

Vancouver, BC

November 28, 2011

(PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED AT 10:05 A.M.)

THE REGISTRAR: Order. The hearing is now resumed.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

MR. WOODALL: Mr. Commissioner, I would like to introduce myself. My name is Kevin Woodall --

THE REGISTRAR: We need, we need to do the speaker please.

MR. WOODALL: Ah, thank you. Mr. Commissioner, I would like to introduce myself. My name is Kevin Woodall.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr. Woodall.

MR. WOODALL: I am working with Claire Hatcher on behalf of Constable Fell.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Thank you for appearing.

MR. VERTLIEB: Mr. Commissioner, just as a quick outline, obviously we're still dealing with Deputy LePard. Mr. Roberts perhaps is going to be half a day or so, but whatever it takes, that's fine. And then Mr. Gratl, who will be some time, and Ms. Tobias. And so I want to get a sense of how we're doing time-wise with the deputy and then determine whether we start Superintendent Williams. I will try to deal with some of the procedural issues that are still outstanding. So, we will just have to play that by ear, so to speak, as it unfolds,

1 if that's convenient for you, Mr. Commissioner.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

3 MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the name is Darrell Roberts and I am
4 appearing here as counsel, along with Robyn
5 Gervais and Bryan Baynham on behalf of First
6 Nations interests, and this is my continued
7 cross-examination of Mr. LePard, Deputy Chief
8 LePard. Good morning, Mr. Commissioner.

9 **DOUGLAS A. LEPARD, resumed:**

10 **CONTINUED CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ROBERTS:**

11 Q I wanted to just back up to where I was at the end
12 of last Thursday. And Mr. Commissioner, you have
13 before you now the binder, a binder with the
14 documents I was using under respective tabs, so do
15 you Mr. LePard, to ease reference to them. So,
16 for example, I was dealing with the documents
17 which are at tab 5 and 6 at the end of the day on
18 Thursday. And so let me just identify what those
19 documents are.

20 There is actually three documents there, all
21 prepared in the form of an aide memoire. That
22 simply means a document to aid my examination.
23 They're prepared by counsel. That means me.
24 They're prepared for the view, to test the
25 question I should say, of how close was the

1 investigation into Pickton in relation to the
2 source information from Hiscox and other evidence,
3 to being able to submit an application, a
4 successful application for a general search
5 warrant under section 487(1) of the Criminal Code.

6 The first part of the aide memoire, which is
7 at tab 5, is a hypothetical application called
8 "Information to Obtain a Search Warrant". It is
9 drawn on the theory that the 10 missing women who
10 are named in that information went missing in
11 accordance with a suspected crime of kidnapping by
12 fraud. That's section 279(1) of the Criminal Code
13 of Canada. And that there, the application seeks
14 information. So, it would be sub, subpart (2) of
15 the section 487 seeks evidence or things that may
16 relate to the alleged or suspected crime. The
17 information sets out what those things are:
18 purses, women's identification papers and women's
19 bloody clothing at the trailer of Pickton on his
20 farm at the address. I understand there is some
21 question as to whether it's the farm, but his
22 property.

23 This morning I'm going to seek to amend my
24 own document by adding the matter of syringes, but
25 I will leave that for the moment.

1 The next document at tab 5 is an affidavit.
2 It's part of the aide memoire, which counsel has
3 prepared. In serving or preparing or containing
4 in the affidavit information that was available,
5 so it will be argued at the end of the day, that
6 comes from or is related to the source, who we can
7 now call, name, his name is Mr. Hiscox, that was
8 provided to the VPD counsel, Constable Shenher,
9 who worked with this source.

10 It also contains other information that was
11 available that had nothing to do with the source,
12 such as all of the information that came from the
13 attempted murder file which the RCMP had on the
14 attempted murder on March 23, 1997 of Victim '97.
15 It contains as well information which would have
16 come to, according to the reports that have been
17 filed in this case on Mr. LePard and Evans, it
18 would have come to Constable Shenher from her
19 conversations with Corporal Connor, who is now,
20 today, Sergeant Connor.

21 So, that's the purpose of those two documents
22 under tab 5. And you have that organized before
23 you, Mr. LePard?

24 A I do.

25 Q The second at -- start again. The third document

1 actually is the affidavit of Corporal Connor, as
2 he then was. Now, again, this has been prepared
3 by counsel, but it differs from the one prepared
4 for Constable Shenher, the hypothetical for
5 Constable Shenher. This one, although
6 hypothetical, borrows exactly paragraphs from
7 Sergeant's Connor's affidavit certified and sworn
8 by him on the 6th day of February, 2002. And for
9 that little bit of advice or information, I simply
10 turn to Tab 7 of the binder, which has been
11 prepared, at the top part of that Exhibit C to the
12 affidavit of Sergeant Mike Connor, it reads:

13 This affidavit of Sergeant Connor has been
14 reviewed in its entirety by Constable Cater.
15 On 2002/02/06, Sergeant Connor reviewed the
16 information and certified its contents to be
17 true.

18 Now, what counsel did, that means me, was to
19 take the relevant paragraphs from this affidavit
20 that relate to the events in 1998, only, and put
21 them in the form of Appendix "B", making two
22 changes. I changed the name, his rank to
23 corporal, which he then was, in the fall of 1998.
24 Second, there were two paragraphs where, in the
25 Sergeant Connor material, there was an insertion

1 of a reference to affirmation by Caldwell. That
2 is information in 1999. I deleted it. Otherwise,
3 I left it alone.

4 Again, it is in support of a search warrant
5 for the things that are listed in the information
6 application by Constable Shenher, supported by her
7 affidavit, and now supported as well by the
8 affidavit of Constable Connor. So, that's enough
9 of a background perhaps.

10 We're all on the same page now, are we, Mr.
11 LePard?

12 A I, I understand it now. When you say "the
13 affidavit of Constable Shenher," though, just so
14 that everyone is clear, it's actually not
15 Constable Shenher's affidavit. It's your
16 affidavit purporting to be from her.

17 Q Of course. But it's hypothetical, --

18 A Yes.

19 Q -- if the application had preceded this way. I
20 believe that's a common understanding of what I'm
21 doing here. In other words, I'm asserting that
22 had she proceeded properly on her investigation,
23 with the support of the VPD, this is what should
24 have been done. Do you understand?

25 A I understand that.

1 Q Now, I was last day, Mr. LePard, already into
2 corporal, the Appendix "B", the affidavit which
3 has been drawn hypothetically for Corporal Connor,
4 as he then was, and I had finished discussing with
5 you or questioning you on the significance of the
6 bloody women's clothing. Remember that?

7 A I will assume that's correct.

8 Q Well, I believe I -- I have a note that I did.
9 You know that that is information that was being
10 provided by source Hiscox?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And that information was coming from his
13 informant, if you will, his old friend, Lee?

14 A Yes.

15 Q Let's go to page 5. Oh, by the way, can I stop
16 here and ask you, I noticed that a request has
17 been made by one of my co-counsel in this case for
18 your original interview notes of the people you
19 interviewed at Farris & Co. before you wrote your
20 report. Have you -- do you know there's been such
21 a request? I am not asking for it now. I am just
22 asking if he knows of whether there's a request.

23 A For all of them or individual or. . .

24 Q Ms. Hatcher I think sent out that request. Have
25 you been alerted to that or not?

1 A I was alerted over the weekend to a request for
2 some notes that I made in preparation for an
3 interview, yes.

4 Q Okay. If you receive any requests coming from me,
5 Mr. Hern, it's to you, not to the witness.

6 I only want to endorse that in one respect.
7 I am curious, when you interviewed Constable
8 Shenher, which you did, --

9 A Yes.

10 Q -- and which, in your interview notes, there are
11 no questions set out?

12 A (Nod)

13 Q You're nodding. Can I have an answer for the
14 record?

15 A Yes, that's correct.

16 Q On the matter of trophies, which was in her notes
17 or her log of her interview of source Hiscox on
18 the occasions, being September 18th and October
19 15th, when you interviewed her, did you ask her of
20 what the word "trophies" meant to her?

21 A I would have to check my notes to see if I did.

22 Q As you sit here, you can't remember that?

23 A No.

24 Q I see. That would be a very significant thing to
25 ask her, wouldn't it, given that trophies is

1 language that relates to serial killing?

2 A Well, I don't know whether I would have needed to
3 ask her that, but I can't speak to what --

4 Q But as to the competence of her investigation,
5 would you not have to do that?

6 A I'm sorry, I missed the first part of your
7 question.

8 Q As to the competence, or incompetence of her
9 investigation, to the extent she was involved in
10 an investigation, it would have been significant
11 to know whether she understood what the word
12 "trophies" was related to?

13 A Uh, I agree, but I don't know that that was an
14 issue in question for me and I would have to check
15 my notes and her statements, which there were
16 several, to satisfy myself whether that was an
17 issue we discussed.

18 Q I'm pressing the point because of this, Mr.
19 LePard. In your evidence, you said more than once
20 that there was no evidence in this case, at the
21 time, of a serial killer. Remember that? You
22 said that?

23 A Uh, I am not going to agree with, with that. I
24 don't know that I said that or not. I talked
25 about what the level of evidence was at certain

1 times.

2 Q Please stay with my thought then. If you did say
3 something like that, the point of that is, is that
4 it would -- if there's no evidence of a serial
5 killer, it indicates the level of concern or, or,
6 or -- what's the -- what do I want to say -- the
7 level of support and intensity with which the
8 investigation would have proceeded, right?

9 A I'm not sure actually what your question is, other
10 than to say that in August, September, October of
11 1999, there was certainly some --

12 Q I'm still in '98.

13 A Sorry. What I meant to say was '98. August,
14 September, October of '98, there was some hearsay
15 information that was suggestive of that. So, I
16 would describe it as some information suggesting
17 that.

18 Q Please understand me. In 1998, in August or July,
19 there was an intense debate within the VPD as to
20 whether the evidence which Constable Shenher and
21 Constable Dickson had marshalled, indicated that,
22 whether or not there was a serial killer; isn't
23 that correct?

24 A You have described that in your documents as a
25 debate over whether there was, it was a killer or

1 a serial killer, and I'm going to completely
2 disagree with you about that that was the debate.
3 The debate was whether there was even foul play
4 involved at all, and I have given evidence over
5 the last seven days and described in detail in my
6 report, is that there were many did not believe
7 foul play was involved at all, while others were
8 coming to the suspicion that there was foul play
9 involved. And the debate, I would say the
10 majority view at the time was that these women
11 could be found, that there was some innocent
12 explanation for their absence, with several
13 investigators believing, starting to lean towards
14 believing that there was foul play.

15 Q With respect, they believed there was foul play.
16 Constable Shenher put out a memo, which you have
17 reviewed, indicating that, in her view, the
18 murders were related; isn't that correct?

19 A What she said in her memo was that, "I think that
20 we will find that these cases are related." But
21 it was a very preliminary memo. I reviewed it
22 again last night and I do not agree with your
23 characterization of it.

24 Q In any event, you did agree last day that the word
25 "trophies" is the language that is associated with

1 a serial killer?

2 A That's one of the associations. It could be for a
3 sexual predator or others. I agree that it could
4 be associated with a serial killer.

5 Q And you saw the paragraph in corporal, or Sergeant
6 Connor's affidavit, where he relates that language
7 to a serial killer?

8 A Yes.

9 Q All right, let's move on. Syringes, top of page
10 5. And I am just going to read a few of these
11 lines and then I have some questions to you about
12 the significance of the syringes. This is coming
13 from source Hiscox, from a conversation with Lee.
14 It reads:

15 During this conversation Pickton asked Lee if
16 she could provide him with syringes. He
17 wanted to use these against Victim '97 --
18 Now, that, of course, is the victim in the
19 attempted murder case, March 23, 1997?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Who fortunately survived?

22 A Yes.

23 Q He asked that -- I'm sorry.

24 -- Victim '97 when he found her. He asked
25 that some of the syringes be new and the

1 others to be used. That the reason for the
2 syringe's condition was not known by Source
3 A.

4 Now, I will refrain from questions. Could
5 you drop your eyes then please to paragraph 19?

6 A Yes.

7 Q At the bottom of the page.

8 That in relation to the above information
9 provided by Source A, Corporal Connor, being
10 the primary investigator of the March 1997
11 incident, recalled a number of syringes being
12 found on the Pickton's kitchen floor. Blood
13 from one syringe was identified by the Royal
14 Canadian Mounted Police "E" Division forensic
15 laboratory as belonging to Victim '97.

16 Stop there. So, that means her DNA was found in
17 that syringe?

18 A Yes.

19 Q I will refrain from another question.

20 There were used and new syringes.

21 And I will stop there. I'd better ask this.

22 A new one would still be in a package?

23 A I don't know if it was still in a package.

24 Q Well, we are not talking about syringes that you
25 go into a drugstore and get here, are we? These

1 are probably from a needle exchange or some --
2 and, therefore, loaded with something or other?

3 A Well, they wouldn't come loaded from a needle
4 exchange.

5 Q Wouldn't they have a narcotic in them?

6 A No. The needles that come from a needle exchange
7 are clean.

8 Q All right, clean. So they -- all right. But they
9 still would -- how would you know that it's a new
10 one as opposed to a used one, when looking at
11 them? The new one would still be in a wrapper or
12 container?

13 A I would suspect so.

14 Q All right.

15 Other syringes were found to contain cocaine.
16 So, that would mean somebody placed the cocaine
17 probably in a solution form in the syringe?

18 A Yes.

19 Q In the vial part of the syringe, right?

20 A In the --

21 Q In the --

22 A In the vial form?

23 Q Yes.

24 A Yes.

25 Q All right, let's go over to paragraph 22, last

1 five lines.

2 When asked if the syringes found on Pickton's
3 kitchen floor were hers, Victim '97 felt that
4 the syringes could be hers as she had some
5 syringes in her fanny pack and that she had
6 worn on the date in question. She believed
7 that the fanny pack was seized by the police
8 as she no longer had it in her possession.

9 One more line, paragraph 23, four lines -- three
10 lines down. Four I should say.

11 Constable Paradis advised he did not recall
12 seizing a fanny pack but does not recall the
13 syringes on the floor.

14 A "But does recall the syringes on the floor."

15 Q Sorry, "did not" -- yeah, "but does recall".

16 Thank you, I misread that.

17 Then over on page 25 -- paragraph 25, page 7.
18 So, here's what Connor does, Corporal Connor. He
19 says:

20 I reviewed the crime scene video --

21 So, like a good police officer, he had taken
22 a video of Pickton's residence in the attempted
23 murder matter, right?

24 A Someone had. I don't know if it was Corporal
25 Connor.

1 Q Somebody did. He was the officer in charge?

2 A Yes.

3 Q It confirmed both used and new syringes were
4 strewn on the floor, however, the fanny pack
5 could not be seen.

6 Two more paragraphs, 27, three lines down.

7 With respect to the syringes, Corporal Connor
8 was able to determine, from reading forensic
9 reports on the investigational file, that the
10 syringes seized at the March 1997 scene
11 contained cocaine, that one syringe also
12 contained the blood of Victim '97.

13 Additionally, Corporal Connor checked with
14 the exhibit custodian to see if the fanny
15 pack was seized and it was not.

16 And lastly, paragraph 28:

17 Still photographs of the crime scene were
18 reviewed by Corporal Don White and Corporal
19 Connor for the fanny pack and one was not
20 located. Therefore, Corporal Connor verily
21 believed that Pickton had his own syringes.

22 He then says this, Mr. LePard.

23 It's also reasonable to assume, given the
24 circumstances, that Pickton had his own
25 syringes. That Pickton, as he does not use

1 drugs, allowed Victim '97 to use his needles,
2 given her blood was identified in one
3 syringe, or when Victim '97 went to use the
4 telephone, along with the use of handcuffs,
5 he injected or attempted to inject cocaine
6 into Victim '97 in an attempt to take control
7 of her.

8 Now, that's everything on syringes. Oh, one
9 more paragraph. One more on syringes, sorry, at
10 the end, paragraph 32. He says:

11 That with respect to the information from
12 Source "A" --

13 Again, that's Mr. Hiscox, you understand?

14 A Yes.

15 Q -- that were not assumptions by Lisa Yelds --
16 That's Lee, his friend, Hiscox's friend?

17 A Yes.

18 Q -- Pickton's request for syringes (both clean
19 and used) [and then he goes on to say] the
20 women's identification and purses, and the
21 bag of bloody clothing she had seen and which
22 Pickton refers to as "trophies", Corporal
23 Connor believes that reliability can be
24 attached to it.

25 The "sic" is there because of the extra

1 "that" which is in his paragraph. I've quoted him
2 from his sergeant paragraph exactly.

3 All right. Now, I have some questions to
4 help me understand and maybe everybody else knows
5 why these things are so, but what would be the
6 reason for Pickton wanting new and used syringes?
7 Can you help us on that?

8 A Well, I see what Corporal Connor has alleged in
9 his affidavit.

10 Q Yes?

11 A I wouldn't want to speculate beyond that.

12 Q But these are syringes for injecting a narcotic?
13 That's what Corporal Connor is suggesting?

14 A Generally.

15 Q Because the ones on the floor and so on around,
16 some of them had cocaine in them?

17 A Yes.

18 Q So, the difference between new and used, well, the
19 used one, it has this much significance. If there
20 are used syringes strewn on the floor of the
21 trailer, then that would indicate that they are
22 likely sources of DNA? Yes?

23 A They could be, yes.

24 Q Either on the needle or from the, whatever fluid
25 is left in the vial, right?

1 A Yes, they could be.

2 Q And that would be a very important matter then to
3 put in an affidavit like this in searching for
4 material on -- evidence on, in relation to
5 kidnapping by fraud of women from downtown
6 Vancouver?

7 A Well, it would be important to try to look for
8 evidence that would -- could be linked to a
9 particular victim, yes.

10 Q Yes. Most likely, the victims, all of the women
11 who are missing and murdered, or suspected
12 murdered at that time, would have had DNA sources
13 available for comparison at a medical clinic or
14 somewhere in Downtown Eastside Vancouver, maybe
15 even at the needle exchange?

16 A Uhm, that was more difficult than you think. But
17 actually, that is one of the things that Sergeant
18 Field did at some point, I don't know whether it
19 was in '98, was go to the BC Cancer Research, the
20 BC Cancer Centre, and gather familial DNA or DNA
21 from some of the missing women from their PAP
22 smears, and she also contacted family members to
23 get some familial DNA so that they would have
24 something to compare evidence to, if they were to
25 recover it.

1 Q So there you would then have that comparison which
2 you could use for any DNA that might be found on
3 material, vials, needles, at Pickton's trailer?

4 A Once it was acquired. I would have to check, but
5 my recollection is that didn't happen until 1999.

6 Q I understand, but it doesn't matter whether it
7 happened, but the -- here we are, Corporal Connor
8 is, Sergeant Connor is saying he had this
9 information in 1998, and it looks like these
10 paragraphs are simply copied from his logbook.
11 He's got the hours when he did all of this work,
12 right?

13 A Yes. So, he's putting his mind to how he can
14 gather evidence to link it to a potential victim,
15 yes.

16 Q But what this tells us is that the used vials that
17 are strewn on the floor, syringes, in Pickton's
18 trailer, could be sources of DNA identification?

19 A It could be.

20 Q And the information in this affidavit, that
21 Pickton doesn't use drugs, is very important
22 information, is it not? That means he had wanted
23 these syringes for some ulterior purpose?

24 A Well, that's one possibility.

25 Q Most likely?

1 A Well, I don't know that. Another possibility is
2 that sex workers were known to frequently visit
3 his property and use drugs and so on, so.

4 Q I suggest you can't go there. You have to couple
5 this evidence with the actual history of his
6 attack on Victim '97, which is what Corporal
7 Connor has done?

8 A Well, I agree with Corporal Connor trying to do
9 that, but you asked me if there were explanations.
10 I'm telling you that there are other explanations
11 because sex workers frequently went there and, the
12 information was, and used drugs on his property.

13 Q I suggest you can't do that either. You realize
14 full well that every person who is a street
15 worker, if you want to call them sex trade worker,
16 on the Downtown Eastside of Vancouver was poor and
17 would not go out to Pickton's property unless they
18 were provided with a ride in a vehicle for the
19 purpose of having -- getting money for sex; isn't
20 that fair?

21 A Uhm, well, I, I didn't say anything to disagree
22 with you. There was, there was --

23 Q But you are giving the impression that other girls
24 somehow just found their way out there and,
25 therefore, we don't have to look at kidnapping by

1 fraud, because they just are -- they're just
2 there?

3 A Uhm, and what I will say again, Mr. Commissioner,
4 is that there was considerable information showing
5 that sex trade workers made their way out to the
6 property by various means of conveyance, including
7 rides from women that did have a vehicle, and I
8 don't know what else. But there is actually quite
9 a bit of information that sex workers were
10 visiting the Pickton property frequently.

11 Q Each and every one of the missing women are likely
12 persons who got into a john's car on a bargain for
13 sex and disappeared out on Pickton's property;
14 isn't that true?

15 A Well, that's one possibility that I don't disagree
16 with and, in fact, I am sure that in some cases
17 that's right. But there were also people, for
18 example, who eventually became one of his victims,
19 like Heather Chinnock, who was reported missing in
20 Surrey, she was a Surrey sex worker, and her
21 fiancé provided information that's in the public
22 record that Pickton would phone her and invite her
23 to come to the property, and she would go out
24 there and had been going there for many years. I
25 think he said since 1991.

1 Q All right. I'm going to ask you to look at the
2 last paragraphs in the affidavit, and then I want
3 to ask you the significance of this material that
4 has been prepared. If you would just take please
5 Appendix "B" and go to paragraph 31 is a good
6 start, page 8. You will see that paragraph 31 is
7 Corporal Connor's review of his interview of
8 Hiscox. By the way, he has it on the 14th day of
9 October, 1998, do you see that, at 1140 hours?

10 A Yes.

11 Q Constable Shenher in her material has that
12 interview on the 15th of October. Have you
13 noticed that slight discrepancy?

14 A I haven't compared the --

15 Q All right.

16 A -- the two documents.

17 Q And then he, in reviewing the evidence, he
18 comments towards the bottom of that paragraph as
19 to what might be an assumption and what is not.
20 Maybe I haven't put that correctly, but look to
21 where he begins "Source A concluded". That's
22 about seven lines from the bottom of that
23 paragraph.

24 A Sorry, are we still on paragraph 31?

25 Q Yes.

1 Source A --

2 A Yes, I see that.

3 Q -- concluded that what were not assumptions
4 on the part of Yelds was her conversation
5 with respect to the request for syringes
6 (both clean and used), the women's
7 identification and purses, and the bag of
8 bloody clothing she had seen and which
9 Pickton refers to as his "trophies". Lastly,
10 Source A stated that Yelds told him that one
11 piece of women's identification was that of a
12 native girl which was seen approximately two
13 years ago.

14 That's a pretty specific piece of
15 recollection, most unlikely to have been invented;
16 would you not agree?

17 A Well, I agree that it's somewhat specific in that
18 it says it's native. I would not agree that it's
19 unlikely to have been invented, because Yelds was
20 not interviewed.

21 Q Well, we'll get to why she wasn't interviewed.

22 Uhm --

23 A Or when she was, did not say that.

24 Q Yes, but let's leave that for the moment. You and
25 I both know that she wasn't interviewed until 10

1 months later when Connor went on his own to see
2 her?

3 A Yes.

4 Q Which he had been warned not to do by Hiscox?

5 A Yes.

6 Q And by the own, his own lady in his office, Bev
7 Hyacinth, said, "She won't talk to you." Isn't
8 that so?

9 A Yes, I understand that.

10 Q That "she's a cop hater and she won't talk to
11 you"?

12 A Yes, still had some comments about that one, if
13 you are going to ask me about that.

14 Q Okay. I want to go to how Corporal Connor regards
15 the evidence of Hiscox. This is taken from his
16 actual affidavit. He says in paragraph 32:

17 With respect to the information from Source
18 A that were not assumptions by Lisa Yelds,
19 Pickton's request for syringes (both clean
20 and used) the women's identification and
21 purses, and the bag of bloody clothing she
22 had seen and which Pickton refers to as
23 "trophies", Corporal Connor believes that
24 reliability can be attached to it.
25 Let's stop there. And if you want, you can

1 match that up to his affidavit as a sergeant.

2 A Yes.

3 Q I take it you accept that that is a copy from
4 that?

5 A Yes.

6 Q All right. Well, let's just stop for a moment.
7 It is still fair to say, isn't it, the syringes
8 is, and Pickton's request for them, is important
9 information, isn't it?

10 A Uhm, I think that it was definitely proper to
11 include that and is interesting information, yes.

12 Q And so we should also include it in the things to
13 be searched for, should we not, because of the
14 potential of linking up DNA?

15 A Yes.

16 Q All right. So, will you do this please? I want
17 to amend this draft hypothetical information, if
18 you will. So, if you go back to the first page at
19 tab 5, so we have a complete and proper
20 hypothetical application, I would like to write at
21 the bottom and then circle it with an arrow to
22 come right after "clothing".

23 A Sorry, we're in tab 5 now?

24 Q First page, tab 5.

25 A Yes.

1 Q It is the actual information application.

2 A Yes.

3 Q Go to the paragraph at the bottom, the main
4 paragraph:

5 The informant says --

6 A Yes.

7 Q -- that and I have reasonable grounds to
8 believe there are purses and women's
9 identification papers, and women's bloody
10 clothing at the trailer of Robert Willie
11 Pickton --

12 You have got that?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Put a little arrow down to the bottom of the page
15 after "clothing" and put in brackets "plus women's
16 jewelry and syringes (both new and used)." Thanks
17 for doing that. And then just put a note beside
18 it, "added November 28th/'11."

19 Now, I think I'm finished with the rest of
20 the affidavit of Corporal Connor. Well, let me be
21 completely thorough. Over the page to paragraphs
22 36 and 37, which are the final two paragraphs.

23 A We're in, we're in which tab now?

24 Q Back to the one at 6, Connor's affidavit.

25 A And we're at paragraph --

1 Q Last --

2 A -- page 37?

3 Q Last page.

4 A Yes.

5 Q He says:

6 Source A admits that he came by this
7 information through Lisa Yelds, that she is a
8 biker type person. Corporal Connor has
9 confirmed Yelds' association to Pickton and
10 lifestyle from information from Mrs.
11 Hyacinth, a Royal Canadian Mounted Police
12 employee who was associated to these
13 individual.

14 That's his misspelling, not mine.

15 That Source "A" refers to the first
16 prostitute as Vic 97, which is the name of
17 the prostitute in the Coquitlam March 1997
18 offence. That Source "A" refers to syringes
19 which are displayed in the Coquitlam March
20 1997 offence.

21 That paragraph is sort of a verification paragraph
22 from Corporal Connor's own knowledge and research,
23 right?

24 A Yes.

25 Q And then paragraph 37:

1 That Source "A" refers to Pickton using the
2 term "trophies" as it related to victims'
3 articles of identification and clothing.

4 I know I referred to this last day, but I'll
5 finish with this.

6 This information is further supported in
7 conversations with Constable John Cater of
8 the Coquitlam Detachment Youth Detail
9 Section, who holds a master's degree in
10 criminology. Constable Cater's master's
11 degree thesis was on the subject of serial
12 murders. During Constable Cater's research
13 he confirmed the collection of "trophies" are
14 common amongst serial murderers.

15 All of that, of course, is very useful and
16 important information in an affidavit of this
17 kind, in seeking the search warrant that is
18 sought --

19 A Yes.

20 Q -- on this hypothetical?

21 A If you're going to assert that the language is
22 that of a serial killer, then it would be proper
23 to put a source for that information.

24 Q If you assume that an affidavit application had
25 been brought by Constable Shenher, there can be no

1 doubt that the assistance of an affidavit like
2 this from Corporal Connor would be huge?

3 A Yes, it would be useful.

4 Q All of the information in his affidavit bearing on
5 syringes and Pickton wanting them and, and on the
6 significance of trophies, that all comes from
7 Corporal Connor?

8 A Yes, I agree that Corporal Connor's affidavit
9 contains important information --

10 Q And also --

11 A -- to the extent that he has information.

12 Q Thank you. And also, a very important matter here
13 to determine, especially since there's going to be
14 a problem for the police to go to Lisa Yelds, is
15 to determine the reality of her relationship with
16 Pickton and with Hiscox and the kind of person she
17 really is. That's huge, isn't it?

18 A I think that those are all important things.

19 Q All right. And because it's such a unique
20 relationship she would have to have with Pickton
21 to know anything about what might be in his
22 trailer, she's probably one of the only people who
23 have been inside that trailer, other than people
24 that he has taken there for sex and possibly to
25 attack them, as he did with Victim '97?

1 A Well, that's not true. There have been other
2 people in that trailer, like, the informant
3 Caldwell who was staying in that trailer, for
4 instance.

5 Q That's later, in 1997. We are still in '98.

6 A That was actually in 1999, but --

7 Q Okay. Sorry, we're in '98 then and your reference
8 is '99.

9 But the point is, she was a very strange
10 person, according to the source information
11 himself. He said, "She's a tough lady, a cop
12 hater, a hard case. She repairs her Harley-
13 Davidson in her front room. She won't talk to the
14 police, but maybe she might talk if somehow I'm
15 along, because she trusts me, because I go all the
16 way back with her to foster care."

17 A Yes.

18 Q And it appears that all of that's true. You know
19 that Corporal Connor goes to this lady in his
20 office. What a fortunate thing that he's got a
21 confirmation source right there, Bev Hyacinth, an
22 assistant or administrative lady, says, "Yeah, I
23 know Pickton. I also know of Lee, Lee or Lisa
24 Yelds. They have been friends for a long time."
25 And he confirms -- she confirms everything that

1 Hiscox said about her, right?

2 A Yes.

3 Q And on top of that, Hiscox, himself, worked for
4 two months for the Picktons. So, it wasn't
5 everything that he was passing on that came from
6 rumour. He had his own knowledge?

7 A Yes, he had some of his own independent
8 observations.

9 Q And so his source information, at one or two
10 points, he says, "I heard Pickton tell me how he
11 can get rid of a body, by grinding it up." I.e.,
12 that's not dependent entirely on what he was told
13 by Lisa Yelds, right?

14 A Yes, I agree, and I have given evidence about that
15 information.

16 Q Yes. And he also knew about the attack on Victim
17 '97?

18 A Yes.

19 Q Now, in an application of this kind, one of the
20 things that is really required, is for consistency
21 overall, and no inconsistency in the information;
22 isn't that so?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And the information here certainly meets that
25 test, doesn't it?

1 A Which information?

2 Q All of the information that came from source
3 Hiscox seems to be consistent internally and
4 externally, from beginning to end?

5 A Yes, I agree with that.

6 Q All right. Second, the credibility that meets --
7 that can be attached to the information that comes
8 from Lee or Lisa Yelds, in one important detail at
9 least, has been confirmed, and that is, that
10 Pickton had a use for needles. Not quite certain
11 what that was. Connor believes it's to control
12 people while he's about to kill them, "but
13 nevertheless, I have looked at my video and
14 photographs and here is syringes, new and used,
15 strewn on the floor." So, when Lisa Yelds, or
16 Lee, says to Hiscox, "I am asked by Pickton to go
17 and get new and used syringes," there is
18 confirmation of that to the extent that he sees
19 that Hiscox, Pickton I should say, has a use for
20 them?

21 A Uhm --

22 Q Isn't that confirmation?

23 A I, I think that there is some confirmation there.
24 I would be wary that there are other plausible
25 explanations, but I don't disagree with your

1 point, that it's important.

2 Q Now, another test for whether or not a search
3 warrant should issue, is that there is some
4 perceived pattern actually observed, which matches
5 up reasonably with the anticipated events that
6 come from the source. Let me get it exactly.

7 You have the benefit of tabs now in that
8 binder in front of you. Please turn to tab 3, to
9 page, at the bottom, 727. This is the excerpt
10 from the Criminal Code of Canada dealing with
11 search warrants. Page 727.

12 A Yes.

13 Q About -- it's such a dense paragraph, but if you
14 could cast your eyes down to the paragraph
15 beginning "grounds for issuing the warrant"; do
16 you see that heading?

17 A Yes.

18 Q The subheading? And if you could go down to about
19 two-thirds of the way down the paragraph, where it
20 begins on the left side, "where the police"?

21 A Yes, I see it.

22 Q Let's start there.

23 Where the police rely on information from an
24 informer, it is not necessary for the police
25 to confirm each detail in the informer's tip,

1 so long as the sequence of events actually
2 observed conforms sufficiently to the
3 anticipated pattern to remove the possibility
4 of innocent coincidence.

5 I will stop reading.

6 Now, is my question to you, in the form of a
7 suggestion, I suppose, that in this case, there
8 was an observed pattern of events, a sequence, an
9 observed pattern in the information in the witness
10 statement of Victim '97, of how she was -- got
11 into the car on an agreed bargain for oral sex;
12 that Pickton took off with her on that basis;
13 that, at one point, she wanted to get out of the
14 vehicle, suggested she had to go to the washroom
15 or whatever, asked him to stop. Remember that?

16 A Yes.

17 Q He didn't.

18 A Right.

19 Q That when he came to streetlights, he slowed down
20 beforehand and then speeded through them.
21 Remember, remember that in her statement?

22 A Uh, I don't remember that specifically but I, I'm
23 sure you're right.

24 Q All right. Now, the only reason she was in that
25 car, of course, was the agreed bargain for oral

1 sex? That's what put her into his custody?

2 A I understand that there was an agreement for sex.

3 Q And that's what put her into his custody?

4 A Yes.

5 Q And then they end up out at Pickton's trailer, out
6 in Port Coquitlam?

7 A Yes.

8 Q All right. And then there is the violent attack
9 on her after the sex, when he tries to -- slips a
10 handcuff on one of her wrists?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And then, as she perceives what he's trying to do,
13 is to put the handcuff on some other firm fixture,
14 so she beats on him and he then gets a club and
15 whacks her. She manages to get a filleting knife
16 and slashes his throat, but he still stabs her in
17 the belly, and after she gets away, she ends up in
18 hospital and almost dies.

19 A That's close to my understanding, yes.

20 Q And then there is a key found in his clothing
21 which unlocks that handcuff that is still on her
22 wrist?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Now, all of that, because she survives, goes into
25 that witness statement?

1 A Yes.

2 Q All right. The contention, the theory for the
3 missing and suspected murdered women is that they
4 got into vehicles on like, similar bargains for
5 sex, and ended up out on Pickton's farm. Whether
6 he picked them up or not is not the issue on the
7 application. What they're simply searching for,
8 or what the application searches -- is seeking, is
9 a search for the information that the source says
10 is there. You understand that's the theory of
11 this application?

12 A Yes.

13 Q All right. Now, I suggest to you, most urgently,
14 that that witness statement is a pattern. How
15 does the Court put it? This is language from the
16 Supreme Court of Canada in the *Debot* case, which
17 is synopsized here, that as long as the sequence
18 of events actually observed -- that witness
19 statement, if you believe in it, which Constable
20 Shenher did, she said she did, and undoubtedly
21 Corporal Connor did, he indicated he had nothing
22 to do with the stay of the charge, right?

23 A Yes.

24 Q But if you believe in it, it puts you in the car
25 virtually as perceiving the pattern of that event

1 and it becomes a benchmark, it becomes a
2 blueprint, it becomes a template, whatever you
3 want to call it, for what is suspected as the
4 crimes committed on these missing women. Isn't
5 that the way this would be argued in search of the
6 search warrant? Isn't that the significance of
7 this evidence?

8 A Well, I agree that the information was very
9 significant in showing this intensely violent
10 attack by Pickton on Victim 1997. In terms of,
11 based on this one incident showing that it could
12 become the basis for this theory, uhm, that's
13 certainly one possibility. And I'm happy to go
14 through your mocked-up ITO and, and respond to it
15 in, in total.

16 Q I am just asking you about this. I haven't asked
17 you to go through my mockup and all other aspects.
18 It's this one.

19 A Yes, I understand what you're saying and I agree
20 that that is one theory and you're building
21 information to support that theory.

22 Q On the basis that it is an observed pattern that
23 ties in with the information from Hiscox as to how
24 the women became missing and murdered with
25 evidence of them on Pickton's farm?

1 A Uhm, I agree that it is consistent.

2 Q All right. One more test. The -- two more.
3 There's the nexus connection. If you look at the
4 bottom of the page 727, it says:

5 Before granting the warrant the justice must
6 be satisfied, among other things, that the
7 grounds stated for obtaining the warrant are
8 current and that there is a nexus between the
9 grounds for believing an offence has been
10 committed and the evidence of the commission.
11 Stop there.

12 Now, the women have been missing over the
13 course of a number of months, starting back in
14 '97. There's a couple of missing women
15 unaccounted for in Dave Dickson's work, and then
16 reports of the missing women come in. And all of
17 the 10 people here are all from your report, with
18 the dates their disappearance is reported to the
19 VPD.

20 A Yes.

21 Q All right. And on the theory of kidnapping by
22 fraud, together with a suspicion that there is
23 evidence, things to be found at Pickton's trailer
24 that relate to that suspected crime, kidnapping by
25 fraud, that is a very close nexus, sufficient at

1 least for the application?

2 A Well, I agree with you that it is, uhm,
3 appropriate to be looking for items that support
4 the theory. As to whether there is a close enough
5 nexus between the items sought, uh, and the crime
6 that's being alleged, I don't think you're there
7 at all.

8 Q Excuse me, I said "nexus", not how close it was.
9 It's a lot closer than if you simply plead that
10 there is a -- this could not have been done if the
11 police force, if the RCMP in Coquitlam had put
12 forward a search warrant like this. They could
13 not have put forward a search warrant on the basis
14 of kidnapping by fraud, could they? They're
15 looking at murder committed in Coquitlam, in their
16 jurisdiction of the crime?

17 A Well, they certainly could have put that
18 information forward. It doesn't matter to the
19 primary investigating agency where other offences
20 occurred, and police agencies do that all the
21 time, is gather in offences that occurred in other
22 jurisdictions and get those charges approved if
23 they can.

24 Q I will come to this in a moment. But the RCMP
25 would not be investigating the crime of kidnapping

1 by fraud commencing in Vancouver, now, would they?

2 A If the RCMP were investigating an allegation of
3 murder, and that's where the lead-up offence
4 occurred, then absolutely, they would.

5 Q But they would first inform you, or somebody at
6 the VPD, "Hey, Mr. LePard, or Doug, [however they
7 wants to refer to you] I have got some facts here
8 I would like to send to you. It looks like
9 there's a crime in your jurisdiction." Wouldn't
10 they do that?

11 A Well, it depends on the circumstances. If there
12 was --

13 Q Most likely?

14 A Well, it depends on the context. If they're
15 alleging a crime that has not been solved, that
16 they think that the VPD should know about and
17 investigate, then yes, that would be routine. If
18 they're investigating a crime, like a murder
19 that's occurred in Coquitlam but they believe that
20 some part of that offence began in Vancouver, I
21 suspect, strongly, that they would maintain
22 control over that entire investigation.

23 Q Even though the crime of kidnapping is in
24 Vancouver?

25 A Absolutely. When, in 2009, when we found a

1 missing sex worker in the trunk of a car in South
2 Vancouver who was reported missing in Burnaby, but
3 she was found dead in Vancouver, Vancouver took
4 over that investigation in its entirety. And the
5 Burnaby investigation, which was a diligent one,
6 into the fact that she was missing, it ends at
7 that point. And the VPD is conducting a murder
8 investigation and all that goes with it, including
9 if they find that she was kidnapped in Burnaby,
10 then they're going to investigate that as well.

11 Q But the, for starters though, to look for the
12 crime of kidnapping, would normally fall to the
13 place where the kidnapping occurred?

14 A Well, as I said, Mr. Commissioner, if there was,
15 if this was just information being passed on about
16 an offence and there wasn't some offence in
17 Coquitlam that was the primary or most serious
18 offence, then I would agree with you. But if
19 you're talking about an incident that concludes in
20 Coquitlam with a murder or an attack, like, in
21 Victim 1997, then it would be entirely routine for
22 the agency or jurisdiction not to want to involve
23 others unnecessarily in the investigation unless
24 they needed assistance, and control that
25 investigation themselves, including whatever

1 follow-ups they needed to do in Vancouver or any
2 other jurisdiction.

3 Q I am going to stop this line of questioning at
4 this point and come back to it. I want to deal
5 with this jurisdiction question now, all right,
6 and try see if I can clear up some of the mystery
7 that may seem to surround it.

8 First of all, jurisdiction to investigate a
9 crime appears to be linked to where the crime was
10 committed; is that right?

11 A Yes.

12 Q So, where you have a crime of murder simpliciter,
13 jurisdiction to investigate that crime of murder
14 is where it apparently is committed, correct?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Let's take, however, a crime which is coupled with
17 an underlying offence. Take the situation of
18 kidnapping at Point A, where somebody is taken
19 into custody either by force or fraud at Point A
20 and transported to Point B in another, another
21 police jurisdiction, and there harm is done
22 violating, let's assume it's kidnapping by fraud,
23 violating the agreement and apparently, on the
24 surface at least, being a crime of kidnapping by
25 fraud with harm caused. Let's make it more to the

1 point. The harm is death caused. You are
2 nodding.

3 A Yes, --

4 Q Do you understand the example?

5 A -- I understand.

6 Q Now, at Point B, let's say that's Port Coquitlam,
7 where death is caused, the crime that actually is
8 committed there is simply murder, right?

9 A It is murder.

10 Q Yes. And normally what would happen there is that
11 the police force there and the prosecution would
12 address it as murder to be proven, according to
13 all the ingredients of murder?

14 A Yes.

15 Q Normally, that would be, if it's first degree
16 murder, specific and deliberate intent?

17 A Yes, I agree that --

18 Q All right.

19 A -- that's part of what they would look at.

20 Q Yes. But as for the intent, they look at planning
21 and so on, for a specific intent to commit murder
22 in order to make it first degree murder?

23 A I agree that they would look at that. If you are
24 asking me if they would --

25 Q I haven't asked you yet the next question. Please

1 don't anticipate me.

2 A Well, I don't want to mislead by not answering all
3 of what you suggested, and you have suggested that
4 there was this lead-up crime, and so I want to
5 make sure that I provide a proper answer.

6 Q I am coming back to the other one. Let's go back
7 to A. The underlying crime is a kidnapping by
8 fraud at Point A. All that's required for the
9 proof of kidnapping by fraud is that there is a
10 taking of the custody, by force or fraud, taking
11 of custody of the person and transporting them to
12 another place against their will. That's the
13 crime of kidnapping, right?

14 A Yes.

15 Q The only intent required for the crime of
16 kidnapping is the presumption that one intends the
17 natural and probable consequences of their act;
18 isn't that correct?

19 A Uhm, I will accept what you're saying. I don't
20 know --

21 Q I hope so. It's reiterated in a case you are
22 involved in, the McMynn case. One of the
23 companion accomplice aspects of that, Vu, went to
24 the Court of Appeal.

25 A Yes, I understand that.

1 Q And that intent is confirmed in the judgement of
2 Chief Justice Finch in that case?

3 A Yes.

4 Q That the only intent required for kidnapping by
5 force or fraud is that one intends the natural and
6 probable consequences of their act. Do you accept
7 that?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Thank you. Then, however, if death is caused
10 whilst in that -- and by the way, that's a,
11 defined as a continuing offence, right? It begins
12 where the person goes into the custody of the
13 accused?

14 A Yes.

15 Q Where, however, death ensues, while in that
16 continuing offence, then the statute, the Criminal
17 Code of Canada steps in and says, in section
18 231(5) (e), that for kidnapping, uhm, where death
19 is caused, that is first degree murder, without
20 any further intent having to be proved, correct?

21 A Yes, I understand that.

22 Q All right. That crime is to be investigated, in
23 terms of where it was committed, by the police
24 force at Point A?

25 A No, I disagree. That's not the practice or

1 contention. The most serious offence, the
2 jurisdiction would be dealing with that murder.
3 They certainly might ask the jurisdiction of Point
4 A to collaborate with them and do the
5 investigation of what occurred in the lead-up.
6 So, there would be cooperation and collaboration.
7 But the agency that was dealing with the most
8 serious offence, this murder, would take custody
9 of that investigation --

10 Q I did not --

11 A -- and not fragment --

12 Q -- ask you that question of who would take custody
13 of it. I am simply saying, the jurisdiction, the
14 criminal investigative jurisdiction for kidnapping
15 is where the kidnapping occurred; is that not so?

16 A Well, there is an offence that occurred at Point
17 A, and I agree that agency in Jurisdiction A would
18 have jurisdiction to investigate that crime, but
19 so would Jurisdiction B.

20 Q I haven't asked you that, whether -- of course you
21 can have two. But Jurisdiction A is investigating
22 the crime of kidnapping. That's all they have to
23 investigate. Because if death is caused, then the
24 statute designates it as first degree murder.
25 They don't have to investigate the murder, do

1 they?

2 A Well, you are putting a, a fact pattern that may
3 legally be correct, but in --

4 Q That is the fact pattern in this case.

5 A -- but in practice --

6 THE COMMISSIONER: Let him finish.

7 THE WITNESS: -- in practice, it's impractical and it is not
8 what occurs.

9 MR. ROBERTS:

10 Q Sir, let's just stay with the first of what you
11 say is legally correct for a moment. You are the
12 one who keeps talking about the jurisdiction to
13 investigate. You are the one who has said that
14 the Vancouver Police Department never had the
15 Pickton investigation. It wasn't theirs to
16 investigate. You have said that more than once in
17 this hearing.

18 A Yes. What I said was that the Coquitlam RCMP had
19 the responsibility to investigate the information
20 about a murder alleged to have occurred in
21 Coquitlam; and VPD had some overall
22 responsibility, the overall responsibility for the
23 missing women investigation generally, because the
24 women were, for the most part, went missing from
25 the Downtown Eastside of Vancouver.

1 Q I am going to repeat the question, and if it's
2 capable of you answering it "yes" I really would
3 appreciate if you would do so.

4 The crime of kidnapping by fraud, where the
5 kidnapping starts in Vancouver, that crime is for
6 Vancouver Police Department to investigate; is
7 that not correct?

8 A No. If the question is, do they have jurisdiction
9 to investigate, then the answer is "yes". If the
10 question --

11 Q That's not -- that --

12 A No, your question was --

13 THE COMMISSIONER: Let him finish.

14 THE WITNESS: -- is it not for the Vancouver Police Department
15 to investigate, and I'm saying the practice, the
16 convention, for many reasons of practicality, the
17 answer is "no".

18 MR. ROBERTS:

19 Q All right, I'll rephrase it. That crime is in the
20 jurisdiction of the Vancouver Police Department to
21 investigate?

22 A It is within the jurisdiction of the Vancouver
23 Police Department to investigate.

24 Q Thank you. And if death is caused, the only
25 additional matter that the Vancouver Police

1 Department, assuming they embarked on that
2 investigation, the only thing they would have to
3 investigate is to confirm that there was death; is
4 that not so? So that then they would charge it as
5 -- they would -- if there's death it caused, then
6 the, the offence that goes with the death could
7 well be charged in Vancouver, along with the
8 kidnapping?

9 A I don't know where -- I suspect that where the
10 charge would be laid would be at Point B, where
11 the murder occurred.

12 Q I suspect that you haven't thought it through. If
13 the charge is where the kidnapping occurred,
14 because that's the underlying offence, and death
15 caused is first degree murder, it would be much
16 easier to investigate and charge that offence
17 where, where the kidnapping occurred, because the
18 only intent that has to be proved in the case is
19 that the kidnapper intended the natural and
20 probable consequences of his act. That's all that
21 would have to be shown if it was charged in
22 Vancouver; isn't that correct?

23 A Well, I think that where the charge would be laid
24 would be something that Crown counsel would be
25 deciding on and where it best served the

1 administration of justice.

2 Q Would you answer my question? If the charge --
3 assume the charge is laid in Vancouver --

4 MR. HERN: I really --

5 THE COMMISSIONER: Let him finish the question.

6 MR. HERN: He's just constantly interrupting and he's asking
7 him complicated questions based on hypotheticals.
8 It's fair to give this man a chance to answer
9 please.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: I agree with you.

11 MR. ROBERTS: I will endeavor not to interrupt. Thank you very
12 much. I appreciate that reminder. I will do the
13 question again. It's very important, because I'm
14 challenging the proposition that Vancouver never
15 had jurisdiction to investigate these missing
16 women.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, he didn't -- that isn't really what he
18 said. He said they had the, the legal
19 jurisdiction to do it, but in practical terms,
20 because of the jurisdictions of policing, that it
21 was more practical for, for Burna -- or for
22 Coquitlam to do it. That's what he's saying.
23 Isn't that right?

24 THE WITNESS: Yes, that we certainly had jurisdiction to
25 investigate the missing women, but when it came to

1 a conclusion that they were being killed in
2 Coquitlam, then they had that jurisdiction, and
3 always accepted it, that that was never in
4 dispute.

5 As to your hypothetical fact pattern, which
6 is very interesting, but I note that Project
7 Evenhanded, this extraordinary investigation, with
8 a hundred-million-dollar budget, didn't find the
9 evidence to have a single charge related to a
10 single victim of kidnapping by fraud.

11 MR. ROBERTS:

12 Q All right. Let me address --

13 THE COMMISSIONER: I think we'll stop there for the morning
14 break.

15 MR. ROBERTS: Pardon me? Yes.

16 THE REGISTRAR: This hearing will now recess for 15 minutes.

17 **(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 11:11 A.M.)**

18 **(PROCEEDINGS RESUMED AT 11:30 A.M.)**

19 THE REGISTRAR: Order. This hearing is now resumed.

20 MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Darrell Roberts again for First Nations
21 interests.

22 Q As I understand your evidence, Mr. LePard, there's
23 no question that, in your mind or in your
24 evidence, that the Vancouver Police Department
25 would have the legal jurisdiction to investigate a

1 kidnapping which begins in its jurisdiction?

2 A Yes.

3 Q There is no question about that?

4 A Yes, I agree.

5 Q And I also take it there is no question that the
6 police today, and perhaps always, investigate the
7 act of crime or the appearance of crime; isn't
8 that correct?

9 A I'm sorry, they investigate?

10 Q The appearance of crime. They don't wait to
11 determine what the intent is of the suspect.

12 A Well, yes, if a crime came to their intention --
13 to their attention, they would investigate that.
14 If they believed a crime had occurred, proving
15 intent would be part of the investigation.

16 Q Yes, but worrying about the intent would never
17 inhibit that investigation? It may be something
18 they look at later, but if there is an act of
19 crime, by its appearance, a police officer or a
20 police force are required to investigate it, are
21 they not?

22 A Yes, if there apparently has been a crime
23 committed, they would investigate it.

24 Q I mean, let's, let's take this example, and I
25 don't want to make fun, but let's suppose that

1 Sergeant Field learned from Constable Shenher that
2 Constable Shenher had a source, and that source
3 was Pickton, and in a discussion, an overview
4 discussion with Constable Shenher, Shenher
5 indicated that, that circumstances that are
6 related by constable, Mr. Hiscox I should say, as
7 to the disappearance of the women, raised the
8 question in my mind of, of kidnapping, you
9 wouldn't expect Sergeant Field to say, "Oh,
10 Constable Shenher, you can't begin to investigate
11 that until you know what's in Mr. Pickton's mind."
12 That would be ludicrous, wouldn't it?

13 A I agree, that if there was information suggesting
14 a kidnapping, it would be quite appropriate to be
15 investigating that.

16 Q All right. Thank you. Uhm, now as to practical
17 consequences. So, if you accept that Vancouver
18 Police Department would have legal jurisdiction to
19 investigate the crime of kidnapping that appears
20 to have been committed in its jurisdiction, that
21 is to say, custody is taken in its jurisdiction,
22 then, in the normal course, all else being equal,
23 Vancouver would make a full-out effort on that
24 investigation, would it not?

25 A If information came to the Vancouver Police

1 Department that someone had been kidnapped, then
2 absolutely, the VPD would be making a full-on
3 effort because, in a kidnapping case, your primary
4 goal is to rescue the victim.

5 Q And that full-out effort is exemplified in the
6 effort that was put out, put forward to capture
7 the kidnapper of young Mr. McMynn, correct?

8 A That's one example, yes.

9 Q Yes. In the evidence as I heard, an effort was
10 made to, in the nature of combined forces,
11 totalling well over a hundred officers in that
12 investigation?

13 A Yes, there was quite a few more than a hundred
14 officers even that were involved in some way
15 during that investigation.

16 Q All right. Another aspect of this is that if the
17 Vancouver Police Department proceeds on an
18 investigation of kidnapping, in its exercise of
19 its legal jurisdiction, in nearly most cases at
20 least it would proceed to investigate, and once
21 there is an arrest, proceed to work with the Crown
22 counsel to see that the correct crime is charged
23 according to the facts, right?

24 A In, in your hypothetical --

25 Q Yes.

1 A -- example? Yes.

2 Q And if that correct charge, on the facts, is
3 kidnapping, then it would -- and it would be
4 expected that that would be charged, especially
5 since it might bear on the effort that has to be
6 made in the prosecution on the issue of either the
7 act or the intent, right?

8 A Yes, the police investigate as fully as possible
9 and provide all the information to Crown counsel
10 and certainly may make recommendations, and then
11 Crown counsel, because we're in a charge approval
12 province, makes the decision about what charges
13 are actually approved.

14 Q And a practical consequence of that, in proving
15 the charge, is that in kidnapping, it's not a very
16 high requirement to prove intent? In fact, all
17 that has to be done is to prove the act itself and
18 then a legal presumption takes over and satisfies
19 the intent, as I have already indicated to you, or
20 which I think you have already agreed to, correct?

21 A Well, that might be getting a little bit out of my
22 expertise. I know that, having followed some of
23 the McMynn trial, it didn't seem quite as simple
24 as you are making it out to be.

25 Q I just reviewed it with you. Chief Justice Finch

1 has confirmed that all that's required in proof of
2 kidnapping, on the aspect of intent, is not a
3 specific intent, is that one presume -- one
4 intends the natural and probable consequences of
5 one's act?

6 A Yes, I will accept that.

7 Q So, the Crown does not have the practical
8 consequence, the Crown doesn't have to make an
9 effort to try to figure out the specific intent of
10 the accused on the charge of kidnapping?

11 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I think, I think in fairness, he's
12 already said that, that he is not conversant with
13 it. I mean, there are a lot of lawyers who don't
14 know the difference between general and specific
15 intent and, you know, the presumptions and the
16 evidentiary presumptions that, that you can draw
17 from the approved facts. So, I think that it
18 might be better to move on.

19 MR. ROBERTS: I will, Mr. Commissioner, but I ask for a little
20 bit of latitude, because I am taking this
21 somewhere significant.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

23 MR. ROBERTS: All right. So, I am simply establishing what
24 he's already said, but I won't --

25 THE COMMISSIONER: But -- excuse me for interrupting you, but

1 what you're telling me is something that you no
2 doubt will argue at the end of the day, that this
3 is what the police ought to have done, and I, and
4 I get that. But, you know, the deputy chief has
5 already said that, that those, the questions that
6 you ask really require a, a legal response and
7 he's not comfortable with doing that. I think you
8 can ask him what his understanding is of the law
9 and what he would have done.

10 MR. ROBERTS: I understand that, Mr. Commissioner. Let me
11 approach it from this angle.

12 Q You have said, and correct me if I'm wrong, you
13 have said that the Crown counsel, in the actual
14 charges against Pickton, looked at this issue of,
15 I believe you said, the kidnapping aspect, or did
16 you, did you intend to say that?

17 A I didn't say those words, Mr. Commissioner. What
18 I said was that despite this extraordinary post
19 February 5th, 2002 investigation by Project
20 Evenhanded with hundreds of staff, uh, a hundred-
21 million-dollar budget, that they did not come up
22 with evidence in that investigation, clearly I am
23 inferring this, that Crown did not approve a
24 single charge in relation to a single victim of
25 any kind of kidnapping.

1 Q Well, is it your understanding then that, in the
2 charges that were laid against Pickton, they were
3 charges which required the proof of specific
4 intent, of deliberation and planning? Is that
5 your understanding of what the charges were?

6 A Well, in that they approved charges of first
7 degree murder, and I understand that requiring
8 planning and intent, deliberation.

9 Q Planning and intent to kill?

10 A Yes.

11 Q All right. So, a practical consequence then of
12 doing that, of proceeding in that way, is being
13 unable to take the advantage of the presumption
14 and the statutory deeming of first degree murder
15 by reason of it occurring, or a death occurring
16 during the course of kidnapping, isn't that your
17 understanding of a practical consequence?

18 A Well, you are getting into legal analysis again
19 and I'm not sure I'm qualified to answer. I will
20 just say that I am sure that Crown would have put
21 their mind to that issue.

22 Q I have read the Court of Appeal reasons for
23 judgement which identifies what happened below.
24 As I understand it, the charges, some 26, were
25 laid out in either Coquitlam, or close to where

1 the offence, the investigative jurisdiction was
2 exercised on first degree murder; is that fair?
3 Is that your understanding?

4 A Yes.

5 Q And the actual trial was in New Westminster in
6 front of Justice Jim Williams?

7 A Yes.

8 Q And the trial was on planning and intent to commit
9 murder requiring the Crown to prove all the
10 elements of the offence, including a specific
11 intent to kill?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And that, and the Crown counsel involved in that
14 were Crown counsel who were instructed by the
15 RCMP. Is that your understanding?

16 A The Crown counsel were instructed by the RCMP?

17 Q No, no, I'm sorry, that's the wrong word to use.
18 But worked with the RCMP in the laying of the
19 charges?

20 A Well, they worked with Project Evenhanded, which
21 was actually a JFO comprised of the VPD and the
22 RCMP.

23 Q Yes. But, but the actual investigation of the
24 murders and the sifting of the evidence on
25 Pickton's farm was really led by the RCMP; am I

1 right?

2 A The lead agency in Project Evenhanded, by virtue
3 of the MOU, was the RCMP, but it was a joint
4 investigation by the RCMP and the VPD.

5 Q All right. But laying the charges the way they
6 were done, charging Pickton with first degree
7 murder as a result -- in connection with the
8 specific intent to kill, requiring evidence of
9 planning and so on, led to some difficulties in
10 proof of first degree murder, in the sense that my
11 good friend Peter Ritchie, doing his job, was able
12 to call some evidence wondering about whether
13 someone else might have been involved in the
14 murder. You have heard about that?

15 A Yes --

16 Q Somebody named Casanova?

17 A Yes, I understand that there were a number of
18 other suspects suggested.

19 Q All right. And that led to some difficulties with
20 the jury, so that, that eventually the case went
21 to the jury and they convicted on second degree
22 murder because of some concern whether somebody
23 else was involved in the murder. I am
24 summarizing, but you are aware of that? You have
25 read the reasons for judgement?

1 A Well, no one knows what the jury thought or came
2 to their, why they came to their decisions.

3 Q But they did have problems with first degree
4 murder and it went down to second degree murder?

5 A The outcome was six convictions for second degree
6 murder, that's true.

7 Q All over the element of intention?

8 A Well, again, I don't know, and no one knows what
9 the discussions of the jury were. But clearly, to
10 prove first degree murder, there needed to be
11 proof that there was planning and deliberation.

12 Q All right. And I will finish up on this with a
13 couple of questions. And that issue went to the,
14 to our Court of Appeal as to whether the actual
15 charge to the jury on whether this could have been
16 a result of a single -- of Pickton alone or in
17 combination with somebody else, that went to the
18 Court of Appeal, and then on to the Supreme Court
19 of Canada finally?

20 A I know that those things did occur but I'm not
21 familiar enough with the details of the appeal to
22 say that that was the reason.

23 Q What do you say to this proposition, that had the
24 Vancouver Police exercised its legal jurisdiction
25 and investigated the crimes, suspected crimes of

1 kidnapping by fraud, against -- with respect to
2 the disappearance of these women, that the
3 investigation, the prosecution, everything would
4 have gone a whole lot better, because all you're
5 investigating is kidnapping, for which the element
6 of intention is only that one intends the natural
7 and probable consequences of the act, and if death
8 is caused, the statute provides the intent. What
9 do you say to the proposition that that would have
10 made everything a lot better, from the
11 investigation right through to prosecution of the
12 trial, of the charges?

13 A I can't come to that conclusion at all because
14 there was an investigation going on into what the
15 many theories into why the women went missing.
16 So, there was considerable investigation. And
17 again, turn to the fact that Evenhanded, of
18 course, had years, before they got to trial, to
19 investigate every possible aspect, and I have
20 every reason to believe it was an extraordinary
21 investigation and which included interviewing
22 people in the Downtown Eastside, associating
23 victims to a certain hotel, uh, associating a
24 certain woman who was known to have brought women
25 out to the property, interviewing sex trade

1 workers, I think 13 of them who had spent one to
2 40 nights at the property and who were not killed.

3 So, there was a very extensive investigation,
4 and yet it did not uncover that evidence leading
5 to a charge of kidnapping by fraud. And I would
6 also say, again, that the VPD, although certainly
7 I, above anyone else, has been very critical of
8 the VPD in an inadequate response, there was
9 extensive investigation trying to determine how
10 and why the women had gone missing, but there was
11 never a witness, never a crime scene, never any
12 physical evidence. It was an incredibly
13 challenging case.

14 But that doesn't mean it wasn't investigated
15 and that it wasn't the duty of the VPD to
16 investigate, and, in fact, it was the duty of the
17 VPD to investigate more diligently than it did I
18 believe. But the investigators were certainly
19 diligent. But as an organization, the VPD failed
20 to provide adequate support to that investigation.

21 Again, when the investigation actually
22 started, which I have said was delayed, the
23 suspect-focused investigation in May of 1999, when
24 the information was coming together, as far as it
25 was known, there hadn't been a woman go missing

1 from the Downtown Eastside since January of 1999.

2 So, there wasn't even the opportunity created
3 by further women going missing, which would have
4 been a terrible thing, but sometimes might have
5 led to some success. So, no, I can't agree with
6 your proposition.

7 Q You told this hearing that you read the material
8 in Corporal Connor's file, right?

9 A Yes.

10 Q And you have read -- you haven't interviewed the
11 RCMP but you have read the material in their file,
12 correct?

13 A I did interview several members of the RCMP and I
14 have read the material in their file, on the
15 Coquitlam file, not the Evenhanded file, except
16 for superficially.

17 Q All right. What do you say to this question? In
18 all of the material you have read, as to what the
19 RCMP investigated, throughout the whole period of
20 time, would it be correct to say that you could
21 not find any evidence that they ever investigated
22 the murder, the disappearance of the suspected
23 murdered women, they never investigated on the
24 basis of their being the victims in a kidnapping?

25 A No, I think that's completely wrong. That what I

1 know about the investigation, which I just
2 described a few minutes ago, included extensive
3 efforts to try to determine how the women got to
4 the property, who was bringing them there, the
5 interviews of the other sex trade workers who had
6 been out there but had not been killed, what the
7 circumstances of that were; I am sure to determine
8 how they got there, but also how Pickton decided,
9 made a decision to kill one sex trade worker but
10 not another; that some went out there, you know,
11 it was almost described, like, by Chinnock's
12 fiance, as to go out for a rest or to party or to
13 use drugs. There was one witness who described
14 Dawn Crey being out there December 31st, 1999, at
15 a party with Pickton, although Evenhanded later
16 determined that that was probably a, a false
17 identification and that it was actually a
18 different sex worker that they identified, who was
19 not killed and who died of medical reasons.

20 So, my understanding of the investigation
21 that Evenhanded did was leave no stone unturned.
22 That this was the biggest murder investigation in
23 history.

24 Q Well, we'll hear from some of the RCMP officers,
25 but I was wondering if, in your reading of the

1 material, did you ever encounter any words that
2 said, "We're investigating kidnapping from
3 Vancouver"?

4 A No, I didn't see those words.

5 Q "We're investigating the disappearance of the
6 women from Downtown Eastside on the basis that
7 they were kidnapped," did you ever see that in the
8 RCMP material?

9 A In the Evenhanded material, it's terabytes of
10 information I understand. The information that I
11 reviewed was a 198-page Crown brief that
12 summarized the investigation, not the tens of
13 thousands of other pages of investigation, and I
14 did not see those words in that brief.

15 Q In your interviews of Constable Shenher, for which
16 we don't have your questions, did you ask her any
17 questions about whether she considered the crime
18 of kidnapping?

19 A Uh, I probably did not ask that question
20 specifically, no.

21 Q Why not?

22 A Well, it was more general than that in asking her
23 to tell me what she had done, why she had done it.
24 I had questions about the conduct of her
25 investigation. So, uhm, it was implicit in that,

1 in that she was investigating how did the women
2 come to go missing from the Downtown Eastside, and
3 other jurisdictions, from Coquitlam and New
4 Westminster and Surrey, and so on, because, as I
5 have said, there were women that went missing from
6 other jurisdictions as well.

7 Q Assume that back in, in 1997, you were -- what was
8 your rank at that time, Mr. LePard?

9 A Sergeant.

10 Q Sergeant, all right. Assume back in February 23
11 of 1997, you get a phone call from Corporal Connor
12 of the RCMP, that may not have been the
13 appropriate level of rank, but let's assume that
14 for a moment. You are a knowledgeable
15 investigator, right?

16 A Reasonably.

17 Q And you have investigated homicide matters
18 probably many times in the past, even at that
19 time?

20 A No. I had been involved in some, in some way in
21 homicide investigations, but I had never been
22 assigned to a homicide and so I had never been the
23 primary investigator on a homicide.

24 Q When did you have your first investigation of a
25 kidnapping?

1 A I don't recall being involved in an investigation
2 of a kidnapping except at the deputy chief level.
3 Certainly in cases of unlawful confinement, I
4 don't recall a kidnapping case. A relatively rare
5 case.

6 Q All right. Well, with your knowledge now, let's
7 make this call to somebody else who would be an
8 experienced investigator in homicide. The call
9 comes from Corporal Connor something like this.
10 "I've got a situation here with a witness
11 statement. She's been attacked by Pickton, by
12 someone called Pickton, uhm, but this person is
13 from the Downtown Eastside of Vancouver. It
14 appears she got into a vehicle over a bargain for
15 oral sex, and in the course of that engagement, he
16 then attacked her and we're going to charge him --
17 she survived, and I have this witness statement
18 from her, and we're going to -- we're thinking of
19 charging him with forceable confinement and
20 attempted murder. But from the facts, I wonder if
21 you fellows would have a look at this?" And then
22 he sends you the statement. You would expect, an
23 experienced investigator who receives it, would
24 look at it?

25 A Yes, of course, if he was asking for our

1 assistance --

2 Q Yes.

3 A -- in supporting his investigation, then we would
4 do that.

5 Q And you would expect that an experienced
6 investigator would see that there is a potential
7 there for the crime of kidnapping by fraud? Would
8 you not expect that?

9 A Uh, I might.

10 Q And if you did, let's assume you did, then you
11 would have to think about whether or not there
12 should be an additional charge of kidnapping by
13 fraud?

14 A Well, what I would be thinking about, because the
15 primary and most serious offence is the one that
16 occurred in Coquitlam, that's obviously the most
17 serious offence, what I would be thinking about
18 is, what would you like me to do to support your
19 investigation and, you know, are there things that
20 you want us to do to follow up here? That's how
21 that would work.

22 Q If you're in any doubt about that, I am sure the
23 Vancouver Police Department has readily available
24 legal advice, don't they? Don't you have lawyers
25 on staff?

1 A No.

2 Q Well, do you have lawyers readily available to
3 review issues that might be doubtful or difficult?

4 A At that time, during that time?

5 Q Yes.

6 A Uh, we would have gone to Crown counsel for advice
7 on --

8 Q I see.

9 A -- criminal/legal issues.

10 Q But if it appears to be something in your
11 jurisdiction and you are required to exercise your
12 legal duty, most people would expect, wouldn't you
13 do something like that and check it out with, with
14 Crown counsel?

15 A Well, if I had doubts that there was an offence
16 committed, uh, then yes, if I were in doubt, I
17 might consult with Crown counsel. But again,
18 that's not what the conversation would have been.
19 The conversation would have been, "You have had
20 this very serious attack on this sex worker in
21 Coquitlam and you are interested in knowing the
22 circumstances, although it appeared pretty clear,
23 of how she came to get to Coquitlam. What can we
24 do to assist you?"

25 Q All right, I am going to come back still again to

1 that in a moment, but I want to finish up the
2 search warrant. I have got a number of questions
3 to ask you. So, it's with respect to the
4 documents at Tabs 5 and 6.

5 A Yes.

6 Q The aide memoire. Assume that is the material in
7 this application for a search warrant in relation
8 to the crime of kidnapping by fraud, suspected
9 crime, and murder that is a result of death being
10 caused. In that review I have done with you, of
11 the merit, the likely probability of all of that
12 information, what do you say to the proposition
13 that, given the test required, reasonable
14 probability, that that test is met on the
15 application with this material?

16 A Mr. Commissioner, in the period of, at the same
17 time, 1994 to 2000, that was probably the most,
18 the period where I have been involved in the most
19 search warrants, either my own search warrants or
20 my detectives, that I was reviewing and giving
21 them advice, and I can tell you that if I had
22 received this draft ITO, I would have ensured that
23 it never saw the light of a Justice of the Peace's
24 office, that it contained false information, that
25 it omitted important information, and the effect

1 of that would be to mislead the Justice of the
2 Peace, and that that is an absolute no-no. That
3 even if the, if the justice were to have issued
4 the search warrant, my view and my experience is
5 that this would never have survived in court,
6 which would have, could have resulted in the
7 evidence being excluded and an acquittal. And I
8 made some notes about the specific problems that I
9 would like to be able to refer to, to give you my
10 justification for those comments.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

12 THE WITNESS: So, number one, I've said that there is false and
13 misleading information. So, paragraph 3 of
14 Appendix "A" make an assertion that is false, and
15 it is the key basis for believing the women have
16 been murdered, and I believe it would mislead the
17 Justice of the Peace. It's asserted that "missing
18 persons are most frequently missing because they
19 have been murdered," that's completely false. At
20 the time, we were receiving over 3,000 missing
21 persons reports a year, and even at the height of
22 the missing women case, almost all of them were
23 found. They would be short-term runaways, hiding
24 from the law, running from problems in their
25 lives, drug debts, gone on a drug/alcohol binge,

1 lost in the outdoors, wanderers with Alzheimer's.
2 There are many, many reasons why people were
3 missing, and the most infrequent cause, contrary
4 to this assertion, is that they had been murdered.

5 Now, a really important part of obtaining an
6 Information to Obtain is that you source your
7 material. There is no source for this. It's
8 asserted that women are most frequently missing
9 because they are -- persons are most frequently
10 missing because they have been murdered. It would
11 have been really important to provide the
12 statistical basis for that statement, but there is
13 no statistical basis because it was not true.

14 Uhm, when missing persons are not found, the
15 reasons often include, for example, bridge
16 suicides, where their bodies might not be found
17 for a lengthy period of time, if ever. Fishing
18 and boating accidents, sometimes only their
19 disarticulated feet turn up, float to the surface
20 in running shoes. In the missing women case,
21 where women who have been found to have died in
22 non-suspicious circumstances, to have changed
23 identify, even gender, to have moved to another
24 province, to be found two years after they had
25 gone missing in an American hospital.

1 So, in my view, it was a very serious error
2 to assert that missing persons are most frequently
3 missing because they have been murdered. Without
4 that assertion, the inference the Justice of the
5 Peace is being asked to infer from the
6 circumstances was considerably weakened.

7 Paragraph 42 alleges that the investigator
8 cannot find a reason for Yelds to have invented
9 the information she provided the source. This
10 cannot be supported. There are other explanations
11 for her making the statements. One plausible one
12 is that she was angry at Pickton for drugging her
13 to have sexual intercourse with her on several
14 occasions. The fact that Pickton had sexually
15 assaulted her, I would suggest, is a very
16 plausible motive to seek revenge, and that
17 information should not have been omitted from the
18 ITO, particularly when coupled with this assertion
19 in the mockup that Shenher cannot think of any
20 reason for her to have fabricated this
21 information. That information is in Shenher's
22 notes of September 2nd, 1998.

23 Paragraph 2 of Appendix "A" reveals that most
24 of the women had gone missing fairly recently.

25 Paragraph 3 states that murder is suspected

1 in the disappearance of each and every one of
2 them. That is an exaggeration. Murder was
3 suspected in some of them, but at this time, there
4 was still a belief that some or most of the women
5 could be found or accounted for, as was the case
6 of the previous list of 71 missing. So, most of
7 the people involved in the investigation believed
8 that that was going to be the case. They were
9 wrong, clearly, but they believed that.

10 So, to suggest otherwise contradicts the
11 extensive efforts that continued to be made into
12 1999 to find them, some with success. For
13 example, Ida Prevost, who went missing in '97, was
14 reported in '98, was found in Arizona in 1999.
15 There were others as well found to have moved
16 away, changed their identity, changed their
17 gender, died of natural causes and so on.

18 So, there was an incredible amount of
19 investigation going on into finding missing women.
20 Foul play was one of the theories that was being
21 pursued. It was believed by some and not by
22 others.

23 Uhm, paragraph 3 asserts that there is only a
24 debate regarding murder versus serial killer, not
25 whether they had been killed. Uhm, I would say

1 that that's false. The appendix claims that
2 information is in my report and in Shenher's
3 August 27, '98 memo.

4 So, I have given evidence for the previous
5 seven days on the stand about the difficulty many
6 members, especially in management, had making a
7 conceptual leap that there was, that it was foul
8 play, that these women were not going to come up.
9 So, that's clearly not what my report says, or
10 what my evidence had been to this point.

11 I reviewed Constable Shenher's memo again
12 last night. I think that it's a gross
13 mischaracterization of her memo in that it says,
14 it appears, it seems, following up on this
15 information, it was still very much at the
16 theoretical stage. So, citing her memo and my
17 report as justification for the -- that there was
18 no debate whether it was murder, the only debate
19 was murder or serial killer, I don't think that
20 the information supports that at all.

21 There were other plausible explanations at
22 this early point in the investigation. I believe
23 this information would mislead the Justice of the
24 Peace. The belief that they were simply missing
25 really prevailed until May 1999, when the suspect-

1 focused investigation began, and when Detective
2 Inspector Rossmo's analysis appeared. Because
3 even in February of 1999, Detective Inspector
4 Rossmo was saying, Inspector Biddlecombe's theory,
5 that given sufficient time, these women might be
6 found, he described that as, "That made some
7 sense. We need to do some more analysis." And so
8 until his report came in May of 1999, that really
9 solidified that it was unlikely that it was any
10 other reason. It wasn't a hundred percent, as he
11 described, but it was unlikely there was another
12 reason, that really then there was a strong
13 inference that could be drawn, as Mr. Roberts is
14 suggesting, should have been drawn or could have
15 been drawn in August, September, October of 1998.

16 Paragraph 20, the ITO notes that Shenher
17 found Source A credible. I agree. But the fact
18 that he is believable is not, in itself,
19 sufficient because he was reporting hearsay.

20 Uhm, by the way, he, although she believed
21 him, he had not been a previously reliable
22 informant, which is one of the things that we
23 certainly look for. This information about the
24 purses and the ID, that was hearsay. So, he can
25 believe it and that's important to note, but that

1 doesn't make his information true.

2 The circumstance, those circumstances, in my
3 mind, would demand efforts to verify Yelds'
4 information, which obviously was going to be
5 difficult, because of her attitude and so on. So,
6 that could have involved an undercover operation,
7 it could have involved wiretap of her phone. That
8 might have needed to have been preceded with a DNR
9 warrant, which is an easier threshold, to
10 establish that there was contact between Pickton
11 and Yelds, because that was not clear.

12 MR. ROBERTS:

13 Q Can you tell me how much longer you might be? I
14 would like to be able to finish this line of cross
15 before 12:30.

16 A Well, I have been asked the question about the
17 sufficiency of the ITO, and I agree that a warrant
18 could have been obtained with the information, and
19 so I can -- I am in your hands. I can stop at any
20 time.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, obviously, counsel has heard enough,
22 so all right.

23 MR. ROBERTS: Pardon me, Mr. Commissioner?

24 THE COMMISSIONER: Sorry?

25 MR. ROBERTS: I didn't hear your point.

1 THE COMMISSIONER: I said obviously you want to move on to the
2 next question.

3 MR. ROBERTS: Yeah, I do sometime or other.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

5 MR. ROBERTS: I take it, I take it that he disagrees with my
6 proposition, he had many reasons for them. I will
7 accept that. But I want to be able to ask a
8 couple of questions sometime or other.

9 THE WITNESS: Well, my answer to the question is --

10 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, in fairness though, I know he was at
11 length with it, but in fairness, he was asked
12 whether or not --

13 MR. ROBERTS: I appreciate it, Mr. Commissioner, yes.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: -- whether there was enough evidence there
15 to -- for a Justice of the Peace to issue a
16 warrant.

17 MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

18 Q Do you have much more? Can you give me a time
19 estimate for the rest of it?

20 A Less than five minutes.

21 Q What about the proposition of writing it out or
22 leaving it and having it put in by your counsel?

23 A Yes, I am happy to provide a copy of my notes.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

25 MR. ROBERTS:

1 Q Because I only have a few questions on this to
2 follow up, and just to identify that what the test
3 is, first of all, is not a test of proof beyond a
4 reasonable doubt on the application for a search
5 warrant, right? It's reasonably probable; isn't
6 that it?

7 A Uh, I would want to look in the Criminal Code
8 before I would agree with what the actual wording
9 is. But, yes, I believe it's something like
10 "reasonable grounds to believe that" --

11 Q Well, you have said you have put forward many
12 applications for search warrants. I am assuming
13 you know the basis as a reasonable probability.

14 A Well, the last search warrant application I wrote
15 was in spring of 2000. So, I certainly remember
16 the basics. But one of the things that I do when
17 I do anything like this, is I am very careful
18 about what I write. I look at the Criminal Code.
19 I satisfy myself. So, I appreciate the
20 opportunity to have a careful look at this draft
21 ITO, like I would if one is being produced to me,
22 rather than as I'm under cross-examination, and
23 what I found was very significant errors in terms
24 of false and misleading information and
25 information that was left out that should have

1 been included.

2 Q All right, I appreciate that. But you did also in
3 your recitation though mention that it was wrong
4 to refer to murder having been committed. It's
5 only necessary to be able to show that there's a
6 suspected murder, isn't there?

7 A Well, I said what I said and I don't think it's
8 how you have just paraphrased it.

9 Q Well, you did say that the section in the Code,
10 487, says for a suspected murder, it permits you
11 to apply for a search warrant?

12 A Yes, and what the ITO, if I recall it, without
13 looking at it, said, is that murder is suspected
14 in each and every one of these cases.

15 Q But even if it's only suspected in two or three,
16 isn't that sufficient to try and get a search
17 warrant?

18 A Well, that's not what I was --

19 Q -- and it's suspected in every one?

20 A I was asked to review the ITO for its sufficiency,
21 to answer the question, --

22 Q All right.

23 A -- as to the sufficiency, and in my view, it is
24 completely insufficient.

25 Q Okay, I understand. One more question. With

1 respect to going to Lisa Yelds to confirm
2 anything, there are two risks involved in that,
3 aren't there? One is that she may put the source,
4 her friend, Hiscox, at risk? That's one risk,
5 isn't it?

6 A Yes, that is one risk, and I'm glad you raise that
7 because I was asked the question about, it was
8 asserted that Detective Constable Shenher had
9 handled that issue badly, may have put the
10 informer at risk, violated informer privilege.
11 And on thinking about that, I would just note that
12 the law seems to be a little bit unsettled around
13 even when informer privilege is engaged. And I am
14 not sure, that based on the discussions that she
15 had, it was even engaged.

16 But if it was, I wonder, when he said, "I
17 will wear a wire, I will introduce an undercover,
18 I know that it's going to be, my name is going to
19 become known to her, I want to do the right
20 thing," I would suggest that the informer
21 privilege, if it existed, was waived. I do agree
22 with you that that would put him at risk. It
23 seems a risk he was willing to take.

24 Q All right. One last question is that the other
25 risk is that she may have gone to Pickton, and

1 whatever evidence might be available, he would
2 have got rid of it?

3 A Yes. That's why I suggested that there was work
4 to be done before. And one of those things, for
5 example, might have been to build the grounds for
6 a wiretap, and that usually starts with getting a
7 Dial Number Recorder, a DNR warrant, to establish
8 that they're in contact, and then that helps build
9 the grounds for a wiretap, and then she could have
10 been stimulated to have conversation with him.
11 And that's how you would build the case and show
12 the connection. Get evidence that what Hiscox is
13 reporting to have heard from Yelds has some
14 credibility. There is a lot of work to it.

15 Q That sounds to me awfully difficult, especially
16 when somebody who has a depression problem, Mr.
17 Hiscox. What about just exercising the old-
18 fashioned approach to the property with a consent
19 document and asking for a consent search of Mr.
20 Pickton? Isn't that something that ought to have
21 been thought about and planned at this time?

22 A Well, I agree, and at one point, Pickton does give
23 his consent. Of course, the danger is approaching
24 him and saying, "We want to search your property.
25 Would you mind consenting?" and then he says,

1 "no," is that then he can go and get rid of the
2 evidence.

3 Q Well, but you can also take that "no" -- maybe,
4 maybe he can't get rid of all of the evidence.
5 You never know that. I mean, you can take that
6 "no" and put it back, take it back and put it in
7 your search warrant application, can you not, that
8 he refused?

9 A Yes, I would put that in. I'm not sure how much
10 inference can be drawn from someone asserting
11 their right to not have their property violated by
12 the state, and I agree with you that that
13 absolutely is something that should be considered,
14 but considered very carefully. We are talking
15 about a murder investigation.

16 Q But you've talked about that as something which
17 the RCMP should have done later on in the Pickton
18 inquiry, right? Why couldn't it have been done
19 here, careful planning with a supervisor who is
20 hands-on and not off at CLEU somewhere, that could
21 have been considered, don't you think?

22 A I agree that it should have been considered. When
23 the issue of consent arose, it was within an
24 interview with Pickton. Uhm, and I would say that
25 you have to be prepared for what happened. The

1 fact was that when the search did happen, it was
2 tens of thousands of dollars worth of fences going
3 up, hundreds of staff. So, you know, you make it
4 sound like, that this is some simple
5 consideration, they should have just gone and done
6 that. Well, I agree that it should be considered.
7 You could also compromise an investigation if you
8 are not very careful about what you're doing and
9 being prepared for the consequences.

10 Q All right. What about arresting Pickton over 24
11 hours and having a qualified interrogator work on
12 him, as was done later on, and -- that is
13 something that could have been done, could it not?

14 A Yes, and I actually suggested that. But I don't
15 think that they were anywhere near there at this
16 point, but they were in 1999 when the Caldwell
17 information came forward.

18 Q With respect, you are quite wrong about that. He
19 had been uttering threats against Victim '97.
20 That itself could have been a basis to go and
21 arrest him and interrogate him; isn't that
22 correct?

23 A Yes. Uhm, you, you would have to be doing it --

24 Q Those, those threats were taken seriously?
25 Corporal Connor warned her?

1 A Yes, but you would have to be doing it in good
2 faith though, that if you got the evidence, it was
3 going to be a charge to proceed with. And I could
4 be wrong on this, but my understanding is that
5 Victim '97 was not interested.

6 Q I am assuming it would be done in good faith. But
7 it was, it was felt serious enough there was a
8 warning given to Victim '97 to watch herself,
9 right?

10 A Yes, I agree.

11 Q So, this could have been done?

12 A The arresting him on that basis?

13 Q Yes, 24-hour arrest. If you don't charge him, you
14 have to let him go after the 24 hours, right? And
15 line up a qualified interrogator, I am sure that
16 the Vancouver Police Department has that kind of
17 resource, and have a go?

18 A Okay. Well, you have asked a couple of questions
19 there. First of all, you can't interrogate a
20 person for a different offence than you are
21 arresting him for, without rewarning him and
22 explaining, "We want to move onto something
23 substantially different here." So that --

24 Q I am assuming you, you know all about the warnings
25 that have to be given.

1 A Yes.

2 Q I would assume they would be carried out.

3 A What I was about to say is that that carries
4 consequences though, is that you're warning this
5 person about what you're investigating, and are
6 you ready to be at that stage yet? Are you
7 thinking that you're going to get the evidence for
8 the offence? So, again, yes, arresting on
9 reasonable grounds, even when there isn't a *prima*
10 *facie* case yet, is a strategy that should be
11 considered. Whether --

12 Q Now -- sorry, go ahead.

13 A Whether that existed here, uh, whether they could
14 make a good-faith arrest for the threatening, I
15 have questions about, because my understanding is
16 that Victim '97 was not interested in that. So,
17 that would be a problem.

18 In terms of the, couldn't the VPD just have
19 gone and done that? Constable Shenher was
20 supporting Corporal Connor in every way and was
21 deferring to Corporal Connor, who is a very
22 seasoned investigator, and who initiated a file
23 right back in the summer of 1998, was taking care
24 of various things. So, Constable Shenher was not
25 going to run off on her own without being in

1 collaboration with Corporal Connor.

2 Q I want to put my alternatives to you, please. So,
3 I have dealt with two of them. The third one is,
4 could not consideration have been given to working
5 with Victim '97 and getting her consent to work
6 with, with the police and, and arrest him on
7 uttering threats and proceed with that? That
8 could have been considered, could it not?

9 A Uhm, surely that could have been considered,
10 but --

11 Q It's a crime to utter threats, isn't it?

12 A Yes, but you would have to look at the information
13 is that she had not received these threats
14 herself, and so you have to look at, well, what
15 was the evidence of the threat, and do we have a
16 case here that we're going to be able to make in
17 the absence of a confession from Pickton.

18 Q Don't you have to try these things, or at least
19 seriously look at them when you are trying to stop
20 what appears to be multiple killings?

21 A Yes, I agree that anything should be considered,
22 any strategy that might lend itself to success, I
23 agree, and an investigator should think of them.
24 They don't think of everything.

25 Q One more. Number four. What about going to the

1 Crown counsel, and whatever the agency is that
2 would be required to reinstate the charge against
3 Pickton for attempted murder and forceable
4 confinement in 1997, should not consideration have
5 been given to that?

6 A Yes, I agree. I actually recommended that in my
7 report, is that that was a strategy that could
8 have been pursued.

9 Q Here's another one. Constable Shenher received
10 the statement of the witness and she went and
11 interviewed the witness '97 in the 1997 stabbing
12 incident, and she believed the witness.

13 A Yes.

14 Q All right? Assume with me that a seasoned,
15 experienced investigator who looked at that and
16 saw the crime, potential crime of kidnapping by
17 fraud, then it would be open to ignore the stay of
18 the charges in Coquitlam and for the Vancouver
19 Police to work with Crown counsel and charge
20 Pickton with kidnapping by fraud on the Victim '97
21 matter and then arrest him for that, and then get
22 a search warrant and go to his property and look
23 for the evidence that, that is in my information
24 here, the hypothetical information. Now, you tell
25 me please, that that could well have been done by

1 the Vancouver Police Department?

2 A Well, first of all, as a practical matter, she
3 would have done that and I agree it would have
4 been good to consider that strategy in
5 consultation with Crown about that, and I'm not
6 saying that didn't occur. I don't know, in terms
7 -- because I don't know what Corporal Connor's
8 conversations with Crown were.

9 But as a practical matter, who she would have
10 worked with was Corporal Connor, because he was
11 the investigator in charge of the investigation
12 into the Victim 1997 incident and --

13 Q Excuse me --

14 A -- also aware --

15 Q Excuse me, my question doesn't --

16 MR. HERN: He's got to let him finish.

17 MR. ROBERTS: -- depend on Corporal Connor, Constable Connor.

18 My question depends upon a --

19 THE COMMISSIONER: Wait a minute. There is an objection first.

20 MR. HERN: Mr. Commissioner, that's a, that's a lengthy
21 question. It's not even a, it wasn't even really
22 a question, but it's a lengthy proposition with
23 many compound features. This witness seems to be
24 able to retain each of those features and is
25 trying to answer in a responsible way. I really

1 think he has to be given the opportunity to
2 finish.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Yes.

4 MR. ROBERTS: I agree, but I didn't ask what Shenher was doing.
5 I put my question that an experienced investigator
6 would have to take that and consider working with
7 Crown counsel and charging kidnapping by fraud
8 and, and that would become a basis for an
9 application for, a search warrant for similar-fact
10 evidence. It's based upon an experienced person
11 noticing that there is a charge here for
12 kidnapping by fraud. That's the basis of it.

13 A And what I will say again is that I just
14 completely disagree with the proposition, is that
15 there had been an investigation into the most
16 serious offence, which was the knifing in
17 Coquitlam. Corporal Connor was in charge of that.
18 Detective Constable Shenher was working with him
19 to try and advance the investigation into this new
20 information. I think highly unlikely that the
21 strategy would be to charge this new charge rather
22 than trying to pursue the entirety of the
23 circumstances before, in that -- you know, it gets
24 into the legal analysis of the Kienapple principle
25 and so on, is charging a person with two different

1 offences related to the same transaction.

2 I agree that it would have been appropriate
3 strategy to consider whether Crown could have
4 recommenced the prosecution against Pickton
5 regarding Victim 1997, and perhaps there was more
6 that could be done to support -- provide more
7 investigation into that charge.

8 But as a, as a strategy proceeding
9 separately, Detective Constable Shenher
10 ostensibly, if she had been more experienced,
11 would have just saw this and gone off and done
12 that on her own, that that is a reasonable
13 proposition, then I disagree completely.

14 Q You do under -- it is your understanding that the
15 stay would not inhibit approaching that subject,
16 would it?

17 A Uhm, I don't know -- I think that that is
18 something that we have to hear from Crown counsel
19 around what were the challenges to recommencing a
20 prosecution after there had been a stay. But it
21 was certainly something I flagged in my report
22 that ought to be looked into, and I note that it's
23 part of the mandate of this inquiry.

24 Q Suffice it to say that it's your understanding
25 that none of these matters were considered in the

1 fall of 1998, were they?

2 A I don't know that the matter of kidnapping by
3 fraud was considered specifically. I don't know
4 that, no.

5 Q And you have looked at and interviewed witnesses
6 with respect to what went on in that time, and you
7 still don't know that, whether or not it was
8 considered; is that right?

9 A Uhm, there's nothing in the documentation or in my
10 interviews to suggest that that specific charge
11 was considered, no.

12 Q I'm going to -- and of course if -- the Vancouver
13 Police Department have a lot of talented
14 investigators and knowledgeable people at all
15 levels of rank; isn't that a fair statement?

16 A Now or then?

17 Q And then too.

18 A Uh, there was certainly talented and knowledgeable
19 investigators at the investigative levels then. I
20 think that, uhm, some managers were less, there
21 was less focus on managers remaining skilled and
22 knowledgeable investigators. There was a
23 different management focus than there is now, for
24 example, where we have nine people who are
25 provincially accredited team commanders and most

1 of them are at the inspector rank, not lower.

2 Q I am not excluding the significance of the
3 management rank, but even at the, what I call
4 street-level experienced detectives, you had some
5 pretty talented people on the force --

6 A Yes.

7 Q -- back then?

8 A Yes, absolutely.

9 Q All right. And if the police department had
10 decided to exercise its legal jurisdiction to
11 investigate the missing and murdered women for
12 kidnapping by fraud, there is no doubt you would
13 have put a major effort into it, wouldn't you?

14 A Well, there was a major effort being put into
15 trying to determine how --

16 Q I am talking about the Pickton suspect
17 investigation.

18 A Well, the Pickton suspect investigation was being
19 led by the Coquitlam RCMP.

20 Q You have misunderstood my question. If the
21 department, the police department of the City of
22 Vancouver had decided to exercise its legal
23 jurisdiction to investigate and potentially
24 prosecute with respect to the missing women,
25 missing and murdered women, on the basis of

1 kidnapping by fraud, a major effort would have
2 been made by the Vancouver Police Department in
3 that endeavor; is that not so?

4 A Uhm, well, what I have said in my report,
5 regardless of whether the suspected offence was
6 kidnapping by fraud, is that there was a major
7 effort to investigate the fact that the women had
8 gone missing, however they had gone missing,
9 whether it was kidnapping by fraud or some other
10 reason.

11 And I have also said in my report, in my, and
12 in my evidence, that the investigation was
13 insufficiently led and insufficiently resourced.
14 And so I will agree with the proposition, because
15 I've already stated it, that's what I criticized
16 my own department for extensively, was not coming
17 to the conclusions soon enough that the most
18 likely reason for the missing women was foul play,
19 regardless of whether there was kidnapping by
20 fraud or it was something else, that it was not
21 resourced as a murder investigation or a
22 kidnapping investigation. It was resourced more
23 as a missing persons investigation, although it
24 was certainly in, especially at the beginning of
25 May and through the summer of 1999, there was

1 Detective Lepine and Detective Constable Chernoff,
2 Detective Constable Fell and Wolthers, who were
3 very much suspect focused, looking for criminal
4 reasons and, and investigating many, many
5 suspects, I think over 500 leads that they
6 investigated about likely suspects who might be
7 responsible for the missing women.

8 But again, there was never a witness, never a
9 crime scene, no physical evidence, no victim's
10 body. So, it was incredibly challenging. Not to
11 say that they shouldn't have done more and done
12 better. I have said that, that the VPD should
13 have done more and should have done better. It
14 would not have changed the fact that it was
15 extremely challenging. The Green River Killer
16 took decades to solve and yet he left all their
17 bodies for them to find. Uhm, so, a very
18 challenging case.

19 And I have said that the VPD should have
20 advocated for a better investigation into Pickton.
21 But I have also said, even absent that, absent
22 working better with the Coquitlam RCMP, better
23 communication, better coordination, better
24 resourcing and that sort of thing, absent that, if
25 it had been the best possible investigation that

1 could have been into the missing women in
2 Vancouver, they might have been killed by someone
3 other than Pickton, and that's why an excellent
4 investigation was necessary, but they weren't.
5 They were killed by Pickton in Coquitlam.

6 So, the best possible investigation was not
7 going to change the fact, the result, unless there
8 was a better investigation in Coquitlam, which I
9 agree that the VPD should have done a better job
10 of supporting, advocating, offering resources,
11 setting up a communication loop to ensure that
12 they were collaborating well together and so on.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: How much longer are you going to be?

14 MR. ROBERTS: I would like to finish on this, and with your
15 leave, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a couple more
16 questions on this subject that I won't come back
17 to.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: All right, thank you.

19 MR. ROBERTS: I ask for your indulgence on that.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

21 MR. ROBERTS:

22 Q I am going to make my question more precise. With
23 respect to Pickton as a suspect for the missing
24 and murdered women, if the VPD had decided to
25 exercise its legal jurisdiction to investigate him

1 as a killer of the missing women on the basis of
2 kidnapping by fraud, is it correct that the VPD
3 would have made a major effort in that regard, on
4 that subject, rather than have one constable
5 reporting to an absent supervisor?

6 MR. HERN: It's a hypothetical question. I think the
7 additional fact that has to be suggested to the
8 witness here is that there was substantial
9 evidence of kidnapping by fraud as a basis --

10 MR. ROBERTS: Well --

11 MR. HERN: Exercising legal jurisdiction, as this witness has
12 clarified, is one thing, but if there is no
13 evidence, how can the suggestion be made there be
14 a substantial --

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, he can answer it in that way. I mean,
16 he said, "if, if there was," that's the premise of
17 the question.

18 MR. HERN: Yes. I just know that Mr. Roberts doesn't want a
19 very lengthy answer and is trying to characterize
20 it more precisely and I just think --

21 THE COMMISSIONER: Well --

22 MR. HERN: -- that that door is left open if it's not precise.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I don't, I don't think it's that
24 imprecise that he can't answer it. Go ahead.

25 MR. ROBERTS:

1 Q Can I have an answer please?

2 A Can you give me the question again?

3 Q Had the Vancouver Police Department exercised its
4 legal jurisdiction to investigate Pickton as a
5 suspect for the missing and murdered women in
6 relation to the crime of kidnapping by fraud, is
7 it fair to say they would have made a major
8 effort?

9 A If there was not an investigation going on into
10 information that Pickton had killed a woman or
11 women in Coquitlam, and there was this vigorous
12 investigation going on, if that was not occurring,
13 because that information did not exist, but there
14 was information that Pickton was kidnapping by
15 fraud women in Vancouver and that's all that was
16 known? Then yes, that hypothetical, they could
17 have done that. Uhm, but that's not the case.
18 The fact is, there was an investigation into the
19 primary offence of murder --

20 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

21 THE WITNESS: -- and the VPD was supporting that investigation.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I think, I think I have your answer on
23 that.

24 MR. ROBERTS: Yes. We'll come back after lunch.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, thank you.

1 MR. ROBERTS: I haven't finished. I have a, sorry, I have an
2 issue involving aboriginal questions that I want
3 to deal with after lunch.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: After lunch?

5 MR. ROBERTS: Yes.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

7 THE REGISTRAR: This hearing is now adjourned until 2 p.m.

8 **(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 12:32 P.M.)**

9 **(PROCEEDINGS RESUMED AT 2:04 P.M.)**

10 THE REGISTRAR: Order. This hearing is now resumed.

11 MR. ROBERTS: Darrell Roberts, First Nations interests.

12 Q Could you turn in your report, Mr. LePard, to page
13 18, Exhibit 1. You have here at page 18 and 19 a
14 series of what you had called findings or
15 determinations, key findings of review?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Let me go to number 3. It reads:

18 There was compelling information received and
19 developed by the VPD and the RCMP from August
20 1998 to late 1999 suggesting that Pickton was
21 the likely killer, and it was sufficient to
22 justify a sustained and intensive
23 investigation. The VPD received the first
24 information about Pickton in July and August
25 1998, and also received extraordinary

1 information from an unrelated informant in
2 1999. The information suggested that
3 Downtown Eastside sex trade workers were
4 willingly visiting the Pickton property in
5 Coquitlam and some were being murdered there.

6 So, I'm suggesting that this paragraph should
7 be rewritten based on the evidence, including your
8 evidence, as follows:

9 Since the Vancouver Police Department had
10 legal investigative jurisdiction into Pickton
11 as a suspect for the crime of kidnapping by
12 fraud, their failure to fully engage and
13 exercise that jurisdiction in 1998 is the
14 major cause of the failure of the Pickton
15 investigation.

16 What do you say to that?

17 A I disagree.

18 Q The next one, number 4, here's what it reads:

19 The VPD passed on ALL --

20 And it's capital letters, your "all", correct?

21 A Yes.

22 Q -- information about Pickton to the RCMP when
23 it received it, because the RCMP had
24 jurisdiction over the investigation of
25 information pertaining to crimes occurring in

1 Coquitlam.

2 It will be my submission at the end of the
3 day this paragraph should be, should be changed
4 and altered to read:

5 Since the VPD, the Vancouver Police
6 Department, had legal investigative
7 jurisdiction into Pickton as a suspect for a
8 kidnapping by fraud of the missing and
9 murdered women, it was a complete failure of
10 that jurisdiction to simply pass on
11 information to the RCMP, who were not
12 investigating the kidnapping by fraud and
13 death-caused crimes under section 231(5)(e)
14 of the Criminal Code.

15 What do you say to that dis --

16 A I disagree.

17 Q Pardon?

18 A I said, I disagree.

19 Q Number 5, your paragraph says:

20 The RCMP accepted responsibility for
21 investigating the Pickton information and led
22 an investigation in Coquitlam. This
23 investigation was intensely pursued until
24 mid-1999, but was thereafter essentially
25 abandoned by the RCMP, although the RCMP

1 continued to explicitly assert authority over
2 the investigation. RCMP management appears
3 to have not understood the significance of
4 the evidence they had in 1999 pointing to
5 Pickton, and did not ensure it was collated
6 in such a way as to allow a proper analysis.

7 As to that paragraph, pointing fingers at the
8 RCMP, I suggest to you, and it will be my
9 submission to this commission, that the RCMP
10 pursued Pickton for murder, not kidnapping by
11 fraud with death caused, which was the
12 responsibility of the Vancouver Police Department
13 to investigate under its legal jurisdiction. What
14 do you say to that?

15 A I disagree and I have already explained my
16 reasoning.

17 Q Well, I am not going to let it go. I am framing
18 the position, and giving you an opportunity so
19 that I do it in your presence and not later in
20 argument.

21 Paragraph 6, it reads:

22 Notwithstanding the many deficiencies in the
23 Vancouver Police Department investigation,
24 they did not cause the failure of the
25 investigation into Pickton because the RCMP

1 had responsibility for that investigation
2 while the VPD focused on other investigative
3 avenues. If the VPD investigation had been
4 better managed, however, the VPD could have
5 brought more pressure to bear on the RCMP to
6 pursue the Pickton investigation more
7 vigorously.

8 I suggest that paragraph should be written as
9 follows:

10 The failure of the Vancouver Police
11 Department to investigate Pickton for
12 kidnapping by fraud, with death caused, is
13 the major cause of the failure of the Pickton
14 investigation and had ramifications all the
15 way through, not only the investigation and
16 through the prosecution.

17 By that I mean adverse ramifications. It
18 would be my submission that's how that finding
19 should read. What do you say to that, sir?

20 A I disagree. I don't think that there is evidence
21 to support that proposition. And I think that
22 while the VPD could have and should have done a
23 better job, that whether or not it was focused on
24 this kidnapping by fraud, the end result needed to
25 be the same and the VPD needed to support the

1 investigation into the primary offence of murder
2 that was occurring in Coquitlam, and could have
3 and should have done more to support and assist
4 and advocate for a better investigation. But I
5 disagree with your proposition completely.

6 Q You understand that it's my contention in my
7 questions to you, that had you pursued, the VPD, a
8 kidnapping by fraud investigation, it would have
9 more focused the investigation on Pickton and it
10 would have improved the ease of his conviction by
11 murder through the statutory provision of section
12 231(5) (e) of the Criminal Code?

13 A No, I think the evidence is to the contrary.

14 Q I am going to add one more that's not in yours,
15 and I need to go to your report first at page 296.
16 Page 296, in the second column, Mr. LePard, you
17 actually use the phrase of "legal jurisdiction".

18 But to put in context the question I am going
19 to put to you, can you find the last paragraph on
20 the second column, "but because", beginning there?
21 Page 296.

22 A The top of the third paragraph?

23 Q The paragraph that begins, "but because the
24 Pickton investigation was so central?

25 A Yes, I see that.

1 Q Let's start there.

2 But because the Pickton investigation was so
3 central to the missing women investigation --
4 And indeed it was, right?

5 A Yes. It as it turned out, yes.

6 Q -- and because he was eventually charged with
7 multiple murders, it is appropriate that
8 analysis to the extent possible be provided,
9 and that unanswered questions be raised for
10 further examination.

11 Stopping there, of course, those unanswered
12 questions should also be asked about the VPD,
13 right?

14 A Well, I think that it's appropriate that if there
15 are unanswered questions for the VPD, that they be
16 answered, yes.

17 Q It should also be noted that the Vancouver
18 Police Department was the subject of extreme
19 criticism in the media after the Pickton
20 charges, with obviously unfounded allegations
21 made that the Vancouver Police Department
22 failed to conduct any investigation or be
23 responsive to the Pickton information.

24 Reading further:

25 (In fact --

1 I believe this is in a parenthesis. Is that in
2 brackets, just because the "i" in the "in"?

3 A Yes.

4 Q (In fact, as described in this report, the
5 VPD provided all such information to the
6 RCMP. In addition, as described later in
7 this chapter, the RCMP legally had --
8 That's your writing? That's how it reads?

9 A Yes.

10 Q -- legally had -- and accepted --
11 jurisdictional responsibility for the Pickton
12 investigation, and had decision-making
13 authority for the investigation.

14 I'll stop there. "Legally had." If it
15 should be found, and this is a question for you,
16 that the Vancouver Police Department itself
17 legally had jurisdiction to investigate Pickton,
18 and failed to do so, I am talking about the
19 Pickton investigation, and that that was a major
20 failure in the investigation of Pickton, and you,
21 as the writer of this report, as the author of
22 this report, knew or ought to have known of this,
23 and I am talking about the failure to exercise its
24 jurisdiction, its legal jurisdiction into the
25 kidnapping by fraud, and the connection that has

1 to a designated first degree murder under section
2 231(5) (e) of the Criminal Code, then -- but that's
3 -- but you wrote it that focussing on the RCMP's
4 legal jurisdiction, then should not a finding be
5 made that your report is unreliable as it
6 primarily attempts to deflect attention from the
7 Vancouver Police Department's failure? Isn't that
8 a finding that should be made here?

9 A Well, what I completely disagree with is that
10 attempts to deflect the VPD's responsibility,
11 because most of the report is focused on the VPD
12 and criticizes the VPD. So, I think that that's a
13 complete mischaracterization.

14 And I look at Deputy Evans' report and her
15 findings of fact and I see that they're extremely
16 consistent with the findings of facts in my
17 report, and I agree with her when she said that
18 there was a failure in both the VPD and the RCMP
19 to take ownership, to make sure that this
20 investigation proceeded properly, and I agree with
21 her on that.

22 And how that is characterized might be
23 slightly different and you have characterized it
24 differently, Mr. Roberts, but I don't think that
25 that makes a difference in that I have said the

1 VPD had a significant responsibility in this,
2 however it's parsed, in making sure that this
3 investigation proceeded well and it failed.

4 So, I have said that repeatedly. I have
5 apologized repeatedly on behalf of the VPD for not
6 doing better. It could have done better and
7 should have done better. So, how you want to
8 apportion blame, I am sure that different people
9 will come to different conclusions. But I agree
10 with Deputy Evans, that it was a shared
11 responsibility to ensure that that investigation
12 proceeded appropriately.

13 Q One of the criticisms of Deputy Chief Evans was
14 the failure of the Vancouver Police Department to
15 recognize that the crime commenced in Vancouver.
16 We've been over this before. It's on page 45 of
17 her report, chapter 8, page 45. You haven't
18 forgotten that criticism?

19 A I read her line which said, in her view, the
20 offence began in Vancouver. There was no analysis
21 supporting that and I'm not sure what she was
22 thinking. But I don't think that it changes the
23 outcome of what needed to occur.

24 Q But you haven't specifically apologized for the
25 failure of the Vancouver Police Department in the

1 Pickton investigation, have you?

2 A I certainly have. Mr. Commissioner, I have
3 apologized several times, in a number of different
4 venues, for the VPD's failings, the contributions
5 that we made, the VPD made, to this failed
6 investigation, which certainly included the
7 investigation into Pickton.

8 Q What I --

9 A I was very clear about that.

10 Q I'm sorry, are you finished?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Back to page 296, and I will put this down. You
13 have said in the first part of your answer that
14 you weren't endeavoring to take criticism away
15 from or the heat off of, or whatever the
16 expression was, of the Vancouver Police
17 Department. Is that what you said?

18 A Well, you put to me a proposition that I disagreed
19 with.

20 Q Deflecting attention from the Vancouver Police
21 Department's failures is the proposition I put to
22 you.

23 A Yes, and my answer was that most of this report is
24 criticizing the VPD.

25 Q Would you go to page 296, that paragraph I just

1 read? Bottom of page 296, second column.

2 A Yes.

3 Q It reads:

4 It is appropriate that --

5 And I will start again, sorry.

6 It should be noted that the Vancouver Police
7 Department was the subject of extreme
8 criticism in the media after the Pickton
9 charges, with obviously unfounded allegations
10 made that the VPD failed to conduct any
11 investigation or be responsive to the Pickton
12 information.

13 Isn't that sentence an endeavor to take the
14 heat off the Vancouver Police Department?

15 A That sentence was an endeavor to respond to
16 headlines and stories that said things like, in
17 February 2002, that the VPD received the Hiscox
18 information in 1998 and did "nothing with it"
19 until the RCMP got a search warrant in 2002. So,
20 that's what that was in response to. That was the
21 context of that.

22 The fact was that, of course, we know that
23 the VPD did provide that information to the VPD
24 (sic) and did do a considerable investigation and
25 did support Corporal Connor in his investigation

1 in Coquitlam.

2 So, it was responding to the criticism
3 repeated over and over and over again to this day,
4 that the VPD received the Hiscox information in
5 1998 and did nothing with it.

6 Q Let's, let's put this legal jurisdiction stuff to
7 one side, Deputy Chief, for the moment, okay? I
8 would like you to tell this inquiry why is it that
9 the Vancouver Police Department were unable to put
10 any major resources into determining the depth of
11 the, the kidnapping or disappearance, if you will,
12 and suspected murders of the missing women by any
13 major resources, leaving an inexperienced
14 constable to receive a tip without supervision?
15 That appears to be the facts. That's what
16 Sergeant Field says. "I said to her, work with
17 your source, go for it." I am not making that up.
18 It's in her report. And she was the only
19 supervisor for Constable Shenher. So -- and she
20 was not, apparently, experienced enough in some
21 areas. Without reviewing all the evidence, you
22 yourself said she wasn't an experienced officer.

23 And as I say, forget the legal jurisdiction.
24 This was a desperate situation at the time for
25 some human beings in the Downtown Eastside and

1 their families. And on the appearance of things,
2 as to the investigation, as to their disappearance
3 and murder, particularly as to a real suspect who
4 was on everybody's list as number one, it appears
5 that there was an appalling lack of adequate
6 resources supplied to his capture. Why is that?

7 A Well, I have given quite a bit of evidence about
8 that and there's quite a bit of information in my
9 report. I'll just say again that you've
10 recharacterized my evidence about Detective
11 Constable Shenher somewhat and that she, I believe
12 when she started, had seven years of police
13 experience. So, she was inexperienced in some
14 things. But that's actually working in an intense
15 environment like Vancouver, quite a bit of police
16 experience. But I agree, she was not an
17 experienced homicide investigator, for example.

18 I've written in my report that, in 1998, when
19 she was assigned, that that was insufficient, that
20 there needed, to advance the investigation into
21 whether there were plausible explanations for the
22 women going missing, they needed to do that quick
23 -- more quickly, and that meant that it needed
24 more resources, like, a partner for her to work
25 with, more officers, that there should have been

1 more urgency.

2 But as I have explained, that was in the
3 context of a view at the time, that this was just
4 like the list of 71 and they're quickly going to
5 be accounted for. When they weren't being
6 accounted for, I agree, there should have been
7 more resources put into that, to accelerate, to
8 advance that investigation.

9 Once there was information to make the
10 implication much stronger, for example, the
11 reports that Detective Constable Shenher were
12 writing, Sergeant Field was writing, and
13 especially the report from Detective Inspector
14 Rossmo, that made it much more compelling that
15 this was, foul play was a likely explanation, then
16 there was what I would say was an honest effort by
17 the inspector in charge at the time, to put more
18 resources into it. There were two homicide
19 investigators assigned. There were two
20 investigators, street investigators assigned.
21 There was Constable Dave Dickson. There was
22 Constable Alex Clarke who had experience working
23 in the Downtown Eastside and in a women's prison.
24 So, in terms of community knowledge and that sort
25 of thing.

1 So, I think that there was an honest effort.
2 Was it sufficient? Uhm, I think that it was at
3 the beginning, but it needed to be sustained and
4 it wasn't. And I have written about that
5 extensively in my report.

6 And also, about all the challenges, again,
7 that it appeared the women had stopped going
8 missing, there was no physical evidence, no
9 witness, no body, all the things that police
10 investigators expect to start the investigation of
11 a crime with, and a lack of belief in some
12 quarters, still, that a serial killer was what was
13 responsible.

14 So, to your proposition that not enough
15 resources were put into the investigation, or
16 sustained in the investigation, that's what I
17 wrote in my report. That's what I have given
18 evidence about.

19 Q But some people, and probably myself included,
20 can't help make a comparison with the massive
21 amount of resources that was put into play to
22 capture the kidnapper of that young man from a
23 relatively wealthy family called "McMynn", which
24 you were involved in the command, the supervision
25 of, of the resources. I may have got the wrong

1 word, but you were in a leading capacity in
2 capturing McMynn. The resources were put into the
3 field, according to the report, or your evidence,
4 of 150 officers. Now, I know McMynn was, was
5 still alive, expected to be still alive, and you
6 wanted to capture him alive.

7 But nevertheless, compared to the downtown
8 missing women, some might say, well, they're
9 missing and, therefore, suspected dead, that's a
10 terrible way to look at it, but what was at stake
11 was the suspicion at least that there were going
12 to be more deaths, more missing women, more
13 murdered women, and, in fact, there were. I mean,
14 I haven't counted the number since 1998, where I
15 have focused on, but I believe it's somewhere
16 around 15 or 16 women who would have been saved if
17 a massive effort had been made in 1998 as I have
18 suggested by my cross-examination should have been
19 done.

20 So, that's the -- some people are going to
21 say between what happened in McMynn and what the
22 effort the VPD made here with the women from,
23 missing from Downtown Eastside, there is a chasm
24 the size of the Grand Canyon between those two
25 things. And so what is the reason for that

1 difference? Yes, you said there had to be more
2 resources. Yes, there had to be this. Is it just
3 because they were sex trade workers and drug
4 addicts? I see you shake your head, but -- and
5 therefore, they're the great unwashed, that you
6 couldn't be bothered, "you" being the VPD? Is
7 that the reason?

8 A No, and you have asked me a number of questions so
9 I want to back up a bit.

10 First of all, I don't think it's an
11 appropriate comparison with McMynn, because most
12 of the officers that were involved in McMynn were
13 not involved in the investigation. They were
14 involved in the rescue. There was 14 residences
15 that needed to be under surveillance and have
16 emergency response teams available, and they
17 started with the first five that were considered
18 the most likely to have Graham McMynn in them.
19 So, it was a function of the nature of the
20 investigations.

21 What I think is a more fair comparison is to
22 look at other investigations of suspected murder,
23 including murders of marginalized women from the
24 Downtown Eastside, and the amount of resources is
25 a product of the investigative challenges.

1 So, I have agreed that there should have been
2 more resources. It should have been treated more
3 like a murder investigation and less like a
4 missing persons investigation. That wouldn't have
5 necessarily meant more members involved, except
6 for if you were bringing in surveillance on a
7 suspect or something like that. I mean, most
8 murder investigations, where it's clear that there
9 is a murder, don't involve hundreds of police
10 officers like McMynn. So --

11 Q More experienced officers would have been a good
12 start.

13 A Well, there was some experienced officers involved
14 in this, very experienced officers.

15 Q 1999 not 1998.

16 A Yes, I agree with you. And I have said that if
17 they had accelerated the missing persons part of
18 the investigation to put that theory to rest more
19 quickly, then it would have been appropriate to
20 bring more resources on sooner than they were.

21 There's been much made about, look at all the
22 resources you had for the Home Invasion Task
23 Force. They were actually about the same. I had
24 a total complement of about 10 and I had to fight
25 for them every day. So, that was where we had,

1 you know, a very clear 13 home invasions of the
2 elderly.

3 And if I had needed more resources, like in
4 McMynn, for an ERT to do an assault on a premises
5 or for surveillance, then that's something that I
6 would have and could have requested, in the same
7 way that surveillance was brought in at the
8 request of the Coquitlam RCMP in 1998 and 1999.

9 So, I just want to make clear that it wasn't
10 -- it's a function of what there is to investigate
11 and what is believed to be the crime. Uh, I think
12 that the VPD has shown over and over again, during
13 this time period and since then, that when there
14 is a known crime against a sex worker, for
15 example, a murder or a serious assault, that the
16 VPD will do everything it can to solve that case,
17 and has been very successful in solving such
18 cases.

19 Q When you look at the evidence, my last question on
20 this subject, however, when you stand back and
21 look at the evidence of the effort of the
22 Vancouver Police Department with respect to the
23 plight of the missing women and their families,
24 trying to find out what went wrong, the one word
25 that comes to mind to characterize the effort of

1 the Vancouver Police Department seems to be
2 "indifference", that you were really not willing
3 to make the effort, for some reason, and that
4 seems to be just indifference to these people.
5 Isn't that a fair assessment?

6 A I think that the investigators involved, like,
7 Detective Constable Shenher and others, that is
8 the farthest from the truth to say that they were
9 indifferent. By all accounts, she and others were
10 extremely diligent.

11 In terms of the organizational response, I
12 don't believe that it was indifference. I believe
13 that it was a lack of coming to the acceptance
14 that the most likely cause of the missing women
15 was that they were being murdered.

16 So, I don't characterize it as indifferent.
17 I don't think that these were people that were
18 indifferent and, and I infer that from how the
19 organization responded to known serious crimes
20 against sex workers. But it was not the VPD's
21 finest hour, clearly. And there were many
22 involved that were making those decisions that
23 wished that they could do that over again, if only
24 they had known what we all know in hindsight.

25 Q I would like you to keep that word "indifference"

1 in mind for the last subject I am going to
2 address, and I'm sorry I have taken so long, but
3 so be it, and it's about aboriginal issues.
4 Indifference. There's not a word in your report,
5 Mr. LePard, not a word, that 50 percent of the
6 missing and murdered women are aboriginal. That's
7 not in your report, is it?

8 A I don't think it's true either.

9 Q Well, this much is true. Fifty percent of my
10 learned friends over here, Mr. Neil Chantler and,
11 and Cameron Ward, 50 percent of their clients are,
12 are aboriginal First Nations people.

13 A Well, I accept that aboriginal women were grossly
14 overrepresented in the numbers, in the women who
15 went missing. My understanding was that it was
16 about a third, which is still much higher than
17 their proportion in the population.

18 Q Well, that's nice, okay, to acknowledge that. But
19 I get some information from a very reliable source
20 here, my colleague, Robyn Gervais, who is doing a
21 great job, and I understand it's pretty close to
22 50 percent. Your third is a bit low. But in any
23 event, it's a remarkable number of the missing and
24 murdered women are aboriginal, and it is equally
25 remarkable, I suggest, that you don't even touch

1 on that startling fact in your report, do you?

2 A Uhm, I don't know if I talk about the percentage
3 of them that were aboriginal. I'm not sure that I
4 knew the information about them being aboriginal
5 or what the numbers were. It was more about the
6 fact that they were -- I looked at the profile
7 that was developed by Detective Constable Shenher
8 and what linked these women together in terms of
9 being addicted, Downtown Eastside sex workers and
10 so on. That they were poor, marginalized and
11 addicts, and that the race, I'm not sure what the
12 relevance was in assessing the investigation.

13 Q I am going to bring the relevance to you right
14 now. Given there is a large number of the missing
15 women are daughters of aboriginal families,
16 there's a need to work with the aboriginal
17 families, with the families of these women that
18 have gone missing, who, to them, are still loved
19 daughters and desire greatly to find out what's
20 going on and can they help and is there any way
21 they can provide information that might lead to
22 their recovery and we hope they're still alive and
23 so on. There is going to be an interface between
24 the Vancouver Police Department and aboriginal
25 families in the investigation of the missing

1 women, right?

2 A I think that's true for all the families, of all
3 the victims.

4 Q And you have written in your report that there was
5 that interface between them, I shouldn't use a
6 word like that, there was that need for the
7 families to provide information, to report their
8 missing daughters, and to get some feedback, and
9 that in your report I believe you said somewhere
10 that, because of some factors I am going to get to
11 in a moment, it actually compromised the
12 investigation I think is the word you use in your
13 report at page 36.

14 A Uhm, well, I think that you have taken that out of
15 context. What I was talking about, compromising
16 the investigation, but, because I was talking --

17 Q You love to say I take things out of context. I
18 think you're unfair.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, that's really -- that doesn't really
20 solve much, by saying that.

21 MR. ROBERTS: I know, but I, I couldn't resist. I am reminded
22 of Lady Macbeth in Shakespeare, "Me thinks thou
23 doth protest too much."

24 Q Anyway, go ahead. I apologize for interrupting
25 you.

1 A Well, I think, I'd have to check, but my
2 recollection is when I talked about compromising
3 the investigation, that the interactions of a
4 civilian worker pre Detective Constable Shenher
5 had compromised it, because the relationships were
6 so poor. So, that's what I was talking about and
7 that's why I say that I think that you took that
8 out of context.

9 I think that when Detective Constable Shenher
10 took over that responsibility, that she did an
11 excellent job of trying to maintain contact with
12 the families and have open relationships with them
13 and exchange information.

14 But what I also wrote was that she was
15 overwhelmed, that she was trying to do too many
16 things at once. And I pointed out the importance
17 in the major case management model, of having a
18 victim liaison person assigned to take care of
19 that, to make sure that we do provide the sort of
20 relationship and information that you are talking
21 about, that, that we should have done a better job
22 of that. But I believe that Detective Constable
23 Shenher did her best in that respect.

24 Q To do a good job of that with respect to First
25 Nations people, aboriginal people, might it be

1 assisted by knowing a little bit about them and
2 about their fear of contacting the police? That
3 would have been a helpful thing to do, don't you
4 think?

5 A Yes, and we certainly had people that were in the
6 VPD or associated with the VPD that could help
7 with that.

8 Q I see. I want to refer to a book. My learned
9 colleague has brought to my attention a book.
10 It's a very small book. It's called -- it's a
11 report by Anthony Sarich, a report on the
12 Cariboo-Chilcotin Justice Inquiry. And with your
13 permission, I just want to tell a bit of a story
14 about the background of this book, because it
15 would have been helpful, it might be a good
16 benchmark about good relationships between
17 aboriginal people and policing forces.

18 Tony Sarich is a graduate of the law school
19 at UBC in 1961, called to the bar in '62, a lawyer
20 practising in Campbell River for many years until
21 he, his passing. He was appointed to the
22 Provincial Court in 1973 and he worked with lots
23 of aboriginal groups in Campbell River and in the
24 Comox Valley. In 1990, he was appointed as, as a
25 commissioner for this inquiry because there were

1 intense difficulties in the Cariboo between the
2 policing and justice forces and the First Nations
3 people up there. And going all the way back to
4 the hanging of three chiefs up there, I believe
5 it's three, by a long-time-ago Justice Begbie in
6 the 1860s, thereabouts, when, in the First
7 Nations' view, all they were doing is trying to
8 defend their land from the taking by white people
9 and resisting the invasion of, of forces on their
10 property. They were hung, and there was a
11 bitterness that lasted, and probably still lasts
12 today. There was also intense bitterness over
13 their children being taken away and put in
14 residential schools.

15 So, up went Tony Sarich, and it's interesting
16 to look at his terms of reference for this
17 inquiry. Excuse me a moment. I'll read it
18 without my glasses. I'm going to go to (f),
19 they're on the last page. It's in a schedule on
20 page 47:

21 Inquire into alleged incidents of bias during
22 any aspect of police investigation into the
23 death, on or off reserve, of a native person
24 of the Cariboo-Chilcotin Region once it was
25 established that the victim was a native

1 person; and, whether there was a bias that
2 influenced the manner in which the death was
3 investigated . . .

4 More germane:

5 Inquire into the level of knowledge of police
6 officers of native culture generally and more
7 particularly their awareness of the culture
8 of the three nations of the Cariboo-Chilcotin
9 Region;

10 Two more:

11 Inquire into the effectiveness of existing
12 communications between the native people of
13 the Cariboo-Chilcotin Region and their
14 leaders and the police forces;

15 Lastly:

16 Inquire into any perception that native
17 people of the Cariboo-Chilcotin Region have
18 of the police force, and any perceptions that
19 the police force have of the native people of
20 the Cariboo-Chilcotin Region, and how these
21 perceptions affect the relationship and
22 interaction between police forces (sic) and
23 native people of the Cariboo-Chilcotin
24 Region.

25 Very interesting terms of reference. And

1 when Anthony, Judge Sarich went there, he found
2 out that the first thing he had to do was to
3 listen to the people. So, he divided his
4 investigation into two parts, and the first part
5 was to go and sit and listen to the people, and it
6 took a long time and all the bitterness poured
7 out, including bitterness over current policing.

8 And the one paragraph in his report that I
9 would like to read to you is on page 11. No,
10 sorry, it's 18, called "Police Reaction".

11 During the course of the Commission hearings,
12 there emerged a pattern of conduct by some
13 police officers toward native people that
14 ranged from indifference [that's the word I
15 used too, indifference] through arrogance and
16 disrespect, to bordering on contempt.

17 Now, that's a finding by a very thoughtful
18 man. I don't think, in our white community of
19 British Columbia, that First Nation people ever
20 had a better white friend, if you can put it that
21 way, than Judge Anthony Sarich.

22 And it would be helpful if, when we have an
23 interaction with our First Nations brothers and
24 sisters, that we are more aware of their, for
25 whatever reason, hostility, fear of the police.

1 Remember, Chief Ed John, when he was here, I made
2 a note of what he said. The police, he had a
3 phonetic name for them, Nayachuknay. Nayachuknay.

4 MS. BASIL: Nayachuknay.

5 MR. ROBERTS:

6 Q It means those who take us away. Those who take
7 us. So, when the aboriginal families are coming
8 to the police, they have to overcome a lot of bad
9 stuff, don't they?

10 A Yes, I agree with all of that.

11 Q If you believe all of this. A lot of difficulty.
12 And yet -- I've lost my train. . .

13 When they came to the, the families came to
14 report missing women, missing daughters, and
15 interacted with someone there, the person they met
16 was Sandy Cameron, right? And when I look at the
17 interview, interviews you conducted with officers
18 of the Vancouver Police Department, if I start
19 with Lori Shenher, Detective Constable Shenher,
20 it's in the interview, tab 11 in the interview
21 binder, for November 19, 2002. She says:

22 Sandy Cameron was a big problem regarding the
23 victim families.

24 Of course that means 50 percent, or maybe a little
25 less, that's First Nations people.

1 I would hear her on the phone a lot and the
2 way she dealt with people generally wasn't
3 great. I heard racist stuff. The only
4 specific thing that the missing women file
5 was there was one day when I, I think it was
6 Tanya Holyk's mother, Dorothy Purcell, I
7 think she's one of the 50 he's charged with,
8 she came into the office to meet with me. I
9 wanted to reinterview her to see if she could
10 help me with anything.

11 This was in late '98 or early '99.

12 Sandy was right there and introduced them and
13 it was not good.

14 Sandy Cameron is the person in the office of the
15 VPD at the time, right?

16 A She was the clerk in the Missing Persons Unit,
17 yes.

18 Q Yes.

19 Sandy was stone-faced and Dorothy went white.
20 It was clearly very awkward. They didn't
21 exchange pleasantries and Dorothy looked like
22 she was going to break into tears, and she
23 later did. She said Sandy wouldn't take her
24 calls, then said if I'd been a bad -- if I'd
25 been a better mother ... that she'd been

1 harsh. It seemed that there had been racial
2 undertones.

3 And then there's more on that. And then
4 there is a statement by Mr. Dave Dickson, which,
5 you interviewed him too?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And Dave Dickson says in his interview statement:

8 I dealt with Sandy Cameron over the years. I
9 felt like we didn't actively go out and look
10 for people. It would be -- I would be in
11 contact with the ministry and safe houses and
12 I would go into the MP files regarding
13 missing street kids. I would go through
14 Sandy's files on a weekly basis checking to
15 see kids that were missing, and might have
16 checked in the kid that night before and, and
17 know she was okay. I would hear Sandy on the
18 phone saying, "We don't look for missing
19 hookers. We don't look for hookers." She
20 was rude on the phone [et cetera].

21 Now, I'm not going to read more. First
22 Nations folks coming in to want to report a
23 missing daughter, and trying to be helpful,
24 overcoming whatever fears they have, as Tony
25 Sarich has indicated in his report, should never

1 have to put up with abuse like that.

2 A I agree.

3 Q Nobody should, but there's so -- misunderstanding
4 of these people.

5 A I agree with you.

6 Q And you, in your report, said -- let's go to page
7 36 of your report, sir. First column, near the
8 top.

9 Some of the allegations of bias were likely
10 fueled by administrative delays and
11 difficulties faced by families and friends
12 when reporting sex trade workers as missing.
13 It just (sic) appears that the conduct of
14 some (sic) civilian VPD staff member, who was
15 working in the Missing Persons Unit prior to
16 the Missing Women investigation, poisoned
17 relations with the families of some of the
18 Missing Women. Those factors are [or sorry]
19 these factors compromised the investigation
20 by creating a lack of trust in the Vancouver
21 Police Department by some of the families of
22 the Missing Women.

23 Some of those families are, of course, those
24 I am representing here in the, in the ethnic
25 sense, the aboriginal families. So, that's what

1 you've written about that, it compromised the
2 investigation, that sort of bad conduct.

3 A Yes, I agree.

4 Q And, of course, it should have been the opposite.

5 Then I want to take you to your report at
6 page 32, and I'm close to being done. First
7 column again, halfway down the page, beginning:

8 In July 2001, --

9 Do you have that?

10 A Yes.

11 Q -- despite the Vancouver Police Department
12 being part of a JFO targeted on solving a
13 serial killer case, a member of the VPD
14 nevertheless made statements to a Missing
15 Women family member minimizing this
16 possibility. In the same month, venomous
17 complaints by Missing Women family members
18 were leveled over comments made to them by a
19 civilian member of the Missing Persons Unit.

20 The civilian person was Sandy Cameron?

21 A Yes.

22 Q I go back to the word "venomous". Why did you
23 write that word, that the complaints were
24 venomous? I looked at the English dictionary. We
25 mean what we say usually, and the dictionary means

1 "venom injected by these people." Is that what
2 you meant here?

3 A Uhm, what I meant --

4 Q That the complaints were venomous?

5 A What I meant, and maybe I should have looked in
6 the dictionary for the word, was that these, the
7 concerns were extreme, that they were very angry
8 at the VPD and at this person particularly. So,
9 what I meant was very angry complaints.

10 Q All right. I see. So, what you really meant to
11 say is that their anger was justified?

12 A Well, certainly if their allegations were true,
13 and there seemed to be a lot of evidence in
14 support, then absolutely, yes, they were
15 justified.

16 Q So, you would be well-advised then to remove that
17 word "venomous"? You should make that edit, just
18 even for that one word. Because it's read by the
19 families that their complaints were venomous. You
20 didn't mean that?

21 A I, I did not mean that. I meant very angry.

22 Q So, we can delete or substitute the word for
23 "angry complaints," can we?

24 A Yes, we can.

25 Q It's been out there for a long time. You might

1 even think about apologizing to First Nations and
2 all families for using that word in your report,
3 don't you think?

4 A Well, for anyone who drew the conclusion that I
5 was being critical of them and not stating that
6 they were angry, and justifiably so, I apologize,
7 because that was not what I was thinking. That's
8 not what I was trying to convey. And I think the
9 context of it was pretty clear.

10 Q I take your word for that. Those are my
11 questions.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: All right, thank you.

13 THE REGISTRAR: Mr. Roberts, did you wish to mark your
14 document?

15 MR. ROBERTS: Do I, again?

16 THE REGISTRAR: The document --

17 MR. ROBERTS: Yes, thank you, Mr. Registrar. I would ask that
18 the binder itself, which, and all counsel I would
19 advise to assemble it with the index, which I have
20 and which the exhibit is, so that it's easy to
21 refer to, and it be marked as an exhibit for
22 identification.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: All right, thank you.

24 THE REGISTRAR: That will be marked for identification letter
25 H, H for Identification.

1 **(EXHIBIT NO. H FOR IDENTIFICATION:** Binder of
2 documents containing Tabs 1 to 7, and entitled
3 "Documents for the Cross-examination of Deputy
4 Chief Douglas LePard")

5 MR. ROBERTS: I have copies of Judge Anthony Sarich's report.
6 I don't feel it necessary to mark it, but if it
7 might be useful to have it at hand, Mr.
8 Commissioner, I would be happy to do so.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: I am in your hands. I've read it a long
10 time ago.

11 MR. ROBERTS: I am not surprised that you did.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: But I haven't seen it -- if you think it
13 will help --

14 MR. ROBERTS: I think, and because I have it copied, I wouldn't
15 mind marking it as an exhibit for identification.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

17 MR. ROBERTS: Those are my questions, Mr. Commissioner.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Roberts.

19 THE REGISTRAR: That document on the justice inquiry will be
20 marked I for identification.

21 **(EXHIBIT NO. I FOR IDENTIFICATION:** Document
22 entitled "Report on the Cariboo-Chilcotin Justice
23 Inquiry")

24 MR. VERTLIEB: Mr. Commissioner, just on, a comment on marking
25 it for identification. The only reason Mr.

1 Roberts feels it would not be marked as an exhibit
2 proper, that we can see, would be for Tab 7, which
3 contains a draft of the Connor material. But for
4 that, there's no reason that it need to be marked
5 for identification. I think Mr. --

6 THE COMMISSIONER: It should be an exhibit.

7 MR. VERTLIEB: Exactly.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

9 MR. VERTLIEB: Now, the only caveat is that I don't know if the
10 DoJ has had a look at that document for concern,
11 but I am assuming that they have looked at that in
12 other ways, because it's not a new document. It's
13 been looked at for months. As soon as the DoJ can
14 tell us it's fine, I would like to get it marked
15 so we don't have the record building up with too
16 many of these marked for identification because --

17 THE COMMISSIONER: Ms. Tobias, what's your position?

18 MS. TOBIAS: Mr. Commissioner, that document is one of the
19 documents of the Williams' appendices which has
20 been revetted, which has been provided to the
21 commission. So, there is no concerns on that
22 score.

23 However, I had been having some extended
24 discussions with Ms. Brooks about how we're going
25 to handle the disclosed documents that we're using

1 in the hearing and the version that is going to be
2 put on the website. And I don't know if one of my
3 friends from commission counsel have had a chance
4 to make decisions on that yet, but what I can say
5 is that that particular document has been looked
6 at for revetting, however, the version that Mr.
7 Roberts used is not the revetted version, so far
8 as I'm aware. So, I think that we had discussed
9 is that the commission should always have the
10 document as disclosed fully, and then what goes on
11 the website is a different issue entirely.

12 MR. VERTLIEB: That's fine. We will sort that out. I am sure
13 it will be fine.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Yes, Mr. Gratl?

15 MR. GRATL: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. Jason Gratl,
16 independent counsel for affected individuals and
17 groups from the Downtown Eastside, especially sex
18 workers and drug users.

19 I would like at this time to mark as
20 identification a binder of documents that's been
21 circulated by e-mail to all counsel last night,
22 consisting of 271 pages.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: What is it?

24 MR. GRATL: It's been cerlox bound.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: A what?

1 MR. GRATL: It's a cerlox-bound --

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, okay.

3 MR. GRATL: -- set of 271 documents.

4 THE REGISTRAR: That will be marked for identification letter
5 J.

6 MR. GRATL: Thank you, Mr. Giles.

7 (EXHIBIT NO. J FOR IDENTIFICATION: Cerlox-bound
8 set of documents consisting of 271 pages)

9 MR. GRATL: And as well, Mr. Commissioner, I had previously
10 marked for identification as A, the letter A, --

11 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

12 MR. GRATL: -- a book of documents that was put to Professor
13 Lowman when he gave evidence.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

15 MR. GRATL: Actually, if you could have that before you during
16 the cross-examination, that might expedite things.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

18 MR. GRATL: And the last document to which I, I don't say I am
19 just going to exclusively make reference to these
20 three documents, but predominantly these three
21 documents, is the report prepared by Deputy Chief
22 LePard.

23 **CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GRATL:**

24 Q And so, just for ease of reference, so we're all
25 on the same page here, the document marked as A

1 for Identification, I am going to refer to that as
2 the "Lowman book".

3 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

4 MR. GRATL:

5 Q And then the document now marked as J for
6 Identification, I'm going to refer to that as the
7 "bias book", because it contains documents that
8 deal predominantly with the issue of bias.

9 Deputy Chief LePard, I will be returning to
10 the deputy chief nomenclature. I don't think that
11 I have the experience to get away with calling you
12 "Mr. LePard", but I also wish to call attention to
13 the reality of your rank within the Vancouver
14 Police Department. You're here, in many respects,
15 not to give your own opinion of what happened, but
16 to present the views of the Vancouver Police
17 Department; is that correct?

18 A Uhm, I, I think that I have a dual role as, first
19 of all, I was the one assigned to do this review
20 and so I'm here for that purpose; and secondly, I
21 am here representing the Vancouver Police
22 Department.

23 Q All right. And you have prepared a report on
24 behalf of the Vancouver Police Department?

25 A Yes.

1 Q And the Vancouver Police Department has officially
2 adopted it?
3 A Yes.
4 Q And the Police Board has adopted it as well,
5 correct?
6 A Yes.
7 Q And specifically the chiefs, Chief Jamie Graham,
8 who assigned you the task of preparing the report,
9 he reviewed it?
10 A Yes.
11 Q And he, he agrees with the report?
12 A Yes.
13 Q And Chief Chu has reviewed the report?
14 A Yes.
15 Q And it was delivered under cover of his letter?
16 A Yes.
17 Q So, plainly, he adopted it in his personal role?
18 A Yes.
19 Q And it's, it's gone to the executive committee.
20 Everybody on the executive committee has reviewed
21 it as well?
22 A Yes. It went to the deputy chiefs several times.
23 They changed over the course of Jamie Graham being
24 chief and, and Jim Chu being chief.
25 Q Okay. So, all of the deputy chiefs reviewed it,

1 correct?

2 A Yes.

3 Q And they all concur with it?

4 A Uhm, I believe so.

5 Q And have you heard anything to the contrary? Have
6 you had somebody come to you at deputy chief level
7 and say, "Gee, Deputy Chief LePard, I don't agree
8 with your report. I think there was bias that
9 influenced the investigation." Has anybody done
10 that?

11 A No.

12 Q Has anybody done that within the Vancouver Police
13 Department at all?

14 A Suggested that there was bias involved in the
15 investigation?

16 Q Yeah. I just want to get a sense of the extent to
17 which your report reflects the views of the
18 Vancouver Police Department, and so I am just
19 asking you whether any member of the Vancouver
20 Police Department has ever come to you and said,
21 "Gee, I don't agree with your conclusions about
22 bias. I believe that." And I'm just suggesting
23 this for an example, not that they used these
24 exact words, but that they said words to the
25 effect that, "bias against sex workers or drug

1 users or aboriginal people influenced or may have
2 influenced the investigation"?

3 A Well, of course, I don't actually say that it
4 didn't in my report. My comments about bias were
5 quite specific in saying that, where there is a
6 known offence, a serious offence against a sex
7 trade worker, that bias does not play a role in
8 how, how that will be investigated.

9 As to the broader issue of the influence of
10 bias generally, how that operates, that was beyond
11 the scope of my review. And so if you have
12 questions about that, I will do my best. But my
13 focus on bias was fairly specific.

14 Q Okay. But my question though is this. Did
15 anybody come and --

16 A No.

17 Q -- come to you from the Vancouver Police
18 Department, any member at all, and say, "Gee, I
19 think you got the bias issue wrong. There is more
20 bias than what you said"?

21 A No. People didn't come to me and say I got
22 something wrong in my report.

23 Q Okay.

24 MR. HERN: I just wanted to allow Mr. Gratl to finish that line
25 of questioning, but the language he's used in

1 that, in terms of adopting the report, and
2 suggesting people may have adopted it personally,
3 I mean, as I said in my opening, I represent the
4 Department as a whole and there are a large group
5 of officers that will be testifying here in the
6 new year, and they don't all share the same view
7 of all events as Deputy Chief LePard has written
8 in his report. You know that but --

9 THE COMMISSIONER: No, I understand that.

10 MR. HERN: -- I just want to clarify that, that adopting it at
11 large is a, in a legal sense, is not what's --

12 THE COMMISSIONER: All right, go ahead.

13 MR. GRATL: My friend is right. I am not asking for any
14 suggestion that there's adoption of hearsay
15 evidence or any things like that. Not in an
16 evidentiary sense. What I was getting at with the
17 witness, Mr. Commissioner, was whether or not this
18 report could be taken as representative of the
19 views of the Vancouver Police Department --

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, he's already answered that.

21 MR. GRATL: -- as an institution.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, go ahead.

23 MR. GRATL:

24 Q I would like to begin at page 281 of your report,
25 Deputy LePard. Sorry, 212 of your report. And

1 I'm sorry if I tread over some of the ground that

2 Mr. Roberts has already stepped on, but --

3 THE COMMISSIONER: I would like you if you don't, because I

4 don't -- you know, we've heard extensive cross-

5 examination. I would appreciate it if -- I don't

6 want to hear the same stuff over again.

7 MR. GRATL: Well, I will be -- I am going to try to avoid it as

8 much as possible, Mr. Commissioner, --

9 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

10 MR. GRATL: -- but I think the bias issue raises an issue --

11 THE COMMISSIONER: No, no, I am not stopping you from

12 cross-examining. I am just saying that we don't

13 need to hear material over and over again, if that

14 evidence has already been heard.

15 MR. GRATL: All right. I will do my best to avoid doing so.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. I know you are at a bit of a

17 disadvantage because you are the last person

18 standing here --

19 MR. GRATL: No, RCMP will be the last.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I know, but I meant --

21 MR. GRATL: Yes.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

23 MR. GRATL:

24 Q Over on page 212, on the right-hand column, in

25 respect of Ms. Cameron, I note that you've come to

1 the conclusion that every police officer
2 interviewed for your review who had worked with
3 Ms. Cameron in the Missing Persons Unit from 1995
4 until she left in late 2001, gave statements that
5 corroborated some or all of the complaints made by
6 the families of sex workers. Is that correct?

7 A Yes, that's my recollection.

8 Q Okay. And those complaints were that Ms. Cameron
9 was rude, abrasive; correct?

10 A Yes.

11 Q And that she made racist remarks?

12 A That was part of it.

13 Q And that she was biased against sex workers?

14 A Yes.

15 Q She had a discriminatory attitude towards them?

16 A Some people believed that, yes.

17 Q And that she provided lifestyle advice to
18 families?

19 A That was one of the allegations.

20 Q She suggested that family members' parenting
21 strategies had failed, and accordingly, had
22 deprived them of the right to make a complaint; is
23 that right?

24 A Uhm, generally, yes.

25 Q Deprived them of the right to be listened to?

1 A Yes, that was the effect of it.

2 Q And of course she was discriminatory against drug

3 users as well?

4 A There were allegations of that, yes.

5 Q And that was corroborated by every police officer

6 you interviewed for the review?

7 A Yes, they all held quite similar views.

8 Q Okay. So, even before, even before the missing

9 women investigation started, there was a report

10 prepared by Sergeant Cooper in 1998; is that

11 correct?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And I will refer you to the bias book at page 1.

14 A Is that J, sorry? Is that --

15 Q J, yes.

16 A Yes.

17 Q This is a report from Sergeant Cooper in charge of

18 the Homicide Squad to Inspector Biddlecombe in

19 charge of the Violent Crime Section, dated January

20 9th, 1998; correct?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And this deals with the very same Ms. Cameron; is

23 that correct?

24 A No.

25 Q Not, not the same?

1 A No, because my understanding of this memo is he's
2 talking about staff in the communications centre
3 and at the public information counter and she
4 didn't work in either of those places.

5 Q Oh, I see. Okay. So that's not Ms. Cameron.
6 It's a, it's a more widespread problem than just
7 Ms. Cameron?

8 A Well, certainly Sergeant Cooper was identifying
9 his concerns, that people were being rebuffed and
10 weren't being taken seriously enough, and to his
11 credit, tried to deal with it.

12 Q And that was both at the public information
13 counter at the -- that's at the police station at
14 312 Main Street; is that correct?

15 A Yes, it was then.

16 Q So, there are some heavy metal doors, you can open
17 them up and you arrive at a, at a counter and
18 there is some Plexiglass there, right?

19 A There was Plexiglass more recently. I don't think
20 it was there at that time.

21 Q All right. So, any person could attend the
22 counter and --

23 A Yes.

24 Q That was the location that's referred to here?

25 A That was one of the locations, yes, the public

1 information counter.

2 Q All right. So the public -- then that's the very
3 public face of the Vancouver Police Department?

4 A Yes.

5 Q And people walked in and they were rebuffed, they
6 were told that they couldn't make a report
7 because, just because the reportee has not seen
8 the person doesn't mean they're missing? That's
9 what they were told?

10 A Yes, they did not get good customer service.

11 Q By this report, this Cooper memo goes quite a bit
12 beyond bad customer service, doesn't it? Doesn't
13 it say that there's a concern that this response
14 could be interpreted as a, as a racist response?

15 A Uhm, I haven't read it for quite a while, but that
16 is the gist of the memo, to my recollection, that
17 people could perceive that.

18 Q All right. And so that concern was not just with
19 the public information counter, but also with the
20 communications department?

21 A Communications section, yes. The 911 and
22 non-emergency report-takers.

23 Q And remind me when you were in charge of that
24 section, the communication section?

25 A I was never in charge of it, but I did work there

1 as a constable in 1990 and 1991.

2 Q So, you, you testified that you never saw any
3 problem with racism while you were at the
4 communications centre; isn't that correct?

5 A Uh, I don't know that I was asked that question
6 about racism. I was asked questions about how a
7 report from a sex trade worker like the report
8 that Susan Davis had made, how that would normally
9 be treated.

10 Q All right. I will ask you now.

11 A I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.

12 Q I said, I am asking you now.

13 A Yes?

14 Q When you were at the communications section, did
15 you, yourself, witness any of the problems
16 referred to in Sergeant Cooper's memo, that people
17 were being rebuffed because they were only friends
18 of the missing person as opposed to a relative,
19 they were rebuffed because the person had to be
20 missing for 24 hours before a report was taken, or
21 because they were told that, simply, just because
22 you haven't seen them, doesn't mean they're
23 missing?

24 A No, I can't say I personally observed any of those
25 things, but I, but I wouldn't disagree with you if

1 you suggested that they did occur from time to
2 time.

3 Q So, they could have happened while you were there?

4 A That they could have happened while I was there?

5 Q Yes. You are not denying that those things might
6 have happened while you were there?

7 A Uhm, if they had happened while I was there and I
8 had known about them, I would have dealt with it,
9 because it would have been unacceptable to me.

10 Q Well, okay. Well, that's great, but it's not the
11 question that I asked. I asked, are you denying
12 that those things could have happened --

13 A No --

14 Q -- while you were there?

15 THE COMMISSIONER: You know, with all due respect, those "could
16 have" questions in cross-examination could mean
17 anything. I mean, anything could have happened, I
18 am sure, but -- I know that that's not what you
19 mean, but, anyway try to, try to be a little more
20 concise in your, in your questions.

21 MR. GRATL:

22 Q All right. So, you're saying, you're saying, "I
23 didn't see any racism, but there might have been
24 some racism I didn't see"?

25 A Well, I am saying that it's, like, 20 years ago.

1 I don't recall any specific incidence of that, and
2 if there had been, I would have dealt with it.
3 That was part of my role some of the time while I
4 was there, to, to deal with the quality control
5 and so on.

6 Uhm, again, as I gave evidence before, if we
7 ever received a complaint of something like that,
8 it's a very accountable system, because every word
9 at that time was tape recorded on the system,
10 every word dispatched, every word in a 911
11 conversation. So, it provided a system so that if
12 we had a complaint about something like that, we
13 could easily find out exactly what was said.

14 Q Okay. So, Sergeant Cooper, having access to those
15 accountability mechanisms, concludes there is a
16 problem, correct?

17 A Yes. At that time, he concluded that there was a
18 problem.

19 Q Okay. So the accountability mechanisms you are
20 referring to obviously aren't a hard and fast
21 deterrent?

22 A Well, Sergeant Cooper, in fairness, he's received
23 information and he is reporting on that
24 information that he's received allegations. And I
25 am not saying that the allegations weren't

1 accurate by any stretch of the imagination. What
2 I am saying is, had there been a specific
3 complaint, he would have been able to go back and
4 actually listen to the tape and see whether it
5 was, what was alleged was reasonable or it was a
6 miscommunication or simply not true or, or
7 whatever it is. But you would need to have the
8 specific complaint, the specific time to listen to
9 the tapes, for example.

10 Q I mean --

11 A But he concluded that there was a problem. I, I
12 accept that.

13 Q All right. Go over the page to page 3 please.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: Page 3 of?

15 MR. GRATL: Of the bias book that's marked as J.

16 MR. HERN: I just don't think it's appropriate to name
17 something "the bias book".

18 THE COMMISSIONER: I don't know what that means.

19 MR. HERN: That's like me coming in and naming "the hero book"
20 or something. Let's just --

21 THE COMMISSIONER: I agree with you. Anyway, we'll take the,
22 we'll take the break.

23 THE REGISTRAR: The hearing will now recess for 15 minutes.

24 **(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 3:11 P.M.)**

25 **(PROCEEDINGS RESUMED AT 3:28 P.M.)**

1 THE REGISTRAR: Order. This hearing is now resumed.

2 MR. GRATL:

3 Q Deputy Chief, I would like to take you to page 6
4 of J. At page 6, we have the first page of what's
5 described as an interview form for Lori Shenher.

6 A Yes.

7 Q It's dated November 19th, 2002.

8 A Sorry, when you say "page 6," where's the page
9 number that you're referring to?

10 Q It's on the top right-hand side. It's a Bates
11 stamped number.

12 A Okay, it's a little bit faded in mine.

13 Q Okay. So, it's a document that's entitled
14 "Interview Form". The name on it is Lori Shenher.
15 The date, November 19th, 2002; is that correct?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Now, it looks as though it's a written statement
18 prepared by someone. Do you know who did the
19 typing on this document?

20 A I did.

21 Q You did all the typing?

22 A Yes.

23 Q So, the process was that a number of questions
24 were asked by yourself and by counsel at the
25 Farris firm; is that correct?

1 A Uh, almost all of it was questions that I asked.
2 Q And notes were taken, handwritten notes?
3 A No. I have very good keyboard skills and I would
4 take what I would describe as a close-to-verbatim
5 statement, not of everything I said, but their
6 responses, to form a cohesive statement, and then
7 provide it to them to adopt or point out
8 corrections or, or whatever. So, I typed as they
9 spoke.
10 Q Okay. So, each individual had an opportunity to
11 review the notes that you had made, the statement
12 that you had prepared for them?
13 A Yes.
14 Q And then adopt it probably by e-mail?
15 A Yes.
16 Q Is that correct?
17 A Yes.
18 Q I take it they also had a chance to consult with
19 their own lawyers, if they wished?
20 A If they chose to.
21 Q Okay. But they were told that they had a right to
22 do that; is that correct?
23 A Uhm, it was certainly open to them and, and there
24 were a couple that did want to do that. But most
25 of them, I explained the purposes of it, and that

1 it wasn't going to remain a, uhm, privileged
2 document likely, or necessarily, and, and they
3 could do whatever they decided they wanted to do.

4 Q So, what we are looking at here is this document,
5 Lori Shenher's statement, November 19th, 2002, is
6 a statement that Ms., or that, that Constable
7 Shenher adopted?

8 A Yes.

9 Q All right. Now, Mr. Roberts read out some of the
10 contents of her statement?

11 A Yes.

12 Q But I would like to read out a little bit more
13 because I think it's important that it become part
14 of the public record. Now, at the bottom of the
15 first paragraph on the first page, the last line
16 begins:

17 She made it clear that it was so awful with
18 her that she just stopped calling.

19 That's a reference to Dorothy Purcell saying
20 it was so awful with Ms. Cameron, that she just
21 stopped calling; is that correct?

22 A Uhm, I'm sorry, I don't see the -- oh, yeah, I see
23 it here. Yes, Dorothy Purcell.

24 Q Yes. That Cameron is so awful, that she just
25 stopped calling?

1 A Yes.

2 Q She was the front-line person with the families,
3 Cameron?

4 A Yes.

5 Q This is an area where we're going to have
6 some explaining to do.

7 A Yes.

8 Q And we'll go to the explanation a little later on.
9 Now, Ms. -- Detective Constable Shenher, she's a
10 detective constable at this time?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Okay. The next paragraph says:

13 When I confronted her, she would completely
14 deny it. Her level of self-awareness was
15 pretty low. Same with racial things, but not
16 in reference to missing women. For example,
17 she was speaking to someone I assume was
18 Asian, she was hollering into the phone,
19 speaking slowly, finally she hollered into
20 the phone, "speak English, this is Canada."
21 I confronted her and she denied it was racist
22 and said if they can't speak English, they
23 should go back to their country.

24 Is that right?

25 A Yes.

1 Q The next paragraph contains a reference that
2 Sergeant Cooper implemented a recorded line,
3 started recording her telephone calls with members
4 of the public.

5 A Yes.

6 Q And then it goes on to say that Ms. Cameron
7 managed to circumvent that protection by having a
8 second line that wasn't recorded for personal
9 calls.

10 A Yes, that's what Detective Constable Shenher told
11 me.

12 Q Ms. -- Detective Constable Shenher then goes on to
13 say:

14 There were sort of two sides to her. I
15 definitely saw it go along racial lines. As
16 she started to get a sense that this was
17 getting to be a bigger deal, she started
18 being a little easier to deal with. I think
19 she picked and chose who she chose to deal
20 with, and I think it was along racial lines.
21 I know Sandra Gagnon, sister of Janet Henry,
22 who's native, I know she had contact with
23 Sandy that was not good, even though Sandy
24 wouldn't say that. She thought when Janet
25 went missing Sandy didn't treat her well.

1 A Yes, that's what she told me.

2 Q And then in the next paragraph, Detective
3 Constable Shenher explains the division of labour
4 and the roles that she and Ms. Cameron
5 respectively played over time. Detective
6 Constable Shenher says:

7 When I came to Missing Persons in 1998, I
8 took over all contact with missing women's
9 families so that Sandy wouldn't have contact,
10 but some of the damage had been done. I
11 definitely sensed the communication barrier
12 and there was information from earlier that I
13 couldn't -- that I wouldn't get. I don't
14 want to be critical of Geramy, but I went to
15 her numerous times about my concerns about
16 Sandy.

17 And by "Geramy", that's Sergeant Geramy Field?

18 A Yes.

19 Q Shenher is saying she went to Field about Cameron?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Sandy was actually allowed to write policy
22 for the office.

23 Is that correct?

24 A That's what she told me, yes.

25 Q For example, we have a lot of chronic

1 runaways from group homes. She set up a
2 system to fax reports back and forth from the
3 group homes so she wouldn't have to bother
4 the detectives. We relied on her to make a
5 determination if those cases started to look
6 like a problem. Everyone was overworked and
7 Geramy had too many things to do and she was
8 happy to say, "Okay, Sandy, you handle it."

9 Detective Constable Shenher said:

10 When I was assigned, I contacted all of the
11 families, gave them my private line and pager
12 and I had all contact with them and they
13 didn't have to contact her again and they
14 were very happy about that. Every time a new
15 missing person came in, it came to Sandy.
16 The call came into the Comm. Centre, was
17 forwarded to our office, and Sandy would be
18 the first person to see the report. In the
19 past, she was really protective of the new
20 reports and she would assess if she dealt
21 with it or it went to a detective. I would
22 say that wasn't appropriate, that it should
23 go to a detective in the first instance. In
24 the end, we agreed we would look at the new
25 reports together and we would agree on how

1 the reports would be distributed. She didn't
2 love it but she accepted it.

3 Is that right?

4 A Yes, that's what she told me.

5 Q In the new paragraph, the next paragraph:

6 I think when Cooper was trying to get rid of
7 her, it went to Internal but I don't know how
8 far it went from there.

9 Is that right?

10 A Yes.

11 Q Obviously, there is a reference to Sergeant Cooper
12 trying to discipline Ms. Cameron?

13 A Yes.

14 Q I haven't seen any documents dealing with those
15 efforts. Have you seen any?

16 A Uhm, I have seen a number of references here and
17 there, like this reference, and like the, I think
18 a memo that you have already asked me about,
19 uhm --

20 Q That's, that's the Cooper memo?

21 A There is a Cooper memo.

22 Q You said that doesn't deal with Cameron.

23 A Yeah, okay, I'm mixing them up in my mind. But I
24 do recall reading information about Sergeant
25 Cooper making efforts on the taped, the tape on

1 the line and so on, and being unsuccessful. So,
2 wherever I read that, I have seen that in, in the
3 information that I reviewed.

4 Q Okay. So, you saw references to those documents?

5 A I saw references to the issue.

6 Q Okay. But you saw no documents dealing with it,
7 no source documents?

8 A I don't recall. I would have to check. I looked
9 at thousands of pages of documents and I don't
10 recall a specific document. I, I do recall the
11 references to it.

12 Q I would ask you to check overnight then, if you
13 could, subject of course to your counsel's advice.

14 In the next paragraph, Detective Constable
15 Shenher tells you:

16 People took me to coffee and breakfast to
17 warn me about Sandy. I had extensive
18 discussions with Al Howlett who she drove
19 crazy. He was pretty high strung and she
20 drove him crazy. He vacillated between
21 trying to deal with her and tuning her out
22 completely. When I came to the office, he
23 wanted nothing to do with the missing women
24 files and I think he couldn't understand why
25 she was still there.

1 People were amazed I could still sit in the
2 same room with her. I really tried to bring
3 her on side to make her contribute, but do my
4 own thing.

5 That's what Shenher tells you?

6 A Yes.

7 Q These are pretty serious allegations?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Correct?

10 A Yes.

11 Q Over the page to page 11 is the statement of Dave
12 Dickson dated November 5th, 2003. And over the
13 page to page 12 is page 3 of that statement,
14 referring to Sandy Cameron's file. Dickson says
15 he had dealt with Sandy Cameron over the years.
16 He says:

17 I felt like we didn't actively go out and
18 look for people. I'd hear Sandy on the phone
19 saying, "Oh, we don't look for hookers...we
20 don't look for hookers." She was rude on the
21 phone but I can't say she didn't do her job.

22 Is that correct?

23 A That's what he told me.

24 Q All right. So, that language, you don't have any
25 reason to doubt that, the accuracy of that

1 statement?

2 A Uh, doubt the accuracy of what Constable Dickson
3 told me?

4 Q Yes, that's correct.

5 A No.

6 Q All right. And over the page to page 13 is the
7 statement of Terry Blythe dated February 26th,
8 2004?

9 A Yes.

10 Q And again, this is Chief Constable Blythe?

11 A Yes, he was Chief Constable.

12 Q And he had an opportunity to review his statement
13 and send it back to you, correct?

14 A Yes. Everyone I provided it to so that they could
15 check it over.

16 Q Over the page, on page 2 of Chief Constable
17 Blythe's statement, you can see that Chief
18 Constable Blythe says that he recalls discussion,
19 "discussions in our SMT meetings." Now, what are
20 SMT meetings?

21 A Senior management team meetings. So, basically,
22 where everybody, inspector and above, would meet
23 once a week.

24 Q All right.

25 A Sometimes the terms were used interchangeably with

1 executive meetings, which caused some confusion,
2 which would just be the deputies and the chief.
3 So, but that's generally what it refers to.

4 Q Okay. So, Chief Constable Blythe says:

5 I recall discussions in our SMT meetings
6 where Brian McGuinness spoke about the whole
7 issue of Missing Women. And the aboriginal
8 community was really dissatisfied with our
9 Missing Persons people, whether they were
10 taking things seriously and they complained
11 about Sandy Cameron. She often pretended to
12 be a detective and that was pretty concerning
13 to all of us.

14 Is that correct?

15 A Yes.

16 Q I take it, the aboriginal reference is to the
17 aboriginal community, are references to concerns
18 about racism?

19 A Well, I take it for what it says, is the concern
20 was that, whether they were taking things
21 seriously.

22 Q I mean, you were there for the interview with
23 Chief Constable Blythe, were you not?

24 A Yes.

25 Q And you were asking questions?

1 A Yes.

2 Q And I take it, since you were on the topic of
3 Sandy Cameron, you asked Chief Constable Blythe
4 about whether or not Cameron was racist or
5 exhibited racist behaviour?

6 A I don't recall specifically what I asked him, but
7 it wouldn't surprise me because this was one of
8 the later interviews and I probably, following up
9 what I had heard earlier, or he might have
10 provided it unsolicited.

11 Q I see. So, you say you might not have followed up
12 because you already knew from everybody else that
13 Cameron was racist?

14 A Uh, I just don't know. I mean, he, uhm, he
15 wouldn't have been having hands-on contact with
16 her like the others. So, I am not saying I did
17 and I am not saying I didn't. I would have to
18 check my notes.

19 Q Okay. So, you do have notes of those interviews?

20 A I have notes of the questions that I wanted to ask
21 each person.

22 Q Well, was racism on the list of questions you
23 wanted to ask each person?

24 A I would have to check my notes. It was certainly
25 something that had come up in interviews with some

1 of the people that were having direct exposure.
2 So, I wouldn't be surprised if I asked about it or
3 created the opportunity for that to be discussed,
4 but I don't recall specifically.

5 Q All right. Then to page 16. This is Constable
6 Dan Dickhout, interview April 5th, 2004.

7 A Yes.

8 Q And the same situation. Constable Dickhout had an
9 opportunity to, to approve the contents of his
10 statement, correct?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Over the page, second-last paragraph:

13 Regarding Sandy on the phone, she was fairly
14 abrupt on the phone, but you wouldn't know
15 who she was talking to so it wasn't like I
16 could tell her to smarten up. There were a
17 few occurrences that you'd kind of go, holy
18 smokes...

19 Over the page, Sergeant Geramy Field, same
20 situation. She had an opportunity to confirm the
21 accuracy of the statement?

22 A Yes.

23 Q The statement dated November 15th, 2002?

24 A Yes.

25 Q If you go over the page, it's the sixth page of

1 Sergeant Field's statement. Sergeant Field states
2 that:

3 Cameron was a problem employee. She can be
4 sweet as pie or very insensitive. "You're
5 not a true family member. I'm not going to
6 take a report."

7 That's a quote provided by Field of Cameron?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And then over the page is the statement of Sandy
10 Cameron herself. Because she had an opportunity
11 to review the statement and confirm its accuracy,
12 correct?

13 A Yes.

14 Q If you turn to page 22 of this J, in the second
15 paragraph, the second full paragraph, Ms. Cameron
16 says:

17 I don't know why some of the family members
18 were critical of me. You'd have to talk to
19 Sandra Gagnon and ask her how I treated her,
20 or Herb Williams. They can get together and
21 say this, but what's rude to someone, might
22 not be rude to someone else. I think their
23 frustration level was high and I was the
24 prime target. I never ever said that I was a
25 police officer on the phone. There was an

1 internal and they pulled the tape and it
2 showed I never said that. I never said that.
3 The police as a joke used to call me that,
4 but I never did that. Other officers might
5 say something. I have a loud voice. People
6 could interpret that as being rude. My
7 frustration level was rising. I felt like
8 here's the limb and I'm on the end of it.
9 Some people -- sure people complained, but I
10 could also complain about people being rude
11 to me. If you're rude to me, I might get
12 defensive, but in no way would that affect
13 the investigation into the missing person. I
14 would take it. There might have been times I
15 was rude.

16 Over the page:

17 The letters of complaint seem to go up when
18 Sergeant Cooper was there. I would refer
19 them to him and he would tell them to put it
20 on paper. Not everyone we deal with is
21 happy. I heard a lot from staff that I was
22 loud and I had a tendency to cut people off,
23 so I tried to deal with that.

24 A Yes.

25 Q That's what she said.

1 A Yes.

2 Q Now, the reason -- I mean, I've included Ms.
3 Cameron's own statement there, and Ms. Cameron's
4 statement is quite consistent with Detective
5 Constable Shenher's assessment, that Ms. Cameron
6 has a very low level of self-awareness. Is that
7 correct?

8 A Yes, I thought so. I thought that she
9 corroborated the complaints from other, from
10 police officers, by her own statement.

11 Q I mean, she denied that she was racist or acting
12 inappropriately, but you attributed that to a low
13 level of self-awareness?

14 A Uhm, those were Detective Constable Shenher's
15 words, but I don't disagree with them. I think
16 that she didn't have real insight into how she was
17 coming across to other people.

18 Q Okay. So that was your personal assessment, as
19 you are putting together your report, to explain
20 to the public how everything happened here; is
21 that correct?

22 A That she didn't have a level of self-awareness?

23 Q Yes.

24 A Yes, I thought that was true.

25 Q That her denials, in effect, confirmed that she

1 was bigoted and racist?

2 A Uhm, I think that her statement did not convince
3 me that the others were wrong.

4 Q All right. So, I am asking you, did you or did
5 you not conclude that Ms. Cameron was racist and
6 bigoted?

7 A I did conclude that she engaged in behaviour that
8 could reasonably be interpreted as racist and
9 bigoted.

10 Q Okay. And you are a reasonable person?

11 A I like to think so.

12 Q Okay. And you came to an interpretation?

13 A Yes.

14 Q So, I take it that you, yourself, reasonably
15 interpreted that her behaviour was racist and
16 bigoted?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Now, in your report, you described that one
19 experienced detective reacted to Cameron's conduct
20 by "walking out of the room"?

21 A Yes.

22 Q Who was that experienced detective?

23 A Uhm, I think that I know who it was, but I would
24 have to check my notes before I'd want to throw it
25 out there, but I believe that I know who it was.

1 Q All right. Well, who do you currently believe it
2 was?

3 A I believe that it was Detective Jim Steinbach.

4 Q Okay. So, Jim Steinbach knew about this as well,
5 to your current recollection?

6 A Yes, I think that. It was a long time ago, so I
7 am trying my best to recall.

8 Q All right. And, and I have already taken you to
9 the passage where you say that every police
10 officer you interviewed for the review, who had
11 worked with Ms. Cameron from 1995 to late 2001,
12 gave statements that corroborated some or all of
13 the complaints.

14 A Yes.

15 Q Is that right?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Okay. So, here's, here's what I want to
18 establish. What we have here doesn't just consist
19 of mere allegations against Ms. Cameron, does it?

20 A No.

21 Q It's very decisive, persuasive evidence that Ms.
22 Cameron is biased and racist?

23 A Yes.

24 Q All right. Now, I note that at pages 211, 213,
25 214, 220 and 326 of your report, you describe

1 alleged conduct of Ms. Cameron.

2 A Yes.

3 Q You repeatedly refer to Ms. Cameron's conduct as
4 "alleged" rather than established as racist and
5 biased?

6 A Yes.

7 Q You never come out and say Ms. Cameron's conduct
8 was racist and biased?

9 A Hmm, I think my report spoke for itself and her
10 statement even corroborated those things. So, I'm
11 not sure what I was thinking when I wrote that.
12 And if, if you were to suggest that I should have
13 just taken that word out of there, I would be fine
14 with that.

15 Q All right. I, I, I don't want to have to take you
16 to each and every reference. So, I will just ask
17 you again, you never put in your report that Ms.
18 Cameron's conduct was racist and biased or
19 bigoted?

20 A Uhm, I don't know if I used those words. I think
21 that it was certainly implicit, and I did write
22 that her conduct was to significantly compromise
23 the investigation because of, uhm, how it affected
24 negatively the relationship with family members of
25 the missing women. I talked about that

1 repeatedly, about the damage that it did, that one
2 person could do so much damage really.

3 Q All right. So, you say, "Yes, I never wrote that
4 her conduct was racist, biased or bigoted in my
5 report"; isn't that correct?

6 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, what does it, what does it matter? He
7 said now she is, he believed she was rather, and
8 other people have said that she was. So, if you
9 are going to ask me at the end of the day to make
10 that finding, subject to what Mr. Hern says, it
11 may be something that I may have to conclude at
12 the end of the day. My point is, he's admitted
13 that. What does it matter if he said "alleged" on
14 a previous occasion?

15 MR. GRATL: All right. Well, I will just, I'll just show you,
16 Mr. Commissioner, what, what this witness actually
17 put in his official report released to the public.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

19 MR. GRATL: It's at page 213 of his report. It's at the bottom
20 right-hand corner, the last paragraph there. This
21 is how far this witness goes.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

23 MR. GRATL: Because it just stands in stark contrast with what
24 he's saying now.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: But isn't what he's saying now more

1 favourable to your position?

2 MR. GRATL: That's not the point, Mr. Commissioner. It's the
3 comparison that's important.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

5 MR. GRATL: If this witness has to be dragged kicking and
6 screaming into admissions that one of the civilian
7 staff members was biased and racist, that says
8 something about the institution for which he
9 speaks. That's the point I am making,
10 Mr. Commissioner.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: I guess it seems to me that there is ample
12 evidence from which I could draw that inference
13 again. Not, not that there was systemic racism.
14 I don't know about that. But the fact that she
15 was racist in some of the comments that she made,
16 of course, I will hear Mr. Hern's argument on
17 that, but I mean, there seems to be ample evidence
18 from other people who have said this, and that
19 evidence is there, so. All right.

20 MR. GRATL: All right.

21 Q So, Detective, or sorry, Deputy Chief, you write:
22 While it appears that Ms. Cameron's behaviour
23 was, in some instances, inappropriate and
24 prejudicial, and that this was particularly
25 detrimental to the reputation and

1 relationship with the families of the missing
2 women, the allegations do not sustain that
3 inference of systemic bias throughout the VPD
4 organization.

5 And I'll just -- my, my question doesn't, at
6 this juncture, relate to this question about
7 inferences of systemic bias. My question relates
8 to your characterization of Ms. Cameron's
9 behaviour as being, in some instances,
10 inappropriate and prejudicial. You will agree
11 with me that's a far cry from a finding of racism
12 and bias?

13 A Well --

14 Q And I am asking you what your explanation is for
15 not using language that accurately describes what
16 happened?

17 A Well, Mr. Commissioner, I think that my report
18 does describe what happened. The fact that I
19 quote so liberally from the statements of the
20 various people that worked in the office with her,
21 the fact that I write that her behaviour was
22 prejudicial, the fact that I write the damage that
23 she did to the relationship with the families.

24 So, I was trying not to beat individual
25 employees over the head, because I was more

1 focused on the organizational failings. So, yes,
2 I could have written it more strongly. I think
3 that it's, I think that it's pretty clear in my
4 report, by including the observations like you
5 have read to me, about everyone that worked with
6 her agreed with this, that her statement, putting
7 her statement which I think is consistent with
8 that.

9 Uhm, so, yes, you could suggest that I should
10 have written that more strongly and there are lots
11 of things that I second-guess myself about. But I
12 am not disagreeing with you that her behaviour was
13 unacceptable, and that there were instances of
14 racist, inappropriate behaviour.

15 I, I just -- the point of that paragraph was
16 that I don't think that we judge the whole
17 organization by the bad behaviour of this one
18 employee, who other employees recognized, like,
19 Sergeant Cooper and the internal investigation in
20 trying to deal with it, and obviously that failed.

21 Q There were more employees, but I will be getting
22 to them in due course.

23 Now, every officer you investigated knew
24 about Ms. Cameron's racist and bigoted behaviour,
25 but she wasn't removed until late 2001, was she?

1 A Every officer that I interviewed, not
2 investigated, uhm, who had dealt with her
3 personally, yes, that was true, and no, she did
4 not leave until 2001.

5 Q Okay. So that, even, I mean, she would be in a
6 position for longer than just 1995 to 2001,
7 correct?

8 A She was there before that, yes.

9 Q Can you tell me, how is it possible that a
10 civilian employee who engages in very well-known
11 bigoted and racist interactions with members of
12 the public is allowed to continue to interface
13 with the public?

14 A It's a fair question, and if you have ever been in
15 management in a unionized workforce, you would
16 know the challenges, but I am not suggesting that
17 it can't be dealt with and shouldn't be dealt
18 with.

19 Q You are saying you, you couldn't deal with this
20 racist bigot because it was a unionized
21 environment; is that your testimony?

22 A No. I'm saying that that makes it more
23 challenging, but I do believe that it is possible,
24 with effective supervision and management and
25 documentation and progressive discipline and so

1 on, to deal with inadequate employees, and clearly
2 that didn't happen.

3 Q So, if there is somebody that everybody knows
4 within the organization is racist and bigoted, but
5 nobody does anything about that for a period of
6 six years, can we say that you have acquiescence
7 to that racist and bigoted behaviour?

8 A Well, I am just going to disagree a little bit,
9 because you said no one does anything about it.
10 There were people that did try to do something
11 about it. Obviously, they failed.

12 Q All right. So, where is the -- you don't have any
13 documentation dealing with them?

14 A Uhm, I say there is reference to there being an
15 internal investigation. Even Ms. Cameron points
16 to that, I believe. But I didn't see that
17 documentation myself.

18 Q Did you look for it?

19 A Uhm, probably not.

20 Q Why not?

21 A Uhm, because I wasn't in doubt about, uhm, what
22 was being described to me, first of all; and
23 secondly, because there wasn't a problem by the
24 time that I became involved to deal with, where I
25 might have wanted to pursue that, for example, if

1 she was still working in what became my division,
2 uhm, but she was not anymore. She wasn't dealing
3 with the public at all.

4 Q Well, from what I can tell you, you have got two
5 problems here. One is, you have got a racist and
6 bigoted employee; and the second is that you've
7 got a management structure all the way up to the
8 chief constable that doesn't do anything about it.
9 Those are the two problems, correct?

10 A Well, I wouldn't agree that they didn't do
11 anything about it. Whatever they did was
12 inadequate --

13 Q All right, sir. Did you review and try to find
14 out about the inadequacies of the management
15 failure to remove Ms. Cameron for this long period
16 of time?

17 A No. That, that wasn't my focus.

18 Q But you agree that there's a second problem there,
19 not just Cameron's racism, but also a management
20 problem of failing to remove her, correct?

21 A I agree that there were some -- there was a lack
22 of management effectiveness in dealing with that
23 issue, I agree.

24 Q And you just decided not to, not to pursue that in
25 your investigation; is that correct?

1 A Yes. I had to decide what I was going to focus on
2 and what I was focusing on was the conduct of the
3 investigation and trying to put together a, a
4 really thorough timeline and then providing some
5 analysis on what I thought were the most key
6 issues. I agree that there were many other issues
7 that I could have focused on, uhm, and I had to
8 decide what was the most important.

9 Q Yes. So, in all the things that you had to
10 investigate, figuring out why management didn't
11 get rid of racist employees wasn't important
12 enough to investigate? That's what you're saying?

13 A Well, that's not what I'm saying.

14 Q Well, in the context of your investigation with
15 all the other things you had to pursue, the
16 reasons why management didn't get rid of a racist
17 employee wasn't important enough for you to
18 pursue?

19 A In all the circumstances, with the fact that she
20 was no longer in that position and that I was
21 writing a review about, which I agree, that that
22 issue was important, but the more important issue
23 to me was why an investigation into the murder of
24 missing women, that's what it turned out to be,
25 had failed, and why women had continued to be

1 murdered beyond the time at which I think there
2 was a reasonable chance of solving the case. So,
3 in relative terms, I think that the failed murder
4 investigation was more important, yes.

5 Q Well, wasn't it your job to figure out what the
6 connections were between potential bias and the
7 failed investigation?

8 A Well, I think that that is a worthy issue.

9 Q Well, how are you going to find that out if you
10 don't investigate the bias, Deputy Chief LePard?

11 A I was going to finish my answer. Uhm, I think
12 that that is a worthy issue for exploration, but
13 what I was focused on, I focused in a limited way
14 on that issue, to look at whether there was bias
15 that impacts on the quality of the investigation
16 when known violent crime against a sex trade
17 worker occurs. So, that was about as far as I
18 went.

19 If you suggest that there is more work to be
20 done on that, I don't disagree with you. But I
21 did have to decide where I was going to limit
22 myself.

23 Q All right. So, where you have decided to stop was
24 investigating senior management team members --

25 A Well, I --

1 Q -- for failure to remove racist employees?

2 A I think that any reasonable review of my report
3 would show that I did not go easy on members of
4 management right to the top.

5 Q Perhaps this is a good time to stop,
6 Mr. Commissioner.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: All right, we will adjourn.

8 THE REGISTRAR: This hearing is now adjourned for the day. It
9 will resume at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

10 MR. HERN: Mr. Commissioner, before we break for the day, there
11 is one document from Mr. Roberts's cross-
12 examination that wasn't entered, which is the
13 notes where Mr. Roberts had got, or asked Chief
14 Deputy LePard to conclude his answer, and he said
15 he had about five more minutes and then we agreed
16 that his notes would go in?

17 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

18 MR. HERN: And he had those -- he has those with him, and just
19 so they don't get misplaced or anything, I just
20 thought we should enter them now --

21 THE COMMISSIONER: All right. You are satisfied they should be
22 in?

23 MR. HERN: Well, I think so. They're the other half of his
24 answer.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, I see.

1 MR. HERN: He has to have an opportunity to finish.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: All right.

3 MR. HERN: So, if we could -- shall we put those as an
4 identification? I don't --

5 THE REGISTRAR: Do you want to, do you want do that in the
6 morning? And then Mr. Roberts may have an
7 opportunity to respond to anything with respect to
8 that.

9 MR. HERN: All right. Well, perhaps you, Mr. Giles, could take
10 the notes from the witness. I haven't reviewed
11 them, so I don't know whether they should be in a
12 letter or in numbers. And I haven't --

13 THE REGISTRAR: Okay. Well, I will hold them until the
14 morning.

15 MR. HERN: All right, thank you.

16 THE REGISTRAR: And then you can deal with them first thing in
17 the morning.

18 MR. HERN: All right.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

20 THE REGISTRAR: This hearing is now adjourned.

21 **(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 4:05 P.M.)**

22

23

24

25

Reporter's certificate

1 I hereby certify the foregoing
2 to be a true and accurate
3 transcription of the proceedings
4 herein to the best of my skill
5 and ability.
6
7
8

9 Gabriele Heise, RPR
10 Official Reporter, BCSRA No. 399
11 Realtime Certified Reporter
12 United Reporting Service Ltd.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

INDEX OF PROCEEDINGS

	PAGE NO.
Proceedings	1
DOUGLAS A. LEPARD (for the Commission)	
Continued cross-examination by Mr. Roberts	2
Proceedings	137
Cross-examination by Mr. Gratl	140
Proceedings	185
Reporter's certificate	186

EXHIBITS

NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
(EXHIBIT NO. H FOR IDENTIFICATION:	Binder of documents containing Tabs 1 to 7, and entitled "Documents for the Cross-examination of Deputy Chief Douglas LePard")	137
(EXHIBIT NO. I FOR IDENTIFICATION:	Document entitled "Report on the Cariboo-Chilcotin Justice Inquiry")	137
(EXHIBIT NO. J FOR IDENTIFICATION:	Cerlox-bound set of documents consisting of 271 pages)	140

<p>'62 [1] - 126:19</p> <p>'97 [22] - 4:14, 12:17, 12:24, 13:15, 15:3, 16:12, 17:1, 17:3, 17:6, 21:6, 30:25, 32:17, 35:10, 39:14, 76:13, 86:19, 87:5, 87:8, 88:16, 89:5, 90:11, 90:20</p> <p>'98 [9] - 10:12, 10:13, 10:14, 19:19, 31:5, 31:7, 76:14, 77:3, 131:11</p> <p>'99 [2] - 31:8, 131:11</p>	<p>1995 [3] - 147:3, 173:11, 179:6</p> <p>1997 [15] - 4:14, 12:19, 13:10, 16:10, 28:17, 28:20, 31:5, 38:10, 42:21, 68:7, 68:11, 90:4, 90:11, 91:12, 93:5</p> <p>1998 [22] - 5:20, 5:23, 10:18, 20:9, 23:9, 75:22, 78:15, 88:23, 94:1, 101:20, 101:25, 102:13, 112:18, 113:5, 114:18, 117:14, 117:17, 119:15, 120:8, 148:10, 148:20, 160:7</p> <p>1999 [19] - 6:2, 10:11, 20:5, 31:6, 64:23, 65:1, 66:14, 76:12, 76:14, 77:25, 78:3, 78:8, 86:16, 96:25, 101:20, 102:2, 104:4, 119:15, 120:8</p> <p>19th [3] - 155:7, 155:15, 157:5</p>	<p>109:2</p> <p>24 [3] - 86:10, 87:14, 151:20</p> <p>24-hour [1] - 87:13</p> <p>25 [2] - 15:17</p> <p>26 [1] - 59:24</p> <p>26th [1] - 165:7</p> <p>27 [2] - 16:6, 77:3</p> <p>271 [4] - 139:22, 140:3, 140:8, 2:13</p> <p>279(1 [1] - 3:12</p> <p>28 [2] - 1:2, 16:16</p> <p>281 [1] - 145:24</p> <p>28th/'11 [1] - 27:18</p> <p>296 [6] - 106:15, 106:16, 106:21, 111:12, 111:25, 112:1</p> <p>2:04 [1] - 101:9</p> <p>2nd [1] - 75:22</p>	<p>26:19, 26:23, 26:24, 72:4, 103:19</p> <p>50 [5] - 122:5, 122:11, 122:22, 130:24, 131:7</p> <p>500 [1] - 97:5</p> <p>5th [3] - 58:19, 164:12, 168:6</p>	<p>abrasive [1] - 147:9</p> <p>abrupt [1] - 168:14</p> <p>absence [2] - 11:12, 89:17</p> <p>absent [4] - 97:21, 97:24, 99:5</p> <p>absolute [1] - 73:2</p> <p>absolutely [6] - 41:4, 41:25, 55:2, 85:13, 95:8, 135:14</p> <p>abuse [1] - 133:1</p> <p>accelerate [1] - 115:7</p> <p>accelerated [1] - 119:17</p> <p>accept [8] - 26:3, 45:19, 46:6, 54:17, 57:6, 80:7, 122:13, 154:12</p> <p>acceptance [1] - 121:13</p> <p>accepted [4] - 52:3, 103:20, 108:10, 162:2</p> <p>access [1] - 153:14</p> <p>accidents [1] - 74:18</p> <p>accomplice [1] - 45:23</p> <p>accordance [1] - 3:11</p> <p>according [5] - 4:16, 31:10, 44:12, 55:23, 117:3</p> <p>accordingly [1] - 147:21</p> <p>accountability [2] - 153:15, 153:19</p> <p>accountable [1] - 153:8</p> <p>accounted [3] - 76:5, 115:5, 115:6</p> <p>accounts [1] - 121:9</p> <p>accredited [1] - 94:25</p> <p>accuracy [4] - 164:25, 165:2, 168:21, 169:11</p> <p>accurate [2] - 154:1, 186:2</p> <p>accurately [1] - 177:15</p> <p>accused [2] - 46:13, 57:10</p> <p>acknowledge [1] - 122:18</p> <p>acquiescence [1] - 180:6</p> <p>acquired [1] - 20:4</p> <p>acquittal [1] - 73:7</p> <p>act [9] - 45:17, 46:6, 50:20, 53:7, 53:18, 56:7, 56:17, 57:5, 63:7</p>
1	2	3	6	
1 [5] - 101:13, 137:2, 148:13, 1:4, 2:6	2 [5] - 3:14, 75:23, 101:7, 165:16, 1:6	3 [8] - 34:8, 73:13, 75:25, 76:23, 101:17, 154:13, 154:14, 164:13	6 [7] - 2:17, 27:24, 72:4, 104:21, 155:3, 155:4, 155:8	
10 [5] - 3:9, 24:25, 39:17, 119:24, 184:9	20 [2] - 78:16, 152:25	31 [3] - 23:5, 23:6, 23:24	6th [1] - 5:8	
10:05 [1] - 1:3	2000 [2] - 72:17, 81:15	312 [1] - 149:14		
11 [3] - 129:9, 130:20, 164:11	2001 [6] - 134:8, 147:4, 173:11, 178:25, 179:4, 179:6	31st [1] - 66:14	7 [5] - 5:10, 15:17, 137:2, 138:2, 2:6	
1140 [1] - 23:9	2002 [9] - 5:8, 58:19, 112:17, 112:19, 130:21, 155:7, 155:15, 157:5, 168:23	32 [3] - 17:10, 25:16, 134:6	71 [2] - 76:6, 115:4	
11:11 [1] - 52:17	2002/02/06 [1] - 5:15	326 [1] - 173:25	727 [3] - 34:9, 34:11, 39:4	
11:30 [1] - 52:18	2003 [1] - 164:12	36 [3] - 27:22, 124:13, 133:7		
12 [1] - 164:13	2004 [2] - 165:8, 168:6	37 [3] - 27:22, 28:2, 28:25	8 [2] - 23:6, 110:17	
12:30 [1] - 79:15	2009 [1] - 41:25	399 [1] - 186:10		
12:32 [1] - 101:8	2011 [1] - 1:2	3:11 [1] - 154:24	8	
13 [3] - 64:1, 120:1, 165:6	211 [1] - 173:24	3:28 [1] - 154:25	9	
137 [3] - 1:7, 2:5, 2:9	212 [2] - 145:25, 146:24		911 [2] - 150:21, 153:10	
14 [1] - 118:14	213 [2] - 173:24, 175:19	4	97 [1] - 28:16	
140 [2] - 1:8, 2:12	214 [1] - 173:25	4 [1] - 102:18	9th [1] - 148:20	
14th [1] - 23:8	22 [2] - 14:25, 169:14	40 [1] - 64:2		
15 [3] - 52:16, 117:16, 154:23	220 [1] - 173:25	42 [1] - 75:7	A	
150 [1] - 117:4	23 [4] - 4:14, 12:19, 15:9, 68:10	45 [2] - 110:16, 110:17	A.M [3] - 1:3, 52:17, 52:18	
15th [3] - 8:19, 23:12, 168:23	231(5)(e [4] - 46:18, 103:13, 106:12,	47 [1] - 127:20	abandoned [1] - 103:25	
16 [2] - 117:16, 168:5		487 [2] - 3:15, 82:10	ability [1] - 186:5	
18 [3] - 101:13, 129:10		487(1 [1] - 3:5	able [10] - 3:3, 16:8, 61:11, 73:9, 79:14, 80:7, 82:5, 89:16, 91:24, 154:3	
185 [1] - 1:9		4:05 [1] - 185:21	aboriginal [20] - 101:2, 122:3, 122:6, 122:12, 122:13, 122:24, 123:3, 123:4, 123:15, 123:16, 123:24, 125:25, 126:17, 126:23, 130:7, 133:25, 144:1, 166:7, 166:16, 166:17	
186 [1] - 1:10		5		
1860s [1] - 127:6		5 [11] - 2:17, 3:7, 4:1, 4:22, 7:15, 12:10,		
18th [1] - 8:18				
19 [3] - 13:5, 101:13, 130:21				
1961 [1] - 126:19				
1973 [1] - 126:22				
198-page [1] - 67:11				
1990 [2] - 126:24, 151:1				
1991 [2] - 22:25, 151:1				
1994 [1] - 72:17				

<p>acting ^[1] - 171:11</p> <p>actively ^[2] - 132:9, 164:17</p> <p>actual ^[8] - 21:5, 25:16, 27:1, 58:13, 60:5, 60:23, 62:14, 81:8</p> <p>add ^[1] - 106:14</p> <p>added ^[1] - 27:18</p> <p>addicted ^[1] - 123:9</p> <p>addicts ^[2] - 118:4, 123:11</p> <p>adding ^[1] - 3:24</p> <p>addition ^[1] - 108:6</p> <p>additional ^[3] - 49:25, 70:12, 99:7</p> <p>additionally ^[1] - 16:13</p> <p>address ^[4] - 3:20, 44:12, 52:12, 122:2</p> <p>adequate ^[2] - 64:20, 114:5</p> <p>adjourn ^[1] - 184:7</p> <p>ADJOURNED ^[4] - 52:17, 101:8, 154:24, 185:21</p> <p>adjourned ^[3] - 101:7, 184:8, 185:20</p> <p>administration ^[1] - 51:1</p> <p>administrative ^[2] - 31:22, 133:10</p> <p>admissions ^[1] - 176:6</p> <p>admits ^[1] - 28:6</p> <p>admitted ^[1] - 175:12</p> <p>adopt ^[2] - 156:7, 156:14</p> <p>adopted ^[5] - 142:2, 142:4, 142:17, 145:2, 157:7</p> <p>adopting ^[2] - 145:1, 145:10</p> <p>adoption ^[1] - 145:14</p> <p>advance ^[3] - 92:19, 114:20, 115:8</p> <p>advantage ^[1] - 59:13</p> <p>adverse ^[1] - 105:17</p> <p>advice ^[6] - 5:9, 70:24, 71:6, 72:21, 147:17, 163:13</p> <p>advise ^[1] - 136:19</p> <p>advised ^[2] - 15:11, 135:16</p> <p>advocate ^[1] - 106:4</p> <p>advocated ^[1] - 97:20</p> <p>advocating ^[1] - 98:10</p> <p>affect ^[2] - 128:21, 170:12</p> <p>affected ^[2] - 139:16,</p>	<p>174:23</p> <p>affidavit ^[27] - 4:1, 4:4, 5:1, 5:7, 5:12, 5:13, 5:19, 6:7, 6:8, 6:13, 6:15, 6:16, 7:2, 12:6, 18:9, 19:3, 20:20, 23:2, 25:16, 26:1, 27:20, 27:24, 29:16, 29:24, 30:1, 30:4, 30:8</p> <p>affirmation ^[1] - 6:1</p> <p>agencies ^[1] - 40:20</p> <p>agency ^[6] - 40:19, 42:22, 47:7, 47:17, 61:2, 90:1</p> <p>ago ^[6] - 24:13, 66:2, 127:5, 137:10, 152:25, 173:6</p> <p>agree ^[62] - 9:13, 9:23, 11:22, 11:24, 12:3, 21:8, 24:16, 24:17, 24:18, 30:8, 32:14, 33:5, 38:8, 38:19, 39:1, 40:2, 42:18, 44:17, 44:23, 47:17, 51:10, 53:4, 54:13, 65:5, 78:17, 79:17, 81:8, 83:21, 84:22, 85:12, 85:22, 86:6, 87:10, 89:21, 89:23, 90:6, 91:3, 92:4, 93:2, 96:14, 98:9, 109:17, 109:20, 110:9, 114:16, 115:6, 119:16, 130:10, 133:2, 133:5, 134:3, 143:7, 143:21, 154:21, 161:25, 177:10, 181:10, 181:18, 181:21, 181:23, 182:6, 182:21</p> <p>agreed ^[7] - 35:11, 35:25, 56:20, 119:1, 161:24, 178:6, 184:15</p> <p>agreement ^[2] - 36:2, 43:23</p> <p>agrees ^[1] - 142:11</p> <p>ahead ^[5] - 88:12, 99:24, 124:24, 145:12, 145:22</p> <p>aid ^[1] - 2:22</p> <p>aide ^[4] - 2:21, 3:6, 4:2, 72:6</p> <p>AI ^[1] - 163:18</p> <p>alerted ^[2] - 7:25, 8:1</p> <p>Alex ^[1] - 115:22</p> <p>alive ^[4] - 117:5, 117:6, 123:22</p>	<p>ALL ^[1] - 102:19</p> <p>allegation ^[1] - 41:2</p> <p>allegations ^[11] - 107:20, 112:9, 133:9, 135:12, 147:19, 148:4, 153:24, 153:25, 164:7, 173:19, 177:2</p> <p>alleged ^[9] - 3:16, 18:8, 40:6, 48:20, 127:21, 154:5, 174:1, 174:4, 175:13</p> <p>alleges ^[1] - 75:7</p> <p>alleging ^[1] - 41:15</p> <p>allow ^[2] - 104:6, 144:24</p> <p>allowed ^[3] - 17:1, 160:21, 179:12</p> <p>almost ^[4] - 36:18, 66:11, 73:22, 156:1</p> <p>alone ^[2] - 6:3, 62:16</p> <p>altered ^[1] - 103:4</p> <p>alternatives ^[1] - 89:2</p> <p>Alzheimer's ^[1] - 74:1</p> <p>amazed ^[1] - 164:1</p> <p>amend ^[2] - 3:23, 26:17</p> <p>American ^[1] - 74:25</p> <p>amount ^[3] - 76:18, 116:21, 118:24</p> <p>ample ^[2] - 176:11, 176:17</p> <p>analysis ^[8] - 59:18, 78:2, 78:7, 92:24, 104:6, 107:8, 110:20, 182:5</p> <p>anger ^[1] - 135:11</p> <p>angle ^[1] - 58:11</p> <p>angry ^[6] - 75:12, 135:7, 135:9, 135:21, 135:23, 136:6</p> <p>answer ^[20] - 8:13, 45:5, 49:9, 49:17, 51:2, 51:8, 59:19, 80:9, 82:21, 91:25, 99:15, 99:19, 99:24, 100:1, 100:22, 111:13, 111:23, 183:11, 184:14, 184:24</p> <p>answered ^[2] - 107:16, 145:20</p> <p>answering ^[2] - 45:2, 49:2</p> <p>Anthony ^[4] - 126:11, 129:1, 129:21, 137:5</p> <p>anticipate ^[1] - 45:1</p> <p>anticipated ^[2] - 34:5, 35:3</p>	<p>anyway ^[3] - 124:24, 152:19, 154:21</p> <p>apologize ^[2] - 124:24, 136:6</p> <p>apologized ^[3] - 110:5, 110:24, 111:3</p> <p>apologizing ^[1] - 136:1</p> <p>appalling ^[1] - 114:5</p> <p>Appeal ^[4] - 45:24, 59:22, 62:14, 62:18</p> <p>appeal ^[1] - 62:21</p> <p>appearance ^[4] - 53:7, 53:10, 53:19, 114:1</p> <p>appeared ^[3] - 71:22, 78:2, 116:7</p> <p>appearing ^[2] - 1:14, 2:4</p> <p>appendices ^[1] - 138:19</p> <p>Appendix ^[5] - 5:21, 7:2, 23:5, 73:14, 75:23</p> <p>appendix ^[1] - 77:1</p> <p>application ^[20] - 3:3, 3:4, 3:7, 3:13, 6:6, 6:19, 26:20, 27:1, 29:24, 32:19, 37:7, 37:8, 37:11, 40:1, 72:7, 72:15, 81:4, 81:14, 85:7, 92:9</p> <p>applications ^[1] - 81:12</p> <p>apply ^[1] - 82:11</p> <p>appointed ^[2] - 126:21, 126:24</p> <p>apportion ^[1] - 110:8</p> <p>appreciate ^[6] - 49:3, 51:12, 80:13, 81:19, 82:2, 146:5</p> <p>approach ^[2] - 58:11, 84:18</p> <p>approaching ^[2] - 84:23, 93:15</p> <p>appropriate ^[11] - 40:3, 54:14, 68:13, 93:2, 107:7, 107:14, 112:4, 118:11, 119:19, 154:16, 161:22</p> <p>appropriately ^[1] - 110:12</p> <p>approval ^[1] - 56:11</p> <p>approve ^[2] - 58:23, 168:9</p> <p>approved ^[4] - 40:22, 56:13, 57:17, 59:6</p> <p>April ^[1] - 168:6</p> <p>area ^[1] - 158:5</p> <p>areas ^[1] - 113:21</p>	<p>argue ^[1] - 58:2</p> <p>argued ^[2] - 4:5, 38:5</p> <p>argument ^[2] - 104:20, 176:16</p> <p>Arizona ^[1] - 76:14</p> <p>arose ^[1] - 85:23</p> <p>arrest ^[6] - 55:21, 86:21, 87:13, 88:14, 89:6, 90:21</p> <p>arresting ^[4] - 86:10, 87:12, 87:21, 88:8</p> <p>arrive ^[1] - 149:17</p> <p>arrogance ^[1] - 129:15</p> <p>arrow ^[2] - 26:21, 27:14</p> <p>articles ^[1] - 29:3</p> <p>Asian ^[1] - 158:18</p> <p>aspect ^[5] - 55:16, 57:2, 58:15, 63:19, 127:22</p> <p>aspects ^[2] - 38:17, 45:23</p> <p>assault ^[2] - 120:4, 120:15</p> <p>assaulted ^[1] - 75:15</p> <p>assemble ^[1] - 136:19</p> <p>assert ^[3] - 29:21, 75:2, 104:1</p> <p>asserted ^[3] - 73:17, 74:8, 83:8</p> <p>asserting ^[2] - 6:21, 85:10</p> <p>assertion ^[4] - 73:14, 74:4, 75:4, 75:18</p> <p>asserts ^[1] - 76:23</p> <p>assess ^[1] - 161:20</p> <p>assessing ^[1] - 123:12</p> <p>assessment ^[3] - 121:5, 171:5, 171:18</p> <p>assigned ^[8] - 68:22, 114:19, 115:19, 115:20, 125:18, 141:19, 142:8, 161:10</p> <p>assist ^[2] - 71:24, 106:3</p> <p>assistance ^[3] - 30:1, 42:24, 70:1</p> <p>assistant ^[1] - 31:22</p> <p>assisted ^[1] - 126:1</p> <p>associated ^[4] - 11:25, 12:4, 28:12, 126:6</p> <p>associating ^[2] - 63:22, 63:23</p> <p>association ^[1] - 28:9</p> <p>associations ^[1] - 12:2</p> <p>assume ^[13] - 7:7, 16:23, 29:24, 43:22,</p>
--	--	--	--	--

51:3, 68:7, 68:10, 68:13, 70:10, 72:6, 88:2, 90:14, 158:17 assuming [5] - 50:1, 81:12, 87:6, 87:24, 138:11 assumption [1] - 23:19 assumptions [3] - 17:15, 24:3, 25:18 AT [8] - 1:3, 52:17, 52:18, 101:8, 101:9, 154:24, 154:25, 185:21 attached [3] - 17:24, 25:24, 33:7 attack [7] - 21:6, 30:25, 32:16, 36:8, 38:10, 42:20, 71:20 attacked [2] - 69:11, 69:16 attempt [1] - 17:6 attempted [7] - 4:13, 4:14, 12:19, 15:22, 17:5, 69:20, 90:3 attempts [2] - 109:6, 109:10 attend [1] - 149:21 attention [5] - 53:13, 109:6, 111:20, 126:9, 141:12 attitude [2] - 79:5, 147:15 attributed [1] - 171:12 August [7] - 10:10, 10:13, 10:18, 77:3, 78:15, 101:19, 101:24 author [1] - 108:21 authority [2] - 104:1, 108:13 available [7] - 4:4, 4:11, 19:13, 70:23, 71:2, 84:1, 118:16 avenues [1] - 105:3 avoid [2] - 146:7, 146:15 aware [4] - 61:24, 91:14, 129:24, 139:8 awareness [5] - 128:7, 158:14, 171:6, 171:13, 171:22 awful [3] - 157:17, 157:20, 157:24 awfully [1] - 84:15 awkward [1] - 131:20	<div>B</div> background [2] - 6:9, 126:14 bad [5] - 130:8, 131:24, 134:2, 150:12, 178:17 badly [1] - 83:9 bag [3] - 17:21, 24:7, 25:21 bar [1] - 126:19 bargain [4] - 22:12, 35:11, 35:25, 69:14 bargains [1] - 37:4 barrier [1] - 160:11 based [5] - 38:11, 51:7, 83:14, 92:10, 102:7 basics [1] - 81:16 BASIL [1] - 130:4 basis [18] - 35:12, 38:12, 38:22, 40:13, 65:24, 67:6, 73:15, 74:12, 74:13, 81:13, 86:20, 87:12, 92:8, 92:12, 95:25, 99:1, 99:9, 132:14 Bates [1] - 155:10 Baynham [1] - 2:5 BC [3] - 1:1, 19:19, 19:20 BCSRA [1] - 186:10 bear [2] - 56:5, 105:5 bearing [1] - 30:4 beat [1] - 177:24 beats [1] - 36:14 became [4] - 22:18, 38:24, 180:24, 181:1 become [4] - 38:12, 83:19, 92:8, 157:13 becomes [3] - 38:1, 38:2 beforehand [1] - 35:20 began [3] - 41:20, 78:1, 110:20 Begbie [1] - 127:5 begin [2] - 54:10, 145:24 beginning [6] - 33:4, 34:15, 96:24, 106:20, 116:3, 134:7 begins [6] - 23:21, 34:20, 46:11, 53:1, 106:23, 157:16 behalf [4] - 1:12, 2:5, 110:5, 141:24 behaviour [11] - 167:5, 172:7,	172:15, 176:22, 177:9, 177:21, 178:12, 178:14, 178:17, 178:24, 180:7 beings [1] - 113:25 belief [3] - 76:4, 77:24, 116:11 believable [1] - 78:18 believes [3] - 17:23, 25:23, 33:11 belly [1] - 36:17 belonging [1] - 13:15 below [1] - 59:23 benchmark [2] - 38:1, 126:16 benefit [1] - 34:7 beside [1] - 27:17 best [8] - 50:25, 97:25, 98:6, 125:23, 144:12, 146:15, 173:7, 186:4 better [22] - 13:21, 57:18, 63:4, 63:10, 97:12, 97:13, 97:20, 97:22, 97:23, 98:8, 98:9, 105:4, 105:23, 106:4, 110:6, 110:7, 125:21, 129:20, 131:25 between [15] - 18:18, 39:8, 40:5, 57:14, 79:10, 117:21, 117:24, 123:23, 124:5, 126:16, 127:1, 128:12, 128:22, 163:20, 183:6 Bev [2] - 25:6, 31:21 beyond [5] - 18:11, 81:3, 144:10, 150:12, 183:1 bias [25] - 127:21, 128:1, 133:9, 141:7, 141:8, 143:8, 143:14, 143:22, 143:25, 144:4, 144:7, 144:10, 144:13, 144:19, 144:20, 146:10, 148:13, 154:15, 154:17, 177:3, 177:7, 177:12, 183:6, 183:10, 183:14 biased [7] - 147:13, 173:22, 174:5, 174:8, 174:18, 175:4, 176:7 Biddlecombe [1] -	148:18 Biddlecombe's [1] - 78:4 big [1] - 130:22 bigger [1] - 159:17 biggest [1] - 66:22 bigot [1] - 179:20 bigoted [11] - 172:1, 172:6, 172:9, 172:16, 174:19, 175:4, 178:24, 179:11, 180:4, 180:7, 181:6 biker [1] - 28:8 binder [9] - 2:13, 5:10, 34:8, 130:21, 136:18, 137:1, 139:20, 2:5 binge [1] - 73:25 bit [17] - 5:9, 22:9, 56:21, 57:20, 83:12, 114:7, 114:8, 114:15, 118:9, 122:22, 126:1, 126:13, 146:16, 150:11, 155:12, 157:12, 180:8 bitterness [4] - 127:11, 127:12, 129:6, 129:7 blame [1] - 110:8 blood [3] - 13:12, 16:12, 17:2 bloody [6] - 3:19, 7:6, 17:21, 24:8, 25:21, 27:9 blueprint [1] - 38:2 Blythe [6] - 165:7, 165:10, 165:18, 166:4, 166:23, 167:3 Blythe's [1] - 165:17 Board [1] - 142:4 boating [1] - 74:18 bodies [2] - 74:16, 97:17 body [3] - 32:11, 97:10, 116:9 book [9] - 126:8, 126:9, 126:10, 126:14, 140:12, 141:7, 148:13, 154:15, 154:19 book" [2] - 141:2, 154:17 bordering [1] - 129:16 borrows [1] - 5:6 bother [1] - 161:3 bothered [1] - 118:6 bottom [11] - 13:7, 23:18, 23:22, 26:21,	27:3, 27:14, 34:9, 39:4, 112:1, 157:14, 175:19 bound [4] - 139:24, 140:1, 140:7, 2:12 brackets [2] - 27:15, 108:2 break [4] - 52:14, 131:22, 154:22, 184:10 breakfast [1] - 163:16 Brian [1] - 166:6 bridge [1] - 74:15 brief [2] - 67:11, 67:14 bring [3] - 119:20, 123:13, 164:2 bringing [2] - 66:4, 119:6 British [1] - 129:19 broader [1] - 144:9 Brooks [1] - 138:24 brothers [1] - 129:23 brought [5] - 29:25, 63:24, 105:5, 120:7, 126:9 Bryan [1] - 2:5 budget [2] - 52:8, 58:21 build [3] - 84:5, 84:8, 84:11 building [2] - 38:20, 138:15 Burna [1] - 51:21 Burnaby [3] - 42:2, 42:5, 42:9 BY [2] - 2:10, 140:23
	<div>C</div> Caldwell [3] - 6:1, 31:3, 86:16 Cameron [37] - 122:11, 130:16, 130:22, 131:14, 132:8, 134:20, 146:25, 147:3, 147:8, 148:22, 149:5, 149:7, 157:20, 157:24, 158:3, 159:6, 160:4, 160:19, 162:12, 162:22, 164:15, 166:11, 167:3, 167:4, 167:13, 169:3, 169:7, 169:10, 169:15, 171:5, 172:5, 173:11, 173:19, 173:22, 174:1,			

<p>180:15, 181:15 Cameron's ^[1] - 164:14, 171:3, 172:19, 174:3, 174:7, 174:18, 176:22, 177:8, 178:24, 181:19 Campbell ^[2] - 126:20, 126:23 Canada ^[6] - 3:13, 34:10, 37:16, 46:17, 62:19, 158:20 Canadian ^[2] - 13:14, 28:11 Cancer ^[2] - 19:19, 19:20 cannot ^[3] - 75:8, 75:10, 75:19 Canyon ^[1] - 117:24 capable ^[1] - 49:2 capacity ^[1] - 117:1 capital ^[1] - 102:20 capture ^[4] - 55:6, 114:6, 116:22, 117:6 capturing ^[1] - 117:2 car ^[5] - 22:12, 35:11, 35:25, 37:24, 42:1 care ^[3] - 31:16, 88:23, 125:18 careful ^[4] - 81:17, 81:20, 85:19, 86:8 carefully ^[1] - 85:14 Cariboo ^[10] - 126:12, 127:1, 127:24, 128:8, 128:13, 128:17, 128:20, 128:23, 137:22, 2:10 Cariboo-Chilcotin ^[9] - 126:12, 127:24, 128:8, 128:13, 128:17, 128:20, 128:23, 137:22, 2:10 carried ^[1] - 88:2 carries ^[1] - 88:3 Casanova ^[1] - 61:16 case ^[30] - 4:17, 7:17, 9:20, 12:19, 31:12, 35:7, 37:16, 45:21, 45:22, 46:2, 48:4, 50:18, 55:3, 61:20, 64:13, 69:4, 69:5, 73:22, 74:20, 76:5, 76:8, 84:11, 88:10, 89:16, 97:18, 100:17, 120:16, 125:17, 134:13, 183:2 cases ^[7] - 11:20, 22:16, 55:19, 69:3, 82:14, 120:18, 161:5</p>	<p>cast ^[1] - 34:14 Cater ^[2] - 5:14, 29:7 Cater's ^[2] - 29:10, 29:12 caused ^[15] - 43:25, 44:1, 44:7, 46:9, 46:19, 47:23, 49:24, 50:5, 50:15, 63:8, 72:10, 103:13, 104:11, 105:12, 166:1 causes ^[1] - 76:17 caveat ^[1] - 138:9 central ^[2] - 106:24, 107:3 Centre ^[2] - 19:20, 161:16 centre ^[2] - 149:2, 151:4 cerlox ^[4] - 139:24, 140:1, 140:7, 2:12 cerlox-bound ^[3] - 140:1, 140:7, 2:12 certain ^[4] - 9:25, 33:10, 63:23, 63:24 certainly ^[23] - 10:11, 32:24, 38:13, 40:17, 47:3, 51:24, 56:10, 64:6, 64:18, 69:3, 78:23, 81:15, 93:21, 94:18, 96:24, 111:2, 111:6, 126:5, 135:12, 149:8, 156:23, 167:24, 174:21 certificate ^[1] - 1:10 certified ^[2] - 5:7, 5:16 Certified ^[1] - 186:11 certify ^[1] - 186:1 cetera ^[1] - 132:20 chairman ^[1] - 98:15 challenges ^[4] - 93:19, 116:6, 118:25, 179:16 challenging ^[6] - 51:14, 64:13, 97:10, 97:15, 97:18, 179:23 chance ^[4] - 51:8, 139:3, 156:18, 183:2 change ^[1] - 98:7 changed ^[7] - 5:22, 74:22, 76:16, 97:14, 103:3, 142:23 changes ^[2] - 5:22, 110:22 Chantler ^[1] - 122:10 chapter ^[2] - 108:7, 110:17 characterization ^[2] - 11:23, 177:8</p>	<p>characterize ^[3] - 99:19, 120:25, 121:16 characterized ^[2] - 109:22, 109:23 charge ^[35] - 16:1, 37:22, 50:4, 50:10, 50:13, 50:16, 50:23, 51:2, 51:3, 52:9, 56:2, 56:11, 56:15, 57:10, 58:24, 62:15, 64:5, 69:16, 70:12, 87:3, 87:13, 90:2, 90:19, 91:11, 92:11, 92:17, 92:21, 93:7, 94:10, 115:17, 148:17, 148:19, 150:23, 150:25 charged ^[6] - 50:7, 50:21, 55:22, 56:4, 107:6, 131:7 charges ^[14] - 40:22, 56:12, 58:14, 59:2, 59:3, 59:5, 59:6, 59:24, 60:19, 61:5, 63:12, 90:18, 107:20, 112:9 charging ^[4] - 61:6, 69:19, 92:7, 92:25 chasm ^[1] - 117:23 check ^[11] - 8:21, 9:14, 20:4, 71:13, 125:1, 163:8, 163:12, 165:15, 167:18, 167:24, 172:24 checked ^[2] - 16:13, 132:16 checking ^[1] - 132:14 Chernoff ^[1] - 97:1 Chief ^[25] - 2:7, 46:2, 56:25, 110:13, 113:7, 130:1, 137:4, 140:21, 141:9, 142:7, 142:13, 143:7, 145:7, 155:3, 165:10, 165:11, 165:16, 165:17, 166:4, 166:23, 167:3, 176:21, 183:10, 184:13, 2:7 chief ^[8] - 58:4, 69:2, 141:10, 142:24, 143:6, 166:2, 181:8 chiefs ^[4] - 127:4, 142:7, 142:22, 142:25 Chilcotin ^[9] - 126:12, 127:24, 128:8, 128:13, 128:17,</p>	<p>128:20, 128:23, 137:22, 2:10 children ^[1] - 127:13 Chinnock ^[1] - 22:19 Chinnock's ^[1] - 66:11 chose ^[3] - 156:20, 159:19 chronic ^[1] - 160:25 Chu ^[2] - 142:13, 142:24 circle ^[1] - 26:21 circulated ^[1] - 139:21 circumstance ^[1] - 79:2 circumstances ^[10] - 16:24, 41:11, 54:5, 66:7, 71:22, 74:22, 75:6, 79:2, 92:23, 182:19 circumvent ^[1] - 159:7 citing ^[1] - 77:16 City ^[1] - 95:21 civilian ^[6] - 125:4, 133:14, 134:19, 134:20, 176:6, 179:10 claims ^[1] - 77:1 Claire ^[1] - 1:12 clarified ^[1] - 99:12 clarify ^[1] - 145:10 Clarke ^[1] - 115:22 clean ^[5] - 14:7, 14:8, 17:18, 24:6, 25:19 clear ^[11] - 6:14, 43:6, 71:22, 79:11, 111:9, 119:8, 120:1, 120:9, 136:9, 157:17, 178:3 clearly ^[7] - 58:22, 62:9, 76:9, 77:9, 121:21, 131:20, 180:1 clerk ^[1] - 131:16 CLEU ^[1] - 85:20 clients ^[1] - 122:11 clinic ^[1] - 19:13 close ^[9] - 2:25, 36:19, 39:25, 40:4, 40:8, 59:25, 122:21, 134:6, 156:4 close-to-verbatim ^[1] - 156:4 closer ^[1] - 40:9 clothing ^[9] - 3:19, 7:6, 17:21, 24:8, 25:21, 27:10, 27:15, 29:3, 36:20 clothing" ^[1] - 26:22 club ^[1] - 36:14 co ^[1] - 7:17 Co ^[1] - 7:19</p>	<p>co-counsel ^[1] - 7:17 cocaine ^[5] - 14:15, 14:16, 16:11, 17:5, 18:16 Code ^[10] - 3:5, 3:12, 34:10, 46:17, 81:7, 81:18, 82:9, 103:14, 106:12, 109:2 coffee ^[1] - 163:16 cohesive ^[1] - 156:6 coincidence ^[1] - 35:4 collaborate ^[1] - 47:4 collaborating ^[1] - 98:12 collaboration ^[2] - 47:6, 89:1 collated ^[1] - 104:5 colleague ^[2] - 122:20, 126:9 collection ^[1] - 29:13 Columbia ^[1] - 129:19 column ^[6] - 106:16, 106:20, 112:1, 133:7, 134:7, 146:24 combination ^[1] - 62:17 combined ^[1] - 55:10 comfortable ^[1] - 58:7 coming ^[12] - 7:12, 8:4, 11:8, 12:12, 45:6, 64:24, 96:16, 121:13, 130:7, 132:22, 154:19, 171:17 Comm ^[1] - 161:16 command ^[1] - 116:24 commanders ^[1] - 94:25 commenced ^[1] - 110:15 commencing ^[1] - 41:1 comment ^[1] - 137:24 comments ^[6] - 23:18, 25:12, 73:10, 134:18, 144:4, 176:15 Commission ^[2] - 129:11, 1:5 commission ^[5] - 39:10, 104:9, 138:21, 139:3, 139:9 COMMISSIONER ^[78] - 1:5, 1:11, 1:14, 2:2, 48:6, 49:13, 51:5, 51:10, 51:17, 52:13, 57:11, 57:22, 57:25, 73:11, 79:21, 79:24, 80:1, 80:4, 80:10, 80:14, 80:24,</p>
---	--	---	---	---

<p>91:19, 92:3, 98:13, 98:18, 98:20, 99:15, 99:21, 99:23, 100:20, 100:22, 100:25, 101:4, 101:6, 124:19, 136:12, 136:23, 137:9, 137:12, 137:16, 137:18, 138:6, 138:8, 138:17, 139:14, 139:23, 139:25, 140:2, 140:11, 140:14, 140:17, 141:3, 145:9, 145:12, 145:20, 145:22, 146:3, 146:9, 146:11, 146:16, 146:20, 146:22, 152:15, 154:14, 154:18, 154:21, 175:6, 175:18, 175:22, 175:25, 176:4, 176:11, 184:7, 184:17, 184:21, 184:25, 185:2, 185:19</p> <p>Commissioner [5] - 1:6, 1:15, 2:8, 137:8, 145:17</p> <p>commissioner [26] - 1:9, 2:1, 2:12, 22:3, 42:14, 57:19, 58:10, 58:17, 72:16, 79:23, 80:13, 91:20, 111:2, 126:25, 137:17, 137:24, 138:18, 139:15, 140:9, 146:8, 175:16, 176:2, 176:10, 177:17, 184:6, 184:10</p> <p>commit [2] - 44:21, 60:8</p> <p>committed [11] - 38:4, 39:10, 40:15, 43:10, 43:14, 44:8, 46:23, 53:23, 54:20, 71:16, 82:4</p> <p>committee [2] - 142:19, 142:20</p> <p>common [2] - 6:20, 29:14</p> <p>communication [4] - 97:23, 98:11, 150:24, 160:11</p> <p>communications [6] - 128:12, 149:2, 150:20, 150:21,</p>	<p>151:4, 151:14</p> <p>community [4] - 115:24, 129:18, 166:8, 166:17</p> <p>Comox [1] - 126:24</p> <p>companion [1] - 45:23</p> <p>compare [1] - 19:24</p> <p>compared [2] - 23:14, 117:7</p> <p>comparison [6] - 19:13, 20:1, 116:20, 118:11, 118:21, 176:3</p> <p>compelling [2] - 101:18, 115:14</p> <p>competence [2] - 9:4, 9:8</p> <p>complain [1] - 170:10</p> <p>complained [2] - 166:10, 170:9</p> <p>complaint [6] - 147:22, 153:7, 153:12, 154:3, 154:8, 170:17</p> <p>complaints [10] - 134:17, 134:23, 135:4, 135:9, 135:19, 135:23, 147:5, 147:8, 171:9, 173:13</p> <p>complement [1] - 119:24</p> <p>complete [3] - 26:19, 103:9, 109:13</p> <p>completely [11] - 11:1, 27:21, 65:25, 73:19, 82:24, 92:14, 93:13, 106:5, 109:9, 158:13, 163:22</p> <p>complicated [1] - 51:7</p> <p>compound [1] - 91:23</p> <p>comprised [1] - 60:21</p> <p>compromise [2] - 86:7, 174:22</p> <p>compromised [4] - 124:11, 125:5, 133:19, 134:1</p> <p>compromising [2] - 124:15, 125:2</p> <p>conceptual [1] - 77:7</p> <p>concern [6] - 10:5, 61:22, 138:10, 150:13, 150:18, 166:19</p> <p>concerning [1] - 166:12</p> <p>concerns [5] - 135:7, 138:21, 149:9, 160:15, 166:17</p> <p>concise [1] - 152:20</p>	<p>conclude [4] - 172:5, 172:7, 175:11, 184:14</p> <p>concluded [3] - 24:3, 153:17, 154:11</p> <p>concluded" [1] - 23:21</p> <p>concludes [2] - 42:19, 153:15</p> <p>conclusion [4] - 52:1, 63:13, 136:4, 147:1</p> <p>conclusions [3] - 96:17, 110:9, 143:21</p> <p>concur [1] - 143:3</p> <p>condition [1] - 13:2</p> <p>conduct [14] - 67:24, 107:22, 112:10, 129:12, 133:13, 134:2, 172:19, 174:1, 174:3, 174:7, 174:18, 174:22, 175:4, 182:2</p> <p>conducted [1] - 130:17</p> <p>conducting [1] - 42:7</p> <p>confession [1] - 89:17</p> <p>confinement [3] - 69:3, 69:19, 90:4</p> <p>confirm [5] - 34:25, 50:3, 83:1, 168:20, 169:11</p> <p>confirmation [4] - 31:21, 33:18, 33:22, 33:23</p> <p>confirmed [7] - 16:3, 28:9, 29:13, 33:9, 46:1, 57:1, 171:25</p> <p>confirms [2] - 31:25</p> <p>conforms [1] - 35:2</p> <p>confronted [2] - 158:13, 158:21</p> <p>confusion [1] - 166:1</p> <p>connection [4] - 39:3, 61:7, 84:12, 108:25</p> <p>connections [1] - 183:6</p> <p>Connor [46] - 4:19, 4:20, 5:1, 5:12, 5:13, 5:15, 5:25, 6:8, 7:3, 13:9, 15:18, 15:25, 16:7, 16:13, 16:19, 16:20, 17:23, 18:8, 18:13, 20:7, 20:8, 21:7, 21:8, 25:1, 25:14, 25:23, 27:20, 28:8, 30:2, 30:7, 31:19, 33:11, 37:21, 68:11, 69:9, 86:25, 88:20, 88:21, 89:1, 91:10, 91:17, 92:17,</p>	<p>112:25, 138:3</p> <p>Connor's [8] - 5:7, 12:6, 23:7, 27:24, 28:22, 30:8, 65:8, 91:7</p> <p>consent [5] - 84:18, 84:19, 84:23, 85:23, 89:5</p> <p>consenting [1] - 84:25</p> <p>consequence [4] - 56:14, 57:8, 59:11, 59:17</p> <p>consequences [8] - 45:17, 46:6, 50:20, 54:17, 57:4, 63:7, 86:9, 88:4</p> <p>consider [3] - 91:4, 92:6, 93:3</p> <p>considerable [3] - 22:4, 63:16, 112:24</p> <p>considerably [1] - 75:6</p> <p>consideration [3] - 86:5, 89:4, 90:4</p> <p>considered [15] - 67:17, 85:13, 85:14, 85:21, 85:22, 86:6, 88:11, 89:8, 89:9, 89:21, 93:25, 94:3, 94:8, 94:11, 118:17</p> <p>consist [1] - 173:18</p> <p>consistency [1] - 32:20</p> <p>consistent [5] - 33:3, 39:1, 109:16, 171:4, 178:7</p> <p>consisting [3] - 139:22, 140:8, 2:13</p> <p>Constable [67] - 1:13, 4:8, 4:18, 5:4, 5:5, 5:14, 6:6, 6:8, 6:13, 6:15, 8:7, 10:20, 10:21, 11:16, 15:11, 23:11, 29:7, 29:10, 29:12, 29:25, 37:19, 54:1, 54:2, 54:4, 54:10, 67:15, 77:11, 83:8, 88:19, 88:24, 90:9, 91:17, 92:18, 93:9, 97:1, 97:2, 113:19, 114:11, 115:11, 115:21, 115:22, 121:7, 123:7, 125:4, 125:9, 125:22, 130:19, 157:6, 158:9, 159:10, 159:12, 160:3, 160:6, 161:9, 163:14, 165:2, 165:10, 165:11,</p>	<p>165:16, 165:18, 166:4, 166:23, 167:3, 168:5, 168:8, 171:5, 171:14</p> <p>constable [6] - 54:6, 99:4, 113:14, 151:1, 158:10, 181:8</p> <p>constantly [1] - 51:6</p> <p>consult [2] - 71:17, 156:18</p> <p>consultation [1] - 91:5</p> <p>contact [10] - 79:10, 84:8, 125:11, 132:11, 159:22, 160:8, 160:9, 161:12, 161:13, 167:15</p> <p>contacted [2] - 19:22, 161:10</p> <p>contacting [1] - 126:2</p> <p>contain [1] - 14:15</p> <p>contained [3] - 16:11, 16:12, 72:24</p> <p>container [1] - 14:12</p> <p>containing [3] - 4:3, 137:2, 2:6</p> <p>contains [6] - 4:10, 4:15, 30:9, 138:3, 141:7, 159:1</p> <p>contempt [1] - 129:16</p> <p>contention [3] - 37:2, 47:1, 106:6</p> <p>contents [3] - 5:16, 157:10, 168:9</p> <p>context [9] - 41:14, 106:18, 112:21, 115:3, 124:15, 124:17, 125:8, 136:9, 182:14</p> <p>continue [1] - 179:12</p> <p>continued [4] - 2:6, 76:11, 104:1, 182:25</p> <p>Continued [1] - 1:6</p> <p>CONTINUED [1] - 2:10</p> <p>continuing [2] - 46:11, 46:16</p> <p>contradicts [1] - 76:10</p> <p>contrary [3] - 74:3, 106:13, 143:5</p> <p>contrast [1] - 175:23</p> <p>contribute [1] - 164:3</p> <p>contributions [1] - 111:4</p> <p>control [5] - 17:6, 33:11, 41:22, 42:24, 153:4</p> <p>convenient [1] - 2:1</p> <p>convention [1] - 49:16</p> <p>conversant [1] - 57:12</p> <p>conversation [7] -</p>
---	--	---	---	--

<p>12:13, 12:15, 24:4, 71:18, 71:19, 84:10, 153:11</p> <p>conversations [3] - 4:19, 29:7, 91:8</p> <p>convey [1] - 136:8</p> <p>conveyance [1] - 22:6</p> <p>convicted [1] - 61:21</p> <p>conviction [1] - 106:10</p> <p>convictions [1] - 62:5</p> <p>convince [1] - 172:2</p> <p>Cooper [14] - 148:10, 148:17, 149:8, 150:11, 153:14, 153:22, 159:2, 162:6, 162:11, 162:20, 162:21, 162:25, 170:18, 178:19</p> <p>Cooper's [1] - 151:16</p> <p>cooperation [1] - 47:6</p> <p>coordination [1] - 97:23</p> <p>cop [2] - 25:10, 31:11</p> <p>copied [2] - 20:10, 137:14</p> <p>copies [1] - 137:5</p> <p>copy [2] - 26:3, 80:23</p> <p>Coquitlam [33] - 28:17, 28:19, 29:8, 36:6, 40:11, 40:15, 41:19, 42:17, 42:20, 44:6, 48:18, 48:21, 51:22, 52:2, 59:25, 65:15, 68:3, 70:16, 71:21, 71:23, 90:18, 92:17, 95:19, 97:22, 98:5, 98:8, 100:11, 102:5, 103:1, 103:22, 106:2, 113:1, 120:8</p> <p>corner [1] - 175:20</p> <p>Corporal [40] - 4:19, 5:1, 7:3, 13:9, 15:18, 15:24, 16:7, 16:13, 16:18, 16:20, 17:22, 18:8, 18:13, 20:7, 21:6, 21:8, 23:7, 25:14, 25:23, 27:20, 28:8, 28:22, 30:2, 30:7, 30:8, 31:19, 37:21, 65:8, 68:11, 69:9, 86:25, 88:20, 88:21, 89:1, 91:7, 91:10, 91:17, 92:17, 112:25</p> <p>corporal [3] - 5:23, 7:2, 12:5</p> <p>correct [53] - 7:7,</p>	<p>8:15, 10:23, 11:18, 43:14, 45:18, 46:20, 48:3, 48:11, 49:7, 50:22, 53:8, 55:7, 55:22, 56:2, 56:20, 58:12, 65:12, 65:20, 86:22, 99:2, 102:20, 141:17, 142:5, 143:1, 147:6, 147:9, 148:11, 148:20, 148:23, 149:14, 151:4, 153:16, 155:15, 155:25, 156:16, 156:22, 157:21, 160:23, 164:9, 164:22, 165:4, 165:13, 166:14, 168:10, 169:12, 171:7, 171:21, 175:5, 179:7, 181:9, 181:20, 181:25</p> <p>corrections [1] - 156:8</p> <p>correctly [1] - 23:20</p> <p>corroborated [5] - 147:5, 148:5, 171:9, 173:12, 174:10</p> <p>counsel [29] - 2:4, 2:23, 4:2, 4:8, 5:3, 5:18, 7:17, 50:24, 55:22, 56:9, 56:11, 58:13, 60:13, 60:14, 60:16, 71:6, 71:14, 71:17, 79:21, 80:22, 90:1, 90:19, 92:7, 93:18, 136:18, 139:3, 139:16, 139:21, 155:24</p> <p>counsel's [1] - 163:13</p> <p>counted [1] - 117:14</p> <p>counter [6] - 149:3, 149:13, 149:17, 149:22, 150:1, 150:19</p> <p>country [1] - 158:23</p> <p>couple [7] - 21:4, 39:14, 62:13, 80:8, 87:18, 98:15, 156:24</p> <p>coupled [2] - 43:16, 75:18</p> <p>course [25] - 6:17, 12:18, 29:15, 35:25, 39:13, 47:20, 54:22, 59:16, 63:18, 69:15, 69:25, 84:23, 94:12, 107:11, 112:22, 129:11, 130:24, 133:23, 134:4, 142:23, 144:3, 148:2, 163:13,</p>	<p>176:16, 178:22</p> <p>court [1] - 73:5</p> <p>Court [8] - 37:15, 37:16, 45:24, 59:22, 62:14, 62:18, 126:22</p> <p>cover [1] - 142:15</p> <p>crazy [2] - 163:19, 163:20</p> <p>created [2] - 65:2, 168:3</p> <p>creating [1] - 133:20</p> <p>credibility [2] - 33:6, 84:14</p> <p>credible [1] - 78:17</p> <p>credit [1] - 149:11</p> <p>Crey [1] - 66:14</p> <p>crime [55] - 3:11, 3:16, 15:20, 16:17, 39:24, 40:5, 40:16, 40:25, 41:9, 41:15, 41:18, 41:23, 42:12, 43:9, 43:12, 43:13, 43:16, 43:24, 44:7, 45:4, 45:7, 45:13, 45:15, 46:22, 47:18, 47:22, 49:4, 49:5, 49:19, 53:7, 53:10, 53:12, 53:14, 53:19, 53:22, 54:19, 55:22, 64:11, 67:17, 70:7, 72:8, 72:9, 89:11, 90:16, 97:9, 100:6, 102:11, 110:15, 116:11, 120:11, 120:14, 183:16</p> <p>Crime [1] - 148:19</p> <p>crimes [6] - 38:4, 62:25, 102:25, 103:13, 121:19</p> <p>criminal [2] - 47:14, 97:3</p> <p>Criminal [9] - 3:5, 3:12, 34:10, 46:16, 81:7, 81:18, 103:14, 106:12, 109:2</p> <p>criminal/legal [1] - 71:9</p> <p>criminology [1] - 29:10</p> <p>critical [4] - 64:7, 136:5, 160:14, 169:18</p> <p>criticism [5] - 107:19, 110:18, 111:14, 112:8, 113:2</p> <p>criticisms [1] - 110:13</p> <p>criticized [1] - 96:15</p> <p>criticizes [1] - 109:12</p> <p>criticizing [1] - 111:24</p> <p>cross [10] - 2:7, 79:14,</p>	<p>81:22, 117:18, 140:16, 146:4, 146:12, 152:16, 184:11, 1:6</p> <p>Cross [3] - 137:3, 1:8, 2:7</p> <p>CROSS [2] - 2:10, 140:23</p> <p>Cross-examination [3] - 137:3, 1:8, 2:7</p> <p>cross-examination [6] - 2:7, 81:22, 117:18, 140:16, 152:16, 1:6</p> <p>CROSS-EXAMINATION [2] - 2:10, 140:23</p> <p>cross-examining [1] - 146:12</p> <p>Crown [24] - 50:24, 55:21, 56:9, 56:11, 57:7, 57:8, 58:13, 58:23, 59:20, 60:9, 60:13, 60:14, 60:16, 67:11, 71:6, 71:14, 71:17, 90:1, 90:19, 91:5, 91:8, 92:7, 93:3, 93:18</p> <p>cry [1] - 177:11</p> <p>culture [2] - 128:6, 128:7</p> <p>curious [1] - 8:7</p> <p>current [3] - 39:8, 129:7, 173:5</p> <p>custodian [1] - 16:14</p> <p>custody [9] - 36:1, 36:3, 43:19, 45:10, 45:11, 46:12, 47:8, 47:12, 54:21</p> <p>customer [2] - 150:10, 150:12</p> <p>cut [1] - 170:22</p>	<p>Dave [5] - 39:15, 115:21, 132:4, 132:7, 164:11</p> <p>Davidson [1] - 31:13</p> <p>Davis [1] - 151:8</p> <p>Dawn [1] - 66:14</p> <p>days [2] - 11:5, 77:5</p> <p>dead [2] - 42:3, 117:9</p> <p>deal [18] - 1:23, 43:4, 101:3, 141:8, 149:11, 153:4, 159:17, 159:18, 159:19, 162:22, 163:21, 170:20, 170:23, 178:20, 179:19, 180:1, 180:24, 185:16</p> <p>dealing [10] - 1:16, 2:16, 34:10, 47:2, 47:7, 162:14, 163:6, 180:13, 181:2, 181:22</p> <p>deals [1] - 148:22</p> <p>dealt [10] - 89:3, 131:2, 132:8, 152:8, 153:2, 161:20, 164:15, 179:2, 179:17</p> <p>death [19] - 44:1, 44:7, 46:9, 46:15, 46:18, 47:23, 49:24, 50:3, 50:5, 50:6, 50:14, 59:15, 63:7, 72:9, 103:13, 104:11, 105:12, 127:23, 128:2</p> <p>death-caused [1] - 103:13</p> <p>deaths [1] - 117:12</p> <p>debate [8] - 10:19, 10:25, 11:2, 11:3, 11:9, 76:24, 77:18</p> <p>Debot [1] - 37:16</p> <p>debts [1] - 73:25</p> <p>decades [1] - 97:16</p> <p>December [1] - 66:14</p> <p>decide [3] - 182:1, 182:8, 183:21</p> <p>decided [7] - 66:8, 95:10, 95:22, 98:24, 157:3, 181:24, 183:23</p> <p>deciding [1] - 50:25</p> <p>decision [3] - 56:12, 66:9, 108:12</p> <p>decision-making [1] - 108:12</p> <p>decisions [3] - 62:2, 121:22, 139:4</p> <p>decisive [1] - 173:21</p>
--	--	---	--	---

<p>deeming ^[1] - 59:14</p> <p>defend ^[1] - 127:8</p> <p>defensive ^[1] - 170:12</p> <p>deferring ^[1] - 88:21</p> <p>deficiencies ^[1] - 104:22</p> <p>defined ^[1] - 46:11</p> <p>definitely ^[3] - 26:10, 159:15, 160:11</p> <p>deflect ^[2] - 109:6, 109:10</p> <p>deflecting ^[1] - 111:20</p> <p>degree ^[18] - 29:9, 29:11, 44:15, 44:22, 46:19, 47:24, 50:15, 59:7, 59:14, 60:2, 61:6, 61:10, 61:21, 62:3, 62:4, 62:5, 62:10, 109:1</p> <p>delayed ^[1] - 64:22</p> <p>delays ^[1] - 133:10</p> <p>delete ^[1] - 135:22</p> <p>deleted ^[1] - 6:2</p> <p>deliberate ^[1] - 44:16</p> <p>deliberation ^[3] - 59:4, 59:8, 62:11</p> <p>delivered ^[1] - 142:15</p> <p>demand ^[1] - 79:3</p> <p>denials ^[1] - 171:25</p> <p>denied ^[2] - 158:21, 171:11</p> <p>dense ^[1] - 34:13</p> <p>deny ^[1] - 158:14</p> <p>denying ^[2] - 152:5, 152:11</p> <p>department ^[5] - 95:9, 95:21, 96:16, 150:20</p> <p>Department ^[48] - 48:14, 49:6, 49:14, 49:20, 49:23, 50:1, 52:24, 54:18, 55:1, 55:17, 70:23, 87:16, 91:1, 94:13, 96:2, 100:3, 102:9, 103:6, 104:12, 104:23, 105:11, 107:18, 107:21, 108:16, 110:14, 110:25, 111:17, 112:7, 112:14, 113:9, 120:22, 121:1, 123:24, 130:18, 133:21, 134:11, 141:14, 141:17, 141:22, 141:24, 142:1, 143:13, 143:18, 143:20, 144:18, 145:4, 145:19, 150:3</p> <p>Department's ^[2] -</p>	<p>109:7, 111:21</p> <p>dependent ^[1] - 32:12</p> <p>depression ^[1] - 84:16</p> <p>deprived ^[2] - 147:22, 147:25</p> <p>depth ^[1] - 113:10</p> <p>deputies ^[1] - 166:2</p> <p>Deputy ^[17] - 1:16, 2:7, 109:14, 110:10, 110:13, 113:7, 137:3, 140:21, 141:9, 143:7, 145:7, 145:25, 155:3, 176:21, 183:10, 184:14, 2:7</p> <p>deputy ^[7] - 1:21, 58:4, 69:2, 141:10, 142:22, 142:25, 143:6</p> <p>describe ^[4] - 10:16, 156:4, 173:25, 177:18</p> <p>described ^[12] - 10:24, 11:5, 66:2, 66:11, 66:13, 78:6, 78:11, 108:4, 108:6, 155:5, 172:18, 180:22</p> <p>describes ^[1] - 177:15</p> <p>DESCRIPTION ^[1] - 2:3</p> <p>designated ^[1] - 109:1</p> <p>designates ^[1] - 47:24</p> <p>desire ^[1] - 123:19</p> <p>desperate ^[1] - 113:24</p> <p>despite ^[2] - 58:18, 134:11</p> <p>Detachment ^[1] - 29:8</p> <p>detail ^[3] - 11:5, 33:8, 34:25</p> <p>Detail ^[1] - 29:8</p> <p>details ^[1] - 62:21</p> <p>Detective ^[27] - 78:1, 78:3, 83:8, 93:9, 97:1, 97:2, 114:10, 115:11, 115:13, 121:7, 123:7, 125:4, 125:9, 125:22, 130:19, 158:9, 159:10, 159:12, 160:2, 160:5, 161:9, 163:14, 171:4, 171:14, 173:3, 176:21</p> <p>detective ^[7] - 92:18, 158:10, 161:21, 161:23, 166:12, 172:19, 172:22</p> <p>detectives ^[3] - 72:20, 95:4, 161:4</p> <p>determination ^[1] -</p>	<p>161:5</p> <p>determinations ^[1] - 101:15</p> <p>determine ^[9] - 1:21, 16:8, 30:13, 30:15, 53:11, 64:9, 66:3, 66:7, 95:15</p> <p>determined ^[1] - 66:16</p> <p>determining ^[1] - 113:10</p> <p>deterrent ^[1] - 153:21</p> <p>detrimental ^[1] - 176:25</p> <p>developed ^[2] - 101:19, 123:7</p> <p>Dial ^[1] - 84:7</p> <p>Dickhout ^[2] - 168:6, 168:8</p> <p>Dickson ^[7] - 10:21, 115:21, 132:4, 132:7, 164:12, 164:14, 165:2</p> <p>Dickson's ^[1] - 39:15</p> <p>dictionary ^[3] - 134:24, 134:25, 135:6</p> <p>died ^[3] - 66:19, 74:21, 76:17</p> <p>dies ^[1] - 36:18</p> <p>difference ^[4] - 18:18, 57:14, 109:25, 118:1</p> <p>different ^[10] - 66:18, 87:20, 87:23, 92:25, 94:23, 109:23, 110:8, 110:9, 111:3, 139:11</p> <p>differently ^[1] - 109:24</p> <p>differs ^[1] - 5:3</p> <p>difficult ^[4] - 19:16, 71:3, 79:5, 84:15</p> <p>difficulties ^[4] - 61:9, 61:19, 127:1, 133:11</p> <p>difficulty ^[2] - 77:5, 130:11</p> <p>diligent ^[3] - 42:5, 64:19, 121:10</p> <p>diligently ^[1] - 64:17</p> <p>direct ^[1] - 168:1</p> <p>dis ^[1] - 103:15</p> <p>disadvantage ^[1] - 146:17</p> <p>disagree ^[18] - 11:2, 21:21, 22:15, 33:25, 46:25, 92:14, 93:13, 102:17, 103:16, 103:18, 104:15, 105:20, 106:5, 109:9, 151:25, 171:15, 180:8, 183:20</p>	<p>disagreed ^[1] - 111:18</p> <p>disagreeing ^[1] - 178:12</p> <p>disagrees ^[1] - 80:5</p> <p>disappearance ^[8] - 39:18, 54:7, 63:2, 65:22, 67:5, 76:1, 113:11, 114:2</p> <p>disappeared ^[1] - 22:13</p> <p>disarticulated ^[1] - 74:19</p> <p>discipline ^[2] - 162:12, 179:25</p> <p>disclosed ^[2] - 138:25, 139:10</p> <p>discrepancy ^[1] - 23:13</p> <p>discriminatory ^[2] - 147:15, 148:2</p> <p>discussed ^[3] - 9:17, 139:8, 168:3</p> <p>discussing ^[1] - 7:4</p> <p>discussion ^[3] - 54:3, 54:4, 165:18</p> <p>discussions ^[6] - 62:9, 83:14, 138:24, 163:18, 165:19, 166:5</p> <p>dispatched ^[1] - 153:10</p> <p>displayed ^[1] - 28:19</p> <p>dispute ^[1] - 52:4</p> <p>disrespect ^[1] - 129:16</p> <p>dissatisfied ^[1] - 166:8</p> <p>distributed ^[1] - 162:1</p> <p>divided ^[1] - 129:3</p> <p>division ^[2] - 160:3, 181:1</p> <p>Division ^[1] - 13:14</p> <p>DNA ^[9] - 13:16, 18:22, 19:12, 19:20, 19:23, 20:2, 20:18, 26:14</p> <p>DNR ^[2] - 79:8, 84:7</p> <p>document ^[24] - 2:22, 3:24, 4:1, 4:25, 84:19, 136:14, 136:16, 137:19, 137:21, 138:10, 138:12, 138:18, 139:5, 139:10, 140:18, 140:25, 141:5, 155:13, 155:19, 157:2, 157:4, 163:10, 184:11, 2:9</p> <p>documentation ^[4] -</p>	<p>94:9, 179:25, 180:13, 180:17</p> <p>Documents ^[2] - 137:3, 2:7</p> <p>documents ^[25] - 2:14, 2:16, 2:19, 2:20, 4:21, 10:24, 23:16, 72:4, 137:2, 138:19, 138:25, 139:20, 140:3, 140:8, 140:12, 140:20, 140:21, 141:7, 162:14, 163:4, 163:6, 163:7, 163:9, 2:6, 2:13</p> <p>DoJ ^[2] - 138:10, 138:13</p> <p>dollar ^[2] - 52:8, 58:21</p> <p>dollars ^[1] - 86:2</p> <p>Don ^[1] - 16:18</p> <p>done ^[41] - 6:24, 21:7, 40:10, 43:21, 56:17, 58:3, 58:9, 61:6, 67:23, 72:10, 84:4, 85:17, 85:18, 86:5, 86:12, 86:13, 87:6, 87:11, 88:19, 90:25, 91:3, 93:6, 93:11, 97:11, 97:13, 98:9, 100:17, 105:22, 106:3, 110:6, 110:7, 117:19, 125:21, 134:6, 143:9, 143:12, 160:10, 183:20</p> <p>door ^[1] - 99:22</p> <p>doors ^[1] - 149:16</p> <p>Dorothy ^[5] - 131:6, 131:19, 131:21, 157:19, 157:23</p> <p>doth ^[1] - 124:23</p> <p>doubt ^[9] - 30:1, 58:2, 70:22, 71:16, 81:4, 95:12, 164:25, 165:2, 180:21</p> <p>doubtful ^[1] - 71:3</p> <p>doubts ^[1] - 71:15</p> <p>Doug ^[1] - 41:6</p> <p>DOUGLAS ^[2] - 2:9, 1:5</p> <p>Douglas ^[2] - 137:4, 2:8</p> <p>down ^[10] - 15:10, 16:6, 27:14, 34:14, 34:18, 34:19, 35:19, 62:4, 111:12, 134:7</p> <p>downtown ^[2] - 19:5, 117:7</p> <p>Downtown ^[15] - 19:14, 21:16, 48:25,</p>
---	---	---	---	---

63:22, 65:1, 67:6, 68:2, 69:13, 102:3, 113:25, 115:23, 117:23, 118:24, 123:9, 139:17 draft [4] - 26:17, 72:22, 81:20, 138:3 dragged [1] - 176:5 draw [2] - 57:16, 176:12 drawn [6] - 3:9, 7:3, 78:13, 78:14, 78:15, 85:10 drew [1] - 136:4 drop [1] - 13:5 drove [2] - 163:18, 163:20 drug [5] - 73:25, 118:3, 139:18, 143:25, 148:2 drug/alcohol [1] - 73:25 drugging [1] - 75:12 drugs [5] - 17:1, 20:21, 21:3, 21:12, 66:13 drugstore [1] - 13:25 dual [1] - 141:18 due [2] - 152:15, 178:22 during [9] - 12:15, 29:12, 55:15, 59:16, 71:4, 120:12, 127:21, 129:11, 140:15 duty [3] - 64:15, 64:16, 71:12 <p style="text-align: center;">E</p> e-mail [2] - 139:21, 156:14 ear [1] - 1:25 early [2] - 77:22, 131:11 ease [3] - 2:15, 106:10, 140:24 easier [3] - 50:16, 79:9, 159:18 easily [1] - 153:13 Eastside [15] - 19:14, 21:16, 48:25, 63:22, 65:1, 67:6, 68:2, 69:13, 102:3, 113:25, 115:23, 117:23, 118:24, 123:9, 139:17 easy [2] - 136:20, 184:3	Ed [1] - 130:1 edit [1] - 135:17 effect [4] - 72:25, 143:25, 148:1, 171:25 effective [1] - 179:24 effectiveness [2] - 128:11, 181:22 effort [20] - 54:23, 55:3, 55:5, 55:6, 55:9, 56:5, 57:9, 95:13, 95:14, 96:1, 96:7, 99:3, 100:8, 115:16, 116:1, 117:17, 117:22, 120:21, 120:25, 121:3 efforts [5] - 66:3, 76:11, 79:3, 162:15, 162:25 either [8] - 18:24, 21:13, 43:19, 56:6, 59:25, 72:19, 122:8, 149:4 elderly [1] - 120:2 element [2] - 62:7, 63:5 elements [1] - 60:10 embarked [1] - 50:1 emerged [1] - 129:12 emergency [2] - 118:16, 150:22 employee [6] - 28:12, 169:3, 178:18, 179:10, 181:6, 182:17 employees [6] - 177:25, 178:18, 178:21, 180:1, 182:11, 184:1 encounter [1] - 67:1 end [13] - 2:11, 2:17, 4:5, 17:10, 33:4, 36:5, 58:2, 103:2, 105:24, 161:24, 170:8, 175:9, 175:12 endeavor [4] - 51:11, 96:3, 112:13, 112:15 endeavoring [1] - 111:14 ended [1] - 37:5 endorse [1] - 8:6 ends [2] - 36:17, 42:6 engage [1] - 102:12 engaged [3] - 83:13, 83:15, 172:7 engagement [1] - 69:15 engages [1] - 179:10 English [3] - 134:24, 158:20, 158:22 ensues [1] - 46:15 ensure [3] - 98:11, 104:5, 110:11 ensured [1] - 72:22 enter [1] - 184:20 entered [1] - 184:12 entire [1] - 41:22 entirely [3] - 32:12, 42:21, 139:11 entirety [3] - 5:14, 42:4, 92:22 entitled [5] - 137:2, 137:22, 155:13, 2:6, 2:10 environment [2] - 114:15, 179:21 equal [1] - 54:22 equally [1] - 122:24 error [1] - 75:1 errors [1] - 81:23 ERT [1] - 120:4 especially [7] - 30:13, 56:4, 77:6, 84:15, 96:24, 115:13, 139:17 essentially [1] - 103:24 establish [3] - 79:10, 84:7, 173:18 established [2] - 127:25, 174:4 establishing [1] - 57:23 estimate [1] - 80:19 et [1] - 132:20 ethnic [1] - 133:24 Evans [3] - 4:17, 110:10, 110:13 Evans' [1] - 109:14 Evenhanded [9] - 52:7, 58:20, 60:20, 61:2, 63:17, 65:15, 66:15, 66:21, 67:9 event [3] - 11:24, 37:25, 122:23 events [6] - 5:20, 34:5, 35:1, 35:8, 37:18, 145:7 eventually [3] - 22:18, 61:20, 107:6 evidence [70] - 3:2, 3:15, 9:19, 9:20, 9:25, 10:4, 10:20, 11:4, 19:4, 19:8, 19:24, 20:14, 21:5, 23:17, 25:15, 32:14, 38:7, 38:25, 39:10, 39:23, 52:9, 52:22, 52:24, 55:9, 58:22, 60:24, 61:8, 61:12, 64:4, 64:12, 65:21, 73:7, 77:4, 77:10, 80:14, 84:1, 84:12, 85:2, 85:4, 87:2, 88:7, 89:15, 90:23, 92:10, 96:12, 97:9, 99:9, 99:13, 102:7, 102:8, 104:4, 105:20, 106:13, 113:21, 114:7, 114:10, 116:8, 116:18, 117:3, 120:19, 120:21, 135:13, 140:13, 145:15, 146:14, 153:6, 173:21, 176:12, 176:17, 176:19 evidentiary [2] - 57:16, 145:16 exact [1] - 143:24 exactly [5] - 5:6, 18:2, 34:6, 138:7, 153:13 exaggeration [1] - 76:2 examination [13] - 2:7, 2:22, 81:22, 107:10, 117:18, 137:3, 140:16, 146:5, 152:16, 184:12, 1:6, 1:8, 2:7 EXAMINATION [2] - 2:10, 140:23 examining [1] - 146:12 example [18] - 2:16, 22:18, 44:4, 53:24, 55:8, 56:1, 74:15, 76:13, 84:5, 94:24, 114:17, 115:10, 120:15, 143:23, 154:9, 158:16, 160:25, 180:25 excellent [2] - 98:3, 125:11 except [3] - 65:15, 69:2, 119:5 excerpt [1] - 34:9 exchange [6] - 14:1, 14:4, 14:6, 19:15, 125:13, 131:21 excluded [1] - 73:7 excluding [1] - 95:2 exclusively [1] - 140:19 excuse [5] - 40:8, 57:25, 91:13, 91:15, 127:17 executive [3] - 142:19, 142:20, 166:1 exemplified [1] - 55:5 exercise [7] - 55:18, 71:11, 95:10, 95:22, 98:25, 102:13, 108:23 exercised [3] - 60:2, 62:24, 100:3 exercising [2] - 84:17, 99:11 exhibit [6] - 16:14, 136:20, 136:21, 137:15, 138:1, 138:6 Exhibit [2] - 5:11, 101:13 EXHIBIT [6] - 137:1, 137:21, 140:7, 2:5, 2:9, 2:12 exhibited [1] - 167:5 EXHIBITS [1] - 2:1 exist [1] - 100:13 existed [2] - 83:21, 88:13 existing [1] - 128:11 expect [6] - 54:9, 69:22, 70:5, 70:8, 71:12, 116:10 expected [2] - 56:4, 117:5 expedite [1] - 140:16 experience [5] - 73:4, 114:13, 114:16, 115:22, 141:11 experienced [16] - 69:8, 69:23, 70:5, 90:15, 92:5, 92:10, 93:10, 95:4, 113:20, 113:22, 114:17, 119:11, 119:13, 119:14, 172:19, 172:22 expertise [1] - 56:22 explain [1] - 171:19 explained [3] - 104:15, 115:2, 156:25 explaining [2] - 87:22, 158:6 explains [1] - 160:3 explanation [4] - 11:12, 115:15, 158:8, 177:14 explanations [6] - 21:9, 21:10, 33:25, 75:10, 77:21, 114:21 explicitly [1] - 104:1 exploration [1] - 183:12 exposure [1] - 168:1 expression [1] -
---	---

<p>111:16 extended ^[1] - 138:23 extensive ^[6] - 64:3, 64:9, 66:2, 76:11, 146:4, 163:17 extensively ^[2] - 96:16, 116:5 extent ^[5] - 9:9, 30:11, 33:18, 107:8, 143:16 externally ^[1] - 33:4 extra ^[1] - 17:25 extraordinary ^[4] - 52:7, 58:18, 63:20, 101:25 extreme ^[3] - 107:18, 112:7, 135:7 extremely ^[3] - 97:15, 109:15, 121:10 eyes ^[2] - 13:5, 34:14</p> <p style="text-align: center;">F</p> <p>fabricated ^[1] - 75:20 face ^[1] - 150:3 faced ^[2] - 131:19, 133:11 facie ^[1] - 88:10 fact ^[29] - 22:16, 42:6, 48:2, 48:4, 52:5, 56:16, 63:17, 64:16, 75:14, 78:17, 86:1, 92:9, 96:7, 97:14, 98:7, 99:7, 100:18, 107:25, 108:4, 109:15, 112:22, 117:13, 123:1, 123:6, 176:14, 177:18, 177:21, 177:22, 182:19 factors ^[3] - 124:10, 133:18, 133:19 facts ^[7] - 41:7, 55:23, 56:2, 57:17, 69:20, 109:16, 113:15 faded ^[1] - 155:12 failed ^[12] - 64:19, 107:22, 108:18, 110:3, 111:5, 112:10, 147:21, 178:20, 180:11, 182:25, 183:3, 183:7 failing ^[1] - 181:20 failings ^[2] - 111:4, 178:1 failure ^[14] - 102:12, 102:14, 103:9, 104:24, 105:10, 105:13, 108:20, 108:23, 109:7,</p>	<p>109:18, 110:14, 110:25, 181:15, 184:1 failures ^[1] - 111:21 fair ^[9] - 21:20, 26:7, 51:8, 60:2, 94:15, 100:7, 118:21, 121:5, 179:14 fairly ^[3] - 75:24, 144:13, 168:13 fairness ^[4] - 57:11, 80:10, 80:11, 153:22 faith ^[3] - 87:2, 87:6, 88:14 fall ^[3] - 5:23, 42:12, 94:1 false ^[7] - 66:16, 72:24, 73:12, 73:14, 73:19, 77:1, 81:24 familial ^[2] - 19:20, 19:23 familiar ^[1] - 62:21 families ^[26] - 114:1, 120:23, 123:15, 123:17, 123:25, 124:2, 124:7, 125:12, 130:7, 130:13, 130:23, 133:11, 133:17, 133:21, 133:23, 133:25, 135:19, 136:2, 147:6, 147:18, 158:2, 160:9, 161:11, 177:1, 177:23 family ^[8] - 19:22, 116:23, 134:15, 134:17, 147:20, 169:5, 169:17, 174:24 fanny ^[6] - 15:5, 15:7, 15:12, 16:4, 16:14, 16:19 far ^[6] - 64:24, 139:7, 162:8, 175:21, 177:11, 183:17 farm ^[5] - 3:20, 3:21, 37:5, 38:25, 60:25 Farris ^[2] - 7:19, 155:25 farthest ^[1] - 121:8 fashioned ^[1] - 84:18 fast ^[1] - 153:20 favourable ^[1] - 176:1 fax ^[1] - 161:2 fear ^[2] - 126:2, 129:25 fears ^[1] - 132:24 features ^[2] - 91:23, 91:24 February ^[6] - 5:8,</p>	<p>58:19, 68:10, 78:3, 112:17, 165:7 feedback ^[1] - 124:8 feet ^[1] - 74:19 Fell ^[2] - 1:13, 97:2 fellows ^[1] - 69:21 felt ^[5] - 15:3, 87:7, 132:9, 164:17, 170:7 fences ^[1] - 86:2 few ^[5] - 12:10, 55:13, 66:2, 81:1, 168:17 fiance ^[2] - 22:21, 66:12 Field ^[10] - 19:18, 54:1, 54:9, 113:16, 115:12, 160:17, 160:19, 168:19, 169:1, 169:7 field ^[1] - 117:3 Field's ^[1] - 169:1 fifty ^[1] - 122:9 fight ^[1] - 119:24 figure ^[2] - 57:9, 183:5 figuring ^[1] - 182:10 file ^[10] - 4:13, 16:9, 65:8, 65:11, 65:14, 65:15, 88:22, 131:4, 164:14 filed ^[1] - 4:17 files ^[3] - 132:12, 132:14, 163:24 filleting ^[1] - 36:15 final ^[1] - 27:22 finally ^[2] - 62:19, 158:19 Finch ^[2] - 46:2, 56:25 findings ^[4] - 101:14, 101:15, 109:15, 109:16 fine ^[5] - 1:18, 138:14, 139:12, 139:13, 174:13 finest ^[1] - 121:21 fingers ^[1] - 104:7 finish ^[13] - 29:5, 48:6, 49:13, 51:5, 62:12, 72:1, 79:14, 91:16, 92:2, 98:14, 144:24, 183:11, 185:1 finished ^[4] - 7:4, 27:19, 101:1, 111:10 firm ^[2] - 36:13, 155:25 First ^[12] - 2:5, 52:20, 101:11, 122:12, 125:24, 127:2, 127:6, 129:19, 129:23, 130:25, 132:21, 136:1 first ^[43] - 3:6, 9:6,</p>	<p>26:18, 26:24, 28:15, 41:5, 43:8, 44:15, 44:22, 46:19, 47:24, 48:10, 50:15, 59:6, 59:14, 60:2, 61:6, 61:10, 62:3, 62:10, 68:24, 81:3, 87:19, 91:2, 91:19, 101:23, 106:15, 109:1, 111:13, 118:10, 118:17, 129:2, 129:4, 133:7, 134:6, 141:18, 155:4, 157:15, 161:18, 161:23, 180:22, 185:16 fishing ^[1] - 74:17 five ^[4] - 15:1, 80:20, 118:17, 184:15 fixture ^[1] - 36:13 flagged ^[1] - 93:21 float ^[1] - 74:19 floor ^[9] - 13:12, 15:3, 15:13, 15:14, 16:4, 18:15, 18:20, 20:17, 33:15 fluid ^[1] - 18:24 focus ^[5] - 94:21, 94:23, 144:13, 181:17, 182:1 focused ^[12] - 64:23, 78:1, 97:3, 105:2, 105:23, 106:9, 109:11, 117:15, 178:1, 182:7, 183:13 focusing ^[1] - 182:2 focussing ^[1] - 109:3 folks ^[1] - 132:22 follow ^[3] - 43:1, 70:20, 81:2 follow-ups ^[1] - 43:1 followed ^[2] - 56:22, 167:11 following ^[2] - 77:14, 167:8 follows ^[2] - 102:8, 105:9 FOR ^[6] - 137:1, 137:21, 140:7, 2:5, 2:9, 2:12 force ^[10] - 40:11, 43:19, 44:11, 45:10, 46:5, 46:24, 53:20, 95:5, 128:18, 128:19 Force ^[1] - 119:23 forceable ^[2] - 69:19, 90:3 forces ^[6] - 55:10, 126:17, 127:2, 127:9, 128:14,</p>	<p>128:22 foregoing ^[1] - 186:1 forensic ^[2] - 13:14, 16:8 forget ^[1] - 113:23 forgotten ^[1] - 110:18 form ^[7] - 2:21, 5:21, 14:17, 14:22, 35:6, 155:5, 156:6 Form" ^[1] - 155:14 forth ^[1] - 161:2 fortunate ^[1] - 31:20 fortunately ^[1] - 12:21 forward ^[6] - 40:12, 40:13, 40:18, 55:6, 81:11, 86:17 forwarded ^[1] - 161:17 foster ^[1] - 31:16 foul ^[9] - 11:3, 11:7, 11:8, 11:14, 11:15, 76:20, 77:7, 96:18, 115:15 four ^[3] - 15:9, 15:10, 89:25 fragment ^[1] - 47:11 framing ^[1] - 104:17 fraud ^[43] - 3:12, 19:5, 22:1, 39:22, 39:25, 40:14, 41:1, 43:19, 43:22, 43:25, 45:8, 45:9, 45:10, 46:5, 49:4, 52:10, 63:1, 64:5, 70:7, 70:13, 72:8, 90:17, 90:20, 92:7, 92:12, 94:3, 95:12, 96:1, 96:6, 96:9, 96:20, 99:2, 99:9, 100:6, 100:15, 102:12, 103:8, 103:12, 104:11, 105:12, 105:24, 106:8, 108:25 frequently ^[7] - 21:2, 21:11, 22:10, 73:18, 74:8, 74:9, 75:2 friend ^[7] - 7:13, 17:16, 61:11, 83:4, 129:20, 145:13 friends ^[5] - 31:24, 122:10, 133:11, 139:3, 151:17 front ^[4] - 31:13, 34:8, 60:6, 158:2 front-line ^[1] - 158:2 frustration ^[2] - 169:23, 170:7 fueled ^[1] - 133:10 full ^[5] - 21:14, 54:23, 55:2, 55:5, 169:15 full-on ^[1] - 55:2</p>
---	--	--	---	---

<p>full-out [2] - 54:23, 55:5</p> <p>fully [3] - 56:8, 102:12, 139:10</p> <p>fun [1] - 53:25</p> <p>function [2] - 118:19, 120:10</p> <p style="text-align: center;">G</p> <p>Gabriele [1] - 186:9</p> <p>Gagnon [2] - 159:21, 169:19</p> <p>gather [3] - 19:20, 20:14, 40:21</p> <p>Gee [3] - 143:7, 143:21, 144:18</p> <p>gender [2] - 74:23, 76:17</p> <p>general [3] - 3:4, 57:14, 67:22</p> <p>generally [7] - 18:14, 48:23, 128:6, 131:2, 144:10, 147:24, 166:3</p> <p>Geramy [5] - 160:14, 160:17, 161:7, 168:19</p> <p>germane [1] - 128:4</p> <p>Gervais [2] - 2:5, 122:20</p> <p>Giles [2] - 140:6, 185:9</p> <p>girl [1] - 24:12</p> <p>girls [1] - 21:23</p> <p>gist [1] - 150:16</p> <p>given [16] - 8:25, 11:4, 16:23, 17:2, 32:14, 72:13, 77:4, 78:5, 87:8, 87:25, 89:4, 90:5, 92:1, 114:7, 116:17, 123:14</p> <p>glad [1] - 83:6</p> <p>glasses [1] - 127:18</p> <p>goal [1] - 55:4</p> <p>good-faith [1] - 88:14</p> <p>graduate [1] - 126:18</p> <p>Graham [3] - 118:18, 142:7, 142:23</p> <p>Grand [1] - 117:24</p> <p>granting [1] - 39:5</p> <p>Gratl [5] - 1:19, 139:14, 139:15, 144:24, 1:8</p> <p>GRATL [29] - 139:15, 139:24, 140:1, 140:3, 140:6, 140:9, 140:12, 140:15, 140:18, 140:23,</p>	<p>141:4, 145:13, 145:21, 145:23, 146:7, 146:10, 146:15, 146:19, 146:21, 146:23, 152:21, 154:15, 155:2, 175:15, 175:19, 175:23, 176:2, 176:5, 176:20</p> <p>great [4] - 118:5, 122:21, 131:3, 152:10</p> <p>greatly [1] - 123:19</p> <p>Green [1] - 97:15</p> <p>grinding [1] - 32:11</p> <p>gross [1] - 77:12</p> <p>grossly [1] - 122:13</p> <p>ground [1] - 146:1</p> <p>grounds [8] - 27:7, 34:15, 39:7, 39:9, 81:10, 84:5, 84:9, 88:9</p> <p>group [3] - 145:4, 161:1, 161:3</p> <p>groups [2] - 126:23, 139:17</p> <p>guess [2] - 176:11, 178:11</p> <p style="text-align: center;">H</p> <p>half [2] - 1:17, 184:23</p> <p>halfway [1] - 134:7</p> <p>hand [4] - 137:7, 146:24, 155:10, 175:20</p> <p>handcuff [3] - 36:10, 36:13, 36:21</p> <p>handcuffs [1] - 17:4</p> <p>handle [2] - 138:25, 161:8</p> <p>handled [1] - 83:9</p> <p>hands [4] - 79:19, 85:20, 137:9, 167:15</p> <p>hands-on [2] - 85:20, 167:15</p> <p>handwritten [1] - 156:2</p> <p>hanging [1] - 127:4</p> <p>happy [6] - 38:13, 80:23, 137:8, 161:8, 161:14, 170:21</p> <p>hard [2] - 31:12, 153:20</p> <p>Harley [1] - 31:12</p> <p>harm [3] - 43:21, 43:25, 44:1</p> <p>harsh [1] - 132:1</p> <p>hatcher [1] - 7:24</p>	<p>Hatcher [1] - 1:12</p> <p>hater [2] - 25:10, 31:12</p> <p>head [2] - 118:4, 177:25</p> <p>heading [1] - 34:16</p> <p>headlines [1] - 112:16</p> <p>hear [10] - 66:24, 79:25, 93:18, 131:1, 132:17, 146:6, 146:13, 151:11, 164:18, 176:16</p> <p>heard [11] - 32:10, 55:9, 61:14, 79:21, 84:13, 131:3, 143:5, 146:4, 146:14, 167:9, 170:21</p> <p>hearing [12] - 1:4, 48:17, 52:16, 52:19, 65:7, 101:7, 101:10, 139:1, 154:23, 155:1, 184:8, 185:20</p> <p>hearings [1] - 129:11</p> <p>hearsay [4] - 10:14, 78:19, 78:24, 145:14</p> <p>heat [2] - 111:15, 112:14</p> <p>Heather [1] - 22:19</p> <p>heavy [1] - 149:16</p> <p>height [1] - 73:21</p> <p>Heise [1] - 186:9</p> <p>held [1] - 148:7</p> <p>help [7] - 18:4, 18:7, 116:20, 123:20, 126:6, 131:10, 137:13</p> <p>helpful [4] - 126:3, 126:15, 129:22, 132:23</p> <p>helps [1] - 84:8</p> <p>Henry [1] - 159:21</p> <p>Herb [1] - 169:20</p> <p>hereby [1] - 186:1</p> <p>herein [1] - 186:4</p> <p>Hern [2] - 8:5, 175:10</p> <p>HERN [20] - 51:4, 51:6, 91:16, 91:20, 99:6, 99:11, 99:18, 99:22, 144:24, 145:10, 154:16, 154:19, 184:10, 184:18, 184:23, 185:1, 185:3, 185:9, 185:15, 185:18</p> <p>Hern's [1] - 176:16</p> <p>hero [1] - 154:19</p> <p>herself [3] - 87:8, 89:14, 169:10</p> <p>hiding [1] - 73:23</p> <p>high [3] - 56:16,</p>	<p>163:19, 169:23</p> <p>higher [1] - 122:16</p> <p>highly [1] - 92:20</p> <p>himself [2] - 31:11, 32:3</p> <p>hindsight [1] - 121:24</p> <p>Hiscox [22] - 3:2, 4:7, 7:10, 8:17, 12:13, 17:13, 23:8, 25:4, 25:15, 30:16, 32:1, 32:3, 33:3, 33:16, 33:19, 38:23, 54:6, 83:4, 84:12, 84:17, 112:17, 113:4</p> <p>Hiscox's [1] - 17:16</p> <p>history [2] - 21:5, 66:23</p> <p>hmm [1] - 174:9</p> <p>hold [1] - 185:13</p> <p>holds [1] - 29:9</p> <p>hollered [1] - 158:19</p> <p>hollering [1] - 158:18</p> <p>holy [1] - 168:17</p> <p>Holyk's [1] - 131:6</p> <p>Home [1] - 119:22</p> <p>home [1] - 120:1</p> <p>homes [2] - 161:1, 161:3</p> <p>Homicide [1] - 148:18</p> <p>homicide [7] - 68:17, 68:21, 68:22, 68:23, 69:8, 114:17, 115:18</p> <p>honest [2] - 115:16, 116:1</p> <p>hookers [3] - 132:19, 164:20</p> <p>hookers...we [1] - 164:19</p> <p>hope [2] - 45:21, 123:22</p> <p>hospital [2] - 36:18, 74:25</p> <p>hostility [1] - 129:25</p> <p>hotel [1] - 63:23</p> <p>hour [1] - 121:21</p> <p>hours [5] - 20:11, 23:9, 86:11, 87:14, 151:20</p> <p>houses [1] - 132:11</p> <p>Howlett [1] - 163:18</p> <p>huge [2] - 30:2, 30:17</p> <p>human [1] - 113:25</p> <p>hundred [5] - 52:8, 55:11, 55:13, 58:20, 78:10</p> <p>hundred-million-dollar [1] - 52:8</p> <p>hundreds [3] - 58:20, 86:3, 119:9</p> <p>hung [1] - 127:10</p>	<p>Hyacinth [3] - 25:7, 28:11, 31:21</p> <p>hypothetical [12] - 3:7, 5:4, 5:6, 6:17, 26:17, 26:20, 29:20, 52:5, 55:24, 90:24, 99:6, 100:16</p> <p>hypothetically [1] - 7:3</p> <p>hypotheticals [1] - 51:7</p> <p style="text-align: center;">I</p> <p>i.e [1] - 32:11</p> <p>ID [1] - 78:24</p> <p>Ida [1] - 76:13</p> <p>Identification [3] - 136:25, 141:1, 141:6</p> <p>identification [20] - 3:18, 17:20, 20:18, 24:7, 24:11, 25:20, 27:9, 29:3, 66:17, 136:22, 136:24, 137:15, 137:20, 137:25, 138:5, 138:16, 139:20, 140:4, 140:10, 185:4</p> <p>IDENTIFICATION [6] - 137:1, 137:21, 140:7, 2:5, 2:9, 2:12</p> <p>identified [3] - 13:13, 17:2, 66:18</p> <p>identifies [1] - 59:23</p> <p>identify [3] - 2:18, 74:23, 81:2</p> <p>identifying [1] - 149:8</p> <p>identity [1] - 76:16</p> <p>ignore [1] - 90:17</p> <p>imagination [1] - 154:1</p> <p>impacts [1] - 183:15</p> <p>implemented [1] - 159:2</p> <p>implication [1] - 115:10</p> <p>implicit [2] - 67:25, 174:21</p> <p>importance [1] - 125:16</p> <p>important [23] - 19:2, 19:7, 20:21, 26:8, 29:16, 30:9, 30:12, 30:18, 33:8, 34:1, 51:13, 72:25, 74:5, 74:11, 78:25, 157:13, 176:3, 182:8, 182:11, 182:17, 182:22,</p>
--	---	--	---	--

183:4 impractical [1] - 48:7 imprecise [1] - 99:24 impression [1] - 21:23 improved [1] - 106:10 inadequacies [1] - 181:14 inadequate [3] - 64:8, 180:1, 181:12 inappropriate [3] - 176:23, 177:10, 178:14 inappropriately [1] - 171:12 incidence [1] - 153:1 incident [5] - 13:11, 38:11, 42:19, 90:12, 91:12 incidents [1] - 127:21 include [3] - 26:11, 26:12, 74:15 included [6] - 63:21, 66:2, 82:1, 111:6, 116:19, 171:2 including [8] - 22:6, 42:8, 42:25, 60:10, 102:7, 118:23, 129:7, 178:4 incompetence [1] - 9:8 inconsistency [1] - 32:21 incredible [1] - 76:18 incredibly [2] - 64:12, 97:10 indeed [1] - 107:4 independent [2] - 32:7, 139:16 INDEX [1] - 1:2 index [1] - 136:19 indicate [1] - 18:21 indicated [5] - 10:21, 37:21, 54:5, 56:19, 132:25 indicates [1] - 10:5 indicating [1] - 11:17 indifference [7] - 121:2, 121:4, 121:12, 121:25, 122:4, 129:14, 129:15 indifferent [3] - 121:9, 121:16, 121:18 individual [4] - 7:23, 28:13, 156:10, 177:24 individuals [1] - 139:16 indulgence [1] - 98:19 inexperienced [2] -	113:13, 114:13 infer [2] - 75:5, 121:18 inference [5] - 75:4, 78:13, 85:10, 176:12, 177:3 inferences [1] - 177:7 inferring [1] - 58:23 influence [1] - 144:9 influenced [4] - 128:2, 143:9, 144:1, 144:2 inform [1] - 41:5 informant [5] - 7:13, 27:5, 31:2, 78:22, 102:1 Information [2] - 3:8, 74:6 information [118] - 3:2, 3:10, 3:14, 3:17, 4:4, 4:10, 4:12, 4:15, 5:9, 5:16, 6:2, 6:5, 7:9, 7:12, 10:15, 10:16, 13:8, 17:11, 20:9, 20:20, 20:22, 21:12, 22:4, 22:9, 22:21, 25:17, 26:9, 26:11, 26:17, 27:1, 28:7, 28:10, 29:6, 29:16, 29:23, 30:4, 30:9, 30:11, 31:10, 32:9, 32:15, 32:21, 32:24, 33:1, 33:2, 33:7, 34:23, 35:9, 37:9, 38:8, 38:21, 38:23, 40:18, 42:15, 48:19, 54:13, 54:25, 56:9, 64:24, 67:10, 72:12, 72:24, 72:25, 73:13, 75:9, 75:17, 75:21, 77:2, 77:15, 77:20, 77:23, 78:23, 79:1, 79:4, 79:18, 81:24, 81:25, 86:17, 89:12, 90:23, 90:24, 92:20, 100:10, 100:13, 100:14, 101:18, 101:24, 102:1, 102:2, 102:22, 102:25, 103:11, 103:21, 107:23, 108:5, 112:12, 112:18, 112:23, 113:4, 114:8, 115:9, 122:19, 123:4, 123:21, 124:7, 125:13, 125:20, 149:3, 149:12, 150:1, 150:19, 153:23, 153:24, 160:12, 162:24,	163:3 informer [5] - 34:24, 83:10, 83:13, 83:20 informer's [1] - 34:25 infrequent [1] - 74:3 ingredients [1] - 44:13 inhibit [2] - 53:17, 93:15 initiated [1] - 88:22 inject [1] - 17:5 injected [2] - 17:5, 135:1 injecting [1] - 18:12 innocent [2] - 11:11, 35:4 inquire [4] - 127:21, 128:5, 128:11, 128:16 inquiry [6] - 85:18, 93:23, 113:8, 126:25, 127:17, 137:19 Inquiry [3] - 126:12, 137:23, 2:11 insensitive [1] - 169:4 insertion [1] - 5:25 inside [1] - 30:23 insight [1] - 171:16 inspector [3] - 95:1, 115:17, 165:22 Inspector [5] - 78:2, 78:3, 78:4, 115:13, 148:18 instance [2] - 31:4, 161:23 instances [3] - 176:23, 177:9, 178:13 institution [2] - 145:21, 176:8 instructed [2] - 60:14, 60:16 insufficient [2] - 82:24, 114:19 insufficiently [2] - 96:13 intend [1] - 58:16 intended [1] - 50:19 intends [4] - 45:16, 46:5, 57:4, 63:6 intense [4] - 10:19, 114:14, 127:1, 127:12 intensely [2] - 38:9, 103:23 intensity [1] - 10:7 intensive [1] - 101:22 intent [25] - 44:16, 44:20, 44:21, 45:15, 46:1, 46:4, 46:20,	50:18, 53:11, 53:15, 53:16, 56:7, 56:16, 56:19, 57:2, 57:3, 57:9, 57:15, 59:4, 59:8, 59:9, 60:8, 60:11, 61:8, 63:8 intention [3] - 53:12, 62:7, 63:6 interacted [1] - 130:15 interaction [2] - 128:22, 129:23 interactions [2] - 125:3, 179:11 interchangeably [1] - 165:25 intercourse [1] - 75:13 interested [3] - 71:21, 87:5, 88:16 interesting [4] - 26:11, 52:6, 127:15, 128:25 interests [3] - 2:6, 52:21, 101:11 interface [3] - 123:23, 124:5, 179:12 internal [3] - 170:1, 178:19, 180:15 Internal [1] - 162:7 internally [1] - 33:3 interpret [1] - 170:6 interpretation [1] - 172:12 interpreted [3] - 150:14, 172:8, 172:15 interrogate [2] - 86:21, 87:19 interrogator [2] - 86:11, 87:15 interrupt [1] - 51:11 interrupting [3] - 51:6, 57:25, 124:24 Interview [1] - 155:14 interview [15] - 7:18, 8:3, 8:10, 8:17, 23:7, 23:12, 65:13, 85:24, 130:17, 130:20, 132:7, 155:5, 166:22, 168:6 interviewed [14] - 7:19, 8:7, 8:19, 24:20, 24:21, 24:25, 65:10, 90:11, 94:5, 132:5, 147:2, 148:6, 173:10, 179:1 interviewing [2] - 63:21, 63:25 interviews [7] - 66:5, 67:15, 94:10, 130:17, 167:8, 167:19, 167:25	introduce [3] - 1:6, 1:10, 83:17 introduced [1] - 131:12 Invasion [1] - 119:22 invasion [1] - 127:9 invasions [1] - 120:1 invented [3] - 24:15, 24:19, 75:8 investigate [44] - 41:17, 42:10, 43:8, 43:13, 47:18, 47:23, 47:25, 48:13, 48:16, 48:19, 49:6, 49:9, 49:15, 49:21, 49:23, 50:3, 50:16, 51:15, 51:25, 52:25, 53:6, 53:9, 53:13, 53:20, 53:23, 54:10, 54:19, 55:20, 56:8, 63:19, 64:16, 64:17, 95:11, 95:23, 96:7, 98:25, 100:4, 104:13, 105:11, 108:17, 120:10, 182:10, 182:12, 183:10 investigated [12] - 46:22, 62:25, 64:14, 65:19, 65:21, 65:23, 68:17, 97:6, 128:3, 144:8, 178:23, 179:2 investigating [15] - 40:19, 40:25, 41:2, 41:18, 47:21, 54:15, 63:5, 67:2, 67:5, 68:1, 88:5, 97:4, 103:12, 103:21, 183:24 investigation [142] - 3:1, 6:22, 9:4, 9:9, 9:10, 10:8, 41:22, 42:4, 42:5, 42:8, 42:23, 42:25, 47:5, 47:9, 48:15, 48:23, 50:2, 52:7, 53:15, 53:17, 54:24, 55:12, 55:15, 55:18, 58:19, 58:22, 60:23, 61:4, 63:3, 63:11, 63:14, 63:16, 63:21, 64:3, 64:9, 64:20, 64:21, 64:23, 66:1, 66:20, 66:22, 67:12, 67:13, 67:25, 68:24, 69:1, 70:3, 70:19, 76:7, 76:19, 77:22, 78:1, 85:15, 86:7, 91:11, 92:15, 92:19, 93:7, 95:17, 95:18, 96:12, 96:21, 96:22, 96:23,
---	---	--	---	--

97:20, 97:25, 98:4, 98:6, 98:8, 100:9, 100:12, 100:18, 100:21, 101:23, 102:15, 102:24, 103:22, 103:23, 104:2, 104:23, 104:25, 105:1, 105:3, 105:6, 105:14, 105:15, 106:1, 106:4, 106:8, 106:9, 106:24, 107:2, 107:3, 107:22, 108:12, 108:13, 108:19, 108:20, 109:20, 110:3, 110:11, 111:1, 111:6, 111:7, 112:11, 112:24, 112:25, 114:2, 114:20, 115:8, 116:10, 116:15, 116:16, 118:13, 119:3, 119:4, 119:18, 123:12, 123:25, 124:12, 124:16, 125:3, 127:22, 129:4, 133:16, 133:19, 134:2, 143:9, 143:15, 144:2, 148:9, 170:13, 174:23, 178:19, 180:15, 181:25, 182:3, 182:14, 182:23, 183:4, 183:7, 183:15	involved [26] - 9:9, 11:4, 11:7, 11:9, 45:22, 55:14, 60:13, 61:13, 61:23, 68:20, 69:1, 72:18, 76:7, 79:6, 79:7, 83:2, 116:24, 118:12, 118:13, 118:14, 119:5, 119:13, 121:6, 121:22, 143:14, 180:24 involving [1] - 101:2 issue [26] - 9:14, 9:17, 34:3, 37:6, 56:6, 58:14, 59:21, 62:13, 80:15, 83:9, 85:23, 101:2, 139:11, 141:8, 144:9, 144:19, 146:10, 163:5, 166:7, 181:23, 182:22, 183:8, 183:12, 183:14 issued [1] - 73:3 issues [6] - 1:23, 71:3, 71:9, 122:3, 182:6 issuing [1] - 34:15 items [2] - 40:3, 40:5 ITO [8] - 38:14, 72:22, 75:18, 78:16, 79:17, 81:21, 82:12, 82:20 itself [7] - 56:17, 78:18, 86:20, 89:22, 108:16, 136:18, 174:9	Judge [3] - 129:1, 129:21, 137:5 judge [1] - 178:16 judgement [3] - 46:1, 59:23, 61:25 July [3] - 10:18, 101:24, 134:8 juncture [1] - 177:6 jurisdiction [47] - 40:16, 41:9, 42:22, 43:2, 43:5, 43:8, 43:13, 43:21, 47:2, 47:3, 47:13, 47:14, 47:18, 48:12, 49:8, 49:20, 49:22, 51:15, 51:19, 51:24, 52:2, 52:25, 53:1, 54:18, 54:20, 54:21, 55:19, 60:1, 62:24, 71:11, 95:10, 95:23, 98:25, 99:11, 100:4, 102:10, 102:13, 102:24, 103:7, 103:10, 104:13, 108:17, 108:24, 109:4, 113:6, 113:23 Jurisdiction [3] - 47:17, 47:19, 47:21 jurisdiction" [1] - 106:17 jurisdictional [1] - 108:11 jurisdictions [4] - 40:22, 51:20, 68:3, 68:6 jury [5] - 61:20, 61:21, 62:1, 62:9, 62:15 justice [5] - 39:5, 51:1, 73:3, 127:2, 137:19 Justice [13] - 46:2, 56:25, 60:6, 72:23, 73:1, 73:17, 75:4, 77:23, 80:15, 126:12, 127:5, 137:22, 2:10 justifiably [1] - 136:6 justification [2] - 73:10, 77:17 justified [2] - 135:11, 135:15 justify [1] - 101:22	keyboard [1] - 156:3 kicking [1] - 176:5 kid [1] - 132:16 kidnapped [3] - 42:9, 55:1, 67:7 kidnapper [3] - 50:19, 55:7, 116:22 kidnapping [77] - 3:11, 19:5, 21:25, 39:21, 39:24, 40:14, 40:25, 41:23, 42:12, 42:13, 43:18, 43:22, 43:24, 45:7, 45:9, 45:13, 45:16, 46:4, 46:18, 47:14, 47:15, 47:22, 49:4, 49:5, 50:8, 50:13, 50:17, 52:10, 53:1, 54:8, 54:14, 54:19, 55:3, 55:18, 56:3, 56:15, 57:2, 57:10, 58:15, 58:25, 59:16, 63:1, 63:5, 64:5, 65:24, 67:2, 67:18, 68:25, 69:2, 69:4, 70:7, 70:12, 72:8, 90:16, 90:20, 92:7, 92:12, 94:2, 95:12, 96:1, 96:6, 96:9, 96:19, 96:22, 99:2, 99:9, 100:6, 100:14, 102:11, 103:8, 103:12, 104:10, 105:12, 105:24, 106:8, 108:25, 113:11 kids [2] - 132:13, 132:15 Kienapple [1] - 92:24 kill [5] - 33:12, 59:9, 60:11, 61:8, 66:9 killed [8] - 52:1, 64:2, 66:6, 66:19, 76:25, 98:2, 98:5, 100:10 Killer [1] - 97:15 killer [15] - 9:21, 10:5, 10:22, 10:25, 11:1, 12:1, 12:4, 12:7, 29:22, 76:24, 77:19, 99:1, 101:21, 116:12, 134:13 killing [1] - 9:1 killings [1] - 89:20 kind [6] - 29:17, 30:16, 32:19, 58:25, 87:16, 168:17 kitchen [2] - 13:12, 15:3 knife [1] - 36:15 knifing [1] - 92:16	knowing [2] - 71:21, 126:1 knowledge [5] - 28:22, 32:6, 69:6, 115:24, 128:5 knowledgeable [4] - 68:14, 94:14, 94:18, 94:22 known [14] - 13:2, 21:2, 63:24, 64:25, 83:19, 100:16, 108:22, 120:14, 121:19, 121:24, 144:6, 152:8, 179:10, 183:16 knows [5] - 7:22, 18:4, 62:1, 62:8, 180:3
L				
laboratory [1] - 13:15 labour [1] - 160:3 lack [5] - 114:5, 116:11, 121:13, 133:20, 181:21 lady [4] - 25:6, 31:11, 31:19, 31:22 Lady [1] - 124:22 laid [5] - 50:10, 50:23, 51:3, 59:2, 59:25 land [1] - 127:8 language [8] - 9:1, 11:25, 12:6, 29:21, 37:15, 144:25, 164:24, 177:15 large [3] - 123:14, 145:4, 145:11 last [24] - 2:12, 7:1, 11:5, 11:22, 11:24, 14:25, 23:2, 28:1, 28:3, 29:4, 77:12, 81:14, 83:24, 106:19, 120:19, 122:1, 127:19, 139:21, 140:18, 146:17, 146:19, 157:15, 168:12, 175:20 lasted [1] - 127:11 lastly [3] - 16:16, 24:9, 128:15 lasts [1] - 127:11 late [5] - 101:20, 131:11, 147:4, 173:11, 178:25 latitude [1] - 57:20 law [4] - 58:8, 73:24, 83:12, 126:18 lawyer [1] - 126:19				
K				
keep [1] - 121:25 keeps [1] - 48:12 Kevin [2] - 1:7, 1:10 key [4] - 36:20, 73:15, 101:15, 182:5				

<p>lawyers ^[4] - 57:13, 70:24, 71:2, 156:19</p> <p>laying ^[2] - 60:18, 61:5</p> <p>lead ^[5] - 41:3, 45:4, 47:5, 61:2, 123:21</p> <p>lead-up ^[3] - 41:3, 45:4, 47:5</p> <p>leaders ^[1] - 128:14</p> <p>leading ^[2] - 64:4, 117:1</p> <p>leads ^[1] - 97:5</p> <p>lean ^[1] - 11:13</p> <p>leap ^[1] - 77:7</p> <p>learned ^[3] - 54:1, 122:10, 126:8</p> <p>least ^[6] - 33:9, 40:1, 43:24, 55:20, 89:18, 117:11</p> <p>leave ^[5] - 3:25, 24:24, 66:21, 98:15, 179:4</p> <p>leaving ^[2] - 80:22, 113:13</p> <p>led ^[7] - 60:25, 61:9, 61:19, 65:5, 95:19, 96:13, 103:21</p> <p>Lee ^[8] - 7:13, 12:13, 12:15, 17:16, 31:23, 33:8, 33:16</p> <p>left ^[7] - 6:3, 18:25, 34:20, 81:25, 97:16, 99:22, 147:4</p> <p>legal ^[25] - 51:18, 52:25, 54:18, 55:19, 56:18, 58:6, 59:18, 62:24, 70:24, 71:12, 92:24, 95:10, 95:22, 98:25, 99:11, 100:4, 102:10, 103:6, 104:13, 106:17, 108:24, 109:4, 113:6, 113:23, 145:11</p> <p>legally ^[6] - 48:3, 48:11, 108:7, 108:10, 108:14, 108:17</p> <p>lend ^[1] - 89:22</p> <p>length ^[1] - 80:11</p> <p>lengthy ^[4] - 74:17, 91:20, 91:22, 99:19</p> <p>LePard ^[26] - 1:16, 2:7, 2:8, 2:15, 4:17, 4:23, 6:11, 7:1, 9:19, 16:22, 41:6, 52:22, 68:8, 101:12, 106:16, 122:5, 137:4, 140:22, 141:9, 141:12, 143:7, 145:7, 145:25, 183:10,</p>	<p>184:14, 2:8</p> <p>LEPARD ^[2] - 2:9, 1:5</p> <p>Lepine ^[1] - 97:1</p> <p>less ^[5] - 80:20, 94:20, 94:21, 119:3, 130:25</p> <p>letter ^[5] - 136:24, 140:4, 140:10, 142:15, 185:12</p> <p>letters ^[2] - 102:20, 170:17</p> <p>level ^[14] - 9:25, 10:5, 10:7, 68:13, 69:2, 95:4, 128:5, 143:6, 158:14, 169:23, 170:7, 171:6, 171:13, 171:22</p> <p>leveled ^[1] - 134:18</p> <p>levels ^[2] - 94:15, 94:19</p> <p>liaison ^[1] - 125:18</p> <p>liberally ^[1] - 177:19</p> <p>lifestyle ^[2] - 28:10, 147:17</p> <p>light ^[1] - 72:23</p> <p>likely ^[14] - 18:22, 19:10, 20:25, 22:11, 41:13, 72:11, 96:18, 97:6, 101:21, 115:15, 118:18, 121:14, 133:9, 157:2</p> <p>limb ^[1] - 170:8</p> <p>limit ^[1] - 183:21</p> <p>limited ^[1] - 183:13</p> <p>line ^[12] - 15:9, 43:3, 79:14, 87:15, 110:19, 144:24, 157:15, 158:2, 159:2, 159:8, 161:11, 163:1</p> <p>lines ^[8] - 12:11, 15:1, 15:9, 15:10, 16:6, 23:22, 159:15, 159:20</p> <p>link ^[1] - 20:14</p> <p>linked ^[3] - 19:8, 43:9, 123:8</p> <p>linking ^[1] - 26:14</p> <p>Lisa ^[9] - 17:15, 25:18, 28:7, 30:14, 31:23, 32:13, 33:8, 33:15, 83:1</p> <p>list ^[4] - 76:6, 114:4, 115:4, 167:22</p> <p>listed ^[1] - 6:5</p> <p>listen ^[4] - 129:3, 129:5, 154:4, 154:8</p> <p>listened ^[1] - 147:25</p> <p>lives ^[1] - 73:25</p> <p>loaded ^[2] - 14:2, 14:3</p> <p>located ^[1] - 16:20</p>	<p>location ^[1] - 149:24</p> <p>locations ^[1] - 149:25</p> <p>log ^[1] - 8:17</p> <p>logbook ^[1] - 20:10</p> <p>long-time-ago ^[1] - 127:5</p> <p>look ^[39] - 19:7, 21:25, 23:1, 23:20, 39:3, 42:11, 44:19, 44:20, 44:23, 53:18, 69:21, 69:24, 78:23, 81:7, 81:18, 81:20, 89:12, 89:14, 89:19, 90:22, 109:14, 117:10, 118:22, 119:21, 120:19, 120:21, 127:16, 130:16, 132:9, 132:18, 132:19, 138:10, 161:5, 161:24, 164:18, 164:19, 164:20, 180:18, 183:14</p> <p>looked ^[13] - 33:13, 58:14, 90:15, 93:22, 94:5, 123:6, 131:21, 134:24, 135:5, 138:11, 138:13, 139:5, 163:8</p> <p>looking ^[6] - 14:10, 40:3, 40:15, 82:13, 97:3, 157:4</p> <p>looks ^[3] - 20:9, 41:8, 155:17</p> <p>loop ^[1] - 98:11</p> <p>Lori ^[4] - 130:19, 155:5, 155:14, 157:5</p> <p>lost ^[2] - 74:1, 130:12</p> <p>loud ^[2] - 170:5, 170:22</p> <p>love ^[2] - 124:17, 162:2</p> <p>loved ^[1] - 123:18</p> <p>low ^[4] - 122:22, 158:15, 171:6, 171:12</p> <p>lower ^[1] - 95:1</p> <p>Lowman ^[2] - 140:13, 141:2</p> <p>Ltd ^[1] - 186:12</p> <p>ludicrous ^[1] - 54:12</p> <p>lunch ^[3] - 100:24, 101:3, 101:4</p>	<p>Main ^[1] - 149:14</p> <p>main ^[1] - 27:3</p> <p>maintain ^[2] - 41:21, 125:11</p> <p>major ^[12] - 95:13, 95:14, 96:1, 96:6, 99:3, 100:7, 102:14, 105:13, 108:19, 113:10, 113:13, 125:17</p> <p>majority ^[1] - 11:10</p> <p>man ^[3] - 51:8, 116:22, 129:18</p> <p>managed ^[2] - 105:4, 159:7</p> <p>management ^[16] - 77:6, 94:23, 95:3, 104:2, 125:17, 165:21, 179:15, 179:24, 181:7, 181:14, 181:19, 181:22, 182:10, 182:16, 183:24, 184:4</p> <p>managers ^[2] - 94:20, 94:21</p> <p>manages ^[1] - 36:15</p> <p>mandate ^[1] - 93:23</p> <p>manner ^[1] - 128:2</p> <p>March ^[6] - 4:14, 12:19, 13:10, 16:10, 28:17, 28:19</p> <p>marginalized ^[2] - 118:23, 123:10</p> <p>mark ^[3] - 136:13, 137:6, 139:19</p> <p>marked ^[12] - 136:21, 136:24, 137:20, 138:1, 138:4, 138:14, 138:16, 140:4, 140:10, 140:25, 141:5, 154:15</p> <p>marking ^[2] - 137:15, 137:24</p> <p>marshalled ^[1] - 10:21</p> <p>massive ^[2] - 116:20, 117:17</p> <p>master's ^[2] - 29:9, 29:10</p> <p>match ^[1] - 26:1</p> <p>matches ^[1] - 34:4</p> <p>material ^[17] - 5:25, 19:4, 20:3, 23:3, 23:11, 65:7, 65:11, 65:14, 65:18, 67:1, 67:8, 67:9, 72:6, 72:15, 74:7, 138:3, 146:13</p> <p>matter ^[14] - 3:24,</p>	<p>8:16, 15:23, 19:2, 20:6, 30:12, 40:18, 49:25, 90:21, 91:2, 91:9, 94:2, 175:6, 175:13</p> <p>matters ^[2] - 68:17, 93:25</p> <p>McGuinness ^[1] - 166:6</p> <p>McMynn ^[12] - 45:22, 55:7, 56:23, 116:23, 117:2, 117:4, 117:21, 118:11, 118:12, 118:18, 119:10, 120:4</p> <p>mean ^[25] - 14:16, 53:24, 57:13, 64:14, 85:5, 99:15, 105:17, 117:13, 119:7, 134:25, 135:20, 135:21, 145:3, 150:8, 151:22, 152:16, 152:17, 152:19, 154:10, 166:22, 167:14, 171:2, 171:11, 176:17, 179:5</p> <p>means ^[10] - 2:22, 2:23, 5:18, 13:16, 20:22, 22:6, 130:6, 130:24, 134:25, 154:18</p> <p>meant ^[11] - 8:20, 10:13, 114:23, 119:5, 135:2, 135:3, 135:5, 135:9, 135:10, 135:21, 146:20</p> <p>mechanisms ^[2] - 153:15, 153:19</p> <p>media ^[2] - 107:19, 112:8</p> <p>medical ^[2] - 19:13, 66:19</p> <p>meet ^[2] - 131:8, 165:22</p> <p>meetings ^[5] - 165:19, 165:20, 165:21, 166:1, 166:5</p> <p>meets ^[2] - 32:24, 33:6</p> <p>member ^[7] - 133:14, 134:13, 134:15, 134:19, 143:19, 144:18, 169:5</p> <p>members ^[12] - 19:22, 65:13, 77:6, 119:5, 134:17, 159:3, 169:17, 174:24, 176:7, 179:11, 183:24, 184:3</p>
--	--	--	---	--

<p>members' ^[1] - 147:20</p> <p>memo ^[14] - 11:16, 11:19, 11:21, 77:3, 77:11, 77:13, 77:16, 149:1, 150:11, 150:16, 151:16, 162:18, 162:20, 162:21</p> <p>memoire ^[4] - 2:21, 3:6, 4:2, 72:6</p> <p>mention ^[1] - 82:3</p> <p>mere ^[1] - 173:19</p> <p>merit ^[1] - 72:11</p> <p>met ^[2] - 72:14, 130:15</p> <p>metal ^[1] - 149:16</p> <p>mid-1999 ^[1] - 103:24</p> <p>might ^[40] - 20:2, 23:19, 30:21, 31:14, 47:3, 56:5, 56:21, 57:18, 61:13, 65:4, 70:9, 71:3, 71:17, 74:16, 78:5, 79:8, 79:13, 84:1, 84:5, 89:22, 97:6, 98:2, 109:22, 117:8, 123:21, 125:25, 126:15, 132:15, 135:25, 137:7, 140:16, 152:5, 152:23, 167:9, 167:11, 169:21, 170:4, 170:11, 170:14, 180:25</p> <p>Mike ^[1] - 5:12</p> <p>million ^[2] - 52:8, 58:21</p> <p>million-dollar ^[1] - 58:21</p> <p>mind ^[11] - 20:13, 52:23, 54:8, 54:11, 59:21, 79:3, 84:25, 120:25, 122:1, 137:15, 162:23</p> <p>mine ^[2] - 28:14, 155:12</p> <p>minimizing ^[1] - 134:15</p> <p>ministry ^[1] - 132:11</p> <p>minute ^[1] - 91:19</p> <p>minutes ^[5] - 52:16, 66:2, 80:20, 154:23, 184:15</p> <p>mischaracterization ^[2] - 77:13, 109:13</p> <p>miscommunication ^[1] - 154:6</p> <p>mislead ^[4] - 45:2, 73:1, 73:16, 77:23</p> <p>misleading ^[2] - 73:13, 81:24</p>	<p>misplaced ^[1] - 184:19</p> <p>misread ^[1] - 15:16</p> <p>missed ^[1] - 9:6</p> <p>Missing ^[12] - 131:16, 133:15, 133:16, 133:18, 133:22, 134:14, 134:17, 134:19, 147:3, 160:7, 166:7, 166:9</p> <p>missing ^[96] - 3:9, 3:10, 19:11, 19:21, 22:11, 22:19, 37:3, 38:4, 38:24, 39:12, 39:14, 39:16, 42:1, 42:2, 42:6, 48:23, 48:24, 51:15, 51:25, 63:15, 64:10, 64:25, 65:3, 68:2, 68:5, 73:17, 73:18, 73:20, 73:22, 74:3, 74:8, 74:10, 74:14, 74:20, 74:25, 75:2, 75:3, 75:24, 76:6, 76:13, 76:19, 77:24, 95:11, 95:24, 95:25, 96:8, 96:18, 96:23, 97:7, 98:1, 98:23, 99:1, 100:5, 103:8, 107:3, 113:12, 114:22, 116:8, 117:8, 117:9, 117:12, 117:23, 119:4, 119:17, 120:23, 121:14, 122:6, 122:15, 122:23, 123:14, 123:18, 123:25, 124:8, 130:14, 131:4, 132:13, 132:15, 132:18, 132:23, 133:12, 148:8, 150:8, 151:18, 151:20, 151:23, 158:16, 159:25, 160:8, 161:15, 163:23, 170:13, 174:25, 177:1, 182:24</p> <p>misspelling ^[1] - 28:14</p> <p>misunderstanding ^[1] - 133:3</p> <p>misunderstood ^[1] - 95:20</p> <p>mixing ^[1] - 162:23</p> <p>mocked ^[1] - 38:14</p> <p>mocked-up ^[1] - 38:14</p> <p>mockup ^[2] - 38:17, 75:19</p> <p>model ^[1] - 125:17</p>	<p>moment ^[10] - 3:25, 24:24, 26:6, 40:24, 48:11, 68:14, 72:1, 113:7, 124:11, 127:17</p> <p>money ^[1] - 21:19</p> <p>month ^[1] - 134:16</p> <p>months ^[4] - 25:1, 32:4, 39:13, 138:13</p> <p>morning ^[7] - 2:8, 3:23, 52:13, 184:9, 185:6, 185:14, 185:17</p> <p>most ^[35] - 19:10, 20:25, 24:15, 37:13, 41:13, 42:17, 47:1, 47:7, 48:24, 55:19, 70:15, 70:16, 71:12, 72:17, 72:18, 73:18, 74:3, 74:8, 74:9, 75:2, 75:23, 76:4, 76:6, 92:15, 94:25, 96:17, 109:11, 111:23, 118:11, 118:18, 119:7, 121:14, 156:24, 182:5, 182:8</p> <p>mother ^[2] - 131:6, 131:25</p> <p>motive ^[1] - 75:16</p> <p>MOU ^[1] - 61:3</p> <p>Mounted ^[2] - 13:14, 28:11</p> <p>move ^[4] - 12:9, 57:18, 80:1, 87:22</p> <p>moved ^[2] - 74:23, 76:15</p> <p>MP ^[1] - 132:12</p> <p>MR ^[95] - 1:6, 1:9, 1:12, 1:15, 2:3, 2:10, 48:9, 49:18, 51:4, 51:6, 51:11, 52:11, 52:15, 52:20, 57:19, 57:23, 58:10, 79:12, 79:23, 79:25, 80:3, 80:5, 80:13, 80:17, 80:25, 91:16, 91:17, 91:20, 92:4, 98:14, 98:19, 98:21, 99:6, 99:10, 99:11, 99:18, 99:22, 99:25, 100:24, 101:1, 101:5, 101:11, 124:21, 130:5, 136:15, 136:17, 137:5, 137:11, 137:14, 137:17, 137:24, 138:7, 138:9, 139:12, 139:15, 139:24,</p>	<p>140:1, 140:3, 140:6, 140:9, 140:12, 140:15, 140:18, 140:23, 141:4, 144:24, 145:10, 145:13, 145:21, 145:23, 146:7, 146:10, 146:15, 146:19, 146:21, 146:23, 152:21, 154:15, 154:16, 154:19, 155:2, 175:15, 175:19, 175:23, 176:2, 176:5, 176:20, 184:10, 184:18, 184:23, 185:1, 185:3, 185:9, 185:15, 185:18</p> <p>MS ^[2] - 130:4, 138:18</p> <p>multiple ^[2] - 89:20, 107:7</p> <p>murder ^[68] - 4:13, 4:14, 12:19, 15:23, 40:15, 41:3, 41:18, 42:7, 42:20, 43:12, 43:13, 44:8, 44:9, 44:12, 44:13, 44:16, 44:21, 44:22, 46:19, 47:2, 47:8, 47:24, 47:25, 48:20, 50:11, 50:15, 59:7, 59:14, 60:2, 60:9, 61:7, 61:10, 61:14, 61:22, 61:23, 62:4, 62:6, 62:10, 65:22, 66:22, 69:20, 72:9, 75:25, 76:2, 76:24, 77:18, 77:19, 82:4, 82:6, 82:10, 82:13, 85:15, 90:3, 96:21, 100:19, 104:10, 106:1, 106:11, 109:1, 114:3, 118:22, 119:3, 119:8, 119:9, 120:15, 182:23, 183:3</p> <p>murdered ^[21] - 19:11, 19:12, 37:3, 38:24, 65:23, 73:16, 73:19, 74:4, 74:10, 75:3, 95:11, 95:25, 98:24, 100:5, 102:5, 103:9, 117:13, 121:15, 122:6, 122:24, 183:1</p> <p>murderers ^[1] - 29:14</p> <p>murders ^[6] - 11:18, 29:12, 60:24, 107:7, 113:12, 118:23</p> <p>must ^[1] - 39:5</p>	<p>mystery ^[1] - 43:6</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">N</p> <hr/> <p>name ^[11] - 1:7, 1:10, 2:3, 4:7, 5:22, 28:16, 83:18, 130:3, 154:16, 155:14</p> <p>named ^[2] - 3:10, 61:16</p> <p>naming ^[1] - 154:19</p> <p>narcotic ^[2] - 14:5, 18:12</p> <p>Nation ^[1] - 129:19</p> <p>Nations ^[10] - 2:6, 52:20, 101:11, 122:12, 125:25, 127:2, 129:23, 130:25, 132:22, 136:1</p> <p>nations ^[1] - 128:8</p> <p>Nations' ^[1] - 127:7</p> <p>native ^[11] - 24:12, 24:18, 127:23, 127:25, 128:6, 128:12, 128:16, 128:19, 128:23, 129:13, 159:22</p> <p>natural ^[6] - 45:17, 46:5, 50:19, 57:4, 63:6, 76:17</p> <p>nature ^[2] - 55:10, 118:19</p> <p>Nayachuknay ^[3] - 130:3, 130:4</p> <p>near ^[2] - 86:15, 133:7</p> <p>nearly ^[1] - 55:19</p> <p>necessarily ^[2] - 119:5, 157:2</p> <p>necessary ^[4] - 34:24, 82:5, 98:4, 137:6</p> <p>need ^[9] - 1:8, 78:7, 106:15, 123:16, 124:6, 138:4, 146:13, 154:7</p> <p>needed ^[14] - 9:2, 42:24, 43:1, 62:10, 79:8, 105:24, 105:25, 110:23, 114:20, 114:22, 114:23, 116:3, 118:15, 120:3</p> <p>needle ^[5] - 14:1, 14:3, 14:6, 18:24, 19:15</p> <p>needles ^[4] - 14:6, 17:1, 20:3, 33:10</p> <p>negatively ^[1] - 174:24</p> <p>Neil ^[1] - 122:10</p> <p>never ^[25] - 48:14,</p>
---	---	---	---	--

<p>51:14, 52:3, 53:16, 64:11, 65:23, 68:21, 68:22, 72:23, 73:5, 85:5, 97:8, 132:25, 150:25, 151:2, 169:24, 170:2, 170:4, 174:7, 174:17, 175:3</p> <p>nevertheless [3] - 33:13, 117:7, 134:14</p> <p>new [19] - 12:25, 13:20, 13:22, 14:9, 14:11, 16:3, 18:6, 18:18, 27:16, 33:14, 33:17, 92:19, 92:21, 138:12, 145:6, 161:14, 161:19, 161:24, 162:5</p> <p>New [2] - 60:5, 68:3</p> <p>next [9] - 4:1, 44:25, 80:2, 102:18, 158:12, 159:1, 160:2, 162:5, 163:14</p> <p>nexus [5] - 39:3, 39:8, 39:25, 40:5, 40:8</p> <p>nice [1] - 122:18</p> <p>night [4] - 11:22, 77:12, 132:16, 139:21</p> <p>nights [1] - 64:2</p> <p>nine [1] - 94:24</p> <p>NO [8] - 137:1, 137:21, 140:7, 1:3, 2:3, 2:5, 2:9, 2:12</p> <p>no" [1] - 49:17</p> <p>nobody [2] - 133:3, 180:5</p> <p>nomenclature [1] - 141:10</p> <p>non [2] - 74:22, 150:22</p> <p>non-emergency [1] - 150:22</p> <p>non-suspicious [1] - 74:22</p> <p>none [1] - 93:25</p> <p>normal [1] - 54:22</p> <p>normally [4] - 42:12, 44:10, 44:15, 151:8</p> <p>note [9] - 7:8, 27:17, 52:6, 78:25, 83:11, 93:22, 130:2, 146:25, 173:24</p> <p>noted [2] - 107:17, 112:6</p> <p>notes [21] - 7:18, 8:2, 8:10, 8:16, 8:21, 9:15, 73:8, 75:22, 78:16, 80:23, 156:2, 156:11, 167:18,</p>	<p>167:19, 167:20, 167:24, 172:24, 184:13, 184:16, 185:10</p> <p>nothing [6] - 4:11, 37:21, 94:9, 112:18, 113:5, 163:23</p> <p>noticed [2] - 7:16, 23:13</p> <p>noticing [1] - 92:11</p> <p>notwithstanding [1] - 104:22</p> <p>November [8] - 1:2, 27:18, 130:21, 155:7, 155:15, 157:5, 164:12, 168:23</p> <p>number [19] - 13:11, 39:13, 61:17, 72:2, 73:12, 89:25, 101:17, 102:18, 103:19, 111:3, 114:4, 117:14, 118:8, 122:23, 123:14, 155:9, 155:11, 155:23, 162:16</p> <p>Number [1] - 84:7</p> <p>numbers [3] - 122:14, 123:5, 185:12</p> <p>numerous [1] - 160:15</p>	<p>50:13, 50:17, 53:14, 70:16</p> <p>occurrences [1] - 168:17</p> <p>occurring [5] - 59:15, 100:12, 102:25, 106:2</p> <p>occurs [2] - 48:8, 183:17</p> <p>October [6] - 8:18, 10:10, 10:14, 23:9, 23:12, 78:15</p> <p>OF [1] - 1:2</p> <p>offence [31] - 28:18, 28:20, 39:9, 41:3, 41:20, 42:16, 42:18, 43:17, 46:11, 46:16, 47:1, 47:8, 47:16, 50:6, 50:14, 50:16, 60:1, 60:10, 70:15, 70:17, 71:15, 87:20, 88:8, 92:16, 96:5, 100:19, 106:1, 110:20, 144:6</p> <p>offences [3] - 40:19, 40:21, 93:1</p> <p>offering [1] - 98:10</p> <p>office [9] - 25:6, 31:20, 72:24, 131:8, 131:14, 160:22, 161:17, 163:22, 177:20</p> <p>officer [10] - 15:21, 16:1, 53:19, 113:22, 147:1, 148:5, 169:25, 173:10, 178:23, 179:1</p> <p>officers [16] - 55:11, 55:14, 66:24, 114:25, 117:4, 118:12, 119:10, 119:11, 119:13, 119:14, 128:6, 129:13, 130:17, 145:5, 170:4, 171:10</p> <p>official [1] - 175:17</p> <p>Official [1] - 186:10</p> <p>officially [1] - 142:1</p> <p>often [2] - 74:15, 166:11</p> <p>old [2] - 7:13, 84:17</p> <p>omitted [2] - 72:25, 75:17</p> <p>once [8] - 9:19, 20:4, 48:16, 55:20, 115:9, 125:16, 127:24, 165:23</p> <p>one [98] - 5:3, 5:5, 7:17, 8:6, 12:2, 13:13, 13:22, 14:10,</p>	<p>14:11, 15:9, 16:11, 16:19, 17:2, 17:8, 17:9, 18:19, 19:17, 20:24, 22:11, 22:15, 22:18, 24:10, 25:12, 27:24, 30:22, 32:9, 32:19, 33:8, 35:13, 36:10, 38:11, 38:13, 38:18, 38:20, 39:2, 42:5, 45:6, 45:16, 45:22, 46:5, 48:12, 48:13, 55:8, 57:3, 62:1, 62:8, 63:6, 64:1, 66:9, 66:13, 70:15, 73:12, 75:11, 76:1, 76:20, 78:22, 81:16, 81:21, 82:14, 82:19, 82:25, 83:3, 83:4, 83:6, 83:24, 84:4, 84:22, 89:3, 89:25, 90:9, 99:4, 99:12, 102:18, 106:14, 110:13, 113:7, 114:4, 120:24, 129:8, 131:5, 131:7, 135:18, 138:18, 139:2, 141:19, 147:19, 149:25, 167:7, 172:18, 175:1, 176:6, 178:17, 180:9, 181:5, 184:11</p> <p>one's [1] - 57:5</p> <p>ones [1] - 18:15</p> <p>open [5] - 90:17, 99:22, 125:12, 149:16, 156:23</p> <p>opening [1] - 145:3</p> <p>operates [1] - 144:10</p> <p>operation [1] - 79:6</p> <p>opinion [1] - 141:15</p> <p>opportunity [12] - 65:2, 81:20, 92:1, 104:18, 156:10, 165:12, 168:3, 168:9, 168:20, 169:10, 185:1, 185:7</p> <p>opposed [2] - 14:10, 151:18</p> <p>opposite [1] - 134:4</p> <p>oral [3] - 35:11, 35:25, 69:15</p> <p>order [5] - 1:4, 44:22, 52:19, 101:10, 155:1</p> <p>organization [5] - 64:19, 121:19, 177:4, 178:17, 180:4</p> <p>organizational [2] - 121:11, 178:1</p>	<p>organized [1] - 4:22</p> <p>original [1] - 7:18</p> <p>ostensibly [1] - 93:10</p> <p>otherwise [2] - 6:2, 76:10</p> <p>ought [4] - 58:3, 84:20, 93:22, 108:22</p> <p>outcome [2] - 62:5, 110:23</p> <p>outdoors [1] - 74:1</p> <p>outline [1] - 1:15</p> <p>outstanding [1] - 1:24</p> <p>overall [3] - 32:21, 48:21, 48:22</p> <p>overcome [1] - 130:8</p> <p>overcoming [1] - 132:24</p> <p>overnight [1] - 163:12</p> <p>overrepresented [1] - 122:14</p> <p>overview [1] - 54:3</p> <p>overwhelmed [1] - 125:15</p> <p>overworked [1] - 161:6</p> <p>own [18] - 3:24, 16:21, 16:24, 25:1, 25:6, 28:22, 32:6, 32:7, 72:19, 88:25, 93:12, 96:16, 141:15, 156:19, 164:4, 171:3, 171:10</p> <p>ownership [1] - 109:19</p>
O				
<p>o'clock [1] - 184:9</p> <p>objection [1] - 91:19</p> <p>observations [2] - 32:8, 178:4</p> <p>observed [7] - 34:4, 35:2, 35:8, 35:9, 37:18, 38:22, 151:24</p> <p>Obtain [2] - 3:8, 74:6</p> <p>obtained [1] - 79:18</p> <p>obtaining [2] - 39:7, 74:5</p> <p>obviously [11] - 1:16, 70:16, 79:4, 79:21, 80:1, 107:20, 112:9, 153:20, 162:11, 178:20, 180:11</p> <p>occasion [1] - 175:14</p> <p>occasions [2] - 8:18, 75:14</p> <p>occur [4] - 62:20, 91:6, 110:23, 152:1</p> <p>occurred [14] - 40:20, 40:21, 41:4, 41:19, 42:13, 47:5, 47:15, 47:16, 48:20, 50:11,</p>				
P				
<p>p.m [1] - 101:7</p> <p>P.M [5] - 101:8, 101:9, 154:24, 154:25, 185:21</p> <p>pack [6] - 15:5, 15:7, 15:12, 16:4, 16:15, 16:19</p> <p>package [2] - 13:22, 13:23</p> <p>page [64] - 6:10, 7:15, 12:9, 13:7, 15:17, 23:6, 26:18, 26:24, 27:14, 27:21, 28:2, 28:3, 34:9, 34:11, 39:4, 101:12, 101:13, 106:15, 106:16, 106:21, 110:16, 110:17, 111:12, 111:25, 112:1, 124:13, 127:19, 127:20, 129:9, 133:6, 134:6,</p>				

<p>134:7, 140:25, 145:24, 146:24, 148:13, 154:13, 154:14, 155:3, 155:4, 155:8, 157:15, 164:11, 164:13, 165:6, 165:16, 168:5, 168:12, 168:19, 168:25, 169:9, 169:14, 170:16, 175:19 PAGE [2] - 1:3, 2:3 pager [1] - 161:11 pages [6] - 67:13, 139:22, 140:8, 163:9, 173:24, 2:13 PAP [1] - 19:21 paper [1] - 170:20 papers [2] - 3:18, 27:9 Paradis [1] - 15:11 paragraph [54] - 12:5, 13:5, 14:25, 15:9, 15:17, 16:16, 17:9, 17:10, 18:1, 18:2, 23:5, 23:6, 23:18, 23:23, 23:24, 25:16, 27:3, 27:4, 27:25, 28:21, 28:25, 34:13, 34:14, 34:19, 73:13, 75:7, 75:23, 75:25, 76:23, 78:16, 102:6, 103:3, 103:19, 104:7, 104:21, 105:8, 106:19, 106:22, 106:23, 111:25, 129:8, 157:15, 158:12, 159:1, 160:2, 162:5, 163:14, 168:12, 169:15, 175:20, 178:15 paragraphs [8] - 5:6, 5:19, 5:24, 16:6, 20:10, 23:2, 27:21, 27:22 paraphrased [1] - 82:8 pardon [3] - 52:15, 79:23, 103:17 parenthesis [1] - 108:1 parenting [1] - 147:20 parsed [1] - 110:2 part [19] - 3:6, 4:2, 5:11, 9:6, 14:19, 24:4, 41:20, 44:19, 48:24, 53:15, 74:5, 93:23, 111:13, 119:17, 129:4, 134:12, 147:12,</p>	<p>153:3, 157:13 particular [2] - 19:9, 139:5 particularly [5] - 75:18, 114:3, 128:7, 135:8, 176:24 partner [1] - 114:24 parts [1] - 129:4 party [2] - 66:12, 66:15 pass [1] - 103:10 passage [1] - 173:9 passed [2] - 42:15, 102:19 passing [2] - 32:5, 126:21 past [2] - 68:18, 161:19 pattern [11] - 34:4, 35:3, 35:8, 35:9, 37:14, 37:25, 38:22, 48:2, 48:4, 52:5, 129:12 Peace [5] - 73:2, 73:17, 75:5, 77:24, 80:15 Peace's [1] - 72:23 people [62] - 7:18, 22:17, 30:22, 30:23, 31:2, 33:12, 39:17, 63:22, 71:12, 74:2, 76:7, 94:14, 94:24, 95:5, 110:8, 116:19, 117:20, 121:4, 121:17, 122:12, 125:25, 126:5, 126:17, 127:3, 127:8, 128:12, 128:17, 128:19, 128:23, 129:3, 129:5, 129:13, 129:19, 130:25, 131:2, 132:10, 133:4, 135:1, 144:1, 144:21, 145:2, 147:16, 149:9, 150:5, 150:17, 151:16, 163:16, 164:1, 164:18, 166:9, 168:1, 170:5, 170:9, 170:10, 170:22, 171:17, 175:8, 176:18, 177:20, 180:10 perceive [1] - 150:17 perceived [1] - 34:4 perceives [1] - 36:12 perceiving [1] - 37:25 percent [6] - 78:10, 122:5, 122:9,</p>	<p>122:11, 122:22, 130:24 percentage [1] - 123:2 perception [1] - 128:16 perceptions [2] - 128:18, 128:21 perhaps [6] - 1:17, 6:9, 53:6, 93:5, 184:5, 185:9 period [7] - 65:19, 72:16, 72:18, 74:17, 120:13, 180:5, 181:15 permission [1] - 126:13 permits [1] - 82:10 person [31] - 21:14, 28:8, 30:16, 31:10, 45:11, 46:12, 69:12, 87:20, 88:5, 92:10, 92:25, 125:18, 127:23, 128:1, 130:15, 131:14, 134:20, 135:8, 146:17, 149:21, 150:8, 151:18, 151:19, 158:2, 161:15, 161:18, 167:21, 167:23, 170:13, 172:10, 175:2 personal [3] - 142:17, 159:8, 171:18 personally [3] - 145:2, 151:24, 179:3 Persons [6] - 131:16, 133:15, 134:19, 147:3, 160:7, 166:9 persons [9] - 22:12, 73:18, 73:21, 74:9, 74:14, 75:2, 96:23, 119:4, 119:17 persuasive [1] - 173:21 pertaining [1] - 102:25 Peter [1] - 61:11 phone [13] - 22:22, 68:11, 79:7, 131:1, 132:18, 132:20, 158:18, 158:20, 164:18, 164:21, 168:13, 168:14, 169:25 phonetic [1] - 130:3 photographs [2] - 16:17, 33:14 phrase [1] - 106:17 physical [3] - 64:12, 97:9, 116:8</p>	<p>picked [2] - 37:6, 159:19 Pickton [85] - 3:1, 3:19, 12:15, 16:21, 16:24, 16:25, 17:22, 18:6, 20:21, 22:10, 22:22, 24:9, 25:22, 27:11, 28:9, 29:1, 30:5, 30:16, 30:20, 31:23, 32:10, 33:10, 33:16, 33:19, 35:12, 38:10, 48:15, 54:3, 58:14, 59:2, 61:6, 62:16, 66:8, 66:15, 69:11, 69:12, 75:12, 75:14, 79:10, 83:25, 84:20, 84:22, 85:17, 85:24, 86:10, 89:17, 90:3, 90:20, 93:4, 95:16, 95:18, 97:20, 98:3, 98:5, 98:23, 100:4, 100:10, 100:14, 101:20, 101:24, 102:4, 102:10, 102:14, 102:22, 103:7, 103:21, 104:5, 104:10, 104:25, 105:6, 105:11, 105:13, 106:9, 106:24, 107:2, 107:19, 107:23, 108:11, 108:17, 108:19, 108:20, 111:1, 111:7, 112:8, 112:11 Pickton's [16] - 13:12, 15:2, 15:22, 17:18, 20:3, 20:17, 21:17, 22:13, 25:19, 26:8, 36:5, 37:5, 38:25, 39:23, 54:11, 60:25 Picktons [1] - 32:4 pie [1] - 169:4 piece [2] - 24:11, 24:14 place [2] - 42:13, 45:12 placed [1] - 14:16 places [1] - 149:4 plainly [1] - 142:17 planned [1] - 84:21 planning [8] - 44:20, 59:4, 59:8, 59:9, 60:8, 61:9, 62:11, 85:19 plausible [5] - 33:24, 75:11, 75:16, 77:21, 114:21 play [12] - 1:25, 11:3,</p>	<p>11:7, 11:8, 11:14, 11:15, 76:20, 77:8, 96:18, 115:15, 116:21, 144:7 played [1] - 160:5 plead [1] - 40:9 pleasantries [1] - 131:21 Plexiglass [2] - 149:18, 149:19 plight [1] - 120:23 plus [1] - 27:15 point [19] - 9:18, 10:3, 19:18, 31:9, 34:1, 35:13, 42:7, 43:4, 44:1, 77:10, 77:22, 79:25, 84:22, 86:16, 156:7, 175:12, 176:2, 176:9, 178:15 Point [9] - 43:18, 43:19, 43:20, 44:6, 45:8, 46:24, 47:3, 47:16, 50:10 pointed [1] - 125:16 pointing [2] - 104:4, 104:7 points [2] - 32:10, 180:15 poisoned [1] - 133:16 police [42] - 15:7, 15:21, 30:14, 31:14, 34:20, 34:23, 34:24, 40:11, 40:20, 43:21, 44:11, 46:23, 53:6, 53:19, 53:20, 56:8, 58:3, 89:6, 95:9, 95:21, 114:12, 114:15, 116:9, 119:9, 126:2, 127:22, 128:5, 128:14, 128:18, 128:19, 128:22, 129:13, 129:25, 130:2, 130:8, 147:1, 148:5, 149:13, 169:25, 170:3, 171:10, 173:9 Police [55] - 13:14, 28:11, 48:14, 49:6, 49:14, 49:20, 49:23, 49:25, 52:24, 54:18, 54:25, 55:17, 52:24, 70:23, 87:16, 90:19, 91:1, 94:13, 96:2, 100:3, 102:9, 103:5, 104:12, 104:23, 105:10, 107:18, 107:21, 108:16, 109:7, 110:14, 110:25, 111:16,</p>
---	---	--	---	---

R				
<p>race [1] - 123:11</p> <p>racial [4] - 132:1, 158:15, 159:15, 159:20</p> <p>racism [9] - 151:3, 151:6, 152:23, 152:24, 166:18, 167:22, 176:13, 177:11, 181:19</p> <p>racist [29] - 131:3, 147:11, 150:14, 158:21, 167:4, 167:5, 167:13, 171:11, 172:1, 172:5, 172:8, 172:15, 173:22, 174:4, 174:8, 174:18, 175:4, 176:7, 176:15, 178:14, 178:24, 179:11, 179:20, 180:4, 180:7, 181:5, 182:11, 182:16, 184:1</p> <p>raise [1] - 83:6</p> <p>raised [2] - 54:7, 107:9</p> <p>raises [1] - 146:10</p> <p>ramifications [2] - 105:14, 105:17</p> <p>ranged [1] - 129:14</p> <p>rank [7] - 5:22, 68:8, 68:13, 94:15, 95:1, 95:3, 141:13</p> <p>rare [1] - 69:4</p> <p>rather [5] - 81:22, 92:21, 99:4, 174:4, 175:7</p> <p>RCMP [39] - 4:13, 40:11, 40:24, 41:2, 48:18, 60:15, 60:16, 60:18, 60:22, 60:25, 61:3, 61:4, 65:11, 65:13, 65:19, 66:24, 67:8, 68:12, 85:17, 95:19, 97:22, 101:19, 102:22, 102:23, 103:11, 103:20, 103:25, 104:2, 104:8, 104:9, 104:25, 105:5, 108:6, 108:7, 109:18, 112:19, 120:8, 146:19</p> <p>RCMP's [1] - 109:3</p> <p>reacted [1] - 172:19</p> <p>Reaction" [1] - 129:10</p>	<p>read [22] - 12:10, 59:22, 61:25, 65:7, 65:10, 65:11, 65:14, 65:18, 103:4, 105:19, 110:19, 112:1, 127:17, 129:9, 132:21, 135:18, 137:9, 150:15, 157:9, 157:12, 163:2, 178:5</p> <p>readily [2] - 70:23, 71:2</p> <p>reading [5] - 16:8, 35:5, 66:25, 107:24, 162:24</p> <p>reads [7] - 5:12, 12:14, 101:17, 102:18, 104:21, 108:8, 112:3</p> <p>ready [1] - 88:6</p> <p>real [2] - 114:3, 171:16</p> <p>reality [2] - 30:15, 141:13</p> <p>realize [1] - 21:13</p> <p>really [23] - 30:17, 32:20, 49:2, 51:4, 51:17, 58:6, 60:25, 74:5, 74:11, 77:25, 78:8, 78:12, 91:21, 91:25, 121:2, 124:19, 135:10, 161:19, 164:2, 166:8, 175:2, 182:4</p> <p>Realtime [1] - 186:11</p> <p>reason [20] - 13:1, 18:6, 35:24, 59:15, 62:22, 63:20, 75:8, 75:20, 78:10, 78:12, 96:10, 96:18, 117:25, 118:7, 121:3, 129:25, 137:25, 138:4, 164:25, 171:2</p> <p>reasonable [12] - 16:23, 27:7, 72:13, 81:4, 81:10, 81:13, 88:9, 93:12, 154:5, 172:10, 183:2, 184:2</p> <p>reasonably [5] - 34:5, 68:16, 81:5, 172:8, 172:14</p> <p>reasoning [1] - 104:16</p> <p>reasons [9] - 49:16, 59:22, 61:25, 66:19, 74:2, 74:15, 80:6, 97:4, 182:16</p> <p>rebuffed [4] - 149:9, 150:5, 151:17, 151:19</p> <p>recall" [1] - 15:15</p>	<p>recalled [1] - 13:11</p> <p>receive [2] - 8:4, 113:14</p> <p>received [12] - 72:22, 89:13, 90:9, 101:18, 101:23, 101:25, 102:23, 112:17, 113:4, 153:7, 153:22, 153:24</p> <p>receives [1] - 69:23</p> <p>receiving [1] - 73:20</p> <p>recently [2] - 75:24, 149:19</p> <p>recess [2] - 52:16, 154:23</p> <p>recharacterized [1] - 114:10</p> <p>recitation [1] - 82:3</p> <p>recognize [1] - 110:15</p> <p>recognized [1] - 178:18</p> <p>recollection [6] - 20:5, 24:15, 125:2, 147:7, 150:16, 173:5</p> <p>recommended [1] - 93:4</p> <p>recommencing [1] - 93:19</p> <p>recommendations [1] - 56:10</p> <p>recommended [1] - 90:6</p> <p>RECONVENED [1] - 1:3</p> <p>record [4] - 8:14, 22:22, 138:15, 157:14</p> <p>recorded [3] - 153:9, 159:2, 159:8</p> <p>Recorder [1] - 84:7</p> <p>recording [1] - 159:3</p> <p>recover [1] - 19:25</p> <p>recovery [1] - 123:22</p> <p>refer [10] - 41:7, 73:9, 82:4, 126:8, 136:21, 141:1, 141:6, 148:13, 170:18, 174:3</p> <p>reference [15] - 2:15, 6:1, 31:7, 127:16, 128:25, 140:19, 140:24, 157:19, 158:16, 159:1, 162:11, 162:17, 166:16, 174:16, 180:14</p> <p>references [5] - 162:16, 163:4, 163:5, 163:11, 166:17</p>	<p>referred [3] - 29:4, 149:24, 151:16</p> <p>referring [3] - 153:20, 155:9, 164:14</p> <p>refers [7] - 17:22, 24:9, 25:22, 28:15, 28:18, 29:1, 166:3</p> <p>reflects [1] - 143:17</p> <p>refrain [2] - 13:4, 13:19</p> <p>refused [1] - 85:8</p> <p>regard [1] - 99:3</p> <p>regarding [5] - 76:24, 93:5, 130:22, 132:12, 168:13</p> <p>regardless [2] - 96:5, 96:19</p> <p>regards [1] - 25:14</p> <p>Region [6] - 127:24, 128:9, 128:13, 128:17, 128:20, 128:24</p> <p>Registrar [1] - 136:17</p> <p>REGISTRAR [18] - 1:4, 1:8, 52:16, 52:19, 101:7, 101:10, 136:13, 136:16, 136:24, 137:19, 140:4, 154:23, 155:1, 184:8, 185:5, 185:13, 185:16, 185:20</p> <p>reinstate [1] - 90:2</p> <p>reinterview [1] - 131:9</p> <p>reiterated [1] - 45:21</p> <p>relate [4] - 3:16, 5:20, 39:24, 177:6</p> <p>related [8] - 4:6, 9:12, 11:18, 11:20, 29:2, 52:9, 54:6, 93:1</p> <p>relates [3] - 9:1, 12:6, 177:7</p> <p>relation [6] - 3:1, 13:8, 19:4, 58:24, 72:7, 100:6</p> <p>relations [1] - 133:17</p> <p>relationship [7] - 30:15, 30:20, 125:20, 128:21, 174:24, 177:1, 177:23</p> <p>relationships [3] - 125:5, 125:12, 126:16</p> <p>relative [2] - 151:18, 183:3</p> <p>relatively [2] - 69:4, 116:23</p> <p>released [1] - 175:17</p>	<p>relevance [2] - 123:12, 123:13</p> <p>relevant [1] - 5:19</p> <p>reliability [2] - 17:23, 25:24</p> <p>reliable [2] - 78:21, 122:19</p> <p>relied [1] - 161:4</p> <p>rely [1] - 34:23</p> <p>remain [1] - 157:1</p> <p>remaining [1] - 94:21</p> <p>remarkable [2] - 122:23, 122:25</p> <p>remarks [1] - 147:11</p> <p>remember [9] - 7:6, 8:22, 9:21, 35:15, 35:21, 35:22, 81:15, 130:1</p> <p>remind [1] - 150:23</p> <p>reminded [1] - 124:21</p> <p>reminder [1] - 51:12</p> <p>remove [5] - 35:3, 135:16, 181:15, 181:20, 184:1</p> <p>removed [1] - 178:25</p> <p>repairs [1] - 31:12</p> <p>repeat [1] - 49:1</p> <p>repeated [1] - 113:3</p> <p>repeatedly [4] - 110:4, 110:5, 174:3, 175:1</p> <p>rephrase [1] - 49:19</p> <p>Report [2] - 137:22, 2:10</p> <p>report [82] - 7:20, 11:6, 39:17, 77:2, 77:9, 77:17, 78:8, 90:7, 93:21, 96:4, 96:11, 101:12, 106:15, 108:4, 108:21, 108:22, 109:5, 109:11, 109:14, 109:17, 110:17, 111:23, 113:18, 114:9, 114:18, 115:13, 116:5, 116:17, 117:3, 122:4, 122:7, 123:1, 124:4, 124:7, 124:9, 124:13, 126:11, 129:8, 130:14, 132:22, 132:25, 133:6, 133:7, 134:5, 136:2, 137:5, 140:21, 141:23, 142:8, 142:11, 142:13, 143:8, 143:17, 144:4, 144:22, 145:1, 145:8, 145:18, 145:24,</p>

<p>145:25, 148:9, 148:17, 150:6, 150:11, 150:22, 151:7, 151:20, 161:18, 169:6, 171:19, 172:18, 173:25, 174:9, 174:17, 175:5, 175:17, 175:19, 177:17, 178:4, 184:2</p> <p>report-takers [1] - 150:22</p> <p>reported [4] - 22:19, 39:18, 42:2, 76:14</p> <p>reportee [1] - 150:7</p> <p>Reporter [2] - 186:10, 186:11</p> <p>Reporter's [1] - 1:10</p> <p>reporting [5] - 78:19, 84:13, 99:5, 133:12, 153:23</p> <p>Reporting [1] - 186:12</p> <p>reports [9] - 4:16, 16:9, 39:16, 73:21, 115:11, 161:2, 161:20, 161:25, 162:1</p> <p>represent [1] - 145:3</p> <p>representative [1] - 145:18</p> <p>representing [2] - 133:24, 141:21</p> <p>reputation [1] - 176:25</p> <p>request [10] - 7:16, 7:21, 7:22, 7:24, 8:1, 17:18, 24:5, 25:19, 26:8, 120:8</p> <p>requested [1] - 120:6</p> <p>requests [1] - 8:4</p> <p>require [1] - 58:6</p> <p>required [10] - 32:20, 45:8, 45:15, 46:4, 53:20, 57:1, 59:3, 71:11, 72:13, 90:2</p> <p>requirement [1] - 56:16</p> <p>requiring [3] - 59:7, 60:9, 61:8</p> <p>rescue [2] - 55:4, 118:14</p> <p>Research [1] - 19:19</p> <p>research [2] - 28:22, 29:12</p> <p>reserve [1] - 127:23</p> <p>residence [1] - 15:22</p> <p>residences [1] - 118:14</p> <p>residential [1] - 127:14</p>	<p>resist [1] - 124:21</p> <p>resisting [1] - 127:9</p> <p>resource [1] - 87:17</p> <p>resourced [3] - 96:13, 96:21, 96:22</p> <p>resources [17] - 98:10, 113:10, 113:13, 114:6, 114:24, 115:7, 115:18, 116:15, 116:21, 116:25, 117:2, 118:2, 118:24, 119:2, 119:20, 119:22, 120:3</p> <p>resourcing [1] - 97:24</p> <p>respect [19] - 8:6, 11:15, 16:7, 17:11, 24:5, 25:17, 63:1, 72:3, 83:1, 86:18, 94:6, 95:24, 98:23, 120:22, 125:23, 125:24, 146:25, 152:15, 185:7</p> <p>respective [1] - 2:14</p> <p>respectively [1] - 160:5</p> <p>respects [1] - 141:14</p> <p>respond [3] - 38:14, 112:15, 185:7</p> <p>responded [1] - 121:19</p> <p>responding [1] - 113:2</p> <p>response [7] - 58:6, 64:8, 112:20, 118:16, 121:11, 150:13, 150:14</p> <p>responses [1] - 156:6</p> <p>responsibility [11] - 48:19, 48:22, 103:20, 104:12, 105:1, 108:11, 109:10, 110:1, 110:11, 125:10</p> <p>responsible [3] - 91:25, 97:7, 116:13</p> <p>responsive [2] - 107:23, 112:11</p> <p>rest [4] - 27:19, 66:12, 80:19, 119:18</p> <p>result [5] - 61:7, 62:16, 72:9, 98:7, 105:24</p> <p>resulted [1] - 73:6</p> <p>resume [1] - 184:9</p> <p>resumed [5] - 1:4, 2:9, 52:19, 101:10, 155:1</p> <p>RESUMED [3] - 52:18, 101:9, 154:25</p>	<p>retain [1] - 91:24</p> <p>returning [1] - 141:9</p> <p>reveals [1] - 75:23</p> <p>revenge [1] - 75:16</p> <p>revetted [2] - 138:20, 139:7</p> <p>revetting [1] - 139:6</p> <p>review [16] - 23:7, 71:3, 72:10, 82:20, 101:15, 141:19, 144:11, 147:2, 148:6, 156:11, 165:12, 169:11, 173:10, 181:13, 182:21, 184:2</p> <p>reviewed [15] - 5:14, 5:15, 11:17, 11:21, 15:20, 16:18, 56:25, 67:11, 77:11, 142:9, 142:13, 142:20, 142:25, 163:3, 185:10</p> <p>reviewing [3] - 23:17, 72:20, 113:21</p> <p>rewarning [1] - 87:21</p> <p>rewritten [1] - 102:7</p> <p>rid [7] - 32:11, 84:2, 85:1, 85:4, 162:6, 182:11, 182:16</p> <p>ride [1] - 21:18</p> <p>rides [1] - 22:7</p> <p>right-hand [3] - 146:24, 155:10, 175:20</p> <p>rising [1] - 170:7</p> <p>risk [7] - 83:4, 83:6, 83:10, 83:22, 83:23, 83:25</p> <p>risks [1] - 83:2</p> <p>Ritchie [1] - 61:11</p> <p>River [3] - 97:15, 126:20, 126:23</p> <p>Robert [1] - 27:10</p> <p>Roberts [16] - 1:17, 2:3, 52:20, 78:13, 99:18, 101:11, 109:24, 136:13, 137:18, 138:1, 139:7, 146:2, 157:9, 184:13, 185:6, 1:6</p> <p>ROBERTS [38] - 2:3, 2:10, 48:9, 49:18, 51:11, 52:11, 52:15, 52:20, 57:19, 57:23, 58:10, 79:12, 79:23, 79:25, 80:3, 80:5, 80:13, 80:17, 80:25, 91:17, 92:4, 98:14, 98:19, 98:21, 99:10, 99:25, 100:24,</p>	<p>101:1, 101:5, 101:11, 124:21, 130:5, 136:15, 136:17, 137:5, 137:11, 137:14, 137:17</p> <p>Roberts's [1] - 184:11</p> <p>Robyn [2] - 2:4, 122:20</p> <p>role [4] - 141:18, 142:17, 144:7, 153:3</p> <p>roles [1] - 160:4</p> <p>room [3] - 31:13, 164:2, 172:20</p> <p>Rossmo [2] - 78:4, 115:14</p> <p>Rossmo's [1] - 78:2</p> <p>routine [2] - 41:17, 42:21</p> <p>Royal [2] - 13:13, 28:11</p> <p>RPR [1] - 186:9</p> <p>rude [9] - 132:20, 147:9, 164:20, 169:21, 169:22, 170:6, 170:10, 170:11, 170:15</p> <p>rumour [1] - 32:6</p> <p>run [1] - 88:25</p> <p>runaways [2] - 73:23, 161:1</p> <p>running [2] - 73:24, 74:20</p>	<p>184:21</p> <p>satisfies [1] - 56:18</p> <p>satisfy [2] - 9:16, 81:19</p> <p>saved [1] - 117:16</p> <p>saw [9] - 12:5, 72:23, 90:16, 93:11, 151:2, 159:15, 163:4, 163:5, 163:6</p> <p>scene [5] - 15:20, 16:10, 16:17, 64:11, 97:9</p> <p>schedule [1] - 127:19</p> <p>school [1] - 126:18</p> <p>schools [1] - 127:14</p> <p>scope [1] - 144:11</p> <p>score [1] - 138:22</p> <p>screaming [1] - 176:6</p> <p>search [27] - 3:4, 6:4, 29:17, 34:2, 34:11, 37:9, 38:5, 38:6, 40:12, 40:13, 72:2, 72:7, 72:19, 73:4, 81:4, 81:12, 81:14, 82:11, 82:16, 84:19, 84:24, 85:7, 86:1, 90:22, 92:9, 112:19</p> <p>Search [1] - 3:8</p> <p>searched [1] - 26:13</p> <p>searches [1] - 37:8</p> <p>searching [2] - 19:3, 37:7</p> <p>seasoned [2] - 88:22, 90:14</p> <p>second [16] - 4:25, 5:24, 33:6, 61:21, 62:4, 62:5, 106:16, 106:20, 112:1, 159:8, 168:12, 169:14, 169:15, 178:11, 181:6, 181:18</p> <p>second-guess [1] - 178:11</p> <p>second-last [1] - 168:12</p> <p>secondly [2] - 141:20, 180:23</p> <p>Section [2] - 29:9, 148:19</p> <p>section [12] - 3:5, 3:12, 3:15, 46:17, 82:9, 103:13, 106:11, 109:1, 150:21, 150:24, 151:14</p> <p>see [36] - 8:21, 8:24, 16:14, 18:8, 23:6, 23:9, 24:2, 25:1, 34:16, 34:21, 43:6,</p>
---	--	--	---	--

<p>55:22, 67:4, 67:7, 67:14, 70:6, 71:8, 106:25, 109:15, 118:4, 126:8, 131:9, 132:15, 135:10, 138:2, 149:5, 152:23, 152:24, 154:4, 157:22, 161:18, 165:17, 167:11, 180:16, 184:25</p> <p>seek [2] - 3:23, 75:16</p> <p>seeking [2] - 29:17, 37:8</p> <p>seeks [2] - 3:13, 3:15</p> <p>seem [3] - 43:7, 56:23, 170:17</p> <p>sees [1] - 33:18</p> <p>seized [3] - 15:7, 16:10, 16:15</p> <p>seizing [1] - 15:12</p> <p>self [4] - 158:14, 171:6, 171:13, 171:22</p> <p>self-awareness [4] - 158:14, 171:6, 171:13, 171:22</p> <p>send [2] - 41:8, 165:13</p> <p>sends [1] - 69:22</p> <p>senior [1] - 183:24</p> <p>Senior [1] - 165:21</p> <p>sense [8] - 1:20, 61:10, 78:7, 133:25, 143:16, 145:11, 145:16, 159:16</p> <p>sensed [1] - 160:11</p> <p>sent [1] - 7:24</p> <p>sentence [2] - 112:13, 112:15</p> <p>separately [1] - 93:9</p> <p>September [5] - 8:18, 10:10, 10:14, 75:22, 78:15</p> <p>sequence [3] - 35:1, 35:8, 37:17</p> <p>Sergeant [27] - 4:20, 5:12, 5:13, 5:15, 5:25, 12:5, 19:17, 20:8, 54:1, 54:9, 113:16, 115:12, 148:10, 148:17, 149:8, 151:16, 153:14, 153:22, 159:2, 160:17, 162:11, 162:24, 168:19, 169:1, 170:18, 178:19</p> <p>sergeant [4] - 18:2, 26:1, 68:9, 68:10</p> <p>Sergeant's [1] - 5:7</p>	<p>serial [15] - 9:1, 9:21, 10:4, 10:22, 11:1, 12:1, 12:4, 12:7, 29:11, 29:14, 29:22, 76:24, 77:19, 116:12, 134:13</p> <p>series [1] - 101:14</p> <p>serious [13] - 42:17, 47:1, 47:8, 70:15, 70:17, 71:20, 75:1, 87:7, 92:16, 120:15, 121:19, 144:6, 164:7</p> <p>seriously [5] - 86:24, 89:19, 149:10, 166:10, 166:21</p> <p>served [1] - 50:25</p> <p>Service [1] - 186:12</p> <p>service [2] - 150:10, 150:12</p> <p>serving [1] - 4:3</p> <p>set [5] - 8:11, 140:3, 140:8, 161:1, 2:12</p> <p>sets [1] - 3:17</p> <p>setting [1] - 98:11</p> <p>seven [4] - 11:5, 23:22, 77:5, 114:12</p> <p>several [6] - 9:16, 11:12, 65:13, 75:13, 111:3, 142:22</p> <p>sex [34] - 21:2, 21:11, 21:15, 21:19, 22:5, 22:9, 22:13, 22:20, 30:24, 35:11, 36:1, 36:2, 36:9, 37:5, 42:1, 63:25, 66:5, 66:9, 66:18, 69:15, 71:20, 102:3, 118:3, 120:14, 121:20, 123:9, 133:12, 139:17, 143:25, 144:6, 147:6, 147:13, 151:7, 183:16</p> <p>sexual [2] - 12:3, 75:13</p> <p>sexually [1] - 75:14</p> <p>shake [1] - 118:4</p> <p>Shakespeare [1] - 124:22</p> <p>shall [1] - 185:3</p> <p>share [1] - 145:6</p> <p>shared [1] - 110:10</p> <p>Shenher [49] - 4:8, 4:18, 5:4, 5:5, 6:6, 6:13, 8:8, 10:20, 11:16, 23:11, 29:25, 37:20, 54:1, 54:2, 54:4, 54:10, 67:15, 75:19, 78:16, 83:8, 88:19, 88:24, 90:9,</p>	<p>92:4, 92:18, 93:9, 113:19, 114:11, 115:11, 121:7, 123:7, 125:4, 125:9, 125:23, 130:19, 155:5, 155:14, 157:7, 158:9, 159:10, 159:12, 160:3, 160:6, 160:19, 161:9, 163:15, 164:5</p> <p>Shenher's [7] - 6:15, 75:21, 77:2, 77:11, 157:5, 171:5, 171:14</p> <p>shoes [1] - 74:20</p> <p>short [1] - 73:23</p> <p>short-term [1] - 73:23</p> <p>show [4] - 82:5, 84:11, 175:15, 184:3</p> <p>showed [1] - 170:2</p> <p>showing [3] - 22:4, 38:9, 38:11</p> <p>shown [2] - 50:21, 120:12</p> <p>sic [5] - 17:25, 112:24, 128:22, 133:13, 133:14</p> <p>side [4] - 34:20, 113:7, 155:10, 164:3</p> <p>sides [1] - 159:14</p> <p>sifting [1] - 60:24</p> <p>significance [8] - 7:5, 12:12, 18:19, 23:3, 30:6, 38:6, 95:2, 104:3</p> <p>significant [6] - 8:24, 9:10, 38:9, 57:21, 81:23, 110:1</p> <p>significantly [1] - 174:22</p> <p>similar [3] - 37:4, 92:9, 148:7</p> <p>similar-fact [1] - 92:9</p> <p>simple [2] - 56:23, 86:4</p> <p>simpliciter [1] - 43:12</p> <p>simply [12] - 2:22, 5:9, 20:10, 37:7, 40:9, 44:8, 47:13, 57:23, 77:24, 103:10, 151:21, 154:6</p> <p>single [5] - 52:9, 52:10, 58:24, 62:16</p> <p>sister [1] - 159:21</p> <p>sisters [1] - 129:24</p> <p>sit [3] - 8:22, 129:5, 164:1</p> <p>situation [5] - 43:17, 69:10, 113:24, 168:8, 168:20</p>	<p>six [2] - 62:5, 180:6</p> <p>sixth [1] - 168:25</p> <p>size [1] - 117:24</p> <p>skill [1] - 186:4</p> <p>skilled [1] - 94:21</p> <p>skills [1] - 156:3</p> <p>slashes [1] - 36:16</p> <p>slight [1] - 23:13</p> <p>slightly [1] - 109:23</p> <p>slips [1] - 36:9</p> <p>slowed [1] - 35:19</p> <p>slowly [1] - 158:19</p> <p>small [1] - 126:10</p> <p>smarten [1] - 168:16</p> <p>smears [1] - 19:22</p> <p>smokes.. [1] - 168:18</p> <p>SMT [3] - 165:19, 165:20, 166:5</p> <p>solidified [1] - 78:9</p> <p>solution [1] - 14:17</p> <p>solve [3] - 97:16, 120:16, 124:20</p> <p>solved [1] - 41:15</p> <p>solving [3] - 120:17, 134:12, 183:2</p> <p>someone [11] - 15:24, 55:1, 61:13, 69:12, 85:10, 98:2, 130:15, 155:18, 158:17, 169:21, 169:22</p> <p>sometime [2] - 80:3, 80:8</p> <p>sometimes [3] - 65:4, 74:18, 165:25</p> <p>somewhat [2] - 24:17, 114:11</p> <p>somewhere [5] - 19:14, 57:21, 85:20, 117:15, 124:9</p> <p>soon [2] - 96:17, 138:13</p> <p>sooner [1] - 119:20</p> <p>sorry [25] - 9:6, 10:13, 12:23, 15:15, 17:9, 23:24, 26:23, 31:7, 53:9, 60:17, 79:24, 88:12, 101:1, 111:10, 112:5, 122:2, 129:10, 133:18, 145:25, 146:1, 148:14, 151:11, 155:8, 157:22, 176:21</p> <p>sort [7] - 28:21, 97:24, 115:24, 125:19, 134:2, 139:12, 159:14</p> <p>sought [2] - 29:18, 40:5</p> <p>sound [1] - 86:4</p>	<p>sounds [1] - 84:15</p> <p>Source [12] - 13:2, 13:9, 17:12, 23:21, 24:1, 24:10, 25:17, 28:6, 28:15, 28:18, 29:1, 78:17</p> <p>source [23] - 3:2, 4:6, 4:9, 4:11, 7:10, 8:17, 12:13, 29:23, 31:10, 31:21, 32:9, 33:2, 34:6, 37:9, 54:2, 74:6, 74:7, 75:9, 83:3, 113:17, 122:19, 163:7</p> <p>sources [3] - 18:22, 19:12, 20:18</p> <p>South [1] - 42:1</p> <p>speaker [1] - 1:8</p> <p>speaking [2] - 158:17, 158:19</p> <p>speaks [1] - 176:9</p> <p>specific [20] - 24:14, 24:17, 44:16, 44:21, 57:3, 57:9, 57:14, 59:3, 60:10, 61:8, 73:8, 94:10, 131:4, 144:5, 144:13, 153:1, 154:2, 154:8, 163:10</p> <p>specifically [7] - 35:22, 67:20, 94:3, 110:24, 142:7, 167:6, 168:4</p> <p>speculate [1] - 18:11</p> <p>speeded [1] - 35:20</p> <p>spent [1] - 64:1</p> <p>spring [1] - 81:15</p> <p>Squad [1] - 148:18</p> <p>stabbing [1] - 90:11</p> <p>stabs [1] - 36:16</p> <p>staff [7] - 58:20, 70:25, 86:3, 133:14, 149:2, 170:21, 176:7</p> <p>stage [2] - 77:16, 88:6</p> <p>stake [1] - 117:10</p> <p>stamped [1] - 155:11</p> <p>stand [2] - 77:5, 120:20</p> <p>standing [1] - 146:18</p> <p>stands [1] - 175:23</p> <p>stark [1] - 175:23</p> <p>start [9] - 1:22, 4:25, 23:6, 34:22, 107:1, 112:5, 116:10, 119:12, 130:18</p> <p>started [8] - 64:22, 114:12, 118:17, 148:9, 159:3, 159:16, 159:17, 161:5</p>
--	--	--	---	---

starters ^[1] - 42:11 starting ^[2] - 11:13, 39:13 startling ^[1] - 123:1 starts ^[2] - 49:5, 84:6 state ^[1] - 85:12 statement ^[39] - 35:10, 35:21, 36:25, 37:14, 37:19, 69:11, 69:17, 69:22, 74:12, 90:10, 94:15, 132:4, 132:7, 155:17, 156:5, 156:6, 156:11, 157:5, 157:6, 157:10, 164:11, 164:13, 165:1, 165:7, 165:12, 165:17, 168:10, 168:21, 168:23, 169:1, 169:9, 169:11, 171:3, 171:4, 171:10, 172:2, 174:10, 178:6, 178:7 statements ^[6] - 9:15, 75:11, 134:14, 147:4, 173:12, 177:19 states ^[2] - 75:25, 169:1 stating ^[1] - 136:5 station ^[1] - 149:13 statistical ^[2] - 74:12, 74:13 statute ^[3] - 46:16, 47:24, 63:8 statutory ^[2] - 59:14, 106:11 stay ^[6] - 10:2, 37:22, 48:10, 90:17, 93:15, 93:20 staying ^[1] - 31:3 Steinbach ^[2] - 173:3, 173:4 stepped ^[1] - 146:2 steps ^[1] - 46:17 still ^[28] - 1:16, 1:24, 10:12, 13:22, 13:23, 14:9, 14:11, 16:17, 23:24, 25:12, 26:7, 31:5, 36:16, 36:21, 71:25, 76:4, 77:15, 94:7, 116:12, 117:5, 122:16, 123:18, 123:22, 127:11, 163:25, 164:1, 181:1 stimulated ^[1] - 84:10 stone ^[2] - 66:21, 131:19 stone-faced ^[1] -	131:19 stop ^[15] - 7:15, 13:16, 13:21, 25:25, 26:6, 35:5, 35:15, 39:11, 43:3, 52:13, 79:19, 89:19, 108:14, 183:23, 184:5 stopped ^[4] - 116:7, 157:18, 157:21, 157:25 stopping ^[2] - 107:11, 146:11 stories ^[1] - 112:16 story ^[1] - 126:13 strange ^[1] - 31:9 strategies ^[1] - 147:21 strategy ^[7] - 88:10, 89:22, 90:7, 91:4, 92:21, 93:3, 93:8 street ^[4] - 21:14, 95:4, 115:20, 132:13 Street ^[1] - 149:14 street-level ^[1] - 95:4 streetlights ^[1] - 35:19 stretch ^[1] - 154:1 strewn ^[4] - 16:4, 18:20, 20:17, 33:15 strong ^[1] - 78:12 stronger ^[1] - 115:10 strongly ^[3] - 41:21, 178:2, 178:10 structure ^[1] - 181:7 strung ^[1] - 163:19 stuff ^[4] - 113:6, 130:9, 131:3, 146:6 sub ^[1] - 3:14 subheading ^[1] - 34:18 subject ^[10] - 29:11, 93:15, 98:16, 99:4, 107:18, 112:7, 120:20, 122:1, 163:13, 175:10 submission ^[3] - 103:2, 104:9, 105:18 submit ^[1] - 3:3 subpart ^[1] - 3:14 substantial ^[2] - 99:8, 99:14 substantially ^[1] - 87:23 substitute ^[1] - 135:22 success ^[3] - 65:5, 76:12, 89:22 successful ^[2] - 3:4, 120:17 suffice ^[1] - 93:24 sufficiency ^[3] - 79:17, 82:20, 82:23 sufficient ^[6] - 39:25,	78:5, 78:19, 82:16, 101:21, 116:2 sufficiently ^[1] - 35:2 suggest ^[13] - 21:4, 21:13, 37:13, 75:15, 76:10, 83:20, 94:10, 104:8, 105:8, 122:25, 174:12, 178:9, 183:19 suggested ^[12] - 35:14, 45:3, 61:18, 84:3, 86:14, 99:7, 102:2, 117:18, 143:14, 147:20, 152:1 suggesting ^[9] - 10:16, 18:13, 54:13, 78:14, 101:20, 102:6, 143:22, 145:2, 179:16 suggestion ^[3] - 35:7, 99:13, 145:14 suggestive ^[1] - 10:15 suicides ^[1] - 74:16 summarized ^[1] - 67:12 summarizing ^[1] - 61:24 summer ^[2] - 88:23, 96:25 superficially ^[1] - 65:16 Superintendent ^[1] - 1:22 supervision ^[3] - 113:14, 116:24, 179:24 supervisor ^[3] - 85:19, 99:5, 113:19 supplied ^[1] - 114:6 support ^[13] - 6:4, 6:23, 10:7, 38:21, 40:3, 64:20, 70:18, 93:6, 105:21, 105:25, 106:3, 112:25, 135:14 supported ^[4] - 6:6, 6:7, 29:6, 75:10 supporting ^[5] - 70:3, 88:20, 98:10, 100:21, 110:21 supports ^[1] - 77:20 suppose ^[2] - 35:7, 53:25 Supreme ^[2] - 37:16, 62:18 surely ^[1] - 89:9 surface ^[2] - 43:24, 74:19 surprise ^[1] - 167:7	surprised ^[2] - 137:11, 168:2 Surrey ^[3] - 22:20, 68:4 surround ^[1] - 43:7 surveillance ^[4] - 118:15, 119:6, 120:5, 120:7 survived ^[3] - 12:21, 69:17, 73:5 survives ^[1] - 36:24 Susan ^[1] - 151:8 suspect ^[16] - 14:13, 41:21, 50:9, 50:12, 53:11, 64:23, 77:25, 95:16, 95:18, 97:3, 98:23, 100:5, 102:11, 103:7, 114:3, 119:7 suspect-focused ^[1] - 64:23 suspected ^[20] - 3:11, 3:16, 19:11, 37:3, 38:3, 39:24, 62:25, 65:22, 72:8, 75:25, 76:3, 82:6, 82:10, 82:13, 82:15, 82:19, 96:5, 113:12, 117:9, 118:22 suspects ^[3] - 61:18, 97:5, 97:6 suspicion ^[3] - 11:8, 39:22, 117:11 suspicious ^[1] - 74:22 sustain ^[1] - 177:2 sustained ^[3] - 101:22, 116:3, 116:16 sweet ^[1] - 169:4 sworn ^[1] - 5:7 synopsized ^[1] - 37:17 syringe ^[6] - 13:13, 13:17, 14:17, 14:19, 16:11, 17:3 syringe's ^[1] - 13:2 syringes ^[35] - 3:24, 12:9, 12:12, 12:16, 12:25, 13:11, 13:20, 13:24, 14:15, 15:2, 15:4, 15:5, 15:13, 15:14, 16:3, 16:7, 16:10, 16:21, 16:25, 17:8, 17:9, 17:18, 18:6, 18:12, 18:20, 20:17, 20:23, 24:5, 25:19, 26:7, 27:16, 28:18, 30:5, 33:14, 33:17 system ^[4] - 153:8, 153:9, 153:11, 161:2	systemic ^[3] - 176:13, 177:3, 177:7 T tab ^[10] - 2:17, 3:7, 4:1, 4:22, 26:19, 26:23, 26:24, 27:23, 34:8, 130:20 Tab ^[2] - 5:10, 138:2 Tabs ^[3] - 72:4, 137:2, 2:6 tabs ^[2] - 2:14, 34:7 takers ^[1] - 150:22 talented ^[3] - 94:13, 94:18, 95:5 Tanya ^[1] - 131:6 tape ^[4] - 153:9, 154:4, 162:25, 170:1 taped ^[1] - 162:25 tapes ^[1] - 154:9 target ^[1] - 169:24 targeted ^[1] - 134:12 task ^[1] - 142:8 Task ^[1] - 119:22 team ^[3] - 94:25, 165:21, 183:24 teams ^[1] - 118:16 tears ^[1] - 131:22 telephone ^[2] - 17:4, 159:3 template ^[1] - 38:2 tendency ^[1] - 170:22 tens ^[2] - 67:12, 86:2 terabytes ^[1] - 67:9 term ^[2] - 29:2, 73:23 terms ^[14] - 38:10, 46:23, 51:19, 81:23, 88:18, 91:6, 115:24, 121:11, 123:8, 127:16, 128:25, 145:1, 165:25, 183:3 terrible ^[2] - 65:4, 117:10 Terry ^[1] - 165:7 test ^[8] - 2:24, 32:25, 34:2, 39:2, 72:13, 72:14, 81:2, 81:3 testified ^[1] - 151:2 testifying ^[1] - 145:5 testimony ^[1] - 179:21 THE ^[102] - 1:4, 1:5, 1:8, 1:11, 1:14, 2:2, 48:6, 48:7, 49:13, 49:14, 51:5, 51:10, 51:17, 51:24, 52:13, 52:16, 52:19, 57:11, 57:22, 57:25, 73:11, 73:12, 79:21, 79:24,
--	--	---	--	---

80:1, 80:4, 80:9, 80:10, 80:14, 80:24, 91:19, 92:3, 98:13, 98:18, 98:20, 99:15, 99:21, 99:23, 100:20, 100:21, 100:22, 100:25, 101:4, 101:6, 101:7, 101:10, 124:19, 136:12, 136:13, 136:16, 136:23, 136:24, 137:9, 137:12, 137:16, 137:18, 137:19, 138:6, 138:8, 138:17, 139:14, 139:23, 139:25, 140:2, 140:4, 140:11, 140:14, 140:17, 141:3, 145:9, 145:12, 145:20, 145:22, 146:3, 146:9, 146:11, 146:16, 146:20, 146:22, 152:15, 154:14, 154:18, 154:21, 154:23, 155:1, 175:6, 175:18, 175:22, 175:25, 176:4, 176:11, 184:7, 184:8, 184:17, 184:21, 184:25, 185:2, 185:5, 185:13, 185:16, 185:19, 185:20 theirs ^[1] - 48:15 themselves ^[1] - 42:25 theoretical ^[1] - 77:16 theories ^[2] - 63:15, 76:20 theory ^[10] - 3:9, 37:2, 37:10, 38:12, 38:20, 38:21, 39:21, 40:4, 78:4, 119:18 thereabouts ^[1] - 127:6 thereafter ^[1] - 103:24 therefore ^[5] - 14:2, 16:20, 21:25, 117:9, 118:5 thesis ^[1] - 29:11 thinking ^[8] - 69:18, 70:14, 70:17, 83:11, 88:7, 110:22, 136:7, 174:11 thinks ^[1] - 124:22 third ^[5] - 4:25, 89:3, 106:22, 122:16, 122:22 thirds ^[1] - 34:19 thorough ^[2] - 27:21, 182:4 thou ^[1] - 124:22 thoughtful ^[1] - 129:17 thousands ^[3] - 67:13, 86:2, 163:9 threat ^[1] - 89:15 threatening ^[1] - 88:14 threats ^[5] - 86:19, 86:24, 89:7, 89:11, 89:13 three ^[9] - 2:20, 15:9, 16:6, 82:15, 127:4, 127:5, 128:8, 140:20 threshold ^[1] - 79:9 throat ^[1] - 36:16 throughout ^[2] - 65:19, 177:3 throw ^[1] - 172:24 Thursday ^[2] - 2:12, 2:18 ties ^[1] - 38:23 time-wise ^[1] - 1:21 timeline ^[1] - 182:4 tip ^[2] - 34:25, 113:14 TOBIAS ^[1] - 138:18 Tobias ^[2] - 1:19, 138:17 today ^[3] - 4:20, 53:6, 127:12 together ^[8] - 39:22, 64:24, 98:12, 123:8, 161:25, 169:20, 171:19, 182:3 tomorrow ^[1] - 184:9 Tony ^[3] - 126:18, 127:15, 132:24 took ^[8] - 35:12, 42:3, 97:16, 125:7, 125:10, 129:6, 160:8, 163:16 top ^[7] - 5:11, 12:9, 32:3, 106:22, 133:8, 155:10, 184:4 topic ^[1] - 167:2 total ^[2] - 38:15, 119:24 totalling ^[1] - 55:11 touch ^[1] - 122:25 tough ^[1] - 31:11 toward ^[1] - 129:13 towards ^[3] - 11:13, 23:18, 147:15 trade ^[11] - 21:15, 22:5, 63:25, 66:5, 66:9, 102:3, 118:3, 133:12, 144:7, 151:7, 183:16 trailer ^[11] - 3:19, 18:21, 20:3, 20:18, 27:10, 30:22, 30:23, 31:2, 31:3, 36:5, 39:23 train ^[1] - 130:12 transaction ^[1] - 93:1 transcription ^[1] - 186:3 transported ^[1] - 43:20 transporting ^[1] - 45:11 tread ^[1] - 146:1 treat ^[1] - 159:25 treated ^[3] - 119:2, 151:9, 169:19 trial ^[5] - 56:23, 60:5, 60:8, 63:12, 63:18 tried ^[3] - 149:11, 164:2, 170:23 tries ^[1] - 36:9 trophies ^[10] - 8:16, 8:20, 8:25, 9:12, 11:25, 17:22, 25:23, 29:2, 29:13, 30:6 trophies" ^[1] - 24:9 true ^[16] - 5:17, 22:14, 31:1, 31:18, 62:6, 74:13, 79:1, 122:8, 122:9, 124:2, 135:12, 154:6, 169:5, 171:24, 179:3, 186:2 trunk ^[1] - 42:1 trust ^[1] - 133:20 trusts ^[1] - 31:15 truth ^[1] - 121:8 try ^[13] - 1:23, 19:7, 43:6, 57:9, 66:3, 82:16, 89:18, 92:19, 146:7, 152:19, 180:10, 181:13 trying ^[21] - 21:8, 36:12, 64:9, 89:19, 91:25, 92:22, 95:15, 99:19, 120:24, 125:11, 125:15, 127:7, 132:23, 136:8, 162:6, 162:12, 163:21, 173:7, 177:24, 178:20, 182:3 tuning ^[1] - 163:21 turn ^[6] - 5:10, 34:8, 63:17, 74:19, 101:12, 169:14 turned ^[2] - 107:5, 182:24 two ^[25] - 4:21, 5:21, 5:24, 16:6, 23:16, 24:12, 27:22, 32:4, 32:9, 34:19, 39:2, 47:21, 74:24, 82:15, 83:2, 89:3, 92:25, 115:18, 115:19, 117:24, 128:10, 129:4, 159:14, 181:4, 181:9 two-thirds ^[1] - 34:19 type ^[1] - 28:8 typed ^[1] - 156:8 typing ^[2] - 155:19, 155:21	42:23, 98:7 unlikely ^[5] - 24:15, 24:19, 78:9, 78:11, 92:20 unlocks ^[1] - 36:21 unnecessarily ^[1] - 42:23 unrelated ^[1] - 102:1 unreliable ^[1] - 109:5 unsettled ^[1] - 83:12 unsolicited ^[1] - 167:10 unsuccessful ^[1] - 163:1 untuned ^[1] - 66:21 unwashed ^[1] - 118:5 up ^[41] - 2:11, 26:1, 26:14, 32:11, 34:5, 36:5, 36:17, 37:5, 37:6, 38:14, 41:3, 43:6, 45:4, 47:5, 58:21, 62:12, 70:20, 72:1, 74:19, 77:8, 77:14, 81:2, 86:3, 87:15, 98:11, 113:17, 118:9, 127:3, 127:4, 127:15, 133:1, 138:15, 149:17, 161:1, 162:23, 167:8, 167:11, 167:25, 168:16, 170:17, 181:7 ups ^[1] - 43:1 urgency ^[1] - 115:1 urgently ^[1] - 37:13 used ^[1] - 27:16 useful ^[3] - 29:15, 30:3, 137:7 users ^[3] - 139:18, 144:1, 148:3 utter ^[1] - 89:11 uttering ^[2] - 86:19, 89:7
U	
UBC ^[1] - 126:19 ulterior ^[1] - 20:23 unable ^[2] - 59:13, 113:9 unacceptable ^[2] - 152:9, 178:13 unaccounted ^[1] - 39:15 unanswered ^[3] - 107:9, 107:11, 107:15 uncover ^[1] - 64:4 under ^[10] - 2:14, 3:5, 4:22, 81:22, 93:14, 103:13, 104:13, 109:1, 118:15, 142:15 undercover ^[2] - 79:6, 83:17 underlying ^[3] - 43:17, 45:7, 50:14 understood ^[2] - 9:11, 104:3 undertones ^[1] - 132:2 undoubtedly ^[1] - 37:20 unfair ^[1] - 124:18 unfolds ^[1] - 1:25 unfounded ^[2] - 107:20, 112:9 unionized ^[2] - 179:15, 179:20 unique ^[1] - 30:19 Unit ^[4] - 131:16, 133:15, 134:19, 147:3 United ^[1] - 186:12 unlawful ^[1] - 69:3 unless ^[3] - 21:17, 42:23, 98:7	vacillated ^[1] - 163:20 Valley ^[1] - 126:24 Vancouver ^[77] - 1:1, 19:6, 19:14, 21:16, 41:1, 41:20, 41:24, 42:2, 42:3, 43:1, 48:14, 48:25, 49:5, 49:6, 49:14, 49:20, 49:22, 49:25, 50:7, 50:22, 51:3, 51:14, 52:24, 54:17, 54:23, 54:25, 55:17, 62:24,

<p>67:3, 69:13, 70:23, 87:16, 90:18, 91:1, 94:12, 95:22, 96:2, 98:2, 100:3, 100:15, 102:9, 103:5, 104:12, 104:23, 105:10, 107:17, 107:21, 108:16, 109:7, 110:14, 110:15, 110:20, 110:25, 111:16, 111:20, 112:6, 112:14, 113:9, 114:15, 120:22, 121:1, 123:24, 130:18, 133:20, 134:11, 141:13, 141:16, 141:21, 141:24, 142:1, 143:12, 143:18, 143:19, 144:17, 145:19, 150:3</p> <p>various [3] - 22:6, 88:24, 177:20</p> <p>vehicle [4] - 21:18, 22:7, 35:14, 69:14</p> <p>vehicles [1] - 37:4</p> <p>venom [1] - 135:1</p> <p>venomous [5] - 134:16, 134:24, 135:4, 135:17, 135:19</p> <p>venomous" [1] - 134:22</p> <p>venues [1] - 111:4</p> <p>verbatim [1] - 156:4</p> <p>verification [1] - 28:21</p> <p>verify [1] - 79:3</p> <p>verily [1] - 16:20</p> <p>version [3] - 139:1, 139:6, 139:7</p> <p>versus [1] - 76:24</p> <p>VERTLIEB [5] - 1:15, 137:24, 138:7, 138:9, 139:12</p> <p>vial [3] - 14:19, 14:22, 18:25</p> <p>vials [2] - 20:3, 20:16</p> <p>Vic [1] - 28:16</p> <p>victim [9] - 12:18, 19:9, 20:14, 52:10, 55:4, 58:24, 125:18, 127:25, 130:23</p> <p>Victim [23] - 4:14, 12:17, 12:24, 13:15, 15:3, 16:12, 17:1, 17:3, 17:6, 21:6, 30:25, 32:16, 35:10, 38:10, 42:21, 86:19, 87:5, 87:8, 88:16,</p>	<p>89:5, 90:20, 91:12, 93:5</p> <p>victim's [1] - 97:9</p> <p>victims [5] - 19:10, 22:18, 63:23, 65:24, 124:3</p> <p>victims' [1] - 29:2</p> <p>video [3] - 15:20, 15:22, 33:13</p> <p>view [10] - 2:24, 11:10, 11:17, 73:4, 75:1, 82:23, 110:19, 115:3, 127:7, 145:6</p> <p>views [4] - 141:16, 143:17, 145:19, 148:7</p> <p>vigorous [1] - 100:11</p> <p>vigorously [1] - 105:7</p> <p>violated [2] - 83:10, 85:11</p> <p>violating [2] - 43:22, 43:23</p> <p>Violent [1] - 148:19</p> <p>violent [3] - 36:8, 38:9, 183:16</p> <p>virtually [1] - 37:25</p> <p>virtue [1] - 61:2</p> <p>visit [1] - 21:2</p> <p>visiting [2] - 22:10, 102:4</p> <p>voice [1] - 170:5</p> <p>VPD [59] - 4:8, 6:23, 10:19, 39:19, 41:6, 41:16, 42:7, 48:21, 55:2, 60:21, 61:4, 64:6, 64:8, 64:15, 64:17, 64:19, 88:18, 97:12, 97:19, 98:9, 98:24, 99:2, 100:21, 101:19, 101:23, 102:19, 103:5, 105:2, 105:3, 105:4, 105:22, 105:25, 106:7, 107:12, 107:15, 108:5, 109:11, 109:12, 109:18, 110:1, 110:5, 111:5, 111:24, 112:10, 112:17, 112:23, 113:4, 117:22, 118:6, 120:12, 120:16, 126:6, 131:15, 133:14, 134:13, 135:8, 177:3</p> <p>VPD's [3] - 109:10, 111:4, 121:20</p> <p>Vu [1] - 45:23</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">W</p> <p>wait [2] - 53:10, 91:19</p> <p>waived [1] - 83:21</p> <p>walked [1] - 150:5</p> <p>walking [1] - 172:20</p> <p>wanderers [1] - 74:1</p> <p>wants [1] - 41:7</p> <p>Ward [1] - 122:11</p> <p>warn [1] - 163:17</p> <p>warned [2] - 25:4, 86:25</p> <p>warning [2] - 87:8, 88:4</p> <p>warnings [1] - 87:24</p> <p>warrant [25] - 3:5, 6:4, 29:17, 34:3, 34:15, 38:6, 39:5, 39:7, 40:12, 40:13, 72:2, 72:7, 73:4, 79:9, 79:17, 80:16, 81:5, 81:14, 82:11, 82:17, 84:7, 85:7, 90:22, 92:9, 112:19</p> <p>Warrant" [1] - 3:8</p> <p>warrants [4] - 34:11, 72:19, 81:12</p> <p>wary [1] - 33:24</p> <p>washroom [1] - 35:14</p> <p>watch [1] - 87:8</p> <p>ways [1] - 138:12</p> <p>weakened [1] - 75:6</p> <p>wealthy [1] - 116:23</p> <p>wear [1] - 83:17</p> <p>website [2] - 139:2, 139:11</p> <p>week [1] - 165:23</p> <p>weekend [1] - 8:1</p> <p>weekly [1] - 132:14</p> <p>well-advised [1] - 135:16</p> <p>well-known [1] - 179:10</p> <p>Westminster [2] - 60:5, 68:4</p> <p>whacks [1] - 36:15</p> <p>whilst [1] - 46:10</p> <p>White [1] - 16:18</p> <p>white [4] - 127:8, 129:18, 129:20, 131:19</p> <p>whole [5] - 63:4, 65:19, 145:4, 166:6, 178:16</p> <p>widespread [1] - 149:6</p> <p>Williams [3] - 1:22, 60:6, 169:20</p> <p>Williams' [1] - 138:19</p>	<p>Willie [1] - 27:10</p> <p>willing [2] - 83:23, 121:2</p> <p>willingly [1] - 102:4</p> <p>wire [1] - 83:17</p> <p>wiretap [3] - 79:7, 84:6, 84:9</p> <p>wise [1] - 1:21</p> <p>wish [2] - 136:13, 141:12</p> <p>wished [2] - 121:23, 156:19</p> <p>witness [23] - 8:5, 35:9, 36:25, 37:14, 37:18, 64:11, 66:13, 69:10, 69:17, 90:10, 90:11, 90:12, 91:23, 97:8, 99:8, 99:11, 116:9, 145:17, 151:15, 175:16, 175:21, 176:5, 185:10</p> <p>WITNESS [6] - 48:7, 49:14, 51:24, 73:12, 80:9, 100:21</p> <p>witnesses [1] - 94:5</p> <p>Wolthers [1] - 97:2</p> <p>woman [3] - 63:24, 64:25, 100:10</p> <p>Women [6] - 133:16, 133:18, 133:22, 134:15, 134:17, 166:7</p> <p>women [80] - 3:9, 11:10, 19:5, 19:10, 19:21, 22:7, 22:11, 37:3, 38:4, 38:24, 39:12, 39:14, 39:16, 48:23, 48:24, 51:16, 51:25, 54:7, 63:2, 63:15, 63:24, 64:10, 65:3, 65:23, 66:3, 67:6, 68:1, 68:5, 73:15, 73:22, 74:8, 74:20, 74:21, 75:24, 76:4, 76:19, 77:8, 78:5, 95:11, 95:24, 95:25, 96:7, 96:18, 97:7, 98:1, 98:24, 99:1, 100:5, 100:11, 100:15, 103:9, 107:3, 113:12, 114:22, 116:7, 117:8, 117:12, 117:13, 117:16, 117:22, 118:23, 120:23, 121:14, 122:6, 122:13, 122:14, 122:24, 123:8, 123:15,</p>	<p>123:17, 124:1, 130:14, 131:4, 148:9, 158:16, 163:23, 174:25, 177:2, 182:24, 182:25</p> <p>women's [12] - 3:18, 7:6, 17:20, 24:6, 24:11, 25:20, 27:8, 27:9, 27:15, 115:23, 160:8</p> <p>wonder [2] - 69:20, 83:16</p> <p>wondering [2] - 61:12, 66:25</p> <p>WOODALL [3] - 1:6, 1:9, 1:12</p> <p>Woodall [3] - 1:7, 1:10, 1:11</p> <p>word [24] - 8:20, 9:11, 11:24, 60:17, 117:1, 120:24, 121:25, 122:4, 122:5, 124:6, 124:12, 129:14, 134:22, 134:23, 135:6, 135:17, 135:18, 135:22, 136:2, 136:10, 153:8, 153:10, 174:13</p> <p>wording [1] - 81:8</p> <p>words [9] - 6:21, 58:17, 67:1, 67:4, 67:14, 143:24, 171:15, 174:20</p> <p>worker [12] - 21:15, 22:20, 42:1, 66:9, 66:18, 71:20, 120:14, 125:4, 144:7, 151:7, 183:17</p> <p>workers [15] - 21:2, 21:11, 22:5, 22:9, 64:1, 66:5, 102:3, 118:3, 121:20, 123:9, 133:12, 139:18, 143:25, 147:6, 147:13</p> <p>workforce [1] - 179:15</p> <p>worn [1] - 15:6</p> <p>worrying [1] - 53:16</p> <p>worth [1] - 86:2</p> <p>worthy [2] - 183:8, 183:12</p> <p>wrapper [1] - 14:11</p> <p>wrist [1] - 36:22</p> <p>wrists [1] - 36:10</p> <p>write [8] - 26:20, 81:18, 134:23, 160:21, 174:21, 176:21, 177:21,</p>
---	---	---	--	---

<p>177:22</p> <p>writer ^[1] - 108:21</p> <p>writing ^[5] - 80:21, 108:8, 115:12, 182:21</p> <p>written ^[9] - 105:8, 114:18, 116:4, 124:4, 134:1, 145:7, 155:17, 178:2, 178:10</p> <p>wrote ^[7] - 7:19, 81:14, 109:3, 116:17, 125:14, 174:11, 175:3</p>
<p>Y</p>
<p>year ^[2] - 73:21, 145:6</p> <p>years ^[10] - 22:24, 24:13, 63:18, 74:24, 114:12, 126:20, 132:8, 152:25, 164:15, 180:6</p> <p>Yelds ^[15] - 17:15, 24:4, 24:10, 24:19, 25:18, 28:7, 30:14, 31:24, 32:13, 33:8, 33:15, 75:8, 79:11, 83:1, 84:13</p> <p>Yelds' ^[2] - 28:9, 79:3</p> <p>yes" ^[1] - 49:9</p> <p>young ^[2] - 55:7, 116:22</p> <p>yourself ^[4] - 113:22, 151:15, 155:24, 172:14</p> <p>Youth ^[1] - 29:8</p>