

INQUIRY INTO THE INVESTIGATION AND
PROSECUTION OF DEREK HARVEY-ZENK

The Honourable Roger Salhany, Q.C., Commissioner

* * * * *

* * * * *

Transcript of Proceedings
before the Commission sitting at
the Winnipeg Convention Centre
Winnipeg, Manitoba

* * * * *

Thursday, July 31, 2008

Volume 24

INQUIRY PROCEEDINGS

COMMISSION STAFF:

Mr. David M. Paciocco Commission Counsel
Mr. Vincent Clifford Associate Commission Counsel
Mr. R.L. Giasson Chief Administrative Officer
Ms. Melissa Braun Administrative Secretary
Ms. Wendy Bergmann Administrative Assistant
Ms. Alnie LeBlanc Commission Clerk

APPEARANCES

Mr. G. Zazelenchuk and
Mr. I. Restall For Robert Taman and Family
Mr. M. Green and
Ms. K. Dixon For Mr. Marty Minuk
Mr. J. Prober and
Mr. B. King For Derek Harvey-Zenk
Mr. R. McDonald and
Ms. B. Bowley For R.M. of East St. Paul
Mr. H. Weinstein and
Ms. L. Labossiere For Mr. Harry Bakema
Ms. S. Hanlin and
Mr. M. Jack For Winnipeg Police Service
Mr. K. Labossiere, Ms. K. Clearwater,
Mr. S. Hoepfner and Mr. S. Messner
For Winnipeg Police Assoc.
Mr. G. McFetridge, Mr. S. Boyd and
Mr. S. Nozick For the Province of Manitoba
Court Reporters:
Debra Kot
Cecelia Reid

INDEX OF PROCEEDINGS

DESCRIPTION	PAGE
WITNESSES:	
Martin Minuk (continued)	
Examination by Mr. Jack	6280
Examination by Mr. Nozick	6286
Examination by Mr. Prober	6383
Examination by Mr. Green	6390
Re-Examination by Mr Paciocco	6414
Richard Peck	
Direct Examination by Mr. Clifford	6418
Examination by Mr. Zazelenchuk	6504
Examination by Mr. Dixon	6518
Brian Richard Kaplan	
Direct Examination by Mr. Paciocco	6531

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT NO.		PAGE
235	Y-3.A, Letter dated February 22, 2008 to Richard Peck, Y-3.b, Letter dated March 4, 2008 to Brian Gover	6420
236	Correspondence from Fillmore Riley to Commission Counsel, February 28, 2008, re Tramley report with attached relevant excerpts	6529
237	CV of Paul Lobsinger along with his opinion evidence relating to East St. Paul Police investigative file and his report addendum dated May 8, 2008	6530

1 THURSDAY, JULY 31, 2008

2 UPON COMMENCING AT 8:59 A.M.

3 THE CLERK: All rise, please. This
4 Commission of Inquiry is now open. Please be
5 seated.

6 MR. JACK: Good morning,
7 Mr. Commissioner.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: Good morning,
9 Mr. Jack.

10 BY MR. JACK:

11 Q Mr. Minuk, I have just a few questions
12 for you. I will certainly endeavour not to be
13 covering ground that has already been covered with
14 you, and I think a fair bit already has.

15 I want to start by taking you back to
16 some of the discussion you had with some of the
17 other counsel about the involvement of the
18 Professional Standards Unit of the Winnipeg Police
19 Service, the PSU?

20 A Yes, sir.

21 Q And you've already confirmed numerous
22 times that you were aware at the beginning of
23 March 2005 that the PSU was becoming involved in
24 assisting in the investigation?

25 A Yes.

1 Q And you were asked by Mr. Weinstein
2 whether or not you had any qualms about that, and
3 we have your response on that. I would take it
4 even further. Apart from not having any qualms,
5 would it be fair to suggest that at that point, in
6 early March 2005, you actually viewed it as a
7 positive thing that the PSU was getting involved?

8 A Well, I'm glad that somebody was
9 getting onto it, yes. I didn't have any problems
10 with PSU, so...

11 Q So, generally positive reaction from
12 your perspective?

13 A Yes.

14 Q And certainly nothing ever stated by
15 you to the contrary?

16 A No, no, no.

17 Q Okay. At any point throughout the
18 investigation?

19 A No, no.

20 Q And we also learned that on March 7,
21 2005, and I believe Mr. Zazelenchuk was putting
22 some of the specific dates to you from Sergeant
23 Poole's notes, it appears that you had a
24 conversation with Sergeant Poole wherein he
25 advised you that the Branigan's aspect was going

1 to be starting --

2 A Right.

3 Q -- on March 17, 2005? And again, you
4 had no concern with PSU interviewing the civilian
5 witnesses?

6 A No.

7 Q And in fact, given the investigation
8 that needed to occur again, you would have viewed
9 that aspect of their involvement as a positive
10 thing?

11 A Yes. Anything being done by
12 investigators on the investigation would be good.
13 It's to get on with it and do the job.

14 Q Thank you. And so, again, it follows
15 that at no point did you express concern or
16 disapproval?

17 A No, I never expressed any concern
18 regarding Professional Standards.

19 Q Thank you. Now, I just want to turn
20 again to an area that was canvassed by several
21 counsel, I think last by Mr. Labossiere. And this
22 is with respect to some apparent contradictions
23 from your perspective in some of the evidence.
24 And by that I mean, firstly, referring to the
25 evidence of Sean Black?

1 A Yes, sir. I am familiar with the
2 issue, yes.

3 Q Yes, I don't need to cover that
4 territory. And also referring to the apparent
5 contradiction, from your perspective, with respect
6 to the evidence of Humniski and Anderson?

7 A Right.

8 Q Okay. And you were asked by
9 Mr. Labossiere whether or not you disclosed any of
10 that to the defence, this apparent contradiction,
11 from your perspective?

12 A If I could what?

13 Q If you had disclosed any of that, if
14 you had contacted Mr. Wolson to disclose it?

15 A I think I indicated that I hadn't,
16 because our conversations had to take a turn to
17 the issue of settlement. And had we gone back to
18 the issue of the hearing, I would have met with
19 each of the officers beforehand and heard what
20 they had to say, and wouldn't have told Mr. Wolson
21 anything different than I would have, of course,
22 been reminded of that I might have otherwise
23 overlooked.

24 Q So apart even from the issue of
25 disclosure or defence, I'm wondering whether it

1 entered your mind whether any further
2 investigation needed to occur. So apart from
3 disclosing to Mr. Wolson, I'm wondering whether or
4 not you had made any contact to the PSU?

5 A I didn't make any contact because the
6 timing was such, sir, that these officers were
7 interviewed in the days leading up to the
8 Preliminary, as I recall it. And then I know that
9 there was an abrupt change of direction.

10 Q Okay. And so you would confirm
11 therefore that you didn't --

12 A No.

13 Q -- contact PSU requesting further
14 investigation?

15 A No.

16 Q Okay.

17 A I don't think PSU became involved at
18 all, ever, after they submitted their report on
19 anything, sir.

20 Q Okay. Not that you had requested them
21 to?

22 A Pardon me?

23 Q Not that you had requested them to
24 either?

25 A No.

1 Q Okay. And specifically with the
2 evidence of Humniski and Anderson, and again I
3 believe it was canvassed in great detail. There
4 was just one comment you made in your evidence in
5 chief when asked by Mr. Paciocco, and I have made
6 note of it, that when you were referring to this
7 second version, if you will, wherein you reported
8 in your September 20 --

9 A Right.

10 Q -- September 20, 2007 report that they
11 indicated some level of impairment and that was
12 affecting their memory. I noted in your testimony
13 that you used the phrase that that was the
14 impression you got. At one point you used that
15 phrase. And so I just wanted to explore that with
16 you because, again, to my mind when one uses that
17 phrase --

18 A Yes. That was what I understood them
19 to be telling, that if I used that phrase, I don't
20 think that I was telling you an impression, that's
21 what I understood them to be telling me, okay.

22 Q And I understand that. But just to be
23 entirely clear, there is no specific recollection
24 of them saying that?

25 A I didn't make note of it, and had I

1 made a note of it, I would have been able to
2 produce it for you.

3 Q That's what you took from the
4 comments?

5 A Right.

6 MR. JACK: Thank you, Mr. Minuk. I
7 have no further questions. Thank you,
8 Mr. Commissioner.

9 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Mr. Jack.

10 MR. NOZICK: Good morning,
11 Mr. Commissioner, Mr. Minuk.

12 THE WITNESS: Good morning, Mr.
13 Nozick.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: You're not bringing
15 all those files over, are you?

16 MR. NOZICK: I hope not.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: We don't have many
18 days.

19 MR. NOZICK: We don't have enough time
20 for that.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

22 BY MR. NOZICK:

23 Q Stan Nozick, just to refresh your
24 memory again, appearing as co-counsel for the
25 Government of Manitoba. If I may get on with it.

1 Mr. Minuk, I want to -- by the way,
2 Mr. Commissioner, I'm going to be referring to
3 several volumes that you may have handy, R-1, R-2,
4 R-4 and volumes G and K?

5 THE COMMISSIONER: What's the last
6 one?

7 MR. NOZICK: R-1, R-2, R-4, G and K.
8 The K, I think, was the RCMP investigation.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Go ahead.

10 BY MR. NOZICK:

11 Q Referring you -- firstly, Mr. Minuk,
12 do you have those volumes there?

13 A I don't have the volumes, I have
14 individual exhibits that have been filed.

15 Q I'm going to refer you first again to
16 Exhibit 55 and Exhibit 54, which appear in volume
17 G-43.a and 43.b?

18 A Fifty-five I don't have, sir; 54, I do
19 have, 54 was the retainer.

20 Q These are the two retainer letters.

21 A Oh, well, I have one dated March 3rd
22 and then another dated August 26th, '04, and they
23 are both attached to the one Exhibit 54.

24 Q Okay. Well, you've got the right
25 documents in any event, and I may have the wrong

1 numbers.

2 A All right.

3 Q I'm referring firstly,
4 Mr. Commissioner, to the letter of August 26,
5 2004, which appears at G-43.a, and this was the
6 original retainer letter that you received back in
7 2004 from the Department of Justice. Is that
8 correct?

9 A Yes, sir.

10 Q And I am noting in the last sentence
11 of paragraph number 1, it says,

12 "Any file referred to you within this
13 time frame but not completed by March
14 31, 2005, will be included in this
15 retainer unless agreement is reached
16 otherwise with Brian Kaplan."

17 A Yes, sir.

18 Q And Brian Kaplan was the Director of
19 Prosecutions and he's the person that has been
20 referred to in these proceedings; is that correct?

21 A Director of Regional Prosecutions and
22 Legal Education.

23 Q In my day we only called them the
24 directors, but thank you.

25 In any event, they then indicate in

1 the next sentence that your client is the
2 Department of Justice and any further instructions
3 should be sought from Brian Kaplan and/or Rob
4 Finlayson. Rob Finlayson was the ADM at the time
5 and is now a Provincial Judge?

6 A Correct.

7 Q I take it his position has been filled
8 by Mr. Slough?

9 A As I understand it, yes.

10 Q And then looking at the letter of
11 March 3rd, 2005, this was a specific retainer
12 letter in relation to this particular
13 investigation, the Harvey-Zenk matter; is that
14 correct?

15 A Yes, sir.

16 Q There's a little different name at the
17 top, but it's the same matter we're talking about?

18 A Right.

19 Q And in that letter, Mr. Kaplan wrote
20 to you confirming the retainer, and says in his
21 letter:

22 "In addition, for the purpose of
23 keeping our office apprised as to the
24 status of this matter, would you
25 kindly contact Colleen Ireton,

1 945-1864, and advise of all court
2 dates if necessary."

3 And then he says:

4 "Please do not hesitate to contact the
5 writer should you have any questions
6 or concerns respecting this matter."

7 Correct?

8 A Yes, sir.

9 Q You see that? It's a lead-up
10 question.

11 A The phone number though is 1854.

12 Q Sorry?

13 A The phone number is 1854, not 64.

14 Q Your eyes are much better than mine.

15 In any event, the point is, you had
16 been a special prosecutor for quite some time at
17 this point; is that correct?

18 A Yes, sir.

19 Q And you were aware of how the
20 independent prosecutor yourself would interact
21 with members of the Department of Justice; is that
22 correct?

23 A Yes, sir.

24 Q So it would not come as any surprise
25 to you to see the last line in the letter where

1 Mr. Kaplan says:

2 "Please do not hesitate to contact the
3 writer should you have any questions
4 or concerns respecting this matter."

5 A No.

6 Q That's standard practice that you
7 would communicate with him, either to inform him
8 with respect to matters, correct?

9 A Meet in person or talk by phone.

10 Q On various cases?

11 A All of them.

12 Q That was the practice at the time; is
13 that correct?

14 A Yes.

15 Q Now, there was also a policy with
16 respect to appointing independent counsel. And
17 that is found at G-44, Mr. Commissioner, and I
18 understand that to be Exhibit 215. Do you have
19 that, Mr. Minuk?

20 A Yes, sir, I do have it.

21 Q I could stand to be corrected on any
22 of these Exhibits.

23 A Yes, sir. I have it, sir.

24 Q And I'm referring you to -- are your
25 pages numbered at the bottom or is this a blank?

1 A They are numbered at the bottom,
2 chronologically, and they are numbered according
3 to the organizational system developed by
4 Mr. Paciocco.

5 Q Okay. I'm going to refer you --

6 A Or perhaps his assistant, colleague.

7 Q I'm going to refer you to the bottom
8 number at page 1384?

9 A 1384, sir, yes.

10 Q And I'm going to refer to you
11 paragraph number C on that page. And that
12 paragraph says:

13 "The advice and decision in this case
14 are final and binding on the
15 Department of Justice for the Province
16 of Manitoba subject only to receiving
17 direction from the Attorney General or
18 the Deputy Attorney General, which
19 direction, if given, will forthwith be
20 made public."

21 Do you see that?

22 A Yes, sir.

23 Q And you had been given a copy of this
24 and were familiar with that, I take it?

25 A Yes, I'm aware of this policy, I have

1 read it, but it's not a policy that on a
2 day-to-day basis I would be concerning myself
3 with, because I don't make these appointments.

4 Q No. This would be something that you
5 got probably when you started acting as a special
6 prosecutor, fair enough?

7 A Well, I can tell you that I gave a
8 talk about it at the Crown Defence Conference
9 recently, I believe last year or within the last
10 year, so I would have been particularly familiar
11 with it.

12 Q All right. You've read it, and you
13 don't read it everyday, but you know it?

14 A Absolutely.

15 Q So you know that the advice and
16 decisions in the case, in this particular case,
17 are final and binding on the Department of Justice
18 for the Province of Manitoba?

19 A Yes.

20 Q So you have the sole authority,
21 subject to following policy, to make these
22 decisions that you, in fact, did make; correct?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And they also in paragraph D, and this
25 is the policy as it was at that time, and I

1 understand it's been amended, and we'll get into
2 that with other witnesses, Mr. Commissioner. But
3 at that time the independent counsel had full
4 access to all employees within, and all documents
5 and information held by the Department of Justice
6 for the Province of Manitoba?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Correct. And that would include
9 Mr. Kaplan and Mr. Slough as being employees of
10 the Department of Justice, right?

11 A Yes, sir.

12 Q So the policy allows for you to have
13 direct access to people like Mr. Kaplan and
14 Mr. Slough, correct?

15 A Yes.

16 Q And the only caveat to your advice and
17 decision being final and binding on the Department
18 of Justice comes in paragraph E which says:

19 "Independent counsel is to be guided
20 by the prosecution policies issued on
21 behalf of the Attorney General of
22 Manitoba which apply to all provincial
23 prosecutions throughout the province."

24 And then they give examples; is that correct?

25 A Yes, sir.

1 Q So the bottom line is that you have
2 the authority to make decisions binding the Crown
3 and the prosecution, as long as you follow the
4 prosecution policies; is that correct?

5 A Yes.

6 Q And I take it in a sensitive case such
7 as the Harvey-Zenk -- this Harvey-Zenk matter was
8 obviously a high profile case?

9 A Yes.

10 Q A very sensitive case to various
11 parties?

12 A Certainly.

13 Q From the family's point of view, they
14 lost a daughter, they lost a wife, and
15 obviously --

16 A Yes.

17 Q -- no one can replace her at this
18 point in time?

19 A Yes, sir.

20 Q And they are obviously emotionally
21 involved in the case?

22 A Yes, sir.

23 Q And from the public point of view, you
24 have an off-duty police officer being charged with
25 some very serious criminal offences?

1 A Yes, sir.

2 Q So it's very high profile and very,
3 very sensitive, correct?

4 A Yes.

5 Q And even though you are making
6 decisions as the case is ongoing, you would want
7 to run these opinions that you had by senior
8 members of the department for various reasons,
9 correct?

10 A Well, I did, yes.

11 Q No question. But one of those reasons
12 would be to make sure that whatever decisions you
13 were making were in accordance with the policies
14 as set out in the policy, is that fair, one of the
15 reasons?

16 A Certainly, that's one of the reasons,
17 for sure, that I would have to be -- I need to be
18 in touch with them.

19 Q Right. You're making decisions, and
20 they are aware of the policy probably better than
21 you are, because they are career civil servants,
22 career Crown Attorneys?

23 A Well, yes, they deal with these on a
24 day-to-day basis. I would only deal with it on a
25 case-by-case basis. So they would have much more

1 familiarity.

2 Q All right. In any event, you maintain
3 contact with primarily, I take it, Brian Kaplan?

4 A Yes. He's the individual, the direct
5 line would be to him.

6 Q Would you agree with me that that
7 would be in accordance with the terms of both your
8 retainer and the policy?

9 A Yes, sir.

10 Q Now, I want to take you to your time
11 sheet that's Exhibit 218. I call it a time sheet.
12 It's been called a docket.

13 A All right.

14 Q I'm not sure what the right
15 terminology it is?

16 THE COMMISSIONER: Which one is that?

17 THE WITNESS: 218.

18 MR. NOZICK: Some would call it an
19 invoice.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you.

21 BY MR. NOZICK:

22 Q I'm not going to refer you to every
23 entry and contact that you had with members of the
24 Department of Justice, but I want to highlight
25 some of them and try and ascertain what the

1 context of these contacts were, if you can bear
2 with me. First of all, it was March 1st, 2005,
3 and on your notation you have, among other things,
4 a telephone call to and from Brian Kaplan. Is
5 that correct?

6 A Yes.

7 Q All right. Now, March 1st, 2005, I
8 understand, after referring to Exhibit 120, which
9 is also I believe G-40, Mr. Commissioner, the date
10 on which the East St. Paul Police Department
11 forwarded their file to Mr. Kaplan?

12 A Okay.

13 Q All right. So I am assuming that you
14 were contacted by Mr. Kaplan's office and told
15 that the report is here, and the report presumably
16 was forwarded on to you on that date?

17 A Presumably. It's hard for me to
18 remember today, sir, what the purpose of each one
19 of these calls was.

20 Q Right. I'm just trying to, and I
21 wasn't there, I don't know what was in the call,
22 but it seems to me to be reasonable that when the
23 report is sent to Mr. Kaplan, that there would be
24 some communication between you and him advising
25 you in some way that the report had been received,

1 and is either being sent or is on its way to you?

2 A Reasonable.

3 Q Does that sound reasonable? And your
4 time sheet indicates .40. I guess that's 4/10 of
5 an hour. Is that what it is?

6 A Yeah.

7 Q And you have a number of other calls
8 as well with other people, particularly Mr. Poole?

9 A Right.

10 Q And other things that you were doing.
11 So it wasn't a lengthy conversation at that point
12 in time with Mr. Kaplan?

13 A No.

14 Q Is that fair?

15 A Clearly.

16 Q Now, the next entry I highlighted
17 here, and nobody has mentioned this, but I
18 highlighted the May 26th, '05 entry?

19 A May 26th, '05.

20 Q Where you have a call to Z. Tessler,
21 that would be Zane Tessler, and he is a Crown
22 Attorney with the Department of Justice?

23 A Right.

24 Q And it's regarding getting a -- "re
25 case list on drunk driving cases." So I am

1 assuming from that 10 minute call, or six minute
2 call, that either you or he phoned each other and
3 one or the other asked if you had a list of cases
4 on drunk driving. Is that fair?

5 A Yes, it would be some professional
6 conversation that we had about our own desk
7 binders of law.

8 Q Okay. Now, do you recall who made the
9 call, who requested the list?

10 A I believe that Mr. Tessler and I had
11 been speaking about it outside of court somewhere,
12 and that the purpose of my call was to remind him
13 that this recent list of cases, I believe, that
14 had been circulated in the department, or one that
15 he had been collecting, he would send over to me.

16 Q Now, this is a common practice, as I
17 understand it, between lawyers, where you have a
18 case and you're thinking about some issues, you
19 may talk to another lawyer, whether it's another
20 defence lawyer or whether it's a Crown Attorney
21 that you know and have a rapport with, in order to
22 exchange ideas and see if they have the latest
23 cases. Is that fair?

24 A Sure, before you moved to Vancouver,
25 you and I did that.

1 Q I'm going to get into the Vancouver
2 system later on. But the bottom line is, we have
3 a very close knit criminal bar in Manitoba,
4 correct?

5 A Yes.

6 Q And nobody is trying to hide what the
7 law is, and if you know a case that's on point, on
8 a point that another lawyer has --

9 A Yes.

10 Q -- you would provide that very
11 willingly; correct?

12 A Yes, we share our knowledge or
13 research with each other.

14 Q It's a sharing of information?

15 A Yes.

16 Q And that's because you told us that in
17 your situation, you're with a major large firm, I
18 can't count the lawyers, but you are basically the
19 only person that does criminal law in your firm?

20 A Right -- I wouldn't be the only one.

21 Q You're the most senior person?

22 A Right.

23 Q And essentially you really don't have
24 anybody to discuss your issues or cases with in
25 your firm?

1 A Correct.

2 Q So you have to use some outside
3 source, whatever that source may be?

4 A Right.

5 Q And similarly, there are a lot of
6 small boutique firms that single sole
7 practitioners, one or two partners, that also
8 don't have the resources to discuss it in-house;
9 correct?

10 A I would think so. They may have their
11 own issues. I don't know what they might be
12 but --

13 Q And you told us that one of the
14 reasons that you would contact, particularly
15 Mr. Kaplan, was if you had an issue with respect
16 to one of your cases, or this particular case,
17 that you might run it by him, if I can use that
18 term?

19 A Yes.

20 Q Some might use the term vet, but I
21 prefer run it by him.

22 A Right. Run it by, yes, talk about it.

23 Q Yes, whatever.

24 A Right.

25 Q Now, turning now to September 21st,

1 2005, on your time sheet -- I'm sorry, September
2 21st was a fax that's found in R-1.91.94, R-2, I
3 believe it should be.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: R-2?

5 MR. NOZICK: I'm sorry, I don't have
6 the actual --

7 THE COMMISSIONER: What is it?

8 MR. NOZICK: This is a fax, this is
9 the fax where Brian Kaplan sent you a copy of a
10 letter that Sveinsons had sent to the Attorney
11 General, and asked you to, I think the terminology
12 is, draft a reply for signature with respect to
13 the justice issues.

14 THE WITNESS: The cover sheet came
15 from Ms. Ireton, and she was actually writing the
16 text of the letter, I believe, on behalf of
17 Mr. Kaplan, as I recall it.

18 BY MR. NOZICK:

19 Q All right. But the point is, you told
20 Commission Counsel that you didn't think that you
21 should be the person to respond to that particular
22 letter?

23 A Well, I didn't respond to it, and I
24 discussed that with Mr. Kaplan.

25 Q And there were several issues, and I'm

1 not going to get into all of the issues in that
2 particular letter, but there were issues relating
3 to the case, correct?

4 A Well, yes.

5 Q To the best of your recollection?

6 A Yes.

7 Q We don't need to read the whole
8 letter.

9 A Right.

10 Q There were issues relating to the
11 administration of justice in Manitoba; correct?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Issues relating to the court system;
14 correct?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Issues relating to the Manitoba Public
17 Insurance Corporation?

18 A Yes.

19 Q All kinds of issues, right?

20 A Yes.

21 Q And it probably, in retrospect -- do
22 you understand how government works? A person
23 writes a letter to the Attorney General, and as I
24 understand it, generally the Attorney General
25 doesn't respond by himself, at least right away.

1 Do you understand --

2 A I don't think I'll ever understand how
3 government works.

4 Q Well, if I suggest to you that it's my
5 understanding and I always --

6 THE COMMISSIONER: If he doesn't
7 understand, there's no use suggesting to him. Go
8 ahead.

9 BY MR. NOZICK:

10 Q All right. Another suggestion that he
11 may understand. I'm going to suggest to you that
12 probably the better phraseology that Mr. Kaplan
13 should have used was ask you for a memo with
14 respect to your contact with the Sveinsons and
15 your knowledge of the case, as opposed to asking
16 you to write the letter. Is that fair?

17 A I don't know what the proper protocol
18 is. I can't -- if you're telling me that's what
19 it is, then that's what it is. I just don't know
20 what the protocol is.

21 Q I don't want to give evidence.

22 A I've never been -- I just don't know
23 what the protocol is.

24 Q That's fair. But at this point in
25 time, you were the prosecutor in charge of the

1 Harvey-Zenk matter, correct?

2 A Right.

3 Q The Sveinsons were the parents of the
4 deceased, correct?

5 A Pardon me?

6 Q The Sveinsons were the parents of the
7 deceased?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Yes. And you had had contact with
10 them, I take it, on an ongoing basis or periodic
11 basis?

12 A Well, periodic contacts with them,
13 yes.

14 Q But it was your responsibility, as a
15 prosecutor in charge of the case, to maintain the
16 contact with them; is that correct?

17 A Well, it's a difficult -- yes, I did
18 maintain contact, I did have periodic contact with
19 the Sveinsons, even though it was the Tamans who
20 were the victims, and I tried to balance out that.

21 Q Now, I don't want to use
22 Mr. Weinstein's language, and I don't want to be
23 critical and I'm not being critical. In that
24 context, it was you that contacted the Sveinsons
25 because you were in charge of prosecution,

1 correct?

2 A Well, yes. I don't really know what
3 the order was. I knew that they needed to, they
4 wanted to speak to somebody.

5 Q And you had a meeting with them, and
6 that would have been on September 28th, if I'm not
7 mistaken?

8 A September 28th -- that would have been
9 October 3rd, sir.

10 Q So October 3rd?

11 A Yes.

12 Q So, had you spoke to Mr. Sveinson to
13 set up the appointment?

14 A Pardon me?

15 Q Had you spoke to Mr. Sveinson to set
16 up the appointment?

17 A If I didn't speak to them personally,
18 maybe my assistant spoke with them to set it up,
19 but it got set up.

20 Q You have on September 28, '05, call
21 from the deceased family?

22 A Right. That may mean simply that they
23 called my office and that I listened to the voice
24 mail, and I may have -- like I can't tell you if I
25 actually spoke with them.

1 Q Okay. And this -- and then you have a
2 call to Mr. Kaplan?

3 A Yes.

4 Q So the way I'm interpreting this, and
5 you tell me if I'm right or wrong in my
6 interpretation, is that you get a call from them
7 or you speak to them, and you call Kaplan to
8 inform him that you had spoken to them and
9 arranged a meeting. Is that fair?

10 A It would appear that that's the
11 rational, reasonable conclusion from this.

12 Q And you meet with them on October 3rd,
13 2005?

14 A Right.

15 Q Correct. And this is well before you
16 are aware of any problems with Bakema and Woychuk;
17 correct?

18 A Oh, yeah. Oh, yes, long before that.

19 Q Pardon me?

20 A Long before that.

21 Q Right. And even at this early point
22 in time, based on your knowledge of the case law
23 and your experience, that you feel that the likely
24 disposition in this particular case will be a
25 conditional sentence. Is that fair?

1 A Well, I just know that, I can tell
2 you, Mr. Nozick, that I would have known by that
3 time in '05, that there are some cases, a handful
4 of cases dealing with impaired driving causing
5 death, there are a handful of cases involving
6 dangerous driving causing death, various levels of
7 courts in Manitoba where there has been a
8 conditional sentence. And I would have informed
9 these people what these cases stood for, what they
10 were about. I think there may be four or five on
11 the impaired by 2005, and maybe eight or nine on
12 dangerous driving. I don't really have the
13 numbers.

14 Q Will you agree with me that as you
15 gain experience, as either defence counsel or even
16 a Crown Attorney, you get a feel for where the
17 case is going at the early stages when you get a
18 file?

19 A Well, the more experienced you are,
20 you read it over, you have a feeling for the file,
21 yes. Someone, I would think that I would get a
22 much better feeling for a file than someone who
23 was a first or second year practitioner.

24 Q Right. And your gut reaction, if you
25 will, your educated opinion on this file is it was

1 going to end up with a conditional sentence of
2 some sort. Is that fair? Your initial reaction?

3 A Well, my assessment would be that,
4 based on the law in Manitoba, that it was a very
5 likely resolution, or likely outcome of the case,
6 whether there was a guilty plea or whether there
7 was a trial, based on the case law.

8 Q And that's eventually what happened,
9 correct, in this case?

10 A What do you mean eventually?

11 Q Well, eventually he received --

12 A Well, at the end of the day, Mr. Zenk
13 received a two year less a day Provincial term of
14 incarceration. Judge ordered that to be served
15 conditionally, on conditions, yes, that was the
16 end of the day.

17 Q Which was bang on with your original
18 assessment of the file, right?

19 A Well --

20 THE COMMISSIONER: It was bang on
21 because he agreed to it.

22 THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yes, that's what
23 happened.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: Not as a result of
25 what the judge decided. Go ahead.

1 BY MR. NOZICK:

2 Q All right. In any event, when you
3 were talking to the Sveinsons on October 3rd, and
4 you expressed this feeling to them, you hadn't
5 discussed this with either Mr. Kaplan or
6 Mr. Slough at that particular time --

7 A No.

8 Q -- or before that meeting? So when
9 you expressed that in your opinion that this is
10 likely to end up as a conditional sentence, it was
11 your own opinion based on your own expertise?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Now, we go to April 21st, 2006, where
14 we have got the Carter revelation?

15 A Yes.

16 Q And on that date, after you spoke to
17 Mr. Carter, you then called Mr. Kaplan?

18 A Yes. That was April 21, page 3401.35,
19 met with Mr. Carter, and then contacted
20 Mr. Kaplan. That's 3401.35, Mr. Commissioner.

21 Q At this point in time, was there a lot
22 of publicity about this case in the Winnipeg
23 papers?

24 A At that time?

25 Q Yeah, at that time. I assume there

1 was some publicity around the time of the offence
2 back in February 2005?

3 A I don't know, Mr. Nozick. I would
4 imagine not, but, honestly, I don't know.

5 Q Now, the Carter revelation is
6 obviously a major problem that you're going to
7 have with your case; correct?

8 A Yes, in my mind.

9 Q And you've got basically one officer
10 saying another officer told him to do things and
11 making very serious allegations?

12 A Right.

13 Q And if that came to light, obviously
14 this is something that the opposition party is
15 going to get a hold of, it's going to be raised in
16 the house, that type of thing?

17 A Well --

18 THE COMMISSIONER: Is this something
19 that should concern him, what's going on in the
20 political arena?

21 MR. NOZICK: I won't pursue that.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

23 BY MR. NOZICK:

24 Q In any event, you call Mr. Kaplan at
25 that time to inform him of the revelation; is that

1 fair?

2 A Yes.

3 Q And you had asked Mr. Carter for a
4 written report?

5 A Which -- yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes,
6 yes.

7 Q Right. And he provided that to you,
8 his report is April 25th, and you've got it on
9 April 26th?

10 A Yes.

11 Q And then on April 27th, you again
12 phone Mr. Kaplan, and I'm going to suggest to you
13 that it makes sense that you told him that you
14 received the report from Mr. Carter?

15 A Yes.

16 Q All right. So you're keeping him
17 up-to-date with respect to what's happening with
18 the revelations at this point?

19 A Yes.

20 Q And I take it that the issue was
21 important enough that you thought that you should
22 meet with Mr. Kaplan; is that fair?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And the meeting was set up on May 2nd?

25 A Yes.

1 Q And you met with him?

2 A Yes.

3 Q And I'm assuming you discussed the
4 Carter report and the possible ramifications to
5 the Crown's case?

6 A Yes.

7 Q I mean, that makes sense. You just
8 got the report, you tell him, I got the report,
9 you have a meeting. I would assume that you talk
10 about what the revelations were?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And as a result of what you told
13 Mr. Kaplan, was it Mr. Kaplan that suggested that
14 this is a serious allegation being made against
15 Mr. Bakema, and we should get an independent
16 police force to investigate it, i.e. the RCMP?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And Mr. Kaplan would be the liaison
19 between -- I understand there's a fellow named
20 Mike Horn that's employed by the Department of
21 Justice, and he is the liaison from the Department
22 of Justice to the RCMP?

23 A I learned that. I had never met
24 Mr. Horn before this incident arose, so...

25 Q But were you advised that when you met

1 him, is that who he was?

2 A Yes.

3 Q Mr. Kaplan told you that?

4 A Yes, I might have even been introduced
5 to Mr. Horn, I probably was introduced to
6 Mr. Horn, and he told me that as well.

7 Q Yeah. So the protocol would be, you
8 talk to Mr. Kaplan, Mr. Kaplan talks to Mr. Horn,
9 Mr. Horn talks to the RCMP?

10 A That's how I understood.

11 Q Appears to be the protocol, all right.
12 In any event, Mr. Horn eventually gets a hold of
13 the RCMP; correct?

14 A Yes.

15 Q And by the way, before I leave this
16 meeting, the intent was once the RCMP did an
17 investigation, that that RCMP report will be
18 referred to a different independent counsel for
19 his opinion with respect to whether there should
20 be a charge against Mr. Bakema?

21 A That's how it materialized once the
22 report was completed. I had no idea of how things
23 would unfold at the outset, because I wasn't,
24 didn't participate in that.

25 Q Okay. Now, on May 12th of 2006, you

1 sent an e-mail, R-1.91.16, asking for a meeting.

2 Do you remember that?

3 A It may well be, yes. If I sent the
4 e-mail, Mr. Nozick, I accept that. I don't really
5 need to --

6 Q In any event, there was a meeting
7 held. First there was a meeting between yourself
8 and Assistant Commissioner Robinson of the RCMP;
9 is that correct? Do you remember that meeting?
10 That was on May 15th.

11 A I thought there was only one meeting
12 with the RCMP, but maybe there were more.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: Is the
14 investigation by the RCMP of any relevance to my
15 mandate?

16 MR. NOZICK: Only as background
17 information, I would think.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: We don't need a lot
19 of background, we need a lot of substance. Let's
20 get to the issues, please.

21 BY MR. NOZICK:

22 Q In any event, I'm suggesting you did
23 have a meeting with Mr. Robinson on May 15th, and
24 then you met with Mr. Kaplan on May 18th, 2006?

25 A All right.

1 Q And by the way, your meeting with the
2 RCMP is referred to on your time sheet?

3 A Pardon me?

4 Q Your meeting with the RCMP is referred
5 to on your time sheet?

6 A Oh, yes. I know I met with him, I'm
7 just saying that --

8 Q All right. On May 18th, you meet with
9 Mr. Kaplan?

10 A Right.

11 Q And at this point in time, I guess the
12 Carter revelation again was revisited about what
13 was happening?

14 A Right.

15 Q And was discussed that the RCMP were
16 investigating it?

17 A Yes, sir.

18 Q And I would imagine that at this point
19 in time, you realized that you couldn't proceed
20 with the Preliminary Hearing in June of 2006, with
21 this investigation up in the air?

22 A That would seem, that was my
23 assessment at that time.

24 Q The point is, one of your chief
25 witnesses was being investigated for obstructing

1 or attempting to obstruct justice?

2 A Yes. It seemed reasonable to me to
3 follow this through.

4 Q It would be folly to proceed with a
5 Preliminary Hearing with that up in the air?

6 A Right.

7 Q And you probably discussed that with
8 Mr. Kaplan as well?

9 A Yes.

10 Q And when a police officer is being
11 investigated for that type of an offence, a very
12 serious offence, it's obviously a very sensitive
13 matter as well; is that fair to say?

14 A Well, yes.

15 Q And you wouldn't want to reveal too
16 much to defence counsel as to the nature of the
17 investigation, is that fair, at that point in
18 time?

19 A I wouldn't reveal anything, because my
20 understanding of the policy was that when these
21 matters are being investigated, we're not to be
22 speaking about them except within the department
23 on an as-needed basis.

24 Q All right.

25 A So I wouldn't be discussing this with

1 Mr. Wolson, or anyone else for that matter, other
2 than -- the only person I was speaking to about it
3 was Mr. Kaplan. And ultimately, on an issue with
4 respect to correspondence, I believe that
5 Mr. Lawlor was invited, just for the limited
6 purpose of drafting a letter, but that's it. No
7 one else was in this.

8 Q And I want to deal with why we needed
9 Mr. Lawlor to draft a letter, because you
10 obviously are experienced and you know how to
11 write letters?

12 A I don't know why Mr. Lawlor was
13 brought in, that was Mr. Kaplan's suggestion. So
14 I just met him when he got there.

15 Q I'm going to suggest to you that
16 because of the sensitive nature of the
17 investigation, that you wanted to be very careful
18 as to exactly how you phrased the letter to
19 Mr. Wolson, and you wanted some guidance in
20 respect to that; is that fair?

21 A Not necessarily guidance. I wanted to
22 talk about it because there was a sensitive issue
23 of the investigation, there was an issue that
24 might arise by reason of delay, and all of these
25 issues prompted me to have a discussion, like a

1 round-table discussion about how to craft the
2 correspondence to Mr. Wolson.

3 Q You raised the issue about delay.
4 Obviously, by requesting the adjournment brings
5 into the effect the Askov case?

6 A Right.

7 Q And the delay would obviously be
8 attributed to the Crown, correct?

9 A Right. It was just another issue
10 added already to the already mounting issues.

11 Q Exactly. In any event, the letter is
12 drafted and goes out. Mr. Wolson, on May 24th,
13 agrees to the adjournment?

14 A Yes, Mr. Wolson does agree at some
15 point in the month of May to the adjournment.

16 Q Okay. Well, it says May 24th. Can we
17 take my word for that?

18 A Yes, sir.

19 Q And the point that I'm making is, as
20 soon as he agrees to the adjournment, again you
21 make a call to Kaplan, presumably, advising him
22 that Wolson has agreed to the adjournment?

23 A All right.

24 Q Is that fair?

25 A Yes. I thought that I had written to

1 Mr. Wolson a couple of times in the month of May.
2 He didn't respond to the letters right away, and
3 then ultimately he contacted me by telephone to
4 let me know that he was in agreement. I think
5 that's how it unfolded.

6 Q I stand to be corrected, but my
7 understanding was it was on May 24th. I don't
8 know how much is going to stand or fall on that.

9 A I don't think --

10 Q It makes sense if that happened on
11 May 24th, the phone call with Mr. Kaplan would
12 have been about that topic; fair?

13 A Well, I don't think at that point --

14 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Minuk, you
15 arrange an adjournment, you don't tell him why.

16 THE WITNESS: Right.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: And the reason why
18 you don't tell him is because there's a sensitive
19 investigation going on of Bakema; is that it?

20 THE WITNESS: Correct.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Let's move
22 on.

23 BY MR. NOZICK:

24 Q Moving on to May 31st, there's
25 reference on your time sheet to a number of phone

1 calls. You talked to Chief Carter on that day.
2 You call, you get a call from Bev Charko. Now, I
3 don't think it's been explained who Bev Charko is?

4 A She is, or was then the provincial
5 court trial coordinator, and I was likely
6 contacting for some purpose with respect to
7 scheduling matters related to this Preliminary.

8 Q Well, given the fact that Wolson had
9 agreed to a new date, Bev Charko would be the
10 liaison with the Provincial Court to try and
11 determine a date for the next date for the
12 Preliminary Hearing. Is that fair, that's who she
13 was?

14 A Two things. One to bring it forward
15 to the court, and secondly to confirm or to
16 canvass dates.

17 Q And then you call Kaplan right after
18 that, I'm assuming, and you tell him we've got
19 dates from Bev Charko; correct?

20 A Or that the matter has been brought
21 forward. It will be cancelled and Charko is
22 looking for dates, one or the other.

23 Q The point is, you call Kaplan to
24 inform him that you had the call with Charko and
25 whatever she said?

1 A Right.

2 Q And then on June 14th, there was an
3 e-mail from Mr. Kaplan's secretary telling you
4 that Doug Abra had been appointed as independent
5 counsel with respect to the Bakema investigations?

6 A Okay.

7 Q Do you recall that?

8 A Yeah.

9 Q And on June 27th, your time sheet
10 shows that you called Mr. Abra, correct?

11 A Yes.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: Why are we spending
13 so much time on this RCMP investigation? Maybe we
14 could focus on the issues. This sounds like an
15 assessment of his account, and that's not my
16 function. I want to deal with this particular
17 case. We can spend the whole morning, maybe the
18 whole day and tomorrow. Let's move on, Mr.
19 Nozick.

20 BY MR. NOZICK:

21 Q One of the issues in this Inquiry, as
22 I understand it, there had been some suggestion,
23 because you had represented police in the past,
24 that you might be coloured with respect to
25 prosecuting police officers?

1 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, that has
2 already been put to bed by other witnesses. Let's
3 move on.

4 BY MR. NOZICK:

5 Q All I'm going to say to you is this,
6 is that the opinion of Mr. Abra was that there was
7 not sufficient evidence to warrant a charge
8 against Mr. Bakema, but you disagreed with that
9 opinion; is that fair?

10 A Yes, I did, sir.

11 Q To the extent that you sent an e-mail
12 to both Mr. Kaplan and Mr. Abra containing the
13 Beaudry case?

14 A Yes, sir.

15 Q Indicating that you thought the charge
16 should be brought?

17 A Yes, sir.

18 Q And now we turn to the week of
19 July 12th, the so-called resolution?

20 A Pardon me?

21 Q The week of July 12, 2007?

22 A All right. Now, okay, I have that in
23 front of me.

24 Q Well, I'm just going to give you --
25 you have your time sheet, but I'm not going to

1 even refer to the time sheet, we don't really need
2 that. The point is, at this point in time you are
3 preparing for a Preliminary Hearing?

4 A Yes, sir.

5 Q And is it your experience that when
6 members of the Winnipeg Police Service are
7 charged, that rarely do they change their plea to
8 a plea of guilty? Is that your experience or --

9 A There is a common thought, generally,
10 that they fight their cases, yes. Generally, the
11 approach would not be to assume that a police
12 officer would be pleading guilty to a charge.

13 Q And that's because, in addition to
14 whatever the court may impose on a particular
15 accused, there is some other serious ramifications
16 to police officers when they are convicted of a
17 criminal offence, fair?

18 A There would be many reasons, Mr.
19 Nozick, for why they choose to fight their cases.
20 I couldn't begin to identify them all and wouldn't
21 want to go there.

22 Q So I'm going to suggest to you that it
23 came as a bit of a surprise when Mr. Wolson raised
24 the possibility of a plea bargain, or entering a
25 plea to the dangerous driving causing death?

1 A Yes, for two reasons. One, the
2 prosecution case or the strength of it, which he
3 would be able to lead and understand, had its
4 problems. And secondly, of course, that the
5 fellow is a police officer, and in light of what I
6 thought the weaknesses of the case were, given
7 that the fellow was a police officer and
8 traditionally they fight their cases, I was
9 surprised.

10 Q And so you start these negotiations
11 with Wolson, and basically by July 12, 2007, you
12 have a tentative, if I can call it, deal in place
13 subject to Wolson confirming it with his client
14 and subject to your running it by Mr. Kaplan; is
15 that fair?

16 A I don't know the date, sir, but I can
17 just tell you again, as I told Mr. Paciocco, as I
18 know the week unfolded, I knew that Mr. Wolson was
19 meeting with his client on the Thursday, that he
20 had raised this issue with me. He had asked me to
21 consider it overnight. That would have been the
22 Friday. On the Friday, I believe I spoke to
23 Mr. Kaplan about it. Would have spoken to
24 Mr. Wolson again, because I knew that from
25 information provided to me by Mr. Wolson, that on

1 the weekend, which was the Saturday, Mr. Zenk and
2 his family, and those he thought would be
3 necessary to be close to him, would all be meeting
4 at Mr. Wolson's office to discuss this issue. And
5 that at some point on the weekend, after the
6 client, along with his family had a chance to
7 consider the matter, I would hear again from
8 Mr. Wolson. And that's how it unfolded.

9 Q All right. But by the evening of
10 July 12th of 2007, you had a tentative
11 arrangement. Is that fair? Not written in stone
12 but a tentative, Wolson was going to recommend
13 this to his client?

14 A Well, if the 12th is the Thursday,
15 yes, I just don't know -- you'll have to forgive
16 me, I'm doing it only by days of the week and I
17 cannot do it by calendar days in the absence of
18 the calendar in front of me.

19 Q The 12th was Thursday, 13th was
20 Friday, 15th was Sunday, 16th is Monday, the first
21 court appearance.

22 A All right.

23 Q So on the Thursday, July 12th, there
24 was a tentative arrangement; is that fair?

25 A At some point that night I believe, or

1 later that afternoon, I would have heard from
2 Mr. Wolson. So I don't know if there was a
3 tentative arrangement at that point. Mr. Wolson
4 was sending out the feelers, if we would call it
5 that, and testing me out and sort of saying
6 whether or not that might be a potential
7 resolution. There was nothing firm at that point.
8 It was Mr. Wolson raising the issue and asking me
9 to consider it.

10 Q And did you indicate to him that you
11 thought that it was a pretty good plea bargain
12 arrangement?

13 A I don't know whether I indicated that
14 to Mr. Wolson. I cannot recall today, but I
15 certainly would have indicated to him that I would
16 think about it and that I would be getting back to
17 him.

18 Q And all of this, all of your mind-set
19 took place without any consultation with either
20 Mr. Kaplan, Mr. Slough, or anybody from the
21 Department of Justice; is that correct, as of the
22 Thursday?

23 A By the time Mr. Wolson and I have
24 had -- Mr. Wolson and I had our discussions before
25 I had any discussions with anyone from Manitoba

1 Justice, yes.

2 Q And you were clearly of the view that
3 this was a very good deal for the Crown, fair?

4 A Well, I thought that it was a good
5 resolution on a case that had a number of
6 problems.

7 Q And you have outlined the problems,
8 and we don't have to go there.

9 A And also that Mr. Wolson, I believe,
10 was recognizing what the law was on sentencing, as
11 we understood it to be, and I thought that even
12 his response was a reasonable one.

13 Q So you were ad idem with Mr. Wolson,
14 correct?

15 A Well, conceptually ad idem on at least
16 thinking that dangerous driving causing death was
17 a reasonable resolution, and that a conditional
18 sentence was what the law was. We didn't discuss
19 what the range would be or what the conditions
20 would be, but conceptually on the topics, yes, we
21 were.

22 Q Did you at that point, or at any other
23 point, discuss with him the facts on which the
24 plea would be based?

25 A No, we didn't discuss that at that

1 particular time, because we weren't at that point.

2 Q Did you at any point in time discuss
3 with him the factual underpinnings for the plea of
4 dangerous driving causing death?

5 A At any time?

6 Q At any time, yes?

7 A Yes, we did, but not at that time,
8 because at that time we weren't even close to a
9 resolution.

10 Q When, to the best of your
11 recollection, would you have had those types of
12 discussions?

13 A We would have had those only after the
14 family meeting when there was some circumstantial
15 guarantee, if I can use that language, even though
16 I don't think that's appropriate, that his client
17 was of the mind to enter a guilty plea. There
18 would be no reason to discuss that beforehand.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: Excuse me a second.
20 Help me with something. As I understand from
21 Mr. Wolson, when an accused pleads guilty, the
22 facts are not read in, in support of the plea --

23 THE WITNESS: Only --

24 THE COMMISSIONER: -- at the time.

25 THE WITNESS: Only if the sentencing

1 doesn't occur at the time.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: So getting back to
3 what I have said, the facts upon which the Crown
4 relies are not read into the record, or before the
5 judge, and the accused counsel or the accused
6 himself or herself does not agree to those facts
7 at the time that the plea is entered?

8 THE WITNESS: Right.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: Then the matter is
10 adjourned. And at the sentencing hearing, the
11 Crown gets up and indicates the facts upon which
12 the Crown relies. Is that the practice?

13 THE WITNESS: Well, they should be
14 communicated to the defence beforehand, but that's
15 how it happens, yes, we talk beforehand and then
16 we read them in.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: I say that because
18 it's an unusual practice that I have never heard
19 of. But, in any event, that's the practice that's
20 carried on in Manitoba.

21 In this particular case, did you, with
22 Mr. Wolson, agree upon the facts that you would
23 eventually read into the record before the plea
24 was entered or after the plea was entered?

25 THE WITNESS: Mr. Commissioner, we

1 discussed them beforehand. And I know that we --
2 when I showed him again, like what it was that I
3 intended to say about it in writing, even though
4 we had spoken about it, he saw again in writing
5 what it is that I had indicated to him.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: Before the plea?

7 THE WITNESS: Oh, yes.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: In other words, you
9 told him before the plea what you were going to
10 say in support of the plea, and upon which the
11 judge had to make a finding, that the facts that
12 you would read into the record supported the plea?

13 THE WITNESS: Yes.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: In other words, if
15 you read facts that didn't support the plea, the
16 judge has an obligation to reject them?

17 THE WITNESS: Yes.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Let me
19 go a little further here. So you told Mr. Wolson
20 in advance what you were going to read in once the
21 plea was entered and on the sentencing day?

22 THE WITNESS: Yes.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: All right. So he
24 understood that?

25 THE WITNESS: Yes.

1 THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Now, when
2 the matter came up for the sentencing, I
3 understand there was again a discussion with him
4 and he said something to the effect, if I recall
5 his evidence, that the two of you spoke about it
6 over the phone and there was some discussion, and
7 you came to some resolution. And you then, on the
8 day of sentencing, read into the record the facts
9 upon which you relied, which were essentially, you
10 say, the same as what you originally told him?

11 THE WITNESS: Yes.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: All right. I am
13 just trying to understand this practice, because
14 I'm wondering whether there was any dispute with
15 Mr. Wolson about the facts that you read in on the
16 day of the sentencing?

17 THE WITNESS: He didn't --

18 THE COMMISSIONER: Whether they were
19 different than the ones that you told him before.

20 THE WITNESS: No. And as I said
21 yesterday or the day before, had Mr. Wolson
22 disagreed with anything that I said, I would have
23 expected him to stand up and say, no, this isn't
24 what we spoke about. And he didn't.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, he didn't at

1 the time. And then he said later he thought about
2 it, and that's when the matter came up after, I
3 believe the judge wrote a letter saying he wasn't
4 prepared to accept the plea bargain, which was not
5 for him to decide, the plea bargain was different
6 from the sentencing. And that's when he got up,
7 and there was some sort of discussion in court
8 about the facts that you were relying upon.

9 THE WITNESS: That's how it unfolded.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: That is how it
11 unfolded, okay. Thank you. Go ahead.

12 BY MR. NOZICK:

13 Q I take it in retrospect, in hindsight,
14 that it probably would have been better to reduce
15 the facts upon which the plea was to be entered
16 into an agreed set of facts. With the benefit of
17 hindsight now, we know --

18 A Yes, I think that there's good sense,
19 Mr. Nozick, in doing that, in simple criminal
20 matters of summary offences, it's probably likely
21 that it need not be. But the more complicated the
22 matter, I do agree that the better way to approach
23 these matters today is by having a statement of
24 agreed fact. And this way there's no disputes.
25 Because each of the parties will sign off on it,

1 and the statement of agreed fact could be filed as
2 an exhibit before the Provincial Court Judge or
3 the Court of Queen's Bench Judge, and the facts
4 are settled.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: Excuse me. Whether
6 it's done by an agreed statement in writing or
7 done at the proceeding, the judge should not
8 accept the plea until he's satisfied that the
9 facts presented by the Crown in support of the
10 plea justify the finding of guilt.

11 THE WITNESS: Yes.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Go
13 ahead.

14 BY MR. NOZICK:

15 Q But in reality, that's the way it's
16 worked in Manitoba for eons, I guess. The judges
17 have accepted the plea, and if the matter is put
18 over to sentencing, the facts aren't read until
19 the sentencing date?

20 A That's the way, that's the local
21 practice.

22 Q It may be wrong, but that's the way it
23 is.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, there's no
25 right or wrong, always.

1 MR. NOZICK: There's always room for
2 improvement, Mr. Commissioner.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Go ahead.

4 MR. NOZICK: And that may well be an
5 area.

6 BY MR. NOZICK:

7 Q Now, as well, and I take it that it
8 goes to this limited defence, there is only a
9 dozen, maybe 15 lawyers practicing criminal law on
10 a regular basis. Is that a fair estimate or has
11 it gone up?

12 A There's a lot of lawyers these days
13 practicing criminal law.

14 Q Okay. I've been away.

15 A In Winnipeg, there are a lot.

16 Q But it is a fairly small bar, you have
17 a close relationship with many members of the
18 criminal bar; right?

19 A Let me put it to you this way, Mr.
20 Nozick, the criminal bar has a lot of lawyers.
21 There is only a select group of that lawyers who
22 are in the top echelon who take on the better and
23 more complicated cases.

24 Q And over the years, you develop a
25 rapport with the other lawyers; right?

1 A Yes.

2 Q And you develop an element of trust,
3 I'm assuming?

4 A With some.

5 Q Well, with Mr. Wolson in particular --

6 A Yes.

7 Q -- there is no way you would doubt
8 anything he says to you.

9 A Yes.

10 Q And he would not doubt your word at
11 all, correct?

12 A Correct.

13 Q And so you get into the habit, if I
14 can put it that way, of having these informal
15 discussions regarding pleas, what pleas are you
16 going to take, what's your position on sentence,
17 what facts are you going to rely on? They are
18 held on an informal basis, is that fair, in some
19 cases?

20 A Well, every prosecutor and defence
21 lawyer, each one is feeling each other out as we
22 move along. I don't think that it's unique to be
23 done by experienced lawyers. Even the junior
24 lawyers try it and learn how to do it.

25 Q You try and work the other side?

1 A Right, you're always --

2 Q Always working. But, let me put it
3 this way. At some point in time, you come to an
4 agreement, there's going to be a plea here. And
5 here's the facts that we're going to rely on in
6 support of the plea. So now you've gone more than
7 feeling each other out and working each other,
8 fair?

9 A Yes.

10 Q And these type of conversations, once
11 you've got the pleas arranged, the sentence
12 arranged, and you're talking about what facts are
13 going to be read in, in support of the charge, are
14 also done on an informal basis, fair?

15 A The whole of the discussion is,
16 whether it's informal or not, it all happens
17 leading up to getting to the court, because what I
18 don't want, or what no lawyer should want to
19 happen is that there's some dispute in the court
20 about what the facts are, or that there is no
21 basis for the charge at all. That's -- we're
22 trying to get to the point where the judge will be
23 satisfied.

24 Q But I guess the problem with doing it
25 in the informal method, that has been the practice

1 in Manitoba for many years, is that it does lend
2 itself for misunderstandings between counsel. One
3 counsel understands one thing, the other counsel
4 understands it a different way?

5 A Well, it's always going to happen,
6 sir.

7 Q Yeah, because it's not in writing and
8 it's not formalized?

9 A Hence the suggestion of something
10 either in writing or something that could be read
11 in by agreement, would solve that problem.

12 Q I'm not criticizing you, Mr. Minuk,
13 because I fully understand what happened. I think
14 I do. But that's the reality of it. There was
15 informal discussions and a misunderstanding
16 occurred, correct? Would you agree with that?

17 A Sure.

18 Q Mr. Wolson's understanding, according
19 to what he says, and I don't think we have any
20 reason to doubt his understanding, is that there
21 would be no reference to any consumption of
22 alcohol at all. That was his understanding. You
23 heard him say that?

24 A That was what he said.

25 Q Your understanding was different?

1 A Correct.

2 Q Your understanding that, is you were
3 entitled to refer to what you call this term
4 anecdotal history --

5 A Right. What I wanted to talk about
6 were the narrative, the background of how it was
7 that this man got to the point that he was at.

8 Q Okay. So you had a fundamental
9 misunderstanding, because it wasn't reduced to
10 writing; is that a fair assessment?

11 A Perhaps we misunderstood what each of
12 us were speaking about and could have been better
13 done had it been in writing.

14 Q And it was continued on when you met
15 with Judge Wyant in his chambers. I don't know if
16 you recall this, but Mr. Wolson testified that you
17 also said to Judge Wyant that there was anecdotal
18 historical evidence of drinking, in your chambers
19 meeting. Do you remember that or not? You don't
20 remember?

21 A I don't remember today.

22 Q But you don't doubt Mr. Wolson?

23 A No, I don't doubt Mr. Wolson. And I
24 know if he did challenge me, I recall telling
25 him -- well, I know the purpose for which I wanted

1 that.

2 Q But it would appear that he didn't
3 challenge you in the chambers at least?

4 A No, he didn't challenge me even in the
5 courtroom on it.

6 Q And again, yes, on August 22nd, when
7 you went to court the first time, you use the same
8 phraseology that you had used before Judge Wyant;
9 correct?

10 A Right.

11 Q And Wolson let it go at that point in
12 time. And the only comment he made is it was
13 nothing to do with the issue of impairment, as
14 opposed to referring to the consumption of
15 alcohol?

16 A Whatever reason, I don't know what was
17 going on in Mr. Wolson's mind, we did not have a
18 discussion about it in court, outside, before,
19 after, or during before the judge.

20 Q In any event, I'm going to suggest to
21 you that the reason this wasn't a major issue in
22 either your mind or Mr. Wolson's mind was because
23 of your understanding of what Judge Wyant would
24 likely do with respect to the either joint
25 recommendation or plea bargain, call it what you

1 will?

2 A Well, I don't know what's in
3 Mr. Wolson's mind. I just sort of know what's in
4 mine. And there was no issue as I -- I didn't
5 see -- had I expected an issue, Mr. Wolson is
6 experienced counsel, he would have made an issue
7 of it.

8 Q All right. And I'm going to suggest
9 to you what happened in the chambers is these
10 things are very informal -- was it a pre-trial
11 meeting, or a resolution meeting, or was it I
12 guess just a meeting that the judge was going to
13 be seized, that type of meeting, is that what it
14 was?

15 A Well, it was an informal meeting with
16 Judge Wyant who was ultimately going to hear the
17 matter.

18 Q I'm just trying to get a picture of
19 this in my mind. So you set up the plea before
20 Judge Wyant on July 17th, which was the Tuesday.
21 And normally that starts at 10:00 o'clock?

22 A Right.

23 Q And I'll get into that later. And
24 before court, presumably around 9:00 o'clock, you
25 go into his chambers, invites you in, hello Marty,

1 hello Richard, that type of meeting?

2 A Well --

3 Q Have a seat in my office?

4 A Your Honour, hello, good morning.

5 Q A nice cordial meeting, I think it was
6 described?

7 A Yes.

8 Q And you are there, presumably he
9 doesn't know anything about the case at this point
10 in time, I would imagine?

11 A Well, he knew that, if he knew that I
12 was there from Manitoba Justice and Mr. Wolson was
13 there, that there was some outside counsel matter,
14 he would know that. And I don't know what their
15 alert system is within the court, but they do
16 follow the outside counsel cases because they need
17 to bring in judges periodically.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, you don't
19 know what was in his mind.

20 THE WITNESS: No.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: Let's go on.

22 BY MR. NOZICK:

23 Q He would know it's a serious matter
24 that is going to be dealt with, talked about?

25 A Well, yes.

1 Q So you go in there and you fill him in
2 on, here's an off-duty police officer who had been
3 at a gathering, I assume you said to him words to
4 this effect, earlier in the evening, 7:00 o'clock
5 in the morning he's on his way, he rear ends
6 somebody, kills a young lady on her way to work?

7 A More or less, yes.

8 Q And Richard says, my client is an
9 off-duty police officer, he's been suspended or
10 may be suspended, there's all kinds of
11 ramifications to him. We have assessed the case.
12 We're both of the view that the proper plea to the
13 charge is dangerous driving causing death,
14 something along those lines?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Okay.

17 A Similar to that.

18 Q And then would you presumably give him
19 some recitation of the background of the case, the
20 gathering the night before, the unexplained
21 accident, driving at the speed limit, missing the
22 yellow lights, a brief resume of those facts?

23 A He would have gotten some brief
24 overview, yes. I don't know which facts I would
25 have told him, but he would have gotten a brief

1 overview.

2 Q So he certainly was aware that the
3 accused was an off-duty police officer?

4 A Well, Mr. Wolson reminded us the other
5 day that he told him that.

6 Q Yeah. So that would make him aware of
7 it. All right. So here is the position we're
8 taking on sentencing, we have a joint
9 recommendation, right? It's going to be a
10 conditional sentence, with various conditions,
11 right? That would have been said to him?

12 A Yes, yes, yes.

13 Q All right. And you told him that you
14 had problems with your case, according to
15 Mr. Wolson?

16 A Right.

17 Q Right. And by problems, I think that
18 you could have also have used the word
19 "exigencies" with the case?

20 A Right, one or the other.

21 Q And I don't know whether you wanted to
22 get into a lot of details with respect to what the
23 exigencies or problems were. Did you discuss any
24 of those problems with him?

25 A We didn't, as I recall.

1 Q So he would have, based on the
2 conversation, Judge Wyant would have been aware
3 that it was an off-duty police officer involved in
4 a fatality, and that the Crown had problems with
5 his case, and a plea bargain or joint
6 recommendation was going to be made?

7 A Yes.

8 Q And then it was said that he
9 volunteered the fact that he had a manslaughter
10 case, and he was going to give a conditional
11 sentence to the accused in that particular case
12 later on that morning?

13 A Yes, sir.

14 Q And what did you -- what was your view
15 when he said that? What did that mean to you, in
16 light of the discussions that you had?

17 A Well, Judge Wyant, of course, said
18 that he would not tell us what it was that he
19 would do with respect to the matter we were
20 speaking to him about. He wasn't going to tell us
21 his decision or anything of that sort but, as you
22 said, communicated -- he first said that, then he
23 told us about this manslaughter, and we had to go
24 on our way because he had to deal with that. And
25 after, when I heard that, I thought that he may

1 likely go along with this, but I couldn't predict
2 that. It gives you a feeling that maybe, yes, the
3 judge thinks this is not bad. But I know at the
4 end of the day that I could be -- I can't take
5 that sort of telling me that he's doing this case
6 and doing that as what's going to happen. But
7 certainly it makes you think that maybe the judge
8 doesn't think you're off base.

9 Q The reason you would go to a judge in
10 advance is, one, alert him as to the sensitivities
11 of the case, I take it?

12 A Well --

13 Q Or not?

14 THE COMMISSIONER: Let's not deal with
15 the reason why you normally do it. Let's deal
16 with the facts of this case. Let's get on with
17 it.

18 BY MR. NOZICK:

19 Q I'm going to suggest to you that,
20 based on what happened here, that there was some
21 sense that Judge Wyant was going to go along with
22 the arrangement?

23 A Well, that's how I personally thought
24 how it might unfold. Mr. Wolson told you that's
25 how he thought it might unfold. But I think both

1 of us are experienced enough to know that you
2 can't get a full final read, so to speak, out of
3 that type of meeting and comment.

4 Q Nobody is asking you for a full read,
5 or that Judge Wyant bound himself in any way. But
6 I understand, according to Wolson's evidence, that
7 you and he discussed it on the way out of the
8 office and by the elevators, and you both came to
9 the consensus that this judge is going to go along
10 with the --

11 A Like, why would he -- I guess we would
12 say, why would he tell us he was doing this if he
13 found what we were talking about to be
14 unfavorable?

15 Q Exactly. And all I'm saying, what he
16 was going to do in his mind is his business, but
17 in your mind --

18 A Right.

19 Q I'm going to suggest to you, Wolson
20 said he was shocked when the case evolved the way
21 it did, he was shocked because he thought the
22 judge knew enough facts to, and was going to go
23 along with it, and he was totally surprised. Was
24 that your feeling as well?

25 A Well, I was definitely surprised, yes.

1 Q All right. Now, if you are of the
2 view that the judge was likely -- let me put it
3 another way. Had you had to do the sentencing and
4 the proceedings over again, I take it you would
5 take a whole different approach. Is that fair?

6 A Well, yes.

7 Q I mean, in hindsight, we now know what
8 evolved. You probably would have made a
9 distinction between a joint recommendation and a
10 "true plea bargain based on exigent
11 circumstances." You probably would have
12 explained?

13 A The language would have been different
14 and clearer, yes.

15 Q I mean, that's what the Sinclair case
16 says, the Lamirande case says, I don't know if it
17 is the law anywhere else than Manitoba, but it is
18 certainly the law in Manitoba?

19 A Mr. Nozick --

20 Q So you would have done that, I'm going
21 to suggest to you?

22 A -- when I look back at what happened,
23 and if there was confusion or misunderstanding on
24 my part with the judge, the judge not
25 understanding me, and some issues with Mr. Wolson,

1 I would do whatever I could now to make sure that
2 those misunderstandings don't occur, and try to
3 put as much, in my mind, as much in writing as
4 possible by agreement so we don't have these
5 problems.

6 Q Okay. You would have crossed the T's
7 and dotted the I's more carefully, in your
8 submission, particularly on August 22nd?

9 A No, I would put the facts in front of
10 the judge more clearly. I would set out, in a way
11 which could never be misunderstood, in writing as
12 well for the judge, the agreement of counsel. So
13 that there would be no misunderstanding. I think
14 that is a better way that we would have both
15 signed off on it, and that would have been the end
16 of it.

17 Q Do you think that the reason that you
18 didn't do it that way, and you did it the way that
19 you did, was because you basically felt quite
20 strongly that the judge would be going along with
21 the joint recommendation made by two senior
22 counsel?

23 A No, not at all. Because at the end of
24 the day, even though recommendations are made by
25 senior counsel, even where in the language of

1 Madam Justice Steele, I believe in Lamirande,
2 where we talk about the quid pro quo, that the
3 judge at the end of the day has the final say, and
4 not counsel, and I don't think that I would do
5 anything just to cavalierly sort of go about it
6 thinking that the judge is going to do this so I
7 don't have to do something else. I just think I
8 would do it with the thought always in the back of
9 my mind, which I tried to do here and will always
10 do, that the judge has the final say, but I'll do
11 what I think is appropriate, what needs to get
12 done.

13 Q Let's move on a bit now. One of the
14 issues that came up is, the term that you use is,
15 and I guess that's a term that you would use,
16 anecdotal historical evidence.

17 A Right.

18 Q It's not one that's in my vocabulary.
19 But in any event, you use that term, and then the
20 issue came up as to whether or not you were -- you
21 were asked whether you were prepared to prove the
22 evidence of consumption of alcohol as opposed to
23 evidence of impairment. Do you remember all that
24 issue?

25 A I know that whole interchange, yes.

1 Q Right. And Wolson told us that after
2 August 22nd, when you raised that term in court,
3 he thought he should have dealt with it a little
4 bit differently as well, he thought he should have
5 addressed it directly at that time with the judge
6 and said, no, I'm not agreeing to that, rather
7 than phrasing it in the term of impairment. And
8 obviously, on reflection, he would have dealt with
9 it differently. But he said the way he dealt with
10 it is he called you after August 22nd, or after
11 August 31st, sometime between the two sentencing
12 dates, August 22nd and September 12th, and he
13 raised that concern with you. Do you remember him
14 telling you that?

15 A I remember him saying that.

16 Q Okay. You remember that happening?

17 A Well, today, after being here for two
18 and a half days, I'm not sure, but I'm not going
19 to disagree with Mr. Wolson.

20 Q So if Mr. Wolson says that he
21 raised --

22 THE COMMISSIONER: He said he doesn't
23 disagree, so can we just move on?

24 BY MR. NOZICK:

25 Q I am moving on. If you don't disagree

1 with Mr. Wolson, what he says is that you agreed
2 not to call evidence with respect to the
3 consumption of alcohol before September 12th, the
4 second sentencing date.

5 A Well, I don't know if that was the
6 discussion, but I want -- Mr. Wolson and I thought
7 we had a clear understanding, and that is why I
8 didn't think he was objecting, which was that I
9 was trying to explain, and I thought he understood
10 totally after why I used that phrase, which was I
11 was trying to tell the judge what had happened
12 from the time this man had stopped work and gone
13 through the evening, and that evidence of alcohol
14 was not something that we were relying on in the
15 case. And that's why I don't -- Mr. Wolson said
16 that when he heard me give the explanation in
17 court that he didn't raise the objection to it,
18 and that's all I can tell you, Mr. Nozick.

19 Q Let me put it another way. On
20 September 12th, when the issue came up in court,
21 there was a recess and you went and phoned
22 Mr. Kaplan and Mr. Slough and had a discussion
23 with them?

24 A Right.

25 Q Okay. If Mr. Wolson is accurate,

1 which you concede that he was, he says that you
2 would have already made an undertaking to him not
3 to call the evidence with respect to alcohol
4 consumption, before the court proceedings on
5 September 12th, and that your conversation, or
6 your call to Slough and Kaplan would be
7 superfluous because you had already made your
8 undertaking?

9 A Well, yes, but it was an issue that I
10 didn't anticipate arising. I didn't know
11 Mr. Wolson was even going to go there, because it
12 didn't seem like we were going there. When the
13 issue arose, I took a break. I thought that it
14 was clear between Mr. Wolson and I that I was not
15 going to be calling evidence. I called the two
16 fellows at Justice, told them what was going on,
17 because clearly they were watching this closely,
18 and told them this is the issue which has now
19 arisen. My understanding of the dialogue is the
20 judge is now asking me whether or not I'm going to
21 be calling evidence on whether or not alcohol was
22 a factor in the marked departure. If I
23 misunderstood the judge, I misunderstood the
24 judge, but that's what I clearly thought he was
25 asking me, because that's what Mr. Wolson was

1 saying, and told them that it was not going to
2 happen.

3 Q But if you had given your undertaking
4 to Mr. Wolson before court on September 12th, not
5 to call evidence regarding the alcohol
6 consumption, you would have felt bound by that
7 undertaking; is that fair?

8 A Well, yes, I made an undertaking to
9 Mr. Wolson but -- that I would have to be bound
10 by.

11 Q So when the judge asks you whether you
12 are calling evidence with respect to alcohol
13 consumption, in court on September 12th, you
14 didn't immediately answer, no, in accordance with
15 your undertaking to Mr. Wolson, did you?

16 A No, I didn't. I first asked for a
17 break.

18 Q You went and you phoned Mr. Kaplan and
19 Mr. Slough. Was that the purpose of telling them,
20 this issue has come up in court?

21 A Right.

22 Q And this is the way I'm going to
23 handle it?

24 A Well, that's how I told him I was
25 going to handle it.

1 Q All right. And that was your decision
2 to make?

3 A Well, ultimately they are all my
4 decisions, I know that.

5 Q But you had made the decision and the
6 undertaking to Mr. Wolson not to call the evidence
7 with respect to alcohol consumption?

8 A Well, yes. But in my conversations
9 with them, I don't feel that they understood that
10 I had any obligation otherwise.

11 Q You let Mr. Kaplan and Mr. Slough
12 know?

13 A Right.

14 Q Right. But the point is, when you
15 made your decision before September 12th not to
16 call the evidence, that was your decision?

17 A Oh, yes, I didn't talk to Kaplan or
18 Slough at all about this matter until it arose in
19 the courtroom, if that's where you're going, Mr.
20 Nozick. I didn't talk to them at all about it.

21 Q And you accept responsibility for
22 that, I take it, that decision?

23 A I don't know if it's accepting
24 responsibility. That's the decision I made.

25 Q All right. I want to go back to

1 July 13th on your time sheet. Now, we got
2 sidetracked a little bit.

3 A I guess if we were at September, we
4 wouldn't go back to July, but I guess we are going
5 back to July.

6 Q We have to deal with the meeting with
7 Mr. Kaplan on July 13th, 2007. Okay. Now, that's
8 a Friday, and that's after you have the tentative
9 arrangement made, but before Wolson meets on the
10 weekend with the family?

11 A Right.

12 Q And various terms have been used to
13 describe the purpose of the meeting. One term was
14 vetted that is used, another term is consulted.
15 But I take it that the meaning of those terms, in
16 your mind, was you want to run by them the
17 proposed deal; is that correct?

18 A Run by?

19 Q Run by Mr. Kaplan --

20 A Yes.

21 Q -- the proposed deal. And you want to
22 make sure that the deal that is being proposed is
23 in accordance with all of the policies. Is that
24 correct?

25 A Yes.

1 Q And these policies you told us, there
2 is a couple of policies that come into play here.
3 One, a policy regarding staying charges. You are
4 aware of that policy?

5 A Yes.

6 Q And there's another policy with
7 respect to recommending conditional sentences?

8 A Right.

9 Q And those are the two policies that
10 would have to be complied with in order for the
11 deal to go through; correct?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And as long as those policies are
14 being complied with, then according to the
15 independent counsel policy, as we discussed
16 earlier, your decision is final and binding;
17 correct? Right?

18 A Yes, I would assume so.

19 Q Yeah. I mean, the only way that
20 Kaplan or anybody else can veto it is if it's not
21 in accordance with Crown policy?

22 A Or was -- I would like to think that
23 also, if for some particular reason they knew
24 about the case they had, and independent counsel
25 was so off base that they might interfere. I

1 don't think it would be responsible of either of
2 them to not interfere at that point.

3 Q Okay. So if it's totally off the
4 wall, then you might think they might say
5 something to you. But as long as you have an
6 opinion --

7 A Well, let me --

8 Q -- and you can justify the basis of
9 your opinion to them, they are bound to go along
10 with your opinion?

11 A Yes, or if the opinion was wrong and
12 they were aware of recent authority which reversed
13 the thinking that counsel was relying on, I would
14 think they would be obliged to point that out as
15 well. I can think of circumstances where they
16 would be obliged to interfere.

17 Q But short of that, they have -- by
18 virtue of the policy, they have to accept your
19 opinion?

20 A That's what the policy says, yes, sir.

21 Q All right. Now, let's look at the
22 policy. First of all, the policy regarding stay
23 of proceedings, G-46, Exhibit 216, if you have it
24 there.

25 A 216, yes, sir.

1 Q It's found in G-46.

2 A What page are you on, sir?

3 Q Page 1389 --

4 A 1389, yes, sir.

5 Q -- in G. Everybody with me here? I'm
6 just looking at the policy statement and it says:

7 "The twofold test for prosecutorial
8 discretion to proceed with or to
9 instruct that charges be instituted
10 is: First of all, whether or not
11 there exists a reasonable likelihood
12 of conviction."

13 Do you see that?

14 A Yes, I see that.

15 Q And it was your opinion from the early
16 point in time, back in October 3rd, 2005, that
17 there was not a reasonable likelihood of
18 conviction with respect to the drinking or
19 alcohol-related charges, the impaired driving
20 causing death, refusal, and the criminal
21 negligence causing death?

22 A There was not, or was?

23 Q That there was not a reasonable
24 likelihood of conviction?

25 A No, I think that there was a

1 reasonable likelihood of conviction on the charges
2 that were laid. Whether or not they could be
3 proven beyond a reasonable doubt is another issue,
4 because the standard for laying the charge, as I
5 understand it, is a reasonable likelihood of
6 conviction. It's a different standard for the
7 laying of the charge as opposed to proof of the
8 charge, as I understand that policy.

9 Q I thought I understood you to say that
10 you didn't think you had a case on the impaired
11 driving and the criminal negligence or the
12 refusal, and you gave a number of reasons.

13 A I told you, Mr. Nozick, those were the
14 problems with the case. That doesn't mean that
15 the charter issue, for example, on the refusal
16 would be resolved against the Crown. I can't rule
17 out that the -- I can't rule out that a judge may
18 find that the charter violations do not call for a
19 remedy that would favour the accused. I would
20 think on balance that there is reasonable
21 likelihood of conviction for the laying of the
22 charges. And as I said to Judge Wyant, with
23 respect to the prosecution, I was of the view that
24 some of the charges, there was a reasonable
25 likelihood of conviction, which is the basis upon

1 which the Crown could proceed. However, that we
2 were not satisfied on some of these charges that
3 there was proof beyond a reasonable doubt for a
4 conviction. There are two different standards, in
5 my mind.

6 Q Let me ask you this question. We know
7 weaknesses or problems that the Crown had with the
8 case from the investigation point of view. How
9 would the, let's call it the Bakema/Woychuk
10 escapade, play out in your mind with respect to
11 reasonably obtaining, the reasonable likelihood of
12 obtaining a conviction?

13 THE COMMISSIONER: He's not talking
14 about conviction at the trial level, he's talking
15 about institution of the proceedings.

16 BY MR. NOZICK:

17 Q I'm not disputing the institution.
18 I'm talking -- the charges, the test for whether
19 to proceed with the charges is whether there's --
20 the issue of whether there continues to be a
21 reasonable likelihood of conviction is an ongoing
22 criteria, correct?

23 A Yes, sir.

24 Q Right. And if at some point in time,
25 maybe initially you get a report from the police

1 saying -- that leads you to believe that there's a
2 reasonable possibility of conviction at the
3 outset, right? I mean, that's why you --

4 A Mr. Nozick, at the end of the day,
5 what you're suggesting to me are matters relating
6 to issues of credibility, certainly the judge may
7 find that one or two of these officers are not
8 believable. But at the end of the day, a judge
9 could make a finding of guilt, or a jury could
10 make a finding of guilt depending on how the
11 evidence goes in and what gets excluded or not.

12 Q But the point --

13 A I don't know if we're speaking the
14 same language here.

15 Q I'll try and be a little more clear.
16 When you authorized the charges, you obviously
17 thought that there was a reasonable possibility
18 for a conviction at that time?

19 A I believe there was a reasonable
20 likelihood of conviction, yes. I maintained that
21 throughout.

22 Q And in some cases then, at some point
23 in time, because of the development in the case,
24 that opinion can change where there's no longer a
25 reasonable likelihood for a conviction?

1 A That can change, yes.

2 Q And if that happens, then your duty is
3 to stay the charge; correct?

4 A Yes.

5 Q All right. Now, in this particular
6 case, we had all of the problems that we have
7 outlined. And then you have the additional
8 problem that comes to your attention in the Carter
9 disclosure?

10 A Yes, sir.

11 Q You have a senior officer at least
12 being suspected of obstructing justice; correct?

13 A Well --

14 Q That was a suspicion?

15 A There has been opinion on that that
16 had been rendered, which was an unfavorable
17 opinion, in my view, to that issue. And to the
18 extent that there was no obstruct justice before
19 the court to consider, it was not on the table for
20 me to consider.

21 Q It's not for you to consider, but you
22 would have -- you'd be duty bound to make
23 disclosure to Richard Wolson the RCMP
24 investigation, right?

25 A Yes.

1 Q And Mr. Richard Wolson would come to a
2 trial, perhaps in front of a jury, armed with this
3 police report; right?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Armed with the allegations that
6 Woychuk was making; right?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Now, how in your mind would that play
9 out in front of a trier of fact? I'm going to
10 suggest to you that that would affect the
11 continuing reasonable likelihood of conviction on
12 anything?

13 A Well, I can look at these, sir,
14 independently. I can see that the dangerous
15 driving stands independent of the matter
16 concerning Mr. Bakema and Mr. Woychuk. The issue
17 of whether or not Mr. Zenk refused or did not
18 refuse the breathalyzer can stand independently of
19 that activity. And so too can the issue of
20 whether he was impaired at the time stand apart
21 from that. Those two fellows have their own
22 problems, but there are other people at the scene,
23 there are other witnesses. And just because they
24 are not believed and their evidence is discarded,
25 I can't be certain that -- I know there are

1 weaknesses, I know there are problems, I'm not
2 sure there is going to be a conviction, but I
3 can't rule that out. There's other evidence,
4 other than just those two people.

5 Now, it may well be that on the whole,
6 the case is fatal and I believe that there will be
7 some problems that the resolution is fine, but I
8 did not think that I should be staying these
9 charges, just independently, before the
10 Preliminary Inquiry. If that's a suggestion you
11 are making to me, I would have not stayed these
12 charges before a Preliminary Inquiry, if that's
13 where we were going.

14 Q Okay. Do you agree with me that in
15 presenting a case to a trier of fact, whether it's
16 a judge or a jury, that what you're trying to
17 persuade the trier of fact is you have a credible
18 case that they can rely on. Isn't that one of the
19 things you have to look to do?

20 A Because I have some problems, Mr.
21 Nozick, I cannot predict to you today that they
22 are fatal. If you're suggesting to me that I
23 ought to have stayed -- I don't understand what
24 the suggestion is?

25 Q I haven't made any suggestion, I am

1 just trying to --

2 A I am just telling you -- we're not
3 communicating.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: Let's communicate
5 and get on with this, otherwise we'll be here all
6 day, if you're going to talk one way and you are
7 going to respond the other way. Put your question
8 again, please.

9 BY MR. NOZICK:

10 Q Let me put it another way.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: Good. Put it
12 clearly.

13 BY MR. NOZICK:

14 Q Why did you stay the charges that you
15 stayed, the drinking and driving?

16 THE COMMISSIONER: At trial, not
17 initially.

18 BY MR. NOZICK:

19 Q Before the preliminary hearing.

20 A Why did I stay them? Because
21 Mr. Wolson and I entered into an arrangement and a
22 plea bargain that he, his client was going to be
23 pleading guilty to dangerous driving and I was
24 going to stay these charges. That's why it
25 happened.

1 Q Okay. And what was the basis of your
2 thinking in accepting the plea bargain? Was it
3 exigent circumstances? Was it a fact that you
4 thought that you might not prove the case? What
5 was your thinking?

6 A My thinking was all of those things,
7 Mr. Nozick. That the case on the other charges
8 was not good, there was credibility problems,
9 there was some charter problems, that there is
10 potentially even some problems with the dangerous
11 driving.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: In short, you
13 didn't have a reasonable likelihood of conviction.
14 Is that what you're saying?

15 THE WITNESS: No, I thought I -- I
16 didn't think that there would be -- at the end of
17 the day, I would think proof issues, proof beyond
18 a reasonable doubt issues.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. You see, you
20 are both talking about the same thing but you're
21 talking about it differently. Move on, please.

22 BY MR. NOZICK:

23 Q I'm going to move on to the
24 conditional sentence policy, G-45,
25 Mr. Commissioner, Exhibit 217, page 1385.

1 A Exhibit 217, yes.

2 Q Now, the term plea bargain, the
3 Commissioner has used it a certain way. I don't
4 want to differ with the Commissioner, but he has
5 used it, a plea bargain is in relation to the
6 charge, and then there's some type of arrangement
7 with respect to sentence. But I take it that
8 really when you use the term plea bargain in the
9 context that we're using, it was a global plea
10 bargain for both the charges and the sentence?

11 A Yes.

12 Q It's not -- you can't dissect it and
13 say the plea bargain terminology only applied to
14 the charges, because it applied also to the
15 sentence?

16 A Yes.

17 Q So, in other words, Wolson agrees to
18 plead guilty to the dangerous driving in
19 consideration of a joint recommendation for a
20 conditional sentence; right?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And had you not agreed to the joint
23 recommendation for the conditional sentence, then
24 likely the deal would have fell through?

25 A Correct.

1 Q And in Exhibit number 217, the --

2 A 207?

3 Q 217?

4 A Yes, sir, I've got it right in front
5 of me.

6 Q In paragraph four?

7 A Which page, sir?

8 Q Page 1385.

9 A Yes, sir.

10 Q Now, this refers to a case conference,
11 which doesn't apply in your case because you are
12 an independent counsel, but what it says:

13 "In those exceptional cases where it
14 has been agreed at a case conference
15 that a Crown Attorney will recommend a
16 conditional sentence. In one of the
17 above situations, the Assistant Deputy
18 Attorney General must be given advance
19 notice of the sentencing date."

20 Correct?

21 A Okay.

22 Q I take it you can read into that if
23 you're going to, that if there's an exceptional
24 case, and I take it this may be an exceptional
25 case, or argued to be an exceptional case, then

1 you have to give the Department of Justice notice
2 of what you're doing, at least in your case?

3 A That's fair, yes.

4 Q Right. And that's part of the reason
5 for communicating with Mr. Kaplan and Mr. Slough?

6 A Yes.

7 Q Now, while a conditional sentence
8 recommendation is exceptional, at page 1386:

9 "However, a case may involve
10 exceptional circumstances that would
11 justify a recommendation about
12 conditional sentence. Exceptional
13 circumstances is difficult to define
14 as they will be unusual and
15 unforeseeable situations that will
16 arise."

17 And then they set out some of the factors that
18 might be included. Do you see that?

19 A Yes, sir.

20 Q And if you go to the second last
21 bullet, it talks about the exigencies of the case,
22 i.e. difficulties with proof. That's what you had
23 here, correct?

24 A Yes.

25 Q "...may permit a Crown Attorney to

1 recommend a conditional sentence in
2 order to obtain a conviction, even
3 though a conditional sentence would
4 not normally be appropriate."

5 Do you agree with that?

6 A I am reading it, yes. That's what it
7 says.

8 Q And do you agree with that, though,
9 that's correct?

10 A Well, I think that it has to be read
11 in the context of the sentence below because --

12 Q I'm going to get that. I am going to
13 get to that in a minute.

14 A All right. That's what it says.

15 Q And it says it's a difficult judgment
16 call and a case conference will often be of
17 assistance in determining whether this course is
18 justified; correct?

19 A Yes.

20 Q Now in your case you don't have the
21 availability of a case conference in the way that
22 it's used in the policy; correct?

23 A There was no availability for that.

24 Q Right. But you do have the ability to
25 consult or run by the case with senior members of

1 the department?

2 A Yes, I said that on a number of
3 occasions.

4 Q So that would be a substitute for the
5 case conference?

6 A That's how I understand the
7 relationship to be.

8 Q Okay. The next bullet:

9 "A Crown Attorney is not required to
10 argue that a conditional sentence is
11 inappropriate in the face of clear
12 authority to the contrary."

13 And I take it, in your case, you have made it
14 clear that there was all kinds of clear authority
15 in Manitoba that that was the proper disposition?

16 A That's my research and I stand by it,
17 certainly to the date of the sentencing of that
18 particular case -- the law in Manitoba, that is.

19 Q Now, after your meeting with Kaplan on
20 July 13th, that was a Friday, on the Sunday you
21 wrote an e-mail to I guess Brian Kaplan and his
22 secretary Colleen. That's found at -- it's
23 Exhibit 227, Mr. Commissioner, found at R-1, I'm
24 sorry R-2.91.49.

25 A This is the briefing them about the

1 case and there was going to be a conditional
2 sentence, yes.

3 Q Do you have that in front of you?

4 A I don't have it in front of me.

5 Q Exhibit 227?

6 A I know what you're speaking about.

7 Yes, I have it here, sir.

8 Q So to put this in context, on Thursday
9 you talked to Wolson, on the Friday you talked to
10 Kaplan, and then Wolson talks to the family on the
11 weekend and gets back to you. And you write
12 Kaplan on the Sunday, July 15th, '07, writing an
13 update on the matter?

14 A Yes, sir, I see that about 10:12.

15 Q You are aware that Mr. Kaplan is
16 actually away from the office but you're sending
17 him a copy anyways. I take it Mr. Kaplan went on
18 holidays?

19 A I don't know why he was away from his
20 office, I just knew he was away.

21 Q Okay. And then in the third paragraph
22 you give a brief summary of the witnesses that
23 were available, the Winnipeg Police Services, the
24 witnesses from the scene, the ambulance, the East
25 St. Paul Police, the RCMP --

1 A Yes.

2 Q -- traffic reconstruction expert,
3 correct?

4 A Yes.

5 Q And then you venture your opinion.
6 "My opinion is that resolving this
7 matter by taking the plea as offered
8 is a very good resolution."

9 A Okay, yes.

10 Q "The evidence in support of the
11 charge of both the drive impaired and
12 refusal of breathalyzer is very, very
13 weak."

14 Correct?

15 A Yes.

16 Q So that was your opinion at the time?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And then you refer:
19 "By reason of the shoddy work of the
20 East St. Paul Police, the charge of
21 refuse breathalyzer is bound to fail."

22 A That was my opinion.

23 Q Yes. So, again, no reasonable
24 possibility of conviction, correct, when you use
25 that terminology?

1 A All right. We will adopt your
2 language.

3 Q Thank you. And then:
4 "The WPS members do not describe Zenk
5 as being impaired, and in speaking to
6 the RCMP expert, his assessment is
7 that the plea may in fact be more than
8 what might happen had the matter gone
9 to trial."

10 A Yes.

11 Q What did you mean by that?

12 A Well, he was telling me that there is
13 a good chance, based on his review of the file,
14 the man could be acquitted, so that the resolution
15 was good.

16 Q Okay. So what was left:
17 "What is left factually is speed
18 within the posted speed limit, no
19 evidence of impairment, no evidence of
20 erratic driving before the collision."

21 Correct?

22 A Right, reading my memo.

23 Q So this appears, if you read your
24 memo, that you are of the view that this was a
25 very good deal for the Crown?

1 A Yes.

2 Q Right. You salvaged a guilty plea,
3 without having to go through a Preliminary
4 Hearing, without having to go through a trial, on
5 a case that you may very well have lost?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And then you point out that the main
8 issue will be the sentencing, and you point out,
9 because the public perception of this case and the
10 family's perception is different than what the law
11 is, as you understood it; correct?

12 A Right.

13 Q Just a couple of quick matters that
14 were canvassed by counsel and not pursued.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Can you do them in
16 three minutes so we can have our break?

17 MR. NOZICK: I'll do my best.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: Good.

19 BY MR. NOZICK:

20 Q Courtroom 404, there was some
21 discussion that it takes a long time, that the
22 family sat there for a long time waiting for the
23 very short matter to be dealt with on July 17th.
24 Do you remember that?

25 A Yes.

1 Q It was brought up?

2 A Yes, sir.

3 Q Court starts at 10:00 o'clock?

4 A Yes, sir.

5 Q Generally people who are interested in
6 a case like this would come early. Were you there
7 early at 9:00 o'clock?

8 A Well, that's my -- I try to get there
9 early.

10 Q People generally come early, and then
11 the 404 court is an assignment room where all the
12 matters scheduled for that day go into that
13 docket, and then they are shipped out to courts,
14 to be tried in other courts?

15 A Right.

16 Q And in this case, your plea was
17 entered?

18 A Right.

19 Q So if there was a delay, and the
20 family is saying it, it may well have been that
21 they were waiting for court to start?

22 A I don't know what they were speaking
23 about and don't want to --

24 Q That's how the court works?

25 A -- think about it. Well, I don't want

1 to think about it. I don't mean it that way, I
2 just cannot tell you what they were thinking
3 about.

4 Q The issue on the release on the
5 promise to appear, you remember saying you agreed
6 to release Mr. Harvey-Zenk on a promise to appear?

7 A Yes.

8 Q You didn't consult with either
9 Mr. Kaplan or Mr. Slough beforehand?

10 A No. Mr. Kaplan wasn't around, and I
11 did not consult with Mr. Slough. And I did not
12 consult with Mr. Ridd, who contacted me about the
13 matter.

14 Q As the independent counsel, that was
15 your decision and your responsibility.

16 A Yes.

17 Q The report from Judge Meyers, Exhibit
18 223 dated December, I think it's 19th, 2005, that
19 was referred to by counsel, and there was a check
20 mark off there where, something along there were
21 no real issues. This was what they call a
22 pre-trial meeting that was held many months before
23 the time was scheduled for the Preliminary
24 Hearing?

25 A Yes.

1 Q It was held in December, the
2 Preliminary in June of '06. And as I understand
3 what happens at these trial conferences, the judge
4 has a little check list, asks a bunch of
5 questions, checks off the checks, and that's it;
6 correct?

7 A Generally speaking.

8 Q And often counsel haven't really spent
9 a great deal of time addressing their minds to the
10 issues?

11 A Oftentimes that does occur.

12 Q And in any event, this was way before
13 the Carter disclosure; right?

14 A Correct.

15 Q Way before the RCMP report, right?

16 MR. NOZICK: I have a couple more
17 questions, it may take more than three minutes.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: All right. 15
19 minutes.

20 THE CLERK: All rise. This Commission
21 of Inquiry is now in recess.

22 (Proceedings recessed at 10:45 and
23 reconvened at 11:00 a.m.)

24 THE CLERK: All rise, please. This
25 Commission of Inquiry is now reopened. Please be

1 seated.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Are you planning to
3 be much longer?

4 MR. NOZICK: Hopefully not. I would
5 estimate five, seven minutes.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: Remember Yogi Berra
7 said it was deja vu all over again. That's the
8 impression I'm getting here.

9 MR. NOZICK: I hear you.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: Okay.

11 BY MR. NOZICK:

12 Q Referring to 91.72?

13 A What exhibit is that?

14 Q Exhibit 233, and it looks like 142,
15 which is 91.73 and 91.74 in volume R-2?

16 A Okay. I have that.

17 Q First of all, Exhibit 233 is an e-mail
18 from Don Slough to yourself requesting some
19 information for a briefing note for the Premier?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Right. And at that point, he sets out
22 a whole number of questions there that he asks you
23 to answer?

24 A Yes.

25 Q Basically, what the case is about,

1 what's going on, that type of thing?

2 A Yes.

3 Q And you answer him, first of all you
4 send a draft and then you send a revised copy?

5 A Yes.

6 Q And in paragraph seven, and this has
7 been referred to, we note that there was
8 additional comments made on number seven --

9 A Yes.

10 Q -- in the final copy vis-a-vis the
11 previous copy?

12 A Yes.

13 Q I take it Mr. Slough did not ask you
14 to add anything to your revised copy; fair?

15 A Mr. Nozick, today, I cannot remember
16 what the discussion was. If there was some
17 additional material, clearly in my mind, it could
18 only have resulted as a consequence of our
19 discussions.

20 MR. NOZICK: Okay. Now, keeping in
21 mind the Yogi Berra caveat, I'll ask no further
22 questions.

23 MR. PROBER: I have to wait until Yogi
24 leaves.

25

1 BY MR. PROBER:

2 Q Good morning, Mr. Commissioner and
3 Mr. Minuk.

4 A Good morning, Mr. Prober.

5 Q I do not expect to be lengthy. First
6 of all, you, Mr. Minuk, draw a distinction, and
7 rightly so, between a reasonable likelihood of
8 conviction and proof beyond a reasonable doubt?

9 A I do, sir.

10 Q That's all you were saying before when
11 Mr. Nozick was questioning you?

12 A Right.

13 Q And in order to proceed with the
14 charges, proceed with them, never mind lay them,
15 but to proceed with them, as a Crown Attorney you
16 have to be satisfied that there's a reasonable
17 likelihood of conviction?

18 A Correct.

19 Q And while you were satisfied that
20 there was a reasonable likelihood of conviction,
21 you were not satisfied that you could prove the
22 alcohol-related charges beyond a reasonable doubt?

23 A Correct.

24 Q Now, in terms of the plea discussions
25 with Richard Wolson, you didn't say to him, I

1 don't have a reasonable likelihood of conviction
2 therefore I'm staying the charges, before the plea
3 discussions, right?

4 A I wouldn't speak like that to
5 Mr. Wolson, ever.

6 Q No. And nor did you tell him before
7 the plea discussions that you were not satisfied
8 that you could prove the charges beyond a
9 reasonable doubt?

10 A Simply put, Mr. Nozick -- Mr. Prober,
11 until Mr. Wolson called me to discuss resolution,
12 we did not -- I have not contacted him at all.

13 Q Right. Well, that's the worst insult
14 I've had today, by the way.

15 A Pardon me?

16 Q You mixed me up with Mr. Nozick.
17 That's about the worst insult I have had today.

18 A Sorry.

19 Q But it's early. In any event, Mr.
20 Nozick and I are friends.

21 All right. So you didn't tell him
22 either of those things, in terms of your case and
23 what your beliefs were with respect to your case
24 before plea discussions were conducted?

25 A I didn't follow you with that.

1 Q You didn't give him what you believed
2 the strength of your case was?

3 A Oh, no, no, no.

4 Q No. And the opening salvo, in fact,
5 comes from Wolson; right?

6 A Correct.

7 Q In terms of plea discussions?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And as a result of that, the alcohol
10 related charges were stayed as part of the plea
11 bargain?

12 A Right.

13 Q Right. And the fact that you told the
14 court that you were not satisfied that you could
15 prove the charges beyond a reasonable doubt, you
16 didn't have legal proof. And you drew the
17 distinction before, when you were in front of
18 Judge Wyant, between the reasonable likelihood of
19 conviction and proof beyond a reasonable doubt.
20 You will recall that?

21 A I do recall that.

22 Q Right. And that fact is not -- I
23 mean, the fact that the charges were stayed as
24 part of the plea bargain, and the fact that you
25 didn't have proof beyond a reasonable doubt, are

1 not mutually exclusive. You don't have proof
2 beyond a reasonable doubt, so you stay the charges
3 as part of the plea bargain; right?

4 A Well, that was my concern.

5 Q Right. Okay. Do you think you could
6 have gotten a plea, a sure conviction, a guilty
7 plea that is to dangerous driving causing death,
8 without staying the alcohol-related charges?

9 A I think that --

10 Q I'm not talking about at trial now,
11 I'm talking about in the plea discussions?

12 A No. No, no, no, I don't think that I
13 could have successfully -- well, I knew that
14 Mr. Wolson was just not going to go there.

15 Q Right. Thank you.

16 The only other area of questioning I
17 have is on the issue of head trauma which was
18 raised with you yesterday. Now, my colleague,
19 Mr. King, printed out yesterday's transcript of
20 evidence. And I just want to make -- when
21 Mr. Paciocco put to you this issue of the head
22 trauma or concussion, it was not made clear, and I
23 want to make it clear with you as to when it was
24 first brought to the attention of you and Judge
25 Wyant. And that was on the August 22nd

1 proceedings. Now, if you want to confirm that, go
2 to volume J, please?

3 A I have.

4 Q Do you have that?

5 A Exhibit 8, that's the August 22nd
6 volume, I have that here.

7 Q You have the August 22nd volume. Now
8 do you have page numbers at the bottom and the
9 top?

10 A Yes, sir.

11 Q Okay. So 1663 at the bottom, the top
12 is 46.

13 Now, I have it, hopefully they will be
14 the same line numbers, line 29, the bottom.

15 "Never once, never once has Derek ever
16 offered to me any concern for
17 himself."

18 And then it goes on to refer to a concussion. Do
19 you have that?

20 A Yes.

21 Q So that's raised at the August 22nd
22 court proceedings; right?

23 A Well, it looks like he raised it.

24 Q Sorry?

25 A He raised it, but what they

1 believed --

2 Q Yes. That was quoted to you yesterday
3 by Mr. Paciocco?

4 A Right.

5 Q But it wasn't put on the record that
6 it was the August 22nd proceedings.

7 A Okay. I don't remember that.

8 Q No, no. Mr. Paciocco didn't put it on
9 the record and I want to clear that up.

10 A Oh, okay, it's not a question.

11 Q That's all. So you see it on the
12 August 22nd proceedings?

13 A I'm reading it, yes.

14 Q No, no. Fair enough. But I just want
15 to confirm the date. And then there's another
16 reference at page 1678 that Mr. Paciocco puts to
17 you, and again it's August 22nd. That's at page
18 61 at the top, 1678 at the bottom, line 15.

19 "I think, quite frankly, that may well
20 have happened, but I don't know that
21 and Derek doesn't know that because of
22 the head trauma that he suffered."

23 But that again is August 22nd, correct, Mr. Minuk?

24 A I see where you're reading from the
25 transcript.

1 Q Do you have it?

2 A I see where you're reading from.

3 Q Okay. That's fine. You obviously had
4 nothing that you were aware of that contradicted
5 that statement?

6 A Well, no.

7 Q No?

8 A Nothing there at all.

9 Q Right. Now, you were satisfied that
10 there were elements of dangerous driving
11 sufficient to ground a plea?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And if necessary, perhaps get a
14 conviction at trial; correct?

15 A Yes.

16 Q And they included the marked departure
17 from the norm, no attempt to stop, no attention
18 paid to the warning lights, no attempt to avoid
19 the collision, plowed into the rear of a vehicle
20 at a high speed, and that caused a death, all of
21 those factors; right?

22 A Right.

23 Q And I put that to you because I want
24 to confirm with you that the issue of the head
25 trauma, the concussion, the loss of memory had no

1 bearing on your taking a plea to dangerous
2 driving?

3 A No.

4 Q No.

5 A Not a part of the driving at all.

6 Q No. Nor was it a factor in agreeing
7 to make a joint recommendation --

8 A No, not at all.

9 Q -- in terms of the sentence?

10 A It wasn't at all.

11 Q No. Because all of that was done
12 before it was ever brought to your attention on
13 August 22nd; right?

14 A Correct.

15 MR. PROBER: Right. Thank you. Those
16 are my questions.

17 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

18 BY MR. GREEN:

19 Q Mr. Minuk, you have given evidence
20 about the investigation that you had instigated of
21 Chief Bakema. And you have told us that you felt
22 that you were constrained in certain ways of
23 revealing the fact that an investigation was going
24 on. Is that correct?

25 A Yes.

1 Q And that was constraint pursuant to an
2 actual policy of the Department of Justice. Is
3 that correct?

4 A Yes, sir.

5 Q And Mr. Commissioner, I'd refer to
6 volume Y-2, which has been marked as I understand
7 it as Exhibit 266 in these proceedings. And if
8 madam clerk can put that -- she's already done so,
9 put it before the witness.

10 And if you look at page 153 at the
11 bottom, sir?

12 THE COMMISSIONER: Is that the opinion
13 of Mr. Gover?

14 MR. GREEN: No, I'm very sorry. I
15 have got the wrong reference, sorry, it's volume
16 G.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: G, okay, thank you.
18 I have that.

19 MR. GREEN: Yes, it's 216.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: 216.

21 MR. GREEN: I'm sorry, volume G-46.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: Ah, okay. Thank
23 you.

24 THE WITNESS: I have Exhibit 216 in
25 front of me, Mr. Green.

1 THE COMMISSIONER: You're looking at
2 the policy statement?

3 MR. GREEN: Yes.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

5 BY MR. GREEN:

6 Q And at the bottom of my copy, it's
7 about six pages in, we have the number 153 --

8 THE COMMISSIONER: You don't have
9 any --

10 MR. GREEN: It's under "procedure,
11 laying charges," it's pages four of five at the
12 top.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

14 BY MR. GREEN:

15 Q Do you have it?

16 A Yes, I do, sir.

17 Q All right. I'm looking at procedure
18 laying of charges, item number 6, which states:

19 "No Crown Attorney shall disclose the
20 fact of a police investigation other
21 on a need to know basis within the
22 prosecution service so as to maintain
23 confidentiality and secrecy respecting
24 the identity of a person who is the
25 subject of a police investigation."

1 Is that the policy and the particular passage --

2 A Yes, sir.

3 Q -- that you had in mind --

4 A Yes, sir.

5 Q -- when you gave that evidence, sir?

6 A Yes, sir.

7 Q Sir, Mr. Zazelenchuk raised some
8 matters with you that I'd just like to refer you
9 to briefly. In particular, he referred you to
10 your statements of account. We have heard those
11 referred to as docketts and what have you. And he
12 pointed out that someone with the initials E.E.M.
13 had recorded time on this particular file?

14 A Yes.

15 Q And you told us who E.E.M. was?

16 A Right.

17 Q And who is it?

18 A Erin McNicol.

19 Q Right. And she is employed at your
20 firm --

21 A Yes.

22 Q -- at the Aikins firm. And she was
23 present at some of the meetings with the Tamans;
24 is that correct?

25 A Yes.

1 Q And you told us, or told Mr. Paciocco
2 that her purpose in, or Mr. Zazelenchuk, her
3 purpose in being at those meetings wasn't to take
4 notes; is that correct?

5 A Right, she wasn't taking notes.

6 Q What was her purpose in being at those
7 meetings?

8 A Only because I was just concerned
9 about the atmosphere between, and the
10 relationship, and I use that in a sort of
11 quotation sense, between myself and the families.
12 And it was just difficult and I just wanted
13 someone there with me.

14 Q Okay. And have you, since this
15 inquiry was called, spoken to Ms. McNicol and
16 asked her whether she has any recollection of what
17 went on at those meetings?

18 A Yes, I did. When the matter came to
19 light, I spoke with her. I asked her if she
20 recorded any notes, if she kept any notes. She
21 checked.

22 Q Does she have any recollection?

23 A Nothing, sir, no. She didn't even
24 remember that she had sat in on the meetings.

25 Q Mr. Zazelenchuk also asked you about

1 meeting with Constable Woychuk. And I think you
2 told him that, in fact, a meeting had been
3 scheduled for the 15th of July. That was a
4 Sunday?

5 A Yes, sir.

6 Q Correct. And we know that that
7 meeting was missed by you, is that correct?

8 A Yes, sir.

9 Q And you have now satisfied yourself,
10 as I understand it, that you simply slept in and
11 that was the reason that you missed the meeting?

12 A I'm not sure I would call it slept in,
13 but I suspect it was a time when I was sleeping,
14 because I wasn't sleeping at all during the
15 evenings during that period of time. I wasn't
16 able to lie down. I could only sit upright. So
17 my sleeping was on and off during that period of
18 time.

19 Q All right. And Mr. Zazelenchuk
20 described Constable Woychuk as being a potentially
21 weak witness. Would you agree with me that he was
22 more than a weak witness, he was -- he had
23 significant and abiding credibility problems.
24 Would you agree with that?

25 A Yes.

1 Q Now, I don't want to rehash evidence,
2 but to put it in context, sir, am I correct in my
3 understanding that from fairly early on after your
4 having received this file, you were of the view
5 that Mr. Harvey-Zenk was facing jail time, but
6 jail time to be served within the community?

7 A Well, yes, and I think I indicated
8 that to both of the families in my early meetings
9 with them that I thought the law in Manitoba was,
10 for these types of offences, either dangerous
11 driving causing death and impaired driving causing
12 death.

13 Q So a conviction on either, you were of
14 the view that it was likely that there would be a
15 conditional sentence?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Is that fair?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And what circumstances did you take
20 into account when you arrived at that opinion,
21 sir?

22 A Primarily, well, first of all, many of
23 the accidents that were described in the case
24 law --

25 Q Yes?

1 A -- and the circumstances of the
2 accident, whether it was rear end accident, people
3 going through red lights, people moving from one
4 lane to the other, but the factual circumstances
5 of the accident. Of course, some with alcohol,
6 some without alcohol.

7 Q And what about the circumstance of
8 Mr. Zenk?

9 A And the circumstances of the offender,
10 which is always front and centre in the
11 conditional sentence cases.

12 Q And what particular circumstances in
13 relation to Harvey-Zenk would you consider?

14 A Well, first of all, Mr. Zenk was a
15 City of Winnipeg Police Officer, so from that I
16 knew that he was employed, what the nature of his
17 employment was, that he had no record. I knew
18 that from the disclosure provided, no previous
19 police contact, so to speak. That he was an
20 individual with roots in the community, that he
21 would likely meet all of the criteria, so able to
22 follow court orders, abide by conditions.

23 Q Had a young family?

24 A Yes, not likely to reoffend. All of
25 the things that I would need to consider in

1 determining whether or not he was a candidate for
2 a conditional sentence.

3 Q Okay. Now, Mr. Paciocco cited you the
4 evidence of the Tamans that you, according to
5 them, you told them that dangerous driving causing
6 death was the most serious of the charges that
7 Harvey-Zenk was facing. You recall Mr. Paciocco
8 bringing that to your attention?

9 A Yes, I do.

10 Q And I believe your evidence was that
11 you wouldn't have told them that, there must be
12 some confusion. Do I have your evidence
13 correctly?

14 A Yes. And it's not the most serious at
15 all, on the scale upward or downward it would be
16 above the refusal.

17 Q Yeah. And that was going to be my
18 point, sir, that if there was any comparison to be
19 made as to it being more serious or most serious,
20 that would have to be in connection with the
21 refuse breathalyzer charge; is that correct?

22 A Yes, more serious than refusing the
23 breathalyzer.

24 Q And the Tamans seem to be particularly
25 interested, I won't say fixated, but there was a

1 lot of discussion about the refuse breathalyzer
2 offence; is that fair?

3 A Yes. Because of the fact of the
4 refusal, and the inferences that people might
5 think can be drawn, and its use and things like
6 that. So the refusal always presents itself as a,
7 presented itself as sort of a topic of discussion.

8 Q Okay. Now, we have heard about your
9 meeting with the Tamans on July 13, 2007, and we
10 know that that was a Friday, correct?

11 A Yes, sir.

12 Q And the Preliminary was to start the
13 following Monday, the 16th?

14 A Yes, sir.

15 Q And the evidence seems to be that
16 pretty significant or serious settlement
17 negotiations with Mr. Wolson had occurred by that
18 time, that is by the Friday. And I think you and
19 Mr. Wolson are of the same mind that those
20 settlement negotiations started either on the
21 Wednesday or the Thursday. Is that correct?

22 A Yes, the serious settlement
23 discussions, yes.

24 Q And they had advanced to the point
25 that you had contacted Mr. Kaplan about them on

1 the Thursday?

2 A Yes.

3 Q And from the memo that has been filed,
4 his memo of a telephone conversation, you called
5 him at home in the evening of that Thursday?

6 A Sure. I believe that, if it says
7 that.

8 Q All right. And then you met with
9 Mr. Kaplan first thing on the Friday morning,
10 immediately before you met with the Tamans; is
11 that correct?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And actually the Tamans have said that
14 you were somewhat late for the meeting with them
15 on that Friday morning. And putting two and two
16 together, I gather that that may have been because
17 you had met with Mr. Kaplan right before; is that
18 fair?

19 A If I was late, it would be because I
20 was coming from Mr. Kaplan's, the meeting with
21 Mr. Kaplan.

22 Q Okay. Mr. Paciocco also referred you
23 to the Tamans' allegations that you told them that
24 you intended to stay the charges of criminal
25 negligence, impaired driving and refusal, and

1 proceed only on the question of dangerous driving
2 to the Preliminary. You will recall --

3 A I heard that.

4 Q -- Mr. Paciocco pressing you fairly
5 vigorously on that in his questioning?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And you denied that allegation
8 completely. That is if the settlement
9 negotiations broke down, that you would stay the
10 charges, stay the three charges and proceed only
11 on the dangerous driving, you denied that
12 vigorously?

13 A I would have gone ahead.

14 Q Now, for the sake of argument
15 Mr. Minuk, I want you to assume that in fact that
16 was your intention, okay. In other words, if the
17 settlement negotiations break down, it was your
18 intention to stay the three charges, the crim neg,
19 the impaired, and the refusal, and only proceed to
20 the Preliminary on the question of the dangerous.
21 Make that assumption?

22 A Yes.

23 Q If that were the case, is that
24 something that you would have run by Mr. Kaplan
25 and Mr. Slough?

1 A If I was just going to stay these
2 charges outright and just go to a Preliminary on
3 dangerous driving, I would have told them that,
4 absolutely, for sure. I wouldn't have gone ahead
5 on something like that without alerting them to
6 that type of activity.

7 Q Sure. And Mr. Paciocco showed you
8 Mr. Kaplan's memo of the Thursday night telephone
9 conversation, and there's nothing in there about
10 staying the charges and proceeding only to the
11 Preliminary on the question of dangerous driving,
12 is there?

13 A I don't recall any. We didn't even
14 talk about that.

15 Q No. And you have read the Commission
16 Counsel's transcript of their interviews with
17 Mr. Kaplan and Mr. Slough, have you?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And there's nothing there that was put
20 by Commission Counsel about staying those three
21 charges and proceeding to the preliminary only on
22 the question of the dangerous driving; correct?

23 A No, I would be surprised to read it.
24 We didn't talk about it. It wasn't a matter of
25 discussion, ever.

1 Q Mr. Paciocco also referred you, I
2 think, to Jordan Taman's evidence, that at the
3 meeting with him and his father on July 13, he
4 asked you point blank whether there was a plea
5 bargain, and you said no. Do you recall
6 Mr. Paciocco referring that to you?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Mr. Minuk, if you look at the sentence
9 that you and Mr. Wolson jointly recommended,
10 sentence of two years less a day to be served in
11 the community, and you look only at that, in your
12 view, were you giving anything up as regards to
13 the sentence itself?

14 A Well, I don't know if I was giving
15 anything up, but I'd say that I didn't think I was
16 because the sentence which I wanted, which I
17 thought was appropriate, was the high end of the
18 Provincial -- it was the end of the allowable
19 period for conditional sentence, two years less a
20 day, which some of the cases were in the teens,
21 some lower, I thought that this was extreme end.

22 Q So, as far as the sentence is
23 concerned, you weren't bargaining anything away in
24 your mind; is that fair?

25 A Based on the law that I understood it

1 to be, and the duration of the sentence, I didn't
2 think I bargained anything away there.

3 Q All right. Now, Mr. Paciocco also
4 asked you yesterday, I believe it was yesterday,
5 about the government, the Department of Justice
6 policy concerning the staying of charges. Do you
7 recall that?

8 A I'm sure he did. It's already
9 beginning to lose --

10 Q In particular, where charges are
11 stayed, the policy that you have to explain that
12 to the court in certain circumstances.

13 A Right. Yes, yes, yes, yes.

14 Q And he suggested to you that nowhere
15 in the transcript, at none of the court
16 appearances, did you fulfill that obligation of
17 explaining the reason for the staying of those
18 charges. Do you recall him making that suggestion
19 to you?

20 A I do recall that now.

21 Q If you refer to the transcript of the
22 appearance on September 12, 2007?

23 A That's exhibit 9?

24 Q I believe so.

25 A What page, Mr. Green, do you want me

1 to look at?

2 Q Page 1702.

3 A Yes, sir.

4 Q And starting at line 13, sir, would
5 you read that into the record, please?

6 A Line 13?

7 Q Yes?

8 A "In short, no evidence capable of
9 meeting the required standards..."

10 Q Read it slowly and out loud, please?

11 A Okay. This is line 13:

12 "In short, no evidence capable of
13 meeting the required standard for
14 prosecutions, a reasonable likelihood
15 of conviction, and all the more so, no
16 evidence resisting a Gardiner
17 challenge was available to the Crown
18 in respect to the offence of impaired
19 driving and refuse breathalyzer. If
20 such evidence may have been available,
21 none was demanded or obtained at the
22 scene in compliance with the
23 requirements set out by the Supreme
24 Court of Canada in R v. Woods 2005
25 Supreme Court of Canada Reports, page

1 42, and recently applied in the
2 Manitoba Court of Appeal by Justice
3 Clearwater the case of R v. Bowler."

4 Q As a result of that, do you agree or
5 disagree with the suggestion that you didn't give
6 an explanation for the staying of the charges to
7 the court?

8 A Well, I was giving an explanation
9 there, what I thought was an explanation.

10 Q So the court was aware of why the --

11 A Yes.

12 Q The reason for the charges being
13 stayed?

14 A That is what I was intending to do,
15 was give that explanation.

16 Q Now, Mr. Paciocco questioned you at
17 length about the transcripts of your various court
18 appearances. And in particular, he asked you
19 about the appearances of August 22nd,
20 September 12th, of last year. And one of the
21 areas that he referred you to and questioned you
22 vigorously about was Judge Wyant's question of
23 whether you would be calling evidence of the
24 consumption of alcohol?

25 A I recall that. It was near the end of

1 the proceeding on September 22nd.

2 Q I just wanted to refer to that
3 transcript, sir, and I think it's found at page
4 1738.7. And I'm interested in the remark at the
5 bottom of page -- of the page at line 29. Do you
6 have that?

7 A Line 29.

8 Q Line 29 on page 1738.7.

9 A I have that.

10 Q Okay. And this is a comment by you.
11 All right. We can start at 26, I guess. And you
12 had been asked the question of whether you were
13 going to be calling evidence of alcohol and you
14 said the following:

15 "What I'd like to do before I answer
16 the question is ask you for five
17 minutes.

18 The Court: Absolutely.

19 Mr. Minuk: Then I'll come back and
20 answer the question. I could answer
21 the question now, but I think it might
22 take too long and I'd prefer to have
23 the five minutes beforehand."

24 When you say, I could answer the
25 question now, you are telling the judge that you'd

1 like five minutes but you could answer the
2 question right there and then; is that correct?

3 A Yes.

4 Q And what would your answer have been?

5 A Pardon me?

6 Q What would your answer have been --

7 A No.

8 Q -- had you given it then. It would
9 have been no?

10 A The same answer I gave him.

11 Q Now, I want you to listen to this
12 question very carefully. Did you at any time
13 understand Judge Wyant to be asking you whether
14 you intended to call evidence of consumption of
15 alcohol as a potential aggravating factor on
16 sentence?

17 A Well, no, he never asked me that
18 question, either on August 22nd or September --
19 for sure not then. And my understanding, sir, is
20 in the course of that dialogue which you just
21 referred me to, the questions that were -- the
22 dialogue that was going on between Mr. Wolson and
23 the judge, I understood them to be talking about
24 those factors which made up the marked departure
25 which formed the basis of the plea. I did not at

1 any time understand that discussion, nor did I
2 ever have the impression that that discussion,
3 based on the dialogue between Mr. Wolson and the
4 judge, had anything to do at that point with
5 sentencing. Because it struck me that they were
6 talking about the whole issue of the basis of the
7 plea, and what the factors were going into that,
8 because that's what Mr. Wolson was talking about.
9 And that's what the judge was speaking to him
10 about.

11 Q So --

12 A And then when he turned to me, I
13 believe that we were still speaking about the same
14 thing, and not about factors taking into account
15 at sentencing, that we were right back to the
16 whole fundamental issue, which is what is it that
17 you gentlemen are saying is the basis for the
18 marked departure, basis of the plea and,
19 Mr. Minuk, are you going to be calling evidence on
20 that issue? That's how I understood that.

21 Q All right. So you never understood
22 him to be questioning that of consumption of
23 alcohol vis-a-vis aggravating factor in
24 sentencing?

25 A No. And I read that over and over

1 again. And because, I just, that's how I
2 understood it. I look at it to see whether or not
3 I may have misunderstood it now that I step back
4 from it. But in the context of the discussion,
5 sir, it still today is to me not a discussion any
6 longer about sentencing, but we spent a lot of
7 time in court, and now we're right back to the
8 beginning again.

9 Q All right. Now, sir, you told us
10 yesterday that quite a while ago you stopped
11 reading media reports on the Taman matter; is that
12 correct?

13 A After the -- it would be shortly after
14 the August 22nd court appearance, I guess.

15 Q But you know that there have been many
16 media reports in both of the daily newspapers in
17 Winnipeg that had been critical of some of the
18 decisions you made and some of the steps you took?

19 A I may not read it, but it's
20 unavoidable in me hearing about it, yes.

21 Q And you are aware of that the Tamans
22 and the Sveinsons have been mightily critical of
23 you in this inquiry?

24 A Yes. Yes, sir.

25 Q Sir, do you feel that criticism is

1 justified?

2 A I think in the circumstances that,
3 from the available evidence that I had to me --

4 Q Yes.

5 A -- what was presented to me, that I
6 conducted myself in the proper manner in this
7 case, in a professional manner, considered the
8 pros and cons of this case and achieved a result,
9 first of all, obtained a conviction in a case
10 where some may say that getting a conviction might
11 be difficult, others may disagree with that, but
12 certainly the certainty of a conviction, I believe
13 that based on the case law in Manitoba at the time
14 of the sentencing hearing, that there would be no
15 cases to support -- well, that there may be some
16 cases, I wouldn't go that far, but certainly the
17 overwhelming majority of cases in Manitoba to the
18 year 2005, when this matter occurred, in cases of
19 impaired driving causing death and all the more so
20 dangerous driving cases causing death, even where
21 other charges of impaired driving cause death
22 might have been laid, but all the research that I
23 came across from 1999, up until the time of the
24 sentencing in 2007, supported the view that in
25 Manitoba, unlike some other provinces, but in

1 Manitoba, the Court of Appeal has indicated that
2 the two year, or the conditional sentence is
3 appropriate. I believe that in getting the high
4 end of that period, as opposed to the teens or the
5 twenties in the months, secured the most serious
6 penalty based on the law as I understood it and in
7 the result, did a good job in this matter. And I
8 see that some people may choose to disagree, but I
9 think that objectively, taking a look at this,
10 that some of the criticism may be -- I don't
11 really want to go there.

12 Q I take it this criticism, we won't go
13 there, but this has exacted a tremendous toil on
14 you, all of this process, sir, is that --

15 A Absolutely. Oh, yes.

16 Q Now, if Judge Wyant --

17 A I wanted to say one thing, sir, which
18 is that if I didn't think it was the right thing
19 to do, I wouldn't have done it.

20 Q All right. Sir, if Judge Wyant had
21 rejected the joint recommendation and imposed some
22 other sentence, in the larger scheme of things,
23 would that really have mattered to you?

24 A No, not at all. I go into every case
25 knowing that, no matter whether I'm acting on

1 behalf of my own clients, or whether or not I'm
2 doing counsel work for the Government of Manitoba,
3 every time I go to court with a joint
4 recommendation, plea bargain, whether it's a quid
5 pro quo or otherwise, that it's always open to the
6 judge to make up his or her mind to follow or not
7 to follow, and always, always warn my clients of
8 that, notwithstanding the fact that they will get
9 some warning of that by the judge. I tell them
10 that. They know that. I know that. And all I
11 can do is the best job that I am able to do. And
12 at the end of the day, wait for the decision. And
13 if I think it's wrong, there's an appeal court.
14 If it's, I think it's --

15 Q But you don't have any vested
16 interest --

17 A None whatsoever.

18 Q -- in the judge accepting the
19 recommendation?

20 A None whatsoever.

21 Q Those are all the questions that I
22 have, Mr. Minuk. Is there anything that you'd
23 like to add?

24 A No, I think we've covered it. I've
25 been here a long time, and Mr. Commissioner has

1 reminded me of the comments of Mr. Berra, and I
2 too enjoy that sport, and I know that he has other
3 witnesses to deal with, and a lot of work ahead of
4 him. And after two and a half days, maybe he's
5 seen enough of me.

6 MR. GREEN: Thank you.

7 BY MR. PACIOCCO:

8 Q After two and a half days, Mr. Minuk,
9 you will be relieved to know that I'm going to
10 exhibit uncharacteristic restraint. I don't have
11 many questions for you.

12 The one I want to deal with very, very
13 briefly is, when you had your Manitoba provincial
14 insurance discussions with the Sveinsons --

15 A Manitoba Provincial Insurance?

16 Q The insurance discussions --

17 A Yes.

18 Q -- they talked about their
19 dissatisfaction with it?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Do you recall them indicating to you
22 that their concern was not that they would not get
23 adequate money for themselves, but their concern
24 was for the inadequacy for the payment that their
25 grandchildren would be eligible to?

1 A It may well be that. I actually, sir,
2 really wanted to find somebody at MPI to call them
3 or give them the name to speak with. That was --
4 really my focus was to try to help them.

5 Q Thank you. The last issue I want to
6 deal with is the question about whether sufficient
7 information was given to the court about the
8 reasons for staying the charge. And they were
9 stayed, of course, way back in the July
10 appearances. Mr. Green took you to the
11 September 12th document. And you'd agree with me
12 that you didn't even anticipate that there would
13 be a September 12th appearance, that you really
14 said what you had to say on the sentencing on
15 August 22nd?

16 A I think I told you that yesterday. If
17 it wasn't yesterday, I can't remember, or the day
18 before.

19 Q Yes. The point is that, absent some
20 exceptional situation where you're called back in,
21 you would have walked away from this case on the
22 22nd and you would never have made any reference
23 to the staying of the charges?

24 A If it's not -- I will have to take you
25 at your word, sir, but if isn't in the

1 August 22nd, then you're right.

2 Q The only other point -- actually there
3 are two. One of the points I want to make very
4 briefly, sir, is that when you do talk about the
5 fact that you did not have evidence for this
6 particular -- I'm just trying to find the page so
7 I'm precise, sir, bear with me. 1702, I believe.

8 A 1702, yes, that's where it is.

9 Q Yeah. You say:
10 "In short, no evidence capable of
11 meeting the required standards for
12 prosecutions or reasonable likelihood
13 of conviction, and all the more so, no
14 evidence resisting a Gardiner
15 challenge was available to the Crown
16 in respect to the offences of impaired
17 driving and refusing the
18 breathalyzer."

19 What I had put to you, sir, was that you had not
20 provided a foundation for the criminal negligence
21 charge and the refusal charge. Now, you'd agree
22 with me that you don't mention --

23 A I agree, yes.

24 Q And the only other point, sir, is you
25 have given bald assertion that you had no

1 reasonable likelihood of conviction on those
2 charges, but you'd agree with me that there was
3 evidence of a demand being made --

4 A Oh, yes.

5 Q -- a process going through, an officer
6 believing he had reasonable and probable grounds.
7 You would agree with me that you don't explain
8 what the problems were with the evidence, but you
9 just kind of leave it hanging as a general
10 conclusion?

11 A I didn't, yes.

12 Q Do you think, given the nature of the
13 policy, and I think you would agree its underlying
14 purpose in allowing the public to understand, it
15 wouldn't be much, much better to explain in brief
16 terms what the problems were so that people could
17 walk away and feel satisfied?

18 A I think if I -- I would have tried to
19 find a balance between not looking as if I was
20 telling them the facts of the case, and not
21 looking as if I was on some full scale attack on
22 the Police Service, some balance between them.

23 Q Do you really think the best place to
24 draw that balance is by just giving the conclusion
25 with no detail, sir? Do you not think it would

1 have been more in keeping with the purpose of the
2 policy to give some more explanation than you did?

3 A More detail can never hurt.

4 MR. PACIOCCO: All right, sir. And
5 thank you for your evidence and your endurance.

6 THE WITNESS: I didn't know I would
7 have such endurance, sir.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Please
9 step down.

10 THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.

11 MR. CLIFFORD: Mr. Commissioner, the
12 next witness is Richard Peck.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: Good morning.

14 THE WITNESS: Good morning, sir.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: You're going to be
16 sworn.

17 RICHARD PECK, having been first duly
18 sworn, testified as follows:

19 THE COMMISSIONER: Where is the
20 opinion, which volume is it?

21 MR. CLIFFORD: Y-1, Your Honour, and
22 it is filed as Exhibit 228.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

24 BY MR. CLIFFORD:

25 Q Good morning, Mr. Peck.

1 A Good morning.

2 Q Mr. Commissioner, prior to the
3 examination-in-chief, what I would propose to do
4 is indicate to you and counsel present the
5 materials that would be relevant to this witness.
6 Most have been filed as an exhibit, and what I
7 will do is refer to them, and also enter one
8 further document up front prior to the
9 examination.

10 So for the benefit of you and my
11 colleagues, relevant documentation would be
12 Exhibit 228, which is the Taman Inquiry volume
13 Y-1. It's broken into four sections, A through D,
14 and that contains the opinion of Mr. Peck. We
15 will also refer to Exhibit 226, which is Y-2 in
16 the Taman disclosure material. And that includes
17 Mr. Gover's opinion and tab A through C.

18 I am also going to refer to Y-3. And
19 if we could at this time enter that as an exhibit?
20 Y-3 in the Taman disclosure material contains at
21 tab A the letter dated February 22nd, 2008 to
22 Mr. Peck, our witness. It's from -- the
23 correspondence is from Mr. Paciocco. And at tab B
24 in Y-3 is the correspondence of March 4, 2008 to
25 Brian Gover.

1 THE CLERK: Exhibit 235.

2 (EXHIBIT 235: Y-3.A, Letter dated
3 February 22, 2008 to Richard Peck,
4 Y-3.b, Letter dated March 4, 2008 to
5 Brian Gover)

6 MR. CLIFFORD: So that will be Exhibit
7 235.

8 I expect our witness will also make
9 disclosure, perhaps collaterally to volume J,
10 which would be the transcripts. This witness will
11 also refer to Exhibit 231, which is Crown policy
12 directives, or Manitoba Minister of Justice policy
13 directives, et cetera. This is found at volumes
14 X-1.1 through X-2.10. And finally, another
15 document that our witness will make reference to
16 is found at Exhibit 217, the disclosure reference
17 is G-45, and this is the Manitoba Department of
18 Justice Prosecutions Policy Directive on the
19 subject of conditional sentencing.

20 Mr. Commissioner, as you are aware and
21 as counsel are aware, Mr. Peck has kindly agreed
22 to provide the Commission with some assistance,
23 and we will be asking him to provide some expert
24 opinion in a number of areas dealing with the role
25 of the Crown, the Crown's discretion, and relevant

1 ethical and professional standards from the Crown
2 perspective. So those are the three areas that we
3 expect to hear an opinion from Mr. Peck on. And
4 he will also provide specific opinions with
5 respect to various facts that were presented to
6 him by Mr. Paciocco in his correspondence.

7 BY MR. CLIFFORD:

8 Q Mr. Peck, if I could, sir, draw your
9 attention to your Curriculum Vitae, which is found
10 at our material Y-1, so Exhibit 228. And, sir,
11 I'd like to start first with your education. I
12 understand, sir, that you completed your studies
13 in law at the University of British Columbia in
14 1974?

15 A That's correct.

16 Q And with respect to your employment
17 history in the legal profession, sir, I understand
18 that you have been practicing since 1974, and I
19 wonder if you could take a moment, sir, and bring
20 the Commission briefly through your employment
21 history to date?

22 A The first six years of my practice,
23 and as well as my articling year, were spent at
24 the offices of Rankin & Company in Vancouver,
25 practicing initially, primarily in the area of

1 criminal law, but also doing some civil litigation
2 and some family litigation. I left there at the
3 beginning of 1982 and set up a firm with one of my
4 partners at Rankin & Company and we practiced
5 together until 1990, when the two of us joined a
6 law firm in Vancouver known as Harper Grey Easton.
7 I stayed there for just under two years, and then
8 set up my own company, my own law firm in 1992,
9 and have been practicing at that law firm since.

10 Q Mr. Peck, I understand that your
11 membership in professional societies and
12 organizations includes being a member of the Law
13 Society of British Columbia. You were also a
14 member of the Society for the Reform of Criminal
15 Law. You are a member of the B.C. Trial Lawyers
16 Association, the Medical Legal Society of British
17 Columbia. You are a fellow of the American
18 College of Trial Lawyers, and a fellow of the
19 International Society of Barristers?

20 A Yes.

21 Q And your current appointments and
22 positions, sir, include the fact that you are a
23 director of the International Society for the
24 Reform of Criminal Law?

25 A Yes.

1 Q You are a member of the management
2 committee for the same society, sir?

3 A Yes.

4 Q You are a life bencher, I understand,
5 with the Law Society of British Columbia?

6 A Yes.

7 Q Appointed Queen's Counsel in 1987?

8 A (Witness nodding)

9 Q A co-chair as well of the Federation
10 of Law Societies of Canada National Criminal Law
11 Program.

12 A Yes.

13 Q A member of the Canadian Judicial
14 Council National Committee on Jury Instructions.
15 Sir, you are also an adjunct professor at the
16 University of British Columbia Law School?

17 A Yes.

18 Q President of the Legal Historical
19 Society of B.C.?

20 A Yes.

21 Q You are a chairperson on the regional
22 committee for the British Columbia Supreme Court
23 Advocacy Institute of Canada?

24 A Yes.

25 Q And you are a member of the Deans

1 Advisory Committee at the University of British
2 Columbia Faculty of Law Innocence Project?

3 A Yes.

4 Q I will not, sir, recite or make
5 reference to all of your articles, publications,
6 and papers that are found at page 5 through 10 in
7 your Curriculum Vitae, or I should say through
8 page 12 in your Curriculum Vitae, but I do note,
9 sir, that at this point you have some 95 articles,
10 publications and papers listed?

11 A Yes.

12 Q I want to touch on some of the areas,
13 sir, where you make reference to professional and
14 educational participation in your Curriculum
15 Vitae. You have indicated that you are a member
16 of the faculty on the Federation of Law Societies
17 National Criminal Law Program. For how long, sir,
18 have you been a member on faculty?

19 A Since 1992.

20 Q You have listed many areas, sir, or
21 programs, conferences, et cetera, where you act as
22 a guest speaker. I understand that you act as a
23 guest speaker at the Supreme Court Judges
24 Conference in Victoria B.C. in 1986, and in many
25 other conferences from '86 to the present day?

1 A Yes.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Excuse me, I didn't
3 know you were the silver gloves boxing champion
4 for Vancouver in 1971.

5 THE WITNESS: Days long past,
6 Mr. Commissioner.

7 MR. McDONALD: We should be mindful of
8 that when questioning him.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: I think we've run
10 across each other over the years.

11 BY MR. CLIFFORD:

12 Q Dealing, sir, with your appellate
13 experience at page 20, you have listed in your
14 Curriculum Vitae your experience as counsel in the
15 Supreme Court of Canada. And I will touch upon it
16 again a little later in your qualifications as we
17 complete them. But I understand, sir, that in
18 addition to the cases that you have listed there,
19 from 1990 through 2006, that you have also acted
20 and argued in the Supreme Court of Canada as
21 counsel on an additional two cases this year, in
22 both the months of May and June?

23 A I think it was March and June but,
24 yes, that's correct.

25 Q You also have referenced, sir, in your

1 CV at page 20 through 22, the numerous decisions,
2 reported decisions, sir, from cases that you have
3 argued in the British Columbia Court of Appeal?

4 A Yes.

5 Q I understand that you have a long
6 history of arguing cases both in the B.C. Court of
7 Appeal and in the Supreme Court of Canada?

8 A Yes.

9 Q I was going to ask you about the
10 golden gloves, but Mr. Commissioner has covered
11 it. So now I'll turn to the area of your
12 practice, sir.

13 In general terms, could you tell the
14 Commission about your practice, the type of work
15 that you are now engaged in, sir?

16 A My practice consists largely of
17 practice in the area of the criminal law, some
18 administrative regulatory practice, virtually all
19 areas of criminal law, and not infrequently acting
20 on behalf of the Crown, either as an ad hoc
21 prosecutor or as a special prosecutor appointed
22 pursuant to section 7 of the Crown Counsel Act of
23 British Columbia. I do a fair amount of appellate
24 work, trial work, and extradition work.

25 Q If I could ask you, Mr. Peck, are you

1 able to comment that in addition to your defence
2 practice, the number of cases where you have acted
3 on behalf of the Crown as an independent
4 prosecutor?

5 A I have acted as Crown counsel in over
6 a hundred cases for the Provincial Crown in
7 British Columbia, some five cases for the
8 Department of Justice. The Federal Crown in B.C.,
9 I have acted for the Crown as a special prosecutor
10 pursuant to section 7 of the Crown Counsel Act in
11 excess of 15 times since that statute was enacted
12 in 1991. I don't know what more I can add to
13 that. I have acted twice for the Crown in the
14 Supreme Court of Canada, and approximately 30
15 times for the Crown in our Provincial Court of
16 Appeal.

17 Q So, in addition to the approximately
18 100 cases that you made reference to doing trial
19 work, or prosecutorial work, you have also acted
20 on behalf of the Crown in appellate work, both at
21 the Supreme Court of Canada and at the appellate
22 level in your province?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Now, sir, I also wanted to determine
25 from you, sir, that in addition to court

1 appearances in handling the prosecution of cases,
2 I understand that you are frequently as well
3 called upon to provide written opinions to the
4 Ministry or the Crown's office in British
5 Columbia. And these issues include, sir, the
6 laying of charges, the staying of charges,
7 procedure, standards, ethics, et cetera?

8 A Those issues would be covered in a
9 general sense, yes. Normally, those referrals
10 deal with the question of whether or not a charge
11 should be laid, and prosecuting the cases.
12 Sometimes ethical issues arise, and there are
13 occasions when I do write peer opinions for them.

14 Q As stated in Mr. Paciocco's
15 correspondence to you at Y-3, tab A, one of the
16 terms of the Commission Inquiry is to inquire into
17 whether all aspects of the prosecution of Derek
18 Harvey-Zenk, including the Crown's position on
19 sentence, were conducted in accordance with the
20 professional and ethical standards expected of
21 lawyers and agents of the Attorney General.

22 You have commented, sir, with respect
23 to your experience in the, with respect to
24 prosecutorial experience and standards, et cetera.
25 And I wonder if you could take a moment and

1 comment on your experience dealing with the issue
2 of ethics? Do I understand that, for instance,
3 you were a bencher?

4 A Yeah. As a bencher, for the decade
5 approximately that I was a bencher of the Law
6 Society, we frequently dealt with ethical matters.
7 I have lectured on ethics, I have written on
8 ethics, and I have helped out many, many members
9 of the profession over the years who have brought
10 to me their professional or ethical problems,
11 which is not untypical of members of our
12 profession when you get to a certain level, and
13 particularly when you've been a bencher.

14 Q Now, sir, I understand that your
15 writing in this area and teaching in this area
16 includes the fact that you are responsible for
17 teaching the advocacy course, or the advanced
18 trial advocacy course at the University of British
19 Columbia Law School, which has a sizeable ethical
20 component to it?

21 A Yes, this was a course that was
22 created by Allen McEachern, the former Chief
23 Justice and I, for third year law students at the
24 University of British Columbia. We felt it
25 important that they have a course of that ilk, and

1 a component of that course is professionalism and
2 ethics. I think in any advocacy course that is
3 worthwhile, a significant component should consist
4 of ethics and professionalism.

5 Q And one further point in this area,
6 Mr. Peck. I understand that you are listed as a
7 senior counsel within your province through the
8 Law Society, as an individual that lawyers from
9 all levels of experience could go to, to get
10 advice on the issue of ethical dilemmas or
11 questions?

12 A I don't even know if that list still
13 exists, but that list was created about, I'm
14 thinking 1985, 1986, both for the criminal bar and
15 the civil bar. And that is accurate. Whether the
16 list still exists, I don't know, but certainly the
17 calls keep coming in.

18 Q And your writing in that area, sir,
19 two examples, and not limited to two, but
20 certainly starting at page 11 in your Curriculum
21 Vitae, the paper entered as number 80 deals with
22 the subject of Ethics and the Practice of Law.
23 And as well, number 94 in your list of
24 publications, the Commandments of Advocacy. These
25 would be two examples, sir, of your writing in

1 this area?

2 A Yes. And particularly, the topics of
3 professionalism and ethics as they relate to the
4 practice of law in the courtroom.

5 MR. CLIFFORD: Mr. Commissioner,
6 that's the extent of the background that I wanted
7 to put before you.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: I think you've
9 written more articles than Mr. Paciocco has.

10 THE WITNESS: I don't think so.

11 MR. CLIFFORD: With your permission,
12 sir, I'm going to now embark on the examination
13 and ask Mr. Peck to provide us all with some
14 expert opinion on the role of the Crown, Crown
15 discretion, and relevant ethical and professional
16 standards.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

18 BY MR. CLIFFORD:

19 Q Mr. Peck, I wanted to start, sir, by
20 asking you to comment on what you understand to be
21 generally the role of an independent prosecutor,
22 focusing on why the concept exists, why we have
23 independent prosecutors, the importance of it, and
24 how the independence is maintained, and I'll have
25 some follow-up questions for you.

1 A Probably the simplest way to explain
2 this would be to go back and give you an example.
3 There was a case in British Columbia in the late
4 1980s that involved allegations against a
5 politician. A number of opinions were written,
6 both inside the Ministry of the Attorney General
7 and outside of the Ministry. Ultimately, a
8 decision not to charge was made. The opposition
9 party in government made allegations of
10 interference. And that lead to a Commission of
11 Inquiry headed up by Steven Owen. And it was
12 entitled the -- his report ultimately became
13 entitled "Discretion to Prosecute." His report
14 was delivered, I think in late 1990, and it gave
15 rise to the Crown Counsel Act of 1991.

16 The purpose the Crown Counsel Act was
17 to sever off from government, in effect, the
18 Attorney General's function as the chief
19 prosecutor in the province. And it did that by
20 effectively putting the Assistant Deputy Attorney
21 General of the province in charge of all
22 prosecutions and all decisions with respect to
23 prosecutions, and insulated the criminal justice
24 branch under the Assistant Deputy Attorney General
25 statutorily from any outside influence.

1 Section six of that statute provides
2 that the Attorney General can give the criminal
3 justice branch specific directions as to a
4 specific prosecution, so long as he does so in
5 writing and it becomes gazetted in the house.

6 He is also entitled, the Attorney
7 General is, to give more general direction to say
8 the branch under subsection 2 of section 6. And
9 again, there are certain requirements that he must
10 meet in order to do that. The whole idea being to
11 separate the Crown prosecution's functions from
12 any potential political interference.

13 They also put in what I would call a
14 fail safe or further measure in section 7. And
15 that section permitted or allowed for the creation
16 of the role of special prosecutor. The idea is to
17 further insulate or separate the prosecutorial
18 function from government or any seeming
19 interference by government. And so that role
20 exists to ensure that any conflict or appearance
21 of conflict is avoided, any bias, any favouritism.
22 And it most often comes into play where a person
23 who is under investigation is a government
24 official, perhaps a politician, perhaps a
25 government member of bureaucracy the civil

1 service, a police officer, a prosecutor, and so
2 on.

3 And the special prosecutor, and I
4 believe this is still the case, is chosen from a
5 list. He's selected by the Assistant Deputy
6 Attorney General. The list itself is created in
7 consultation between the Assistant Deputy Attorney
8 General and the treasurer or president of the Law
9 Society, I believe. And it's a list of, it
10 contains a number of names and the special
11 prosecutor is selected from that list. The idea
12 being that they are, by dint of being members of
13 the private bar, separate from the Crown office
14 and able to exercise and carry out a completely
15 independent assessment of the prosecution, without
16 influence from the government and/or from the
17 criminal justice branch in British Columbia.

18 Q It goes without saying, Mr. Peck, that
19 the importance of maintaining the independence is
20 one that is essential, but I understand, sir, that
21 in your experience as an independent or special
22 prosecutor that there are times where you will
23 want to discuss or perhaps detail the progress of
24 a case. And does that, from time to time, occur
25 with your practice?

1 A It does. But where I might advise or
2 consult, I would not take direction. And that's
3 where the independence exists at that point.

4 Q And I understand, sir, that your
5 authority to make decisions is one that is
6 independent, is vested in you as an independent or
7 special prosecutor by virtue of the fact you've
8 been selected and have the experience to do that.
9 And you would have the sole authority to make
10 decisions as long as you followed the applicable
11 provincial policy?

12 A Yes, I think that's a fair statement.

13 Q Now, sir, I'd like to turn to the
14 factors that you have provided specific opinions
15 on, and those are found in your opinion. And for
16 the benefit of counsel, we would be dealing with
17 Exhibit 228 at tab D, and for the benefit of you
18 as well, Mr. Commissioner.

19 Now, prior, sir, to getting into the
20 specifics of your opinion, I wanted to confirm
21 with you, sir, that the basis of the following
22 opinions that you will be provided are detailed
23 very clearly in Mr. Paciocco's material, which is
24 now Exhibit 235. Your opinion in these areas as
25 they relate to the conduct of the prosecution,

1 Mr. Peck, are based, as I understand it, and
2 include hypothetical facts that have been
3 presented to you. Is that true, sir?

4 A Yes. And I set this out in paragraph
5 1.4 of my opinion, that's accurate.

6 Q You have also considered, sir, the
7 prosecutorial standards and ethics material that I
8 have referred to earlier?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Exhibit 311?

11 A And for my purposes, they came in two
12 binders, tab binders.

13 Q And I understand as well, sir, that
14 you have also taken into consideration the
15 Manitoba Department of Justice Prosecution Policy
16 Directives Guideline 4 CON:1, the subject being
17 conditional sentences?

18 A Yes. And Mr. Commissioner, this
19 document was not included in the materials I
20 received some months ago and relied upon for the
21 basis of my opinion, it was provided to me last
22 night.

23 Q And I understand, sir, that having had
24 the opportunity to review that guideline in its
25 entirety, that it does not change your opinion,

1 sir, or opinions?

2 A No.

3 Q You have also been furnished with and
4 considered, Mr. Peck, the opinion of Brian Gover,
5 who will also be providing expert opinion evidence
6 to the Commission?

7 A Yes.

8 Q And you will see, sir, that although
9 you and he concur for the most part, there are
10 certain areas where there is a divergence of
11 opinion?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Now, sir, if I could ask you to direct
14 your attention to your observations on the
15 investigation and the provable facts, as they
16 existed in this case.

17 Sir, having had the opportunity to
18 review all of the materials that I have just
19 referred to, can you comment, sir, on whether the
20 investigation in this case was adequate or
21 inadequate?

22 A My comment is that the investigation
23 was inadequate. In my view, there was a failure
24 to gather meaningful evidence with respect to this
25 matter. That includes the failure of the

1 attending police to apparently do any initial
2 assessment as to the condition of Mr. Harvey-Zenk
3 in any meaningful way.

4 There is some suggestion in the
5 material that I reviewed to rely upon my opinion
6 that there were significant irregularities in the
7 course of the investigation and in the course of
8 putting together police notes and reports and that
9 type of thing. It was, I think it would be a soft
10 statement to say that this investigation was
11 inadequate. And there were also certain mistakes
12 made in the course of the police dealing with
13 Mr. Zenk that incapacitated the prosecutor from
14 proceeding with certain of the charges.

15 Q And, sir, I understand that your
16 opinion in this factor is set out at page 6,
17 paragraphs 3.1 through 3.3?

18 A Yes, and in very brief compass.

19 Q Could I ask you, sir, whether you
20 could provide further comment on your opinion,
21 sir, on the amount or paucity of evidence there
22 was with respect to impairment?

23 A The word that you used is paucity, I
24 use the same word, a lack of, small amount of
25 evidence of impairment. That was coupled with the

1 failure to do an on-scene assessment as to the
2 condition of the accused. Observations made over
3 the course of the ensuing hours tended to negate
4 an allegation of impairment. Subsequent
5 investigation of police officers who had been with
6 Mr. Harvey-Zenk prior to the accident tended to
7 negate an assertion of impairment. The case was
8 bereft of cogent evidence to substantiate a charge
9 of impaired driving or impaired driving causing
10 death.

11 Q I understand as well, Mr. Peck, that
12 in those areas where there were observations or
13 claims to have been observations of signs of
14 impairment that you have recognized, in your
15 expert opinion, that there would be difficulties
16 with respect to proof. You make reference to one
17 of those areas, for instance, the evidence of
18 Constable Pedersen, who had processed
19 Mr. Harvey-Zenk for his photographs and
20 fingerprints under the Identification of Criminals
21 Act, for instance?

22 A Yes. And this was not untypical of
23 the state of the record that Crown counsel had
24 before him when he proceeded to deal with this
25 matter. We have this assertion that Constable

1 Pedersen, in the course of dealing with this man,
2 Harvey-Zenk, under the Identification of Criminals
3 Act, claimed to have observed signs of impairment
4 at that time. But there is no record of this in
5 her notes, whether contemporaneous or made shortly
6 after the matter. And simultaneous with this, you
7 have the evidence of, or apparent evidence of a
8 person known as a wellness officer who attends
9 contemporaneously with Mr. Harvey-Zenk and says
10 that he showed no signs of impairment. So one, in
11 effect, negates the other. And I say more than
12 negates because the absence of a contemporaneous
13 note is somewhat telling.

14 Q And, sir, what conclusion does that
15 bring you to with respect to the difficulties that
16 this case presented for the prosecutor?

17 A This case was a prosecutor's
18 nightmare, in my view. There were four counts
19 that had been laid. Three of them, in my view,
20 had virtually no hope of being the subject matter
21 of a successful prosecution. Matters of proof
22 were at best equivocal in those areas. It was an
23 extremely troubling case for a prosecutor to be
24 presented with, any prosecutor to be presented
25 with.

1 Q Mr. Gover, at this point I'd like to
2 bring you to --

3 A Gover's coming next week.

4 MR. CLIFFORD: I apologize, and I've
5 been doing that over the last few days.

6 BY MR. CLIFFORD:

7 Q Mr. Peck, if I could bring your
8 attention to page 8, please? And I'd like to
9 review with you the opinions that you've rendered
10 on the questions that were put to you by
11 Commission Counsel. And if we could deal with 4.1
12 and 4.2 in your opinion at page 8, and I'll state
13 the question, sir, and then what I'll do is ask
14 you to provide your opinion on these areas.

15 4.2.A, whether it is a conflict of
16 interest or it is otherwise
17 inappropriate to act as a prosecutor
18 where a police officer is the accused
19 after acting in the past for police
20 officers;
21 and B, whether there is a conflict of
22 interest or it is otherwise
23 inappropriate to act as a prosecutor
24 in a case where a defence lawyer has,
25 in the past, acted for a co-accused in

1 a joint trial where you were counsel
2 for another person."

3 A I give the opinion that the fact that
4 a member of the private bar retained to prosecute
5 a police officer has, in the past, acted in the
6 defence of police officers is effectively
7 irrelevant to the consideration. I see that, in
8 my view, no -- I say that in my view, no conflict
9 of interest arises from class or occupation.
10 There are situations here where a conflict could
11 arise, and I cite them as being the following:
12 Firstly, where the lawyer has previously
13 represented the very person he is now being called
14 upon to prosecute, and that seems to me to be
15 patently obvious. Secondly, where the lawyer had
16 previously worked closely with the very police
17 officer he is now being called upon to prosecute.
18 And thirdly, in those rare situations where the
19 private practitioner's practice depends almost
20 solely upon representing police officers and thus
21 deriving his income from that business. And
22 subject to those areas, I don't see any conflict
23 in the way this question is posed.

24 On the second issue, you are talking
25 about whether there's a conflict merely because

1 two lawyers in opposition on this particular case
2 had in the past worked jointly on a case. And
3 again, to me, there is no conflict there. This
4 happens from time to time. It happens in the
5 criminal bar, it happens at the civil bar. You
6 know, we do take an oath when we're called to the
7 bar. We're supposed to adhere to the tenets and
8 strictures of that oath, as a starting point. But
9 in these scenarios presented, these questions
10 posed, I do not see a conflict.

11 Q Sir, have you had the opportunity to
12 review Mr. Gover's view with respect to
13 representing of police officers? And he has
14 expressed an opinion that the recency of your last
15 representation of a police officer may factor into
16 his opinion. Do you share that view, sir?

17 A No.

18 Q Could you comment on it further?

19 A I don't see how it is relevant, the
20 fact that I may have acted for a police officer
21 yesterday, and today I'm prosecuting another
22 police officer. I see no relationship between the
23 two that gives rise to a conflict.

24 Q Mr. Peck, I'd like to refer now to the
25 issue of whether it was appropriate or within

1 acceptable prosecutorial standards to either
2 recommend or express agreement with the release on
3 a promise to appear without conditions of a person
4 accused of criminal negligence causing death,
5 impaired driving causing death, dangerous driving
6 causing death, and refusal to provide a breath
7 sample. And that's set out at 4.3, subsection C,
8 at page 9 in your opinion, sir.

9 What is your view, sir, on whether
10 this is an acceptable prosecutorial -- whether the
11 accepted prosecutorial standards were met by
12 releasing the individual on a promise to appear?

13 A On the facts of this case?

14 Q Yes.

15 A I don't see it being a problem in the
16 sense that this is a common practice. I can't
17 speak to this jurisdiction, I can speak to British
18 Columbia. When I came to reviewing this question,
19 I spoke to at least one very senior Crown. I am
20 lead to understand that this is a common practice.
21 That persons in these circumstances are released
22 without the necessity of going through a show
23 cause hearing pursuant to the Criminal Code.

24 There are circumstances where they are
25 released with conditions. It's case specific.

1 And there are cases where a person in these
2 circumstances will not be released by the consent
3 or at the will of the Crown or the police on a
4 promise to appear of this type, and there will be
5 a show cause, and usually those are cases where
6 the person has some criminal history, usually a
7 driving related history, or the particular
8 circumstances of the case are grossly aggravated,
9 a high speed chase, for instance, in a stolen car
10 that leads to the death of someone by running a
11 stop sign, that type of thing. So this is not, in
12 my experience, to my understanding, an unusual
13 circumstance.

14 Q Now, Mr. Peck, a couple of points.
15 First, on the hypothetical facts that you were
16 presented, your opinion relates, or seems to be
17 confined to the issue of pursuing the concept of a
18 detention order or simply releasing on a promise
19 to appear without conditions. Had you considered
20 the further option, sir, of releasing on
21 conditions to a peace officer, pursuant to section
22 503(2) of the Criminal Code?

23 A Only indirectly, and I addressed that
24 in a limited extent toward the bottom of the
25 response to the question, where I talk about

1 consent release by Crown counsel under 515,
2 section 515(2)(d) of the Criminal Code, a release
3 with conditions. And I think there is merit in
4 some of these cases with a peace officer, a police
5 officer imposing conditions after consultation
6 with the Crown. It seems to me that these would
7 likely be in circumstance -- the person is going
8 to lose their licence in any event, in this
9 circumstance, for a certain set period of time. I
10 think it's usually 90 days, certainly in British
11 Columbia and I think in this province. So then
12 the condition would be a question of abstinence
13 from alcohol. If there was some indication that
14 the person had a history of that in the fact
15 pattern, that would, in my view, probably be an
16 appropriate condition.

17 Q Now, sir, you see in the opinion of
18 Mr. Gover that you and he are not in agreement,
19 that he has indicated quite clearly that in his
20 view a more restrictive form of release was
21 required. And I understand, sir, you obviously
22 take issue with his opinion in this regard?

23 A That may be driven by Mr. Gover's
24 experience in his jurisdiction, as a prosecutor.
25 What I've given you is what my understanding is of

1 my jurisdiction.

2 MR. CLIFFORD: Mr. Commissioner, it's
3 12:32, and we are making pretty steady progress
4 here. Did you want me to continue or --

5 THE COMMISSIONER: Let's go to 12:45.

6 MR. CLIFFORD: Indeed.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: One of my roles in
8 this Commission is to ensure that counsel stick to
9 the times, and they had been very good at it.
10 Except I'm required to break at 3:15 because the
11 coffee bar, quite close by, closes at 3:30. So
12 senior counsel at the end of the room actually
13 stands at 3:15 to remind me.

14 We're carrying on. Go ahead.

15 MR. CLIFFORD: Thank you.

16 BY MR. CLIFFORD:

17 Q Mr. Peck, dealing with issues D and E,
18 being whether it is within acceptable
19 prosecutorial standards to stay or withdraw a
20 charge of refusing to provide a sample on the
21 hypothetical facts set out in Mr. Paciocco's
22 letter, and also whether it is consistent with the
23 Manitoba Crown policy directives to stay or
24 withdraw a charge of refusing to provide a sample,
25 on the hypothetical facts set out in

1 Mr. Paciocco's letter, sir, could we have your
2 opinion on those questions?

3 A This power to stay a charge lies at
4 the core of the exercise of prosecutorial
5 discretion. Very often, decisions made to
6 exercise the discretion in this way are difficult.
7 Sometimes it's a lot easier for a prosecutor not
8 to exercise discretion to stay a charge and simply
9 let the court decide.

10 In the circumstances of this case,
11 based on the evidentiary record available to this
12 prosecutor, as of the time the matter was coming
13 to court, which I note is about two and a half
14 years after the accident, a woefully long delay,
15 but in any event. This evidence, in my view, was
16 so inadequate, so fraught with difficulty, so
17 subject to challenge in a number of different
18 areas, including charter challenges, that by the
19 time Crown counsel was dealing with this matter,
20 certainly July of 2007, the case had become one
21 where there was, in my opinion, no longer a
22 reasonable likelihood of conviction. And I think
23 it was apt to stay that charge.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: Is it the practice
25 in British Columbia to stay a charge where the

1 Crown is not intending to proceed on that specific
2 charge? Or is it the practice, as it is in
3 Ontario, and I have been off the bench now for 10
4 years, to simply, in the Provincial Court,
5 withdraw the charge, or in the Superior Court to
6 indicate that no evidence will be offered and the
7 charge is, in fact, dismissed?

8 THE WITNESS: The practice, and I
9 understand the question and the import of it, and
10 I had actually had some debate with Michael Code,
11 for instance, about this. The practice in British
12 Columbia has been, at least during the course of
13 my professional career, to stay the charge. It is
14 not a common practice in British Columbia to
15 formally withdraw the charge. And the stay occurs
16 in one of two ways. It is sometimes done in open
17 court by Crown counsel rising and directing the
18 clerk of the court to enter a stay of proceedings,
19 and not infrequently simply attending at the
20 registry and noting the stay on the information or
21 the indictment.

22 BY MR. CLIFFORD:

23 Q Mr. Peck, you referred to some of the
24 difficulty or the problems in proving the case.
25 With respect to the refusal charge, you listed as

1 some of those problems the form of the demand, the
2 blood versus the breath. In your opinion, you
3 have referred to existence of reasonable and
4 probable grounds, the right to counsel issue. One
5 of the other areas that you refer to, sir, is
6 section 254(3) of the Criminal Code, and that
7 being that the demand was made as soon as
8 practicable. And you indicate in your opinion,
9 sir, that there was no demand until almost 40
10 minutes after Mr. Harvey-Zenk was first dealt with
11 by the police. If the evidence were to show, sir,
12 that when the arresting officer, Sergeant Carter,
13 indicated that he formed his reasonable and
14 probable grounds, that soon thereafter he made the
15 demand. Would that change your view with respect
16 to the potential frailties or the potential for an
17 argument under 254(3)?

18 A On that particular point, yes, but
19 that does not in any way cleanse this case
20 sufficiently that one would be inclined to proceed
21 with the prosecution because of a host of other
22 problems here, some of which you have mentioned
23 and I have mentioned.

24 Q So, in your view, sir, on both of
25 those issues with respect to the staying of the

1 refusal, it is within acceptable prosecutorial
2 standards, and also consistent with the Manitoba
3 Crown policy directives?

4 A Yes, that's my opinion.

5 Q Now, sir, I'd like to get your opinion
6 on whether it was within acceptable general
7 prosecutorial standards to stay or withdraw the
8 charges of impaired driving causing death on the
9 hypothetical facts that were presented to you, and
10 also whether it was consistent with the Manitoba
11 Crown policy directives to stay the charge of
12 impaired driving causing death on the hypothetical
13 facts that you were provided?

14 A Well, as you know, my conclusion is
15 that it was appropriate and within the policy to
16 stay this particular offence. To repeat what I
17 have said here in the report would be to be
18 reiterating what I have already said about the
19 problems with proof that the prosecution faced in
20 this case, and there were many. There were also
21 problems in the context, from the Crown's
22 perspective, of there being a number of other
23 witnesses available to the defence who would
24 counter or contradict any suggestion of impairment
25 at the time of driving. At best, it was an

1 extremely marginal case by the time it came to
2 fruition here in July of 2007, had a host of
3 difficulties of proof and, in my opinion, was an
4 appropriate exercise of prosecutorial discretion to
5 have stayed this particular offence.

6 Q Mr. Peck, I note at page 12 in your
7 report at paragraph 1, on those issues, you refer
8 to five officers who attended on the scene, set
9 out to determine whether Mr. Harvey-Zenk had
10 consumed alcohol or was impaired. The Commission
11 has heard evidence that there were essentially two
12 officers who dealt primarily with Mr. Harvey-Zenk,
13 and there were civilians on scene as well. They
14 too did not note signs of impairment. The fact
15 that you've got two officers dealing with him, as
16 opposed to five, does that in any material way
17 change your opinion?

18 A No. And in fact, if you want to
19 change it to two, go ahead, because it doesn't
20 make a whit of difference to my opinion. When
21 these police attended the scene, it seems to me
22 they had three primary immediate responsibilities:
23 First of all, to see to the injured; secondly, to
24 secure the scene for safety and investigational
25 purposes, safeties of the other members of the

1 travelling public, and investigational purposes,
2 particularly in terms of accident reconstruction;
3 and thirdly, to carry out an immediate
4 investigation as to how and why this occurred, who
5 caused the accident, and what was that person's
6 condition. And that was not done. And this goes
7 back to what we started with, completely
8 inadequate investigation.

9 Q Sir, dealing with the questions of
10 whether it was within acceptable general
11 prosecutorial standards to stay a charge of
12 criminal negligence causing death on the
13 hypothetical facts, and whether it was consistent
14 with the Manitoba policy directives to do the same
15 thing, I understand, sir, in your opinion you make
16 some reference and explain to a certain extent the
17 difference between those two charges. I'd ask you
18 to do that, sir. Explain briefly the difference
19 between the charge of crim neg causing death with
20 respect to the dangerous, and give us your opinion
21 on the appropriateness of the criminal negligence
22 charge being stayed?

23 A Mr. Commissioner, this will take more
24 than the remaining few minutes that we have. And
25 for continuity purposes, you might wish to --

1 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I think it's
2 a good time because senior counsel at the end is
3 getting a little edgy, and I think it may be an
4 appropriate time for us to take our break. Are we
5 doing well, Mr. Paciocco? How are we moving?

6 MR. PACIOCCO: We're moving well
7 enough that I anticipate being on my airplane this
8 evening, but not well enough that we couldn't
9 squeeze in another witness if we have a short
10 lunch, so I'm going to leave it to you.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, counsel have
12 been working very hard.

13 MR. PACIOCCO: They have indeed and I
14 would suggest 2:00 o'clock.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Let's break until,
16 and I'll try to remember, 2:00 o'clock today.

17 THE CLERK: All rise. This Commission
18 of Inquiry is adjourned until 2:00 o'clock.

19 (Proceedings recessed at 12:44 p.m.
20 and reconvened at 2:00 p.m.)

21 THE CLERK: All rise. This Commission
22 of Inquiry is now reopened, please be seated.

23 MR. CLIFFORD: Good afternoon,
24 Mr. Commissioner. Good afternoon, Mr. Peck.

25

1 BY MR. CLIFFORD:

2 Q Prior to the lunch break, I put the
3 question to you whether it was within acceptable
4 general prosecutorial standards and Manitoba policy
5 directives to stay the charge of criminal
6 negligence on the hypothetical facts presented to
7 you. And, sir, you were going to give your
8 opinion on that question and make reference to the
9 charge of criminal negligence and dangerous
10 driving, and I would invite you to do so at this
11 time.

12 A My response, in the simplest terms, is
13 that it was within general prosecutorial standards
14 to stay this charge of criminal negligence causing
15 death, and certainly it is not inconsistent with
16 Manitoba policy directives. To understand how one
17 reaches that conclusion, it is necessary to
18 understand the distinction between dangerous
19 driving and criminal negligence causing death.

20 The fault element -- first of all,
21 both of these offences in the Criminal Code are
22 what we refer to as conduct based offences. In
23 other words, you derive the fault element, which
24 is a modern term for what we used to call the mens
25 rea, or mental element, from the conduct. You

1 look at the conduct in order to assess the state
2 of the case and whether it meets dangerous driving
3 or whether it supersedes that and is a case of
4 criminal negligence causing death. So the fault
5 element for dangerous driving is what we refer to
6 as a marked departure from the norm. The fault
7 element for criminal negligence causing bodily
8 harm or causing death is a marked and substantial
9 departure from the norm, the norm being the
10 reasonable driver in the circumstances.

11 For the conduct part of this, the
12 conduct that you look at for dangerous driving,
13 the issue is dangerousness to the public in the
14 circumstances of the road at the time. For
15 criminal negligence, it is a much more elevated
16 standard, and that is a standard of wanton or
17 reckless disregard for the lives and safety of
18 others. So you have these two departures as
19 between a fault element for dangerous driving
20 versus crim neg and the conduct element, the act
21 itself. Probably a simple way of analyzing this
22 is by thinking of it as existing on a continuum.
23 At the low end of the continuum you would have
24 pure accident, motor vehicle case that is a pure
25 accident. You can't attribute any level of fault

1 or degree of fault to anyone. Those cases are
2 extraordinarily rare, they do exist but they are
3 very rare.

4 As you move along the continuum you
5 have conduct that's impugnable but not greatly
6 impugnable. So you would have conduct that
7 offended say the provisions of the Provincial
8 Motor Vehicle Act, you have an indication of
9 careless driving, what we call careless driving,
10 driving without the due care and attention, that
11 type of thing.

12 Further along the continuum you start
13 getting into the Criminal Code offences, and you
14 now meet dangerous driving. So that conduct is
15 exacerbated, it is more aggravated conduct than
16 mere careless driving under the Motor Vehicle Act.

17 And then at the extreme end of the
18 continuum, you have criminal negligence causing
19 death. So it really becomes a matter, there is no
20 science to this, it is an art form. You are
21 looking at the nature of the conduct that gave
22 rise to the accident and you are trying to put it
23 somewhere on that continuum.

24 Then it becomes a matter of trying to
25 assess, what are the factors that we can look at

1 that help us know where we fall on the continuum.
2 And the case law is somewhat helpful because you
3 can look at similar cases that have been found to
4 meet the standard of dangerous driving, and
5 similar cases of elevated or exaggerated conduct
6 that meet the standard of criminal negligence.
7 And it is a matter of degree and, in fact, that's
8 language taken right out of the cases.

9 One court, the Ontario Court of
10 Appeal, has referred in a case to this problem in
11 these terms, whether specific conduct should be
12 categorized as criminal negligence is one of the
13 most difficult and uncertain areas of the law. So
14 it is a matter of feel to some extent, and as I
15 say, you look to the case law for some guidance to
16 assist you.

17 The types of things that you would
18 find that would justify not only charging, but
19 convicting someone for criminal negligence causing
20 death, would be indications of a grossly reckless
21 driving pattern that had preceded the accident for
22 some time and distance, significant evidence of
23 alcohol consumption, perhaps ignoring warnings,
24 perhaps assuming risks in a heedless manner that
25 ought not to be assumed.

1 And when one looks at all of these
2 different factors and measures the conduct here, a
3 conduct that has been presented to me on the
4 assumed facts, the case is clearly a case of
5 dangerous driving. It is a strong case, in my
6 view, of dangerous driving. But in my view it is
7 not anything near a strong case of criminal
8 negligence.

9 So when I take all of these factors
10 together, I come to a conclusion that the
11 likelihood or the prospect of achieving a
12 conviction for criminal negligence causing death
13 is very low and, to my mind, would not satisfy the
14 charge approval standard in this province,
15 certainly not in British Columbia, of a reasonable
16 likelihood of conviction. Whereas, at the same
17 time, one can safely conclude that a charge of
18 dangerous driving causing death clearly meets that
19 standard, would certainly meet the British
20 Columbia standard for charge approval as well,
21 which is a higher standard, we cast our charge
22 approval at a substantial likelihood of conviction
23 as opposed to a reasonable likelihood of
24 conviction, but either standard would be met.
25 Ultimately, the difference in terms of consequence

1 is one that is somewhat difficult to measure,
2 because dangerous driving causing death carries a
3 maximum term of imprisonment of 14 years.
4 Criminal negligence causing death carries a
5 maximum term of imprisonment of life. One should
6 remember that these maximums are reserved for
7 comparatively rare cases involving what the courts
8 have described as the worst offender on the worst
9 occasion.

10 Q Mr. Peck, in your explanation on
11 criminal negligence causing death in the realm of
12 driving offences, you made reference to ignoring
13 repeated warnings. And I wanted to confirm, sir,
14 that in the hypothetical facts presented to you,
15 you have taken into consideration the fact that
16 there were warning lights in place?

17 A I have taken that fact into account
18 and it is set out in my opinion.

19 Q And with respect to a gross pattern of
20 driving and ignoring repeated warnings, would you
21 elaborate further on what you would mean by that?

22 A Evidence that the driver had for some
23 period of time been weaving markedly in and out of
24 a driving lane, perhaps had struck other vehicles,
25 parked cars perhaps along the route, had shot

1 through lights on a number of occasions, that type
2 of thing.

3 Q So the presence of an overhead
4 lighting system could be taken into consideration,
5 but yet would not place the offence necessarily in
6 the category of criminal negligence, more securely
7 perhaps in the area, as I understand your opinion,
8 in that of dangerous driving?

9 A Yes, not to my thinking. And again,
10 understand clearly that we are not dealing with an
11 exact science here, we are dealing with something
12 that falls on a continuum depending on the factors
13 that you have, and an assessment, an experiential
14 assessment that most of us are required to make as
15 to whether or not there is going to be a likely
16 conviction if a charge is laid.

17 Q Now, Mr. Peck, I would like you to
18 provide testimony, please, on the issue of whether
19 it is within acceptable general prosecutorial
20 standards to agree on the hypothetical facts set
21 out in Mr. Paciocco's correspondence to a plea
22 bargain arrangement that would result in staying
23 of charges of the criminal negligence causing
24 death, the impaired causing death, and the
25 refusing to provide a sample, in exchange for a

1 guilty plea to the dangerous driving causing
2 death, and agreeing to a joint submission for a
3 conditional sentence of two years, so whether that
4 would be within acceptable general prosecutorial
5 standards and consistent with the Manitoba Crown
6 policy directives?

7 A The short answer is that I think it
8 was acceptable and consistent in those two
9 questions. The way I approached this, based on my
10 conclusion that the facts available give rise to a
11 clear case of dangerous driving causing death, a
12 marked departure from the standard of care of a
13 reasonable person, it was acceptable to accept a
14 plea to that offence. You have to understand that
15 on the one hand a Crown can accept a plea, or
16 agree to a plea to an offence where the evidence
17 supports that. They can't where the evidence
18 doesn't support it. So the evidence here clearly
19 supported the offence of dangerous driving causing
20 death. But the question, the real question here
21 is whether the joint position for a conditional
22 sentence of two years was within acceptable
23 prosecutorial standards and within the guidelines.

24 So what do we do when we try to answer
25 that question? What we have to do is we have to

1 look at what are the sentencing patterns in the
2 jurisdiction where this offence occurred that tell
3 us whether or not a two year conditional sentence
4 is acceptable or not. The starting point for me
5 was to look at the authorities that had been
6 presented to the Chief Judge in this case,
7 authorities from this jurisdiction. There were I
8 think 11 in total, one of which was an Ontario
9 decision, the rest were Manitoba decisions.

10 Q Could I confirm with you, Mr. Peck,
11 that you, in your review of the applicable
12 jurisprudence, reviewed as one component the case
13 book that was filed before the judge, and in
14 addition, conducted your own independent
15 research --

16 A I was just going to come to that.

17 Q -- on a broader scale?

18 A Yeah, I was just coming to that.

19 Q All right.

20 A So the starting point was to look at
21 their cases, the cases that the judge had before
22 him that the counsel for the Crown and the counsel
23 for the defence had fastened on and presented.
24 And certainly those cases clearly support the
25 propriety or appropriateness of a two-year

1 conditional sentence for dangerous driving causing
2 death in these circumstances. But we didn't stop
3 there and we went beyond that, and I thought it
4 would be useful to have research done to see
5 whether or not there were other cases in the same,
6 in around the same time, going back to about 1999.

7 Q And prior to giving your opinion on
8 that, Mr. Peck, can you comment on whether you
9 felt the compendium of cases that was put before
10 the trial judge was comprehensive?

11 A Yeah, I was just going to say after we
12 did our own research, we concluded it was
13 comprehensive and, in fact, the relevant case law
14 had been placed before the Chief Judge. And there
15 being no other single factor, in my mind, that in
16 any way meaningfully removed this from the
17 mainstream of cases, it seemed to me that to agree
18 to this resolution and sentence was not
19 inconsistent with other general principles or
20 specific Crown policies. And there was, to my
21 mind, no policy that I had been presented with, in
22 these materials, that would in any way detract
23 from that conclusion.

24 I think it is important to know that,
25 one thing we know in the criminal justice system

1 in this country is that it tends to be somewhat
2 province specific, depending on the nature of the
3 offence. It is probably a fairly notorious fact
4 that for certain types of drug offences, you are
5 better off being sentenced in British Columbia
6 than you are in the Prairie Provinces. A drug
7 offence in British Columbia that would normally
8 draw a conditional sentence or something less in
9 Manitoba or Saskatchewan might well draw a four
10 year sentence of straight prison.

11 So what I found when I was looking at
12 this is that Manitoba, in its own area and looking
13 at dangerous driving causing death, there tends to
14 be a convention, perhaps a tradition of
15 jurisprudence that supports a non-prison sentence
16 for dangerous driving causing death. This
17 province, our research and obviously the research
18 of the people involved in this case, indicated
19 that that was the case.

20 Q One area I wanted to clarify with you,
21 Mr. Peck, in your opinion thus far and in your
22 testimony you've referred to the case of dangerous
23 driving as a clear case of dangerous driving. And
24 in our Commission evidence, we've heard in
25 evidence terms such as a strong case, a weak case,

1 et cetera. What do you mean when you say a clear
2 case of dangerous driving? Can you give some
3 comment with respect to the relative strength or
4 weakness of the case?

5 A A case where if I was the prosecutor
6 handling this matter, I would have no doubt going
7 in that I would obtain a conviction for dangerous
8 driving causing death.

9 Now, I think we need to refer to this
10 document that I saw for the first time last night,
11 because that had not been a part of my
12 consideration. And this document,
13 Mr. Commissioner, that I'm referring to, is a
14 Manitoba Department of Justice policy directive
15 guideline. And I'm not sure of the exhibit
16 number.

17 Q The exhibit number is 217, and the
18 disclosure reference is G-45. It is the Manitoba
19 Department of Justice Prosecutions Policy
20 Directive on the subject of conditional
21 sentencing.

22 A And I don't quite know why this wasn't
23 included in the materials, but I will preface my
24 remarks by saying it doesn't really change my
25 opinion, but I do want to make some comments about

1 it. This is a policy directive which would be
2 aimed at all Crown counsel in this province
3 handling certain classes of cases under the
4 Criminal Code. And this policy directive is dated
5 April 2005, so it postdates the accident and the
6 case at bar, or the case under review by some two
7 months. And the effect of this directive is to
8 instruct Crown counsel that as a general rule
9 there should not be a recommendation for a
10 conditional sentence in cases involving death or
11 serious bodily harm. If a prosecutor handling
12 such a case, after this directive came down,
13 wished to recommend a sentence that was a
14 conditional sentence, in circumstances where death
15 or serious bodily harm was concerned, that
16 prosecutor was required to engage in what is
17 referred to as a case conference involving more
18 senior members of the Crown prosecution service,
19 or Department of Justice in Manitoba, in effect,
20 to obtain their imprimatur or okay to recommend
21 such a sentence. This directive says that there
22 may be exceptional circumstances in a given case
23 that justify a recommendation of a conditional
24 sentence. The directive says exceptional
25 circumstances is difficult to define as there will

1 be unusual and unforeseeable situations that will
2 arise. It further says that a Crown Attorney is
3 not required to argue that a conditional sentence
4 is inappropriate in the face of clear authority to
5 the contrary. And it concludes under the heading
6 "rationale" on page 4, that it is important that
7 the position taken by the Crown with respect to
8 sentence be thoroughly considered and approved by
9 way of a case conference. It doesn't say you
10 can't have a conditional sentence, you can't
11 recommend it, you can't go along with it. What it
12 says is you have got to have a case conference
13 and/or be involved in a case that is highly
14 exceptional.

15 What does this mean to the independent
16 or special prosecutor who is assigned the carriage
17 of this prosecution? Certainly, that person
18 cannot be subject to a requirement of obtaining
19 approval because that person is in the role of an
20 independent prosecutor. So the independent
21 prosecutor looking at this is going to take this
22 as advisory only, but he or she is the very
23 approver, they are the person that has to make the
24 decision, and they do not go to seek approval from
25 senior members of the Crown counsel office because

1 they are independent. As I prefaced my remarks,
2 nothing in here changes my opinion.

3 Q Do you see any difficulty at all with
4 an independent or special prosecutor coming to a
5 conclusion on a conditional sentence, and then
6 advising, for instance, individuals that he or she
7 may be required to report to of the decision?

8 A I don't think there is anything wrong
9 with advising. There may be circumstances where
10 you would want to run it by someone else. But if
11 that's your conclusion, nobody has the power under
12 the policy directive appointing independent
13 prosecutors, or special prosecutors, to overrule
14 you or override you on that. You are the person
15 that makes that decision. They want you as an
16 independent prosecutor and you are independent.

17 Q Now, Mr. Peck, your opinion that the
18 agreement to the plea bargain and the plea itself
19 was within the Crown discretion and consistent
20 with the policy directives, you recognize of
21 course that you and Mr. Gover are in disagreement
22 rather significantly on this point. And I wonder
23 if you could comment on his position that entering
24 into the joint position for the imposition of a
25 conditional sentence in this case would have

1 tended to bring the administration of justice into
2 disrepute?

3 A I don't agree with that opinion of
4 Mr. Gover. This sentence was consonant with
5 sentences in this jurisdiction for similar conduct
6 that preceded this offence and post-dated this
7 offence. Some of these cases appear to be more
8 egregious or aggravated in their facts. There was
9 a case in 2003 called Duchominsky, two counts of
10 dangerous driving causing death and three counts
11 of dangerous driving causing bodily harm, 24 month
12 conditional sentence. There is a case from 2001
13 called Higgins -- Duchominsky by the way is
14 reported, a reported case from the Manitoba Court
15 of Appeal. Higgins again is a Manitoba Court of
16 Appeal case from 2001, dangerous driving causing
17 death, facts involved, impairment by alcohol, 18
18 month conditional sentence. There is a case of
19 Perron, 2007, from the Manitoba Court of Appeal,
20 of dangerous driving causing death, again with a
21 two-year conditional sentence.

22 So if the courts in this province see
23 fit to mete out sentences that are of a
24 conditional nature for this offence before, both
25 before and after this offence, I do not see how

1 one can claim that to agree to such a sentence
2 brings the administration, or tends to bring the
3 administration of justice into disrepute.

4 Q Mr. Peck, I would like to turn your
5 attention, sir, to the issue as to whether it was
6 within acceptable general prosecutorial standards
7 to agree or decide not to prove that the accused
8 had consumed alcohol after that allegation fell
9 into issue on the hypothetical facts that you were
10 presented?

11 A Mr. Commissioner, this analysis
12 commences at page 22 of the opinion. The
13 evidentiary record in this case was extremely
14 problematic on this issue. There was some
15 evidence that the accused had consumed some
16 alcohol some time before the accident. This, to
17 some extent, turns on the importance of that
18 factor in the sentencing process. And the law is
19 in a state of some uncertainty on this point.
20 Logically, the proof of consumption of alcohol
21 would be considered an aggravating factor on
22 sentencing in a case of this nature if it could
23 somehow be linked to the accident. There is
24 disagreement in the courts on this point. Some
25 cases tend to indicate that the mere fact that

1 someone had consumed some alcohol should be always
2 considered an aggravating factor, even if it
3 doesn't appear to have factored into the accident
4 itself.

5 Other cases seem to indicate that we
6 are looking for situations where, in fact, the
7 consumption had been at least in part a cause of
8 the accident. And the case law in this
9 jurisdiction, to my way of thinking, is not
10 certain on this point, it is not set. And I
11 analyzed that looking at some of these cases.
12 There is a case called Manty the Court of Appeal
13 in this province from 2006. That case refers to
14 the absence of the aggravating factors, including
15 no evidence of alcohol having been consumed.
16 There is the case of Tremblay from 2008, that
17 post-dates this case, similar to Manty in its
18 conclusion. And then there is a case that I
19 referred to earlier in 2003, from the Manitoba
20 Court of Appeal of Duchominsky which says that the
21 presence of alcohol, that is the mere fact of the
22 consumption of alcohol, as I read the case, could
23 be considered as an aggravating factor. There is
24 a 2006 case from the British Columbia Court of
25 Appeal that is to like effect.

1 So the question, I think the starting
2 point is, is it going to make a difference if I
3 can prove as a prosecutor that this man,
4 Harvey-Zenk, had consumed a beer at 11:00 o'clock,
5 or whatever it was, because the proof of that was
6 very problematic. It wasn't going to make a
7 difference given the case law. My conclusion
8 would be, unless I can link it some way to the
9 accident, probably not. And then it becomes a
10 question of a cost benefit analysis, how much, how
11 likely is it that I'm going to be able to prove
12 it, and even if I do prove it, is it going to make
13 any difference?

14 So my conclusion was that the mere
15 fact of the consumption of some alcohol, I didn't
16 see that as being a particularly relevant factor
17 in the sentencing process. The evidence was just
18 so scant on this point.

19 Q Mr. Peck, there is, obviously, we can
20 see in your opinion and based on your testimony
21 somewhat of an ongoing and healthy debate on that
22 point in the jurisprudence. I understand as well
23 that you would have taken into consideration the
24 Proulx decision from the Manitoba Court of Appeal,
25 which we know was reviewed in the Supreme Court of

1 Canada, but with no mention being made of the
2 alcohol?

3 A And I make that point in my opinion.

4 Q Indeed. In light of the jurisprudence
5 tending one way or the other, if there was an
6 indication, for instance, as there was in this
7 case, perhaps from the transcripts, that this was
8 a factor that the trial judge was interested in,
9 or the sentencing judge was interested in, in
10 other words, that it seemed as though he might
11 have wanted to ride that horse, would that be
12 something that would influence your opinion?

13 A Not necessarily. I mean, that's why
14 we have an adversarial system with three
15 independent actors, an independent and private
16 defence bar, an independent prosecution service,
17 and an independent and impartial judge. Judge's
18 wishes are always something that you consider, but
19 you have to make your own decision when you are
20 presenting a case, and that decision depends on
21 relevance and proof. But I will say this, that if
22 the law were settled and the mere fact that
23 consumption of any alcohol was to be considered as
24 an aggravating factor, if that were the state of
25 the law, and if proof were available on a standard

1 of proof beyond a reasonable doubt, Regina v.
2 Gardiner standard, then in my view it would be
3 Crown counsel's duty to attempt to prove that
4 fact. I think what has to be understood, by any
5 who don't know this, is that if at a sentencing
6 proceeding the defence contests a fact, and the
7 Crown wishes the court to rely upon that fact in
8 sentencing, as an aggravating factor usually, it
9 is incumbent and it is the law that the Crown is
10 required to prove that fact beyond a reasonable
11 doubt. And that's what I mean by reference to the
12 Gardiner case. In those circumstances, if the law
13 were settled, if the evidence was there, then I
14 think it would be Crown counsel's duty to proceed
15 to prove that fact.

16 Q And based on the hypothetical facts
17 presented to you, Mr. Peck, you concluded that
18 Crown counsel was acting within the acceptable
19 prosecutorial standards and within the Crown policy
20 directives. But on this point, we see as well a
21 dramatic divergence of opinion between you and
22 Mr. Gover. I take it you are aware of his view
23 that if alcohol consumption was of sufficient
24 importance to warrant inclusion in the facts, the
25 prosecutor should have been able to prove it. And

1 he goes further and indicates that the decision
2 not to attempt to prove consumption of alcohol was
3 tantamount to an agreement not to place the facts
4 before the court.

5 A I adamantly disagree with that last
6 phrase, tantamount to an agreement. This was a
7 prosectorial decision, as I see it. I come and
8 deal with this a little further on in the opinion
9 at page 34, if you want to wait until then, or we
10 can jump to that, but I think logically perhaps we
11 should stay where we are.

12 Q All right. That's what we will do.

13 I take it, based on Mr. Gover's
14 opinion and your disagreement with it, that
15 obviously the logical conclusion one might draw is
16 that you and he don't take a similar view of the
17 case law and what the mere consumption of alcohol
18 suggests?

19 A And I think given the state of the
20 law, Mr. Commissioner, at this time, reasonable
21 people can disagree on this point.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: The Supreme Court
23 of Canada proves that every day.

24 THE WITNESS: I'm merely a humble
25 lawyer so I can't respond to that,

1 Mr. Commissioner.

2 BY MR. CLIFFORD:

3 Q On the issue, Mr. Peck, of the debate
4 and what the cases may stand for, your reliance on
5 the Manitoba cases, the Manitoba jurisprudence
6 supports your opinion on the conditional sentence
7 imposition and the appropriateness of that
8 sentence. The Manitoba jurisprudence also seems
9 to lean very heavily in favour of taking the mere
10 consumption of alcohol into consideration as an
11 aggravating factor?

12 A I'm not so sure that I would say leans
13 heavily, and I think I referred you to the
14 Duchominsky case where the Court of Appeal in
15 Manitoba in 2003, referring to the aggravating
16 factor of the presence of alcohol in a dangerous
17 driving case, said it could be considered, that's
18 the language that I fastened on, not that it must
19 be considered. So whichever way you want to cut
20 this deck, it is still going to end up that there
21 is a reasonable debate out there on this point.

22 Q I take it, sir, you considered as well
23 the recent Court of Appeal decision from Manitoba,
24 the Tremblay decision, the court had concluded
25 there that in that case the accused had consumed

1 alcohol, that the court indicated that they
2 thought they had to take that into account to some
3 degree, even though they noted from Crown
4 counsel's submission that is an ambulance
5 attendant at the time found the accused,
6 Mr. Tremblay, to be alert and normal.

7 A I took that not to be a Court of
8 Appeal decision, but rather a Queen's Bench
9 decision.

10 Q And you were correct perhaps in doing
11 so. Let me confirm. That's right. I flipped to
12 the wrong title page. But there are, in addition
13 to the Manitoba decisions, many cases in the
14 British Columbia jurisprudence as well that
15 suggests much the same thing, that the mere
16 consumption of alcohol could allow the sentencing
17 judge to consider it as an aggravating factor in a
18 dangerous driving case.

19 A All right. If we are going to debate
20 this, let's look at -- and I did refer you to
21 Prasad from the Court of Appeal of British
22 Columbia in 2006, where it is stated that the
23 consumption, the mere fact of consumption can be
24 considered, can be, as an aggravating factor. I
25 do cite from the English Court of Criminal Appeal,

1 some years ago on this very point, at page 23 of
2 my opinion. The B.C. Court of Appeal in 1973 case
3 refers with approval to the case of McBride in the
4 English Court of Criminal Appeal and says this:

5 "In order to render evidence as to the
6 drink taken by the driver admissible,
7 such evidence must tend to show that
8 the amount of drink taken was such as
9 would adversely affect a driver or
10 alternatively that the driver was in
11 fact adversely affected."

12 If we look at sentencing in a principled manner
13 and we want to consider aggravating factors, it
14 seems to me that we need to look at aggravating
15 factors that have some relationship to the matter
16 being sentenced. So it seems to me that if
17 someone consumes one glass of beer at noon, and is
18 driving along Portage and Main, in this city, at
19 1:00 o'clock, or 1:30, and then starts reaching or
20 fiddling with a CD player or something and rear
21 ends someone, it is hard to imagine how the
22 consumption of one glass of beer becomes an
23 aggravating factor in those circumstances.
24 Logically, I have difficulty with the mere
25 expression or proposition that the mere

1 consumption of any alcohol prior to a motor
2 vehicle accident should be an aggravating factor
3 on sentencing. It doesn't logically connect for
4 me. Unless either Parliament or perhaps the
5 Supreme Court of Canada, in its jurisprudential
6 role over the Common Law decides as a matter of
7 policy that that should be the case. We are not
8 really talking now so much about logic, but we are
9 talking about a policy driven issue. And the
10 courts remain undecided. So, to my mind, it is
11 not at this point certain that it is the case by
12 any means that the mere consumption is and always
13 will be an aggravating factor.

14 Q I appreciate that, Mr. Peck, and I
15 take your opinion. But I think you would agree
16 that certainly the debate is a healthy one and
17 certainly the argument is there to be made to the
18 contrary?

19 A Absolutely. I'm not sure how healthy
20 the debate is, but the argument is there to be
21 made to the contrary.

22 Q In the sense that it is an issue that
23 we see in many levels of court throughout many
24 jurisdictions.

25 A Yes.

1 Q And there is a diversion of opinion
2 amongst many levels of courts and jurisdictions.

3 A Yes.

4 Q Now, sir, moving on, and this I think
5 this will allow you to give an opportunity to
6 expand further on that issue, as you mentioned
7 earlier. Dealing with the questions, sir, whether
8 it is within acceptable prosecutorial standards
9 and/or ethical principles to present a joint
10 submission or position to a judge, without making
11 it clear to the judge that the joint position was
12 arrived at as a result of a plea bargain; and the
13 second issue, which is slightly different, is
14 whether judging from the transcripts that you were
15 provided, whether sufficient efforts had been made
16 or taken by the prosecutor in the context of all
17 the submissions made to alert the presiding judge
18 to the fact that the joint position was arrived at
19 as a result of the plea bargain.

20 Could I have your opinion on those
21 issues, sir?

22 A And, Mr. Commissioner, this commences
23 at page 24.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

25 THE WITNESS: My conclusion on this

1 point is that in this province there is clear
2 authority emanating from the Manitoba Court of
3 Appeal that it is incumbent upon counsel to make
4 it apparent, to make it manifest to the court,
5 when a joint submission is in the nature of a true
6 plea bargain. The case that I cite is Regina v.
7 Sinclair from 2004. The case clearly stands for
8 the proposition that the clearer the quid pro quo
9 or the plea bargain, the more weight should be
10 given an appropriate joint submission by the
11 sentencing judge. And this, of course, is what
12 happened in this case, it wasn't made clear when
13 the facts were first explicated to the court, on
14 August 22nd, that this was, that what was being
15 presented to this judge was in the nature of a
16 true or pure plea bargain.

17 The Manitoba Court of Appeal in the
18 Sinclair case seems to be fairly explicit on the
19 obligations of counsel in this regard. And in
20 fact, they say if the joint submission is as a
21 result of, for example, an evidentiary gap in the
22 Crown's case, or the absence of an essential
23 witness, this is information that should be
24 provided to the court by counsel, and particularly
25 Crown counsel. And I derive from that Sinclair

1 case a number of conclusions. I stated them
2 simply as this. The essence of the plea bargain
3 should be placed on the record in open court, and
4 there is a particular duty on Crown counsel to
5 ensure that this information is clearly placed
6 before the court.

7 Why does the Sinclair case say this?
8 Because it equally says that the more toward the
9 end of the spectrum you are in a true plea
10 bargain, where the accused has given up essential
11 rights to achieve this joint submission, the more
12 incumbent it is upon the sentencing judge to pay
13 heed to those submissions. And the judge needs to
14 know this in terms of assessing the priority of
15 the plea bargain, what has been given up, and how
16 he or she should approach the issue that's been
17 presented to him. And we know that in the case at
18 bar under review, the Chief Judge was very
19 critical of counsel for not having made it clear
20 at the first instance on August 22nd, 2007, that
21 the case before him was in the nature of a true
22 plea bargain.

23 This, of course, became the subject of
24 further discussion when counsel reappeared on
25 September 12th, 2007. At that time counsel

1 clearly moved to correct this state of affairs and
2 to satisfy the Chief Judge that this was in fact a
3 true plea bargain. And I have cited a great deal
4 of the transcript to this effect at pages 28 and
5 following. Although it took some time, given the
6 way this was articulated, to finally get the
7 message across, but it certainly was done on
8 September 12th. And if one has regard to the
9 transcript, you can see comments at pages 17 and
10 21 to this effect. And comments, in fact, by
11 defence counsel that support the notion that this
12 was in fact a joint submission in the nature of a
13 true plea bargain, and his comments are at page 41
14 of that same transcript.

15 BY MR. CLIFFORD:

16 Q Mr. Peck, a couple of follow-up
17 questions flowing from that. One of the things
18 you mentioned was that Chief Judge Wyant was
19 critical of counsel, and particularly critical of
20 Crown counsel for not having made it clear during
21 the August 22nd sentencing proceedings that the
22 case before him was more in the nature of a true
23 plea bargain than a joint submission. And you've
24 rendered your opinion, sir, that you felt that the
25 emphasis was also particularly on Crown counsel to

1 achieve that. Why do you feel that it is more on
2 Crown counsel, for instance, than equally shared
3 amongst the parties?

4 A Because that's what the Manitoba Court
5 of Appeal said precisely in the Sinclair case.
6 They used the phrase "particularly on Crown
7 counsel," the onus, Crown counsel is presenting
8 the matter to the court, here is where the onus
9 lies.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: One of the problems
11 in a plea bargain is that it is important for
12 Crown counsel to relate to the judge in open court
13 the reasons for the bargain, so that there is no
14 public perception that a deal has been made that
15 is unreasonable.

16 In other words, if Crown counsel is
17 going to indicate, first of all, that there is a
18 bargain and he should make it, the facts
19 surrounding the bargain. In this case Crown
20 counsel was somewhat concerned with revealing the
21 circumstances surrounding the bargain and, in
22 fact, indicating the weakness in his case because
23 he wanted to strike a proper balance, and I will
24 have to look at my notes, I don't know if I got
25 them all down correctly, in not embarrassing the

1 police because of the nature of the investigation.

2 How far do you think Crown counsel
3 should go in revealing the bargain and the facts
4 surrounding the bargain?

5 THE WITNESS: I wasn't aware that
6 Crown counsel was concerned about not embarrassing
7 the police, but to me that would be a completely
8 irrelevant consideration. The police made their
9 own bed in this investigation and have to sleep in
10 it. If the plea bargain is driven by the
11 inadequacy of the investigation, the problems with
12 proof and that type of thing, then it seems to me
13 that needs to be put before the judge so he
14 understands.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Let's take another
16 situation of a bargain; let us assume that the
17 Crown comes in and says, I have an undercover
18 officer here, I don't wish to reveal in open court
19 the fact that we are withdrawing this charge or we
20 are -- here in this province they stay them -- we
21 are not proceeding on a particular charge because
22 I don't want that fact to be made known in public.
23 How does the Crown counsel deal with that?

24 THE WITNESS: Well, he would have to
25 be guarded in the language he used, because he is

1 dealing with issues of investigational and perhaps
2 informal privilege in those circumstances. It is
3 often in those cases, a wink is as good as a nod.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: Sir, you can't wink
5 and nod to the public.

6 THE WITNESS: No, you can't wink and
7 nod to the public, but you can get your message
8 across to the court, and you can say that there
9 are serious investigational interests at risk here
10 that motivate this resolution, My Lord. That is
11 kind of the way -- I would have to think it
12 through more, you are posing the question to me
13 like that, but that's the way I think I would
14 approach it.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: But your opinion is
16 that there is a duty and a responsibility on the
17 Crown to advise the court of the weaknesses in his
18 case?

19 THE WITNESS: As it relates to this
20 true plea bargain.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: One of the
22 problems, of course, in Manitoba is that the
23 practice is a little unusual, maybe not for
24 Manitoba, but for the province from which I come,
25 in that the accused is arraigned, the plea is

1 taken, and then the matter is adjourned for
2 sentence, at which time the Crown will then set
3 out what facts he or she relies upon. In other
4 words, at the time that the judge makes a finding
5 of guilt, he or she is not given a factual basis
6 in support of the plea, which I have difficulty
7 with, but that then comes on the date of
8 sentencing.

9 How would that affect the disclosure
10 by the Crown? Because there is a concern, a
11 genuine concern that the moment the Crown at that
12 stage gets up and says, I have got weakness in
13 this case for these reasons, the defence may stand
14 up and say, I'm not pleading guilty, I am asking
15 that my plea be withdrawn.

16 THE WITNESS: In fact, in the case at
17 bar, it seems to me that not only was the plea
18 taken but the other three counts stayed, and then
19 it was adjourned.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

21 THE WITNESS: One way that this -- and
22 you may know at the end of my report I make
23 reference to this -- this problem might have been
24 alleviated, although I wasn't directing my mind to
25 your question in writing this, was by the

1 production and presentation to the court as an
2 exhibit an agreed statement of facts.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: That's what we were
4 talking about.

5 THE WITNESS: That would have brought
6 clarity and certainty to this proceeding.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank
8 you.

9 BY MR. CLIFFORD:

10 Q Mr. Peck, I take it from your
11 testimony and opinion, sir, that you felt as
12 though the proceedings, on August 22nd, left the
13 court with the absence of a proper foundation to
14 conclude that it was a true bargain. And with
15 respect to this omission, sir, do I conclude that
16 you felt as though this was one of the errors that
17 the Crown had committed?

18 A Yes, I find it was an error. I noted
19 the Chief Judge's comment, particularly I think on
20 October 29th, when the actual judgment was
21 rendered, that he referred to this as an
22 inadvertent omission. And I think that that is a
23 proper -- I agree with that.

24 Q That was the question I was going to
25 put to you, sir, and have you give your opinion on

1 that. I take it you have expressed that, that you
2 are in agreement with Judge Wyant's findings on
3 that point, although it was a mistake, it was
4 committed through inadvertence?

5 A Yes. And I don't find the failure to
6 draw the plea bargain, the nature of the plea
7 bargain to the attention of the court on the first
8 occasion, August 22nd, to be a mistake or a
9 conduct that gives rise, in my mind, to any notion
10 of professional or unethical misconduct. To my
11 mind, it is an inadvertent omission.

12 I think that, you know, one of the
13 things that we have to be cognizant of is the
14 nature of the case. This is a highly emotive
15 case. Cases of this nature put extreme pressure
16 on counsel, the court, the parties, people
17 involved, everyone involved. The media focus is
18 intense. The facts are tragic. The emotional
19 atmosphere of courtrooms in cases of this nature
20 can sometimes verge on being overwhelming, even to
21 the most hardened lawyer, hardened counsel. And
22 this is the very crucible, I think,
23 Mr. Commissioner in which mistakes happen from
24 time to time.

25 You know, one can say or argue, well,

1 isn't it really in these cases that counsel should
2 be hypervigilant, as it were? But we are dealing
3 with an intensely human system. The courtroom is
4 a place where the foibles and frailties of the
5 human condition are often manifest, and often
6 prodded and poked. And it can be a very difficult
7 atmosphere. So I think we have to recognize the
8 context in which mistakes of this nature not only
9 can occur, but do occur. There is no such thing
10 as a counsel of perfection and we all make
11 mistakes in the course of our careers. None of us
12 can cast the first stone.

13 Q Mr. Peck, your comments with respect
14 to the media focus being intense, emotive
15 atmosphere, verging on the point of being
16 overwhelming, these are things, I take it, you
17 were able to glean from the transcript simply by
18 reviewing the exchanges that took place between
19 the counsel and court?

20 A Absolutely, and indeed I took it from
21 many of the comments of the learned trial judge,
22 both in the course of dealing with counsel on the
23 sentencing and in his reasons for judgment on
24 sentence.

25 Q You've provided the Commission with

1 testimony about the potential for an agreed
2 statement of fact, and how that might improve the
3 situation. You have also provided testimony with
4 respect to giving as much detail and clarity to
5 the judge as possible, and communicating as much
6 as possible with the judge, the court. Can you
7 provide some further comment, Mr. Peck, with
8 respect to communication with other individuals
9 that are involved in the process? For instance,
10 as an independent prosecutor, I take it that you
11 do have to deal quite frequently with family
12 members who have been affected by tragedies,
13 crimes?

14 A And this doesn't just apply to
15 prosecutors, this applies to all of us who deal in
16 the criminal justice system, whether defending or
17 prosecuting. If you are defending, you are very
18 often dealing with clients, many of whom are very
19 ordinary people who have made a mistake, sometimes
20 a tragic mistake. You are dealing with the
21 families of your clients. You intend, or desire
22 to take steps in the course of the defence that
23 they may not understand, agree with, like.
24 Communication is imperative. It is part of what
25 we do for a living. You get the clients, you get

1 the family in, you explain the problems with the
2 case, what is likely to happen or not happen,
3 where you think you can go with the defence or
4 can't go, what the sentencing range is, how we are
5 going to deal with it, what we can and can't
6 accomplish. You explain the law to these people.
7 Because the average person doesn't understand
8 these things.

9 And the same obligation, it seems to
10 me, rests with the prosecutor. If I'm a special
11 prosecutor in circumstances like this where there
12 are -- you have got an absolute tragedy you are
13 dealing with. You have got people who are in
14 grief, in bereavement, and you are going to
15 make -- and I have no idea what happened in this
16 particular case, but if I'm handling it, I want to
17 get those people in, I want to get the family in,
18 I want to say to them, here are the problems,
19 whatever it is. Here is what I think I can do,
20 here is what I can't do, here is the way we have
21 got to deal with this. Communicate to them,
22 explain to them the problems, let them know.
23 Communication is -- I think we are supposed to
24 pride ourselves in our ability to be
25 communicators, but sometimes I think we don't

1 perhaps express ourselves as we should, or as
2 often as we should, or as meaningfully as we
3 should. It takes a little bit of extra time and a
4 little bit of extra work, but it seems to me in
5 most cases it is well worth it.

6 Q On the issue of -- I appreciate what
7 you have said on that point, and just tying this
8 back to the submissions in court, providing the
9 judge with clarity and detail on the fact that we
10 were dealing with a true plea bargain, do you
11 think that an experienced judge or lawyer would
12 have recognized that that is simply what they are
13 dealing with, just on the facts of what was
14 presented to them on August 22nd?

15 A They might well do. I mean, you know,
16 but you don't take these things for granted. If
17 you have got an obligation to do something, you do
18 it. You don't just assume that the judge is going
19 to know that this is a true plea bargain. And
20 clearly here there was a problem in this
21 communication, so he didn't apparently pick up on
22 that, judging by what he said on September 12th
23 and later on October 29th. You can't simply shunt
24 your obligations on an assumption of what somebody
25 else is going to believe or think. You have a

1 positive obligation to advise the court of
2 something, you do it. Is that responsive to the
3 question?

4 Q Yes, I think it is. And if it isn't,
5 I'm sure other counsel will attempt to clarify it.

6 I would like to refer you now to page
7 34 in your written opinion, and ask for your
8 evidence, sir, and your opinion on the issue of
9 whether on the transcripts in this case, and in
10 light of the hypothetical facts set out in
11 Mr. Paciocco's correspondence, adequate
12 information was furnished by the prosecutor to
13 satisfy the ethical and professional obligations
14 of a prosecutor presenting the factual
15 underpinnings of the guilty plea?

16 A And, Mr. Commissioner, this question
17 is what lead me ultimately to think that this case
18 ought to have been dealt with by an agreed
19 statement of facts, because that forces counsel to
20 focus on the matter and to present to the court a
21 document that brings clarity, concision to the
22 court. And my conclusion -- and what this
23 question really revolves around is when the Crown
24 counsel in this case made reference in his
25 explication of the facts to what he referred to as

1 anecdotal historical evidence respecting the
2 consumption of alcohol. My view of this is that
3 had counsel analyzed the case in the context of
4 drafting an agreed statement of facts, this phrase
5 would likely have been omitted. This expression
6 would not have gone before the court. Once he
7 analyzed this and saw that either it was going to
8 be extremely difficult to prove, and he couldn't
9 meet the Gardiner standard on this issue, or that
10 the cost benefit analysis did not invite
11 proceeding to try to prove it, then you would omit
12 that from the recitation of the factual context
13 for the plea and the sentence.

14 I mean, what happens when he raises
15 this and he is challenged on it by the court, and
16 indeed he is challenged on it by defence counsel,
17 and defence counsel says that is no part of this
18 plea, this reference to anecdotal historical
19 evidence. Defence counsel says quite properly,
20 anecdotal evidence is not evidence. Of course it
21 isn't. By definition an anecdote is a story, it
22 is pure hearsay. If you can't prove it, you don't
23 say it.

24 So I think that that -- it was use of
25 that expression that caused this particular

1 problem. And when he is challenged on it after a
2 recess, Crown counsel comes back and simply says
3 that he would not be seeking to call evidence on
4 this point. So if that was his conclusion, he
5 shouldn't have mentioned it in the first place.

6 I also think that, in retrospect, in
7 reviewing my opinion, Mr. Commissioner, that
8 probably, having mentioned it, and now having
9 decided that he is not going to attempt to prove
10 it, he should have followed that up with some
11 explanation. And the Martin report makes some
12 reference to that. I pointed that out in my
13 discussions with counsel last night, the Martin
14 report at volume 2, page 314. And had I thought
15 of that before, I would have included it in my
16 opinion. But having advised the court that he
17 would not be seeking to call evidence on a point
18 that he raised, he probably should have given an
19 explanation to the court. I think that his use of
20 that language was an act that I described as
21 really overreaching. He was reaching too far in
22 terms of what was capable of proof in his case,
23 and it didn't really add a great deal to what was
24 going to be happening in the case. So I think
25 that was a mistake that he made.

1 Again, I do not see this as being an
2 ethical problem or a question of professional
3 misconduct, it was overreaching, it was a mistake.
4 And it certainly was not, in my view, an effort to
5 sanitize facts before the court. He simply had a
6 situation where he overstated his case and had to
7 back off it.

8 Q Mr. Peck, would I be correct in
9 suggesting to you that your conclusion that the
10 mistake was not in deciding not to call evidence
11 on the alcohol consumption, but in making
12 reference to it in the first place, that your
13 opinion on that is predicated heavily on the fact
14 that -- you've expressed your opinion that had he
15 decided to prove alcohol, there would be the issue
16 as well, to what end? In other words, that it is
17 based --

18 A Yes.

19 Q -- very heavily on your opinion as to
20 what the net effect, or proof would be of actually
21 calling the fact that there had been some
22 consumption?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Because I take it you agree that the
25 was evidence there to be called that there had

1 been some consumption. You are aware of the odour
2 of alcohol of the paramedics, et cetera?

3 A Yes. And I'm aware of the fact that
4 apparent observation was not recorded in any
5 police notes, notwithstanding that there was some
6 suggestion that these paramedics had told the
7 police officer about it. I'm aware of the other
8 contradictions in the evidence and the notes. Why
9 all of that occurred, I don't really know, because
10 I haven't been here to listen to this Commission
11 of Inquiry and the various witnesses. But, yes.

12 Q All right. Now, I wanted to, before
13 dealing with your final conclusions when you look
14 at everything comprehensively, go back, if we
15 could, to the issue of the stay of the refusal.
16 There were other factors, sir, that I wanted to
17 address with you, and this of course dealt with
18 the D and E in your opinion, whether the stay of
19 the refusal was in line with acceptable
20 prosecutorial standards and consistent with the
21 policy directives. And you have given your
22 opinion, sir, that in your view it was consistent
23 and within accepted prosecutorial standards. But I
24 wanted to put to you, sir, that there were other
25 factors at play here. The Commission has heard

1 evidence with respect to the fact that the issue
2 of the blood versus breathalyzer demand, if you
3 were to consider, for instance, that the
4 prosecutor might have had information where he
5 could have presented to the court that this was a
6 clerical error which had been pointed out to the
7 Crown, and there had been indications of the fact
8 that the breathalyzer demand was read as opposed
9 to a blood demand, but it was recorded
10 inaccurately.

11 A Well, that would simply be a matter of
12 proof, wouldn't it? A matter of contest between
13 counsel if the matter proceeded to trial.
14 Presumably, defence counsel is going to say to the
15 officer who made the demand, but, sir, isn't the
16 best evidence your contemporaneous recording of
17 the demand? Yes, normally it would be. And
18 didn't you record this as a blood demand? I mean,
19 that's the kind of thing, I can see the potential
20 for the accused taking the witness stand and
21 saying, I was given a blood demand, and then I
22 immediately invoked my right to counsel, phoned a
23 lawyer and said, I am at the police station, they
24 have given me a blood demand. And the lawyer
25 says, well, are you incapacitated, incapable of

1 giving a breath sample? No. Well, then refuse.
2 So that notion of a clerical error -- and I'm not
3 so certain, if I'm the prosecutor in this case,
4 seeing the number of difficulties and problems in
5 this case, I'm not going to be so ready to accept
6 someone's assertion that that was just a clerical
7 error in these circumstances. I mean, was the
8 direction to Woychuk to make notes in a certain
9 fashion a clerical error? There is a lot of
10 undercurrents to this case that cause problems.
11 Even if you accept that it is a clerical error,
12 there are a host of other problems embedded in
13 this notion that one can prove the refusal, to a
14 standard beyond a reasonable doubt. I just don't
15 buy it.

16 Q What if there was information provided
17 to the prosecutor on the issue of the clerical
18 error, that the factual circumstances surrounding
19 the timing of the demand were consistent with it
20 being a breathalyzer demand, in other words, in
21 close proximity to a breathalyzer room, and also
22 you would have additional evidence of Officer
23 Woychuk, that he was present when it was a
24 breathalyzer demand that was read, would that
25 impact or change your view?

1 A Let me just give you two responses to
2 that.

3 Q And I can imagine what they are going
4 to be.

5 A Firstly, there are a host of other
6 problems with this charge in terms of proof, in
7 terms of available defences. Secondly, I'm not so
8 certain that I'm going to just readily accept
9 Constable Woychuk's word on that, or anything, by
10 the time I'm getting to this prosecution.

11 Q Those are the factors, sir, that I
12 wanted to cover, A through O. If I could in
13 conclusion, in your examination-in-chief, sir, at
14 this time, ask you to refer to your conclusion
15 section in your written opinion and provide it to
16 the Commission, please?

17 A It is succinctly stated,
18 Mr. Commissioner, page 37, under the heading
19 conclusion in three short paragraphs.

20 Firstly, my conclusion is that Crown
21 counsel handling this case erred in two areas.
22 Firstly, he failed to adequately set out the basis
23 for the joint submission to the sentencing judge
24 on August 22nd. Like the Chief Judge, on my
25 review of this, my conclusion is that this error

1 is attributable to inadvertence and not any
2 malefices. And I note that Crown moved to correct
3 this error at the next court appearance on
4 September 12th.

5 Secondly, I think Crown counsel was in
6 error in this whole area of using this phrase of
7 anecdotal historical evidence, because the phrase
8 is really, in terms of the law, somewhat
9 meaningless. It was an act, I find, of
10 overreaching, but I do not find that either of
11 these errors amount to unethical conduct on the
12 part of counsel handling, as I've said, a tragic,
13 highly emotive, very difficult case in terms of
14 proof and the atmosphere of the courtroom.

15 Q Thank you, Mr. Peck.
16 Mr. Commissioner, prior to taking our next --

17 THE COMMISSIONER: You have six
18 seconds.

19 MR. CLIFFORD: Good. I will try to be
20 useful here.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Weinstein is on
22 his feet.

23 MR. CLIFFORD: I wonder at this point
24 if we could canvass amongst counsel whether there
25 will be questions for Mr. Peck, so we can try to

1 adequately gauge what we should do for the rest of
2 the afternoon, because there is the potential of
3 getting Mr. Kaplan on.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. You will do
5 that in the break. Thank you. We will now rise.

6 THE CLERK: All rise. This Commission
7 of Inquiry is in recess.

8 (Proceedings recessed at 3:15 p.m. and
9 reconvened at 3:30 p.m.)

10 THE CLERK: All rise, please. This
11 Commission of Inquiry is now reopened. Please be
12 seated.

13 BY MR. ZAZELENCHUK:

14 Q Sir, I have never been a prosecutor,
15 independent or otherwise, so you will forgive me
16 if my questions are a bit basic.

17 We heard evidence earlier in these
18 proceedings that before a charge is laid,
19 generally speaking, it is the police who are in
20 charge of the investigation, they may go to a
21 prosecutor for advice, but generally speaking the
22 ball is in their court. Is that your
23 understanding as well?

24 A Yes. And I think that's a traditional
25 understanding in jurisdictions all across Canada,

1 the police investigate, the Crown prosecute.

2 There are occasions when a prosecutor may be
3 consulted for advice.

4 Q Sure, it blurs sometimes, but
5 generally. We also heard evidence to the effect
6 that once a charge is laid and a prosecutor is
7 assigned to the case, be it a line prosecutor in
8 the department or a special prosecutor,
9 independent like yourself, it is perfectly fair
10 game for the prosecutor to direct certain other
11 areas of investigation. Is that your
12 understanding as well?

13 A Yes.

14 Q And I guess that when you are an
15 independent prosecutor, you are a bit like Harry
16 Truman, the buck is going to stop on your desk?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And so it is perfectly fair game for
19 you to say to the investigator that you are
20 dealing with, look, I want you to interview that
21 witness, or I want you to try and look for this
22 document, or things like that?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And is that something that you've done
25 from time to time?

1 A Yes.

2 Q Okay. Now, at some point after the
3 charge is laid and you have been appointed the
4 independent prosecutor, you get some materials
5 from the police; correct?

6 A Yes, that would be the case in this
7 jurisdiction. Let me clarify something for you.
8 In British Columbia and in two other Canadian
9 jurisdictions, I believe, New Brunswick and
10 Quebec, it may be Nova Scotia, Quebec, there is
11 what is called the charge approval system whereby
12 the charge is not laid by the police, it is laid
13 only after the Crown has approved the charge and
14 directed the police to lay it. In Manitoba and
15 all of the other provinces, the police lay the
16 charge and then the report comes to the Crown.

17 Q I see. So in your jurisdiction you
18 would get the material before the charge is laid,
19 if you have been appointed the independent
20 prosecutor?

21 A Yes.

22 Q I see.

23 A And I would make the decision about
24 laying the charge and what charge, if I'm in a
25 position of a special prosecutor, or even if I'm

1 in the position of an ad hoc prosecutor, the
2 prosecution service makes the decision as to the
3 charge or charges.

4 Q In your particular case, have you ever
5 been brought in after the charge has been laid?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And --

8 A Not as a special prosecutor, simply as
9 what we call an ad hoc prosecutor.

10 Q Okay. And I'm not sure, I'm not even
11 going to ask you the difference because I'm not
12 sure it is relevant to where I want to go.

13 In those cases where you were brought
14 in as an ad hoc prosecutor, after the charge had
15 been laid, at some point after you accepted the
16 assignment to be an ad hoc prosecutor, you would
17 have gotten a bundle of documents, witness
18 statements, officer's notes, police reports,
19 interviews, photographs, things like that;
20 correct?

21 A Yes.

22 Q Okay. And am I correct in assuming
23 that that would be something you would want to go
24 through at a very early stage?

25 A Yes.

1 Q And maybe not necessarily that day or
2 that week, but as quickly as you could, and in any
3 event you wouldn't let a period of months go by
4 before you went through that material?

5 A Not normally.

6 Q And am I correct in assuming that the
7 reason you would want to go through that material
8 as quickly as you could is because you would want
9 to see if you could identify any problems in the
10 evidence, or the case, and if you could, you would
11 want them fixed; correct?

12 A That might not be my motivation. I
13 think my motivation would be just to get a handle
14 on what I was doing, get a handle on the case.
15 And in the course of reading and reviewing that
16 material, I might identify legal issues that I
17 would want research done on by my members of my
18 law firm, my associates. I might well identify
19 areas that I thought were subject to problems of
20 proof, and I might give a direction or request
21 that further investigative steps be taken. I
22 think generally the answer to your question is,
23 yes, I would review the case fairly quickly upon
24 receipt. Depend upon, to some extent how far down
25 the line the case was likely to be coming to court

1 for the trial, in the trial.

2 Q Sure. I understand that. But my
3 point is simply that, as a general practice, you
4 would want to review the materials you got from
5 the police sooner rather than later?

6 A Absolutely.

7 Q Thank you. Now, just following up,
8 you indicated to me a few minutes ago that you
9 have in some cases directed investigators to do a
10 little bit further investigation in this area or
11 that area. Has anybody ever not done it? Do you
12 understand my question?

13 A Absolutely. Not for me, but I know
14 that this has on occasion been a problem. There
15 have been occasions where the follow-up has not
16 been done, or not been done adequately, where the
17 Crown has requested it be done.

18 Q And if you can't, you've told us it
19 hasn't happened to you, so if you can't answer
20 this question, I will understand it, but you are
21 produced as an expert today. So what would you do
22 if you directed a police officer, a police officer
23 on a file that you've been given, either as an
24 independent prosecutor or as an ad hoc prosecutor,
25 to look for a particular document or interview a

1 particular witness, and he or she doesn't seem to
2 be doing it?

3 A Probably communicate with the person,
4 get them into the office or phone them up and say,
5 look, you have got to understand, I just didn't
6 idly make this request. I require this be done, I
7 need this help. And if it persisted -- because
8 the police, like everybody else, are busy, they
9 have other obligations, I might go to a superior
10 officer and say, I'm not getting the cooperation I
11 need. It has never happened, but that's my
12 hypothetical answer to your hypothetical facts.

13 Q No, and I appreciate that limitation
14 on it, sir, but whether at the end of the day if
15 Mr. Commissioner finds those questions helpful, or
16 answers helpful or not, I thought he might, so
17 that's why I asked them.

18 You talked about the need to
19 communicate, in the last part of your evidence,
20 the need to communicate with the family, be it
21 when you are a defence counsel, and I think you
22 seemed to apply that was equally important when
23 you were a prosecutor, is that correct?

24 A Absolutely.

25 Q And as a prosecutor in a case

1 involving the loss of a human life, particularly a
2 younger person, which is always more tragic than,
3 you know, somebody who has lived a full and long
4 life, although they are both tragic, we will
5 agree.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: Speak for yourself.
7 We elderly people have to be protected.

8 MR. ZAZELENCHUK: My 87 year old
9 mother would agree with you 100 per cent,
10 Mr. Commissioner.

11 BY MR. ZAZELENCHUK:

12 Q But in a case involving a sudden
13 tragic death of a human life, that you were given
14 the brief to prosecute, do I understand correctly
15 that you would want to try and meet with the
16 family, the victims, at an early stage of the
17 proceeding, within a month or two or something
18 like that?

19 A I would certainly meet with the family
20 any time that I was going to take a step that was
21 of significance in the course of the conduct of
22 the brief. Whether I would meet with them
23 immediately or later, I really can't say. I would
24 have to have much more --

25 Q I understand that.

1 A I can tell you this: That very often
2 people in the position of a bereaving, a grieving
3 family will want to meet with you. And it is
4 extraordinarily important to take the time to do
5 that and to communicate with people. They are
6 human beings and they are suffering and they are
7 entitled to your input and your advice and
8 information, so they understand.

9 Q You will get no argument from me on
10 that point, sir.

11 Just to follow that up a little bit.
12 You say that the family may want to meet with you.
13 If you are appointed a prosecutor in a case
14 involving a death, will you send a letter to the
15 next of kin or something saying I have been
16 appointed the prosecutor, this is my business
17 card, if you want to talk to me, call my secretary
18 for an appointment, or something to that effect?

19 A They will know that I have been
20 appointed, and in fact, many of these files will
21 carry the phone number of a Victim Service worker
22 so that you can communicate with the family. Does
23 that help?

24 Q Yes, that helps very much, sir. You
25 agree with me that the credibility of witnesses,

1 particularly civilian witnesses, and witnesses who
2 aren't what I call professional witnesses, such as
3 experts, senior police officers, is something
4 that's better determined through an interview than
5 through a statement on a piece of paper? I mean
6 that's -- chicken soup?

7 A Common sense.

8 Q Common sense, yes. As a special
9 prosecutor, do you interview civilian witnesses
10 before the Preliminary Inquiry, at some period,
11 two, three, four weeks, or do you leave it as it
12 comes?

13 A You have to do your preparation. Of
14 course, you interview the witnesses.

15 Q And at what stage do you think it is
16 desirable to interview, particularly civilian
17 witnesses who may never have been in a courtroom?

18 A Well, I mean, well in advance of the
19 proceeding. I really, again, can't give you any
20 definitive. But, you know, I mean, you have to
21 sit down with your witnesses, particularly the
22 important -- we are talking about the important
23 witness in a case. You have to go through their
24 evidence, you have to assess their evidence. And
25 one of the things that happens when you do this

1 with witnesses is that they will sometimes give
2 something different from what is contained in the
3 statement, and that triggers a disclosure
4 obligation on you to advise the defence of this
5 change, or omission, or whatever it is.

6 Q I can appreciate that.

7 A There are all kinds of reasons why you
8 interview witnesses.

9 Q And something extra can also either
10 make your case stronger or weaker?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And that's another reason for doing it
13 sooner rather than later, correct?

14 A Yes.

15 Q Okay. Just a couple more points, sir.
16 When you were asked about the desirability or not
17 desirability of calling evidence with respect to
18 alcohol consumption as opposed to alcohol
19 impairment -- you recall when Mr. Clifford asked
20 you that question?

21 A Um-hum.

22 Q And you gave us an answer saying, if
23 the law was settled and if -- do you recall that?

24 A Yes.

25 Q Okay. My question to you, sir, about

1 that answer that you gave is one of the things you
2 said is you would engage in a cost benefit
3 analysis. What did you mean by that, sir?

4 A Whether the effort was worth the
5 result that was likely to ensue is what I meant by
6 that. That wasn't in the context of if the law
7 was settled, it was in the context of the law as I
8 see it now, and it is unsettled.

9 Q I see. So I misunderstood you there.
10 But when you said a cost benefit analysis, you
11 weren't talking about money?

12 A Absolutely not.

13 Q And I just wanted to make that clear,
14 I understood you not to be talking about money,
15 but maybe some lay people in the audience didn't.

16 A No, no.

17 Q So, you are talking about the effort
18 of getting the evidence out as opposed to the
19 benefits that you as a prosecutor will get from
20 getting the evidence out?

21 A Yes.

22 Q Okay. You indicated a couple of times
23 in your direct evidence that what we are talking
24 about here is an art and not an exact science.
25 And later on you said, reasonable people can agree

1 to disagree on points. You recall those comments,
2 sir?

3 A Yes.

4 Q And that's no different than saying,
5 if a chap walks into my office and gives me a fact
6 situation and asks me what his chances are as a
7 plaintiff, and I say they are 60/40 in your
8 favour, and he goes down the hall and sees my
9 colleague down the hall and gives him the same
10 fact situation, and my colleague says there, you
11 know, 55/45 against you. Neither one of us is
12 right or wrong. We are having a different
13 assessment of facts, and at the end of the day,
14 there is only one person, or 12 people if it is a
15 jury, who is going to be able to give you a
16 definitive answer, and even that can be appealed;
17 correct?

18 A Yes.

19 Q Okay. One last point, sir. You
20 indicated to us that on the hypothetical given to
21 you, you referred to the dangerous driving cause
22 death charge as a clear case. You recall that?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And Mr. Clifford asked you what a
25 clear case was, and you said, by that I mean if I

1 was a prosecutor, I would expect to get a
2 conviction, or words to that effect; correct?

3 A Yes.

4 Q How do you reconcile that, or maybe
5 you don't have to reconcile that, but given that
6 statement, what did the accused, Mr. Harvey-Zenk,
7 give up by pleading guilty to dangerous driving
8 cause death?

9 A He gave up his right to a trial, to
10 challenge the case. Notwithstanding my view, I'm
11 not necessarily right, that is my view and I stand
12 by it, but there are always contingencies in
13 litigation.

14 Q Is there anything else, other than his
15 right to a trial, that you can see in that
16 hypothetical?

17 A Not patently, but after some
18 reflection I might have some.

19 Q Every litigator will tell you, I'm
20 sure, that he won cases that he thought were
21 losers and he lost cases that he thought were
22 winners. I know I have. You would agree with me
23 on that, wouldn't you, sir?

24 A Absolutely.

25 Q Getting back to the point, what the

1 accused, in your opinion, gave up by entering a
2 plea to dangerous driving causing death was his
3 right to have a trial, and you can't think of
4 anything else?

5 A No, but that right should not be
6 underestimated in terms of its importance.

7 Q I have never prosecuted, I have
8 defended a lot, and I agree with you on that,
9 sir. Thank you for your help.

10 MR. McDONALD: No questions,
11 Mr. Commissioner.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

13 MR. HOEPPNER: We have no questions
14 Mr. Commissioner.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

16 MR. WEINSTEIN: No questions.

17 MR. JACK: No questions,
18 Mr. Commissioner.

19 MR. PROBER: No questions.

20 MR. NOZICK: No questions that aren't
21 *deja vu*.

22 BY MS. DIXON:

23 Q I just have a few questions, sir.

24 Mr. Peck, my name is Dixon and I'm
25 co-counsel for Mr. Minuk, the Crown prosecutor in

1 this case.

2 Sir, I think in answer to a question
3 that Mr. Zazelenchuk just asked you, you said that
4 you had given thought to a cost benefit analysis.
5 And I believe that that was in the context of
6 deciding whether there would be cogent evidence to
7 substantiate an impaired case. Am I correct on
8 that?

9 A No. Whether there would be evidence
10 to prove consumption of -- mere consumption.

11 Q Right.

12 A That was the context in which the
13 question was posed by Mr. Clifford.

14 Q All right. And as I understand the
15 evidence that you gave, you would have come to the
16 conclusion in this case that there wasn't
17 sufficient benefit to call that sort of evidence,
18 correct?

19 A Predicated upon my interpretation of
20 the current state of the law --

21 Q Right.

22 A -- on sentencing in this area.

23 Q Right. And you were asked earlier by
24 Mr. Clifford about the release of persons charged
25 with the type of offence we have here?

1 A Yes.

2 Q And I believe your evidence was that
3 the practice in B.C., as far as you are aware,
4 would be consistent with the release of a person
5 in these circumstances, in Mr. Zenk's
6 circumstances, and facing these charges on a
7 promise to appear; right?

8 A I believe that to be the case.

9 Q Right. And you alluded in your report
10 to the fact that sometimes conditions can be
11 attached, but I believe that the attachment of a
12 condition relative to abstaining from alcohol was
13 linked by you to the situation where there was
14 some evidence that the person has a prior history
15 of that fact pattern. Am I correct on that?

16 A Yeah. And in a way you are exercising
17 discretion. My view is that there should be some
18 logical nexus between a condition, whether it be a
19 condition of bail or a condition of supervised
20 release or probation, whatever it is, there should
21 be some logical link between the imposition of a
22 condition and the person's conduct. I really
23 don't see much merit in situations where trial
24 judges, for instance, from time to time will
25 impose a series of conditions every time they deal

1 with an offender in a certain area,
2 notwithstanding the fact that the offender doesn't
3 have a problem in the certain area. So to me
4 there has to be some logical connection.

5 Q Right. And I think what I was asking
6 about was the imposition of conditions on the
7 release of an accused who has been charged, back
8 at that stage. I don't know whether you know
9 Mr. Richard Wolson, a local Manitoba lawyer?

10 A Yes.

11 Q He is a prominent member of our
12 defence bar. And he has given evidence in this
13 case that it is not unusual in Manitoba to release
14 people in Mr. Harvey-Zenk's circumstances, with
15 his background and facing the charges that he was
16 facing, it is not uncommon to release them on a
17 promise to appear without conditions?

18 A And I think I've said that, although
19 mine is more a B.C. generated view.

20 Q You agree with that.

21 A Right.

22 Q You were asked a few questions by
23 Mr. Clifford about Gover's opinion.

24 A Yes.

25 Q And in particular, you were asked

1 about Mr. Gover's opinion that the sentence in
2 this case was overly lenient. Do you recall that
3 exchange?

4 A Yes.

5 Q And you disagreed with that?

6 A Yes. I think the sentence in this
7 case is consonant with sentences for the same
8 offence in this jurisdiction.

9 Q Now, Mr. Gover, in his opinion, seems
10 to cite a recent amendment to the Criminal Code in
11 support of his opinion. That is an amendment that
12 came into force after the sentencing in this case.
13 In your view, is that an appropriate assessment?

14 THE COMMISSIONER: We are talking
15 about now.

16 MS. DIXON: Is it --

17 THE COMMISSIONER: Not at the time.

18 MS. DIXON: I'm asking him if it would
19 be appropriate.

20 THE WITNESS: I understand the
21 question. I am just looking for a note on that I
22 had, Mr. Commissioner.

23 I don't agree with that. What that
24 does is it superimposes on counsel a factor that,
25 in my view, should probably not be taken into

1 account. What he is saying is this: He is saying
2 that in May, I think May the 1st, 2007, Parliament
3 tabled legislation to come into force six months
4 later, on December 1st, 2007. He is saying that
5 that demonstrates Parliament's will. Parliament's
6 will, in theory, is the will of the people. And
7 therefore there is a sentiment out there, a belief
8 that people charged and convicted of certain types
9 of offences should not be subject to a conditional
10 sentence order.

11 And the effect of that legislation, of
12 course, which now has been proclaimed in effect,
13 is to take away from certain offenders the ability
14 to obtain a conditional sentence. I think it puts
15 too fine an analysis, it imposes a standard really
16 almost of correctness. We are dealing with an
17 area of reasonableness. It also in a de facto
18 kind of a way affronts section 11(i) of the
19 charter, a notion that you are entitled to the
20 lesser sentence that prevailed at the time that
21 your offence was committed.

22 In saying that, I think it is
23 imminently arguable that a conditional sentence is
24 a lesser sentence than a standard jail term. So
25 it -- I just don't understand how we should be

1 imposing this very fine analysis requirement on
2 prosecutors to take a position that, because
3 Parliament is going to do something, we should be
4 responding to it in terms of our submissions. It
5 doesn't jive with my thinking.

6 BY MS. DIXON:

7 Q And it just seemed to me unfair that
8 you would cite something that came into effect
9 subsequent to a sentencing hearing, and I just
10 wanted your thoughts on that. Thank you.

11 Now, you gave evidence this morning, I
12 think, that the charge of impaired, impaired cause
13 death in this case was a very, very marginal case.
14 The case for impaired cause death was very
15 marginal and, therefore, it was very appropriate
16 to stay that charge down the line?

17 A It wasn't inconsistent with accepted
18 prosecutorial standards and Manitoba guidelines to
19 do that.

20 Q Right.

21 A It was within the reasonable exercise
22 of Crown counsel's discretion to do that.

23 Q And the charge of refusal was fraught
24 with difficulties?

25 A That's my opinion.

1 Q Right. So, again, it was reasonable
2 to stay that charge, correct?

3 A Yes.

4 Q And the criminal negligence charge was
5 one that was unlikely to succeed at trial?

6 A I don't really see this as a case of
7 criminal negligence causing death. I'm sure, as
8 hard as some people in this room find it to accept
9 that, it was a proper prosecution of a dangerous
10 driving causing death, which has a maximum term of
11 incarceration, as I have said, of 14 years.

12 Q So it was reasonable to stay that
13 charge?

14 A Yes.

15 Q And you were directed to the question
16 of the joint position on sentence, and you gave
17 evidence that you reviewed the jurisprudence in
18 Manitoba --

19 A Yes.

20 Q -- relevant to these types of
21 offences, both the authorities that were put
22 forward by counsel in this case and generally.
23 And that you have found that the jurisprudence in
24 Manitoba clearly supports the propriety of a
25 two-year conditional sentence, as I have written

1 down your evidence?

2 A On the facts of this case --

3 Q Yes?

4 A -- as have been presented to me, yes.

5 Q And I believe you were asked if you
6 were the prosecutor would you have thought you
7 would obtain a conviction on the charge of
8 dangerous driving cause death, and you said you
9 would have thought you could obtain a conviction
10 on that?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And so my question to you is, if you
13 had been the prosecutor in this case, you wouldn't
14 have had any hesitation accepting the plea bargain
15 that was ultimately implemented in this case? I
16 mean, given the evidence that you have given us as
17 to the strength of the charges and the
18 appropriateness of the disposition?

19 A I don't know that, to phrase it the
20 way you have in the context of "not have any
21 hesitation" is something that I would necessarily
22 agree with. I mean -- you agonize over these
23 cases, all right? You are going to spend a lot of
24 time thinking about this, worrying about it. Am I
25 doing the right thing? Am I right in taking this

1 position? Is it consistent with the law? Is
2 there something I'm missing? Ultimately, on the
3 facts before me, the answer is yes, but I would
4 take out the "without hesitation" part.

5 MS. DIXON: All right. Thank you.
6 Those are my questions.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Any
8 re-examination?

9 MR. CLIFFORD: Mr. Commissioner, no
10 re-examination.

11 Mr. Peck, on behalf of the Commission,
12 I would like to thank you for attending and
13 assisting us.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you propose
15 calling another witness?

16 MR. PACIOCCO: I would like to take
17 advantage of the half hour that God gave us,
18 Mr. Commissioner.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: Maybe we will give
20 you 25 minutes, because I'm going to take a short
21 adjournment. All right.

22 THE CLERK: All rise. This Commission
23 of Inquiry is in recess.

24 (Proceedings recessed at 4:00 p.m. and
25 reconvened at 4:05 p.m.)

1 THE CLERK: All rise, please. This
2 Commission of Inquiry is now reopened. Please be
3 seated.

4 MR. McDONALD: Mr. Commissioner, with
5 Mr. Paciocco's consent, I would like to clear up
6 an evidentiary issue pending the start of the next
7 witness.

8 You will recall that exhibit 69 in
9 these proceedings is the statement of facts
10 pertinent to the Rural Municipal of East St. Paul
11 agreed to by Commission Counsel and interested
12 parties. And that was read into the record at the
13 conclusion of the case, of the presentation of the
14 case involving the East St. Paul witnesses. On
15 page 5 of that exhibit, the first paragraph,
16 reference is made to pages 21, 22 and 23 of a
17 report prepared by Robert Tramley that appears in
18 volume P-1.82 at pages 2182, 2183 and 2184. I
19 neglected, sir, through oversight, to have those
20 documents marked as an exhibit, and with Mr.
21 Paciocco's concurrence, I will do that. It will
22 be volume P-1, all of the documents at tab P-1.82,
23 which is my letter to Mr. Paciocco dated
24 February 28th, together with the reference pages
25 of the Tramley report. So that can become the

1 next exhibit.

2 (EXHIBIT 236: P-1.82 Correspondence
3 from Fillmore Riley to Commission
4 Counsel, February 28, 2008, re Tramley
5 report with attached relevant
6 excerpts)

7 MR. McDONALD: Thank you.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: Tell me when you
9 need to go, grab your plane.

10 MR. PACIOCCO: I will indeed. Thank
11 you very much for that consideration,
12 Mr. Commissioner.

13 Just before we have this witness sworn
14 in, the expert witness, Paul Lobsinger from the
15 Elmer Police College who was set to testify on
16 behalf of the Commission Counsel, has -- we are
17 going to be filing his report, or excerpts from
18 his report in lieu of his oral testimony, through
19 the consent of everyone gathered. And I wanted to
20 express my thanks for that, it has made the
21 process much more efficient. I am providing the
22 clerk with two copies of the relevant pages from
23 the report, including the CV of Sergeant
24 Lobsinger, his opinion, as well as an addendum to
25 his opinion dealing with a narrower question that

1 was solicited subsequently, that narrower question
2 being internal investigations by police officers.
3 With that document in, it would be marked as
4 exhibit?

5 THE CLERK: 237.

6 (EXHIBIT 237: CV of Paul Lobsinger
7 along with his opinion evidence
8 relating to East St. Paul Police
9 investigative file and his report
10 addendum dated May 8, 2008)

11 MR. WEINSTEIN: I can advise,
12 Mr. Commissioner, that Commission Counsel
13 canvassed the issue of him not having to appear,
14 and us consenting to the report going in as -- and
15 we met, some of us met with Commission Counsel
16 yesterday. We wanted to put on the record, and I
17 know Mr. Paciocco agrees, that notwithstanding the
18 fact that we are agreeing to it going in, we are
19 not agreeing that it has weight to be attached to
20 it. We are not agreeing to all of the contents of
21 it, and I don't think that Mr. Paciocco either is
22 agreeing to everything that's being said in that
23 report.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

25 MR. PACIOCCO: Yes. I can clarify

1 that it was put in on the understanding that
2 parties are free to contest the contents and are
3 not to be taken to have accepted the contents, and
4 that they will use it as it suits their case.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. You
6 will not be calling him.

7 MR. PACIOCCO: We will not be calling
8 him.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

10 BRIAN RICHARD KAPLAN, having first
11 been duly affirmed, testified as
12 follows:

13 BY MR. PACIOCCO:

14 Q Good afternoon, Mr. Kaplan.

15 A Good afternoon, Mr. Paciocco.

16 Q You are the director of Regional
17 Prosecution and Legal Education here in the
18 Province of Manitoba for Manitoba Justice?

19 A Correct.

20 Q Sir, you are obviously a highly placed
21 Crown prosecutor. I understand that there are
22 four directors?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And the directors work under the
25 direction of the Assistant Deputy Attorney

1 General?

2 A Correct.

3 Q And, sir, as part of your
4 responsibility, I understand that you, of course,
5 are responsible for legal education, as your title
6 indicates, for prosecutors?

7 A Correct.

8 Q More importantly for our purposes,
9 sir, I also have been given to understand that the
10 attorney -- that the Assistant Deputy Attorney
11 General's authority to appoint independent
12 prosecutors has been delegated to your office?

13 A Correct.

14 Q Given your role in that regard, and
15 our review of the file, it is apparent, sir, that
16 you played some role in the ultimate appointment
17 of Mr. Martin Minuk as the special prosecutor of
18 Derek Harvey-Zenk?

19 A Correct.

20 Q I'm going to ask you to refer to a
21 document that I will have shown to you now, it is
22 exhibit 215 in these proceedings, found at volume
23 G-44.

24 Sir, you should have in front of you
25 the Manitoba Department of Justice Prosecution

1 Policy Directive for the Appointment of
2 Independent Counsel dated in January of 2005?

3 A Correct.

4 Q The page numbers at the bottom are
5 page numbers that we have utilized in organizing
6 our materials, sir, and I will refer those to you
7 to orient you in the document.

8 The first issue I wanted to clarify
9 and point out through your good offices, sir, is
10 that in this case the decision was ultimately
11 made, appropriately with the policy, to appoint an
12 independent prosecutor because Derek Harvey-Zenk
13 was a police officer. And this protocol and the
14 practice in this province is that whenever a
15 criminal charge is laid against a person who is
16 directly connected to the justice system, there
17 may be a reasonable perception that the accused
18 could receive some kind of differential treatment
19 if prosecuted by a staff Crown Attorney. And that
20 as a result of that policy, and in keeping with
21 practice, that's how Mr. Minuk came to be involved
22 in this case?

23 A Correct.

24 Q I also notice from the protocol, sir,
25 at page 1382, the third page of the document, that

1 there are four levels of independence that are
2 described as potential appointments in cases where
3 this policy is invoked. Those level of
4 independence of prosecutors, I suspect, work on
5 gradation of least independent to most
6 independent, and begin with the appointment of a
7 Crown Attorney from within Manitoba but from
8 another Crown office. The next step would be the
9 appointment of a private prosecutor from Manitoba,
10 and I understand that Mr. Minuk fits into that
11 category, sir?

12 A Correct.

13 Q And the next rung up the ladder of
14 independence would be to seek the assistance of a
15 Crown Attorney from another province. And the
16 ultimate level of independence would be the
17 appointment of a private practitioner from another
18 province.

19 I will come back to this later, sir,
20 but how are private practitioners such as
21 Mr. Minuk designated for selection in cases
22 involving independent counsel? If you are into
23 the second level and you are getting a private
24 practitioner from within Manitoba, how are they
25 selected when it comes time to choose one for the

1 purposes of a prosecution?

2 A They are selected -- as long as I can
3 recall, having done this, again, in gradation as
4 far as our outside counsel. I think when you
5 first interviewed me, I used a term perhaps that I
6 shouldn't have in reflection, and that was our
7 stable of outside counsel.

8 Q You are taking that term back, sir?
9 Because I have grown very fond of it.

10 A Then leaving it with you, let it be
11 stable. Out of the stable of our outside counsel,
12 we would assign the more serious matters probably
13 to the top three regular retained outside counsel.
14 As far as police officers being involved, that
15 would then fall to one of the top three that we
16 use. In this case, Mr. Minuk certainly fell
17 within that category of the top three of the four
18 in the stable, if you will.

19 Q So there are four in the stable, and
20 you had three who you would designate as top
21 counsel who might receive a case like the
22 Harvey-Zenk prosecution, and another who I take it
23 does more, not mundane, but less contentious types
24 of cases, or at least did at that time?

25 A I have to be careful what I say, but,

1 yes, you are correct.

2 Q Yes. This idea of having a group of
3 identified individuals is supported, I understand,
4 by one-year retainer agreements with each of them?

5 A Yes. When we first started -- to give
6 you a minute's worth of history of the case --
7 when we first started there was no type of annual
8 retainer. And we were engaging outside counsel,
9 similar to the policy you see here, but we noticed
10 that if we possibly could shift it to annual
11 retainers, being, or attempting to be fiscally
12 responsible, it might assist us. And we found
13 that, yes, it has assisted us in doing the annual
14 retainers with those particular stable, if you
15 will, of outside counsel.

16 Q Sir, if you could please try speaking
17 into the mic, I think it might assist those in the
18 audience to hear everything you say. But thank
19 you for that answer.

20 The stable of prosecutors that you
21 have, and I know you didn't come here prepared to
22 provide us with precise statistics, but are you
23 able to indicate how regularly each of those
24 persons would be called upon to work as
25 independent counsel? Are you able to give us an

1 indication of the number of cases or the
2 percentage of their practice that they might
3 expect to spend as independent prosecutors?

4 A Certainly had you -- certainly had you
5 asked me to bring the material, my support person
6 always has available that sort of statistic to
7 give. If you are asking me to give a
8 guesstimate --

9 Q I'm asking you for your best estimate,
10 unless you would classify it as a shear guess,
11 sir. But given that you appoint, I was wondering
12 whether you are in a position to give us some
13 indication of the frequency with which each of
14 those individuals might expect to be called upon,
15 and how much of their practice would actually be
16 prosecuting?

17 A I will try and give you my best
18 estimate, if you will. There are months that go
19 by that we will use some of our retained counsel a
20 lot, or a smaller amount. On average, I would
21 have to say two or three, perhaps even four
22 matters could come to them within a month period.
23 Sometimes more, depending on the nature and
24 complexity and issues involved with the cases that
25 we get in that have conflicts.

1 Q All right. So they get a fairly
2 regular part of their practice, I would take it,
3 from the privilege of serving the province in this
4 way?

5 A They get a fair workload I would say.

6 Q All right. And I just ask the
7 question because, as you know, the Commissioner is
8 interested in potential systemic issues as well,
9 including the process that is used in the
10 practices relating to the appointment of
11 independent counsel. And I'm going to just put it
12 to you for your response. Is there any risk, in
13 your view, that those independent prosecutors, who
14 are used from such a small stable and who are used
15 with such regularity, might not come to think of
16 themselves or be thought of by the department as
17 just another wing of the prosecution service?

18 A I'm not sure I caught the last part,
19 if you will forgive me, just to repeat it?

20 Q There was a lot in the question, so I
21 understand. Basically, I'm wondering whether if
22 those select number of individuals who act as
23 independent prosecutors on an ongoing basis, with
24 an annual retainer, might not come to think of
25 themselves, given the regularity with which they

1 are called on to do this, to think of themselves
2 as just another branch of the prosecution service,
3 rather than people, outside people who are removed
4 from the prosecution service. Are you in a
5 position to give me any indication as to whether
6 you think that might be a fair concern for anyone
7 to have?

8 A I'm not prepared to say it might not
9 be a fair concern, but I think the best people
10 obviously to ask are the outside counsel and their
11 view, how they feel doing these kind of things.
12 In my past experience, I think that they are doing
13 a job, and they are not quite connected to our
14 offices, but yet obviously have access to
15 information and ability to talk to any of the
16 Crowns.

17 Q All right. So they are not quite
18 connected to your office. And the term "quite"
19 and I know that this is a term, it may be totally
20 meaningless, but are they not kind of like quasi
21 Crowns? They are regular people getting Crown
22 work?

23 A Obviously they act as Crowns for us in
24 that position.

25 Q And they may well identify themselves

1 as independent prosecutors by trade?

2 A Sure.

3 Q Sir, I understand that the policy that
4 we've just examined has since been revised as a
5 result of the Krindle report?

6 A Correct.

7 Q And it was changed in February of
8 2008?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Exhibit 49 is the revised policy which
11 has already been put into evidence. It can be
12 found at book R-3, at tab 92.7, page 3364.

13 A Sorry, page?

14 Q Page 3364. There is a lot that's been
15 put into that tab because of the way in which we
16 received our disclosure, but you will find it at
17 page 3364.

18 A Yes.

19 Q You will notice, sir, that there are a
20 number of terms and conditions that are contained
21 in the Crown policy that are notionally included
22 within the retainer of your independent
23 prosecutors, sir?

24 A Yes.

25 Q And those terms have been altered as a

1 result of the revision of this policy, from the
2 one that we were just examining and the one that
3 was in effect when Mr. Minuk was retained, sir.
4 Could you please take a look at 3368, the fifth
5 page of the document, at condition G?

6 If I'm correct, sir, and please
7 correct me if I'm wrong, this is a new insertion
8 into the independent prosecutor's policy. And
9 what G says is:

10 "The independent counsel is bound by
11 the same obligations as those imposed
12 on departmental prosecutors with
13 respect to the Victims' Bill of
14 Rights. A copy of the prosecution
15 policy regarding legislative
16 obligations on departmental
17 prosecutors under the Victims' Bill of
18 Rights must also be provided to the
19 independent counsel. Additional
20 inquiries can be directed by
21 independent counsel to the Director of
22 Regional Prosecutions and Education,
23 who can facilitate consultation with
24 the Victims' Services branch."

25 Can you explain, sir, why this has

1 been added to the policy, if you are in a position
2 to do so?

3 A I would believe it was added as a
4 result of Madam Justice, as she then was,
5 Krindle's, comments and suggestions based on her
6 report and review of the independent policy that
7 we had.

8 Q Okay. And were you privy to the
9 rationale for that change?

10 A That I really can't answer.

11 Q Fair enough, sir. I won't call them
12 up, but they are found in exhibit 55 of the
13 Commission's materials, book G-43. If you do need
14 to see them at any point, I will have them put in
15 front of you, sir. But they do not include any
16 reference to the Victims' Bill, there is no
17 paragraph or term put into the retainer that makes
18 any reference to the Victims' Bill. Nor at the
19 time did the Independent Prosecutor Policy make
20 any reference to the Victims' Bill.

21 Are you able to indicate, based on
22 your involvement with Mr. Minuk's retainers,
23 whether he was provided with documentation
24 relating to the Victims' Bill of Rights, whether
25 it be the policies internal to Manitoba Justice,

1 or whether it be with a copy of the statute
2 itself?

3 A I can only give you, I guess what
4 could be termed hearsay coming from my support
5 person. And that would be that she advised me
6 that Mr. Minuk had been given a copy of the
7 Victims' Bill of Rights. And she also added, if
8 I'm recalling correctly, that any updates that
9 come along occasionally would be provided to
10 outside counsel. So I'm going to include, I
11 believe, Mr. Minuk in that.

12 Q Okay. Because Mr. Minuk certainly had
13 familiarity with the Victims' Bill through his
14 many years of experience, but couldn't provide us
15 with firm indications as to whether he had
16 received the documents. But essentially, sir, I
17 take it, you, of course, would rely on the
18 information you've been given, but I take it you
19 feel there are firm and dependable systems in
20 place to ensure that Victims' Rights materials are
21 properly disseminated to your independent counsel?

22 A I would like to say definitely yes on
23 that point.

24 Q And I take it that you understand,
25 through your position, the importance of ensuring

1 that all of your Crowns are familiar with those
2 provisions and the practices of your office?

3 A Fair enough.

4 Q Mr. Minuk was formally appointed to
5 prosecute Derek Harvey-Zenk on the 3rd of March,
6 are you aware of that, 2005?

7 A Yes, I am aware of that now.

8 Q Yes. And he came to be involved,
9 though, much earlier. On February 25th, in fact,
10 a Mr. Russ Ridd, who I understand was a duty
11 Crown, he is a full time Crown in your office but
12 I understand was acting as duty Crown on that day,
13 was contacted by Chief Carter as a result of this
14 incident, sir. And he ultimately provided Chief
15 Carter with Mr. Minuk's number. And Mr. Minuk was
16 then called upon by Chief Carter to provide
17 guidance on how to proceed, and received
18 information relating to contact with your office
19 for the filing of the brief, for example, terms
20 and conditions of release, and discussion, and
21 ultimate opinion on the appropriate charges to lay
22 in the circumstances.

23 Is it common practice for your
24 retained Crowns, independent Crowns, to be called
25 upon prior to their formal appointment to give

1 this kind of advice, sir?

2 A In certain circumstances, what we try
3 and do is appoint as early as possible outside
4 counsel, because there is issues as far as -- I'm
5 telling you -- as far as bail, et cetera, et
6 cetera. In this particular case, for some unknown
7 reason, and I've checked it since last we spoke as
8 to where I was on that day, and now I can tell you
9 definitely under oath, I'm not sure where I was.
10 Russ Ridd is the supervising senior Crown at that
11 time of the intake unit. And we had basically
12 weekly dealings, because he would see matters
13 coming in to our office, and could all of a sudden
14 note to me that there is certain conflict cases,
15 and he would bring it to my attention, so he knew
16 how the system certainly worked.

17 To answer your question, basically
18 Mr. Ridd would have then gotten in touch with one
19 of the outside counsel, in this case Mr. Minuk,
20 and that's how he became involved.

21 Q Okay, sir. And we also have, through
22 Mr. Minuk's evidence and testimony of various
23 officers from the Winnipeg Police Service
24 Professional Standards Unit, learned that
25 Mr. Minuk was also contacted on March 2nd, the day

1 before his formal appointment, to discuss the
2 steps that should be taken in ensuring that an
3 investigation be done of Mr. Harvey-Zenk's
4 movements in the hours leading up to the accident,
5 because East St. Paul Police had not undertaken
6 that investigation, and indicated they had
7 resource issues as to whether they could. And the
8 Professional Standards Unit was looking for advice
9 on whether they should become involved, and
10 whether this was something that the prosecutors'
11 office would be comfortable with. So at this
12 point, Mr. Minuk is not formally appointed. Are
13 you able to indicate whether there was any
14 discussion with him having an ongoing role in
15 connection with this file prior to the appointment
16 of March 3rd?

17 A I believe there was, and I'm sure you
18 will correct me if I'm wrong, there was a
19 March 2nd email. I believe it was from myself to
20 Mr. Minuk. I believe I was asking him for some
21 information vis a vis charges, perhaps, that might
22 have arisen. I stand to be corrected. I don't
23 have the R-1 and R-2 binders, I think it was in
24 one of them, that at least would show to me that I
25 was in touch in some way with Mr. Minuk.

1 Q I noticed that in exhibit 218,
2 Mr. Minuk's dockets, there is an indication of
3 mail to "B. Kaplan, re update." And our
4 information, sir, is that that email came about as
5 a result of the PSU conversation, unless I'm
6 mistaken, sir. Do you recall whether you had a
7 conversation with Mr. Minuk before this?
8 Essentially, sir, what I'm probing is the
9 dependability of the system in terms of having
10 independent prosecutors take carriage of files at
11 the early stages. Was this serendipity or is this
12 how it is normally done; you earmark somebody and
13 it takes a few days to get the formal appointment
14 in place?

15 A It takes perhaps a few days to get
16 that formal letter. But what I have done in the
17 past on many occasions is, because of my
18 relationship with many of the outside counsel, is
19 to at least give them, if I'm there, which
20 obviously I wasn't there on this particular date,
21 to give them a heads up perhaps by even a call
22 saying, this fellow has come in, we would like it
23 to be sent to you. And I always say, if there is
24 any conflict, please get back to me as soon as
25 possible so that we can rearrange who is to

1 receive the file.

2 Q Okay, sir. I think that's probably
3 going to be the time we had today. I knew we
4 would get a little past the introductions, but I'm
5 glad we got a start on this, and we will ask you
6 to -- ultimately, the Commissioner will no doubt
7 ask you to re-attend on Tuesday. But those are
8 the questions that I'm going to ask you today.

9 A I appreciate that.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you.
11 Tuesday, 9:00 o'clock.

12 THE CLERK: All rise. This Commission
13 of Inquiry is adjourned until Tuesday at 9:00 a.m.

14 (Adjourned at 4:30 p.m.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

COURT REPORTERS' CERTIFICATE

Debra Kot and Cecelia Reid, court reporters in the Province of Manitoba, do hereby certify the foregoing pages are a true and correct transcript of our Stenotype notes as taken by us at the time and place hereinbefore stated.

Cecelia Reid

Debra Kot

A				
abide 6397:22	6397:2,2,5 6439:6	6412:25 6426:19	6277:4,5,6	afternoon 6328:1
abiding 6395:23	6448:14 6453:2,5	6441:19 6475:18	6426:18	6454:23,24
ability 6372:24	6456:24,25	6544:12	admissible 6479:6	6504:2 6531:14
6493:24 6523:13	6457:22 6458:21	activity 6365:19	adopt 6376:1	6531:15
6539:15	6467:5 6471:16	6402:6	advance 6332:20	again 6282:3,8,14
able 6286:1 6326:3	6471:23 6472:3,8	actors 6474:15	6347:10 6370:18	6282:20 6285:2
6395:16 6397:21	6473:9 6480:2	actual 6303:6	6513:18	6285:16 6286:24
6413:11 6427:1	6546:4	6391:2 6489:20	advanced 6399:24	6287:15 6313:11
6434:14 6473:11	accidents 6396:23	actually 6281:6	6429:17	6317:12 6320:20
6475:25 6491:17	accomplish 6493:6	6303:15 6307:25	advantage 6527:17	6326:17,24
6516:15 6536:23	accordance 6296:13	6374:16 6400:13	adversarial 6474:14	6327:7 6332:2,4
6536:25 6542:21	6297:7 6355:14	6415:1 6416:2	adversely 6479:9,11	6333:3 6341:6
6546:13	6357:23 6358:21	6447:12 6449:10	advice 6292:13	6349:4 6367:8
above 6370:17	6428:19	6498:20 6537:15	6293:15 6294:16	6375:5 6381:7
6398:16	according 6292:2	ad 6329:13,15	6430:10 6504:21	6388:17,23
Abra 6323:4,10	6339:18 6345:14	6426:20 6507:1,9	6505:3 6512:7	6410:1,8 6425:16
6324:6,12	6348:6 6358:14	6507:14,16	6545:1 6546:8	6433:9 6443:3
abrupt 6284:9	6398:4	6509:24	advise 6290:1	6461:9 6470:15
absence 6327:17	account 6323:15	adamantly 6476:5	6435:1 6487:17	6470:20 6498:1
6440:12 6472:14	6393:10 6396:20	add 6382:14	6495:1 6514:4	6513:19 6525:1
6482:22 6489:13	6409:14 6460:17	6413:23 6427:12	6530:11	6535:3
absent 6415:19	6478:2 6523:1	6497:23	advised 6281:25	against 6314:14
absolute 6493:12	accurate 6353:25	added 6320:10	6314:25 6497:16	6315:20 6324:8
absolutely 6293:14	6430:15 6436:5	6542:1,3 6543:7	6543:5	6361:16 6432:4
6402:4 6407:18	accused 6325:15	addendum 6279:9	advising 6298:24	6516:11 6533:15
6412:15 6480:19	6330:21 6331:5,5	6529:24 6530:10	6320:21 6469:6,9	agents 6428:21
6491:20 6509:6	6345:3 6346:11	addition 6289:22	advisory 6424:1	aggravated 6445:8
6509:13 6510:24	6361:19 6439:2	6325:13 6425:18	6468:22	6457:15 6470:8
6515:12 6517:24	6441:18 6444:4	6427:1,17,25	advocacy 6423:23	aggravating
abstaining 6520:12	6471:7,15	6463:14 6478:12	6429:17,18	6408:15 6409:23
abstention 6446:12	6477:25 6478:5	additional 6364:7	6430:2,24	6471:21 6472:2
accept 6316:4	6483:10 6487:25	6382:8,17	affairs 6484:1	6472:14,23
6334:4 6335:8	6500:20 6517:6	6425:21 6501:22	affect 6365:10	6474:24 6475:8
6356:21 6359:18	6518:1 6521:7	6541:19	6479:9 6488:9	6477:11,15
6462:13,15	6533:17	address 6499:17	affected 6479:11	6478:17,24
6501:5,11 6502:8	achieve 6483:11	addressed 6352:5	6492:12	6479:13,14,23
6525:8	6485:1	6445:23	affecting 6285:12	6480:2,13
acceptable 6444:1	achieved 6411:8	addressing 6380:9	affirmed 6531:11	ago 6410:10
6444:10 6447:18	achieving 6459:11	adequate 6414:23	affronts 6523:18	6436:20 6479:1
6451:1,6 6453:10	acquitted 6376:14	6437:20 6495:11	after 6284:18	6509:8
6455:3 6461:19	across 6411:23	adequately 6502:22	6298:8 6311:16	agonize 6526:22
6462:4,8,13,22	6425:10 6484:7	6504:1 6509:16	6322:17 6327:5	agree 6297:6
6463:4 6471:6	6487:8 6504:25	adhere 6443:7	6330:13 6331:24	6309:14 6320:14
6475:18 6481:8	act 6424:21,22	adjourned 6331:10	6334:2 6341:19	6331:6,22
6499:19	6426:22 6427:10	6454:18 6488:1	6346:25 6352:1	6334:22 6339:16
accepted 6335:17	6432:15,16	6488:19 6548:13	6352:10,10,17	6366:14 6372:5,8
6444:11 6499:23	6439:21 6440:3	6548:14	6353:10 6357:8	6395:21,24
6507:15 6524:17	6441:17,23	adjournment	6373:19 6396:3	6406:4 6415:11
6531:3	6456:20 6457:8	6320:4,13,15,20	6410:13,13	6416:21,23
accepting 6356:23	6457:16 6497:20	6320:22 6321:15	6414:4,8 6440:6	6417:2,7,13
6368:2 6413:18	6503:9 6538:22	6527:21	6441:19 6446:5	6461:20 6462:16
6526:14	6539:23	adjunct 6423:15	6448:14 6450:10	6464:17 6470:3
access 6294:4,13	acted 6425:19	ADM 6289:4	6464:11 6467:12	6471:1,7 6480:15
6539:14	6427:2,5,9,13,19	administration	6470:25 6471:8	6489:23 6492:23
accident 6344:21	6441:25 6442:5	6304:11 6470:1	6497:1 6506:2,13	6498:24 6511:5,9
	6443:20	6471:2,3	6507:5,14,15	6512:25 6515:25
	acting 6293:5	administrative	6517:17 6522:12	6517:22 6518:8

<p>6521:20 6522:23 6526:22 agreed 6310:21 6320:22 6322:9 6334:16,24 6335:1,6 6353:1 6369:22 6370:14 6379:5 6420:21 6489:2 6492:1 6495:18 6496:4 6528:11 agreeing 6352:6 6390:6 6462:2 6530:18,19,20,22 agreement 6288:15 6321:4 6338:4 6339:11 6350:4 6350:12 6444:2 6446:18 6469:18 6476:3,6 6490:2 agreements 6536:4 agrees 6320:13,20 6369:17 6530:17 Ah 6391:22 ahead 6287:9 6305:8 6310:25 6334:11 6335:13 6336:3 6401:13 6402:4 6414:3 6447:14 6452:19 Aikins 6393:22 aimed 6467:2 air 6317:21 6318:5 airplane 6454:7 alcohol 6339:22 6341:15 6351:22 6353:3,13 6354:3 6354:21 6355:5 6355:12 6356:7 6385:9 6397:5,6 6406:24 6407:13 6408:15 6409:23 6446:13 6452:10 6458:23 6470:17 6471:8,16,20 6472:1,15,21,22 6473:15 6474:2 6474:23 6475:23 6476:2,17 6477:10,16 6478:1,16 6480:1 6496:2 6498:11 6498:15 6499:2 6514:18,18 6520:12 alcohol-related 6360:19 6383:22</p>	<p>6386:8 alert 6343:15 6347:10 6478:6 6481:17 alerting 6402:5 allegation 6314:14 6401:7 6439:4 6471:8 allegations 6312:11 6365:5 6400:23 6432:4,9 Allen 6429:22 alleviated 6488:24 allow 6478:16 6481:5 allowable 6403:18 allowed 6433:15 allowing 6417:14 allows 6294:12 alluded 6520:9 almost 6442:19 6450:9 6523:16 Alnie 6277:7 along 6279:8 6327:6 6337:22 6344:14 6347:1 6347:21 6348:9 6348:23 6350:20 6359:9 6379:20 6457:4,12 6460:25 6468:11 6479:18 6530:7 6543:9 already 6280:13,14 6280:21 6320:10 6320:10 6324:2 6354:2,7 6391:8 6404:8 6451:18 6540:11 altered 6540:25 alternatively 6479:10 although 6437:8 6484:5 6488:24 6490:3 6511:4 6521:18 always 6305:5 6335:25 6336:1 6338:1,2 6339:5 6351:8,9 6397:10 6399:6 6413:5,7,7 6472:1 6474:18 6480:12 6511:2 6517:12 6537:6 6547:23 ambulance 6374:24 6478:4</p>	<p>amended 6294:1 amendment 6522:10,11 American 6422:17 among 6298:3 amongst 6481:2 6485:3 6503:24 amount 6426:23 6438:21,24 6479:8 6503:11 6537:20 analysis 6471:11 6473:10 6496:10 6515:3,10 6519:4 6523:15 6524:1 analyzed 6472:11 6496:3,7 analyzing 6456:21 Anderson 6283:6 6285:2 and/or 6289:3 6434:16 6468:13 6481:9 anecdotal 6340:4 6340:17 6351:16 6496:1,18,20 6503:7 anecdote 6496:21 annual 6536:7,10 6536:13 6538:24 another 6287:22 6300:19,19 6301:8 6305:10 6312:10 6320:9 6349:3 6353:19 6357:14 6358:6 6361:3 6367:10 6388:15 6420:14 6442:2 6443:21 6454:9 6486:15 6514:12 6527:15 6534:8,15,17 6535:22 6538:17 6539:2 answer 6355:14 6381:23 6382:3 6407:15,20,20,24 6408:1,4,6,10 6462:7,24 6508:22 6509:19 6510:12 6514:22 6515:1 6516:16 6519:2 6527:3 6536:19 6542:10 6545:17 answers 6510:16 anticipate 6354:10</p>	<p>6415:12 6454:7 anybody 6301:24 6328:20 6358:20 6509:11 anyone 6319:1 6328:25 6457:1 6539:6 anything 6282:11 6283:21 6284:19 6318:19 6333:22 6337:8 6343:9 6346:21 6351:5 6365:12 6382:14 6403:12,15,23 6404:2 6409:4 6413:22 6459:7 6469:8 6502:9 6517:14 6518:4 anyways 6374:17 anywhere 6349:17 apart 6281:4 6283:24 6284:2 6365:20 apologize 6441:4 apparent 6282:22 6283:4,10 6440:7 6482:4 6499:4 6532:15 apparently 6438:1 6494:21 appeal 6406:2 6412:1 6413:13 6426:3,7 6427:16 6458:10 6470:15 6470:16,19 6472:12,20,25 6473:24 6477:14 6477:23 6478:8 6478:21,25 6479:2,4 6482:3 6482:17 6485:5 appealed 6516:16 appear 6287:16 6308:10 6341:2 6379:5,6 6444:3 6444:12 6445:4 6445:19 6470:7 6472:3 6520:7 6521:17 6530:13 appearance 6327:21 6404:22 6410:14 6415:13 6433:20 6503:3 appearances 6277:9 6404:16 6406:18 6406:19 6415:10 6428:1</p>	<p>appearing 6286:24 appears 6281:23 6288:5 6315:11 6376:23 6528:17 appellate 6425:12 6426:23 6427:20 6427:21 applicable 6435:10 6463:11 applied 6369:13,14 6406:1 applies 6492:15 apply 6294:22 6370:11 6492:14 6510:22 appoint 6532:11 6533:11 6537:11 6545:3 appointed 6323:4 6423:7 6426:21 6506:3,19 6512:13,16,20 6544:4 6546:12 appointing 6291:16 6469:12 appointment 6307:13,16 6512:18 6532:16 6533:1 6534:6,9 6534:17 6538:10 6544:25 6546:1 6546:15 6547:13 appointments 6293:3 6422:21 6534:2 appreciate 6480:14 6494:6 6510:13 6514:6 6548:9 apprised 6289:23 approach 6325:11 6334:22 6349:5 6483:16 6487:14 approached 6462:9 appropriate 6330:16 6351:11 6372:4 6403:17 6412:3 6443:25 6446:16 6451:15 6452:4 6454:4 6482:10 6522:13 6522:19 6524:15 6544:21 appropriately 6533:11 appropriateness 6453:21 6463:25 6477:7 6526:18</p>
--	--	--	--	---

approval 6459:14 6459:20,22 6468:19,24 6479:3 6506:11 approved 6468:8 6506:13 approver 6468:23 approximately 6427:14,17 6429:5 April 6311:13,18 6313:8,9,11 6467:5 apt 6448:23 area 6282:20 6336:5 6386:16 6421:25 6426:11 6426:17 6429:15 6429:15 6430:5 6430:18 6431:1 6461:7 6465:12 6465:20 6503:6 6509:10,11 6519:22 6521:1,3 6523:17 areas 6406:21 6420:24 6421:2 6424:12,20 6426:19 6435:24 6437:10 6439:12 6439:17 6440:22 6441:14 6442:22 6448:18 6450:5 6458:13 6502:21 6505:11 6508:19 arena 6312:20 arguable 6523:23 argue 6373:10 6468:3 6490:25 argued 6370:25 6425:20 6426:3 arguing 6426:6 argument 6401:14 6450:17 6480:17 6480:20 6512:9 arise 6319:24 6371:16 6428:12 6442:11 6468:2 arisen 6354:19 6546:22 arises 6442:9 arising 6354:10 armed 6365:2,5 arose 6314:24 6354:13 6356:18 around 6312:1 6342:24 6379:10	6464:6 6495:23 arraigned 6487:25 arrange 6321:15 arranged 6308:9 6338:11,12 arrangement 6327:11,24 6328:3,12 6347:22 6357:9 6367:21 6369:6 6461:22 arresting 6450:12 arrived 6396:20 6481:12,18 art 6457:20 6515:24 articles 6424:5,9 6431:9 articling 6421:23 articulated 6484:6 ascertain 6297:25 asked 6281:1 6283:8 6285:5 6300:3 6303:11 6313:3 6326:20 6351:21 6355:16 6394:16,19,25 6403:4 6404:4 6406:18 6407:12 6408:17 6510:17 6514:16,19 6516:24 6519:3 6519:23 6521:22 6521:25 6526:5 6537:5 asking 6305:15 6316:1 6328:8 6348:4 6354:20 6354:25 6408:13 6420:23 6431:20 6488:14 6521:5 6522:18 6537:7,9 6546:20 Askov 6320:5 asks 6355:11 6380:4 6381:22 6516:6 aspect 6281:25 6282:9 aspects 6428:17 assertion 6416:25 6439:7,25 6501:6 assess 6456:1 6457:25 6513:24 assessed 6344:11 assessing 6483:14 assessment 6310:3 6310:18 6317:23	6323:15 6340:10 6376:6 6434:15 6438:2 6439:1 6461:13,14 6516:13 6522:13 assign 6535:12 assigned 6468:16 6505:7 assignment 6378:11 6507:16 assist 6458:16 6536:12,17 assistance 6372:17 6420:22 6534:14 assistant 6277:6 6292:6 6307:18 6316:8 6370:17 6432:20,24 6434:5,7 6531:25 6532:10 assisted 6536:13 assisting 6280:24 6527:13 Assoc 6277:17 Associate 6277:3 associates 6508:18 Association 6422:16 assume 6311:25 6314:9 6325:11 6344:3 6358:18 6401:15 6486:16 6494:18 assumed 6458:25 6459:4 assuming 6298:13 6300:1 6314:3 6322:18 6337:3 6458:24 6507:22 6508:6 assumption 6401:21 6494:24 as-needed 6318:23 atmosphere 6394:9 6490:19 6491:7 6491:15 6503:14 attached 6279:6 6287:23 6520:11 6529:5 6530:19 attachment 6520:11 attack 6417:21 attempt 6389:17,18 6475:3 6476:2 6495:5 6497:9 attempting 6318:1 6536:11 attendant 6478:5	attended 6452:8,21 attending 6438:1 6449:19 6527:12 attends 6440:8 attention 6364:8 6386:24 6389:17 6390:12 6398:8 6421:9 6437:14 6441:8 6457:10 6471:5 6490:7 6545:15 attorney 6292:17 6292:18 6294:21 6299:22 6300:20 6303:10 6304:23 6304:24 6309:16 6370:15,18 6371:25 6373:9 6383:15 6392:19 6428:21 6432:6 6432:18,20,24 6433:2,6 6434:6,7 6468:2 6531:25 6532:10,10 6533:19 6534:7 6534:15 Attorneys 6296:22 attributable 6503:1 attribute 6456:25 attributed 6320:8 audience 6515:15 6536:18 August 6287:22 6288:4 6341:6 6350:8 6352:2,10 6352:11,12 6386:25 6387:5,7 6387:21 6388:6 6388:12,17,23 6390:13 6406:19 6408:18 6410:14 6415:15 6416:1 6482:14 6483:20 6484:21 6489:12 6490:8 6494:14 6502:24 authorities 6463:5 6463:7 6525:21 authority 6293:20 6295:2 6359:12 6373:12,14 6435:5,9 6468:4 6482:2 6532:11 authorized 6363:16 availability 6372:21 6372:23 available 6374:23	6405:17,20 6411:3 6416:15 6448:11 6451:23 6462:10 6474:25 6502:7 6537:6 average 6493:7 6537:20 avoid 6389:18 avoided 6433:21 aware 6280:22 6290:19 6292:25 6296:20 6308:16 6345:2,6 6346:2 6358:4 6359:12 6374:15 6389:4 6406:10 6410:21 6420:20,21 6475:22 6486:5 6499:1,3,7 6520:3 6544:6,7 away 6304:25 6321:2 6336:14 6374:16,19,20 6403:23 6404:2 6415:21 6417:17 6523:13 a.m 6280:2 6380:23 6548:13
B				
B 6277:12,13 6419:23 6441:21 6547:3 back 6280:15 6283:17 6288:6 6312:2 6328:16 6331:2 6349:22 6351:8 6356:25 6357:4,5 6360:16 6374:11 6407:19 6409:15 6410:3,7 6415:9,20 6432:2 6453:7 6464:6 6494:8 6497:2 6498:7 6499:14 6517:25 6521:7 6534:19 6535:8 6547:24 background 6316:16,19 6340:6 6344:19 6431:6 6521:15 bad 6347:3 bail 6520:19 6545:5 Bakema 6277:14 6308:16 6314:15 6315:20 6321:19				

6323:5 6324:8 6365:16 6390:21 Bakema/Woychuk 6362:9 balance 6306:20 6361:20 6417:19 6417:22,24 6485:23 bald 6416:25 ball 6504:22 bang 6310:17,20 bar 6301:3 6336:16 6336:18,20 6430:14,15 6434:13 6442:4 6443:5,5,7 6447:11 6467:6 6474:16 6483:18 6488:17 6521:12 bargain 6325:24 6328:11 6334:4,5 6341:25 6346:5 6349:10 6367:22 6368:2 6369:2,5,8 6369:10,13 6385:11,24 6386:3 6403:5 6413:4 6461:22 6469:18 6481:12 6481:19 6482:6,9 6482:16 6483:2 6483:10,15,22 6484:3,13,23 6485:11,13,18,19 6485:21 6486:3,4 6486:10,16 6487:20 6489:14 6490:6,7 6494:10 6494:19 6526:14 bargained 6404:2 bargaining 6403:23 Barristers 6422:19 base 6347:8 6358:25 based 6308:22 6310:4,7 6311:11 6329:24 6346:1 6347:20 6349:10 6376:13 6403:25 6409:3 6411:13 6412:6 6436:1 6448:11 6455:22 6462:9 6473:20 6475:16 6476:13 6498:17 6542:5 6542:21 basic 6504:16	basically 6301:18 6312:9 6326:11 6350:19 6381:25 6538:21 6545:11 6545:17 basis 6293:2 6296:24,25 6306:10,11 6318:23 6336:10 6337:18 6338:14 6338:21 6359:8 6361:25 6368:1 6392:21 6408:25 6409:6,17,18 6435:21 6436:21 6488:5 6502:22 6538:23 bear 6298:1 6416:7 bearing 6390:1 Beaudry 6324:13 became 6284:17 6432:12 6483:23 6545:20 become 6448:20 6528:25 6546:9 becomes 6433:5 6457:19,24 6473:9 6479:22 becoming 6280:23 bed 6324:2 6486:9 beer 6473:4 6479:17,22 beforehand 6283:19 6330:18 6331:14,15 6332:1 6379:9 6407:23 begin 6325:20 6534:6 beginning 6280:22 6404:9 6410:8 6422:3 behalf 6294:21 6303:16 6413:1 6426:20 6427:3 6427:20 6527:11 6529:16 beings 6512:6 belief 6523:7 beliefs 6384:23 believable 6363:8 believe 6281:21 6285:3 6293:9 6298:9 6300:10 6300:13 6303:3 6303:16 6319:4 6326:22 6327:25	6329:9 6334:3 6351:1 6363:1,19 6366:6 6398:10 6400:6 6404:4,24 6409:13 6411:12 6412:3 6416:7 6434:4,9 6494:25 6506:9 6519:5 6520:2,8,11 6526:5 6542:3 6543:11 6546:17 6546:19,20 believed 6365:24 6385:1 6388:1 believing 6417:6 below 6372:11 bench 6335:3 6449:3 6478:8 bencher 6423:4 6429:3,4,5,13 benefit 6334:16 6419:10 6435:16 6435:17 6473:10 6496:10 6515:2 6515:10 6519:4 6519:17 benefits 6515:19 bereavement 6493:14 bereaving 6512:2 bereft 6439:8 Bergmann 6277:6 Berra 6381:6 6382:21 6414:1 best 6304:5 6330:10 6377:17 6413:11 6417:23 6440:22 6451:25 6500:16 6537:9,17 6539:9 better 6290:14 6296:20 6305:12 6309:22 6334:14 6334:22 6336:22 6340:12 6350:14 6417:15 6465:5 6513:4 between 6298:24 6300:17 6314:19 6316:7 6339:2 6349:9 6352:11 6354:14 6383:7 6385:18 6394:9 6394:11 6408:22 6409:3 6417:19 6417:22 6434:7 6443:22 6453:17 6453:19 6455:18	6456:19 6475:21 6491:18 6500:12 6520:18,21 Bev 6322:2,3,9,19 beyond 6361:3 6362:3 6368:17 6383:8,22 6384:8 6385:15,19,25 6386:2 6464:3 6475:1,10 6501:14 bias 6433:21 Bill 6541:13,17 6542:16,18,20,24 6543:7,13 binders 6300:7 6436:12,12 6546:23 binding 6292:14 6293:17 6294:17 6295:2 6358:16 bit 6280:14 6325:23 6351:13 6352:4 6357:2 6494:3,4 6504:16 6505:15 6509:10 6512:11 Black 6282:25 blank 6291:25 6403:4 blood 6450:2 6500:2,9,18,21,24 blurs 6505:4 bodily 6456:7 6467:11,15 6470:11 book 6463:13 6540:12 6542:13 both 6287:23 6297:7 6324:12 6344:12 6347:25 6348:8 6350:14 6368:20 6369:10 6375:11 6396:8 6410:16 6425:22 6426:6 6427:20 6430:14 6432:6 6450:24 6455:21 6470:24 6491:22 6511:4 6525:21 bottom 6291:25 6292:1,7 6295:1 6301:2 6387:8,11 6387:14 6388:18 6391:11 6392:6 6407:5 6445:24 6533:4 bound 6348:5	6355:6,9 6359:9 6364:22 6375:21 6541:10 boutique 6302:6 Bowler 6406:3 Bowley 6277:13 boxing 6425:3 Boyd 6277:17 branch 6432:24 6433:3,8 6434:17 6539:2 6541:24 Branigan's 6281:25 Braun 6277:5 break 6354:13 6355:17 6377:16 6401:17 6447:10 6454:4,15 6455:2 6504:5 breath 6444:6 6450:2 6501:1 breathalyzer 6365:18 6375:12 6375:21 6398:21 6398:23 6399:1 6405:19 6416:18 6500:2,8 6501:20 6501:21,24 Brian 6278:16 6279:3 6288:16 6288:18 6289:3 6297:3 6298:4 6303:9 6373:21 6419:25 6420:5 6437:4 6531:10 brief 6344:22,23,25 6374:22 6417:15 6438:18 6511:14 6511:22 6544:19 briefing 6373:25 6381:19 briefly 6393:9 6414:13 6416:4 6421:20 6453:18 bring 6322:14 6343:17 6421:19 6440:15 6441:2,7 6470:1 6471:2 6537:5 6545:15 bringing 6286:14 6398:8 brings 6320:4 6471:2 6495:21 British 6421:13 6422:13,16 6423:5,16,22 6424:1 6426:3,23 6427:7 6428:4
---	---	--	--	---

6429:18,24 6432:3 6434:17 6444:17 6446:10 6448:25 6449:11 6449:14 6459:15 6459:19 6465:5,7 6472:24 6478:14 6478:21 6506:8 broader 6463:17 broke 6401:9 broken 6419:13 brought 6319:13 6322:20 6324:16 6378:1 6386:24 6390:12 6429:9 6489:5 6507:5,13 Brunswick 6506:9 buck 6505:16 bullet 6371:21 6373:8 bunch 6380:4 bundle 6507:17 bureaucracy 6433:25 business 6348:16 6442:21 6512:16 busy 6510:8 buy 6501:15 B.C 6422:15 6423:19 6424:24 6426:6 6427:8 6479:2 6520:3 6521:19	6498:10 6507:9 6512:17 6513:2 6519:17 6542:11 6547:21 called 6288:23 6297:12 6307:23 6311:17 6323:10 6352:10 6354:15 6384:11 6394:15 6400:4 6415:20 6428:3 6442:13 6442:17 6443:6 6470:9,13 6472:12 6498:25 6506:11 6536:24 6537:14 6539:1 6544:16,24 calling 6354:15,21 6355:12 6406:23 6407:13 6409:19 6498:21 6514:17 6527:15 6531:6,7 calls 6298:19 6299:7 6322:1 6430:17 came 6303:14 6312:13 6325:23 6333:2,7 6334:2 6348:8 6351:14 6351:20 6353:20 6394:18 6411:23 6436:11 6444:18 6452:1 6467:12 6522:12 6524:8 6533:21 6544:8 6547:4 Canada 6405:24,25 6423:10,23 6425:15,20 6426:7 6427:14 6427:21 6474:1 6476:23 6480:5 6504:25 Canadian 6423:13 6506:8 cancelled 6322:21 candidate 6398:1 canvass 6322:16 6503:24 canvassed 6282:20 6285:3 6377:14 6530:13 capable 6405:8,12 6416:10 6497:22 car 6445:9 card 6512:17 care 6457:10	6462:12 career 6296:21,22 6449:13 careers 6491:11 careful 6319:17 6535:25 carefully 6350:7 6408:12 careless 6457:9,9,16 carriage 6468:16 6547:10 carried 6331:20 carries 6460:2,4 carry 6434:14 6453:3 6512:21 carrying 6447:14 cars 6460:25 Carter 6311:14,17 6311:19 6312:5 6313:3,14 6314:4 6317:12 6322:1 6364:8 6380:13 6450:12 6544:13 6544:15,16 case-by-case 6296:25 cast 6459:21 6491:12 categorized 6458:12 category 6461:6 6534:11 6535:17 caught 6538:18 cause 6411:21 6444:23 6445:5 6472:7 6501:10 6516:21 6517:8 6524:12,14 6526:8 caused 6389:20 6453:5 6496:25 causing 6309:4,6 6325:25 6329:16 6330:4 6344:13 6360:20,21 6386:7 6396:11 6396:11 6398:5 6411:19,20 6439:9 6444:4,5,6 6451:8,12 6453:12,19 6455:14,19 6456:4,7,8 6457:18 6458:19 6459:12,18 6460:2,4,11 6461:23,24	6462:1,11,19 6464:1 6465:13 6465:16 6466:8 6470:10,11,16,20 6518:2 6525:7,10 cavalierly 6351:5 caveat 6294:16 6382:21 CD 6479:20 Cecelia 6277:20 6549:6,15 cent 6511:9 centre 6276:13 6397:10 certain 6365:25 6369:3 6390:22 6404:12 6429:12 6433:9 6437:10 6438:11,14 6446:9 6453:16 6465:4 6467:3 6472:10 6480:11 6501:3,8 6502:8 6505:10 6521:1,3 6523:8,13 6545:2 6545:14 certainly 6280:12 6281:14 6295:12 6296:16 6328:15 6345:2 6347:7 6349:18 6363:6 6373:17 6411:12 6411:16 6430:16 6430:20 6446:10 6448:20 6455:15 6459:15,19 6463:24 6468:17 6480:16,17 6484:7 6498:4 6511:19 6535:16 6537:4,4 6543:12 6545:16 certainty 6411:12 6489:6 CERTIFICATE 6549:2 certify 6549:7 cetera 6420:13 6424:21 6428:7 6428:24 6466:1 6499:2 6545:5,6 chairperson 6423:21 challenge 6340:24 6341:3,4 6405:17 6416:15 6448:17 6517:10	challenged 6496:15 6496:16 6497:1 challenges 6448:18 chambers 6340:15 6340:18 6341:3 6342:9,25 champion 6425:3 chance 6327:6 6376:13 chances 6516:6 change 6284:9 6325:7 6363:24 6364:1 6436:25 6450:15 6452:17 6452:19 6466:24 6501:25 6514:5 6542:9 changed 6540:7 changes 6469:2 chap 6516:5 charged 6295:24 6325:7 6519:24 6521:7 6523:8 charging 6458:18 Charko 6322:2,3,9 6322:19,21,24 charter 6361:15,18 6368:9 6448:18 6523:19 chase 6445:9 check 6379:19 6380:4 checked 6394:21 6545:7 checks 6380:5,5 chicken 6513:6 chief 6277:4 6285:5 6317:24 6322:1 6390:21 6429:22 6432:18 6463:6 6464:14 6483:18 6484:2,18 6489:19 6502:24 6544:13,14,16 choose 6325:19 6412:8 6534:25 chosen 6434:4 chronologically 6292:2 circulated 6300:14 circumstance 6397:7 6445:13 6446:7,9 circumstances 6349:11 6359:15 6368:3 6371:10 6371:13 6396:19
C C 6292:11 6419:17 6444:7 calendar 6327:17 6327:18 call 6297:11,18 6298:4,21 6299:20 6300:1,2 6300:9,12 6307:20 6308:2,6 6308:7 6312:24 6320:21 6321:11 6322:2,2,17,23,24 6326:12 6328:4 6340:3 6341:25 6353:2 6354:3,6 6355:5 6356:6,16 6361:18 6362:9 6372:16 6379:21 6395:12 6408:14 6415:2 6433:13 6455:24 6457:9 6497:3,17				

6397:1,4,9,12 6404:12 6411:2 6444:21,24 6445:2,8 6448:10 6456:10,14 6464:2 6467:14 6467:22,25 6469:9 6475:12 6479:23 6485:21 6487:2 6493:11 6501:7,18 6520:5 6520:6 6521:14 6544:22 6545:2 circumstantial 6330:14 cite 6442:11 6478:25 6482:6 6522:10 6524:8 cited 6398:3 6484:3 city 6397:15 6479:18 civil 6296:21 6422:1 6430:15 6433:25 6443:5 civilian 6282:4 6513:1,9,16 civilians 6452:13 claim 6471:1 claimed 6440:3 claims 6439:13 clarify 6465:20 6495:5 6506:7 6530:25 6533:8 clarity 6489:6 6492:4 6494:9 6495:21 class 6442:9 classes 6467:3 classify 6537:10 cleanse 6450:19 clear 6285:23 6353:7 6354:14 6363:15 6373:11 6373:14,14 6386:22,23 6388:9 6462:11 6465:23 6466:1 6468:4 6481:11 6482:1,12 6483:19 6484:20 6515:13 6516:22 6516:25 6528:5 clearer 6349:14 6482:8 clearly 6299:15 6329:2 6350:10 6354:17,24	6367:12 6382:17 6435:23 6446:19 6459:4,18 6461:10 6462:18 6463:24 6482:7 6483:5 6484:1 6494:20 6525:24 Clearwater 6277:16 6406:3 clerical 6500:6 6501:2,6,9,11,17 clerk 6277:7 6280:3 6380:20,24 6391:8 6420:1 6449:18 6454:17 6454:21 6504:6 6504:10 6527:22 6528:1 6529:22 6530:5 6548:12 client 6289:1 6326:13,19 6327:6,13 6330:16 6344:8 6367:22 clients 6413:1,7 6492:18,21,25 Clifford 6277:3 6278:12 6418:11 6418:21,24 6420:6 6421:7 6425:11 6431:5 6431:11,18 6441:4,6 6447:2,6 6447:15,16 6449:22 6454:23 6455:1 6477:2 6484:15 6489:9 6503:19,23 6514:19 6516:24 6519:13,24 6521:23 6527:9 close 6301:3 6327:3 6330:8 6336:17 6447:11 6501:21 closely 6354:17 6442:16 closes 6447:11 Code 6444:23 6445:22 6446:2 6449:10 6450:6 6455:21 6457:13 6467:4 6522:10 coffee 6447:11 cogent 6439:8 6519:6 cognizant 6490:13 collaterally 6420:9	colleague 6292:6 6386:18 6516:9 6516:10 colleagues 6419:11 collecting 6300:15 Colleen 6289:25 6373:22 College 6422:18 6529:15 collision 6376:20 6389:19 coloured 6323:24 Columbia 6421:13 6422:13,17 6423:5,16,22 6424:2 6426:3,23 6427:7 6428:5 6429:19,24 6432:3 6434:17 6444:18 6446:11 6448:25 6449:12 6449:14 6459:15 6459:20 6465:5,7 6472:24 6478:14 6478:22 6506:8 come 6290:24 6338:3 6355:20 6358:2 6365:1 6378:6,10 6407:19 6459:10 6463:16 6476:7 6487:24 6519:15 6523:3 6534:19 6536:21 6537:22 6538:15,24 6543:9 6547:22 comes 6294:18 6364:8 6385:5 6433:22 6486:17 6488:7 6497:2 6506:16 6513:12 6534:25 comfortable 6546:11 coming 6400:20 6430:17 6441:3 6448:12 6463:18 6469:4 6508:25 6543:4 6545:13 Commandments 6430:24 commences 6471:12 6481:22 COMMENCING 6280:2 comment 6285:4 6341:12 6348:3	6407:10 6427:1 6429:1 6431:20 6437:19,22 6438:20 6443:18 6464:8 6466:3 6469:23 6489:19 6492:7 commented 6428:22 comments 6286:4 6382:8 6414:1 6466:25 6484:9 6484:10,13 6491:13,21 6516:1 6542:5 Commission 6276:13 6277:1,2 6277:3,7 6279:5 6280:4 6303:20 6380:20,25 6402:15,20 6420:22 6421:20 6426:14 6428:16 6432:10 6437:6 6441:11 6447:8 6452:10 6454:17 6454:21 6465:24 6491:25 6499:10 6499:25 6502:16 6504:6,11 6527:11,22 6528:2,11 6529:3 6529:16 6530:12 6530:15 6548:12 Commission's 6542:13 committed 6489:17 6490:4 6523:21 committee 6423:2 6423:14,22 6424:1 common 6300:16 6325:9 6444:16 6444:20 6449:14 6480:6 6513:7,8 6544:23 communicate 6291:7 6367:4 6493:21 6510:3 6510:19,20 6512:5,22 communicated 6331:14 6346:22 communicating 6367:3 6371:5 6492:5 communication	6298:24 6492:8 6492:24 6493:23 6494:21 communicators 6493:25 community 6396:6 6397:20 6403:11 company 6421:24 6422:4,8 comparatively 6460:7 comparison 6398:18 compass 6438:18 compendium 6464:9 complete 6425:17 completed 6288:13 6315:22 6421:12 completely 6401:8 6434:14 6453:7 6486:7 complexity 6537:24 compliance 6405:22 complicated 6334:21 6336:23 complied 6358:10 6358:14 component 6429:20 6430:1,3 6463:12 comprehensive 6464:10,13 comprehensively 6499:14 concede 6354:1 concept 6431:22 6445:17 conceptually 6329:15,20 concern 6282:4,15 6282:17 6312:19 6352:13 6386:4 6387:16 6414:22 6414:23 6488:10 6488:11 6539:6,9 concerned 6394:8 6403:23 6467:15 6485:20 6486:6 concerning 6293:2 6365:16 6404:6 concerns 6290:6 6291:4 concision 6495:21 conclude 6459:17 6489:14,15 concluded 6464:12 6475:17 6477:24
--	--	---	---	--

<p>concludes 6468:5 conclusion 6308:11 6417:10,24 6440:14 6451:14 6455:17 6459:10 6462:10 6464:23 6469:5,11 6472:18 6473:7 6473:14 6476:15 6481:25 6495:22 6497:4 6498:9 6502:13,14,19,20 6502:25 6519:16 6528:13 conclusions 6483:1 6499:13 concur 6437:9 concurrence 6528:21 concussion 6386:22 6387:18 6389:25 condition 6438:2 6439:2 6446:12 6446:16 6453:6 6491:5 6520:12 6520:18,19,19,22 6541:5 conditional 6308:25 6309:8 6310:1 6311:10 6329:17 6345:10 6346:10 6358:7 6368:24 6369:20,23 6370:16 6371:7 6371:12 6372:1,3 6373:10 6374:1 6396:15 6397:11 6398:2 6403:19 6412:2 6420:19 6436:17 6462:3 6462:21 6463:3 6464:1 6465:8 6466:20 6467:10 6467:14,23 6468:3,10 6469:5 6469:25 6470:12 6470:18,21,24 6477:6 6523:9,14 6523:23 6525:25 conditionally 6310:15 conditions 6310:15 6329:19 6345:10 6397:22 6444:3 6444:25 6445:19 6445:21 6446:3,5 6520:10,25</p>	<p>6521:6,17 6540:20 6544:20 conduct 6435:25 6455:22,25 6456:1,11,12,20 6457:5,6,14,15,21 6458:5,11 6459:2 6459:3 6470:5 6490:9 6503:11 6511:21 6520:22 conducted 6384:24 6411:6 6428:19 6463:14 conference 6293:8 6370:10,14 6372:16,21 6373:5 6424:24 6467:17 6468:9 6468:12 conferences 6380:3 6424:21,25 confidentiality 6392:23 confined 6445:17 confirm 6284:10 6322:15 6387:1 6388:15 6389:24 6435:20 6460:13 6463:10 6478:11 confirmed 6280:21 confirming 6289:20 6326:13 conflict 6433:20,21 6441:15,21 6442:8,10,22,25 6443:3,10,23 6545:14 6547:24 conflicts 6537:25 confusion 6349:23 6398:12 connect 6480:3 connected 6533:16 6539:13,18 connection 6398:20 6521:4 6546:15 cons 6411:8 consensus 6348:9 consent 6445:2 6446:1 6528:5 6529:19 consenting 6530:14 consequence 6382:18 6459:25 consider 6326:21 6327:7 6328:9 6364:19,20,21 6397:13,25</p>	<p>6474:18 6478:17 6479:13 6500:3 consideration 6369:19 6436:14 6442:7 6460:15 6461:4 6466:12 6473:23 6477:10 6486:8 6529:11 considered 6411:7 6436:6 6437:4 6445:19 6468:8 6471:21 6472:2 6472:23 6474:23 6477:17,19,22 6478:24 consist 6430:3 consistent 6447:22 6451:2,10 6453:13 6462:5,8 6469:19 6499:20 6499:22 6501:19 6520:4 6527:1 consists 6426:16 consonant 6470:4 6522:7 Constable 6395:1 6395:20 6439:18 6439:25 6502:9 constrained 6390:22 constraint 6391:1 consult 6372:25 6379:8,11,12 6435:2 consultation 6328:19 6434:7 6446:5 6541:23 consulted 6357:14 6505:3 consumed 6452:10 6471:8,15 6472:1 6472:15 6473:4 6477:25 consumes 6479:17 consumption 6339:21 6341:14 6351:22 6353:3 6354:4 6355:6,13 6356:7 6406:24 6408:14 6409:22 6458:23 6471:20 6472:7,22 6473:15 6474:23 6475:23 6476:2 6476:17 6477:10 6478:16,23,23 6479:22 6480:1</p>	<p>6480:12 6496:2 6498:11,22 6499:1 6514:18 6519:10,10 contact 6284:4,5,13 6289:25 6290:4 6291:2 6297:3,23 6302:14 6305:14 6306:9,16,18,18 6397:19 6544:18 contacted 6283:14 6298:14 6306:24 6311:19 6321:3 6379:12 6384:12 6399:25 6544:13 6545:25 contacting 6322:6 contacts 6298:1 6306:12 contained 6514:2 6540:20 containing 6324:12 contains 6419:14,20 6434:10 contemporaneous 6440:5,12 6500:16 contemporaneously 6440:9 contentious 6535:23 contents 6530:20 6531:2,3 contest 6500:12 6531:2 contests 6475:6 context 6298:1 6306:24 6369:9 6372:11 6374:8 6396:2 6410:4 6451:21 6481:16 6491:8 6496:3,12 6515:6,7 6519:5 6519:12 6526:20 contingencies 6517:12 continue 6447:4 continued 6278:4 6340:14 continues 6362:20 continuing 6365:11 continuity 6453:25 continuum 6456:22 6456:23 6457:4 6457:12,18,23 6458:1 6461:12 contradict 6451:24</p>	<p>contradicted 6389:4 contradiction 6283:5,10 contradictions 6282:22 6499:8 contrary 6281:15 6373:12 6468:5 6480:18,21 convention 6276:13 6465:14 conversation 6281:24 6299:11 6300:6 6346:2 6354:5 6400:4 6402:9 6547:5,7 conversations 6283:16 6338:10 6356:8 convicted 6325:16 6523:8 convicting 6458:19 conviction 6360:12 6360:18,24 6361:1,6,21,25 6362:4,12,14,21 6363:2,18,20,25 6365:11 6366:2 6368:13 6372:2 6375:24 6383:8 6383:17,20 6384:1 6385:19 6386:6 6389:14 6396:13 6405:15 6411:9,10,12 6416:13 6417:1 6448:22 6459:12 6459:16,22,24 6461:16 6466:7 6517:2 6526:7,9 CON:1 6436:16 cooperation 6510:10 coordinator 6322:5 copies 6529:22 copy 6292:23 6303:9 6374:17 6382:4,10,11,14 6392:6 6541:14 6543:1,6 cordial 6343:5 core 6448:4 Corporation 6304:17 corrected 6291:21 6321:6 6546:22 correctly 6398:13</p>
---	---	--	---	--

6485:25 6511:14 6543:8 correctness 6523:16 correspondence 6279:5 6319:4 6320:2 6419:23 6419:24 6421:6 6428:15 6461:21 6495:11 6529:2 cost 6473:10 6496:10 6515:2 6515:10 6519:4 Council 6423:14 counsel's 6402:16 6475:3,14 6478:4 6524:22 count 6301:18 counter 6451:24 country 6465:1 counts 6440:18 6470:9,10 6488:18 couple 6321:1 6358:2 6377:13 6380:16 6445:14 6484:16 6514:15 6515:22 coupled 6438:25 course 6283:21 6326:4 6346:17 6372:17 6397:5 6408:20 6415:9 6429:17,18,21,25 6430:1,2 6438:7,7 6438:12 6439:3 6440:1 6449:12 6469:21 6482:11 6483:23 6487:22 6491:11,22 6492:22 6496:20 6499:17 6508:15 6511:21 6513:14 6523:12 6532:4 6543:17 courtroom 6341:5 6356:19 6377:20 6431:4 6491:3 6503:14 6513:17 courtrooms 6490:19 courts 6309:7 6378:13,14 6460:7 6470:22 6471:24 6480:10 6481:2 cover 6283:3 6303:14 6502:12	covered 6280:13 6413:24 6426:10 6428:8 covering 6280:13 co-accused 6441:25 co-chair 6423:9 co-counsel 6286:24 6518:25 craft 6320:1 created 6429:22 6430:13 6434:6 creation 6433:15 credibility 6363:6 6368:8 6395:23 6512:25 credible 6366:17 crim 6401:18 6453:19 6456:20 crimes 6492:13 Criminals 6439:20 6440:2 criteria 6362:22 6397:21 critical 6306:23,23 6410:17,22 6483:19 6484:19 6484:19 criticism 6410:25 6412:10,12 criticizing 6339:12 crossed 6350:6 Crowns 6539:16,21 6539:23 6544:1 6544:24,24 Crown's 6314:5 6420:25 6428:4 6428:18 6451:21 6482:22 crucible 6490:22 current 6422:21 6519:20 Curriculum 6421:9 6424:7,8,14 6425:14 6430:20 cut 6477:19 CV 6279:8 6426:1 6529:23 6530:6 <hr/> D D 6293:24 6419:13 6435:17 6447:17 6499:18 daily 6410:16 dangerousness 6456:13 date 6298:9,16 6311:16 6322:9	6322:11,11 6326:16 6335:19 6353:4 6370:19 6373:17 6388:15 6421:21 6488:7 6547:20 dated 6279:2,3,9 6287:21,22 6379:18 6419:21 6420:2,4 6467:4 6528:23 6530:10 6533:2 dates 6281:22 6290:2 6322:16 6322:19,22 6352:12 daughter 6295:14 David 6277:2 day 6288:23 6310:12,13,16 6322:1 6323:18 6332:21 6333:8 6333:16,21 6345:5 6347:4 6350:24 6351:3 6363:4,8 6367:6 6368:17 6378:12 6403:10,20 6413:12 6415:17 6424:25 6476:23 6508:1 6510:14 6516:13 6544:12 6545:8,25 days 6284:7 6286:18 6327:16 6327:17 6336:12 6352:18 6414:4,8 6425:5 6441:5 6446:10 6547:13 6547:15 day-to-day 6293:2 6296:24 de 6523:17 deal 6296:23,24 6319:8 6323:16 6326:12 6329:3 6346:24 6347:14 6347:15 6357:6 6357:17,21,22 6358:11 6369:24 6376:25 6380:9 6414:3,12 6415:6 6428:10 6439:24 6441:11 6476:8 6484:3 6485:14 6486:23 6492:11 6492:15 6493:5	6493:21 6497:23 6520:25 dealing 6309:4 6420:24 6425:12 6429:1 6435:16 6438:12 6440:1 6447:17 6448:19 6452:15 6453:9 6461:10,11 6481:7 6487:1 6491:2,22 6492:18,20 6493:13 6494:10 6494:13 6499:13 6505:20 6523:16 6529:25 dealings 6545:12 deals 6430:21 dealt 6343:24 6352:3,8,9 6377:23 6429:6 6450:10 6452:12 6495:18 6499:17 Deans 6423:25 debate 6449:10 6473:21 6477:3 6477:21 6478:19 6480:16,20 Debra 6277:20 6549:6,19 decade 6429:4 deceased 6306:4,7 6307:21 December 6379:18 6380:1 6523:4 decide 6334:5 6448:9 6471:7 decided 6310:25 6497:9 6498:15 decides 6480:6 deciding 6498:10 6519:6 decision 6292:13 6294:17 6346:21 6356:1,5,15,16,22 6356:24 6358:16 6379:15 6413:12 6432:8 6463:9 6468:24 6469:7 6469:15 6473:24 6474:19,20 6476:1,7 6477:23 6477:24 6478:8,9 6506:23 6507:2 6533:10 decisions 6293:16 6293:22 6295:2	6296:6,12,19 6356:4 6410:18 6426:1,2 6432:22 6435:5,10 6448:5 6463:9 6478:13 deck 6477:20 defence 6283:10,25 6293:8 6300:20 6309:15 6318:16 6331:14 6336:8 6337:20 6427:1 6441:24 6442:6 6451:23 6463:23 6474:16 6475:6 6484:11 6488:13 6492:22 6493:3 6496:16,17,19 6500:14 6510:21 6514:4 6521:12 defences 6502:7 defended 6518:8 defending 6492:16 6492:17 define 6371:13 6467:25 definitely 6348:25 6543:22 6545:9 definition 6496:21 definitive 6513:20 6516:16 degree 6457:1 6458:7 6478:3 deja 6381:7 6518:21 delay 6319:24 6320:3,7 6378:19 6448:14 delegated 6532:12 delivered 6432:14 demand 6417:3 6450:1,7,9,15 6500:2,8,9,15,17 6500:18,21,24 6501:19,20,24 demand 6405:21 demonstrates 6523:5 denied 6401:7,11 department 6288:7 6289:2 6290:21 6292:15 6293:17 6294:5,10,17 6296:8 6297:24 6298:10 6299:22 6300:14 6314:20 6314:21 6318:22 6328:21 6371:1
--	--	--	---	---

<p>6373:1 6391:2 6404:5 6420:17 6427:8 6436:15 6466:14,19 6467:19 6505:8 6532:25 6538:16</p> <p>departmental 6541:12,16</p> <p>departure 6354:22 6389:16 6408:24 6409:18 6456:6,9 6462:12</p> <p>departures 6456:18</p> <p>Depends 6508:24</p> <p>dependability 6547:9</p> <p>dependable 6543:19</p> <p>depending 6363:10 6461:12 6465:2 6537:23</p> <p>depends 6442:19 6474:20</p> <p>Deputy 6292:18 6370:17 6432:20 6432:24 6434:5,7 6531:25 6532:10</p> <p>Derek 6276:1 6277:12 6387:15 6388:21 6428:17 6532:18 6533:12 6544:5</p> <p>derive 6455:23 6482:25</p> <p>deriving 6442:21</p> <p>describe 6357:13 6376:4</p> <p>described 6343:6 6395:20 6396:23 6460:8 6497:20 6534:2</p> <p>DESCRIPTION 6278:2</p> <p>designate 6535:20</p> <p>designated 6534:21</p> <p>desirability 6514:16 6514:17</p> <p>desirable 6513:16</p> <p>desire 6492:21</p> <p>desk 6300:6 6505:16</p> <p>detail 6285:3 6417:25 6418:3 6434:23 6492:4 6494:9</p> <p>detailed 6435:22</p> <p>details 6345:22</p>	<p>detention 6445:18</p> <p>determine 6322:11 6427:24 6452:9</p> <p>determined 6513:4</p> <p>determining 6372:17 6398:1</p> <p>detract 6464:22</p> <p>develop 6336:24 6337:2</p> <p>developed 6292:3</p> <p>development 6363:23</p> <p>dialogue 6354:19 6408:20,22 6409:3</p> <p>differ 6369:4</p> <p>difference 6452:20 6453:17,18 6459:25 6473:2,7 6473:13 6507:11</p> <p>different 6283:21 6289:16 6315:18 6333:19 6334:5 6339:4,25 6349:5 6349:13 6361:6 6362:4 6377:10 6448:17 6459:2 6481:13 6514:2 6516:4,12</p> <p>differential 6533:18</p> <p>differently 6352:4,9 6368:21</p> <p>difficult 6306:17 6371:13 6372:15 6394:12 6411:11 6448:6 6458:13 6460:1 6467:25 6491:6 6496:8 6503:13</p> <p>difficulties 6371:22 6439:15 6440:15 6452:3 6501:4 6524:24</p> <p>difficulty 6448:16 6449:24 6469:3 6479:24 6488:6</p> <p>dilemmas 6430:10</p> <p>dint 6434:12</p> <p>direct 6278:12,17 6294:13 6297:4 6437:13 6505:10 6515:23</p> <p>directed 6506:14 6509:9,22 6525:15 6541:20</p> <p>directing 6449:17 6488:24</p>	<p>direction 6284:9 6292:17,19 6433:7 6435:2 6501:8 6508:20 6531:25</p> <p>directions 6433:3</p> <p>directive 6420:18 6466:14,20 6467:1,4,7,12,21 6467:24 6469:12 6533:1</p> <p>directives 6420:12 6420:13 6436:16 6447:23 6451:3 6451:11 6453:14 6455:5,16 6462:6 6469:20 6475:20 6499:21</p> <p>directly 6352:5 6533:16</p> <p>director 6288:18,21 6422:23 6531:16 6541:21</p> <p>directors 6288:24 6531:22,24</p> <p>disagree 6352:19,23 6352:25 6406:5 6411:11 6412:8 6476:5,21 6516:1</p> <p>disagreed 6324:8 6333:22 6522:5</p> <p>disagreement 6469:21 6471:24 6476:14</p> <p>disapproval 6282:16</p> <p>discarded 6365:24</p> <p>disclose 6283:14 6392:19</p> <p>disclosed 6283:9,13</p> <p>disclosing 6284:3</p> <p>disclosure 6283:25 6364:9,23 6380:13 6397:18 6419:16,20 6420:9,16 6466:18 6488:9 6514:3 6540:16</p> <p>discretion 6360:8 6420:25 6431:15 6432:13 6448:5,6 6448:8 6452:4 6469:19 6520:17 6524:22</p> <p>discuss 6301:24 6302:8 6327:4 6329:18,23,25</p>	<p>6330:2,18 6345:23 6384:11 6434:23 6546:1</p> <p>discussed 6303:24 6311:5 6314:3 6317:15 6318:7 6332:1 6348:7 6358:15</p> <p>discussing 6318:25</p> <p>discussion 6280:16 6319:25 6320:1 6333:3,6 6334:7 6338:15 6341:18 6353:6,22 6377:21 6382:16 6399:1,7 6402:25 6409:1,2 6410:4,5 6483:24 6544:20 6546:14</p> <p>discussions 6328:24 6328:25 6330:12 6337:15 6339:15 6346:16 6382:19 6383:24 6384:3,7 6384:24 6385:7 6386:11 6399:23 6414:14,16 6497:13</p> <p>dismissed 6449:7</p> <p>disposition 6308:24 6373:15 6526:18</p> <p>dispute 6333:14 6338:19</p> <p>disputes 6334:24</p> <p>disputing 6362:17</p> <p>disregard 6456:17</p> <p>disrepute 6470:2 6471:3</p> <p>dissatisfaction 6414:19</p> <p>dissect 6369:12</p> <p>disseminated 6543:21</p> <p>distance 6458:22</p> <p>distinction 6349:9 6383:6 6385:17 6455:18</p> <p>divergence 6437:10 6475:21</p> <p>diversion 6481:1</p> <p>Dixon 6277:11 6278:14 6518:22 6518:24 6522:16 6522:18 6524:6 6527:5</p> <p>docket 6297:12 6378:13</p>	<p>dockets 6393:11 6547:2</p> <p>document 6415:11 6419:8 6420:15 6436:19 6466:10 6466:12 6495:21 6505:22 6509:25 6530:3 6532:21 6533:7,25 6541:5</p> <p>documentation 6419:11 6542:23</p> <p>documents 6287:25 6294:4 6507:17 6528:20,22 6543:16</p> <p>doing 6299:10 6327:16 6334:19 6338:24 6347:5,6 6348:12 6371:2 6413:2 6422:1 6427:18 6441:5 6454:5 6478:10 6508:14 6510:2 6514:12 6526:25 6536:13 6539:11 6539:12</p> <p>Don 6381:18</p> <p>done 6282:11 6335:6,7 6337:23 6338:14 6340:13 6349:20 6351:12 6390:11 6391:8 6412:19 6449:16 6453:6 6464:4 6484:7 6505:24 6508:17 6509:11 6509:16,16,17 6510:6 6535:3 6546:3 6547:12 6547:16</p> <p>dotted 6350:7</p> <p>doubt 6337:7,10 6339:20 6340:22 6340:23 6361:3 6362:3 6368:18 6383:8,22 6384:9 6385:15,19,25 6386:2 6466:6 6475:1,11 6501:14 6548:6</p> <p>Doug 6323:4</p> <p>down 6395:16 6401:9,17 6418:9 6467:12 6485:25 6508:24 6513:21 6516:8,9 6524:16 6526:1</p>
--	---	---	--	--

downward 6398:15	6308:21 6309:17	6455:20,23,25	6544:3	ethics 6428:7
dozen 6336:9	6360:15 6378:6,7	6456:5,7,19,20	ensue 6515:5	6429:2,7,8 6430:2
draft 6303:12	6378:9,10	elements 6389:10	ensuing 6439:3	6430:4,22 6431:3
6319:9 6382:4	6384:19 6396:3,8	elevated 6456:15	ensure 6433:20	6436:7
drafted 6320:12	6507:24 6511:16	6458:5	6447:8 6483:5	even 6281:4
drafting 6319:6	6545:3 6547:11	elevators 6348:8	6543:20	6283:24 6296:5
6496:4	earmark 6547:12	eligible 6414:25	ensuring 6543:25	6306:19 6308:21
dramatic 6475:21	easier 6448:7	Elmer 6529:15	6546:2	6309:15 6315:4
draw 6383:6	East 6277:13	email 6546:19	enter 6330:17	6325:1 6329:11
6417:24 6421:8	6279:8 6298:10	6547:4	6419:7,19	6330:8,15 6332:3
6465:8,9 6476:15	6374:24 6375:20	emanating 6482:2	6449:18	6337:23 6341:4
6490:6	6528:10,14	embark 6431:12	entered 6284:1	6350:24,25
drawn 6399:5	6530:8 6546:5	embarrassing	6331:7,24,24	6354:11 6368:10
drew 6385:16	Easton 6422:6	6485:25 6486:6	6332:21 6334:15	6372:2 6394:23
drink 6479:6,8	echelon 6336:22	embedded 6501:12	6367:21 6378:17	6402:13 6411:20
drinking 6340:18	edgy 6454:3	emotional 6490:18	6430:21	6415:12 6430:12
6360:18 6367:15	educated 6309:25	emotionally	entering 6325:24	6472:2 6473:12
drive 6375:11	education 6288:22	6295:20	6469:23 6518:1	6478:3 6490:20
driven 6446:23	6421:11 6531:17	emotive 6490:14	entirely 6285:23	6501:11 6506:25
6480:9 6486:10	6532:5 6541:22	6491:14 6503:13	entirety 6436:25	6507:10 6516:16
driver 6456:10	educational	emphasis 6484:25	entitled 6340:3	6537:21 6547:21
6460:22 6479:6,9	6424:14	employed 6314:20	6432:12,13	evening 6327:9
6479:10	effect 6320:5	6393:19 6397:16	6433:6 6512:7	6344:4 6353:13
drug 6465:4,6	6333:4 6344:4	employees 6294:4,9	6523:19	6400:5 6454:8
drunk 6299:25	6432:17 6440:11	employment	entry 6297:23	evenings 6395:15
6300:4	6467:7,19	6397:17 6421:16	6299:16,18	event 6287:25
Duchominsky	6472:25 6484:4	6421:20	eons 6335:16	6288:25 6290:15
6470:9,13	6484:10 6498:20	enacted 6427:11	equally 6483:8	6297:2 6311:2
6472:20 6477:14	6505:5 6512:18	end 6310:1,12,16	6485:2 6510:22	6312:24 6315:12
due 6457:10	6517:2 6523:11	6311:10 6347:4	equivocal 6440:22	6316:6,22
duly 6418:17	6523:12 6524:8	6350:15,23	Erin 6393:18	6320:11 6331:19
6531:11	6541:3	6351:3 6363:4,8	erratic 6376:20	6341:20 6351:19
duration 6404:1	effectively 6432:20	6368:16 6397:2	erred 6502:21	6380:12 6384:19
during 6341:19	6442:6	6403:17,18,21	error 6489:18	6446:8 6448:15
6395:14,15,17	efficient 6529:21	6406:25 6412:4	6500:6 6501:2,7,9	6508:3
6449:12 6484:20	effort 6498:4	6413:12 6447:12	6501:11,18	eventually 6310:8
duty 6364:2,22	6515:4,17	6454:2 6456:23	6502:25 6503:3,6	6310:10,11
6475:3,14 6483:4	efforts 6481:15	6457:17 6477:20	errors 6489:16	6315:12 6331:23
6487:16 6544:10	egregious 6470:8	6483:9 6488:22	6503:11	ever 6281:14
6544:12	eight 6309:11	6498:16 6510:14	escapade 6362:10	6284:18 6305:2
	either 6284:24	6516:13	essence 6483:2	6384:5 6387:15
	6291:7 6299:1	endeavour 6280:12	essential 6434:20	6390:12 6402:25
E	6300:2 6309:15	ends 6344:5	6482:22 6483:10	6409:2 6507:4
E 6294:18 6447:17	6311:5 6328:19	6479:21	essentially 6301:23	6509:11
6499:18	6339:10 6341:22	endurance 6418:5,7	6333:9 6452:11	every 6297:22
each 6283:19	6341:24 6359:1	engage 6467:16	6543:16 6547:8	6337:20 6412:24
6298:18 6300:2	6379:8 6384:22	6515:2	estimate 6336:10	6413:3 6476:23
6301:13 6334:25	6396:10,13	engaged 6426:15	6381:5 6537:9,18	6517:19 6520:25
6337:21,21	6399:20 6408:18	engaging 6536:8	et 6420:13 6424:21	everybody 6360:5
6338:7,7 6340:11	6426:20 6444:1	English 6478:25	6428:7,24 6466:1	6510:8
6425:10 6536:4	6459:24 6480:4	6479:4	6499:2 6545:5,5	everyday 6293:13
6536:23 6537:13	6496:7 6503:10	enjoy 6414:2	ethical 6421:1	everyone 6490:17
earlier 6344:4	6509:23 6514:9	enough 6286:19	6428:12,20	6529:19
6358:16 6436:8	6530:21	6293:6 6313:21	6429:6,10,19	everything 6499:14
6472:19 6481:7	elaborate 6460:21	6348:1,22	6430:10 6431:15	6530:22 6536:18
6504:17 6519:23	elderly 6511:7	6388:14 6414:5	6481:9 6495:13	evidentiary 6448:11
6544:9	element 6337:2	6454:7,8 6542:11	6498:2	6471:13 6482:21
early 6281:6				

6528:6 evolved 6348:20 6349:8 exacerbated 6457:15 exact 6461:11 6515:24 exacted 6412:13 exactly 6319:18 6320:11 6348:15 exaggerated 6458:5 examination 6278:5 6278:6,7,8,12,13 6278:14,17 6419:9 6431:12 examination-in-c... 6419:3 6502:13 examined 6540:4 examining 6541:2 example 6361:15 6432:2 6482:21 6544:19 examples 6294:24 6430:19,25 except 6318:22 6447:10 exceptional 6370:13 6370:23,24,25 6371:8,10,12 6415:20 6467:22 6467:24 6468:14 excerpts 6279:6 6529:6,17 excess 6427:11 exchange 6300:22 6461:25 6522:3 exchanges 6491:18 excluded 6363:11 exclusive 6386:1 Excuse 6330:19 6335:5 6425:2 exercise 6434:14 6448:4,6,8 6452:4 6524:21 exercising 6520:16 exhibits 6279:1 6287:14 6291:22 exigencies 6345:19 6345:23 6371:21 exigent 6349:10 6368:3 exist 6457:2 existed 6437:16 existence 6450:3 existing 6456:22 exists 6360:11 6430:13,16	6431:22 6433:20 6435:3 expand 6481:6 expect 6383:5 6420:8 6421:3 6517:1 6537:3,14 expected 6333:23 6342:5 6428:20 experience 6308:23 6309:15 6325:5,8 6425:13,14 6428:23,24 6429:1 6430:9 6434:21 6435:8 6445:12 6446:24 6539:12 6543:14 experienced 6309:19 6319:10 6337:23 6342:6 6348:1 6494:11 experiential 6461:13 expert 6375:2 6376:6 6420:23 6431:14 6437:5 6439:15 6509:21 6529:14 expertise 6311:11 experts 6513:3 explain 6353:9 6404:11 6417:7 6417:15 6432:1 6453:16,18 6493:1,6,22 6541:25 explained 6322:3 6349:12 explaining 6404:17 explanation 6353:16 6406:6,8 6406:9,15 6418:2 6460:10 6497:11 6497:19 explicated 6482:13 explication 6495:25 explicit 6482:18 explore 6285:15 express 6282:15 6444:2 6494:1 6529:20 expressed 6282:17 6311:4,9 6443:14 6490:1 6498:14 expression 6479:25 6496:5,25 extent 6324:11 6364:18 6431:6	6445:24 6453:16 6458:14 6471:17 6508:24 extra 6494:3,4 6514:9 extradition 6426:24 extraordinarily 6457:2 6512:4 extreme 6403:21 6457:17 6490:15 extremely 6440:23 6452:1 6471:13 6496:8 eyes 6290:14 e-mail 6316:1,4 6323:3 6324:11 6373:21 6381:17 E.E.M 6393:12,15	failed 6502:22 failure 6437:23,25 6439:1 6490:5 fair 6280:14 6281:5 6293:6 6296:14 6299:14 6300:4 6300:23 6305:16 6305:24 6308:9 6308:25 6310:2 6313:1,22 6318:13,17 6319:20 6320:24 6321:12 6322:12 6324:9 6325:17 6326:15 6327:11 6327:24 6329:3 6336:10 6337:18 6338:8,14 6340:10 6349:5 6355:7 6371:3 6382:14 6388:14 6396:17 6399:2 6400:18 6403:24 6426:23 6435:12 6505:9,18 6538:5 6539:6,9 6542:11 6544:3 fairly 6336:16 6396:3 6401:4 6465:3 6482:18 6508:23 6538:1 fall 6321:8 6458:1 6535:15 falls 6461:12 familiar 6283:1 6292:24 6293:10 6544:1 familiarity 6297:1 6543:13 families 6394:11 6396:8 6492:21 family 6277:10 6307:21 6327:2,6 6330:14 6357:10 6374:10 6377:22 6378:20 6397:23 6422:2 6492:11 6493:1,17 6510:20 6511:16 6511:19 6512:3 6512:12,22 family's 6295:13 6377:10 far 6403:22 6411:16 6465:21 6486:2 6497:21 6508:24 6520:3 6535:4,14	6545:4,5 fashion 6501:9 fastened 6463:23 6477:18 fatal 6366:6,22 fatality 6346:4 father 6403:3 fault 6455:20,23 6456:4,6,19,25 6457:1 favour 6361:19 6477:9 6516:8 favouritism 6433:21 fax 6303:2,8,9 February 6279:2,5 6312:2 6419:21 6420:3 6528:24 6529:4 6540:7 6544:9 Federal 6427:8 Federation 6423:9 6424:16 feel 6308:23 6309:16 6356:9 6410:25 6417:17 6458:14 6485:1 6539:11 6543:19 feelers 6328:4 feeling 6309:20,22 6311:4 6337:21 6338:7 6347:2 6348:24 feet 6503:22 fell 6369:24 6471:8 6535:16 fellow 6314:19 6326:5,7 6422:17 6422:18 6547:22 fellows 6354:16 6365:21 felt 6350:19 6355:6 6390:21 6429:24 6464:9 6484:24 6489:11,16 few 6280:11 6441:5 6453:24 6509:8 6518:23 6521:22 6547:13,15 fiddling 6479:20 fifth 6541:4 Fifty-five 6287:18 fight 6325:10,19 6326:8 file 6279:9 6288:12 6298:11 6309:18 6309:20,22,25
F				
		face 6373:11 6468:4 faced 6451:19 facilitate 6541:23 facing 6396:5 6398:7 6520:6 6521:15,16 facto 6523:17 factor 6354:22 6390:6 6408:15 6409:23 6438:16 6443:15 6464:15 6471:18,21 6472:2,23 6473:16 6474:8 6474:24 6475:8 6477:11,16 6478:17,24 6479:23 6480:2 6480:13 6522:24 factored 6472:3 factors 6371:17 6389:21 6408:24 6409:7,14 6435:14 6457:25 6459:2,9 6461:12 6472:14 6479:13 6479:15 6499:16 6499:25 6502:11 factual 6330:3 6397:4 6488:5 6495:14 6496:12 6501:18 factually 6376:17 faculty 6424:2,16 6424:18 fail 6375:21 6433:14		

6310:18 6376:13 6393:13 6396:4 6509:23 6530:9 6532:15 6546:15 6548:1 filed 6287:14 6335:1 6400:3 6418:22 6419:6 6463:13 files 6286:15 6512:20 6547:10 filing 6529:17 6544:19 fill 6344:1 filled 6289:7 Fillmore 6279:5 6529:3 final 6292:14 6293:17 6294:17 6348:2 6351:3,10 6358:16 6382:10 6499:13 finally 6420:14 6484:6 find 6361:18 6363:7 6415:2 6416:6 6417:19 6458:18 6489:18 6490:5 6503:9,10 6525:8 6540:16 finding 6332:11 6335:10 6363:9 6363:10 6488:4 findings 6490:2 finds 6510:15 fine 6366:7 6389:3 6523:15 6524:1 fingerprints 6439:20 Finlayson 6289:4,4 firm 6301:17,19,25 6328:7 6393:20 6393:22 6422:3,6 6422:8,9 6508:18 6543:15,19 firms 6302:6 first 6287:15 6298:2 6309:23 6316:7 6327:20 6341:7 6346:22 6355:16 6359:22 6360:10 6381:17 6382:3 6383:5 6386:24 6396:22 6397:14 6400:9 6411:9 6418:17 6421:11 6421:22 6445:15	6450:10 6452:23 6455:20 6466:10 6482:13 6483:20 6485:17 6490:7 6491:12 6497:5 6498:12 6528:15 6531:10 6533:8 6535:5 6536:5,7 firstly 6282:24 6287:11 6288:3 6442:12 6502:5 6502:20,22 fiscally 6536:11 fit 6470:23 fits 6534:10 five 6309:10 6381:5 6392:11 6407:16 6407:23 6408:1 6427:7 6452:8,16 fixated 6398:25 fixed 6508:11 flipped 6478:11 flowing 6484:17 focus 6323:14 6415:4 6490:17 6491:14 6495:20 focusing 6431:22 foibles 6491:4 follow 6295:3 6318:3 6343:16 6384:25 6397:22 6413:6,7 6512:11 followed 6435:10 6497:10 following 6293:21 6399:13 6407:14 6435:21 6442:11 6484:5 6509:7 follows 6282:14 6418:18 6531:12 follow-up 6431:25 6484:16 6509:15 folly 6318:4 fond 6535:9 force 6314:16 6522:12 6523:3 forces 6495:19 foregoing 6549:8 forgive 6327:15 6504:15 6538:19 form 6446:20 6450:1 6457:20 formal 6544:25 6546:1 6547:13 6547:16 formalized 6339:8 formally 6449:15	6544:4 6546:12 formed 6408:25 6450:13 former 6429:22 forthwith 6292:19 forward 6322:14,21 6525:22 forwarded 6298:11 6298:16 found 6291:17 6303:2 6348:13 6360:1 6373:22 6373:23 6407:3 6420:13,16 6421:9 6424:6 6435:15 6458:3 6465:11 6478:5 6525:23 6532:22 6536:12 6540:12 6542:12 foundation 6416:20 6489:13 four 6309:10 6370:6 6392:11 6419:13 6440:18 6465:9 6513:11 6531:22 6534:1 6535:17,19 6537:21 frailties 6450:16 6491:4 frame 6288:13 frankly 6388:19 fraught 6448:16 6524:23 free 6531:2 frequency 6537:13 frequently 6428:2 6429:6 6492:11 Friday 6326:22,22 6327:20 6357:8 6373:20 6374:9 6399:10,18 6400:9,15 friends 6384:20 front 6324:23 6327:18 6350:9 6365:2,9 6370:4 6374:3,4 6385:17 6391:25 6397:10 6419:8 6532:24 6542:15 fruition 6452:2 fulfill 6404:16 full 6294:3 6348:2,4 6417:21 6511:3 6544:11	fully 6339:13 function 6323:16 6432:18 6433:18 functions 6433:11 fundamental 6340:8 6409:16 furnished 6437:3 6495:12 further 6281:4 6284:1,13 6286:7 6289:2 6332:19 6382:21 6419:8 6430:5 6433:14 6433:17 6438:20 6443:18 6445:20 6457:12 6460:21 6468:2 6476:1,8 6481:6 6483:24 6492:7 6508:21 6509:10 <hr/> G <hr/> G 6277:10,17 6287:4,7 6360:5 6391:16,17 6541:5,9 gain 6309:15 game 6505:10,18 gap 6482:21 Gardiner 6405:16 6416:14 6475:2 6475:12 6496:9 gather 6400:16 6437:24 gathered 6529:19 gathering 6344:3 6344:20 gauge 6504:1 gave 6293:7 6361:12 6393:5 6408:10 6432:14 6457:21 6514:22 6515:1 6517:9 6518:1 6519:15 6524:11 6525:16 6527:17 gazetted 6433:5 general 6292:17,18 6294:21 6303:11 6304:23,24 6370:18 6417:9 6426:13 6428:9 6428:21 6432:6 6432:21,24 6433:2,7,7 6434:6 6434:8 6451:6 6453:10 6455:4	6455:13 6461:19 6462:4 6464:19 6467:8 6471:6 6509:3 6532:1 generally 6281:11 6304:24 6325:9 6325:10 6378:5 6378:10 6380:7 6431:21 6504:19 6504:21 6505:5 6508:22 6525:22 General's 6432:18 6532:11 generated 6521:19 gentlemen 6409:17 genuine 6488:11 gets 6315:12 6331:11 6363:11 6374:11 6488:12 getting 6281:7,9 6299:24 6328:16 6331:2 6338:17 6381:8 6411:10 6412:3 6435:19 6454:3 6457:13 6502:10 6504:3 6510:10 6515:18 6515:20 6517:25 6534:23 6539:21 Giasson 6277:4 give 6294:24 6305:21 6324:24 6344:18 6346:10 6353:16 6371:1 6374:22 6385:1 6406:5,15 6415:3 6418:2 6432:2 6433:2,7 6442:3 6453:20 6455:7 6462:10 6466:2 6481:5 6489:25 6502:1 6508:20 6513:19 6514:1 6516:15 6517:7 6527:19 6536:5 6536:25 6537:7,7 6537:12,17 6539:5 6543:3 6544:25 6547:19 6547:21 given 6282:7 6292:19,23 6322:8 6326:6 6355:3 6370:18 6390:19 6408:8 6415:7 6416:25 6417:12 6446:25
--	---	--	--	--

6467:22 6473:7 6476:19 6482:10 6483:10,15 6484:5 6488:5 6497:18 6499:21 6500:21,24 6509:23 6511:13 6516:20 6517:5 6519:4 6521:12 6526:16,16 6532:9,14 6537:11 6538:25 6543:6,18 gives 6347:2 6443:23 6490:9 6516:5,9 giving 6403:12,14 6406:8 6417:24 6464:7 6492:4 6501:1 glad 6281:8 6548:5 glass 6479:17,22 glean 6491:17 global 6369:9 gloves 6425:3 6426:10 God 6527:17 goes 6320:12 6336:8 6363:11 6387:18 6434:18 6453:6 6476:1 6516:8 golden 6426:10 gone 6283:17 6336:11 6338:6 6353:12 6376:8 6401:13 6402:4 6496:6 good 6280:6,8 6282:12 6286:10 6286:12 6328:11 6329:3,4 6334:18 6343:4 6367:11 6368:8 6375:8 6376:13,15,25 6377:18 6383:2,4 6412:7 6418:13 6418:14,25 6419:1 6447:9 6454:2,23,24 6487:3 6503:19 6531:14,15 6533:9 gotten 6344:23,25 6386:6 6507:17 6545:18 Gover 6279:3	6391:13 6419:25 6420:5 6437:4 6441:1 6446:18 6469:21 6470:4 6475:22 6522:9 government 6286:25 6304:22 6305:3 6404:5 6413:2 6432:9,17 6433:18,19,23,25 6434:16 Gover's 6419:17 6441:3 6443:12 6446:23 6476:13 6521:23 6522:1 grab 6529:9 gradation 6534:5 6535:3 grandchildren 6414:25 granted 6494:16 great 6285:3 6380:9 6484:3 6497:23 greatly 6457:5 Green 6277:11 6278:8 6390:18 6391:14,19,21,25 6392:3,5,10,14 6404:25 6414:6 6415:10 Grey 6422:6 grief 6493:14 grieving 6512:2 gross 6460:19 grossly 6445:8 6458:20 ground 6280:13 6389:11 grounds 6417:6 6450:4,14 group 6336:21 6536:2 grown 6535:9 guarantee 6330:15 guarded 6486:25 guess 6299:4 6317:11 6335:16 6338:24 6342:12 6348:11 6351:15 6357:3,4 6373:21 6407:11 6410:14 6505:14 6537:10 6543:3 guesstimate 6537:8 guest 6424:22,23 guidance 6319:19 6319:21 6458:15	6544:17 guided 6294:19 guideline 6436:16 6436:24 6466:15 guidelines 6462:23 6524:18 guilt 6335:10 6363:9,10 6488:5 guilty 6310:6 6325:8,12 6330:17,21 6367:23 6369:18 6377:2 6386:6 6462:1 6488:14 6495:15 6517:7 gut 6309:24 G-40 6298:9 G-43 6542:13 G-43.a 6287:17 6288:5 G-44 6291:17 6532:23 G-45 6368:24 6420:17 6466:18 G-46 6359:23 6360:1 6391:21	happening 6313:17 6317:13 6352:16 6497:24 happens 6331:15 6338:16 6364:2 6380:3 6443:4,4,5 6496:14 6513:25 hard 6298:17 6454:12 6479:21 6525:8 hardened 6490:21 6490:21 harm 6456:8 6467:11,15 6470:11 Harper 6422:6 Harry 6277:14 6505:15 Harvey-Zenk 6276:1 6277:12 6289:13 6295:7,7 6306:1 6379:6 6396:5 6397:13 6398:7 6428:18 6438:2 6439:6,19 6440:2,9 6450:10 6452:9,12 6473:4 6517:6 6532:18 6533:12 6535:22 6544:5 Harvey-Zenk's 6521:14 6546:3 having 6281:4 6334:23 6337:14 6377:3,4 6396:4 6418:17 6436:23 6437:17 6472:15 6483:19 6484:20 6497:8,8,16 6516:12 6530:13 6531:10 6535:3 6536:2 6546:14 6547:9 head 6386:17,21 6388:22 6389:24 headed 6432:11 heading 6468:5 6502:18 heads 6547:21 healthy 6473:21 6480:16,19 hear 6327:7 6342:16 6381:9 6421:3 6536:18 heard 6283:19 6328:1 6331:18 6339:23 6346:25	6353:16 6393:10 6399:8 6401:3 6452:11 6465:24 6499:25 6504:17 6505:5 hearing 6283:18 6317:20 6318:5 6322:12 6325:3 6331:10 6367:19 6377:4 6379:24 6410:20 6411:14 6444:23 6524:9 hearsay 6496:22 6543:4 heavily 6477:9,13 6498:13,19 heed 6483:13 heedless 6458:24 held 6294:5 6316:7 6337:18 6379:22 6380:1 hello 6342:25 6343:1,4 help 6330:20 6415:4 6458:1 6510:7 6512:23 6518:9 helped 6429:8 helpful 6458:2 6510:15,16 helps 6512:24 Hence 6339:9 her 6295:17 6344:6 6394:2,2,6,16,19 6394:19 6413:6 6440:5 6542:5 hereinbefore 6549:10 herself 6331:6 hesitate 6290:4 6291:2 hesitation 6526:14 6526:21 6527:4 hide 6301:6 Higgins 6470:13,15 high 6295:8 6296:2 6389:20 6403:17 6412:3 6445:9 higher 6459:21 highlight 6297:24 highlighted 6299:16 6299:18 highly 6468:13 6490:14 6503:13 6531:20 himself 6304:25 6331:6 6348:5
H				
H 6277:14 habit 6337:13 half 6352:18 6414:4 6414:8 6448:13 6527:17 hall 6516:8,9 hand 6462:15 handful 6309:3,5 handle 6355:23,25 6508:13,14 handling 6428:1 6466:6 6467:3,11 6493:16 6502:21 6503:12 handy 6287:3 hanging 6417:9 Hanlin 6277:15 happen 6338:19 6339:5 6347:6 6355:2 6376:8 6490:23 6493:2,2 happened 6310:8 6310:23 6321:10 6339:13 6342:9 6347:20 6349:22 6353:11 6367:25 6388:20 6482:12 6493:15 6509:19 6510:11				

6387:17 hindsight 6334:13 6334:17 6349:7 historical 6340:18 6351:16 6423:18 6496:1,18 6503:7 history 6340:4 6421:17,21 6426:6 6445:6,7 6446:14 6520:14 6536:6 hoc 6426:20 6507:1 6507:9,14,16 6509:24 Hoepfner 6277:16 6518:13 hold 6312:15 6315:12 holidays 6374:18 home 6400:5 honestly 6312:4 Honour 6343:4 6418:21 Honourable 6276:2 hope 6286:16 6440:20 hopefully 6381:4 6387:13 Horn 6314:20,24 6315:5,6,8,9,12 horse 6474:11 host 6450:21 6452:2 6501:12 6502:5 hour 6299:5 6527:17 hours 6439:3 6546:4 house 6312:16 6433:5 human 6491:3,5 6511:1,13 6512:6 humble 6476:24 Humniski 6283:6 6285:2 hundred 6427:6 hurt 6418:3 hypervigilant 6491:2 hypothetical 6436:2 6445:15 6447:21 6447:25 6451:9 6451:12 6453:13 6455:6 6460:14 6461:20 6471:9 6475:16 6495:10 6510:12,12 6516:20 6517:16	I	6471:17 6475:24 6518:6 6543:25 important 6313:21 6429:25 6464:24 6468:6 6485:11 6510:22 6512:4 6513:22,22 importantly 6532:8 impose 6325:14 6520:25 imposed 6412:21 6541:11 imposes 6523:15 imposing 6446:5 6524:1 imposition 6469:24 6477:7 6520:21 6521:6 impression 6285:14 6285:20 6381:8 6409:2 imprimatur 6467:20 imprisonment 6460:3,5 improve 6492:2 improvement 6336:2 impugnable 6457:5 6457:6 inaccurately 6500:10 inadequacy 6414:24 6486:11 inadequate 6437:21 6437:23 6438:11 6448:16 6453:8 inadvertence 6490:4 6503:1 inadvertent 6489:22 6490:11 inappropriate 6373:11 6441:17 6441:23 6468:4 incapable 6500:25 incapacitated 6438:13 6500:25 incarceration 6310:14 6525:11 incident 6314:24 6544:14 inclined 6450:20 include 6294:8 6422:22 6428:5 6436:2 6542:15 6543:10 included 6288:14	6371:18 6389:16 6436:19 6466:23 6497:15 6540:21 includes 6419:16 6422:12 6429:16 6437:25 including 6428:18 6448:18 6472:14 6529:23 6538:9 inclusion 6475:24 income 6442:21 inconsistent 6455:15 6464:19 6524:17 incumbent 6475:9 6482:3 6483:12 indeed 6447:6 6454:13 6474:4 6491:20 6496:16 6529:10 independence 6431:24 6434:19 6435:3 6534:1,4 6534:14,16 independently 6365:14,18 6366:9 INDEX 6278:1 6279:1 indicate 6288:25 6328:10 6419:4 6449:6 6450:8 6471:25 6472:5 6485:17 6536:23 6542:21 6546:13 indicated 6283:15 6285:11 6328:13 6328:15 6332:5 6396:7 6412:1 6424:15 6446:19 6450:13 6465:18 6478:1 6509:8 6515:22 6516:20 6546:6 indicates 6299:4 6331:11 6476:1 6532:6 indicating 6324:15 6414:21 6485:22 indication 6446:13 6457:8 6474:6 6537:1,13 6539:5 6547:2 indications 6458:20 6500:7 6543:15 indictment 6449:21 indirectly 6445:23	individual 6287:14 6297:4 6397:20 6430:8 6444:12 individuals 6469:6 6492:8 6536:3 6537:14 6538:22 inferences 6399:4 influence 6432:25 6434:16 6474:12 inform 6291:7 6308:8 6312:25 6322:24 informal 6337:14 6337:18 6338:14 6338:16,25 6339:15 6342:10 6342:15 6487:2 information 6294:5 6301:14 6316:17 6326:25 6381:19 6415:7 6449:20 6482:23 6483:5 6495:12 6500:4 6501:16 6512:8 6539:15 6543:18 6544:18 6546:21 6547:4 informed 6309:8 infrequently 6426:19 6449:19 initial 6310:2 6438:1 initially 6362:25 6367:17 6421:25 initials 6393:12 injured 6452:23 Innocence 6424:2 input 6512:7 inquire 6428:16 inquiries 6541:20 inquiry 6276:1,19 6280:4 6323:21 6366:10,12 6380:21,25 6394:15 6410:23 6419:12 6428:16 6432:11 6454:18 6454:22 6499:11 6504:7,11 6513:10 6527:23 6528:2 6548:13 insertion 6541:7 inside 6432:6 instance 6429:2 6439:17,21 6445:9 6449:11 6469:6 6474:6
--	----------	--	---	---

6483:20 6485:2 6492:9 6500:3 6520:24 instigated 6390:20 Institute 6423:23 instituted 6360:9 institution 6362:15 6362:17 instruct 6360:9 6467:8 instructions 6289:2 6423:14 insulate 6433:17 insulated 6432:23 insult 6384:13,17 insurance 6304:17 6414:14,15,16 intake 6545:11 intend 6492:21 intended 6332:3 6400:24 6408:14 intending 6406:14 6449:1 intense 6490:18 6491:14 intensely 6491:3 intent 6315:16 intention 6401:16 6401:18 interact 6290:20 interchange 6351:25 interest 6413:16 6441:16,22 6442:9 interested 6378:5 6398:25 6407:4 6474:8,9 6528:11 6538:8 interests 6487:9 interfere 6358:25 6359:2,16 interference 6432:10 6433:12 6433:19 internal 6530:2 6542:25 International 6422:19,23 interpretation 6308:6 6519:19 interpreting 6308:4 interview 6505:20 6509:25 6513:4,9 6513:14,16 6514:8 interviewed 6284:7	6535:5 interviewing 6282:4 interviews 6402:16 6507:19 introduced 6315:4 6315:5 introductions 6548:4 investigate 6314:16 6505:1 investigated 6317:25 6318:11 6318:21 investigating 6317:16 investigation 6276:1 6280:24 6281:18 6282:7 6282:12 6284:2 6284:14 6287:8 6289:13 6315:17 6316:14 6317:21 6318:17 6319:17 6319:23 6321:19 6323:13 6362:8 6364:24 6390:20 6390:23 6392:20 6392:25 6433:23 6437:15,20,22 6438:7,10 6439:5 6453:4,8 6486:1,9 6486:11 6504:20 6505:11 6509:10 6546:3,6 investigational 6452:24 6453:1 6487:1,9 investigations 6323:5 6530:2 investigative 6279:9 6508:21 6530:9 investigator 6505:19 investigators 6282:12 6509:9 invite 6455:10 6496:10 invited 6319:5 invites 6342:25 invoice 6297:19 invoked 6500:22 6534:3 involve 6371:9 involved 6280:23 6281:7 6284:17 6295:21 6346:3 6432:4 6465:18	6468:13 6470:17 6490:17,17 6492:9 6533:21 6535:14 6537:24 6544:8 6545:20 6546:9 involvement 6280:17 6282:9 6542:22 involving 6309:5 6460:7 6467:10 6467:17 6511:1 6511:12 6512:14 6528:14 6534:22 in-house 6302:8 Ireton 6289:25 6303:15 irregularities 6438:6 irrelevant 6442:7 6486:8 issued 6294:20 issues 6300:18 6301:24 6302:11 6303:13,25 6304:1,2,10,13,16 6304:19 6316:20 6319:25 6320:10 6323:14,21 6349:25 6351:14 6363:6 6368:17 6368:18 6379:21 6380:10 6428:5,8 6428:12 6447:17 6450:25 6452:7 6481:21 6487:1 6508:16 6537:24 6538:8 6545:4 6546:7 item 6392:18 iterating 6451:18 I's 6350:7 i.e 6314:16 6371:22	joined 6422:5 joint 6341:24 6345:8 6346:5 6349:9 6350:21 6369:19,22 6390:7 6412:21 6413:3 6442:1 6462:2,21 6469:24 6481:9 6481:11,18 6482:5,10,20 6483:11 6484:12 6484:23 6502:23 6525:16 jointly 6403:9 6443:2 Jordan 6403:2 judges 6335:16 6343:17 6424:23 6520:24 Judge's 6474:17 6489:19 judging 6481:14 6494:22 judgment 6372:15 6489:20 6491:23 Judicial 6423:13 July 6276:16 6280:1 6324:19 6324:21 6326:11 6327:10,23 6342:20 6357:1,4 6357:5,7 6373:20 6374:12 6377:23 6395:3 6399:9 6403:3 6415:9 6448:20 6452:2 jump 6476:10 June 6317:20 6323:2,9 6380:2 6425:22,23 junior 6337:23 jurisdiction 6444:17 6446:24 6447:1 6463:2,7 6470:5 6472:9 6506:7,17 6522:8 jurisdictions 6480:24 6481:2 6504:25 6506:9 jurisprudence 6463:12 6465:15 6473:22 6474:4 6477:5,8 6478:14 6525:17,23 jurisprudential 6480:5	jury 6363:9 6365:2 6366:16 6423:14 6516:15 justice 6288:7 6289:2 6290:21 6292:15 6293:17 6294:5,10,18 6297:24 6299:22 6303:13 6304:11 6314:21,22 6318:1 6328:21 6329:1 6343:12 6351:1 6354:16 6364:12,18 6371:1 6391:2 6404:5 6406:2 6420:12,18 6427:8 6429:23 6432:23 6433:3 6434:17 6436:15 6464:25 6466:14 6466:19 6467:19 6470:1 6471:3 6492:16 6531:18 6532:25 6533:16 6542:4,25 justified 6372:18 6411:1 justify 6335:10 6359:8 6371:11 6458:18 6467:23
K				
K 6277:11,16,16 6287:4,7,8 Kaplan's 6298:14 6319:13 6323:3 6400:20 6402:8 keep 6430:17 keeping 6289:23 6313:16 6382:20 6418:1 6533:20 kept 6394:20 kills 6344:6 kin 6512:15 kind 6417:9 6487:11 6500:19 6523:18 6533:18 6539:11,20 6545:1 kindly 6289:25 6420:21 kinds 6304:19 6344:10 6373:14 6514:7 King 6277:12 6386:19				

knew 6307:3 6326:18,24 6343:11,11 6348:22 6358:23 6374:20 6386:13 6397:16,17 6545:15 6548:3	later 6301:2 6328:1 6334:1 6342:23 6346:12 6425:16 6494:23 6509:5 6511:23 6514:13 6515:25 6523:4 6534:19	6422:2 6489:12 legal 6288:22 6385:16 6421:17 6422:16 6423:18 6508:16 6531:17 6532:5 legislation 6523:3 6523:11	liaison 6314:18,21 6322:10 licence 6446:8 lie 6395:16 lies 6448:3 6485:9 lieu 6529:18 life 6423:4 6460:5 6511:1,4,13 light 6312:13 6326:5 6346:16 6394:19 6474:4 6495:10 lighting 6461:4 lights 6344:22 6389:18 6397:3 6460:16 6461:1	6493:2 6496:5 6508:25 6515:5 limit 6344:21 6376:18 limitation 6510:13 limited 6319:5 6336:8 6430:19 6445:24 line 6290:25 6295:1 6297:5 6301:2 6387:14,14 6388:18 6405:4,6 6405:11 6407:5,7 6407:8 6499:19 6505:7 6508:25 6524:16 lines 6344:14 link 6473:8 6520:21 linked 6471:23 6520:13 list 6299:25 6300:3 6300:9,13 6380:4 6430:12,13,16,23 6434:5,6,9,11 listed 6424:10,20 6425:13,18 6430:6 6449:25 listen 6408:11 6499:10 listened 6307:23 litigation 6422:1,2 6517:13 litigator 6517:19 little 6289:16 6332:19 6352:3 6357:2 6363:15 6380:4 6425:16 6454:3 6476:8 6487:23 6494:3,4 6509:10 6512:11 6548:4 lived 6511:3 lives 6456:17 living 6492:25 Lobsinger 6279:8 6529:14,24 6530:6 local 6335:20 6521:9 logic 6480:8 logical 6476:15 6520:18,21 6521:4 logically 6471:20 6476:10 6479:24 6480:3 long 6295:3
L				
L 6277:14 Labossiere 6277:14 6277:16 6282:21 6283:9 lack 6438:24 ladder 6534:13 lady 6344:6 laid 6361:2 6411:22 6428:11 6440:19 6461:16 6504:18 6505:6 6506:3,12 6506:12,18 6507:5,15 6533:15 Lamirande 6349:16 6351:1 lane 6397:4 6460:24 language 6306:22 6330:15 6349:13 6350:25 6363:14 6376:2 6458:8 6477:18 6486:25 6497:20 large 6301:17 largely 6426:16 larger 6412:22 last 6282:21 6287:5 6288:10 6290:25 6293:9,9 6371:20 6406:20 6415:5 6436:21 6441:5 6443:14 6466:10 6476:5 6497:13 6510:19 6516:19 6538:18 6545:7 late 6400:14,19 6432:3,14	latest 6300:22 Lawlor 6319:5,9,12 lawyer 6300:19,20 6301:8 6337:21 6338:18 6441:24 6442:12,15 6476:25 6490:21 6494:11 6500:23 6500:24 6521:9 lawyers 6300:17 6301:18 6336:9 6336:12,20,21,25 6337:23,24 6422:15,18 6428:21 6430:8 6443:1 lay 6383:14 6506:14 6506:15 6515:15 6544:21 laying 6361:4,7,21 6392:11,18 6428:6 6506:24 lead 6326:3 6432:10 6444:20 6495:17 leading 6284:7 6338:17 6546:4 leads 6363:1 6445:10 lead-up 6290:9 lean 6477:9 leans 6477:12 learn 6337:24 learned 6281:20 6314:23 6491:21 6545:24 least 6304:25 6329:15 6341:3 6364:11 6371:2 6444:19 6449:12 6472:7 6534:5 6535:24 6546:24 6547:19 leave 6315:15 6417:9 6454:10 6513:11 leaves 6382:24 leaving 6535:10 LeBlanc 6277:7 lectured 6429:7 left 6376:16,17	6465:8 6535:23 lesser 6523:20,24 let 6321:4 6332:18 6336:19 6338:2 6341:11 6349:2 6353:19 6356:11 6359:7 6362:6 6367:10 6448:9 6478:11 6486:16 6493:22 6502:1 6506:7 6508:3 6535:10 letter 6279:2,3 6288:4,6 6289:10 6289:12,19,21 6290:25 6303:10 6303:16,22 6304:2,8,23 6305:16 6319:6,9 6319:18 6320:11 6334:3 6419:21 6420:2,4 6447:22 6448:1 6512:14 6528:23 6547:16 letters 6287:20 6319:11 6321:2 let's 6316:19 6321:21 6323:18 6324:2 6343:21 6347:14,15,16 6351:13 6359:21 6362:9 6367:4 6447:5 6454:15 6478:20 6486:15 level 6285:11 6362:14 6427:22 6429:12 6456:25 6534:3,16,23 levels 6309:6 6430:9 6480:23 6481:2 6534:1	like 6294:13 6307:24 6319:25 6323:14 6332:2 6348:11 6354:12 6358:22 6378:6 6381:14 6384:4 6387:23 6393:8 6399:5 6402:5 6407:15 6408:1 6413:23 6421:11 6435:13 6441:1,8 6443:24 6451:5 6461:17 6471:4 6472:25 6487:13 6492:23 6493:11 6495:6 6502:24 6505:9,15,22 6507:19 6510:8 6511:18 6527:12 6527:16 6528:5 6535:21 6539:20 6543:22 6547:22 likelihood 6360:11 6360:17,24 6361:1,5,21,25 6362:11,21 6363:20,25 6365:11 6368:13 6383:7,17,20 6384:1 6385:18 6405:14 6416:12 6417:1 6448:22 6459:11,16,22,23 likely 6308:23 6310:5,5 6311:10 6322:5 6334:20 6341:24 6347:1 6349:2 6369:24 6396:14 6397:21 6397:24 6446:7 6461:15 6473:11	

<p>6308:18,20 6358:13 6359:5 6377:21,22 6407:22 6413:25 6424:17 6425:5 6426:5 6433:4 6435:10 6448:14 6511:3 6535:2 longer 6363:24 6381:3 6410:6 6448:21 look 6349:22 6359:21 6365:13 6366:19 6391:10 6403:8,11 6405:1 6410:2 6412:9 6456:1,12 6457:25 6458:3 6458:15 6463:1,5 6463:20 6478:20 6479:12,14 6485:24 6499:13 6505:20,21 6509:25 6510:5 6541:4 looking 6289:10 6322:22 6360:6 6392:1,17 6417:19,21 6457:21 6465:11 6465:12 6468:21 6472:6,11 6522:21 6546:8 looks 6381:14 6387:23 6459:1 Lord 6487:10 lose 6404:9 6446:8 losers 6517:21 loss 6389:25 6511:1 lost 6295:14,14 6377:5 6517:21 lot 6302:5 6311:21 6316:18,19 6336:12,15,20 6345:22 6399:1 6410:6 6414:3 6448:7 6501:9 6518:8 6526:23 6537:20 6538:20 6540:14 loud 6405:10 low 6456:23 6459:13 lower 6403:21 lunch 6454:10 6455:2</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">M</p> <p>M 6277:2,11,15 madam 6351:1 6391:8 6542:4 mail 6307:24 6547:3 main 6377:7 6479:18 mainstream 6464:17 maintain 6297:2 6306:15,18 6392:22 maintained 6363:20 6431:24 maintaining 6434:19 major 6301:17 6312:6 6341:21 majority 6411:17 makes 6313:13 6314:7 6321:10 6347:7 6469:15 6488:4 6497:11 6507:2 6542:17 making 6296:5,13 6296:19 6312:11 6320:19 6365:6 6366:11 6404:18 6447:3 6481:10 6498:11 malefices 6503:2 man 6340:7 6353:12 6376:14 6440:1 6473:3 management 6423:1 mandate 6316:15 manifest 6482:4 6491:5 manner 6411:6,7 6458:24 6479:12 manslaughter 6346:9,23 Manty 6472:12,17 many 6286:17 6325:18 6336:17 6339:1 6379:22 6396:22 6410:15 6414:11 6424:20 6424:24 6429:8,8 6451:20 6478:13 6480:23,23 6481:2 6491:21 6492:18 6512:20 6543:14 6547:17</p>	<p>6547:18 March 6279:3 6280:23 6281:6 6281:20 6282:3 6287:21 6288:13 6289:11 6298:2,7 6419:24 6420:4 6425:23 6544:5 6545:25 6546:16 6546:19 marginal 6452:1 6524:13,15 mark 6379:20 marked 6354:22 6389:16 6391:6 6408:24 6409:18 6456:6,8 6462:12 6528:20 6530:3 markedly 6460:23 Martin 6278:4 6497:11,13 6532:17 Marty 6277:11 6342:25 material 6382:17 6419:16,20 6421:10 6435:23 6436:7 6438:5 6452:16 6506:18 6508:4,7,16 6537:5 materialized 6315:21 materials 6419:5 6436:19 6437:18 6464:22 6466:23 6506:4 6509:4 6533:6 6542:13 6543:20 mattered 6412:23 matters 6291:8 6318:21 6322:7 6334:20,23 6363:5 6377:13 6378:12 6393:8 6429:6 6440:21 6535:12 6537:22 6545:12 maximum 6460:3,5 6525:10 maximums 6460:6 maybe 6307:18 6309:11 6316:12 6323:13,17 6336:9 6347:2,7 6362:25 6414:4 6487:23 6508:1</p>	<p>6515:15 6517:4 6527:19 McBride 6479:3 McDonald 6277:13 6425:7 6518:10 6528:4 6529:7 McEachern 6429:22 McFetridge 6277:17 McNicol 6393:18 6394:15 mean 6282:24 6307:22 6310:10 6314:7 6346:15 6349:7,15 6358:19 6361:14 6363:3 6376:11 6379:1 6385:23 6460:21 6466:1 6468:15 6474:13 6475:11 6494:15 6496:14 6500:18 6501:7 6513:5,18 6513:20 6515:3 6516:25 6526:16 6526:22 meaning 6357:15 meaningful 6437:24 6438:3 meaningfully 6464:16 6494:2 meaningless 6503:9 6539:20 means 6480:12 meant 6515:5 measure 6433:14 6460:1 measures 6459:2 media 6410:11,16 6490:17 6491:14 Medical 6422:16 meet 6291:9 6308:12 6313:22 6317:8 6397:21 6433:10 6457:14 6458:4,6 6459:19 6496:9 6511:15 6511:19,22 6512:3,12 meeting 6307:5 6308:9 6311:8 6313:24 6314:9 6315:16 6316:1,6 6316:7,9,11,23 6317:1,4 6326:19 6327:3 6330:14</p>	<p>6340:19 6342:11 6342:11,12,13,15 6343:1,5 6348:3 6357:6,13 6373:19 6379:22 6395:1,2,7,11 6399:9 6400:14 6400:20 6403:3 6405:9,13 6416:11 meetings 6393:23 6394:3,7,17,24 6396:8 meets 6357:9 6456:2 6459:18 Melissa 6277:5 member 6422:12,14 6422:15 6423:1 6423:13,25 6424:15,18 6433:25 6442:4 6521:11 members 6290:21 6296:8 6297:23 6325:6 6336:17 6372:25 6376:4 6429:8,11 6434:12 6452:25 6467:18 6468:25 6492:12 6508:17 membership 6422:11 memo 6305:13 6376:22,24 6400:3,4 6402:8 memory 6285:12 6286:24 6389:25 mens 6455:24 mental 6455:25 mention 6416:22 6474:1 mentioned 6299:17 6450:22,23 6481:6 6484:18 6497:5,8 mere 6457:16 6471:25 6472:21 6473:14 6474:22 6476:17 6477:9 6478:15,23 6479:24,25 6480:12 6519:10 merely 6442:25 6476:24 merit 6446:3 6520:23 message 6484:7</p>
---	---	--	--	---

6487:7 Messner 6277:16 met 6283:18 6311:19 6314:1 6314:23,25 6316:24 6317:6 6319:14 6340:14 6400:8,10,17 6444:11 6459:24 6530:15,15 mete 6470:23 method 6338:25 Meyers 6379:17 mic 6536:17 Michael 6449:10 might 6283:22 6302:11,17,20 6315:4 6319:24 6323:24 6328:6 6347:24,25 6358:25 6359:4,4 6368:4 6371:18 6376:8 6399:4 6407:21 6411:10 6411:22 6435:1 6453:25 6465:9 6474:10 6476:15 6488:23 6492:2 6494:15 6500:4 6508:12,16,18,20 6510:9,16 6517:18 6535:21 6536:12,17 6537:2,14 6538:15,24 6539:6,8 6546:21 mightily 6410:22 Mike 6314:20 mind 6284:1 6285:16 6312:8 6330:17 6341:17 6341:22,22 6342:3,19 6343:19 6348:16 6348:17 6350:3 6351:9 6357:16 6362:5,10 6365:8 6382:17,21 6383:14 6393:3 6399:19 6403:24 6413:6 6459:13 6464:15,21 6480:10 6488:24 6490:9,11 mindful 6425:7 minds 6380:9 mind-set 6328:18	mine 6290:14 6342:4 6521:19 Minister 6420:12 Ministry 6428:4 6432:6,7 Minuk 6277:11 6278:4 6280:11 6286:6,11 6287:1 6287:11 6291:19 6321:14 6339:12 6383:3,6 6388:23 6390:19 6401:15 6403:8 6407:19 6409:19 6413:22 6414:8 6518:25 6532:17 6533:21 6534:10,21 6535:16 6541:3 6543:6,11,12 6544:4,15 6545:19,25 6546:12,20,25 6547:7 Minuk's 6542:22 6544:15 6545:22 6547:2 minute 6300:1,1 6372:13 minutes 6377:16 6380:17,19 6381:5 6407:17 6407:23 6408:1 6450:10 6453:24 6509:8 6527:20 minute's 6536:6 misconduct 6490:10 6498:3 missed 6395:7,11 missing 6344:21 6527:2 mistake 6490:3,8 6492:19,20 6497:25 6498:3 6498:10 mistaken 6307:7 6547:6 mistakes 6438:11 6490:23 6491:8 6491:11 misunderstanding 6339:15 6340:9 6349:23 6350:13 misunderstandings 6339:2 6350:2 misunderstood 6340:11 6350:11 6354:23,23	6410:3 6515:9 mixed 6384:16 modern 6455:24 moment 6421:19 6428:25 6488:11 Monday 6327:20 6399:13 money 6414:23 6515:11,14 month 6320:15 6321:1 6470:11 6470:18 6511:17 6537:22 months 6379:22 6412:5 6425:22 6436:20 6467:7 6508:3 6523:3 6537:18 more 6296:25 6309:19 6316:12 6334:21 6336:23 6338:6 6344:7 6350:7,10 6363:15 6376:7 6380:16,17 6395:22 6398:19 6398:22 6405:15 6411:19 6416:13 6418:1,2,3 6427:12 6431:9 6433:7 6440:11 6446:20 6453:23 6456:15 6457:15 6461:6 6467:17 6470:7 6482:9 6483:8,11 6484:22 6485:1 6487:12 6511:2 6511:24 6514:15 6521:19 6529:21 6532:8 6535:12 6535:23 6537:23 morning 6280:6,8 6286:10,12 6323:17 6343:4 6344:5 6346:12 6383:2,4 6400:9 6400:15 6418:13 6418:14,25 6419:1 6524:11 most 6301:21 6398:6,14,19 6412:5 6419:6 6433:22 6437:9 6458:13 6461:14 6490:21 6494:5 6534:5	mother 6511:9 motivate 6487:10 motivation 6508:12 6508:13 motor 6456:24 6457:8,16 6480:1 mounting 6320:10 move 6321:21 6323:18 6324:3 6337:22 6351:13 6352:23 6368:21 6368:23 6457:4 moved 6300:24 6484:1 6503:2 movements 6546:4 moving 6321:24 6352:25 6397:3 6454:5,6 6481:4 MPI 6415:2 much 6290:14 6296:25 6309:22 6318:16 6321:8 6323:13 6350:3,3 6381:3 6417:15 6417:15 6456:15 6473:10 6478:15 6480:8 6492:4,5 6511:24 6512:24 6520:23 6529:11 6529:21 6537:15 6544:9 mundane 6535:23 Municipal 6528:10 must 6370:18 6398:11 6433:9 6477:18 6479:7 6541:18 mutually 6386:1 myself 6293:2 6394:11 6411:6 6546:19 <hr/> N <hr/> name 6289:16 6415:3 6518:24 named 6314:19 names 6434:10 narrative 6340:6 narrower 6529:25 6530:1 National 6423:10 6423:14 6424:17 nature 6318:16 6319:16 6397:16 6417:12 6457:21 6465:2 6470:24 6471:22 6482:5	6482:15 6483:21 6484:12,22 6486:1 6490:6,14 6490:15,19 6491:8 6537:23 near 6406:25 6459:7 necessarily 6319:21 6461:5 6474:13 6508:1 6517:11 6526:21 necessary 6290:2 6327:3 6389:13 6455:17 necessity 6444:22 need 6283:3 6296:17 6304:7 6316:5,18,19 6325:1 6334:21 6343:16 6392:21 6397:25 6466:9 6479:14 6510:7 6510:11,18,20 6529:9 6542:13 needed 6282:8 6284:2 6307:3 6319:8 needs 6351:11 6483:13 6486:13 neg 6401:18 6453:19 6456:20 negate 6439:3,7 negates 6440:11,12 neglected 6528:19 negligence 6360:21 6361:11 6400:25 6416:20 6444:4 6453:12,21 6455:6,9,14,19 6456:4,7,15 6457:18 6458:6 6458:12,19 6459:8,12 6460:4 6460:11 6461:6 6461:23 6525:4,7 negotiations 6326:10 6399:17 6399:20 6401:9 6401:17 Neither 6516:11 net 6498:20 never 6282:17 6305:22 6314:23 6331:18 6350:11 6383:14 6387:15 6387:15 6408:17 6409:21 6415:22
---	--	--	--	--

6418:3 6504:14 6510:11 6513:17 6518:7 new 6322:9 6506:9 6541:7 newspapers 6410:16 next 6289:1 6299:16 6322:11 6373:8 6418:12 6441:3 6503:3,16 6512:15 6528:6 6529:1 6534:8,13 nexus 6520:18 nice 6343:5 night 6327:25 6344:20 6402:8 6436:22 6466:10 6497:13 nightmare 6440:18 nine 6309:11 nobody 6299:17 6301:6 6348:4 6469:11 nod 6487:3,5,7 nodding 6423:8 none 6404:15 6405:21 6413:17 6413:20 6491:11 non-prison 6465:15 noon 6479:17 norm 6389:17 6456:6,9,9 normal 6478:6 normally 6342:21 6347:15 6372:4 6428:9 6465:7 6500:17 6508:5 6547:12 notation 6298:3 note 6285:6,25 6286:1 6381:19 6382:7 6424:8 6440:13 6448:13 6452:6,14 6503:2 6522:21 6545:14 noted 6285:12 6478:3 6489:18 notes 6281:23 6394:4,5,20,20 6438:8 6440:5 6485:24 6499:5,8 6501:8 6507:18 6549:9 nothing 6281:14 6328:7 6341:13 6389:4,8 6394:23	6402:9,19 6469:2 notice 6370:19 6371:1 6533:24 6540:19 noticed 6536:9 6547:1 noting 6288:10 6449:20 notion 6484:11 6490:9 6501:2,13 6523:19 notionally 6540:21 notorious 6465:3 notwithstanding 6413:8 6499:5 6517:10 6521:2 6530:17 Nova 6506:10 nowhere 6404:14 number 6288:11 6290:11,13 6292:8,11 6299:7 6321:25 6329:5 6361:12 6370:1 6373:2 6381:22 6382:8 6392:7,18 6420:24 6427:2 6430:21,23 6432:5 6434:10 6448:17 6451:22 6461:1 6466:16 6466:17 6483:1 6501:4 6512:21 6537:1 6538:22 6540:20 6544:15 numbered 6291:25 6292:1,2 numbers 6288:1 6309:13 6387:8 6387:14 6533:4,5 numerous 6280:21 6426:1 <hr/> O <hr/> O 6502:12 oath 6443:6,8 6545:9 objecting 6353:8 objection 6353:17 objectively 6412:9 obligation 6332:16 6356:10 6404:16 6493:9 6494:17 6495:1 6514:4 obligations 6482:19 6494:24 6495:13 6510:9 6541:11	6541:16 obliged 6359:14,16 observation 6499:4 observations 6437:14 6439:2 6439:12,13 observed 6440:3 obstruct 6318:1 6364:18 obstructing 6317:25 6364:12 obtain 6372:2 6466:7 6467:20 6523:14 6526:7,9 obtained 6405:21 6411:9 obtaining 6362:11 6362:12 6468:18 obvious 6442:15 obviously 6295:8,15 6295:20 6312:6 6312:13 6318:12 6319:10 6320:4,7 6352:8 6363:16 6389:3 6446:21 6465:17 6473:19 6476:15 6531:20 6539:10,14,23 6547:20 occasion 6460:9 6490:8 6509:14 occasionally 6543:9 occasions 6373:3 6428:13 6461:1 6505:2 6509:15 6547:17 occupation 6442:9 occur 6282:8 6284:2 6331:1 6350:2 6380:11 6434:24 6491:9,9 occurred 6339:16 6399:17 6411:18 6453:4 6463:2 6499:9 occurs 6449:15 October 6307:9,10 6308:12 6311:3 6360:16 6489:20 6494:23 odour 6499:1 off 6334:25 6347:8 6350:15 6358:25 6359:3 6379:20 6380:5 6395:17 6432:17 6449:3 6465:5 6498:7	offence 6312:1 6318:11,12 6325:17 6399:2 6405:18 6451:16 6452:5 6461:5 6462:14,16,19 6463:2 6465:3,7 6470:6,7,24,25 6519:25 6522:8 6523:21 offences 6295:25 6334:20 6396:10 6416:16 6455:21 6455:22 6457:13 6460:12 6465:4 6523:9 6525:21 offended 6457:7 offender 6397:9 6460:8 6521:1,2 offenders 6523:13 offered 6375:7 6387:16 6449:6 office 6289:23 6298:14 6307:23 6327:4 6343:3 6348:8 6374:16 6374:20 6428:4 6434:13 6468:25 6510:4 6516:5 6532:12 6534:8 6539:18 6544:2 6544:11,18 6545:13 6546:11 officer 6277:4 6295:24 6312:9 6312:10 6318:10 6325:12 6326:5,7 6344:2,9 6345:3 6346:3 6364:11 6397:15 6417:5 6434:1 6440:8 6441:18 6442:5 6442:17 6443:15 6443:20,22 6445:21 6446:4,5 6450:12 6486:18 6499:7 6500:15 6501:22 6509:22 6509:22 6510:10 6533:13 officers 6283:19 6284:6 6323:25 6325:16 6363:7 6439:5 6441:20 6442:6,20 6443:13 6452:8 6452:12,15	6513:3 6530:2 6535:14 6545:23 officer's 6507:18 offices 6421:24 6533:9 6539:14 official 6433:24 off-duty 6295:24 6344:2,9 6345:3 6346:3 often 6372:16 6380:8 6433:22 6448:5 6487:3 6491:5,5 6492:18 6494:2 6512:1 Oftentimes 6380:11 Oh 6287:21 6308:18,18 6317:6 6332:7 6356:17 6385:3 6388:10 6412:15 6417:4 old 6511:8 omission 6489:15 6489:22 6490:11 6514:5 omit 6496:11 omitted 6496:5 once 6315:16,21 6332:20 6338:10 6387:15,15 6496:6 6505:6 ones 6333:19 one-year 6536:4 ongoing 6296:6 6306:10 6362:21 6473:21 6538:23 6546:14 only 6288:23 6292:16 6294:16 6296:24 6301:19 6301:20 6316:11 6316:16 6319:2 6327:16 6330:13 6330:23,25 6336:8,21 6341:12 6358:19 6369:13 6382:18 6386:16 6394:8 6395:16 6401:1 6401:10,19 6402:10,21 6403:11 6416:2 6416:24 6445:23 6458:18 6468:22 6488:17 6491:8 6506:13 6516:14 6543:3
--	---	---	---	--

<p>Ontario 6449:3 6458:9 6463:8 onto 6281:9 onus 6485:7,8 on-scene 6439:1 open 6280:4 6413:5 6449:16 6483:3 6485:12 6486:18 opening 6385:4 opinions 6296:7 6421:4 6428:3,13 6432:5 6435:14 6435:22 6437:1 6441:9 opportunity 6436:24 6437:17 6443:11 6481:5 opposed 6305:15 6341:14 6351:22 6361:7 6412:4 6452:16 6459:23 6500:8 6514:18 6515:18 opposition 6312:14 6432:8 6443:1 option 6445:20 oral 6529:18 order 6300:21 6307:3 6358:10 6372:2 6383:13 6433:10 6445:18 6456:1 6479:5 6523:10 ordered 6310:14 orders 6397:22 ordinary 6492:19 organizational 6292:3 organizations 6422:12 organizing 6533:5 orient 6533:7 original 6288:6 6310:17 originally 6333:10 others 6411:11 6456:18 otherwise 6283:22 6288:16 6356:10 6367:5 6413:5 6441:16,22 6504:15 ought 6366:23 6458:25 6495:18 ourselves 6493:24 6494:1 outcome 6310:5</p>	<p>outlined 6329:7 6364:7 outright 6402:2 outset 6315:23 6363:3 outside 6300:11 6302:2 6341:18 6343:13,16 6432:7,25 6535:4 6535:7,11,13 6536:8,15 6539:3 6539:10 6543:10 6545:3,19 6547:18 over 6286:15 6300:15 6309:20 6333:6 6335:18 6336:24 6349:4 6381:7 6409:25 6409:25 6425:10 6427:5 6429:9 6439:2 6441:5 6480:6 6526:22 overhead 6461:3 overlooked 6283:23 overly 6522:2 overnight 6326:21 overreaching 6497:21 6498:3 6503:10 override 6469:14 override 6469:13 oversight 6528:19 overstated 6498:6 overview 6344:24 6345:1 overwhelming 6411:17 6490:20 6491:16 Owen 6432:11 own 6300:6 6302:11 6311:11,11 6365:21 6413:1 6422:8,8 6463:14 6464:12 6465:12 6474:19 6486:9 o'clock 6342:21,24 6344:4 6378:3,7 6454:14,16,18 6473:4 6479:19 6548:11</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">P</p> <hr/> <p>Paciocco 6277:2 6278:9,17 6285:5 6292:4 6326:17 6386:21 6388:3,8</p>	<p>6388:16 6394:1 6398:3,7 6400:22 6401:4 6402:7 6403:1,6 6404:3 6406:16 6414:7 6418:4 6419:23 6421:6 6431:9 6454:5,6,13 6527:16 6528:23 6529:10 6530:17 6530:21,25 6531:7,13,15 Paciocco's 6428:14 6435:23 6447:21 6448:1 6461:21 6495:11 6528:5 6528:21 pages 6291:25 6392:7,11 6484:4 6484:9 6528:16 6528:18,24 6529:22 6549:8 paid 6389:18 paper 6430:21 6513:5 papers 6311:23 6424:6,10 paragraph 6288:11 6292:11,12 6293:24 6294:18 6370:6 6374:21 6382:6 6436:4 6452:7 6528:15 6542:17 paragraphs 6438:17 6502:19 paramedics 6499:2 6499:6 Pardon 6284:22 6306:5 6307:14 6308:19 6317:3 6324:20 6384:15 6408:5 parents 6306:3,6 parked 6460:25 Parliament 6480:4 6523:2 6524:3 Parliament's 6523:5,5 part 6349:24 6371:4 6385:10 6385:24 6386:3 6390:5 6437:9 6456:11 6466:11 6472:7 6492:24 6496:17 6503:12 6510:19 6527:4</p>	<p>6532:3 6538:2,18 participate 6315:24 participation 6424:14 particular 6289:12 6293:16 6302:16 6303:21 6304:2 6308:24 6311:6 6323:16 6325:14 6330:1 6331:21 6337:5 6346:11 6358:23 6364:5 6373:18 6393:1,9 6393:13 6397:12 6404:10 6406:18 6416:6 6443:1 6445:7 6450:18 6451:16 6452:5 6483:4 6486:21 6493:16 6496:25 6507:4 6509:25 6510:1 6521:25 6536:14 6545:6 6547:20 particularly 6293:10 6299:8 6302:14 6350:8 6398:24 6429:13 6431:2 6453:2 6473:16 6482:24 6484:19,25 6485:6 6489:19 6511:1 6513:1,16 6513:21 parties 6295:11 6334:25 6485:3 6490:16 6528:12 6531:2 partners 6302:7 6422:4 party 6312:14 6432:9 passage 6393:1 past 6323:23 6425:5 6441:19,25 6442:5 6443:2 6539:12 6547:17 6548:4 patently 6442:15 6517:17 pattern 6446:15 6458:21 6460:19 6520:15 patterns 6463:1 paucity 6438:21,23 Paul 6277:13 6279:8,9 6298:10</p>	<p>6374:25 6375:20 6528:10,14 6529:14 6530:6,8 6546:5 pay 6483:12 payment 6414:24 peace 6445:21 6446:4 Peck 6278:11 6279:3 6418:12 6418:17,25 6419:14,22 6420:3,21 6421:3 6421:8 6422:10 6426:25 6430:6 6431:13,19 6434:18 6436:1 6437:4 6439:11 6441:7 6443:24 6445:14 6447:17 6449:23 6452:6 6454:24 6460:10 6461:17 6463:10 6464:8 6465:21 6469:17 6471:4 6473:19 6475:17 6477:3 6480:14 6484:16 6489:10 6491:13 6492:7 6498:8 6503:15 6503:25 6518:24 6527:11 Pedersen 6439:18 6440:1 peer 6428:13 penalty 6412:6 pending 6528:6 people 6294:13 6299:8 6309:9 6365:22 6366:4 6378:5,10 6397:2 6397:3 6399:4 6412:8 6417:16 6465:18 6476:21 6490:16 6492:19 6493:6,13,17 6511:7 6512:2,5 6515:15,25 6516:14 6521:14 6523:6,8 6525:8 6539:3,3,9,21 per 6511:9 percentage 6537:2 perception 6377:9 6377:10 6485:14 6533:17 perfection 6491:10</p>
---	---	--	---	---

<p>perfectly 6505:9,18 perhaps 6292:6 6340:11 6365:2 6389:13 6420:9 6433:24,24 6434:23 6458:23 6458:24 6460:24 6460:25 6461:7 6465:14 6474:7 6476:10 6478:10 6480:4 6487:1 6494:1 6535:5 6537:21 6546:21 6547:15,21 period 6395:15,17 6403:19 6412:4 6446:9 6460:23 6508:3 6513:10 6537:22 periodic 6306:10,12 6306:18 periodically 6343:17 permission 6431:11 permit 6371:25 permitted 6433:15 Perron 6470:19 persisted 6510:7 person 6288:19 6291:9 6301:19 6301:21 6303:21 6304:22 6319:2 6392:24 6433:22 6440:8 6442:2,13 6444:3 6445:1,6 6446:7,14 6462:13 6468:17 6468:19,23 6469:14 6493:7 6510:3 6511:2 6516:14 6520:4 6520:14 6533:15 6537:5 6543:5 personally 6307:17 6347:23 persons 6444:21 6519:24 6536:24 person's 6453:5 6520:22 perspective 6281:12 6282:23 6283:5 6283:11 6421:2 6451:22 persuade 6366:17 pertinent 6528:10 phone 6290:11,13 6291:9 6313:12</p>	<p>6321:11,25 6333:6 6510:4 6512:21 phoned 6300:2 6353:21 6355:18 6500:22 photographs 6439:19 6507:19 phrase 6285:13,15 6285:17,19 6353:10 6476:6 6485:6 6496:4 6503:6,7 6526:19 phrased 6319:18 phraseology 6305:12 6341:8 phrasing 6352:7 pick 6494:21 picture 6342:18 piece 6513:5 place 6326:12 6328:19 6417:23 6460:16 6461:5 6476:3 6491:4,18 6497:5 6498:12 6543:20 6547:14 6549:10 placed 6464:14 6483:3,5 6531:20 plaintiff 6516:7 plane 6529:9 planning 6381:2 play 6358:2 6362:10 6365:8 6433:22 6499:25 played 6532:16 player 6479:20 plead 6369:18 pleading 6325:12 6367:23 6488:14 6517:7 pleads 6330:21 pleas 6337:15,15 6338:11 please 6280:3,4 6290:4 6291:2 6316:20 6367:8 6368:21 6380:24 6380:25 6387:2 6405:5,10 6418:8 6441:8 6454:22 6461:18 6502:16 6504:10,11 6528:1,2 6536:16 6541:4,6 6547:24 plowed 6389:19 pointed 6393:12</p>	<p>6497:12 6500:6 points 6416:3 6445:14 6514:15 6516:1 poked 6491:6 policies 6294:20 6295:4 6296:13 6357:23 6358:1,2 6358:9,13 6464:20 6542:25 political 6312:20 6433:12 political 6432:5 6433:24 Poole 6281:24 6299:8 Poole's 6281:23 Portage 6479:18 posed 6442:23 6443:10 6519:13 posing 6487:12 position 6289:7 6337:16 6345:7 6428:18 6462:21 6468:7 6469:23 6469:24 6481:10 6481:11,18 6506:25 6507:1 6512:2 6524:2 6525:16 6527:1 6537:12 6539:5 6539:24 6542:1 6543:25 positions 6422:22 positive 6281:7,11 6282:9 6495:1 possibility 6325:24 6363:2,17 6375:24 possible 6314:4 6350:4 6492:5,6 6545:3 6547:25 possibly 6536:10 postdates 6467:5 posted 6376:18 post-dated 6470:6 post-dates 6472:17 potential 6328:6 6408:15 6433:12 6450:16,16 6492:1 6500:19 6504:2 6534:2 6538:8 potentially 6368:10 6395:20 power 6448:3 6469:11</p>	<p>practicable 6450:8 practice 6291:6,12 6300:16 6331:12 6331:18,19 6333:13 6335:21 6338:25 6421:22 6426:12,14,16,17 6426:18 6427:2 6430:22 6431:4 6434:25 6442:19 6444:16,20 6448:24 6449:2,8 6449:11,14 6487:23 6509:3 6520:3 6533:14 6533:21 6537:2 6537:15 6538:2 6544:23 practiced 6422:4 practices 6538:10 6544:2 practicing 6336:9 6336:13 6421:18 6421:25 6422:9 practitioner 6309:23 6534:17 6534:24 practitioners 6302:7 6534:20 practitioner's 6442:19 Prairie 6465:6 Prasad 6478:21 preceded 6458:21 6470:6 precise 6416:7 6536:22 precisely 6485:5 predicated 6498:13 6519:19 predict 6347:1 6366:21 preface 6466:23 prefaced 6469:1 prefer 6302:21 6407:22 preliminary 6284:8 6317:20 6318:5 6322:7,12 6325:3 6366:10,12 6367:19 6377:3 6379:23 6380:2 6399:12 6401:2 6401:20 6402:2 6402:11,21 6513:10 Premier 6381:19</p>	<p>preparation 6513:13 prepared 6334:4 6351:21 6528:17 6536:21 6539:8 preparing 6325:3 presence 6461:3 6472:21 6477:16 present 6393:23 6419:4 6424:25 6481:9 6495:20 6501:23 presentation 6489:1 6528:13 presented 6335:9 6399:7 6411:5 6421:5 6436:3 6440:16,24,24 6443:9 6445:16 6451:9 6455:6 6459:3 6460:14 6463:6,23 6464:21 6471:10 6475:17 6482:15 6483:17 6494:14 6500:5 6526:4 presenting 6366:15 6474:20 6485:7 6495:14 presents 6399:6 president 6423:18 6434:8 presiding 6481:17 pressing 6401:4 pressure 6490:15 presumably 6298:15,17 6320:21 6342:24 6343:8 6344:18 6500:14 pretty 6328:11 6399:16 6447:3 prevailed 6523:20 previous 6382:11 6397:18 previously 6442:12 6442:16 pre-trial 6342:10 6379:22 pride 6493:24 primarily 6297:3 6396:22 6421:25 6452:12 primary 6452:22 principled 6479:12 principles 6464:19 6481:9</p>
--	---	--	---	--

<p>printed 6386:19 prior 6419:2,8 6435:19 6439:6 6455:2 6464:7 6480:1 6503:16 6520:14 6544:25 6546:15 priority 6483:14 prison 6465:10 private 6434:13 6442:4,19 6474:15 6534:9 6534:17,20,23 privilege 6487:2 6538:3 privy 6542:8 pro 6351:2 6413:5 6482:8 probable 6417:6 6450:4,14 probably 6293:5 6296:20 6304:21 6305:12 6315:5 6318:7 6334:14 6334:20 6349:8 6349:11 6432:1 6446:15 6456:21 6465:3 6473:9 6497:8,18 6510:3 6522:25 6535:12 6548:2 probation 6520:20 Prober 6277:12 6278:7 6382:23 6383:1,4 6384:10 6390:15 6518:19 probing 6547:8 problem 6312:6 6338:24 6339:11 6364:8 6444:15 6458:10 6488:23 6494:20 6497:1 6498:2 6509:14 6521:3 problematic 6471:14 6473:6 problems 6281:9 6308:16 6326:4 6329:6,7 6345:14 6345:17,23,24 6346:4 6350:5 6361:14 6362:7 6364:6 6365:22 6366:1,7,20 6368:8,9,10 6395:23 6417:8 6417:16 6429:10</p>	<p>6449:24 6450:1 6450:22 6451:19 6451:21 6485:10 6486:11 6487:22 6493:1,18,22 6501:4,10,12 6502:6 6508:9,19 procedure 6392:10 6392:17 6428:7 proceed 6317:19 6318:4 6360:8 6362:1,19 6383:13,14,15 6401:1,10,19 6449:1 6450:20 6475:14 6544:17 proceeded 6439:24 6500:13 proceeding 6335:7 6402:10,21 6407:1 6438:14 6475:6 6486:21 6489:6 6496:11 6511:17 6513:19 proceedings 6276:12,19 6278:1 6288:20 6349:4 6354:4 6359:23 6362:15 6380:22 6387:1 6387:22 6388:6 6388:12 6391:7 6449:18 6454:19 6484:21 6489:12 6504:8,18 6527:24 6528:9 6532:22 process 6412:14 6417:5 6471:18 6473:17 6492:9 6529:21 6538:9 processed 6439:18 proclaimed 6523:12 prodded 6491:6 produce 6286:2 produced 6509:21 production 6489:1 profession 6421:17 6429:9,12 professional 6280:18 6282:18 6300:5 6411:7 6421:1 6422:11 6424:13 6428:20 6429:10 6431:15 6449:13 6490:10 6495:13 6498:2</p>	<p>6513:2 6545:24 6546:8 professionalism 6430:1,4 6431:3 professor 6423:15 profile 6295:8 6296:2 Program 6423:11 6424:17 programs 6424:21 progress 6434:23 6447:3 Project 6424:2 prominent 6521:11 promise 6379:5,6 6444:3,12 6445:4 6445:18 6520:7 6521:17 prompted 6319:25 proof 6361:7 6362:3 6368:17 6368:17 6371:22 6383:8 6385:16 6385:19,25 6386:1 6439:16 6440:21 6451:19 6452:3 6471:20 6473:5 6474:21 6474:25 6475:1 6486:12 6497:22 6498:20 6500:12 6502:6 6503:14 6508:20 proper 6305:17 6344:12 6373:15 6411:6 6485:23 6489:13,23 6525:9 properly 6496:19 6543:21 propose 6419:3 6527:14 proposed 6357:17 6357:21,22 proposition 6479:25 6482:8 propriety 6463:25 6525:24 pros 6411:8 prosectorial 6451:7 6452:4 6453:11 6455:4,13 6461:19 6462:4 6462:23 6471:6 6475:19 6476:7 6481:8 6499:20 6499:23</p>	<p>prosecute 6432:13 6442:4,14,17 6505:1 6511:14 6544:5 prosecuted 6518:7 6533:19 prosecuting 6323:25 6428:11 6443:21 6492:17 6537:16 prosecution 6276:1 6294:20 6295:3,4 6306:25 6326:2 6361:23 6392:22 6428:1,17 6433:4 6434:15 6435:25 6436:15 6440:21 6450:21 6451:19 6467:18 6468:17 6474:16 6502:10 6507:2 6525:9 6531:17 6532:25 6535:1,22 6538:17 6539:2,4 6541:14 prosecutions 6288:19,21 6294:23 6405:14 6416:12 6420:18 6432:22,23 6466:19 6541:22 prosecution's 6433:11 prosecutorial 6360:7 6427:19 6428:24 6433:17 6436:7 6444:1,10 6444:11 6447:19 6448:4 6451:1 6524:18 prosecutors 6431:23 6469:13 6469:13 6492:15 6524:2 6532:6,12 6534:4 6536:20 6537:3 6538:13 6538:23 6540:1 6540:23 6541:12 6541:17 6546:10 6547:10 prosecutor's 6440:17 6541:8 prospect 6459:11 protected 6511:7 protocol 6305:17,20 6305:23 6315:7 6315:11 6533:13</p>	<p>6533:24 Proulx 6473:24 provable 6437:15 prove 6351:21 6368:4 6383:21 6384:8 6385:15 6471:7 6473:3,11 6473:12 6475:3 6475:10,15,25 6476:2 6496:8,11 6496:22 6497:9 6498:15 6501:13 6519:10 proven 6361:3 proves 6476:23 provide 6301:10 6420:22,23 6421:4 6428:3 6431:13 6438:20 6441:14 6444:6 6447:20,24 6461:18,25 6492:7 6502:15 6536:22 6543:14 6544:16 provided 6313:7 6326:25 6397:18 6416:20 6435:14 6435:22 6436:21 6451:13 6481:15 6482:24 6491:25 6492:3 6501:16 6541:18 6542:23 6543:9 6544:14 provides 6433:1 providing 6437:5 6494:8 6529:21 province 6277:18 6292:15 6293:18 6294:6,23 6427:22 6430:7 6432:19,21 6446:11 6459:14 6465:2,17 6467:2 6470:22 6472:13 6482:1 6486:20 6487:24 6531:18 6533:14 6534:15 6534:18 6538:3 6549:7 provinces 6411:25 6465:6 6506:15 provincial 6289:5 6294:22 6310:13 6322:4,10 6335:2 6403:18 6414:13 6414:15 6427:6</p>
---	--	--	--	--

6427:15 6435:11 6449:4 6457:7 proving 6449:24 provisions 6457:7 6544:2 proximity 6501:21 PSU 6280:19,23 6281:7,10 6282:4 6284:4,13,17 6547:5 public 6292:20 6295:23 6304:16 6377:9 6417:14 6453:1 6456:13 6485:14 6486:22 6487:5,7 publications 6424:5 6424:10 6430:24 publicity 6311:22 6312:1 pure 6456:24,24 6482:16 6496:22 purpose 6289:22 6298:18 6300:12 6319:6 6322:6 6340:25 6355:19 6357:13 6394:2,3 6394:6 6417:14 6418:1 6432:16 purposes 6436:11 6452:25 6453:1 6453:25 6532:8 6535:1 pursuant 6391:1 6426:22 6427:10 6444:23 6445:21 pursue 6312:21 pursued 6377:14 pursuing 6445:17 put 6324:2 6335:17 6336:19 6337:14 6338:2 6349:2 6350:3,9 6353:19 6367:7,10,11 6374:8 6384:10 6386:21 6388:5,8 6389:23 6391:8,9 6396:2 6402:19 6416:19 6431:7 6433:13 6441:10 6455:2 6457:22 6464:9 6486:13 6489:25 6490:15 6499:24 6525:21 6530:16 6531:1 6538:11 6540:11 6540:15 6542:14	6542:17 puts 6388:16 6523:14 putting 6281:21 6400:15 6432:20 6438:8 P-1 6528:22 P-1.82 6528:18,22 6529:2 p.m 6454:19,20 6504:8,9 6527:24 6527:25 6548:14 <hr/> Q <hr/> qualifications 6425:16 qualms 6281:2,4 quasi 6539:20 Quebec 6506:10,10 Queen's 6335:3 6423:7 6478:8 questioned 6406:16 6406:21 questioning 6383:11 6386:16 6401:5 6409:22 6425:8 questions 6280:11 6286:7 6290:5 6291:3 6380:5,17 6381:22 6382:22 6390:16 6408:21 6413:21 6414:11 6430:11 6431:25 6441:10 6443:9 6448:2 6453:9 6462:9 6481:7 6484:17 6503:25 6504:16 6510:15 6518:10,13,16,17 6518:19,20,23 6521:22 6527:6 6548:8 quick 6377:13 quickly 6508:2,8,23 quid 6351:2 6413:4 6482:8 quite 6290:16 6350:19 6388:19 6410:10 6446:19 6447:11 6466:22 6492:11 6496:19 6539:13,17,18 quo 6351:2 6413:5 6482:8 quotation 6394:11 quoted 6388:2	Q.C 6276:2 <hr/> R <hr/> R 6277:13 6405:24 6406:3 raise 6353:17 raised 6312:15 6320:3 6325:23 6326:20 6352:2 6352:13,21 6386:18 6387:21 6387:23,25 6393:7 6497:18 raises 6496:14 raising 6328:8 ramifications 6314:4 6325:15 6344:11 range 6329:19 6493:4 Rankin 6421:24 6422:4 rapport 6300:21 6336:25 rare 6442:18 6457:2,3 6460:7 rarely 6325:7 rather 6352:6 6469:22 6478:8 6509:5 6514:13 6539:3 rational 6308:11 rationale 6468:6 6542:9 RCMP 6287:8 6314:16,22 6315:9,13,16,17 6316:8,12,14 6317:2,4,15 6323:13 6364:23 6374:25 6376:6 6380:15 re 6279:6 6299:24 6529:4 6547:3 rea 6455:25 reached 6288:15 reaches 6455:17 reaching 6479:19 6497:21 reaction 6281:11 6309:24 6310:2 read 6293:1,12,13 6304:7 6309:20 6330:22 6331:4 6331:16,23 6332:12,15,20 6333:8,15	6335:18 6338:13 6339:10 6348:2,4 6370:22 6372:10 6376:23 6402:15 6402:23 6405:5 6405:10 6409:25 6410:19 6472:22 6500:8 6501:24 6528:12 readily 6502:8 reading 6372:6 6376:22 6388:13 6388:24 6389:2 6410:11 6508:15 ready 6501:5 real 6379:21 6462:20 reality 6335:15 6339:14 realized 6317:19 really 6301:23 6307:2 6309:12 6316:4 6325:1 6369:8 6380:8 6412:11,23 6415:2,4,13 6417:23 6457:19 6466:24 6480:8 6491:1 6495:23 6497:21,23 6499:9 6503:8 6511:23 6513:19 6520:22 6523:15 6525:6 6542:10 realm 6460:11 reappeared 6483:24 rear 6344:5 6389:19 6397:2 6479:20 rearrange 6547:25 reason 6319:24 6321:17 6330:18 6339:20 6341:16 6341:21 6347:9 6347:15 6350:17 6358:23 6371:4 6375:19 6395:11 6404:17 6406:12 6508:7 6514:12 6545:7 reasonableness 6523:17 reasonably 6362:11 reasons 6296:8,11 6296:15,16 6302:14 6325:18	6326:1 6361:12 6415:8 6485:13 6488:13 6491:23 6514:7 recall 6284:8 6300:8 6303:17 6323:7 6328:14 6333:4 6340:16 6340:24 6345:25 6385:20,21 6398:7 6401:2 6402:13 6403:5 6404:7,18,20 6406:25 6414:21 6514:19,23 6516:1,22 6522:2 6528:8 6535:3 6547:6 recalling 6543:8 receipt 6508:24 receive 6533:18 6535:21 6548:1 received 6288:6 6298:25 6310:11 6310:13 6313:14 6396:4 6436:20 6540:16 6543:16 6544:17 receiving 6292:16 recency 6443:14 recent 6300:13 6359:12 6477:23 6522:10 recently 6293:9 6406:1 recess 6353:21 6380:21 6497:2 6504:7 6527:23 recessed 6380:22 6454:19 6504:8 6527:24 recitation 6344:19 6496:12 recite 6424:4 reckless 6456:17 6458:20 recognize 6469:20 6491:7 recognized 6439:14 6494:12 recognizing 6329:10 recollection 6285:23 6304:5 6330:11 6394:16 6394:22 recommend
--	--	---	--	--

6327:12 6370:15 6372:1 6444:2 6467:13,20 6468:11 recommendation 6341:25 6345:9 6346:6 6349:9 6350:21 6369:19 6369:23 6371:8 6371:11 6390:7 6412:21 6413:4 6413:19 6467:9 6467:23 recommendations 6350:24 recommended 6403:9 recommending 6358:7 reconcile 6517:4,5 reconstruction 6375:2 6453:2 reconvened 6380:23 6454:20 6504:9 6527:25 record 6331:4,23 6332:12 6333:8 6388:5,9 6397:17 6405:5 6439:23 6440:4 6448:11 6471:13 6483:3 6500:18 6528:12 6530:16 recorded 6393:13 6394:20 6499:4 6500:9 recording 6500:16 red 6397:3 reduce 6334:14 reduced 6340:9 refer 6287:15 6292:5,7,10 6297:22 6325:1 6340:3 6375:18 6387:18 6391:5 6393:8 6404:21 6407:2 6419:7,15 6419:18 6420:11 6443:24 6450:5 6452:7 6455:22 6456:5 6466:9 6478:20 6495:6 6502:14 6532:20 6533:6 reference 6321:25 6339:21 6388:16 6391:15 6415:22	6420:15,16 6424:5,13 6427:18 6439:16 6453:16 6455:8 6460:12 6466:18 6475:11 6488:23 6495:24 6496:18 6497:12 6498:12 6528:16,24 6542:16,18,20 referenced 6425:25 referrals 6428:9 referred 6288:12,20 6315:18 6317:2,4 6379:19 6382:7 6393:9,11 6400:22 6403:1 6406:21 6408:21 6436:8 6437:19 6449:23 6450:3 6458:10 6465:22 6467:17 6472:19 6477:13 6489:21 6495:25 6516:21 referring 6282:24 6283:4 6285:6 6287:2,11 6288:3 6291:24 6298:8 6341:14 6381:12 6403:6 6466:13 6477:15 refers 6370:10 6472:13 6479:3 reflection 6352:8 6517:18 6535:6 Reform 6422:14,24 refresh 6286:23 refusal 6360:20 6361:12,15 6375:12 6398:16 6399:4,6 6400:25 6401:19 6416:21 6444:6 6449:25 6451:1 6499:15 6499:19 6501:13 6524:23 refuse 6365:18 6375:21 6398:21 6399:1 6405:19 6501:1 refused 6365:17 refusing 6398:22 6416:17 6447:20 6447:24 6461:25 regard 6446:22 6482:19 6484:8 6532:14	regarding 6282:18 6299:24 6337:15 6355:5 6358:3 6359:22 6541:15 regards 6403:12 Regina 6475:1 6482:6 regional 6288:21 6423:21 6531:16 6541:22 registry 6449:20 regular 6336:10 6535:13 6538:2 6539:21 regularity 6538:15 6538:25 regularly 6536:23 regulatory 6426:18 rehash 6396:1 Reid 6277:20 6549:6,15 reject 6332:16 rejected 6412:21 relate 6431:3 6435:25 6485:12 related 6322:7 6385:10 6445:7 relates 6445:16 6487:19 relating 6279:8 6304:2,10,13,16 6363:5 6530:8 6538:10 6542:24 6544:18 relation 6289:12 6369:5 6397:13 relationship 6336:17 6373:7 6394:10 6443:22 6479:15 6547:18 relative 6466:3 6520:12 release 6379:4,6 6444:2 6446:1,2 6446:20 6519:24 6520:4,20 6521:7 6521:13,16 6544:20 released 6444:21,25 6445:2 releasing 6444:12 6445:18,20 relevance 6316:14 6474:21 relevant 6279:6 6419:5,11 6420:25 6431:15	6443:19 6464:13 6473:16 6507:12 6525:20 6529:5 6529:22 reliance 6477:4 relied 6333:9 6436:20 relies 6331:4,12 6488:3 relieved 6414:9 rely 6337:17 6338:5 6366:18 6438:5 6475:7 6543:17 relying 6334:8 6353:14 6359:13 remain 6480:10 remaining 6453:24 remark 6407:4 remarks 6466:24 6469:1 remedy 6361:19 remember 6298:18 6316:2,9 6340:19 6340:20,21 6351:23 6352:13 6352:15,16 6377:24 6379:5 6381:6 6382:15 6388:7 6394:24 6415:17 6454:16 6460:6 remind 6300:12 6447:13 reminded 6283:22 6345:4 6414:1 removed 6464:16 6539:3 render 6479:5 rendered 6364:16 6441:9 6484:24 6489:21 reoffend 6397:24 reopened 6380:25 6454:22 6504:11 6528:2 repeat 6451:16 6538:19 repeated 6460:13 6460:20 replace 6295:17 reply 6303:12 report 6279:6,9 6284:18 6285:10 6298:15,15,23,25 6313:4,8,14 6314:4,8,8 6315:17,22	6362:25 6365:3 6379:17 6380:15 6432:12,13 6451:17 6452:7 6469:7 6488:22 6497:11,14 6506:16 6520:9 6528:17,25 6529:5,17,18,23 6530:9,14,23 6540:5 6542:6 reported 6285:7 6426:2 6470:14 6470:14 reporters 6277:19 6549:2,6 reports 6405:25 6410:11,16 6438:8 6507:18 representation 6443:15 represented 6323:23 6442:13 representing 6442:20 6443:13 request 6508:20 6510:6 requested 6284:20 6284:23 6300:9 6509:17 requesting 6284:13 6320:4 6381:18 require 6510:6 required 6373:9 6405:9,13 6416:11 6446:21 6447:10 6461:14 6467:16 6468:3 6469:7 6475:10 requirement 6468:18 6524:1 requirements 6405:23 6433:9 research 6301:13 6373:16 6411:22 6463:15 6464:4 6464:12 6465:17 6465:17 6508:17 reserved 6460:6 resisting 6405:16 6416:14 resolution 6310:5 6324:19 6328:7 6329:5,17 6330:9 6333:7 6342:11 6366:7 6375:8 6376:14 6384:11
---	--	--	---	---

resolved 6361:16	6485:20 6486:3	Rob 6289:3,4	6333:10 6341:7	6496:19 6497:2
resolving 6375:6	revelation 6311:14	Robert 6277:10	6363:14 6368:20	6500:25 6516:10
resource 6546:7	6312:5,25	6528:17	6387:14 6399:19	6541:9
resources 6302:8	6317:12	Robinson 6316:8,23	6408:10 6409:13	scale 6398:15
respecting 6290:6	revelations 6313:18	Roger 6276:2	6423:2 6438:24	6417:21 6463:17
6291:4 6392:23	6314:10	role 6420:24	6453:14 6459:16	scant 6473:18
6496:1	reversed 6359:12	6431:14,21	6464:5,6 6478:15	scenarios 6443:9
respond 6303:21,23	review 6376:13	6433:16,19	6484:14 6493:9	scene 6365:22
6304:25 6321:2	6436:24 6437:18	6468:19 6480:6	6516:9 6522:7	6374:24 6405:22
6367:7 6476:25	6441:9 6443:12	6532:14,16	6541:11	6452:8,13,21,24
responding 6524:4	6463:11 6467:6	6546:14	sample 6444:7	scheduled 6378:12
response 6281:3	6483:18 6502:25	roles 6447:7	6447:20,24	6379:23 6395:3
6329:12 6445:25	6508:23 6509:4	room 6336:1	6461:25 6501:1	scheduling 6322:7
6455:12 6538:12	6532:15 6542:6	6378:11 6447:12	sanitize 6498:5	scheme 6412:22
responses 6502:1	reviewed 6438:5	6501:21 6525:8	Saskatchewan	School 6423:16
responsibilities	6463:12 6473:25	roots 6397:20	6465:9	6429:19
6452:22	6525:17	round-table 6320:1	sat 6377:22 6394:24	science 6457:20
responsibility	reviewing 6444:18	route 6460:25	satisfied 6335:8	6461:11 6515:24
6306:14 6356:21	6491:18 6497:7	rule 6361:16,17	6338:23 6362:2	Scotia 6506:10
6356:24 6379:15	6508:15	6366:3 6467:8	6383:16,19,21	Sean 6282:25
6487:16 6532:4	revised 6382:4,14	run 6296:7 6302:17	6384:7 6385:14	seat 6343:3
responsible 6359:1	6540:4,10	6302:21,22	6389:9 6395:9	seated 6280:5
6429:16 6532:5	revision 6541:1	6357:16,18,19	6417:17	6381:1 6454:22
6536:12	revisited 6317:12	6372:25 6401:24	satisfy 6459:13	6504:12 6528:3
responsive 6495:2	revolves 6495:23	6425:9 6469:10	6484:2 6495:13	second 6285:7
rest 6463:9 6504:1	re-attend 6548:7	rung 6534:13	Saturday 6327:1	6309:23 6330:19
Restall 6277:10	re-examination	running 6326:14	saw 6332:4 6466:10	6353:4 6371:20
restraint 6414:10	6278:9 6527:8,10	6445:10	6496:7	6442:24 6481:13
restrictive 6446:20	Richard 6278:11,16	Rural 6528:10	saying 6285:24	6534:23
rests 6493:10	6279:3 6343:1	Russ 6544:10	6312:10 6317:7	secondly 6322:15
result 6310:24	6344:8 6364:23	6545:10	6328:5 6334:3	6326:4 6442:15
6314:12 6385:9	6365:1 6383:25	R-1 6287:3,7	6348:15 6352:15	6452:23 6502:7
6406:4 6411:8	6418:12,17	6373:23 6546:23	6355:1 6363:1	6503:5
6412:7 6461:22	6420:3 6521:9	R-1.91.16 6316:1	6368:14 6378:20	seconds 6503:18
6481:12,19	6531:10	R-1.91.94 6303:2	6379:5 6383:10	secrecy 6392:23
6482:21 6515:5	Ridd 6379:12	R-2 6287:3,7	6409:17 6434:18	secretary 6277:5
6533:20 6540:5	6544:10 6545:10	6303:2,4 6381:15	6466:24 6500:21	6323:3 6373:22
6541:1 6542:4	6545:18	6546:23	6512:15 6514:22	6512:17
6544:13 6547:5	ride 6474:11	R-2.91.49 6373:24	6516:4 6523:1,1,4	section 6426:22
resulted 6382:18	rightly 6383:7	R-3 6540:12	6523:22 6547:22	6427:10 6433:1,8
resume 6344:22	rights 6483:11	R-4 6287:4,7	says 6288:11	6433:14,15
retained 6442:4	6541:14,18	R.L 6277:4	6289:20 6290:3	6445:21 6446:2
6535:13 6537:19	6542:24 6543:7	R.M 6277:13	6291:1 6292:12	6450:6 6502:15
6541:3 6544:24	6543:20	<hr/>	6294:18 6320:16	6523:18
retainer 6287:19,20	Riley 6279:5 6529:3	S	6337:8 6339:19	sections 6419:13
6288:6,15	rise 6280:3 6380:20	6277:15,16,16,17	6344:8 6349:16	secure 6452:24
6289:11,20	6380:24 6432:15	6277:18	6349:16 6352:20	secured 6412:5
6297:8 6536:4,8	6443:23 6454:17	safe 6433:14	6353:1 6354:1	securely 6461:6
6538:24 6540:22	6454:21 6457:22	safely 6459:17	6359:20 6360:6	see 6290:9,25
6542:17	6462:10 6490:9	safeties 6452:25	6370:12 6372:7	6292:21 6300:22
retainers 6536:11	6504:5,6,10	safety 6452:24	6372:14,15	6342:5 6360:13
6536:14 6542:22	6527:22 6528:1	6456:17	6400:6 6440:9	6360:14 6365:14
retrospect 6304:21	6548:12	sake 6401:14	6467:21,24	6368:19 6371:18
6334:13 6497:6	rising 6449:17	Salhany 6276:2	6468:2,12	6374:14 6388:11
reveal 6318:15,19	risk 6487:9 6538:12	salvaged 6377:2	6472:20 6479:4	6388:24 6389:2
6486:18	risks 6458:24	salvo 6385:4	6483:8 6486:17	6410:2 6412:8
revealing 6390:23	road 6456:14	same 6289:17	6488:12 6496:17	6437:8 6442:7,22

6443:10,19,22 6444:15 6446:17 6452:23 6464:4 6469:3 6470:22 6470:25 6473:16 6473:20 6475:20 6476:7 6480:23 6484:9 6498:1 6500:19 6506:17 6506:22 6508:9 6515:8,9 6517:15 6520:23 6525:6 6536:9 6542:14 6545:12 seeing 6501:4 seek 6468:24 6534:14 seeking 6497:3,17 seem 6317:22 6354:12 6398:24 6472:5 6510:1 seemed 6318:2 6464:17 6474:10 6510:22 6524:7 seeming 6433:18 seems 6298:22 6399:15 6442:14 6445:16 6446:6 6452:21 6477:8 6479:14,16 6482:18 6486:12 6488:17 6493:9 6494:4 6522:9 seen 6414:5 sees 6516:8 seized 6342:13 select 6336:21 6538:22 selected 6434:5,11 6435:8 6534:25 6535:2 selection 6534:21 send 6300:15 6382:4,4 6512:14 sending 6328:4 6374:16 senior 6296:7 6301:21 6350:21 6350:25 6364:11 6372:25 6430:7 6444:19 6447:12 6454:2 6467:18 6468:25 6513:3 6545:10 sense 6313:13 6314:7 6321:10 6334:18 6347:21	6394:11 6428:9 6444:16 6480:22 6513:7,8 sensitive 6295:6,10 6296:3 6318:12 6319:16,22 6321:18 sensitivities 6347:10 sent 6298:23 6299:1 6303:9,10 6316:1 6316:3 6324:11 6547:23 sentenced 6465:5 6479:16 sentences 6358:7 6436:17 6470:5 6470:23 6522:7 sentencing 6329:10 6330:25 6331:10 6332:21 6333:2,8 6333:16 6334:6 6335:18,19 6345:8 6349:3 6352:11 6353:4 6370:19 6373:17 6377:8 6409:5,15 6409:24 6410:6 6411:14,24 6415:14 6420:19 6463:1 6466:21 6471:18,22 6473:17 6474:9 6475:5,8 6478:16 6479:12 6480:3 6482:11 6483:12 6484:21 6488:8 6491:23 6493:4 6502:23 6519:22 6522:12 6524:9 sentiment 6523:7 separate 6433:11 6433:17 6434:13 September 6285:8 6285:10 6302:25 6303:1 6307:6,8 6307:20 6352:12 6353:3,20 6354:5 6355:4,13 6356:15 6357:3 6404:22 6406:20 6407:1 6408:18 6415:11,13 6483:25 6484:8 6494:22 6503:4 serendipity 6547:11 Sergeant 6281:22	6281:24 6450:12 6529:23 series 6520:25 serious 6295:25 6312:11 6314:14 6318:12 6325:15 6343:23 6398:6 6398:14,19,19,22 6399:16,22 6412:5 6467:11 6467:15 6487:9 6535:12 servants 6296:21 served 6310:14 6396:6 6403:10 service 6277:15 6280:19 6325:6 6392:22 6417:22 6434:1 6467:18 6474:16 6507:2 6512:21 6538:17 6539:2,4 6545:23 Services 6374:23 6541:24 serving 6538:3 set 6296:14 6307:13 6307:15,18,19 6313:24 6334:16 6342:19 6350:10 6371:17 6405:23 6422:3,8 6436:4 6438:16 6444:7 6446:9 6447:21 6447:25 6452:8 6460:18 6461:20 6472:10 6488:2 6495:10 6502:22 6529:15 sets 6381:21 settled 6335:4 6474:22 6475:13 6514:23 6515:7 settlement 6283:17 6399:16,20,22 6401:8,17 seven 6381:5 6382:6,8 sever 6432:17 several 6282:20 6287:3 6303:25 share 6301:12 6443:16 shared 6485:2 sharing 6301:14 shear 6537:10 sheet 6297:11,11 6299:4 6303:1,14	6317:2,5 6321:25 6323:9 6324:25 6325:1 6357:1 shift 6536:10 shipped 6378:13 shocked 6348:20,21 shoddy 6375:19 short 6359:17 6368:12 6377:23 6405:8,12 6416:10 6454:9 6462:7 6502:19 6527:20 shortly 6410:13 6440:5 shot 6460:25 show 6444:22 6445:5 6450:11 6479:7 6546:24 showed 6332:2 6402:7 6440:10 shown 6532:21 shows 6323:10 shunt 6494:23 side 6337:25 sidetracked 6357:2 sign 6334:25 6445:11 signature 6303:12 signed 6350:15 significance 6511:21 significant 6395:23 6399:16 6430:3 6438:6 6458:22 significantly 6469:22 signs 6439:13 6440:3,10 6452:14 silver 6425:3 similar 6344:17 6458:3,5 6470:5 6472:17 6476:16 6536:9 similarly 6302:5 simple 6334:19 6456:21 simplest 6432:1 6455:12 simply 6307:22 6384:10 6395:10 6445:18 6448:8 6449:4,19 6483:2 6491:17 6494:12 6494:23 6497:2 6498:5 6500:11	6507:8 6509:3 simultaneous 6440:6 since 6394:14 6421:18 6422:9 6424:19 6427:11 6540:4 6545:7 Sinclair 6349:15 6482:7,18,25 6483:7 6485:5 single 6302:6 6464:15 sit 6395:16 6513:21 sitting 6276:13 situation 6301:17 6415:20 6486:16 6492:3 6498:6 6516:6,10 6520:13 situations 6370:17 6371:15 6442:10 6442:18 6468:1 6472:6 6520:23 six 6300:1 6392:7 6421:22 6433:1 6503:17 6523:3 sizeable 6429:19 sleep 6486:9 sleeping 6395:13,14 6395:17 slept 6395:10,12 slightly 6481:13 Slough 6289:8 6294:9,14 6311:6 6328:20 6353:22 6354:6 6355:19 6356:11,18 6371:5 6379:9,11 6381:18 6382:13 6401:25 6402:17 slowly 6405:10 small 6302:6 6336:16 6438:24 6538:14 smaller 6537:20 societies 6422:11 6423:10 6424:16 society 6422:13,14 6422:16,19,23 6423:2,5,19 6429:6 6430:8 6434:9 soft 6438:9 sole 6293:20 6302:6 6435:9 solely 6442:20 solicited 6530:1
--	--	--	---	--

<p>solve 6339:11 somebody 6281:8 6307:4 6344:6 6415:2 6494:24 6511:3 6547:12 somehow 6471:23 someone 6309:21 6309:22 6393:12 6394:13 6445:10 6458:19 6469:10 6472:1 6479:17 6479:21 someone's 6501:6 something 6293:4 6312:14,18 6330:20 6333:4 6339:9,10 6344:14 6351:7 6353:14 6359:5 6379:20 6401:24 6402:5 6461:11 6465:8 6474:12 6474:18 6479:20 6494:17 6495:2 6505:24 6506:7 6507:23 6511:17 6512:15,18 6513:3 6514:2,9 6524:3,8 6526:21 6527:2 6546:10 sometime 6352:11 sometimes 6428:12 6448:7 6449:16 6490:20 6492:19 6493:25 6505:4 6514:1 6520:10 6537:23 somewhat 6400:14 6440:13 6458:2 6460:1 6465:1 6473:21 6485:20 6503:8 somewhere 6300:11 6457:23 soon 6320:20 6450:7,14 6547:24 sooner 6509:5 6514:13 sorry 6290:12 6303:1,5 6373:24 6384:18 6387:24 6391:14,15,21 6540:13 sort 6310:2 6328:5 6334:7 6342:3 6346:21 6347:5</p>	<p>6351:5 6394:10 6399:7 6519:17 6537:6 sought 6289:3 sound 6299:3 sounds 6323:14 soup 6513:6 source 6302:3,3 so-called 6324:19 speak 6307:4,17 6308:7 6348:2 6384:4 6397:19 6415:3 6444:17 6444:17 6511:6 speaker 6424:22,23 speaking 6300:11 6318:22 6319:2 6340:12 6346:20 6363:13 6374:6 6376:5 6378:22 6380:7 6409:9,13 6504:19,21 6536:16 special 6290:16 6293:5 6426:21 6427:9 6433:16 6434:3,10,21 6435:7 6468:16 6469:4,13 6493:10 6505:8 6506:25 6507:8 6513:8 6532:17 specific 6281:22 6285:23 6289:11 6421:4 6433:3,4 6435:14 6444:25 6449:1 6458:11 6464:20 6465:2 specifically 6285:1 specifics 6435:20 spectrum 6483:9 speed 6344:21 6376:17,18 6389:20 6445:9 spend 6323:17 6526:23 6537:3 spending 6323:12 spent 6380:8 6410:6 6421:23 spoke 6307:12,15 6307:18,25 6311:16 6326:22 6333:5,24 6394:19 6444:19 6545:7 spoken 6308:8 6326:23 6332:4</p>	<p>6394:15 sport 6414:2 squeeze 6454:9 St 6277:13 6279:9 6298:10 6374:25 6375:20 6528:10 6528:14 6530:8 6546:5 stable 6535:7,11,11 6535:18,19 6536:14,20 6538:14 staff 6277:1 6533:19 stage 6488:12 6507:24 6511:16 6513:15 6521:8 stages 6309:17 6547:11 Stan 6286:23 stand 6291:21 6321:6,8 6333:23 6365:18,20 6373:16 6477:4 6488:13 6500:20 6517:11 6546:22 standard 6291:6 6361:4,6 6405:13 6456:16,16 6458:4,6 6459:14 6459:19,20,21,24 6462:12 6474:25 6475:2 6496:9 6501:14 6523:15 6523:24 standards 6280:18 6282:18 6362:4 6405:9 6416:11 6421:1 6428:7,20 6428:24 6431:16 6436:7 6444:1,11 6447:19 6451:2,7 6453:11 6455:4 6455:13 6461:20 6462:5,23 6471:6 6475:19 6481:8 6499:20,23 6524:18 6545:24 6546:8 stands 6365:15 6447:13 6482:7 start 6280:15 6326:10 6378:21 6399:12 6407:11 6421:11 6431:19 6457:12 6528:6 6548:5</p>	<p>started 6293:5 6399:20 6453:7 6536:5,7 starting 6282:1 6405:4 6430:20 6443:8 6463:4,20 6473:1 starts 6342:21 6378:3 6479:19 state 6439:23 6441:12 6456:1 6471:19 6474:24 6476:19 6484:1 6519:20 stated 6281:14 6428:14 6478:22 6483:1 6502:17 6549:10 statement 6334:23 6335:1,6 6360:6 6389:5 6392:2 6435:12 6438:10 6489:2 6492:2 6495:19 6496:4 6513:5 6514:3 6517:6 6528:9 statements 6393:10 6507:18 states 6392:18 station 6500:23 statistic 6537:6 statistics 6536:22 status 6289:24 statute 6427:11 6433:1 6543:1 statutorily 6432:25 stay 6359:22 6364:3 6367:14,20,24 6386:2 6400:24 6401:9,10,18 6402:1 6447:19 6447:23 6448:3,8 6448:23,25 6449:13,15,18,20 6451:7,11,16 6453:11 6455:5 6455:14 6476:11 6486:20 6499:15 6499:18 6524:16 6525:2,12 stayed 6366:11,23 6367:15 6385:10 6385:23 6404:11 6406:13 6415:9 6422:7 6452:5 6453:22 6488:18 staying 6358:3</p>	<p>6366:8 6384:2 6386:8 6402:10 6402:20 6404:6 6404:17 6406:6 6415:8,23 6428:6 6450:25 6461:22 steady 6447:3 Steele 6351:1 Stenotype 6549:9 step 6410:3 6418:9 6511:20 6534:8 steps 6410:18 6492:22 6508:21 6546:2 Steven 6432:11 stick 6447:8 still 6409:13 6410:5 6430:12,16 6434:4 6477:20 stolen 6445:9 stone 6327:11 6491:12 stood 6309:9 stop 6389:17 6445:11 6464:2 6505:16 stopped 6353:12 6410:10 story 6496:21 straight 6465:10 strength 6326:2 6385:2 6466:3 6526:17 strictures 6443:8 strike 6485:23 strong 6459:5,7 6465:25 stronger 6514:10 strongly 6350:20 struck 6409:5 6460:24 students 6429:23 studies 6421:12 subject 6292:16 6293:21 6326:13 6326:14 6392:25 6420:19 6430:22 6436:16 6440:20 6442:22 6448:17 6466:20 6468:18 6483:23 6508:19 6523:9 submission 6350:8 6462:2 6478:4 6481:10 6482:5 6482:10,20 6483:11 6484:12</p>
---	---	--	---	--

6484:23 6502:23 submissions 6481:17 6483:13 6494:8 6524:4 submitted 6284:18 subsection 6433:8 6444:7 subsequent 6439:4 6524:9 subsequently 6530:1 substance 6316:19 substantial 6456:8 6459:22 substantiate 6439:8 6519:7 substitute 6373:4 succeed 6525:5 successful 6440:21 successfully 6386:13 succinctly 6502:17 sudden 6511:12 6545:13 suffered 6388:22 suffering 6512:6 sufficient 6324:7 6389:11 6415:6 6475:23 6481:15 6519:17 sufficiently 6450:20 suggest 6281:5 6305:4,11 6313:12 6319:15 6325:22 6341:20 6342:8 6347:19 6348:19 6349:21 6365:10 6454:14 suggested 6314:13 6404:14 suggesting 6305:7 6316:22 6363:5 6366:22 6498:9 suggestion 6305:10 6319:13 6323:22 6339:9 6366:10 6366:24,25 6404:18 6406:5 6438:4 6451:24 6499:6 suggestions 6542:5 suggests 6476:18 6478:15 suits 6531:4 summary 6334:20 6374:22 Sunday 6327:20	6373:20 6374:12 6395:4 superfluous 6354:7 superimposes 6522:24 superior 6449:5 6510:9 supersedes 6456:3 supervised 6520:19 supervising 6545:10 support 6330:22 6332:10,15 6335:9 6338:6,13 6375:10 6411:15 6462:18 6463:24 6484:11 6488:6 6522:11 6537:5 6543:4 supported 6332:12 6411:24 6462:19 6536:3 supports 6462:17 6465:15 6477:6 6525:24 supposed 6443:7 6493:23 Supreme 6405:23 6405:25 6423:22 6424:23 6425:15 6425:20 6426:7 6427:14,21 6473:25 6476:22 6480:5 sure 6296:12,17 6297:14 6300:24 6339:17 6350:1 6352:18 6357:22 6366:2 6386:6 6395:12 6400:6 6402:4,7 6404:8 6408:19 6466:15 6477:12 6480:19 6495:5 6505:4 6507:10,12 6509:2 6517:20 6525:7 6538:18 6540:2 6545:9 6546:17 surprise 6290:24 6325:23 surprised 6326:9 6348:23,25 6402:23 surrounding 6485:19,21 6486:4 6501:18	suspect 6395:13 6534:4 suspected 6364:12 suspended 6344:9 6344:10 suspicion 6364:14 Sveinson 6307:12 6307:15 Sveinsons 6303:10 6305:14 6306:3,6 6306:19,24 6311:3 6410:22 6414:14 sworn 6418:16,18 6529:13 system 6292:3 6301:2 6304:13 6343:15 6461:4 6464:25 6474:14 6491:3 6492:16 6506:11 6533:16 6545:16 6547:9 systemic 6538:8 systems 6543:19 <hr/> T <hr/> tab 6419:17,21,23 6428:15 6435:17 6436:12 6528:22 6540:12,15 table 6364:19 tabled 6523:3 taken 6436:14 6458:8 6460:15 6460:17 6461:4 6468:7 6473:23 6479:6,8 6481:16 6488:1,18 6508:21 6522:25 6531:3 6546:2 6549:9 takes 6377:21 6494:3 6547:13 6547:15 taking 6280:15 6345:8 6375:7 6390:1 6394:5 6409:14 6412:9 6477:9 6500:20 6503:16 6526:25 6535:8 talk 6291:9 6293:8 6300:19 6302:22 6314:9 6315:8 6319:22 6331:15 6340:5 6351:2 6356:17,20	6367:6 6402:14 6402:24 6416:4 6445:25 6512:17 6539:15 talked 6322:1 6343:24 6374:9,9 6414:18 6510:18 talking 6289:17 6311:3 6338:12 6348:13 6362:13 6362:14,18 6368:20,21 6386:10,11 6408:23 6409:6,8 6442:24 6480:8,9 6489:4 6513:22 6515:11,14,17,23 6522:14 talks 6315:8,9 6371:21 6374:10 Taman 6277:10 6410:11 6419:12 6419:16,20 Tamans 6306:19 6393:23 6398:4 6398:24 6399:9 6400:10,13,23 6410:21 Taman's 6403:2 tantamount 6476:3 6476:6 teaching 6429:15 6429:17 teens 6403:20 6412:4 telephone 6298:4 6321:3 6400:4 6402:8 tell 6293:7 6307:24 6308:5 6309:1 6314:8 6321:15 6321:18 6322:18 6326:17 6346:18 6346:20 6348:12 6353:11,18 6379:2 6384:6,21 6413:9 6426:13 6463:2 6512:1 6517:19 6529:8 6545:8 telling 6285:19,20 6285:21 6305:18 6323:3 6340:24 6347:5 6352:14 6355:19 6367:2 6376:12 6407:25 6417:20 6440:13	6545:5 tend 6471:25 6479:7 tended 6439:3,6 6470:1 tending 6474:5 tends 6465:1,13 6471:2 tenets 6443:7 tentative 6326:12 6327:10,12,24 6328:3 6357:8 term 6302:18,20 6310:13 6340:3 6351:14,15,19 6352:2,7 6357:13 6357:14 6369:2,8 6455:24 6460:3,5 6523:24 6525:10 6535:5,8 6539:18 6539:19 6542:17 termed 6543:4 terminology 6297:15 6303:11 6369:13 6375:25 terms 6297:7 6357:12,15 6383:24 6384:22 6385:7 6390:9 6417:16 6426:13 6428:16 6453:2 6455:12 6458:11 6459:25 6465:25 6483:14 6497:22 6502:6,7 6503:8 6503:13 6518:6 6524:4 6540:20 6540:25 6544:19 6547:9 territory 6283:4 Tessler 6299:20,21 6300:10 test 6360:7 6362:18 testified 6340:16 6418:18 6531:11 testify 6529:15 testimony 6285:12 6461:18 6465:22 6473:20 6489:11 6492:1,3 6529:18 6545:22 testing 6328:5 text 6303:16 thank 6282:14,19 6286:6,7,9 6288:24 6297:20 6334:11 6376:3
---	--	---	---	---

6386:15 6390:15 6390:17 6391:17 6391:22 6392:4 6392:13 6414:6 6415:5 6418:5,8 6418:10,23 6447:15 6489:7 6503:15 6504:5 6509:7 6518:9,12 6518:15 6524:10 6527:5,7,12 6529:7,10 6530:24 6531:5,9 6536:18 6548:10 thanks 6529:20 their 6282:9 6284:18 6285:12 6298:11 6302:10 6325:7,10,19 6326:8 6343:14 6365:21,24 6380:9 6402:16 6414:18,22,23,24 6429:10 6446:8 6463:21 6467:20 6470:8 6486:8 6504:22 6513:23 6513:24 6531:4 6537:2,15 6538:2 6539:10 6544:25 themselves 6414:23 6538:16,25 6539:1,25 theory 6523:6 thing 6281:7 6282:10 6312:16 6339:3 6368:20 6382:1 6400:9 6409:14 6412:17 6412:18 6438:9 6445:11 6453:15 6457:11 6461:2 6464:25 6478:15 6486:12 6491:9 6500:19 6526:25 things 6298:3 6299:10 6312:10 6315:22 6322:14 6342:10 6366:19 6368:6 6384:22 6397:25 6399:5 6412:22 6458:17 6484:17 6490:13 6491:16 6493:8 6494:16 6505:22 6507:19 6513:25 6515:1 6539:11	thinking 6300:18 6329:16 6351:6 6359:13 6368:2,5 6368:6 6379:2 6430:14 6456:22 6461:9 6472:9 6524:5 6526:24 thinks 6347:3 third 6374:21 6429:23 6533:25 thirdly 6442:18 6453:3 thoroughly 6468:8 though 6290:11 6296:5 6306:19 6330:15 6332:3 6350:24 6372:3,8 6474:10 6478:3 6489:12,16 6544:9 thought 6313:21 6316:11 6320:25 6324:15 6325:9 6326:6 6327:2 6328:11 6329:4 6329:11 6334:1 6346:25 6347:23 6347:25 6348:21 6351:8 6352:3,4 6353:6,9 6354:13 6354:24 6361:9 6363:17 6368:4 6368:15 6396:9 6403:17,21 6406:9 6464:3 6478:2 6497:14 6508:19 6510:16 6517:20,21 6519:4 6526:6,9 6538:16 thoughts 6524:10 three 6377:16 6380:17 6401:10 6401:18 6402:20 6421:2 6440:19 6452:22 6470:10 6474:14 6488:18 6502:19 6513:11 6535:13,15,17,20 6537:21 through 6318:3 6353:13 6358:11 6369:24 6377:3,4 6397:3 6417:5 6419:13,17 6420:14 6421:20 6424:6,7 6425:19	6426:1 6430:7 6438:17 6444:22 6461:1 6487:12 6490:4 6502:12 6507:24 6508:4,7 6513:4,5,23 6528:19 6529:18 6533:9 6543:13 6543:25 6545:21 throughout 6281:17 6294:23 6363:21 6480:23 Thursday 6276:16 6280:1 6326:19 6327:14,19,23 6328:22 6374:8 6399:21 6400:1,5 6402:8 times 6280:22 6321:1 6427:11 6427:15 6434:22 6447:9 6515:22 timing 6284:6 6501:19 title 6478:12 6532:5 today 6298:18 6328:14 6334:23 6340:21 6352:17 6366:21 6382:15 6384:14,17 6410:5 6443:21 6454:16 6509:21 6548:3,8 together 6400:16 6422:5 6438:8 6459:10 6528:24 toil 6412:13 told 6283:20 6298:14 6301:16 6302:13 6303:19 6312:10 6313:13 6314:12 6315:3,6 6326:17 6332:9 6332:19 6333:10 6333:19 6344:25 6345:5,13 6346:23 6347:24 6352:1 6354:16 6354:18 6355:1 6355:24 6358:1 6361:13 6385:13 6390:21 6393:15 6394:1,1 6395:2 6398:5,11 6400:23 6402:3 6410:9 6415:16 6499:6 6509:18	tomorrow 6323:18 top 6289:17 6336:22 6387:9 6387:11 6388:18 6392:12 6535:13 6535:15,17,20 topic 6321:12 6399:7 topics 6329:20 6431:2 total 6463:8 totally 6348:23 6353:10 6359:3 6539:19 touch 6296:18 6424:12 6425:15 6545:18 6546:25 toward 6445:24 6483:8 trade 6540:1 tradition 6465:14 traditional 6504:24 traditionally 6326:8 traffic 6375:2 tragedies 6492:12 tragedy 6493:12 tragic 6490:18 6492:20 6503:12 6511:2,4,13 Tramley 6279:6 6528:17,25 6529:4 transcript 6276:12 6386:19 6388:25 6402:16 6404:15 6404:21 6407:3 6484:4,9,14 6491:17 6549:8 transcripts 6406:17 6420:10 6474:7 6481:14 6495:9 trauma 6386:17,22 6388:22 6389:25 travelling 6453:1 treasurer 6434:8 treatment 6533:18 Tremblay 6472:16 6477:24 6478:6 tremendous 6412:13 trial 6310:7 6322:5 6362:14 6365:2 6367:16 6376:9 6377:4 6380:3 6386:10 6389:14 6422:15,18 6426:24 6427:18	6429:18 6442:1 6464:10 6474:8 6491:21 6500:13 6509:1,1 6517:9 6517:15 6518:3 6520:23 6525:5 tried 6306:20 6351:9 6378:14 6417:18 trier 6365:9 6366:15,17 triggers 6514:3 troubling 6440:23 true 6349:10 6436:3 6482:5,16 6483:9 6483:21 6484:3 6484:13,22 6487:20 6489:14 6494:10,19 6549:8 Truman 6505:16 trust 6337:2 try 6297:25 6322:10 6337:24,25 6350:2 6363:15 6378:8 6415:4 6454:16 6462:24 6496:11 6503:19 6503:25 6505:21 6511:15 6536:16 6537:17 6545:2 trying 6298:20 6301:6 6333:13 6338:22 6342:18 6353:9,11 6366:16 6367:1 6416:6 6457:22 6457:24 Tuesday 6342:20 6548:7,11,13 turn 6282:19 6283:16 6324:18 6426:11 6435:13 6471:4 turned 6409:12 turning 6302:25 turns 6471:17 twenties 6412:5 twice 6427:13 twofold 6360:7 two-year 6463:25 6470:21 6525:25 tying 6494:7 type 6312:16 6318:11 6338:10 6342:13 6343:1 6348:3 6369:6
---	--	---	---	---

6382:1 6402:6 6426:14 6438:9 6445:4,11 6457:11 6461:1 6486:12 6519:25 6536:7 types 6330:11 6396:10 6458:17 6465:4 6523:8 6525:20 6535:23 T's 6350:6	6354:19 6396:3 6408:19 6445:12 6446:25 6504:23 6504:25 6505:12 6531:1 understands 6339:3 6339:4 6486:14 understood 6285:18 6285:21 6315:10 6329:11 6332:24 6353:9 6356:9 6361:9 6377:11 6403:25 6408:23 6409:20,21 6410:2 6412:6 6475:4 6515:14 undertaken 6546:5 undertaking 6354:2 6354:8 6355:3,7,8 6355:15 6356:6 unethical 6490:10 6503:11 unexplained 6344:20 unfair 6524:7 unfavorable 6348:14 6364:16 unfold 6315:23 6347:24,25 unfolded 6321:5 6326:18 6327:8 6334:9,11 unforeseeable 6371:15 6468:1 unique 6337:22 unit 6280:18 6545:11,24 6546:8 University 6421:13 6423:16 6424:1 6429:18,24 unknown 6545:6 unless 6288:15 6473:8 6480:4 6537:10 6547:5 unlikely 6411:25 unlikely 6525:5 unreasonable 6485:15 unsettled 6515:8 until 6335:8,18 6356:18 6382:23 6384:11 6411:23 6422:5 6450:9 6454:15,18 6476:9 6548:13 untypical 6429:11	6439:22 unusual 6331:18 6371:14 6445:12 6468:1 6487:23 6521:13 update 6374:13 6547:3 updates 6543:8 upright 6395:16 upward 6398:15 up-to-date 6313:17 use 6302:2,17,20 6305:7 6306:21 6330:15 6341:7 6351:14,15,19 6369:8 6375:24 6394:10 6399:5 6438:24 6496:24 6497:19 6531:4 6535:16 6537:19 used 6285:13,14,19 6305:13 6341:8 6345:18 6353:10 6357:12,14 6369:3,5 6372:22 6438:23 6455:24 6485:6 6486:25 6535:5 6538:9,14 6538:14 useful 6464:4 6503:20 uses 6285:16 using 6369:9 6503:6 usually 6445:5,6 6446:10 6475:8 utilized 6533:5	versus 6450:2 6456:20 6500:2 vested 6413:15 6435:6 vet 6302:20 veto 6358:20 vetted 6357:14 Victim 6512:21 victims 6306:20 6511:16 6541:13 6541:17,24 6542:16,18,20,24 6543:7,13,20 Victoria 6424:24 view 6295:13,23 6329:2 6344:12 6346:14 6349:2 6361:23 6362:8 6364:17 6376:24 6396:4,14 6403:12 6411:24 6437:23 6440:18 6440:19 6442:8,8 6443:12,16 6444:9 6446:15 6446:20 6448:15 6450:15,24 6459:6,6 6475:2 6475:22 6476:16 6496:2 6498:4 6499:22 6501:25 6517:10,11 6520:17 6521:19 6522:13,25 6538:13 6539:11 viewed 6281:6 6282:8 vigorously 6401:5 6401:12 6406:22 Vincent 6277:3 violations 6361:18 virtually 6426:18 6440:20 virtue 6359:18 6435:7 vis 6546:21,21 vis-a-vis 6382:10 6409:23 Vitae 6421:9 6424:7 6424:8,15 6425:14 6430:21 vocabulary 6351:18 voice 6307:23 volume 6276:17 6287:16 6381:15 6387:2,6,7 6391:6 6391:15,21	6418:20 6419:12 6420:9 6497:14 6528:18,22 6532:22 volumes 6287:3,4 6287:12,13 6420:13 volunteered 6346:9 vu 6381:7 6518:21
<hr/> U <hr/>				<hr/> W <hr/>
ultimate 6532:16 6534:16 6544:21 ultimately 6319:3 6321:3 6342:16 6356:3 6432:7,12 6459:25 6495:17 6526:15 6527:2 6533:10 6544:14 6548:6 Um-hum 6514:21 unavoidable 6410:20 uncertain 6458:13 uncertainty 6471:19 uncharacteristic 6414:10 uncommon 6521:16 undecided 6480:10 under 6392:10 6422:7 6432:24 6433:8,23 6439:20 6440:2 6446:1 6450:17 6457:16 6467:3,6 6468:5 6469:11 6483:18 6502:18 6531:24 6541:17 6545:9 undercover 6486:17 undercurrents 6501:10 underestimated 6518:6 underlying 6417:13 underpinnings 6330:3 6495:15 understanding 6305:5 6318:20 6321:7 6339:18 6339:20,22,25 6340:2 6341:23 6349:25 6353:7				wait 6382:23 6413:12 6476:9 waiting 6377:22 6378:21 walk 6417:17 walked 6415:21 walks 6516:5 wall 6359:4 wanted 6285:15 6307:4 6319:17 6319:19,21 6340:5,25 6345:21 6394:12 6403:16 6407:2 6412:17 6415:2 6427:24 6431:6 6431:19 6435:20 6460:13 6465:20 6474:11 6485:23 6499:12,16,24 6502:12 6515:13 6524:10 6529:19 6530:16 6533:8 wanton 6456:16 warn 6413:7 warning 6389:18 6413:9 6460:16 warnings 6458:23 6460:13,20 warrant 6324:7 6475:24 wasn't 6298:21 6299:11 6315:23 6334:3 6340:9 6341:21 6346:20 6379:10 6388:5 6390:10 6394:3,5 6395:14,15 6402:24 6415:17 6466:22 6473:6 6482:12 6486:5 6488:24 6515:6 6519:16 6524:17 6547:20 watching 6354:17 ways 6390:22
		<hr/> V <hr/>		
		v 6405:24 6406:3 6475:1 6482:6 Vancouver 6300:24 6301:1 6421:24 6422:6 6425:4 various 6291:10 6295:10 6296:8 6309:6 6345:10 6357:12 6406:17 6421:5 6499:11 6545:22 vehicle 6389:19 6456:24 6457:8 6457:16 6480:2 vehicles 6460:24 venture 6375:5 verge 6490:20 verging 6491:15 version 6285:7		

<p>6449:16 weak 6375:13 6395:21,22 6465:25 weaker 6514:10 weakness 6466:4 6485:22 6488:12 weaknesses 6326:6 6362:7 6366:1 6487:17 weaving 6460:23 Wednesday 6399:21 week 6324:18,21 6326:18 6327:16 6441:3 6508:2 weekend 6327:1,5 6357:10 6374:11 weekly 6545:12 weeks 6513:11 weight 6482:9 6530:19 Weinstein 6277:14 6281:1 6503:21 6518:16 6530:11 Weinstein's 6306:22 wellness 6440:8 Wendy 6277:6 went 6341:7 6353:21 6355:18 6374:17 6394:17 6464:3 6508:4 weren't 6330:1,8 6403:23 6515:11 we'll 6294:1 6367:5 we're 6289:17 6318:21 6338:5 6338:21 6344:12 6345:7 6363:13 6367:2 6369:9 6410:7 6443:6,7 6447:14 6454:6 we've 6322:18 6413:24 6425:9 6465:24 6540:4 whatsoever 6413:17,20 whichever 6477:19 while 6371:7 6383:19 6410:10 whit 6452:20 whole 6304:7 6323:17,18 6338:15 6349:5 6351:25 6366:5 6381:22 6409:6</p>	<p>6409:16 6433:10 6503:6 wife 6295:14 willingly 6301:11 wing 6538:17 wink 6487:3,4,6 winners 6517:22 Winnipeg 6276:13 6276:14 6277:15 6277:17 6280:18 6311:22 6325:6 6336:15 6374:23 6397:15 6410:17 6545:23 wish 6453:25 6486:18 wished 6467:13 wishes 6474:18 6475:7 withdraw 6447:19 6447:24 6449:5 6449:15 6451:7 withdrawing 6486:19 withdrawn 6488:15 witnesses 6278:3 6282:5 6294:2 6317:25 6324:2 6365:23 6374:22 6374:24 6414:3 6451:23 6499:11 6512:25 6513:1,1 6513:2,9,14,17,21 6514:1,8 6528:14 woefully 6448:14 Wolson's 6327:4 6339:18 6341:17 6341:22 6342:3 6348:6 won 6517:20 wonder 6421:19 6428:25 6469:22 6503:23 wondering 6283:25 6284:3 6333:14 6537:11 6538:21 Woods 6405:24 word 6320:17 6337:10 6345:18 6415:25 6438:23 6438:24 6502:9 words 6332:8,14 6344:3 6369:17 6401:16 6455:23 6474:10 6485:16 6488:4 6498:16 6501:20 6517:2</p>	<p>work 6337:25 6344:6 6353:12 6375:19 6413:2 6414:3 6426:14 6426:24,24,24 6427:19,19,20 6494:4 6531:24 6534:4 6536:24 6539:22 worked 6335:16 6442:16 6443:2 6545:16 worker 6512:21 working 6338:2,7 6454:12 workload 6538:5 works 6304:22 6305:3 6378:24 worrying 6526:24 worst 6384:13,17 6460:8,8 worth 6494:5 6515:4 6536:6 worthwhile 6430:3 wouldn't 6283:20 6301:20 6318:15 6318:19,25 6325:20 6357:4 6384:4 6398:11 6402:4 6411:16 6412:19 6417:15 6500:12 6508:3 6517:23 6526:13 Woychuk 6308:16 6365:6,16 6395:1 6395:20 6501:8 6501:23 Woychuk's 6502:9 WPS 6376:4 write 6305:16 6319:11 6374:11 6428:13 writer 6290:5 6291:3 writes 6304:23 writing 6303:15 6332:3,4 6335:6 6339:7,10 6340:10,13 6350:3,11 6374:12 6429:15 6430:18,25 6433:5 6488:25 written 6313:4 6320:25 6327:11 6428:3 6429:7 6431:9 6432:5</p>	<p>6495:7 6502:15 6525:25 wrong 6287:25 6308:5 6335:22 6335:25 6359:11 6391:15 6413:13 6469:8 6478:12 6516:12 6541:7 6546:18 wrote 6289:19 6334:3 6373:21 Wyant 6340:15,17 6341:8,23 6342:16,20 6346:2,17 6347:21 6348:5 6361:22 6385:18 6386:25 6408:13 6412:16,20 6484:18 Wyant's 6406:22 6490:2</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <hr/> <p>X-1.1 6420:14 X-2.10 6420:14</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Y</p> <hr/> <p>yeah 6299:6 6308:18 6310:22 6311:25 6315:7 6323:8 6339:7 6345:6 6358:19 6398:17 6416:9 6429:4 6463:18 6464:11 6520:16 year 6293:9,10 6309:23 6310:13 6406:20 6411:18 6412:2 6421:23 6425:21 6429:23 6463:3 6465:10 6511:8 years 6336:24 6339:1 6403:10 6403:19 6421:22 6422:7 6425:10 6429:9 6448:14 6449:4 6460:3 6462:3,22 6479:1 6525:11 6543:14 yellow 6344:22 yesterday 6333:21 6386:18 6388:2 6404:4,4 6410:10 6415:16,17 6443:21 6530:16</p>	<p>yesterday's 6386:19 Yogi 6381:6 6382:21,23 young 6344:6 6397:23 younger 6511:2 Y-1 6418:21 6419:13 6421:10 Y-2 6391:6 6419:15 Y-3 6419:18,20,24 6428:15 Y-3.A 6279:2 6420:2 Y-3.b 6279:3 6420:4</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Z</p> <hr/> <p>Z 6299:20 Zane 6299:21 Zazelenchuk 6277:10 6278:13 6281:21 6393:7 6394:2,25 6395:19 6504:13 6511:8,11 6519:3 Zenk 6310:12 6327:1 6365:17 6376:4 6397:8,14 6438:13 Zenk's 6520:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <hr/> <p>04 6287:22 05 6299:18,19 6307:20 6309:3 06 6380:2 07 6374:12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <hr/> <p>1 6288:11 6452:7 1st 6298:2,7 6523:2 6523:4 1.4 6436:5 1:00 6479:19 1:30 6479:19 10 6300:1 6424:6 6449:3 10:00 6342:21 6378:3 10:12 6374:14 10:45 6380:22 100 6427:18 6511:9 11 6430:20 6463:8 11(i) 6523:18 11:00 6380:23 6473:4 12 6324:21 6326:11</p>
---	--	--	--	--

6404:22 6424:8 6452:6 6516:14 12th 6315:25 6324:19 6327:10 6327:14,19,23 6352:12 6353:3 6353:20 6354:5 6355:4,13 6356:15 6406:20 6415:11,13 6483:25 6484:8 6494:22 6503:4 12:32 6447:3 12:44 6454:19 12:45 6447:5 120 6298:8 13 6399:9 6403:3 6405:4,6,11 13th 6327:19 6357:1,7 6373:20 1382 6533:25 1384 6292:8,9 1385 6368:25 6370:8 1386 6371:8 1389 6360:3,4 14 6460:3 6525:11 14th 6323:2 142 6381:14 15 6336:9 6380:18 6388:18 6427:11 15th 6316:10,23 6327:20 6374:12 6395:3 153 6391:10 6392:7 16th 6327:20 6399:13 1663 6387:11 1678 6388:16,18 17 6282:3 6484:9 17th 6342:20 6377:23 1702 6405:2 6416:7 6416:8 1738.7 6407:4,8 18 6470:17 18th 6316:24 6317:8 1854 6290:11,13 19th 6379:18 1971 6425:4 1973 6479:2 1974 6421:14,18 1980s 6432:4 1982 6422:3 1985 6430:14 1986 6424:24	6430:14 1987 6423:7 1990 6422:5 6425:19 6432:14 1991 6427:12 6432:15 1992 6422:8 6424:19 1999 6411:23 6464:6 <hr/> 2 2 6433:8 6497:14 2nd 6313:24 6545:25 6546:19 2:00 6454:14,16,18 6454:20 20 6285:8,10 6425:13 6426:1 2001 6470:12,16 2003 6470:9 6472:19 6477:15 2004 6288:5,7 6482:7 2005 6280:23 6281:6,21 6282:3 6288:14 6289:11 6298:2,7 6303:1 6308:13 6309:11 6312:2 6360:16 6379:18 6405:24 6411:18 6467:5 6533:2 6544:6 2006 6311:13 6315:25 6316:24 6317:20 6425:19 6472:13,24 6478:22 2007 6285:10 6324:21 6326:11 6327:10 6357:7 6399:9 6404:22 6411:24 6448:20 6452:2 6470:19 6483:20,25 6523:2,4 2008 6276:16 6279:3,3,6,10 6280:1 6419:21 6419:24 6420:3,4 6472:16 6529:4 6530:10 6540:8 207 6370:2 21 6311:18 6484:10 6528:16 21st 6302:25 6303:2 6311:13	215 6291:18 6532:22 216 6359:23,25 6391:19,20,24 217 6368:25 6369:1 6370:1,3 6420:16 6466:17 218 6297:11,17 6547:1 2182 6528:18 2183 6528:18 2184 6528:18 22 6279:2 6420:3 6426:1 6471:12 6528:16 22nd 6341:6 6350:8 6352:2,10,12 6386:25 6387:5,7 6387:21 6388:6 6388:12,17,23 6390:13 6406:19 6407:1 6408:18 6410:14 6415:15 6415:22 6416:1 6419:21 6482:14 6483:20 6484:21 6489:12 6490:8 6494:14 6502:24 223 6379:18 226 6419:15 227 6373:23 6374:5 228 6418:22 6419:12 6421:10 6435:17 23 6479:1 6528:16 231 6420:11 233 6381:14,17 235 6279:2 6420:1,2 6420:7 6435:24 236 6279:5 6529:2 237 6279:8 6530:5,6 24 6276:17 6470:11 6481:23 24th 6320:12,16 6321:7,11 25 6527:20 25th 6313:8 6544:9 254(3) 6450:6,17 26 6288:4 6407:11 26th 6287:22 6299:18,19 6313:9 266 6391:7 27th 6313:11 6323:9 28 6279:5 6307:20 6484:4 6529:4	28th 6307:6,8 6528:24 29 6387:14 6407:5,7 6407:8 29th 6489:20 6494:23 <hr/> 3 3rd 6287:21 6289:11 6307:9 6307:10 6308:12 6311:3 6360:16 6544:5 6546:16 3.1 6438:17 3.3 6438:17 3:15 6447:10,13 6504:8 3:30 6447:11 6504:9 30 6427:14 31 6276:16 6280:1 6288:14 31st 6321:24 6352:11 311 6436:10 314 6497:14 3364 6540:12,14,17 3368 6541:4 34 6476:9 6495:7 3401.35 6311:18,20 37 6502:18 <hr/> 4 4 6279:3 6419:24 6420:4 6436:16 6468:6 4.1 6441:11 4.2 6441:12 4.2.A 6441:15 4.3 6444:7 4/10 6299:4 4:00 6527:24 4:05 6527:25 4:30 6548:14 40 6299:4 6450:9 404 6377:20 6378:11 41 6484:13 42 6406:1 43.b 6287:17 46 6387:12 49 6540:10 <hr/> 5 5 6424:6 6528:15 503(2) 6445:22 515 6446:1	515(2)(d) 6446:2 54 6287:16,18,19,23 55 6287:16 6542:12 55/45 6516:11 <hr/> 6 6 6392:18 6433:8 6438:16 60/40 6516:7 61 6388:18 6280 6278:5 6286 6278:6 6383 6278:7 6390 6278:8 64 6290:13 6414 6278:9 6418 6278:12 6420 6279:2 6504 6278:13 6518 6278:14 6529 6279:5 6530 6279:8 6531 6278:17 69 6528:8 <hr/> 7 7 6281:20 6426:22 6427:10 6433:14 7:00 6344:4 <hr/> 8 8 6279:10 6387:5 6441:8,12 6530:10 8:59 6280:2 80 6430:21 86 6424:25 87 6511:8 <hr/> 9 9 6404:23 6444:8 9:00 6342:24 6378:7 6548:11 6548:13 90 6446:10 91.72 6381:12 91.73 6381:15 91.74 6381:15 92.7 6540:12 94 6430:23 945-1864 6290:1 95 6424:9
---	---	--	---	---