

Commission of Inquiry
Into the Wrongful
Conviction of David Milgaard
before
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE
EDWARD P. MacCALLUM

Transcript of Proceedings
and
Testimony before the Commission
sitting at the
Radisson Hotel at
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

On Thursday, June 9th, 2005

Volume 51

Inquiry Proceedings



Commission Staff:

Mr. Douglas C. Hodson,	Commission Counsel
Mr. Jordan Hardy, Esq.,	Assistant Commission Counsel
Ms. Candace D. Congram,	Executive Director
Ms. Sandra Boswell,	Document Manager
Ms. Kara Isabelle,	Document Assistant

Support Staff:

Ms. Irene Beitel,	Clerk to the Commission
Ms. Karen Hinz, CSR, and	Official Q.B. Court Reporters
Mr. Don Meyer, RPR, CSR,	
Mr. Hugh Esson,	Security Officer
Mr. Cam Gilbertson,	Inland Audio Technician



INDEX OF PROCEEDINGS

DESCRIPTION:

PAGE:

JOSEPH PENKALA, CONTINUED

- BY MR. FOX	9764
- BY MR. ELSON	9863
- BY MR. BERESH	9913
- BY MR. PRINGLE	9935
- BY MR. WILSON	9938



Transcript of Proceedings

(Reconvened at 9:00 a.m.)

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Morning.

ALL COUNSEL: Morning.

MR. ELSON: Mr. Commissioner, I'm not
scheduled to go first, Mr. Fox is, but there is a
matter I would wish to raise.

As a result of the CBC National
News last evening, I had spoken earlier with
Mr. Hodson when a question had been asked of me
by a member of the local media with respect to
the propriety of broadcasting or publishing any
interviews of any of the parties with respect to
a witness' testimony while that witness was still
on the stand, it was my understanding from
Mr. Hodson -- and I stand to be corrected -- that
at the very least there was to be no publication
and no broadcast of an interview of one of the
parties, and preferably no interview given at all
with respect to a witness' testimony, while that
witness was on the stand and before that witness'
testimony had concluded.

I notice that neither
Mr. Lockyer nor Mrs. Milgaard are here this
morning, but there was an interview, and it



1 appeared to me from the interview I saw on CBC
2 National News last evening that it was an
3 interview of Mrs. Milgaard while former Chief
4 Penkala was on the stand.

09:06 5 I'm not asking for a specific
6 remedy in this respect, in fairness to
7 Mrs. Milgaard it was a very brief interview, she
8 made a comment with respect to a reaction that
9 she had on one particular part of the testimony.

09:06 10 Having said that, it may be
11 appropriate to remind all parties of the
12 propriety of consenting to media interviews with
13 respect of a witness' testimony before that
14 witness' evidence is concluded.

09:07 15 And, again, I'm probably rising
16 at the wrong time because, in fairness, neither
17 Mr. Lockyer nor Mrs. Milgaard are here, but it is
18 nonetheless a point that perhaps not only the
19 parties should be reminded of, but also the
09:07 20 members of the media reminded of.

21 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Hodson?

22 MR. HODSON: Yes. I believe that the
23 ruling made earlier, Mr. Commissioner, was a
24 direction to the parties and counsel not to
09:07 25 discuss the evidence of any witness until that



1 witness' evidence was concluded. I believe that
2 was the ruling made. As opposed to a direction
3 to the media, I believe it was to the parties and
4 counsel, is my recollection.

09:07 5 MR. WOLCH: Mr. Commissioner, I apologize,
6 I didn't see the news item at all and I don't
7 know what was stated on it so it's a bit
8 difficult to respond for Mrs. Milgaard.

9 I don't recall if the ban or
09:07 10 suggestion, or whatever it might be, but
11 obviously something to be followed, applies to
12 counsel or applies to individuals, or whether it
13 can apply to individuals in terms of their
14 reaction to evidence. But certainly counsel,
09:08 15 obviously, must follow it. I don't know if it
16 can be applied to people beyond counsel.

17 In any event, there also is a
18 fine line between commenting on the evidence and
19 making comments on the broader sense, and not
09:08 20 having seen what Mrs. Milgaard said I don't know,
21 and I'm not even sure if My Friend is saying
22 Mr. Lockyer said anything or not, I don't know.

23 I do know that I was approached
24 yesterday to comment on the evidence and I
09:08 25 declined because of your ruling. The, some media



1 were particularly interested in our reaction to
2 the apology, etcetera, and I indicated 'I can't
3 comment until this is over', and that's the way
4 it stood. But perhaps there should be some
09:09 5 clarification if, Mr. Commissioner, you feel you
6 have the jurisdiction to apply that to
7 individuals as opposed to just counsel. And,
8 keeping that in mind, I really don't know if
9 there was a comment on the evidence or not, I
09:09 10 don't know. My Friend does not specifically say
11 other than to say it was a brief comment about
12 her reaction and her feelings, and I don't know
13 if she can be precluded from saying what her
14 feelings are on an issue, so I know I'm not being
09:09 15 overly helpful, I just don't know.

16 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay. Thanks.
17 Somebody has handed me up a piece of paper; what
18 is this, Mr. Hodson?

19 MR. HODSON: Yes, we can actually call up
09:09 20 the ruling on the screen, it's page 1264, volume
21 9 from the January 26th transcript, it will just
22 be a second for that to load.

23 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay. What's this
24 that I have been handed here? Can that be seen
09:11 25 by everybody? Okay. And when was this; does



1 anybody know?

2 MR. HODSON: This was January the 26th.

3 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay. And at
4 another time, Mr. Hodson, my memory is that I
09:11 5 asked the public at large, particularly the
6 media, to be cautious about jumping to
7 conclusions on the basis of a witness that we're
8 hearing at any particular time because that
9 wouldn't be the entire story --

09:12 10 MR. HODSON: And I --

11 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- and they should
12 exercise some restraint. But I don't think I'm
13 in any position to order them not to report this
14 or report that, they can -- this is a public
09:12 15 inquiry.

16 MR. HODSON: That's right. And I think,
17 the interview that Mr. Elson is referring to
18 Mrs. Milgaard was giving her reaction, I believe,
19 to Mr. Penkala's evidence regarding the
09:12 20 apology --

21 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.

22 MR. HODSON: -- and it was a very brief
23 interview.

24 And I'm wondering, I'm not sure
09:12 25 what the wishes of the parties are, but maybe we



1 could just remind and reinforce to all parties
2 and to counsel the directive that no party or
3 counsel should be commenting on evidence of a
4 witness until the evidence is concluded.

09:12 5 Certainly, when a witness is done, I don't think
6 there's any restrictions; is that -- I think --

7 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well I suppose, on
8 the basis of what you can see before you, there
9 is no restrictions at this moment, it's simply an
09:13 10 expression of my wish based upon certain
11 practicalities. If counsel respect it I would be
12 very happy, and if their clients refrain from
13 talking to anybody, particularly the media, about
14 the evidence of a witness while it's ongoing, I
09:13 15 would be even happier. But, if they choose not
16 to, I suppose they run the risk of impeding the
17 effectiveness of the Inquiry.

18 Morning, Mr. Fox.

19 **JOSEPH PENKALA, continued:**

20 **BY MR. FOX:**

21 **Q** Thank you. Thank you, a glass of water, if I get
22 too many of them up here I'll spill one for sure.

23 Mr. Penkala, my name is Aaron
24 Fox, I'm the lawyer for Eddie Karst in these
09:14 25 proceedings. I'm going to cover some ground with



1 you, and particularly involving the investigation
2 in 1969, and what took place in 1970 and '71.

3 First of all just a couple of
4 general questions. I'm assuming as a former
09:14 5 police officer, and you were a police officer with
6 many years of experience, so looking back on your
7 own career, and obviously watching very closely
8 the work that others did because in your various
9 supervisory capacities, including eventually
09:14 10 chief, fair to say that sometimes mistakes are
11 made?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And fair to say that sometimes things are
14 overlooked or we don't get things exactly right?

09:15 15 A Yes.

16 Q And I can tell you -- and no disrespect meant, Mr.
17 Commissioner -- judges tell me all the time that I
18 didn't get things right, and occasionally when I
19 get them to agree with me usually the Court of
09:15 20 Appeal tells us that we're both wrong, but that
21 happens, and I'm assuming that just goes with the
22 job; fair to say?

23 A Yes, the job, and the complexity of the job.

24 Q Right. The suggestion, though, that was put to
09:15 25 you by Mr. Lockyer over the last couple of days



1 sort of went quite a bit beyond suggesting to you
2 that you just made a mistake or overlooked
3 something or didn't interpret something correctly.
4 As I read his comments or listened to his
09:15 5 comments -- and I think they were pretty direct --
6 he suggested an outright coverup by the members of
7 the Saskatoon Police Service and he suggested,
8 basically, that you knew David Milgaard was
9 innocent and framed him; he suggested that you
09:16 10 knew Larry Fisher was guilty, you let him go; and
11 you did that knowing that an innocent man was
12 going to sit in jail and that a guilty man went
13 out there and committed a number of more serious
14 offences which he wouldn't have otherwise
09:16 15 committed. That was what was put to you. Now I
16 understand you don't have counsel here, Mr.
17 Penkala?

18 A I do not.

19 Q And you agree you and I have never spoken about
09:16 20 this matter before?

21 A That's correct.

22 Q I just want to ask you, I'm just going to give you
23 an opportunity, can you just tell me how you
24 respond or react to the statement that was put to
09:16 25 you that you, as a member of the Saskatoon Police



1 Service, intentionally hid the fact that David
2 Milgaard was innocent and hid the fact that Larry
3 Fisher was guilty; can you tell me how you respond
4 or how you feel about that?

09:16 5 A I think I made that response before, but I can
6 tell you right now that there was not a crumb of
7 truth in that, in that suggestion by Mr. Lockyer.
8 I was -- I'm offended to have that suggestion
9 brought forward, and my experience with officers
09:17 10 that I worked with, I really never knew a police
11 officer that would stoop to that type of a
12 process.

13 Q I'm going to ask you specifically about Eddie
14 Karst, who was a detective in 1969 and 1970 and
09:17 15 into '71; were you aware of, then or now, of any
16 conduct on the part of then-former Detective Karst
17 which suggested to you that he was hiding or
18 covering up either David Milgaard's lack of
19 involvement in the death of Gail Miller or Larry
09:17 20 Fisher's involvement in it?

21 A No.

22 Q And knowing Detective Karst, having worked with
23 him and supervised him, can you tell me what, and
24 this is just an opinion of yours, but in your
09:15 25 opinion what is the likelihood that he might be



1 involved in something like that?

2 A I've known Mr. Karst for probably 50 years and
3 I've never experienced anything in the category
4 that's being suggested.

09:16 5 Q Now I'm going to talk about this, the case
6 specifically now. Mr. Lockyer reviewed with you
7 and argued that you should have concluded that Mr.
8 Fisher murdered Gail Miller, that should have been
9 the conclusion you came to, and as I listened to
09:16 10 your evidence, I noted a couple of occasions when
11 you tried to bring up the subject or the point
12 that you still had this evidence against David
13 Milgaard that you had to consider and deal with.
14 I want to go through that evidence with you a bit
09:16 15 or at least what your knowledge was as to why
16 David Milgaard was a suspect, notwithstanding all
17 we know about Larry Fisher, why in 1969, 1970 did
18 you consider David Milgaard a suspect in the death
19 of Gail Miller. Okay?

09:16 20 A Okay.

21 Q Now, if I go to January 31st, 1969, I think you've
22 already acknowledged that there were similarities
23 between the death of Gail Miller and the two rapes
24 and indecent assault that occurred prior to that
09:17 25 time, that's correct, that we've already talked



1 about that?

2 A Yeah.

3 Q But am I also correct that in pursuing that there
4 were many, many, many suspects that were
09:17 5 investigated in relation to the death of Gail
6 Miller?

7 A Yes.

8 Q I think then early in these proceedings, earlier
9 in this phase of the proceedings, and we don't
09:17 10 need to bring it up, but it's document 326548,
11 which was a compilation study that was put
12 together by Commission Counsel that indicated that
13 a total of 208 possible suspects were investigated
14 as possibly being responsible for the death of
09:17 15 Gail Miller. Does that sound about right to you?

16 A I'm not sure what reference, what this is
17 reference to.

18 Q This is reference to various individuals who you
19 received information on in 1969 that may have been
09:18 20 somehow involved in the death of Gail Miller, so
21 you would investigate them to see are they
22 responsible or can we clear them as not being
23 responsible.

24 A And I'm assuming that you are talking about the
09:18 25 list of sex offenders that we --



1 Q Actually, I'm talking about in document 326548, it
2 includes everybody from Les Spence, who was an
3 acquaintance of Gail Miller, to friends of Gail
4 Miller, to other people who somebody came up to
09:18 5 and said hey, this person was driving around with
6 ladies' underwear under the seat of his car, all
7 of these people were investigated?

8 A Yes, and I wouldn't know that of my personal
9 knowledge, but yes.

09:18 10 Q And you would be aware, however, though, that many
11 people were investigated as possible suspects?

12 A In a general sense, yes.

13 Q Okay. And I think that particular document
14 referred to also indicates that 38 individuals
09:19 15 were checked out after March 2nd, 1969, which was
16 the date that Albert "Shorty" Cadrain came in and
17 identified David Milgaard, and I take it you don't
18 have any personal, direct knowledge of that, but
19 you wouldn't dispute that number?

09:19 20 A No, I wouldn't.

21 Q Now, Mr. Lockyer made the statement to you, and it
22 was repeated a number of times, that -- and I'm
23 referring to document, maybe we can just bring
24 that up if we could, 250609, this is the RCMP
09:19 25 summary report which I think is dated May 21st,



1 1969. This is the document of course, Mr.
2 Penkala, that refers to that May 16th, 1969
3 meeting that I've highlighted there in paragraph
4 3, okay, so that's the time frame I want to talk
09:20 5 about just for a second. The suggestion was put
6 to you that the investigation was going nowhere in
7 finding a suspect, that's what the suggestion was.
8 Would I be correct that sort of quite to the
9 contrary, as at May 16th, 1969 you had information
09:20 10 that did point to a suspect in the death of Gail
11 Miller and that suspect would be David Milgaard?

12 A Yes, that would be correct, yes.

13 Q I'm not suggesting at that point in time you had
14 made any decision that you thought he should be
09:20 15 charged or he was the one who did it or whatever,
16 but there's no question by that point in time you
17 had already received some very direct information
18 from Albert "Shorty" Cadrain suggesting David
19 Milgaard was involved in the death of Gail Miller;
09:20 20 would that be correct?

21 A That's my understanding, yes.

22 Q And I want to -- and if we look at Mr. Cadrain's
23 statement, and we don't need to review it, but
24 would I be correct that at least in general terms
09:21 25 Mr. Cadrain, in his statement, he came in to see



1 the police on March 2nd, 1969, put David Milgaard
2 in the area of the murder; that would be correct?

3 A That's my understanding. As you are obviously
4 aware, I wasn't directly involved, but the general
09:21 5 understanding is that that was the situation.

6 Q Described seeing blood on the clothes of Mr.
7 Milgaard?

8 A I recall that, yes.

9 Q Described Mr. Milgaard changing his clothes?

09:21 10 A Yes.

11 Q Described, referred to various statements and
12 conduct of Mr. Milgaard which, at least as Shorty
13 Cadrain indicated to him, that he may have been
14 involved in killing Gail Miller?

09:21 15 A Yes.

16 Q And indicated that he and the others were afraid
17 of Mr. Milgaard?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And, frankly, expressed his opinion that he
09:21 20 thought David Milgaard was involved in the murder
21 of Gail Miller, that was the general information
22 that you received about March 2nd, 1969 from
23 Mr. Cadrain?

24 A That's my recollection.

09:22 25 Q Now, just in general terms, having received that



1 information, I mean, this fellow walks in, you
2 didn't arrest him, he comes in out of the blue and
3 volunteers this for you, what do you do with that?
4 You've got this information, he's made this
09:22 5 statement, it points towards David Milgaard. Just
6 generally, as a police officer, as a police
7 service, what are you going to do with that
8 information?

9 A You take it seriously and investigate it further.

09:22 10 Q And in investigating it further, are you making a
11 determination already at that point, yes, it's
12 true, or no, it's not true?

13 A No. That's why you would investigate it further,
14 to establish whether there's truth in it, and as a
09:22 15 rule these things usually identify themselves in
16 the interests of whether the statements are true
17 or not true.

18 Q So he comes in with a story, you are going to see
19 whether or not there's any evidence that either
09:23 20 supports that story or eliminates that story?

21 A Yes.

22 Q Either says, indicates there may be something
23 truthful to what he's saying or maybe he's just
24 feeding us a load of garbage and we can scratch
09:23 25 this one off the list too; fair to say?



1 A Yes, very fair, yes.

2 Q I want to talk to you just in general terms. When
3 you -- we've heard the word incriminating used an
4 awful lot, incriminating evidence and so on.

09:23 5 Would it be fair to say, Mr. Penkala, that
6 incriminating evidence sometimes can be the most
7 innocent of things, it might look like it's not
8 incriminating or supports an allegation, but it
9 may in fact do that?

09:23 10 A Oh, yes.

11 Q Unfortunately I've had too many clients who I've
12 advised not to give a statement and who have said
13 no, I didn't give a statement, I just told them
14 that I was there and I told them I had a knife in
09:24 15 my hand, but I didn't tell them I stabbed them.
16 That kind of statement, saying I was there, I did
17 have a knife but I didn't stab the person might
18 sound kind of innocent, but it may very well be
19 viewed as incriminating evidence?

09:24 20 A Yes, I follow, yes.

21 Q And maybe not the type of statement that a Crown
22 might be able to use or would decide to use in a
23 case, but it's something that the police would
24 look at, the information that came with that in
09:24 25 deciding whether you should investigate further;



1 fair to say?

2 A Oh, very fair, yes.

3 Q So when we look at, for example, what Albert
4 Cadrain said, one of the next things you would do
09:24 5 is go, want to speak to his two travelling
6 companions, Nichol John and Ron Wilson, and that's
7 what was done?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And you are trying to find out from them is there
09:24 10 some basis, is there some substance to what he
11 says; correct?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Now, and I know you are not familiar with those
14 statements at this point in time, but generally at
09:25 15 that time you would have had some idea what was on
16 the file in terms of reports and statements, you
17 certainly had a better knowledge back in 1969 than
18 you do now?

19 A That's true.

09:25 20 Q And when we look at those statements, and I don't
21 think we have to review them, but the initial
22 statements obviously indicated that Nichol John
23 and Ron Wilson said that David Milgaard hadn't
24 left them, hadn't been out of their sight and that
09:25 25 would suggest that they, you know, that he didn't



1 kill Gail Miller; correct?

2 A That would be an assumption that would be made,
3 yes.

4 Q Right. But those statements also confirmed what
09:25 5 Albert Cadrain had said, which is that they were
6 in Saskatoon early in the morning when the murder
7 occurred, indicated that they were in the area
8 where the murder occurred and indicated that he
9 did change his clothes that morning; correct?

09:25 10 A Yes, that's my understanding.

11 Q So when you've got that information, fair to say
12 not, it's not kind of telling you for sure David
13 Milgaard is our man, but it's not sort of telling
14 you for sure he's not our man; correct?

09:26 15 A That's the way I perceived that information, yes.

16 Q And the logical thing to do is then continue with
17 your investigation and see where it takes you?

18 A Yes.

19 Q Now, when you are carrying out your investigation,
09:26 20 I'm assuming, Mr. Penkala, you are looking for
21 evidence or information that would directly relate
22 to the alleged offence?

23 A Yes.

24 Q But I assume you are also looking to see anything
09:26 25 else that might indicate could this individual



1 have committed the offence or is it not likely
2 that he would have committed the offence?

3 A That's kind of a normal process of investigation.

4 Q Police officers are trying to get a feel for what
09:26 5 they are dealing with, they are trying to use
6 their instincts; correct?

7 A Yes, oh, yes.

8 Q You also are assessing are the people telling the
9 truth when they make certain statements to you?

09:27 10 A Yes. That's always a challenge, yes.

11 Q Also trying to decide whether or not they are even
12 -- telling the truth is a credible issue, but a
13 reliability issue would be were they on drugs or
14 something like that that maybe they really don't
09:27 15 know what went on, you are assessing that all the
16 time fair to say?

17 A Oh, very much so.

18 Q And you are trying to make a read as to whether I
19 should pursue this further or do I really think
09:27 20 they are telling the truth, that goes on all the
21 time?

22 A Yes.

23 Q It wouldn't be surprising, surprise you, Mr.

24 Penkala, to know that probably every lawyer in
09:27 25 this room has been doing that every minute that



1 you've been up on the witness stand, we do it all
2 the time, we're assessing what witnesses are
3 saying in trying to make some decision, is it
4 reliable, is it credible or should we just move
09:27 5 on, that goes on all the time, it wouldn't
6 surprise you to hear that?

7 A I understand.

8 Q So I'm looking at some of the evidence that was
9 gathered then as a result of Albert Cadrain's
09:28 10 statement and I want to -- if you could just bring
11 up document 106640. This is the statement -- or
12 sorry, that was done by Lieutenant Short. Now, at
13 the bottom of this statement starting at about,
14 right about there, Detective Short in his
09:29 15 statement says:

16 "Also female Nichol John was located at
17 a hippie house in Regina and she was
18 after considerable persuasion brought to
19 the Regina gaol and interviewed by Karst
09:29 20 and myself was placed in a room with
21 Cadrain and allowed to discuss this
22 matter and it was learned from her after
23 this discussion that through
24 interrogation that she was of the
09:29 25 opinion that Cadrain was -- "



1 If you can go to the next page,

2 "-- was telling the truth and that

3 everything he said was exactly what

4 happened on this trip."

09:29 5 So Lieutenant Short is reporting back Nichol John

6 was interviewed, she did say that he wasn't gone,

7 but I believe Albert "Shorty" Cadrain when he

8 says, when he's telling his story. Just

9 something else you've got to take a look at,

09:29 10 maybe Cadrain is truthful, maybe what he is

11 saying is true, just another factor you would

12 have to consider; fair to say?

13 A Absolutely.

14 Q It also goes on and says:

09:30 15 "She was of the opinion that Milgaard

16 was of a dangerous character and that he

17 had forced her to have intercourse etc.

18 several times and she was afraid of

19 him."

09:30 20 Now, as an investigator investigating the Gail

21 Miller file, being told that David Milgaard is

22 possibly involved in this and then finding out

23 from his travelling companion that she says,

24 whether it's correct or not, but she's saying

09:30 25 that he forced her to have intercourse and



1 considered him as a dangerous character, that
2 would be something you would look at to say maybe
3 we're on the right track?

4 A Oh, I think an investigator would observe the red
09:30 5 flag coming up, yes.

6 Q Sure. And we've heard Nichol John testify to that
7 and she's described it and in later years she
8 referred to as being rape, but whatever, whether
9 it's correct or not, as an investigator receiving
09:30 10 that information, it would be pretty hard to
11 ignore that as at least suggesting maybe I should
12 be continuing to follow up this fellow as a
13 suspect; fair to say?

14 A I think there would be an obligation.

09:31 15 Q And then Sharon Williams was interviewed and this
16 was the former girlfriend of David Milgaard and
17 she was interviewed March 22nd, '69, I think her
18 statement is found at document 006500. This
19 statement looks like it was obtained March --
09:31 20 sorry, March 20th, '69, I think it's about 12
21 pages long, I believe it's Detective Malanowich
22 who obtained this statement, and if you go to
23 document 009245 if we could and I believe this is
24 Detective Malanowich's statement. If we go to the
09:32 25 next page, I think his name is on there. Yeah,



1 Sergeant John Malanowich. And I understand he was
2 in morality at that time?

3 A That's my understanding, yes.

4 Q Okay. I'm not going to go through this statement
09:32 5 or his report in detail, but it states that after
6 speaking with Sharon Williams, she gave a
7 statement again referring to forced sexual
8 activity, it refers to an occasion when David
9 Milgaard said he had a gun, reports about an
09:32 10 occasion when he was poking her and pointing a
11 knife at her, talks about extensive drug use,
12 travelling throughout Canada, confirmed what
13 Albert Cadrain said about being in Edmonton, so
14 all of this information is received March 22nd,
09:32 15 '69 both in her statement and in the report of
16 Sergeant Malanowich. Again, evidence that you
17 would look at or information you would look at
18 suggesting maybe David Milgaard should be a prime
19 suspect in this thing, maybe what Shorty Cadrain
09:33 20 is saying can be true?

21 A Yes. That's kind of convincing in support of what
22 is already known.

23 Q When you -- going back in 1969, Mr. Wolch referred
24 to Wilson and Nichol John and David Milgaard as
09:33 25 being kids and certainly age wise they were kids,



1 they weren't very old, we know that?

2 A Yes.

3 Q They were 16, 17 years of age?

4 A Yes.

09:33 5 Q But would it be fair to say that as a police
6 officer you are also looking to see, okay, what's
7 the background, what's their experience in life,
8 what's their experience in the criminal world in
9 assessing whether or not David Milgaard might be
09:33 10 involved in something like this. Would that be
11 fair to say?

12 A Yes.

13 Q So we look at Ron Wilson and we see that by 1969
14 he had already done a stint in jail, been involved
09:34 15 with the law, was involved in the use and sale of
16 drugs, maybe he's only 17 years old, but it's kind
17 of like he's been around the block a little bit so
18 to speak. Fair to say?

19 A Yes.

09:34 20 Q When you look at David Milgaard, you found out
21 from talking to Nichol John, you found out from
22 talking to Sharon Williams and others he's been
23 involved with the law, he's been selling drugs
24 throughout the country, he's been pretty sexually
09:34 25 active in what has been described by two people as



1 in a forceful way. Again, pretty young person,
2 but again sort of been around the block a bit?

3 A Yes.

4 Q And all that does, it doesn't tell you that David
09:34 5 Milgaard killed Gail Miller, but you would have to
6 agree it certainly would point you in that
7 direction, point you to say that maybe we should
8 keep on following this up?

9 A Yes.

09:34 10 Q Now, I don't know if you are aware of this, but
11 the statements were obtained, the statement was
12 obtained from Mr. Cadrain, Shorty Cadrain, and I
13 understand he was questioned fairly extensively
14 after that about his statement and basically
09:35 15 didn't back down, he stuck with what he said. Are
16 you aware of that?

17 A In a general sense, yes.

18 Q And I think if we can look at again Lieutenant
19 Short's report, 106640, if you could highlight
09:35 20 just that area there:

21 "On March 5/69 Albert Cadrain was again
22 brought in by my request and another
23 statement taken from him at which time
24 he verified and stuck with his story and
09:35 25 he was interviewed at that time by



1 several members of this department and
2 one Insp. Riddell of the RCMP and also
3 S/Sgt. Edmundson -- "

4 Who I think was with the RCMP.

09:36 5 "I might mention here that on Sunday,
6 March 2/69 after getting in touch with
7 Supt. Wood and Chief of Police James
8 Kettles that it was decided that Det.
9 Karst would go to Winnipeg ..."

09:36 10 And that's when they talked about interviewing
11 David Milgaard. So it looks like Shorty Cadrain
12 is brought in March 5th, 1969, a number of
13 officers, including a couple of officers from the
14 RCMP, spoke to him and he's still sticking to his
09:36 15 story?

16 A That's what it says, yes.

17 Q So again it doesn't tell you necessarily that what
18 he's saying is truthful, but he's not backing down
19 from it. You've still got a story, you've still
09:36 20 got evidence or testimony -- sorry, it isn't
21 evidence or testimony, but you've got a statement
22 from him that points towards David Milgaard that
23 he hasn't retracted, you've still got to deal with
24 as a police service; is that fair to say?

09:36 25 A Yes. Obligated to.



1 Q Obligated to. And in that regard -- well, I'll
2 leave that for a second. Now, we want to go back
3 to Ron Wilson and Nichol John because they've gave
4 you statements and the concern with their
09:37 5 statements has been expressed a couple of ways,
6 one, maybe they are lying, in other words, what
7 they said is not correct, but the second concern
8 is maybe they are just not telling you the full
9 story; correct?

09:37 10 A Yes.

11 Q And that wouldn't be surprising, that somebody
12 might be a witness to an offence that was
13 committed by a friend or maybe somehow involved
14 peripherally even, might not give you the full
09:37 15 story?

16 A My experience has been that that's usually the
17 way.

18 Q And it would be pretty sloppy police practice not
19 to follow up on that and see if you could at least
09:37 20 make some ascertainment (sic) in your own mind as to
21 whether I've got the whole story or not; correct?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Would I be correct as well that in looking and
24 trying to make that assessment, obviously you are
09:38 25 trying to get some read off the individuals who



1 are giving you the statements, but you are also
2 looking at the statements themselves to see, well,
3 how do they compare, are there inconsistencies, is
4 somebody saying one thing, somebody saying
09:38 5 something else, what's the explanation for that;
6 would that be correct?

7 A That would be a proper approach, yes.

8 Q And I wondered about that, because when I looked
9 at -- and I don't know if you recall this or not,
09:40 10 David Milgaard gave a statement on March 3rd,
11 1969; you are familiar with that or at least know
12 that he did that?

13 A Umm, I'm not positively sure that I -- March the
14 3rd did you say?

09:41 15 Q Let me put this it way; you are aware that David
16 Milgaard gave one statement fairly quickly after
17 Albert Cadrain came in and then gave a second
18 statement later on; the exact dates, I'm assuming
19 you are not aware of that?

09:41 20 A No, I'm not.

21 Q Okay. In his first statement, and it's document
22 006586 and it's at page 3 -- and I don't need to
23 bring it up but it's been referred to a number of
24 times -- David Milgaard states that when he was
09:41 25 looking around for Shorty Cadrain's, that he spoke



1 to an older lady for directions, spoke to a lady
2 on the street seeking directions. Ron Wilson,
3 Nichol John, in their first statements make no
4 reference to speaking to a lady, old, young, or at
09:41 5 all, for directions; do you recall that or do you
6 remember anything about that?

7 A Umm, not specifically.

8 Q Okay. As an investigator, though, would that sort
9 of perk your interest; why is David Milgaard
09:42 10 mentioning that he spoke to an old lady, quick to
11 point out that she is old, yet Ron Wilson and
12 Nichol John just aren't making any reference to
13 just speaking to a lady at all? Might that be
14 something that you just want to know why is that,
09:42 15 why -- maybe it's a completely innocent
16 explanation, maybe they just forgot about it, or
17 maybe they want to cover up the fact that they
18 spoke -- that David Milgaard spoke to a lady that
19 morning?

09:42 20 A I think a good detective would want to follow that
21 up.

22 Q All that happens is your antennae go up and maybe
23 we want to find out why this is?

24 A Exactly.

09:42 25 Q And Mr. -- it was suggested that, well, there is a



1 -- you are presupposing that these people are
2 lying, that Nichol John and Ron Wilson are lying.
3 Did you automatically -- would it be an automatic
4 conclusion that these people are lying?

09:42 5 A I would suggest, I would suggest that when you are
6 dealing in this type of a situation it's not so
7 much whether they are lying, it's trying to
8 establish, through efforts, whether it's the
9 truth, if you know what I mean. I mean people say
09:43 10 things and they may be true, they may not be true,
11 I think an investigator looks at those things with
12 some doubt in all cases until it's more or less
13 established, 'eh, that is true because other
14 things support it'. I think that's kind of a
09:43 15 general approach that an investigator would take.

16 Q So what you are doing is not saying Nichol John is
17 lying or she's telling the truth, you are just
18 saying 'I think I want to find out as best I can
19 is she lying or is she telling the truth, or does
09:43 20 she have further information that she can give
21 us'?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Fair to say?

24 A Yes.

09:43 25 Q And if I look, can you bring up document 106661,



1 this is Detective Karst's report of April 18th,
2 1969. Detective Karst, in this paragraph here,
3 states:

4 "With the assistance of Ken Walters,
5 Cst. ...",

6 Ken Walters:

7 "... with the Regina City Police, we
8 located the NicholJohn girl at 817
9 Victoria Ave. and transported her to the
09:44 10 City Police Station and was interviewed
11 at length. Further investigation of the
12 girl when she was interviewed gave one
13 the feeling that she was telling the
14 truth and she emphatically stated she
09:44 15 could not recall any time while they
16 were in the City of Saskatoon during the
17 morning of the murder at which the
18 Wilson or Milgaard had left the vehicle
19 in which they were driving long enough
09:44 20 to commit this offence. She denied that
21 Milgaard had left their vehicle at any
22 time to go to the bathroom or go for a
23 cup of coffee which she could recall.
24 This girl did however state that she
09:45 25 felt Milgaard was capable of an offence



1 of this nature and admitted having
2 sexual relations with him at different
3 times and that he was more of the animal
4 nature than you would expect of a
09:45 5 human."

6 So Detective Karst is sort of showing the pros
7 and the cons of what Nichol John is saying, she's
8 saying something which would seem to exonerate
9 David Milgaard of this offence, he didn't leave
09:45 10 the car; correct?

11 A Yes.

12 Q He is noting that in his report; is that fair to
13 say?

14 A Yes.

09:45 15 Q At the same time he is saying 'Nichol John also
16 gave us some information that suggests he is
17 capable of an offence like that'; correct?

18 A Yes.

19 Q All you are doing as an investigator is gathering
09:45 20 that information and hoping somebody will be able
21 to digest it at some point in time in deciding
22 whether a charge should be laid or not; fair to
23 say?

24 A Yes.

09:46 25 Q And he certainly confirms that when you go to the



1 next page of the report, that would be 662, if I
2 could:

3 "Although there are many unanswered
4 questions with regards to Milgaard's
09:46 5 activities on that particular morning,
6 if one is to believe the girl,
7 NicholJohn, and it appears that she is
8 very convincing with her story, then
9 there is no way in which Milgaard can be
09:46 10 connected with this crime."

11 Again, that's Detective Karst pointing out
12 there's unanswered questions, he's got some
13 issues here with what's being said; on the other
14 hand noting she is true and she seems convincing
09:46 15 at this point, then he wasn't involved. All he
16 is pointing out is sort of both sides of the
17 issue; fair to say?

18 A I agree.

19 Q And he goes on here near the bottom of the,
09:46 20 towards the end of the page:

21 "With regards to the above information
22 it now appears that further questioning
23 of Cadrain is warranted with regards to
24 the blood as both youths Milgaard and
09:47 25 Wilson along with the girl, NicholJohn



1 deny that Milgaard had any blood on his
2 clothing, while Cadrain emphatically
3 states that he observed this blood."

4 That sort of lays out pretty clearly the issue
09:47 5 that was facing the police service at that point
6 in time; Albert Cadrain saying there's blood,
7 David Milgaard looks like the suspect, Nichol
8 John/Wilson give some information which suggests
9 he is capable of the offence but say they didn't
09:47 10 see blood, what's going on here; fair to say?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And, again, you would expect a good investigator
13 to do that, point out those two different
14 conflicting positions?

09:47 15 A Yes.

16 Q And then goes on further to say concerns he has
17 about whether or not Cadrain had heard about the
18 offence previously, and I think if you turn to the
19 next page as well, concerns about whether or not
09:48 20 he had been smoking marijuana the night before;
21 correct?

22 A Yes.

23 Q So, I'm not sure we'll ask Mr. Karst when he
24 testifies what his opinion was at that point in
09:48 25 time, but certainly in his reports he is -- he



1 seems to be putting down both sides of the issue
2 so to speak fair to say?

3 A That's the way I see it, yes.

4 Q And that's what you would expect a good
09:48 5 investigator to do?

6 A Yes.

7 Q Can we just turn to the document that's been
8 referred to as the summary, this is document
9 006799, please. If we could go to the last page
09:48 10 of that document, if you could highlight that,
11 take my marking out of it. Thanks, thank you.

12 "- Nichol John, Wilson and Cadrain be
13 brought to Saskatoon ...",
14 this is the suggestions:

09:49 15 "... where with all present true story
16 can be obtained ...",
17 and I think it's supposed to be:

18 "... even if hypnosis or polygraph are
19 necessary."

09:49 20 Umm, sort of looks like you are suggesting
21 exactly what Mr. Karst was talking about; let's
22 find out what the true story is?

23 A Yes, and that's, that's a very reasonable approach
24 to, to the situation as I understand it was up to
09:49 25 that point.



1 Q Can we bring up document 250609, please, and if we
2 look at paragraph 4. This is, again, what was
3 referred to as the turning point by various
4 counsel who have questioned you:

09:50 5 "After a great deal of discussion it was
6 agreed that David Milgaard could be
7 considered as the prime suspect in this
8 case and that further efforts should be
9 made to eliminate or implicate him in
09:50 10 this offence."

11 Is that your understanding of what came out of
12 that meeting on May 16th, 1969?

13 A Yes.

14 Q 'Eliminate' means determine that he wasn't
09:50 15 responsible?

16 A Yes.

17 Q 'Implicate' means finding evidence, if there's
18 evidence there, that suggests that he was?

19 A Yes.

09:50 20 Q Seems to be you are sort of doing the very same
21 thing that's referred to in the summary that's
22 referred to in Detective Karst's report, you are
23 going to look at the issue and decide is there
24 evidence there that either eliminates him or
09:51 25 implicates him; correct?



1 A My understanding of that situation, that was
2 precisely the purpose of the meeting.

3 Q There was reference made to the description of Mr.
4 Milgaard as the prime suspect; as at March 16 --
09:51 5 May 16th, 1969, was there any other suspect in
6 relation to the death of Gail Miller?

7 A I --

8 Q Had anyone else pointed directly to any other
9 suspect as being responsible for the --

09:51 10 A I'm not aware that that came up. I have no
11 recollection of any other suspects coming up. I
12 would suggest that there were no other suspects
13 other than, you know, what I refer to as the, the
14 Milgaard group.

09:51 15 Q When --

16 A Pardon me.

17 Q When you are investigating a criminal offence and
18 you are looking -- I mean some cases I assume are
19 pretty easy to deal with, I find a fellow laying
09:52 20 on the ground with a knife in his heart and the
21 accused is laying on top of him drunk holding the
22 knife in his hand, pretty easy to identify who
23 your suspect is in a case like that?

24 A Yes.

09:52 25 Q Fair to say?



1 A Of course, yes.

2 Q This one doesn't fall into that category, we're --
3 you were more limited, at least nobody, the
4 suspect wasn't found immediately and so on, you
09:52 5 are trying to piece the story together; correct?

6 A Right.

7 Q Would I be correct that in any investigation like
8 that, where I'm now looking at a suspect who
9 hasn't given me a statement admitting he committed
09:52 10 the offence or whatever, I at some point in time
11 have to complete the work of either implicating
12 him or eliminating him, that's the road I have to
13 go down at some point in time with that suspect;
14 fair to say?

09:52 15 A Yes, that's, that's the, that's the practice of
16 investigating.

17 Q That isn't unique to this case or the Paul Morin
18 case, or any other case like it, that's basically
19 police work; once I have identified a suspect that
09:53 20 seems to be connected or possibly connected to the
21 offence, I have got to go down that road to try
22 and implicate him or eliminate him, one or the
23 other?

24 A Absolutely.

09:53 25 Q Now I understand, Mr. Penkala, on the taking of



1 the second set of statements, the second more
2 detailed statements from Nichol John and Ron
3 Wilson, you weren't directly involved in that?

4 A No I was not.

09:53 5 Q Umm, but you are aware that they, in fact,
6 acknowledged -- first of all, in those statements
7 they provided considerably more information about
8 what had taken place on the morning of January
9 31st, 1969?

09:53 10 A Yes.

11 Q Correct?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And I'm not sure if you are aware of this or not,
14 having followed the proceedings after 1970 up to
09:54 15 the present time, that although we've heard lots
16 about recantations and so on, at the end of the
17 day Mr. Wilson still acknowledges that there was a
18 lot of information that he did not give the police
19 in his first statement which was relevant; would
09:54 20 that be correct?

21 A Umm, again, I'm not, --

22 Q Sure.

23 A -- of my own personal knowledge, really aware of
24 that.

09:54 25 Q Sure. So information like 'yeah, we did break



1 into an elevator in Aylesbury, yeah we did have a
2 knife in the car, yeah we did get stuck, yeah we
3 did in fact separate for a period of time, yeah we
4 did plan to roll somebody that morning to possibly
09:54 5 steal a purse', all of that information, none of
6 that was in the first statement, it was in the
7 second statement, it's been acknowledged as being
8 truthful, at least as much as we can accept
9 something like that from Mr. Wilson, so would it
09:54 10 be fair to say the gut instinct, if I can describe
11 it that way, that Wilson and John maybe weren't
12 giving you all of the information the first time
13 around proved to be correct?

14 A I would have come to that conclusion, yes.

09:55 15 Q So I want to go, now, to May 25th-26th, 1969. You
16 have now -- you, and by 'you' I mean the Saskatoon
17 Police Service -- have now received all of this
18 information; you have got Albert Cadrain's story,
19 he is sticking with it; you have got what Nichol
09:55 20 John and Sharon Williams have told you about him;
21 you have got the evidence of Wilson and John in
22 terms of what they saw and heard, all of those
23 sorts of things; at that point in time who makes
24 the decision that there's going to be a charge
09:55 25 laid against David Milgaard?



1 A Umm, the normal process would be the coordinator
2 would indicate what support there is for the
3 findings, and then my experience and my
4 understanding is that you would approach the Crown
09:56 5 prosecutor and review those aspects of evidence
6 that you have to legally establish that they are
7 valid, and then proceed with -- with the
8 appropriate charge.

9 Q Sure. You might have reasons to believe David
09:56 10 Milgaard committed this offence which might not
11 constitute evidence that a Crown prosecutor could
12 use in a Court of law?

13 A Right.

14 Q Comments, for example we see in the summary
09:56 15 document -- and that would be, again, document
16 006799 at page 4 of that document -- right there:

17 "Father of Milgaard made statement to
18 effect that he was not surprised and had
19 suspected something like this might
09:57 20 happen."

21 That might not be evidence that the Crown could
22 use but, again, it's something that the police
23 might have that helped suggest or might point
24 them, suggesting they are going down the right
09:57 25 track in pursuing Mr. Milgaard as a suspect; fair



1 to say?

2 A Yes.

3 Q But at the point in time that the Crown gets it
4 now the Crown is going to do some review, what
09:57 5 have I got by way of admissible evidence, is there
6 a basis to proceed with a charge?

7 A That's my understanding, yes.

8 Q To your knowledge, certainly in that time period,
9 would the police ever lay a murder charge without
09:57 10 consulting first with the Crown?

11 A I don't think so.

12 Q The matter then proceeds to trial and Lapchuk and
13 Melnyk also testify at trial, and I take it other
14 than hearing, perhaps, about their evidence you
09:58 15 weren't involved in that?

16 A That's correct.

17 Q Okay. But certainly, at the end of the day, you
18 have got basically five friends or acquaintances
19 of Mr. Milgaard giving evidence that directly
09:58 20 implicates him in the death of Gail Miller; Mr.
21 Cadrain, Mr. Wilson, Ms. John, Mr. Lapchuk,
22 Mr. Melnyk, correct?

23 A Yes.

24 Q The suggestion is made 'well what, what about
09:58 25 Larry Fisher', and let's say Larry Fisher showed



1 up the day of the trial or the day after the trial
2 and said 'I, I raped Ms. (V1)-, I raped
3 Ms. (V2)-----, I assaulted (V5)-- (V5)---'; what
4 if he showed up and said that -- 'but I didn't do
09:59 5 anything to Gail Miller', the position he still
6 takes and the position he testified to in the
7 Supreme Court of Canada. If he showed up and said
8 that would you be in any position to say 'okay,
9 David Milgaard, you are gone, you are not involved
09:59 10 in this'?

11 A No. The same process that we have been talking
12 about this morning would then apply to the
13 supposed confession of, as you are suggesting,
14 Larry Fisher. You would have to go through that,
09:59 15 an investigator would have to go through that same
16 process to verify whether he is accurate in what
17 he is suggesting, you would obviously, with the --
18 if the time frame was that close you would
19 obviously look at both crimes. You know, that
10:00 20 would put an entirely different approach to the
21 investigation of the Miller murder if it had
22 occurred in that fashion.

23 Q The fact of the matter remained, though, that you
24 still had five people directly implicating David
10:00 25 Milgaard; correct?



1 A Yes.

2 Q And whether Larry Fisher raped (V1)--- (V1)- or
3 whether he raped Ms. (V2)-----, the fact is you
4 still had those five witnesses pointing to David
10:00 5 Milgaard?

6 A Yes.

7 Q I want to talk just a little bit about Larry
8 Fisher a bit. There was a -- the letter, and we
9 don't need to bring it up -- well, let's bring it
10:00 10 up. This is 058476, a February 5, 1969 letter.
11 This is the letter that you wrote to the RCMP, and
12 there's attached to it two pages where you
13 summarize the Gail Miller offence and then refer
14 to two other rapes that occurred in Saskatoon.

10:01 15 A Yes.

16 Q And I'm assuming what you are doing is asking them
17 to see if they have got any information about
18 other perpetrators, other people that might have
19 committed the offences, that might match up to
10:01 20 what we've got for the Gail Miller offence?

21 A That's why Crime Index existed.

22 Q And they may have, you hoped that they would come
23 back and say 'well here, we've got a fellow over
24 here who sort of sounds like him' or 'he has
10:01 25 committed an offence like that', and then you



1 would follow it up?

2 A That's the way that works, yes.

3 Q Fair to say you didn't receive any response to
4 this letter, they didn't supply you with any
10:01 5 possible suspects?

6 A I'm not aware of any.

7 Q Okay. The theory that's discussed is that the
8 person who killed Gail Miller would have also
9 committed the, at that time, the offences
10:02 10 involving (V1)-, (V2)----- and (V3)-----, that's
11 the theory, and correct when I say it was just
12 that, a theory?

13 A Yes, it's been proposed in my -- in the
14 examination of me, yes.

10:02 15 Q And it would be correct that there certainly were
16 similarities between those other three offences?

17 A Yes.

18 Q But there also were some differences, they weren't
19 identical?

10:02 20 A Umm, yes, I think that's fair, yes.

21 Q For example in the Gail Miller case it appears she
22 was robbed, her purse was taken, her money was
23 gone?

24 A Yes.

10:02 25 Q Correct? I don't think that occurred in those,



1 those first three, (V2)-----, (V1)-, or
2 (V3)-----?

3 A I'm not, I'm not --

4 Q I think --

10:02 5 A -- specifically --

6 Q We've heard that already. And I suppose one of
7 the other most significant differences is that in
8 the Miller case there was an actual stabbing, in
9 fact not just one stabbing, a very vicious
10:03 10 stabbing that took place that involved a number of
11 slash wounds and then a number of stab wounds that
12 ultimately led to the death of this individual?

13 A Yes.

14 Q That was one dramatic difference between this file
10:03 15 and those other three; would that be correct?

16 A Yes.

17 Q And then I suppose the ultimate difference, in
18 terms of these files, was that in the case of
19 (V1)-, (V2)-----, (V3)-----, I'm not aware -- and
10:03 20 I'm assuming you are not aware -- that anyone was
21 specifically implicated in those three offences;
22 in other words nobody said 'there's your suspect
23 for those offences', correct?

24 A That's my understanding, that --

10:03 25 Q Big difference in the Gail Miller case, you



1 eventually had someone who was specifically
2 implicated in that offence; correct?

3 A Yes.

4 Q I want to just talk about the (V4)--- file for a
10:03 5 minute. Umm, this is the lady who was sexually
6 assaulted or indecently assaulted, I think as it
7 was described at that time, as she was walking
8 down the street the morning that Gail Miller was
9 murdered. Now the evidence we've heard is that
10:04 10 Gail Miller left her home at about 6:40-6:45 a.m.
11 and sometime after that, we assume before she got
12 to her bus stop, was sexually assaulted, raped,
13 murdered, that murder involved removing some
14 clothes, putting some clothes back on, and then
10:04 15 the stabbing death of her?

16 A Yes.

17 Q So sometime 6:45 a.m., after that, that occurred.
18 The (V4)--- assault occurred at 7:07 a.m. some
19 distance away. I think if you look at the, the
10:04 20 investigation report that was done -- and you
21 don't need to bring it up -- investigation report
22 that was done, I believe it was by the RCMP, it's
23 document 0213167 (sic), at page 223 of that
24 document -- you don't need to bring it up -- but
10:05 25 the distance to walk from where the Gail Miller



1 assault took place to where the (V4)--- assault
2 took place was described as an eight-minute walk.

3 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just give me the
4 number again, please, would you?

10:05 5 MR. FOX: I believe it's at document
6 0213167 (sic), and I believe it's at page 223 of
7 that document, 223 is the page number of the
8 document, not the ID number.

9 BY MR. FOX:

10:05 10 Q All right. Looking at that, first of all in terms
11 of the logistics of it, what do you think the
12 possibility is that someone, after 6:45 a.m.,
13 would have encountered Gail Miller, dragged her
14 into an alley, removed her clothes, sexually
10:05 15 assaulted her, raped her, put her -- had her coat
16 back on, slashed her, stabbed her, left, and by
17 7:07 was an eight-minute walk away touching
18 someone that they are just approaching face to
19 face on the street; logistically does that seem
10:06 20 very possible to you as a police investigator?

21 A Not really, but still possible I guess.

22 Q Still possible, doesn't sound very possible, but
23 possible I guess?

24 A Yes.

10:06 25 Q And if you put in there that the perpetrator who



1 committed the offence in Gail Miller had a car and
2 also drove the car back to an address some
3 distance away and then was walking back after
4 dropping off the car it even seems less likely
10:06 5 that it could have occurred in that time period;
6 you would agree?

7 A Yes, I think that's, that's appropriate, yup.

8 Q Looking at the (V4)--- assault, she described
9 someone who approached her on the street face to
10:06 10 face and she gave a very detailed description of
11 that individual, quote, "face to face", basically
12 he touched her, grabbed at her, ran his hands on
13 her body, and she screamed and he ran away. That,
14 fair bit different from what we saw in the sexual
10:07 15 assaults or rapes of (V1)-, (V2)-----, even Gail
16 Miller, if we assume it's the same?

17 A I -- and I recognize that it is different.

18 Q Just a completely almost different category of
19 offence; one is somebody walking down the street
10:07 20 face to face approaching someone and touching
21 them, screaming, and running away, the others
22 involve someone being grabbed, pulled into an
23 alley, identity hidden throughout, and a very
24 protracted sexual assault taking place; fair to
10:07 25 say?



1 A Yes.

2 Q I'll leave it for someone else to figure out
3 whether that's similar or not.

4 If I can go to 1969, to your
10:07 5 knowledge was Larry Fisher at any time in 1969
6 identified as a suspect in any offence, in any
7 sexual offence or any offence at all; were you
8 aware of him being identified as a suspect in
9 anything?

10:08 10 A Larry Fisher was not known to the Saskatoon Police
11 Department throughout '69.

12 Q As I understand Larry Fisher, in 1969, had no
13 criminal record?

14 A Umm, certainly not with us, not --

10:08 15 Q None that you have been able to ascertain?

16 A That's right. Well, we didn't have a name, so we,
17 we couldn't even --

18 Q Yeah?

19 A -- we couldn't even check the central indices of
10:08 20 the nation in regards to that.

21 Q But certainly, looking back now, we don't see that
22 Larry Fisher was on some place with a previous
23 record for sexual assault, or anything of that
24 nature, being investigated for anything like that,
10:08 25 he is just not on the radar screen at all in



1 1969; --

2 A That's --

3 Q -- correct?

4 A That's right.

10:09 5 Q You were aware that the Winnipeg Police
6 apprehended him in Winnipeg in 1970, he was
7 actually caught raping someone there?

8 A Yes, I'm aware of that, yes.

9 Q Now I want to, I'm not sure if you are familiar
10:09 10 with these documents, but I'm going to show them
11 to you and ask you if you are and then I'm going
12 to ask you some questions about it. Could we have
13 document 093349. This is the statement that Larry
14 Fisher gave on September 19th, 1970 in Winnipeg.
10:09 15 I'm not sure if it's -- have you seen that
16 document? This is a statement where he is
17 apprehended and immediately gives a statement
18 acknowledging that he had sexually assaulted a
19 lady or raped a lady in Winnipeg.

10:10 20 A I don't, I don't recall seeing this statement
21 before.

22 Q Okay. Show document 093357. This is the
23 information that was laid against -- I'll just
24 kind of highlight it, and if we can walk from the
10:10 25 top down to the bottom, yeah, that's good -- the



1 information is laid against Larry Earl Fisher --
2 if we can just continue scrolling up -- he was
3 charged September 19th with a sexual assault, it
4 appears as though he appeared February 12th, '71,
10:10 5 waived his right to a preliminary hearing, and
6 went straight to trial; that's how you would read
7 that?

8 A Yes.

9 Q His counsel at that time was an L. Greenberg, so
10:10 10 he had a lawyer representing him appears to be the
11 case, L. Greenberg counsel for the defence?

12 A That's what it says, yes.

13 Q And then he is sentenced May 20th, '71 to 6 1/2
14 years consecutive on each of the two counts, that
10:11 15 would be a total of 13 years; that appears to be
16 what went -- took place?

17 A Yes.

18 Q So the charge was laid, the information was sworn
19 September 19th, '70, not finally disposed of until
10:11 20 May 20th, '71, and that's when he gets his 13-year
21 sentence.

22 A That's what it says, yes.

23 Q Okay. Now I want to go back. Can we have up
24 document 261186. Now this is a statement given by
10:11 25 Mr. Fisher October 21st, 1970, looks like it's



1 taken by two officers from actually I think it's
2 the Fort Garry police department, and he goes on
3 saying:

4 "Q Do you wish to give a statement?

10:12 5 A Yes. I want to clear up three more
6 things. The first one was in
7 Saskatoon sometime around ...",
8 thanks, keep on scrolling there:

9 "I want to clear up three more things.

10:12 10 The first one was in Saskatoon sometime
11 around this spring. I was downtown, I
12 seen this girl get on a bus so I got on
13 to. She got off and I got off to. I
14 followed her. I grabbed her from the
10:12 15 front, dragged her into the back of a
16 yard. I took off her clothes and raped
17 her. This was in the Pleasant Hill
18 District around Avenue U. It was
19 around, west of St. Paul's Hospital, I
10:12 20 think. I think the girl was wearing a
21 dark coat and slacks.

22 The second one was also in
23 Saskatoon, near the University. I don't
24 know what I was doing in that District.
10:13 25 I saw the girl, I followed her, dragged



1 her into a back alley. I tried to rape
2 her but a car came along and I took off.
3 This happened this summer, about six or
4 seven months ago. The girl was wearing
10:13 5 slacks and carried some books."

6 And refers to a third one in Winnipeg. So he has
7 given a statement October 21st, 1970 already to
8 the Winnipeg Police admitting to two rapes in
9 Saskatoon, or at least one rape and one attempted
10:13 10 rape?

11 A Yes.

12 Q That would be correct?

13 A Yes.

14 Q The statements that were then obtained by

10:13 15 Detective Karst and Inspector -- is it Inspector
16 Nordstrom --

17 A Yes.

18 Q -- Inspector Nordstrom, they are October 22nd,
19 1970. The one is 012642, that's the first one,
10:13 20 that deals with (V5)-- (V5)---. I'm not going to
21 go through this, but this is where he describes in
22 pretty brief detail his rape of (V5)-- (V5)---,
23 and it's acknowledged that it was in February in
24 1970. He said he thought, I think he refers
10:14 25 somewhere he thought it was later, but -- or



1 sorry, the second one he refers to later than
2 that, February 1970. Would I be correct that by
3 the time, obviously by the time Detective Karst
4 and Mr. Nordstrom or chief -- or Inspector
10:14 5 Nordstrom went to Winnipeg they weren't going,
6 frankly, to interrogate to get some something new
7 because Fisher had already given the statement to
8 Winnipeg the day before?

9 A It would appear that way, yes.

10:12 10 Q And I'm sure you are not sure of what did
11 transpire, but pretty logical that once Winnipeg
12 got the information October 21st, they would have
13 phoned Saskatoon and said hey, we've got a fellow
14 here that says he committed a couple of rapes in
10:12 15 Saskatoon, do you want to talk to him and get a
16 statement from him, that's pretty logical?

17 A That would be a standard process.

18 Q And Detective Karst going there with Inspector
19 Nordstrom on October 22nd, it's kind of a done
10:12 20 deal already by that time, this isn't new or
21 revealing, they are basically going to get a
22 statement just conforming what he has already told
23 the Winnipeg police; fair to say?

24 A Yes.

10:12 25 Q Inspector Nordstrom, as I understand it, he was



1 the head of morality?

2 A He was, yes.

3 Q And so logical that he would go along?

4 A Yes.

10:12 5 Q And the (V5)--- and -- the second statement that
6 was given is 012639 and I don't think we have
7 to -- well, let's bring it up just for the record.
8 That's again the October 22nd statement and that
9 relates to Ms. (V3)----- and he describes it and
10:13 10 again gives a little bit of detail, not much about
11 it and says where it took place and so on.
12 Basically these two matters, (V3)----- and
13 (V5)---, those investigations would fall under the
14 morality section?

10:13 15 A Yes.

16 Q And logical, therefore, that Inspector Nordstrom
17 would have been there?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And I take it the follow-up, if there's even going
10:13 20 to be any follow-up because you've now, this is
21 more or less a done deal, he has pled guilty, that
22 would fall to the morality section; in other
23 words, what are we going to do with these
24 statements, are there going to be some charges
10:14 25 laid, that sort of thing?



1 A Yes.

2 Q You mention that, not surprising, Detective Karst
3 would have gone along because he was a good
4 investigator and was often sent or occasionally
10:14 5 sent to get statements and that because he did a
6 good job?

7 A Yes.

8 Q But once those statements were obtained, this
9 would be a morality issue and they are going to
10:14 10 decide where they go?

11 A That would be the normal practice.

12 Q Detective Karst was not in morality?

13 A No.

14 Q The sentencing takes place on May 21st -- May
10:14 15 20th, 1970 we saw from the information, he gets a
16 total of 13 years. Would the -- would the police
17 service, Saskatoon Police Service have a role in
18 arranging the court appearance for Larry Fisher in
19 Saskatchewan or wherever, would you have a role in
10:15 20 that? Who would make the final call on how that's
21 going to be dealt with?

22 A Well, I would suggest that if it's established
23 that a crime within the Saskatoon jurisdiction had
24 occurred and they had support for the crime, it
10:15 25 would be the Saskatoon Police Department's



1 obligation to prepare the charges and set them.

2 Q Now, you prepare the charges. Who's going to deal
3 with those charges?

4 A Normally it would initiate with the division that
10:15 5 is charged with the responsibility. In this case
6 it was the morality division, they would have the
7 investigation to that point and they would then
8 follow it up with --

9 Q Who would deal with the charges in court?

10:16 10 A It would be -- charges would be sought on the
11 basis, assuming that they are supportable, and
12 then some officer in the court would swear to the
13 information and then once the information and the
14 accused is before the court, the process then
10:16 15 becomes that of the court.

16 Q And who discusses with the accused or his defence
17 counsel what your sentence is going to be, that
18 sort of thing?

19 A It would be the Crown.

10:16 20 Q The prosecutor would deal with that?

21 A Yes.

22 Q In this particular case we saw that Mr. Fisher
23 eventually pled guilty, notwithstanding he had
24 given his statements already in October of 1970 to
10:16 25 the Winnipeg charges, he didn't plead guilty until



1 May 20th, 1971 and at that time got 13 years. He
2 then came back to Saskatchewan, pled guilty to
3 four charges here and got concurrent time. Would
4 the Saskatoon Police Service have been involved in
10:17 5 negotiating whatever agreement there was in terms
6 of where he's going to plead guilty, what sort of
7 sentence he's going to get, anything of that
8 nature?

9 A My understanding of that process is that either
10:17 10 the accused or his defence counsel would initiate
11 that process and that that process would have to
12 be, if it was going to be heard or dealt with in a
13 jurisdiction other than the jurisdiction where the
14 crime occurred, the Attorney General would have to
10:17 15 provide his consent or waive the process.

16 Q We saw on the information in the Winnipeg charges
17 that Mr. Fisher was represented by a Lawrence, or
18 L, I think it's Lawrence Greenberg, and I think
19 we'll hear that he similarly represented Mr.
10:18 20 Fisher on the charges in Saskatchewan. Do you
21 know, to your knowledge, if the Saskatoon Police
22 Service would have had any direct dealings with
23 Mr. Greenberg?

24 A I don't have any information on that.

10:18 25 Q And would you expect that they would or would you



1 expect that that would be dealt with by the Crown
2 prosecutor's office or the Department of Justice?

3 A I was never really involved in that other than a
4 very general sense, but I would suggest that a
10:18 5 possible way would be the defence lawyer would
6 contact the Attorney General and then maybe get
7 direction from the Attorney General and then it
8 would kind of come back through the Saskatoon
9 Police Department. As I understand, it did
10:18 10 because there's some correspondence where they
11 were asked for the summary of those offences that
12 were going to be dealt with.

13 Q So in other words, you were asked for some
14 information which you provided?

10:19 15 A Yes.

16 Q In terms of negotiating what his sentence should
17 be, that sort of thing, any indication that the
18 Saskatoon Police Service was involved in that?

19 A No, and usually the police are never involved in
10:19 20 that aspect.

21 Q Now, the suggestion was made that Mr. Fisher
22 didn't receive any time for the offences he
23 committed in Saskatchewan and I want to ask you
24 about that. Is it fair to say that circumstances
10:19 25 arise where you would have an accused who is



1 arrested on one or two or maybe more than two
2 offences, is going to clearly be found guilty,
3 decides to plead guilty and decides that he's
4 going to basically clear everything up at the same
10:19 5 time?

6 A Yes.

7 Q That could happen in some very minor offences,
8 like, for example -- I shouldn't describe break
9 and enter as minor offences, but you might have
10:20 10 someone who's caught on two or three break and
11 enters, they are prepared to admit to six others
12 and want to get them cleared up all at the same
13 time?

14 A That's usually -- my experience has been that
10:20 15 that's usually how these things occur.

16 Q And part of the reason for that is that the
17 individual doesn't want to do time on the first
18 two break and enters, get released, then gets
19 charged on the next six and then maybe have to go
10:20 20 back to jail again?

21 A I think that's an element that must cross the mind
22 of the accused.

23 Q And generally if I've got to go to jail, maybe I
24 might as well get everything cleared up so that
10:20 25 when I get out I can start fresh, so to speak?



1 A Yes.

2 Q We see that happen with more serious offences as
3 well, armed robberies for example?

4 A Yes.

10:20 5 Q Someone might have got caught holding up a
6 7-Eleven and admits to two or three others because
7 they want to get them all cleared up. Fair to
8 say?

9 A My experience has indicated that's the way it
10:21 10 usually happens.

11 Q You would see that and you would have seen that
12 certainly with sexual assault offences, and I'm
13 thinking, for example, certainly in the last 20
14 years we've seen a number of individuals charged
10:21 15 with sexual assaults, residential school
16 situations, situations like that, positions of
17 trust, offences laid, charges laid there?

18 A In a general sense, yes, I have.

19 Q Sure. And it's not uncommon in those
10:21 20 circumstances to see a series of guilty pleas
21 entered and basically one large sentence imposed?

22 A Yes.

23 Q And I take it you are not able to comment what
24 role the Saskatchewan offences had on the 13 year
10:21 25 sentence that he received in Winnipeg?



1 A No.

2 Q But in your experience as a police officer, it
3 wouldn't be unusual that the 13 year sentence was
4 imposed with some consideration that he's also
10:22 5 going to be giving guilty pleas on some charges in
6 Saskatchewan as well, that they are going to clean
7 everything up, that certainly is a possibility?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And all the more so when we know that when he
10:22 10 entered his guilty plea in Manitoba and received
11 his sentence on May 20th, 1971, he had already
12 given statements admitting to at least two of the
13 offences in Saskatchewan?

14 A It would appear that that's what happened.

10:22 15 Q Okay. The sentencing that took place of Mr.
16 Fisher in Saskatchewan on December 21st, 1971, I
17 take it you have no particular knowledge of that?

18 A No.

19 Q In terms of why that date was picked or whether it
10:22 20 had anything to do with Mr. Fisher or his counsel
21 wanting that date or that time, you have no
22 knowledge of that?

23 A No knowledge.

24 Q Were you aware of anything that prevented the
10:23 25 public from having access to what took place in



1 the sentencing of Mr. Fisher in 1971?

2 A No.

3 Q Would I be correct that basically criminal record
4 is public information?

10:23 5 A Yes.

6 Q If the CBC or anybody else wanted to see if Larry
7 Fisher had a criminal record or had been convicted
8 of criminal offences, it's available to the
9 public?

10:23 10 A I should correct that, I think a conviction is
11 public.

12 Q Yes. A conviction is public record?

13 A Yeah.

14 Q Now, there was some questions asked about advising
10:23 15 complainants or advising people who have been the
16 victim of offences as to the outcome of charges?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Now, I just want to talk in this particular case,
19 dealing with the (V2)-----, (V1)-, (V5)---,
10:24 20 (V3)----- offences, those all would have fallen
21 under the morality section?

22 A Yes.

23 Q And in terms of -- by that I mean the
24 investigators assigned to those files would have
10:24 25 been all morality officers?



1 A I would assume that that was the case.

2 Q And would have been overseen by, in this case by
3 Inspector Nordstrom?

4 A Yes.

10:24 5 Q And in terms of somebody going and advising those
6 four that charges had been disposed of dealing, or
7 their charges had been disposed of, would you
8 normally expect that that would fall to morality?

9 A Yes.

10:24 10 Q Now, we heard from --

11 A Or somebody on behalf of morality.

12 Q They would be the ones giving the directions or
13 overseeing it I should say.

14 A Yes.

10:24 15 Q We've heard from Ms. (V5)---, (V5)-- (V5)---
16 testified that she was advised of an arrest and
17 that the individual was arrested and was
18 responsible for some other rapes as well, we've
19 heard that testimony, and I think it's in the RCMP
10:25 20 report of her which is document 254911, and again
21 I take it you have no knowledge as to how that
22 came about or sort of why she was told that and
23 maybe the others weren't?

24 A No, and I would have never -- I wouldn't have been
10:25 25 in a position at that time to really be involved



1 in that process.

2 Q Sure. Could we have up document 105246, and this
3 is a report of Gus Weir who I understand was a
4 morality officer?

10:25 5 A I believe that's right.

6 Q And this is a report, February 5th, '71, and so
7 this would have been after Mr. Fisher had given
8 his statement, still hadn't -- the charge hadn't
9 been disposed of, but given his statement.

10:26 10 "The situation concerning this
11 occurrence and the alleged mental
12 condition of the accused was explained
13 to this girl and her parents. At the
14 present time these people appear to be
10:26 15 completely satisfied with the actions
16 taken re this occurrence. This therefor
17 is a concluded report."

18 If I can just scroll up a bit I think. Sorry.
19 Yeah, no, that's it. So it appears as though at
10:26 20 that time Officer Weir, Morality Officer Weir
21 certainly is advising Ms. (V5)--- that there is
22 an accused talking something about the mental
23 condition, and I'm not going to ask you questions
24 about that because there are some other documents
10:27 25 that refer to that I think, but talking about the



1 mental conditions, certainly advising her about
2 the accused and it appears as though she
3 considers the matter concluded. I'm sure you
4 weren't aware that this took place in February,
10:27 5 '71?

6 A No, I'm not.

7 Q But fair to say it appears as though Morality
8 Officer Weir is getting back to the victim and
9 advising her at least of the status of the
10:27 10 situation?

11 A That's what it suggests to me.

12 Q And in terms of why that doesn't appear to have
13 happened with the others, you are not sure of
14 that?

10:27 15 A No, I don't know.

16 Q Now I want to ask you a few questions about the
17 suggestion that the information about the rapes
18 and sexual assaults took place was somehow hidden
19 from Mr. Milgaard or his defence counsel in 1969
10:28 20 and early 1970 when he went to trial. First of
21 all, was there any attempt on your part, you
22 personally, to try and hide that information from
23 either Mr. Milgaard or his defence counsel or
24 anyone on behalf of Mr. Milgaard?

10:28 25 A No.



1 Q Are you aware of any effort by any members of the
2 Saskatoon Police Service, and specifically
3 Detective Karst or anyone else, to try and hide
4 that information from Mr. Milgaard?

10:28 5 A I'm not aware of anything of that nature.

6 Q Now, Mr. Fisher has been referred to as a serial
7 rapist and are you -- I don't know if you can
8 comment on this in terms of how well it was known
9 in 1968 into 1969 and early 1970 that someone had
10:29 10 committed or was alleged to have committed a
11 number of sexual offences. Do you know how
12 wide-spread that information might have been?

13 A It's kind of hard to assess that at this stage of
14 the game because of the time frame. I'm sure --
10:29 15 I'm sure that the presence of those types of
16 crimes would have been a concern to the community
17 and of course to the police service.

18 Q Okay. We've referred to document 050611 and if we
19 can just bring that up if you could, and that's
10:29 20 just the publication that took place on page 3 of
21 the *StarPhoenix* December 14, '68 issuing a warning
22 about two instances of alleged rape and an assault
23 that were brought to the police's attention,
24 Riverdale area and one at the university, telling
10:30 25 people to be on the look-out, be careful, and I



1 don't know if you said whether you had any
2 specific recollection of that being put out or
3 not?

4 A No, I didn't. I think this is the first time I've
10:30 5 seen this.

6 Q Okay. But it has been established that was put
7 out there, so certainly there's some public notice
8 gone out, be on the look-out?

9 A And I'm not surprised at that.

10:30 10 Q Okay. I'm going to ask if we can have document
11 050612, this is a copy of a publication of a
12 February 3rd, 1969 edition of the *StarPhoenix* and
13 it starts out, if I can highlight that paragraph:

14 "A \$2,000 reward was authorized today by
10:30 15 the Board of Police Commissioners for
16 information leading to the apprehension
17 of the slayer of Gail Miller."

18 And gives the address there. If we can go on, if
19 I can just look at this area here, highlight that
10:31 20 if I could, thanks:

21 "One of the possibilities being
22 investigated by the police is that the
23 attacker was a rapist who was active in
24 the city last fall.

10:31 25 She had been dead about an hour



1 before her body was found by a child
2 Friday morning about 8:30.

3 Police have issued a plea to
4 all citizens to contribute any
10:31 5 information which might aid in the
6 investigation."

7 I'm not sure, do you recall this publication?

8 A I don't recall it. I do recall that there was a
9 reward posted, I recall that, but I don't
10:31 10 specifically recall this, and it doesn't suggest
11 that I didn't see it at the time, I just don't
12 remember.

13 Q Sure, I appreciate that. But certainly it seems
14 to be sending out the message to the public that
10:31 15 this murder might be related to the attacker who
16 was a rapist active in the offences in the fall?

17 A Yes.

18 Q If we can put up document 050613, this is a
19 similar story that appeared in the Regina
10:32 20 *Leader-Post* February 4th, '69, first paragraph
21 there -- sorry, yeah.

22 "Police are investigating the
23 possibility that the person who slashed
24 a 20-year-old nurses' aide to death
10:32 25 Friday may be the same person who



1 attacked three women here last fall."

2 This is story originating out of Saskatoon.

3 "Last fall police said that they

4 believed one man was responsible for two

10:32 5 rapes and one attempted rape of women on

6 city streets."

7 Again, this a *Leader-Post* article, but would it

8 be fair to say that this seems to be saying to

9 the public, you know, we think it could be the

10:32 10 same person, might be, might not be, but we're

11 concerned it might be the same person; correct?

12 A That's what I would assume, yes.

13 Q And then if we could put up document 050614, this

14 is a February 6, '69 article, "Purse yields no

10:33 15 fingerprints," and I think you already referred to

16 that, checked the purse for fingerprints, didn't

17 find anything, and then we've got a statement by

18 Superintendent Wood:

19 "Supt. Wood said women who have recently

10:33 20 been indecently assaulted and had not

21 pressed charges or reported the

22 incidents were now coming forward to the

23 police."

24 Again, it seems to be referring, okay, we've got

10:33 25 other matters, people are coming forward, that



1 sort of thing. It's interesting, the (V9)----
2 report, although the incident occurred January
3 15th, '69, the report she brought in on February
4 6th, '69. I'm not sure if that's what
10:33 5 Superintendent Wood is referring to, but again it
6 seems to be at least you are telling the public
7 there might be some connection?

8 A Yes.

9 Q When this matter proceeded to preliminary hearing,
10:33 10 to trial, did you have any reason to believe that
11 Mr. Milgaard or his counsel or anybody else on his
12 behalf wouldn't have been aware of these sort of
13 rather public stories that were out there, that
14 someone had committed some sexual offences that
10:34 15 might have been the same person?

16 A I would not be knowledgeable on those things.

17 Q You had no indication of that one way or the
18 other?

19 A No.

10:34 20 Q I want to ask you, do you recall, sir, getting any
21 requests, did you receive any request on behalf of
22 Mr. Milgaard or on behalf of his counsel or anyone
23 on his behalf saying 'lookit, can you give us some
24 information about these other offences, can you
10:34 25 tell us about them, these are reported'?



1 A No, I don't have that information. I've never
2 had.

3 Q Do you know if you received any request to supply
4 information on any of the people that you had
10:34 5 considered as possible suspects in the death of
6 Gail Miller?

7 A No.

8 Q In 1969 -- let me ask you this question, I want to
9 talk about disclosure, disclosure of information
10:35 10 by -- to defence counsel. First of all, in 1969
11 and 1970 were the police directly involved in
12 delivering disclosure to defence counsel?

13 A I would say no. I think they would respond to
14 direction from the Crown.

10:35 15 Q So the communication in terms of I want disclosure
16 if I'm defence counsel or here is disclosure if I
17 am the Department of Justice or Crown prosecutor,
18 that would take place between the Crown prosecutor
19 and defence counsel?

10:35 20 A That was my understanding.

21 Q Direction would be you being told by the Crown get
22 this information for me because I want to pass it
23 on to the defence, something of that nature?

24 A Yes.

10:35 25 Q And we know, and I as a defence counsel know that



1 things evolved with disclosure after the Charter
2 was implemented, after the Stinchcomb decision
3 came down. Do you know what I mean when I refer
4 to the Stinchcomb decision?

10:36 5 A Yes.

6 Q Can you tell us what that is?

7 A Well --

8 Q Just as your understanding of it.

9 A My understanding is that there was a -- the case
10:36 10 had provided for the required sharing of
11 information with defence on cases. That's
12 basically the limit of my understanding.

13 Q Sure. That was a decision of the Supreme Court of
14 Canada?

10:36 15 A Yes, I would assume.

16 Q And certainly after the Charter and after the
17 Stinchcomb decision came down, the disclosure
18 obligations changed quite significantly?

19 A My understanding is that they are now, it's an
10:36 20 obligation to provide.

21 Q 1969, 1970 would have been prior to the
22 implementation of the Charter and prior to
23 Stinchcomb?

24 A That's the way I understand it.

10:37 25 Q I'm jumping around a little bit, but there's a



1 couple of areas I want to cover. Sexual assaults
2 and rapes were dealt by the morality section of
3 the Saskatoon Police Service in 1969-'70?

4 A Yes.

10:37 5 Q Was that still the situation when you retired as
6 chief in 1991?

7 A I'm not certain. At some point we started to
8 amalgamate some of the police, police divisions,
9 and I can't be certain. I think at some point,
10:37 10 and I may be wrong, at some point morality and
11 detectives were amalgamated.

12 Q Can you tell me what else was dealt with by
13 morality in 1969, what other types of offences or
14 areas of question?

10:37 15 A Well, they would deal with situations of lesser
16 importance such as bootlegging and gaming and that
17 type of thing, that would be, that would also fall
18 into the area of morality, sudden deaths. When I
19 say sudden deaths, these are deaths that occur at
10:38 20 home usually of natural causes, but in any event,
21 there has to be an examination by police and the
22 involvement of the coroner, those are the kinds of
23 issues that -- suicides, sometimes suicides fell
24 into that situation, suicide was obvious and of
10:38 25 course morality would tend to that.



1 Q In terms of sudden deaths, would it be fair to say
2 if there was any indication of sort of foul play
3 or that it wasn't just a natural death, so to
4 speak, that it would then be moved over to the
10:38 5 detective section?

6 A Yes, and it would probably be jointly approached.

7 Q Looking back on it now in 2005, looking back on
8 the situation in 1969, rapes, and in this case
9 we're dealing with some very, very serious rapes,
10:39 10 and by that I mean, you know, of individuals who
11 suffered greatly because of them, they sort of
12 stand out in morality as being an extremely
13 serious offence that's lumped in with a number of
14 other offences that just aren't very serious?

10:39 15 A I think that's a fair assessment, yes.

16 Q Would it be fair to say that maybe our thinking
17 has changed a bit on that, that the police
18 service's thinking has changed on that a bit over
19 the years to sort of move those type of offences
10:39 20 more into the category of murder and serious
21 assaults, that sort of thing?

22 A I would think that possibly that is occurring.
23 I've been away from police work for over 13 years
24 and I'm not sure what's happened since I've been
10:40 25 away, but the thinking was already there before I



1 left and I'm not just quite certain when we
2 started to restructure the organization of the
3 police department to include those offences as I
4 had suggested earlier. I think we amalgamated
10:40 5 morality and the detective division. There was
6 also a youth section that was involved there and I
7 think that was separated for the very need to deal
8 because eventually you had to deal with youth in a
9 different way than you did with adults.

10:40 10 Q Although I think you've indicated this, you would
11 hope that there would be communication between,
12 say, the morality section and the detective
13 section. The fact, however, that you had two
14 different sections, one section is dealing with an
10:41 15 offence and this section, the detective section is
16 dealing with the murder and they are separated can
17 create some communication problems?

18 A Oh, there's no question about it, that's always,
19 always a concern throughout an organization such
10:41 20 as the police department. There's -- when I left
21 there I think there was over 400 police officers.
22 The incidence of the work load had increased very
23 much, the population of the city had increased
24 very much, and it became a greater concern as the
10:41 25 city grew.



1 Q And in this particular situation, the Gail Miller
2 situation, although notwithstanding that you
3 looked at the possibility the perpetrator of the
4 rapes may have also been the murderer of Gail
10:41 5 Miller, the fact remained that the rapes were
6 being investigated by morality and the murder was
7 being investigated by the detective section; would
8 that be correct?

9 A Yes.

10:42 10 MR. FOX: Mr. Commissioner, I'm not sure
11 when you wanted to break for the morning. I can
12 carry on here for a while yet.

13 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: At 11.

14 MR. FOX: At 11, 15 minutes?

10:42 15 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, no, sorry,
16 I've got my times wrong. We can break now.

17 MR. FOX: Thanks.

18 (Adjourned at 10:42 a.m.)

19 (Reconvened at 11:05 a.m.)

11:05 20 MR. FOX: Mr. Commissioner, it's great to
21 have all this backing back here, because they can
22 correct my errors. I made another error, Mr.
23 Penkala, so don't feel bad.

24 I -- you asked for a document
11:05 25 number, this was referring to the RCMP report



1 that indicated the time to walk, I think, from
2 the Gail Miller location to the (V4)--- location,
3 and I gave you an incorrect number. The number
4 for that report, the correct number --

11:05 5 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just a minute, if
6 I can get back to it here, please.

7 MR. FOX: It's an 02 number.

8 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, I'll go
9 through it later, just give it to me.

11:05 10 MR. FOX: Okay. And the correct number,
11 it's the RCMP report, and it's 023167, that's the
12 document number. I made reference to, I think,
13 page 223, which was the page number, I can't
14 remember that offhand.

11:06 15 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh yes, yeah.

16 MR. FOX: But that's the correct document.

17 BY MR. FOX:

18 Q Now, Mr. Penkala, a couple more questions. I just
19 want to bring up, if I could, the (V5)-- (V5)---
11:06 20 statement that was given in October of 1970, and
21 that's document 012642, and if we look at -- if we
22 look at that down right about there, if we could
23 highlight that part, it looks like Mr. Fisher was
24 asked about where he was living on the date of
11:06 25 this offence, and this was in February of 1970:



1 "Q On that date do you remember where you
2 were living?

3 A Yes, I lived at 1824 Avenue D North."

4 would have been the indication of his address
11:07 5 there. If we can look, then, if you can bring up
6 the (V3)----- statement and --

7 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And when was that
8 date?

9 MR. FOX: Sorry, that was the date, I think
11:07 10 he was asked where he was living the date of the
11 offence, which would have been February of 1970.

12 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right.

13 BY MR. FOX:

14 Q And then if you can bring up the (V3)-----
11:07 15 statement, and that's 0126 -- 012639. Thanks.
16 And the question was asked, now we're talking
17 about November '68 offence so the question was
18 asked:

19 "Q Did you live in Saskatoon around
11:07 20 November of 1968",
21 and he answered:

22 "A Yes, probably at 512 Avenue F South or
23 1530 Avenue C North."

24 And I think, if you read through the two
11:08 25 statements, there is no indication that he lived,



1 at some point in time, at 334 Avenue O South, and
2 that, of course, would have been the address
3 where Albert Cadrain lived and Larry Fisher
4 apparently lived in the basement.

11:08 5 A Yes. Pardon me, yes.

6 Q Are you aware of any information coming to you, or
7 coming to the Saskatoon Police Service in the fall
8 of 1970, indicating that Mr. Fisher had lived, at
9 one time, at 334 Avenue O South?

11:08 10 A Umm, I don't recall in my personal knowledge.

11 Q There is none in the statements that were obtained
12 and you have no recollection of that either?

13 A That's right.

14 Q I want to talk just a little bit about Linda
11:08 15 Fisher, and she was the wife, ex-wife of Larry
16 Fisher, who came in and apparently spoke at the
17 police station and gave a statement, or a report
18 at least, I think in 1980 it was, and you indicate
19 that you have no recollection of that?

11:09 20 A That's, that's correct.

21 Q And no recollection of what follow-up that took
22 place with that statement?

23 A That's right.

24 Q Okay. Now would I be correct just in general
11:09 25 terms, speaking to you as a former police officer,



1 if I received a statement like that ten years
2 after the fact from an ex-wife at 4:20 in the
3 morning who was drinking, and perhaps some
4 suggestion that there had been recently announced
11:09 5 a \$10,000 reward, I might at least initially view
6 it with some skepticism?

7 A Umm, I think, I think that's reasonable to assume
8 that.

9 Q Those are all just factors that would go into
11:09 10 where you go with that?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Am I correct that certainly, prior to 1980, there
13 had been never any record that you are aware of,
14 or knowledge that you have, of hearing anything
11:10 15 from Linda Fisher, or anyone on her behalf, that
16 Larry Fisher might have somehow been involved in
17 the death of Gail Miller?

18 A I'm not aware of anything.

19 Q Can you bring up document 213637, please. I'm
11:11 20 sorry, it might be 213627 -- yes, 627, I'm sorry.
21 Thanks. This was a letter of Mr. Merchant, who
22 appears to have been then counsel for Mr.
23 Milgaard, that Ms. Knox had pointed out and
24 Commission Counsel had then produced. It's dated
11:11 25 October 12th, 1983, it's a letter sent by



1 Mr. Merchant to a process serving company, and in
2 the last paragraph -- if I could just highlight
3 that -- the letter begins asking him to try and
4 locate these people, and reference there is to:

11:11 5 "Linda Fisher."

6 Referred to:

7 "In 1969 she lived at 334 Avenue O
8 South, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. She
9 married Larry Fisher who is presently in
11:11 10 prison for a rape charge."

11 Do you remember any contact by anyone on behalf
12 of David Milgaard in 1983, or through the balance
13 of the 1980s, asking you for information about
14 Linda Fisher or Larry Fisher?

11:12 15 A No.

16 Q I want to just, I'm -- go back to 1969. When we
17 look at the reports it looks like Mr. Karst, then
18 Detective Karst, didn't have very much involvement
19 with the Gail Miller murder investigation
11:12 20 throughout the month of February 1969; I don't
21 know if you have any recollection of that or not?

22 A Umm, in a general sense, I recall that --

23 Q And it looks like his first significant
24 involvement, I think he had did some
11:12 25 house-to-house in -- questioning the very first



1 day, but after that the first significant
2 involvement seems to be when he was asked to take
3 the statement from Albert Cadrain on March 2nd,
4 1969?

11:13 5 A That's consistent with my understanding, yes.

6 Q You had written the letter that we've already
7 referred to February 5th, 1969 to the RCMP seeing
8 if they could come up with anybody that might have
9 committed a similar offence, that sort of thing?

11:13 10 A Yes.

11 Q And I'm assuming, from February 5th through to
12 March 2nd, 1969, you were also at least looking at
13 the other rapes to see 'is there any suspect that
14 we can identify in those offences, or one of those
11:13 15 offences, that we might be able to connect to the
16 Gail Miller matter'?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And it would be fair to say that by March of 1969,
19 when Detective Karst became involved in the file,
11:13 20 nobody had been identified to fit that category?

21 A That, in my, in my knowledge, is consistent, yes.

22 Q And Detective Karst would have been -- become
23 involved essentially when David Milgaard was
24 identified as really the first suspect that you
11:14 25 had where you had direct evidence that he may



1 have, someone may have been involved in the death
2 of Gail Miller?

3 A Yes.

4 Q The (V1)- -- and I realize you weren't in
11:14 5 morality, but the (V1)- raped occurred in October
6 '68 and the (V2)----- one in November of '68, I'm
7 assuming morality would have been investigating
8 those offences on an ongoing basis from the time
9 they were -- occurred and reported to try and find
11:14 10 a suspect?

11 A That would be my assumption as well.

12 Q And certainly by March 2nd, '69, we're now four or
13 five months down the road after those offences, no
14 suspect had been identified?

11:14 15 A Not to my knowledge.

16 Q Umm, there was a suggestion put to you in
17 cross-examination by Mr. Lockyer that, after the
18 meeting of May 16th, 1969, the so-called theory
19 that one person may have been responsible for all
11:15 20 of these offences was basically never looked at
21 again; do you remember that suggestion being put
22 to you?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And I understand that -- maybe we can just bring
11:15 25 this document up, and I'm not sure if I gave this



1 to you ladies or not, but 042513. This is a
2 report, and I think it's dated May 28th, 1969 by
3 -- sorry -- if we can highlight that there -- I
4 think it's Morality Officer Cressman?

11:15 5 A Yes.

6 Q And, looking at the report, I'm not sure if we can
7 -- looks like he has got some follow-up on the
8 files, some further discussions with Ms. (V1)-,
9 and it concludes he hasn't been able to locate
11:16 10 Vince Silvester:

11 "I would respectfully suggest
12 that due to the length of time this file
13 has been open and all leads have been
14 followed up, and nothing further has
11:16 15 been learned about the person
16 responsible this file be closed. In the
17 event that any new information comes to
18 light this file could then be opened."

19 So it appears as though May 28th, 1969 this
20 so-called theory, I guess, was being addressed,
21 at least to the extent that you just couldn't
22 find anybody that you could connect to the (V1)-
23 offence?

24 A It appears that that, that was obviously the
11:16 25 conclusion of the investigator, and that's not



1 unusual.

2 Q Sure. And if we go back, your theory so to speak,
3 and a logical one it was at the time, kind of came
4 up very quickly after the Gail Miller murder, you
11:17 5 wrote February 5th, '69. But if we can just bring
6 up the RCMP report, the May 7th, '69 report,
7 250597, now this report is -- it's date-stamped
8 May 16th, '69, it's dated May 7th, 1969, so this
9 is -- February to March, March to April, April to
11:17 10 May -- pretty much three months since the theory
11 was espoused, and would it be fair to say that by
12 May 7th of 1969, some three months after this
13 theory was espoused, you still hadn't come up with
14 any suspect that was connected to all of the
11:18 15 offences?

16 A It would appear by this report.

17 Q Fair to say by May 7th, '69 you had David
18 Milgaard, who was a suspect in the Gail Miller
19 murder; correct?

11:18 20 A Yes.

21 Q But you still didn't have any other suspects on
22 the other offences?

23 A It would appear that way, yes.

24 Q And I'm going to suggest to you that there appears
11:18 25 to have been some fairly extensive work to try and



1 find a common suspect but you just weren't getting
2 anywhere in that?

3 A A person can certainly assume, and I think that
4 would be a very accurate assumption by the fact
11:18 5 that --

6 Q Well just, if we could look at paragraph 15 for
7 example -- I'm sorry, I'm giving you paragraph
8 numbers, not page numbers -- but paragraph 15 is
9 -- sets out very clearly reference to the (V4)---,
11:18 10 (V4)---- (V4)--- matter and the circumstances of
11 it, so it would appear as though (V4)--- was
12 looked at as another possible, possible lead,
13 possible similar offence. And it concludes, the
14 review concludes:

11:19 15 "(V4)--- was again interviewed by Insp.
16 Riddell, however she was unable to
17 enlarge on any of the information
18 already given to the City Police."

19 I'm not sure if you have a recollection of that
11:19 20 but it appears as though you investigated it, and
21 the RCMP came in, they investigated it, you just
22 weren't getting any more from her?

23 A It would suggest that, yes.

24 Q I want to, if we could, move to paragraph 19. If
11:19 25 we go to paragraph 19, that's where it begins, it



1 lists the other two rapes and attempted rape that
2 occurred in '68 that felt there might be some
3 similarities. If we could go to the next page it
4 lists the three, again (V1)-, (V2)-----,
11:19 5 (V3)-----. If we could go to paragraph 20, some
6 more follow-up:

7 "As none of the exhibits obtained in any
8 of the above cases had been analyzed by
9 our Laboratory, it was suggested that
11:20 10 this be done in order to establish
11 whether or not the person responsible in
12 these incidents was the same one
13 responsible for the Miller murder.
14 Accordingly, on 20 March 69 exhibits
11:20 15 obtained from (V2) (V2)- (V2)----- and
16 (V1)--- (V1)- were transported to
17 C.D.L., Regina for serological
18 examination."

19 And it goes on to describe what was -- go to
11:20 20 paragraph 21:

21 "As a result of the foregoing, it is
22 felt there is a strong possibility the
23 three rapes and the murder are directly
24 connected. In view of this, extensive
11:20 25 interrogation was conducted with



1 (V2)----- with negative results. She,
2 however, did indicate and named a person
3 who was later interrogated and submitted
4 to a blood test which indicated he was a
11:20 5 member of the O Group. These three
6 girls have been interviewed at length to
7 no avail. All stated that they have not
8 seen a person as described in their
9 statements nor have they any idea who
11:21 10 may have been responsible."

11 Once again, it appears as though there had been
12 some follow-up by the RCMP to what you did, being
13 the Saskatoon Police Service, and they are still
14 not coming up with anybody?

11:21 15 A That's what it appears to say.

16 Q And I think that conclusion is reinforced on
17 paragraph 32, which is at 607, right at the
18 bottom:

19 "As it is believed that the rapes which
11:21 20 occurred in this area in the late fall
21 of 1968 are definitely connected to this
22 offence and were committed by the same
23 person, local individuals who have been
24 interrogated have fitted the
11:21 25 descriptions as given by (V2)-----,



1 (V1)- and (V3)-----. Attempts to
2 uncover further information in this
3 respect have been to no avail.

4 Searches, etc. have been conducted in an
11:21 5 effort to recover clothing lost by the
6 victims, also without result."

7 Is it fair to say that you investigated, the RCMP
8 came in, they took a look at it, investigated,
9 there was a theory but by May of 1969 no common
11:22 10 suspect was found --

11 A I --

12 Q -- by yourself or by the RCMP?

13 A That's the way it appears to me, yes.

14 Q And what you had in May of 1969 was evidence which
11:22 15 pointed directly towards David Milgaard in
16 relation to the murder of Gail Miller; correct?

17 A Yes.

18 Q I have asked you some questions about Mr. Karst.
19 Umm, based on your dealings with Mr. Karst over
11:22 20 the 50 years that you have known him, your
21 supervision of him when you were a senior officer
22 and ultimately the chief, do you; what do you
23 think is the likelihood that he would have coerced
24 a statement out of Nichol John, Ron Wilson, Albert
11:22 25 Cadrain implicating Gail Miller -- or implicating



1 David Milgaard?

2 A I have never known Mr. Karst to be in that
3 particular area at all, I have never known him to
4 attempt that, and while I didn't always work with
11:23 5 him I just don't see it in his character.

6 Q Detective Karst is going to be, or former
7 Detective Karst is going to be able to testify,
8 Lieutenant Short is deceased, and Mr. Pringle and
9 I were commiserating, we hope there isn't an
11:23 10 inquiry 30 years from now about this Inquiry and
11 we're deceased, because the last thing I want to
12 have is people talking about me when I'm dead and
13 you are not here to defend yourself. But
14 Lieutenant Short, I'm just going to ask you, can
11:23 15 you tell me what your impressions were of
16 Lieutenant Short in terms of his honesty or the
17 possibility that he might have been involved in a
18 coverup or fabricating evidence, anything like
19 that?

11:23 20 A I simply would not -- pardon me -- I just would
21 not see that in Mr. Short neither.

22 Q We've talked a little bit, and there's been some
23 documentation filed at the outset which sort of
24 lists the hierarchy, if I can describe it as that,
11:24 25 in 1969. And you had the chief, the deputy chief,



1 and then the superintendent of criminal
2 investigations, that would have been
3 Superintendent Wood. He would have overseen all
4 criminal investigations, that included your
11:24 5 department as well, as I understand it?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And then the three divisions, detective, morality,
8 and investigation; detective would be headed up by
9 Lieutenant Short?

11:24 10 A Yes.

11 Q And morality would have been headed up by
12 Inspector Nordstrom?

13 A Yes.

14 Q And then you would have headed up the ident?

11:24 15 A That's right.

16 Q Would you three have been considered equal rank?

17 A No, I was of a lesser rank as was Lieutenant
18 Short, and --

19 Q So Inspector Nordstrom would have been the highest
11:24 20 rank of the three?

21 A He was, yes.

22 Q Okay. And just going to detectives, below
23 detectives you would have then had detective
24 sergeants, that would have been Mackie, Reid,
11:25 25 Porter and Ward; those were --



1 A Yes.

2 Q Okay. And then below that you then have the
3 detectives, and there is a number of them, and
4 that's where we would find Eddie Karst?

11:25 5 A That's correct.

6 Q In terms of -- and I don't think Mr. Karst is
7 going to suggest otherwise, that he wouldn't have
8 had input in terms of the investigation, that sort
9 of thing -- but in terms of overall direction of
11:25 10 the investigation or decision-making would I be
11 correct that he, as a detective, would not have
12 had a direct role in that, so to speak?

13 A Yes, I think that's fair. He would certainly have
14 an opportunity to seek direction and provide
11:25 15 input, but it wouldn't be left to his own, his
16 own --

17 Q It wouldn't be what?

18 A It wouldn't be left to his own devices to continue
19 with things.

11:25 20 Q So Detective Sergeant Mackie or perhaps Lieutenant
21 Short might say 'we're going to go this direction,
22 follow up on this', and he would do that?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And would report back?

11:26 25 A Yes, he would be obligated to do that.



1 Q And, in reporting back, might give his comments or
2 opinions or views about what he thought about what
3 he found; that sort of thing?

4 A Yes.

11:26 5 Q And might also give input as to where he thought
6 you should go in the next step?

7 A Yes.

8 Q But, ultimately, that decision would have been
9 made by someone higher up than him?

11:26 10 A By his supervisor, yes.

11 Q You were asked repeatedly about your position on
12 the conviction of David Milgaard and whether it
13 was correct or incorrect, or whether Mr. Milgaard
14 was innocent, as information began to come out
11:27 15 about the possibility that Larry Fisher was
16 involved, or some third party was responsible for
17 all of these offences; you obviously recall that,
18 those questions that were put to you?

19 A Yes.

11:27 20 Q As a police service in, or as a police officer in
21 1969-1970, after a trial takes place, and more
22 significantly I suppose a conviction is entered,
23 is there any general follow-up by a police officer
24 or a police service on a matter at that particular
11:27 25 point in time? I'm just trying to get some idea



1 of kind of your mindset at the time, or what do
2 you do with that file, so to speak, after it's
3 gone to the Crown, a decision has been made to lay
4 a charge, it's gone through trial and there has
11:28 5 now been a conviction; where are things at then,
6 now, as far as the police service goes?

7 A Well I, I think I mentioned it throughout my, or
8 at some point during my testimony. Usually the
9 police officers had workloads that were very
11:28 10 heavy, and once a conviction was obtained and more
11 or less a conclusion to an investigation had
12 occurred, the -- the common-sensical thinking
13 would be 'well, I'm not worrying about that any
14 more, I have set that aside and I have got so many
11:28 15 ahead of me'. So I think that was a general
16 attitude by investigators, it's no longer valid.

17 If something would bring it back
18 to light, well then that was a different
19 situation, but generally, yes, the investigators
11:28 20 would put that aside and not worry about it any
21 more.

22 Q Did you have any ability, as a police service, to
23 deal with a conviction once it was done? I mean
24 did you have any ability to say 'we're going to
11:29 25 set aside this conviction'; anything like that?



1 A In terms of setting aside the conviction?

2 Q Yeah?

3 A I don't think it was necessary. It would be known
4 to the investigator, the file would indicate, at
11:29 5 some point would indicate that it went to trial,
6 there was a conviction obtained, and it would be
7 almost a procedural conclusion of that file which
8 then would go into storage.

9 Q And in terms of, I suppose, carriage of what
11:29 10 happens after that, if somebody is coming along
11 saying 'there is a problem with this conviction'
12 or something like that, who is sort of overseeing
13 that process, at least from your perspective?

14 A Well from my perspective, and relating to this
11:29 15 situation where there was a conviction, I would --
16 I would have only acted on direction from the
17 Justice Department saying 'look, we now have some
18 concerns, we want to look at this', there probably
19 would be opportunity to weigh it in terms of
11:30 20 whether the Saskatoon Police force was the
21 appropriate agency to deal with a reinvestigation,
22 but in any event I would seek the direction of the
23 Attorney General.

24 Q Umm, Mr. Penkala, just you yourself, going back to
11:30 25 1970, did you take some comfort in the fact that,



1 for example, a Crown prosecutor had looked at this
2 and decided that a charge should go ahead, that a
3 prelim was held, that a trial was held, that an
4 appeal took place, that he had a -- that Mr.

11:30 5 Milgaard had the benefit of what I think you would
6 agree would have been seasoned, experience defence
7 counsel at the time; did you take some comfort in
8 that, that, you know, that the process basically
9 worked, or went through or appeared to have
11:31 10 worked?

11 A I was satisfied and accepted that and took a view
12 that the conviction was appropriate, and I more or
13 less stayed with that thought until the very end.

14 Q Umm, I'm going to ask to bring up document 216059.
11:31 15 This is a letter, a copy of a letter that was
16 apparently sent by then -- by Mr. Merchant, then
17 counsel for Mr. Milgaard, to Justice Tallis --
18 then Justice Tallis, who was his counsel.

19 "Since it is some time since we spoke, I
11:31 20 write to remind you that I am
21 particularly interested in the
22 instructions given by Mr. Milgaard and
23 the reason why he did not testify. If
24 he in fact admitted that he committed
11:32 25 the crime, then I would like to know."



1 I think it's common ground, and you well know,
2 there is no obligation on an accused to testify
3 and there's no adverse conclusions,
4 evidentiary-wise, that could be drawn from that
11:32 5 fact; you would be aware of that?

6 A Yes.

7 Q Having said that, were you aware that Mr. Milgaard
8 had not testified at his trial in 1970?

9 A Yes, and -- and I -- yes, and then later, of
11:32 10 course, I wondered why he hadn't.

11 Q Just something else that you looked at and kind of
12 had, the fact that he hadn't stood up at his trial
13 under oath and said 'I didn't do this', did that
14 play any part in looking at 'maybe we've got the
11:32 15 right guy here'?

16 A Oh, of course, yes.

17 Q The Supreme Court issued a decision in this
18 matter. On the Milgaard review, it was issued
19 April 14th, 1992. I'm assuming you were aware of
11:33 20 all -- I think you testified, did you testify
21 before the Supreme Court?

22 A No I did not.

23 Q Did not? You were aware of the review that was
24 taking place before the Supreme Court?

11:33 25 A Yes, via the --



1 Q Hearing about it?

2 A Yes.

3 Q And were aware that a number of people testified
4 there?

11:33 5 A Yes.

6 Q David Milgaard testified; were you aware of that?

7 A I guess maybe I was. I'm not quite certain.

8 Q Were you aware, were you made aware or become
9 aware of the decision that was issued by the
11:33 10 Supreme Court?

11 A At some point I had got a copy of the decision.

12 Q Could we bring up document 160801. Now I think we
13 know that on the reference David Milgaard
14 testified, Mr. Justice Tallis testified, Linda
11:33 15 Fisher testified, Larry Fisher testified, those
16 are all people who gave evidence, Eddie Karst
17 testified and a number of other people. If we can
18 turn to page 804 of the document at number 804,
19 this is the finding as issued by the Supreme Court
11:34 20 April 14th, '92. Now this would have been,
21 obviously, after all of the information about
22 Fisher's involvement in the other rapes that took
23 place, and that Fisher had come forward, but we
24 didn't have the benefit of any DNA evidence at
11:34 25 that time. Paragraph 3:



1 "It is appropriate to begin by stating
2 that in our view David Milgaard had the
3 benefit of a fair trial in January 1970.
4 We have not been presented with any
11:34 5 probative evidence that the police acted
6 improperly in the investigation of the
7 robbery, sexual assault and murder of
8 Gail Miller or in their interviews with
9 any of the witnesses. Nor has evidence
11:34 10 been presented that there was inadequate
11 disclosure in accordance with the
12 practice prevailing at the time.
13 Milgaard was represented by able and
14 experienced counsel. No error in law or
11:35 15 procedure has been established. At the
16 conclusion of the first trial, there was
17 ample evidence upon which the jury,
18 which had been properly instructed,
19 could return a verdict of guilty."

11:35 20 You became aware of that decision?

21 A Yes.

22 Q You agree with what was stated there?

23 A I constantly believed that.

24 Q You certainly took comfort that the Supreme Court
11:35 25 saw it the same way you did?



1 A Yes.

2 Q If we can scroll down to paragraph 5, they said:

3 "In our view, this evidence ...",

4 and they are referring to the recantation and so

11:35 5 on:

6 "... together with other evidence we

7 have heard, constitutes credible

8 evidence that could reasonably be

9 expected to have affected the verdict of

11:35 10 the jury considering the guilt or

11 innocence of David Milgaard. Our

12 conclusion in this respect is not to be

13 taken as a finding of guilt against

14 Fisher, nor indeed that the evidence

11:35 15 would justify charging him with the

16 murder of Gail Miller."

17 You are aware of that?

18 A Yes. I --

19 Q Again --

11:35 20 A Pardon me?

21 Q Sorry, go ahead?

22 A Oh, I must -- was just going to add that I did see
23 this before, yes.

24 Q Right. And, again, seems to be the Supreme

11:36 25 Court -- and it speaks for itself -- but it would



1 be a view that you saw that doesn't necessarily
2 mean that we've even got evidence to charge Larry
3 Fisher with something that took place?

4 A Yes.

11:35 5 Q Didn't have the DNA benefit then?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And if we can go on then to the top, the next
8 page, 805, first three paragraphs:

9 "As to the first --"

11:36 10 And they are talking about the three standards:

11 "As to the first, we are not satisfied
12 beyond a reasonable doubt that David
13 Milgaard is innocent of the murder of
14 Gail Miller.

11:36 15 As to the second, we are not
16 satisfied, on the basis of the judicial
17 record, the reference case and the
18 further evidence heard in this
19 reference, on a preponderance of all the
11:36 20 evidence, that David Milgaard is
21 innocent of that murder.

22 Third, we are satisfied that
23 there has been new evidence placed
24 before us which is reasonably capable of
11:36 25 belief and which taken together with the



1 evidence adduced at trial could
2 reasonable be expected to have affected
3 the verdict. We will therefore be
4 advising the Minister to quash the
11:36 5 conviction and direct a new trial under
6 s. 690(a) of the *Criminal Code*. In
7 light of this decision, it would be
8 inappropriate to discuss the evidence in
9 detail or to comment upon the
11:36 10 credibility of the witnesses."

11 You were familiar with that result as well?

12 A Yes.

13 Q At the end of the day what the Supreme Court said
14 is we're not exonerating him, we're not directing
11:37 15 he be acquitted, they are basically saying there's
16 more evidence, let's have a new trial?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Did you have any objection to Mr. Milgaard having
19 a new trial, to him having an opportunity to
11:37 20 present his new evidence?

21 A No.

22 MR. FOX: Thank you, sir. Those are all
23 the questions I have.

24 MR. ELSON: I can perhaps get started,
11:37 25 Mr. Commissioner.



1 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, please.

2 BY MR. ELSON:

3 Q Former Chief Penkala, my name is Richard Elson and
4 I represent the Saskatoon Police Service.

11:37 5 It would be fair to say that you
6 and I have not had any conversations at any time
7 and specifically with respect to your evidence
8 before this Commission of Inquiry; is that
9 correct?

11:38 10 A That is correct.

11 Q And indeed from our office, specifically from my
12 partner, Mr. John Beckman Q.C., you would have
13 received a letter, as would all the other former
14 officers of the Saskatoon Police Service, to the
11:38 15 effect that our representation was of Chief Sabo
16 and the police service and that it did not extend
17 to any former officers of the police service; is
18 that correct?

19 A That's the way I understood it, yes.

11:38 20 Q Now, I want to talk with you -- I'll refer to you
21 as Chief Penkala if that's all right, I think it
22 would perhaps be appropriate.

23 Chief Penkala, with respect to
24 the role of the identification unit, I believe you
11:38 25 testified that it was primarily a service unit to



1 other sections within the Saskatoon City Police in
2 the late 1960s, early 1970s. Did I hear your
3 evidence correctly in that respect?

4 A Yes.

11:38 5 Q And as a service unit, would it be fair to say
6 that it was primarily involved in the collection
7 of physical evidence and in the site assessment
8 with respect to sudden death cases and homicide
9 cases; is that correct?

11:39 10 A Yes. It wouldn't exclude any cases really. If
11 investigators wanted your service, they would call
12 on you.

13 Q Right, I understand that. Now, other than sudden
14 death cases or homicide cases, in which other
11:39 15 cases would officers from the identification unit
16 be involved in the collection of physical evidence
17 and assessment of a crime scene, what other types
18 of crimes or offences or incidents if they were
19 not crimes or offences?

11:39 20 A We were involved in motor vehicle accidents, hit
21 and runs, assaults -- assaults basically, we would
22 photograph injuries of assaults, suicides, and of
23 course all major crimes such as murder, rape
24 cases, if the rape cases involved need for
11:40 25 photography, matters relevant to fingerprinting.



1 Physical matching, that's where your automobile
2 accidents, you would physically match items left
3 at the scene of a hit and run and match them with
4 a vehicle that had been produced or was produced
11:40 5 with suspicions that it was involved. That's the
6 nature of the duties that ident was involved in.

7 Q I want to pursue one aspect of your answer and
8 that is with respect to offences which we've
9 commonly now referred to as sexual assault but
11:40 10 which were previously described as rape or
11 indecent assault in 1969. Would it be fair to say
12 that it was quite common in the investigation of
13 those offences that identification may not be
14 called at all, for example, in the investigation
11:41 15 of the (V1)--- (V1)- or the (V2) (V2)- (V2)-----
16 cases?

17 A That's right.

18 Q And in many instances it would be either a patrol
19 officer or a detective who would be involved in
11:41 20 the investigation of those offences without any
21 assistance from identification at all and without
22 having requested any assistance from
23 identification?

24 A That's correct.

11:41 25 Q And your involvement in those instances, for



1 example, in the (V1)--- (V1)- case and the (V2)
2 (V2)- (V2)----- cases, identification would not be
3 involved in any site assessment or in the
4 collection of physical evidence?

11:41 5 A Not necessarily, that's right.

6 Q Would there be occasions in which an officer from
7 identification would be involved in the medical
8 examination of a complainant in a rape case in the
9 same way that an office from identification would
10 attend the autopsy in the case of a homicide?

11 A I'm not aware of any cases where that occurred
12 unless the identification officer was -- because
13 he's a police officer, he might have taken the
14 first complaint on a rape, then he would follow
11:42 15 that through, and I guess my explanation is that
16 if you were attending to a complaint of rape,
17 basically you would take that victim to a
18 physician and the physician would do the
19 examination, so in most cases I don't think ident
11:42 20 would be involved.

21 Q And so if there was a police officer who would be
22 in attendance during the medical examination of a
23 complainant in a rape case, it would likely be a
24 patrol officer or perhaps an officer from
11:43 25 morality; would that be a fair assessment?



1 A Yes.

2 Q Now, we did hear some evidence, and I'm not
3 certain, I know you were here for a part of the
4 evidence that had been presented by Mr. Chartier,
11:43 5 we did hear some evidence from Mr. Chartier with
6 respect to the stove-piping of information, that
7 there was a tendency for information to be
8 stove-piped within morality, within identification
9 and within the detective units or sections of the
11:43 10 Saskatoon Police Service at that time. He did
11 allow that it has, in his opinion, since become
12 significantly better. I wonder if you could
13 comment on that aspect of Mr. Chartier's evidence
14 as I've described it to you?

11:43 15 A I did hear that evidence and I first had some
16 problems understanding what stove-piping is, but
17 now I understand.

18 Q I believe he also referred to another metaphor as
19 silo, if that's of more assistance to you.

11:44 20 A Well, I now know what he was talking about and I
21 disagree with him. There certainly is a
22 procedural flow in each of the divisions of the
23 police department, but certainly there is always
24 freedom for investigators and supervisors to
11:44 25 relate to one another and I was somewhat --



1 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Would you be
2 careful about the tense you use when you answer
3 that, sir. I'm really interested in 1969, '70.

4 A Yes.

11:44 5 BY MR. ELSON:

6 Q Yes. Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. If you could
7 confine your answer to that period of time.

8 A Well, I am confining to that period of time in
9 that --

11:44 10 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So there was --

11 A Pardon me?

12 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You are saying
13 there was a procedural flow at that time?

14 A Oh, yes.

11:44 15 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But laterally
16 there wouldn't be communication?

17 A There would be the freedom for communications
18 laterally and almost an obligation to do that.

19 BY MR. ELSON:

11:45 20 Q Could you describe the nature of that obligation?
21 How could that obligation arise?

22 A Well, while each division has its own procedural
23 flow, it also has the knowledge that other
24 divisions can be of assistance and the sharing of
11:45 25 information which is a very important aspect of



1 police investigations, is the sharing of
2 information, so it would be foolish for an
3 investigator or supervisor not to consider those
4 issues.

11:45 5 Q Now, you did indicate I believe in your testimony
6 that there were frequent meetings between the
7 heads of the detective section, the morality
8 section and yourself as the head of the
9 identification section or division, I may be
11:45 10 misnaming it. How frequent again were those
11 meetings that took place and what type of issues
12 would be discussed at those meetings?

13 A It goes back to 1969, I recall that every morning
14 it coincided with a coffee break, the senior
11:46 15 officers would meet in the coffee room and they
16 would in turn bring, if there was a particularly
17 significant file that had been initiated during
18 the past 24 hours, they would bring a detective
19 sergeant or whoever from whatever division and
11:46 20 that would be discussed at these meetings to
21 acquaint the executive officers with the past 24
22 hours of activities.

23 Q I see. Now, you talked a little bit, and forgive
24 me for going back to this, but you talked a little
11:46 25 bit about the involvement of officers from



1 identification in the investigation of rape
2 offences or complaints of rape and you had
3 indicated that they would not be in attendance at
4 a medical examination of the complainant. Since
11:47 5 1969 there have been development of sexual assault
6 or rape kits. Are you familiar with the
7 development of those kits?

8 A Not specifically, no.

9 Q All right. So I take it that those kits had not
11:47 10 become developed during the period of time, for
11 example, that you were the head of identification?

12 A Well, there was certainly procedures that were
13 drawn and I don't remember specifically whether we
14 had kits. I would assume that the kits are in
11:47 15 reference to vials and containers and slides and
16 things that would be necessary. In those days I
17 think the co-operation between the hospitals and
18 the police department were such that those were
19 available through the hospital.

11:48 20 Q In the case -- we heard evidence from Dr. Emson,
21 he had testified some time earlier, if my memory
22 serves me correctly, on January 26th of this year,
23 and Dr. Emson talked at that time about the use of
24 sexual assault kits during autopsies of homicide
11:48 25 victim s who also appeared to have been sexually



1 assaulted relatively concurrent with the homicide.
2 Are you aware of any such kit having been used in
3 autopsies during the period of time that you were
4 the head of the identification section?

11:48 5 A No, I'm not.

6 Q Are you aware of any such kits being used in the
7 conduct of autopsies prior to your retirement from
8 the Saskatoon Police Service in 1991?

9 A I'm not aware, but, you know, I could be mistaken.
11:49 10 Things progressed, I changed, my responsibilities
11 changed, so I don't know if I can give you a
12 definite answer on that.

13 Q And in fairness -- just in terms of general police
14 operations in a general way, you would agree with
11:49 15 me that as technology improves, as medical science
16 improves and as our ability to collect and
17 understand evidence that is picked up and proved,
18 there has been changes in all aspects of police
19 investigation work. Is that a fair comment?

11:49 20 A Oh, very fair, and I can certainly indicate that
21 training had continued and had improved, methods
22 changed, science changed, so the police department
23 would attempt to keep up with those changes.

24 Q Now, you talked a little bit about the changes
11:50 25 since 1969 and 1970. I would like to go back to



1 1969 and specifically around the time of the Gail
2 Miller autopsy. I'll begin first with a general
3 question and I'll narrow it down subsequently to
4 my specific question, but generally what was the
11:50 5 relationship between the pathologist, such as
6 Dr. Emson, and the identification officer who
7 would be in attendance, and what I'm getting at is
8 would there be a pecking order, was there a case
9 of either one party instructing the other with
11:50 10 respect to the collection of evidence, I wonder if
11 you could explain that perhaps a little bit more?

12 A The autopsy is the pathologist's domain and the
13 police officer was there to seek the types of
14 evidence that would be appropriate for the
11:51 15 investigation that he is conducting and we had
16 very good co-operation with Dr. Emson and St.
17 Paul's Hospital in regards to that and we benefit
18 from the expert knowledge of the pathologists that
19 were there which helped us and we were able to
11:51 20 obtain the kinds of specimens and biological
21 evidence that was necessary for the proposal to --
22 or the sending to the crime lab for establishing
23 some definite principles.

24 Q Now, Dr. Emson testified that his primary concern
11:51 25 was to identify the cause of death and of course



1 the police officer's concern was to collect
2 evidence which would be of assistance in
3 identifying a possible perpetrator. If there was
4 a physical piece of evidence and it was unclear
11:52 5 whether or not that physical piece of evidence
6 collected during an autopsy would be of assistance
7 in possibly identifying the perpetrator, would --
8 I'm trying to get a sense as to whose call that
9 would be. Would it be a case of your deference to
11:52 10 Dr. Emson or would it be a case of Dr. Emson's
11 deference to you in identifying whether or not
12 that piece of evidence might be of assistance?

13 A It would be a police -- it would be a police
14 deference, yes.

11:52 15 Q But what if the police officer were not certain or
16 did not know or did not have the expertise to
17 assess whether or not that physical piece of
18 evidence would assist in identifying a
19 perpetrator? I'm obviously speaking about the
11:52 20 vaginal aspirate that was taken from Gail Miller.

21 A Yes.

22 Q At that time what knowledge did you have as to
23 whether or not that material might be of any
24 assistance in identifying a possible perpetrator?

11:53 25 A I think it would be fair for me to suggest that at



1 that particular time, 1969, basically the concern
2 would be whether there was sperm which indicated
3 that there was, that would support that there was
4 a rape.

11:53 5 Q And that was the extent of your knowledge at that
6 time?

7 A I think that was appropriate, right.

8 Q And if you had expected that Dr. Emson might
9 have -- if he was aware that this information or
11:53 10 that that physical evidence might be of some
11 assistance to you in identifying a possible
12 perpetrator, would you agree with me that you
13 would have expected him to have shared that
14 information with you?

11:53 15 A I'm sure he would have.

16 Q And the fact that he did not share it with you,
17 you surmised that that information would not be of
18 assistance in identifying who the perpetrator
19 might be; would that be a fair comment?

11:54 20 A Yes.

21 Q Now, I just want to deal a little bit with the
22 process of contacting victims after a conviction.
23 To some extent Mr. Fox has pre-empted me, as is
24 his right, with respect to that issue, but it
11:54 25 would be fair to say that in 1969 and 1970 there



1 wasn't a specific victim support services section
2 within the Saskatoon City Police; is that correct?

3 A Yes.

4 Q Since that time, and indeed as I understand it
11:54 5 during the time that you were the chief of police,
6 there has since been established a victim service
7 section within the Saskatoon Police Service; is
8 that correct?

9 A Well, I would not be surprised that that's
11:55 10 established, yes.

11 Q And it's my understanding that it was even
12 established during the time you were the chief, or
13 that at least it was in operation during the
14 period of time you were the chief?

11:55 15 A Well, I always wanted to believe that
16 investigators would always consider the victim in
17 all circumstances and I think the training that
18 was received by police officers would suggest that
19 there was an obligation on whatever level of the
11:55 20 police force, that there was an obligation to
21 attend to victims in terms of their needs.

22 Q You would agree with me, though, that it was not
23 somewhat more -- it wasn't formalize, though,
24 until the establishment of a victim services
11:55 25 section?



1 A That's right.

2 Q Now, Mr. Lockyer put it to you that it was unique
3 for the Saskatoon Police Service not to have any
4 contact with the media and perhaps not to disclose
11:56 5 to the complainants, and we do have evidence that
6 at least it was disclosed to Ms. (V5)---, but not
7 to have disclosed the fact to Mr. Fisher's victims
8 that indeed Mr. Fisher had pled guilty or been
9 convicted, he put it to you that that scenario was
11:56 10 unique. I would ask you to comment on how unique
11 the other aspect of that scenario is, how unique
12 is it in your experience that someone should be
13 apprehended in the process of committing an
14 offence in another jurisdiction and within a very
11:56 15 short period of time of having been caught in the
16 act confessed to crimes in which he had not
17 previously been suspected of having committed that
18 crime or he had not previously been linked in
19 another jurisdiction and then having that
11:56 20 individual transported to a completely different
21 centre from where the offences occurred and enter
22 a plea, how unique in your experience is that
23 scenario?

24 A Well, it is pretty unique to start with, and are
11:57 25 you still asking me whether we would advise the



1 media?

2 Q Well, not only that, but under those circumstances
3 how likely is it that the Saskatoon Police Service
4 or the investigators would even have been informed
11:57 5 of the disposition that had taken place in the
6 scenario I've described, in the unique scenario
7 I've described?

8 A Well, it obviously would be, it would be doubtful
9 whether they would be informed in the short period
11:57 10 of time.

11 MR. ELSON: Mr. Commissioner, this is
12 perhaps an appropriate time to break. I see it's
13 12 o'clock.

14 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, thank you.

01:34 15 (Adjourned at 11:58 a.m.)

16 (Reconvened at 1:34 p.m.)

17 BY MR. ELSON:

18 Q I wonder if I could have document number 25061 --
19 or pardon me -- 609 on the screen, please. This
01:34 20 is -- if we could go to the next page which I
21 believe is 610. Chief Penkala, I don't want to
22 refer to a specific passage in this report, but
23 this is a report that you have -- your attention
24 has been commended to not only by Commission
01:35 25 Counsel but also by Mr. Lockyer and also by



1 Mr. Fox. This is an investigation report by I
2 believe it was Sergeant Riddell at the time, if I
3 have his rank correct?

4 A He was an inspector.

01:35 5 Q An inspector at the time?

6 A Yes.

7 Q Okay. This is an RCMP investigation report and
8 you will recall that, as I understand it, the RCMP
9 were asked to assist in the murder investigation;
01:35 10 is that correct?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And there was not only this report but there would
13 have been other reports, notably -- and again I
14 keep forgetting the ranks -- but notably of
01:35 15 Edmondson and I believe maybe also one of
16 Rasmussen?

17 A Yes.

18 Q What was the normal practice with respect to
19 investigation reports that would be prepared by
01:35 20 the RCMP when they were assisting the Saskatoon
21 Police Service in the conduct of an investigation;
22 would there be a receptacle or a place where
23 copies of these investigation reports would exist
24 within the Saskatoon Police Department?

01:36 25 A Umm, I have no knowledge that these reports were



1 ever on Saskatoon files. Now I can tell by the
2 content that obviously that information had been
3 shared with our investigators and the case in
4 general, but I have no knowledge that any --
01:36 5 either one of those two reports were ever on our
6 file.

7 Q All right. And, in fact, would it be fair to say
8 that you would not expect RCMP reports of this
9 kind to be located on the City of Saskatoon Police
01:36 10 Service file?

11 A I think, if it was going to be on our report file,
12 it would show that a copy had been provided to the
13 Saskatoon Police Department, and I don't believe I
14 have seen that on this report.

01:37 15 Q In the same context you were aware, of course,
16 that the polygrapher from the Calgary Police
17 Service had been asked to assist in this file, and
18 it's my understanding that there was no
19 polygrapher with the Saskatoon City Police in
01:37 20 1969?

21 A That was my understanding, yeah, also.

22 Q And if another municipal police department was
23 asked to provide assistance to the Saskatoon
24 Police Service in the conduct of an investigation,
01:37 25 any reports generated by those officers would be



1 the property of those officers and the departments
2 by whom they were employed; is that correct?

3 A Umm, yes, that's -- that's an assumption that I
4 would take, yes.

01:37 5 Q And in this case, in terms of the polygraph
6 results of an examination done of Ron Wilson, that
7 may be a reason why the results have never been
8 found on any file within the Saskatoon Police
9 Service?

01:38 10 A Well, it appears that that's what happened, yes.

11 Q Now while we're talking about records you talked
12 at some length, and I don't want to spend much
13 time of it because it was the subject of the
14 Police Commission investigation as well, you
01:38 15 talked about the fact that there have been records
16 or files that went missing in the course of the
17 conversion to microfilm or to microfiche; is that
18 correct?

19 A From the report that I had access to from the
01:38 20 Saskatchewan Police Commission that was stated in
21 that report.

22 Q Since you testified I have had an opportunity to
23 make some inquiries, and I'd ask you to -- I'm
24 going to put a proposition to you and ask you
01:38 25 whether or not you have any facts within your



1 knowledge tending to suggest that I am wrong.

2 It's my understanding that there was a process of
3 conversion that involved purging of files which
4 lasted from 1962 until 1979, and that during that
01:39 5 period of 17 years files were converted into some
6 electronic or image form; does that accord with
7 your recollection as well?

8 A Yes.

9 Q So the files with respect to the (V1)-, (V2)-----,
01:39 10 and (V3)----- complaints, those files would have
11 been included in the material that was being
12 converted to microfiche and purged between 1962
13 and 1979?

14 A That's my understanding.

01:39 15 Q So if they were lost in the conversion process
16 they would have been lost, or at least a portion
17 of those documents would have been lost or
18 unavailable, as of 1979 at the latest?

19 A Umm, well I'm not, I'm not so sure just when --
01:39 20 when we first established that those files were
21 missing, I -- you know, I don't know that
22 specifically.

23 Q If we were to compare the process of record and
24 file retrieval between 1969, 1970, 1971 compared
01:40 25 to the process of file retrieval and record



1 retrieval around the time of your retirement in
2 1991, would it be fair to say that there was a
3 tightening-up of the process during that period of
4 time?

01:40 5 A Yes.

6 Q Is it fair to say that, although some files and
7 records could be signed out in the late 1960s or
8 early 1970s, it was a rather loose system and
9 there might not have been as much follow-up as
01:40 10 there was later on; is that fair comment?

11 A I don't know if I would call it a 'loose system'.
12 I think it's important to identify that it was a
13 manual system until somewhere in the early '70s,
14 and then some of the procedures of file-storing
01:41 15 and recording were, I guess you would call it
16 computerized today. Instead of having manual
17 index cards for keeping track of files it was
18 converted, my understanding was it was converted
19 to a microscopic or a -- or as -- a computer
01:41 20 system where it could be drawn up on a screen.

21 Q Okay.

22 A And then in 19, 1977 we moved from the old
23 building into the new building, and there was an
24 effort at that time to probably conclude some of
01:41 25 those transitions because there would be an awful



1 volume of files and papers that would have to be
2 moved maybe unnecessarily.

3 Q I see.

4 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Elson, I
01:42 5 wonder if I could interrupt from you and ask you
6 to try to find out from the witness, if you can,
7 were there three different phases to record
8 keeping; the first being hard copy, the second
9 microfilm, and the third computerized -- computer
01:42 10 stored files, because I'm confused as to --

11 MR. ELSON: I was just --

12 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- where microfilm
13 came into all this.

14 BY MR. ELSON:

01:42 15 Q Do you understand the Commissioner's questions
16 with respect to the storage?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Perhaps, if you could give an explanation, that
19 might assist the Commissioner?

01:42 20 A Yes. The keeping of records before they were
21 destroyed was a microfiche system, which was a
22 method of literally photocopying each page of the
23 documents which was -- then became a microfilm,
24 and then we had a viewing apparatus where the
01:42 25 microfilm could be placed into, and it would be



1 enlarged so that it would be useful to anyone that
2 wanted to go back on records. You know, the
3 process was after it was micro -- microfilmed, the
4 microfilm would come back from the, from the --

01:43 5 Q From the processor?

6 A -- from the processor, and there was a check made
7 of the sequence of those files on that microfilm
8 to ensure that nothing was missed, and then it
9 would be designated for -- the hard copies would
01:43 10 be designated for destruction.

11 The index cards, that's the
12 initial index to kind of acquaint you with what
13 the number and where that file would be, was
14 transferred at some point from a card file system
01:43 15 to a system that could be brought up on a
16 computer. I don't know the specific times of
17 those because I was -- we had a manager in charge
18 of the central records at that time.

19 MR. ELSON: Does that assist, Mr.
01:43 20 Commissioner?

21 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, to some
22 degree, but the problem with your question as it
23 began is this, that he said from '62 to '69 the
24 conversion process from hard copy to electronic
01:43 25 form took place, but it didn't take place all in



1 one jump --

2 MR. ELSON: No, it didn't.

3 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- from microfilm?

4 BY MR. ELSON:

01:44 5 Q My understanding, former Chief Penkala, is that
6 this was very much an evolutionary process that
7 took a number of years?

8 A Oh, very definitely, yes.

9 Q And at the end of the day, the idea was to ensure
01:44 10 as much as possible, at least after 1979, that
11 there would be some form of electronic backup for
12 the files as they existed or as they came into
13 existence; is that a fair assessment?

14 A Yes.

01:44 15 Q So although these, although a number of files, and
16 it's my understanding that there were more than
17 just the files pertaining to the (V1)- and
18 (V2)----- offences that were lost, there were a
19 number of other files that were lost in the course
01:44 20 that had not yet been microfiched but
21 unfortunately were purged before the microfiching
22 had occurred; is that correct?

23 A That's my understanding from the Saskatchewan
24 Police Commission's report.

01:44 25 Q Now, I want to talk a little bit about the conduct



1 of the Saskatoon Police Service after David
2 Milgaard was convicted and specifically in the
3 course of the investigation that was conducted by
4 the Department of Justice and the RCMP in 1990.
01:45 5 Yesterday I believe that there was a document that
6 Mr. Lockyer referred to, and I'm sorry, I don't
7 have the exact page, I believe it is Mr. Williams'
8 memorandum of July of 1990, and I should have made
9 a mental note of what that particular number was.

01:45 10 MR. GIBSON: It's 010019.

11 BY MR. ELSON:

12 Q Thank you, Mr. Gibson. If I could have that
13 document placed on the screen. You will recall
14 yesterday, yesterday morning specifically, that
01:46 15 Mr. Lockyer put this memorandum of Mr. Williams to
16 you dated July 5, 1990 and, in fairness, the
17 memorandum wasn't to you, it was to the file, and
18 he referred to the passage, that paragraph, I
19 wonder if I could have that blown up, please --
01:46 20 how do I get rid of the red line? I've forgotten
21 now. Oh, clear. Where in that paragraph
22 Mr. Williams indicates that the information he had
23 received from Mr. Wolch, I quote:

24 "... did not accord with the information
01:46 25 we had earlier received from the RCMP



1 and the Saskatoon City Police, who
2 advised us that there were not any
3 incidents of rape attributed to Larry
4 Fisher, which occurred in Saskatoon."

01:46 5 Prior to Mr. Lockyer presenting that memorandum
6 to you, I take it that you were not aware of this
7 memorandum or of the comment that Mr. Williams
8 made in it?

9 A No, I wasn't.

01:47 10 Q Now, I wonder if I could have document 248202
11 placed on the screen, please. Now, this document
12 that I've actually -- the first page is 248202,
13 but it then goes on for 94 pages and it's my
14 understanding that this contains information that
01:47 15 was collected not by Superintendent Goodman, whose
16 name appears on the first page, but rather
17 information that was collected by Sergeant R.A.
18 Pearson of the RCMP. Do you recall having met
19 Sergeant Pearson of the RCMP in the course of the
01:47 20 investigation that was done in 1990?

21 A I don't have any recollection. I know Sergeant
22 Pearson, but I don't have recollection of meeting
23 him in the time frame that you are seeking.

24 Q It's my understanding that Sergeant Pearson was
01:48 25 directly involved in the investigation and was



1 primarily operating in association with or under
2 Mr. Williams' instructions. Was that your
3 understanding or do you have any recollection to
4 that effect?

01:48 5 A Well, I've learned that since I've been here, yes.

6 Q Now, whatever information was provided to the
7 Department of Justice, is it fair to say that that
8 information would have been provided either to
9 Mr. Williams directly or to whichever RCMP officer
01:48 10 was delegated by Mr. Williams to assist him in
11 this investigation?

12 A I would assume that that's the process and I'm not
13 aware that the Saskatoon Police Department was
14 ever privy to this information.

01:48 15 Q Now, yesterday you were asked as to who the
16 liaison might be, or might have been rather,
17 between the Saskatoon Police Service and the
18 RCMP/Department of Justice during this
19 investigation in 1990 and I believe your answer
01:49 20 yesterday was that you didn't recall who that
21 liaison was. If I were to suggest to you that it
22 was Inspector Quinn, would that refresh your
23 memory in any way?

24 A Honestly I don't remember. I would be surprised
01:49 25 that there wasn't a liaison officer. I would



1 suggest that the liaison officer was appointed by
2 the person that was in charge of that particular
3 division of the police force. As I said
4 yesterday, Mr. Williams was free to contact me
01:49 5 directly, I was in the chief's office at that
6 time.

7 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You mean -- are
8 you saying liaison as between the SPS and the
9 Department of Justice?

10 BY MR. ELSON:

11 Q Yes, yes. And Inspector Quinn, what was his role
12 in 1990; do you recall?

13 A I'm not certain. He was an inspector, so in all
14 likelihood he was a patrol inspector possibly or
01:50 15 he could have been an inspector in the area of the
16 detective division. I don't know that for a fact.

17 Q Now, in the memorandum that I had earlier referred
18 to from Mr. Williams, it somehow suggests that the
19 Saskatoon City Police, or the Saskatoon Police
01:50 20 Service as it was then known at that time and
21 still is, was asked for information with respect
22 to any offences Larry Fisher had committed in
23 Saskatoon. Do you know, former Chief Penkala,
24 whether or not there was a specific request made
01:51 25 prior to that memorandum by the RCMP or the



1 Department of Justice with respect to whether or
2 not the police service was aware of any offences
3 committed by Mr. Fisher within the City of
4 Saskatoon?

01:51 5 A No.

6 Q Now I would like to refer to page, in this
7 document, page 248219 and specifically paragraph
8 70. In that paragraph Sergeant Pearson indicates:

9 "Called Regina City Police and talked to
01:51 10 S/Sgt. Kline. He will check the records
11 for the 1971 rape offence in Regina and
12 determine if it is available and if a
13 blood typing was done."

14 You are familiar with the CPIC records that would
01:52 15 exist today and that existed at that time that
16 Sergeant Pearson was conducting his investigation
17 in 1990, you are aware that such records exist;
18 is that correct?

19 A No, I'm not.

01:52 20 Q What I'm talking about is I'm talking about CPIC
21 records generally.

22 A Oh, the medium of, yes.

23 Q And CPIC records with respect to a particular
24 conviction would indicate where the conviction was
01:52 25 entered, that's your understanding; correct?



1 A Oh, yes, yes, that's right.

2 Q But if the conviction was entered in a judicial
3 centre or in a court other than for the area in
4 which the offence was committed, one would not be
01:52 5 able to know that in looking at a CPIC document;
6 is that correct?

7 A I think this is the area that you want to go. The
8 CPIC would indicate that there was a conviction
9 provided that that conviction was registered with
01:53 10 Ottawa.

11 Q Let me be more specific. In the case of Larry
12 Fisher we do now know, and the evidence and the
13 records indicate, that Mr. Fisher appeared in
14 court in Regina and his conviction was entered
01:53 15 into the Court of Queen's Bench in Regina with
16 respect to the Saskatchewan offences to which he
17 had pled guilty, notwithstanding the fact that the
18 Saskatchewan offences to which he had pled guilty
19 were committed in Saskatoon. That's the scenario.
01:53 20 Under those circumstances, you would agree with me
21 that the CPIC would show a conviction and it would
22 show the conviction entered into Regina, but it
23 would not show where the offences for which the
24 accused was convicted occurred?

01:53 25 A I guess that could happen, it could happen. I



1 think I'm somewhat -- if you were to call up a
2 criminal record on an individual, that criminal
3 record would indicate that the offence occurred in
4 Saskatoon, or at least the conviction occurred in
01:54 5 Saskatoon, but there are other messages that use
6 the same system and in those cases they are
7 abbreviated and possibly would not provide that
8 information.

9 Q If we could go to page 248240 and specifically
01:54 10 paragraph 190. In that paragraph it says, and I
11 quote, "Mr. Williams called --" and it refers to a
12 date, and I'm sorry, if we can show the date which
13 is on the left. That would appear -- I believe
14 that refers to a date of July 4 of 1990 which
01:54 15 roughly corresponds with the memorandum I had
16 earlier brought to your attention.

17 "Mr. Williams called, wanting to confirm
18 if Saskatoon City Police had any
19 information on convictions of Fisher in
01:55 20 Saskatoon in 1968 to 1970. It was
21 originally believed these were Regina
22 offences but is now believed Fisher went
23 to court in Regina and the offences
24 actually took place in Saskatoon."

01:55 25 So I take it it is, the scenario I put to you



1 from these documents is that up until that
2 memorandum of July 5, 1990 and up until the
3 conversation between Mr. Williams and Mr. Wolch,
4 there had been no request from the RCMP or the
01:55 5 Department of Justice of the City of Saskatoon
6 with respect to offences committed by Mr. Fisher
7 in Saskatoon?

8 A It would certainly appear that way.

9 Q So therefore when Mr. Lockyer suggests, as he did
01:55 10 yesterday morning, that the City of Saskatoon
11 withheld information from the Department of
12 Justice, you would agree with me that's not true?

13 A Yes.

14 Q I wonder if we can turn then to pages 248 and 249,
01:56 15 and actually if we could have 244 -- sorry, if we
16 could go back to 249. 248, 249, thank you. In
17 paragraph 240, from the information within that
18 paragraph:

19 "At this time Mr. Williams also revealed
01:57 20 that the report from Centurion
21 Ministries suggested that a source in
22 the Saskatoon Police Department provided
23 certain material which is not officially
24 released. This portion of the report
01:57 25 was vetted out and the identity is



1 unknown. Mr. Williams is also
2 interested in securing any old police
3 reports on the Saskatoon victims of
4 Larry Fisher. It should be noted that
01:57 5 this had been pursued previously and I
6 have been told by the city police
7 officials that these reports no longer
8 exist."

9 And the reason of course they no longer exist,
01:57 10 we've already canvassed, and that was as a result
11 of a process that you described having taken
12 place up to roughly 1977 and 1979?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Also Mr. Lockyer dealt with this matter yesterday,
01:58 15 if I could ask for paragraph 244 to be
16 highlighted. In that paragraph, partway down,
17 about the fourth line, it says:

18 "The suggestion is that city police
19 quietly had Fisher taken to court,
01:58 20 knowing he may have been involved in the
21 Miller offence. Mr. Williams will be
22 pursuing this further and apparently has
23 since talked with Sask. AAG Murray Brown
24 and the record suggests that this was a
01:58 25 preferred indictment brought in by the



1 provincial A.G., as Fisher was
2 represented by lawyer Lawrence Greenberg
3 of Winnipeg and the Regina appearance
4 was apparently a convenience. I have no
01:58 5 explanation why the victims were never
6 advised of the fact Fisher had been
7 convicted for these attacks. This
8 remains a mystery at this time."

9 From this, and consistent with the evidence that
01:59 10 you gave in answering Mr. Lockyer's questions,
11 would you agree with me it is apparent that the
12 decision for this matter to be dealt with in
13 Regina had nothing to do with the Saskatoon City
14 Police; is that a fair assessment?

01:59 15 A Yes.

16 Q And in fact, the Saskatoon City Police would have
17 no involvement and virtually no input in
18 determining where an accused would enter his or
19 her guilty plea?

01:59 20 A Yes.

21 Q Now, Mr. Lockyer spent some time yesterday talking
22 about the role and the responsibility of the
23 police to provide information to the counsel for a
24 convicted prisoner. Former Chief Penkala, in your
02:00 25 view how important in the operation of a police



1 service is the aspect of finality to an
2 investigation where that investigation has
3 ultimately resulted in either a conviction or an
4 acquittal and appeals have been exhausted, how
02:00 5 important is the aspect of finality, if at all, in
6 that assessment?

7 A Well, I think the fact of what the disposition
8 was, I think there's an interest in that, but once
9 that is established, I think the police force
02:00 10 would, and those interested in that particular
11 issue, would just forget about it and go on to
12 their next case or their case load that they have.

13 Q Is it practical for files to be kept open beyond
14 the date, for example, in this case of a
02:01 15 conviction and to continue to work on that file,
16 continue to collect evidence and continue to
17 assess evidence after a conviction has been
18 entered and after all of the appeals from that
19 conviction have been properly exhausted?

02:01 20 A Definitely not. It would be a waste of resource
21 time.

22 Q And typically, and going back also to that period
23 of time after 1970-'71 and after the application
24 for leave from the Supreme Court of Canada, how
02:01 25 busy was the police service? This may be a silly



1 question to ask of you, but how busy was the
2 police service and how much time would they have
3 to devote to ongoing investigations after a
4 conviction?

02:01 5 A I suppose the best way I could answer that, there
6 was constantly more work than we had resources to
7 do and you did have to prioritize your work, and of
8 course under the circumstances, unless you had
9 assigned somebody specifically, there would be no
02:02 10 interest in approaching a dead file in reality.

11 Q How common is it in your experience for
12 individuals, after conviction, to continue to
13 proclaim their innocence?

14 A Who would be -- you mean --

02:02 15 Q Generally speaking.

16 A The accused?

17 Q The accused, the convicted prisoner.

18 A Oh, I'm not aware of, other than this particular
19 case, I'm really not aware of any others.

02:02 20 Q Now, you are aware that there is a provision of
21 the *Criminal Code* which does permit a convicted
22 prisoner to make application to the Minister of
23 Justice for review on the grounds of a miscarriage
24 of justice. You are aware such a provision
02:02 25 exists?



1 A Generally, yes.

2 Q And you are aware that that provision was indeed
3 employed by Mr. Milgaard and his counsel on two
4 occasions, one unsuccessfully and the second time
02:03 5 successfully?

6 A Yes.

7 Q Other than, and to some extent I'm asking you a
8 legal question, and forgive me for doing so and if
9 you don't feel qualified to answer it I
02:03 10 understand, other than that provision of the law,
11 are you aware of any other provision of provincial
12 law, federal law or any regulation which
13 authorizes or gives authority to any municipal
14 police service to review cases post conviction
02:03 15 outside of a review done by the Minister of
16 Justice?

17 A That's the auspices under which I operated and I
18 don't believe there is, but I'm not a legal
19 person.

02:03 20 Q Now, my friend Mr. Fox pre-empted me and took away
21 my closing question that I wanted to ask you by
22 referring to the decision of the Supreme Court of
23 Canada and as he put it to you, the Supreme Court
24 of Canada, notwithstanding that they heard the
02:04 25 evidence of Larry Fisher, they heard the evidence



1 of Linda Fisher, they heard the evidence of
2 (V4)---- (V4)---, at the end of hearing all of
3 that evidence -- admittedly they didn't hear from
4 you, but they did hear from Eddie Karst -- after
02:04 5 hearing all of that evidence they came to the
6 conclusion that there was no police wrongdoing,
7 how vindicated or not did you feel from the
8 decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in the
9 result that they ultimately applied to that case?

02:04 10 A Well, because there was a great degree of
11 controversy and aggressiveness by the media, I
12 think we were vindicated to hear what came from
13 the Supreme Court.

14 Q Now, you had indicated that despite the fact that
02:04 15 there had been an earlier police theory indicating
16 that possibly the perpetrator of the 1968
17 offences, the (V1)-, (V2)----- and (V3)-----
18 offences may also have been the perpetrator of
19 Gail Miller's murder, and Mr. Lockyer asked you
02:05 20 some questions about that and you candidly
21 acknowledged that that was one of the theories
22 that was being assessed and employed at that time,
23 and then ultimately when evidence came to light
24 with respect to Mr. Milgaard and ultimately the
02:05 25 charge was laid, you indicated that the police



1 theory did not necessarily exculpate Mr. Milgaard,
2 I believe that was your evidence, the original
3 theory did not exculpate?

4 A Yes.

01:44 5 MR. ELSON: Mr. Commissioner, there is a
6 document that was disclosed in CaseVault -- and I
7 have had discussions with My Friend Mr. Frayer
8 and also with Commission Counsel -- which refers
9 to the opinion of former Justice William McIntyre
02:06 10 of the Supreme Court of Canada.

11 That opinion was apparently
12 disclosed to the Provincial Department of
13 Justice, and I gather was ultimately included in
14 the material that was provided to Commission
02:06 15 Counsel and, as a consequence of that, found its
16 way into CaseVault. I was wondering, I don't
17 have a copy of that opinion, that opinion
18 apparently has not yet been disclosed, but there
19 is a memorandum which summarizes the opinion of
02:07 20 Mr. -- of former Justice McIntyre with respect to
21 whether or not a miscarriage of justice had
22 occurred in this particular case.

23 I have spoken with Mr. Frayer,
24 Mr. Frayer is concerned about the fact that that
02:07 25 document did find its way into CaseVault, and he



1 is somewhat concerned that the solicitor and
2 client privilege may not have been waived, but
3 indeed it may have been waived, and unfortunately
4 he has not had an opportunity to seek
02:07 5 instructions.

6 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Who is the client?

7 MR. ELSON: Well, that's a good question,
8 and I'll have to let Mr. Frayer deal with that.

9 It was a document that I simply
02:07 10 found in the course of my search and, not to put
11 too fine a point on it, I was planning to put it
12 to former Chief Penkala to show that he was in
13 good company with respect to the opinions he had
14 of the case, and that was the context in which I
02:08 15 was wanting to put -- former Chief Penkala has
16 not seen that document, I would expect, I'm sure
17 he hasn't -- but Mr. Frayer was indeed concerned.

18 If it is your view, sir, that
19 the disclosure of that document, or the further
02:08 20 disclosure of that document and the raising of
21 that document before any witness ought to await
22 Mr. Frayer receiving instructions, then I won't
23 deal with it any further. But, in light of the
24 fact that it is in the material, I thought it
02:08 25 might be somewhat helpful to put it to the



1 witness as again -- as I say, again, simply to
2 show that he was in good company with the opinion
3 that he held.

4 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well the fact that
02:08 5 you don't put it to him at this time, of course,
6 won't prevent you from doing so in the future so
7 long as its relevant.

8 MR. ELSON: That's right.

9 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Frayer, do you
02:08 10 take any position on this?

11 MR. FRAYER: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.

12 I have had some discussions, as
13 have been outlined by Mr. Elson, with respect to
14 this particular document, and some discussions
02:09 15 with Commission Counsel at the same time.

16 I am concerned about the fact
17 that I have been unable to trace how this
18 document got into the hands of the Inquiry,
19 ultimately, other than to say that it appears to
02:09 20 have come from the Department of Justice to the
21 Government of Saskatchewan, to the RCMP when they
22 did their review in 1993, to the Inquiry.

23 And, without going into the
24 document itself, it's a memorandum from Douglas
02:09 25 J.A. Rutherford, who was at that time an



1 Associate Deputy Attorney General to the Deputy
2 Minister of Justice, and has as part of its
3 contents discussions that took place with the
4 Honourable W.R. McIntyre, Q.C., a former Justice
02:09 5 of the Supreme Court of Canada, then in practice
6 in the City of Vancouver.

7 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh.

8 MR. FRAYER: And so I haven't had an
9 opportunity to trace the background of this, I
02:10 10 was only advised of Mr. Elson's intentions late
11 yesterday afternoon, and we have had some
12 discussions with respect to it.

13 I'm having some difficulty with
14 respect to the relevance of it in any event. To
02:10 15 put, as I expect, the opinion or the thoughts of
16 a person whose advice was sought by the Minister
17 of Justice to this witness is a method by which
18 he is endeavouring to confirm that Chief Penkala
19 was of the same view as the -- as was
02:10 20 Mr. McIntyre. So --

21 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Umm, that is a
22 difficulty, one which I'm sure we can deal with
23 at some point in the future.

24 The business about
02:10 25 solicitor/client privilege, however, is of



1 immediate concern and, on the face of it, it
2 would seem to be a privileged communication --

3 MR. FRAYER: Yes.

4 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- for all we
02:10 5 know, and I would be reluctant to have it aired
6 at this moment without determining what that
7 position is with respect to privilege.

8 In the meantime, perhaps it
9 should be expunged from CaseVault until we -- it
02:11 10 can be re-introduced.

11 MR. FRAYER: All counsel have had access to
12 it but it isn't out in the general public.

13 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Now -- yes?

14 MR. WOLCH: If you could excuse my dress,
15 which has been explained, --

16 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.

17 MR. WOLCH: -- a few comments. This issue
18 will arise later, for certain, in the systemic
19 review of the -- of 690 in the sense that our
02:11 20 complaint has been, always has been that we have
21 never even seen this document until even now, and
22 we've always questioned how the Minister can make
23 a decision that we have no input as to the
24 Milgaard position on what is being given to
02:11 25 Justice McIntyre. We can't -- we never had a



1 chance to speak to him, to put forward our case,
2 to do anything at all, and that is one of the
3 systemic complaints that we will ask you to
4 address.

02:12 5 But, having said that, I think
6 the, one of the first issues on solicitor/client,
7 I think Mr. Frayer may wish to check -- I don't
8 know the answer to this -- whether Justice
9 McIntyre qualifies as a solicitor? I don't know
02:12 10 if he was practicing law.

11 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But he has just
12 said he was practicing law.

13 MR. FRAYER: Well, that's my understanding,
14 Mr. Commissioner. By that time I believe -- and
02:12 15 it's subject to confirmation -- that he was in
16 practice in Vancouver after having served as a
17 Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada.

18 MR. WOLCH: That would be the answer. I
19 don't know, I didn't know then if he was brought
02:12 20 in a quasi-judicial position or as a lawyer, but
21 in any event that issue will really be addressed
22 because one of our main concerns systemically was
23 that we were not allowed to speak to him at the
24 time to say 'well what about this' and 'what
02:12 25 about that'.



1 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Uh-huh?

2 MR. WOLCH: And so I'm not sure how helpful
3 it is to have the chief say he is in good
4 company, we don't know what Justice McIntyre had.

02:13 5 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well I'll cross
6 that bridge if -- when I have to, but not before.
7 The question of relevancy can await us, can await
8 further development, but privilege can't.

9 Mr. Hodson, if this document is
02:13 10 in CaseVault, can we remove it for the time?

11 MR. HODSON: If I can just -- my
12 understanding of the document, it's not the
13 actual opinion.

14 MR. ELSON: It isn't.

02:13 15 MR. HODSON: And Mr. Frayer had conveyed to
16 me earlier that they were claiming privilege on
17 the opinion given by Mr. Justice McIntyre to the
18 Minister, so I was aware of that opinion.

19 What this document is is a
02:13 20 memorandum from Douglas Rutherford to the Deputy
21 Minister, and I believe Mr. Rutherford was legal
22 counsel at the time?

23 MR. FRAYER: Yes.

24 MR. HODSON: And providing a summary of the
02:13 25 opinion, and I think Mr. Frayer's concern is that



1 in order to assert privilege over the opinion,
2 whether or not the disclosure of this memorandum
3 talking about the opinion may impact that waiver,
4 and it may well.

02:14 5 Now this document was given to
6 the government we believe some time ago, in the
7 early '90s I believe to the Government of
8 Saskatchewan, not the opinion but the memo
9 talking about the opinion.

02:14 10 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But it was from
11 the Federal Department of Justice to the
12 Saskatchewan Department of Justice?

13 MR. HODSON: A copy -- the memorandum from
14 Mr. Rutherford to the Deputy Minister which talks
02:14 15 about the opinion, --

16 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

17 MR. HODSON: -- a copy of that memorandum
18 was given to the Government of Saskatchewan we
19 believe in the early '90s, but for what purpose I
02:14 20 can't say.

21 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But the document
22 that you hold there was a Federal in-house
23 document; was it?

24 MR. HODSON: Yes.

02:14 25 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right. So



1 it's simply a derivative document to which, on
2 the face of it, the privilege would attach as
3 well if attached to the original.

4 MR. HODSON: And I think --

02:14 5 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: The fact that it
6 was transmitted to Saskatchewan, I suppose one
7 might say unless some restrictions were placed
8 upon it that would constitute a waiver of
9 privilege, but we don't know all that yet so why
02:15 10 don't we just put a lid on it somehow, to put it
11 in the vernacular.

12 MR. HODSON: Yeah, and if I can just
13 suggest a solution, and I think that's
14 Mr. Frayer's concern as expressed to me; twofold,
02:15 15 one, he wishes to be in a position to assess the
16 privilege issue and to make whatever argument he
17 wishes, and he may wish to say that it's still
18 privileged, in which case we would deal with it.
19 He's not in a position to deal with that today
02:15 20 but what I would suggest, this is on CaseVault,
21 the parties have it, it's not a public document,
22 and subject to what Mr. Elson has to say, who
23 wishes to use it, certainly that's the quandary
24 we're in right now. If he -- there is two ways
02:15 25 of going about it; one, he can put it to the



1 witness and use it and we try to preserve
2 Mr. Frayer's arguments saying that doesn't
3 prejudice it, but then the document becomes
4 public; or, of course, secondly we simply defer
02:15 5 it, allow Mr. Frayer to address the Commission on
6 the issue when he has instructions and time to
7 prepare, and I guess I would ask Mr. Elson how
8 that affects him? Because I can bring Mr.
9 Penkala back.

02:16 10 MR. ELSON: It really doesn't affect me a
11 great deal. And, in fact, I was aware the
12 document existed because I came across it. The
13 only reason it dawned on me at all was because
14 Mr. Lockyer, in the course of cross-examining
02:16 15 former Chief Penkala, was basically putting the
16 proposition to him in his question that Dr. (sic)
17 Penkala's opinion about the impact of the Fisher
18 evidence was extraordinary, and he was seeming to
19 suggest that no rational human being could
02:16 20 possibly hold such an opinion, and with the
21 greatest of respect I was wanting to hold Mr.
22 Justice McIntyre as being a rational human being.

23 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And not being, I
24 forget the expression, Mr. -- what was the noun
02:16 25 that was used?



1 MR. HODSON: I believe it was 'buffoon'.

2 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Buffoon. Okay,

3 yes, I can see your point. But it's something

4 that can be done later on, if indeed it's

02:17 5 relevant, so -- but at this moment the privilege

6 concern is --

7 MR. ELSON: Mr. Commissioner, for my

8 purposes, having raised it, I think I have just

9 accomplished what I wanted to accomplish.

02:17 10 MR. HODSON: Perhaps I could just suggest

11 that I will deal with Mr. Frayer on that, obtain

12 his position, and that I will advise counsel and

13 would ask counsel not to use this document

14 without first checking with either myself or

02:17 15 Mr. Frayer.

16 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well I'll make an

17 order to that effect.

18 MR. HODSON: Okay.

19 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Not to use it or

02:17 20 to disclose it to anybody. Thanks, Mr. Frayer.

21 MR. FRAYER: Thank you.

22 BY MR. ELSON:

23 Q Mr. -- former Chief Penkala, one final question,

24 and I'm going to make reference to an institution

02:17 25 that you have made comments about before, and that



1 is the media. This morning there appeared in the
2 National Post an editorial, specifically on page
3 A10 of the National Post an editorial by Brian
4 Hutchinson -- I don't have it and I'm not sure I
02:18 5 can pull it up. There are a number of passages I
6 suppose I could refer to but I will only refer to
7 one, and that is the one that appears up near the
8 top of the page. That image is suddenly becoming
9 darker, I don't know whether or not we have the
02:19 10 technological capacity to blow that up or not?

11 MR. HODSON: Yeah, we do.

12 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I think they can
13 do anything around here, Mr. Elson.

14 MR. ELSON: I'm impressed. If push comes
02:19 15 to shove I can probably just refer to the
16 passage, and it's the passage, it's the passage
17 here. Drop it down just a little bit, please.

18 BY MR. ELSON:

19 Q In that, Mr. Hutchinson makes a number of comments
02:19 20 with respect to the conduct of the Saskatoon City
21 Police and then makes reference to matters which
22 he conveys as being matters of fact, and
23 specifically he says:

24 "Mr. Wilson and Mr. Cadrain eventually
02:20 25 recanted, saying they had made up the



1 story because of pressure applied to
2 them by Saskatoon police."

3 And it goes on to talk about Nichol John.

4 To your knowledge, based upon
02:20 5 what you understand of this investigation, had
6 Mr. Albert (Shorty) Cadrain ever, to the day he
7 died, recanted the story he gave on March the
8 2nd, 1969 about David Milgaard having blood on
9 his clothes?

02:20 10 A I'm not aware that he did.

11 Q And if I were to suggest to you that the evidence
12 already received before this Commission of Inquiry
13 is that he did not, would that surprise you, that
14 he did not recant his story?

02:20 15 A No, it doesn't surprise me.

16 Q When you talk about your concerns about the media,
17 is this the kind of thing that you would have been
18 concerned about, is this an example of the kind of
19 thing that you would have been concerned about and
02:21 20 were identifying both to Commission Counsel and to
21 Mr. Lockyer in the questions that were being asked
22 of you?

23 A Exactly, and the amounts of such inferences by the
24 media, yes.

02:21 25 Q Thank you former Chief Penkala, I have no further



1 questions.

2 MR. HODSON: I'm not sure, I think we have
3 four more counsel to cross, I'm wondering whether
4 we might want to take the break now. We've got
02:21 5 --

6 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh yes, we --

7 MR. HODSON: And then I can sort out --

8 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: We stop at 3:30
9 today, don't we?

02:21 10 MR. HODSON: Yes, we stop at 3:30, so maybe
11 this is an appropriate time to break.

12 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: 15 minutes.

13 *(Adjourned at 2:21 p.m.)*

14 *(Reconvened at 2:39 p.m.)*

02:40 15 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Beresh?

16 **BY MR. BERESH:**

17 **Q** Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. Mr. Penkala, I will
18 not be long with you, and I can assure you that
19 the aim of my questioning is not to attract any
02:40 20 national media, in fact I have spent most of my
21 life trying to shun the media, --

22 MR. HODSON: Is there an objection?

23 MR. BERESH: -- not always successfully.

24 **BY MR. BERESH:**

02:40 25 **Q** Mr. Penkala, since 1969 through to the present



1 time, in your exhaustive review of files and
2 documents that have been made available to you in
3 your exhaustive involvement in this case, is it
4 correct that nowhere have you observed, in any of
02:40 5 the documents or in any of the information you
6 have received, any arrangement or agreement in
7 which Mr. Fisher was involved that his matters in
8 1970-71 would be dealt with in any location of his
9 choosing?

02:41 10 A Never.

11 Q Is it also correct, from that exhaustive
12 involvement and review, that you have seen no
13 agreement wherein there was any arrangement that
14 his judicial matters be dealt with in a fashion
02:41 15 where there would not be media present?

16 A No.

17 Q And is it correct as well, sir, that you are not
18 privy to any information which would suggest that,
19 in any respect, any sentence he received was
02:41 20 untoward or something that might be improper?

21 A Never.

22 Q Okay. There was discussion or a suggestion to you
23 I think yesterday that there was something
24 untoward about entry of pleas by him in Regina,
02:41 25 Saskatchewan; do you recall that?



1 A Yes.

2 Q I did -- I wonder, sir, if you are aware of
3 documented attempts by his Winnipeg lawyer to try
4 to have Saskatchewan matters waived to Manitoba
02:42 5 for concurrent resolution?

6 A I was not aware of that.

7 Q Okay. But I take it that wouldn't be unusual for
8 a lawyer to want to try to conclude all matters on
9 behalf of an accused in one location, at one time,
02:42 10 before one sentencing judge?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Okay. Let me suggest to you that the documents in
13 fact exist and that, as a result of legal opinion,
14 that could not be achieved. But I take it, sir,
02:42 15 that you likewise have no personal knowledge, or
16 even indirect knowledge, of any plea arrangements
17 between Mr. Fisher's then-counsel in Winnipeg and
18 Crown counsel?

19 A No, I don't have any.

02:42 20 Q You wouldn't be privy to any discussions vis-a-vis
21 having seen any memos or documents to that effect;
22 is that correct?

23 A That's correct.

24 Q Okay. But I take it you are aware of what we know
02:43 25 as the principle of global sentencing?



1 A Yes.

2 Q That is that, although somebody may commit
3 multiple offences, we take the view that they
4 should not receive individualized sentences but
02:43 5 one global sentence taking into account those
6 offences?

7 A Yes.

8 Q I take it you wouldn't be aware of whether or not
9 there was an arrangement for a global-type
02:43 10 sentence to be imposed on Mr. Fisher?

11 A I was not aware.

12 Q You wouldn't be aware, specifically, if there was
13 a -- there were discussions and an agreement for a
14 global-type sentence dealing with all of the
02:43 15 convictions of Mr. Fisher, even though the pleas
16 occurred in separate jurisdictions?

17 A I would have no information.

18 Q And, if a global sentence was in fact imposed,
19 then it would be incorrect and probably misleading
02:43 20 to suggest that he received not one day extra in
21 Saskatchewan; is that correct?

22 A That's right, yes.

23 Q You were asked, also, about the fact that Mr.
24 Fisher was transported to Regina instead of
02:44 25 Saskatoon and, for those of us who are not



1 geographically challenged, I take it you were
2 fully aware of the fact that there were RCMP
3 planes travelling from Prince Albert to Regina on
4 a regular basis?

02:44 5 A Yes.

6 Q Couriering either accused appearing in trial
7 courts or accused appearing in appellate courts in
8 Regina?

9 A Yes.

02:44 10 Q And my understanding, correct me if I'm wrong, is
11 that the appellate court criminal division, in
12 1969-'70, in the early '70s in Saskatchewan, sat
13 only at Regina?

14 A I don't know that for a fact, but that's
02:44 15 reasonable, yes.

16 Q Yes. So there would be nothing unusual about him
17 being taken from Prince Albert to Regina?

18 A I wouldn't think so.

19 Q Okay. And I take it, as well, you wouldn't be
02:44 20 aware of any discussions between his counsel at
21 the time and Crown prosecutors in Saskatchewan
22 about the convenience of defence counsel in terms
23 of resolution of the case?

24 A No.

02:45 25 Q But I take it you are now aware from information



1 you received, albeit not personal information,
2 that the plea took place in a public courtroom?

3 A Yes.

4 Q That the courtroom was not closed to the public?

02:45 5 A That's my understanding.

6 Q It was not closed to the media?

7 A That's my understanding.

8 Q Okay. Sir, I wanted to ask you very quickly,

9 yesterday you were shown the document by

02:45 10 Mr. Wolch -- and I could have it produced if you

11 wish -- which was a, I'll call it a schematic

12 prepared by the RCMP about similarities or

13 dissimilarities of the various allegations against

14 Mr. Fisher; do you recall that?

02:45 15 A Yes.

16 Q There was a large schematic?

17 A Yes.

18 Q All right. And I'm wondering in that regard, you

19 weren't asked this question, were you aware that

02:45 20 when that schematic was subject to judicial review

21 by Mr. Justice Allbright that, of those

22 allegations, only three were found to be similar?

23 A I wasn't aware of that.

24 Q Okay. You were never made aware of that; were

02:46 25 you?



1 A No.

2 Q Okay. And, in that regard, you were asked by Mr.
3 Fox, able counsel, today about the dissimilarities
4 and you agreed that there were dissimilarities?

02:46 5 A Yes.

6 Q Okay. You will recall, sir, that there was
7 discussion about -- a theoretical discussion about
8 whether Ms. Miller was attacked at or about the
9 scene where she was found, or whether she was
02:46 10 dropped there after having been attacked
11 potentially in a car; are you?

12 A Yes.

13 Q You will recall as well that, from information you
14 now have, Mary Marcoux went up to Ms. Miller's
02:46 15 body thinking that she was asleep or passed out in
16 the alley?

17 A I wasn't personally aware of that, but --

18 Q But you are now?

19 A Yes, yes.

20 Q You are aware that Linda Duffus claims that she,
21 independent of Ms. Marcoux, went up to the body?

22 A No, not specifically, no.

23 Q No? Let me advise you that that's, in fact, her
24 evidence; that people from the funeral home came
02:47 25 up around the body?



1 A Yes.

2 Q Okay. And the reason I ask that is because
3 obviously any markings in the snow which the
4 police might have believed to be marks of a
02:47 5 struggle could well have been explained by people
6 walking around curious as to whether the person
7 was conscious, needed help, in that regard; is
8 that correct?

9 A Umm, I didn't see it that way.

02:47 10 Q I appreciate that, but clearly that's one
11 interpretation one could reasonably put on the
12 circumstantial evidence; isn't that fair?

13 A I suppose that could be entertained, yes.

14 Q So, and if we accepted that -- and we're not
02:47 15 saying it's the truth or not -- but if we accept
16 that, then it would suggest that the body was
17 dumped after attack or after assault in the alley;
18 is that correct? That's one interpretation.

19 A That could be an interpretation I suppose.

02:48 20 Q Which would mean that a vehicle would have been
21 involved?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Which would have been a major distinction from any
24 of the other circumstantial modus operandi that
02:48 25 was found on that chart or anywhere else?



1 A Yeah, that would have been a difference, yes.

2 Q Total difference?

3 A Yes.

4 Q Okay. Sir, I was interested, you were asked about
02:48 5 Linda Fisher and why the police didn't follow up
6 on that or didn't do more, and I'm wondering; are
7 you aware that Linda Fisher, from proven
8 information, was a severe alcoholic?

9 A I didn't know that.

02:48 10 Q Were you aware that she had psychiatric problems
11 or psychiatric illness?

12 A I didn't know that.

13 Q Were you aware that she had knowledge of an
14 offered reward of some \$10,000?

02:49 15 A I was not aware of that.

16 Q Okay. That she was under the influence of alcohol
17 when she went to the police with her complaint?

18 A I wasn't really aware of that neither.

19 Q That she had a major falling out with her husband
02:49 20 and there was substantial animosity between the
21 two of them?

22 A I gathered that, somewhere along the lines, I had
23 some knowledge of that.

24 Q And of course there was a delay of some 10, 11
02:49 25 years before she came forward with her



1 information?

2 A Yes.

3 Q And, by that time, substantial information about
4 Gail Miller's death had been made public?

02:49 5 A Yes.

6 Q For example, it's my recollection that if anyone
7 followed David Milgaard's trial publicly, they
8 would have seen that it was believed that a paring
9 knife was involved?

02:49 10 A Yeah, very obviously that would have happened.

11 Q And, obviously, you found a paring knife handle at
12 the scene?

13 A I found the blade.

14 Q The blade, I'm sorry, which would have been made
02:50 15 public?

16 A Yes.

17 Q So for someone to take, it wouldn't have been
18 difficult for someone to take even that little bit
19 of information and use it to their own benefit, if
02:50 20 they just so chose?

21 A That's possible, yes.

22 Q I take it all of that information would have been
23 important in someone assessing the veracity of her
24 complaint?

02:50 25 A Yes.



1 Q And it may well have been that, had that been
2 known at the time, that no one would have pursued
3 the complaint; is that correct?

4 A Well I, I think that those would be reasons not to
02:50 5 pursue it.

6 Q Sir, you were asked about what occurred to police
7 files which were unsolved; can we talk about that
8 for a moment?

9 A Yes.

02:50 10 Q So, as I gathered yesterday and today and even
11 before in examination-in-chief, there were two
12 broad categories of police files, obviously,
13 solved and unsolved?

14 A Yes.

02:51 15 Q You told us that solved, I believe in 19 -- we're
16 talking the time frame of '69-'70, early '70s;
17 fair?

18 A Yes.

19 Q So, as I understood your evidence, the solved
02:51 20 files were microfilmed and eventually hard copies
21 destroyed after ten years?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Okay. Unsolved, though, remained, I take it, hard
24 copy?

02:51 25 A Yes.



1 Q Probably were never microfilmed, or were they?

2 A I'm not sure whether they were microfilmed or not.

3 Q Oh.

4 A But, in any event, they could have been
02:51 5 microfilmed but the hard copy would have been
6 retained. It had a different statutory
7 requirement to keep.

8 Q And would it have been retained, that is the
9 unsolved hard copy files, would they have been
02:51 10 retained at the police station, physically, or
11 some other location?

12 A Umm, at that time they would have been at the
13 police station, physically, in a separate locked
14 room.

02:52 15 Q Okay. So, so as Mr. Commissioner can understand,
16 from say '69 until the new building they would
17 have been retained at the police station?

18 A Oh, I'm sorry, we're talking about -- I just lost
19 track of that -- we're talking about the old
02:52 20 building. There was a dead storage lockup in the
21 old building as well, yes.

22 Q Okay. And so were unsolved files kept in dead
23 storage?

24 A Yes.

02:52 25 Q Okay. The reason I ask that is that we now hear



1 often about new departments within the police
2 forces where they deal with cold, they're called
3 'cold files'?

4 A Yes.

02:52 5 Q Are you aware of that phrase?

6 A Yes.

7 Q My understanding is that it refers to unsolved
8 cases?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Is that your understanding?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Was there a cold file unit, in 1969 and up to
13 1975, in the Saskatoon Police force?

14 A There was not.

02:52 15 Q Then who supervised the review of unsolved files?

16 A It would be, it would be a situation that the
17 department that was responsible, for example the
18 detectives for a murder file, that would be
19 constantly at the elbow of, of the coordinators
02:53 20 within that file, and basically unsolved crimes of
21 that nature were, were well-remembered by the
22 department as a whole.

23 Q I appreciate that, but you agree that police
24 personnel then, as now, change and move from
02:53 25 department to department?



1 A Yes.

2 Q Then whose job was it to supervise the review of
3 that, like every two years, every five years?

4 A I'm not certain that there was anybody in the time
02:53 5 frame that you have identified.

6 Q Was there a review process?

7 A I'm not aware of one specifically.

8 Q Like someone saying, 'well let's go back and look
9 at the files that we haven't solved'?

02:53 10 A I think that, if an issue came up, availability
11 would then exist to go back and re --

12 Q Okay.

13 A -- look at the record, yeah.

14 Q So was there either a hard copy or some type of
02:54 15 electronic copy of the list of those files?

16 A I'm not sure --

17 Q So I come into the department, morality, I'm
18 new -- and I would be a likely candidate for
19 morality -- I come into that department and I want
02:54 20 to know what files haven't been solved; is there
21 somewhere I can look at that list?

22 A I think you would have to go to central records
23 and they could provide you that, that list.

24 Q Had you ever seen such a list?

02:54 25 A I can't say that I have, specifically.



1 Q So I take it there was no specific protocol about
2 review of those files on a regular, ongoing basis?

3 A I'm not aware of a routine review.

4 Q And, just so we can dovetail that, what happened
02:54 5 to the unsolved file; how long did it remain open?

6 A Well some of those files, well those files are
7 never closed in reality, they may be inactive but
8 they are not closed, and the destruction of that
9 file would just simply not occur.

02:55 10 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I wonder if we
11 could see if there is a distinction between major
12 crimes and thefts, for example?

13 MR. BERESH: Thank you. Good point.

14 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: There must be
02:55 15 innumerable theft files which are closed but not
16 solved.

17 BY MR. BERESH:

18 Q So, without offending anyone, can we agree that
19 there is a major, there are major files which
02:55 20 cause, well let's say cause either serious harm,
21 serious assaults, murder, that sort of thing, --

22 A Yes.

23 Q -- as opposed to less-serious?

24 A Yes.

02:55 25 Q Was there a distinction in the period say 1969 to



1 1975, please, unsolved?

2 A A distinction between unsolved and -- in terms of
3 the type of file?

4 Q Let me put the question this way. Was there a
02:55 5 difference in the protocol or policy in terms of
6 destruction of unsolved files in categories of
7 serious versus not serious or minor?

8 A I don't think so.

9 Q That is, were some minor files closed simply
02:56 10 because they were minor, even though they were
11 unsolved?

12 A Yes.

13 Q But some -- but the major ones were not closed?

14 A The major ones were not closed.

02:56 15 Q And we see --

16 A A murder, a murder file would not be closed.

17 Q Okay. So, and when you say 'not closed', does
18 that mean that the hard copy remained at the
19 police station all the time?

02:56 20 A Yes.

21 Q Was never microfilmed?

22 A I can't be sure whether that would have been
23 microfilmed but a hard copy would be retained. As
24 a matter of fact, during my tenure as the chief, I
02:56 25 had directed that files of that nature be



1 catalogued and put together because we didn't have
2 anyone specifically assigned, and sometimes these
3 files get kind of --

4 Q And --

02:56 5 A And we -- and I had them assign someone to
6 specifically go through them, catalogue them, so
7 that if you were referring to any specific aspect
8 of it, it would be easily retrievable.

9 Q And when was that done, sir, that you asked for it
02:57 10 to be catalogued?

11 A I became chief in '82, so it would be sometimes
12 between '82 and my retirement in '91.

13 Q Prior to that, had there been the cataloguing
14 process that you put in place?

02:57 15 A There may have been, but under, under direction of
16 another supervisor, or maybe specific cases were
17 set out that way.

18 Q Now I want to get back, I want to press you on
19 this if I can. Was there, or had you ever seen a
02:57 20 physical list, before you became chief, of
21 unsolved cases identifying the nature of the
22 allegation; murder, sexual assault, name of
23 deceased, complainant, victim?

24 A No, I didn't see one.

02:57 25 Q Is there anyone who you think may be testifying at



1 this Commission who can tell us whether or not one
2 existed, or would have more knowledge than
3 yourself?

4 A I don't know. As I said a few moments ago, that
02:58 5 responsibility would lie with the manager of
6 central records, and he would have been in a
7 position -- at that time it was a Mr. Gerry
8 Keelan -- he would have been in a position to help
9 any supervisor or any investigator to retrieve and
02:58 10 find cases that, that needed to be referenced.

11 Q But Keelan, I understood, was off-premise?

12 A No.

13 Q He was on-premise?

14 A Oh yes.

02:58 15 Q But supervised the off-premise location?

16 A No, the -- all of the, all of the record system
17 was on-premise.

18 Q Okay, all throughout 1969 and 1970?

19 A Oh yes.

02:58 20 Q Okay. And available for access by anyone -- a
21 member of the police force?

22 A Yes, and only by permission. It was -- it was
23 secured to the point that you would have to
24 inquire and, as long as you were a police officer,
02:59 25 you would be provided the opportunity to even take



1 the file out if you so desired.

2 Q Would you have to sign in so we would know who
3 accessed what files?

4 A You would have to sign for the file, yes.

02:59 5 Q Okay. This is an obvious question but, for the
6 record, let's make it clear. Obviously, Larry
7 Fisher had no control over any police files?

8 A No, oh no, nope.

9 Q Larry Fisher never entered into any agreement that
02:59 10 his files be destroyed in any way, or lost, or
11 anything else?

12 A I don't know how.

13 Q I wouldn't think so. Finally, sir, I'm interested
14 in one area which is -- are these binders. My
02:59 15 understanding is that the binders that you kept at
16 your home were two in number?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And they included material relevant to this case?

19 A Relative to this case, yes.

02:59 20 Q And I apologize, I'm not sure and I'm not clear in
21 my mind; when did you start to accumulate that
22 material?

23 A Actually it was accumulating at the time of the
24 incident, which was in 1969, and then it
03:00 25 progressively grew. Most of the contents of those



1 personal files were copies of my own reports.

2 Q Let me be clear. I understand when the materials
3 surfaced and were recorded, my question is when
4 did you start to, first start to accumulate the
03:00 5 materials in the binders?

6 A Oh, I -- specifically what happened is when I left
7 work I took the file, which was loose copies, I
8 took that with me and took it home, it -- I
9 interpreted it as my property, I took it home.
03:00 10 Later, with all the controversy surrounding this
11 very case, I sat down and put these copies in a
12 sequence of date-wise and put them in the binders.

13 Q And were your superiors, or at least the then, the
14 chief who followed you, was he aware you had the
03:00 15 file?

16 A I don't know if he was or not.

17 Q Was it with his permission that these items were
18 copied and kept?

19 A I don't think I had to get permission from him.
03:00 20 Those were my copies. I dictated those reports, I
21 wrote them. As far as I was concerned they were
22 my personal --

23 Q Had you ever done that with any other file in
24 which you were directly or indirectly involved as
03:01 25 a police officer?



1 A I'm not sure. I think I have. I can't just
2 specifically -- they were reserved to the very
3 serious type of investigations that were taking
4 place which involved considerable time and the
03:01 5 expectation that you might at some time have to
6 return with information.

7 Q And finally, sir, you had those binders I take it
8 then in 1997, '98, '99?

9 A Yes.

03:01 10 Q And you were aware that Mr. Sinclair, Mr. Johnston
11 were prosecuting Mr. Fisher?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Is it correct that the existence of those binders
14 was not made known to either of those prosecutors?

03:02 15 A I don't recall other than the fact that I had my
16 notebook. I was visited by RCMP officers who I
17 guess took a statement from me, I don't recall
18 signing a statement, but they interviewed me and
19 of course I testified at the preliminary and at
03:02 20 the trial of Larry Fisher.

21 Q Did you reveal to the RCMP that you personally had
22 those two binders?

23 A I don't recall if I did or not. There would be no
24 reason not to reveal it.

03:02 25 Q Did you ever reveal to Mr. Johnston or Mr.



1 Sinclair that you had those binders?

2 A I don't know at this stage. There would have been
3 no -- there would have been no reason to deny that
4 I had them, that would be for sure, but --

03:03 5 Q Well, did they ask that you produce them?

6 A No, not that I'm aware of. I don't remember that
7 being --

8 Q By 1997, even though you weren't chief and not
9 involved directly with police matters, you were
03:03 10 well aware of the Supreme Court of Canada's
11 decision in Stinchcomb as you mentioned this
12 afternoon?

13 A Yes.

14 Q And the need to disclose?

03:03 15 A Yes.

16 Q Did Mr. Sinclair or Mr. Johnston ever ask for
17 those binders, to either review them, to look at
18 them?

19 A Well, basically the information that's in those
03:03 20 binders would have been shared with them and
21 whether they saw them or not, they would in
22 fact -- I would suspect that they would even have
23 copies of those reports.

24 Q Where was it shared with them, please, physical
03:03 25 location?



1 A Where was it shared with them?

2 Q Yes. You said you shared it with them?

3 A Well, they would have, Sinclair and Mr. Johnston
4 would have had access to the police file I would
03:04 5 think.

6 Q I appreciate that. I just want to focus on the
7 binders if we can. Did you physically take the
8 binders and show it to them or did they go to a
9 location where you had the binders or go to your
03:04 10 home and look at them, please.

11 A No, I don't recall showing them the binders nor
12 them asking me about them.

13 MR. BERESH: I see. Those are my
14 questions, sir.

03:04 15 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks.

16 BY MR. PRINGLE:

17 Q Mr. Penkala, I'm Alex Pringle, I'm counsel for
18 Calvin Tallis. I doubt whether my questions will
19 even attract local media attention.

03:04 20 There was a suggestion yesterday
21 that the Crown's case back in 1970 against David
22 Milgaard as it approached the trial was not a
23 strong case. Do you remember that?

24 A Yes.

03:05 25 Q You are aware of the major evidence that the Crown



1 had against Milgaard back prior to trial in 1970,
2 the evidence of Cadrain, John, Wilson, Melnyk,
3 Lapchuk?

4 A Yes, in generalities, yes.

03:05 5 Q Looking at it from the point of view of defending
6 this case, this was not an easy case to defend
7 when you had witnesses giving, you know,
8 potentially giving testimony that was contemplated
9 at that trial; is that fair to say?

03:05 10 A Yes, very much so.

11 Q And there wasn't -- were you aware of any, back in
12 1970, were you aware of any motive as to why
13 Messrs. Lapchuk or Melnyk would want to fabricate
14 testimony against Mr. Milgaard?

03:06 15 A No.

16 Q And yesterday with respect to -- yesterday and
17 today you've been asked about disclosure and I
18 gather that you were not involved yourself in the
19 process of determining what disclosure Mr. Tallis
03:06 20 should have received?

21 A That's correct.

22 Q So you are not aware of what disclosure or lack of
23 disclosure that he received when he was preparing
24 for the defence of David Milgaard?

03:06 25 A That's correct.



1 Q Mr. Tallis -- I gather, let's put it this way, Mr.
2 Penkala, by the time this trial came along, you
3 would have been a police officer for 15 1/2 years?

4 A That's approximately right, yes.

03:07 5 Q And you were the head of the identification
6 department?

7 A Yes.

8 Q So you would have had more than a passing
9 familiarity with the court system and the criminal
03:07 10 justice system in Saskatoon?

11 A Yes.

12 Q You were aware of, probably aware and had observed
13 many of the lawyers in Saskatoon?

14 A At that time, yes.

03:07 15 Q And Mr. Tallis, how would you rate him as far as
16 being a criminal defence lawyer at that time?

17 A My understanding of Mr. Tallis at that time, that
18 he was the best defence lawyer in Saskatchewan. I
19 remember him as a very thorough, very thorough
03:07 20 defence lawyer and yet a very fair person and I
21 don't know of any specifics, but I appeared before
22 him and I always thought he was a gentleman.

23 Q And that would be what you felt his reputation to
24 be at the time that he took this case back in 1969
03:08 25 and then represented Mr. Milgaard at the trial in



1 1970?

2 A Yes, and one of the things, that people that would
3 have to come before the cross-examination of
4 Mr. Tallis were in some fear because they knew of
03:08 5 his thoroughness and a police officer on the
6 witness stand wants to do a good job, so he was a
7 very thorough, very thorough defence counsel.

8 MR. PRINGLE: Thank you very much. Those
9 are my questions.

03:08 10 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks.

11 BY MR. WILSON:

12 Q Chief Penkala, my name is Garrett Wilson, I
13 represent Serge Kujawa, and I'm from that school
14 similar to that of Mr. Elson where once a chief,
03:09 15 always a chief, so I will regard you as chief
16 today.

17 A Thank you very much.

18 Q Now, I was interested in your comments on Calvin
19 Tallis, defence lawyer, as he was in 1970. I was
03:09 20 also listening with interest the other day when
21 Mr. Lockyer put to you some questions about my
22 client Mr. Kujawa. In 1971, the 1970s generally
23 and the 1980s generally you were either a senior
24 officer in the Saskatoon Police Force or the chief
03:10 25 thereof?



1 A Yes.

2 Q Did you come to know Mr. Kujawa and his employment
3 with the Department of Justice in Regina during
4 those years?

03:10 5 A Yes, I had dealings with Mr. Kujawa, not
6 specifically with this case that's before this
7 Inquiry, but as the chief of police I had
8 opportunities and the privilege of seeking his
9 advice on legal issues and he was always readily
03:10 10 forthcoming with information, information that
11 sometimes you may have been disappointed with
12 learning, but he was respected to the point that
13 if Mr. Kujawa said that's the way it is, I don't
14 think there was anybody that would deny him the
03:11 15 right of making that kind of a decision.

16 Q He was the director of public prosecutions in the
17 Department of Justice during most of the period I
18 speak of?

19 A Yes.

03:11 20 Q I take it from the explanation you just gave me,
21 that you held his advice in high regard?

22 A Very much so.

23 Q You found him very competent in his professional
24 duties?

03:11 25 A Yes.



1 Q How about his integrity and standards of honesty?

2 A Oh, there was no -- it was never questioned.

3 Q The sort of person who might be involved in a
4 coverup such as we've been hearing in this
03:11 5 Inquiry?

6 A I can't even think of it in those terms. That's
7 just not -- that's just not Mr. Kujawa.

8 Q Uh-huh. Could we look at 261053, please. You
9 were queried about this piece of correspondence by
03:12 10 Mr. Lockyer I believe?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And Mr. Lockyer felt free to question you about
13 Mr. Kujawa's knowledge and responsibilities, you
14 were questioned about this letter. I notice it is
03:12 15 addressed to the attention of K.W. MacKay, Crown
16 solicitor?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Do you know Mr. MacKay as well?

19 A I know of him, I don't know him.

03:13 20 Q But he was a Crown solicitor in the Department of
21 Justice at that time?

22 A Yes, that's how I -- that's what it reminds me of,
23 yes.

24 Q Are you aware of any protocol or procedure that
03:13 25 was in place in the Department of Justice in 1971



1 that would require Mr. Kujawa to reply to Mr.
2 MacKay's mail?

3 A I don't know their policies and procedures at all,
4 but it sounds highly unlikely.

03:13 5 Q I would think so. Would you take that down,
6 please. Now, my notes from your service records
7 suggest that in 1962 you were an identification
8 officer with the Saskatoon Police Department?

9 A Yes.

03:14 10 Q Did you, in May of 1962, have any part in the
11 investigation of a murder of a young nurse on the
12 river bank in Saskatoon near the weir?

13 A I did not, but I'm aware of the murder.

14 Q You are aware of the file, a young lady by the
03:14 15 name of Alex Wiwcharuk?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Date of death, 18th of May, 1962?

18 A That seems about right, yes.

19 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What was her name,
03:14 20 Mr. Wilson?

21 MR. WILSON: Wiwcharuk, W-I-W-C-H-A-R-U-K.

22 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks.

23 BY MR. WILSON:

24 Q She was, I believe, 20 years of age?

03:15 25 A That's approximately right.



1 Q Her body was not found on the day of death in that
2 instance I believe, but some days later, some
3 attempt had been made to cover up the body?

4 A She was buried in a shallow grave on the river
03:15 5 bank, yes.

6 Q That was a highly-publicized murder and subsequent
7 investigation in Saskatoon?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Still unsolved?

03:15 10 A Still unsolved as far as I know.

11 Q And has received some recent publicity in fact?

12 A Quite recently I recall reading.

13 Q Yes. So speaking of cold cases, this one has come
14 up for review and has been worked upon?

03:16 15 A That would be a prime example of cold case review,
16 yes.

17 Q A couple of questions about that case relative to
18 the work you were doing in the Gail Miller murder.
19 Was any thought given to a comparison between that
03:16 20 1962 killing and the one you were dealing with in
21 January of 1969?

22 A I suspect there was. I don't have a specific
23 recollection. I know that the Wiwcharuk murder
24 was also a sex attack, so I would think that
03:16 25 probably that was brought back into the minds of



1 the investigators at that moment, not only just
2 for comparison, but there's always a desire to
3 solve cases regardless of how old they are.

4 Q Can you tell us whether there was another sex
03:17 5 killing of a young woman in Saskatoon between 1962
6 and 1969 when the Gail Miller murder happened?

7 A I can't off the top of my head. Between 1969
8 and --

9 Q Between '62 and '69.

03:17 10 A Oh, '62 and '69. I can't from, just from my
11 general knowledge, I can't think of any specific
12 case.

13 Q If there was an unsolved murder of that sort out
14 there, you would remember it; would you not?

03:17 15 A Oh, yes, and I'm starting to recall, we had a
16 murder at the Saskatoon golf course, I think it
17 remains unsolved.

18 Q And what year did that happen?

19 A I believe that was '62. I'm sort of guessing at
03:17 20 that, but --

21 Q That was also a young female was it?

22 A No, that was an elderly gentleman and he was a
23 janitor at the clubhouse at the golf course.

24 Q Can you tell us if there was any feeling of
03:18 25 additional pressure to solve the Gail Miller



1 murder because of the still outstanding 1962
2 murder we're speaking of?

3 A There was certainly pressure to solve the crime,
4 but I don't think it was related to any other
03:18 5 outstanding unsolved crimes. I think most
6 credible police officers recognize the importance
7 of pursuing and solving a serious crime and I
8 think every police officer, at least that's my
9 feeling, is under pressure to do whatever is
03:18 10 possible to find the perpetrator.

11 Q And do you recall any political or media pressure
12 in 1969 relating back to the '62 killing?

13 A Not really. I think there was publicity about its
14 occurrence, but -- there certainly was about the
03:19 15 Wiwcharuk, there was probably more about the
16 Wiwcharuk case than there was about the Hartz
17 case, that was the male person. Certainly there
18 was publicity.

19 Q Now, speaking about sentencing, I want to be
03:19 20 delicate about this, chief, but it wouldn't
21 surprise me if you shared what I suggest is a
22 general feeling among the police and prosecutors
23 in Saskatchewan that the judiciary is somewhat
24 lenient on sentencing in this province?

03:19 25 A Well, I suppose our personal thoughts, if you get



1 into our personal thoughts and because of the
2 involvement, I'm sure that police officers think
3 in those terms, but I don't think they would dare
4 voice them publicly.

03:20 5 Q No, of course not, but they would harbour those
6 feelings when they see one of their customers back
7 on the street a lot earlier than they would prefer
8 to see them?

9 A I think that's a fair assessment, yes.

03:20 10 Q Now, Mr. Beresh was asking you about the global
11 sentencing with respect to Mr. Fisher and the fact
12 that the 10 year sentence concurrent out of
13 Saskatchewan didn't add any time to the 13 years
14 he had already received in Manitoba; correct?

03:20 15 A That's right.

16 Q And I believe we have evidence before us that Mr.
17 Fisher was out on the street again in 1980 and in
18 1980, in fact within a few months of that,
19 committed a very vicious rape and a determined
03:20 20 attempted murder in North Battleford; correct?

21 A I think that's right, yes.

22 Q And he was convicted of that offence and appeared
23 for sentencing?

24 A That's correct.

03:21 25 Q And when he appeared for sentencing, he would have



1 had on his record at that time the two convictions
2 from Manitoba and the four from Saskatchewan; is
3 that correct?

4 A Yeah.

03:21 5 Q Six vicious rapes, or five vicious rapes and one
6 indecent assault; right?

7 A Should have, yes.

8 Q And that he had already served a sentence of 13
9 years?

03:21 10 A Yes.

11 Q And now only by a fluke did he escape a murder
12 charge, but he's up against a very vicious,
13 heinous crime. One would expect that the
14 sentencing he would receive for that would be in
03:21 15 excess of the one that he had previously served;
16 wouldn't you agree?

17 A Well, again, it goes back to personal opinions and
18 I always felt that it was improper for a police
19 officer to get involved in those issues.

03:22 20 Q But there still is an elevated level of punishment
21 assumed to exist within the system; is there not?

22 A Oh, yes, of course.

23 Q But in fact, as we know, Fisher received only 10
24 years for that offence in North Battleford; is
03:22 25 that correct?



1 A I don't know for a fact.

2 Q I think that's in evidence before us.

3 A Yeah.

4 Q May we have document 324970. This is a letter
03:23 5 about which we've heard so much in the last few
6 days, chief, written in April, 1991, and you make
7 some strong comments, you express some strong
8 opinions about the media. Now, there was a second
9 high profile murder trial that took place in
03:23 10 Saskatoon some years before that, the Colin
11 Thatcher trial in 1984. Do you recall that?

12 A Yes.

13 Q The offence occurred in Regina, but the trial took
14 place here?

03:23 15 A Yes.

16 Q Conviction took place in the fall, November I
17 think, of 1984, the appeal process was followed,
18 Saskatchewan Court of Appeal, Supreme Court of
19 Canada finally I think rendered a decision in
03:24 20 1987, and that was a situation where there were
21 strong contentions of wrongful conviction; were
22 there not?

23 A I understand -- I remember this going on, but the
24 specifics is pretty difficult. I had maybe not as
03:24 25 much interest in that case as I had in our



1 home-grown cases.

2 Q True, but a lot of that was happening in
3 Saskatoon, there was an application by Thatcher
4 under 690 of the Code then for a review by the
03:24 5 Federal Minister of Justice. Were you aware of
6 that?

7 A No, not specifically.

8 Q Your department was not involved in any way with
9 the investigation that was called for by that
03:24 10 application?

11 A I'm not aware that we were.

12 Q Do you recall the media being rather replete with
13 claims of wrongful conviction on the part of
14 Thatcher and his supporters?

03:25 15 A Again, I don't know how I could not remember, but
16 I don't seem to have any recollection of what
17 actually --

18 Q Well, I was going to suggest to you that the air
19 was so thick with claims of wrongful conviction in
03:25 20 the late 1980s and early 1990s that even a saintly
21 chief of police might be provokable arising out of
22 two different cases. However, if you don't
23 recall, I'm going to leave it.

24 Some of the allegations that
03:25 25 were made in the Milgaard matter respecting your



1 department were extreme in the least. Do you
2 recall an allegation being made by counsel on
3 behalf of Mr. Milgaard and carried by the media
4 that two of the Crown witnesses in the Milgaard
03:26 5 trial had been paid, specifically Lapchuk and
6 Melnyk?

7 A I don't have personal knowledge of that, but I
8 think I heard that before.

9 Q Yeah. That couldn't have happened without the
03:26 10 complicity of your department could it?

11 A I would not think so.

12 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I'm sorry, I don't
13 know if you purposely avoided naming the counsel
14 who made such allegations, but would you mind
03:26 15 doing so if you know his name, as long as you can
16 tell us it was or wasn't the trial counsel.

17 MR. WILSON: No, it was Mr. Wolch.

18 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Pardon me?

19 MR. WILSON: Mr. Wolch made those
03:26 20 allegations.

21 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right.

22 BY MR. WILSON:

23 Q And specifically Mr. Wolch claimed publicly that
24 the witnesses had been bought and paid and the
03:27 25 remuneration was a reduced sentence on some



1 criminal matters they were facing in Regina?

2 A I heard about it, but I wasn't a party or I wasn't
3 specifically informed on that.

4 Q So what's your reaction when you hear a comment
03:27 5 like that being made about your department, chief?

6 A It's very hurtful, especially when in your heart
7 you know that you've never experienced or known
8 any people within the department that would stoop
9 to those tactics.

03:27 10 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I'm sorry, I
11 missed your answer to the question. Do you
12 regard the -- do you recall Milgaard's counsel
13 having made such an accusation, I missed your
14 answer.

03:27 15 A No, I don't recall that specifically, no.

16 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But in general you
17 would find such comments hurtful?

18 A Yes.

19 BY MR. WILSON:

03:28 20 Q Many of the statements you make in your letter of
21 April 17th, of course, I suggest could have had
22 equal application to the case of Colin Thatcher,
23 who is also pleading wrongful conviction; would
24 you agree?

03:28 25 A That could be. I'm not very familiar with the --



1 Q Everything you say in your letter about the due
2 process and the administration of justice would
3 have been correct in the Thatcher case, in which
4 all those contentions of wrongful conviction were
03:29 5 made but were never established; correct?

6 A Yes, in my case that's the feeling, and that's
7 what I felt.

8 Q In your 37 years in law enforcement did you ever
9 encounter another case where someone convicted of
03:29 10 an offence was later discovered not to have
11 committed that offence?

12 A No, this is the first one.

13 Q First and only one is the Milgaard affair?

14 A Yes.

03:29 15 Q In 37 years of your hands-on experience?

16 A That's right.

17 Q Have there been perhaps one or two occasions when
18 someone you were quite convinced of being guilty
19 was acquitted?

03:29 20 A Yes, in my opinion there were a lot of people that
21 were acquitted that I felt were guilty.

22 Q And if we believe the adage that *better ten guilty*
23 *go free than one innocent be convicted* that means
24 the justice system, in your experience, worked
03:30 25 pretty well; didn't it?



1 A Yes, I accept that, yes.

2 Q It's not a perfect system, it's run by human
3 beings. When you go on to say in the bottom
4 paragraph of the first page of your letter that
03:30 5 our justice system is recognized as the best in
6 the world, Mr. Wolch gave you some query on that;
7 do you still hold to that belief?

8 A Yes I do.

9 Q I suggest that you may find it well-shared with
03:30 10 others in this room.

11 A I'm, I'm encouraged by that.

12 Q Thank you, chief.

13 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks,
14 Mr. Wilson.

03:31 15 MR. HODSON: I believe Ms. Knox is next, it
16 is 3:30 and I believe she will be more than a
17 minute.

18 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: More than a
19 minute? So we're 1:00 Monday?

03:31 20 (*Adjourned at 3:31 p.m.*)

21

22

23

24

25



OFFICIAL QUEEN'S BENCH COURT REPORTERS' CERTIFICATES:

We, Karen Hinz, CSR, and Donald G. Meyer, RPR, CSR,
Official Queen's Bench Court Reporters for the Province of
Saskatchewan, hereby certify that the foregoing pages
contain a true and correct transcription of our shorthand
notes taken herein to the best of our knowledge, skill,
and ability.

_____, CSR

Karen Hinz, CSR

Official Queen's Bench Court Reporter

_____, RPR, CSR

Donald G. Meyer, RPR, CSR

Official Queen's Bench Court Reporter



\$

\$10,000 - 9840:5,
9921:14
\$2,000 - 9827:14

'

'62 - 9884:23, 9943:9,
9943:10, 9943:19,
9944:12
'68 - 9826:21, 9838:17,
9843:6, 9847:2
'69 - 9780:17, 9780:20,
9781:15, 9808:11,
9828:20, 9829:14,
9830:3, 9830:4,
9843:12, 9845:5,
9845:6, 9845:8,
9845:17, 9884:23,
9924:16, 9943:9,
9943:10
'69-'70 - 9923:16
'70 - 9810:19, 9868:3
'70s - 9882:13,
9917:12, 9923:16
'71 - 9765:2, 9767:15,
9810:4, 9810:13,
9810:20, 9824:6,
9825:5
'82 - 9929:11, 9929:12
'90s - 9907:7, 9907:19
'91 - 9929:12
'92 - 9858:20
'98 - 9933:8
'99 - 9933:8
'buffoon' - 9910:1
'but - 9801:4
'cold - 9925:3
'eliminate' - 9794:14
'he - 9802:24
'implicate' - 9794:17
'is - 9842:13
'look - 9855:17
'lookit - 9830:23
'loose - 9882:11
'maybe - 9857:14
'nichol - 9790:15
'not - 9928:17
'okay - 9801:8
'there - 9855:11
'we're - 9852:21,
9854:24
'well - 9800:24,
9802:23, 9854:13,
9905:24, 9926:8
'what - 9905:24
'yeah - 9797:25
'you' - 9798:16

O

006500 - 9780:18
006586 - 9786:22
006799 - 9793:9,
9799:16
009245 - 9780:23
010019 - 9886:10
0126 - 9838:15
012639 - 9814:6,
9838:15
012642 - 9812:19,
9837:21
02 - 9837:7
0213167 - 9805:23,
9806:6
023167 - 9837:11
042513 - 9844:1
050611 - 9826:18

050612 - 9827:11
050613 - 9828:18
050614 - 9829:13
058476 - 9802:10
093349 - 9809:13
093357 - 9809:22

1

1/2 - 9810:13, 9937:3
10 - 9921:24, 9945:12,
9946:23
105246 - 9824:2
106640 - 9778:11,
9783:19
106661 - 9788:25
10:42 - 9836:18
11 - 9836:13, 9836:14,
9921:24
11:05 - 9836:19
11:58 - 9877:15
12 - 9780:20, 9877:13
1264 - 9762:20
12th - 9810:4, 9840:25
13 - 9810:15, 9815:16,
9817:1, 9820:24,
9821:3, 9834:23,
9945:13, 9946:8
13-year - 9810:20
14 - 9826:21
14th - 9857:19,
9858:20
15 - 9836:14, 9846:6,
9846:8, 9913:12,
9937:3
1530 - 9838:23
15th - 9830:3
16 - 9782:3, 9795:4
160801 - 9858:12
16th - 9771:2, 9771:9,
9794:12, 9795:5,
9843:18, 9845:8
17 - 9782:3, 9782:16,
9881:5
17th - 9950:21
1824 - 9838:3
18th - 9789:1, 9941:17
19 - 9846:24, 9846:25,
9882:22, 9923:15
190 - 9892:10
1960s - 9864:2, 9882:7
1962 - 9881:4,
9881:12, 9941:7,
9941:10, 9941:17,
9942:20, 9943:5,
9944:1
1968 - 9826:9,
9838:20, 9848:21,
9892:20, 9899:16
1969 - 9765:2,
9767:14, 9768:17,
9768:21, 9769:19,
9770:15, 9771:1,
9771:2, 9771:9, 9772:1,
9772:22, 9775:17,
9781:23, 9782:13,
9784:12, 9786:11,
9789:2, 9794:12,
9795:5, 9797:9,
9798:15, 9802:10,
9808:4, 9808:5,
9808:12, 9809:1,
9825:19, 9826:9,
9827:12, 9831:8,
9831:10, 9832:21,
9833:13, 9834:8,
9841:7, 9841:16,
9841:20, 9842:4,
9842:7, 9842:12,
9842:18, 9843:18,
9844:2, 9844:19,
9845:8, 9845:12,
9849:9, 9849:14,
9850:25, 9865:11,
9868:3, 9869:13,
9870:5, 9871:25,
9872:1, 9874:1,
9874:25, 9879:20,
9881:24, 9912:8,
9913:25, 9925:12,
9927:25, 9930:18,
9931:24, 9937:24,
9942:21, 9943:6,
9943:7, 9944:12
1969-'70 - 9833:3,
9917:12
1969-1970 - 9853:21
1970 - 9765:2,
9767:14, 9768:17,
9797:14, 9809:6,
9809:14, 9810:25,
9812:7, 9812:19,
9812:24, 9813:2,
9815:15, 9816:24,
9825:20, 9826:9,
9831:11, 9832:21,
9837:20, 9837:25,
9838:11, 9839:8,
9855:25, 9857:8,
9859:3, 9871:25,
9874:25, 9881:24,
9892:20, 9930:18,
9935:21, 9936:1,
9936:12, 9938:1,
9938:19
1970-'71 - 9896:23
1970-'71 - 9914:8
1970s - 9864:2,
9882:8, 9938:22
1971 - 9817:1,
9821:11, 9821:16,
9822:1, 9881:24,
9890:11, 9938:22,
9940:25
1975 - 9925:13, 9928:1
1977 - 9882:22,
9894:12
1979 - 9881:4,
9881:13, 9881:18,
9885:10, 9894:12
1980 - 9839:18,
9840:12, 9945:17,
9945:18
1980s - 9841:13,
9938:23, 9948:20
1983 - 9840:25,
9841:12
1984 - 9947:11,
9947:17
1987 - 9947:20
1990 - 9886:4, 9886:8,
9886:16, 9887:20,
9888:19, 9889:12,
9890:17, 9892:14,
9893:2
1990s - 9948:20
1991 - 9833:6, 9871:8,
9882:2, 9947:6
1992 - 9857:19
1993 - 9902:22
1997 - 9933:8, 9934:8
19th - 9809:14, 9810:3,
9810:19
1:00 - 9952:19
1:34 - 9877:16

2

2/69 - 9784:6
20 - 9820:13, 9847:5,

9847:14, 9941:24
20-year-old - 9828:24
2005 - 9755:21, 9834:7
208 - 9769:13
20th - 9780:20,
9810:13, 9810:20,
9815:15, 9817:1,
9821:11
21 - 9847:20
213627 - 9840:20
213637 - 9840:19
216059 - 9856:14
21st - 9770:25,
9810:25, 9812:7,
9813:12, 9815:14,
9821:16
223 - 9805:23, 9806:6,
9806:7, 9837:13
22nd - 9780:17,
9781:14, 9812:18,
9813:19, 9814:8
24 - 9869:18, 9869:21
240 - 9893:17
244 - 9893:15, 9894:15
248 - 9893:14, 9893:16
248202 - 9887:10,
9887:12
248219 - 9890:7
248240 - 9892:9
249 - 9893:14, 9893:16
250597 - 9845:7
250609 - 9770:24,
9794:1
25061 - 9877:18
254911 - 9823:20
25th-26th - 9798:15
261053 - 9940:8
261186 - 9810:24
26th - 9762:21, 9763:2,
9870:22
28th - 9844:2, 9844:19
2:21 - 9913:13
2:39 - 9913:14
2nd - 9770:15, 9772:1,
9772:22, 9842:3,
9842:12, 9843:12,
9912:8

3

3 - 9771:4, 9786:22,
9826:20, 9858:25
30 - 9850:10
31st - 9768:21, 9797:9
32 - 9848:17
324970 - 9947:4
326548 - 9769:10,
9770:1
334 - 9839:1, 9839:9,
9841:7
37 - 9951:8, 9951:15
38 - 9770:14
3:30 - 9913:8, 9913:10,
9952:16
3:31 - 9952:20
3rd - 9786:10, 9786:14,
9827:12

4

4 - 9794:2, 9799:16,
9892:14
400 - 9835:21
4:20 - 9840:2
4th - 9828:20

5

5 - 9802:10, 9860:2,
9886:16, 9893:2

5/69 - 9783:21
50 - 9768:2, 9849:20
51 - 9755:22
512 - 9838:22
5th - 9784:12, 9824:6,
9842:7, 9842:11,
9845:5

6

6 - 9810:13, 9829:14
607 - 9848:17
609 - 9877:19
610 - 9877:21
627 - 9840:20
662 - 9791:1
69 - 9847:14
690 - 9904:19, 9948:4
690(a) - 9862:6
6:40-6:45 - 9805:10
6:45 - 9805:17,
9806:12
6th - 9830:4

7

7-eleven - 9820:6
70 - 9890:8
7:07 - 9805:18,
9806:17
7th - 9845:6, 9845:8,
9845:12, 9845:17

8

804 - 9858:18
805 - 9861:8
817 - 9789:8
8:30 - 9828:2

9

9 - 9762:21
94 - 9887:13
9764 - 9758:4
9863 - 9758:5
9913 - 9758:6
9935 - 9758:7
9938 - 9758:8
9:00 - 9759:2
9th - 9755:21

A

A10 - 9911:3
Aag - 9894:23
Aaron - 9757:7,
9764:23
abbreviated - 9892:7
ability - 9854:22,
9854:24, 9871:16,
9953:7
able - 9774:22,
9790:20, 9808:15,
9820:23, 9842:15,
9844:9, 9850:7,
9859:13, 9872:19,
9891:5, 9919:3
Absolutely - 9779:13,
9796:24
accept - 9798:8,
9920:15, 9952:1
accepted - 9856:11,
9920:14
access - 9821:25,
9880:19, 9904:11,
9930:20, 9935:4
accessed - 9931:3
accidents - 9864:20,
9865:2



accomplish - 9910:9
accomplished - 9910:9
accord - 9881:6, 9886:24
accordance - 9859:11
Accordingly - 9847:14
account - 9916:5
accumulate - 9931:21, 9932:4
accumulating - 9931:23
accurate - 9801:16, 9846:4
accusation - 9950:13
accused - 9795:21, 9816:14, 9816:16, 9817:10, 9818:25, 9819:22, 9824:12, 9824:22, 9825:2, 9857:2, 9891:24, 9895:18, 9897:16, 9897:17, 9915:9, 9917:6, 9917:7
achieved - 9915:14
acknowledged - 9768:22, 9797:6, 9798:7, 9812:23, 9899:21
acknowledges - 9797:17
acknowledging - 9809:18
acquaint - 9869:21, 9884:12
acquaintance - 9770:3
acquaintances - 9800:18
acquittal - 9896:4
acquitted - 9862:15, 9951:19, 9951:21
act - 9876:16
acted - 9855:16, 9859:5
actions - 9824:15
active - 9782:25, 9827:23, 9828:16
activities - 9791:5, 9869:22
activity - 9781:8
actual - 9804:8, 9906:13
adage - 9951:22
add - 9860:22, 9945:13
additional - 9943:25
address - 9807:2, 9827:18, 9838:4, 9839:2, 9905:4, 9909:5
addressed - 9844:20, 9905:21, 9940:15
adduced - 9862:1
Adjourned - 9836:18, 9877:15, 9913:13, 9952:20
administration - 9951:2
admissible - 9800:5
admit - 9819:11
admits - 9820:6
admitted - 9790:1, 9856:24
admittedly - 9899:3
admitting - 9796:9, 9812:8, 9821:12
adults - 9835:9
adverse - 9857:3
advice - 9903:16, 9939:9, 9939:21
advise - 9876:25, 9910:12, 9919:23
advised - 9774:12, 9823:16, 9887:2, 9895:6, 9903:10
advising - 9822:14, 9822:15, 9823:5, 9824:21, 9825:1, 9825:9, 9862:4
affair - 9951:13
affect - 9909:10
affected - 9860:9, 9862:2
affects - 9909:8
afraid - 9772:16, 9779:18
afternoon - 9903:11, 9934:12
Ag - 9895:1
age - 9781:25, 9782:3, 9941:24
agency - 9855:21
aggressiveness - 9899:11
ago - 9812:4, 9907:6, 9930:4
agree - 9765:19, 9766:19, 9783:6, 9791:18, 9807:6, 9856:6, 9859:22, 9871:14, 9874:12, 9875:22, 9891:20, 9893:12, 9895:11, 9925:23, 9927:18, 9946:16, 9950:24
agreed - 9794:6, 9919:4
agreement - 9817:5, 9914:6, 9914:13, 9916:13, 9931:9
ahead - 9854:15, 9856:2, 9860:21
aid - 9828:5
aide - 9828:24
aim - 9913:19
air - 9948:18
aired - 9904:5
albeit - 9918:1
Albert - 9770:16, 9771:18, 9775:3, 9776:5, 9778:9, 9779:7, 9781:13, 9783:21, 9786:17, 9792:6, 9798:18, 9839:3, 9842:3, 9849:24, 9912:6, 9917:3, 9917:17
alcohol - 9921:16
alcoholic - 9921:8
Alex - 9935:17, 9941:15
Alexander - 9757:13
Allbright - 9918:21
allegation - 9774:8, 9929:22, 9949:2
allegations - 9918:13, 9918:22, 9948:24, 9949:14, 9949:20
alleged - 9776:22, 9824:11, 9826:10, 9826:22
alley - 9806:14, 9807:23, 9812:1, 9919:16, 9920:17
allow - 9867:11, 9909:5
allowed - 9778:21, 9905:23
almost - 9807:18, 9855:7, 9868:18
amalgamate - 9833:8
amalgamated - 9833:11, 9835:4
amounts - 9912:23
ample - 9859:17
analyzed - 9847:8
animal - 9790:3
animosity - 9921:20
announced - 9840:4
answer - 9865:7, 9868:2, 9868:7, 9871:12, 9888:19, 9897:5, 9898:9, 9905:8, 9905:18, 9950:11, 9950:14
answered - 9838:21
answering - 9895:10
antennae - 9787:22
apologize - 9761:5, 9931:20
apology - 9762:2, 9763:20
apparatus - 9883:24
apparent - 9895:11
appeal - 9856:4, 9947:17
Appeal - 9765:20, 9947:18
appeals - 9896:4, 9896:18
appear - 9813:9, 9821:14, 9824:14, 9825:12, 9845:16, 9845:23, 9846:11, 9892:13, 9893:8
appearance - 9815:18, 9895:3
Appearances - 9757:1
appeared - 9760:1, 9810:4, 9828:19, 9856:9, 9870:25, 9891:13, 9911:1, 9937:21, 9945:22, 9945:25
appearing - 9917:6, 9917:7
appellate - 9917:7, 9917:11
application - 9896:23, 9897:22, 9948:3, 9948:10, 9950:22
applied - 9761:16, 9899:9, 9912:1
applies - 9761:11, 9761:12
apply - 9761:13, 9762:6, 9801:12
appointed - 9889:1
appreciate - 9828:13, 9920:10, 9925:23, 9935:6
apprehended - 9809:6, 9809:17, 9876:13
apprehension - 9827:16
approach - 9786:7, 9788:15, 9793:23, 9799:4, 9801:20
approached - 9761:23, 9807:9, 9834:6, 9935:22
approaching - 9806:18, 9807:20, 9897:10
appropriate - 9760:11, 9799:8, 9807:7, 9855:21, 9856:12, 9859:1, 9863:22, 9872:14, 9874:7, 9877:12, 9913:11
April - 9789:1, 9845:9, 9857:19, 9858:20, 9947:6, 9950:21
area - 9772:2, 9776:7, 9783:20, 9826:24, 9827:19, 9833:18, 9848:20, 9850:3, 9889:15, 9891:3, 9891:7, 9931:14
areas - 9833:1, 9833:14
argued - 9768:7
argument - 9908:16
arguments - 9909:2
arise - 9818:25, 9868:21, 9904:18
arising - 9948:21
armed - 9820:3
arrangement - 9914:6, 9914:13, 9916:9
arrangements - 9915:16
arranging - 9815:18
arrest - 9773:2, 9823:16
arrested - 9819:1, 9823:17
article - 9829:7, 9829:14
ascertain - 9808:15
ascertainment - 9785:20
aside - 9854:14, 9854:20, 9854:25, 9855:1
asleep - 9919:15
aspect - 9818:20, 9865:7, 9867:13, 9868:25, 9876:11, 9896:1, 9896:5, 9929:7
aspects - 9799:5, 9871:18
aspire - 9873:20
assault - 9768:24, 9805:18, 9806:1, 9807:8, 9807:24, 9808:23, 9810:3, 9820:12, 9826:22, 9859:7, 9865:9, 9865:11, 9870:5, 9870:24, 9920:17, 9929:22, 9946:6
assaulted - 9801:3, 9805:6, 9805:12, 9806:15, 9809:18, 9829:20, 9871:1
assaults - 9807:15, 9820:15, 9825:18, 9833:1, 9834:21, 9864:21, 9864:22, 9927:21
assert - 9907:1
assess - 9826:13, 9873:17, 9896:17, 9908:15
assessed - 9899:22
assessing - 9777:8, 9777:15, 9778:2, 9782:9, 9922:23
assessment - 9785:24, 9834:15, 9864:7, 9864:17, 9866:3, 9866:25, 9885:13, 9895:14, 9896:6, 9945:9
assign - 9929:5
assigned - 9822:24, 9897:9, 9929:2
assist - 9873:18, 9878:9, 9879:17, 9883:19, 9884:19, 9888:10
assistance - 9789:4, 9865:21, 9865:22, 9867:19, 9868:24, 9873:2, 9873:6, 9873:12, 9873:24, 9874:11, 9874:18, 9879:23
Assistant - 9756:3, 9756:6
assisting - 9878:20
Associate - 9903:1
association - 9888:1
assume - 9776:24, 9795:18, 9805:11, 9807:16, 9823:1, 9829:12, 9832:15, 9840:7, 9846:3, 9870:14, 9888:12
assumed - 9946:21
assuming - 9765:4, 9765:21, 9769:24, 9776:20, 9786:18, 9802:16, 9804:20, 9816:11, 9842:11, 9843:7, 9857:19
assumption - 9776:2, 9843:11, 9846:4, 9880:3
assure - 9913:18
attach - 9908:2
attached - 9802:12, 9908:3
attack - 9920:17, 9942:24
attacked - 9829:1, 9919:8, 9919:10
attacker - 9827:23, 9828:15
attacks - 9895:7
attempt - 9825:21, 9850:4, 9871:23, 9942:3
attempted - 9812:9, 9829:5, 9847:1, 9945:20
Attempts - 9849:1
attempts - 9915:3
attend - 9866:10, 9875:21
attendance - 9866:22, 9870:3, 9872:7
attending - 9866:16
attention - 9826:23, 9877:23, 9892:16, 9935:19, 9940:15
attitude - 9854:16
Attorney - 9817:14, 9818:6, 9818:7, 9855:23, 9903:1
attract - 9913:19, 9935:19
attributed - 9887:3
Audio - 9756:14
auspices - 9898:17
authority - 9898:13
authorized - 9827:14
authorizes - 9898:13
automatic - 9788:3
automatically - 9788:3
automobile - 9865:1
autopsies - 9870:24, 9871:3, 9871:7
autopsy - 9866:10, 9872:2, 9872:12, 9873:6
avail - 9848:7, 9849:3
availability - 9926:10
available - 9822:8, 9870:19, 9890:12, 9914:2, 9930:20



Ave - 9789:9
Avenue - 9811:18,
 9838:3, 9838:22,
 9838:23, 9839:1,
 9839:9, 9841:7
avoided - 9949:13
await - 9901:21,
 9906:7
aware - 9767:15,
 9770:10, 9772:4,
 9783:10, 9783:16,
 9786:15, 9786:19,
 9795:10, 9797:5,
 9797:13, 9797:23,
 9803:6, 9804:19,
 9804:20, 9808:8,
 9809:5, 9809:8,
 9821:24, 9825:4,
 9826:1, 9826:5,
 9830:12, 9839:6,
 9840:13, 9840:18,
 9857:5, 9857:7,
 9857:19, 9857:23,
 9858:3, 9858:6, 9858:8,
 9858:9, 9859:20,
 9860:17, 9866:11,
 9871:2, 9871:6, 9871:9,
 9874:9, 9879:15,
 9887:6, 9888:13,
 9890:2, 9890:17,
 9897:18, 9897:19,
 9897:20, 9897:24,
 9898:2, 9898:11,
 9906:18, 9909:11,
 9912:10, 9915:2,
 9915:6, 9915:24,
 9916:8, 9916:11,
 9916:12, 9917:2,
 9917:20, 9917:25,
 9918:19, 9918:23,
 9918:24, 9919:17,
 9919:20, 9921:7,
 9921:10, 9921:13,
 9921:15, 9921:18,
 9925:5, 9926:7, 9927:3,
 9932:14, 9933:10,
 9934:6, 9934:10,
 9935:25, 9936:11,
 9936:12, 9936:22,
 9937:12, 9940:24,
 9941:13, 9941:14,
 9948:5, 9948:11
awful - 9774:4,
 9882:25
Aylesbury - 9798:1

B

background - 9782:7,
 9903:9
backing - 9784:18,
 9836:21
backup - 9885:11
bad - 9836:23
balance - 9841:12
ban - 9761:9
bank - 9941:12, 9942:5
based - 9764:10,
 9849:19, 9912:4
basement - 9839:4
basis - 9763:7, 9764:8,
 9775:10, 9800:6,
 9816:11, 9843:8,
 9861:16, 9917:4,
 9927:2
bathroom - 9789:22
Battleford - 9945:20,
 9946:24
became - 9835:24,
 9842:19, 9859:20,

9883:23, 9929:11,
 9929:20
Beckman - 9863:12
become - 9842:22,
 9858:8, 9867:11,
 9870:10
becomes - 9816:15,
 9909:3
becoming - 9911:8
began - 9853:14,
 9884:23
begin - 9859:1, 9872:2
begins - 9841:3,
 9846:25
behalf - 9823:11,
 9825:24, 9830:12,
 9830:21, 9830:22,
 9830:23, 9840:15,
 9841:11, 9915:9,
 9949:3
beings - 9952:3
Beitel - 9756:10
belief - 9861:25,
 9952:7
below - 9851:22,
 9852:2
Bench - 9891:15,
 9953:1, 9953:3,
 9953:14, 9953:20
benefit - 9856:5,
 9858:24, 9859:3,
 9861:5, 9872:17,
 9922:19
Beresh - 9757:9,
 9758:6, 9913:15,
 9913:16, 9913:23,
 9913:24, 9927:13,
 9927:17, 9935:13,
 9945:10
best - 9788:18, 9897:5,
 9937:18, 9952:5,
 9953:6
better - 9775:17,
 9867:12, 9951:22
Between - 9943:7,
 9943:9
between - 9761:18,
 9768:23, 9803:16,
 9804:14, 9831:18,
 9835:11, 9869:6,
 9870:17, 9872:5,
 9881:12, 9881:24,
 9888:17, 9889:8,
 9893:3, 9915:17,
 9917:20, 9921:20,
 9927:11, 9928:2,
 9929:12, 9942:19,
 9943:5
beyond - 9761:16,
 9766:1, 9861:12,
 9896:13
Big - 9804:25
binders - 9931:14,
 9931:15, 9932:5,
 9932:12, 9933:7,
 9933:13, 9933:22,
 9934:1, 9934:17,
 9934:20, 9935:7,
 9935:8, 9935:9,
 9935:11
biological - 9872:20
bit - 9761:7, 9766:1,
 9768:14, 9782:17,
 9783:2, 9802:7, 9802:8,
 9807:14, 9814:10,
 9824:18, 9832:25,
 9834:17, 9834:18,
 9839:14, 9850:22,
 9869:23, 9869:25,
 9871:24, 9872:11,

9874:21, 9885:25,
 9911:17, 9922:18
blade - 9922:13,
 9922:14
block - 9782:17,
 9783:2
blood - 9772:6,
 9791:24, 9792:1,
 9792:3, 9792:6,
 9792:10, 9848:4,
 9890:13, 9912:8
blow - 9911:10
blown - 9886:19
blue - 9773:2
Board - 9827:15
Bobs - 9757:4
body - 9807:13,
 9828:1, 9919:15,
 9919:21, 9919:25,
 9920:16, 9942:1,
 9942:3
books - 9812:5
bootlegging - 9833:16
Boswell - 9756:5
bottom - 9778:13,
 9791:19, 9809:25,
 9848:18, 9952:3
bought - 9949:24
break - 9797:25,
 9819:8, 9819:10,
 9819:18, 9836:11,
 9836:16, 9869:14,
 9877:12, 9913:4,
 9913:11
Brian - 9757:9, 9911:3
bridge - 9906:6
brief - 9760:7,
 9762:11, 9763:22,
 9812:22
bring - 9768:11,
 9769:10, 9770:23,
 9778:10, 9786:23,
 9788:25, 9794:1,
 9802:9, 9805:21,
 9805:24, 9814:7,
 9826:19, 9837:19,
 9838:5, 9838:14,
 9840:19, 9843:24,
 9845:5, 9854:17,
 9856:14, 9858:12,
 9869:16, 9869:18,
 9909:8
broad - 9923:12
broadcast - 9759:18
broadcasting -
 9759:12
broadener - 9761:19
brought - 9767:9,
 9778:18, 9783:22,
 9784:12, 9793:13,
 9826:23, 9830:3,
 9884:15, 9892:16,
 9894:25, 9905:19,
 9942:25
Brown - 9894:23
Bruce - 9757:8
Buffoon - 9910:2
building - 9882:23,
 9924:16, 9924:20,
 9924:21
buried - 9942:4
bus - 9805:12, 9811:12
business - 9903:24
busy - 9896:25, 9897:1

C

Cadrain - 9770:16,
 9771:18, 9771:25,
 9772:13, 9772:23,

9775:4, 9776:5,
 9778:21, 9778:25,
 9779:7, 9779:10,
 9781:13, 9781:19,
 9783:12, 9783:21,
 9784:11, 9786:17,
 9791:23, 9792:2,
 9792:6, 9792:17,
 9793:12, 9800:21,
 9839:3, 9842:3,
 9849:25, 9911:24,
 9912:6, 9936:2
Cadrain's - 9771:22,
 9778:9, 9786:25,
 9798:18
Caldwell - 9757:4
Calgary - 9879:16
Calvin - 9757:13,
 9935:18, 9938:18
Cam - 9756:14
Canada - 9757:11,
 9781:12, 9801:7,
 9832:14, 9896:24,
 9898:23, 9898:24,
 9899:8, 9900:10,
 9903:5, 9905:17,
 9947:19
Canada's - 9934:10
Candace - 9756:4
candidate - 9926:18
candidly - 9899:20
canvassed - 9894:10
capable - 9789:25,
 9790:17, 9792:9,
 9861:24
capacities - 9765:9
capacity - 9911:10
car - 9770:6, 9790:10,
 9798:2, 9807:1, 9807:2,
 9807:4, 9812:2,
 9919:11
card - 9884:14
cards - 9882:17,
 9884:11
career - 9765:7
careful - 9826:25,
 9868:2
carriage - 9855:9
carried - 9812:5,
 9949:3
carry - 9836:12
carrying - 9776:19
case - 9768:5,
 9774:23, 9794:8,
 9795:23, 9796:17,
 9796:18, 9803:21,
 9804:8, 9804:18,
 9804:25, 9810:11,
 9816:5, 9816:22,
 9822:18, 9823:1,
 9823:2, 9832:9, 9834:8,
 9861:17, 9866:1,
 9866:8, 9866:10,
 9866:23, 9870:20,
 9872:8, 9873:9,
 9873:10, 9879:3,
 9880:5, 9891:11,
 9896:12, 9896:14,
 9897:19, 9899:9,
 9900:22, 9901:14,
 9905:1, 9908:18,
 9914:3, 9917:23,
 9931:18, 9931:19,
 9932:11, 9935:21,
 9935:23, 9936:6,
 9937:24, 9939:6,
 9942:15, 9942:17,
 9943:12, 9944:16,
 9944:17, 9947:25,
 9950:22, 9951:3,

9951:6, 9951:9
cases - 9788:12,
 9795:18, 9832:11,
 9847:8, 9864:8, 9864:9,
 9864:10, 9864:14,
 9864:15, 9864:24,
 9865:16, 9866:2,
 9866:11, 9866:19,
 9892:6, 9898:14,
 9925:8, 9929:16,
 9929:21, 9930:10,
 9942:13, 9943:3,
 9948:1, 9948:22
Casevault - 9900:6,
 9900:16, 9900:25,
 9904:9, 9906:10,
 9908:20
catalogue - 9929:6
catalogued - 9929:1,
 9929:10
cataloguing - 9929:13
categories - 9923:12,
 9928:6
category - 9768:3,
 9796:2, 9807:18,
 9834:20, 9842:20
Catherine - 9757:4
caught - 9809:7,
 9819:10, 9820:5,
 9876:15
causes - 9833:20
cautious - 9763:6
Cbc - 9759:8, 9760:1,
 9822:6
Cdl - 9847:17
central - 9808:19,
 9884:18, 9926:22,
 9930:6
centre - 9876:21,
 9891:3
Centurion - 9893:20
certain - 9764:10,
 9777:9, 9833:7, 9833:9,
 9835:1, 9858:7, 9867:3,
 9873:15, 9889:13,
 9893:23, 9904:18,
 9926:4
certainly - 9761:14,
 9775:17, 9781:25,
 9783:6, 9790:25,
 9792:25, 9800:8,
 9800:17, 9803:15,
 9808:14, 9808:21,
 9820:12, 9820:13,
 9821:7, 9824:21,
 9825:1, 9827:7,
 9828:13, 9832:16,
 9840:12, 9843:12,
 9846:3, 9852:13,
 9859:24, 9867:21,
 9867:23, 9870:12,
 9871:20, 9893:8,
 9908:23, 9944:3,
 9944:14
Certainly - 9764:5,
 9944:17
Certificates - 9953:1
certify - 9953:4
challenge - 9777:10
challenged - 9917:1
chance - 9905:1
change - 9776:9,
 9925:24
changed - 9832:18,
 9834:17, 9834:18,
 9871:10, 9871:11,
 9871:22
changes - 9871:18,
 9871:23, 9871:24
changing - 9772:9



character - 9779:16,
9780:1, 9850:5
charge - 9790:22,
9798:24, 9799:8,
9800:6, 9800:9,
9810:18, 9824:8,
9841:10, 9854:4,
9856:2, 9861:2,
9884:17, 9889:2,
9899:25, 9946:12
charged - 9771:15,
9810:3, 9816:5,
9819:19, 9820:14
charges - 9814:24,
9816:1, 9816:2, 9816:3,
9816:9, 9816:10,
9816:25, 9817:3,
9817:16, 9817:20,
9820:17, 9821:5,
9822:16, 9823:6,
9823:7, 9829:21
charging - 9860:15
chart - 9920:25
Charter - 9832:1,
9832:16, 9832:22
Chartier - 9867:4,
9867:5
Chartier's - 9867:13
check - 9808:19,
9884:6, 9890:10,
9905:7
checked - 9770:15,
9829:16
checking - 9910:14
chief - 9765:10,
9813:4, 9833:6,
9849:22, 9850:25,
9875:5, 9875:12,
9875:14, 9906:3,
9923:11, 9928:24,
9929:11, 9929:20,
9932:14, 9934:8,
9938:14, 9938:15,
9938:24, 9939:7,
9944:20, 9947:6,
9948:21, 9950:5,
9952:12
Chief - 9760:3, 9784:7,
9863:3, 9863:15,
9863:21, 9863:23,
9877:21, 9885:5,
9889:23, 9895:24,
9901:12, 9901:15,
9903:18, 9909:15,
9910:23, 9912:25,
9938:12
chief's - 9889:5
child - 9828:1
choose - 9764:15
choosing - 9914:9
chose - 9922:20
circumstances -
9818:24, 9820:20,
9846:10, 9875:17,
9877:2, 9891:20,
9897:8
circumstantial -
9920:12, 9920:24
citizens - 9828:4
City - 9789:7, 9789:10,
9789:16, 9846:18,
9864:1, 9875:2, 9879:9,
9879:19, 9887:1,
9889:19, 9890:3,
9890:9, 9892:18,
9893:5, 9893:10,
9895:13, 9895:16,
9903:6, 9911:20
city - 9827:24, 9829:6,
9835:23, 9835:25,
9894:6, 9894:18
claimed - 9949:23
claiming - 9906:16
claims - 9919:20,
9948:13, 9948:19
clarification - 9762:5
clean - 9821:6
clear - 9769:22,
9811:5, 9811:9, 9819:4,
9886:21, 9931:6,
9931:20, 9932:2
cleared - 9819:12,
9819:24, 9820:7
clearly - 9792:4,
9819:2, 9846:9,
9920:10
Clerk - 9756:10
client - 9901:2, 9901:6,
9938:22
clients - 9764:12,
9774:11
close - 9801:18
closed - 9844:16,
9918:4, 9918:6, 9927:7,
9927:8, 9927:15,
9928:9, 9928:13,
9928:14, 9928:16
closed - 9928:17
closely - 9765:7
closing - 9898:21
clothes - 9772:6,
9772:9, 9776:9,
9805:14, 9806:14,
9811:16, 9912:9
clothing - 9792:2,
9849:5
clubhouse - 9943:23
co - 9870:17, 9872:16
co-operation -
9870:17, 9872:16
coat - 9806:15,
9811:21
Code - 9862:6,
9897:21, 9948:4
coerced - 9849:23
coffee - 9789:23,
9869:14, 9869:15
coincided - 9869:14
cold - 9925:2, 9925:12,
9942:13, 9942:15
Colin - 9947:10,
9950:22
collect - 9871:16,
9873:1, 9896:16
collected - 9873:6,
9887:15, 9887:17
collection - 9864:6,
9864:16, 9866:4,
9872:10
comfort - 9855:25,
9856:7, 9859:24
coming - 9780:5,
9795:11, 9829:22,
9829:25, 9839:6,
9839:7, 9848:14,
9855:10
commended - 9877:24
comment - 9760:8,
9761:24, 9762:3,
9762:9, 9762:11,
9820:23, 9826:8,
9862:9, 9867:13,
9871:19, 9874:19,
9876:10, 9882:10,
9887:7, 9950:4
commenting -
9761:18, 9764:3
Comments - 9799:14
comments - 9761:19,
9766:4, 9766:5, 9853:1,
9904:17, 9910:25,
9911:19, 9938:18,
9947:7, 9950:17
commiserating -
9850:9
Commission - 9755:2,
9755:14, 9756:1,
9756:2, 9756:3,
9756:10, 9769:12,
9840:24, 9863:8,
9877:24, 9880:14,
9880:20, 9900:8,
9900:14, 9902:15,
9909:5, 9912:12,
9912:20, 9930:1
Commission's -
9885:24
Commissioner -
9759:3, 9759:5,
9760:21, 9760:23,
9761:5, 9762:5,
9762:16, 9762:23,
9763:3, 9763:11,
9763:21, 9764:7,
9765:17, 9806:3,
9836:10, 9836:13,
9836:15, 9836:20,
9837:5, 9837:8,
9837:15, 9838:7,
9838:12, 9862:25,
9863:1, 9868:1, 9868:6,
9868:10, 9868:12,
9868:15, 9877:11,
9877:14, 9883:4,
9883:12, 9883:19,
9884:20, 9884:21,
9885:3, 9889:7, 9900:5,
9901:6, 9902:4, 9902:9,
9902:11, 9903:7,
9903:21, 9904:4,
9904:13, 9904:16,
9905:11, 9905:14,
9906:1, 9906:5,
9907:10, 9907:16,
9907:21, 9907:25,
9908:5, 9909:23,
9910:2, 9910:7,
9910:16, 9910:19,
9911:12, 9913:6,
9913:8, 9913:12,
9913:15, 9913:17,
9924:15, 9927:10,
9927:14, 9935:15,
9938:10, 9941:19,
9941:22, 9949:12,
9949:18, 9949:21,
9950:10, 9950:16,
9952:13, 9952:18
Commissioner's -
9883:15
Commissioners -
9827:15
commit - 9789:20,
9916:2
committed - 9766:13,
9766:15, 9777:1,
9777:2, 9785:13,
9796:9, 9799:10,
9802:19, 9802:25,
9803:9, 9807:1,
9813:14, 9818:23,
9826:10, 9830:14,
9842:9, 9848:22,
9856:24, 9876:17,
9889:22, 9890:3,
9891:4, 9891:19,
9893:6, 9945:19,
9951:11
committing - 9876:13
common - 9846:1,
9849:9, 9854:12,
9857:1, 9865:12,
9897:11
common-sensical -
9854:12
commonly - 9865:9
communication -
9831:15, 9835:11,
9835:17, 9868:16,
9904:2
communications -
9868:17
community - 9826:16
companion - 9779:23
companions - 9775:6
company - 9841:1,
9901:13, 9902:2,
9906:4
compare - 9786:3,
9881:23
compared - 9881:24
comparison - 9942:19,
9943:2
competent - 9939:23
compilation - 9769:11
complainant - 9866:8,
9866:23, 9870:4,
9929:23
complainants -
9822:15, 9876:5
complaint - 9866:14,
9866:16, 9904:20,
9921:17, 9922:24,
9923:3
complaints - 9870:2,
9881:10, 9905:3
complete - 9796:11
completely - 9787:15,
9807:18, 9824:15,
9876:20
complexity - 9765:23
complicity - 9949:10
computer - 9882:19,
9883:9, 9884:16
computerized -
9882:16, 9883:9
concern - 9785:4,
9785:7, 9826:16,
9835:19, 9835:24,
9872:24, 9873:1,
9874:1, 9904:1,
9906:25, 9908:14,
9910:6
concerned - 9829:11,
9900:24, 9901:1,
9901:17, 9902:16,
9912:18, 9912:19,
9932:21
concerning - 9824:10
concerns - 9792:16,
9792:19, 9855:18,
9905:22, 9912:16
conclude - 9882:24,
9915:8
concluded - 9759:22,
9760:14, 9761:1,
9764:4, 9768:7,
9824:17, 9825:3
concludes - 9844:9,
9846:13, 9846:14
conclusion - 9768:9,
9788:4, 9798:14,
9844:25, 9848:16,
9854:11, 9855:7,
9859:16, 9860:12,
9899:6
conclusions - 9763:7,
9857:3
concurrent - 9817:3,
9871:1, 9915:5,
9945:12
condition - 9824:12,
9824:23
conditions - 9825:1
conduct - 9767:16,
9772:12, 9871:7,
9878:21, 9879:24,
9885:25, 9911:20
conducted - 9847:25,
9849:4, 9886:3
conducting - 9872:15,
9890:16
confessed - 9876:16
confession - 9801:13
confine - 9868:7
confining - 9868:8
confirm - 9892:17,
9903:18
confirmation -
9905:15
confirmed - 9776:4,
9781:12
confirms - 9790:25
conflicting - 9792:14
conforming - 9813:22
confused - 9883:10
Congram - 9756:4
connect - 9842:15,
9844:22
connected - 9791:10,
9796:20, 9845:14,
9847:24, 9848:21
connection - 9830:7
cons - 9790:7
conscious - 9920:7
consecutive - 9810:14
consent - 9817:15
consenting - 9760:12
consequence -
9900:15
consider - 9768:13,
9768:18, 9779:12,
9869:3, 9875:16
considerable -
9778:18, 9933:4
considerably - 9797:7
consideration -
9821:4
considered - 9780:1,
9794:7, 9831:5,
9851:16
considering - 9860:10
considers - 9825:3
consistent - 9842:5,
9842:21, 9895:9
constantly - 9859:23,
9897:6, 9925:19
constitute - 9799:11,
9908:8
constitutes - 9860:7
consulting - 9800:10
contact - 9818:6,
9841:11, 9876:4,
9889:4
contacting - 9874:22
contain - 9953:5
containers - 9870:15
contains - 9887:14
contemplated - 9936:8
content - 9879:2
contentions - 9947:21,
9951:4
contents - 9903:3,
9931:25
context - 9879:15,
9901:14
continue - 9776:16,
9810:2, 9852:18,
9896:15, 9896:16,
9897:12



continued - 9764:19, 9871:21
Continued - 9758:3
continuing - 9780:12
contrary - 9771:9
contribute - 9828:4
control - 9931:7
controversy - 9899:11, 9932:10
convenience - 9895:4, 9917:22
conversation - 9893:3
conversations - 9863:6
conversion - 9880:17, 9881:3, 9881:15, 9884:24
converted - 9881:5, 9881:12, 9882:18
conveyed - 9906:15
conveys - 9911:22
convicted - 9822:7, 9876:9, 9886:2, 9891:24, 9895:7, 9895:24, 9897:17, 9897:21, 9945:22, 9951:9, 9951:23
Conviction - 9755:4, 9947:16
conviction - 9822:10, 9822:12, 9853:12, 9853:22, 9854:5, 9854:10, 9854:23, 9855:1, 9855:6, 9855:15, 9856:12, 9862:5, 9874:22, 9890:24, 9891:2, 9891:8, 9891:9, 9891:14, 9891:21, 9891:22, 9892:4, 9896:3, 9896:15, 9896:17, 9896:19, 9897:4, 9897:12, 9898:14, 9947:21, 9948:13, 9948:19, 9950:23, 9951:4
conviction - 9854:25, 9855:11
convictions - 9892:19, 9916:15, 9946:1
convinced - 9951:18
convincing - 9781:21, 9791:8, 9791:14
coordinator - 9799:1
coordinators - 9925:19
copied - 9932:18
copies - 9878:23, 9884:9, 9923:20, 9932:1, 9932:7, 9932:11, 9932:20, 9934:23
copy - 9827:11, 9856:15, 9858:11, 9879:12, 9883:8, 9884:24, 9900:17, 9907:13, 9907:17, 9923:24, 9924:5, 9924:9, 9926:14, 9926:15, 9928:18, 9928:23
coroner - 9833:22
Correct - 9797:11, 9803:25
correct - 9766:21, 9768:25, 9769:3, 9771:8, 9771:12, 9771:20, 9771:24, 9772:2, 9775:11, 9776:1, 9776:9,

9776:14, 9777:6, 9779:24, 9780:9, 9785:7, 9785:9, 9785:21, 9785:23, 9786:6, 9790:10, 9790:17, 9792:21, 9794:25, 9796:5, 9796:7, 9797:20, 9798:13, 9800:16, 9800:22, 9801:25, 9803:11, 9803:15, 9804:15, 9804:23, 9805:2, 9809:3, 9812:12, 9813:2, 9822:3, 9822:10, 9829:11, 9836:8, 9836:22, 9837:4, 9837:10, 9837:16, 9839:20, 9839:24, 9840:12, 9845:19, 9849:16, 9852:5, 9852:11, 9853:13, 9863:9, 9863:10, 9863:18, 9864:9, 9865:24, 9875:2, 9875:8, 9878:3, 9878:10, 9880:2, 9880:18, 9885:22, 9890:18, 9890:25, 9891:6, 9914:4, 9914:11, 9914:17, 9915:22, 9915:23, 9916:21, 9917:10, 9920:8, 9920:18, 9923:3, 9933:13, 9936:21, 9936:25, 9945:14, 9945:20, 9945:24, 9946:3, 9946:25, 9951:3, 9951:5, 9953:5
corrected - 9759:16
correctly - 9766:3, 9864:3, 9870:22
correspondence - 9818:10, 9940:9
corresponds - 9892:15
Cotler - 9757:12
counsel - 9760:24, 9761:4, 9761:12, 9761:14, 9761:16, 9762:7, 9764:2, 9764:3, 9764:11, 9766:16, 9794:4, 9810:9, 9810:11, 9816:17, 9817:10, 9821:20, 9825:19, 9825:23, 9830:11, 9830:22, 9831:10, 9831:12, 9831:16, 9831:19, 9831:25, 9840:22, 9856:7, 9856:17, 9856:18, 9859:14, 9895:23, 9898:3, 9904:11, 9906:22, 9910:12, 9910:13, 9913:3, 9915:17, 9915:18, 9917:20, 9917:22, 9919:3, 9935:17, 9938:7, 9949:2, 9949:13, 9949:16, 9950:12
Counsel - 9756:2, 9756:3, 9759:4, 9769:12, 9840:24, 9877:25, 9900:8, 9900:15, 9902:15, 9912:20
country - 9782:24
counts - 9810:14

couple - 9765:3, 9765:25, 9768:10, 9784:13, 9785:5, 9813:14, 9833:1, 9837:18, 9942:17
Couriering - 9917:6
course - 9771:1, 9796:1, 9826:17, 9833:25, 9839:2, 9857:10, 9857:16, 9864:23, 9872:25, 9879:15, 9880:16, 9885:19, 9886:3, 9887:19, 9894:9, 9897:8, 9901:10, 9902:5, 9909:4, 9909:14, 9921:24, 9933:19, 9943:16, 9943:23, 9945:5, 9946:22, 9950:21
Court - 9756:11, 9765:19, 9799:12, 9801:7, 9832:13, 9857:17, 9857:21, 9857:24, 9858:10, 9858:19, 9859:24, 9860:25, 9862:13, 9891:15, 9896:24, 9898:22, 9898:23, 9899:8, 9899:13, 9900:10, 9903:5, 9905:17, 9934:10, 9947:18, 9953:1, 9953:3, 9953:14, 9953:20
court - 9815:18, 9816:9, 9816:12, 9816:14, 9816:15, 9891:3, 9891:14, 9892:23, 9894:19, 9917:11, 9937:9
courtroom - 9918:2, 9918:4
courts - 9917:7
cover - 9764:25, 9787:17, 9833:1, 9942:3
covering - 9767:18
coverup - 9766:6, 9850:18, 9940:4
Cox - 9757:10
Cpic - 9890:14, 9890:20, 9890:23, 9891:5, 9891:8, 9891:21
create - 9835:17
credibility - 9862:10
credible - 9777:12, 9778:4, 9860:7, 9944:6
Cressman - 9844:4
crime - 9791:10, 9815:23, 9815:24, 9817:14, 9856:25, 9864:17, 9872:22, 9876:18, 9944:3, 9944:7, 9946:13
Crime - 9802:21
crimes - 9801:19, 9826:16, 9864:18, 9864:19, 9864:23, 9876:16, 9925:20, 9927:12, 9944:5
Criminal - 9862:6, 9897:21
criminal - 9782:8, 9795:17, 9808:13, 9822:3, 9822:7, 9822:8, 9851:1, 9851:4, 9892:2, 9917:11, 9937:9, 9937:16, 9950:1

cross - 9819:21, 9843:17, 9906:5, 9909:14, 9913:3, 9938:3
cross-examination - 9843:17, 9938:3
cross-examining - 9909:14
Crown - 9774:21, 9799:4, 9799:11, 9799:21, 9800:3, 9800:4, 9800:10, 9816:19, 9818:1, 9831:14, 9831:17, 9831:18, 9831:21, 9854:3, 9856:1, 9915:18, 9917:21, 9935:25, 9940:15, 9940:20, 9949:4
Crown's - 9935:21
crumb - 9767:6
Csr - 9756:11, 9756:12, 9953:2, 9953:12, 9953:13, 9953:18, 9953:19
Cst - 9789:5
cup - 9789:23
curious - 9920:6
customers - 9945:6

D

dangerous - 9779:16, 9780:1
dare - 9945:3
dark - 9811:21
darker - 9911:9
date - 9770:16, 9821:19, 9821:21, 9837:24, 9838:1, 9838:8, 9838:9, 9838:10, 9845:7, 9892:12, 9892:14, 9896:14, 9932:12
Date - 9941:17
date-stamped - 9845:7
date-wise - 9932:12
dated - 9770:25, 9840:24, 9844:2, 9845:8, 9886:16
dates - 9786:18
David - 9755:4, 9757:2, 9757:10, 9766:8, 9767:1, 9767:18, 9768:12, 9768:16, 9768:18, 9770:17, 9771:11, 9771:18, 9772:1, 9772:20, 9773:5, 9775:23, 9776:12, 9779:21, 9780:16, 9781:8, 9781:18, 9781:24, 9782:9, 9782:20, 9854:3, 9784:11, 9784:22, 9786:10, 9786:15, 9786:24, 9787:9, 9787:18, 9790:9, 9792:7, 9794:6, 9798:25, 9799:9, 9801:9, 9801:24, 9802:4, 9841:12, 9842:23, 9845:17, 9849:15, 9850:1, 9853:12, 9858:6, 9858:13, 9859:2, 9860:11, 9861:12, 9861:20, 9886:1, 9912:8, 9922:7, 9935:21, 9936:24
dawned - 9909:13
death - 9767:19, 9768:18, 9768:23, 9769:5, 9769:14, 9769:20, 9771:10, 9771:19, 9795:6, 9800:20, 9804:12, 9805:15, 9828:24, 9831:5, 9834:3, 9840:17, 9843:1, 9864:8, 9864:14, 9872:25, 9922:4, 9941:17, 9942:1
deaths - 9833:18, 9833:19, 9834:1
deceased - 9850:8, 9850:11, 9929:23
December - 9821:16, 9826:21
decide - 9774:22, 9777:11, 9794:23, 9815:10
decided - 9784:8, 9856:2
decides - 9819:3
deciding - 9774:25, 9790:21
decision - 9771:14, 9778:3, 9798:24, 9832:2, 9832:4, 9832:13, 9832:17, 9852:10, 9853:8, 9854:3, 9857:17, 9858:9, 9858:11, 9859:20, 9862:7, 9895:12, 9898:22, 9899:8, 9904:23, 9934:11, 9939:15, 9947:19
decision-making - 9852:10
declined - 9761:25
defence - 9810:11, 9816:16, 9817:10, 9818:5, 9825:19, 9825:23, 9831:10, 9831:12, 9831:16, 9831:19, 9831:23, 9831:25, 9832:11,



9856:6, 9917:22,
9936:24, 9937:16,
9937:18, 9937:20,
9938:7, 9938:19
defend - 9850:13,
9936:6
defending - 9936:5
defer - 9909:4
deference - 9873:9,
9873:11, 9873:14
definite - 9871:12,
9872:23
Definitely - 9896:20
definitely - 9848:21,
9885:8
degree - 9884:22,
9899:10
delay - 9921:24
delegated - 9888:10
delicate - 9944:20
delivering - 9831:12
denied - 9789:20
deny - 9792:1, 9934:3,
9939:14
Department - 9808:11,
9818:2, 9818:9,
9831:17, 9855:17,
9878:24, 9879:13,
9886:4, 9888:7,
9888:13, 9889:9,
9890:1, 9893:5,
9893:11, 9893:22,
9900:12, 9902:20,
9907:11, 9907:12,
9939:3, 9939:17,
9940:20, 9940:25,
9941:8
department - 9784:1,
9811:2, 9835:3,
9835:20, 9851:5,
9867:23, 9870:18,
9871:22, 9879:22,
9925:17, 9925:22,
9925:25, 9926:17,
9926:19, 9937:6,
9948:8, 9949:1,
9949:10, 9950:5,
9950:8
Department's -
9815:25
departments - 9880:1,
9925:1
Deputy - 9903:1,
9906:20, 9907:14
deputy - 9850:25
derivative - 9908:1
describe - 9798:10,
9819:8, 9847:19,
9850:24, 9868:20
described - 9780:7,
9782:25, 9805:7,
9806:2, 9807:8, 9848:8,
9865:10, 9867:14,
9877:6, 9877:7,
9894:11
Described - 9772:6,
9772:9, 9772:11
describes - 9812:21,
9814:9
Description - 9758:2
description - 9795:3,
9807:10
descriptions - 9848:25
designated - 9884:9,
9884:10
desire - 9943:2
desired - 9931:1
despite - 9899:14
destroyed - 9883:21,
9923:21, 9931:10

destruction - 9884:10,
9927:8, 9928:6
Det - 9784:8
detail - 9781:5,
9812:22, 9814:10,
9862:9
detailed - 9797:2,
9807:10
detective - 9767:14,
9787:20, 9834:5,
9835:5, 9835:12,
9835:15, 9836:7,
9851:7, 9851:8,
9851:23, 9852:11,
9865:19, 9867:9,
9869:7, 9869:18,
9889:16
Detective - 9767:16,
9767:22, 9778:14,
9780:21, 9780:24,
9789:1, 9789:2, 9790:6,
9791:11, 9794:22,
9812:15, 9813:3,
9813:18, 9815:2,
9815:12, 9826:3,
9841:18, 9842:19,
9842:22, 9850:6,
9850:7, 9852:20
detectives - 9833:11,
9851:22, 9851:23,
9852:3, 9925:18
determination -
9773:11
determine - 9794:14,
9890:12
determined - 9945:19
determining -
9895:18, 9904:6,
9936:19
developed - 9870:10
development - 9870:5,
9870:7, 9906:8
devices - 9852:18
devote - 9897:3
dictated - 9932:20
died - 9912:7
difference - 9804:14,
9804:17, 9804:25,
9921:1, 9921:2, 9928:5
differences - 9803:18,
9804:7
different - 9790:2,
9792:13, 9801:20,
9807:14, 9807:17,
9807:18, 9835:9,
9835:14, 9854:18,
9876:20, 9883:7,
9924:6, 9948:22
difficult - 9761:8,
9922:18, 9947:24
difficulty - 9903:13,
9903:22
digest - 9790:21
direct - 9766:5,
9770:18, 9771:17,
9817:22, 9842:25,
9852:12, 9862:5
directed - 9928:25
directing - 9862:14
direction - 9760:24,
9761:2, 9783:7, 9818:7,
9831:14, 9852:9,
9852:14, 9852:21,
9855:16, 9855:22,
9929:15
Direction - 9831:21
directions - 9787:1,
9787:2, 9787:5,
9823:12
directive - 9764:2

directly - 9772:4,
9776:21, 9795:8,
9797:3, 9800:19,
9801:24, 9831:11,
9847:23, 9849:15,
9887:25, 9888:9,
9889:5, 9932:24,
9934:9
Director - 9756:4
director - 9939:16
disagree - 9867:21
disappointed -
9939:11
disclose - 9876:4,
9910:20, 9934:14
disclosed - 9876:6,
9876:7, 9900:6,
9900:12, 9900:18
disclosure - 9831:9,
9831:12, 9831:15,
9831:16, 9832:1,
9832:17, 9859:11,
9901:19, 9901:20,
9907:2, 9936:17,
9936:19, 9936:22,
9936:23
discovered - 9951:10
discuss - 9760:25,
9778:21, 9862:8
discussed - 9803:7,
9869:12, 9869:20
discusses - 9816:16
discussion - 9778:23,
9794:5, 9914:22,
9919:7
discussions - 9844:8,
9900:7, 9902:12,
9902:14, 9903:3,
9903:12, 9915:20,
9916:13, 9917:20
disposed - 9810:19,
9823:6, 9823:7, 9824:9
disposition - 9877:5,
9896:7
dispute - 9770:19
disrespect - 9765:16
dissimilarities -
9918:13, 9919:3,
9919:4
distance - 9805:19,
9805:25, 9807:3
distinction - 9920:23,
9927:11, 9927:25,
9928:2
District - 9811:18,
9811:24
division - 9816:4,
9816:6, 9835:5,
9868:22, 9869:9,
9869:19, 9889:3,
9889:16, 9917:11
divisions - 9833:8,
9851:7, 9867:22,
9868:24
Dna - 9858:24, 9861:5
Document - 9756:5,
9756:6
document - 9769:10,
9770:1, 9770:13,
9770:23, 9771:1,
9778:11, 9780:18,
9780:23, 9786:21,
9788:25, 9793:7,
9793:8, 9793:10,
9794:1, 9799:15,
9799:16, 9805:23,
9805:24, 9806:5,
9806:7, 9806:8,
9809:13, 9809:16,
9809:22, 9810:24,

9823:20, 9824:2,
9826:18, 9827:10,
9828:18, 9829:13,
9836:24, 9837:12,
9837:16, 9837:21,
9840:19, 9843:25,
9856:14, 9858:12,
9858:18, 9877:18,
9886:5, 9886:13,
9887:10, 9887:11,
9890:7, 9891:5, 9900:6,
9900:25, 9901:9,
9901:16, 9901:19,
9901:20, 9901:21,
9902:14, 9902:18,
9902:24, 9904:21,
9906:9, 9906:12,
9906:19, 9907:5,
9907:21, 9907:23,
9908:1, 9908:21,
9909:3, 9909:12,
9910:13, 9918:9,
9947:4
documentation -
9850:23
documented - 9915:3
documents - 9809:10,
9824:24, 9881:17,
9883:23, 9893:1,
9914:2, 9914:5,
9915:12, 9915:21
domain - 9872:12
Don - 9756:12
Donald - 9953:2,
9953:19
done - 9764:5, 9775:7,
9778:12, 9782:14,
9805:20, 9805:22,
9813:19, 9814:21,
9847:10, 9854:23,
9880:6, 9887:20,
9890:13, 9898:15,
9910:4, 9929:9,
9932:23
doubt - 9788:12,
9861:12, 9935:18
doubtful - 9877:8
Douglas - 9756:2,
9902:24, 9906:20
dovetail - 9927:4
down - 9783:15,
9784:18, 9793:1,
9796:13, 9796:21,
9799:24, 9805:8,
9807:19, 9809:25,
9832:3, 9832:17,
9837:22, 9843:13,
9860:2, 9872:3,
9894:16, 9911:17,
9932:11, 9941:5
downtown - 9811:11
Dr - 9870:20, 9870:23,
9872:6, 9872:16,
9872:24, 9873:10,
9874:8, 9909:16
dragged - 9806:13,
9811:15, 9811:25
dramatic - 9804:14
drawn - 9857:4,
9870:13, 9882:20
dress - 9904:14
drinking - 9840:3
driving - 9770:5,
9789:19
Drop - 9911:17
dropped - 9919:10
dropping - 9807:4
drove - 9807:2
drug - 9781:11
drugs - 9777:13,

9782:16, 9782:23
drunk - 9795:21
due - 9844:12, 9951:1
Duffus - 9919:20
dumped - 9920:17
during - 9789:16,
9854:8, 9866:22,
9869:17, 9870:10,
9870:24, 9871:3,
9873:6, 9875:5,
9875:12, 9875:13,
9881:4, 9882:3,
9888:18, 9928:24,
9939:3, 9939:17
duties - 9865:6,
9939:24

E

Earl - 9810:1
early - 9769:8, 9776:6,
9825:20, 9826:9,
9864:2, 9882:8,
9882:13, 9907:7,
9907:19, 9917:12,
9923:16, 9948:20
easily - 9929:8
easy - 9795:19,
9795:22, 9936:6
Eddie - 9757:7,
9764:24, 9767:13,
9852:4, 9858:16,
9899:4
edition - 9827:12
editorial - 9911:2,
9911:3
Edmondson - 9878:15
Edmonton - 9781:13
Edmundson - 9784:3
Edward - 9755:7
effect - 9799:18,
9863:15, 9888:4,
9910:17, 9915:21
effectiveness -
9764:17
effort - 9826:1, 9849:5,
9882:24
efforts - 9788:8,
9794:8
eight - 9806:2,
9806:17
eight-minute - 9806:2,
9806:17
either - 9767:18,
9773:19, 9794:24,
9796:11, 9817:9,
9825:23, 9839:12,
9865:18, 9872:9,
9879:5, 9888:8, 9896:3,
9910:14, 9917:6,
9926:14, 9927:20,
9933:14, 9934:17,
9938:23
Either - 9773:22
elbow - 9925:19
elderly - 9943:22
electronic - 9881:6,
9884:24, 9885:11,
9926:15
element - 9819:21
elevated - 9946:20
elevator - 9798:1
eliminate - 9794:9,
9796:22
eliminates - 9773:20,
9794:24
eliminating - 9796:12
Elson - 9757:6, 9758:5,
9759:5, 9763:17,
9862:24, 9863:2,



9863:3, 9868:5,
9868:19, 9877:11,
9877:17, 9883:4,
9883:11, 9883:14,
9884:19, 9885:2,
9885:4, 9886:11,
9889:10, 9900:5,
9901:7, 9902:8,
9902:13, 9906:14,
9908:22, 9909:7,
9909:10, 9910:7,
9910:22, 9911:13,
9911:14, 9911:18,
9938:14
Elson's - 9903:10
emphatically -
9789:14, 9792:2
employed - 9880:2,
9898:3, 9899:22
employment - 9939:2
empted - 9874:23,
9898:20
Emson - 9870:20,
9870:23, 9872:6,
9872:16, 9872:24,
9873:10, 9874:8
Emson's - 9873:10
encounter - 9951:9
encountered -
9806:13
encouraged - 9952:11
end - 9791:20,
9797:16, 9800:17,
9856:13, 9862:13,
9885:9, 9899:2
endeavouring -
9903:18
enforcement - 9951:8
enlarge - 9846:17
enlarged - 9884:1
ensure - 9884:8,
9885:9
enter - 9819:9,
9876:21, 9895:18
entered - 9820:21,
9821:10, 9853:22,
9890:25, 9891:2,
9891:14, 9891:22,
9896:18, 9931:9
enters - 9819:11,
9819:18
entertained - 9920:13
entire - 9763:9
entirely - 9801:20
entry - 9914:24
equal - 9851:16,
9950:22
error - 9836:22,
9859:14
errors - 9836:22
escape - 9946:11
especially - 9950:6
espoused - 9845:11,
9845:13
Esq - 9756:3, 9757:3,
9757:6, 9757:9
essentially - 9842:23
Esson - 9756:13
establish - 9773:14,
9788:8, 9799:6,
9847:10
established - 9788:13,
9815:22, 9827:6,
9859:15, 9875:6,
9875:10, 9875:12,
9881:20, 9896:9,
9951:5
establishing - 9872:22
establishment -
9875:24

etc - 9779:17, 9849:4
etcetera - 9762:2
evening - 9759:9,
9760:2
event - 9761:17,
9833:20, 9844:17,
9855:22, 9903:14,
9905:21, 9924:4
eventually - 9765:9,
9805:1, 9816:23,
9835:8, 9911:24,
9923:20
evidence - 9760:14,
9760:25, 9761:1,
9761:14, 9761:18,
9761:24, 9762:9,
9763:19, 9764:3,
9764:4, 9764:14,
9768:10, 9768:12,
9768:14, 9773:19,
9774:4, 9774:6,
9774:19, 9776:21,
9778:8, 9781:16,
9784:20, 9784:21,
9794:17, 9794:18,
9794:24, 9798:21,
9799:5, 9799:11,
9799:21, 9800:5,
9800:14, 9800:19,
9805:9, 9842:25,
9849:14, 9850:18,
9858:16, 9858:24,
9859:5, 9859:9,
9859:17, 9860:3,
9860:6, 9860:8,
9860:14, 9861:2,
9861:18, 9861:20,
9861:23, 9862:1,
9862:8, 9862:16,
9862:20, 9863:7,
9864:3, 9864:7,
9864:16, 9866:4,
9867:2, 9867:4, 9867:5,
9867:13, 9867:15,
9870:20, 9871:17,
9872:10, 9872:14,
9872:21, 9873:2,
9873:4, 9873:5,
9873:12, 9873:18,
9874:10, 9876:5,
9891:12, 9895:9,
9896:16, 9896:17,
9898:25, 9899:1,
9899:3, 9899:5,
9899:23, 9900:2,
9909:18, 9912:11,
9919:24, 9920:12,
9923:19, 9935:25,
9936:2, 9945:16,
9947:2
evidentiary - 9857:4
evidentiary-wise -
9857:4
evolutionary - 9885:6
evolved - 9832:1
ex - 9839:15, 9840:2
ex-wife - 9839:15,
9840:2
exact - 9786:18,
9886:7
exactly - 9765:14,
9779:3, 9793:21
Exactly - 9787:24,
9912:23
examination -
9803:14, 9833:21,
9843:17, 9847:18,
9866:8, 9866:19,
9866:22, 9870:4,
9880:6, 9923:11,

9938:3
examination-in-chief -
9923:11
examining - 9909:14
example - 9775:3,
9799:14, 9803:21,
9819:8, 9820:3,
9820:13, 9846:7,
9856:1, 9865:14,
9866:1, 9870:11,
9896:14, 9912:18,
9922:6, 9925:17,
9927:12, 9942:15
excess - 9946:15
exclude - 9864:10
exculpate - 9900:1,
9900:3
excuse - 9904:14
executive - 9869:21
Executive - 9756:4
exercise - 9763:12
exhausted - 9896:4,
9896:19
exhaustive - 9914:1,
9914:3, 9914:11
exhibits - 9847:7,
9847:14
exist - 9878:23,
9890:15, 9890:17,
9894:8, 9894:9,
9915:13, 9926:11,
9946:21
existed - 9802:21,
9885:12, 9890:15,
9909:12, 9930:2
existence - 9885:13,
9933:13
exists - 9897:25
exonerate - 9790:8
exonerating - 9862:14
expect - 9790:4,
9792:12, 9793:4,
9817:25, 9818:1,
9823:8, 9879:8,
9901:16, 9903:15,
9946:13
expectation - 9933:5
expected - 9860:9,
9862:2, 9874:8,
9874:13
experience - 9765:6,
9767:9, 9782:7, 9782:8,
9785:16, 9799:3,
9819:14, 9820:9,
9821:2, 9856:6,
9876:12, 9876:22,
9897:11, 9951:15,
9951:24
experienced - 9768:3,
9859:14, 9950:7
expert - 9872:18
expertise - 9873:16
explain - 9872:11
explained - 9824:12,
9904:15, 9920:5
explanation - 9786:5,
9787:16, 9866:15,
9883:18, 9895:5,
9939:20
express - 9947:7
expressed - 9772:19,
9785:5, 9908:14
expression - 9764:10,
9909:24
expunged - 9904:9
extend - 9863:16
extensive - 9781:11,
9845:25, 9847:24
extensively - 9783:13
extent - 9844:21,

9874:5, 9874:23,
9898:7
extra - 9916:20
extraordinary -
9909:18
extreme - 9949:1
extremely - 9834:12

F

fabricate - 9936:13
fabricating - 9850:18
face - 9806:18,
9806:19, 9807:9,
9807:10, 9807:11,
9807:20, 9904:1,
9908:2
facing - 9792:5,
9950:1
fact - 9767:1, 9767:2,
9774:9, 9787:17,
9797:5, 9798:3,
9801:23, 9802:3,
9804:9, 9835:13,
9836:5, 9840:2, 9846:4,
9855:25, 9856:24,
9857:5, 9857:12,
9874:16, 9876:7,
9879:7, 9880:15,
9889:16, 9891:17,
9895:6, 9895:16,
9896:7, 9899:14,
9900:24, 9901:24,
9902:4, 9902:16,
9908:5, 9909:11,
9911:22, 9913:20,
9915:13, 9916:18,
9916:23, 9917:2,
9917:14, 9919:23,
9928:24, 9933:15,
9934:22, 9942:11,
9945:11, 9945:18,
9946:23, 9947:1
factor - 9779:11
factors - 9840:9
facts - 9880:25
fair - 9765:10, 9765:13,
9765:22, 9773:25,
9774:1, 9774:5, 9775:1,
9775:2, 9776:11,
9777:16, 9779:12,
9780:13, 9782:5,
9782:11, 9784:24,
9790:12, 9790:22,
9791:17, 9792:10,
9793:2, 9796:14,
9798:10, 9799:25,
9803:20, 9807:14,
9807:24, 9813:23,
9818:24, 9825:7,
9829:8, 9834:1,
9834:15, 9834:16,
9842:18, 9845:11,
9849:7, 9852:13,
9859:3, 9863:5, 9864:5,
9865:11, 9866:25,
9871:19, 9871:20,
9873:25, 9874:19,
9874:25, 9879:7,
9882:2, 9882:6,
9882:10, 9885:13,
9888:7, 9895:14,
9920:12, 9923:17,
9936:9, 9937:20,
9945:9
Fair - 9782:18, 9788:23,
9795:25, 9803:3,
9820:7, 9845:17
fairly - 9783:13,
9786:16, 9845:25
fairness - 9760:6,
9760:16, 9871:13,
9886:16
fall - 9796:2, 9814:13,
9814:22, 9823:8,
9827:24, 9828:16,
9829:1, 9829:3,
9833:17, 9839:7,
9848:20, 9947:16
fallen - 9822:20
falling - 9921:19
familiar - 9775:13,
9786:11, 9809:9,
9862:11, 9870:6,
9890:14, 9950:25
familiarity - 9937:9
far - 9854:6, 9932:21,
9937:15, 9942:10
fashion - 9801:22,
9914:14
Father - 9799:17
fear - 9938:4
February - 9802:10,
9810:4, 9812:23,
9813:2, 9824:6, 9825:4,
9827:12, 9828:20,
9829:14, 9830:3,
9837:25, 9838:11,
9841:20, 9842:7,
9842:11, 9845:5,
9845:9
federal - 9898:12
Federal - 9907:11,
9907:22, 9948:5
feeding - 9773:24
feelings - 9762:12,
9762:14, 9945:6
fell - 9833:23
fellow - 9773:1,
9780:12, 9795:19,
9802:23, 9813:13
felt - 9789:25, 9847:2,
9847:22, 9937:23,
9940:12, 9946:18,
9951:7, 9951:21
female - 9778:16,
9943:21
few - 9825:16,
9904:17, 9930:4,
9945:18, 9947:5
figure - 9808:2
file - 9775:16, 9779:21,
9804:14, 9805:4,
9842:19, 9844:12,
9844:16, 9844:18,
9854:2, 9855:4, 9855:7,
9869:17, 9879:6,
9879:10, 9879:11,
9879:17, 9880:8,
9881:24, 9881:25,
9882:14, 9884:13,
9884:14, 9886:17,
9896:15, 9897:10,
9925:12, 9925:18,
9925:20, 9927:5,
9927:9, 9928:3,
9928:16, 9931:1,
9931:4, 9932:7,
9932:15, 9932:23,
9935:4, 9941:14
file-storing - 9882:14
filed - 9850:23
files - 9804:18,
9822:24, 9844:8,
9879:1, 9880:16,
9881:3, 9881:5, 9881:9,
9881:10, 9881:20,
9882:6, 9882:17,
9883:1, 9883:10,
9884:7, 9885:12,



9885:15, 9885:17,
9885:19, 9896:13,
9914:1, 9923:7,
9923:12, 9923:20,
9924:9, 9924:22,
9925:15, 9926:9,
9926:15, 9926:20,
9927:2, 9927:6,
9927:15, 9927:19,
9928:6, 9928:9,
9928:25, 9929:3,
9931:3, 9931:7,
9931:10, 9932:1
files - 9925:3
final - 9815:20,
9910:23
finality - 9896:1,
9896:5
Finally - 9931:13
finally - 9810:19,
9933:7, 9947:19
findings - 9799:3
fine - 9716:18, 9901:11
fingerprinting -
9864:25
fingerprints - 9829:15,
9829:16
First - 9765:3, 9825:20,
9831:10, 9951:13
first - 9759:6, 9786:21,
9787:3, 9797:6,
9797:19, 9798:6,
9798:12, 9800:10,
9804:1, 9806:10,
9811:6, 9811:10,
9812:19, 9819:17,
9827:4, 9828:20,
9841:23, 9841:25,
9842:1, 9842:24,
9859:16, 9861:8,
9861:9, 9861:11,
9866:14, 9867:15,
9872:2, 9881:20,
9883:8, 9887:12,
9887:16, 9905:6,
9910:14, 9932:4,
9951:12, 9952:4
Fisher - 9757:9,
9766:10, 9767:3,
9768:8, 9768:17,
9800:25, 9801:14,
9802:2, 9802:8, 9808:5,
9808:10, 9808:12,
9808:22, 9809:14,
9810:1, 9810:25,
9813:7, 9815:18,
9816:22, 9817:17,
9817:20, 9818:21,
9821:16, 9821:20,
9822:1, 9822:7, 9824:7,
9826:6, 9837:23,
9839:3, 9839:8,
9839:15, 9839:16,
9840:15, 9840:16,
9841:5, 9841:9,
9841:14, 9853:15,
9858:15, 9858:23,
9860:14, 9861:3,
9876:8, 9887:4,
9889:22, 9890:3,
9891:12, 9891:13,
9892:19, 9892:22,
9893:6, 9894:4,
9894:19, 9895:1,
9895:6, 9898:25,
9899:1, 9909:17,
9914:7, 9916:10,
9916:15, 9916:24,
9918:14, 9921:5,
9921:7, 9931:7, 9931:9,

9933:11, 9933:20,
9945:11, 9945:17,
9946:23
Fisher - 9800:25
Fisher's - 9767:20,
9858:22, 9876:7,
9915:17
fit - 9842:20
fitted - 9848:24
five - 9800:18,
9801:24, 9802:4,
9843:13, 9926:3,
9946:5
flag - 9780:5
flow - 9867:22,
9868:13, 9868:23
fluke - 9946:11
focus - 9935:6
follow - 9761:15,
9774:20, 9780:12,
9785:19, 9787:20,
9803:1, 9814:19,
9814:20, 9816:8,
9839:21, 9844:7,
9847:6, 9848:12,
9852:22, 9853:23,
9866:14, 9882:9,
9921:5
follow-up - 9814:19,
9814:20, 9839:21,
9844:7, 9847:6,
9848:12, 9853:23,
9882:9
followed - 9761:11,
9797:14, 9811:14,
9811:25, 9844:14,
9922:7, 9932:14,
9947:17
following - 9783:8
foolish - 9869:2
Force - 9938:24
force - 9855:20,
9875:20, 9889:3,
9896:9, 9925:13,
9930:21
forced - 9779:17,
9779:25, 9781:7
forceful - 9783:1
forces - 9925:2
foregoing - 9847:21,
9953:4
forget - 9896:11,
9909:24
forgetting - 9878:14
forgive - 9869:23,
9898:8
forgot - 9787:16
forgotten - 9886:20
form - 9881:6,
9884:25, 9885:11
formalize - 9875:23
Former - 9863:3,
9895:24
former - 9760:3,
9765:4, 9767:16,
9780:16, 9839:25,
9850:6, 9863:13,
9863:17, 9885:5,
9889:23, 9900:9,
9900:20, 9901:12,
9901:15, 9903:4,
9909:15, 9910:23,
9912:25
Fort - 9811:2
forthcoming - 9939:10
forward - 9767:9,
9829:22, 9829:25,
9858:23, 9905:1,
9921:25
foul - 9834:2

four - 9817:3, 9823:6,
9843:12, 9913:3,
9946:2
fourth - 9894:17
Fox - 9757:7, 9758:4,
9759:6, 9764:18,
9764:20, 9764:24,
9806:5, 9806:9,
9836:10, 9836:14,
9836:17, 9836:20,
9837:7, 9837:10,
9837:16, 9837:17,
9838:9, 9838:13,
9862:22, 9874:23,
9878:1, 9898:20,
9919:3
frame - 9771:4,
9801:18, 9826:14,
9887:23, 9923:16,
9926:5
framed - 9766:9
frankly - 9772:19,
9813:6
Frayer - 9757:10,
9900:7, 9900:23,
9900:24, 9901:8,
9901:17, 9901:22,
9902:9, 9902:11,
9903:8, 9904:3,
9904:11, 9905:7,
9905:13, 9906:15,
9906:23, 9909:5,
9910:11, 9910:15,
9910:20, 9910:21
Frayer's - 9906:25,
9908:14, 9909:2
free - 9889:4, 9940:12,
9951:23
freedom - 9867:24,
9868:17
frequent - 9869:6,
9869:10
fresh - 9819:25
Friday - 9828:2,
9828:25
friend - 9785:13,
9898:20
Friend - 9761:21,
9762:10, 9900:7
friends - 9770:3,
9800:18
front - 9811:15
full - 9785:8, 9785:14
fully - 9917:2
funeral - 9919:24
future - 9902:6,
9903:23

G

Gail - 9767:19, 9768:8,
9768:19, 9768:23,
9769:5, 9769:15,
9769:20, 9770:3,
9771:10, 9771:19,
9772:14, 9772:21,
9776:1, 9779:20,
9783:5, 9795:6,
9800:20, 9801:5,
9802:13, 9802:20,
9803:8, 9803:21,
9804:25, 9805:8,
9805:10, 9805:25,
9806:13, 9807:1,
9807:15, 9827:17,
9831:6, 9836:1, 9836:4,
9837:2, 9840:17,
9841:19, 9842:16,
9843:2, 9845:4,
9845:18, 9849:16,

9849:25, 9859:8,
9860:16, 9861:14,
9872:1, 9873:20,
9899:19, 9922:4,
9942:18, 9943:6,
9943:25
game - 9826:14
gaming - 9833:16
gaol - 9778:19
garbage - 9773:24
Garrett - 9757:5,
9938:12
Garry - 9811:2
gather - 9900:13,
9936:18, 9937:1
gathered - 9778:9,
9921:22, 9923:10
gathering - 9790:19
General - 9817:14,
9818:6, 9818:7,
9855:23, 9903:1
general - 9765:4,
9770:12, 9771:24,
9772:4, 9772:21,
9772:25, 9774:2,
9783:17, 9788:15,
9818:4, 9820:18,
9839:24, 9841:22,
9853:23, 9854:15,
9871:13, 9871:14,
9872:2, 9879:4,
9904:12, 9943:11,
9944:22, 9950:16
generalities - 9936:4
Generally - 9897:15,
9898:1
generally - 9773:6,
9775:14, 9819:23,
9854:19, 9872:4,
9890:21, 9938:22,
9938:23
generated - 9879:25
gentleman - 9937:22,
9943:22
geographically -
9917:1
Gerry - 9930:7
Gibson - 9757:8,
9886:10, 9886:12
Gilbertson - 9756:14
girl - 9789:8, 9789:12,
9789:24, 9791:6,
9791:25, 9811:12,
9811:20, 9811:25,
9812:4, 9824:13
girlfriend - 9780:16
girls - 9848:6
given - 9759:19,
9796:9, 9810:24,
9812:7, 9813:7, 9814:6,
9816:24, 9821:12,
9824:7, 9824:9,
9837:20, 9846:18,
9848:25, 9856:22,
9904:24, 9906:17,
9907:5, 9907:18,
9942:19
glass - 9764:21
global - 9915:25,
9916:5, 9916:9,
9916:14, 9916:18,
9945:10
global-type - 9916:9,
9916:14
golf - 9943:16,
9943:23
Goodman - 9887:15
Government - 9902:21,
9907:7, 9907:18
government - 9907:6

grabbed - 9807:12,
9807:22, 9811:14
grave - 9942:4
great - 9794:5,
9836:20, 9899:10,
9909:11
greater - 9835:24
greatest - 9909:21
greatly - 9834:11
Greenberg - 9810:9,
9810:11, 9817:18,
9817:23, 9895:2
grew - 9835:25,
9931:25
ground - 9764:25,
9795:20, 9857:1
grounds - 9897:23
Group - 9848:5
group - 9795:14
grown - 9948:1
guess - 9806:21,
9806:23, 9844:20,
9858:7, 9866:15,
9882:15, 9891:25,
9909:7, 9933:17
guessing - 9943:19
guilt - 9860:10,
9860:13
guilty - 9766:10,
9766:12, 9767:3,
9814:21, 9816:23,
9816:25, 9817:2,
9817:6, 9819:2, 9819:3,
9820:20, 9821:5,
9821:10, 9859:19,
9876:8, 9891:17,
9891:18, 9895:19,
9951:18, 9951:21,
9951:22
gun - 9781:9
Gus - 9824:3
gut - 9798:10
guy - 9857:15

H

hand - 9774:15,
9791:14, 9795:22
handed - 9762:17,
9762:24
handle - 9922:11
hands - 9807:12,
9902:18, 9951:15
hands-on - 9951:15
happier - 9764:15
happy - 9764:12
harbour - 9945:5
hard - 9780:10,
9826:13, 9883:8,
9884:9, 9884:24,
9923:20, 9923:23,
9924:5, 9924:9,
9926:14, 9928:18,
9928:23
Hardy - 9756:3
harm - 9927:20
Hartz - 9944:16
head - 9814:1, 9869:8,
9870:11, 9871:4,
9937:5, 9943:7
headed - 9851:8,
9851:11, 9851:14
heads - 9869:7
head - 9778:6, 9817:19,
9864:2, 9867:2, 9867:5,
9867:15, 9899:3,
9899:4, 9899:12,
9924:25, 9950:4
heard - 9774:3,
9780:6, 9792:17,



9797:15, 9798:22,
9804:6, 9805:9,
9817:12, 9823:10,
9823:15, 9823:19,
9860:7, 9861:18,
9870:20, 9898:24,
9898:25, 9899:1,
9947:5, 9949:8, 9950:2
hearing - 9763:8,
9800:14, 9810:5,
9830:9, 9840:14,
9899:2, 9899:5, 9940:4
Hearing - 9858:1
heart - 9795:20,
9950:6
heavy - 9854:10
heinous - 9946:13
held - 9856:3, 9902:3,
9939:21
help - 9920:7, 9930:8
helped - 9799:23,
9872:19
helpful - 9762:15,
9901:25, 9906:2
here' - 9857:15
hereby - 9953:4
herein - 9953:6
Hersh - 9757:2
hid - 9767:1, 9767:2
hidden - 9807:23,
9825:18
hide - 9825:22, 9826:3
hiding - 9767:17
hierarchy - 9850:24
high - 9939:21, 9947:9
higher - 9853:9
highest - 9851:19
highlight - 9783:19,
9793:10, 9809:24,
9827:13, 9827:19,
9837:23, 9841:2,
9844:3
highlighted - 9771:3,
9894:16
highly - 9941:4,
9942:6
highly-publicized -
9942:6
Hill - 9811:17
him' - 9802:24
Hinz - 9756:11, 9953:2,
9953:13
hippie - 9778:17
hit - 9864:20, 9865:3
Hodson - 9756:2,
9759:10, 9759:16,
9760:21, 9760:22,
9762:18, 9762:19,
9763:2, 9763:4,
9763:10, 9763:16,
9763:22, 9906:9,
9906:11, 9906:15,
9906:24, 9907:13,
9907:17, 9907:24,
9908:4, 9908:12,
9910:1, 9910:10,
9910:18, 9911:11,
9913:2, 9913:7,
9913:10, 9913:22,
9952:15
hold - 9907:22,
9909:20, 9909:21,
9952:7
holding - 9795:21,
9820:5
home - 9805:10,
9833:20, 9919:24,
9931:16, 9932:8,
9932:9, 9935:10,
9948:1

home-grown - 9948:1
homicide - 9864:8,
9864:14, 9866:10,
9870:24, 9871:1
Hon - 9757:11
Honestly - 9888:24
honesty - 9850:16,
9940:1
Honourable - 9755:6,
9903:4
hope - 9835:11,
9850:9
hoped - 9802:22
hoping - 9790:20
hospital - 9870:19
Hospital - 9811:19,
9872:17
hospitals - 9870:17
Hotel - 9755:16
hour - 9827:25
hours - 9869:18,
9869:22
house - 9778:17,
9841:25, 9907:22
house-to-house -
9841:25
Hugh - 9756:13
human - 9790:5,
9909:19, 9909:22,
9952:2
hurtful - 9950:6,
9950:17
husband - 9921:19
Hutchinson - 9911:4,
9911:19
hypnosis - 9793:18

I

Id - 9806:8
idea - 9775:15, 9848:9,
9853:25, 9885:9
ident - 9851:14,
9865:6, 9866:19
identical - 9803:19
identification -
9863:24, 9864:15,
9865:13, 9865:21,
9865:23, 9866:2,
9866:7, 9866:9,
9866:12, 9867:8,
9869:9, 9870:1,
9870:11, 9871:4,
9872:6, 9937:5, 9941:7
identified - 9770:17,
9796:19, 9808:6,
9808:8, 9842:20,
9842:24, 9843:14,
9926:5
identify - 9773:15,
9795:22, 9842:14,
9872:25, 9882:12
identifying - 9873:3,
9873:7, 9873:11,
9873:18, 9873:24,
9874:11, 9874:18,
9912:20, 9929:21
identity - 9807:23,
9893:25
ignore - 9780:11
illness - 9921:11
image - 9881:6, 9911:8
immediate - 9904:1
immediately - 9796:4,
9809:17
impact - 9907:3,
9909:17
impeding - 9764:16
implementation -
9832:22

implemented - 9832:2
implicate - 9794:9,
9796:22
implicated - 9804:21,
9805:2
implicates - 9794:25,
9800:20
implicating - 9796:11,
9801:24, 9849:25
importance - 9833:16,
9944:6
important - 9868:25,
9882:12, 9895:25,
9896:5, 9922:23
imposed - 9820:21,
9821:4, 9916:10,
9916:18
impressed - 9911:14
impressions - 9850:15
improper - 9914:20,
9946:18
improperly - 9859:6
improved - 9871:21
improves - 9871:15,
9871:16
in-house - 9907:22
inactive - 9927:7
inadequate - 9859:10
inappropriate - 9862:8
incidence - 9835:22
incident - 9830:2,
9931:24
incidents - 9829:22,
9847:12, 9864:18,
9887:3
include - 9835:3
included - 9851:4,
9881:11, 9900:13,
9931:18
includes - 9770:2
including - 9765:9,
9784:13
inconsistencies -
9786:3
incorrect - 9837:3,
9853:13, 9916:19
increased - 9835:22,
9835:23
incriminating -
9774:3, 9774:4, 9774:6,
9774:8, 9774:19
indecent - 9768:24,
9865:11, 9946:6
indecently - 9805:6,
9829:20
indeed - 9860:14,
9863:11, 9875:4,
9876:8, 9898:2, 9901:3,
9901:17, 9910:4
independent - 9919:21
index - 9882:17,
9884:11, 9884:12
Index - 9758:1,
9802:21
indicate - 9776:25,
9799:2, 9839:18,
9848:2, 9855:4, 9855:5,
9869:5, 9871:20,
9890:24, 9891:8,
9891:13, 9892:3
indicated - 9762:2,
9769:12, 9772:13,
9772:16, 9775:22,
9776:7, 9776:8, 9820:9,
9835:10, 9837:1,
9848:4, 9870:3, 9874:2,
9899:14, 9899:25
indicates - 9770:14,
9773:22, 9886:22,
9890:8

indicating - 9839:8,
9899:15
indication - 9818:17,
9830:17, 9834:2,
9838:4, 9838:25
indices - 9808:19
indictment - 9894:25
indirect - 9915:16
indirectly - 9932:24
individual - 9776:25,
9804:12, 9807:11,
9819:17, 9823:17,
9876:20, 9892:2
individualized -
9916:4
individuals - 9761:12,
9761:13, 9762:7,
9769:18, 9770:14,
9785:25, 9820:14,
9834:10, 9848:23,
9897:12
inferences - 9912:23
influence - 9921:16
information - 9769:19,
9771:9, 9771:17,
9772:21, 9773:1,
9773:4, 9773:8,
9774:24, 9776:11,
9776:15, 9776:21,
9780:10, 9781:14,
9781:17, 9788:20,
9790:16, 9790:20,
9791:21, 9792:8,
9797:7, 9797:18,
9797:25, 9798:5,
9798:12, 9798:18,
9802:17, 9809:23,
9810:1, 9810:18,
9813:12, 9815:15,
9816:13, 9817:16,
9817:24, 9818:14,
9822:4, 9825:17,
9825:22, 9826:4,
9826:12, 9827:16,
9828:5, 9830:24,
9831:1, 9831:4, 9831:9,
9831:22, 9832:11,
9839:6, 9841:13,
9844:17, 9846:17,
9849:2, 9853:14,
9858:21, 9867:6,
9867:7, 9868:25,
9869:2, 9874:9,
9874:14, 9874:17,
9879:2, 9886:22,
9886:24, 9887:14,
9887:17, 9888:6,
9888:8, 9888:14,
9889:21, 9892:8,
9892:19, 9893:11,
9893:17, 9895:23,
9914:5, 9914:18,
9916:17, 9917:25,
9918:1, 9919:13,
9921:8, 9922:1, 9922:3,
9922:19, 9922:22,
9933:6, 9934:19,
9939:10
informed - 9877:4,
9877:9, 9950:3
initial - 9775:21,
9884:12
initiate - 9816:4,
9817:10
initiated - 9869:17
injuries - 9864:22
Inland - 9756:14
innocence - 9860:11,
9897:13
innocent - 9766:9,

9766:11, 9767:2,
9774:7, 9774:18,
9787:15, 9853:14,
9861:13, 9861:21,
9951:23
innumerable - 9927:15
input - 9852:8,
9852:15, 9853:5,
9895:17, 9904:23
inquire - 9930:24
inquiries - 9880:23
inquiry - 9763:15,
9850:10
Inquiry - 9755:2,
9755:23, 9764:17,
9850:10, 9863:8,
9902:18, 9902:22,
9912:12, 9939:7,
9940:5
Insp - 9784:2, 9846:15
inspector - 9878:4,
9878:5, 9889:13,
9889:14, 9889:15
Inspector - 9812:15,
9812:18, 9813:4,
9813:18, 9813:25,
9814:16, 9823:3,
9851:12, 9851:19,
9888:22, 9889:11
instance - 9942:2
instances - 9826:22,
9865:18, 9865:25
instead - 9916:24
instead - 9882:16
instinct - 9798:10
instincts - 9777:6
institution - 9910:24
instructed - 9859:18
instructing - 9872:9
instructions -
9856:22, 9888:2,
9901:5, 9901:22,
9909:6
integrity - 9940:1
intentionally - 9767:1
intentions - 9903:10
intercourse - 9779:17,
9779:25
interest - 9787:9,
9896:8, 9897:10,
9938:20, 9947:25
interested - 9762:1,
9856:21, 9868:3,
9894:2, 9896:10,
9921:4, 9931:13,
9938:18
interesting - 9830:1
interests - 9773:16
interpret - 9766:3
interpretation -
9920:11, 9920:18,
9920:19
interpreted - 9932:9
interrogate - 9813:6
interrogated - 9848:3,
9848:24
interrogation -
9778:24, 9847:25
interrupt - 9883:5
interview - 9759:18,
9759:19, 9759:25,
9760:1, 9760:3, 9760:7,
9763:17, 9763:23
interviewed - 9778:19,
9779:6, 9780:15,
9780:17, 9783:25,
9789:10, 9789:12,
9846:15, 9848:6,
9933:18
interviewing - 9784:10



interviews - 9759:13,
9760:12, 9859:8
introduced - 9904:10
investigate - 9769:21,
9773:9, 9773:13,
9774:25
investigated - 9769:5,
9769:13, 9770:7,
9770:11, 9808:24,
9827:22, 9836:6,
9836:7, 9846:20,
9846:21, 9849:7,
9849:8
investigating -
9773:10, 9779:20,
9795:17, 9796:16,
9828:22, 9843:7
investigation - 9765:1,
9771:6, 9776:17,
9776:19, 9777:3,
9789:11, 9796:7,
9801:21, 9805:20,
9805:21, 9816:7,
9828:6, 9841:19,
9851:8, 9852:8,
9852:10, 9854:11,
9859:6, 9865:12,
9865:14, 9865:20,
9870:1, 9871:19,
9872:15, 9878:1,
9878:7, 9878:9,
9878:19, 9878:21,
9878:23, 9879:24,
9880:14, 9886:3,
9887:20, 9887:25,
9888:11, 9888:19,
9890:16, 9896:2,
9912:5, 9941:11,
9942:7, 9948:9
investigations -
9814:13, 9851:2,
9851:4, 9869:1, 9897:3,
9933:3
investigator - 9779:20,
9780:4, 9780:9, 9787:8,
9788:11, 9788:15,
9790:19, 9792:12,
9793:5, 9801:15,
9806:20, 9815:4,
9844:25, 9855:4,
9869:3, 9930:9
investigators -
9822:24, 9854:16,
9854:19, 9864:11,
9867:24, 9875:16,
9877:4, 9879:3, 9943:1
involve - 9807:22
involved - 9768:1,
9769:20, 9771:19,
9772:4, 9772:14,
9772:20, 9779:22,
9782:10, 9782:14,
9782:15, 9782:23,
9785:13, 9791:15,
9797:3, 9800:15,
9801:9, 9804:10,
9805:13, 9817:4,
9818:3, 9818:18,
9818:19, 9823:25,
9831:11, 9835:6,
9840:16, 9842:19,
9842:23, 9843:1,
9850:17, 9853:16,
9864:6, 9864:16,
9864:20, 9864:24,
9865:5, 9865:6,
9865:19, 9866:3,
9866:7, 9866:20,
9881:3, 9887:25,
9894:20, 9914:7,

9920:21, 9922:9,
9932:24, 9933:4,
9934:9, 9936:18,
9940:3, 9946:19,
9948:8
involvement -
9767:19, 9767:20,
9833:22, 9841:18,
9841:24, 9842:2,
9858:22, 9865:25,
9869:25, 9895:17,
9914:3, 9914:12,
9945:2
involving - 9765:1,
9803:10
Irene - 9756:10
Irwin - 9757:12
Isabelle - 9756:6
issue - 9762:14,
9777:12, 9777:13,
9791:17, 9792:4,
9793:1, 9794:23,
9815:9, 9874:24,
9896:11, 9904:17,
9905:21, 9908:16,
9909:6, 9926:10
issued - 9828:3,
9857:17, 9857:18,
9858:9, 9858:19
issues - 9791:13,
9833:23, 9869:4,
9869:11, 9905:6,
9939:9, 9946:19
issuing - 9826:21
it - 9788:14
item - 9761:6
items - 9865:2,
9932:17
itself - 9860:25,
9902:24

J

jail - 9766:12, 9782:14,
9819:20, 9819:23
James - 9757:3, 9784:7
janitor - 9943:23
January - 9762:21,
9763:2, 9768:21,
9797:8, 9830:2, 9859:3,
9870:22, 9942:21
Jennifer - 9757:10
job - 9765:22, 9765:23,
9815:6, 9926:2, 9938:6
John - 9775:6,
9775:22, 9778:16,
9779:5, 9780:6, 9781:1,
9781:24, 9782:21,
9785:3, 9787:3,
9787:12, 9788:2,
9788:16, 9790:7,
9790:15, 9793:12,
9797:2, 9798:11,
9798:20, 9798:21,
9800:21, 9849:24,
9863:12, 9912:3,
9936:2
John/wilson - 9792:8
Johnston - 9933:10,
9933:25, 9934:16,
9935:3
jointly - 9834:6
Jordan - 9756:3
Joseph - 9758:3,
9764:19
Joyce - 9757:3
judge - 9915:10
judges - 9765:17
judicial - 9861:16,
9891:2, 9905:20,

9914:14, 9918:20
judiciary - 9944:23
July - 9886:8, 9886:16,
9892:14, 9893:2
jump - 9885:1
jumping - 9763:6,
9832:25
June - 9755:21
jurisdiction - 9762:6,
9815:23, 9817:13,
9876:14, 9876:19
jurisdictions - 9916:16
jury - 9859:17, 9860:10
justice - 9897:24,
9900:21, 9937:10,
9951:2, 9951:24,
9952:5
Justice - 9755:6,
9757:11, 9757:13,
9818:2, 9831:17,
9855:17, 9856:17,
9856:18, 9858:14,
9886:4, 9888:7,
9888:18, 9889:9,
9890:1, 9893:5,
9893:12, 9897:23,
9898:16, 9900:9,
9900:13, 9900:20,
9902:20, 9903:2,
9903:4, 9903:17,
9904:25, 9905:8,
9905:17, 9906:4,
9906:17, 9907:11,
9907:12, 9909:22,
9918:21, 9939:3,
9939:17, 9940:21,
9940:25, 9948:5
justify - 9860:15

K

Kara - 9756:6
Karen - 9756:11,
9953:2, 9953:13
Karst - 9757:7,
9764:24, 9767:14,
9767:16, 9767:22,
9768:2, 9778:19,
9784:9, 9789:2, 9790:6,
9791:11, 9792:23,
9793:21, 9812:15,
9813:3, 9813:18,
9815:2, 9815:12,
9826:3, 9841:17,
9841:18, 9842:19,
9842:22, 9849:18,
9849:19, 9850:2,
9850:6, 9850:7, 9852:4,
9852:6, 9858:16,
9899:4
Karst's - 9789:1,
9794:22
Keelan - 9930:8,
9930:11
keep - 9783:8, 9811:8,
9871:23, 9878:14,
9924:7
keeping - 9762:8,
9882:17, 9883:8,
9883:20
Ken - 9789:4, 9789:6
kept - 9896:13,
9924:22, 9931:15,
9932:18
Kettles - 9784:8
kids - 9781:25
kill - 9776:1
killed - 9783:5, 9803:8
killing - 9772:14,
9942:20, 9943:5,

9944:12
kind - 9774:16,
9774:18, 9776:12,
9777:3, 9781:21,
9782:16, 9788:14,
9809:24, 9813:19,
9818:8, 9826:13,
9845:3, 9854:1,
9857:11, 9879:9,
9884:12, 9912:17,
9912:18, 9929:3,
9939:15
kinds - 9833:22,
9872:20
kit - 9871:2
kits - 9870:6, 9870:7,
9870:9, 9870:14,
9870:24, 9871:6
Kline - 9890:10
knife - 9774:14,
9774:17, 9781:11,
9795:20, 9795:22,
9798:2, 9922:9,
9922:11
knowing - 9766:11,
9767:22, 9894:20
knowledge - 9768:15,
9770:9, 9770:18,
9775:17, 9797:23,
9800:8, 9808:5,
9817:21, 9821:17,
9821:22, 9821:23,
9823:21, 9839:10,
9840:14, 9842:21,
9843:15, 9868:23,
9872:18, 9873:22,
9874:5, 9878:25,
9879:4, 9881:1, 9912:4,
9915:15, 9915:16,
9921:13, 9921:23,
9930:2, 9940:13,
9943:11, 9949:7,
9953:6
knowledgeable -
9830:16
known - 9768:2,
9781:22, 9808:10,
9826:8, 9849:20,
9850:2, 9850:3, 9855:3,
9889:20, 9923:2,
9933:14, 9950:7
Knox - 9757:4,
9840:23, 9952:15
Kujawa - 9757:5,
9938:13, 9938:22,
9939:2, 9939:5,
9939:13, 9940:7,
9941:1
Kujawa's - 9940:13
Kw - 9940:15

L

lab - 9872:22
Laboratory - 9847:9
lack - 9767:18,
9936:22
ladies - 9844:1
ladies' - 9770:6
lady - 9787:1, 9787:4,
9787:10, 9787:13,
9787:18, 9805:5,
9809:19, 9941:14
laid - 9790:22,
9798:25, 9809:23,
9810:1, 9810:18,
9814:25, 9820:17,
9899:25
Lapchuk - 9800:12,
9800:21, 9936:3,
9936:13, 9949:5
large - 9763:5,
9820:21, 9918:16
Larry - 9757:9,
9766:10, 9767:2,
9767:19, 9768:17,
9800:25, 9801:14,
9802:2, 9802:7, 9808:5,
9808:10, 9808:12,
9808:22, 9809:13,
9810:1, 9815:18,
9822:6, 9839:3,
9839:15, 9840:16,
9841:9, 9841:14,
9853:15, 9858:15,
9861:2, 9887:3,
9889:22, 9891:11,
9894:4, 9898:25,
9931:6, 9931:9,
9933:20
last - 9759:9, 9760:2,
9765:25, 9793:9,
9820:13, 9827:24,
9829:1, 9841:2,
9850:11, 9947:5
Last - 9829:3
lasted - 9881:4
late - 9848:20, 9864:2,
9882:7, 9903:10,
9948:20
laterally - 9868:15,
9868:18
latest - 9881:18
law - 9782:15,
9782:23, 9799:12,
9859:14, 9898:10,
9898:12, 9905:10,
9905:12, 9951:8
Lawrence - 9817:17,
9817:18, 9895:2
lawyer - 9764:24,
9777:24, 9810:10,
9818:5, 9895:2,
9905:20, 9915:3,
9915:8, 9937:16,
9937:18, 9937:20,
9938:19
lawyers - 9937:13
lay - 9800:9, 9854:3
laying - 9795:19,
9795:21
lays - 9792:4
lead - 9846:12
Leader - 9828:20,
9829:7
Leader-post - 9828:20,
9829:7
leading - 9827:16
leads - 9844:13
learned - 9778:22,
9844:15, 9888:5
learning - 9939:12
least - 9759:17,
9768:15, 9771:24,
9772:12, 9780:11,
9785:19, 9786:11,
9796:3, 9798:8, 9812:9,
9821:12, 9825:9,
9830:6, 9839:18,
9840:5, 9842:12,
9844:21, 9855:13,
9875:13, 9876:6,
9881:16, 9885:10,
9892:4, 9932:13,
9944:8, 9949:1
leave - 9785:2, 9790:9,
9808:2, 9896:24,
9948:23
led - 9804:12
left - 9775:24, 9789:18,



9789:21, 9805:10,
9806:16, 9835:1,
9835:20, 9852:15,
9852:18, 9865:2,
9892:13, 9932:6
legal - 9898:8,
9898:18, 9906:21,
9915:13, 9939:9
legally - 9799:6
length - 9789:11,
9844:12, 9848:6,
9880:12
lenient - 9944:24
Les - 9770:2
less - 9788:12, 9807:4,
9814:21, 9854:11,
9856:13, 9927:23
less-serious - 9927:23
lesser - 9833:15,
9851:17
letter - 9802:8,
9802:10, 9802:11,
9803:4, 9840:21,
9840:25, 9841:3,
9842:6, 9856:15,
9863:13, 9940:14,
9947:4, 9950:20,
9951:1, 9952:4
level - 9875:19,
9946:20
liaison - 9888:16,
9888:21, 9888:25,
9889:1, 9889:8
lid - 9908:10
lie - 9930:5
Lieutenant - 9778:12,
9779:5, 9783:18,
9850:8, 9850:14,
9850:16, 9851:9,
9851:17, 9852:20
life - 9782:7, 9913:21
light - 9844:18,
9854:18, 9862:7,
9899:23, 9901:23
likelihood - 9767:25,
9849:23, 9889:14
likely - 9777:1, 9807:4,
9866:23, 9877:3,
9926:18
likewise - 9915:15
limit - 9832:12
limited - 9796:3
Linda - 9839:14,
9840:15, 9841:5,
9841:14, 9858:14,
9899:1, 9919:20,
9921:5, 9921:7
line - 9761:18,
9886:20, 9894:17
lines - 9921:22
linked - 9876:18
list - 9769:25, 9773:25,
9926:15, 9926:21,
9926:23, 9926:24,
9929:20
listened - 9766:4,
9768:9
listening - 9938:20
lists - 9847:1, 9847:4,
9850:24
literally - 9883:22
live - 9838:19
lived - 9838:3,
9838:25, 9839:3,
9839:4, 9839:8, 9841:7
living - 9837:24,
9838:2, 9838:10
load - 9762:22,
9773:24, 9835:22,
9896:12

local - 9759:11,
9848:23, 9935:19
locate - 9841:4, 9844:9
located - 9778:16,
9789:8, 9879:9
location - 9837:2,
9914:8, 9915:9,
9924:11, 9930:15,
9934:25, 9935:9
locked - 9924:13
lookup - 9924:20
Lockyer - 9757:3,
9759:24, 9760:17,
9761:22, 9765:25,
9767:7, 9768:6,
9770:21, 9843:17,
9876:2, 9877:25,
9886:6, 9886:15,
9887:5, 9893:9,
9894:14, 9895:21,
9899:19, 9909:14,
9912:21, 9938:21,
9940:10, 9940:12
Lockyer's - 9895:10
logical - 9776:16,
9813:11, 9813:16,
9814:3, 9814:16,
9845:3
logistically - 9806:19
logistics - 9806:11
look - 9771:22, 9774:7,
9774:24, 9775:3,
9775:20, 9779:9,
9780:2, 9781:17,
9782:13, 9782:20,
9783:18, 9788:25,
9794:2, 9794:23,
9801:19, 9805:19,
9826:25, 9827:8,
9827:19, 9837:21,
9837:22, 9838:5,
9841:17, 9846:6,
9849:8, 9855:18,
9926:8, 9926:13,
9926:21, 9934:17,
9935:10, 9940:8
look-out - 9826:25,
9827:8
looked - 9786:8,
9836:3, 9843:20,
9846:12, 9856:1,
9857:11
Looking - 9806:10,
9807:8, 9834:7, 9936:5
looking - 9765:6,
9776:20, 9776:24,
9778:8, 9782:6,
9785:23, 9786:2,
9786:25, 9795:18,
9796:8, 9808:21,
9834:7, 9842:12,
9844:6, 9857:14,
9891:5
looks - 9780:19,
9784:11, 9788:11,
9792:7, 9793:20,
9810:25, 9837:23,
9841:17, 9841:23,
9844:7
loose - 9882:8, 9932:7
lost - 9849:5, 9881:15,
9881:16, 9881:17,
9885:18, 9885:19,
9924:18, 9931:10
lumped - 9834:13
lying - 9785:6, 9788:2,
9788:4, 9788:7,
9788:17, 9788:19

M

Maccallum - 9755:7,
9759:3, 9760:21,
9762:16, 9762:23,
9763:3, 9763:11,
9763:21, 9764:7,
9806:3, 9836:13,
9836:15, 9837:5,
9837:8, 9837:15,
9838:7, 9838:12,
9863:1, 9868:1,
9868:10, 9868:12,
9868:15, 9877:14,
9883:4, 9883:12,
9884:21, 9885:3,
9889:7, 9901:6, 9902:4,
9902:9, 9903:7,
9903:21, 9904:4,
9904:13, 9904:16,
9905:11, 9906:1,
9906:5, 9907:10,
9907:16, 9907:21,
9907:25, 9908:5,
9909:23, 9910:2,
9910:16, 9910:19,
9911:12, 9913:6,
9913:8, 9913:12,
9913:15, 9927:10,
9927:14, 9935:15,
9938:10, 9941:19,
9941:22, 9949:12,
9949:18, 9949:21,
9950:10, 9950:16,
9952:13, 9952:18
Mackay - 9940:15,
9940:18
Mackay's - 9941:2
Mackie - 9851:24,
9852:20
mail - 9941:2
main - 9905:22
major - 9864:23,
9920:23, 9921:19,
9927:11, 9927:19,
9928:13, 9928:14,
9935:25
Malanowich -
9780:21, 9781:1,
9781:16
Malanowich's -
9780:24
male - 9944:17
man - 9766:11,
9766:12, 9776:13,
9776:14, 9829:4
Manager - 9756:5
manager - 9884:17,
9930:5
Manitoba - 9821:10,
9915:4, 9945:14,
9946:2
manual - 9882:13,
9882:16
March - 9770:15,
9772:1, 9772:22,
9780:17, 9780:19,
9780:20, 9781:14,
9783:21, 9784:6,
9784:12, 9786:10,
9786:13, 9795:4,
9842:3, 9842:12,
9842:18, 9843:12,
9845:9, 9847:14,
9912:7
Marcoux - 9919:14,
9919:21
marijuana - 9792:20
marking - 9793:11
markings - 9920:3
marks - 9920:4

married - 9841:9
Mary - 9919:14
match - 9802:19,
9865:2, 9865:3
matching - 9865:1
material - 9873:23,
9881:11, 9893:23,
9900:14, 9901:24,
9931:18, 9931:22
materials - 9932:2,
9932:5
matter - 9759:7,
9766:20, 9778:22,
9800:12, 9801:23,
9825:3, 9830:9,
9846:10, 9853:24,
9857:18, 9894:14,
9895:12, 9928:24,
9948:25
matter' - 9842:16
matters - 9814:12,
9829:25, 9864:25,
9911:21, 9911:22,
9914:7, 9914:14,
9915:4, 9915:8, 9934:9,
9950:1
Mcintyre - 9900:9,
9900:20, 9903:4,
9903:20, 9904:25,
9905:9, 9906:4,
9906:17, 9909:22
me' - 9854:15
mean - 9773:1, 9788:9,
9795:18, 9798:16,
9822:23, 9832:3,
9834:10, 9854:23,
9861:2, 9889:7,
9897:14, 9920:20,
9928:18
means - 9794:14,
9794:17, 9951:23
meant - 9765:16
meantime - 9904:8
media - 9759:11,
9760:12, 9760:20,
9761:3, 9761:25,
9763:6, 9764:13,
9876:4, 9877:1,
9899:11, 9911:1,
9912:16, 9912:24,
9913:20, 9913:21,
9914:15, 9918:6,
9935:19, 9944:11,
9947:8, 9948:12,
9949:3
medical - 9866:7,
9866:22, 9870:4,
9871:15
medium - 9890:22
meet - 9869:15
meeting - 9771:3,
9794:12, 9795:2,
9843:18, 9887:22
meetings - 9869:6,
9869:11, 9869:12,
9869:20
Melnik - 9800:13,
9800:22, 9936:2,
9936:13, 9949:6
member - 9759:11,
9766:25, 9848:5,
9930:21
members - 9760:20,
9766:6, 9784:1, 9826:1
memo - 9907:8
memorandum -
9886:8, 9886:15,
9886:17, 9887:5,
9887:7, 9889:17,
9889:25, 9892:15,

9893:2, 9900:19,
9902:24, 9906:20,
9907:2, 9907:13,
9907:17
memory - 9763:4,
9870:21, 9888:23
memos - 9915:21
mental - 9824:11,
9824:22, 9825:1,
9886:9
mention - 9784:5,
9815:2
mentioned - 9854:7,
9934:11
mentioning - 9787:10
Merchant - 9840:21,
9841:1, 9856:16
message - 9828:14
messages - 9892:5
Messrs - 9936:13
met - 9887:18
metaphor - 9867:18
method - 9883:22,
9903:17
methods - 9871:21
Meyer - 9756:12,
9953:2, 9953:19
micro - 9884:3
microfiche - 9880:17,
9881:12, 9883:21
microfiched - 9885:20
microficheing -
9885:21
microfilm - 9880:17,
9883:9, 9883:12,
9883:23, 9883:25,
9884:4, 9884:7, 9885:3
microfilmed - 9884:3,
9923:20, 9924:1,
9924:2, 9924:5,
9928:21, 9928:23
microscopic - 9882:19
might - 9761:10,
9767:25, 9774:7,
9774:17, 9774:22,
9776:25, 9782:9,
9784:5, 9785:12,
9785:14, 9799:9,
9799:10, 9799:19,
9799:21, 9799:23,
9802:18, 9802:19,
9819:9, 9819:24,
9820:5, 9826:12,
9828:5, 9828:15,
9829:10, 9829:11,
9830:7, 9830:15,
9840:5, 9840:16,
9840:20, 9842:8,
9842:15, 9847:2,
9850:17, 9852:21,
9853:1, 9853:5,
9866:13, 9873:12,
9873:23, 9874:8,
9874:10, 9874:19,
9882:9, 9883:19,
9888:16, 9901:25,
9908:7, 9913:4,
9914:20, 9920:4,
9933:5, 9940:3,
9948:21
Might - 9787:13
Milgaard - 9755:4,
9757:2, 9757:3,
9759:24, 9760:3,
9760:7, 9760:17,
9761:8, 9761:20,
9763:18, 9766:8,
9767:2, 9768:13,
9768:16, 9768:18,
9770:17, 9771:11,



9771:19, 9772:1,
9772:7, 9772:9,
9772:12, 9772:17,
9772:20, 9773:5,
9775:23, 9776:13,
9779:15, 9779:21,
9780:16, 9781:9,
9781:18, 9781:24,
9782:9, 9782:20,
9783:5, 9784:11,
9784:22, 9786:10,
9786:16, 9786:24,
9787:9, 9787:18,
9789:18, 9789:21,
9789:25, 9790:9,
9791:9, 9791:24,
9792:1, 9792:7, 9794:6,
9795:4, 9795:14,
9798:25, 9799:10,
9799:17, 9799:25,
9800:19, 9801:9,
9801:25, 9802:5,
9825:19, 9825:23,
9825:24, 9826:4,
9830:11, 9830:22,
9840:23, 9841:12,
9842:23, 9845:18,
9849:15, 9850:1,
9853:12, 9853:13,
9856:5, 9856:17,
9856:22, 9857:7,
9857:18, 9858:6,
9858:13, 9859:2,
9859:13, 9860:11,
9861:13, 9861:20,
9862:18, 9866:2,
9898:3, 9899:24,
9900:1, 9904:24,
9912:8, 9935:22,
9936:1, 9936:14,
9936:24, 9937:25,
9948:25, 9949:3,
9949:4, 9951:13
Milgaard's - 9767:18,
9791:4, 9922:7,
9950:12
Miller - 9767:19,
9768:8, 9768:19,
9768:23, 9769:6,
9769:15, 9769:20,
9770:3, 9770:4,
9771:11, 9771:19,
9772:14, 9772:21,
9776:1, 9779:21,
9783:5, 9795:6,
9800:20, 9801:21,
9802:13, 9802:20,
9803:8, 9803:21,
9804:8, 9804:25,
9805:8, 9805:10,
9805:25, 9806:13,
9807:1, 9807:16,
9827:17, 9831:6,
9836:1, 9836:5, 9837:2,
9840:17, 9841:19,
9842:16, 9843:2,
9845:4, 9845:18,
9847:13, 9849:16,
9849:25, 9859:8,
9860:16, 9861:14,
9872:2, 9873:20,
9894:21, 9919:8,
9942:18, 9943:6,
9943:25
Miller' - 9801:5
Miller's - 9899:19,
9919:14, 9922:4
mind - 9762:8,
9785:20, 9819:21,
9931:21, 9949:14

minds - 9942:25
mindset - 9854:1
Minister - 9757:10,
9862:4, 9897:22,
9898:15, 9903:2,
9903:16, 9904:22,
9906:18, 9906:21,
9907:14, 9948:5
Ministries - 9893:21
minor - 9819:7,
9819:9, 9928:7, 9928:9,
9928:10
minute - 9777:25,
9805:5, 9806:2,
9806:17, 9837:5,
9952:17, 9952:19
minutes - 9836:14,
9913:12
miscarriage - 9897:23,
9900:21
misleading - 9916:19
misnaming - 9869:10
missed - 9884:8,
9950:11, 9950:13
missing - 9880:16,
9881:21
mistake - 9766:2
mistaken - 9871:9
mistakes - 9765:10
modus - 9920:24
moment - 9764:9,
9904:6, 9910:5, 9923:8,
9943:1
moments - 9930:4
Monday - 9952:19
money - 9803:22
month - 9841:20
months - 9812:4,
9843:13, 9845:10,
9845:12, 9945:18
morality - 9781:2,
9814:1, 9814:14,
9814:22, 9815:9,
9815:12, 9816:6,
9822:21, 9822:25,
9823:8, 9823:11,
9824:4, 9833:2,
9833:10, 9833:13,
9833:18, 9833:25,
9834:12, 9835:5,
9835:12, 9836:6,
9843:5, 9843:7, 9851:7,
9851:11, 9866:25,
9867:8, 9869:7,
9926:17, 9926:19
Morality - 9824:20,
9825:7, 9844:4
Morin - 9796:17
Morning - 9759:3,
9759:4, 9764:18
morning - 9759:25,
9776:6, 9776:9,
9787:19, 9789:17,
9791:5, 9797:8, 9798:4,
9801:12, 9805:8,
9828:2, 9836:11,
9840:3, 9869:13,
9886:14, 9893:10,
9911:1
most - 9774:6, 9804:7,
9866:19, 9913:20,
9939:17, 9944:5
Most - 9931:25
motive - 9936:12
motor - 9864:20
move - 9778:4,
9834:19, 9846:24,
9925:24
moved - 9834:4,
9882:22, 9883:2

multiple - 9916:3
municipal - 9879:22,
9898:13
murder - 9772:2,
9772:20, 9776:6,
9776:8, 9789:17,
9800:9, 9801:21,
9805:13, 9828:15,
9834:20, 9835:16,
9836:6, 9841:19,
9845:4, 9845:19,
9847:13, 9847:23,
9849:16, 9859:7,
9860:16, 9861:13,
9861:21, 9864:23,
9878:9, 9899:19,
9925:18, 9927:21,
9928:16, 9929:22,
9941:11, 9941:13,
9942:6, 9942:18,
9942:23, 9943:6,
9943:13, 9943:16,
9944:1, 9944:2,
9945:20, 9946:11,
9947:9
murdered - 9768:8,
9805:9, 9805:13
murderer - 9836:4
Murray - 9894:23
must - 9761:15,
9819:21, 9860:22,
9927:14
mystery - 9895:8

N

name - 9764:23,
9780:25, 9808:16,
9863:3, 9887:16,
9929:22, 9938:12,
9941:15, 9941:19,
9949:15
named - 9848:2
naming - 9949:13
narrow - 9872:3
nation - 9808:20
national - 9913:20
National - 9759:8,
9760:2, 9911:2, 9911:3
natural - 9833:20,
9834:3
nature - 9790:1,
9790:4, 9808:24,
9817:8, 9826:5,
9831:23, 9865:6,
9868:20, 9925:21,
9928:25, 9929:21
near - 9791:19,
9811:23, 9911:7,
9941:12
necessarily - 9784:17,
9861:1, 9866:5, 9900:1
necessary - 9793:19,
9855:3, 9870:16,
9872:21
need - 9769:10,
9771:23, 9786:22,
9802:9, 9805:21,
9805:24, 9835:7,
9864:24, 9934:14
needed - 9920:7,
9930:10
needs - 9875:21
negative - 9848:1
negotiating - 9817:5,
9818:16
never - 9766:19,
9767:10, 9768:3,
9818:3, 9818:19,
9823:24, 9831:1,

9840:13, 9843:20,
9850:2, 9850:3, 9880:7,
9895:5, 9904:21,
9904:25, 9918:24,
9924:1, 9927:7,
9928:21, 9931:9,
9940:2, 9950:7, 9951:5
Never - 9914:10,
9914:21
new - 9813:6, 9813:20,
9844:17, 9861:23,
9862:5, 9862:16,
9862:19, 9862:20,
9882:23, 9924:16,
9925:1, 9926:18
News - 9759:9, 9760:2
news - 9761:6
next - 9775:4, 9779:1,
9780:25, 9791:1,
9792:19, 9819:19,
9847:3, 9853:6, 9861:7,
9877:20, 9896:12,
9952:15
Nichol - 9775:6,
9775:22, 9778:16,
9779:5, 9780:6,
9781:24, 9782:21,
9785:3, 9787:3,
9787:12, 9788:2,
9788:16, 9790:7,
9792:7, 9793:12,
9797:2, 9798:19,
9849:24, 9912:3
Nicholjohn - 9789:8,
9791:7, 9791:25
night - 9792:20
nobody - 9796:3,
9804:22, 9842:20
None - 9808:15
none - 9798:5,
9839:11, 9847:7
nonetheless - 9760:18
Nordstrom - 9812:16,
9812:18, 9813:4,
9813:5, 9813:19,
9813:25, 9814:16,
9823:3, 9851:12,
9851:19
normal - 9777:3,
9799:1, 9815:11,
9878:18
Normally - 9816:4
normally - 9823:8
North - 9838:3,
9838:23, 9945:20,
9946:24
notably - 9878:13,
9878:14
note - 9886:9
notebook - 9933:16
noted - 9768:10,
9894:4
notes - 9941:6, 9953:6
nothing - 9844:14,
9884:8, 9895:13,
9917:16
notice - 9759:23,
9827:7, 9940:14
noting - 9790:12,
9791:14
notwithstanding -
9768:16, 9816:23,
9836:2, 9891:17,
9898:24
noun - 9909:24
November - 9838:17,
9838:20, 9843:6,
9947:16
nowhere - 9771:6,
9914:4

number - 9766:13,
9770:19, 9770:22,
9784:12, 9786:23,
9804:10, 9804:11,
9806:4, 9806:7, 9806:8,
9820:14, 9826:11,
9834:13, 9836:25,
9837:3, 9837:4, 9837:7,
9837:10, 9837:12,
9837:13, 9852:3,
9858:3, 9858:17,
9858:18, 9877:18,
9884:13, 9885:7,
9885:15, 9885:19,
9886:9, 9911:5,
9911:19, 9931:16
numbers - 9846:8
nurse - 9941:11
nurses' - 9828:24

O

o'clock - 9877:13
oath - 9857:13
objection - 9862:18,
9913:22
Obligated - 9784:25,
9785:1
obligated - 9852:25
obligation - 9780:14,
9816:1, 9832:20,
9857:2, 9868:18,
9868:20, 9868:21,
9875:19, 9875:20
obligations - 9832:18
observe - 9780:4
observed - 9792:3,
9914:4, 9937:12
obtain - 9872:20,
9910:11
obtained - 9780:19,
9780:22, 9783:11,
9783:12, 9793:16,
9812:14, 9815:8,
9839:11, 9847:7,
9847:15, 9854:10,
9855:6
obvious - 9833:24,
9931:5
obviously - 9761:11,
9761:15, 9765:7,
9772:3, 9775:22,
9785:24, 9801:17,
9801:19, 9813:3,
9844:24, 9853:17,
9858:21, 9873:19,
9877:8, 9879:2, 9920:3,
9922:10, 9922:11,
9923:12
Obviously - 9931:6
occasion - 9781:8,
9781:10
occasionally -
9765:18, 9815:4
occasions - 9768:10,
9866:6, 9898:4,
9951:17
occur - 9819:15,
9833:19, 9927:9
occurred - 9768:24,
9776:7, 9776:8,
9801:22, 9802:14,
9803:25, 9805:17,
9805:18, 9807:5,
9815:24, 9817:14,
9830:2, 9843:5, 9843:9,
9847:2, 9848:20,
9854:12, 9866:11,
9876:21, 9885:22,
9887:4, 9891:24,



9892:3, 9892:4,
9900:22, 9916:16,
9923:6, 9947:13
occurrence - 9824:11,
9824:16, 9944:14
occurring - 9834:22
October - 9810:25,
9812:7, 9812:18,
9813:12, 9813:19,
9814:8, 9816:24,
9837:20, 9840:25,
9843:5
off-premise - 9930:11,
9930:15
offence - 9776:22,
9777:1, 9777:2,
9785:12, 9789:20,
9789:25, 9790:9,
9790:17, 9792:9,
9792:18, 9794:10,
9795:17, 9796:10,
9796:21, 9799:10,
9802:13, 9802:20,
9802:25, 9805:2,
9807:1, 9807:19,
9808:6, 9808:7,
9834:13, 9835:15,
9837:25, 9838:11,
9838:17, 9842:9,
9844:23, 9846:13,
9848:22, 9876:14,
9890:11, 9891:4,
9892:3, 9894:21,
9945:22, 9946:24,
9947:13, 9951:10,
9951:11
offences - 9766:14,
9802:19, 9803:9,
9803:16, 9804:21,
9818:11, 9818:22,
9819:2, 9819:7, 9819:9,
9820:2, 9820:12,
9820:17, 9820:24,
9821:13, 9822:8,
9822:16, 9822:20,
9826:11, 9828:16,
9830:14, 9830:24,
9833:13, 9834:14,
9834:19, 9835:3,
9842:14, 9842:15,
9843:8, 9843:13,
9843:20, 9845:15,
9845:22, 9853:17,
9864:18, 9864:19,
9865:8, 9865:13,
9865:20, 9870:2,
9876:21, 9885:18,
9889:22, 9890:2,
9891:16, 9891:18,
9891:23, 9892:22,
9892:23, 9893:6,
9899:17, 9899:18,
9916:3, 9916:6
offences' - 9804:23
offended - 9767:8
offenders - 9769:25
offending - 9927:18
offered - 9921:14
offhand - 9837:14
office - 9818:2,
9863:11, 9866:9,
9889:5
Officer - 9756:13,
9824:20, 9825:8,
9844:4
officer - 9765:5,
9767:11, 9773:6,
9782:6, 9816:12,
9821:2, 9824:4,
9839:25, 9849:21,

9853:20, 9853:23,
9865:19, 9866:6,
9866:12, 9866:13,
9866:21, 9866:24,
9872:6, 9872:13,
9873:15, 9888:9,
9888:25, 9889:1,
9930:24, 9932:25,
9937:3, 9938:5,
9938:24, 9941:8,
9944:8, 9946:19
officer's - 9873:1
officers - 9767:9,
9777:4, 9784:13,
9811:1, 9822:25,
9835:21, 9854:9,
9863:14, 9863:17,
9864:15, 9869:15,
9869:21, 9869:25,
9875:18, 9879:25,
9880:1, 9933:16,
9944:6, 9945:2
Official - 9756:11,
9953:1, 9953:3,
9953:14, 9953:20
officially - 9893:23
officials - 9894:7
often - 9815:4, 9925:1
old - 9782:1, 9782:16,
9787:4, 9787:10,
9787:11, 9882:22,
9894:2, 9924:19,
9924:21, 9943:3
older - 9787:1
on-premise - 9930:13,
9930:17
once - 9796:19,
9813:11, 9815:8,
9816:13, 9854:10,
9854:23, 9896:8,
9938:14
Once - 9848:11
One - 9827:21, 9946:13
one - 9759:18, 9760:9,
9764:22, 9771:15,
9773:25, 9775:4,
9784:2, 9785:6, 9786:4,
9786:16, 9789:12,
9791:6, 9796:2,
9796:22, 9804:6,
9804:9, 9804:14,
9807:19, 9811:6,
9811:10, 9811:22,
9812:6, 9812:9,
9812:19, 9813:1,
9819:1, 9820:21,
9826:24, 9829:4,
9829:5, 9830:17,
9835:14, 9839:9,
9842:14, 9843:6,
9843:19, 9845:3,
9847:12, 9865:7,
9867:25, 9872:9,
9878:15, 9879:5,
9885:1, 9891:4, 9898:4,
9899:21, 9903:22,
9905:2, 9905:6,
9905:22, 9908:6,
9908:15, 9908:25,
9910:23, 9911:7,
9915:9, 9915:10,
9916:5, 9916:20,
9920:10, 9920:11,
9920:18, 9923:2,
9926:7, 9929:24,
9930:1, 9931:14,
9938:2, 9942:13,
9942:20, 9945:6,
9946:5, 9946:15,
9951:12, 9951:13,

9951:17, 9951:23
ones - 9823:12,
9928:13, 9928:14
ongoing - 9764:14,
9843:8, 9897:3, 9927:2
open - 9844:13,
9896:13, 9927:5
opened - 9844:18
operandi - 9920:24
operated - 9898:17
operating - 9888:1
operation - 9870:17,
9872:16, 9875:13,
9895:25
operations - 9871:14
opinion - 9767:24,
9767:25, 9772:19,
9778:25, 9779:15,
9792:24, 9867:11,
9900:9, 9900:11,
9900:17, 9900:19,
9902:2, 9903:15,
9906:13, 9906:17,
9906:18, 9906:25,
9907:1, 9907:3, 9907:8,
9907:9, 9907:15,
9909:17, 9909:20,
9915:13, 9951:20
opinions - 9853:2,
9901:13, 9946:17,
9947:8
opportunities - 9939:8
opportunity - 9766:23,
9852:14, 9855:19,
9862:19, 9880:22,
9901:4, 9903:9,
9930:25
opposed - 9761:2,
9762:7, 9927:23
order - 9763:13,
9847:10, 9872:8,
9907:1, 9910:17
organization - 9835:2,
9835:19
original - 9900:2,
9908:3
originally - 9892:21
originating - 9829:2
otherwise - 9766:14,
9852:7
Ottawa - 9891:10
ought - 9901:21
outcome - 9822:16
outlined - 9902:13
outright - 9766:6
outset - 9850:23
outside - 9898:15
outstanding - 9944:1,
9944:5
over - 9762:3
overall - 9852:9
overlooked - 9765:14,
9766:2
overly - 9762:15
overseeing - 9823:13,
9855:12
overseen - 9823:2,
9851:3
own - 9765:7, 9785:20,
9797:23, 9852:15,
9852:16, 9852:18,
9868:22, 9922:19,
9932:1

P
Page - 9758:2
page - 9762:20,
9779:1, 9780:25,
9786:22, 9791:1,

9791:20, 9792:19,
9793:9, 9799:16,
9805:23, 9806:6,
9806:7, 9826:20,
9837:13, 9846:8,
9847:3, 9858:18,
9861:8, 9877:20,
9883:22, 9886:7,
9887:12, 9887:16,
9890:6, 9890:7, 9892:9,
9911:2, 9911:8, 9952:4
pages - 9780:21,
9802:12, 9887:13,
9893:14, 9953:4
paid - 9949:5, 9949:24
paper - 9762:17
papers - 9883:1
paragraph - 9771:3,
9789:2, 9794:2,
9827:13, 9828:20,
9841:2, 9846:6, 9846:7,
9846:8, 9846:24,
9846:25, 9847:5,
9847:20, 9848:17,
9860:2, 9886:18,
9886:21, 9890:7,
9890:8, 9892:10,
9893:17, 9893:18,
9894:15, 9894:16,
9952:4
Paragraph - 9858:25
paragraphs - 9861:8
pardon - 9850:20,
9877:19
Pardon - 9795:16,
9839:5, 9860:20,
9868:11, 9949:18
parents - 9824:13
paring - 9922:8,
9922:11
part - 9760:9, 9767:16,
9819:16, 9825:21,
9837:23, 9857:14,
9867:3, 9903:2,
9941:10, 9948:13
particular - 9760:9,
9763:8, 9770:13,
9791:5, 9816:22,
9821:17, 9822:18,
9836:1, 9850:3,
9853:24, 9874:1,
9886:9, 9889:2,
9890:23, 9896:10,
9897:18, 9900:22,
9902:14
particularly - 9762:1,
9763:5, 9764:13,
9765:1, 9856:21,
9869:16
parties - 9759:13,
9759:19, 9760:11,
9760:19, 9760:24,
9761:3, 9763:25,
9764:1, 9908:21
partner - 9863:12
partway - 9894:16
party - 9764:2,
9853:16, 9872:9,
9950:2
pass - 9831:22
passage - 9877:22,
9886:18, 9911:16
passages - 9911:5
passed - 9919:15
passing - 9937:8
past - 9869:18,
9869:21
pathologist - 9872:5
pathologist's -
9872:12

pathologists - 9872:18
patrol - 9865:18,
9866:24, 9889:14
Paul - 9796:17
Paul's - 9811:19,
9872:17
Pearson - 9887:18,
9887:19, 9887:22,
9887:24, 9890:8,
9890:16
pecking - 9872:8
Penkala - 9758:3,
9760:4, 9764:19,
9764:23, 9766:17,
9771:2, 9774:5,
9776:20, 9777:24,
9796:25, 9836:23,
9863:3, 9863:21,
9863:23, 9877:21,
9885:5, 9889:23,
9895:24, 9901:12,
9901:15, 9903:18,
9909:9, 9909:15,
9910:23, 9912:25,
9913:17, 9913:25,
9935:17, 9937:2,
9938:12
Penkala's - 9763:19,
9909:17
people - 9761:16,
9770:4, 9770:7,
9770:11, 9777:8,
9782:25, 9788:1,
9788:4, 9788:9,
9801:24, 9802:18,
9822:15, 9824:14,
9826:25, 9829:25,
9831:4, 9841:4,
9850:12, 9858:3,
9858:16, 9858:17,
9919:24, 9920:5,
9938:2, 9950:8,
9951:20
perceived - 9776:15
perfect - 9952:2
Perhaps - 9883:18,
9910:10
perhaps - 9760:18,
9762:4, 9800:14,
9840:3, 9852:20,
9862:24, 9863:22,
9866:24, 9872:11,
9876:4, 9877:12,
9904:8, 9951:17
period - 9798:3,
9800:8, 9807:5, 9868:7,
9868:8, 9870:10,
9871:3, 9875:14,
9876:15, 9877:9,
9881:5, 9882:3,
9896:22, 9927:25,
9939:17
peripherally - 9785:14
perk - 9787:9
permission - 9930:22,
9932:17, 9932:19
permit - 9897:21
perpetrator - 9806:25,
9836:3, 9873:3, 9873:7,
9873:19, 9873:24,
9874:12, 9874:18,
9899:16, 9899:18,
9944:10
perpetrators - 9802:18
person - 9770:5,
9774:17, 9783:1,
9803:8, 9828:23,
9828:25, 9829:10,
9829:11, 9830:15,



9843:19, 9844:15,
9846:3, 9847:11,
9848:2, 9848:8,
9848:23, 9889:2,
9898:19, 9903:16,
9920:6, 9937:20,
9940:3, 9944:17
personal - 9770:8,
9770:18, 9797:23,
9839:10, 9915:15,
9918:1, 9932:1,
9932:22, 9944:25,
9945:1, 9946:17,
9949:7
personally - 9825:22,
9919:17, 9933:21
personnel - 9925:24
perspective - 9855:13,
9855:14
persuasion - 9778:18
pertaining - 9885:17
phase - 9769:9
phases - 9883:7
phoned - 9813:13
photocopying -
9883:22
photograph - 9864:22
photography -
9864:25
phrase - 9925:5
physical - 9864:7,
9864:16, 9866:4,
9873:4, 9873:5,
9873:17, 9874:10,
9929:20, 9934:24
Physical - 9865:1
physically - 9865:2,
9924:10, 9924:13,
9935:7
physician - 9866:18
picked - 9821:19,
9871:17
piece - 9762:17,
9796:5, 9873:4, 9873:5,
9873:12, 9873:17,
9940:9
pipd - 9867:8
pipd - 9867:6,
9867:16
place - 9765:2, 9797:8,
9804:10, 9806:1,
9806:2, 9807:24,
9808:22, 9810:16,
9814:11, 9815:14,
9821:15, 9821:25,
9825:4, 9825:18,
9826:20, 9831:18,
9839:22, 9853:21,
9856:4, 9857:24,
9858:23, 9861:3,
9869:11, 9877:5,
9878:22, 9884:25,
9892:24, 9894:12,
9903:3, 9918:2,
9929:14, 9933:4,
9940:25, 9947:9,
9947:14, 9947:16
placed - 9778:20,
9861:23, 9883:25,
9886:13, 9887:11,
9908:7
plan - 9798:4
planes - 9917:3
planning - 9901:11
play - 9834:2, 9857:14
plea - 9821:10, 9828:3,
9876:22, 9895:19,
9915:16, 9918:2
plead - 9816:25,
9817:6, 9819:3

pleading - 9950:23
pleas - 9820:20,
9821:5, 9914:24,
9916:15
Pleasant - 9811:17
pled - 9814:21,
9816:23, 9817:2,
9876:8, 9891:17,
9891:18
Pm - 9877:16, 9913:13,
9913:14, 9952:20
point - 9760:18,
9768:11, 9771:10,
9771:13, 9771:16,
9773:11, 9775:14,
9783:6, 9783:7,
9787:11, 9790:21,
9791:15, 9792:5,
9792:13, 9792:24,
9793:25, 9794:3,
9796:10, 9796:13,
9798:23, 9799:23,
9800:3, 9816:7, 9833:7,
9833:9, 9833:10,
9839:1, 9853:25,
9854:8, 9855:5,
9858:11, 9884:14,
9901:11, 9903:23,
9910:3, 9927:13,
9930:23, 9936:5,
9939:12
pointed - 9795:8,
9840:23, 9849:15
pointing - 9781:10,
9791:11, 9791:16,
9802:4
points - 9773:5,
9784:22
poking - 9781:10
Police - 9757:6,
9766:7, 9766:25,
9777:4, 9784:7, 9789:7,
9789:10, 9798:17,
9808:10, 9809:5,
9812:8, 9815:17,
9815:25, 9817:4,
9817:21, 9818:9,
9818:18, 9826:2,
9827:15, 9828:3,
9828:22, 9833:3,
9839:7, 9846:18,
9848:13, 9855:20,
9863:4, 9863:14,
9864:1, 9867:10,
9871:8, 9875:2, 9875:7,
9876:3, 9877:3,
9878:21, 9878:24,
9879:9, 9879:13,
9879:16, 9879:19,
9879:24, 9880:8,
9880:14, 9880:20,
9885:24, 9886:1,
9887:1, 9888:13,
9888:17, 9889:19,
9890:9, 9892:18,
9895:16, 9911:21,
9925:13, 9938:24,
9941:8
police - 9765:5,
9767:10, 9772:1,
9773:6, 9774:23,
9782:5, 9784:24,
9785:18, 9792:5,
9796:19, 9797:18,
9799:22, 9800:9,
9806:20, 9811:2,
9813:23, 9815:16,
9818:19, 9821:2,
9826:17, 9827:22,

9829:3, 9829:23,
9831:11, 9833:8,
9833:21, 9834:17,
9834:23, 9835:3,
9835:20, 9835:21,
9839:17, 9839:25,
9853:20, 9853:23,
9853:24, 9854:6,
9854:9, 9854:22,
9859:5, 9863:16,
9863:17, 9866:13,
9866:21, 9867:23,
9869:1, 9870:18,
9871:13, 9871:18,
9871:22, 9872:13,
9873:1, 9873:13,
9873:15, 9875:5,
9875:18, 9875:20,
9879:22, 9889:3,
9890:2, 9894:2, 9894:6,
9894:18, 9895:23,
9895:25, 9896:9,
9896:25, 9897:2,
9898:14, 9899:6,
9899:15, 9899:25,
9912:2, 9920:4, 9921:5,
9921:17, 9923:6,
9923:12, 9924:10,
9924:13, 9924:17,
9925:1, 9925:23,
9928:19, 9930:21,
9930:24, 9931:7,
9932:25, 9934:9,
9935:4, 9937:3, 9938:5,
9939:7, 9944:6, 9944:8,
9944:22, 9945:2,
9946:18, 9948:21
police's - 9826:23
policies - 9941:3
policy - 9928:5
political - 9944:11
polygraph - 9793:18,
9880:5
polygrapher -
9879:16, 9879:19
population - 9835:23
Porter - 9851:25
portion - 9881:16,
9893:24
position - 9763:13,
9801:5, 9801:6, 9801:8,
9823:25, 9853:11,
9902:10, 9904:7,
9904:24, 9905:20,
9908:15, 9908:19,
9910:12, 9930:7,
9930:8
positions - 9792:14,
9820:16
positively - 9786:13
possibilities - 9827:21
possibility - 9806:12,
9821:7, 9828:23,
9836:3, 9847:22,
9850:17, 9853:15
possible - 9769:13,
9770:11, 9803:5,
9806:20, 9806:21,
9806:22, 9806:23,
9818:5, 9831:5,
9846:12, 9846:13,
9873:3, 9873:24,
9874:11, 9885:10,
9922:21, 9944:10
possibly - 9769:14,
9779:22, 9796:20,
9798:4, 9834:22,
9873:7, 9889:14,
9892:7, 9899:16,
9909:20

Post - 9911:2, 9911:3
post - 9828:20,
9829:7, 9898:14
posted - 9828:9
potentially - 9919:11,
9936:8
practical - 9896:13
practicalities -
9764:11
practice - 9785:18,
9796:15, 9815:11,
9859:12, 9878:18,
9903:5, 9905:16
practicing - 9905:10,
9905:12
pre - 9874:23, 9898:20
pre-empted - 9874:23,
9898:20
precisely - 9795:2
precluded - 9762:13
prefer - 9945:7
preferably - 9759:19
preferred - 9894:25
prejudice - 9909:3
prelim - 9856:3
preliminary - 9810:5,
9830:9, 9933:19
premise - 9930:11,
9930:13, 9930:15,
9930:17
prepare - 9816:1,
9816:2, 9909:7
prepared - 9819:11,
9878:19, 9918:12
preparing - 9936:23
preponderance -
9861:19
presence - 9826:15
present - 9793:15,
9797:15, 9824:14,
9862:20, 9913:25,
9914:15
presented - 9859:4,
9859:10, 9867:4
presenting - 9887:5
presently - 9841:9
preserve - 9909:1
press - 9929:18
pressed - 9829:21
pressure - 9912:1,
9943:25, 9944:3,
9944:9, 9944:11
presupposing -
9788:1
pretty - 9766:5,
9780:10, 9782:24,
9783:1, 9785:18,
9792:4, 9795:19,
9795:22, 9812:22,
9813:11, 9813:16,
9845:10, 9876:24,
9947:24, 9951:25
prevailing - 9859:12
prevent - 9902:6
prevented - 9821:24
previous - 9808:22
previously - 9792:18,
9865:10, 9876:17,
9876:18, 9894:5,
9946:15
primarily - 9863:25,
9864:6, 9888:1
primary - 9872:24
prime - 9781:18,
9794:7, 9795:4,
9942:15
Prince - 9917:3,
9917:17
principle - 9915:25
principles - 9872:23

Pringle - 9757:13,
9758:7, 9850:8,
9935:16, 9935:17,
9938:8
priorize - 9897:7
prison - 9841:10
prisoner - 9895:24,
9897:17, 9897:22
privilege - 9901:2,
9903:25, 9904:7,
9906:8, 9906:16,
9907:1, 9908:2, 9908:9,
9908:16, 9910:5,
9939:8
privileged - 9904:2,
9908:18
privy - 9888:14,
9914:18, 9915:20
probative - 9859:5
problem - 9855:11,
9884:22
problems - 9835:17,
9867:16, 9921:10
procedural - 9855:7,
9867:22, 9868:13,
9868:22
procedure - 9859:15,
9940:24
procedures - 9870:12,
9882:14, 9941:3
proceed - 9799:7,
9800:6
proceeded - 9830:9
proceedings -
9764:25, 9769:8,
9769:9, 9797:14
Proceedings -
9755:12, 9755:23,
9758:1, 9759:1
proceeds - 9800:12
process - 9767:12,
9777:3, 9799:1,
9801:11, 9801:16,
9813:17, 9816:14,
9817:9, 9817:11,
9817:15, 9824:1,
9841:1, 9855:13,
9856:8, 9874:22,
9876:13, 9881:2,
9881:15, 9881:23,
9881:25, 9882:3,
9884:3, 9884:24,
9885:6, 9888:12,
9894:11, 9926:6,
9929:14, 9936:19,
9947:17, 9951:2
processor - 9884:5,
9884:6
proclaim - 9897:13
produce - 9934:5
produced - 9840:24,
9865:4, 9918:10
professional - 9939:23
profile - 9947:9
progressed - 9871:10
progressively -
9931:25
proper - 9786:7
properly - 9859:18,
9896:19
property - 9880:1,
9932:9
proposal - 9872:21
proposed - 9803:13
proposition - 9880:24,
9909:16
propriety - 9759:12,
9760:12
pros - 9790:6
prosecuting - 9933:11



prosecutions -
9939:16
prosecutor - 9799:5,
9799:11, 9816:20,
9831:17, 9831:18,
9856:1
prosecutor's - 9818:2
prosecutors -
9917:21, 9933:14,
9944:22
protocol - 9927:1,
9928:5, 9940:24
protracted - 9807:24
proved - 9798:13,
9871:17
proven - 9921:7
provide - 9817:15,
9832:20, 9852:14,
9879:23, 9892:7,
9895:23, 9926:23
provided - 9797:7,
9818:14, 9832:10,
9879:12, 9888:6,
9888:8, 9891:9,
9893:22, 9900:14,
9930:25
providing - 9906:24
Province - 9953:3
province - 9944:24
Provincial - 9900:12
provincial - 9895:1,
9898:11
provision - 9897:20,
9897:24, 9898:2,
9898:10, 9898:11
provocable - 9948:21
psychiatric - 9921:10,
9921:11
public - 9763:5,
9763:14, 9821:25,
9822:4, 9822:9,
9822:11, 9822:12,
9827:7, 9828:14,
9829:9, 9830:6,
9830:13, 9904:12,
9908:21, 9909:4,
9918:2, 9918:4, 9922:4,
9922:15, 9939:16
publication - 9759:17,
9826:20, 9827:11,
9828:7
publicity - 9942:11,
9944:13, 9944:18
publicized - 9942:6
publicly - 9922:7,
9945:4, 9949:23
publishing - 9759:12
pull - 9911:5
pulled - 9807:22
punishment - 9946:20
purged - 9881:12,
9885:21
purging - 9881:3
purpose - 9795:2,
9907:19
purposely - 9949:13
purposes - 9910:8
purse - 9803:22,
9829:16
Purse - 9829:14
purse - 9798:5
pursue - 9777:19,
9865:7, 9923:5
pursued - 9894:5,
9923:2
pursuing - 9769:3,
9799:25, 9894:22,
9944:7
push - 9911:14
put - 9765:24,

9766:15, 9766:24,
9769:11, 9771:5,
9772:1, 9786:15,
9801:20, 9806:15,
9806:25, 9827:2,
9827:6, 9828:18,
9829:13, 9843:16,
9843:21, 9853:18,
9854:20, 9876:2,
9876:9, 9880:24,
9886:15, 9892:25,
9898:23, 9901:10,
9901:11, 9901:15,
9901:25, 9902:5,
9903:15, 9905:1,
9908:10, 9908:25,
9920:11, 9928:4,
9929:1, 9929:14,
9932:11, 9932:12,
9937:1, 9938:21
putting - 9793:1,
9805:14, 9909:15

Q

Qb - 9756:11
Qc - 9757:2, 9757:5,
9757:7, 9757:10,
9757:13, 9863:12,
9903:4
qualified - 9898:9
qualifies - 9905:9
quandary - 9908:23
quash - 9862:4
quasi - 9905:20
quasi-judicial -
9905:20
Queen's - 9891:15,
9953:1, 9953:3,
9953:14, 9953:20
queried - 9940:9
query - 9952:6
questioned - 9783:13,
9794:4, 9904:22,
9940:2, 9940:14
questioning - 9791:22,
9841:25, 9913:19
questions - 9765:4,
9791:4, 9791:12,
9809:12, 9822:14,
9824:23, 9825:16,
9837:18, 9849:18,
9853:18, 9862:23,
9883:15, 9895:10,
9899:20, 9912:21,
9913:1, 9935:14,
9935:18, 9938:9,
9938:21, 9942:17
quick - 9787:10
quickly - 9786:16,
9845:4, 9918:8
quietly - 9894:19
Quinn - 9888:22,
9889:11
Quite - 9942:12
quite - 9766:1, 9771:8,
9832:18, 9835:1,
9858:7, 9865:12,
9951:18
quote - 9807:11,
9886:23, 9892:11

R

Ra - 9887:17
radar - 9808:25
Radisson - 9755:16
raise - 9759:7
raised - 9910:8
raising - 9901:20

ran - 9807:12, 9807:13
rank - 9851:16,
9851:17, 9851:20,
9878:3
ranks - 9878:14
rape - 9780:8, 9812:1,
9812:9, 9812:10,
9812:22, 9826:22,
9829:5, 9841:10,
9847:1, 9864:23,
9864:24, 9865:10,
9866:8, 9866:14,
9866:16, 9866:23,
9870:1, 9870:2, 9870:6,
9874:4, 9887:3,
9890:11, 9945:19
raped - 9801:2,
9802:2, 9802:3,
9805:12, 9806:15,
9809:19, 9811:16,
9843:5
rapes - 9768:23,
9802:14, 9807:15,
9812:8, 9813:14,
9823:18, 9825:17,
9829:5, 9833:2, 9834:8,
9834:9, 9836:4, 9836:5,
9842:13, 9847:1,
9847:23, 9848:19,
9858:22, 9946:5
raping - 9809:7
rapist - 9826:7,
9827:23, 9828:16
Rasmussen - 9878:16
rate - 9937:15
rather - 9830:13,
9882:8, 9887:16,
9888:16, 9948:12
rational - 9909:19,
9909:22
Rcmp - 9757:8,
9770:24, 9784:2,
9784:4, 9784:14,
9802:11, 9805:22,
9823:19, 9836:25,
9837:11, 9842:7,
9845:6, 9846:21,
9848:12, 9849:7,
9849:12, 9878:7,
9878:8, 9878:20,
9879:8, 9886:4,
9886:25, 9887:18,
9887:19, 9888:9,
9889:25, 9893:4,
9902:21, 9917:2,
9918:12, 9933:16,
9933:21
Rcmp/department -
9888:18
re - 9824:16, 9904:10,
9926:11
re-introduced -
9904:10
react - 9766:24
reaction - 9760:8,
9761:14, 9762:1,
9762:12, 9763:18,
9950:4
read - 9766:4, 9777:18,
9785:25, 9810:6,
9838:24
readily - 9939:9
reading - 9942:12
reality - 9897:10,
9927:7
realize - 9843:4
really - 9762:8,
9767:10, 9777:14,
9777:19, 9797:23,
9806:21, 9818:3,

9823:25, 9842:24,
9864:10, 9868:3,
9897:19, 9905:21,
9909:10, 9921:18,
9944:13
reason - 9819:16,
9830:10, 9856:23,
9880:7, 9894:9,
9909:13, 9920:2,
9924:25, 9933:24,
9934:3
reasonable - 9793:23,
9840:7, 9861:12,
9862:2, 9917:15
reasonably - 9860:8,
9861:24, 9920:11
reasons - 9799:9,
9923:4
recant - 9912:14
recantation - 9860:4
recantations - 9797:16
recanted - 9911:25,
9912:7
receive - 9803:3,
9818:22, 9830:21,
9916:4, 9946:14
received - 9769:19,
9771:17, 9772:22,
9772:25, 9781:14,
9798:17, 9820:25,
9821:10, 9831:3,
9840:1, 9863:13,
9875:18, 9886:23,
9886:25, 9912:12,
9914:6, 9914:19,
9916:20, 9918:1,
9936:20, 9936:23,
9942:11, 9945:14,
9946:23
receiving - 9780:9,
9901:22
recent - 9942:11
recently - 9829:19,
9840:4, 9942:12
receptacle - 9878:22
recognize - 9807:17,
9944:6
recognized - 9952:5
recollection - 9761:4,
9772:24, 9795:11,
9827:2, 9839:12,
9839:19, 9839:21,
9841:21, 9846:19,
9881:7, 9887:21,
9887:22, 9888:3,
9922:6, 9942:23,
9948:16
Reconvened - 9759:2,
9836:19, 9877:16,
9913:14
record - 9808:13,
9808:23, 9814:7,
9822:3, 9822:7,
9822:12, 9840:13,
9861:17, 9881:23,
9881:25, 9883:7,
9892:2, 9892:3,
9894:24, 9926:13,
9930:16, 9931:6,
9946:1
recorded - 9932:3
recording - 9882:15
records - 9880:11,
9880:15, 9882:7,
9883:20, 9884:2,
9884:18, 9890:10,
9890:14, 9890:17,
9890:21, 9890:23,
9891:13, 9926:22,
9930:6, 9941:6

recover - 9849:5
red - 9780:4, 9886:20
reduced - 9949:25
refer - 9795:13,
9802:13, 9824:25,
9832:3, 9863:20,
9877:22, 9890:6,
9911:6, 9911:15
reference - 9769:16,
9769:17, 9769:18,
9787:4, 9787:12,
9795:3, 9837:12,
9841:4, 9846:9,
9858:13, 9861:17,
9861:19, 9870:15,
9910:24, 9911:21
referenced - 9930:10
Referred - 9841:6
referred - 9770:14,
9772:11, 9780:8,
9781:23, 9786:23,
9793:8, 9794:3,
9794:21, 9794:22,
9826:6, 9826:18,
9829:15, 9842:7,
9865:9, 9867:18,
9886:6, 9886:18,
9889:17
referring - 9763:17,
9770:23, 9781:7,
9829:24, 9830:5,
9836:25, 9860:4,
9898:22, 9929:7
refers - 9771:2,
9781:8, 9812:6,
9812:24, 9813:1,
9892:11, 9892:14,
9900:8, 9925:7
refrain - 9764:12
refresh - 9888:22
regard - 9785:1,
9918:18, 9919:2,
9920:7, 9938:15,
9939:21, 9950:12
regarding - 9763:19
regardless - 9943:3
regards - 9791:4,
9791:21, 9791:23,
9808:20, 9872:17
Regina - 9778:17,
9778:19, 9789:7,
9828:19, 9847:17,
9890:9, 9890:11,
9891:14, 9891:15,
9891:22, 9892:21,
9892:23, 9895:3,
9895:13, 9914:24,
9916:24, 9917:3,
9917:8, 9917:13,
9917:17, 9939:3,
9947:13, 9950:1
registered - 9891:9
regular - 9917:4,
9927:2
regulation - 9898:12
Reid - 9851:24
reinforce - 9764:1
reinforced - 9848:16
reinvestigation -
9855:21
relate - 9776:21,
9867:25
related - 9828:15,
9944:4
relates - 9814:9
relating - 9855:14,
9944:12
relation - 9769:5,
9795:6, 9849:16
relations - 9790:2



relationship - 9872:5
Relative - 9931:19
relative - 9942:17
relatively - 9871:1
released - 9819:18, 9893:24
relevance - 9903:14
relevancy - 9906:7
relevant - 9797:19, 9864:25, 9902:7, 9910:5, 9931:18
reliability - 9777:13
reliable - 9778:4
reluctant - 9904:5
remain - 9927:5
remained - 9801:23, 9836:5, 9923:23, 9928:18
remains - 9895:8, 9943:17
remedy - 9760:6
remember - 9787:6, 9828:12, 9837:14, 9838:1, 9841:11, 9843:21, 9870:13, 9888:24, 9934:6, 9935:23, 9937:19, 9943:14, 9947:23, 9948:15
remembered - 9925:21
remind - 9760:11, 9764:1, 9856:20
reminded - 9760:19, 9760:20
reminds - 9940:22
remove - 9906:10
removed - 9806:14
removing - 9805:13
remuneration - 9949:25
rendered - 9947:19
repeated - 9770:22
repeatedly - 9853:11
replete - 9948:12
reply - 9941:1
report - 9763:13, 9763:14, 9770:25, 9781:5, 9781:15, 9783:19, 9789:1, 9790:12, 9791:1, 9794:22, 9805:20, 9805:21, 9823:20, 9824:3, 9824:6, 9824:17, 9830:2, 9830:3, 9836:25, 9837:4, 9837:11, 9839:17, 9844:2, 9844:6, 9845:6, 9845:7, 9845:16, 9852:24, 9877:22, 9877:23, 9878:1, 9878:7, 9878:12, 9879:11, 9879:14, 9880:19, 9880:21, 9885:24, 9893:20, 9893:24
reported - 9829:21, 9843:9
reported' - 9830:25
Reporter - 9953:14, 9953:20
Reporters - 9756:11, 9953:3
Reporters' - 9953:1
reporting - 9779:5, 9853:1
reports - 9775:16, 9781:9, 9792:25, 9841:17, 9878:13, 9878:19, 9878:23, 9878:25, 9879:5,

9879:8, 9879:25, 9894:3, 9894:7, 9932:1, 9932:20, 9934:23
represent - 9863:4, 9938:13
representation - 9863:15
represented - 9817:17, 9817:19, 9859:13, 9895:2, 9937:25
representing - 9810:10
reputation - 9937:23
request - 9783:22, 9830:21, 9831:3, 9889:24, 9893:4
requested - 9865:22
requests - 9830:21
require - 9941:1
required - 9832:10
requirement - 9924:7
reserved - 9933:2
residential - 9820:15
resolution - 9915:5, 9917:23
resource - 9896:20
resources - 9897:6
respect - 9759:11, 9759:13, 9759:20, 9760:6, 9760:8, 9760:13, 9764:11, 9849:3, 9860:12, 9863:7, 9863:23, 9864:3, 9864:8, 9865:8, 9867:6, 9872:10, 9874:24, 9878:18, 9881:9, 9883:16, 9889:21, 9890:1, 9890:23, 9891:16, 9893:6, 9899:24, 9900:20, 9901:13, 9902:13, 9903:12, 9903:14, 9904:7, 9909:21, 9911:20, 9914:19, 9936:16, 9945:11
respected - 9939:12
respectfully - 9844:11
respecting - 9948:25
respond - 9761:8, 9766:24, 9767:3, 9831:13
response - 9767:5, 9803:3
responsibilities - 9871:10, 9940:13
responsibility - 9816:5, 9895:22, 9930:5
responsible - 9769:14, 9769:22, 9769:23, 9794:15, 9795:9, 9823:18, 9829:4, 9843:19, 9844:16, 9847:11, 9847:13, 9848:10, 9853:16, 9925:17
restraint - 9763:12
restrictions - 9764:6, 9764:9, 9908:7
restructure - 9835:2
result - 9759:8, 9778:9, 9847:21, 9849:6, 9862:11, 9894:10, 9899:9, 9915:13
resulted - 9896:3
results - 9848:1, 9880:6, 9880:7
retained - 9924:6,

9924:8, 9924:10, 9924:17, 9928:23
retired - 9833:5
Retired - 9757:14
retirement - 9871:7, 9882:1, 9929:12
retracted - 9784:23
retrievable - 9929:8
retrieval - 9881:24, 9881:25, 9882:1
retrieve - 9930:9
return - 9859:19, 9933:6
reveal - 9933:21, 9933:24, 9933:25
revealed - 9893:19
revealing - 9813:21
review - 9771:23, 9775:21, 9799:5, 9800:4, 9846:14, 9857:18, 9857:23, 9897:23, 9898:14, 9898:15, 9902:22, 9904:19, 9914:1, 9914:12, 9918:20, 9925:15, 9926:2, 9926:6, 9927:2, 9927:3, 9934:17, 9942:14, 9942:15, 9948:4
reviewed - 9768:6
reward - 9827:14, 9828:9, 9840:5, 9921:14
Richard - 9863:3
Rick - 9757:6
rid - 9886:20
Riddell - 9784:2, 9846:16, 9878:2
rising - 9760:15
risk - 9764:16
river - 9941:12, 9942:4
Riverdale - 9826:24
road - 9796:12, 9796:21, 9843:13
robbed - 9803:22
robberies - 9820:3
robbery - 9859:7
Rochelle - 9757:8
role - 9815:17, 9815:19, 9820:24, 9852:12, 9863:24, 9889:11, 9895:22
roll - 9798:4
Ron - 9775:6, 9775:23, 9782:13, 9785:3, 9787:2, 9787:11, 9788:2, 9797:2, 9849:24, 9880:6
room - 9777:25, 9778:20, 9869:15, 9924:14, 9952:10
roughly - 9892:15, 9894:12
routine - 9927:3
Rpr - 9756:12, 9953:2, 9953:18, 9953:19
rule - 9773:15
ruling - 9760:23, 9761:2, 9761:25, 9762:20
run - 9764:16, 9865:3, 9952:2
running - 9807:21
runs - 9864:21
Rutherford - 9902:25, 9906:20, 9906:21, 9907:14

S

S/sgt - 9784:3, 9890:10
Sabo - 9863:15
saintly - 9948:20
sale - 9782:15
Sandra - 9756:5
Sask - 9894:23
Saskatchewan - 9755:17, 9815:19, 9817:2, 9817:20, 9818:23, 9820:24, 9821:6, 9821:13, 9821:16, 9841:8, 9880:20, 9885:23, 9891:16, 9891:18, 9902:21, 9907:8, 9907:12, 9907:18, 9908:6, 9914:25, 9915:4, 9916:21, 9917:12, 9917:21, 9937:18, 9944:23, 9945:13, 9946:2, 9947:18, 9953:4
Saskatoon - 9755:17, 9757:6, 9766:7, 9766:25, 9776:6, 9789:16, 9793:13, 9798:16, 9802:14, 9808:10, 9811:7, 9811:10, 9811:23, 9812:9, 9813:13, 9813:15, 9815:17, 9815:23, 9815:25, 9817:4, 9817:21, 9818:8, 9818:18, 9826:2, 9829:2, 9833:3, 9838:19, 9839:7, 9841:8, 9848:13, 9855:20, 9863:4, 9863:14, 9864:1, 9867:10, 9871:8, 9875:2, 9875:7, 9876:3, 9877:3, 9878:20, 9878:24, 9879:1, 9879:9, 9879:13, 9879:19, 9879:23, 9880:8, 9886:1, 9887:1, 9887:4, 9888:13, 9888:17, 9889:19, 9889:23, 9890:4, 9891:19, 9892:4, 9892:5, 9892:18, 9892:20, 9892:24, 9893:5, 9893:7, 9893:10, 9893:22, 9894:3, 9895:13, 9895:16, 9911:20, 9912:2, 9916:25, 9925:13, 9937:10, 9937:13, 9938:24, 9941:8, 9941:12, 9942:7, 9943:5, 9943:16, 9947:10, 9948:3
sat - 9917:12, 9932:11
satisfied - 9824:15, 9856:11, 9861:11, 9861:16, 9861:22
saw - 9760:1, 9798:22, 9807:14, 9811:25, 9815:15, 9816:22, 9817:16, 9859:25, 9861:1, 9934:21
scenario - 9876:9, 9876:11, 9876:23, 9877:6, 9891:19, 9892:25
scene - 9864:17, 9865:3, 9919:9, 9922:12
scheduled - 9759:6

schematic - 9918:11, 9918:16, 9918:20
school - 9820:15, 9938:13
science - 9871:15, 9871:22
scratch - 9773:24
screamed - 9807:13
screaming - 9807:21
screen - 9762:20, 9808:25, 9877:19, 9882:20, 9886:13, 9887:11
scroll - 9824:18, 9860:2
scrolling - 9810:2, 9811:8
search - 9901:10
Searches - 9849:4
seasoned - 9856:6
seat - 9770:6
second - 9762:22, 9771:5, 9785:2, 9785:7, 9786:17, 9797:1, 9798:7, 9811:22, 9813:1, 9814:5, 9861:15, 9883:8, 9894:4, 9947:8
secondly - 9909:4
section - 9814:14, 9814:22, 9822:21, 9833:2, 9834:5, 9835:6, 9835:12, 9835:13, 9835:14, 9835:15, 9836:7, 9869:7, 9869:8, 9869:9, 9871:4, 9875:1, 9875:7, 9875:25
sections - 9835:14, 9864:1, 9867:9
secured - 9930:23
securing - 9894:2
Security - 9756:13
see - 9761:6, 9764:8, 9769:21, 9771:25, 9773:18, 9776:17, 9776:24, 9782:6, 9782:13, 9785:19, 9786:2, 9792:10, 9793:3, 9799:14, 9802:17, 9808:21, 9820:2, 9820:11, 9820:20, 9822:6, 9828:11, 9842:13, 9850:5, 9850:21, 9860:22, 9869:23, 9877:12, 9883:3, 9910:3, 9920:9, 9927:11, 9928:15, 9929:24, 9935:13, 9945:6, 9945:8
seeing - 9772:6, 9809:20, 9842:7
seek - 9852:14, 9855:22, 9872:13, 9901:4
seeking - 9787:2, 9887:23, 9939:8
seem - 9790:8, 9806:19, 9904:2, 9948:16
seeming - 9909:18
selling - 9782:23
sending - 9828:14, 9872:22
senior - 9849:21, 9869:14, 9938:23
sense - 9761:19, 9770:12, 9783:17, 9818:4, 9820:18, 9841:22, 9873:8,



9904:19
sensical - 9854:12
sent - 9815:4, 9815:5,
 9840:25, 9856:16
sentence - 9810:21,
 9816:17, 9817:7,
 9818:16, 9820:21,
 9820:25, 9821:3,
 9821:11, 9914:19,
 9916:5, 9916:10,
 9916:14, 9916:18,
 9945:12, 9946:8,
 9949:25
sentenced - 9810:13
sentences - 9916:4
sentencing - 9815:14,
 9821:15, 9822:1,
 9915:10, 9915:25,
 9944:19, 9944:24,
 9945:11, 9945:23,
 9945:25, 9946:14
separate - 9798:3,
 9916:16, 9924:13
separated - 9835:7,
 9835:16
September - 9809:14,
 9810:3, 9810:19
sequence - 9884:7,
 9932:12
Serge - 9757:5,
 9938:13
Sergeant - 9781:1,
 9781:16, 9852:20,
 9878:2, 9887:17,
 9887:19, 9887:21,
 9887:24, 9890:8,
 9890:16
sergeant - 9869:19
sergeants - 9851:24
serial - 9826:6
series - 9820:20
serious - 9766:13,
 9820:2, 9834:9,
 9834:13, 9834:14,
 9834:20, 9927:20,
 9927:21, 9927:23,
 9928:7, 9933:3, 9944:7
seriously - 9773:9
serological - 9847:17
served - 9905:16,
 9946:8, 9946:15
serves - 9870:22
service - 9773:7,
 9784:24, 9792:5,
 9815:17, 9826:17,
 9853:20, 9853:24,
 9854:6, 9854:22,
 9863:16, 9863:17,
 9863:25, 9864:5,
 9864:11, 9875:6,
 9890:2, 9896:1,
 9896:25, 9897:2,
 9898:14, 9941:6
Service - 9757:6,
 9766:7, 9767:1,
 9798:17, 9815:17,
 9817:4, 9817:22,
 9818:18, 9826:2,
 9833:3, 9839:7,
 9848:13, 9863:4,
 9863:14, 9867:10,
 9871:8, 9875:7, 9876:3,
 9877:3, 9878:21,
 9879:10, 9879:17,
 9879:24, 9880:9,
 9886:1, 9888:17,
 9889:20
service's - 9834:18
services - 9875:1,
 9875:24
serving - 9841:1
set - 9797:1, 9816:1,
 9854:14, 9854:25,
 9929:17
sets - 9846:9
setting - 9855:1
seven - 9812:4
several - 9779:18,
 9784:1
severe - 9921:8
sex - 9769:25,
 9942:24, 9943:4
Sexual - 9833:1
sexual - 9781:7,
 9790:2, 9807:14,
 9807:24, 9808:7,
 9808:23, 9810:3,
 9820:12, 9820:15,
 9825:18, 9826:11,
 9830:14, 9859:7,
 9865:9, 9870:5,
 9870:24, 9929:22
sexually - 9782:24,
 9805:5, 9805:12,
 9806:14, 9809:18,
 9870:25
shallow - 9942:4
share - 9874:16
shared - 9874:13,
 9879:3, 9934:20,
 9934:24, 9935:1,
 9935:2, 9944:21,
 9952:9
sharing - 9832:10,
 9868:24, 9869:1
Sharon - 9780:15,
 9781:6, 9782:22,
 9798:20
Short - 9778:12,
 9778:14, 9779:5,
 9850:8, 9850:14,
 9850:16, 9850:21,
 9851:9, 9851:18,
 9852:21
short - 9876:15,
 9877:9
Short's - 9783:19
shorthand - 9953:5
Shorty - 9770:16,
 9771:18, 9772:12,
 9779:7, 9781:19,
 9783:12, 9784:11,
 9786:25, 9912:6
shove - 9911:15
show - 9809:10,
 9879:12, 9891:21,
 9891:22, 9891:23,
 9892:12, 9901:12,
 9902:2, 9935:8
Show - 9809:22
showed - 9800:25,
 9801:4, 9801:7
showing - 9790:6,
 9935:11
shown - 9918:9
shun - 9913:21
sic - 9785:20, 9805:23,
 9806:6, 9909:16
sides - 9791:16,
 9793:1
sight - 9775:24
sign - 9931:2, 9931:4
signed - 9882:7
significant - 9804:7,
 9841:23, 9842:1,
 9869:17
significantly -
 9832:18, 9853:22,
 9867:12
signing - 9933:18
silly - 9896:25
silo - 9867:19
Silvester - 9844:10
similar - 9808:3,
 9828:19, 9842:9,
 9846:13, 9918:22,
 9938:14
similarities - 9768:22,
 9803:16, 9847:3,
 9918:12
similarly - 9817:19
simply - 9764:9,
 9850:20, 9901:9,
 9902:1, 9908:1, 9909:4,
 9927:9, 9928:9
Sinclair - 9933:10,
 9934:1, 9934:16,
 9935:3
sit - 9766:12
site - 9864:7, 9866:3
sitting - 9755:15
situation - 9772:5,
 9788:6, 9793:24,
 9795:1, 9824:10,
 9825:10, 9833:5,
 9833:24, 9834:8,
 9836:1, 9836:2,
 9854:19, 9855:15,
 9925:16, 9947:20
situations - 9820:16,
 9833:15
six - 9812:3, 9819:11,
 9819:19
Six - 9946:5
skepticism - 9840:6
skill - 9953:6
slacks - 9811:21,
 9812:5
slash - 9804:11
slashed - 9806:16,
 9828:23
slayer - 9827:17
slides - 9870:15
sloppy - 9785:18
smoking - 9792:20
snow - 9920:3
so-called - 9843:18,
 9844:20
solicitor - 9901:1,
 9905:9, 9940:16,
 9940:20
solicitor/client -
 9903:25, 9905:6
solution - 9908:13
solve - 9943:3,
 9943:25, 9944:3
solved - 9923:13,
 9923:15, 9923:19,
 9926:20, 9927:16
solved - 9926:9
solving - 9944:7
Someone - 9820:5
someone - 9805:1,
 9806:12, 9806:18,
 9807:9, 9807:20,
 9807:22, 9808:2,
 9809:7, 9819:10,
 9826:9, 9830:14,
 9843:1, 9853:9,
 9876:12, 9922:17,
 9922:18, 9922:23,
 9926:8, 9929:5, 9951:9,
 9951:18
sometime - 9805:11,
 9805:17, 9811:7,
 9811:10
sometimes - 9765:10,
 9765:13, 9774:6,
 9833:23, 9929:2,
 9929:11, 9939:11
somewhat - 9867:25,
 9875:23, 9892:1,
 9901:1, 9901:25,
 9944:23
somewhere - 9812:25,
 9882:13, 9921:22,
 9926:21
sorry - 9778:12,
 9780:20, 9784:20,
 9813:1, 9828:21,
 9836:15, 9840:20,
 9844:3, 9846:7, 9886:6,
 9892:12, 9893:15,
 9922:14, 9924:18,
 9949:12, 9950:10
Sorry - 9824:18,
 9838:9, 9860:21
sort - 9766:1, 9771:8,
 9776:13, 9783:2,
 9787:8, 9790:6,
 9791:16, 9792:4,
 9793:20, 9794:20,
 9802:24, 9814:25,
 9816:18, 9817:6,
 9818:17, 9823:22,
 9830:1, 9830:12,
 9834:2, 9834:11,
 9834:19, 9834:21,
 9842:9, 9850:23,
 9852:8, 9853:3,
 9855:12, 9913:7,
 9927:21, 9940:3,
 9943:13, 9943:19
sorts - 9798:23
sought - 9816:10,
 9903:16
sound - 9769:15,
 9774:18, 9806:22
sounds - 9802:24,
 9941:4
source - 9893:21
South - 9838:22,
 9839:1, 9839:9, 9841:8
speaking - 9781:6,
 9787:4, 9787:13,
 9839:25, 9873:19,
 9897:15, 9942:13,
 9944:2, 9944:19
speaks - 9860:25
specific - 9760:5,
 9827:2, 9872:4, 9875:1,
 9877:22, 9884:16,
 9889:24, 9891:11,
 9927:1, 9929:7,
 9929:16, 9942:22,
 9943:11
specifically - 9762:10,
 9767:13, 9768:6,
 9787:7, 9804:5,
 9804:21, 9805:1,
 9826:2, 9828:10,
 9863:7, 9863:11,
 9870:8, 9870:13,
 9872:1, 9881:22,
 9886:2, 9886:14,
 9890:7, 9892:9, 9897:9,
 9911:2, 9911:23,
 9916:12, 9919:22,
 9926:7, 9926:25,
 9929:2, 9929:6, 9932:6,
 9933:2, 9939:6, 9948:7,
 9949:5, 9949:23,
 9950:3, 9950:15
specifics - 9937:21,
 9947:24
specimens - 9872:20
Spence - 9770:2
spend - 9880:12
spent - 9895:21,
 9913:20
sperm - 9874:2
spill - 9764:22
spoken - 9759:9,
 9766:19, 9900:23
spread - 9826:12
spring - 9811:11
Sps - 9889:8
St - 9811:19, 9872:16
stab - 9774:17,
 9804:11
stabbed - 9774:15,
 9806:16
stabbing - 9804:8,
 9804:9, 9804:10,
 9805:15
Staff - 9756:1, 9756:9
stage - 9826:13,
 9934:2
stamped - 9845:7
stand - 9759:15,
 9759:16, 9759:21,
 9760:4, 9778:1,
 9834:12, 9938:6
standard - 9813:17
standards - 9861:10,
 9940:1
StarPhoenix - 9826:21,
 9827:12
start - 9819:25,
 9876:24, 9931:21,
 9932:4
started - 9833:7,
 9835:2, 9862:24
starting - 9778:13,
 9943:15
starts - 9827:13
state - 9789:24
statement - 9766:24,
 9770:21, 9771:23,
 9771:25, 9773:5,
 9774:12, 9774:13,
 9774:16, 9774:21,
 9778:10, 9778:11,
 9778:13, 9778:15,
 9780:18, 9780:19,
 9780:22, 9780:24,
 9781:4, 9781:7,
 9781:15, 9783:11,
 9783:14, 9783:23,
 9784:21, 9786:10,
 9786:16, 9786:18,
 9786:21, 9796:9,
 9797:19, 9798:6,
 9798:7, 9799:17,
 9809:13, 9809:16,
 9809:17, 9809:20,
 9810:24, 9811:4,
 9812:7, 9813:7,
 9813:16, 9813:22,
 9814:5, 9814:8, 9824:8,
 9824:9, 9829:17,
 9837:20, 9838:6,
 9838:15, 9839:17,
 9839:22, 9840:1,
 9842:3, 9849:24,
 9933:17, 9933:18
statements - 9772:11,
 9773:16, 9775:14,
 9775:16, 9775:20,
 9775:22, 9776:4,
 9777:9, 9783:11,
 9785:4, 9785:5, 9786:1,
 9786:2, 9787:3, 9797:1,
 9797:2, 9797:6,
 9812:14, 9814:24,
 9815:5, 9815:8,
 9816:24, 9821:12,
 9838:25, 9839:11,
 9848:9, 9950:20
states - 9781:5,



9786:24, 9789:3,
9792:3
stating - 9859:1
station - 9839:17,
9924:10, 9924:13,
9924:17, 9928:19
Station - 9789:10
status - 9825:9
statutory - 9924:6
stayed - 9856:13
steal - 9798:5
step - 9853:6
sticking - 9784:14,
9798:19
still - 9759:14,
9768:12, 9784:14,
9784:19, 9784:23,
9797:17, 9801:5,
9801:24, 9802:4,
9806:21, 9824:8,
9833:5, 9845:13,
9845:21, 9848:13,
9876:25, 9889:21,
9908:17, 9944:1,
9946:20, 9952:7
Still - 9806:22, 9942:9,
9942:10
Stinchcomb - 9832:2,
9832:4, 9832:17,
9832:23, 9934:11
stint - 9782:14
stood - 9762:4,
9857:12
stoop - 9767:11,
9950:8
stop - 9805:12,
9913:8, 9913:10
storage - 9855:8,
9883:16, 9924:20,
9924:23
stored - 9883:10
stories - 9830:13
storing - 9882:14
story - 9763:9,
9773:18, 9773:20,
9779:8, 9783:24,
9784:15, 9784:19,
9785:9, 9785:15,
9785:21, 9791:8,
9793:15, 9793:22,
9796:5, 9798:18,
9828:19, 9829:2,
9912:1, 9912:7,
9912:14
stove - 9867:6, 9867:8,
9867:16
stove-piped - 9867:8
stove-piping - 9867:6,
9867:16
straight - 9810:6
street - 9787:2,
9805:8, 9806:19,
9807:9, 9807:19,
9945:7, 9945:17
streets - 9829:6
strong - 9847:22,
9935:23, 9947:7,
9947:21
struggle - 9920:5
stuck - 9783:15,
9783:24, 9798:2
study - 9769:11
subject - 9768:11,
9880:13, 9905:15,
9908:22, 9918:20
submitted - 9848:3
subsequent - 9942:6
subsequently - 9872:3
substance - 9775:10
substantial - 9921:20,

9922:3
successfully - 9898:5,
9913:23
sudden - 9833:18,
9833:19, 9834:1,
9864:8, 9864:13
suddenly - 9911:8
suffered - 9834:11
suggest - 9775:25,
9788:5, 9795:12,
9799:23, 9815:22,
9818:4, 9828:10,
9844:11, 9845:24,
9846:23, 9852:7,
9873:25, 9875:18,
9881:1, 9888:21,
9889:1, 9908:13,
9908:20, 9909:19,
9910:10, 9912:11,
9914:18, 9915:12,
9916:20, 9920:16,
9941:7, 9944:21,
9948:18, 9950:21,
9952:9
suggested - 9766:6,
9766:7, 9766:9,
9767:17, 9768:4,
9787:25, 9835:4,
9847:9, 9893:21
suggesting - 9766:1,
9771:13, 9771:18,
9780:11, 9781:18,
9793:20, 9799:24,
9801:13, 9801:17
suggestion - 9761:10,
9765:24, 9767:7,
9767:8, 9771:5, 9771:7,
9800:24, 9818:21,
9825:17, 9840:4,
9843:16, 9843:21,
9894:18, 9914:22,
9935:20
suggestions - 9793:14
suggests - 9790:16,
9792:8, 9794:18,
9825:11, 9889:18,
9893:9, 9894:24
suicide - 9833:24
suicides - 9833:23,
9864:22
summarize - 9802:13
summarizes - 9900:19
summary - 9770:25,
9793:8, 9794:21,
9799:14, 9818:11,
9906:24
summer - 9812:3
Sunday - 9784:5
superintendent -
9851:1
Superintendent -
9829:18, 9830:5,
9851:3, 9887:15
superiors - 9932:13
supervise - 9926:2
supervised - 9767:23,
9925:15, 9930:15
supervision - 9849:21
supervisor - 9853:10,
9869:3, 9929:16,
9930:9
supervisors - 9867:24
supervisory - 9765:9
supply - 9803:4,
9831:3
support - 9781:21,
9788:14, 9799:2,
9815:24, 9874:3,
9875:1
Support - 9756:9

supportable - 9816:11
supporters - 9948:14
supports - 9773:20,
9774:8
suppose - 9764:7,
9764:16, 9804:6,
9804:17, 9853:22,
9855:9, 9897:5, 9908:6,
9911:6, 9920:13,
9920:19, 9944:25
supposed - 9793:17,
9801:13
Supreme - 9801:7,
9832:13, 9857:17,
9857:21, 9857:24,
9858:10, 9858:19,
9859:24, 9860:24,
9862:13, 9896:24,
9898:22, 9898:23,
9899:8, 9899:13,
9900:10, 9903:5,
9905:17, 9934:10,
9947:18
Supt - 9784:7, 9829:19
surfaced - 9932:3
surmised - 9874:17
surprise - 9777:23,
9778:6, 9912:13,
9912:15, 9944:21
surprised - 9799:18,
9827:9, 9875:9,
9888:24
surprising - 9777:23,
9785:11, 9815:2
surrounding - 9932:10
suspect - 9768:16,
9768:18, 9771:7,
9771:10, 9771:11,
9780:13, 9781:19,
9792:7, 9794:7, 9795:4,
9795:5, 9795:9,
9795:23, 9796:4,
9796:8, 9796:13,
9796:19, 9799:25,
9804:22, 9808:6,
9808:8, 9842:13,
9842:24, 9843:10,
9843:14, 9845:14,
9845:18, 9846:1,
9849:10, 9934:22,
9942:22
suspected - 9799:19,
9876:17
suspects - 9769:4,
9769:13, 9770:11,
9795:11, 9795:12,
9803:5, 9831:5,
9845:21
suspicious - 9865:5
swear - 9816:12
sworn - 9810:18
system - 9882:8,
9882:13, 9882:20,
9883:21, 9884:14,
9884:15, 9892:6,
9930:16, 9937:9,
9937:10, 9946:21,
9951:24, 9952:2,
9952:5
system' - 9882:11
systemic - 9904:18,
9905:3
systemically - 9905:22

T

tactics - 9950:9
talks - 9781:11,
9907:14
Tallis - 9757:13,

9856:17, 9856:18,
9858:14, 9935:18,
9936:19, 9937:1,
9937:15, 9937:17,
9938:4, 9938:19
Tdr - 9757:4
Technician - 9756:14
technological -
9911:10
technology - 9871:15
ten - 9840:1, 9923:21,
9951:22
tend - 9833:25
tendency - 9867:7
tending - 9881:1
tense - 9868:2
tenure - 9928:24
terms - 9761:13,
9771:24, 9772:25,
9774:2, 9775:16,
9798:22, 9804:18,
9806:10, 9817:5,
9818:16, 9821:19,
9822:23, 9823:5,
9825:12, 9826:8,
9831:15, 9834:1,
9839:25, 9850:16,
9852:6, 9852:8, 9852:9,
9855:1, 9855:9,
9855:19, 9871:13,
9875:21, 9880:5,
9917:22, 9928:2,
9928:5, 9940:6, 9945:3
test - 9848:4
testified - 9801:6,
9823:16, 9857:8,
9857:20, 9858:3,
9858:6, 9858:14,
9858:15, 9858:17,
9863:25, 9870:21,
9872:24, 9880:22,
9933:19
testifies - 9792:24
testify - 9780:6,
9800:13, 9850:7,
9856:23, 9857:2,
9857:20
testifying - 9929:25
Testimony - 9755:14
testimony - 9759:14,
9759:20, 9759:22,
9760:9, 9760:13,
9784:20, 9784:21,
9823:19, 9854:8,
9869:5, 9936:8,
9936:14
that' - 9790:17,
9802:25, 9905:25
Thatcher - 9947:11,
9948:3, 9948:14,
9950:22, 9951:3
theft - 9927:15
thefts - 9927:12
themselves - 9773:15,
9786:2
then-counsel -
9915:17
then-former - 9767:16
theoretical - 9919:7
theories - 9899:21
theory - 9803:7,
9803:11, 9803:12,
9843:18, 9844:20,
9845:2, 9845:10,
9845:13, 9849:9,
9899:15, 9900:1,
9900:3
therefor - 9824:16
therefore - 9814:16,
9862:3, 9893:9

thereof - 9938:25
they've - 9785:3
thick - 9948:19
thinking - 9820:13,
9834:16, 9834:18,
9834:25, 9854:12,
9919:15
Third - 9861:22
third - 9812:6,
9853:16, 9883:9
this' - 9801:10,
9852:22, 9855:18,
9857:13, 9905:24
thorough - 9937:19,
9938:7
thoroughness -
9938:5
thoughts - 9903:15,
9944:25, 9945:1
three - 9803:16,
9804:1, 9804:15,
9804:21, 9811:5,
9811:9, 9819:10,
9820:6, 9829:1,
9845:10, 9845:12,
9847:4, 9847:23,
9848:5, 9851:7,
9851:16, 9851:20,
9861:8, 9861:10,
9883:7, 9918:22
throughout - 9781:12,
9782:24, 9807:23,
9808:11, 9835:19,
9841:20, 9854:7,
9930:18
Thursday - 9755:21
tightening - 9882:3
tightening-up - 9882:3
today - 9827:14,
9882:16, 9890:15,
9908:19, 9913:9,
9919:3, 9923:10,
9936:17, 9938:16
together - 9769:12,
9796:5, 9860:6,
9861:25, 9929:1
took - 9765:2,
9804:10, 9806:1,
9806:2, 9810:16,
9811:16, 9812:2,
9814:11, 9821:15,
9821:25, 9825:4,
9825:18, 9826:20,
9839:21, 9849:8,
9856:4, 9856:11,
9858:22, 9859:24,
9861:3, 9869:11,
9884:25, 9885:7,
9892:24, 9898:20,
9903:3, 9918:2, 9932:7,
9932:8, 9932:9,
9933:17, 9937:24,
9947:9, 9947:13,
9947:16
top - 9795:21,
9809:25, 9861:7,
9911:8, 9943:7
Total - 9921:2
total - 9769:13,
9810:15, 9815:16
touch - 9784:6
touched - 9807:12
touching - 9806:17,
9807:20
towards - 9773:5,
9784:22, 9791:20,
9849:15
trace - 9902:17, 9903:9
track - 9780:3,
9799:25, 9882:17,



9924:19
training - 9871:21,
 9875:17
transcript - 9762:21
Transcript - 9755:12,
 9759:1
transcription - 9953:5
transferred - 9884:14
transitions - 9882:25
transmitted - 9908:6
transpire - 9813:11
transported - 9789:9,
 9847:16, 9876:20,
 9916:24
travelling - 9775:5,
 9779:23, 9781:12,
 9917:3
trial - 9800:12,
 9800:13, 9801:1,
 9810:6, 9825:20,
 9830:10, 9853:21,
 9854:4, 9855:5, 9856:3,
 9857:8, 9857:12,
 9859:3, 9859:16,
 9862:1, 9862:5,
 9862:16, 9862:19,
 9917:6, 9922:7,
 9933:20, 9935:22,
 9936:1, 9936:9, 9937:2,
 9937:25, 9947:9,
 9947:11, 9947:13,
 9949:5, 9949:16
tried - 9768:11, 9812:1
trip - 9779:4
true - 9773:12,
 9773:16, 9773:17,
 9775:19, 9779:11,
 9781:20, 9788:10,
 9788:13, 9791:14,
 9793:15, 9793:22,
 9893:12, 9953:5
True - 9948:2
trust - 9820:17
truth - 9767:7,
 9773:14, 9777:9,
 9777:12, 9777:20,
 9779:2, 9788:9,
 9788:17, 9788:19,
 9789:14, 9920:15
truthful - 9773:23,
 9779:10, 9784:18,
 9798:8
try - 9796:21, 9825:22,
 9826:3, 9841:3, 9843:9,
 9845:25, 9883:6,
 9909:1, 9915:3, 9915:8
trying - 9775:9,
 9777:4, 9777:5,
 9777:11, 9777:18,
 9778:3, 9785:24,
 9785:25, 9788:7,
 9796:5, 9853:25,
 9873:8, 9913:21
turn - 9792:18, 9793:7,
 9858:18, 9869:16,
 9893:14
turning - 9794:3
two - 9768:23, 9775:5,
 9782:25, 9792:13,
 9802:12, 9802:14,
 9810:14, 9811:1,
 9812:8, 9814:12,
 9819:1, 9819:10,
 9819:18, 9820:6,
 9821:12, 9826:22,
 9829:4, 9835:13,
 9838:24, 9847:1,
 9879:5, 9898:3,
 9908:24, 9921:21,
 9923:11, 9926:3,

9931:16, 9933:22,
 9946:1, 9948:22,
 9949:4, 9951:17
twofold - 9908:14
type - 9767:11,
 9774:21, 9788:6,
 9833:17, 9834:19,
 9869:11, 9916:9,
 9916:14, 9926:14,
 9928:3, 9933:3
types - 9826:15,
 9833:13, 9864:17,
 9872:13
typically - 9896:22
typing - 9890:13

U

ultimate - 9804:17
ultimately - 9804:12,
 9849:22, 9853:8,
 9896:3, 9899:9,
 9899:23, 9899:24,
 9900:13, 9902:19
Umm - 9786:13,
 9787:7, 9793:20,
 9797:5, 9797:21,
 9799:1, 9803:20,
 9805:5, 9808:14,
 9839:10, 9840:7,
 9841:22, 9843:16,
 9849:19, 9855:24,
 9856:14, 9878:25,
 9880:3, 9881:19,
 9903:21, 9920:9,
 9924:12
unable - 9846:16,
 9902:17
unanswered - 9791:3,
 9791:12
unavailable - 9881:18
unclear - 9873:4
uncommon - 9820:19
uncover - 9849:2
under - 9770:6,
 9814:13, 9822:21,
 9857:13, 9862:5,
 9877:2, 9888:1, 9897:8,
 9898:17, 9921:16,
 9929:15, 9944:9,
 9948:4
Under - 9891:20
understood - 9863:19,
 9923:19, 9930:11
underwear - 9770:6
Unfortunately -
 9774:11
unfortunately -
 9885:21, 9901:3
unique - 9796:17,
 9876:2, 9876:10,
 9876:11, 9876:22,
 9876:24, 9877:6
unit - 9863:24,
 9863:25, 9864:5,
 9864:15, 9925:12
units - 9867:9
University - 9811:23
university - 9826:24
unknown - 9894:1
unless - 9866:12,
 9897:8, 9908:7
unlikely - 9941:4
unnecessarily -
 9883:2
unsolved - 9923:7,
 9923:13, 9924:9,
 9924:22, 9925:7,
 9925:15, 9925:20,
 9927:5, 9928:1, 9928:2,

9928:6, 9928:11,
 9929:21, 9942:9,
 9942:10, 9943:13,
 9943:17, 9944:5
Unsolved - 9923:23
Unsuccessfully -
 9898:4
untoward - 9914:20,
 9914:24
unusual - 9821:3,
 9845:1, 9915:7,
 9917:16
up - 9762:17, 9762:19,
 9764:22, 9767:18,
 9768:11, 9769:10,
 9770:4, 9770:24,
 9778:1, 9778:11,
 9780:5, 9780:12,
 9783:8, 9785:19,
 9786:23, 9787:17,
 9787:21, 9787:22,
 9788:25, 9793:24,
 9794:1, 9795:10,
 9795:11, 9797:14,
 9801:1, 9801:4, 9801:7,
 9802:9, 9802:10,
 9802:19, 9803:1,
 9805:21, 9805:24,
 9810:2, 9810:23,
 9811:5, 9811:9, 9814:7,
 9814:19, 9814:20,
 9816:8, 9819:4,
 9819:12, 9819:24,
 9820:5, 9820:7, 9821:7,
 9824:2, 9824:18,
 9826:19, 9828:18,
 9829:13, 9837:19,
 9838:5, 9838:14,
 9839:21, 9840:19,
 9842:8, 9843:25,
 9844:7, 9844:14,
 9845:4, 9845:6,
 9845:13, 9847:6,
 9848:12, 9848:14,
 9851:8, 9851:11,
 9851:14, 9852:22,
 9853:9, 9853:23,
 9856:14, 9857:12,
 9858:12, 9871:17,
 9871:23, 9882:3,
 9882:9, 9882:20,
 9884:15, 9886:19,
 9892:1, 9893:1, 9893:2,
 9894:12, 9911:5,
 9911:7, 9911:10,
 9911:25, 9919:14,
 9919:21, 9919:25,
 9921:5, 9925:12,
 9926:10, 9942:3,
 9942:14, 9946:12
us' - 9788:21
useful - 9884:1

V

V1 - 9801:2, 9802:2,
 9803:10, 9804:1,
 9804:19, 9807:15,
 9822:19, 9843:4,
 9843:5, 9844:8,
 9844:22, 9847:4,
 9847:16, 9849:1,
 9865:15, 9866:1,
 9881:9, 9885:17,
 9899:17
V2 - 9801:3, 9802:3,
 9803:10, 9804:1,
 9804:19, 9807:15,
 9822:19, 9843:6,
 9847:4, 9847:15,

9848:1, 9848:25,
 9865:15, 9866:1,
 9866:2, 9881:9,
 9885:18, 9899:17
V3 - 9803:10, 9804:2,
 9804:19, 9814:9,
 9814:12, 9822:20,
 9838:6, 9838:14,
 9847:5, 9849:1,
 9881:10, 9899:17
V4 - 9805:4, 9805:18,
 9806:1, 9807:8, 9837:2,
 9846:9, 9846:10,
 9846:11, 9846:15,
 9899:2
V5 - 9801:3, 9812:20,
 9812:22, 9814:5,
 9814:13, 9822:19,
 9823:15, 9824:21,
 9837:19, 9876:6
V9 - 9830:1
vaginal - 9873:20
valid - 9799:7, 9854:16
Vancouver - 9903:6,
 9905:16
various - 9765:8,
 9769:18, 9772:11,
 9794:3, 9918:13
vehicle - 9789:18,
 9789:21, 9864:20,
 9865:4, 9920:20
veracity - 9922:23
verdict - 9859:19,
 9860:9, 9862:3
verified - 9783:24
verify - 9801:16
vernacular - 9908:11
versus - 9928:7
vetted - 9893:25
via - 9857:25
vials - 9870:15
vicious - 9804:9,
 9945:19, 9946:5,
 9946:12
victim - 9822:16,
 9825:8, 9866:17,
 9870:25, 9875:1,
 9875:6, 9875:16,
 9875:24, 9929:23
victims - 9849:6,
 9874:22, 9875:21,
 9876:7, 9894:3, 9895:5
Victoria - 9789:9
view - 9840:5,
 9847:24, 9856:11,
 9859:2, 9860:3, 9861:1,
 9895:25, 9901:18,
 9903:19, 9916:3,
 9936:5
viewed - 9774:19
viewing - 9883:24
views - 9853:2
Vince - 9844:10
vindicated - 9899:7,
 9899:12
virtually - 9895:17
vis - 9915:20
vis-a-vis - 9915:20
visited - 9933:16
voice - 9945:4
Volume - 9755:22
volume - 9762:20,
 9883:1
volunteers - 9773:3

W

waive - 9817:15
waived - 9810:5,
 9901:2, 9901:3, 9915:4

waiver - 9907:3,
 9908:8
walk - 9805:25,
 9806:2, 9806:17,
 9809:24, 9837:1
walking - 9805:7,
 9807:3, 9807:19,
 9920:6
walks - 9773:1
Walters - 9789:4,
 9789:6
wants - 9938:6
Ward - 9851:25
warning - 9826:21
warranted - 9791:23
waste - 9896:20
watching - 9765:7
water - 9764:21
ways - 9785:5,
 9908:24
wearing - 9811:20,
 9812:4
weigh - 9855:19
weir - 9941:12
Weir - 9824:3, 9824:20,
 9825:8
well-remembered -
 9925:21
well-shared - 9952:9
Wempe - 9757:8
west - 9811:19
wherein - 9914:13
whichever - 9888:9
whole - 9785:21,
 9925:22
wide - 9826:12
wide-spread - 9826:12
wife - 9839:15, 9840:2
William - 9900:9
Williams - 9780:15,
 9781:6, 9782:22,
 9798:20, 9886:15,
 9886:22, 9887:7,
 9888:9, 9888:10,
 9889:4, 9889:18,
 9892:11, 9892:17,
 9893:3, 9893:19,
 9894:1, 9894:21
Williams' - 9886:7,
 9888:2
Wilson - 9757:5,
 9758:8, 9775:6,
 9775:23, 9781:24,
 9782:13, 9785:3,
 9787:2, 9787:11,
 9788:2, 9789:18,
 9791:25, 9793:12,
 9797:3, 9797:17,
 9798:9, 9798:11,
 9798:21, 9800:21,
 9849:24, 9880:6,
 9911:24, 9936:2,
 9938:11, 9938:12,
 9941:20, 9941:21,
 9941:23, 9949:17,
 9949:19, 9949:22,
 9950:19, 9952:14
Winnipeg - 9784:9,
 9809:5, 9809:6,
 9809:14, 9809:19,
 9812:6, 9812:8, 9813:5,
 9813:8, 9813:11,
 9813:23, 9816:25,
 9817:16, 9820:25,
 9895:3, 9915:3,
 9915:17
wise - 9781:25,
 9857:4, 9932:12
wish - 9759:7,
 9764:10, 9811:4,



9905:7, 9908:17,
9918:11
wishes - 9763:25,
9908:15, 9908:17,
9908:23
withheld - 9893:11
witness - 9759:14,
9759:21, 9760:25,
9763:7, 9764:4, 9764:5,
9764:14, 9778:1,
9785:12, 9883:6,
9901:21, 9902:1,
9903:17, 9909:1,
9938:6
witness' - 9759:14,
9759:20, 9759:21,
9760:13, 9760:14,
9761:1
witnesses - 9778:2,
9802:4, 9859:9,
9862:10, 9936:7,
9949:4, 9949:24
Wiwcharuk - 9941:15,
9941:21, 9942:23,
9944:15, 9944:16
Wolch - 9757:2,
9761:5, 9781:23,
9886:23, 9893:3,
9904:14, 9904:17,
9905:18, 9906:2,
9918:10, 9949:17,
9949:19, 9949:23,
9952:6
woman - 9943:5
women - 9829:1,
9829:5, 9829:19
wonder - 9867:12,
9872:10, 9877:18,
9883:5, 9886:19,
9887:10, 9893:14,
9915:2, 9927:10
wondered - 9786:8,
9857:10
wondering - 9763:24,
9900:16, 9913:3,
9918:18, 9921:6
Wood - 9784:7,
9829:18, 9829:19,
9830:5, 9851:3
word - 9774:3
words - 9785:6,
9804:22, 9814:23,
9818:13
workloads - 9854:9
works - 9803:2
world - 9782:8, 9952:6
worry - 9854:20
worrying - 9854:13
wounds - 9804:11
Wr - 9903:4
write - 9856:20
written - 9842:6,
9947:6
wrongdoing - 9899:6
wrongful - 9947:21,
9948:13, 9948:19,
9950:23, 9951:4
Wrongful - 9755:3
wrote - 9802:11,
9845:5, 9932:21
9810:15, 9815:16,
9817:1, 9820:14,
9834:19, 9834:23,
9840:1, 9849:20,
9850:10, 9881:5,
9885:7, 9921:25,
9923:21, 9926:3,
9937:3, 9939:4,
9941:24, 9945:13,
9946:9, 9946:24,
9947:10, 9951:8,
9951:15
Yesterday - 9886:5
yesterday - 9761:24,
9886:14, 9888:15,
9888:20, 9889:4,
9893:10, 9894:14,
9895:21, 9903:11,
9914:23, 9918:9,
9923:10, 9935:20,
9936:16
yields - 9829:14
young - 9783:1,
9787:4, 9941:11,
9941:14, 9943:5,
9943:21
yourself - 9849:12,
9850:13, 9855:24,
9869:8, 9930:3,
9936:18
youth - 9835:6, 9835:8
youths - 9791:24
yup - 9807:7

Y

yard - 9811:16
year - 9820:24, 9821:3,
9870:22, 9943:18,
9945:12
years - 9765:6, 9768:2,
9780:7, 9782:3,
9782:16, 9810:14,

