

STATEMENT ANALYSIS OF TERRY ARNOLD'S INTERVIEW

March 9th, 2000 - Mission Institution, Mission, B.C.

The following is a breakdown and analysis of suspect Terry ARNOLD's interview with Winnipeg Police Service 2000-03-09. Statement analysis is a semi-objective examination of the verbal content of the statement to determine veracity and probabilities of deception. Deceit clearly seems to place greater intellectual demands on a person than does honesty; thus reducing spontaneity and resulting in speech patterns that reflect a greater need to monitor what is said. In a probing interview, the untruthful are faced with two choices; to either psychologically and verbally create and erect a defense against being caught lying; and, go on the offense as an aggressor to combat the source of the threat.

Prior to analyzing the statement the writer took into consideration the pre-determined pattern of deceit and lying that has become a habitual way of life for Terry ARNOLD. Terry Samuel ARNOLD has been diagnosed as a sociopath and pathological liar since he was 15 years of age and under the control of the Seven Oaks Detention Center. He has maintained a pattern of lying that habitually minimizes and justifies his own behaviour, while projecting blame on others. He has never accepted responsibility for his own actions. His character assessment shows that he is very untrustworthy. This does not mean that he has lied necessarily in this interview; however, the analysis of **the verbal content tends to be consistent with his habitual pattern of lying.**

The clinical diagnosis on Terry ARNOLD indicates that he is a very intelligent individual who shows many character traits and behaviour patterns typical of a psychopath. ARNOLD is said to internalize nothing, but expects immediate gratification of what he sees as his needs. He has no true internalized value system or conscience. ARNOLD has developed a pattern of self-deception that rationalizes and avoids looking at his own attitudes and behaviour.

Untruthful people feel two types of anxiety within the probing interview. They face the anxiety brought on by emotional guilt, called guilt deception; or, the anxiety of being caught and exposed for what they have done, called detection apprehension. As ARNOLD does not have a conscience or feel guilty about his own behaviour, he will not feel any guilt deception. He has developed a pattern of deception that defends against exposure of his actions. **ARNOLD constantly evaluates the threat level of each inquiry as to its sensitivity and focus upon the relevant issue.** This is at the very heart of Terry ARNOLD's developed schema of deceit.

Throughout the interview of ARNOLD at Mission, B.C., he continuously assessed each aspect of the interview. The truthful simply answer the questions to the best of their recollection. What ARNOLD did was assess each aspect of the interview as a threat to his exposure. What you see is that ARNOLD aggressively attacks the character of people he knows have information detrimental to his situation. ARNOLD also calculates each bit of information and begins to design his lie accordingly. In their research, Stiff & Miller (1986) indicate that the interviewer influences the lying behaviour of the liar. By giving positive feedback to a person who is making false statements it will increase deceitfulness. The liar, who is "reading" the target, is inclined to increase the behaviour that is being reinforced. By indicating considerable interest in what is being said, this encourages the liar to progressively escalate their stories. This certainly matched the interview with ARNOLD. **The writer will dissect certain areas of the interview and demonstrate how ARNOLD escalates his story relative to each particular point he is asked about.** The truthful simply do not do that. ARNOLD either attempts to discredit the information or rationalizes his behaviour when he knows he cannot simply deny that behaviour. ARNOLD also contradicts himself on occasion and the writer will detail those contradictions.

The other indicator of deception in this interview is a number of times ARNOLD has demonstrated “**guilty knowledge**” of the crime through the use of “**negative outward statements**”. Part of the anxiety one feels from “detection apprehension” is forecasting potential problems with their stories. Reality and biology cannot be cheated. When a person committed, participated or received guilty knowledge of a significant nature, it is probable it was transferred into long-term memory. The interview is perceived as a threat and the untruthful must respond by either lying directly or by being verbally evasive. In an attempt to black out guilty knowledge, the liar is holding an internal monologue telling himself that he didn’t do the act. In this attempt to suppress the guilty knowledge, the liar often makes a negative outward response by telling the interviewer that an action was not done in reality, knowing that it was. The writer will layout many different occasions where ARNOLD made a negative statement in an attempt to sway the interviewer.

The following analysis will look at how ARNOLD deals with the following relevant issues within this interview,

- A. ARNOLD’s knowledge of the case against SOPHONOW
- B. SOPHONOW’s apparent jailhouse confession to ARNOLD
- C. ARNOLD’s visit to the St. Boniface Hospital
- D. ARNOLD’s previous visits to the Ideal Donut Shop
- E. ARNOLD’s involvement with Police during the investigation
- F. Jackie WHITE (Gurergil) as part of the alibi
- G. ARNOLD’s knowledge of Barbara STOPPEL
- H. ARNOLD’s cowboy hat
- I. ARNOLD’s alibi

The writer will also identify several negative outward statements indicating guilty knowledge throughout each section.

A. ARNOLD’s knowledge of the case against SOPHONOW

Prior to this interview, ARNOLD had discussed knowing Thomas SOPHONOW in a 1994 police interview with Detective Archie DOODY in Dorchester Penitentiary. ARNOLD initiated SOPHONOW into the interview with the following,

“Have you heard of Thomas SOPHONOW? Thomas SOPHONOW was a guy in Winnipeg, who, uh, murdered a girl in a restaurant with some rope. He tied her up with some rope uh, tied her up with a rope or something...and the rope was identified to be from B.C. Hydro and he worked for B.C. Hydro. He was consequently convicted and, uh, he says he didn’t do it and **later on it was found out that he didn’t do it**...even though he was convicted....alright?”

It appeared that ARNOLD had a vested interest in the case at that time. In the initial introduction of this interview ARNOLD is informed we are investigating Barbara Stopple’s murder. ARNOLD

immediately equates her name and the donut shop to Thomas SOPHONOW. ARNOLD indicates that he was not aware that SOPHONOW had three trials, but indicates, **“It was pretty obvious”** that SOPHONOW committed the murder.

ARNOLD then begins to feel that he is a suspect and begins to get confrontational. He then states (p. 5)

“...if there’s some question that I’m a suspect in this forget it, our talk is over, there’s no way I’m gonna be railroaded in this again, **I don’t know the guy, I don’t know what happened, all I know is what I read in the papers and I have an aunt with a fucking big mouth** who happened to phone the Winnipeg Police Station about someone that didn’t even look like me.”

ARNOLD appears to be minimizing his knowledge in this statement and at the same time running down his aunt who he feels turned him in as a suspect. He then states (p. 6) **“I’m familiar with what you’re talking about,.. I didn’t know about the Sophonow thing....”**

ARNOLD then becomes less confrontational when he is advised that we are still looking at SOPHONOW. He now again asserts SOPHONOW’s guilt stating, **“There’s no doubt about it in my mind”** (p. 7).

ARNOLD is later asked why there is no doubt in his mind (p 18). ARNOLD states,

“I remember that when they after when I had left the Safety Building, when he had I believe he had got acquitted or mistrial or something like that I read in the paper I didn’t follow it a lot after that, **I found out a long time later I feel it’s from my mom that he had been convicted** and that this uh I had told her I’m no..I’m not surprised, I didn’t say why just I’m not surprised and it was **mostly because of the B.C. connection.**”

He states he never told his mother about the supposed confession of SOPHONOW to him **“because of the B.C. connection that you know everybody knew about him right....”** He further states (p. 19), **“...I think I read a little thing in the paper that he had been released or that he was outta jail or whatever, and I was pretty surprised.....I was pretty surprised with everything that that that he had been acquitted.”**

At the beginning of the interview ARNOLD was reluctant to admit he knew SOPHONOW or much about the case. He also initially denied knowing SOPHONOW, but by the end of the interview he tells of SOPHONOW’s supposed jailhouse confession in great detail. The following section deals with that supposed confession.

B. SOPHONOW’s apparent jailhouse confession to ARNOLD

The very fact that ARNOLD claims SOPHONOW made a jailhouse confession to him would probably set a precedent. The writer knows of no other situation in which the possible actual killer came forward and claimed a wrongfully accused suspect confessed to him in jail. If we consider the post offense behaviour of Terry ARNOLD, we should not be surprised that ARNOLD claims this actually took place. However, again the writer will dissect the statement dealing with this supposed confession. As with every section that I will deal with, ARNOLD initially denies knowing SOPHONOW, then he claims to get a vague recollection of meeting SOPHONOW, and then he ends up quoting and cross-

examining SOPHONOW. This memory recall is not consistent with true memory, but more consistent with the story telling of a pathological liar intent on preventing the detection of his actions.

In the early stages of the interview ARNOLD considered himself a suspect. He began to get confrontational as investigators simply explained why they were there to speak to him. He speaks up and states (p 5) **“ifI’m a suspect..... our talk is over.... I don’t know the guy, I don’t know what happened, all I know is what I read in the papers....”** ARNOLD then perceives that the focus of the interview is not on him as a suspect, but as a potential witness against SOPHONOW and he changes his demeanour. He now indicates he is **“familiar with what you’re talking about”** (p 6). He then quickly asserts his confidence in SOPHONOW’s guilt stating, **“there’s no doubt in my mind.”** (p 7).

D/Sgt. BROWN then affords ARNOLD his rights and ARNOLD replies, **“I’m not a suspect, I’m not an accused and I’m definitely not a witness.”** (p 10) ARNOLD is then informed that we had previous information that he came forward regarding SOPHONOW’s apparent confession. ARNOLD is then informed that we had information that he had come forward through his lawyer about the confession from SOPHONOW. ARNOLD **then becomes vague** with his first response stating, **“That sounds vaguely familiar, that was a long time ago....there was somebody that I had talked to that had said they had done something.”** (p 13) He then begins to build his story with further confidence as he all of a sudden acknowledges the occasion, he states, **“I don’t know if that was at the Safety Building or if that was out at the Headingley Remand Center?”** (p. 13)

He is still vague and reluctant to identify SOPHONOW as the guy he spoke to referring to him as “somebody”. He is asked by D/Sgt. ALLAN if he ever met Thomas Sophonow and ARNOLD states, **“I remember meeting quite a few people..”** (p 14) ARNOLD then suddenly recalls he spoke specifically to SOPHONOW, stating **“...I remember meeting the guy cause I remember being interested when they arrested him.”** ARNOLD now only claims to have a vague memory of the conversation. He states, **“I can’t remember exactly how the conversation I can remember bits and pieces....”**

ARNOLD then begins to say there was **“...something about a rope...”** and then changes his cognitive thought process by slipping in a **negative outward statement of guilty knowledge** - **“..now before this time I had never been to B.C., never been to British Columbia.”** (p 15) Truthful people do not possess guilty knowledge or feel the need to argue their innocence in a non-accusatory interview. This is also called **bargaining behaviour** which is more prominent from a deceptive subject. The fact that he interrupted his cognitive thought process is a stronger indication that this is a concern to him. ARNOLD actually goes to great lengths to convince investigators he was never in B.C. (p. 15-16). We can contradict ARNOLD on this lie as he claims he was never in B.C. since he was “knee-high to a grasshopper”. We can prove through other sources that ARNOLD was in B.C. at various times through his teens.

ARNOLD again begins to build his story with confidence in his memory;

- He claims SOPHONOW **“said he worked for B.C. Hydro....I remember him talking about the Hydro Company and some rope”** (p 16) He then qualifies the importance of this comment, by claiming he did not know about the Hydro and rope connection until he read it in the paper. This was a common myth regarding this case, that SOPHONOW worked for the Hydro Company in which the rope was connected. That is false.
- He then claims SOPHONOW discussed why they were not going to convict him stating, **“he made comments like uh uhm they’re not gonna convict him because they got their times wrong”.... “something about the times and thathad been some guy had gone to the**

hospital and said it was him and people assumed it was him he said it wasn't even him." ... "It was like it was like he got lucky, like somebody happened to be there and when he found out that somebody'd been delivering toys said it was him that was there" ... "said he got lucky.." ... "people were identifying him he said but it wasn't him".. (p 17)

- He was asked specifically if SOPHONOW admitted to killing Barbara STOPPEL and ARNOLD stated "...well he didn't it was more along the lines, of uh he'd made comments like you know they say there's no such thing as a perfect murder, and then he'd laugh (p 18)
- ARNOLD is asked if he can remember where the conversation took place and ARNOLD has difficulty answering the question concretely. When people have a real memory of an event they associate the event to the location and surroundings in which it took place. If ARNOLD can recall the details of this conversation, then he should be able to recall where it took place. ARNOLD vaguely answers "...I can barely remember that much so.." (p. 19) "**there were cells with barred doors, uh like bars....like solid doors there were bars on..**" (p 19). He then states, "**Well we're out on the range all day...**" He cannot recall whether it was at Headingley or Remand, but he states, "**seems to me it was at the Safety Building.**" (p 20)
- (p 74) D/Sgt. Brown begins to tell ARNOLD that they have no further questions and ARNOLD now takes the initiative to further advance his confidence in SOPHONOW's guilt and their alleged conversation. He starts by stating, "**...I remember over the years never having any doubt in my mind that he did it, because..**" Again ARNOLD shows a vested interest in this case from it's onset. He then follows up stating it was because he had heard the rope was from B.C. Hydro and he now remembers SOPHONOW telling him, "**....I remember him telling me that he worked for the (Hydro)**" - ARNOLD now begins to actually quote SOPHONOW and himself regarding the conversation they had. ARNOLD states, "**...I asked him why would they arrest him if he if if of all all these people in the world why would they arrest him and charge him and I remember saying to him they must have had something on him, oh he said I used to work for B.C. Hydro and this and I say rope 'cause I don't remember exactly what he had said that they used could be obtained through it was what they bought, the Hydro Company.**" He then claims to challenge SOPHONOW by stating, "**I remember looking right at him and I says how many people do you think were in Manitoba from B.C. that worked with the Hydro Company, had access to this particular rope that were in that donut shop on the night that you said that you were in there that this girl happened to be strangled with this particular rope, now how many people do you think are are in Manitoba at that time? (p 75) Besides you, that were in there, I said did you happen to see anybody in there that you knew from B.C.?**" (p. 76 - With this last sentence ARNOLD actually leans forward towards investigators and smiles - he was obviously pleased with himself over his logic.)
- (p. 78) ARNOLD again asserts his confidence in SOPHONOW's guilt and further recall of the conversation stating, "**...I have no doubt in my mind because of what he said there's no doubt in my mind and I guess the biggest thing was him saying look this this patsy they call him, this person that was at the hospital that wasn't him that people were identifying as him and it wasn't him.**"

The writer feels this fabricated jailhouse confession should be considered damning evidence against Terry ARNOLD. This fabrication builds from a complete denial it happened, through a vague

recall, to an actual quote and cross-examination by ARNOLD. It also contradicts the real facts of the case. SOPHONOW has never worked for B.C. Hydro, nor claimed to have to anybody. This was common public perception based on media accounts. It is highly unlikely SOPHONOW would have admitted this to ARNOLD. ARNOLD has used what he has learned in the media court coverage to build a stronger recall of the alleged confession. The account of the conversation here also appears to contradict what he reportedly told his defense lawyer Heather PULLAN February 28th, 1983. ARNOLD had come forward to police through his lawyer on that date claiming SOPHONOW had made this confession while they were in gaol together between July & September 1982. ARNOLD claims SOPHONOW stated out of frustration to ARNOLD, **“Of course, I did it and if you don’t get off my back you’re going to get it too.”** (Lawyer’s notes PULLAN to Greg BRODSKY typed 83-03-02)

The pattern and intent of this fabrication matches the post offense behaviour of ARNOLD. It is intended to deflect suspicion away from himself and back onto SOPHONOW. In one last reference to SOPHONOW, ARNOLD is asked directly if he had any involvement at all with the death of Barbara STOPPEL? His answer appears to reflect further guilty knowledge. He states, **“No... But I’m still very confident that uh I have no doubt in my mind that they let the wrong guy go.”** (Page 54) Language is tied directly to cognition and knowledge. ARNOLD knows SOPHONOW is the wrong guy and refers to him as such. If he truly believed he was the killer we would expect him to say they let the right guy go.

C. ARNOLD’S visit to the hospital

Terry ARNOLD visited the hospital five days after the attack at the hospital. He demanded to see the family at the emergency counter. They did not allow him to see her, but hospital staff did have Mrs. STOPPEL attend and speak with ARNOLD. Back then ARNOLD claimed he **“was a truck driver who frequented the Ideal Donuts and had got to know and converse with Barbara.”** First, ARNOLD only held a class 7 driver’s license at that time and at no time drove a truck; and secondly, would not have had the opportunity to get to know STOPPEL well enough to become so close. Even back then his lies were evident. This again fits his pattern of deceit, as it speaks of his intentions for attending the hospital. We know ARNOLD feels no remorse or sympathy for STOPPEL (he is quoted by other witnesses, when the murder is discussed, as saying “the bitch deserved it”). **This would be a visit out of self-preservation.** The media had not reported her death and one would surmise after five days, that she might in fact survive the attack. If she did survive the attack, she would become a witness who could possibly identify her attacker. This would certainly be the motivation behind such a visit by ARNOLD. Keeping ARNOLD’s personality in mind, the average citizen would find it both very daring, intrusive and socially inappropriate to demand to see the family at the hospital. ARNOLD’s lack of socialization skills and his propensity for blatant lying would not detract him from such an action. It is these same personality traits that probably allowed him to convince investigators back then that he was not responsible. He could lie without feeling the anxiety of guilt and remorse and at the same time turn people off with his lack of socialization skills. Previous investigators wrote him off as a “goof”. This visit should have been treated as a major red flag in 1981. Unlike SOPHONOW, ARNOLD injected himself into the investigation.

In our recent interview, ARNOLD attempts to deny he ever visited the hospital, however, he again changes his stance on that issue as the interview progresses. Early in the interview, D/Sgt. BROWN indicates that the report documents his visit to the hospital and he flatly denies that happened twice (p. 11). BROWN states, “... because after the death of Barbara Stoppel, at that donut shop she went to the hospital where she survived for about 5 days, okay, she was brain dead and they had to pull the plug on her, okay? But during that time and I know this from talking to the police officers and reading the file.... you went there to visit her, to see how she was doing and you spoke with Mrs.

Stoppel.” ARNOLD replies, **“That’s not correct.”** BROWN then follows up, “Okay well I’m telling you what I’ve read and.... you went there and spoke to Mrs. Stoppel and she provided us with your name and you were just inquiring about Barbara’s health.” Again ARNOLD replies, **“That’s not correct.”**

Later in the interview, ARNOLD is again questioned as to his involvement in the initial investigation and he begins to change his stance on the visit. D/Sgt. ALLAN states, “...because of the fact that you had gone to the hospital and Mrs. Stoppel, uh you had said that you were a friend of Barbara’s and you were concerned for her, and that’s how the police...” ARNOLD now replies, (p. 34 - 35).

“That’s possible I don’t know.... It’s it’s possible at the time uhm at the time uhm (sighs) uhm (pause) at the time I was trying to do the right thing in a in a lot a ways and getting fucked around in a lot a ways and And it’s possible that I might have uh gone down and spoke to Mrs. Sto - Stoppel or Sopho..... be-because somehow because of the uh my aunt and and and being talked to and being and they you know so close in my neighborhood and the possible that I’m uh the possibility that I might have even I’ve run into her as a as a waitress when I went in to meet my mom or something it’s very possible I might have went down there just happened to be in the neighborhood because I wandered Winnipeg a lot over the years. That I might have been in the area and went in just to see if if she was okay, and and and asked to talk to her mom or whatever, but it wouldn’t a been because I was there you know like the guy coming back to his crime and shit like that you know it’s because you know well I felt like I was being dragged Into something, for me it was a big exciting thing you know... like somebody I was I was picked up and arrested for this thing that you know that happened in my neighbourhood and they think that you know I mean I was a little bugger back then.”

This lengthy dissertation is a very good example of how ARNOLD lies in a tough situation. He has realized that he cannot simply deny the visit to the hospital any longer, yet has to minimize and justify the reason he attended. He knows it would not look good for him to admit he had a “crush” on Stoppel as he did in the initial interview. At this point in the interview he is also dodging that he knew Stoppel and that he was in the donut shop. As a result we get this rather lengthy dissertation where he claims he **might have been in the area just to see if she was okay and asked to talk to her mom, but it wouldn’t a been because I was there you know like the guy coming back to his crime and shit like that.** He then claims it **would have been because he was picked up and arrested for this thing. This piece of logical justification is outright erroneous and impossible, as police never picked him up for questioning until after his hospital visit.** Now, he is attempting to use that as an excuse to attend the hospital.

His answers to these questions show a clear indication that they are not coming from memory, but from clear logic and self-preservation, not the plain direct simple truth. He has again initially denied the visit and then given in to some slight recall, but justified his reasons for what happened.

D. ARNOLD’s previous visits to the Ideal Donut Shop

ARNOLD claims to the initial investigators that he had met STOPPEL and eventually had a “crush” on her as a result of his visits to the Ideal Donut Shop. A potential witness who knew Terry ARNOLD came forward to defense lawyer Greg Brodsky and claimed that ARNOLD was in the donut shop the day of the murder teasing the waitress.

On page 24 the interview changes focus from SOPHONOW's connection to ARNOLD to ARNOLD's alibi and whereabouts on the night of the murder. ARNOLD begins to explain that he was with cab driver Reggie DAVIES on the night of the murder but **quickly initiates the donut shop into the conversation**. Like guilty knowledge, ARNOLD is **forecasting potential threats to his detection**. As a result he begins an **attempt to distance himself away from the donut shop**.

ARNOLD's opening remarks about the donut shop (p. 26), **"...I know Reggie used to go in the restaurant for donuts every now and again, I went in there once or twice but usually with my mom or my sister...."** ARNOLD has acknowledged that he has been in the donut shop once or twice **but usually** with my mom or sister. ARNOLD is attempting to state that he has never been in the donut shop alone. He however, contradicts himself with the language he uses. "Usually" does not mean always. If he was never in the shop alone, we would expect him to say he was "always" with my mom or sister. This is another example of a negative outward statement.

ARNOLD then attempts to get a better recall of when he was in the donut shop (p. 26). He states, **"..I was never a big donut and coffee guy and I mighta been in there once or twice in my life.... as a matter of fact I think I probably remember every time I was in there it was either to meet my mom, or to meet this meet some girl..."**. ARNOLD attempts two things here. First he attempts to say I don't drink coffee so I have no reason to go in there and secondly, to convince you that he remembers each time he was in the shop. In other words I don't go in to have coffee by myself and I remember every time I was in there and **never alone**. Again he is using a negative outward statement to convince you he was not in the shop. He is trying to tell you he specifically remembers going there to meet a girl yet only describes her as "some" girl. If he specifically remembers a location, we expect he would specifically remember the girl. Instead he generalizes the identity of the girl.

ARNOLD is then asked, "Had you been in that donut shop prior to getting out (of gaol)?" ARNOLD answers this with another negative outward statement, **"But never at night it'd just the daytime there."** ARNOLD knows the murder was at night, so his immediate response is a negative statement in defense of that guilty knowledge. He'll admit to being in the donut shop, but not alone, and not at night.

(p 35) See Section C above. In ARNOLD's lengthy dissertation he states at one point, **"..possibility that I might have even I've run into her as a as a waitress when I went in to meet my mom or something...."**

(p37) ARNOLD is confronted with the information that two elderly ladies were in the donut shop and "...they actually recall you sitting in there and when the young girl was working cause its the same day and you had actually asked her if you could assist her with putting some dishes away or..." ARNOLD quickly states, **"I don't remember that."** That is not a denial of fact, but a absence of recall. He then justifies why he would not do so, **"No, that seems a little far fetched I you know I don't get involved in somebody's work."** Again this is not a denial, but an objection. He is not saying it did not happen. He is saying I don't remember it happening and this is why I would not do that. He is again confronted with the information of these two ladies and he replies, **"...thats highly unlikely."** Again this is not a denial. He is simply saying it is unlikely. This lack of a direct denial tends to contradict his assertion earlier of specific recall of each time he was in the shop. That is not what we expect from the truthful.

(p. 38) ARNOLD is further questioned as to other sightings of him in the mall that day. He once again reveals guilty knowledge with the use of a negative outward statement. He states, **"But the thing is even if I was in there in the afternoon, okay I well, I mean like fuck uh let's say I did go in there in**

the afternoon and let's say I went and bought a loaf of bread and a quart of milk and then wandered over to the donut shop waiting for my mom or something, and and maybe I had offered and and and and and maybe even done something to help out or something which I never I had never been in the kitchen, but let's say it's it's it doesn't matter because at the time when this happened I was in a taxi cab going downtown." This is a very significant indication of guilty knowledge. It is highly unlikely that anyone other than the killer would use that negative statement. It indicates that he knew the killer was in the kitchen and views that action as a threat to his detection.

(p 64) ARNOLD is then confronted with the name of the elderly lady (Hazel Barton) who saw him in the donut shop on the day of the murder. D/Sgt. BROWN states (p 65) "She remembers you having a coffee in there or something" and ARNOLD replies, "**No no no that's that's I don't drink coffee and you can ask anybody I don't drink coffee I don't like coffee so that's a lie to begin with.**" (We have interviewed many of ARNOLD's associates who claim ARNOLD not only frequented coffee shops, but drank coffee. ARNOLD himself, stated in his initial alibi to police, that he woke up, cleaned up and had a coffee). ARNOLD then uses his habitual manner of character assassination of any potential witness, stating that the woman was a practicing witchcraft person, and also, that she held a grudge against him over a ring she alleges ARNOLD stole from her. (p. 66) ARNOLD states, "**...But she has reason not to like me because I wasn't very nice to her after that happened.**"

ARNOLD is then confronted with the fact that he admitted to initial investigators that he had been in the donut shop earlier that same afternoon. ARNOLD then gives another lengthy dissertation in which ARNOLD attempts to justify and suppress his actions in the donut shop. He states (p. 67),

"...I believe I said it's possible that I was in there that afternoon. I don't remember being in there but it was possible. I believe that's what I said to them that day....but like I said I did drop in there once in a while...Once or twice but I do remember when I went in there there was usually always lots of people in there (at this point he concedes he has been in there on a couple of occasions. He is not willing to concede that he told investigators it was that afternoon but it is possible. However, he protects himself by qualifying that if he was in there then there was usually always lots of people in there - another negative outward statement attempting to persuade you he was never alone with the victim)

...Y'know .. there was once I went in there to meet my mom. Another time I went in there my mom was having coffee with somebody and I believe it was Reggie....and another time I went in there and I sat at the table and there was lots of people there cause I was waiting for somebody. Uh uh a girl. I don't remember who but I remember it was a girl cause I had, I was dressed up I had nice clothes on and they came in and we left together. I have no idea where we went what we did anything but I remember. And other that that I was never in there. (ARNOLD is attempting to further assert that he was never in the shop alone. He is attempting to indicate that he remembers every time he was in the store. He claims there was one time when he was alone in the shop. He is forecasting that there are potential witnesses that can put him in the donut shop so he had better give a reason for that. He then states that there were lots of people [never alone] and that he was waiting for somebody [reason for being in the shop]. He then cannot recall who the girl was but tells us that he had nice clothes on. He then states "they" came in. This is a pronoun indicating more than one person came in. It is inconsistent with "a" girl. We expect "she" came in if the story is coming from memory. This is an indication the story is coming from logic. A further indication that the story is coming from logic is that he is telling you to believe that he was waiting for a girl because he had nice clothes on. [This is further distancing for ARNOLD. He is willing to admit that he was in the shop one time, but he was dressed nice i.e. not like the cowboy.] He can remember waiting for a girl, yet does

not know who she was, where they went or what they did. This is very inconsistent with a true memory of an event.) ...

... Y'know I never made chit chat with uh or got friendly or anything with anybody who worked in there. One face was all the same. I don't even remember what the people looked like that was there. (Again ARNOLD uses a negative outward statement to persuade you that he kept to himself when he went into the shop. This again is a product of guilty knowledge that he in fact knew Barbara Stoppel and did chat her up. We know through his associates and other waitresses that ARNOLD's personality and characteristic traits were this very way. It also contradicts his initial accounts to investigators that he did in fact know her through his conversations with her at the donut shop; to the point of a crush.)...

...Uh the only thing I remember about the place is that the tables were along the window and the counter was along the other wall. I don't remember if there were doors in there or anything. I wasn't in there enough." (ARNOLD gives an accurate account of the layout of the store, yet he states that he doesn't remember if there were doors in there. When people describe people, places or things they describe what they remember, not what they don't remember. This is another negative outward statement similar to never being in the kitchen. There are saloon type doors leading into the kitchen, which the killer passed through. This would be another attempt by ARNOLD to persuade you that he wasn't there that night because he does not remember the doors that the killer would have gone through.)

In this section ARNOLD clearly sees the donut shop as a threat. He knows he cannot simply deny being within the donut shop so he reluctantly admits that he was in the donut shop, but never;

- alone
- at night
- got friendly or chit chatted with anyone
- drank coffee
- been in the kitchen
- remember doors inside.
- dressed like a cowboy

E. ARNOLD's involvement with Police during the investigation

According to the initial investigation report, the police questioned ARNOLD four times. The first interview was at his apartment the day after he visited the hospital and as a follow-up to that visit. It appears that he was questioned as a potential witness, rather than a suspect on that day. The second interview was two days later by two other detectives working on a different tip. ARNOLD was questioned as a potential suspect at the Public Safety Building at which time he provided an alibi. ARNOLD was questioned again three days later by two different detectives, but was quickly eliminated

as ARNOLD told them he had already been questioned. Finally ARNOLD was questioned again as a potential suspect three weeks after the murder, however, it is unsure what led to this questioning. He was again questioned at the Public Safety Building.

ARNOLD also phoned in three tips to police in the month following the murder, each coming on the heels of his questioning. ARNOLD was questioned regarding this involvement with the police in our recent interview.

At the early stages of the interview ARNOLD is defensive and aggressively argues that he is not a suspect and blames the initial contact with police on his aunt (Lila PATON). ARNOLD states, **“....and I have an aunt with a fucking big mouth who happened to phone the Winnipeg Police Station about someone that didn’t even look like me.”** (p. 5) ARNOLD and his aunt were very close back then as he lived with her after getting out of Seven Oaks Youth Center. The investigation has since revealed that his aunt has knowledge of an incident in 1978 or 1979 in which she thought ARNOLD had strangled two young native girls at the rooming house they were living in. He knows the police, in follow-up of a tip, were directed to his place on Cromwell by this aunt. Hence, he blames her for the police suspecting him in the initial investigation. If anyone knew ARNOLD the best back then, it was his aunt Lila PATON. She is a threat because of this. ARNOLD, in keeping with his pattern of deceit, attacks her character to indicate she and her information are not trustworthy.

ARNOLD further blames his aunt for this police suspicion (p. 10), **“My aunt phoned in...had a description...composite....and my aunt phoned in and said that I I might look like this person and they picked me up and they questioned me and then they let me go.”** ARNOLD then minimizes this suspicion by stating he was not the only suspect back then. He states, **“...I remember the night they brought me into Winnipeg and they had about six or seven people that they were talking to that night about this incident...it wasn’t just me there at once.”** At this stage of the interview ARNOLD is attempting to say that he was not the prime suspect. It is all simply because his “fucking” aunt phoned in, but they were talking to all sorts of other people. This attitude changes later in the interview when he contradicts this thought process.

(p 35) ARNOLD is being questioned later in the interview as to why he visited the hospital. He is attempting to justify why he “may” have gone there by now stating it was because of the pressure of being the suspect. He states, **“...it wouldn’t a been because I was there you know like the guy coming back to his crime and shit like that you know it’s because you know well I felt like I was being dragged into something, for me it was a big exciting thing you know...like somebody I was I was picked up and arrested for this thing that (chuckles) you know that happened in my neighbourhood and they think that you know I mean I was a little bugger back then..”** Now instead of minimizing him being a suspect, he is maximizing the issue in order to justify why he may have visited the hospital. At first he is trying to tell us that he was not really considered a suspect and now he is saying he visited the hospital because he was actually “arrested”.

ARNOLD further contradicts his initial thought process late in the interview when he attempts to justify why he phoned in tips to the police. He also initially denies calling in tips at all, but like his typical pattern of deception, he then vaguely recalls making the calls and then admits to doing so but justifying why he did. Again he justifies why by stating it was because he was the prime suspect. (p. 72)

He is asked if he ever phoned the police with a tip and he states, **“No!”**

BROWN, “Recall at all?”

ARNOLD, **“No!”**

BROWN, “Recall doing that about someone at McDonald’s? In that area after being let off by the police you spotted someone that looked like the composite?”

ARNOLD, “**That’s possible that seems to be vague sound vaguely familiar I dunno.**” [vague recall]

ALLAN, “Yeah, there’s a couple times in here Terry that from the report that you had actually phoned in a couple tips or a couple sightings of the look-alike.

ARNOLD, [now cannot deny so better justify] “**You gotta remember that night I was pulled in I was pretty traumatized.... y’know like like uh uh I was crying I was really upset and everything and and it’s possible that uh I if I seen somebody that looked like this I was phoning y’know anything to to y’know, just in case this happened to be the guy so I could clear myself y’know like. Y’know y’know. At the time I didn’t know that there were other people being called down y’know. As far as I knew at the time when it was like I was the only one in the whole world that they were questioning about this thing I’m like holy fuck man.** [This certainly contradicts his initial account on p. 11 where he is minimizing himself as a suspect and states “they had six or seven people they were talking to that night... it wasn’t just me.”]

ALLAN, “Take the heat off you.”

ARNOLD, “**Well let’s find, no not to take the heat off me let’s find the fuckin’ guy who did it so they know it wasn’t me right?”**

Regarding his involvement with the police, ARNOLD has obviously recognized the threats that are a result of that involvement. He has again assassinated the character of another witness. He has again attempted to deny his post offense behaviour, but then vaguely recalls it when he knows he cannot simply deny and then justifies why he was acting in such a manner. This is the not the product of a truthful mind.

F. Jackie WHITE (Gurergil) as part of the alibi.

In both his interviews with initial investigators where an alibi was provided, ARNOLD claims he took the bus to the Salisbury House restaurant at Portage Avenue & Camden Street arriving at approximately 2040 to 2045 hours. ARNOLD could not recall who was working when he arrived; however, he stated his “girlfriend” Jackie WHITE (then Gurergil) saw him there at 2300 hours when she arrived to work her night shift. WHITE has since provided a KGB videotaped statement indicating that she lied to police on ARNOLD’s behalf that night. WHITE states that she was not his girlfriend, but a married waitress who used to be a counselor and gotten to know and feel sorry for ARNOLD. She did not know why ARNOLD wanted her to tell the police that he was in the restaurant when she arrived at 2300 hours, but **he did not in fact show up at the restaurant until approximately 3-5 am.** WHITE also indicated other circumstantial evidence suggesting ARNOLD as the suspect and are reflected in the review investigation report. For the sake of this analysis we will focus on what ARNOLD speaks about relative to the Salisbury House and Jackie WHITE. WHITE states she had known ARNOLD for quite a while, as he was a regular customer at the coffee shop. ARNOLD also arranged an apartment for WHITE at 25 Cromwell three months after the murder where he had been living and his mother was the caretaker. ARNOLD further broke into that same apartment and was arrested and charged by WHITE for that break in.

We would expect that ARNOLD would remember Jackie WHITE. The analysis of the interview, however, reveals reluctance on ARNOLD to commit himself to attending to the Salisbury House that night. He also goes through his typical increasing progression of commitment to his knowledge of who WHITE was. He would view WHITE as a threat to his detection.

When discussing the alibi ARNOLD provided to police initially, ARNOLD claims he does not recall stating he was at the Salisbury House. He also minimizes his knowledge of the place. BROWN asks ARNOLD if it would help if he reminded him that he took a bus to the Salisbury House at Camden and Portage. ARNOLD then states, **“That’s very possible, I don’t I don’t I don’t know why I would though Reggie woulda’ just dropped me off then I think at Camden and Portage...Camden and Portage...Camden and Portage...Is that out by Polo Park? It’s right by the Big Boy’s and yeah uh by ...Ashburn Roadthere used to be a J.B. Big Boy’s there I believe that there was somebody up there I used to go see a waitress I think.”** (p. 30) [ARNOLD has simply referred to WHITE as “somebody” or “a waitress” and then qualified his commitment to her stating “I think”]

ARNOLD is then fed the name Jackie Gurergil and that she was his girlfriend (p. 31). ARNOLD replies, **“She wasn’t a girlfriend exactly we were we had just met a short while ago, through another taxi driver.”** [He now commits that he knows whom we are talking about] ARNOLD is then informed that we have spoken to her and she puts him in the Salisbury House and he replies, **“uh...huh..yeah that’s possible.....like I went up there a lot right and it wasnt just with uh it was with another another cab driver too, that uh that actually introduced me to her, it was another cab driver.”** ARNOLD is asked who the cab driver was and he becomes reluctant to identify. Truthful people have no fear of identifying people that can verify their accounts. The following conversation takes place;

ALLAN, “Who was that Terry?”

ARNOLD, **“It wasn’t Reggie it was another another cab driver, that uh”**

ALLAN, “A friend of you mom’s or a friend of Reggie’s?”

ARNOLD, **“A friend of my sister’s”**

ALLAN, “A friend of your sister’s?”

ARNOLD, **“Yeah, I don’t think Reggie liked him much but, is it necessary?”**

ALLAN, “Uhm, sure.”

ARNOLD, **“I doubt that he would have anything to do with that his name is John Gillis.”** [ARNOLD reluctantly gives up the name, but qualifies GILLIS stating he wouldn’t know anything, obviously forecasting that police would go speak to him. Interesting enough, when police are questioning ARNOLD regarding his cowboy hat he attempts to deflect some attention onto GILLIS (p. 50) He states, **“and if you ask me if anybody looks like somebody in that picture it would be John”** He is in the same mode of behaviour he was when a suspect initially. When the focus is on him he deflects suspicion on others.]

ARNOLD is later asked what time he would have arrived at the Salisbury House? (p. 33) He replies, **“Uh, it would’a been later in the evening now that now that you mention it because I don’t think she started work until between four and six, and the wh- I wouldn’t a went there during supper hour cause it would’a been too busy, so it would have been later on in the evening like you said.”** He is then asked if Jackie was there when he got there and he states, **“No, I don’t even remember that,**

no that... I don't remember if uh I don't know if she was there when I got there, sometimes she was sometimes she wasn't, I'd just wait 'til she got there. ARNOLD has now admitted that he was in the Sals on that night and that he has been there before, waiting for her. He now admits seeing her frequently. He does not elaborate any further whether this part of his alibi is still as the way he told it initially.

ARNOLD admits further association to Jackie WHITE and the Salisbury House when he is being questioned about his cowboy hat. He is attempting to say he was always wearing a baseball cap and now uses his association to WHITE and his visits to the Sals to minimize his cowboy hat use. (p. 50)

ARNOLD, **“Well cause I was always wearing my baseball cap.”**

BROWN, “Okay and how do you landmark when you last had your cowboy hat?”

ARNOLD, **“Well because I never had it when I was when I was meeting with that uh the woman at the Salisbury House I never had it.”** [wants to use her to say he always wore a baseball cap, yet is still reluctant to call her anything but “that woman”]

BROWN, “Okay, that's important.”

ARNOLD, **“Uh I never had it then cause she used to tell me how much she hated my ball cap.”**

BROWN, “So you remember not having your cowboy hat during your meetings with Jackie Gurergil?”

ARNOLD, **“Yeah, I didn't have it when I was with her.....”**

The conversation comes back to Jackie on page 52...

BROWN, “When did you meet Jackie? After your release or was that before? I think after?”

ARNOLD, **“I have no idea.”**

BROWN, “Okay, I'm just trying to landmark cause you said you you Jackie wouldn't have seen you with, you never wore your hat with Jackie.”

ARNOLD, **“Well, I remember the comments that she that she hated my ball cap. It was a dirty old... ball cap and ... as a matter of fact she'd reach over the counter sometimes take it off and throw it behind the counter where I couldn't get it eh.”**

ARNOLD is reluctant to commit to knowing WHITE early in the interview when it relates to his alibi. He knows she is a threat. He is, however, quite willing to admit later that he knew her well when it relates to his cowboy hat. He is attempting to tell us that we should believe him because Jackie always saw him with a baseball hat. His contradiction of his knowledge and association with WHITE is again consistent with his pattern of deceit. ARNOLD does also forecast her as a threat and begins to assassinate her character as well. He ends off speaking about her by stating, **“and she was a nice lady though when I first met her.”** (p. 53) [Now that she is a threat she is untrustworthy.]

G. ARNOLD's knowledge of Barbara Stoppel

ARNOLD visited the hospital five days after the attack. He told her mother that he got to know Barbara from the donut shop and conversed with her. Police questioned him as a suspect two days later, at which time he admitted to visiting the hospital out of concern for the victim. Three weeks later, he is again questioned as a suspect and admitted he got to know Stoppel from the donut shop when he went in for coffee. He indicated that he had seen her at the donut shop two or three times prior to her demise and only at the donut shop. He admitted during this interview that he had developed a "crush" on the victim, which led to his visit to the hospital.

It was discovered during the review investigation, that both Terry ARNOLD and Barbara Stoppel worked at the Red River Exhibition during June of 1981. We have been unable to determine for certain whether ARNOLD ever met or talked with Stoppel during the exhibition.

In this interview ARNOLD will not admit to knowing Stoppel prior to her death. He rationalizes why he went to the hospital visit, which I analyzed at length in section C, and D. He now knows that to admit knowing Barbara Stoppel would be of great concern.

He does not, however, completely deny the possibility that he may have met her while in the donut shop. He is confronted with the information he provided to the initial investigators with some of the following responses,

(p. 35) ARNOLD, **"...possibility that I might have even I've run into her as a as a waitress when I went into meet my mom or something..."**

(p. 36) BROWN, "Do you remember Barbara Stoppel?"

ARNOLD, **"No."**

BROWN, "The young waitress from the Ideal Donut, do you remember her?"

ARNOLD, **"Barbara Stoppel... that's the mother?"** [ARNOLD is actually feigning that he is unfamiliar with who exactly Barbara Stoppel is. This is very hard to believe, but it reveals ARNOLD's mode of deceit. He is in a mode of attempting to minimize his involvement and knowledge of Stoppel and cannot even admit to knowing her name. It is equally unbelievable because at the very beginning of this interview, ARNOLD immediately equated suspect Thomas SOPHONOW to the name Barbara Stoppel and the Ideal Donut Shop. (p. 1-2) ALLAN states, "... What this is about is with regards to a murder that happened in the city of Winnipeg, 1981, December 23rd with regards to Barbara Stoppel. She was murdered in a donut shop. ARNOLD immediately responds, **"Oh Thomas Sophonow."**]

BROWN, "No, that uh Barbara Stoppel's the victim,"

ARNOLD, **"No, uh, ...I don't"**

BROWN, "Do you remember her from the donut shop?"

ARNOLD, **"No, uh uh uh like I says I might'a been there once or twice I might even have bought a donut."**

(p. 39) ARNOLD is confronted by the information that two elderly ladies saw him in the donut shop bothering the waitress. He again attempts to distance himself from this,

ARNOLD, **“I don’t I don’t know the n- I don’t know and to this day and I never did know the names of anyone in there, I’ve never it wasn’t a place that I frequented”** [This certainly contradicts his accounts in the initial investigation]

(p. 41-42) ARNOLD is confronted with the information that he provided initial investigators that he had a crush on Stoppel,

ALLAN, “...you had indicated to them that you had saw a couple times, Barbara Stoppel at the donut shop, again, that doesn’t mean anything with regards to that night.”

ARNOLD, **“Is that the mother or the daughter?”** [As above he again feigns a lack of recognition to the name]

ALLAN, “Barbara is is the person who died.”

ARNOLD, **“Okay.”**

ALLAN, “But you had indicated to these officers that you actually had a crush on Barbara, those were your words to them.”

ARNOLD, **“Nah, I don’t think so.”** [This is not a denial. It is a qualified response]

BROWN, “Well you were a young guy that time I mean..”

ARNOLD, **“But it’s possible... I had a crush on everybody...I had a crush on every woman...yeah but I don’t know I don’t I don’t remember saying something like that... I don’t even remember if they showed me a picture of the person or not, I don’t think they did, I don’t think everybody, anybody ever showed me a person of what this person looked like there.”** [He knows he cannot outright deny making the comments as it is documented by the initial investigators, so he minimizes it’s effect by stating that he had a crush on everyone, not just the murder victim. He then attempts to state that maybe he said it, but he was confused who the victim actually was. There would be no confusion about whom they were talking about back at that time.]

ARNOLD is then confronted with the information that they both worked at the Red River Exhibition that same summer. (p. 42-43) ARNOLD initially indicates that he did not think he worked for Conklin Shows in the summer of 1981. He doubts the investigators, until it is revealed that he was arrested that summer and a mug photo was taken of him wearing his Conklin Shows shirt. He then quickly recalls that he did and he makes a very revealing negative outward statement indicating guilty knowledge. The following conversation takes place,

ALLAN, “Cause Barbara we knew the summer before in eighty-one you worked for Conklin Shows, you used to work the Ex at the time.”

ARNOLD, **“On Conklin Shows? No, I did that for a couple of years.”**

ALLAN, “Okay, cause Barbara actually worked at Conklin at the Ex in the summer of eighty-one, do you remember ever meeting her back then?”

ARNOLD, **“No. Uh, Conklin Shows... I worked for Conklin Shows the summer of eighty-one?”** [In other words, Do I have to admit I worked there?]

ALLAN, “Well it could have been the Red River Ex, I don’t know who was under contract to supply it back then.”

ARNOLD, **“In Winnipeg?”**

ALLAN, “Yeah.”

ARNOLD, **“Are you sure about that?”** [In other words, Can you prove it?]

ALLAN, “Yeah, there’s actually a photo of you Terry uh when you were arrested I think for this Furby incident that I’m trying to recall when it happened, you actually had the shirt of the Conklin Shows on it.”

ARNOLD, [Now that we can prove it, he remembers] **“Oh yeah yeah I remember... I remember that.”**

ALLAN, “So that that was based that was in the summer of eighty-one.”

ARNOLD, **“You know what that was in a matter of fact I had that I.D. card for years afterwards yeah yeah yeah, I had forgotten where I’d gotten that. Yeah that was uh I was uh building a ride I worked for a ride, I didn’t work game booths or anything.”** [This is another negative outward statement indicating guilty knowledge. It is most revealing as Barbara Stoppel worked the game booths. More importantly **Barbara Stoppel worked a dart game** in which balloons were burst by the dart. Even more revealing was the recent interview of ARNOLD’s stepbrother Leonard KENYON who remembered that **ARNOLD worked behind the scenes of a dart game booth.** He said his brother turned off the public so he had to work behind the scenes blowing up the balloons. KENYON knew ARNOLD did this in Calgary and could not recall if that is what he did in Winnipeg. This negative outward statement is a very good indicator that ARNOLD did in fact remember Barbara Stoppel from the Red River Exhibition.]

ARNOLD continues.... **“I worked on uh setting up and tearing down a a ride or not a ride a uh a uh a walk through the floors moved.... And it was all outside, out in the open right and uh uhm I had to do a bit a, bolting and a little bit a welding and a plate had come loose that we had to tack back into place and I remember the power kept going off or some stupid thing like that, but I wasn’t there very long I can remember that.”** [Once again ARNOLD is distancing himself from the Exhibition. He is now trying to persuade us by saying I now remember working there, but I wasn’t there very long, so I would not have met her there.]

(p. 44) ALLAN, “So we we told you Barbara Stoppel was also uh worked at Conklin Shows at the Ex, doesn’t mean anything to ya?”

ARNOLD, **“No.”**

ALLAN, "Okay."

ARNOLD, "No. Surprise." [I believe there is a very good possibility that ARNOLD met and remembered Barbara Stoppel from the Red River Exhibition. She was a friendly outgoing beautiful girl, and as her sister Roxanne stated, (who also worked at the Ex) "The carnival guys were always after the girls." ARNOLD's personality and infatuation with young girls would have certainly accentuated that carni feature.]

Whether ARNOLD met Stoppel at the Red River Exhibition or not, he is clearly trying to distance himself from his initial accounts to investigators in 1981. He is now contradicting the fact that he met Stoppel at the donut shop in which he frequented and conversed with her, and that he had a crush on her. He obviously now understands the suspiciousness of his teenage behaviour and how it relates to this murder.

H. ARNOLD's cowboy hat.

ARNOLD was arrested three times from June 1981 to October 1981 and each time he was documented wearing a cowboy hat. On his final arrest, he was arrested along with a male named Stuart DICKIE. DICKIE was recently interviewed and described a cowboy hat that ARNOLD always wore that was identical to the hat in the composite drawing. He described the hat as a dark brown cowboy hat with round gold tokens around the base of the hat. In our recent investigation, an intercepted phone conversation between ARNOLD and his mother revealed the existence of such a hat. ARNOLD is pleading with his mother that he did not have a hat, while she corrects ARNOLD stating, "Ya, you had that Indiana Jones hat. I told them that you just left it up in the shelf of the closet." ARNOLD pleads back, "No, mom I never had no fucking hat." Many other family and friends recall ARNOLD wearing such a hat and two independent tips came into the original investigation because of ARNOLD and his hat. The first tip from a male accomplice indicated ARNOLD looked like the composite, had a cowboy hat and his violent nature made him capable of the murder. The second tip was from the manager of the Salisbury House Restaurant that ARNOLD frequented. The manager reports ARNOLD wore the hat until the murder and then began wearing a black toque. The review investigation revealed two witnesses who recall ARNOLD wearing a black "rapper's type toque". One of these witnesses is even his other stepbrother Lynn KENYON.

ARNOLD was released from the Remand Center on December 15th, 1981; eight days prior to the murder. When questioned by police as a suspect, he claimed that his cowboy hat was never given to him when he was released from the Remand Center. He claimed his possessions were shipped out east with his accomplice's belongings. He claimed he never wore a cowboy hat since that release. This very fact contradicts other witnesses.

In our recent interview, ARNOLD again distances himself from the hat and at the same time claims he never wore a buck knife. As soon as the focus of the questioning is changed to his cowboy hat, he recognizes it as a threat as well as the rest of his appearance,

(p. 44) ALLAN, "On a different note, uhm and we're telling you December fifteenth and it escapes me what you were you would have been on charge for when you got out of the Remand Center or jail uhm something happened with a cowboy hat you used to have, miss do you do you recall that cause you did have a cowboy hat you used to wear?"

ARNOLD, **“I was a fan of John Wayne’s for the longest time... Yeah back then yeah, and back then I was uhm I was somebody said that I used to wear a buck knife on my belt, and you know I never ever wore a buck knife on my belt, okay, I remember I remember that I remember that too someone said I wore uh and I never wore a buck knife on my belt for the simple reason I was I was always afraid somebody would would challenge me that had a bigger buck knife on their belt... [Instead of answering the simple question of wearing a hat he remains in his defensive mode and realizes that the buck knife was a threat, so he had better argue that away. Not only is he telling us another negative outward statement saying he didn’t wear a buck knife, but he is using the absurd logic that he wouldn’t wear one because someone might have a bigger one on their belt???] ... **My mother didn’t like that kinda thing around either she wouldn’t have me we-wear and uh no I didn’t always wear a cowboy hat... very rarely, once in a while I wore a cowboy hat but usually I wore a an old baseball cap and mother eventually took it and put a match to it...** [He gets back to answering the question and as he knows he cannot simply deny having a hat, he minimizes how often he wore it. He claims “rarely, once in a while” which contradicts what we know from others and his arrests.]**

There is further discussion regarding his remarks to the initial investigators about losing his hat when it went east with his accomplice’s possessions, but that was not clarified. BROWN attempts to clarify when ARNOLD quit wearing a cowboy hat and ARNOLD attempts to argue that he didn’t have the hat when the murder happened **because he was wearing a baseball cap at that time.** (p. 49-51)

BROWN, “This is what we’re trying to clarify here with regards to the hat. Because the composite you you remember you tell us about your aunt saying you look like the composite. The composite of the bad guy was wearing a cowboy hat. We’re trying to clarify when you didn’t have your hat anymore so the indications back then was that you didn’t have your hat ... on the fifteenth.”

ARNOLD, **“I I know I know that I didn’t have my hat when this this incident happened..”**

BROWN, “Okay and and how do you know that. That that’s what we need to know.”

ARNOLD, **“Well cause I was always wearin’ my baseball cap.”**

BROWN, “Okay, and how do you landmark when you last had your cowboy hat?”

ARNOLD, **“Well because I never had it when I was when I was meeting with that uh the woman at Salisbury House I never had it.”** [This certainly contradicts the accounts of the manager Betteanne Commodore and waitress Jackie White – Commodore phoned in the tip stating he wore the cowboy hat up until the murder and then began wearing a touque]

BROWN, “Okay.”

ARNOLD, **“Uh I never had it then ‘cause she used to tell me how much she hated my my ball cap... because she like to have just my hair right but I didn’t wash my hair often enough...** [He is attempting to tell us that he remembers this because she liked his hair, yet he admits it was dirty – more foolish logic. He did not want to admit knowing Jackie Gurergil at first, but now that he is trying to use her as a reason why we should believe he did not have a cowboy hat at that time.] ... **as a matter of fact the only reason I even remember why I I ended up getting that stupid hat was because of John Gillis... because he would all the time,**

uh and if you ask me if anybody looks like somebody in that picture it would be John...in that composite. [Again he minimizes the hat, by stating he didn't really like the hat, it was only because of John Gillis, and he then deflects attention on to Gillis]

BROWN, "So you remember not having your your cowboy hat during your meetings with Jackie Gurergil?"

ARNOLD, "**Yeah I d- I didn't have it when I was with her...**"

BROWN, "Anytime with her did you have your cowboy hat?"

ARNOLD, "**No I don't think so... like I say it wasn't something I wore very often.... Once in a while, usually it was only if I was going out with John. John would take me up North Main to this old theatre to watch the Rocky Horror Picture Show. Or once in a while we'd go down and and watch the wrestlers. Or we'd, or the Priscilla Hotel used to have a wrestling ring in the back where they used to practice....**"

BROWN, "So you're fairly confident by December fifteenth anyways when you got released you didn't have a hat after that point?"

ARNOLD, "**No.**"

ARNOLD clearly sees his cowboy hat as a threat and has attempted to distance himself from it. He has, however, contradicted the numerous accounts of family and former associates.

I. ARNOLD's alibi.

When ARNOLD was questioned in the initial investigation, he gave his alibi on two separate occasions to two different teams of detectives. Both of those alibis were similar and are as follows. ARNOLD states he was at the Dominion Center for milk and bread in the afternoon and returned home to his mother's suite at #9-25 Crowell Street at approximately 13:30 hours. He claims he then fell asleep until approximately 20:00 hours when he was awakened by either his mother or stepbrother Lynn Kenyon. He states he cleaned up and **had some coffee** (in our interview he claimed that he never drank coffee, yet in his original alibi itself he claims to have had coffee at home). He then got a ride to the Northstar Inn with his mother's cab driving friend Reggie Davies. He then took the bus from there to the Salisbury House restaurant at Portage & Camden arriving sometime between 20:40 to 20:45 hours (approximate time of the murder). He then stayed there until his "girlfriend" Jackie Gurergil (WHITE) arrived at 23:00 hours to start her shift. (WHITE now testifies that ARNOLD was not there when she arrived and did not show up until the very early morning hours – she admits to lying to Police for ARNOLD back then.)

In our recent interview, we questioned him to see if he would clarify or remember his alibi. He did remember his whereabouts, but is very reluctant to commit himself to the Salisbury House. He knows that Jackie WHITE is now a threat. He attempts to claim that he could not have committed the murder because he was in a taxicab with Reggie Davies at the time of the murder. Reggie Davies could not confirm that back then and he cannot confirm that today. Reggie Davies is also not a reliable witness as he suffers from psychological instability. As it stood back then, ARNOLD does not have a verifiable

alibi. As of this date, we know that he had Jackie WHITE lie about his alibi. The following is what ARNOLD had to say about his alibi today.

(p. 24 - 25) Questioning begins regarding his alibi.

BROWN, "...the police also talked to you about your whereabouts that day...do you recall that?"

ARNOLD, "**Yeah.**"

BROWN, "Okay, and what we'd like to do is that we'd like to clarify some of those points 'cause its been a long time....do you recall telling the police what you were doing that day December twenty-third of nineteen eighty-one?"

ARNOLD, "**Yeah, I remember...one night they brought me down to the police station and..**"

BROWN, "Okay, and they asked you what you were doing the day of the killing? Do you remember what you told them?"

ARNOLD, "**Uhm I was in a taxi cab with a friend of mine, my mother's boyfriend, going downtown,**"

BROWN, "Okay, that's Reggie Davies?"

ARNOLD, "**And I yeah Reggie Davies yeah and that woulda been ... I was sleeping, I remember I was sleeping in in it was either my mom's or my sister's apartment and Reggie came and picked me up and we wen- we went downtown and we were coming to the house we were going one way or the other, I think we were going downtown, I had asked him to give me a ride downtown, and me and my mom's boyfriend he was going that way anyway.**"

ALLAN, "Do you remember what time that might have been Terry?"

ARNOLD, "**Uhm I remember after I left the police station talking with my mom and my sister, that and even Reggie, Reggie and I we kinda made a comment about it that wow you know it's like we we drove up the road that way past the mall there almost at the same time it was happening. That if we had'a stopped there we might'a caught the guy....I remember making some comment about that.**" [ARNOLD does not tell us what time he thought it was from his memory of the event, but tells us how he talked to his mom, sister and Reggie after learning the time from police. He is telling us how he was talking to his mom, sister and Reggie so he could influence them on what they would tell the police to back up his alibi.]

The interview now shifts to the donut shop, which we covered in section D. It is brought back to his alibi again (p. 27-29).

BROWN, "...what we're trying to account for is your actions... you just told us that you were woken up that day, now uhm I'd like to clarify this cause there's conflicting uh uh reports you were woken up by your mom or your brother that day."

ARNOLD, "**Mm hmm, one or the two... might have been woke up by Reggie, I believe it was my mom that woke me because Reggie was there to pick me up.**"

BROWN, "Okay, you had planned earlier for Reggie to pick you up to take you downtown?"

ARNOLD, “Uhm it possible it might have been coincidence he stopped by the house all the time cause him and my mom.....”

BROWN, “Right, you told... police officers way back then that you got woken up by your mother or your brother you’re saying they probably Mom at a certain time, do you now still remember that time?”

ARNOLD, “All I remember was early evening...around supper time maybe it was starting to get dark, uh if I remember right when Reggie and I were going up up the road like I don’t know how long I was awake before we left but I know it was dark out when when we went driving up, I’d say maybe between six and seven... I would say somewhere between six and seven, or five and seven or five and eight it could be...you know if could’a been up til ten o’clock” [He certainly did not want to narrow down the time – anywhere from five to ten o'clock.]

BROWN, “And you ... where you got in the cab with Reggie he drove you where?”

ARNOLD, “Downtown.”

BROWN, “Downtown?”

ARNOLD, “I believe well I remember let’s see... we were going down the road making chit chat I spend most of my time talking but uh with him...I remember going over a little bridge of some kind, uhm I guess where he dropped me off I have no idea could have been north Main, could have Portage Avenue, could have been a friend’s place out by Polo Park or..”

BROWN, “If I remind you because I’ve read the report what you originally told the police maybe it’ll it’ll help spark it a a memory there, uhm you were dropped around the Northstar”

ARNOLD, “Northstar Inn, sure that sounds right...I agree it’s kind of a connection point I believe Notre Dame comes down there... North Main is kind of a connection where I can go just about anywhere...”

The interview continues with the questioning regarding him seeing Jackie WHITE that night at the Salisbury House Restaurant. This was analyzed in section F. ARNOLD does not commit himself to attending to the Salisbury House that night. The interview comes back to his whereabouts that night later in the interview (p. 55),

BROWN, “...we just clarify certain things you told the police eighteen years ago about getting woken up by your mom. Getting driven by Reggie Davies to the Northstar. And and then taking a bus to the Sal’s and and Jackie..”

ARNOLD, “Well you you you you tell me that I went down to the Salisbury House from, I remember goin’ down there...uhm if y’know if I did it that night, if I said if I said back then that’s what I did that night then that’s what I did uh to to today uhm I remember waking up I remember uh Reggie and I joking around about something. I remember us driving downtown he had his radio on. I don’t remember where he dropped me off..”

BROWN, “And do you remember that conversation that you and Reggie had..on the way. Do you remember the conversation you and Reggie were having on the way downtown at all?”

ARNOLD, “**No I remember we were joking around... laughing. I remember it was well I remember that neither one of us were in a bad mood we were both in good moods y’know...**” [ARNOLD has again forecasted that the killer must have been in a mood to kill, so he makes another negative outward statement.]

ARNOLD has assessed his situation today. He knows that Reggie Davies is not a threat due to his unreliability, so he has simply stated, “I could not have killed Barbara Stoppel because I was in a taxicab with Reggie Davies, besides I was in a good mood.” He has not heard from Jackie WHITE (Gurergil) for eighteen years. He knows they did not part ways on good terms, as he broke into her apartment and stole her belongings. He is not prepared to commit himself to her as part of his alibi today. Back then he relied on her heavily. She has since explained why. ARNOLD does not have an alibi. He has asked someone to lie for him on the night of the murder, at a time when he was dressed completely different from usual and acting very agitated. This same witness recalls ARNOLD stating, “The bitch deserved it” when he overheard the radio news coverage of the murder.

CONCLUSION:

At the time of the murder ARNOLD was at the very least anti-social personality disorder. He is now diagnosed as rating very high on the Hare Psychopathy Checklist. Either way he lacks remorse and he lacks conscience. As with all psychopaths they are very ego driven and concern themselves with only what matters to them. ARNOLD is a pathological liar. He has been described as such by all those who knew him at a very early developmental age. His criminal history has consistently displayed this same behaviour. This same behaviour carried over into this interview.

Some may suggest that if he is a pathological liar, then how do we believe anything he says? A pathological liar is not necessarily a skillful liar. The more skillful liar takes advantage of better socialization skills. ARNOLD has always lied to prevent himself from taking responsibility for his actions and exposure of his weaknesses. **He has never yet lied to make a situation worse for himself by taking responsibility.** ARNOLD is a calculating liar. He calculates what is a threat to the exposure and detection of his actions and then calculates whether he can outright deny that detection. If not, he is surely going to rationalize, minimize and justify his behaviour while assassinating the credibility of anyone possessing knowledge of his actions. This is a habitual way of life for ARNOLD. This pattern of deceit has been clearly evident throughout this interview with ARNOLD.

Each section in this analysis speaks of a guilty mind. When we consider all sections combined, Terry ARNOLD truly speaks as a deceptive person with guilty knowledge of this murder.

Detective Sergeant Robert Legge #1207
Winnipeg Police Service
Special Investigations Unit – Barbara Stoppel Homicide Investigation

Date: 2000-07-02
