

6 July 2001

A Summary to Conincide with the Final Report of
Sgt. Croal's Complaint Investigation

Major Point : Criminal Fraud

So no Over Sights nor Misunderstanding may be made.

For Public Disclosure.

Delivered in Person

TO:

Sgt. Cam Croal
RCMP Public Complaint Investigator of the Foster-King Report.

regards to : Sgt. Paul Williams of Commercial Crime
and
the RCMP detachment Kitchener Commander

presented before the meeting of Greenhalgh
with Sgt. Croal.

Since Sgt. Croal will be formalizing a final report on the complaint of the Foster-King Investigation; there are TWO major questions that must be answered as they PROVE that fraud did indeed occur.

- ONE: Was there evidence of intent to DECEIVE in order to receive monies that would not be possible if truthful, honest and ethical means were used; i.e. criminal fraud?
- TWO: Is there reasonable evidence that the governments of Canada, and Ontario would have something to lose if an official report made findings that fraud had occurred: i.e., a political motive for the (covert) coercion of Foster and King?

6 July 2001

Criminal Fraud 2.

RULE #1

Ignorance of the law and naivete are NOT reasonable NOR realistic defences for the University of Waterloo.

The Administrators, Governors, Senate and other officials of the University of Waterloo are NOT naive, innocent ordinary citizens. They are composed of leading business people and politicians. The best example is Senator Trevor Eyton, who was not only a UW senator, but also a federal Senator and a chief executive of one of Canada's largest businesses, Brascan. The officials at the University of Waterloo would have a GREATER, not less, understanding of the law than the average citizen; and since many have also sworn oaths of office and trust, they have a greater responsibility expected of them, NOT LESS!

IGNORANCE OF THE LAW WAS NOT A FACTOR: they knew full well what they were doing-- THEY NEVER DREAMT THAT THEY WOULD BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE!

The fact is, because of their greater awareness, their criminal actions are more reprehensible than an average citizen's.

RULE #2

Sgt. Lutes (22 Oct. 97) gave a written definition of fraud under the criminal code that Foster and King should have referred to when they took over the investigation. He wrote,

"The offence of Fraud as set out in the Criminal Code of Canada states the following;

'Everyone who by deceit, falsehood or other fraudulent means, whether or not it is a false pretense within the meaning of the Act, defrauds the public or any other person whether ascertained or not, of any property, money or valuable security, is guilty of fraud. "'

NOW EMPHASIZE:

1. by deceit
2. by falsehood
3. or other fraudulent means

AND

Defrauds the public or OTHER person of:

6 July 2001

1. ANY property (i.e., under the Ministry of Health Mandate cancer research is PUBLIC PROPERTY paid for by the taxpayers of Canada)
2. money(i.e., the NIH scholarship money is real, and Yale has set the precedent for scholarship fraud)
3. valuable security (public trust and tax dollars)

IS GUILTY OF FRAUD!!!

Deceit, Falsehood and Other Fraudulent Means(LYING)

1. Did the University of Waterloo LIE in order to get money for J.C.M.Riley to receive the MRCC—NIB co—sponsored scholarship to go to Yale?

Ans. YES!

2. IS the scholarship worth money and its position actually more valuable than money (Yale precedent in charging students with scholarship fraud)?

Ans. YES!

3. Was J.C.M.,Riley HONESTLY, TRUTHFULLY and ETHICALLY qualified for the scholarship , or was DECEIT and FALSEHOODS used to make him appear qualified?

Ans. deceit and falsehoods were used.

Under the definition of the Criminal Code, the University of Waterloo COMMITTED CRIMINAL FRAUD!

All the evidence of lying was available to Foster and King: why did they not state that the University of Waterloo lied to receive monies not possible by truthful, honest means?

That must be explained in the Sgt. Croal Complaint Report. As to who could be, consequently charged with cover up (i.e., the Ontario Human Rights Commission and other prominent people and politicians; up to the PMO).

Sgt. Croal , this will be my major theme when we meet to discuss your findings. I believe fraud has been proven under the Criminal Code.

Edward A. Greenhalgh.