

one was quite close so the investigator decided to make a single cast combining all three. Due to its oily heaviness it wasn't necessary to treat the soil with any preparation, and he simply walled the impressions around with a crib, poured in the plaster of Paris and marked it for identification, and let it stand about 20 minutes to dry. The case then was lifted and taken to R.C.M.P. division headquarters where it was allowed to set overnight. In the morning it was cleansed with cold water and subjected to close examination which revealed the presence on it of enough characteristics to permit of positive identification. (It is of interest to note here that the plaster didn't disturb the soil in the imprints, and because of the oily ground surface another cast preserving all detail could have been made.)

On June 23 the city police forwarded a pair of work boots, but a superficial comparison showed at once that they had not caused the footprints though they clearly were of the same general size, shape and contour and worn thin in the same places as the footwear that had. The boots submitted were worn at the tips of the toes and on the outside edges of the heels, while from the cast it was apparent that the footwear responsible had steel clips at these points and in addition were patched at the toes. Indications were that the imprints had been made by shoes rather than boots.

These findings made known to the city police, they next day forwarded a pair of brown oxfords owned by the same suspect. Examination and comparison revealed over 20 points of similarity between the cast and the shoes, all of them in coincidental sequence. The investigator made several actual-size photographic enlargements of each shoe, of the cast and of the impressions and enumerated on all three sets the evident points of comparison.

The suspect was one Peter Procille of Winnipeg, possessor of a considerable

previous record for shop breaking, who had been arrested by an R.C.M.P. highway patrol for Possession of House-breaking Tools by Night, s. 464 (a) Cr. Code, and was in custody awaiting trial. A stay of proceedings was granted regarding that charge, and on October 6 Procille having elected for a speedy trial under Part XVIII of the code appeared at Winnipeg before Judge A. R. Macdonell in County Court and pleaded not guilty to Breaking, Entering and Theft, s. 461 Cr. Code.

The exhibits—the shoes, cast and photographic enlargements—were introduced as evidence, and in comparing them the investigator treated each shoe individually in his testimony. After drawing attention to the comparative size, shape and general contour of the shoes and impressions, he started at the toe and worked back to the heel and, using calipers to demonstrate the correctness of his assertions, stressed that each point of similarity was in exact relative position on the shoes and on the cast. Attention was then turned to the photographic enlargements on which pertinent characteristics had been plotted for ready reference by the Court.

An employee of Marshall-Wells Ltd. testified that on the evening before the offence was committed he had dumped some used oil on the ground where the footprints were later discovered and was certain that the ground was dry and bare of foot marks then. Thus a complete chain of evidence was forged—the footprints were made during the night, the shoes were owned by the accused, as established by the city police, and the cast certified to his presence at the scene of the crime. He was found guilty and sentenced to 23 months' imprisonment in Headingly gaol.

Subsequently by letter both Crown Attorney W. J. Johnston and Acting Crown Prosecutor L. D. Morosnick commented on the efficient way in which the investigation had been carried out.