

**Winnipeg Police Service
PSU/Internal Affairs**

02 10 16

Jack Ewatski Esquire,

Chief of Police.

RE: Recommended changes in the PSU.

Sir, I respectfully report for your information the following:

It is with great discomfort and disappointment that I am submitting this report. I have been debating the merits of doing so for several months and now feel that by remaining silent I would do greater harm than good to the Service. I submit this report accepting the possibility of retribution from higher-ranking members and as a result I will not be entering the Promotion process.

I am also compelled by section 11.02 of our Rules and Regulations which states "*A member who witnesses a violation of, has personal knowledge of, or has probable grounds for believing that any other member has violated any law or provision of the regulations shall immediately submit a written report to the Division Commander. Such report shall give complete details of the alleged violation, together with the names and addresses of any witness who may know anything concerning the matter.*"

During the course of my career I have been selected to numerous sensitive assignments requiring a high degree of integrity, impartiality, and honesty. These include:

- *As a Constable arresting fellow Officers alleged to be involved in a break-in conspiracy.
- *As a Constable working nine months undercover for the Vice Division and purchasing Steroids from a fellow Officer. This resulted in his arrest and resignation and death threats being made to myself, and my young children.
- *As a Constable I was assigned to an operational review of a Police shooting and vehicle pursuit. The incident called into question the actions of my shift, my supervisor, the Duty Inspector and a Deputy Chief.
- *The re-investigation of the Barbara Stoppel Murder leading to the exoneration of an innocent man.
- *Several arrests, numerous investigations, and several regulatory charges of fellow Officers while assigned to PSU.

As such I have demonstrated my commitment to the Service even though the tasks have been unpleasant. I have done what has been asked of me.

As noted earlier, in 1999 I was selected to assist in the Barbara Stoppel Murder Re-investigation. During the course of my 18-month involvement I was exposed to, what I believe to be, many questionable decisions and misinformation. These issues have been documented but are not intended for this forum. Certain issues arising from this case, however, will be presented in this report in conjunction with other concerns I have in the operations of the PSU.

The common theme of these examples leads me to believe that there is a need for an independent Commissioner/body to oversee PSU and control to be relinquished from the Executive. The reasoning will be self-evident and will protect the service from the perception of corruption that the public and members may have. In essence "Public concerns and perceptions regarding biased and compromised investigations will be set to rest through implementation of external investigation." (1).

Further "It is also of fundamental importance that the internal affairs section be independent from interference by those in senior operational or management positions." (2). Interference from senior officers may be perceived by others as being corrupt which again justifies the need for an external investigation. In fact "There may be circumstances where it is considered imperative that investigations be carried out by an external body. This may arise when it is established that the internal affairs is corrupt."(3). In this context Corruption may be defined as:

"...a deliberate unlawful conduct on the part of a Police Officer, utilizing his or her position, regardless of the motivation."(4).

Further, "Unlawful act" is defined in our regulations as:

"...contrary to the provisions of any Federal, Provincial, or municipal statute, or any combination thereof."

Addressing these concerns is of paramount importance since "Complacency, neglect, and failed leadership will eventually propel the executives and officers of these services (including the upright, blameless and ethical) into an enclosure where relentless inquiry, media attack, and revealed misconduct will crush both the spirit of the department and previously enjoyed public support." (5).

1. Search Warrant for Inspector Ken Bieners Residence

The Barbara Stoppel/Thomas Sophonow re-investigation team was assigned to take a fresh approach to the case with "New eyes". As a result members having no ties with the case or the Homicide unit were selected.

I believe that an external body should have headed the re-investigation. It has been noted that "Outside investigation is required if systemic, organizational, and management failings are to be revealed."(6). Investigators from the service should be assigned in this regard but they should be under the direction of an impartial independent supervisor. The reasoning is self-evident: "Internal investigation is compromised from the outset as self-interest acts to protect the organization from civil Liability." (7)

Due to the fact that this investigation would entail detailed internal scrutiny and eventually a public inquiry, the need for an external control would have been highlighted. As a result public perception may deem our efforts as tainted. An example of such a potential perception is as follows:

During the course of the Barbara Stoppel Murder re-investigation it was discovered that retired Inspector Ken Biener destroyed numerous exhibits in the case. It was my opinion that Biener had retained some exhibits and that they were still in his possession at his residence. As a result I established what I believed to be grounds for a search warrant.

The importance of obtaining a warrant and retrieving the exhibits cannot be over stressed since they may provide the offenders DNA. Of equal importance failing to obtain these exhibits would result in no charges being laid against a suspect without a confession (reflected in case law and discussions with crown counsel).

As a result I discussed the merits of obtaining a search warrant with Sgt. Vogen on several occasions. He related that this would not be his decision and that it would be up to "Them" (The Executive). I pursued this matter further on 00 03 26 by speaking to you in person. In response to my desire to obtain a warrant you replied, "We can't do that he's a retired Inspector." This comment was made in front of Sgt. Vogen and Crown Attorney Rick Saull.

On 00 04 07 I met with Crown attorneys Rick Saull and Dale Schille. We discussed the missing exhibits in the case and again stressed the importance of obtaining them. I advised that I would again recommend a search warrant for Ken Bieners residence that was met with their support.

On 00 04 10 I spoke with Sgt. Vogen again in an effort to be allowed to obtain a search warrant for Bieners residence. I stressed that an outside agency looking in would criticize us for not being impartial and thorough. My efforts may have been further complicated by the fact that Sgt. Vogen worked under Inspector Biener in the Youth Division.

On 00 04 17 I met with Inspector McCaskill and again advised him of all the grounds I had to obtain a warrant. Inspector McCaskill indicated that he did not know all the information before but would take it up with the Executive. I again stressed the importance of obtaining the warrant and retrieving the missing exhibits.

On 00 04 30 I spoke with Cst. John Burchill. He advised that you had decided that Ken Biener was to be interviewed regarding the destruction of exhibits but this was **NOT** to be done under charge and caution. Further we were **NOT** to obtain a search warrant.

I truly believed that somehow the message might have been misinterpreted since it made no sense to me. As a result I contacted Sgt. Vogen at home on 00 05 04. He stated that

1. Per Inspector McCaskill there was to be **NO** search warrant at Bieners residence.

2. Per Inspector McCaskill Biener was **NOT** to be charge and cautioned even if he brought exhibits to the interview.

I again expressed my dissatisfaction with the decision and advised that the investigation was being jeopardized. However at the time I felt compelled to do as I was told as outlined by section 10.01 "Members shall obey a lawful order or directive issued by a member senior in rank." After much reflection I now do not believe that this was a "Lawful Order".

On 00 05 05 I contacted retired Inspector Ken Biener and requested that he attend to our office for an interview. I further requested that he bring his notebooks pertaining to the Stoppel case and all exhibits he had in his possession. Biener denied having any exhibits but agreed to the interview. I relayed that I knew he had further exhibits and stressed that we required them in order to proceed against the new suspect. Biener later accused me of "Trick Fucking" him into bringing the exhibits. On this charge I am guilty but I had no other recourse available to me.

On 00 05 10 retired Inspector Ken Biener attended to our office at 850 Empress in possession of his notebooks. After approx 1 hour he admitted destroying most of the exhibits and advised he had some others in his trunk. He then turned over a box of exhibits from the case including the belt Barbara Stoppel was wearing at the time of her Murder, which was never tested at the Crime Lab. Following my orders, Ken Biener was not chartered.

On 00 05 11 Sgt. Vogen and I reported in person to the Executive. Present were you, D/Chief Thompson, Inspector McCaskill, and Police Legal counsel Inspector Schumacher. After relating the results of the interview I concluded that I did not have any more grounds for a warrant to Beiners residence nor did I believe he could be charged since I had not cautioned him.

Later this date I spoke with Crown Rick Saull and updated him on the incident. At this point Saull now stated that it was a confession case and no charges could be laid against a new suspect.

Some of the more important exhibits still outstanding in the case are:

- 1.Barbara Stoppels Bra.
- 2.Barbara Stoppels underwear.
- 3.Her shoes and socks.
- 4.A Kleenex with mucus believed to be the killers.

I remain perplexed by the decision not to obtain a search warrant. I voiced my displeasure to Sgt. Vogen who simply stated that it was not his decision.

John H. Conditt of the FBI wrote, "Citizens bestow great power and authority upon their law enforcement organizations. They expect and deserve accountability from their law enforcement public servants and demand that these organizations display a high degree of Integrity." (8). He states further, "...thoroughness is vitally important to the internal investigative process." (9).

It is my opinion that we were not thorough in this case nor did we display a great deal of integrity. I am equally frustrated that I had nowhere to go with my concerns. I addressed my issues with Sgt. Vogen, Inspector McCaskill, other investigators and the Chief of Police. I do not believe that the results/decision would have been the same had Ken Biener been a retired Constable. In fact if we can obtain a warrant for stolen C.D's at the residence of a Constable, why can't we obtain a warrant for exhibits in a murder case at a retired Inspectors residence?

There is a possibility that retired Inspector Biener had the remaining missing exhibits prior to my phone call and may have subsequently destroyed them. If this was the case we lost our only hope of DNA comparison and thereby any chance of a successful conclusion to this case.

It is my opinion that if an independent commissioner were assigned to this case a warrant would have been executed. I do not believe that I was allowed to do my job. Further, both Barbara Stoppel and her family have not been served well. In fact Rick Stoppel knows that there was no warrant and will be pursuing the matter further. Rob Finlayson advised him of this. It is for this reason as well that I am addressing the issue.

I strongly recommend that future cases of this type be independent and that the persons involved herein be considered for charges of obstruct justice, obstruct peace officer and discreditable conduct if warranted.

2. Delayed interview of Terry Arnold

Terry Samuel Arnold has been defined as a "person of interest" in the Barbara Stoppel Murder investigation. As previously indicated it has become a confession case. In this regard the investigative team determined that the timing of a hard interview was crucial in order to have any success. It would also be a psychological battle of will with the suspect. Without going into the details of the investigation I will simply state that the crucial time for interviewing Arnold was first requested on 00 10 18. Investigators Robert Legge/Paul Brown and Murray Allan agreed.

On 00 11 06 D/Sgt Legge submitted a memo addressed to you again requesting an interview with Arnold in early December and outlining the merits of it. These recommendations were turned down.

Due to the fact that Ken Biener had destroyed exhibits, and kept exhibits in his residence and Ken Biener was to testify at the inquiry it was imperative to interview Arnold as soon as possible. If the inquiry revealed this information Arnold would know we had no case and an interview would be fruitless (Unfortunately this was the case and the information was later revealed in the inquiry). In fact even Rick Stoppel brought up this concern with you and requested an early interview.

Our Investigative team repeatedly requested an early interview to supervisors on 00 11 30 & 00 12 04 to no avail. Inspector McCaskill later advised me that the media release of Sophonows exoneration was put off for several months due to negative "press" from the 911 incident. The Interview in turn was put off due to the pressure of the inquiry. These issues had nothing to do with the murder investigation.

On 01 01 17 I received information that Arnold had new hope for an appeal and was feeling confident that he would get a new trial. The timing for an interview was now becoming problematic as we feared and we were losing momentum. On 01 02 22 D/Sgt Legge presented a 2 team interview approach which is supported by Crown Rick Saull. It is also suggested to have the interview soon.

In summary we requested an interview with the suspect on 00 10 16 and were not approved to do so until 01 03 07 resulting in a five month delay. The main reason given to this team for the delays focused on the inquiry. It may be said that the interests of the City at the time superseded the interests of the Murder investigation. Having an independent commissioner in charge would have eliminated any such possible perception.

3. Chief Ewatski's comments on CJOB 02 04 03

During the course of the re-investigation I was assigned to act as a liaison with the Stoppel family. This involved hundreds of hours on my own time that I found very rewarding. It was with great satisfaction that they received partial closure to this tragedy that has caused them over 20 years of pain.

On 02 04 03 I received a phone call from Rick Stoppel who was extremely disappointed with what he had heard on CJOB's Adler show from you. I also listened to the comments and found them disturbing. Of particular note are the following(Re: the Stoppel case).

"We have really left no stone unturned in this homicide investigation."

"We are continuing to work on it on a daily basis."

"We have put members from our homicide unit other specially trained officers that have skills and abilities that can investigate historical homicides they have been working on this for over 2 years now nothing but this file itself."

"I'm optimistic that continuing with the investigation the way we are doing in a very comprehensive manner that one day we will gather enough evidence to lay a charge against the person responsible for the murder of Barbara Stoppel."

Unfortunately our "ongoing" investigation was disbanded approx 1 year earlier and even our phone lines were disconnected. You referred to this "ongoing" investigation on several other occasions earlier prompting me to ask Sgt. Vogen if there was anything ongoing. He replied with laughter and a "No". This was confirmed by other former-members of the unit and Inspector McCaskill.

This has now brought mistrust with the Stoppel family and thereby brought discredit upon the reputation of the Service. Once again I have no venue to address my concerns since there is no independent body. The Stoppels are left to wonder what exactly has changed over the past 20 years. Moreover provincial victims legislation does not appear to have been followed.

I recommend that an independent body be assigned and discern whether regulatory charges of deceit and discreditable conduct are in order against you.

4. Firearms Crown Opinion on Cst. K. Lugg

On 01 06 12 I was assigned to investigate Cst. K. Lugg concerning possible firearm charges. I received information from S/Sgt A. Scott that Lugg had explained his situation to Inspector A. Stannard and had given a plausible explanation for the incident. S/Sgt Scott instructed me to interview Inspector Stannard.

On 01 06 20 I received a phone call from EACP R. Hall. Inspector Hall advised me that he had spoken with Inspector Stannard about my request for an interview. Inspector Hall asked me to forgo interviewing Stannard as it would do more harm than good in the district. I advised Inspector Hall that S/Sgt Scott had directed me to obtain a statement. I was then asked again to forgo the interview and I complied.

I later spoke with S/Scott and advised him of what had occurred. He stated that this was interference and it had happened other times in the past.

I believe that this again shows a need for an independent commissioner to oversee this unit and again I had no one to address this issue with.

With regards to the Crown opinion on Cst. Lugg I did not believe it was in the interest of Justice to charge him and that it should not go for Crown opinion. I was however directed to submit for Crown opinion resulting in unnecessary stress on Cst. Lugg for several months. The Crown opinion came back no charges and the assigned Crown Doug Abra agreed that it was not in the public interest to charge.

5. Public Mischief Charge

It is well know that "frivolous and vexatious complaints of officer misconduct are a perennial source of irritation and consternation for Police unions and their membership."(10). In his 1970 textbook on supervision of Police N.F. Iannone (LAPD) identified the following primary objectives of complaint investigation:

- *To protect the reputation and integrity of the force.
- *To protect the public interest.
- *To protect the accused employee from unjust accusation.

On 01 11 21 D/Sgt Trakalo and I arrested and charged a male with public mischief after he made a false complaint of police assaulting him. I swore to the information and forwarded the details to EACP Inspector Hall for a media release. This release never occurred.

A release of this arrest may have served as a caution for other complainants making future false allegations and may have instilled more perceived credibility in this unit from our members.

I confronted S/Sgt Scott on this issue that he agreed was unfortunate. I also asked what you thought of our arrest. He relayed that the your comment was “He’s not native is he?” I fail to understand how this could be an issue.

An independent commissioner would remove this perception and ensure that public mischief arrests are made public especially in light of the fervour the Service presents in releasing the names of officers charged.

6. Cst. Robert Savoie Investigation

I have received information from the assigned investigators in the sexual assault investigation of Robert Savoie. I was not present during the initial stages as I was on course at the Academy. The content of this information is again disturbing especially in light of the Ken Biener non-warrant.

D/Sgt R. Trakalo and Sgt. G. Hudson have advised me that they were in possession of 2-signed warrants to be executed at the residence of Robert Savoie and his work locker. The warrants would potentially yield evidence in this case that would either exonerate the officer or point to his guilt.

Sexual assaults of this nature require immediate action by investigators since crucial exhibits such as DNA may be lost or destroyed. Prompt execution of the warrants would be essential. Moreover our procedure manual requires it.

I have been advised that EACP Inspector Hall ordered the suspension of executing the warrants for approx 3 hours. This was allegedly done on your instructions. According to investigators, the complainant’s *appearance* may have had an influence in the Executives decision.

During the course of the delay investigators continued to request that the warrants be executed. After much debate it is alleged that Inspector Hall asked for a rising of hands in a vote to determine if they should be executed. I have great difficulty believing that this was actually part of the decision-making process and hope it was not the case. It is further noted that Inspector Hall may not have believed the complainants version of events stating it was a “Cock and Bull story.”

In the end PSU investigators and Sex Crimes detectives stood steadfast and referred to policy requiring the executing of the search warrants. Following the “vote” Inspector Hall was outnumbered and stated the he would “take the hit” for the decision, suggesting that someone higher in rank had ordered that the warrant not be executed. The warrant was executed and essential DNA samples were obtained. It is my opinion that the three-hour delay was unjustified and jeopardized the investigation. In fact all PSU members involved debated at length after the warrant about

- a) Charging the EACP with Obstruct Justice and Discreditable conduct.
- b) Requesting immediate transfers from PSU.

It is essential that the executive know this concern since officer notes document the delay and it will most likely come out in court. Moreover, as a result of full disclosure, defence counsel and the public prosecutor have been given copies of these officer's notes. This will cause embarrassment and discredit to the Service.

Whatever the reasoning behind the delay and instructions from you and the EACP I do not believe that an independent body would have concurred. Even though incriminating evidence was found during the warrant, in another case it may have shown him to be innocent and the complainant lying.

In this regard the incident becomes more serious since the complainant tried to take her own life shortly after her disclosure. Apparently she thought the Police did not believe her.

An independent commissioner/body may be required to discern whether charges of obstruct justice, obstruct peace officer, or some similar regulatory charge is in order especially when considering that members were being instructed to breach Policy by the EACP.

7. Savoie Media Release

Sgt Hudson and I were assigned to arrest Cst Savoie for the offence of Sexual Assault. In good faith we arranged for him to turn himself in through discussions with his counsel Richard Wolson. Sgt. Hudson and I also shared the same concern for Savoie's well being in light of the fact that he possessed several firearms. As a result Richard Wolson mediated for us and Savoie agreed to turn over all weapons voluntarily.

While processing Savoie at the PSU office with counsel Cathy Boulet, Sgt Hudson and I were advised by S/Sgt Scott that "They" had a media release on the arrest of Savoie. This was done prior to our releasing him and prior to us seizing his guns. I have great difficulty seeing the urgent necessity of releasing this information. The release may be perceived as political and self-serving in nature and in fact could have jeopardized officer safety had Savoie heard the release as we were taking his guns. We were later advised that you requested the release prior to your leaving town for the weekend.

I believe that an independent commissioner would guard against this type of action.

I also find this incident especially frustrating for the following reason: Why do we release the arrest of an officer while still in custody and being processed while being inactive on the release of the arrest of a male charged with Public Mischief on false accusations against Police? The perception of the members is not good. Further we should keep in mind that:

"Organizations must protect the privacy of employees subjected to the disciplinary process." (11). The member responsible should be cautioned on the timing of this release.

8. Equal treatment of all members

A recent FBI article noted that “equal treatment of all employees is fundamental to the concept of fairness, therefore, all allegations of employee misconduct should receive the same review process.” (12). In the case of the Winnipeg police Service this is not the case.

During my career I have heard numerous examples of how higher-ranking members are treated in a more positive light pertaining to misconduct. In the past year I have received information of an allegation involving a current Inspector. The Inspector is alleged to have had a relationship with an informant in the past and lent her money. The complainant was concerned when he called her requesting repayment. His actions were described as unprofessional and I will not enter into further details at this time.

As a result PSU was contacted and later the Executive advised. However instead of investigating the matter through regular channels the suspect Inspector was spoken to by Supt. Evans and the investigation was terminated.

If this Service is diligent in the investigating of lower ranked members for the theft of birdseed, gum, a water bottle, and C.D.'s then perhaps we should also investigate the possible charge of obstruction of Justice in a Murder Investigation or obstruction of Justice in a Sexual assault investigation by high-ranking members. On this point I do not belittle the offence of theft but the extremes are present.

If we are to be vigilant in investigating officers making split second decisions in tense situations then perhaps we should also address calculated decisions made by senior members.

“If a Chief demands fair, thorough, and impartial investigations, there is a high potential for objective and responsible results. However, any lesser standard for internal affairs will allow for and encourage organizational and individual protectionism.” (12). The need for an independent commissioner is again highlighted and would create more accountability.

9. Past Crown Opinions

Since my transfer to the PSU there has been great debate generated concerning the submission of reports for Crown Opinion. Since that time this unit has been more inclined to have “round table discussions” on cases as an alternative. This has met with great success.

Unfortunately past cases and opinions continue to bring perceived discredit to the unit as cases are going to trial. Two strong recommendations should be contemplated in the selection for Crown attorneys assigned to this task:

1. "Prosecutors or crown attorneys who are responsible for reviews and charging decisions should not be counsel who are mixing on a daily basis with line officers." (14).
2. "Arrangements should also be made for assignment of prosecutors to be the most seasoned, effective, and independent prosecutors." (15).

The perception in past cases may be that this is not the case. Further it should be recommended that these same counsels have the same independence from high-ranking members.

On 02 09 12 a meeting was held at the PSU office boardroom. Present were EACP Insp. Hall, S/Sgt Poole, Sgts Hudson, Robins, Simpson, Pearson, and D/Sgts Vertone, Levasseur and myself. During this meeting EACP Hall stated "Jannine LeMere when she was doing them (Crown opinions) would phone me regularly and throw things at me and I would give her my opinion." He offered these opinions prior to her recommendations being submitted. The EACP repeated that this was done on a regular basis.

How can anyone perceive that there is an independent crown when she is obtaining the opinion of the EACP? The mechanics of these internal investigations may be seen as follows:

Invest-----PSU officer report-----Crown Opinion-----Crown Decision
I
I
EACP Opinion

I find these comments especially troubling since, at the same meeting the EACP instructed all investigators to keep their opinions out of internal reports.

It may be said that in order for Justice to be seen as "Just" it need be evidently swift and evidently certain. Unfortunately this is not the case. More importantly the personal damage inflicted on our members cannot be easily un-done. Once a case has been exhausted and the decision is a stay how do we give back the time to the employee? How do we justify his/her promotion ineligibility during that time?

These issues may warrant a review of these recent decisions by an independent body especially in light of judicial criticism on how some cases made it to court and the comments made by the EACP.

10. Memo to Chief Ewatski from Cst. J. Quail dated 01 10 15 and 10 11 01

Cst. Quail advised me recently of the A/M memo. Cst. Quail has documented a concern he had regarding senior members not following domestic violence Policy. By bringing this matter up he had concerns of retribution from the senior ranking members involved.

Adhering to section 11.02 of our regulations Cst. Quail documents an incident that needs to be addressed and should be done without any fears of reprisals. To date he has not been satisfied with Police action and other members have mirrored this concern.

An independent Commissioner would not only present himself/herself as more objective but possibly more approachable. It is unfortunate that there does not appear to be anyone to independently address these issues in a neutral forum.

Conclusions:

1.

Section 8.01 of our regulations states:

“It is the duty of every member of the Police Service to observe the law, comply with lawful directives and orders and to properly discharge their duties as a member of the service.”

The senior officers listed in this report may be guilty of Discreditable conduct. The Winnipeg Police Service regulations defines this offence as follows:

Section 20.01 Discreditable Conduct, that is, if a member

- e) Acts in an inappropriate or disorderly manner on or off duty, or in a manner likely to bring discredit upon the reputation of the service, or
- f) Makes or signs a false or misleading, oral or written statement or entry in any document or record pertaining to the members duties.

The following Criminal charges may also be warranted.

Section 129 obstructing peace officer every one who

- a) resists or wilfully obstructs a public officer or a peace officer in the execution of his duty or any person lawfully acting in aid of such an officer
- b) resists or wilfully obstructs any person in the lawful execution of a process against lands or goods or in making a lawful distress or seizure.

Section 139 obstruct justice

2) every one who wilfully attempts in any manner other than the manner described in subsection 1) to obstruct, pervert or defeat the course of justice

2.

The “Core Values” of the Winnipeg Police Service are defined as follows:

Honesty

“Being truthful and open in our interactions with each other and the citizens we serve.”

Integrity

“Being above reproach, ethical and doing what is right.”

Trust

“Being honourable and maintaining a high level of trust with each other and the members of our communities.”

Respect

“Valuing each other and our citizens by showing understanding and appreciation for our similarities and differences.”

Accountability

“Being conscientious, professional, dependable and accountable for our actions by the citizens we service.”

Commitment To Excellence

“Adhering to strict standards of conduct and performance in everything we do.”

These core values are not mere words but rather a state of being.

The incidents described in this report demonstrate the need for an independent commissioner to oversee the PSU. Honourable and experienced investigators currently man the PSU. I have confidence in the leadership of S/Sgt Poole and I would welcome working under such conditions with an independent body in position.

Having an independent body does not negate the role and responsibility of reporting to the Chief of Police. This must be maintained. However there should be no perceived interference on the unit from that office.

As indicated at the onset of this report I have hesitated in bringing up these concerns. I have informed the President and Vice President of the WPS Association some fellow workers and I have sought Legal counsel. The common advice has been one of caution. I have been informed that by bringing the matter to light there is a strong probability of retribution from senior officers in the form of unfavourable transfers and halted promotion.

After much introspection I have concluded that I can look in the mirror with honour only if I present the truth. Ethically I am compelled to do so. To this end, Sociologist Ernest Becker once noted:

“...When modern man sets in motion vast social institutions but does not take critical control of them, the institutions assume their own momentum; the people who man the institutions become like ants mechanically doing their duty, and no one dares to question the routine to which the institutions conform.” (16).

These incidents need be addressed and I have been left with no other avenue with the exception of the Provincial Justice Minister. We must have the responsibility to stand up and take blame and be held accountable for things we do wrong.

If the members listed herein decide not to corroborate what I have documented then I stand alone with honour and integrity and time will serve me well.

I am Sir,

Yours respectfully,

D/Sgt A. Mikolajewski B.A. (hons.) M.A.
PSU/Internal Affairs #1448

Respectfully submitted

S/Sgt J. Poole PSU

Footnotes

1. Patrick S. Knoll Police Law Reports, "A focus of internal affairs – international perspective, report to commission. 1977. p.79
2. Ibid p. 95
3. Ibid p. 81
4. Ibid p. 72
5. Pat Knoll Q.C. "Police corruption-from brass monkeys to wisemen." Speaker notes, Alberta Law enforcement Review board, June 14-18 2001. p. 5.
6. op.cit., "Police Law reports" p.80.
7. Ibid p. 80
8. John H. Conditt Jr. FBI Law enforcement bulletin "Institutional integrity. The four elements of self-policing." November 2000. p. 18
9. Ibid p. 22
10. op.cit., "Police Law reports" p. 133
11. op.cit., "FBI Law enforcement bulletin" p. 22
12. Ibid p. 20
13. op.cit., "Police Law reports" p. 88
14. Ibid p. 124
15. Ibid p. 125
16. Ernest Becker, The Structure of Evil, (The Free Press, New York, 1968), p.142