80:18	arrangements [1] -	48:10, 49:6, 50:11,	30:9, 71:25	5:19, 5:21, 6:8, 7:1,
applicants [1] - 91:8	13:20	52:24, 53:2, 61:1,	Binder [2] - 93:25,	7:12, 7:20, 8:15, 9:10,
application [5] -	arrest [3] - 19:13,	65:14, 72:7	2:7	12:9, 12:14, 12:17,
86:4, 86:6, 86:19,	41:21, 87:15		binder [4] - 4:13,	13:4, 13:10, 13:16,
90:2, 90:6	arrested [1] - 43:19	В	21:13, 21:16, 75:17	13:17, 14:14, 15:20,
applied [1] - 4:8	articled [1] - 2:6		bit [2] - 64:20, 78:14	18:14, 19:20, 24:15,
apply [2] - 3:25, 42:1	articles [1] - 2:8	background [7] -	blood [2] - 25:9,	25:8, 26:22, 28:20,
appointed [1] - 3:6	aside [1] - 19:4	2:2, 36:22, 41:19,	31:16	28:25, 32:11, 35:5,
appreciate [5] - 19:5,	assault [6] - 4:23,	54:7, 54:9, 55:11,	Bmc [1] - 77:5	35:13, 35:17, 35:23,
42:20, 55:3, 80:11,	38:14, 38:18, 38:22,	58:8	Board [1] - 83:7	38:11, 40:1, 40:4,
84:6	39:9, 39:11	bail [11] - 3:14, 24:3,	board [3] - 72:18,	52:3, 52:6, 52:10,
approach [4] - 7:3,	assessments [1] -	40:14, 41:6, 41:10,	72:24, 85:15	53:17, 54:24, 58:5,
7:9, 67:15, 89:9	6:2	41:14, 42:11, 42:22,	bond [8] - 34:12,	58:20, 58:22, 59:5,
approaches [1] -	assign [1] - 49:2	43:1, 43:11, 43:19	37:17, 37:20, 38:9,	59:14, 60:19, 62:3,
28:13	assigned [28] - 7:6,	balance [1] - 69:25	38:23, 39:2, 39:21	62:13, 62:17, 63:3,
appropriate [4] -	8:7, 8:13, 8:25, 9:7,	bar [3] - 2:3, 2:4,	bonds [6] - 33:20,	63:11, 63:23, 64:4,
5:13, 83:2, 84:5,	10:9, 12:17, 12:20,	15:8	37:4, 38:24, 39:2,	64:21, 65:8, 66:2,
86:12	12:24, 22:16, 22:18,	based [10] - 1:9,	40:6, 40:12	66:9, 67:17, 72:3,
approval [22] - 3:20,	22:21, 23:2, 23:16,	32:14, 51:16, 52:14,	book [1] - 44:10	72:23, 88:23, 93:18
3:24, 4:8, 5:20, 6:1,	28:12, 48:1, 48:10,	59:25, 68:17, 68:18,	Book[2] - 93:22, 2:4	cases [13] - 5:24,
6:10, 13:7, 13:11,	48:14, 49:15, 52:6,	68:19, 73:11, 84:10	booked [1] - 69:21	8:24, 9:6, 28:21,
38:8, 38:12, 44:7,	64:9, 64:22, 65:4,	Basis[1] - 37:10	bottom [2] - 45:10,	39:21, 51:20, 62:25,
45:1, 55:16, 55:20,	65:8, 65:12, 66:4,	basis [7] - 5:25, 20:7,	47:5	63:6, 63:9, 64:2,
55:24, 56:19, 56:24,	67:5, 69:17	30:22, 37:11, 42:2,	bouncing [1] - 73:3	69:13, 72:1, 74:21
62:11, 64:22, 73:9,	assigning [1] - 64:13	73:11, 86:8	brain [1] - 14:2	Castellani [1] - 25:24
73:21, 73:24	assignment [4] -	bat [1] - 19:22	Branch [4] - 20:25,	categorization [2] -
approvals [2] - 3:13,	9:15, 10:5, 10:12,	Baumgartel [1] - 2:7	21:3, 50:21, 55:9	62:10, 64:6
3:18	10:14	Bc[1] - 1:1	Branch's [1] - 20:19	categorized [1] -
approve [3] - 37:20,	assignments [2] -	bears [1] - 60:6	breach [1] - 18:17	62:12
74:3, 75:9	8:12, 49:8	beaten [2] - 38:22,	breached [1] - 18:14	categorizing [1] -
approved [11] - 9:16,	assist [4] - 17:13,	87:1	brief [1] - 92:4	62:12
10:16, 16:7, 28:24,	68:22, 75:22, 86:11	become [3] - 84:25,	briefly [2] - 5:4,	category [2] - 63:15,
33:14, 34:3, 45:23,	assistance [3] -	93:20, 93:21	55:18	63:24
46:3, 46:6, 56:17,	14:8, 44:25, 70:12	becomes [1] - 67:17	bring [1] - 81:5	caused [1] - 30:6
73:22	assisted [1] - 47:2	began [1] - 51:5	British [1] - 3:21	cavalier [1] - 41:23
April [9] - 1:2, 4:16,	assume [8] - 7:4,	begin [1] - 71:8	Brooks[1] - 89:1	Certainly[4] - 9:4,
10:16, 11:4, 22:7,	22:10, 23:10, 25:15,	beginning [1] - 3:1		19:8, 67:22, 69:17
23:25, 24:3, 86:11,	48:9, 57:22, 61:5,	behalf [7] - 11:11,	brought [2] - 82:1, 89:14	certainly [2] - 38:16,
91:19	61:14	77:23, 82:19, 83:6,	Bryce [1] - 21:10	50:10
archived [1] - 18:21	attempt [2] - 12:9,	83:14, 83:21, 85:14		certify [1] - 94:9
area [7] - 15:14,	15:20	behind [2] - 56:12,	build [1] - 58:19	challenge [2] - 69:3,
16:6, 28:23, 71:13,	attempted [2] - 25:8,	58:8	built [1] - 2:16	72:1
74:18, 75:13, 91:20	38:25	bench [2] - 3:7, 37:2	burden [2] - 38:5,	challenging [1] -
argue [2] - 43:13,	attend [1] - 23:22	beneath [1] - 78:21	60:1 Burnaby(4) 0:22	60:2
43:17	attended [2] - 3:17,	benefit [1] - 89:6	Burnaby [4] - 9:22,	chance [1] - 29:9
arguing [1] - 60:2	23:22	beside [1] - 78:2	9:23, 77:8, 79:7	change [2] - 62:9,
argument [12] -	attention [3] - 6:14,	best [7] - 11:25,	busy [1] - 69:10	72:5
60:20, 81:6, 82:10,	9:7, 81:13	12:5, 12:25, 28:4,	-	Chantler[8] - 17:20,
82:11, 84:6, 84:7,	attitude [1] - 41:24	29:12, 66:7, 94:12	C	17:22, 20:14, 20:16,
84:20, 85:4, 85:9,	attracted [1] - 9:6	better [3] - 27:24,	and and an a	21:6, 21:7, 1:5
85:22, 87:6, 92:1	attributed [1] - 42:16	58:2, 73:19	calendars [1] - 81:5	charge [29] - 3:13,
arguments [4] -	August [1] - 2:22	between [6] - 42:4,	Cameron[1] - 88:3	3:18, 3:20, 3:24, 4:7,
75:4, 75:5, 84:25,	available [7] - 38:10,	42:24, 54:3, 54:12,	Canada[1] - 52:24	5:20, 6:1, 6:10, 13:14,
90:22	38:17, 68:22, 85:24,		cannot [1] - 91:21	33:2, 38:8, 38:12,
arise [1] - 75:2	86:1, 86:3, 86:14	54:16, 84:1 Boy(2) 77:5 77:6	capable [3] - 7:13,	40:2, 42:24, 44:6,
arises [1] - 39:25	average [3] - 8:12,	Bev [3] - 77:5, 77:6,	14:8, 70:4	44:25, 55:16, 55:20,
arose [2] - 75:21,	8:13, 69:22	77:7	career [1] - 74:21	55:24, 56:16, 56:19,
81:8	avoid [1] - 25:2	beyond [3] - 34:14,	carefully [1] - 14:19	56:24, 62:10, 64:22,
	avoiu [1] - 20.2	37:8, 38:21		. , ,
		ii		

72:10, 73:21, 73:24,	commission [4] -	comparatively [1] -	15:12	contacted [1] - 70:7
75:3, 75:9	85:7, 89:4, 89:14,	5:23	confinement [2] -	contacting [2] -
Charges[1] - 21:17	93:15	competence [2] -	25:9, 39:1	68:15, 70:13
charges [37] - 4:20,	commissioner [5] -	51:9, 51:11	Confirm[1] - 78:1	containing [4] -
4:21, 5:13, 5:14, 9:17,	5:6, 17:14, 51:15,	competent [1] -	confirm [5] - 18:17,	93:23, 94:1, 2:5, 2:8
10:16, 16:8, 16:13,	52:25, 89:6	51:12	31:9, 47:16, 77:21,	contains [1] - 21:14
16:16, 20:22, 28:24,	Commissioner [116]	complainant [13] -	79:10	context [6] - 33:14,
30:7, 30:19, 33:2,	- 1:5, 1:7, 1:11, 1:23,	12:18, 12:19, 14:11,	confirms [1] - 80:4	38:18, 39:9, 39:11,
33:10, 33:15, 33:19,	4:3, 17:20, 17:21,	28:25, 29:2, 29:7,	confused [1] - 78:14	53:9, 54:16
34:1, 34:3, 34:8, 34:9,	20:9, 20:10, 20:12,	29:23, 30:21, 33:20,	connect [1] - 16:17	contextual [1] -
35:6, 35:20, 36:4,	21:7, 29:12, 34:21,	37:9, 39:11, 40:5,	connection [1] - 17:4	53:16
36:14, 37:20, 38:25,	35:4, 35:9, 35:18,	72:14	Connor [45] - 3:22,	continuation [2] -
39:16, 40:7, 41:25,	36:2, 36:7, 36:8,	complainants [1] -	9:17, 10:4, 12:14,	78:13, 78:15
45:23, 46:3, 46:6,	36:12, 36:21, 36:25,	12:22		continues [1] - 61:19
61:7, 61:15, 73:21,	38:24, 39:8, 39:10,	complaint [3] -	13:1, 13:5, 14:1, 14:9,	
74:3	39:13, 39:23, 39:25,	30:24, 31:1, 74:9	14:13, 14:24, 18:6,	continuity [3] -
Charter [2] - 60:21,	40:9, 40:17, 41:2,		19:10, 25:10, 26:16,	24:16, 25:15, 31:15
75:4	41:9, 42:17, 42:19,	complete [1] - 9:24	26:18, 28:3, 31:24,	contrast [1] - 7:11
chief [2] - 89:11, 1:4	43:9, 43:24, 43:25,	completed [1] - 2:7	32:9, 32:13, 40:1,	control [1] - 65:3
	43.9, 43.24, 43.25, 44:3, 50:15, 52:21,	completing [1] -	40:12, 40:20, 42:5,	conversation [7] -
Chief[1] - 1:25	44.3, 50.15, 52.21, 52:23, 53:25, 54:7,	27:17	42:10, 42:18, 48:9,	40:12, 42:5, 42:10,
circulating [1] - 86:2		complex [1] - 64:14	49:22, 50:11, 50:23,	42:18, 72:22, 73:1,
circumstances [4] -	54:15, 54:25, 55:11, 55:14, 60:18, 60:19	complexity [2] - 9:3,	51:3, 59:6, 60:24,	73:12
18:10, 39:3, 40:1,	55:14, 60:18, 60:19, 60:20, 60:23, 61:5,	62:21	61:13, 61:25, 66:11,	conveying [1] -
42:2		complicated [2] -	69:3, 69:25, 72:23,	37:24
Claire[1] - 85:18	61:16, 61:24, 62:8,	66:14, 66:15	76:12, 77:2, 77:11,	cooperation [1] -
clarify [2] - 66:3,	73:25, 74:4, 75:15,	complicates [1] -	77:23, 78:19, 79:17,	27:22
85:12	75:22, 76:1, 76:2,	70:8	80:9	copy [1] - 10:21
clean [2] - 71:4,	80:15, 80:16, 80:18,	complications [1] -	Connor's [4] - 20:2,	Coquitlam[9] - 2:22,
71:10	81:11, 81:24, 82:2,	75:2	26:25, 74:20, 80:10	51:6, 53:4, 53:6, 53:7,
clear [3] - 82:17,	82:5, 82:12, 82:14,	complied [1] - 56:19	conscious [1] -	76:23, 77:18, 77:20,
83:6, 86:13	82:15, 83:10, 83:12,	con [1] - 87:5	58:18	79:21
clearly [2] - 52:8,	83:20, 83:25, 84:18,	conceivable [1] -	consent [6] - 59:7,	Corporal[2] - 25:10,
61:1	84:22, 85:1, 85:5,	36:18	59:20, 60:5, 60:6,	61:13
clerk [2] - 78:3,	85:10, 85:17, 85:18,	concern [4] - 15:10,	60:11, 60:17	correct [6] - 4:25,
79:15	86:5, 86:17, 86:18,	57:2, 80:22, 83:15	conservatively [1] -	19:10, 40:23, 44:8,
client [1] - 83:8	86:25, 87:25, 88:7,	concerned [7] - 4:25,	6:4	60:12, 85:1
closer [1] - 70:3	88:10, 88:15, 88:18,	12:19, 54:5, 61:8,	consider [4] - 5:12,	correctly [1] - 85:21
Cnt [1] - 78:13	88:25, 89:17, 89:22,	62:4, 83:18, 87:13	11:10, 38:8, 87:12	correspondence [12]
Code[1] - 34:13	89:23, 90:1, 90:4,	concerning [2] -	considerable [1] -	- 10:18, 10:21, 21:22,
cognizant [2] -	90:6, 90:11, 90:24,	4:15, 17:14	80:24	22:15, 22:19, 22:22,
61:21, 75:6	91:3, 91:6, 91:9,	concerns [1] - 14:25	consideration [1] -	22:24, 23:2, 23:4,
colleague [1] - 3:21	91:13, 91:16, 91:23,	concludes [1] - 88:1	28:23	23:17, 28:2, 28:6
collect [1] - 59:9	91:25, 92:6, 92:10,	conclusion [2] -	considered [4] -	Counsel [4] - 1:22,
Columbia[1] - 3:21	92:22, 93:5, 93:7,	31:12, 52:11	8:22, 19:20, 38:16,	64:3, 82:21, 83:2
column [5] - 76:9,	93:9, 93:11, 93:12,	condition [4] - 40:5,	38:23	counsel [27] - 2:10,
78:25, 79:17, 79:18,	94:2	42:13, 43:1, 71:8	considering [2] -	5:8, 10:19, 10:24,
79:24	commissioner's [1] -	42.13, 43.1, 71.6	6:9, 39:16	17:23, 24:25, 25:23,
comfortable [1] -	11:16	41:14, 42:12, 42:23,	consistent [2] - 4:7,	26:1, 26:6, 27:23,
12:22	committed [1] -	41.14, 42.12, 42.23, 43:1	5:25	32:6, 34:22, 39:15,
coming [6] - 32:13,	34:15	43:1 conduct [11] - 6:24,	Constable ^[5] -	44:5, 44:8, 44:14,
32:16, 49:1, 59:24,	committees [1] -	,	82:23, 82:24, 83:7,	51:19, 61:6, 72:19,
69:2, 88:3	3:16	8:1, 24:3, 41:6, 49:19,	83:13, 86:21	81:6, 82:17, 83:21,
,	common [3] - 50:7,	49:20, 54:1, 55:2,	consultation [1] -	86:2, 89:4, 89:15,
commence [1] - 1:15	57:16, 57:19	55:8, 55:20, 58:16	72:15	90:14, 93:16
commenced [1] - 2:9	communication [1] -	conducted [1] -		
comment [5] - 52:13,	57:14	59:17	consulted [2] - 14:6,	count [1] - 4:22
54:1, 68:2, 68:8,	communities [1] -	conference [5] -	19:12	counter [1] - 92:24
68:23	32:8	23:22, 23:23, 47:11,	consumption [1] -	counts [1] - 80:6
comments [2] - 29:4,	community [1] -	77:13, 78:16	93:3	couple [4] - 2:20,
85:23	82:19	confidence [1] - 52:9	contact [3] - 64:15,	18:6, 21:11, 24:7
Commission[1] - 1:3		confident [2] - 12:15,	64:18, 70:6	course [22] - 9:21,
		iii		

11:10, 25:20, 29:1,	5:10, 5:23, 6:3, 6:9,	28:16, 31:22, 46:13,	demarcation [1] -	77:19, 79:7
29:2, 31:11, 35:2,	7:3, 7:12, 8:1, 8:3,	46:15, 46:17, 47:1,	84:4	discretion [2] - 20:3,
35:10, 46:12, 47:20,	8:5, 8:13, 8:23, 9:8,	47:12, 47:14, 47:16,	department [1] -	54:24
48:12, 53:1, 57:1,	9:16, 9:23, 12:11,	49:6, 66:5, 66:8, 71:2,	85:15	discuss [7] - 1:13,
57:17, 59:21, 60:9,	12:12, 12:13, 12:20,	71:8, 77:16, 77:21,	Department [2] -	14:2, 32:25, 33:6,
64:15, 74:21, 77:19,	12:23, 13:2, 13:6,	78:1, 79:10, 80:4	83:3, 93:15	33:15, 33:18, 71:19
78:8, 82:9, 88:16	13:10, 13:12, 14:4,	date's [1] - 49:5	depth [3] - 55:21,	discussed [4] - 3:20,
court [25] - 2:15,	14:7, 14:14, 15:3,	dated [1] - 4:16	65:19, 65:22	14:25, 32:11, 55:16
3:14, 9:22, 9:23, 11:6,	15:6, 15:15, 15:17,	dates [7] - 47:13,	depths [1] - 56:4	discussion [3] -
13:23, 24:2, 24:5,	16:3, 16:7, 17:15,	78:2, 78:4, 78:6, 81:3,	Deputy [2] - 3:3, 3:5	35:1, 35:3, 62:5
27:16, 48:22, 64:24,	22:15, 22:18, 22:25,	81:5, 86:1	describe [2] - 18:25,	discussions [1] -
64:25, 65:14, 68:25,	23:2, 24:5, 25:20,	daughter [1] - 21:10	53:8	33:11
69:20, 72:2, 76:17,	25:25, 26:2, 26:6,	Dave [2] - 79:20,	described [1] - 9:13	dispatch [1] - 26:24
76:18, 76:24, 76:25,	27:22, 28:12, 29:5,	79:21	Description [1] - 2:2	distance [1] - 84:1
77:8, 77:15, 77:20,	33:12, 34:8, 34:13,	Davies [2] - 20:10,	designate [1] - 29:25	distinct [2] - 62:23,
78:3	35:21, 35:22, 37:14,	20:13	designated [2] -	63:2
Court[2] - 3:7, 20:13	39:15, 41:16, 42:1,	days [2] - 30:17, 49:2	6:16, 6:19	distribute [1] - 8:11
court's [1] - 20:8	44:8, 44:14, 44:25,	deadline [2] - 90:16,	desire [1] - 88:7	district [1] - 79:22
courthouse [3] -	48:4, 48:7, 48:14,	91:23	desk [2] - 11:5, 48:7	Document [4] -
2:16, 2:17, 48:13	49:2, 49:15, 49:18,	deal [13] - 2:1, 11:17,	destroyed [2] -	93:22, 93:25, 2:4, 2:7
Courtroom[1] -	51:3, 51:4, 51:24,	16:16, 23:8, 35:8,	15:16, 18:21	document [17] -
78:13	52:1, 52:14, 52:16,	36:16, 40:17, 81:16,	destruction [5] -	4:18, 4:24, 18:13,
courtroom [5] - 8:2,	53:4, 53:9, 53:13,	83:16, 85:11, 87:10,	15:24, 16:1, 18:8,	44:15, 81:13, 82:18,
48:15, 69:14, 69:18,	53:21, 54:4, 54:16,	87:23, 90:7	18:10, 18:14	82:21, 82:22, 82:25,
69:22	56:11, 57:14, 57:21,	dealing [5] - 35:16,	detail [1] - 56:22	83:4, 83:13, 87:7,
courtrooms [1] -	58:6, 58:10, 58:14,	43:22, 51:16, 51:18,	details [2] - 32:17,	87:8, 90:15, 93:19,
7:23	59:1, 59:3, 60:6, 60:9,	92:20	73:2	93:24, 2:6
cover [2] - 5:4, 75:14	61:6, 62:2, 62:24,	dealings [6] - 10:11,	Detective [2] - 83:6,	Documents [2] -
covered [1] - 25:5	63:18, 64:2, 65:4,	10:13, 10:15, 19:9,	83:12	93:23, 2:5
credibility [1] - 38:4	65:12, 65:14, 65:25,	19:14, 76:8	devoted [1] - 81:13	documents [10] -
Crime ^[5] - 8:22,	66:3, 66:11, 66:20,	dealt [9] - 16:21,	Different[1] - 28:13	4:6, 4:13, 21:17,
8:23, 9:2, 9:5, 88:19	66:23, 67:5, 68:10,	17:11, 36:1, 51:2,	different [4] - 28:13,	84:15, 91:23, 92:13,
crimes [1] - 64:8	68:17, 69:13, 69:16,	64:2, 76:15, 76:17,	39:3, 39:5, 65:1	92:22, 92:25, 94:1,
Criminal [6] - 20:19,	69:17, 69:23, 71:18,	81:19, 90:11	differing [4] - 81:1,	2:8
20:24, 21:3, 34:13,	71:19, 72:5, 72:16,	death [1] - 87:2	82:7, 83:24	domestic [2] - 38:13,
50:20, 55:9	72:18, 74:14, 75:6,	debrief [1] - 58:6	difficult [2] - 13:1,	38:18
criminal [3] - 24:25,	76:9, 76:20, 76:22,	December [2] - 3:4,	38:19	done [14] - 16:10,
33:19, 37:20	76:25, 77:14, 77:24,	3:6	difficulty [3] - 53:20,	19:24, 20:5, 28:15,
critical [1] - 89:9	79:3	decide [1] - 54:11	54:13, 91:18	30:1, 31:24, 35:6,
Cross [12] - 17:22,	Crown's [7] - 18:7,	decision [16] - 12:15,	diligence [1] - 51:13	36:3, 36:10, 49:8,
21:8, 32:4, 44:4,	18:13, 51:20, 51:21,	12:23, 13:1, 15:11,	diligent [1] - 51:14	61:8, 68:15, 86:22
50:19, 52:22, 1:5, 1:6,	57:18, 60:14, 74:1	15:12, 19:18, 20:13,	direct [2] - 57:10,	door [1] - 14:4
1:7, 1:8, 1:9, 1:10	Crown-based [1] -	56:24, 72:7, 73:5,	92:3	doubt [4] - 32:19,
cross [2] - 75:13,	68:17	73:7, 74:1, 80:23,	directed [1] - 80:7	34:14, 37:8, 38:21
82:1	crudely [1] - 61:11	82:4, 84:10, 88:24	directing [1] - 90:14	doubts [1] - 38:19
Cross-exam [6] - 1:5,	Ctd [1] - 77:25	decision-making [3]	directive [1] - 88:6	Doust [15] - 20:7,
1:6, 1:7, 1:8, 1:9, 1:10	cure [1] - 70:20	- 12:15, 15:11, 15:12	directly [1] - 43:3	20:10, 20:15, 36:6,
Cross-examination	current [1] - 70:2	decisions [3] - 7:8,	disagree [1] - 35:18	36:8, 36:17, 36:24,
[6] - 17:22, 21:8, 32:4,	Custody[1] - 79:18	38:8, 88:13	disagreement [1] -	37:1, 50:16, 50:17,
44:4, 50:19, 52:22	custody [1] - 79:19	defence [10] - 10:19,	68:4	50:19, 50:20, 52:20,
cross-examination	_	10:24, 25:23, 27:23,	disappearances [1] -	52:21, 1:9
[2] - 75:13, 82:1	D	51:2, 51:18, 60:1,	17:24	down [9] - 32:16,
Crossin[6] - 81:17,		77:14, 79:2, 79:18	disciplined [1] -	34:24, 43:14, 43:15,
81:20, 81:22, 83:5,	daily [1] - 72:1	Defence [1] - 26:1	89:20	64:25, 78:24, 87:21,
85:13, 90:13	danger [4] - 42:3,	Definitely [2] - 51:10,	disclosure [18] -	91:15, 91:17
Crown [141] - 1:6,	42:8, 42:15, 43:5	70:10	9:22, 9:23, 10:20,	Downtown [5] - 32:6,
2:10, 2:11, 2:13, 2:14,	dangers [1] - 41:24	degree [1] - 53:3	10:25, 11:5, 11:9,	40:23, 42:9, 42:14,
2:15, 2:18, 2:21, 2:22,	Darrell [1] - 21:9	delay [2] - 75:4,	24:5, 49:17, 64:24,	82:19
2:24, 2:25, 3:3, 3:9,	date [25] - 7:7, 7:11,	90:19	65:13, 65:14, 65:20,	downwards [1] -
3:23, 4:11, 4:15, 5:8,	10:3, 27:1, 27:3,	demands [1] - 69:5	76:23, 76:25, 77:8,	39:17
		iv.	,, ,	
		1 17		

iv

draft [3] - 7:24, 8:10, 26:21 drafts [1] - 27:15 drawn [2] - 27:1, 27:4 drift [1] - 90:8 dropped [1] - 3:5 drug [9] - 29:15, 29:19, 30:22, 31:7, 31:9, 31:10, 31:13, 68:4, 70:20 drugs [2] - 25:10, 29:3 Ds[1] - 79:20 during [4] - 51:1, 57:16, 66:16, 69:6 duties [4] - 3:8, 13:23, 54:25, 70:2

Ε

e-mail [1] - 80:24 e-mails [1] - 90:10 earliest [1] - 72:3 early [1] - 66:9 ease [1] - 54:22 easier [3] - 37:17, 37:19, 78:4 easily [2] - 52:1, 52:2 East [1] - 45:18 Eastside [5] - 32:6, 40:23, 42:9, 42:14, 82:19 easy [2] - 28:14, 68:5 edit [1] - 92:25 edited [3] - 93:14, 93:17, 93:18 educating [1] - 58:15 educational [1] -58:11 effect [2] - 23:6, 32:23 effectively [3] -34:12.58:14.72:19 efficient [1] - 86:16 effort [2] - 25:17, 67:1 efforts [1] - 18:9 either [3] - 14:11, 46:19, 78:17 emerged [1] - 15:15 end [3] - 1:12, 41:25, 43:13 End [1] - 45:18 endeavour [1] - 25:1 ends [1] - 58:5 engage [3] - 25:1, 34:25, 59:9 engaged [2] - 35:2,

35:16 ensure [2] - 54:25, 66:20 enter [2] - 13:6, 41:16 entered [10] - 11:18, 11:22, 17:2, 17:15, 42:6, 61:10, 63:20, 71:15, 74:13, 80:5 entering [4] - 32:10, 33:12, 71:20, 71:21 entertained [1] -34:2 entirely [2] - 67:15, 87:3 entirety [1] - 56:9 entitled [7] - 21:16, 36:12, 36:21, 93:22, 93:25, 2:4, 2:7 entries [1] - 77:13 entry [4] - 41:12, 77:10, 79:4, 79:12 equal [1] - 60:14 error [1] - 15:18 especially [1] - 33:13 essentially [7] -34:25, 53:12, 53:13, 57:4, 57:9, 64:23, 65:10 establish [1] - 60:9 estimates [6] - 1:9, 88:5, 88:8, 88:11, 88:22, 89:21 etcetera [2] - 21:18, 75:4 event [4] - 16:17, 27:20, 81:15, 87:17 events [3] - 12:1, 12:5, 19:6 evidence [41] - 1:16, 4:3, 12:5, 14:9, 15:16, 18:4, 19:17, 22:4, 24:16, 24:18, 25:3, 25:12, 25:14, 26:25, 27:6, 28:19, 31:16, 38:4, 41:17, 53:19, 56:23, 57:5, 57:7, 57:24, 57:25, 58:19, 58:20, 59:10, 59:13, 60:2, 61:13, 61:15, 65:23, 70:23, 74:20, 80:14, 86:10, 87:9, 87:11, 89:13 ex [1] - 42:12 exact [1] - 46:16 Exactly [3] - 5:15, 58:17, 63:10 exam [8] - 75:14, 1:5, 1:6, 1:7, 1:8, 1:9, 1:10, 1:11

examination [10] -17:22, 21:8, 32:4, 44:4, 50:19, 52:22, 75:13, 75:16, 82:1, 89:11 Examination [1] -1.25 example [11] - 25:25, 38:14, 38:18, 55:22, 56:4, 57:18, 58:22, 61:17, 64:21, 66:21, 69:13 exceed [1] - 60:10 except [2] - 55:5, 91:19 exception [1] - 65:7 exceptional [1] -42:1 excluded [1] - 60:3 Excuse [1] - 53:18 excused [1] - 80:17 Excused [1] - 80:20 exercise [2] - 20:3, 54:24 exhibit [3] - 4:12, 92:17, 92:19 Exhibit [11] - 21:15, 47:4, 63:21, 75:18, 92:18, 92:19, 93:20, 93:22, 93:25, 2:4, 2:7 exhibits [5] - 84:25, 93:1. 93:2. 93:9. 93:10 Exhibits [2] - 92:13, 2:1 exists [1] - 3:20 expanded [1] - 4:20 expect [3] - 45:2, 70:19, 87:23 expected [2] - 48:2, 48:7 expeditious [1] -27:18 experience [6] -12:21, 21:1, 51:16, 52:15, 74:24, 89:4 experienced [1] -50:10 expert [1] - 31:18 explain [2] - 58:7, 61:16 explaining [1] - 73:5 explore [5] - 53:12, 57:13, 62:19, 64:20, 74:18 exploring [1] - 39:24 expressed [1] -25:24 expresses [1] -87:16

expression [1] -81:12 extend [1] - 55:8 extended [1] - 90:14 extensive [1] - 25:5 extensively [1] -50:22 extent [1] - 55:5 extreme [2] - 42:3, 69:5 extremely [1] - 74:25 F faces [1] - 60:1 facie [1] - 59:22 facing [1] - 69:3 fact [12] - 15:8, 20:4. 20:14. 22:17. 25:22. 26:7. 27:2. 27:5. 27:11, 51:23, 66:15, 74:8 factor [5] - 29:22, 30:4, 30:13, 30:18, 56:24 factors [3] - 39:4, 53:1, 87:12 facts [7] - 5:3, 5:7, 5:9, 11:17, 11:25, 12:3, 17:13 factually [1] - 26:23 fails [1] - 58:6 fair [9] - 55:19, 60:11, 60:13, 65:5, 66:1, 68:2, 68:8, 70:18, 70:23 fairly [3] - 25:5, 50:22, 82:17 fairness [1] - 87:4 fall [4] - 2:23, 3:10, 64:4, 72:6 fall-out [1] - 72:6 fallen [2] - 63:14, 63:23 familiar [4] - 4:14, 48:13, 50:24, 62:23 families [3] - 17:23, 20:17, 82:21 far [5] - 4:25, 26:23, 36:3, 62:3, 87:13 favour [1] - 75:23 fear [4] - 33:21, 37:10, 37:11, 37:24 feature [1] - 28:25 February[6] - 10:3, 16:11, 19:13, 27:8, 49:7, 49:8 **Fell**[4] - 82:23, 82:24, 85:18, 86:21 felt [1] - 69:8

female [6] - 12:18, 12:19, 12:20, 12:22, 12:23, 13:2 few [4] - 2:25, 18:1, 18:3. 80:22 file [88] - 6:14, 6:16, 6:17, 6:19, 6:22, 7:5, 7:6, 7:7, 8:5, 8:8, 8:13, 9:2, 9:10, 9:16, 9:17, 9:20, 10:4, 10:9, 10:11, 10:13, 10:15, 11:3, 11:4, 11:6, 12:11, 12:24, 12:25, 14:2, 14:18, 15:15, 15:24, 17:3, 18:8, 18:10, 18:15, 19:10, 19:16, 19:18, 19:25, 20:25, 22:6, 22:16, 22:18, 22:21, 23:13, 23:16, 23:17, 23:24, 24:2, 24:6, 24:20, 25:7, 28:7, 29:21, 29:25, 33:22, 47:21, 47:22, 48:1, 49:19, 49:20, 54:1, 56:4, 62:10, 62:12, 62:13, 62:20, 62:21, 63:2, 64:13, 64:18, 65:4, 65:8, 66:4, 67:5, 67:9, 67:13, 68:11, 71:14, 75:7, 76:16, 77:18, 90:21, 92:3 filed [5] - 84:20, 85:24, 86:4, 86:6, 90:16 files [12] - 8:4, 8:14, 8:20, 8:21, 8:22, 9:1, 16:1, 50:4, 63:6, 63:8, 71:17.71:23 filing [2] - 91:23, 92:2 fill [1] - 78:5 final [3] - 20:22, 39:21, 74:18 finally [1] - 52:13 fine [3] - 35:22, 85:25, 91:24 finish [1] - 29:11 firm [1] - 2:6 first [11] - 16:7, 19:8, 39:17, 43:9, 51:5, 51:7, 56:18, 66:3, 71:19, 78:11, 89:24 firstly [1] - 42:6 fit [1] - 13:4 five [2] - 2:8, 91:20 flag [3] - 28:18, 29:20, 30:6 flagged [2] - 28:7, 47:21

flagging [1] - 30:4 flaw [1] - 65:17 flurry [1] - 90:9 focus [2] - 41:18, 53:13 focused [1] - 41:11 focusing [1] - 31:1 followed [3] - 2:11, 15:19, 89:8 following [2] - 10:24, 91:10 force [1] - 70:15 foregoing [1] - 94:9 form [4] - 10:22, 59:21, 75:4, 84:11 formal [1] - 67:3 formulated [3] -40:21, 42:7, 43:6 forum [1] - 84:16 forward [3] - 26:21, 61:18, 62:1 forwarded [1] -10:21 four [12] - 2:12, 4:20, 7:21, 7:24, 8:12, 8:14, 9:13, 48:6, 48:8, 49:1, 49:2, 69:23 four-day [1] - 49:1 four-month [1] - 9:13 fourth [1] - 4:22 frame [3] - 5:19, 91:14, 91:18 Fraser[1] - 51:5 free [1] - 14:2 frequently [1] - 3:14 friend [7] - 22:5, 29:8, 40:25, 41:3, 47:2, 54:22, 85:20 front [11] - 16:23, 16:25, 18:16, 19:2, 21:19, 23:23, 44:10, 48:8, 50:17, 56:8, 75:17 full [1] - 1:10 fulsome [1] - 89:13 fumble [1] - 24:17 function [1] - 5:11 functions [1] - 53:21 future [4] - 55:2, 70:1, 70:3 G gang [1] - 9:2 gang-related [1] -9:2 gather [2] - 9:19, 28:1 gathered [1] - 61:13

gathering [1] - 57:24 general [10] - 33:9, 35:17, 35:19, 36:13, 36:21, 43:15, 53:9, 53:16, 54:23, 57:15 Generally[1] - 37:6 generally [6] - 37:7, 38:13, 53:22, 54:6, 60:14, 61:10 **Gibbons**[1] - 21:23 Giles[1] - 2:1 given [11] - 1:9, 19:17, 22:18, 33:25, 44:1, 49:14, 49:23, 50:2, 66:11, 87:10, 87:18 Gould[1] - 2:7 Government[1] -52:23 granted [4] - 39:14, 41:10, 41:13, 43:19 Gratl[47] - 32:4, 32:5, 34:24, 36:5, 37:3, 39:7, 39:9, 39:11, 39:15, 39:24, 40:8, 40:10, 40:19, 41:19, 42:18, 42:20, 43:23, 44:1, 44:3, 82:12, 82:14, 82:16, 83:11, 83:19, 84:1, 84:21, 84:24, 85:3, 85:6, 86:18, 87:25, 89:22, 89:23, 90:2, 90:5, 90:23, 90:25, 91:4, 91:8, 91:10, 92:7, 92:11, 92:24, 93:11, 93:14, 94:3, 1:7 Grati's [1] - 85:19 greater [1] - 88:12 greatest [1] - 36:8 grounds [6] - 33:20, 34:16, 37:15, 55:4, 83:17, 86:9 grown [1] - 81:11 guess [2] - 27:18, 66:7 guessing [1] - 35:22 guide [1] - 40:3 guidelines [2] - 40:4, 56:19 guilty [1] - 38:22 Н half [3] - 2:8, 30:16, 88:4 half-hour [1] - 30:16 handled [1] - 65:1 handling [1] - 6:24

handwritten [1] -4:18 hard [1] - 51:24 hard-nosed [1] -51:24 harder [1] - 70:5 Hatcher [3] - 85:18, 86.98 Hatcher's [1] - 86:18 head [1] - 56:14 heading [1] - 78:23 hear [5] - 11:8, 26:17, 83:19, 85:25, 86:14 heard [8] - 1:6, 6:16, 14:9, 15:16, 18:19, 30:13, 76:7, 85:16 hearing [5] - 1:4, 24:3, 43:11, 84:22, 94:4 hearings [2] - 3:15, 87:1 heightened [1] - 9:11 help [5] - 7:15, 45:21, 45:24, 47:7, 72:16 helpful [1] - 11:8 helps [1] - 61:12 hereby [1] - 94:9 Hern [1] - 85:12 heroin [3] - 45:20, 45:22, 46:7 hesitate [2] - 38:15, 55.4 higher [1] - 85:8 highly [1] - 43:7 hindsight [1] - 28:14 Hira[6] - 91:15, 91:16, 91:17, 91:24, 92:2 Hold [1] - 76:14 hold [2] - 65:25, 88:7 Holmes [1] - 23:23 hope [3] - 7:4, 8:8, 26:23 hopeful [1] - 24:9 hospital [1] - 41:22 hour [5] - 30:16, 91:2, 91:3 hours [1] - 69:20 housekeeping [2] -89:24, 92:11 hundreds [1] - 74:21 hurry [1] - 85:2 husband [1] - 38:21 L lbc [1] - 79:2 vi

Ibd [1] - 79:1 **Ibj**[1] - 78:25 ice [1] - 86:13 idea [1] - 74:15 ideas [1] - 73:3 identification [5] -92:13, 93:19, 93:20, 93:24, 2:6 identified [3] - 20:21, 21:22, 86:21 identify [4] - 19:18, 68:11, 83:21, 84:12 identifying [1] -86:20 immediately [1] -67:7 impact [2] - 57:10, 61:21 implies [1] - 52:8 importance [3] -5:17, 58:16, 84:3 important [3] -41:16, 57:7, 59:16 imposed [2] - 39:3, 42:12 in-depth [2] - 65:19, 65:22 incident [1] - 36:20 include [2] - 42:21, 42:22 included [9] - 10:21, 33:7, 33:16, 35:6, 35:20, 36:4, 36:13, 39:20, 40:7 including [2] - 52:15, 56:9 inconvenience [1] -41:22 incorrect [1] - 21:15 incumbent [1] - 67:8 independent [7] -10:8, 12:2, 14:16, 18:5, 32:12, 93:23, 2:5 Independent [1] -82:17 independently [1] -18:9 Index [1] - 1:1 index [1] - 21:22 indicate [1] - 29:22 indicated [4] - 40:25, 41:3, 41:4, 52:25 indicates [2] - 11:21, 47:15 individual [6] - 17:2, 27:21, 28:12, 34:15, 65:2, 67:15 individuals [2] -32:8, 82:20

information [3] -33:3, 34:2, 85:6 informations [1] -56:5 informed [4] - 13:22, 15:19, 60:7, 83:3 initials [3] - 76:19, 78:24, 79:20 initiated [4] - 79:1, 79:2, 79:17 inquire [1] - 18:9 inquiries [2] - 41:6, 89:3 inquiry [5] - 17:25, 36:20, 53:2, 85:7, 89:8 instituted [1] - 5:14 intend [1] - 54:22 intending [1] - 54:23 interactive [1] -53:22 interest [3] - 44:6, 52:25, 83:1 interested [1] - 20:18 interesting [2] -37:22, 62:5 interests [1] - 82:18 interior [1] - 25:13 interminably [1] -90:8 interrupt [1] - 29:8 interviewed [1] -27:4 interviewing [1] -68:16 invariably [1] - 73:25 investigating [2] -10:18. 10:22 investigation [7] -54:18, 54:20, 57:5, 57:6, 57:17, 57:23, 87:19 investigations [1] -61:20 investigative [4] -57:9, 57:15, 58:16, 61:22 investigator [3] -58:7, 72:12, 72:13 investigator's [1] -29:4 involve [1] - 42:13 involved [4] - 25:9, 25:10, 68:21 involvement [3] -15:23, 15:25, 79:8 involving [1] - 39:21 irrelevant [1] - 36:11 isolation [1] - 54:11 issue [12] - 15:19,

19:1, 20:19, 39:13,	42:25, 75:3, 75:9	likelihood [1] - 74:22	52:23, 54:15, 55:15,	memo [3] - 10:22,
40:6, 43:4, 43:20,	Langley[1] - 2:10	likely [5] - 46:7,	60:19, 60:23, 61:16,	46:16, 46:25
53:23, 61:2, 80:21,	large [2] - 12:16,	47:25, 48:24, 49:22,	62:8, 74:5, 75:11,	memory [8] - 4:25,
81:8, 84:8	57:22	65:23	1:10	10:8, 14:20, 16:19,
issued [1] - 88:6	largely [1] - 53:16	Likely[1] - 50:2	manager [1] - 7:20	17:7, 17:8, 45:21,
issues [4] - 1:14,	last [7] - 11:2, 22:6,	Lila[1] - 79:16	managers [2] -	45:24
24:15, 58:12, 87:24	71:13, 77:10, 80:3,	line [1] - 34:24	13:17, 72:4	mental [2] - 35:1,
items [2] - 25:14,	81:19, 92:11	lined [1] - 31:21	mandate [1] - 85:14	35:15
31:14	late [1] - 66:8	lines [3] - 82:16,	manuscript [5] -	mention [1] - 59:1
itself [3] - 29:22,	law [10] - 2:2, 2:3,	83:24, 84:2	80:23, 82:3, 87:14,	Mention [1] - 59:3
63:25, 85:8	2:6, 20:12, 25:20,	list [5] - 50:17, 69:17,	90:5, 90:7	mentioned [6] - 7:18,
	25:24, 58:12, 59:23,	69:19, 75:12, 77:16	Maple [1] - 2:12	15:3, 48:5, 66:19,
J	86:9, 91:21	lists [1] - 65:1	March [2] - 3:1, 3:2	71:24, 82:25
5	lawyer's [1] - 11:11	lives [1] - 42:24	Marion [1] - 21:10	merely [1] - 20:3
January[11] - 2:9,	lawyers [2] - 81:1,	Lm [1] - 79:15	mark [1] - 93:10	met [2] - 32:5, 61:7
11:18, 11:22, 14:11,	82:7	longest [1] - 89:5	Mark [1] - 34:22	microphone [3] -
14:12, 14:15, 17:15,	lay [1] - 61:15	Look[1] - 76:8	marked [11] - 4:12,	1:18, 34:20, 41:2
26:12, 27:3, 28:3,	laying [1] - 61:7	look [15] - 8:9, 11:1,	21:14, 82:6, 84:25,	middle [1] - 3:1
80:5	lead [2] - 33:1, 58:7	12:17, 23:13, 23:16,	92:13, 92:17, 92:18,	might [10] - 9:2,
Jason[1] - 32:5	leading [1] - 66:17	23:18, 26:21, 29:4,	93:1, 93:9, 93:13,	13:20, 18:3, 33:6,
job [6] - 2:25, 4:9,	Leanna[1] - 94:14	43:3, 44:13, 45:15,	93:19 93:19	68:6, 68:22, 74:8,
5:6, 7:19, 26:6, 89:15	learn [3] - 20:25,	43:3, 44:13, 45:15, 48:25, 56:13, 80:3,	material [10] - 3:23,	83:1, 83:9, 87:10
Judge[2] - 23:23,	learn [3] - 20:25, 21:4, 87:8	48:25, 56:13, 80:3, 93:16	5:5, 10:1, 10:17,	Mike [1] - 60:24
50:21			16:23, 16:25, 46:24,	mind [1] - 40:21
	learned [2] - 22:5,	looked [8] - 8:7,	56:8, 56:9, 68:24	minds [1] - 90:15
judge [3] - 24:12,	87:9	11:3, 11:6, 16:2, 22:6,	materials [5] - 14:18,	
79:1, 79:20	least [1] - 73:8	22:11, 22:17, 45:25	92:14, 92:16, 92:18,	minimize [1] - 89:10
judges [2] - 7:22,	leave [3] - 1:12, 19:4,	looking [15] - 39:17,	92:14, 92:10, 92:18, 92:20	minutes [1] - 91:20
79:22	27:5	39:19, 39:20, 45:9,		missing [2] - 17:24,
judges' [2] - 7:19,	leaves [1] - 27:7	47:4, 49:24, 56:16,	matter [11] - 20:4, 25:1, 26:24, 35:25,	20:22
49:7	left [4] - 2:24, 10:12,	57:21, 61:18, 62:1,		moment [4] - 23:18,
judgment [5] - 12:16,	45:10, 81:25	64:21, 65:19, 70:1,	51:23, 57:20, 72:14, 83:10, 83:11, 92:11	26:11, 27:6, 53:18
20:8, 52:14, 52:18,	legal [3] - 37:25,	71:18, 79:12		moments [1] - 80:22
52:19	57:18, 57:21	looks [1] - 78:22	matters [10] - 2:19,	Monday [6] - 88:4,
judicial [3] - 7:20,	Len[1] - 50:20	loose [1] - 43:16	24:18, 25:2, 25:5,	91:10, 91:19, 91:21,
13:17, 72:3	lends [1] - 85:8	Lori[1] - 85:13	27:12, 31:17, 40:15,	92:8, 94:5
June[1] - 78:16	length [2] - 30:14,	lost [3] - 13:19,	85:15, 89:24	month [4] - 9:13,
Justice[5] - 20:19,	30:18	21:10, 42:23	maximum [1] - 89:12	14:14, 49:7, 69:4
20:25, 21:3, 50:21,	lengthy [3] - 24:11,	lower [3] - 37:21,	mean [19] - 5:9, 7:2,	months [15] - 2:12,
55:9	24:14, 56:4	38:3, 85:3	7:15, 7:16, 8:17,	3:1, 7:21, 7:24, 8:12,
	less [4] - 9:13, 18:3,	Lowman [3] - 92:14,	18:19, 34:11, 35:7,	8:14, 47:18, 48:6,
K	20:5, 33:2	92:16, 92:18	38:13, 41:13, 48:12,	48:9, 66:12, 68:9,
	lesser [10] - 33:7,	Ltd [1] - 94:16	61:12, 62:4, 65:18,	68:10, 70:1, 90:12,
Karey[1] - 89:1	33:16, 35:6, 35:20,	lunch [1] - 91:2	65:19, 65:20, 77:25,	92:12
Keep[1] - 77:9	36:4, 36:13, 38:5,		79:11, 83:12	morning [3] - 1:17,
keep [1] - 39:4	39:19, 39:20, 40:6	Μ	meaning [1] - 80:1	4:4, 21:9
key [2] - 56:24, 86:23	letter [16] - 10:23,		Meaning [1] - 80:2	most [6] - 7:12, 8:8,
kind [5] - 13:14,	21:25, 22:9, 22:11,	Macdonald [1] -	means [5] - 28:18,	14:6, 33:1, 39:17,
35:1, 35:15, 56:6,	22:17, 23:9, 23:11,	79:16	78:13, 79:14, 79:19,	47:25
64:14	23:14, 23:19, 23:21,	Macdonald's [1] -	80:1	move [5] - 11:15,
knife [1] - 25:9	26:12, 49:11, 49:17,	18:23	meant [1] - 9:11	26:24, 62:7, 62:8,
knowing [2] - 31:6,	49:23, 50:2, 79:19	Maclean [3] - 77:5,	medical [2] - 24:15,	72:4
31:8	letters [1] - 23:7	77:6, 77:7	31:15	moved [4] - 2:17,
knowledge [5] -	level [3] - 42:15,	mail [1] - 80:24	meet [1] - 38:5	13:20, 24:23, 72:5
18:20, 25:7, 50:7,	85:3, 85:8	mails [1] - 90:10	meeting [5] - 14:10,	moving [1] - 90:19
54:8, 67:12	liaise [1] - 72:3	major [1] - 64:8	18:5, 32:14, 32:17,	multiple [3] - 69:14,
known [1] - 5:3	liaising [2] - 13:17,	Major [5] - 8:22,	32:18	69:16, 69:18
	68:17	8:23, 9:2, 9:5, 88:19	meetings [2] - 3:16,	murder [6] - 12:10,
L	lifetime [1] - 23:6	majority [2] - 3:12,	70:8	15:20, 16:8, 16:16,
<u> </u>	light [3] - 18:4,	3:17	members [2] - 58:10,	25:8, 38:25
laid [4] - 39:16,	18:22, 41:17	Makosz [11] - 52:22,	58:11	murdered [1] - 17:24
		vii		
			_	_

must [2] - 22:10, 32:15 N name [4] - 1:20, 6:10, 6:13, 32:5 named [1] - 17:5 Narbonne [6] - 44:3, 44:4, 44:5, 50:14, 50:15, 1:8 narrative [1] - 89:5	noted [3] - 8:4, 10:16, 68:19 notes [1] - 68:20 nothing [5] - 11:13, 22:23, 36:5, 78:2, 78:8 notice [6] - 8:15, 46:19, 86:4, 86:6, 86:19, 90:2 notified [1] - 68:25 November [6] - 47:14, 48:9, 66:9,	13:2, 14:5, 32:16, 35:21, 50:8, 50:24, 51:4, 51:6, 51:7, 53:21, 55:17, 57:18, 67:4, 69:10, 71:17 officer [4] - 10:19, 10:22, 53:25, 74:1 officers [2] - 41:21, 87:21 offices [3] - 6:22, 16:3, 50:24 Official [1] - 94:15	36:10, 71:3, 71:9 ought [4] - 39:14, 81:13, 84:8, 90:15 ourself [1] - 86:2 ourselves [2] - 86:1, 86:14 outline [2] - 88:2, 89:18 outset [3] - 6:25, 56:13, 64:9 outside [1] - 33:19 outstanding [2] -	39:21, 40:6, 40:12 People [1] - 88:5 people [8] - 76:19, 81:4, 81:14, 87:23, 88:2, 88:7, 88:17, 88:24 percentage [2] - 64:2, 64:5 perfect [1] - 13:4 perhaps [9] - 1:14, 4:2, 8:19, 20:5, 25:6, 25:16, 65:17, 80:21, 86:12
nature [5] - 30:24, 30:25, 34:1, 57:23, 64:19 necessarily [3] - 23:15, 63:8, 73:10 necessary [2] - 55:1,	77:22, 79:10, 79:13 Nr [1] - 93:13 number [3] - 24:5, 30:17, 80:25 numbering [1] - 21:15	often [2] - 27:14, 58:6 once [7] - 9:23, 10:11, 34:24, 67:5, 71:2, 88:6, 92:20 One[4] - 2:21, 28:23,	89:23, 92:12 overlap [1] - 63:4 own [3] - 7:3, 20:20, 32:22	Perhaps [3] - 58:2, 73:19, 80:16 period [9] - 27:10, 27:19, 42:24, 48:15, 53:5, 65:10, 66:17, 69:4, 69:7
67:23 need [22] - 1:13, 14:7, 17:6, 34:14,	numbers [3] - 47:5, 93:24, 2:6	54:25, 81:5 one [17] - 2:21, 5:23, 11:10, 25:16, 26:15,	page [14] - 26:20, 45:6, 45:9, 45:10,	person [12] - 11:11, 16:21, 17:9, 25:16, 28:4, 49:22, 70:20,
41:18, 49:2, 55:11, 56:22, 63:21, 67:24,	Ο	27:7, 32:24, 51:16, 61:17, 65:10, 65:20,	45:11, 45:16, 47:5, 63:15, 75:25, 76:2,	77:24, 79:14, 80:1, 80:2, 88:3
68:11, 71:4, 71:10, 73:10, 87:12, 88:12, 88:22, 88:23, 89:19, 89:20, 91:3, 91:19 needed [5] - 5:14, 7:1, 66:24, 67:2, 72:4 needs [1] - 89:14 Neil [1] - 17:20 never [2] - 11:6, 81:16 nevertheless [1] - 35:7 new [4] - 2:16, 49:19, 58:12, 86:8 New [6] - 2:6, 2:20, 3:2, 8:24, 9:5, 9:8 next [12] - 8:11, 8:12, 24:7, 48:8, 50:16, 74:6, 88:2, 89:13, 89:18, 90:3, 91:11, 93:1 nice [2] - 60:20, 62:4 niece [1] - 59:7 no-go [2] - 42:13, 43:1 none [1] - 85:6 normal [8] - 5:11, 9:21, 11:10, 12:10, 46:12, 48:12, 48:19, 71:16 Normally [1] - 31:14 normally [1] - 23:6 nosed [1] - 51:24 notation [3] - 77:18, 78:14, 79:5 note [3] - 8:1, 8:5,	object [4] - 34:18, 34:23, 41:1, 41:3 objecting [1] - 20:7 objection [4] - 20:1, 40:15, 41:8, 91:13 objective [2] - 34:16, 37:9 obtain [3] - 34:11, 56:5, 59:10 obtained [2] - 57:7, 59:14 Obviously[2] - 82:24, 88:11 obviously [11] - 5:21, 16:10, 41:13, 54:9, 54:18, 56:16, 56:23, 66:4, 66:15, 67:18, 81:14 occasional [1] - 3:15 occupied [1] - 30:14 occurred [2] - 15:20, 35:13 occurring [2] - 58:24, 58:25 October [16] - 9:18, 10:3, 10:5, 22:1, 22:9, 46:14, 47:10, 47:12, 47:25, 48:9, 49:5, 49:11, 50:1, 66:9, 77:12, 77:17 offence [2] - 33:16, 34:15 offences [4] - 33:7, 39:18, 39:19, 39:20	68:19, 69:4, 74:23, 75:13, 79:21, 90:7 ongoing [2] - 54:19, 64:18 onus [1] - 60:6 open [4] - 7:23, 14:4, 84:22 open-door [1] - 14:4 opinion [5] - 13:3, 42:7, 43:6, 57:24, 85:16 opinions [2] - 87:18 Oppal[1] - 4:4 opportunity [1] - 72:3 oppose [1] - 91:11 opposed [7] - 34:3, 60:16, 83:4, 83:5, 83:9, 83:11, 84:13 opposes [1] - 82:24 opposing [1] - 87:23 opposition [2] - 82:16, 83:17 option [3] - 38:10, 38:17, 39:21 oral [5] - 82:10, 84:5, 85:9, 87:9, 91:25 orally [1] - 85:25 Order[1] - 1:4 order [5] - 34:11, 34:13, 42:10, 87:5, 92:10 orderly [1] - 86:15 ordinarily [1] - 62:17 ordinary [1] - 83:20 original [1] - 4:20	77:17, 78:11, 80:4 Page [2] - 1:2, 2:2 pages [4] - 93:23, 94:1, 2:5, 2:8 panel [1] - 88:19 paragraph [1] - 24:8 Pardon [2] - 24:1, 37:18 part [17] - 5:11, 6:23, 7:19, 8:8, 12:16, 14:6, 28:25, 30:8, 30:9, 31:4, 43:2, 51:4, 57:22, 71:25, 84:11, 85:13, 89:15 parte [1] - 42:12 participants [3] - 84:17, 89:7, 89:12 particular [7] - 12:14, 35:8, 35:13, 53:17, 54:17, 74:7, 83:8 particularly [3] - 5:17, 53:1, 86:21 parties [4] - 83:21, 84:12, 84:13 parts [2] - 54:19, 54:20 party [1] - 60:5 pass [1] - 22:22 passed [2] - 22:14, 25:16 Peace [1] - 39:2 peace [14] - 33:19, 34:11, 37:4, 37:17, 37:19, 38:9, 38:23, 38:24, 39:2, 39:4,	personal [1] - 79:15 personalities [1] - 87:21 perspective [2] - 52:14, 60:15 Peter [2] - 22:1, 24:10 phone [3] - 70:7, 72:8, 88:3 photographic [3] - 24:16, 25:11, 31:15 photographs [2] - 25:12, 25:13 physical [1] - 37:11 pick [1] - 14:1 picking [1] - 7:13 Pickton [20] - 4:15, 6:11, 15:21, 16:8, 16:16, 17:4, 20:21, 21:11, 21:17, 41:13, 41:21, 41:24, 42:2, 42:8, 42:13, 42:16, 43:4, 77:21, 80:1, 87:15 Pickton's [5] - 19:13, 25:13, 43:6, 58:23, 59:7 place [4] - 16:3, 16:4, 16:5, 67:8 placed [1] - 53:8 plate [1] - 66:16 plays [1] - 72:18 pleas [1] - 9:25 plenty [1] - 8:9 Pm [1] - 1:3 point [7] - 13:12,

34:7, 39:10, 51:17,	82:10	64:24, 65:22, 68:1,	86:16, 87:17, 93:3	74:23, 75:3
59:10, 60:24, 69:2	preferable [1] -	70:25, 71:7, 75:5,	publicly [2] - 84:9,	reactivating [1] -
	•	88:6		
Police [3] - 83:3,	60:14		86:23	74:24
83:7, 93:15	preparation [13] -	processes [2] - 35:1,	purpose [3] - 36:15,	reactivations [1] -
police [30] - 44:21,	4:3, 7:1, 9:12, 19:25,	35:15	56:12, 60:11	74:19
53:15, 53:22, 53:25,	20:4, 28:19, 29:21,	produced [1] - 57:6	purposes [1] - 27:7	read [7] - 18:23,
54:4, 54:17, 56:10,	30:15, 50:5, 55:21,	Professor [1] - 92:16	pursuing [1] - 60:25	19:3, 31:11, 56:7,
57:5, 57:10, 57:14,	62:17, 66:14, 70:1	prompted [1] - 14:22	put [6] - 23:12, 25:1,	56:11, 78:24, 88:5
57:16, 57:21, 58:3,	prepare [7] - 7:10,	properly [4] - 13:24,	26:2, 42:11, 58:10,	readily [2] - 52:2,
58:12, 58:15, 58:18,	48:23, 52:10, 66:12,	61:10, 93:17, 93:18	92:16	52:3
61:17, 61:21, 64:15,	66:22, 68:11, 90:21			
		property [1] - 20:21	putting [4] - 29:13,	reading [2] - 56:4,
64:18, 68:18, 68:19,	prepared [2] - 81:15,	propose [1] - 92:7	32:24, 58:2, 61:10	89:4
70:11, 72:11, 72:13,	87:15	proposed [2] -		reads [2] - 24:8, 45:9
73:22, 73:25, 74:8,	preparing [3] - 8:15,	35:25, 91:18	Q	real [2] - 43:19, 82:8
87:19, 87:21	65:11, 65:18	proposing [1] - 90:2	-	reality [1] - 89:9
police-based [2] -	pressing [2] - 51:20,	propriety [1] - 41:12	questioning [1] -	realize [1] - 81:12
68:18, 68:19	70:2	prosecute [4] -	41:20	really [20] - 5:5, 36:9,
policies [2] - 55:2,	presumably [1] -	12:25, 13:4, 22:21,	questions [19] -	41:10, 41:15, 41:18,
67:4	74:15			
policy [29] - 13:8,		28:12	12:4, 14:5, 18:1, 18:3,	42:17, 43:11, 43:13,
	presumptively [1] -	prosecuted [2] -	18:7, 21:6, 21:11,	56:3, 61:8, 61:11,
13:9, 14:4, 15:17,	59:18	8:23, 9:4	24:7, 24:16, 31:15,	65:7, 65:18, 65:24,
15:18, 18:7, 18:13,	pretty [3] - 27:10,	prosecuting [1] -	32:2, 35:14, 41:4,	68:11, 69:2, 69:25,
18:16, 18:22, 23:5,	71:22, 92:4	67:13	44:1, 50:14, 53:15,	71:1, 83:15, 91:5
23:9, 35:5, 35:21,	prima [1] - 59:22	prosecution [18] -	54:22, 75:11, 75:12	realm [1] - 31:6
36:4, 36:13, 36:22,	principles [1] - 3:24	6:25, 7:9, 12:21, 33:6,	quick [2] - 45:1,	reason [11] - 11:24,
39:15, 40:3, 62:24,	private [1] - 87:16	33:15, 38:20, 39:18,	76:14	12:16, 15:10, 25:15,
63:12, 63:16, 63:17,	pro [1] - 87:4	55:8, 57:2, 57:11,	quickly [2] - 28:20,	26:19, 29:20, 32:19,
63:25, 64:1, 67:8,	probability [2] -			40:2, 52:4, 63:24,
73:14, 73:16, 73:20,		59:17, 59:24, 61:3,	73:15	
74:7	31:13, 48:20	61:18, 61:23, 62:1,	quite [7] - 7:13, 24:9,	64:12
	problem [2] - 68:12	64:16, 67:24	54:23, 57:16, 57:19,	reasonable [9] -
Port [7] - 2:22, 51:6,	problems [2] - 30:20,	prosecutions [2] -	68:1, 84:1	25:17, 33:20, 34:14,
53:6, 53:7, 76:23,	56:13	7:4, 64:8		34:16, 37:7, 37:8,
77:20, 79:21	procedure [2] - 16:2,	prosecutor [6] -	R	37:15, 38:21, 59:18
posed [1] - 41:24	16:4	37:7, 37:19, 50:10,		reasonably [2] -
position [1] - 86:13	proceed [2] - 40:4,	51:17, 65:3, 67:16	raise [1] - 81:7	70:19, 90:21
positions [2] - 51:21,	89:20	prosecutor's [1] -		reasoning [1] - 13:14
84:5	proceeded [1] -	65:3	Randi[13] - 14:13,	reasons [1] - 58:7
possibility [3] -	-		51:6, 66:11, 69:3,	
33:25, 34:5, 34:7	34:10	prosecutors [4] -	69:8, 73:3, 76:12,	receive [4] - 8:3,
	proceeding [2] -	9:5, 28:13, 65:2,	77:2, 77:23, 78:19,	22:23, 57:17, 67:12
possible [2] - 11:1,	13:16, 60:16	72:20	79:16, 80:8, 80:9	received [3] - 8:6,
12:20	Proceedings [4] -	prostitute [1] - 45:17	Randis [1] - 77:11	10:4, 22:11
possibly [1] - 40:16	1:3, 21:17, 94:6, 1:1	prove [2] - 37:8,	rare [1] - 74:25	recently [1] - 24:20
posted [3] - 85:7,	proceedings [32] -	38:20	rather [5] - 18:21,	recollect [1] - 19:9
86:23, 93:2	9:20, 11:2, 11:18,	provide [4] - 10:25,	27:25, 28:10, 41:23,	recollection [10] -
practical [2] - 7:2,	12:9, 17:1, 17:15,	41:19, 44:21, 70:11	59:9	12:3, 13:9, 14:16,
13:12	32:11, 33:1, 33:13,	provided [3] - 56:7,		18:5, 19:14, 32:13,
practice [10] - 12:10,	35:3, 39:14, 41:7,	•	Ravi[1] - 91:17	
22:20, 32:25, 33:5,		56:11, 88:9	Rc [6] - 76:12, 76:21,	32:22, 43:10, 72:21,
	41:12, 41:17, 42:25,	providing [2] -	77:2, 77:22, 78:18,	81:20
33:8, 35:17, 35:20,	43:20, 46:11, 46:22,	66:25, 89:21	79:16	recommendations
38:7, 71:17, 71:22	47:15, 54:2, 54:5,	Provincial [1] - 3:7	Rcmp[1] - 41:21	[2] - 55:1, 55:7
practices [5] - 53:14,	54:10, 61:9, 71:15,	proving [2] - 38:19,	Re [2] - 75:16, 1:11	reconsider [1] - 82:4
55:17, 57:9, 57:15,	71:24, 73:17, 74:10,	60:6	re [4] - 21:17, 75:3,	Reconvened[1] - 1:3
67:4	74:13, 76:3, 77:11,	provision [1] - 73:23	75:9, 75:14	record [14] - 9:19,
practising [1] - 15:4	78:12, 94:11	prudent [1] - 85:21	Reexam [1] - 1:11	11:2, 11:21, 37:1,
pre [4] - 23:22,	proceeds [1] - 56:14	•		46:11, 46:22, 47:15,
47:11, 77:13, 78:16	process [20] - 4:8,	psychological [1] -	re-exam [1] - 75:14	76:3, 77:10, 78:11,
pre-trial [4] - 23:22,	• • • •	37:12	Reexamination [1] -	
•	6:10, 9:24, 12:24,	public [13] - 43:16,	75:16	84:11, 84:12, 84:14,
47:11, 77:13, 78:16	24:22, 24:25, 27:17,	84:3, 84:11, 84:14,	re-laid [2] - 75:3,	85:12
predicted [1] - 74:6	27:24, 28:1, 28:2,	84:15, 84:16, 84:18,	75:9	red [24] - 6:17, 6:19,
prefer [2] - 32:22,	28:9, 44:7, 56:15,	84:21, 84:24, 85:3,	reactivated [2] -	6:22, 7:5, 8:4, 8:5,
		<u> </u>		
		ix		

8:8, 8:14, 9:1, 9:10,	43:7, 54:2, 87:7,	75:3, 76:22, 89:11	17:23, 18:20, 20:17,	second-guessing
19:18, 28:7, 28:18,	87:13, 87:22	respectful [2] - 43:3,	23:19, 32:5, 37:4,	[1] - 35:22
29:20, 30:4, 30:6,	reluctant [1] - 57:19	84:8	50:21, 52:24, 55:16,	secondly [1] - 43:10
47:21, 50:3, 62:13,				
	remained [1] - 16:4	respectfully [1] -	62:4, 80:14, 1:3	section [6] - 34:2,
63:2, 63:6, 63:8, 67:9,	remedies [1] - 33:18	86:3	room [1] - 81:17	38:9, 38:15, 38:23,
67:13	remember [2] -	respecting [1] -	Rory [1] - 52:23	39:3, 60:20
red-flagged [1] -	16:19, 16:24	24:15	rota [2] - 7:20, 49:7	see [24] - 7:5, 8:4,
47:21	remote [5] - 33:25,	respond [5] - 22:16,	routine [1] - 57:20	20:4, 23:7, 23:8,
refer [1] - 15:5	34:4, 34:6, 43:11,	22:19, 23:3, 23:17,	routinely [3] - 13:13,	23:11, 23:13, 25:23,
reference [18] - 5:5,	43:12	86:12	14:5, 38:16	30:25, 39:25, 45:8,
11:16, 25:15, 33:9,	reopen [1] - 75:7	respondents [1] -	Rr [1] - 76:11	46:15, 54:13, 77:10,
35:8, 35:11, 42:20,	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•		
	Reprec [1] - 79:24	91:10	rules [1] - 87:11	77:12, 77:16, 78:12,
43:2, 43:8, 43:12,	reply [2] - 91:12,	responding [2] -	ruling [5] - 36:23,	78:18, 78:24, 79:6,
53:5, 53:17, 53:23,	92:9	28:5, 85:19	44:1, 55:12, 81:9,	82:18, 82:20, 82:22,
54:21, 55:7, 61:20,	report [14] - 4:11,	responsible [2] -	86:8	84:15
63:21, 78:18	4:14, 5:8, 5:10, 5:12,	7:17, 69:24	run [2] - 76:18, 77:19	seed [1] - 81:11
references [1] -	5:22, 21:14, 29:5,	rest [1] - 88:21	running [1] - 7:14	seeing [3] - 14:19,
86:10	44:8, 44:14, 56:11,	restraining [1] -	511	17:3, 53:20
referred [2] - 63:17,	59:1, 59:3, 61:5	34:12	<u> </u>	seek [3] - 25:21,
92:21			S	25:22, 57:17
referring [6] - 4:12,	Reporter [1] - 94:15	result [3] - 13:21,		
	Reporting [1] - 94:16	58:18, 82:3	safety [4] - 33:21,	seeking [3] - 34:25,
24:12, 26:19, 35:4,	reports [1] - 6:5	Results[3] - 78:23,	37:12, 39:12, 43:15	57:24, 86:7
63:16, 72:11	represent [5] -	78:25, 79:17	Sandy [1] - 88:3	seizure [1] - 62:6
reflection [3] - 19:25,	20:17, 40:22, 42:3,	resume [1] - 94:5	sat [1] - 3:16	seminars [1] - 58:11
20:24, 42:15	78:15, 85:14	resumed [1] - 1:4	satisfied [4] - 32:14,	sends [1] - 49:12
refresh [2] - 45:21,	represented [2] -	retention [3] - 15:25,	40:3, 61:6, 74:1	senior [9] - 9:8,
45:24	42:8, 43:5	18:7, 18:13		12:20, 13:2, 14:7,
regardless [1] - 68:6	representing [1] -	return [1] - 70:7	scale [1] - 51:15	14:13, 15:3, 15:6,
Region [1] - 51:5			scenario [1] - 39:5	15:8, 33:12
	83:12	returned [2] - 77:18,	schedule [9] - 8:6,	
Regional[2] - 3:3, 3:5	represents [1] -	77:20	8:7, 10:12, 47:22,	sense [5] - 9:11,
regional [2] - 15:16,	85:13	review [11] - 5:12,	48:8, 66:25, 78:4,	50:23, 63:2, 78:17,
63:17	reputation [1] -	6:4, 7:8, 46:11, 55:19,	89:25, 91:5	86:20
Registrar[9] - 1:4,	51:23	55:21, 56:9, 67:6,	scheduled [12] - 1:8,	sensitive [5] - 62:25,
1:17, 1:20, 1:22,	reputational [1] -	67:9, 73:19	7:23, 13:18, 27:8,	63:3, 63:5, 63:9,
34:20, 37:1, 93:13,	82:25	reviewed [10] - 4:14,	30:17, 31:22, 48:21,	63:11
93:18, 94:4	request [1] - 24:22	4:24, 9:22, 10:17,		sent [2] - 10:18, 61:5
regrettably [2] -	•	44:7, 44:15, 45:4,	48:22, 75:12, 77:15,	September [5] - 10:2,
42:21, 42:22	requested [1] - 70:12		88:20, 91:1	46:14, 77:11, 78:12,
	requesting [2] -	46:25, 68:24, 73:24	schedules [8] - 7:22,	
rehabilitate [3] -	10:20, 10:24	reviewing [2] - 10:1,	7:25, 8:3, 8:10, 48:4,	79:4
67:20, 67:25, 70:21	requests [3] - 11:9,	62:11	48:5, 72:5	Sergeant [1] - 59:5
rehabilitating [2] -	11:13	reviews [1] - 55:25	scheduling [10] -	serious [15] - 5:21,
68:4, 71:7	require [3] - 50:4,	revisit [1] - 81:9	3:13, 3:19, 7:18,	5:24, 12:9, 19:20,
reinforcing [1] -	64:14, 67:19	revisited [1] - 80:24	10:14, 46:15, 46:25,	24:25, 34:1, 34:8,
58:15	required [6] - 13:10,	Richard [3] - 1:19,	47:18, 66:20, 71:25,	39:18, 62:24, 63:3,
relate [2] - 12:11,	30:15, 37:8, 37:14,	1:21, 1:3	72:17	63:5, 63:8, 63:11,
55:5	38:5, 62:16			70:20, 71:17
related [2] - 9:2, 41:5		Ridge [1] - 2:12	scope [2] - 60:10,	seriously [1] - 68:4
	requirement [1] -	rise [1] - 90:9	74:6	• • • •
relates [2] - 60:21,	13:5	Ritchie [7] - 10:19,	scrambling [1] -	seriousness [3] -
73:20	requires [1] - 25:6	21:23, 22:1, 23:21,	86:11	30:7, 30:18, 62:20
relating [2] - 12:1,	resources [1] - 68:22	24:10, 26:12, 26:20	scrutiny [1] - 85:3	Service [1] - 94:16
73:16	respect [31] - 2:19,	Robert[3] - 4:15,	search [13] - 16:10,	Services [4] - 68:17,
relation [1] - 36:19	17:2, 19:13, 35:15,	6:11, 19:12	58:23, 58:25, 59:2,	68:18, 68:20, 68:23
relationship [5] -	35:18, 36:8, 36:17,	Roberts[7] - 21:8,	59:9, 59:17, 59:20,	set [22] - 5:10, 9:25,
53:15, 54:3, 54:9,	36:20, 40:14, 51:19,	21:9, 29:10, 29:16,	59:21, 59:25, 60:10,	10:2, 33:3, 46:13,
54:12, 54:16	53:19, 55:7, 55:10,	32:2, 76:8, 1:6	60:15, 62:6, 86:23	46:17, 47:13, 49:5,
relevance [4] -				64:25, 66:5, 66:8,
	57:15, 58:23, 61:20,	Roberts [1] - 75:21	seat [1] - 1:23	69:23, 71:2, 71:3,
20:11, 35:11, 36:19,	62:9, 62:24, 64:7,	role [2] - 52:15,	seated [1] - 1:22	
39:2	67:4, 67:6, 68:25,	72:18	Second [1] - 76:2	71:9, 81:5, 89:24,
relevant [9] - 36:17,	69:6, 70:12, 71:14,	Romano[18] - 1:6,	second [2] - 35:22,	90:16, 90:17, 91:3,
40:7, 41:11, 41:15,	72:16, 74:9, 74:19,	1:14, 1:19, 1:21, 2:1,	75:25	91:5

х

sets [1] - 54:21 setting [2] - 65:15, 81:3 severe [2] - 33:2 severely [2] - 67:18, 67:23 93.5 sex [5] - 31:3, 31:5, 40:22, 42:8, 43:7 Shenher [7] - 61:25, 81:25, 83:7, 83:13, 85:13, 90:5, 90:7 Shenher's [1] - 86:10 shield [1] - 85:23 shoplifting [1] - 7:12 short [3] - 2:11, 27:10, 44:21 shortcuts [1] - 56:8 shorten [1] - 89:2 shortly [1] - 74:12 show [2] - 34:14, 37:14 shows [1] - 47:22 signature [2] - 80:7, 80:10 significance [2] -6:21, 6:22 significant [1] -3:18 67:17 similarly [1] - 33:18 simple [1] - 7:11 simply [7] - 16:4, 20:23, 22:21, 22:24, 30:7, 61:17, 73:5 sitting [2] - 32:16, 92:24 situation [2] - 41:20, 73:2 situations [1] - 38:14 skill [1] - 94:12 SI[3] - 78:22, 79:3, 79:4 small [2] - 64:1, 64:4 **Smith**[1] - 94:14 sober [2] - 71:4, 71:10 someone [9] - 22:20, 48:1, 49:12, 49:19, 68:9, 72:9, 72:11, 78:5, 83:14 sometime [5] - 9:18, 10:5, 46:13, 49:4, 66:8 sometimes [1] -28:16 somewhat [1] -61:11 **soon** [4] - 11:1, 49:6, 67:10, 68:13 sooner [2] - 27:24, 28:10

sorry [3] - 45:11, 71:2, 77:4 **Sorry**[8] - 21:2, 34:21, 44:16, 52:17, 69:16, 79:12, 86:5, **sort** [4] - 23:1, 65:15, 74:8, 87:1 Sound [1] - 52:19 sounding [2] - 72:18, 72:24 sounding-board [1] - 72:18 speaking [4] - 5:23, 38:13, 40:20, 83:14 special [1] - 6:14 specially [4] - 64:9, 64:12, 64:22, 65:8 specific [7] - 3:9, 33:9, 35:4, 36:20, 48:15, 49:17, 58:12 specifically [4] -5:18, 38:11, 91:15, 91:17 specified [1] - 23:5 spend [1] - 86:25 spent [3] - 2:8, 3:12, spoken [2] - 14:24, 74:14 staff [3] - 16:1, 22:14, 23:1 stage [8] - 10:14, 19:25, 55:20, 59:17, 61:22, 62:11, 64:23, 89:19 stand [1] - 1:15 standard [1] - 38:7 stands [4] - 78:25, 79:1, 79:2, 79:5 star [1] - 79:24 start [3] - 27:24, 28:20, 88:19 started [1] - 28:10 state [1] - 1:20 statements [3] -25:22, 56:5, 56:10 Stay[1] - 21:16 stay [35] - 11:18, 11:22, 12:8, 13:6, 13:11, 13:13, 17:1, 17:14, 32:10, 33:1, 33:12, 35:8, 39:13, 40:20, 41:12, 41:17, 42:5, 42:25, 43:20, 53:20, 54:2, 54:5, 54:10, 61:9, 63:20, 71:15, 71:20, 71:21, 71:24, 73:11, 74:10, 74:13, 74:24, 75:3,

80:4 stayed [9] - 13:21, 20:22, 40:2, 58:5, 72:1, 72:10, 74:20, 75:7.80:6 staying [2] - 35:3, 71:18 stays [2] - 73:16, 74:19 **step** [3] - 8:21, 56:18, 59:16 steps [3] - 61:3, 61:22, 67:24 still [7] - 25:12, 27:4, 44:10, 81:21, 86:16, 91:1 stint [1] - 2:12 Stone^[2] - 79:20, 79:21 straightforward [1] -92:5 stray [1] - 55:4 strength [1] - 38:4 strictly [1] - 88:8 stroked [1] - 78:21 strong [3] - 31:12, 62:2, 84:4 struck [1] - 77:15 study [1] - 2:5 subject [4] - 17:25, 27:12, 54:20, 80:25 subjective [1] -34:16 submission [7] -41:23, 42:14, 43:4, 84:2, 84:8, 85:20, 92:3 submissions [7] -43:23, 81:2, 83:22, 84:10, 86:15, 89:25, 90:3 successful [4] -33:7, 33:16, 37:23, 39:19 successfully [1] -60:1 suggest [4] - 14:10, 46:5, 86:3, 92:2 suggested [2] - 81:6, 84:7 suggesting [3] -24:12, 35:12, 35:24 suggestion [1] -86:19 suggests [1] - 28:9 suit [1] - 26:1 suited [2] - 12:25, 28:4 supervision [1] -25:11

∎xi ∎

support [4] - 16:1, 22:14, 23:1, 60:15 suppose [2] - 37:22, 58:11 Surely[1] - 27:24 surprise [1] - 72:8 Surrey [1] - 2:17 surrounding [1] -11:17 Suzette [1] - 44:5 synopsis [1] - 45:1 system [2] - 43:14, 43:21 systemic [1] - 53:1

т

tab [8] - 21:20, 44:13, 44:16, 44:17, 49:10, 49:11, 63:21, 75:23 Tab[2] - 47:2, 73:14 tack [1] - 60:25 ten [2] - 51:16, 91:20 term [3] - 11:15, 29:24, 86:23 terms [27] - 5:5, 5:20, 7:8, 11:8, 13:8, 29:21, 35:8, 35:16, 39:17, 42:20, 43:2, 43:7, 43:12, 51:8, 51:13, 52:9, 53:5, 53:23, 54:21, 55:6, 61:19, 63:12, 63:15, 65:19, 72:16, 86:20, 89:21 test [2] - 42:2, 61:7 testified [4] - 32:9, 32:12.61:25 testify [3] - 67:25, 71:5, 71:11 testimony [1] - 32:20 themselves [1] -26:2 Theyve [2] - 93:14, 93:18 they've [2] - 7:6, 93:16 threat [2] - 40:22, 43:6 three [12] - 4:20, 7:20, 27:15, 48:5, 48:8, 66:12, 66:17, 68:9, 68:10, 69:4, 69:22.70:1 three-month [1] -69·4 three-week [1] -66:17 threshold [3] -37:21, 37:25, 38:1

throughout [5] -53:5, 53:14, 61:19, 64:15, 65:10 Thursday[1] - 88:22 title [1] - 3:4 today [5] - 1:5, 18:1, 81:22, 88:1, 90:23 together [1] - 51:7 took [3] - 9:17, 61:3, 92:25 top [2] - 45:8, 81:11 topic [1] - 62:9 Toselli[3] - 76:13, 77:3.77:5 totally [1] - 82:9 touch [1] - 71:13 towards [1] - 41:24 toxicology [1] -31:17 toxilogical [1] -24:18 trade [2] - 31:3, 31:5 traffic [1] - 80:25 trailer [6] - 25:14, 58:23, 59:2, 59:6, 59:13, 61:1 transcends [1] -54:17 transcribed [1] -94:11 transcript [3] - 86:9, 86:22, 94:10 transcripts [1] -86:24 transparency [3] -84:16, 84:18, 85:9 transparent [1] -84:23 transpired [1] - 19:6 Tretiak[1] - 2:7 trial [89] - 2:11, 2:12, 2:14, 2:18, 2:21, 2:22, 2:25, 3:13, 3:15, 3:18, 7:3, 7:7, 7:11, 7:14, 7:17, 7:25, 8:2, 8:11, 10:1, 10:2, 10:12, 10:14, 13:18, 20:1, 22:15, 23:22, 27:8, 27:16, 28:16, 30:13, 30:16, 30:18, 31:22, 46:13, 46:15, 46:17, 46:19, 46:25, 47:11, 47:13, 47:16, 47:17, 48:4, 48:6, 48:11, 48:19, 48:23, 49:1, 49:6, 55:22, 58:6, 64:25, 65:4, 65:11, 65:12, 65:15, 65:18, 65:23, 65:24, 65:25, 66:3, 66:5, 66:8,

66:11, 66:12, 66:17, 66:20, 66:21, 66:23, 67:5, 68:10, 71:1, 71:2, 71:8, 71:18, 71:25, 72:16, 72:19, 74:13, 77:13, 77:21, 78:1, 78:4, 78:9, 78:16.79:10 trials [9] - 8:1, 13:19, 13:20, 13:21, 23:3, 69:14, 69:16, 69:18, 69:23 trite [2] - 91:20, 92:4 true [2] - 63:5, 94:10 try [2] - 27:10, 66:19 trying [4] - 29:12, 70:6, 85:22, 89:10 Tuesday[2] - 88:20, 88:21 turn [7] - 1:17, 21:13, 26:11, 26:20, 56:21, 73:15, 75:23 turned [1] - 24:21 two [6] - 16:7, 27:15, 84:2, 89:23, 90:12, 93:2 twofold [1] - 13:15 type [3] - 13:10, 34:12, 72:22 types [2] - 8:20, 33:11 typical [2] - 20:5, 20:6 Typically[1] - 89:3 U ultimate [3] - 36:15, 54:10, 61:23 ultimately [1] - 20:21 Under [2] - 79:17, 79:18 under [11] - 20:12, 25:11, 28:2, 34:13, 39:2, 40:3, 59:18, 78:23, 79:3, 79:24 understandably [1] -20:18 understood [3] - 5:7, 15:3, 28:19 unfolding [1] - 89:5 unfortunately [1] -28:16 Unfortunately [1] -12:2 union [1] - 85:14 United [1] - 94:16 unlawful [1] - 25:8 unless [7] - 22:10, 36:17, 49:10, 52:3,

54:11, 65:11, 84:25 unreasonable [1] -59:22 unusual [4] - 11:13, 22:23, 24:24, 58:3 **up** [16] - 7:13, 7:24, 16:17, 25:18, 25:21, 25:25, 26:1, 26:7, 26:9, 27:5, 31:21, 49:1, 58:5, 65:15, 66:17, 67:15 usual [1] - 22:20 utilized [1] - 72:2 V Vancouver [5] - 1:1, 45:18, 83:3, 83:7, 93:15 various [2] - 27:12, 87:18 vast [1] - 3:12 verbatim [1] - 19:3 Vertlieb [29] - 1:5, 1:8, 1:12, 1:25, 17:18, 22:6, 75:12, 75:16, 76:2, 76:4, 80:11, 80:14, 80:16, 80:21, 81:22, 81:25, 82:3, 82:6, 88:1, 88:11, 88:16, 88:19, 89:1, 89:18, 93:4, 93:6, 93:8. 1:4. 1:11 vet [1] - 23:1 viability [1] - 57:11 victim [2] - 29:23, 68:21 Victim[4] - 68:17, 68:18, 68:20, 68:23 victims [1] - 43:15 video [1] - 25:12 view [6] - 13:12, 14:19, 34:8, 50:3, 51:18, 63:24 view's [1] - 87:20 viewed [1] - 59:6 views [5] - 81:1, 82:7, 83:2, 85:11,

87:16

77:3, 77:5

vigorous [1] - 84:1

violence [1] - 39:22

Vittorio [3] - 76:13,

voice [1] - 26:17

Vpd[2] - 93:24, 2:6

Vt[2] - 76:12, 77:2

W

Wait[1] - 76:14

waiting [2] - 81:20, 90:12 walked [1] - 27:16 wants [1] - 82:18 Ward[4] - 81:9, 81:17, 82:3, 90:13 warrant [8] - 16:11, 59:11, 59:18, 59:25, 60:2, 60:15, 60:16, 60:25 warranted [1] - 87:3 warrantless [2] -59:20, 59:21 ways [2] - 35:24, 58:14 web [1] - 93:2 webcast [1] - 85:4 website [1] - 85:7 Wednesday [9] -88:21, 90:3, 90:17, 91:6, 91:8, 91:11, 92:8 week [8] - 27:8, 48:21, 66:17, 66:21, 88:2, 89:13, 89:18, 90:3 weighed [1] - 81:1 welcome [1] - 80:13 well-placed [1] -53:8 Westminster [6] -2:6, 2:20, 3:2, 8:24, 9:5, 9:9 Whalley[2] - 2:13, 2:15 whatever's [1] - 56:7 whatsoever [1] -20:11 whereas [1] - 59:20 Whereas [1] - 60:5 whichever [1] - 27:3 whole [1] - 43:14 wife [1] - 38:22 William[2] - 4:15, 6:11 window [1] - 9:13 wished [1] - 13:6 Witness[1] - 80:20 witness [33] - 1:5, 1:8, 1:15, 29:23, 34:22, 34:25, 35:14, 37:23, 41:5, 42:4, 42:6, 42:16, 43:5, 53:19, 55:5, 55:9, 56:5, 56:10, 67:19, 67:22, 67:25, 68:5, 68:12, 68:16, 70:6, 70:7, 70:13, 70:15, 70:22, 71:7, 80:16, 91:1

xii

witness's [1] - 41:6 witnesses [4] -31:14, 31:18, 31:19, 45:2 Wolthers[1] - 85:19 women [3] - 17:24, 20:20, 42:23 wondering [1] -44:13 Woodall[3] - 82:23, 84:6, 85:20 word [3] - 24:17, 38:16, 73:19 words [1] - 16:18 worker [3] - 31:3, 31:5, 68:23 workers [3] - 40:22, 42:8, 43:7 write [4] - 25:18, 25:21, 26:1, 26:7 writes [1] - 25:25 writing [4] - 23:21, 24:13, 24:21, 25:2 written [19] - 3:23, 4:19, 26:9, 78:3, 81:6, 82:11, 84:7, 84:10, 84:19, 84:24, 85:4, 85:22, 86:15, 86:19, 87:5, 89:25, 90:3, 90:22, 92:3 Υ year [5] - 2:10, 2:18, 6:2, 6:6, 56:1 years [5] - 2:8, 2:20, 15:5, 19:5, 50:21 vesterday [1] - 41:4 young [1] - 72:20 youth [2] - 2:15, 2:19