

From: Pat.Reid@edmonton.ca
To: cainesbrian@hotmail.com
Date: Fri, 20 Nov 2009 11:59:29 -0700
Subject: Last Friday's Weigh in

Hi Brian:

I thought I sent you this request already, anyway here it is again - I would like your recollection of what happened at the weigh in last Friday. I have asked Bill, Dave and April the same question - and have a detailed response from April already.

One specific question I am asking is who exactly said Ann Saccaruto could go back to the hotel and make weight and return later.

Your recollection would be appreciated.
cheers, Pat

From: BRIAN CAINES [cainesbrian@hotmail.com]
Sent: November 20, 2009 3:52 PM
To: Pat Reid
Subject: RE: Last Friday's Weigh in

Pat,

I think the issue of who sent Ann Sacaruto back to her hotel is a non issue. I think the issue now is more you saying that Murray Greg had issue with the weigh in and he wanted to know what you were going to do about it. By reading his e-mail it sounds like he had no issues with the weigh ins at all and didn't care what you were going to do about it.

From: Pat.Reid@edmonton.ca
To: cainesbrian@hotmail.com
Date: Sat, 21 Nov 2009 11:18:29 -0700
Subject: RE: Last Friday's Weigh in

Standard operating procedure for the past three-four years was to have one time weigh-ins (you already know this.) Dave Wiles can tell you when the Board made the operational ruling that no time be allowed AFTER the weigh in - instead the scales were provided BEFORE the weigh-in so the onus was on the person being weighed and not the officials doing the weighing.

As you also know from the many weigh-ins you have done with April and Mark - when someone weighed over the limit they could "on the spot" drop their pants and with a towel try one last time.

So when Saccaruto weighed over - you no doubt understand why April looked at you and shook her head "no" when Pearson tried to save his pay day by saying - it was the local Commissions call - but you could go by WBC rules and take two hours to make weight. You no doubt remember April looking at you and shaking her head "no".

So when some mystery person - not on the Commission - told Saccaruto to run back to the hotel and do whatever to make weight - the normal operating procedure was breached. If you don't like the word illegal that's up to you. When normal protocol - normal regulations are breached and something else is done to circumvent those protocols or regulations - that is what I happen to call, in terms of Governance "illegal". Call it what you want - the result of doing it is that the fight is no longer a title, (which just so happens to mean Ed Pearson is no longer needed as Championship Supervisor, and out the window goes his hefty payday - did you know that?) - and the fight still goes on as you are well aware - and Saccaruto gives Jelena 25% of her purse.

Pearson, I suspect motivated by the reality his payday was about to end - goes to his friend Orest and low and behold Saccaruto is suddenly playing by different rules - with NO ONE on the Commission approving Saccaruto to leave the premises or Saccaruto to return an hour later to make weight.

You know the rest of the story - and I have it in writing from April and Bill - I am still waiting for your version, requested last week.

Governance and public trust is something I happen to take seriously Brian. This isn't the first time the Commission has not acted in good faith - but hopefully it is the last time. Enough is enough as they say. It seems every event there is some cute twist to assist a promoter - why the promoter instead of the Commission you might ask? Maybe ask Mark Grotski about his meeting with Maria, former Chair of the Commission and Orest. Maybe ask Dave Wiles about the tape he listened to about our esteem Chair wanting free tickets to an April Wine concert. Incident after incident. Quite interesting to follow the trail of lies and deceit.

As far as the city is concerned, the split between Governance and Operations is the next major step for the Commission and then ensuring those on the Governance side are actually going to "govern" in an unbiased and uncompromising manner will be the next step. Rules and regulations will be properly written that will ensure the public trust is safe and no longer compromised by "interpretation for convenience".

Enough said - you know all of this. Although he now regrets it I understand, thankfully Murray Greig filled me in on the weigh-in improprieties and I was able to follow it up by asking Commission members to "come good" on what went on - that is up to the point of the back room meeting. Two synonyms for good

governance are "honesty" and "ntegrityi". That is what I plan to bring to the ECSC table as Executive Director.

cheers,
Pat

From: cainesbrian@hotmail.com
To: pat.reid@edmonton.ca
Subject: RE: Last Friday's Weigh in
Date: Sat, 21 Nov 2009 12:15:52 -0700

You need to change your tone when your dealing with me. Before you start throwing around words like "lies and deceit" and "honesty and Integrity" you need to take a close look at yourself and what you have been doing since you started.

I won't get into a pissing match with you. So don't bother writing anymore insulting e-mails.
