

No further mention of this was made until prompted by the police interviews years later.

As unexpectedly as the suspect started talking to police, he stopped. Two days after his arrest, the suspect became very uncooperative and rebuffed all further interview attempts. He returned to the anti-authoritative demeanour common during his previous encounters with the police. During the subsequent trials, this attitude change became the focus of attention. The defence did not belabour the truthfulness of the confession. Instead, defence lawyers focused their arguments on the suspect's apparent state of mind when he provided the statement. By his own admissions, the suspect was a cocaine user. During his trial testimony, he claimed to have consumed large quantities of the drug on the days preceding his arrest. Deprived of the drug after his arrest, he was suffering from drug withdrawal, or as it was referred to in the evidence, the suspect was experiencing cocaine psychosis. This psychosis, the defence claimed, caused him to lose control over what he was saying. They asked each judge to rule the statement a product of an inoperative mind, and therefore, inadmissible. In each case, the court ruled against the defence. The judges claimed that the statement contained too many minute details of the crimes, and that in their opinion, the suspect was more than aware of what he was doing when interviewed by the police. In fact, one or more of the judges commented that in their opinions the suspect demonstrated above-average intelligence and recall.

The only stolen item recovered from the crimes committed by this individual was a ring he was wearing at the time of his arrest. It had been taken during his last known offence, the robbery at Wallace Jewellers in

Chilliwack. Throughout his confessions, the suspect did not implicate anyone else in his crimes. Working for the most part as a loner, the only conceivable person who could have provided information which may have led to his arrest, would have been the person who disposed of his stolen property. Perhaps he recognized the loyalty this person showed him over the years and returned the favour by not exposing him or her. He may also have felt that if convicted and sent to jail, he did not wish to carry a label of informer with him.

The suspect was convinced by British Columbia juries, in separate trials, of first degree murder, the attempted murder of the bank manager, two bank robberies, and two jewellery store robberies in Vancouver. He was sentenced to life imprisonment, without eligibility for parole for at least 25 years, for the murder. The other convictions resulted in lengthy jail terms concurrent to the life sentence. The other matters in the province and those in Alberta were withdrawn, as it was the opinion of the Attorneys General that further expense to conduct such prosecutions would not be justified.

The judges in the various trials made some interesting comments about the investigation conducted into those matters. One was impressed with the effort the investigators had gone to, to provide as much corroboration as possible for the suspect's confession. These efforts helped the Crown prepare for all eventualities that might, and often did, arise during the trials. For example, during his testimony the suspect claimed he hadn't actually committed the murder but had read about the discovery of the remains in the newspaper. Research by the investigators in preparation for the trial had demonstrated that the articles in the