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## Transcript of Proceedings

(Reconvened at 9:00 a.m.)
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Good morning.
ALL COUNSEL: Good morning.

## EVATT FRANCIS ANTHONY MERCHANT, continued:

## BY MR. PRINGLE:

Q
humour, but $I$ said to him you work about 18 hours a day, and he said to me, in all seriousness, yes, I used to be able to work longer hours, but now that I'm older $I$ just can't put in the hours, and he really meant it. A couple of times a month the secretaries would come in and find him asleep at his desk. He was -- he trained us and did himself an incredible thorough job of everything and I had the benefit of being with him at a couple of preliminary inquiries which, when $I$ knew better once I had practiced a few years, it was apparent to me how thorough his preparation had been and his capacity to communicate with witnesses, he would draw out of witnesses things that were done wonderfully. Sometimes he would play the hayseed, sometimes he would be tough, sometimes he -- he had -- his reputation in the day was as one of the -- one of, if not the best criminal lawyer in Saskatchewan, and not only did he have this total grasp of legal principles, work very hard, but he was prepared to go into great detail and uneconomically he would overwork files. If he got into it and it needed more work and he said it will cost $X$, but the amount of work that was involved was really double $X$, he would do double
X. I was then and am now a great fan both of his skills and his capacity.

And with respect to Legal Aid cases, did you ever notice him letting up on Legal Aid cases?

He was no different on Legal Aid than he was on any other case. Legal Aid was only -- Legal Aid is different today than it was then and he was really of the old school approach that there were certain things that you did almost as a matter of charity and you dealt with them the same way you dealt with any other case. If he undertook the case, he threw himself totally into it.

You said yesterday, you made a comment that if you are in front of a jury you really have a large problem if the accused does not testify and you said that you probably heard Calvin Tallis say that. I gather, Mr. Merchant, you are not sure exactly whether he said that, you think he may have said that, but --

Yeah. It's difficult to put into, you know, sort of -- it's kind of the training from mentors. The consensus view when you were always forced to be in front of juries was that it was difficult for juries to accept that people -- to accept the admonition from a judge you ought not to pay any
attention to the fact that the accused didn't testify.

But each and every case is different; would you agree with me?

Absolutely, and certainly the judgment of Cal Tallis is, he would have exercised judgment with great capacity.

Okay. Now I would like to just bring back a document, 156673, which is a letter to you from David Milgaard dated May 13th, 1981, and in your dealings with Mr. Tallis when you talked to him on the phone and when you met with him at the court house in Regina, was this the document that you were relying upon as a consent for -- by David Milgaard to give Justice Tallis information? No, I don't think so. I believe I had a consent that $I$ had drawn, an instruction form.

Do you know where that document is now?
No, I don't have my file, and no, I don't.
Because I thought I had heard you say the other day that you thought that the file that Mr. Hodson had resurrected was the complete file?

Not precisely. What $I$ said was I don't have reason to believe that anything is missing, but it's like asking me if an ashtray is missing from
my living room and if you then ask me about the ashtray, but my belief is that $I$ had a specific authorization.

Do you know that for sure?
No.
Okay. And if we could now go to document 332571, and this appears to be your initial contact with Justice Tallis about this matter?

So it appears.
Okay. And as --
Well, I'm not positive that it's my initial contact, I mean, I'm just recollecting as you are, but this is a rather offhand -- unless there was an enclosure that cast some light on this, that's a strange initial contact, but it may have been. Okay. And in your letter you say you would appreciate him answering one or two questions. I get the impression that your major focus in contacting him was to find out why David Milgaard didn't testify at the trial and that would be one, at least one of the questions you would want to ask him?

A
It might have been, but my -- I can't say that's my recollection. It's my reconstruction that I've just sort of begun what I'm doing and I'm not yet
in a position to question very thoroughly, so I'm sort of saying I'm involved here and $I$ would like to talk to you relatively briefly.

Do you know what the one or two questions were that you were referring to in that letter?

No, no.
Okay. And if we could then turn to document number 216050 , and this appears to be the second letter that you sent to him and it refers to talking to him on June 16th, and that would have been a telephone conversation?

A
Q

A

Q

A
.
Yes. I'm not sure that he -- I wouldn't draw the inference that there was any discussion of not
testifying or testifying. I would read this letter to say that we had a conversation and he said, well, you know, $I$ just don't remember very much about it and $I$ would want to look more carefully.

Okay. Do you recall him indicating that he would have to look for his working file?

I don't recall those words.
He could have said that though?
Could have.
Okay. And you were at his firm for a while. Do you recall that after Justice Tallis was appointed to the Northwest Territories Supreme Court, his firm moved on two to three occasions?

Yes.
There was some -- they moved around a bit and to different locations; do you recall that?

Yes, and Roy Romanow left for sort of a different life and Irving Goldenberg, later Mr. Justice Goldenberg, went to the Caymans as I recall and Mr. Goldenberg senior died, you know, so there were -- Mayer Schulman left, went elsewhere, so the firm had some people changes and office changes and a whole bunch of --

Q Disruptions?

A
Q
And you -- as we find out, you eventually meet with Justice Tallis at the court house in Regina in November of 1982. In the intervening period of time, before that meeting took place, do you recall the fact that he had cancer and had very serious surgery for cancer in April of ' 82 ?

No, I didn't know that. I'm pleased that he did well.

So you don't recall that in the context of this as him being not at work for part of this period of time?

No, I don't.
And not at work and also suffering from the, from health problems during part of this time?

A
Q
A
$Q$
A
A -- he was -- there was some mention of my
political connections, so the political
connections resulted in an interest in what judges were doing and how they were doing it. He was of very high reputation for working hard in the north and that's how he came to be on the court of

Appeal and he -- and for his entire period of time was one of the hardest workers on the Court of Appeal which $I$ would have expected flowing from his capacities, and even in that period of time he was thought to be working very hard, and effectively.

And if we could turn to document number 216059, please. In this document, this is a letter where you are sort of renewing, indicating again you wanted to talk to him about certain things involving Mr. Milgaard, and in this letter you say you are particularly interested in the instructions given by Mr. Milgaard and the reason why he did not testify. That's -- that seemed to be the focus of what you wanted to know from Justice Tallis, is that correct, Mr. Merchant?

A

Q

A
Q It was a big part of my inquiry.

Okay. And eventually you meet with him on November 29th, 1982, document, if we could get document 213628 . And, as $I$ understand it, these are your notes of this -- these are notes of this meeting?

Correct.
Do you know whether those notes were made during the meeting or after the meeting?

A
$Q$
A

A

I don't know, but I'm very confident they were made while he was speaking.

But you are not certain about that?
Not certain, but the context of the wording, and for example 'he was away from the car', 'he confirmed', 'he confirmed', and this is my writing, writing desperately and trying, trying to keep up, 'he confirmed, he confirmed changing his clothes at Shorty Cadrain's but said there was no blood', 'between Saskatoon and' -- you know, I can tell from the speed of -- if $I$ were writing in a more leisurely way, if $I$ were writing on a pad I'd -- it wouldn't be slanting off a page or -- so I'd be surprised. Actually, you know, I may well have said to the judge "where is Meota", and that's where I've written in 'North Battleford', and so I -- I -- as I -- I think $I$ made the notes at the time.

The words that are in the notes; I gather you can't say that every word is the exact word that he used?

No, but $I$ would have been trying to, I would have been trying to write down what he said. You know, he said "I've really decided not to talk about this" and he said -- "and I", sort of like "I've
made that the rule", and $I$ took from that that he had declined to talk with Mr. Young, and then as you reflect on it he answered all my questions. Yeah.

Yeah. So he said "I'm not going to tell you", and then he not only told me, but frankly he satisfied me.

Okay.

I mean $I$ came away understanding.
I was standing over there 20
minutes ago thinking, you know, if you could have put a million dollars into David's defence you could have assembled a bunch of lawyers who could have explained his -- the curiosities of his problem, maybe he could have testified and been found not guilty, but $I$ fully understood what went through the judge's mind and $I$ wouldn't second-guess that decision.

Okay.
Particularly, particularly given his capacity to speak eloquently before the House of Lords and at the same time -- well he was never before the House of Lords -- and at the same time, from what I saw, connect with a jury. So if anyone, in my experience, could do a rumple of the Old Bailey
and talk about reasonable doubt and think he might succeed, I'd have thought he'd have been the person, but -- so I didn't come away from that saying in my mind "boy, the judge made a mistake not putting him on the stand".

Okay. And so, ultimately, he seemed to answer the major questions that you had about this matter? Yes.

Okay. And if we could just take a look at document number 183639, I think this document bears out what you just said, Mr. Merchant, this is a letter of December the 10 th, ' 82 from yourself to Mr. Milgaard, and just the first paragraph there, the second sentence:
"He continues to be prepared to do everything he can to assist you."

And was that a fair statement?
Yes. I was -- you know, as you read these letters and letters of report, $I$ was very forthcoming with what was going on in my thinking, and both with David and with Joyce Milgaard. And there was a reason for all of that, because there was this sort of combination of attack, Joyce Milgaard was a sort of untrainable tiger but if one looks back on it clearly Joyce, Mr. Wolch, Mr. Asper, that's
the reason David is out, and all the while they were a part of this battle. So I wouldn't normally be writing these sort of complete letters of report for most people because there just wouldn't be a utility to it, but they really were working in a sort of a team here, and David was helpful, his mother was more helpful, Peter was helpful, so there was a transference of knowledge that went far beyond what $I$ would normally do, particularly where, of course, as you might have guessed, $I$ too was spending a whole lot more time than the dollars available would justify.

Yeah. Now if we could just go back to document 213628, I think it's clear from this document when you, particularly when you look at the fact that even though you don't have it in the actual memo, but when you look at the fact where there's discussion about blood on the clothing and being with the people, being with the witnesses against him and stuff like that, that Mr. Tallis told you, as part of this, that David had denied his involvement in this matter?

A
Yes. Yes, he did. And the other inference to be drawn from these notes, which would have been made quickly and these might be the notes of four or
five minutes even though $I$ might have been able to write it in two, but the fact that he was speaking to me more or less in code indicated that he took the time to fully refresh his mind about what was involved, so when he said all of these things he said those things because he knew their significance, and when $I$ wrote them down $I$ knew their significance. Of course, I was on the case and he hadn't been on it for a long time, so it's obvious, it was obvious that he didn't just come in and say "well, you know, I really can't help you, here's the file". Instead, in his usual thorough way, he fully refreshed his mind is what I would think is apparent from reading these notes.

And if we could just go, there's one other document $I$ would like you to comment upon, and I think $I$ know what you are going to say here but $I$ think, just for the record, we should deal with this. Document 162821. Now this is another memo of the same meeting and it provides the date, and I understand that you didn't -- this is not your handwriting; is that right, Mr. Merchant?

A
No, it's not my handwriting.
And do you have any idea whose handwriting it is?

And if we can go to the second page, maybe that would be of some assistance, it has basically the same content but -- maybe I shouldn't have been so presumptuous. You are satisfied it isn't your handwriting; is that fair to say?

Satisfied it is not my handwriting, but you have this -- well, it's not my handwriting, but I gather somebody was sort of trying to do a trued copy of my notes because they -- you know, the little code words that $I$ used, 'stab wounds through', for example, and --

Do you remember ever consulting with anybody, somebody consulting with you and trying to find out what your little abbreviations or your short forms were, to make some sense of that? No.

Okay. And the . 6 hours at the bottom; do you have any -- is that something that would have come from your notes or is that something somebody has added? Like it's not on the other memo that we've shown you.

A
Umm, I don't, I -- it may have been on the other memo but it doesn't show up. This was before computerization --

Right.

Q

A

Q

A

Q
A
-- so --
Maybe we just --
-- you made notes on files and then, when you sent
bills, you went through them and missed half the
time. So my method was to put time, so -- but I,
again, $I$ don't know.
Would that meeting on November 29th, this . 6
hours, sound about right for the length of meeting
or --
Yes.
Okay.
But that would be -- I wasn't with Judge Tallis
for 36 minutes, I don't think. That would include
the five or six minutes that it took for me to get
to the courthouse, and probably the two or three
minutes to go in and see him, so $I$ don't recall it
as a long chat.
Okay.
I just live a few blocks from the courthouse.
Okay.
Or work a few blocks.
And, as far as you can recall, that was the only
meeting you had with Justice Tallis about this
matter?

Q
BY MS. MCLEAN:
Good morning, sir. My name is Joanne McLean, I represent Joyce.

Most of the questions $I$ have for
you relate to systemic matters and $I$ would like to get your thoughts on some ideas you may have about what we can do to address the problems within the system. You understood the Department of Justice requirements essentially to be that there had to be something new in order to get a review of a case; am I correct?

Correct.
If we could have 173964 up, please. This is the telephone conversation or conference call that you were having with Joyce and Peter Carlyle-Gordge in May of 1981. The first section here, this was addressed yesterday, and this is the one where you are talking about the bombshells in there, unless there's some real bombshells you wouldn't have:
"Unless we had some real bombshells, you wouldn't have any real chance of fighting the case again. That's what I meant earlier. It's not a matter of deciding whether he should have been
convicted of the crime the last time or not, and whether there were significant inconsistencies which should have resulted in his not being convicted the last time, or not. The question is whether things can be so significant that the ...",

Attorney General:
"... of Canada would authorize a new trial or some investigation into the matter. Those kinds of things -- the time factor of driving the car -- that'd be fine if we could get by the bombshell, the requirement for the bombshell. And certainly she ...", that would be Nichol John:
"... didn't say anything that gives you any bombshell."

Am I correct that what you are saying there essentially is that if you had a bombshell or some significant piece of new evidence, that you could piggyback other arguments onto it, maybe re-explore some of the things that had come out in the trial?

A
If you had a bombshell then conjunctively, with
other evidence, you could say "here are some more minor errors, but this is what really should result in you turning the rock over and seeing what went wrong". So you are correct, I was looking for some, some lever to pry the interests of the officials in Ottawa.

183639, please. And this is an example, I think, of something along those lines. This is a letter you wrote to David Milgaard in December of 1982 after you'd spoken to Mr. Tallis, and you set out at the beginning:
"More than ever, I believe that unless we can persuade some witness to recant their story, then very little can be done."

Okay. And that's a reflection of the same thing, you need something fresh, new, a bombshell?

Correct.
And then at the bottom here -- can we go down further, please, the very last bit. Now this is, the last paragraph here is about your conversation with judge, Justice Tallis, where he says:
"Because the stab wounds went through her overcoat but not through the dress, one gathers that she had no dress on
when stabbed? I don't know what the significance of that anomaly is but Judge Tallis drew it once again to my attention."

And $I$ suggest to you, sir, that that's -- that's something that you probably were not aware of the significance of because you didn't have the trial transcripts in your possession at that time, you had no retainer to investigate the whole case or to review the transcripts looking for holes or things like that; am I right?

Correct.

And ultimately that point, that Ms. Miller did not have her, at least the upper part of her dress on her body when she was stabbed, was something that was grafted onto the arguments to the Minister of Justice because it actually meant that a trial witness, Nichol John, could not have seen what she'd described; do you understand that that's how that was used eventually?

Yes I do.
Now one of the roadblocks that you have to getting fresh evidence or new things is the reaction of authorities; is that right? 216040, please. When you were --

A

Q in May of 1981 -- could we blow it up a little bit please -- you wrote a letter to Mr. Caldwell thanking him for a meeting that he had had with you, and asking him for:
"... the names of the people who
received the reward out of the police fund in connection with the arrest and conviction of Mr. Milgaard."

Then you go on to express that full disclosure will ultimately serve his interests as well as the Milgaards. You were interested in getting information about who received the reward because it may have had a motivation for somebody not to tell the truth?

A
Q please -- July of that same year you are making the same request to the Saskatoon Police

Commission. And the Saskatoon Police Commission, for your information, are the ones that actually paid the reward out, and it was ultimately paid out to Albert Cadrain. And you are asking there for:
"... the names of the people who
received the reward out of the police fund in connection with the arrest and conviction of Mr. David Milgaard." So can we assume that or do you recall that Mr. Caldwell's response to you was that you should contact the Saskatoon Police Commission?

I don't recall, but $I$ thought there was a letter that -- where he said "no" -- I don't recall. Okay. Well there is a letter that said "no", that's 106852, September the 14th, 1880 -- 1981, and it's a reply to you from the chief of police, and it's not who you had written to, you had written to the Police Commission, but as we'll see in a minute $I$ think what happens is that the Police Commission passes it on back to the Chief of Police, who then passes it back to the Commission, who passes it back to the Chief of Police, who writes to you --Uh-huh.
-- advising you that your letter -- it says "with reference to my letter" but I think that means 'with reference to your letter of July the 13th': "... this is to advise that $I$ brought your letter to the attention of the

Saskatoon Board of Police Commissioners, they discussed it on September 9 ... and have advised me that they are not inclined to release the name(s) of the person(s) who received the reward in connection with the arrest and conviction of Mr. David Milgaard." So you are not even getting a confirmation there of how many people might have shared in the reward?

A

2
Well, I would characterize it worse than that, there's a -- by intention the letter disassembles to make sure that I'm confused about whether there's one or two and $I$-- and the language "not inclined to release" is fun language over something that's sort of important.

106850, please. And I don't think you would have seen this document, it's one that intervenes your, between your request in July and the response that you get in September. It's written on August the $21 s t$ of 1981 from the Chief of Police to the Board of the Police Commissioners, specifically to the Mayor who's the chairman, indicating that you have made a request -- sorry, let me just start with your request down here:
"In this particular case, I am advised there was a reward when David Milgaard was tried and convicted and $I$ would recommend to the Board that Mr. Merchant be advised we are not prepared to release that information. I am aware that legal steps could perhaps be taken to obtain the information, but I think that if we voluntarily release the information, we would violate a trust that was placed in us when the person who gave the information came forward." Do you know what legal steps you could have taken to obtain that information, how costly or how time-consuming?

A
I don't know. As I said a couple of times yesterday, this was pre-Stinchcombe, and in addition it was after conviction as opposed to before.

Q Uh-huh.
A
And I'm not sure, even today, that $I$ know what one could do. You make a Court application, but I know that when you sail uncharted waters in the litigation system it's expensive, and of course the determination of the government to control
information is of greater value to the government than it is to an individual litigant because this affords the government an opportunity to mistreat all sorts of people as opposed to just the one. So I didn't think it -- I didn't pursue or think about 'how do $I$ get this by making a Court application' and I, candidly, I don't -- I'm not sure it would succeed even today. Maybe it would today.

Thank you. Going up to the first paragraph here, this paragraph deals specifically with having received your letter, and we just reviewed your letter which is the, asking for the information about who got the reward, however it says here: "We've had conversations and/or correspondence with a local lawyer here in Saskatoon with the Milgaard family and most recently with Mr. Merchant and our reply in all cases has been that we are not prepared to release information unless the Attorney's General Department indicate there will be a re-examination of this case and if that is done, any information we have will be made available to the Attorney's General

Department. Notwithstanding that, there has been a constant effort to seek information from us and to give current addresses of persons who were witnesses. We have steadfastly refused to supply such information."

That attitude, I would imagine, is not terribly helpful to counsel for somebody who claims they are wrongly convicted and is trying to interview trial witnesses to see whether or not they might be recanting their evidence?

I follow Fowler, so red comma white comma and blue as opposed to red white and blue, but I take it that this communication really meant to say with a local lawyer here in Regina, comma with the Milgaard family, comma, and most recently with Mr. Merchant, so they are really saying we've refused three times to various people. Clearly control of information is important in terms of any examination of wrongful conviction or even wrong impressions by parole boards who are -- in relation to release.

The converse for legislators and
judges $I$ expect to examine is protection of police information, protection of sources, and secondly,
it becomes a never-ending story if everyone who is convicted has access constantly to can we keep turning this over, where does it end, so you're correct in suggesting to me this was most unhelpful in this instance, but where the line should be drawn is the kind of thing $I$ used to think about when $I$ was in the legislature, but I'm not sure $I$ think about it any more.

Okay. So what we've accomplished between your letter of July the 13 th and September the 14 th is that two months have passed and the results are nothing in terms of what you were trying to do; correct?

Yeah, and $I$ just didn't understand why there was this sort of systemic clamming up. I was used to the government being like this even though I thought it was wrong, but it crosses your mind that if there's nothing to hide, why wouldn't they give even these most basic bits of information, and I might add, 'just take a hike, we won't tell you who got the reward,' but they didn't, for example, write and say if we voluntarily release the information we would violate the trust that was placed in us or they didn't write and say if we release the information in this case we may
find ourselves compelled to release the
information in cases where somebody from prison will call a cousin and the person who assisted the police, if you want to put it in a nice characterization, or the way the telephone call would be, please pay a visit to this rat and help him to understand that he didn't do a good thing, so, I mean, it wasn't even as though they were prepared to enter into the dialogue of the whys or they weren't prepared to say there are conditions by which we would release this information. I mean, there are a whole lot of in-betweens between stony silence without explanation and some other means of assisting. This wasn't, and they knew by now, they had had Mr. Young, they had me, they -this wasn't just sort of a jailhouse lawyer inquiry that was -- they had to see this as being more substantial, so to me $I$ think there are greys between black and white, yes and no.

You are quite right. 331961, please. You are quite right that you weren't the first, Mr. Young had been making requests. This is a reply that he received January 6 of 1981 and it seems that he was seeking, in the first paragraph, response here, it seems Mr. Young had been seeking:
"... to be given permission to interview the police officers involved in the investigation of the charges and to have access to the complete police file. I am sorry to say that $I$ cannot agree to such a request."

Again, the same kind of thing, you can't get access to the places where you may find the evidence that you need to make an application to the Minister of Justice; correct?

A
Yes.

And then the second paragraph of the response -And again, if $I$ could interrupt -Go ahead.
-- it seems to me there might be some systemic reason for saying we don't want you bothering our police officers because they've got their mind, they've got their mind into it and they understood everything and they could answer questions five years ago, but they can't keep writing final examinations on criminal procedure every time some new lawyer shows up every year, but producing the file, even if it got produced with whiting, with things whited out, they said, well, we have an informant here we have to protect might be some
explanation, but the refusal to release files, again, you might say we'll release files to lawyers, but we won't release files to people in prison. I mean, there are a whole lot of in-betweens flowing from stonewall, we'll tell you nothing, to send over your relatives and we'll devote ourselves full time to answering questions and reconstructing on every conviction that's ever occurred. At that end of the tunnel $I$ can see some huge problems, but $I$ don't see much in the way of problems of saying, yes, we have a police file, you can come and look at it, we've done some whiting out, something like that.

Now, in relation to your comment about the police officers not needing to study again a case that they may have forgotten the details of, that doesn't seem to be what the issue is. If we go on, and this again is the same reply to Mr. Young: "You will recall that $I$ asked you yesterday during our conversation whether this case was going to be re-opened or perhaps more specifically what the actual reason for wanting to have access to our file and to interview those officers involved in the
investigation is and you could not supply that."

And again, that would be sort of impossible to supply if one were looking for information within the file; right?

Correct.
The letter goes on:
"If there is some justification for re-examining this conviction $I$ feel that the reasons for that must be presented to the Attorney General's Department and if necessary we will certainly be prepared to discuss our file with a representative of the Attorney General's Department and, of course, have our members interviewed by a representative of the Attorney General's Department. If the Attorney General sees fit to acquaint you with the information he has at his disposal, then $I$ would have no objection to that. In the meantime, I can only advise you $I$ am not prepared to have our file made available to yourself or members of the Milgard family, nor am I prepared to have the members involved
in the investigation available for
interviewing."
So that seems to be true stonewalling rather than any concern that the potential witnesses might have forgotten information?

A
$Q$

A
Well, sure, he both says no and passes the responsibility somewhere else, but $I$ was just guessing at reasons why -- you asked me 20 minutes ago sort of for some systemic thoughts and $I$ can see some justifications for saying we're not going to allow family members, we're not going to send files to prisons. I can certainly see that that has to be considered by judges and legislators. And the reason why information might not be disclosed to lawyers, is there some -Well, I've got a little bigger problem with that, disclosure to lawyers on certain conditions. I mean, we receive from Attorney General's Departments all the time documents on the basis that we may not disclose, we may not copy. In order to make the system fair and in order to avoid exactly what happened here, a person is wrongfully convicted, we have to take some controlled and acceptable risks of disclosure of information and we do that and to some extent the
question is how far over should the line go. Okay. 106842 please. This is a second letter to Mr. Young from the chief of police written January $23 r d, 1981$ in response to a clarified request from Mr. Young indicating:
"... as indicated to you we would contact the three people --"

And the three people are Nichol John, Albert

Cadrain and Ronald Wilson,
"... would contact the three people
noted in your letter and ascertain
whether they wish to have their whereabouts made known to you and I might say that this is standard procedure whenever we receive a request to locate persons and $I$ am treating this in that vein.

We have now been in contact
with Mr. Cadrain and Mr. Wilson and

Ms. Nichol John and all three of them
are most emphatic that they do not want
their whereabouts made known to yourself
or to the Milgaard family and we will
respect those wishes."

Carrying on:
"As indicated to you previously, I recognize that cases can be re-opened, however, $I$ also recognize that certain procedures should be followed. If the Milgaard family have reasons sufficient to cause a review of this case, we are certainly prepared to co-operate by making our file available to a representative of the Attorney's General Department. We would, of course, point out that the three witnesses you are trying to locate have indicated they do not wish their whereabouts made known, but it would then be up to the representative of the Attorney General to decide whether those people should be interviewed and by whom."

Now, the witnesses referred to there,
Mr. Cadrain, Ms. John, Mr. Wilson, were contacted by Mr. Karst, one of the main investigators on the trial file. My question is, is there potential that there's some problems there if the witnesses, for example, had been inclined to say that they had been pressured by police, is there a problem if they are contacted by the main
investigator to see whether or not they want to co-operate with the reinvestigation?

A There's a problem, and when we dealt with Nichol John, it's hard to conceive that at any time she was most emphatic that she didn't want to have any contact because, to the contrary, she was quite open, and as we all know, the person doing the asking has a huge advantage, do you want to be -that doesn't matter whether you are doing a political poll or contacting somebody to see if they want -- you know, do you want to be bothered by having somebody come and harass you about your evidence or we've had a request and we're worried about the danger that you might be in if somebody comes and sees you, do you want us to disclose your name, or Gary Young is a respected, responsible lawyer from a highly regarded law firm in Saskatoon and I'm sure you've heard of the law firm and may we have Mr. Young contact you, he has a few questions. The way the question is posed will be significant and, as you say, the person who poses the question could have an intimidating effect, and, you know, we sort of see this in movies where the policeman goes to the witness and sort of re-intimidates.

And just to come full circle there, both Mr. Wilson and Mr. Cadrain eventually took the position that they had been pressured significantly at the time of the prosecution, and you are aware of that; right?

Yes.
216097 .
Well, they took that position and I think Nichol John was pressured. If there was no reason -- if she wasn't facing any charges, if they told her we're not holding you for any reason, there are no charges against you, what was she doing in custody. You don't have to say to somebody here's the pressure, holding them in custody is as much pressure as a person can face. 216097, please, and this is just -COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Ms. Knox? MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, again, I haven't risen on this point in a while, but in terms of the fullness of the information, the evidence before the Commission is that while Ron Wilson said in a statement that he gave to a Centurion Ministries worker that he been intimidated by police, he basically retracted that and said in fact the police were very nice
to him, that's the evidence that's here, he has some issues with the polygraph operator.

With respect to Ms. John,
there's evidence before the Inquiry that she asked to stay at the police station because she was scared as opposed to oppression, so in asking the witness to answer these questions and the conclusions he's drawing, I think it's imperative that he be given the full information. Albert Cadrain's evidence $I$ wasn't here for, he is of course deceased, but there was documentary evidence where he retracted what he had said to the investigator and said in fact the police didn't oppress him and that he was kind of tricked by the investigator on behalf of the Milgaards, so $I$ think it's becoming very important that in answering the questions, in fairness to Mr. Merchant, that he have a full picture of what the actual evidence is as opposed to what may have been said at points in time, and I really do have a concern that what we're getting into now is not conveying the full picture of the evidence as it has been presented under oath by Mr. Wilson and by Ms. John and through documentary evidence in respect to

Mr. Cadrain.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.
MS. MCLEAN: With respect, sir, I'm not discussing with this witness the Inquiry evidence, I'm discussing the process of getting the application for a review of the case before the Minister of Justice and ultimately before a Court for rehearing and the events leading up to that and that's why I didn't ask a question about Nichol John. Both Mr. Cadrain and Mr. Wilson did make the allegation that they had been pressured by the police, that's the point of my question.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes. I think the objection was that you didn't make it clear enough what their final position was on that aspect of it, so $I$ take the objection into consideration and $I$ trust that you will put the evidence fairly, that's all she's asking.

MS. McLEAN: Yeah, the final position that they took came after the reference.

BY MS. McLEAN:
Q The document 216097 of June $28 t h, 1983$, this is coming to the end of your retainer?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What's that number?

BY MS. MCLEAN:
216097. It's coming to the end of your retainer, it's your letter to Mr. Shannon, it ends with:
"As you likely have sensed we are basically stymied by an inability to contact former witnesses. As a result the cost of continuing the work is not significant."

So it's kind of a vicious circle when you are trying to bring an application before the Minister of Justice isn't it?

A
$Q$

A
Correct, and you asked me earlier, a long time ago, is there a public, a public issue as well, and there is a public issue because the decision to reopen is a discretionary disposition made by a
cabinet minister, a political person. You know, if we go back in time, the Attorney General was in the cabinet and wasn't elected, it's only in less than 100 years that Attorney's General are political and a part of the system, so the more troublesome the crime, this was an heinous crime, the greater the public attention on the crime, the greater the pressure upon the Attorney General, subconscious pressure and really effective pressure not to reopen, not to -- not to go through all that we've seen here.

And if you are undertaking to assist somebody who wants to have their case re-examined, the time and resources required are absolutely horrific; are they not?

A Absolutely. You were -- on this case specifically just regards time, you were retained in 1981 at which point David was roughly halfway through his time in prison?

A Yes.
$Q$
And then the real efforts to try and get a review, having failed at appeals and having failed at parole, the actual time of really trying to get an application together and before the minister to
its successful conclusion is about another 11 to 12 years, from 1980 until 1992 when he was ultimately released?

A

Lawyers, experts, travel, long distance, transcripts, and then you also have to have, in addition to money, you have to also be dealing, you know, as you deal with experts, as you deal with lawyers, you have to be willing -- dealing with people who are willing to be associated with somebody who is carrying a label of a rapist/murderer and that can also be sometimes difficult; can it not?

A
And you ask about cost. I mean, you can see the work that $I$ did, but if we had had the kind of information that would have made it feasible to expect success, well then the additional work and the additional cost would have been huge, so even though a great deal of work and time went into this, that would have only been the beginning. And you need money for, what, skip tracers, investigations if you don't have a mother that's going to go and interview them, however well or badly that may turn out?

Yeah.

Yes, very much, and it has that, the public
problem of people don't want to look into that and the political people don't want to look into it. I guess that's why England sent them all to Australia.

Just on the issue of cost, 219540, this is a letter from you in November of 1983 , this is to Joyce Milgaard:
"I have your message about hiring a
tracing service to find Mr. Wilson. The
cost of that might well be $\$ 200.00$ and we are not sure of the success that would be involved."
$\$ 200$ just to make somebody -- to have somebody try to find a witness with no guarantee of success.

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q
To try to find one witness of three significant ones in this case.

A

Q
Okay. It doesn't sound like much now, but -Well, back in --

It was more then.
-- 1981 that would have been, what, maybe a week's pay to some people.

Uh-huh.

Yes.
So we've heard, and we will hear over the coming
months, about lots of problems with the 690 application treatment once it's in the Department of Justice, but there's a huge problem just getting to the stage where you can start to put an application together; correct?

I agree.
Do you have any suggestions on what could be done to resolve some of those problems?

If $I$ were blue-skying, it might be appropriate if the process were taken out of the seeming political hands of the Attorney General so that the decision to reopen wouldn't be a perceived political decision as it was here, as it was with Fisher, as it was for Truscott, where they sent the matter to the Supreme Court for a review. Could $I$ just jump in there for a minute. You said as it was for Fisher.

I'm sorry, I meant Donald Marshal.
Thank you.
And if it were removed from that level of public attention, that would relieve potential applicants from trying to draw public attention to their plight, so we have, for example, the Fifth Estate and the sorts of attempts by people to get, to bring some public pressure or inquiry. Second, if
it were removed from the attorney -- from the political process and were not under public gaze, then it might be possible for that office, once some beginnings were shown, some reason for concern, to consider modest funding. The government does a good deal of funding of programs where people are going to fight with them. There are all sorts of programs where you apply for money to get to hire lawyers at maybe a third of their rate, you know. It's not, you don't hire a room full of Queen's counsels, but there are these programs now in the civil side where, inquiries to try to change the law and to try to move things forward. If $I$ were blue-skying, those are a couple of things that $I$ think might merit consideration, so that if you could show I've got the beginnings of a case and demonstrated that, then they might give you seed money to keep going and they might give you more money to keep going because the wrongful convictions are very troublesome for a society. They give -- and they are probably troublesome in terms of obtaining convictions, so if you have juries who are mindful of the various wrongful convictions, it may result in them finding people who are guilty not guilty
just out of worry, but $I$ don't know that my white-hat considerations are -- as I say, I'm not in the legislature.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Forgive me, Mr. Merchant, I don't understand what blue-skying means and $I$ don't understand what white-hating means. Can you tell me, please?

Yes, My Lord. Blue-skying just means sort of dreaming about different things and just conjecturing without a lot of thought of the disadvantages, and $I$ forget which business administration person says you'll start a meeting wearing white hats and you present every idea you can think of and then you go to a green hat and you do some analysis of them and then you go to a black hat and you say here are all the problems, and the reason that they advance that thinking is if you do them at the same time as soon as you start to advance ideas, if everybody is saying that won't work for this reason, it inhibits the sort of free thought, so white hat means do a little -- do a little dreaming without thinking of the disadvantages.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Good.

```
BY MS. McLEAN:
```

And when you say take it out of the political arena so there isn't a need to put pressure by publicity, and so on, on somebody, are you speaking of, maybe for lack of better terminology, some kind of an independent board or body that could deal with these issues?

Well, somebody within the -- I'd have them within -- right now, in reality, this is quite independent so, in reality, the Attorney General doesn't take the book home, take the file home for the weekend and say "yeah, I'm gonna do it". The Attorney General, in reality, is now told "here's what we recommend and here's why we recommend it", but the problem is the Attorney General makes the announcement and the Attorney General is seen to make the decision, and even the people advising the Attorney General have to take into consideration that this is a highly political case or this is a case that's going to make a difference in the way we're perceived on the justice front.

Q
Uh-huh?
A
'We're tough on justice', everybody wants to be tough on justice, even though the rates of crime have been going down penalties keep going up all
the while the rates of crime go down in Canada, because public opinion is -- lags catching up to the reality that, indeed, we're doing a good job. So all the political parties follow this same illusion in, or address the illusion in the voters' minds, it's not -- we don't so much need a change in the reality, we need a change -- forgive me, judge, as $I$ white-hat it -- we need a change in the perception. So if the perception were some independent commissioner, a retired, respected justice, they made the decision, they looked at it, they made the announcement, in my mind the attorneys general would like to be relieved of what can sometimes be a problem for them and the re-opening process would be enlarged, and appropriately enlarged.

It might result, as it did in Truscott, of a re-opening and a re-affirmation. The government re-opened, the Supreme Court heard it, they actually re-heard witnesses, somebody came in and talked about the lesions on Truscott's penis for example, so there was a real re-hearing. But that really flowed from sort of the politics of the pressure on having a great book and $I$ think there might have even been a movie. Remove that
and I think it would be better for the political system, better for the perception of the public, and it might ease, it might make it easier for the system to re-examine the possibility that a mistake had been made.

Okay. I take your point on the applications that are being considered and your answer in respect of that, but what about getting to the point where you can put an application?

Well the only -- if $I$ were trying to find the line, it seems to me there has to be protection against the police departments just endlessly having to rework old files just because somebody either had the money to hire a lawyer or had family who were interested in reworking the old files, so there has to be some beginnings of a justification in my speculation. Uh-huh.

Second, if there is some beginnings, if I were running the world $I$ would then have this independent body with a capacity to fund to be of assistance. Very frequently the people who have been wrongly convicted don't have money for anything to be done, they might have been represented by Legal Aid, their families don't
have money, they didn't get an O.J. Simpson defence, so if there is beginnings then I'd like to see some capacity to fund. So conjunctively, it seems to me, that might result in more applications, some of them might result in an application where, as in Truscott, they said "yeah, we got it right", which has benefit in itself because a re-affirmation is good for society; bad for society would be a bit of expense and this sort of perception that maybe the system doesn't work as well as it should. But $I$ think that perception is -- abounds in society, that the system doesn't necessarily work as well as it should.

Thank you, sir, those are all my questions.
BY MR. WOLCH:
Mr. Merchant, I'm Hersh Wolch, and I'm David Milgaard's lawyer.

Nice to see you again.
I will not be all that long with you. Just one small point, for the record, on Truscott. You may be aware that the current Minister of Justice, in spite of it all, has declared that there likely was a miscarriage of justice and it's currently before the courts. I just point that out for
the -- just to clarify that.
And would it be fair to say that, in your approach to this case and a general approach to be taken, that you like to see an air of reality to the claim, if $I$ can use those words, that when somebody says "I have been wrongly convicted" you are looking is there an air of reality to that assertion; would that be fair? That would be a good, this blue-skying that $I$ did, that would be a good characterization of -For example you had Mr. Howland, a well-respected member of the parole board, saying in effect that he thought David was innocent. Now that's something quite rare. Firstly, I'm not even sure what possible difficulty he could get into for saying that; do you know if that's a risk to him to even say that?

A
I thought it was extraordinary and a testament to his strength that he would say that, and really become a bit of a paladin within the system to try to assist David, and I agree with you that that kind of confident assertion from a respected member of the parole board might well be a part of the air of reality.

You wouldn't know this, but he actually dropped by
here at one point in time to watch the Inquiry?
A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A

2

A

Q And then you had Carlyle-Gordge, a writer, devoting a lot of time it would appear, and you wouldn't expect somebody to devote a lot of time to some cause he didn't believe in?

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

A

There were a wide variety, as you say, of people who thought something was wrong, and there wasn't -- this wasn't, this approach to the Attorney General's Department and the police wasn't -ought not to have been taken as just a flyer and people without any substance coming forward. And I take it, though, to get to the next step, to complete the air of reality, you really have to have sufficient disclosure or sufficient material to assess what caused the conviction?

Yes.
And you are greatly hampered by not having that access or you were greatly hampered by not having that access?

Yes.
And even if you had the access you'd be hampered by lack of funds?

Yes.
For example, if you had access to all the material
and found a document or something that you felt was not disclosed or was not utilized properly, you might be able to combine that with everything else and say "this is very real, it has to be looked at"; do you follow me?

I do. And of course, post-Stinchcombe, you might
also be able to come forward with a sort of a prosecutorial inaction and that might be, to use my word of 20 some years ago, that might be the 'bombshell'.

Yeah. And I think the Commissioner will have to address it later, and I'm not going to do it now with you, but we'll have to address how

Stinchcombe or the principle of Stinchcombe applies after your appeals are exhausted. That's something we're going to have to look at, I'm sure, so $I$ won't deal with it now, but you have raised a very valuable area of concern.

Now I'd like to turn to 213628,
and I want to deal with Justice Tallis, to some degree. Would you agree with this comment; that we have to be careful not to confuse Justice Tallis' well-earned reputation with his memory or ability to remember?

Yes.
Now that comment was one that $I$ heard from him himself so I'm not too worried about saying that. But you have to be careful not to say that, because he is who he is, that he is infallible or his memory is perfect or he couldn't forget something?

A
$Q$

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

Q

Lord Denning got overruled from time to time and may have been wrong.

Yeah.
Great lawyers make mistakes.
I'm not sure you picked a good example, Lord Denning was wrong in a number of cases, but -- and found to be so -- but -- and we'll leave that for now.

But, in any event, what $I$ am saying is that we have to be careful not to mix up credibility, integrity, honesty, with human memory?

And, unfortunately, it's not just a matter of deciding whether your client is innocent or not guilty, or telling the truth or whatever, it's the
difficult decision?

Yes. (
-- other factors affect that decision?

A

Q

A
$Q$
up your defence, hopefully through the Crown witnesses, and possibly provide material that will come out again through the -- your accused if he testifies, if you know what $I$ am getting at; that is if you expect your client is going to say something you might put it to certain witnesses or it will govern your cross-examination?

Correct.
And another consideration, of course, is that if your client does testify you lose your last word? Yes. That's --

That is your -- you lose the advantage in front of the jury, you are punished if your client testifies, you might think it should be the other way around, but if your client testifies now you've got to go first and you have no idea what the prosecutor is going to say after you so it's a big disadvantage to have your client testify? That's one of the disadvantages.

Yeah. So all of these factors would come into play when Justice Tallis is deciding what is the right way to go?

And David could be saying "look, I want to testify, they are all lying", but that's only one
of the factors he would consider in the overall picture?

A
Q

Yes.
Now you would also be aware, of course, that Justice Tallis could not force the prosecution to put into evidence what David had told the police when he was first questioned, that the rules of evidence are such it's up to the prosecutor if he puts in an accused's statement?

I'm sorry, I don't -- I'm not familiar with that area of the law.

Okay. I was going to suggest to you that perhaps we might later look at the possibility that that could be up to the judge's discretion, that is an application could be made to the judge to say it's not fair not to put before the jury what the accused said under questioning by the police when he was first arrested, that it's unfair?

I, to the extent my view matters, I think that if -- that an exculpatory statement ought to be, they ought to say "this was what was said", and they ought to say it to show consistency or near consistency.

Now, perhaps this is a bit systemic, but it seems there is a basic recognition that an accused who
is innocent, who is telling the truth, may very well not be believed?

A
Unfortunately, that's the case, and I would have thought that was particularly the case at this time, which people may forget, but this happens to be a time when $I$ was $22-23$ and people who did drugs and had -- they were, they were very suspect by society, it wasn't -- it wasn't like today where -- so, absolutely.

Well there is also; isn't there a general disadvantage for accused people because the thought is always in the trier of fact's mind that this person has a reason to lie?

Yes.
So you start off with a big disadvantage, do you not --

A Well ---- as an accused person, that "well there is a reason to lie, you are charged with a crime"? Well, as you know, a couple of hundred years ago you were not -- you couldn't testify for that very reason, that you were just assumed, your testimony was assumed almost to be irrelevant because why wouldn't you lie about it.
$Q$
But one of the really difficult areas of any trial
is credibility, it's one of the toughest to assess of anybody, be it a witness, be it an accused, it's very, very difficult; is it not?

A

Q

A
Q
And a person testifying can be under a tremendous amount of strain; take an accused who has been in custody for a long period of time?

A
I always thought that there was a huge tactical disadvantage if the accused testified from custody, because the perception by jurors was unless he -- he's probably guilty and that's why he was refused bail, wasn't released, and there was a huge burden on the accused because you couldn't, you couldn't give him notes, you couldn't spend time in a sort of a leisurely and appropriate way to prepare, to prepare the accused. So the accused coming in, sometimes even in what looked like prison garb, or not prison garb but they knew that it wasn't street clothes, all of these things contributed to the disadvantage mentally for the accused, and a
perceptional disadvantage.
Well you can see, for example in David's case, testifying at the Supreme Court after all those years in jail, all he had been through, all the difficulties he's had in jail and all the experiences, to then be asked questions about what he remembered about an innocuous morning many years ago; it would be very difficult?

It would be difficult.
Just very briefly on the document, I pulled it up here and $I$ don't know if you, if your memory is any better than the notes itself, but there is a note at the beginning about 'the notebook was given back to David'; now I'm presuming that that would be at the end of the retainer, but were you led to believe anything different?

A
$Q$

A
Q
I don't recall, I -- I --
Would you agree that's the most logical
interpretation, it's unlikely you would give back instructions while you were still acting is all I'm really saying?

Yeah. I don't know.
And there is a discussion about being stuck; is there any discussion as to how many times that vehicle was stuck?

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q

A

No.
The notes indicate one time?
I thought it meant one time.
I only have one other question to ask you, and my interest is not the same as others in this area, it was brought up earlier and we're aware of your involvement in the residential schools?

Yes.
And you have represented, I believe, a number of clients there?

We represent about, currently, 8200 clients, and because $I$ answer the phone at night and on weekends I've probably spoken, over time, with a thousand plus, and people -- and I've met with many of them. The work tends to be done largely by other lawyers, but $I$ do a lot of direct contact with people sort of at an initial stage.

And these are mostly victims who suffered, in the residential schools, various types of abuse, etcetera?

Yeah. In addition to talking to a lot of people our firm has done half, about half the trials of residential schools, and I've handled most of them. One case to the Supreme Court I handled the trial, the appeal, the Supreme Court, four
appeals, I handled them, various applications for leave, I handled them, so yes.

Q
A

Q

A
And --
All, all, all of those trial cases, and most of the people with whom we've dealt, have either been seriously physically abused or sexually abused.

Yes. And $I$ believe that for most, not all but for most, there's been settlements entered, and the point $I$ want to focus on is the ability of those victims to come forward and tell their stories. What has been your experience?

I've observed and been told by a wide cross-section that it's extremely difficult for them. I think of it as an emotional wound that's been papered over and bandaged and then they tear the bandage off the emotional wound.

The problem in large part is the anticipation of having to tell their story as well as the problem of telling the story, so when they testify it's very hard on them, when they prepare to testify it's very hard on them, and things that are said to them trigger memories that they don't talk about or -- it's a very difficult experience for people. They recount that, and it's obvious it's a very difficult experience as you watch them
going through it and as they talk to you when they are testifying.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Excuse me.
MR. BOYCHUK: Mr. Commissioner, I think I know where this is going, and my understanding is that we were going to be served with a motion and we were going to deal with the issue of Mr. Milgaard's attendance.

My main concern is, although I
respect that -- Mr. Merchant's ability as a lawyer, he is not a psychiatrist, he is not a psychologist, so $I$ don't know that this helps us.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I'm not sure it does either, but I'm not sure where we're going either?

MR. WOLCH: I'm almost there, sir, that $I$ think from first-hand experience -- it's not a matter of opinion, it's a matter of what he's seen first-hand, and I'm mindful of getting evidence before you, sir, in the most efficient way, and this seems to be a low-cost way of getting it on one issue. Of course there will be other evidence coming, but we have a unique opportunity here to have a witness who has dealt with thousands of victims who, of course, have
been through terrible times, and his experience with testifying and the ability to testify helps us in a couple areas. It helps us on the issue My Friend raised, it also helps us with the difficulty an accused has in a systemic case.

For example Steven Truscott, he
has been mentioned many times, testified in the Supreme Court after six years waiting to be hanged; what would that have done to his credibility findings? David testified in the Supreme Court as well after horrific times in jail, how -- you know, so that it does set a basis for understanding that perhaps these credibility findings are quite unfair to the wrongly convicted, that if you look at the judgement in the Supreme Court it doesn't even refer to David testifying, and so what can a wrongly convicted person do when they are faced with the problems of being through the system and then being expected to be a wonderful witness. There's -- there should be some, perhaps, allowance made, you know, for an innocent person who is trying to testify. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well I -- yeah. I think your client (sic) answered that point, he
said it was very difficult for them to testify.
But on the other point, however much this client -- this witness might know about the difficulty of witnesses faced in describing a, having been abused, that's not what Mr. Milgaard is going to be asked to describe. Whatever abuse he has suffered is irrelevant to us, in the prison system.

MR. WOLCH: No, but how the, the answer is how --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: If he comes he is going to be asked to describe what happened to -MR. WOLCH: Well, no, but it's the abuse that gets triggered, that is the point.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, no, it's -well, don't ask this witness about it, he is telling you about abuse in a different context.

MR. WOLCH: Well, much lesser abuse, not that it's not terrible.

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: No, it's a -- I take the objector's point, the witness has nothing to offer that's useful in that respect. Mr. Wilson?

MR. WILSON: Nothing to add to what you've already said, Mr. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right, thank you.

MR. WOLCH: I have no further questions. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you. MR. HODSON: I have no re-examination.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Anybody else?

MR. HODSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Merchant.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay, thank you for coming, Mr. Merchant, you are excused.

A
$Q$
BY MR. HODSON :

Good morning, Mr. Young. Thank you for agreeing to testify before this Commission of Inquiry. I understand, sir, that you reside in Saskatoon?

I do.

And that you are currently a practicing lawyer
with the Robertson Stromberg Pedersen law firm?
A Yes, I am.
$Q$
And that you've practiced law in Saskatoon since 1972?

A

Primarily civil law with a focus in civil
litigation, but $I$ did do some criminal work at that time as $I$ did in the early stages of my career.

And at that time $I$ think your firm, some of the other people involved were Nick Sherstobitoff who is now an Appeal Court judge; is that correct? That is correct.

And $I$ just want to go through this morning sort of in a general way some of the areas that you covered on the matter and $I$ think we heard yesterday and this morning from Mr. Merchant who followed you as counsel for David and Joyce

Milgaard. Can we just go back to sort of the first, your first engagement. Who was it that retained you?

It was Joyce Milgaard.
And I don't want to get too legalistic here, but your client, $I$ take it, would have been David and/or Joyce Milgaard or how did you see that? I believe that $I$ felt $I$ had a joint responsibility to the two of them at the time, but that $I$ answered primarily to Joyce as it was she who had made the retainer.

And can you tell us generally, what were your -what were your instructions, what were you asked to do?

My perception of what Mrs. Milgaard was after was to, of course speaking in the broadest possible sense, to see what could be done about getting her son out of jail and we knew that that, in all likelihood, would require a reference from the Minister of Justice, and in order to get that we had to investigate the matter and look for new evidence, and in particular our focus was on seeing whether or not we could identify someone else who may have been in a position to commit the crime.

And so finding someone else who committed the crime then would mean that David Milgaard had not committed the crime?

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
Q
Nothing.
And did you have any recollection or were you aware of any rape offences or convictions in Saskatoon in 1968 to 1970 , that time frame?

No.
And $I$ just want to go through generally the areas that $I$ think you dealt with and, Mr. Young, just based on my review of your file, and $I$ should point out, Mr. Commissioner, that Mr. Young did produce his file to the Commission, we've provided
that to all the parties and basically today and this morning I will go through the relevant parts of that file, but if $I$ can just maybe generally summarize the work that you did, one part was to get transcripts of the preliminary hearing and trial for Mrs. Milgaard; is that correct, one of the tasks that you undertook?

I believe that the answer to that is yes. I do recall getting transcripts. I have no specific recollection as to whether or not it was the preliminary transcript or the trial transcript. And I'll take you through some notes, Mr. Young, but $I$ think generally it appears from the file at least that one of the tasks you participated in was assisting in getting preliminary hearing and trial transcripts; is that fair?

A
Q

And I think you had some contact with Mr. Caldwell, the former prosecutor?

Q

A

Q
A

Q

A
$Q$

Or the prosecutor of the case, pardon me. Fourth, you made efforts through the Saskatoon City Police to obtain access to their file?

Right.
And we'll talk a bit about that.
I did.
And fifth, you made efforts to get contact information for witnesses from the police? Yes.

Sixth, $I$ think you had some discussions about a fellow by the name of Mahar who had been charged with murder in 1969 and $I$ think Mr. Sherstobitoff, your partner, had acted for him and there were some, and again I'll take you through the notes on this, some discussion that he might have been the person responsible for Gail Miller's death. Do you have a recollection of that?

Yes, I do, although my recollection is that Mr . Sherstobitoff may have been the prosecutor rather than the defence counsel.

I'm sorry, and that may well be the case, and I think in that case, if $I$ 'm not mistaken, there's a media article that indicates he was found not guilty by reason of insanity. Is that your understanding?

Generally, yes.
And then as well $I$ think you were involved in getting psychiatric reports for, about David Milgaard to deal with some parole or prison issues that he was facing; is that -- again just from the file it looks like you were asked to get some reports and you in fact did get some?

Yes.
And again from my read of the file, and $I$ would ask you to correct this, it does not look like you were involved directly in the interview of any witnesses; is that fair?

Yes.
And so again $I$ think about a four month, about a four month time frame you were involved, I think the end of December through until probably around the end of April?

Actively involved in that time frame, yes.
So I think if we can call up the first document, 331970, and $I$ just propose to go through some of your file documents and get you to comment, and I think this may have been the first engagement, December 24 th, 1980, you got a call from Mrs. Milgaard. Does that sound about the right time? Yes.

And again there's just a couple of notes here, it looks as though, 'Phoned Caldwell (trial
transcript in Q.B.) - phoned G. Randall,' who I think was Gwen Randall who was a lawyer at

Mr. Tallis' former firm; is that right?
It is.
And talking about 'check for transcripts'. Can you tell us any more about what's on this document other than what is obvious?

No.
And am I right to assume that one of the first tasks would be to get, to look at getting the trial transcripts?

I would have considered it to be such.
If we can then go to 331973, I want to show you a couple of documents. Do you remember a fellow by the name of Chris O'Brien who was a radio announcer who was assisting Mrs. Milgaard? Does that name bring back any memory?

Very limited.
He -- this note looks like 'Re: Joyce Milgaard file on line now.' It's Mr. O'Brien calling.
'Wants to meet with the police - may need me to request same.'

Then if we can call up 219408,
and this is a document that you may not have seen, it's a letter from Deputy Chief Corey to the Chief of Police John Gibbon around this time frame, and I just want to go through parts of this because I think it relates to the note.
"Corey states that at approximately 4:15
... December 30 ... he received a long
distance telephone call from a person
who identified himself as Chris O'Brien, an employee of CHAB who was calling from Regina. He advised me that he was involved in the investigation recently instituted by Mrs. Joyce Milgaard, relating to the murder conviction of her son.

O'Brien claimed to be related
through marriage to Mrs. Milgaard who had sought his assistance in obtaining information relating to events that resulted in David's conviction. He stated that he had obtained some transcripts and other information and as a result, believed that Police files contained much more information than had been presented in Court. As a result,
he requested permission to interview the Police Officers involved in the investigation and access to the complete Police file relating to this investigation."

And scroll down, please:
"I advised O'Brien that $I$ would not grant this permission, as it was an unusual request that would have to be taken under advisement by the Office of the Chief of Police and as $I$ was only acting for a very limited time, I suggested that he contact your office early in January, 1981 if he wished to pursue the matter.

O'Brien asked what your
position would be and $I$ assured him that I could not speak on your behalf, however, was confident that you would render a professional decision."

Then the next page:
"Mrs. Milgaard has retained Mr. Gary Young, a local lawyer, associated with the firm of Sherstobitoff, Hrabinsky, Stromberg, and Young ... and Mr. O'Brien
suggested that he may have Mr. Young contact your office on his behalf.

I have since learned that Mr. O'Brien went to contact Parker ..." Etcetera. And again, it looks like on, at or about the time of your engagement, that Mr. O'Brien had made a request of the police to get access to the police file, were you aware of that or do you have any recollection of that, and that he may have in fact called you to assist him in getting that?

A
I have no recollection of it at all, of that aspect.

Q And again, what is your recollection if any of Chris O'Brien and his involvement?

A
From what $I$ can reconstruct from the file, I met with Mr. O'Brien on one occasion, but I have no recollection of him, and $I$ can't recall any discussions with him.

Q And I appreciate you making that distinction, Mr. Young. You've had an opportunity to look at your file and if you can tell us where -- and I'll try to be careful in my questions as to what you recall versus what you think happened or reconstruct based on the file.

I just want to go through some of your telephone notes, and this is a December -- if you can -December 30 th, 1980 , so again it's around this same time frame. There's actually four different notes. This one is to Ian Buckwold (Milgaard) and my understanding, Mr. Buckwold was a lawyer at the firm, the Goldenberg firm which was the predecessor to Mr. Tallis' firm; is that right?

A
2
And he says:
"- they sent trial transcripts to David Milgaard - they have transcripts from the prelim - but won't release without Milgaard's authorization."

And I take it that would be an accurate note of your discussion with him?

A
It is.

And you had some dealings with Mr. Buckwold and efforts to get what was on Mr. Tallis' file?

Yes.

And again 331975, just again -- this is I think Susan Martineau who I believe is David Milgaard's sister; is that right? Do you recall some dealings with her? reviews the facts,' and then the Latta case in

Alberta, Minister of Justice granted a reference. I think professor of law. Truscott case, Coffin case, and then at the bottom, 'In many of these cases there was new evidence.' And then Miss Nichol John, or pardon me, 'Nicol John evidence.' Do you have a recollection of the discussion with Mr. Tallis beyond what's in this note?

Yes, I do. It's stayed with me for some reason, it stayed in my mind, and it was to the effect that Mr. Tallis, Justice Tallis said to me, he gave me words of caution, and it was something to the effect that be cautious when dealing with some of the individuals involved in this situation, and I took that to mean that they, that one could not predict how they might act.

And who did you think he meant by individuals, are you talking witnesses or who?

A

Q

A
As best $I$ can remember, it was a very, a very succinct warning to the effect be careful. And again, $I$ think you said you didn't draw any -I mean, who did you think he was talking about or
did you ever form that conclusion?

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
I have no recollection, but $I$ did make a note to -- I have no recollection, but there's something in my file that suggests that -- whether or not it's my note or it comes from some other source -- suggests that it was the way in which
the evidence of Nichol John had come out at trial
that was of significance to, that Mr. Justice Tallis felt was significant to the ultimate conviction.

And I'll take you to that note a bit later. I think that may have been in a transcript of a telephone discussion that you had with, I think it was David Milgaard, Joyce Milgaard and Peter Carlyle-Gordge, and is that something that you recall seeing in a file that you've looked at recently?

A
$Q$

And I'll just quickly call them $u p$ on the screen, we don't need to go through them, but they are from your file, 332012, and this is the reference
from the Supreme Court Act, and I'm assuming that's your underlining. If we can just go to the next page, again dealing with references to the Court. The next page, and the next page, there's the Truscott case, and $I$ think the next page, please, and 617 of the code, so again it would appear from your file, sir, that you had done some research or review of these issues; is that a fair assumption?

A
$Q$
If we can then go to 331972 and if we can just call that up. This is December 31, '80 and you recall the note $I$ showed you about Chris O'Brien and Deputy Chief Corey's letter indicating a call from Chris O'Brien on December 30th. It looks as though December 31 you phoned the Deputy Chief of Police, he says:
"- he will not authorize release of info

- police chief will be back Mon Jan 5
- I am to contact him."

So again, fair to say that you would have
followed up with the deputy chief on December 31 and been told to deal with the chief on the 5 th; is that right?

A Yes.

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q

A

Q

A

Did you know Chief Gibbon at the time or Deputy Chief Corey, were you familiar with these people? I don't think so. Had you dealt with senior police officers before in your capacity as a lawyer?

Not to my recollection.
Then go to 331966, again $I$ just want to identify this, this is January 2nd, 1980:
"3/4 hr. office. Chris O'Brien \& Susan."

Who I presume is Susan Martineau, and information about Albert Cadrain, where he lives, trial transcript. Do you have any recollection of meeting with Chris O'Brien and Susan in your office?

Then if we can go to 331965, this is January 5,
'81, and this looks to be a call with Chief Gibbon. I presume where it's got 10 minutes, that would be the time of the call; is that right? Yes.

It says:
"He will not release info. - nor
authorize his officers to discuss the
case unless we give him some reason for
wanting to do so.
- suggests we go thru' A.G."
I'm assuming that's the Attorney General?

A
Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
I think it fair to say that it was not the response that $I$ was hoping for. I don't believe that $I$ was, that $I$ was taken aback by the response, or felt as though there was something unreasonable in it at that point because $I$ still had another direction in which $I$ might turn, and that was turn to the $A G$, speak with Bobs Caldwell,
that kind of thing.
And we'll come back to that a bit later. If we could then go to 331 -- well, 331964 , January 6, '81, it just looks like Dennis Berezowsky tells you they have copies of trial transcript. 'I can read it there.' Presumably that's at the court house; is that right?

Yes.
Then 331963, this is January 6, '81, a call with Joyce Milgaard $I$ presume setting up a meeting in January. And then down at the bottom it says: "She gave me full authority to speak to media."

Do you recall, Mr. Young, what role the media were playing at this time or what this might have been referring to?

A
$Q$

A
Q
No, I don't.
If we can go to 331962 , it's the same date, it
looks like there was a call from someone at CBC Winnipeg where you've got a note 'called'. Do you have any recollection what that might have related to?

None.
331961, and this is the January 6, 1981 letter from John Gibbon back to you and they talk about
the, your inquiries and the inquiries from Chris O'Brien and to interview police officers and to have access to the complete file.
"I am sorry to say that $I$ cannot agree to such a request."

And if we can just scroll down, it says:
"You will recall that $I$ asked you
yesterday during our conversation
whether this case was going to be
re-opened or perhaps more specifically
what the actual reason for wanting to have access to our file and to interview those officers involved in the
investigation is and you could not supply that."

Again, let me just pause there. I think there's a subsequent letter, Mr. Young, where you advised the police that you are looking at reopening the case. Do you recall whether that might have been something you gave to Mr. Gibbon on the first call?

A
I don't remember whether $I$ gave it to him on the first call, but $I$ have a recollection of having a concern that he had misunderstood where we were at. I wanted to make it absolutely clear to him
that we -- that I, I think I have to say, I have to say me personally at that particular point, had no reason to suggest that his department had done anything wrong and wanted to make it clear to him that we were simply looking at the matter, I didn't want him to be defensive about it and to refuse me access to his officers or to his file material by reason of an overly defensive position if he thought that $I$ was accusing his department of wrongdoing, and $I$ wasn't doing that at that point.

And do you know what Chris O'Brien might have said to the police in his attempts to get the files, do you have any recollection of that from --

No. No, none.
And then it says:
"If there is some justification for re-examining this conviction $I$ feel that the reasons for that must be presented to the Attorney General's Department and if necessary we will certainly be prepared to discuss our file with a representative of the Attorney General's Department and, of course, have our members interviewed by a representative
of the Attorney General's Department.
If the Attorney General sees fit to acquaint you with the information he has at his disposal, then $I$ would have no objection to that. In the meantime, I can only advise you that $I$ am not
prepared to have our file made available to yourself or members of the Milgard family, nor am $I$ prepared to have the members involved in the investigation available for interviewing."

And again, we touched on this just a bit earlier with the telephone note. What was your reaction to this letter, Mr. Young?

Again, it wasn't the answer that $I$ was looking for, but $I$ was not alarmed because $I$ still had other avenues through which I might approach the issue.

And can you tell us again what you could have or would have done?

Well, certainly talking to Bobs Caldwell would have been, $I$ hope was the next step within reason in this regard.

And is that something again that you did or would have done?

To a limited degree only in that $I$ did speak with Bobs Caldwell, but $I$ have no recollection as to whether or not $I$ raised access to the police file with Mr. Caldwell. I think that it seems likely that $I$ would have gotten to that point at some stage. I don't think $I$ did get to that point before I -- before Mrs. Milgaard changed lawyers. And had -- so did the change of -- let's go on this basis, if there had not been a change of
lawyers and you continued to act, what further steps would you have taken as far as getting access to the police file?

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

For the moment, $I$ can't think of anything that $I$ would have done other than go through Bobs Caldwell.

And asked for him to get access to the police file?

Yes. That is the only thing $I$ can think of, for the moment, that $I$ might have pursued.

And again, you had made a comment earlier about -and, again, there's another letter when you follow up with Chief Gibbon -- about that you were not alleging, at that time, any wrongdoing by the police. Do you recall having a sense at the time that the police were defensive in their dealings with you or had an impression that someone was maybe suggesting wrongdoing on their part?

No, no I didn't, but $I$ definitely -- I didn't get the sense -- I did not see Chief Gibbon's response to me as being a true reflection of what $I$ had tried to communicate to him during the course of my initial call to him, and my letter was to clarify that.

And maybe we can just call up 331953. And this is
your letter of January 12 th, and follow-up, and I think what you say -- you acknowledge his letter. You say:
"In order to insure that there is no misunderstanding as to the approach of myself and the Milgaard family with respect to our wish to speak with one or more of the police officers involved in the Milgaard investigation, $I$ wish to indicate that the reason for same is that it is hoped that information can be obtained that might ultimately lead to the exoneration of Mr. Milgaard."

And, again, you go on to give -- ask for assistance on contacting three witnesses. And again this paragraph, the second paragraph that $I$ read then, does that capture what you had tried to communicate to Chief Gibbon?

A

2
,
I see. And what was the purpose in getting the police file, what were you looking -- what were direct response to his suggestion in his letter to me that we may have something, and I wanted to make it clear to him in this letter that we didn't, we're looking.
you going to look for in there?
A
Inconsistencies. We were going to do the
detective work, to the extent that we could for ourselves, to see whether or not the prosecution had done its job properly.

Now if we can go to 331960, and I'll come back to this letter in a moment. And is this a telephone note, are you able to tell us, or is this just an attendance?

I think this is a record of my attendance at the courthouse.

And the trial transcript; do you know where that was located at the courthouse?

No.
And again, just for the record, 331947 . This is a
letter from Mrs. Milgaard to you and it talks about, it says:
"I hope it has been possible for you to spend some time going over the transcripts so that it will be possible for me to see you on January 16th."

So I take it one of your tasks was to go through the transcript and look for things that might help David Milgaard?

A I read the transcript.

And do you have any recollection, Mr. Young, after having read the transcript, what your thoughts were as far as whether there were any errors that jumped out, or any areas where you thought could be pursued on Mr. Milgaard's behalf, or what you generally thought about the case against Mr. Milgaard and his prospects for moving to set aside the conviction?

I didn't find anything in the transcript that led me to conclude that, on the basis of that alone, we could succeed in having the matter set aside. I found the matter sufficiently complex to cause me to believe that one had to dig very deeply into the matter before drawing any conclusions. And did you at the time, as counsel, at some point form any impressions about Mr. Milgaard's responsibility for the crime, or his guilt, or his innocence?

A
I don't think that I did. I may have expressed a certain measure of hope, I suppose, for Mrs. Milgaard, but at no stage in my own involvement in the matter did $I$ reach the conclusion that more likely than not David was innocent. I reserved, $I$ continued to reserve my judgement with respect to it. It wasn't
necessary, perhaps, for me to form judgement at that particular point, but $I$ don't believe that $I$ felt capable of judging the matter on the information that $I$ had available to me.

If we can go to 331958, please. And this is a January 9, '81 attendance at the courthouse, it
looks like you ordered the transcript, the diagram, and a copy of the statement given by Nichol John to the police; is that right?

Yes.

And that statement, by the way, was an exhibit at the trial, and so $I$-- do you think that came from the Court file, or do you recall?

I have no recollection, but it does appear to me to be so.

And then if we can go to 331956. This is a telephone note of January $12, \quad 81$ that -- would this be that Chief Gibbon called, you called him back, and gave him these names?

I think so.
And it says:
"I am to confirm in writing - he will
inquire + advise".
And then, $I$ think, if we can go back to 331953.
And so, again, I think we touched on this second
full paragraph; you also asked them to get:
"... the assistance of the ... Police in
locating ... individuals:

Ronald ... Wilson;

Nichol John;

Albert ... Cadrain.

It is possible that the family will want to try to speak to other individuals involved in the investigative and trial process, however for the time being $I$ simply wish to ask for the assistance of the police with respect to locating the three people mentioned above."

And then the next page, and then $I$ think you set out how these three were involved in the case?

A

Q

A
$Q$
And had you considered getting a private investigator or a tracing service or someone else to do the locate, or what prompted you to ask the police to do that?

A
Probably the, I believe it would be the cheapest and most direct method of dealing with it from our perspective. We did consider, I believe that I asked Joyce whether or not she wanted me to hire someone to look for them, and $I$ have no recollection of getting instructions to do so. Was there any desire on your part, Mr. Young, to have the police involved or be aware that you would be talking to these witnesses?

No.
Or was it simply an assistance in locating?
I was looking for as much help as I could get from them.

But again, and maybe let me rephrase it, did you -- were you looking to have your interviews of these witnesses to be done sort of via the police, in other words so that in that situation, compared to finding them on your own so the police don't know and then having them go to the police; was that an issue in your mind?

No, no, we just wanted to have their help in locating them.
$Q$ Okay. If we can then go to 331948, again just a note of January 12 th, and again it looks as though this is a day spent at the courthouse reviewing
the transcript; is that fair, is that correct? It's possible that this is a note, a to-do note to myself suggesting that that is what $I$ want to do. Okay. I'm sorry, I thought this might be times that you were -- and it says "read including to page 662", and $I$ don't know if anything flows from that?

I think I'm just reading the transcripts there. Then if we can go to 213139. And this is the letter from Joyce Milgaard to Jim and Jackie, I'm not sure who they are, but it's January $15 t h$, 1981. So this would be, I think, right around the time you are reviewing transcripts, and there is a comment here, it talks about Mr. and Mrs.

Carlyle-Gordge and saying:
"They have agreed to work on our case providing it can be done without anyone knowing about their connection with it at the start. They feel they would be greatly hampered in their work if the police knew what they were up to. I have naturally told Mr. Young about it, in fact, he has forwarded the transcripts to me and $I$ am having them recopied ...",
etcetera. And, just on that point, what was your understanding of the role that Mr. Peter Carlyle-Gordge was playing in that matter?

A

Q

A

Q

A

Yes.
-- and David Milgaard?
Yes, I did, in one sense, yes, but on the other
hand I never ever got the sense that he was doing it because he was doing it for Joyce. I mean he may well have been doing it for himself, you know, he felt it was the right thing to do and therefore he was doing it.

Yeah, no, and when $I$ said "on behalf of" maybe the question was as part of the investigating team, so to speak; is that how you viewed him?

Yes.
Were you aware that he was a writer as well?
Yes I was.
And did you have any understanding of him writing
about this subject matter or --
A
I believe that $I$ did assume that he was doing it because it might provide him with something to write about.

And then there is a comment here -- no, if we can go back, sorry -- and this is a reference to you. Mrs. Milgaard writes:
"He said that he had briefly gone through parts of them ...",
and $I$ think those are the transcripts or the interviews:
"... and I asked him on what he had read, if he had been on the jury, what would have been his thoughts on David's guilt. He said he would have had serious doubts, so that has given me hope."

And, again, is that consistent with what you told us earlier about what your thoughts were,

Mr. Young? Are you able to comment on that; did you reach the conclusion as stated here?

I don't think that $I$ did, but it's entirely possible that $I$ did try to give Joyce some hope with respect to the matter. It's -- it would be unusual for me to overstate it to someone such as

Joyce in these circumstances but, nevertheless, it would not be unusual for me to try to give her some hope if $I$ felt that there was any possibility of there being some.

Then if we with go to 331989. And this is just a document signed by David Milgaard authorizing you to have access to his files, and $I$ presume this was what you needed to access Mr. Tallis' file; is that right?

I felt so.

And then 331944 . This is January $21, \quad$ '81, it looks as though there is a call with Maureen Milgaard, and talks here about:
"Mr. ... Carlyle-Gordge - reporter -

McLean's - wants to have a conference call - encourage David that efforts are being made to help".

And then the next page -- actually no, I'm sorry, we can go to 331942 . This is your note of January $22, \quad$ '80:
"1/2 hour - conference call - David Milgaard, Joyce Milgaard - Peter Carlyle-Gordge". Now did you -- do you recall that conversation at least generally?

BY MR. HODSON:
Yes, it was '81 -- no, that was 19 -- that should be '81, would that be correct, that would be a -I think so.

Yeah. If we can call up 155260. And this appears, $I$ believe this to be an edited transcript of the conference call, if we can just call out at the top. It's got:
"David, Joyce, Peter, L for Lawyer, Young -- Jan 22/81".

And again, $I$ 've shown you this transcript Mr. Young, were you aware that the call was being taped at the time?

A
I have a recollection of such a conversation, yes.
And was it a conference call or --
Yes, yes it was, in the sense that there were a number of parties to the call.

And were you with anybody when the call was taken or do you know where everybody was when the call was set up?

No, I was alone.
Yeah.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I suppose that means '81, does it?

I don't think so.

And, again, you have had a chance to at least go through this transcript recently; is that fair? Yes.

And do you have any reason to dispute -- and, again, $I$ think in fairness there's some editing as we see at the top -- but again, from what's in this transcript, does anything jump out as being something that is attributed to you or you may not have said?

A
I have no reason to think that this transcript is inaccurate.

And just a couple of points that come out, and there's just a discussion here that -- about, I think Joyce is talking to David about what might be on his prison file about him being a schizophrenic, and can't leave that on the file. And then if we can just scroll down a bit, and Mrs. Milgaard appears then to ask you if you can:
"... do this for David ..."
and get some:
"... access to that file so he can read
it himself ...",
etcetera, and we'll see later in your file where you write a number of letters to some health care providers to get reports; is that right?

A Yes it is.
Q
And would it be fair to assume that that came as a result of this call and that you were asked to get that information because of concerns that either Joyce or David Milgaard had about that information being on his file?

I think it is fair.
And then if we can go to the next page, I just want to go through parts of this, because it involves -- I think from the transcript it looks like Peter Carlyle-Gordge asked a number of questions of David Milgaard, is that right, about the events of January 31,1969 i is that correct? It is.

And at this time you would have read the transcript or parts of the transcript; is that fair?

A
$Q$

A
Q
If we can go to 155263. Do you have a
recollection of there being evidence at the trial about an incident in a motel room where two witnesses at the trial said that David Milgaard,
for lack of a better word, reenacted the crime and made some incriminating remarks; do you recall
that being part of the evidence in the case?
A

Q
And, here, this is -- and Mrs. Milgaard says:
"David, in that motel, do you recall doing that or not? Becuz it said that you were under the influence of drugs at that time."

David says:
"I remember being high in the hotel
room, but $I$ don't remember those people showing up in the hotel room."

Mrs. Milgaard says:
"You see, they didn't have either of
those girls on the stand."
And David says:
"Yeah, one girl's name which you
probably don't have is Judy Frank.",
it probably should be Ute Frank. and
Mrs. Milgaard says:
"We've got that. We're going to follow
it up."
And do you recall that being part of the case, Mr. Young, about this motel room reenactment or
this evidence?

A
Q

Nothing other than what $I$ read in the transcript. And then, if we can go to the next page, and then Mr. Carlyle-Gordge is asking about the woman that was asked for directions. And I take it, sir, you would have been aware of the evidence or the Crown theory that the Wilson vehicle stopped to ask a woman for directions and shortly after got stuck, and I think the Crown theory was that the woman asked for directions was the woman -- was Gail Miller or likely Gail Miller; do you recall that being, at least generally, part of the Crown's case?

I believe I do.
And then Mr. Carlyle-Gordge asks:
"Other than what you have said to your mother, can you recall anything else about the woman you talked to? asking directions?"

And David says:
"Oh, just that it was an older woman,
OK. I think it was --",
question:
"How old?",
David:
"-- it was like this. We turned around alright but the tires were spinning on the car. It was very old tires on the car, and I'm not sure if we went up there to ask her directions. The idea was to turn around, and I'll be honest with you. The idea was to look her over and see if we could possibly grab her purse, you know. Cuz we were short of funds at the time. But as we turned around, I'm not sure whether we asked her for directions or whether we just continued turning back again around the centre of the boulevard and then going to the garage."

And then:
"We had some soup in the garage ... a little package of soup?"

And, again, do you recall, Mr. Young, at the time you were looking at the transcript and looking at the evidence, trying to find some inconsistencies, did this -- do you recall this being discussed any further or what, if anything, you did with this information from Mr. Milgaard?

A
I have no recollection of doing anything with it.

And then 155268. And there is a discussion here where $I$ think David Milgaard asks you some questions, and it says:
"(turns to Mr. Young, the lawyer)", but I'm assuming that that was an editorial, he was not -- I mean he was in prison at the time, you weren't there; is that fair?

Yes?
Correct? And this is what's attributed to David: "As a lawyer, Mr. Young, you realize the protections a person has, especially in a non capital murder case. From this perspective, either as Defence or as Prosecution, for a person in my situation, excepting the fact that I'm not guilty, what would have to be done or in what areas -- like say for instance like a police chief evidencing -- it wouldn't be dealt with by a police chief, it wouldn't be dealt with by a prosecutor -- possibly you could look at it from that perspective and figure out areas that would be of our concern that may be areas of our investigation."

And then you say:
"I think that $I$ follow you David."
Peter says:
"What we need is new evidence. Is that not the 1 st thing?"

David says:
"Yeah. I'm not even sure exactly what would be called for in the Supreme Court of Canada now, after an appeal. It has to be new evidence; it has to be --- law evidence."

And then Mrs. Milgaard says:
"Mr. Y told me it would have to be new evidence. Say we went to Nichol and she changed or admitted to being under a great deal of pressure, we could show something over that period of time.

There may be something that way."
And again generally, Mr. Young, would that have been what your advice would have been to Joyce and David Milgaard about what might be needed for a reference?

A Yes.
Q Then if we can go to 155270. And, again, this follows a discussion about Nichol John's evidence, and then again Mr. Carlyle-Gordge says:
"I checked the trial transcript and she retracted the written statement, and I
don't think there's anything too serious against you in what she did admit. The problem was that the Crown managed to get the statement in anyway."

And then David Milgaard says:
"I can barely hear you. The statement was probably one of the most damaging things against me becuz ---- the jury. Her reaction to the statement as it was read to the jury, in itself, was more detrimental than the statement. He said
'Is this true? Is this true?' and she started crying, and whatnot, and she said 'It's true, it's true.'

And then Peter says:
"I think $I$ can confirm what David is saying, becuz I spoke ...",
and I'm sorry, I think this is you, Mr. Young:
"I think $I$ can confirm what David is saying, becuz $I$ spoke to Cal Tallis and he indicated to me that that was his feeling about what Nichol had to say:
it was more the manner in which it came

A
Q

A

Q
out."
And then, if $I$ can just pause there, is that the note that you had commented on earlier, Mr. Young, as something that you felt Mr. Tallis had said to you?

Yes.
And, again, is that by memory or by the fact that it's in this transcript that you are saying you think that that happened?

The fact that it's in the transcript.
And then David Milgaard says:
"About Cal Tallis: the fact the I wanted to take the stand and he suggested I not take the stand; he asked me to sign a document saying I didn't want to take the stand, and many other things, like especially when $I$ asked about the garage, you know if it was possible to have someone check it, and if it was possible for this or that, .. I'm not saying -- I guess I am saying I think he was inadequate in what he was doing. Is there anything beyond that, you know -- anything unethical? I'm reaching anywhere, anyhow, to somehow
prove that I'm not guilty."
And then you say:
"Why didn't he want you to take the stand, David?"

David says:
"He felt that it was all --- The different stories that had come out of Wilson, the diff. stories that'd come out of Nichol John and all the rest of it -- He felt that was in itself sufficient enough that if $I$ got up and actually told him what what $I$ told him was the truth, that it'd probably go against me. That was his decision there."

You say:
"You can't necessarily be critical of
that, David."
And he says:
"I can't?"
And you say:
"Any good defence counsel takes the position that there's very little to be gained by having the defendant on the stand. There is a theory that maintains
that in principle."

And then David says:
"OK, that --",
I'm not sure:
"-- be rationalized by the majority of
the people being defended are possibly
guilty?"
I think you -- and then if we can just scroll down. That part that $I$ read, Mr. Young, again, do you have any recollection of that generally being discussed with Mr. Milgaard?

A

Q
A
Q

A
I believe that $I$ have a recollection of this. I could never have restated the wording, but $I$ do believe that $I$ have a recollection of this portion of the conversation.

And do you have a recollection of David Milgaard expressing concerns about not testifying himself ,

A
Q
and about Mr. Tallis' representation of him?
As indicated in the transcript, yes.
And if you can scroll down, 155271. Mrs. Milgaard says, I think to you:
"Have you had any luck with the Police Dept. yet, Gary? regarding Nichol or the others?"

You say:
"I haven't heard any yet, Joyce. I certainly can push in that direction, and am. I don't have any negative response from them, so they stll may help us ... I'll quickly phone the police chief in Sask. as soon as I get off the conference call \& see if he's reached a decision as to what he will do."

And again, at this time, you would have already received the one letter from him indicating that they wouldn't give you access unless you went through the Attorney General; is that correct? Yes.

And, again, is that -- you agree with what's attributed to here, that -- and let me rephrase that. Did you view that as a negative response
from the police? I'm not asking that very well, let me try again.

That's all right. In any event, you go ahead if you care to, but $I$ just want to take a second to read this.

Sure.
I believe that what $I$ am referencing here is that I didn't have a negative response to our request to have them provide their assistance in locating --

Right.
A
$Q$

A
$Q$
-- the three witnesses.
Yeah, and that was my next question. They had -you had asked them to find the three and you hadn't heard back on that; is that right?

I'd have to double-check the timing on the letter, but I suspect that that is so.

Based on your notes $I$ think $I$ can tell you, Mr.
Young, that you hadn't yet -- I don't think you had yet heard back from the police regarding the locating.

I think this is probably an appropriate spot to break, Mr. Commissioner. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
(Adjourned at 11:59 a.m.)
(Reconvened at 1:30 p.m.)
BY MR. HODSON:

BY MR. HODSON:
Good afternoon, Mr. Young. If we could just go back to the transcript of the phone call, 155260, and go to 272, I think we finished off reading your comment, and $I$ think you told us that you were still waiting to hear about witness whereabouts, and there's a comment right at the top here that's attributed to you and I think the question is, David had asked you: "What was the initial reception by any of the police there in Saskatoon upon your enquiries?"

And you said:
"Well at the lower levels it seemed to be fairly positive. But the police chief himself ultimately put his foot down and said that unless we came up with some valid reason for expecting to find evidence that hasn't already been dealt with, he didn't want his police officers spending time on helping us out."

And I'm wondering if that would reflect what you would have been told by the police at the time,

Mr. Young?
I hope so. The only conversation that $I$ have, that $I$ recall having with the police would be conversations with the police chief himself and the other conversation would be with the deputy chief, and it may be that the, that it was at the lower levels $I$ may be referring to the deputy chief and it may be that $I$ felt that $I$ had some support from him for getting the documents by reason of my conversation with him.

Okay.
But I do not recall. I am reconstructing. If we can then go to 331941, just carrying on with the contacting the witnesses, this is January 22, '81, it looks like Chief Gibbon, you talked to him:
"He says - Cadrain has been contacted -
\& he does not want to talk to anyone
about Milgaard - he says Milgaard
threatened Cadrain - they are still
looking for Wilson \& John \& will not
release info. relating to their address
unless they are willing."
Again, did you have any concerns about that approach being taken by the police?

A

None.
And can we take it from that that Mrs. Milgaard didn't want the police getting in touch with Wilson or John?

I believe that we can.
And I think just to assist, and I'll take you to a couple of documents, and we've already seen some. Around this time, $I$ think in fact on January 21, if I'm not mistaken, Mrs. Milgaard actually had interviewed Ron Wilson by phone and contact had already been made with Nichol John; do you recall that, and again the dates you maybe weren't aware of, but do you remember that happening, that Mrs. Milgaard had in fact talked to them?

A Yes. At the very least $I$ believe $I$ was aware of her conversations with Mr. Wilson. I am uncertain at this point as to whether $I$ was aware of her conversations with Nichol John.

And just for the record, we don't need to call them up, but on your file there is, as document 331993, a transcript of a telephone call between Joyce Milgaard and Ron Wilson on January 26, 1981 and we've heard tapes earlier of discussions that Mrs. Milgaard had prior to that date with George Lapchuk and Mr . Lapchuk agreeing to give assistance to finding Ron Wilson. There's also a second one, 331978, which is an April 15th, '81 call between Ron Wilson and Joyce Milgaard, so at this point $I$ think you are telling us that -- in fact, let me call up the next document, 331939, it looks as though this is a note from the next day, and am $I$ correct in this that you had maybe tried to reach Chief Gibbon to tell him you didn't need to find John and Wilson, but wasn't able to reach him in time? I'm speculating on that. I can't recall.

If we can go to 331932, and this is a January 23 letter from Chief John Gibbon, and again just in the second paragraph, they confirm they've been in
contact with Cadrain, Wilson and John and all three of them are most emphatic that they do not want their whereabouts made known to you or to the Milgaard family and he says we will respect those wishes, and then the next paragraph, he says:
"As indicated to you previously, I recognize that cases can be re-opened, however, $I$ also recognize that certain procedures should be followed. If the Milgaard family have reasons sufficient to cause a review of this case, we are certainly prepared to co-operate by making our file available to a representative of the Attorney's General Department. We would, of course, point out that the three witnesses you are trying to locate have indicated they do not wish their whereabouts made known, but it would then be up to the representative of the Attorney General to decide whether those people should be interviewed and by whom."

And $I$ take it, sir, this is what you talked about earlier this morning about the avenue you were considering in going to a representative of the

Attorney General to get access to the police file?

Oh, they are not your notes?
No, they are not my notes, and the author hasn't signed them, but $I$ believe them to be the notes of

Lucille Lamb who was then at that time a junior lawyer in our law firm.

Okay. Maybe we can just go to a couple of notes here, 'Call to AG department,' I think these all relate to exhibits, and then to 331933, and then this is a note from Mr. Caldwell:
"- as far as exhibits are concerned he thinks still intact

- doesn't think they can have a new
trial or anything - would be interested to know what Mrs. Milgaard proposes to do.

Call to Registrar's Office. Denis to call me back."

And then 331931, this is a note January 29, Dennis Berezowsky:
"Exhibits are still at Ct. House insofar as they are aware."

And:

> "- again asked for a copy of Nichol

John's statement \& diagram."
So it looks like there was some concern that
exhibits were destroyed and someone followed up and were advised that no, they were not destroyed and they were intact. Is that a fair reading of those notes?

A

Q

"Spent with Mrs. M. Peter
Carlyle-Gordge at Ct. H. \& in my
office."

Do you recall what at the court house, or what you were looking at and where you were looking at it?

A

Q think February 1:
"Mrs. M phoned - wanted me to look into
the following

- phoned Ian Buckwold re getting access
to their files. He will check with
Tallis \& advise.
- reward money?"

And then if you can call out this bottom part, it says:
"Caldwell ..."
Phone number,
"... he says he gave copies of material
statements to Tallis - however he is
prepared to go over his file with me -
but will not release copies to Mrs. M."
And pause there. Does that accord with your recollection of your discussion with Mr.

Caldwell?

A Yes.

Now, do you have a recollection of looking at Mr. Caldwell's prosecution file?

No, I don't.
Mr. Caldwell has testified before the Inquiry that he believes that he provided his file to you at the court house in his office for you to look at and he says he has a recollection of that. Are you able to assist us in saying whether you, it's something you may have done and forgot or you didn't do it or you might have done it?

I don't believe that $I$ looked at his file. I don't believe that $I$ reviewed his file. It is theoretically possible that he showed me the file and for one reason or another $I$ didn't review it at that time, but I can't -- I can't reconstruct any reason for me not getting into it if it was made available to me at that given point and $I$ do not believe that I saw, that I reviewed the file based both on my recollection and on my reconstruction of my file material because it would have been sufficiently important I believe that $I$ would have had notes of it had $I$ reviewed the file.

And if you had not looked at his file, would there be any reason that you did not do so?

A

Q

No, none that $I$ can identify. Timing might have been a reason, but there was plenty of time for me to follow up on it after the 2nd of February. And I'm just wondering, I think you've told us, would this note be accurate, that he made the offer to you to go look at his file?

Yes.
And again, do you know if there was a reason -let's put aside timing for a moment -- a reason that you would not have gone and looked at his file?

I can't identify any.
And I think we will see shortly that in about April you were disengaged as counsel and had you not been disengaged, is this something that you would have done?

I believe I would have.
And then as between February and April of '81, can you think of any reason why you wouldn't have reviewed the file?

No.
Did you consider what was on Mr. Caldwell's file to be of importance in the work that you were doing?

I would have considered it to be such.

Q

If we can then go to 331925, just on the -- just before I leave that, I think Mr. Caldwell's evidence was that his office was at the court house and I'm wondering, Mr. Young, do you have a recollection of looking at perhaps the Court file in Mr. Caldwell's office as opposed to his file? I don't remember being in Mr. Caldwell's office. I do have a recollection of being at the court house and looking for exhibits and transcripts. Do you recall seeing Mr. Caldwell while you were at the court house?

No.
If we can go to -- 331925 is up, this is February
2nd, '81, again just a letter to Mr. Buckwold asking to go through Mr. Tallis' file; is that right, and it looks as though you sent the authorization from David Milgaard?

Correct.
And then 331924, February 2nd, '81, it looks as though Mrs. Milgaard has located Shorty Cadrain, will try to interview him, and then she asks you to get statements given by those who administered lie detector tests, other suspects, etcetera, so I take it that would be a note of a discussion that would record what Mrs. Milgaard told you or asked
you to do?
A
Q

And then just down at the bottom, Mr. Buckwold says:
"While we have no objection to your access to the file on behalf of Mr . Milgaard, $I$ will have to review the file so that internal memorandum may be removed. I hope to be in a position to review the file in the near future." Now, as far as internal memorandum, Mr. Young, at this time, 1981, what was the practice amongst lawyers as far as disclosing files to successor lawyers or to other lawyers?

A

And again, would internal memorandum be considered lawyers' work product in your view?

A Yes.

And so did this surprise you then or cause you any concern, that Mr. Buckwold would be removing internal memorandum from the file he was going to provide you?

It didn't surprise me. I would have preferred to have access to the work product. As it was, I wasn't getting insights into the way in which the matter had been analysed by anyone, $I$ was getting some of the objective, so-called objective information, the transcripts and access to statements and that sort of thing, but not to people's thought processes.

And I won't go through -- just for the record, Mr. Commissioner, there's a few other notes that are on the file and I'll put Mr. Young's entire file in where there are efforts where Mr. Young, I think you are contacting Mr. Buckwold on a couple of occasions to perhaps prompt him a bit to get the file review done; is that fair? Fair.

Then if we can go to 331919, this is March the 6th, and it looks as though George Taylor now has the file and will be going through it, perhaps this weekend, and $I$ think the notes show that George Taylor, who was a senior partner at that
firm, had picked up the matter and was going to review the file; is that right?

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
It is my writing I believe and I don't know what it refers to.

And then just for the record, if we can go to the next page, there's a discussion of some other
And then just scroll down, it talks about Father Murphy and then just at the bottom, it's got here, 'Wilson 2 part statement May 23 ...' I think that's cut off, might be 24 , and then you have 'on file'. Is that your writing or do you know what that refers to?
$Q$
points, 5 to 10 that $I$ think Mrs. Milgaard asked you some questions about, is that right, was Gail on Avenue $O$ and $N$, did police interview, Mrs. Cadrain, etcetera. Would that be a fair reading of the notes, that these were questions or things that Mrs. Milgaard was asking you to check on?

Yes.
And then if $I$ can call up just for the record 048569, and this is a document, it's edited transcript of conversations between Gary Young, Mrs. Milgaard and Danchuk. That's an error. I think on this tape that the RCMP typed up there was a Danchuk interview as well, and I don't propose to go through this, and I'm not sure, Mr. Young, did you get a chance to look at this, this transcript?

A
Yes, I did, and I wondered about the reference to Danchuk.

Q That's an error, but $I$ think this is the March 10th -- the notes that $I$ just showed you with Mrs. Milgaard on March 10th, if you go through the list of the subject matters in your notes, they correspond almost exactly with the subject matters raised in the phone call and it appears that this
is a transcript of the phone call between you and Mrs. Milgaard of March 10th, '81. Is that --

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$ I have no reason to think otherwise. And again, were you aware that your call was being taped?

I don't believe so.
And $I$ don't propose to go through anything in the transcript. If we could go ahead to 331913 just quickly, and again this came up in that previous call, Mrs. Milgaard $I$ think had a suspect by the name of Lalonde in North Battleford and it looks as though she had asked you to make some inquiries. Is that correct?

It is.
And again, would this be -- I think you told us earlier one of the mandates or one of the items you were looking into was to see if you could find who committed the crime; is that right?

That's correct.
And then 331911, this is March 11th, it looks as though this is a letter from the law firm, Mr. Buckwold saying you are free to take the file on the strict condition that you return the file intact upon completion of your review. And then if we can go to 331910, this is March 11th, '81,
it looks as though:
"- picked up file at Goldenberg Taylor

- reviewed same."

And then statements of, $I$ think that's Ron Wilson, Cadrain, March 2 and 5, and Nichol John, and so I take it, sir, on that day you would have actually picked up the file and reviewed it? Yes.

Now, do you have a recollection of what, how big that file was or what was on that file and what wasn't on the file?

No, I have no recollection except -- I have no recollection of what was on it with any kind of precision except to say that there was no work product and $I$ was, it was a very Spartan file. And again $I$ want to show you, and I've shown you these prior to you testifying, this Commission has three memorandums prepared by Mr. Tallis and I just want to go through and ask you if you recall seeing these. The first is 153491, this is a memorandum dated June 10th, 1969, I don't propose to go through it, it's a memorandum prepared by Mr. Tallis to the file $I$ think shortly after his retainer, and would this be a work product document in your view, Mr. Young, in what you
described?
A
Q
And do you have a recollection of seeing a document of this nature or this document on the file?

No, I have no recollection, which leads me to the view that it wasn't on the file.

Okay. And sorry, from that are you telling us that you don't believe it was on the file that you looked at in 1981?

A

Q

A
Q

A
I don't believe it was.
And again, this would be Mr. Tallis', and just go through parts about it, talking about the Crown's case and his thought process. If you would have seen this document on the file, is this something you think you would have made a note of or a copy of?

I think so.
And again, from the fact that there's no note on your file, or a copy of this on your file, does that conclude you to think that you didn't see it or it wasn't on the file when you looked at it? That, along with the fact that with the other things that I've described, my general recollection of the state of the file plus
something such as this would, I believe, have stayed in my mind.
$Q$
Okay. And just for the record, this is a document, this one $I$ think we obtained from Mr. Wolch. 224933 is a memorandum of August 20th, 1969 and it's Mr. Tallis' memorandum about attending the scene, St. Mary's church, and you had a chance to read through these this morning; is that correct, Mr. Young?

Quickly, but yes.
And again, $I$ don't propose to go through them. This memorandum, again, can you tell us whether you think this was on the file that Mr. Tallis' former law firm provided to you in 1981?

No, I don't think it was, and I would give the same answers for this memorandum as with the previous.

And, again, this memorandum was provided to the Commission by -- on behalf of Mrs. Milgaard, and 048305 is the third memo $I$ showed you. This is a September 8, 1969 memo, and we have seen this document before, it relates to a discussion or a meeting that Mr. Tallis had with Mr. Caldwell. We've only got the first page, scroll down to the bottom, and it kind of ends off there. And,
again, you have looked at this memo and do you think this is a memorandum that was on the file when you looked at it in 1981?

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

Q
And Dennis Cadrain gave a statement to the police I think on March the 2nd, 1969, he is the brother of Albert Cadrain or was the brother of Albert Cadrain, and that police statement, at least based
and do you have any recollection as to what that referred to?

None.
on the record we have seen a copy of that statement was on the police file, it was on Mr. Caldwell's file, but that statement, being the March 2nd, '69 statement, was not provided to Mr. Tallis, and nor do $I$ believe was it tendered as evidence on -- at the trial and therefore would not have been an exhibit. And I'm wondering, Mr. Young, if you are able to, based on that information that $I$ have provided to you, give us some indication of whether this is referring to the same statement of Dennis Cadrain and, if so, where either you or Mrs. Milgaard might have gotten it from?

I am unable to make any comment of any nature whatsoever with respect to it, I don't remember anything about it.

Okay. Thank you. Next, if we can go to 331896, which is the second page of these notes, and there is a remark that says, '89 copies, J. Milgaard, 89 times 7, 6.23 charge for photocopying done by Joyce herself', and am I correct that she would have been in your office and would have made copies of something that day?

I believe so.

Are you able to tell us what it was she would have
copied?

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q

Yeah. And did you have any involvement in any of those steps to either -- other than trying to find her, as far as interviewing her, or was that something being done by Mrs. Milgaard,
been keeping you advised of, generally, of what she was doing with Nichol Demyen?

I understood her to be doing that.

Mr. Carlyle-Gordge, or others?
Yes, it was being done by them, I don't believe I had any involvement.

And 331977. And this is a letter from
Mrs. Milgaard to you April 20th, '81 and talks again about getting your conclusions on the review of the case law, and then if we can scroll down, there is a reference here to:
"You will note the dates, ...",
and it has a clipping attached:
"... and the fact that Mr. Mahar was seeing a priest at St. Mary's Rectory in August, the paring knife ...", etcetera.
"We noticed that a member of your firm represented him. Perhaps you could check this out with him."

And $I$ think the newspaper clipping is 331191, if we could maybe just have that brought up for a moment. Is that the full page, I say is that the -- oh, okay, it looks like it's cut off. Maybe if we could just call up this part. Now $I$ think you said this was, you thought it was prosecuted by --

A
I thought it was prosecuted by Mr. Sherstobitoff
but --
I think actually, here, it says defence counsel?
It does suggest, indeed, I'm undoubtedly mistaken.
Okay. So again, if we could just go back to
331977, and do you have any recollection --
there's some notes here about some follow-up that you would have had about -- and I'll actually refer you to a letter in a moment, to your letter, but do you have a recollection of making inquiries, appropriate inquiries about Mr. Mahar and whether he might be a suspect?

I did speak with Nick about it, Nick Sherstobitoff about it, and my recollection is that it appeared in a dead end.

And if we could just go to the bottom, it looks as
though Mrs. Milgaard has sent you a copy of the
latest call to Ron Wilson, and there is a
transcript on your file that $I$ have already
identified, and I take it that's when she sent you
that information?
I think so.
Then if we can go to 331877 . This would be your reporting letter, I presume, to Mrs. Milgaard after you had reviewed the law on the Section 617?

A I think so.

And, again, $I$ don't want to dwell on this but at the bottom you express your view that:
"In order to satisfy the Minister of
Justice that a reference should be directed, it would be necessary to submit evidence of a very strong nature pointing in the direction of the innocence of your son. The evidence would have to be submitted in Affidavit form."

And I take it that that's something you would have concluded based on your review of the law at the time?

Yes.
Go to the next page. I don't propose to go through it, but there is the report, the discussion on the Maher case with

Mr. Sherstobitoff, and you indicate that while some of the material is privileged, certain information is public, and $I$ think you ended up concluding that this was a dead end; is that right?

A

Q
That was my recollection.
And then if we can go to 331857, and this is the letter of June 25,1981 from Mrs. Milgaard to you,
and explaining that Howard Shannon became involved, and Tony Merchant was becoming involved, and would it be fair to say that at this point your involvement in the file ended?

A
$Q$
Thank you, Mr. Young, those are all my questions. I expect that counsel may have -- may or may not have questions. No? No? MR. WOLCH: Unless somebody else has. You can ask, but --

MR. HODSON: Alex, do you have --
MR. PRINGLE: I have one question.
MR. HODSON: One, one, and maybe. Go ahead.

BY MS. KNOX:

Q Mr. Young, I'm Catherine Knox, I introduced myself to you this morning and $I$ believe you know that I -- that my office acts as counsel for Mr. Caldwell.

Am I correct in understanding your evidence that when you contacted Mr. Caldwell, he was quite cooperative with you in the sense that he extended, your file indicates he extended you an offer to look at his file if you wished?

A
$Q$
A

Q

A
$Q$
A

Q
A

Q
Okay. And Mr. Hodson has indicated to you that it is his evidence that he remembers you coming to his office, you say you don't remember going to Okay.
-- but I've got no reason to -- I found him professional in my dealings with him.
his office and looking at the file, but can you say that in fact you didn't go there and, at some point in time, peruse his file to any degree?

A

Q
BY MR. PRINGLE:
Mr. Young, my name is Alex Pringle, I represent Calvin Tallis.

And I'd just like you to, just
to be thorough here, look at a document 331838.
And just quickly look at that, and then take a
look at the next document, 331839. And then
finally the -- have you had a chance to see that?
A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A

Q
A
$Q$
This is another account, and this last page indicates photocopy charges, the account
indicates:

> "Photocopy charges, material from the Milgaard file";
do you have anything -- idea what that's about?
A

Q
A
-- or portions thereof if not. I'm sorry, I do have a recollection now, if $I$ may, and I think I was asked -- I think Bob Kennedy asked to look at my file, and did so, and asked me for specific portions of the file, and this reflects the photocopying charges.

Okay.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Who is he, sir?

A Bob Kennedy was with the, at that time the law firm of Gauley \& Company, and it is my sense, going by memory, that he was doing so at the request of Mr . Wolch. I could be mistaken on that but that's --

MR. HODSON: Actually, if you call up 331841, I'm sorry, it might assist. I think it was in connection with the civil proceedings, it
was just getting a copy -- if you could take a look at the screen -- of certain documents, and $I$ think that's in the folder. That corresponds with the date, $I$ believe.

MR. PRINGLE: Okay.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: 3 which, 31,
that's 331841?
MS. KNOX: Yeah. I think, Mr.
Commissioner, $I$ can clarify with certainty.
Mr. Kennedy, who now works at
my office, was in 19 -- the mid-'90s at the Gauley \& Company office, which is where Mr. Fox and Mr. Boychuk are from, and back in those days when he was with that office Mr. Kennedy was working with respect to the representations of some of the city police officers, Mr. Short, Mr. Karst, and Mr. Mackie, $I$ think, in terms of civil claims, or some of them, so his involvement was to get some documents that were listed in -for purposes of examination for discovery in the civil claim in his role at that time, but it was on behalf of Saskatoon City Police officers he was acting.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
BY MR. PRINGLE:

And I have one other question for you, Mr. Young, on -- if we could go to 155264. You have a -- Mr. Hodson went over this with you earlier, but starting about a third of the page down, David Milgaard is providing an account as to what happened at a material time in this matter. First of all I'd like you to confirm that that sounds like what he said to you, or what is taken down here is -- are you fairly certain that's what he said, you have no reason to dispute that?

I -- no, I have no reason to dispute it, but $I$ got myself on this particular note a bit earlier when I said much the same thing, and then on reflection felt that "any" perhaps should have read "many" in relation to the defence counsel.

Right.
So that, within reason, $I$ believe this to be an accurate reflection of what took place.

Right. And in there you note that he admits that, with respect to this what he describes as the 'older woman', that they were going to take -that there was a -- let's get the exact words here:
"The idea was to look her over and see if we could possibly grab her purse,
. . .";
do you see that? That's --

A
Q

A
$Q$

## BY MR. WOLCH:

Mr. Young, I'm Hersh Wolch, I'm David Milgaard's lawyer. I apologize not meeting you earlier, I
was kind of preoccupied, to be honest. Just a lawyer. I apologize not meeting you earlier, I
was kind of preoccupied, to be honest. Just a very -- couple questions.

Regarding Mr. Pringle's recent questions to you, $I$ don't intend to go through it, but the comments about the older woman on that transcript; there's a great deal of preamble to it, is there not, as to location and things like that?

A
Yes I do.
And certainly just that admission alone, if he were to take the witness stand before a jury, would certainly be something that would be very detrimental to his case, would it not, in the context of this case?

I wouldn't take issue with you. I don't believe that $I$ would want to venture a personal opinion without having much more information available to me with respect to the context.

Okay. Those are all my questions, thank you.
$Q$

I think there was.

Yeah, so you have to put it in the context of the overall picture?

A
$Q$

Now what $I$ can say with respect to that is, because $I$ do have a general recollection of that portion of the conversation, and with respect to Mr. Tallis we all -- I think his reputation was so sound and so broadly accepted as being beyond reproach amongst the lawyers in Saskatchewan at that particular stage that $I$, along with everybody else I suspect, would give him the benefit of the doubt and we would automatically -- and we would not want to move quickly to any conclusions
suggesting that he had made any kind of significant error. That doesn't mean he didn't make an error, $I$ have absolutely no idea under the circumstances, $I$ don't have a clue. But the one thing $I$ do know is that $I$ respected him and that, because David Milgaard expressed to me that perhaps something had gone wrong, I would take that information, take it for what it's worth, but it would mean nothing more to me than David Milgaard --

Okay. With the benefit of hindsight, an innocent person questioning things is not too surprising, after he has been wrongly convicted?

Just one last point. I for -- meant to ask it of Mr. Merchant, so I'll probably ask it of you. Were you here when $I$ questioned Mr. Merchant about the problems of deciding if a client will testify or not?

A I believe I was.

Q

A
Okay. -- and the truth of it is $I$ don't necessarily feel
comfortable offering an opinion unless $I$ know what -- and the truth of it is $I$ don't necessarily feel
comfortable offering an opinion unless $I$ know what I am talking about. circumstances. I don't disagree with you, I have no reason to disagree with you, but it's not the field within which $I$ have practiced extensively, -Cent

Q
Well, it's smart, because $I$ was leading into a trap. The trap is this; if you do testify and you are convicted the position is you weren't believed. You follow what $I$ am saying? It's a damned if you do/damned if you don't, is what $I$ am getting at, because if you don't testify, "well you didn't take the stand and answer the allegations", if you do testify, "well look, you talked and the jury didn't believe you". You see what $I$ am getting at; you can't win.

Well of course $I$ see what you are getting at, and again with the greatest of respect -- and $I$ know that it's my job to answer your questions -Okay.
-- if you were presenting, if you and I were arguing, presenting argument with respect to this, I would be delighted to debate it with you, but to state under oath that $I$ agree or disagree with you --

Okay.
-- when it is a field that is -- has the potential
to be complex and is not one where $I$ practice regularly, $I$ 'm not comfortable giving you an opinion.

I respect that. But you do see the point of the
dilemma that we'll deal with perhaps later, that either way the accused can't win, is what $I$ am saying?

A
$Q$
I see your point.
Thank you. Those are all my questions, Mr. Commissioner.

MR. HODSON: I believe that is all. Thank you very much, Mr. Young.

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: You are excused then, Mr. Young.

MR. HODSON: I'd like to advise that $I$ have an hour and a half of read-ins, but $I$ think there'd be mutiny, so $I$ think we're done for the day Mr. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right.
(Adjourned at 2:26 p.m.)
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| 20834:7 <br> able [11] - 20683:3, | act [2] - 20760:15 | 20727:16, 20803:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { amount [2]-20683:24, } \\ & \text { 20740:10 } \end{aligned}$ | application' [1] - 20706:7 |
| 20695:1, 20733:22, | Act [2]-20762:19 | ect [1] - 20736:1 |  | applications [3] - |
| 20734:1, 20773:8, | 20763:1 | Affidavit [1] - 20821 : affirmation [2] - | analysed [1] - 20809:8 | $\begin{aligned} & 20729: 6,20730: 5, \\ & 20743: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 20780:20, 20799:20, 20805:8, 20816:12, | cted [2] - 20748:6 | 20728:18, 20730:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { analysis }[1]-20726: 15 \\ & \text { and' }[1]-20691: 10 \end{aligned}$ | applies [1] - 20734:9 |
| $20817: 8,20817: 25$ | 20752:13 | ords [1] - 20706:3 | anecdote [1] - 20682:25 | apply [1] - 20725:8 |
| abounds [1] - 20730:12 | 20756:12, 20826:23 | aid [1] - 20736:4 | announcement [2] - |  |
| absolutely [4] - | Actively $[1]$ - 20753:18 | afternoon [1] - 20796:3 Ag [3] - 20765:5, | announcer [1] - | 20688:12 <br> appreciate [2] - |
| 20721:14, 20739:9, | acts [1] - 20822:18 | 20765:25, 20802:7 | 20754:18 <br> anomaly [1] - 20701:2 | 20686:17, 20757:20 |
| 20767:25, 20830:3 | actual [5] - 20694:16 | ago [7] - 20692:11, |  | approach [8] - 20684:8, |
| Absolutely [2] | 20711:23, 20718:19 | $20710: 20,20713: 9,$ | answer [11]-20693:6, | 20731:3, 20731:4, <br> 20733:3, 20769:17, |
| 20685:5, $20721: 16$ | 20721:24, 20767:1 | $20720: 23,20734: 3 \text {, }$ | 20710:19, 20718:7, |  |
| abuse [5] - 20742:19, | add [2] - 20708:20 | $\text { 20739:20, } 20741: 8$ | 20729:7, 20742:12, | 20772:5, 20797:25, |
| 20746:7, 20746:13, | 20746:24 | agree [14]-20685:4 | 20746:9, $20751: 8$, | 20798:1 |
| 20746:17, 20746:18 | added [1] - 20696:20 | 20687:16, 20710:5, | 20769:15, 20801:24, | appropriate [4] -20724:9, 20740:20, |
| abused [3] - 20743:6, | addition [3] - 20705:18, | 20724:6, $20731: 21$, | 20832:7, 20832:13 |  |


| ```20795:23, 20820:10 appropriately [1] - 20728:16 April[7] - 20689:7, 20753:17, 20799:13, 20806:14, 20806:18, 20818:10, 20819:5 Archives [1] - 20801:15 area [6] - 20734:12, 20738:11, 20742:5, 20748:11, 20748:12 areas [8] - 20739:25, 20745:3, 20748:22, 20750:21, 20774:4, 20788:17, 20788:23, 20788:24 arena [1] - 20727:2 arguing [1] - 20832:16 argument [1] - 20832:16 arguments [2] - 20699:22, 20701:16 arrest [3] - 20702:9, 20703:3, 20704:6 arrested [1] - 20738:18 article [1] - 20752:23 ascertain [1] - 20714:11 ashtray [2] - 20685:25, 20686:2 aside [3] - 20774:7, 20774:11, 20806:9 asleep [1] - 20683:6 aspect [2]-20719:16, 20757:13 Asper[1] - 20693:25 assembled [1] - 20692:13 assertion [2] - 20731:8, 20731:22 assess [2] - 20733:10, 20740:1 assist [8] - 20693:16, 20720:20, 20721:12, 20731:21, 20757:10, 20798:17, 20805:8, 20825:24 assistance [9] - 20696:2, 20729:22, 20755:18, 20772:15, 20776:2, 20776:11, 20777:11, 20795:9, 20799:12 Assistant[2] - 20679:5, 20679:6 assisted [1] - 20709:3 assisting [3] - 20709:14, 20751:15, 20754:18 associated [2] - 20722:21, 20756:23``` |  | ```20807:17 authorize [3] - 20699:9, 20763:18, 20765:2 authorizing [1] - 20781:6 automatically [1] - 20829:24 available [12] - 20694:12, 20706:25, 20712:23, 20713:1, 20715:8, 20750:13, 20769:7, 20769:11, 20775:4, 20800:13, 20805:17, 20828:11 Avenue[1] - 20811:3 avenue [1] - 20800:24 avenues [3] - 20769:17, 20770:7, 20798:2 avoid [1] - 20713:22 aware [17] - 20701:6, 20705:6, 20717:5, 20730:22, 20738:4, 20742:6, 20750:18, 20757:8, 20777:8, 20779:23, 20782:23, 20786:6, 20798:23, 20799:1, 20799:3, 20802:21, 20812:4None``` ```bad [1] - 20730:9 badly [1] - 20722:14 bail [1] - 20740:16 Bailey[1] - 20692:25 bandage [1] - 20743:16 bandaged [1] - 20743:15 barely [1] - 20790:8 Based [1] - 20795:18 based [6] - 20750:23, 20757:25, 20805:19, 20816:25, 20817:8, 20821:12 basic [2] - 20708:19, 20738:25 basis [4]-20713:19, 20745:13, 20770:25, 20774:10 battle [1] - 20694:2 Battleford [1] - 20812:11 Battleford' [1] - 20691:16 bears [1] - 20693:11 became [1] - 20822:1 become [1] - 20731:20 becomes [1] - 20708:1 becoming [2] -``` ```bad [1] - 20730:9 badly [1] - 20722:14 bail [1] - 20740:16 Bailey[1] - 20692:25 bandage [1] - 20743:16 bandaged [1] - 20743:15 barely [1] - 20790:8 Based [1] - 20795:18 based [6] - 20750:23, 20757:25, 20805:19, 20816:25, 20817:8, 20821:12 basic [2] - 20708:19, 20738:25 basis [4]-20713:19, 20745:13, 20770:25, 20774:10 battle [1] - 20694:2 Battleford [1] - 20812:11 Battleford' [1] - 20691:16 bears [1] - 20693:11 became [1] - 20822:1 become [1] - 20731:20 becomes [1] - 20708:1 becoming [2] -``` | ```20718:16, 20822:2 Becuz[1] - 20785:7 becuz [3] - 20790:10, 20790:19, 20790:22 beginning [3] - 20700:11, 20722:10, 20741:13 beginnings [5] - 20725:4, 20725:17, 20729:16, 20729:19, 20730:2 begun [1] - 20686:25 behalf [9]-20718:15, 20756:18, 20757:2, 20774:5, 20779:9, 20779:19, 20808:12, 20815:19, 20826:22 Beitel[1] - 20679:9 belief [1] - 20686:2 believes [1] - 20805:5 Bench [4] - 20834:1, 20834:3, 20834:14, 20834:20 benefit [4] - 20683:9, 20730:7, 20829:23, 20830:11 Berezowsky [4] - 20759:5, 20766:4, 20802:19, 20803:18 best [3] - 20683:18, 20760:22, 20834:6 better [6] - 20683:10, 20727:4, 20729:1, 20729:2, 20741:12, 20785:1 between [9] - 20704:19, 20708:9, 20709:12, 20709:19, 20799:7, 20799:14, 20806:18, 20811:11, 20812:1 betweens [2] - 20709:12, 20711:5 beyond [4] - 20694:9, 20760:7, 20791:23, 20829:20 big [4] - 20690:17, 20737:18, 20739:15, 20813:9 bigger [1] - 20713:16 bill [1] - 20810:4 billable [1] - 20682:23 bills [1] - 20697:4 bit [14] - 20682:13, 20688:16, 20700:20, 20702:3, 20730:9, 20731:20, 20738:24, 20752:5, 20762:5, 20766:2, 20769:12, 20783:17, 20809:18, 20827:12``` | ```bits [1] - 20708:19 black [2] - 20709:19, 20726:16 blocks [2] - 20697:19, 20697:21 blood [1] - 20694:18 blood' [1] - 20691:10 blow [1] - 20702:3 Blue[1] - 20726:8 blue [6] - 20707:12, 20707:13, 20724:9, 20725:14, 20726:5, 20731:9 blue-skying [4] - 20724:9, 20725:14, 20726:5, 20731:9 Blue-skying [1] - 20726:8 Board [3] - 20704:1, 20704:21, 20705:4 board [3] - 20727:5, 20731:12, 20731:23 boards [1] - 20707:21 Bob[2] - 20825:12, 20825:18 Bobs[6] - 20680:5, 20765:25, 20769:21, 20770:1, 20770:18, 20771:5 body [3] - 20701:15, 20727:5, 20729:21 bombshell [6] - 20699:14, 20699:15, 20699:18, 20699:20, 20699:25, 20700:17 bombshells [3] - 20698:19, 20698:20, 20698:21 book [2] - 20727:10, 20728:24 Boswell[1] - 20679:4 bothered [1] - 20716:11 bothering [1] - 20710:16 bottom [10] - 20696:17, 20700:19, 20760:3, 20766:11, 20804:14, 20808:9, 20810:17, 20815:25, 20820:15, 20821:2 boulevard [1] - 20787:14 boy [1] - 20693:4 Boychuk [3] - 20680:8, 20744:4, 20826:13 boys [1] - 20803:12 break [1] - 20795:23 briefly [4] - 20687:3, 20741:10, 20748:10, 20780:8``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| bring [4]-20685:8, | 20682:8, 20682 | 20731:3, 20739:3 | change [6]-20725:13, | 0825:25, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20720:10, 20724:25, } \\ & \text { 20754:19 } \end{aligned}$ | 20684:16, 20824:9 | $\begin{aligned} & 20739: 4,2074 \\ & 20742: 24,207 \end{aligned}$ | 20770:24, 20770: | 20826:18, 20826:21 claim [3] - 20731 .5, |
| broadest [1] - 20749:16 |  |  | 2 | 0826 |
| broadly [1] - 20829:20 <br> brother [2]-20816:23, | cancer [2] - 2068 | $\begin{aligned} & 20752: 21,20752: 22 \\ & 20759: 25,20760: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20789:14 } \\ & \text { changes [2] - 20688: } \end{aligned}$ | claimed $[1]$ - 20755:16 claims $[2]-20707: 8$, |
| 20816 | 20689:7 <br> Candace[1] - 20679:3 <br> candidly [1] - 20706:7 <br> cannot [2] - 20710:5, | 20 | 20688:24 <br> changing [1] - 20691:8 | 20826:18 <br> clamming [1] - <br> 20708:15 |
| 20742.6, 20819 |  | 20767:19, 20774:6 |  |  |
| 20742:6, 20819:19 Bruce $_{[1]}$ - 20680:9 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20767:19, 20774:6 } \\ & \text { 20776:15, 20778:1 } \end{aligned}$ | characterization [2] <br> 20709:5, 20731:10 |  |
| wold [10] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20767:4 } \\ & \text { canvassed }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 20735:14 } \end{aligned}$ | 20785:3, 20785:24 | characterize [1] - 20704:11 | clarify [3] - 20731:1, |
| 0804: |  | 20800:11, 20814:14,20819:7, 20821:17, | charge [1] - 20817:20 <br> charged [2]-20739:19, | $\text { clear }[5]-20694: 14,$$20719 \cdot 14.20767 \cdot 25$ |
| 0808: | 20735:14 <br> capable [1] - 20775:3 <br> capacities [1] - 20690:4 <br> capacity [7] - 20683:13, |  |  |  |
| 20808:9, 20809:2, |  | 20828:7, 20828:8 <br> cases [10] - 20682:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20752:11 } \\ & \text { charges [7] - 20710:3, } \end{aligned}$ | 20768:4, 20772:22 <br> Clearly[1] - 20707:18 |
| 20809:17, 20812:22 | capacity [7] - 20683:13, 20684:2, 20685:7 | cases [10] - 20682:18, 20684:3, 20684:4, |  |  |
| 20692:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20684:2, 20685:7, } \\ & \text { 20692:20, 20729:21, } \\ & \text { 20730:3, 20764:5 } \\ & \text { capital }[1]-20788: 12 \\ & \text { capture }[1]-20772: 17 \end{aligned}$$\operatorname{car}_{[3]}-20699: 12,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20684:3, 20684:4, } \\ & \text { 20706:19, 20709:2, } \end{aligned}$ | 20717:10, 20717:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { clearly }[1] \text { - 20693:25 } \\ & \text { Clerk[1] - 20679:9 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | 20715.2 20735: | 20824:25, 20825:2, <br> 20825:7, 20825:15 | Clerk[1] - 20679:9 <br> client [10]-20735:24, |
| bu |  | $\begin{aligned} & 20743: 4,20760: 4 \\ & 20800: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 20825:7, 20825:15 <br> charity [1] - 20684:10 | 20737:5, 20737:10, 20737:13, 20737:15, |
|  |  | cast [1] - 20686:14 | cheapest [1] - 20777 |  |
|  | 20787:3, 20787:4 | catching [1] - 20728:2 <br> Catherine [2] - 20680:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { check [6] - 20791:19, } \\ & \text { 20795:16, 20804:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20746:3, 20749:6, } \\ & 20830: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| cabinet [2]-20721:1,20721:3 | care [2] - 20783:24, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20822:16 } \\ & \text { caused }[1]-20733: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20795:16, 20804:11, } \\ & \text { 20811:6, 20819:17, } \end{aligned}$ | clients [2] - 20742:10, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 20795: 4 \\ & \text { career }[1]-20748: 16 \\ & \text { careful }[5]-20734: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { caused }[1]-20733: 10 \\ & \text { caution }[1]-20760: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 20824:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20742:11 } \\ & \text { clipping [2] - 20819:10, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 20714:9, 20714:19 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cautious [2] - 20760:12, } \\ & \text { 20760:20 } \end{aligned}$ | checked [1] - 20790:1 <br> chief [12] - 20703:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20819:18 } \\ & \text { clothes [2] - 20691:9, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 20715:19, | careful [5] - 20734:16, |  | 20714:3, 20763:19, |  |
| 20719:1, 20719:10 | 20757:23, 20760:23 | Cavalier $[1]$ - 20678:16 <br> Caymans[1] - 20688:20 | 20763:22, 20763:23, | 20740:23 |
| 20764:12, 20776:6 |  |  | 20788:18, 20788:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { clothing }[1]-20694: 18 \\ & \text { clue }[1]-20830: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| 20797:17, 20797:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { carefully [1] - 20688:5 } \\ & \text { Carlyle[13] - 20698:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Caymans[1] - 20688:20 } \\ & \text { Cbc }_{[1]}-20766: 19 \end{aligned}$ | 20794:14, 20796:17, |  |
| 20800:1, 20807:20 | 20732:22, 20762:9, | centre [1] - 20787:1 | 20797:4, 20797:6, | co [4] - 20715:7, |
| 20811:4, 20813:5, | 20778:15, 20779:3,20781:14, 20781:23, | Centurion ${ }^{\text {[1] }}$ |  | 20716:2, 20761:11, |
| 20816:18, 20816:22 |  | 20717:23 <br> certain [15] - 20684:9, |  |  |
| 20816:24, 20816:25 | 20781:14, 20781:23 20784:11, 20786:4, |  | 20755.2 20756:11 | 0800:12 |
| 20817:11 | 20786:15, 20789:25 | 20690:10, 20691:3, |  |  |
| Cadrain's [2] - $20691: 9$, | 20803:24, 20819:1 | 20691:4, 20713:17 | 20763:14, 20763:16, | 20800:12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20718:10 } \\ & \text { cake [2] - 20720:14, } \end{aligned}$ | Carlylegordge [13] 20698:16, 20732:22 | 20715:3, 20737:6, 20774:20, 20800:8 | 20764:1, 20764:2, <br> 20764:21, 20765:9, | co-operative [1] |
| 20720:15 | 20762:9, 20778:15, | 20818:17, 20821:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20764:21, 20765:9, } \\ & \text { 20771:13, 20771:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { code [4] - 20695:3, } \\ \text { 20696:10, 20762:18, } \end{gathered}$ |
| Cal[3]-20685:5 | 20779:3, 20781:14, | $20824: 4,20825: 5 \text {, }$ | 20772:18, 20775:18, |  |
| 20790:22, 20791:12 | 20786:4, 20786:15, | 20826:2, 20827:9 <br> certainly [11] - 20685:5, | 20797:15, 20799:19,20799:24, 20801:15 | 20763:6 |
| Caldwell[20] - 20680:5, |  |  |  | Coffin [2] - 20760:2,20762:19 |
| 20702:4, 20750:11, | 20789:25, 20803:24, 20819:1 | 20699:15, 20712:12, | Chris[11] - 20680:8, |  |
| 20751:24, 20754:2, |  | 20713:12, 20715:7 | 20754:17, 20755:9 | combina |
| 20765:25, 20769:21, | Carrying [1] - 20714:25 <br> carrying [2] - 20722.22 | 20768:21, 20769:2 | 20757:15, 20763:13, | 20693:23 |
| 20770:1, 20770:3, |  | 20794:10, 20800:1 | 63:15, 20764 |  |
| 20770:18, 20770:20, |  | 20828:4, 20828:6 <br> certainty [2] - | 20767:1, 20768:12 | comfortable [2] - |
| 20771:6, 20802:9, |  |  |  | 20831:24, 20832:23 <br> coming [8] - 20719:23, |
| 20804:16, 20804:24, | 20684:11, 20684:12, | 20816:14, 20826: | church [1] - 20815:7 |  |
| 20805:4, 20807:10, | 20685:3, 20695:8,20698:12, $20698: 23$ | Certificates[1] -20834:1 | circle [2]-20717:1,20720:9 | 20720:2, 20723:25, |
| 20815:23, 20822:19, |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 20733: 6,20740: 21, \\ & 20744: 23,20747: 10, \end{aligned}$ |
| 20822:22 Caldwell's 77 | 20698:12, 20698:2 | certify [1] - 20834: | 20720:9 <br> circumstances [4] - |  |
| $20703: 6,2080$ | 20706:23, 20708:25, | Chab[1] - 20755:10 chairman [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20781:1, 20829:11, } \\ & 20830: 4,20831: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 20823:24 comma [4]-20707:12, |
| 20806:22, 20807:2, | 20715:6, 20719:6, | 20704:23 <br> chance [5] - 20698:22, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { City }[2]-20752: 2, \\ & 20826: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20707:15, 20707:16 } \\ & \text { comment [15] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 20807:6, 20807:7, | $20721: 13,20721: 17,$ |  |  |  |
| 20817:3 | 20723:23, 20725:17, | chance [5] - 20698:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { city }[1]-20826: 16 \\ & \text { civil [6] - 20725:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20682:19, 20684:13, } \\ & \text { 20695:17, 20711:14, } \end{aligned}$ |
| Calvin [5] - 20680:13, | 20727:18, 20727:19, | 20815:8, 20824:14 |  |  |
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| 20734:15, 20734:20, | complain [1] - 20829:12 | conjecturing [1] - | contained [1] - | 20725:20, 20725:23, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20753:21, 20771:11, | complete [7] | 20726:10 | 20755:24 | 20725:24, 20750:18 |
| 20778:14, 20780:5, | 20685:22, 20694:3 | conjunctively [2] - | content [1] - 20696:3 | cooperation [1] - |
| 20780:20, 20796:6, | 20710:4, 20733:8, | 20699:25, 20730:3 | contents [1] - 20816:5 | 20823:5 |
| 20796:8, 20817:14, | 20756:3, 20759:14 | connect [1] - 20692:24 | context [6] - 20689:10, | cooperative [1] - |
| 20823:15 | 20767:3 | connection [5] - | 20691:4, 20746:17, | 20822:22 |
| $20791 \text { :3 }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { completion } \\ & \text { 20812:24 } \end{aligned}$ | 20702:9, 20703:3, | 20828:8, 20828:12 20829:1 | copied [1] - 20818:1 |
| comments [5] | complex [2] - 20774:12, | 20825:25 | continuation [1] - | 20804:18, 20804:21, |
| 20682:11, 20828:21, | 20832:22 | connections [2] | 20801:19 | 20817:19, 20817:23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20829: 4,20829: 6, \\ & 20829: 10 \end{aligned}$ | computerization [1] - | 20689:21, 20689:22 | Continued [1] - 20681:3 | copy [9]-20696:9, |
| Commis | $20$ | consensus [1] - 20684:22 | continued [5] | $\begin{aligned} & 20713: 20,20775: 8, \\ & 20802: 23,20814: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| 20678:2, 20678:14, | concern [9]-20713:4, | consent [2] - 20685:14, | 20774:24, 20787:13 | 20814:20, 20817:1, |
| 20679:1, 20679:2 | 20718:21, 20725:5, | 20685:16 | 20801:15 | 20820:16, 20826:1 |
| 20679:9, 20702:21, | 20734:12, 20744:9, | consider [4] - 20725:5, | continues [1] - | Corey[5] - 20755:2, |
| 20703:7, 20703:14, | 20767:24, 20788:23, | 20738:1, 20777:3, | 20693:15 | 20755:6, 20764:2, |
| 20703:16, 20703:18, | 20802:25, 20809:2 | 20806:22 | continuing [1] - | 20801:15, 20801:20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20717:21, 20747:21, } \\ & 20750.25 ~ 20212.17 ~ \end{aligned}$ | concerned [2] - | consideration [4] | 20720:7 | Corey's [1] - 20763:14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20750: 25,20813: 17, \\ & 20815: 19 \end{aligned}$ | 20759:4, 20802:10 | 20719:17, 20725:16, | contrary [1] - 20716:6 | correct [29]-20682:15, <br> 20687:18, 20690•16 |
| commissioner [1] | 20765:17, 20784:4 | considerations [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { contributed [1] - } \\ & \text { 20740:24 } \end{aligned}$ | 20698:12, 20699:19, |
| 20728:10 | 20793:25, 20797:24 | 20726:2 | control [2]-20705:25, | 20700:4, 20708:4, |
| Commissioner [35] - | conclude [2] | considered [6] | 20707:18 | 20708:13, 20710:10, |
| 20682:3, 20717:17, | 20774:10, 20814:21 | 20713:13, 20729:7 | controlled [1] - | 20724:5, 20748:5, |
| 20717:18, 20719:2, | concluded [1] - | 20754:14, 20776:22, | 20713:24 | 20748:9, 20748:19, |
| 20719:13, 20719:24, | 20821:12 | 20806:25, 20808:23 | conversation [14] - | 20748:20, 20751:6, |
| 20726:4, 20726:24, | concluding [1] | considering [1] - | 20687:11, 20687:15, | 20753:10, 20759:19, |
| $20734: 5,20744: 3$ | 20821:21 | 20800:25 | $20688: 2,20698: 15$ | 20778:1, 20782:14 |
| $20745: 24,20746: 11$ | conclusion [4]- | consistency [2] 20738.22, 20738. | 20700:21, 20711:20, | 20784:13, 20794:21, <br> 20799:18, 20803.20 |
| 20746:15, 20746:20, | $20774: 23,20780: 2$ | 20738:22, 20738:23 | 20767:8, 20781:24, | 20812:13, 20812:19, |
| 20746:25, 20747:1, | conclusions [5] | 20780:18 | $20797: 2,20797: 5,$ | 20815:9, 20817:21, |
| 20747:4, 20747:6, $20747 \cdot 9 \quad 20747 \cdot 13$ | 20718:8, 20760:19, | constant [1] - 20707:2 | 20797:10, 20829:18 | 20822:20, 20834:5 |
|  | 20774:14, 20819:6, | constantly [1] - | conversations [5] - | Correct[15] - 20682:16, |
| $20795: 23,20795: 24,$ | 20829:25 | 20708:2 | 20706:15, 20797:4, | $20690 \text { :23, 20698:13, }$ |
| 20809:14, 20825:17, | $20812: 23$ | $20696: 12,2069$ | 20811:11 | 20702:17, 20712:6, |
| $\text { 20826:6, } 20826: 9,$ | conditions [2] | consuming [1] | converse [1] - 20707:23 | 20720:22, 20737:8, |
| 20833:9, 20833:14, | 20709:10, 20713:17 | 20705:15 | conveying [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 20737: 23,20750: 4, \\ & \text { 20762:15, 20776:16 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 20833:15 | conference [6] | contact [22] - 20686:7, | 20718:2 | 20788:9, 20807:18 |
| Commissioners[2] - | $20781 \text { :21, 20782:2, }$ | $20703: 7,20714: 7$ | $20699: 1,20699: 4$ | correspond [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20704:1, 20704:22 } \\ & \text { commit [1] - 20749:24 } \end{aligned}$ | $20782: 18,20794: 15$ | 20714:10, 20714:18, | 20705:3, 20707:9, | $20811: 24$ correspo |
| committed [3] - | Confident [3]-2069 20731:22, 20756:19 | $\begin{aligned} & 20716: 6,20716: 19 \\ & 20720: 6,20742: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 708:2, 20713:23, | 20706:16 |
| 20750:1, 20750:3, | confirm [5] - 20775:22, | $20751 \text { :23, 20752:7, }$ | 20732:15, 20745:15, | corresponds [1] |
| 20812:18 | 20790:18, 20790:21, | 20756:13, 20757:2, | 20745:18, 20829:7, | 20826:3 |
| communicate [3] - | 20799:25, 20827:7 | $20757: 4,20763: 20$ | $20830: 13,20832: 3$ | cost [7] - 20683:24, |
| 20772:18 | confirmation [1] - | 20765:14, 20798:9, | Conviction [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 20720: 7,20722: 4 \\ & 20722: 8,20723: 5, \end{aligned}$ |
| communication [1] - | confirmed [2] - 20691:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20798:21, 20800:1, } \\ & \text { 20823:16 } \end{aligned}$ | 20678:4 conviction [14] - | 20723:10, 20744:21 |
| Company [2] | confirmed' [2] - | contacted [4]- | 20702:10, 20703:4, 20704:7. 20705:18. | costly [1] - 20705:14 <br> Cotler[1] - 20680:12 |
| 20825:19, 20826:12 |  | 20797:17, 20822:21 | $20707: 20,20711: 8$ | counsel [13]-20707:8, |
| compared [1] - | 20803:10 | contacting [5] | 20712:9, 20733:10, | 20748:25, 20750:5, |
| 20777:17 | confuse [1] - 20734:16 | 20686:19, 20716:10, | 20750:7, 20755:14, | 20752:20, 20774:15, |
| compelled [1] - 20709:1 | confused [1] - | 20772:15, 20797:14 | $20755: 20,20762: 4,$ | 20792:22, 20793:13, |
| competent [1] - <br> 20740 : 6 | 20704:13 | 20809:17 | $20768: 18,20774: 8$ | 20793:16, 20806:14, <br> 20820.2, 20822•7 |
| 20740:6 | Congram[1] - 20679:3 | contain [1] - 20834:5 | convictions [4]- | 20820:2, 20822:7, |

Page 6


Page 7

|  | 20808:19 <br> disclosure [4] - <br> 20702:11, 20713:17, <br> 20713:24, 20733:9 <br> discovery [1] - <br> 20826:20 <br> discretion [1] - <br> 20738:14 <br> discretionary [1] - <br> 20720:25 <br> discuss [3]-20712:13, 20765:2, 20768:22 <br> discussed [4] - <br> 20687:15, 20704:2, <br> 20787:23, 20793:11 <br> discussing [3] - <br> 20719:4, 20719:5, <br> 20761:19 <br> discussion [20] - <br> 20687:17, 20687:25, <br> 20694:18, 20741:23, <br> 20741:24, 20752:15, <br> 20758:17, 20760:6, <br> 20761:4, 20762:7, <br> 20765:9, 20783:13, <br> 20788:1, 20789:24, <br> 20804:23, 20807:24, <br> 20810:13, 20810:25, <br> 20815:22, 20821:17 <br> discussions [3] - <br> 20752:10, 20757:19, <br> 20799:9 <br> disengaged [2] - <br> 20806:14, 20806:15 <br> disposal [2] - 20712:20, <br> 20769:4 <br> disposition [1] - <br> 20720:25 <br> dispute [3]-20783:4, <br> 20827:10, 20827:11 <br> Disruptions [2] - <br> 20688:25, 20689:1 <br> distance [2]-20722:16, 20755:8 <br> distinction [1] - <br> 20757:20 <br> do/damned [1] - <br> 20832:5 <br> Document [4] - <br> 20679:4, 20679:5, <br> 20679:6, 20695:20 <br> document [36] - <br> 20685:9, 20685:13, <br> 20685:18, 20686:6, <br> 20687:7, 20690:7, <br> 20690:8, 20690:19, <br> 20690:20, 20693:10, <br> 20694:13, 20694:14, <br> 20695:17, 20704:18, <br> 20719:22, 20733:20, |  | $\qquad$ <br> 20694:24, 20708:6, 20831:7 <br> dreaming [2] - 20726:9, 20726:22 <br> dress [3] - 20700:24, 20700:25, 20701:14 <br> drew [1] - 20701:3 <br> driving [1] - 20699:12 <br> dropped [1] - 20731:25 drugs [2] - 20739:7, <br> 20785:8 <br> during [5] - 20689:15, 20690:24, 20711:20, <br> 20767:8, 20771:22 <br> dwell [1] - 20821:1 <br> E <br> early [4]-20748:11, <br> 20748:15, 20756:14, <br> 20761:9 <br> earned [1] - 20734:17 <br> ease [1] - 20729:3 <br> easier [1] - 20729:3 <br> Eddie [1] - 20680:8 <br> edited [2] - 20782:17, <br> 20811:10 <br> editing [1] - 20783:5 <br> editorial [1] - 20788:5 <br> Edward [1] - 20678:7 <br> effect [5] - 20716:23, <br> 20731:12, 20760:9, <br> 20760:12, 20760:23 <br> effective [1] - $20721: 9$ <br> effectively [1] - 20690:6 <br> efficient [1] - 20744:20 <br> effort [1] - 20707:2 <br> efforts [8] - 20721:22, <br> 20752:2, 20752:7, <br> 20758:20, 20759:13, <br> 20781:16, 20809:16, <br> 20818:14 <br> either [13]-20729:14, <br> 20743:5, 20744:14, <br> 20744:15, 20784:4, <br> 20785:15, 20788:13, <br> 20793:18, 20817:12, <br> 20818:4, 20818:6, <br> 20818:23, 20833:2 <br> elected [1] - 20721:3 <br> eloquently [1] - <br> 20692:21 <br> elsewhere [1] - <br> 20688:22 <br> Elson [1] - 20680:7 <br> emotional [2] - <br> 20743:14, 20743:16 <br> emphatic [3] - <br> 20714:21, 20716:5, | ```20800:2 employee [1] - 20755:10 enclosure [1] - 20686:14 encourage [1] - 20781:16 end [10] - 20708:3, 20711:9, 20719:23, 20720:2, 20741:15, 20748:7, 20753:16, 20753:17, 20820:14, 20821:21 ended [3] - 20810:4, 20821:20, 20822:4 ending [1] - 20708:1 endlessly [1] - 20729:12 ends [2] - 20720:3, 20815:25 enduring [1] - 20823:9 engagement [4] - 20749:2, 20750:5, 20753:22, 20757:6 England [1] - 20723:3 enlarged [3] - 20728:15, 20728:16, 20818:9 enquiries [1] - 20796:13 enter [1] - 20709:9 entered [1] - 20743:8 entire [2] - 20690:1, 20809:15 entirely [1] - 20780:22 error [4] - 20811:12, 20811:20, 20830:2, 20830:3 errors [2]-20700:2, 20774:3 especially [2] - 20788:11, 20791:17 Esq[3]-20680:7, 20680:8, 20680:9 essentially [2] - 20698:10, 20699:20 Estate[1] - 20724:23 etcetera [6] - 20742:20, 20779:1, 20783:23, 20807:23, 20811:4, 20819:14 Etcetera[1] - 20757:5 Evatt [2] - 20681:3, 20682:5 event [3] - 20687:22, 20735:9, 20795:3 events [4] - 20719:8, 20755:19, 20784:13, 20818:17 eventually [5] -``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



Page 9


| 20799:9, 20801 :8 hearing [3] - 20728:22, 20751:5, 20751:15 heinous [1] - 20721:6 help [8] - 20695:11, 20709:6, 20773:24, 20776:18, 20777:12, 20777:21, 20781:17, 20794:13 helpful [4] - 20694:7, 20694:8, 20707:8 helping [1] - 20796:22 helps [5] - 20744:12, 20745:2, 20745:3, 20745:4, 20831:16 hereby [1] - 20834:4 herein [1] - 20834:6 herself' [1] - 20817:21 Hersh [3] - 20680:2, 20730:17, 20828:15 hide [1] - 20708:18 high [2] - 20689:24, 20785:11 highly [2] - 20716:17, 20727:18 <br> hike [1] - 20708:20 himself [9]-20683:7, 20684:12, 20734:21, 20755:9, 20779:16, 20783:22, 20793:25, 20796:17, 20797:4 hindsight [1] 20830:11 <br> Hinz [3] - 20679:10, 20834:2, 20834:13 hire [4]-20725:9, 20725:10, 20729:14, 20777:4 <br> hiring [1] - 20723:8 Hodson [17]-20679:2, 20681:8, 20685:21, 20747:5, 20747:7, 20747:12, 20747:16, 20747:19, 20782:12, 20796:2, 20822:11, 20822:13, 20823:23, 20825:23, 20827:3, 20833:7, 20833:11 holding [2]-20717:11, 20717:14 <br> holes [1] - 20701:10 home [2] - 20727:10 Hon [1] - 20680:11 honest [3]-20740:7, 20787:6, 20828:17 honesty [1] - 20735:11 Honourable [1] 20678:6 hope [8]-20769:22, 20773:18, 20774:20, | 20780:17, 20780:23, 20781:3, 20797:2, 20808:15 hoped $[1]-20772: 11$ hopefully $[1]-20737: 1$ hoping ${ }_{[1]}-20765: 20$ horrific $[2]-20721: 14$, 20745:11 hotel $[3]-20785: 11$, 20785:13, 20803:12 Hotel $[1]-20678: 16$ hour $[2]-20781: 21$, 20833:12 hours $[6]-20682: 23$, 20683:1, 20683:3, 20683:4, 20696:17, 20697:8 hours' $[1]-20810: 5$ House $[3]-20692: 21$, 20692:23, 20802:20 house $[9-20685: 13$, $20689: 3,20759: 11$, 20766:7, 20804:1, 20805:6, 20807:4, 20807:9, 20807:11 Howard $[2]-20732: 11$, 20822:1 Howland $[1]-20731: 11$ hr $[1]-20764: 9$ Hrabinsky $[1]-$ $20756: 24$ huge $[6]-20711: 10$, $20716: 8,20722: 8$, $20724: 3,20740: 12$, $20740: 17$ human $[1]-20735: 11$ humour $[1]-20683: 1$ hundred $[1]-20739: 20$ hysterical $[1]-$ $20803: 11$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Page 11

| 20767:2, 20767:12, | 20822:4, 20823:11, | John[29] - 20699:16, | 20719:22, 20813:21, | 20722:5, 20727:5, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20807:21, 20811:3, | 20826:18 | 20701:18, 20714:8, | 20 | 20731:22, 20732:13, |
| 20811:14, 20818:14 Interviewed [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & -20784: 10 \\ & \text { ] - 20690:11 } \end{aligned}$ | 20714:20, 20715:19, | 1] - 20802:4 | 20766:1, 20813:13 20815:25, 20828:1 |
| 20803:9 | rene [1] - 20679:9 | 20718:3, 20718:24, | 20684:24, 20725:23, | 20829:6, 20830:1 |
| interviewed [5] - | relevant [2] | 20719:10, 20755:3 | 20740:5 | kinds [1] - 20699:11 |
| 20712:16, 20715:17, | 20739:23, 20746:7 | 20760:5, 20761:18, | jurors [1] - 20740:14 | knife [1] - 20819:13 |
| 20768:25, 20798:21, | ing [1] - 20688:19 | 20762:1, 20766:25, | jury [9]-20684:14, | knowing [1] - 20778:18 |
| 20800:22 | Irwin [1] - 20680:12 | 20775:9, 20776:5, | 20692:24, 20737:13, | knowledge [4] |
| interviewing [3] - | belle [1] - 20679:5 | 20792:9, 20797:21 | 20738:16, 20780:13, | 20682:22, 20694:8, |
| 20713:2, 20769:11, | issue [12]-20711:17, | 20798:9, 20798:15, | 20790:10, 20790:12, | 20750:6, 20834:6 |
| 20818:24 | 20720:23, 20720:24, | 20798:22, 20799:4, | 20828:5, 20832:9 | known [6] - 20714:13, |
| interviews [2] - | 20723:5, 20735:14, | 20799:20, 20799:24, | justice [4]-20727:21, | 20714:22, 20715:13, |
| 20777:15, 20780:11 | 20744:7, 20744:22, | 20800:1, 20803:11, | 20727:24, 20728:11, | 20759:21, 20800:3, |
| intimidated [1] - | 20745:3, 20769:18, | 20813:5 | 20730:24 | 20800:18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20717:24 } \\ & \text { intimidates [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20777:20, 20828:9, } \\ & 20831: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Johris [3] - 20761:19, } \\ & \text { 20789:24, 20802:24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Justice[32] - 20678:6, } \\ & \text { 20680:11, 20680:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{Knox}_{[7]}-20680: 5, \\ 20681: 9,20717: 17, \end{gathered}$ |
| 20716:25 | ues [5] - 20718:2, | joint [1] - 20749:8 | 20685:15, 20686:8, | 20717:18, 20822:15, |
| intimidating [1] - | 20727:6, 20750:12, | Joyce[31] - 20680:3, | 20687:19, 20688:12 | 20822:16, 20826:8 |
| 20716:22 | 20753:4, 20763:8 | 20693:21, 20693:23, | 20688:19, 20689:3, | Krogan[1] - 20680:4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { introduced [1] - } \\ & 208 २ 2 \cdot 16 \end{aligned}$ | it'd [1] - 20792:13 <br> items [1]-20812:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 20693: 25,20698: 4, \\ & \text { 20698:16, 20723:7, } \end{aligned}$ | 20690:16, 20697:23, 20698:9, 20700:22, | Kujawa[1] - 20680:6 |
| investigate [2] - | itself [4] - 20730:8, | 20748:6, 20748:25, | $20701: 17,20710: 10$ | L |
| 20779:20 |  | 20755:13, 20762:8, | 20734:14, 20734:16 | label [1] - 20722:22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { investigation [14]- } \\ & 20699 \cdot 1020710 \cdot 3 \end{aligned}$ | J | 20766:10, 20777:4, 20778:10, 20779:10, | $\begin{aligned} & 20736: 8,20737: 21, \\ & 20738: 5,20749: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lack }[3]-20727: 4, \\ & 20733: 17,20785: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 20720:17, 20755:12, | Jackie[1] - 20778:10 | 20781:1, $20781: 22$, | 20760:1, 20760:10, | Lalonde[1] - 20812:11 |
| 20756:3, 20756:5, | jail [4] - 20741:4, | 20782:20, 20783:14, | 20762:2, 20779:7, | Lamb [1] - 20802:4 |
| 20761:9, 20767:14, | 20741:5, 20745:12 | 20784:5, 20789:19, | 20821:4 | Lana[ 1] - 20680:4 $^{\text {2 }}$ |
| 20769:10, 20772:9, | 20749:18 | 20794:9, 20799:8, | justice' [1] - 20727:23 | language [2] - |
| 20779:6, 20788:24 | jailhouse [1] - 20709:16 | 20799:14, 20817:21 | justification [3] - | 20704:14, 20704:15 |
| investigations [2] - <br> 20722:12, 20798:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Jan[2] - 20763:19, } \\ & \text { 20782:21 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { judge [8] - 20684:25, } \\ & \text { 20691:15, 20693:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20712:8, 20729:17, } \\ & \text { 20768:17 } \end{aligned}$ | Lapchuk[3]-20799:11, $20803 \cdot 10$ |
| investigative [1] - | January[26] - 20709:23, | 20700:22, 20728:8, | justifications [1] - | large [2] - 20684:14, |
| 20776:9 | 20714:3, 20756:14, | 20738:15, 20747:11, | 20713:10 | 20743:17 |
| investigator [4] 20716:1, 20718:13, | 20764:8, 20764:20, 20766:3, 20766:9, | Judge[3] - 20682:24, | justify [1] - 20694:12 | largely [1] - 20742:15 |
| 20718:15, 20776:23 | 20766:11, 20766:24, | 20697:12, 20701:3 | K | last [10] - 20699:1, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { investigators [1] - } \\ & \text { 20715:20 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20772:1, 20773:21, } \\ & \text { 20775:6, 20775:17, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { judge's [2] - 20692:17, } \\ & \text { 20738:14 } \end{aligned}$ |  | 20699:5, 20700:20, <br> 20700.21, 20736.12 |
| involved [24] - | 20777:24, 20778:11, | judgement [3]- | Kara[1] - 20679:5 | 20736:18, 20736:24, |
| 20683:25, 20687:2, | 20781:11, 20781:20, <br> 20784:13, 20797:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20745:16, 20774:25, } \\ & \text { 20775:1 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Karen[3] - 20679:10, } \\ & \text { 20834:2, 20834:13 } \end{aligned}$ | 20737:10, 20824:24, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20695: 5,20710: 2, \\ & \text { 20711:25, 20712:25, } \end{aligned}$ | 20798:19, 20799:8, | judges [4] - 20689:22, | Karst[3] - 20680:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20830:20 } \\ & \text { latest [1] - 20820:17 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 20723:12, 20748:18, | 20799:23, 20801:5, <br> 20802.18, 20803.7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20707:24, 20713:13 } \\ & \text { 20740:4 } \end{aligned}$ | 20715:20, 20826:17 <br> keep [6] - 20691:8, | Latta[1] - 20759:25 |
| 20753:11, 20753:15, | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 20802:18, 20803:7 } \\ \text { 20803:22 } \end{array}$ | judging [1] - 20775:3 | $20708: 2,20710: 20,$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { law [19] - 20716:17, } \\ \text { 20716:18, 20725:13, } \end{gathered}$ |
| 20753:18, 20755:12, | Jennifer [1] - 20680:10 | judgment [3] - 20685:5, | 20725:18, 20725:19, | 20738:11, 20748:1, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20756: 2,20760: 13 \\ & \text { 20767:13, 20769:10, } \end{aligned}$ | jeopardy [1] - 20732:8 <br> Jerry[1] - 20679:12 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 20685:6, 20759:24 } \\ \text { Judy [1] - 20785:19 } \end{gathered}$ | 20727:25 <br> keeping [1] - 20818:19 | 20748:3, 20748:13, <br> 20750:10, 20751:20 |
| 20772:8, 20776:9, | Jim[1] - 20778:10 | July[5] - 20702:18, | Kendry[1] - 20679:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20750:10, 20751:20, } \\ & \text { 20760:2, 20789:9, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 20776:15, 20777:8, | Joanne[2] - 20680:3, | 20702:19, 20703:23, | Kennedy[4]-20825:12, | 20802:5, 20812:21, |
| 20822:2 | 20698:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20704:19, 20708:10 } \\ & \text { jump [2] - 20724:16, } \end{aligned}$ | 20825:18, 20826:10, 20826:14 | 20815:14, 20819:7, |
| involvement [9] - $20694: 22,20742: 7 \text {, }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { job [5] - 20683:8, } \\ & \text { 20728:3, 20732:8, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { jump [2] } \\ & \text { 20783:7 } \end{aligned}$ | kind [15] - 20684:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20820:24, 20821:12, } \\ & \text { 20825:18, 20831:12 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 20757:15, 20774:22, | 20773:5, 20832:13 | jumped [1] - 20774:4 | 20708:6, 20710:7, | Lawyer1] - 20782:20 |
| 20818:22, 20819:3, | Jodie[1] - 20679:6 | June[4] - 20687:10, | 20718:15, 20720:9, | lawyer [21] - 20682:12, |



Page 13
20707:14, 20724:18, 20742:3, 20760:16, 20830:20
meantime [2] -
20712:21, 20769:5
measure [1] - 20774:20
media [4] - 20750:13,
20752:23, 20766:13, 20766:14
meet [3]-20689:2, 20690:18, 20754:23 meeting [17] - 20689:5, 20690:22, 20690:25, 20695:21, 20697:7, 20697:8, 20697:23, 20702:5, 20726:12, 20732:20, 20764:14, 20766:10, 20801:10, 20815:23, 20816:12, 20828:16
Melnyk [1] - 20803:10
member [4]-20731:12, 20731:23, 20732:17, 20819:15
members [8] -
20712:16, 20712:24, 20712:25, 20713:11, 20740:5, 20768:25, 20769:8, 20769:10
memo [9]-20687:14, 20694:16, 20695:20, 20696:20, 20696:23, 20815:20, 20815:21, 20816:1, 20816:14 memorandum [12] 20808:14, 20808:17, 20808:23, 20809:3, 20813:21, 20813:22, 20815:5, 20815:6, 20815:12, 20815:16, 20815:18, 20816:2
memorandums [1] -
20813:18
memories [1] -
20743:22
memory [8]-20734:17,
20734:24, 20735:12,
20741:11, 20754:19,
20762:13, 20791:7, 20825:20
mentally [1] - 20740:25
mention [1] - 20689:20
mentioned [3] -
20682:10, 20745:7,
20776:13
mentors [1] - 20684:21
Meota [1] - 20691:15
Merchant [20] -
20681:3, 20682:5,
20682:7, 20684:17,

20690:16, 20693:11, 20695:23, 20698:1, 20705:4, 20706:18, 20707:17, 20718:18, 20726:5, 20730:17, 20747:8, 20747:10, 20748:24, 20822:2, 20830:21, 20830:22

## Merchant's [1] -

## 20744:10

merit [1] - 20725:15 message [1]-20723:8 met [4]-20685:12, 20742:14, 20757:16, 20764:18
method [2] - 20697:5, 20777:2
Meyer [3] - 20679:11, 20834:2, 20834:19 mid-'90s [1]-20826:11 might [65] - 20686:23, 20693:1, 20694:10, 20694:25, 20695:1, 20704:9, 20707:10, 20708:20, 20710:15, 20710:25, 20711:2, 20713:4, 20713:14, 20714:14, 20716:14, 20720:13, 20720:20, 20723:10, 20724:9, 20725:3, 20725:15, 20725:18, 20725:19, 20728:17, 20728:25, 20729:3, 20729:24, 20730:4, 20730:5, 20731:23, 20733:22, 20733:25, 20734:2, 20734:3, 20737:6, 20737:14, 20738:13, 20746:3, 20752:15, 20760:15, 20765:24, 20766:15, 20766:21, 20767:19, 20768:12, 20769:17, 20771:10, 20772:12, 20773:23, 20778:4, 20779:7, 20780:3, 20783:14, 20789:20, 20793:14, 20805:10, 20806:1, 20810:19, 20817:12, 20820:11, 20825:24, 20829:7, 20829:8, 20831:8
mild [1] - 20829:8
mildly [1] - 20829:5
Milgaard [119] 20678:4, 20680:2, 20680:3, 20685:10, 20685:15, 20686:19, 20687:21, 20690:11,

20690:13, 20693:13, 20693:21, 20693:23, 20700:9, 20702:10, 20703:4, 20704:7, 20705:2, 20706:17, 20707:16, 20714:23, 20715:5, 20723:7, 20746:6, 20748:6, 20748:7, 20749:1, 20749:4, 20749:7, 20749:15, 20750:2, 20750:7, 20751 :6, 20753:4, 20753:24, 20754:18, 20754:21, 20755:13, 20755:17, 20756:22, 20758:6, 20758:13, 20762:8, 20762:17, 20766:10, 20770:23, 20772:6, 20772:9, 20772:13, 20773:16, 20773:24, 20774:7, 20774:21, 20778:10, 20779:10, 20779:12, 20780:7, 20781:6, 20781:13, 20781:22, 20783:18, 20784:5, 20784:12, 20784:20, 20784:25, 20785:5, 20785:14, 20785:21, 20787:24, 20788:2, 20789:11, 20789:20, 20790:7, 20791:11, 20793:11, 20793:24, 20794:3, 20797:19, 20798:6, 20798:13, 20798:20, 20798:25, 20799:8, 20799:10, 20799:14, 20800:4, 20800:10, 20801:6, 20802:14, 20803:8, 20803:14, 20807:17, 20807:20, 20807:25, 20808:13, 20810:13, 20811:1, 20811:6, 20811:12, 20811:22, 20812:2, 20812:10, 20815:19, 20816:11, 20817:12, 20817:19, 20818:11, 20818:14, 20818:25, 20819:5, 20820:16, 20820:23, 20821:25, 20825:3, 20827:5, 20830:6, 20830:10
Milgaard's [7] 20730:18, 20744:8, 20758:15, 20758:23, 20774:5, 20774:16, 20828:15
Milgaards [3] 20702:2, 20702:13,

Milgard [2] - 20712:24, 20769:8
Miller [4]-20701:13,
20750:7, 20786:11
Miller's [1] - 20752:16
million [1]-20692:12
mind [14]-20692:17, 20693:4, 20695:4, 20695:13, 20708:17, 20710:17, 20710:18, 20728:12, 20739:12, 20760:9, 20760:19, 20761:6, 20777:20, 20815:2
mindful [2]-20725:23, 20744:19 minds [1] - 20728:6 Minister [10] 20680:10, 20701:16, 20710:10, 20719:7, 20720:11, 20730:22, 20749:20, 20760:1, 20779:7, 20821:3
minister [2]-20721:1, 20721:25
Ministries [1] 20717:23
minor [1] - 20700:2 minute [2]-20703:15, 20724:16 minutes [8]-20692:11, 20695:1, 20697:13, 20697:14, 20697:16, 20713:8, 20764:22, 20816:11
miscarriage [1] 20730:24
Miss [1] - 20760:4 missed [1] - 20697:4 missing [2]-20685:24, 20685:25 mistake [2]-20693:4, 20729:5
mistaken [4] -
20752:22, 20798:20, 20820:3, 20825:21 mistakes [1] - 20735:4 mistreat [1] - 20706:3 misunderstanding [1] 20772:5
misunderstood [1] 20767:24
mix [1] - 20735:10 modest [1] - 20725:5 moment [9]-20736:12, 20736:18, 20771:4, 20771:10, 20773:7, 20806:9, 20810:11, 20819:20, 20820:8

Mon [1] - 20763:19 money [9]-20722:11, 20722:18, 20725:9, 20725:18, 20725:19, 20729:14, 20729:23, 20730:1, 20804:13
month [4]-20682:16,
20683:5, 20753:14,
20753:15
months [2]-20708:11, 20724:1
morning [11] - 20682:3, 20682:4, 20698:3, 20741:7, 20747:20, 20748:21, 20748:24, 20751:2, 20800:24, 20815:8, 20822:17
Most [1] - 20698:5
most [16] - 20694:4,
20706:18, 20707:16, 20708:4, 20708:19, 20714:21, 20716:5, 20741:18, 20742:23, 20743:4, 20743:7, 20743:8, 20744:20, 20777:2, 20790:9, 20800:2
mostly [1] - 20742:18
motel [3]-20784:24,
20785:6, 20785:25
mother [3]-20694:7,
20722:12, 20786:17
motion [1] - 20744:6
motivation [1] -
20702:15
move [2]-20725:13,
20829:25
moved [2] - 20688:14,
20688:16
movie [1] - 20728:25
movies [1] - 20716:24
moving [1] - 20774:7
muck [1] - 20736:5
murder [3]-20752:12,
20755:14, 20788:12
Murphy [1] - 20810:17
must [2] - 20712:10,
20768:19
mutiny [1] - 20833:13

| $\mathbf{N}$ |
| :--- |
|  |
| name [10]-20682:7, |
| 20698:3, 20716:16, |
| 20750:14, 20752:11, |
| 20754:17, 20754:19, |
| 20785:18, 20812:11, |
| 20824:8 |
| name(s [1] - 20704:4 |


| names [3]-20702:7, | 20701:18, 20714:8, | 20758:6, 20759:23, | 20818:4 | 20715:20, 20723:22, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20703:1, 20775:19 } \\ & \text { naturally [1] - 20778:22 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20714:20, 20716:3, } \\ & \text { 20717:8, 20719:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20795:18, 20801:4, } \\ & \text { 20801:11, 20801:25, } \end{aligned}$ | obtaining [2] - <br> 20725:22, 20755:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20730:20, 20732:1, } \\ & \text { 20734:20, 20737:19, } \end{aligned}$ |
| nature [4]-20761:16, | 20760:5, 20761:18, | 20802:1, 20802:2, | obvious [4]-20695:10, | 20737:25, 20739:2 |
| 20814:4, 20817:14, | 20761:19, 20762:1, | 20802:3, 20802:6 | 20743:24, 20754:9 | 20740:1, 20742:2, |
| 20821:6 | 20775:9, 20776:5, | 20803:4, 20804:6 | casion [1] - 20757:17 | 20742:3, 20742:4 |
| near [2]-20738:22, | 20789:13, 20789:24, | 20805:22, 20809:14 | occasions [2] | 20744:22, 20751:4, |
| 20808:16 | 20790:24, 20792:9, 20794:6, 20798:22, | $\begin{aligned} & 20809: 24,20810: 9, \\ & 20811: 5,20811: 21, \end{aligned}$ | 20688:14, 20809:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 20751: 6,20751: 14, \\ & \text { 20754:11, 20757:17, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 20730:13, 20732:14, | 20799:4, 20802:23, | 20811:23, 20817:18, | offences [1] - 20750:18 | 20758:6, 20760:14 |
| 20792:17, 20798:3, | 20813:5, 20818:11, | 20820:6, 20834:6 | offer [3] - 20746:22, | 20772:7, 20773:22 |
| 20831: 23 | 20818:13, 20818:20 <br> Nick[3] - 20748:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { nothing [7]-20708:12, } \\ & \text { 20708:18, 20711:6, } \end{aligned}$ | 20806:6, 20822:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20774:13, 20779:13, } \\ & \text { 20785:18, 20790:9, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 20712:12, 20768:21, | 20820:12 | 20746:22, 20761:10, | $20831: 24$ | 20794:19, 20799:13, |
| 20775:1, 20801:9, | Nicol [1] - 20798:9 | 20823:11, 20830:9 | offhand [1] - 20686:13 | 20805:14, 20812:16, |
| $20821: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { night }[1]-20742: 12 \\ & \text { non }[1]-20788: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Nothing [3] - 20746:24, } \\ & \text { 20750:16, 20786:2 } \end{aligned}$ | Office[2] - 20756:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20815:4, 20822:12, } \\ & \text { 20822:13, 20827:1, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 20710:9, 20722:11, | None [3] - 20766:23, | notice [1] - 20684:4 | 20802:16 | $20830: 4,20830: 20,$ |
| 20727:2, 20728:6, | 20798:12, 20816:21 | noticed [1] - 20819:15 | 20725:3, 20756:13, | 20831:4, 20832:22 |
| 20728:7, 20728:8, | none [2]-20768:15, | Notwithstanding [1] - | 20757:2, 20764:9, | One [2]-20742:24, |
| 20754:23, 20759:3, 20762:24, 20789:3, | 20806:1 <br> normally [4]-20694:3, | 20707:1 <br> November | 20764:15, 20765:15, | 20822:13 <br> ones [2] - 20702:22, |
| 20799:5, 20799:19 | 20694:9, 20736:11, | 20689:4, 20690:19, | 20807:3, 20807:6, | 20723:23 |
| needed [3]-20683:23, | 20736:25 | 20697:7, 20723:6 | 20807:7, 20817:22 | open [1]-20716:7 |
| 20781:8, 20789:20 | north [1] - 20689:24 | number [11] - 20687:8, | 20822:18, 20823:25, | opened [6] - 20711:22, 20715•2 20728:19 |
| needing [1] - 20711:15 negative [3] - 20794:11, | North [1] - 20812:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20690:7, 20693:10, } \\ & \text { 20702:18, 20719:25, } \end{aligned}$ | 20824:1, 20826:11, 20826:12, 20826:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20715:2, 20728:19, } \\ & \text { 20767:10, 20779:8, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20794:25, 20795:8 } \\ & \text { never [4]-20692:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20688:13 } \\ & \text { note [37] - 20741:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20735:6, 20742:9, } \\ & \text { 20782:4, 20783:24, } \end{aligned}$ | Officer[1] - 20679:12 <br> officers [13]-20710:2, | 20800:7 <br> opening [2]-20728:15, |
| 20708:1, 20779:14, | 20754:21, 20755:5, 20758:16, 20759:17 | 20784:11, 20804:17 | 20710:17, 20711:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20728:18 } \\ & \text { operate }[3]-20715: 7 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ |
| never-ending [1] 20708:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 20760: 7,20761: 18, \\ & 20761: 21,20761: 24, \end{aligned}$ | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 20765: 2,20767: 2, \\ & \text { 20767:13, 20768:7, } \end{aligned}$ | 20716:2, 20800:12 operative [1] - |
| nevertheless [1] <br> $20781 \cdot 1$ | 20762:5, 20763:13, 20764:17, 20766:20 | Obrien [18] - 20754:17 | 20772:8, 20796:22, <br> 20826.16, $20826 \cdot 2$ | 20761:11 <br> operator [1] - 2071 |
| new [12] - 20698:11, | 20769:13, 20773:8, | $20754: 22,20755: 9,$ | Officers[1] - 20756:2 | opinion [9]-20728:2, |
| 20699:9, 20699:21, | 20775:17, 20777:24, | 20755:16, 20756:7, | Official[5] - 20679:10, | 20732:12, 20732:14, |
| 20700:17, 20701:23, | 20778:2, 20781:19, | 20756:16, 20756:25 | 20834:1, 20834:3, | 20744:18, 20828:10, |
| 20710:22, 20749:21, | 20791:3, 20799:17, | 20757:4, 20757:7, | 20834:14, 20834:20 | 20831:17, 20831:24, |
| 20760:4, 20789:3, | 20801:7, 20801:18, | 20757:15, 20757:17, | officials [1] - 20700:6 | 20832:24 |
| 20789:9, 20789:12, | 20802:9, 20802:18, 20803:7, 20804:5, | 20763:13, 20763:15, 20764:9, 20764:14, | $\mathbf{O j}_{\mathbf{j}[1]}-20730: 1$ | opportunity [4] - <br> 20706:3, 20744:24 |
| 20802:12 <br> Newis [1] - 20759:12 | $20806: 5,20807: 24$ | 20764:18, 20767:2, | Old [1] - 20692:25 old [5] - 20684:8, | $20751: 18,20757: 21$ |
| newspaper [1] - | 20810:7, 20810:11, | 20768:12 | 20729:13, 20729:15, | opposed [7] - |
| 20819:18 | 20814:16, 20814:19, | oath [2] - 20718:24 20832:18 | $20786: 24,20787: 3$ | 20705:18, 20706:4, |
| next [20] - 20733:7, 20747:16, 20756:21, | 20827:19 | objection [5] | older [3] - 20683:4, | 20718:19, 20762:13, |
| 20763:3, 20763:4, | notebook [1] | 20712:21, 20719:14 | once [4] - 20683:11, | 20807:6 |
| 20763:5, 20769:22, 20776:14, 20781:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20741:13 } \\ & \text { noted [2] - 20714:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20719:16, 20769:5, } \\ & \text { 20808:11 } \end{aligned}$ | $20701 \text { :3, 20724:2, }$ 20725:3 | oppress [1] - 20718:14 oppression [1] - |
| 20784:8, 20786:3, <br> 20795:13, 20799:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20765:10 } \\ & \text { notes [40]-20690:21, } \end{aligned}$ | objective [2] - 20809:9 objector's [1] - | one [58] - 20682:14, 20682.24 20683:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20718:6 } \\ & \text { order }[7]-20698: 11, \end{aligned}$ |
| 20799:17, 20800:5, | 20690:24, 20691:17, | 20746:21 | 20683:18, 20686:17 | 20713:21, 20749:20, |
| 20801:13, 20810:25, | 20691:19, 20694:24, | observed [1] | $20686: 20,20686: 21,$ | 20772:4, 20821:3, |
| 20821:15, 20824:13 | 20694:25, 20695:15, | 20743:12 | 20687:4, 20690:2, | 20823:6 |
| Next[1] - 20817:17 | 20696:9, 20696:19, | obtain [3]-20705:8, | 20693:24, 20695:16, | ordered [1] - 20775:7 |
| nice [2]-20709:4, 20717:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20697:3, 20740:18, } \\ & \text { 20741:12, 20742:2, } \end{aligned}$ | 20705:14, 20752:3 obtained [5] - | 20698:18, 20700:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { otherwise [2]-20812:3, } \\ & \text { 20830:16 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Nice[1] - 20730:19 | $20751: 12,20752: 14,$ | 20755:21, 20772:12, | 20701:22, 20704:14, <br> 20704:18, 20705:21, | Ottawa[1] - 20700:6 |
| Nichol [25] - 20699:16, | 20754:1, 20758:3, | 20803:9, 20815:4, | 20706:4, 20712:4, | ought [5] - 20684:25, |

Page 15

| 20733:5, 20738:20, | 20779:20, 20785:3, | perceived [2] - | 20779:2, 20781:22, | 20799:3, 20799:15, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20738:21, 20738:22 | 20785:24, 20786:12, | 20724:12, 20727:20 | 20782:20, 20784:11, | 20800:15, 20805:17, |
| ourselves [3]-20709:1, | 20793:9, 20804:14, | perception [7] | 20789:2, 20790:17, | 20822:3, 20823:6, |
| 20711:7, 20773:4 | 20810:18, 20819:22, | 20728:9, 20729:2 | 20803:23 | 20824:3, 20830:20, |
| outline [1] - 20759:10 | 20823:18 | 20730:10, 20730:12, | Phone [1] - 20804:17 | 20831:4, 20832:25, |
| overall [2]-20738:1, | participated [1] - | 20740:14, 20749:15 | phone [9]-20685:12, | 20833:4 |
| 20829:2 | 20751:14 <br> particular [6] - 20705:1, | perceptional [1] - | 20742:12, 20759:2, 20794:13, 20796:4, | pointing [1] - 20821:7 <br> points [3] - 20718:20, |
| overly [2] - 20768:8, | 20749:22, 20768:2, | perfect [1] - 20734:24 | 20798:21, 20811:25, | 20783:12, 20811: |
| 20770:6 | $20775: 2,20827: 12$ 20829:22 | Perhaps [1] - 20819:16 | $20812: 1,20816: 12$ | Police [21] - 20680:7, 20702.20, 20702.21 |
| overruled [1] - 20735:1 overstate [1] - | 20829:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { perhaps [15] - 20705:7, } \\ & 20711: 22,20738: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { phoned [4] - 20754:3, } \\ & \text { 20763:16, 20804:8, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20702:20, 20702:21, } \\ & \text { 20703:7, 20703:14, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 20780:25 | 20692:20 | 20738:24, 20745:13, | 20804:10 | 20703:16, 20703:17, |
| overwork [1] | particularly [5] | 20745:21, 20767:10, | Phoned [1] - 20759:11 | 20703:19, 20704:1, |
| $20683: 22$ | 20690:12, 20692:20, | 20775:1, 20807:5, | photocopy [2] - <br> 20824.25, 20825:6 | 20704:21, 20704:22, $20752 \cdot 2 \quad 20755 \cdot 3$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { own [2] - 20774:21, } \\ & \text { 20777:18 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20694:10, 20694:15, } \\ & 20739: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20809:18, 20809:23, } \\ & \text { 20827:14, 20829:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20824: 25,20825: 6 \\ & \text { Photocopy [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20752: 2,20755: 3 \\ & 20755: 23,20756: 2, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | parties [3] - 20728:4 | $20830: 7,20833: 1$ | 20825:2 | 20756:4, 20756:11, |
| P | 20751:1, 20782:4 | period [7] - 20682:16, | photocopying [2] - | 20763:17, 20776:2, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { partner [2] - 20752:13, } \\ & \text { 20809:25 } \end{aligned}$ | 20689:4, 20689:11, 20690:1, 20690:4, | 20817:20, 20825:15 | $20794: 5,20826: 22$ police [72] - 20702: |
| package [1] - 20787:18 | $\text { parts [6] - } 20751 \text { :2, }$ | 20740:11, 20789:16 | pick [1] - 20810:10 | 20703:2, 20703:12, |
| pad [1] - 20691:12 | 20755:4, 20780:9 | permission [3] | picked [4] - 20735:5, | 20707:24, 20709:4, |
| Page [1] - 20681:2 | 20784:9, 20784:16, | 20710:1, 20756:1, | 20810:1, 20813:2, | 20710:2, 20710:4, |
| page [20]-20691:13, | 20814:13 | 20756:8 | 20813:7 | 20710:17, 20711:11, |
| 20696:1, 20756:21, | passed [2]-20708:11, | persist [1] - 20770:13 | picture [5] - 20718:19, | 20711:14, 20714:3, |
| 20763:3, 20763:4, | 20803:15 | persisted [1] - | 20718:23, 20736:16, | 20715:24, 20717:24, |
| 20763:5, 20776:14, | passes [4]-20703:16, | 20770:11 | 20738:2, 20829:2 | 20717:25, 20718:5, |
| 20778:6, 20781:18, | 20703:17, 20703:18, | person [29]-20693:3, | piece [1] - 20699:21 | 20718:14, 20719:12, |
| 20784:8, 20786:3, | 20713:6 | 20705:11, 20709:3, | piggyback [1] - | 20729:12, 20733:4, |
| 20801:13, 20810:25, | pause [3] - 20767:16 | 20713:22, 20716:7, | 20699:22 | 20738:6, 20738:17, |
| 20815:24, 20817:18, | 20791:2, $20804: 22$ | 20716:21, 20717:15, | place [3] - 20689:5, | 20752:8, 20754:23, |
| 20819:20, 20821:15, | pay [3] - 20684:25, | 20721:1, 20726:12, | 20824:19, 20827:18 | 20757:7, 20757:8, |
| 20824:24, 20827:4 | 20709:6, 20723:20 | 20732:3, 20732:13, | placed [2] - 20705:11, | 20763:19, 20764:4 |
| pages [2] - 20816:17, | Pedersen [1] - 20748:1 | 20732:14, 20732:18, <br> $20736 \cdot 2,20736 \cdot 18$ | $20708: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20765:14, 20767:2, } \\ & \text { 20767:18, 20768:13, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 20834:4 <br> paid [2] - 20702:23 | penalties [1] - 20727:25 penis [1] - 20728:22 | $\begin{aligned} & 20736: 2,20736: 18 \\ & 20739: 13,20739: 18 \end{aligned}$ | places [1] - 20710:8 | $20770: 2,20770: 4$ |
| $\text { paladin [1] - } 20731: 20$ | people [42] - 20682:23, | 20740:7, 20740:9, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { play [2] - 20683:15, } \\ & \text { 20737:21 } \end{aligned}$ | 20770:8, 20770:10, |
| papered [1] - 20743:15 | 20684:24, 20688:23, | 20745:18, 20745:22, | playing [2] - 20766:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20770:12, 20770:19, } \\ & \text { 20771:3, 20771:7, } \end{aligned}$ |
| paragraph [11] - | 20694:4, 20694:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20752:16, 20755:8, } \\ & \text { 20788:11, 20788:14 } \end{aligned}$ | 20779:3 | $20771: 15,20771: 16$ |
| 20693:14, 20700:21, <br> 20706:10, 20706:11 | 20702:7, 20703:1, <br> 20704-9, 20706:4 | 20829:7, 20830:12 | pleased [1] - 20689:8 | 20772:8, 20772:25, |
| $20709: 24,20710: 12$ | 20707:18, 20711:3, | 20830:14 | plenty [1] - 20806:2 | 20775:9, 20776:12, |
| 20772:16, 20776:1, | 20714:7, 20714:8, | person(s [1] - 20704:5 | plus [2]-20742:14, | $20776: 25,20777: 8$ |
| $20799: 25,20800: 5$ | 20714:10, 20715:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { personal [3]- } \\ & \text { 20816:15, } 20828: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 20814:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20777:16, 20777:18, } \\ & \text { 20777:19, 20778:21, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { pardon [2]-20752:1, } \\ & \text { 20760:5 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20722: 21,20723: 1 \\ & 20723: 2,20723: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20816:15, 20828:10, } \\ & 20831: 17 \end{aligned}$ | Pm [2] - 20796:1, | 20788:18, 20788:19, |
|  | $20724: 24,20725: 7$ | personally [1] - | 20833:16 | 20794:14, 20795:1, |
| paring [1] - 20819:13 | $20725: 25,20727: 16$ | 20768:2 | point [36] - 20701:13, | 20795:20, 20796:12, |
| Parker [1] - 20757:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20729:22, 20733:1, } \\ & \text { 20733:6, 20739:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { persons [2]-20707:4, } \\ & \text { 20714:16 } \end{aligned}$ | 20719:12, 20721:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 20796: 16,20796: 21, \\ & 20796: 25,20797: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| parole [5] - 20707:21, | 20739:6, 20739:11 |  | $20729: 6,20729: 8$ | $20797: 4,20797: 25$ |
| 20721:24, 20731:12, <br> 20731:23, 20753:4 | 20742:14, 20742:17 | 20777:3, 20788:13, | $\begin{aligned} & 20730: 21,20730: 25, \\ & 20730 \cdot 1 \text { 20743.a } \end{aligned}$ | 20798:9, 20798:14, |
| part [22] - 20689:11, | 20742:21, 20743:5, | 20788:22 | $20745: 25,20746: 2$ | $20801: 1,20801: 12$ |
| 20689:15, 20690:17, | 20743:24, 20748:18, | persuade [1] - | 20746:14, 20746:21, | $20811 \text { :3, } 20816 \text { :22, }$ $20816: 25,20817: 2$ |
| 20694:2, 20694:21, | 20764:2, 20776:13, | 20700:13 | $20750: 24,20761: 9,$ | 20826:16 |
| $20701: 14,20721: 5$ | 20776:18, 20785:12, | peruse [2] - 20824:3, | 20765:23, 20768:2, | policeman [1] - |
| 20731:23, 20743:17, | 20793:6, 20800:21, | 20824:4 | 20768:11, 20770:21, | 20716:24 |
| $20751 \text { :4, } 20762 \text { :20, }$ 20771:18, 20777:7, | people's [1] - 20809:12 | Peter [10] - 20694:7, 20698:16, 20762:8 | 20770:22, 20774:15, | political [13] - |


| $\begin{aligned} & 20689: 21,20716: 10, \\ & 20721: 1,20721: 5 \end{aligned}$ | 20813:14 predeces | $\begin{aligned} & \text { principle [2]-20734:8, } \\ & \text { 20793:1 } \end{aligned}$ | 20823:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { psychiatric [1] - } \\ & \text { 20753:3 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20723:2, 20724:11, | 20758:9 | principles [1] | 20759:22 | ps |
| 20724:13, 20725:2, | predict [1] - 20760:15 | 20683:20 | professor [1] - 20760:2 | 20744:11 |
| 20727:1, 20727:18, | preferred [1] - 20809:5 | Pringle [11] - 20680:13, | programs [3] - 20725:6, | psychologist [1] - |
| 20728:4, 20729:1 | prelim [1] - 20758:14 | 20681:4, 20681:10, | 20725:8, 20725:12 | 20744:12 |
| politics [1]-20728:23 | preliminary [4] | 20682:6, 20682:7, | progresses [1] - | public [14]-20720:23, |
| poll [1] - 20716:10 | 20683:10, 20751:5, | 20735:15, 20822:12, | 20736:14 | 20720:24, 20721:7, |
| polygraph [1] - 20718:2 | 20751:11, 20751:15 | 20824:7, 20824:8, <br> 20826.5, $20826 \cdot 25$ | prompt [1] - 20809:18 | 20722:25, 20724:20, |
| 20829:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { preoccupied [1] } \\ & \text { 20828:17 } \end{aligned}$ | 20826:5, 20826:25 <br> Pringle's [1] - 2082 | prompted [1] | 20724:22, 20724:25, 20725.2, 20728.2 |
| portions [2]-20825:10, | preparation [1] - | prison [9] - 20709:2, | properly [2] - 20733:21, | 20729:2, 20732:5, |
| 20825:14 posed [1] | 20683:12 | $20711: 4,20721: 20,$ $20740: 22,20746: 8,$ | 20773:5 | $\text { 20732:17, } 20821: 20$ |
| poses [1] | prepare [3] - 20740:20, 20743:20 | 20753:4, 20783:15 | propose [6] - 20753:20, 20811:15, 20812:7, | pulled [1] - 20741:10 |
| position [12] - 20687:1, | prepared [17] - | 20788:6 | 20813:21, 20815:11, | punished [1] - |
| 20687:20, 20717:3, | 20683:21, 20693:15, | prisons [1] - 20713:12 | 20821:15 | 20737:13 |
| 20717:8, 20719:15, | 20705:5, 20706:20, | private [1]-20776:22 | proposes [1] - | purpose [2]-20761:7, |
| 20719:19, 20749:24, | 20709:9, 20709:10, | privileged [1] - | 20802:14 | 20772:24 |
| 20756:17, 20768:8, | 20712:13, 20712:22, | 20821:19 | prosecuted [2] - | purposes [1] - |
| 20792:23, 20808:15, | 20712:25, 20715:7, | problem [12] - | 20819:23, 20819:25 | 20826:20 |
| 20832:3 <br> positive [2] - 20 | $\begin{aligned} & 20768: 22,20769: 7 \\ & 20769: 9,20800: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20684: 15,20692: 15, \\ & 20713: 16,20715: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Prosecution [1] - } \\ & \text { 20788:14 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { purse [2] - 20787:9, } \\ & 20827: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| 20796:16 | $20804: 20,20813: 18$ | $20716: 3,20723: 1$ | prosecution [4] | pursue [2] - 20706:5, |
| possession [1] - | 20813:22 | 20724:3, 20727:14 | 20717:4, 20738:5, | 20756:15 |
| $20701: 8$ | present [1] - 20726:13 | $\begin{aligned} & 20728: 14,20743: 17 \\ & 20743: 19,20790: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $20773: 4,20805: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { pursued [2] - 20771:10, } \\ & \text { 20774:5 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 20729:4, 20738:13, | 20712:10, 20718:23 | problems [10] - | 20737:17, 20738:8, | push [1] - 20794:10 |
| $20781: 3$ | $20755: 25,20768: 19$ | 20689:15, 20698:8, | $20751: 24,20752: 1,$ | put [19] - 20683:4, |
| $20731: 15,20749: 16$ | 20832:15, 20832:16 | 20715:22, 20724:1, | prosecutorial [] | 20697:5, 20709:4, |
| 20773:18, 20773:20, | preserve [1] - 20801:9 | 20724:8, 20726:16, | 20734:2 | 20719:17, 20720:13, |
| 20776:7, 20778:2, | pressure [9] | 20745:19, 20830:23 | prospects [1] - 20774:7 | 20724:4, 20727:2, |
| 20780:23, 20791:19, | 20717:14, 20717:15 | procedure [2] - | protect [1] - 20710:25 | 20729:9, 20732:8, |
| $20791: 20,20805: 13$ | $20721 \text { :8, } 20721 \text { :9, }$ | $20710: 21,20714: 15$ <br> procedures [2] - | protection [3] - | $20736: 5,20737: 6,$ |
| $20737: 2,20787: 8$ | 20727:2, 20728:24 | $20715: 4,20800: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20707:24, 20707:25, } \\ & \text { 20729:11 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20738: 6,20738: 16, \\ & 20796: 17,20806: 9, \end{aligned}$ |
| 20788:21, 20793:6, | 20789:15 | Proceedings [4] - | protections [1] - | $20809: 15,20829: 1$ |
| 20827:25, 20831:8 | pressured [4] | 20678:12, 20678:23 | 20788:11 | puts [1] - 20738:9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { post [1] - 20733:25 } \\ & \text { post-stinchcombe } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20715: 24,20717: 3, \\ & 20717: 9,20719: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 20681:1, 20682:1 proceedings [1] - | Prove [1] - 20720:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { putting [2] - 20693:5, } \\ & 20736: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| 20733:25 | presumably [2] - | 20825:25 | 20720:18, 20792:1 |  |
| potential [4] - 20713:4, | 20818:3, 20829:14 | process [6] - 20719:5, | provide [4] - 20737:2, | Q |
| 20832:21 | $20766: 6$ | 20728:15, 20776:10, | 20809:4 |  |
| 20748:12, 20808:18, | $\begin{gathered} \text { presume [6] } \\ 20764: 11,20 \end{gathered}$ | 20814:1 | provided [9] - | 20754:3 |
| 20832:22 | 20766:10, 20781:7, | 20809:12 | 20751:20, 20805:5 | Qc[4]-20680:2 |
| practiced [3] | 20810:13, 20820:23 | produce [1] - 20750:25 | 20815:14, 20815:18 | 20680:6, 20680:10, |
| 20683:11, 20748:3, | presuming [1] - | produced [1] | 20817:4, 20817:9, | 20680:13 |
| 20831:20 <br> practicing | 20741:14 <br> presumptuous [1] | 20710:23 <br> producing | 20825:8 <br> providers [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Queen's [5] - 20725:11, } \\ & \text { 20834:1, 20834:3, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 20747:25 | 20696:4 | 20710:22 | 20783:25 | 20834:14, 20834:20 |
| pre [1] - 20705:17 | previous [2] - 20812:9, | product [5] - 20808:21, | provides [1] - 20695:21 | questioned [2] - |
| pre-stinchcombe [1] - | 20815:17 | 20808:24, 20809:6, | providing [2] - | 20738:7, 20830:22 |
| 20705:17 | previously [2] 20715:1, 20800:6 | 20813:15, 20813:24 | 20778:17, 20827:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { questioning [3] - } \\ & \text { 20738:17, 20830:12, } \end{aligned}$ |
| preamble [1] - 20828:22 | priest [1] - 20819:12 | $20756: 20,20761: 12$ | Province [1] - 20834:3 | 20830:14 |
| precisely [1] - 20685:23 | Primarily [1] - 20748:13 | 20823:2, 20823:7, | 20720:21 | questions [30]- |
| precision [1] - | primarily [1] - 20749:10 | 20823:8, 20823:13, | pry [1] - 20700:5 | 20682:8, 20686:17, |
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| 20772:24, 20773:4, | 20759:14, 20774:7, | 20760:13, 20777:17, | 20748:21, 20749:1, | 20792:4, 20792:25, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20773:21, 20783:6, | 20774:11, 20776:14, | 20788:15 | 20777:16, 20809:11, | 20828:5, 20832:7 |
| 20783:23, 20785:15, | 20782:7, 20831:17 | six [2] - 20697:14, | 20816:8 | standard [1] - 20714:14 |
| 20787:8, 20794:15, 20806:13, 20812:17, | setting [1] - 20766:10 <br> settlements [1] - | 20745:8 | $\begin{gathered} \text { sorts [3] - 20706:4, } \\ \text { 20724:24, 20725:8 } \end{gathered}$ | standing [1] - 20692:10 |
| 20814:21, 20823:7, | 20743:8 | skill [1] - 20834:6 | sought [2] - 20755:18, | 20724:4, 20726:12, |
| 20824:14, 20824:21, | sexually [1] - 20743:6 | skills [1] - 20684:2 | 20823: | 20726:19, 20739:15, |
| 20824:23, 20827:24, | Shannon [3]-20720:3, | skip [1] - 20722:11 | sound [4]-20697:8, | 20761:9, 20778:19 |
| 20828:2, 20831 :5, 20832.9, 20832•11 | 20732:11, 20822:1 | skying [5] - 20724:9, | 20723:16, 20753:24, | start-point [1] - 20761:9 |
| $20832: 25,20833: 4$ | share [1] - 20831:1 | 20725:14, 20726:5, | 20829:20 | started [1] - 20790:15 |
| seed [1] - 20725:18 | Sheraton [1] - 20678:16 | slanting [1] - 20691:13 | soup [2]-20787:17, | state [2] - 20814:25, |
| seeing [7] - 20700:3, | Sherstobitoff [7] | small [1] - 20730:21 | 20787:18 | 20832:18 |
| 20749:23, 20762:10, | 20748:18, 20752:12, | smart [1] - 20832:1 | source [2] - 20761:25, | statement [20] - |
| 20807:10, 20813:20, | 20752:19, 20756:24, | so-called [1] - 20809:9 | 20801:8 | 20693:17, 20717:22, |
| 20814:3, 20819:12 | 20819:25, 20820:12, | society [5] - 20725:21, | sources [1] - 20707:25 | 20738:9, 20738:20, |
| seeking [2] - 20709:24, | 20821:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 20730: 9,20730: 12 \\ & 20739: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Spartan [2] - 20813:15, } \\ & \text { 20816:6 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20775: 8,20775: 11, \\ & 20790: 2,20790: 6, \end{aligned}$ |
| 20709:25 | short [2] - 20696:14, | someone [11] | speaking [4] - 20691:2, 20695•2, 20727•4 | 20790:8, 20790:11, 20790:13. 20802:24 |
| seeming [1] - 20724:10 | shorthand [1] - 20834:5 | 20750:1, 20766:19, | 20749:16 | 20810:18, 20816:17, |
| sees [3] - 20712:18, | shortly [3] - 20786:8 | 20771:17, 20776:23, | specific [4]-20686:2, | 20816:22, 20816:25, |
| 20716:15, 20769:2 | 20806:13, 20813:23 | 20777:5, 20780:25, | $20751: 9,20801: 24$ | 20817:2, 20817:3, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { send }[2]-20711: 6, \\ & 20712 \cdot 11 \end{aligned}$ | Shorty [2] - 20691:9, | 20791:19, 20803:1, | 20825:13 <br> specifically [5] | 20817:4, 20817:11 <br> statements [5] - |
| sending [1] - 20810:4 <br> senior [3] - 20688:21, | show [7] - 20696:23 | Sometimes [1] 20683•15 | 20704:22, 20706:11, $20711: 22,20721: 17$ | 20804:19, 20807:22, 20809:11, 20813:4, |
| 20764:4, 20809:25 | 20754:15, 20789:15 | sometim | 20767:10 | 20816:8 |
| sense [14]-20682:25, | 20809:24, 20813:16 | 20683:16, 20722:23, | speculating [1] - | states [1] - 20755:6 |
| 20696:15, 20732:5, | showed [4] - 20763:13, | 20728:14, 20736:2 | 20799:2 | station [1] - 20718:5 |
| 20735:17, 20749:17, | 20805:13, 20811:21, | 20740:6, 20740:2 | speculation [1] - | stay [1] - 20718:5 |
| 20761:5, 20771:15, | 20815:20 | somewhere [1] | 20729:17 | stayed [4] - 20760:8, |
| 20771:20, 20779:13, | owing [1] - 20785:13 | 20713 | speed [1] - 20691: | 20760:9, 20761:5 |
| 20779:14, 20782:3, | shown [4]-20696:21, | son [3]-20749:18 | spend [2] - 20740:19, | 20815:2 |
| 20822:23, 20825:19, | 20725:4, 20782:22 | 20755:15, 20821: | 20773:19 | steadfastly [1] - |
| 20831:11 | 20813:16 | soon [2] - 20726:18, | spending [2] - | 20707:5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { sensed }[1]-20720: 4 \\ & \text { sent }[8]-20687: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { shows }[1]-20710: 22 \\ & \text { sic }[1]-20745: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20794:14 } \\ & \text { sorry [17] - 20704:2 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 20694:11, 20796:22 } \\ \text { spent [1] - 20777:25 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { step [2]-20733:7, } \\ & \text { 20769:22 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 20697:3, 20723:3, | side [1] - 20725:1 | 20710:5, 20724:18 | Spent [1] - 20803:2 | steps [6]-20705:7 |
| 20724:14, 20758:12, | sign [1] - 20791:15 | 20738:10, 20752:21, | spinning [1] - 20787:2 | 20705:13, 20770:16, |
| 20807:16, 20820:16, | signed [2] - 20781:6, | 20759:16, 20760:21, | spite [1] - 20730:23 | 20771:2, 20801:9, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20820:19 } \\ & \text { sentence [1] - 20693:1 } \end{aligned}$ | 20802:3 | 20767:4, 20770:5, <br> 20778:4, 20780:6 | spoken [2] - 20700:10, $20742 \cdot 13$ | 20818:23 <br> Steven[1] - 20745: |
| September [5] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { significance [6] } \\ 20695: 7,20695: 8 \end{gathered}$ | $20781: 18,20790: 20$ | spot [1] - 20795:2 | still [9] - 20740:4, |
| 20703:11, 20704:2, | 20701 :2, 20701:7, | 20801:14, 20814:8, | spots [1] - 20759:11 | 20741:20, 20765:23, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20704: 20,20708: 10 \\ & 20815: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 20735:17, 20762:2 | $20825: 10,20825: 24$ | St [2] - 20815:7, | 20769:16, 20796:7, $20797: 20,20798: 2$ |
| Serge [1] - 20680:6 | significant [8] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { sort [32] - 20682:25, } \\ \text { 20684:20, 20686:25, } \end{gathered}$ | 20819:12 | 20802:11, 20802:20 |
| serious [3]-20689:7, | $20699: 21,20716: 21,$ | $20687: 2,20688: 18$ | stabbed [2] - 20701:1, | Stinchcombe [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20780:16, } 20790: 3 \\ & \text { seriously [1] - } 20743 \end{aligned}$ | 20720:8, 20723:22, | $20690: 9,20691: 25$ $20693: 23,20693: 24$ | 20701:15 | $20734: 8$ |
| seriousness [1] - | significantly | 20694:3, 20694:6, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Staff [2] - 20679:1, } \\ & \text { 20679:8 } \end{aligned}$ | $20705: 17,20733: 25$ |
| 20683:2 | 20717:4 | 20696:8, 20704:16, | stage [5] - 20724:4, | stll [1] - 20794:12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { serve [1] - 20702:12 } \\ & \text { served [1] - 20744:6 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { silence [1] - 20709:13 } \\ & \text { simply [3] - 20768:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20708:15, 20709:16, } \\ & \text { 20712:3, 20713:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $20742: 17,20770: 22$ 20774:21, 20829:22 | stonewall [1] - 20711:5 stonewalling $[1]$ - |
| Service [1] - 20680:7 | $\begin{gathered} \text { simply [3] - 20768:5 } \\ \text { 20776:11, 20777:11 } \end{gathered}$ | 20716:23, 20716:25, | 20774:21, 20829:22 | 20713:3 |
| service [2]-20723:9, | Simpson [1] - 20730:1 | $20726: 8,20726: 21$ | stand [11] - 20693:5, | stony [1] - 20709:13 |
| 20776:23 | sister [1] - 20758:24 | 20728:23, 20730:10, | $20736: 5,20736: 20$ | stopped [1] - 20786:7 |
| set [9]-20700:10, | sitting [1] - 20678:15 | $20732: 5,20734: 1$ | 20785:16, 20791:13, | stories [3] - 20743:10, |
| 20736:25, 20745:12, | situation [3] - |  | $20791: 14,20791: 16,$ | 20792:7, 20792:8 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { story }[4]-20700: 14, \\ & 20708: 1,20743: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20761: 23,20761: 25 \\ & 20765: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20685: 15,20686: 8, \\ & 20687: 19,20688: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { testament }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 20731:18 } \end{aligned}$ | thousands [1] - 20744:25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20743:19 | summarize [1] | $20689: 3,20690: 16$ | testified | threatened |
| strain [1] - 20740:10 | 20751:4 | 20694:20, 20697:12, | 20740:13, 20745:7 | 20797:20 |
| strange [1] - 20686:15 | summer [1] - 20682:14 | 20697:23, 20700:10 | 20745:10, 20805:4 | three [18]-20688:14, |
| street [1] - 20740:23 | Superficial [1] - | 20700:22, 20701:3 | testifies [3]-20737:4, | 20697:15, 20707:18, |
| strength [1] - 20731:19 | 20750:9 | 20734:14, 20736:8 | 20737:14, 20737:15 | 20714:7, 20714:8, |
| strict [1] - 20812:23 | supply [4] - 20707:5, | 20737:21, 20738:5 | testify [23]-20684:15, | 20714:10, 20714:20, |
| strike [1] - 20761:3 | 20712:2, 20712:4, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20759:18, 20759:21, } \\ & 20760 \cdot 7 \text {, } 20760 \cdot 10 \end{aligned}$ | 20685:2, 20686:20, | 20715:11, 20723:22, |
| strikes [1] - 20793:13 | 20767:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 20760: 7,20760: 10, \\ & 20761: 7,20762: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20687: 21,20690: 14, \\ & 20735 \cdot 16 \quad 20737 \cdot 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20772:15, 20776:13, } \\ & 20776: 15.20776: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| Stromberg [2] - | Support [1] - 20679:8 | $20790: 22,20791: 4$ | 20735:16, 20737:10, | 20795:12, 20795:14 |
| strong [1] - 20821:6 | suppose [2] - 20774:20, | $20791: 12,20804: 12$ | $20739: 21,20743: 20,$ | $20800: 2,20800: 16$ |
| stuck [3] - 20741:23, | 20782:10 | 20804:19, 20813:18, | 20743:21, 20745:2, | 20813:18 |
| 20741:25, 20786:8 | Supreme [12] - | 20813:23, 20815:23 | 20745:23, 20746:1, | threw [1] - 20684:12 |
| study [1] - 20711:15 | 20688:13, 20724:15, | 20817:5, 20824:9, | 20747:21, 20830:23, | through' [1] - 20696:1 |
| stuff [1] - 20694:20 | 20728:19, 20741:3, | 20829:6, 20829:1 | 20831:6, $20831: 7$, | thru' [1] - 20765:5 |
| stymied [1] - 20720:5 | $20742: 24,20742: 25$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tallis' [12]-20734:17, } \\ & \text { 20751:19, 20754:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20831: 10,20832: 2, \\ & 20832 \cdot 6 \text { 20832•8 } \end{aligned}$ | Thursday[1] - 20678:21 |
| subconscious [1] - | $20745: 16,20762: 10$ | $20758: 9,20758: 20$ | testify/not [1] | tiger [1]-20693:24 |
| subject [3] - 20780:1, | 20763:1, 20789:7 | 20781:8, 20794:1, | 20735:16 | 20705:15 |
| 20811:23, 20811:24 | surgery [1] - 20689:7 | 20807:15, 20808:7 | testifying [9]-20688:1 | Timing[1] - 20806:1 |
| submit [1] - 20821:6 | surprise [2]-20809:1, | 20814:12, 20815:6 | 20740:9, 20741 :3, | timing [2] - 20795:16, |
| submitted [1] - 20821:9 | 20809:5 | 20815:13 | 20744:2, 20745:2, | 20806:9 |
| subsequent [1] - | surprised [2] | taped [2] - 20782 |  | tires [2] - 20787:2, |
| 20767:17 | 20691:14, 20829:10 | 20812:5 | Testimony[1] | $\text { to-do [1] - } 20778$ |
| substantial [1] | 20829:8, 20830:12 | es [2]-20799: | 678:1 | today [6] - 20684:7, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20709:18 } \\ & \text { succeed }[3]-20693: 2, \\ & \text { 20706:8, 20774:11 } \end{aligned}$ | Susan [5] - 20758:23 | 20803:10 | testimony [2] - | 20705:21, 20706:8, |
|  | 20764:10, 20764:11, | $\begin{gathered} \text { tasks [4] - 20751:7, } \\ 20751: 14,20754: 12 . \end{gathered}$ | 20739:22, 20803:11 | $20706: 9,20739: 8$ |
|  | 20764:14, 20764:18 <br> suspect [5] - 20739 | 20773:22 | thanking [1] - 20702:5 | 20751:1 <br> together [2] - |
| 20723:11, 20723:15 | 20795:17, 20812:10, | ylor[5] - 20808:5, | that'd [2] - 20699:12, | 20724:5 |
|  | 20820:11, 20829:23 | 20809:22, 20809:25 | 20792:8 | Tony[2] - 20679:13, |
| 20722:1 | suspects [1] - 20807:23 |  | theoretically [1] - | 20822:2 |
|  | sworn [1] - 20747:18 | $\mathbf{r}[1]-20680: 5$ | 20805:13 | took [9]-20689:5, |
| 20808:6, 20808:19 | Sworn [1] - 20681:7 | [2] - 20694:6 | theory [3]-20786:7 | 20692:1, 20695:3 |
|  | system [12]-20698:9, | 20779:20 | 20786:9, 20792:2 | 20697:14, 20717:2, |
| suffered [2] - 20742:18, | 20705:24, 20713:21, |  | here'd [1] - 20833:13 | 20717:8, 20719:20, |
| 20746:7 | 20721:5, $20729: 2$ | Technician[1] | therefore [2] - | 20760:14, 20827:18 |
| sufficient [5] - 20715:5, | 20729:4, 20730:10, | 20679:13 | 20779:17, 20817:6 | top [4]-20782:19, |
|  | 20730:13, 20731:20, | 20687:11, 20687: | thereof [1] - 20825:10 | 20783:6, 20796:9, |
| 20733:9, 20792:11, | 20732:9, 20745:19, | 20687:17, 20698:15, | $20710: 18,20799: 25$ | 20804:6 |
| 20800:10 | systemic [6] - 20698:6, | 20709:5, 20755:8, | thinking [4]-20692:11, | totally [1] - 20684:12 |
| 20774:12, 20805:21 | 20708:15, 20710:15, | 20758.2, 20762 | 20693:20, 20726:17, | touch [1] - 20798:14 |
|  | 20713:9, 20738:24, | 20775:17, 20799:7 | 20726:22 | touched [3]-20750:11, |
| 20738:12, 20768:3, |  | endered [1] - 20817:5 |  | 769:12, 207 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20816:15, 20820:3 } \\ & \text { suggested [4] - } \end{aligned}$ | T | s [1] - 20742:15 | 20815:20, 20827:4 | tough [5]-20683:16, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20756:13, 20757:1, } \\ & \text { 20791:14, 20798:2 } \end{aligned}$ |  | 2072 | 20683:12, 20695:13, | 20735:18, 20735:20 |
| suggesting | tactical [1] - 20740:12 | :19 | 20824:11 | tougher [1] - 20740:4 |
| 20708:4, 20771:18, |  |  | ughly [1] | toughest [1] - 20740:1 |
| 20778:3, 20830:1 |  |  | 20687:1 | tracers [1] - 20722:11 |
| suggestion [1] - | 20810:16, 20819:5 Tallis[42] - 20680:13, | 20746:19 | thoughts [5] - 20698:7, | tracing [2]-20723:9, |
| 20772:20 | $20682: 8,20682: 12$ | terribly [1] - 20707:7 | $20780: 14,20780: 19$ | 20776:23 |
| 20724:7 | 20682:24, 20684:16, | Territories[1] | thousand [1] - | trained [1] - 20683:7 |
|  | 20685:6, 20685:11, | 20688:13 |  | g [1] - 20684:21 |
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| 20751:11, 20754:3, | tried [4]-20705:3, | 20816:6 | 20693:24 | victims [3]-20742:18, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20759:14, 20762:6, | 20771:22, 20772:17, |  | unusual [5] - 20756:9, | $20743: 10,20744: 25$ |
| 20764:13, 20766:5, | 20799:18 | U | 20761:3, 20780:25 | view [8] - 20684:22 |
| 20773:12, 20773:23, | trier [1] - 20739:12 |  | 20781:2, 20808:21 | 20738:19, 20794:25, |
| 20773:25, 20774:2, | trigger [1] - 20743:22 |  | up [59]-20682:13, | 20808:24, 20813:25, |
| 20774:9, 20775:7, | triggered [1] - 20746:14 | ultimate [1] - 20762:3 | 20684:4, 20691:8, | 20814:7, $20821: 2$, |
| 20778:1, 20782:17, | troublesome [3] - | ultimately [8] - 20693:6, | 20696:23, 20698:14, | 20831:1 |
| 20782:22, 20783:2, | 20721:6, 20725:21, | 20701:13, 20702:12, | 20702:3, 20706:10, | viewed [1] - 20779:21 |
| 20783:7, 20783:10, | 20725:22 | 20702:23, 20719:7, | 20708:15, 20710:22, | violate [2] - 20705:10, |
| 20784:10, 20784:16, | true [7]-20713:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20722:3, 20772:12, } \\ & \text { 20796:17 } \end{aligned}$ | 20715:14, 20719:8, | 20708:23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20786: 2,20787: 20, \\ & \text { 207an•1 } 20791 \cdot 8 \end{aligned}$ | $20771: 21,20790: 14,$ | 20796:17 | 20727:25, 20728:2, | visit [2] - 20709:6, |
| 20790:1, 20791:8, 20791:10, 20794:2 | 20790:16, 20834:5 | Umm [1] - 20696:22 | 20735:10, 20736:5, | 20816:15 |
| 20796:4, 20799:7, | trued [1] - 20696:8 | uncertain [1] - 20799:2 | $20738: 14,20741: 10,$ | Volume[1] - 20678:22 voluntarily [2] - |
| 20811:11, 20811:17, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Truscott[8] - 20724:14, } \\ & \text { 20728:18, 20730:6, } \end{aligned}$ | uncharted [1] - | 20742:6, 20753:19, | voluntarily [2] - 20705:9, 20708:22 |
| 20812:1, 20812:8, | 20730:21, 20745:6, | 20705:23 | 20754:25, 20762:23, | voters' [1] - 20728:6 |
| 20820:18, 20828:22 | 20760:2, 20762:18, | under [10]-20718:24 | 20763:12, 20763:22, | vs [1] - 20762:19 |
| Transcript[2] - | 20763:5 | 20725:2, 20738:17, | 20766:10, 20770:15, |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 20678:12, 20682:1 } \\ \text { transcription [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | Truscotts [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 20740: 9,20756: 10, \\ & 20785: 8,20789: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20771: 13,20771: 25, \\ & 20772: 1,20778: 21, \end{aligned}$ | W |
| 20834:5 | trust [3]-20705:10, | 20829:11, 20830:3, | 20779:6, 20782:7, 20782:16. 20785:1 |  |
| 20816:8 | 20708:23, 20719:17 | 20832:18 <br> underlining [1] | $20785: 23,20787: 4,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { waiting [2] - 20745:8, } \\ & \text { 20796:7 } \end{aligned}$ |
| transcripts [18] - | 20735:25, 20739:1, | 20763:2 | 20792:11, 20796:18, | wants [3] - 20721:13, |
| 20701:8, $20701: 10$, | 20792:13, 20823:19, | understood [4]- | 20799:6, 20799:16, 20800:19, $20801 \cdot 23$ | 20727:23, 20781:15 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20722:17, 20751:5, } \\ & 20751: 9,20751: 16, \end{aligned}$ | 20831:23 | 20692:16, 20698:9, | $\text { 20803:1, } 20806: 3$ | warning [1] - 20760:23 |
| 20754:13, 20755:22, | 20723:14, 20723:22, | undertaking [1] | 20807:13, 20810:1, | 20743:25 |
| 20758:12, 20758:13, | 20725:13, 20731:20, | $20721: 12$ | 20810:4, 20810:10, | waters [1] - 20705:23 |
| 20778:8, 20778:13, | 20757:22, 20759:6, | undertook [2] | 20812:9, 20813:2, | wearing [1] - 20726:13 |
| 20778:24, 20780:10, | $20781 \text { :2, } 20795: 2,$ | undoubtedly [1] | 20813:7, 20819:19, |  |
| 20807:9, 20809:10 | 20807:21 | 20820:3 | 20819:22, 20820:6, | 20727:11, 20809:24 |
| transcripts ${ }^{\text {c }}$ [1] - | trying [19]-20691:7, | uneconomically [1] |  | weekends [1] - |
| transference | $\begin{aligned} & 20691: 22,20691: 23, \\ & 20696: 8,20696: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20683:22 } \\ & \text { unethical [1] - 20791:24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\text { useful [1] - } 20746: 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20742:13 } \\ & \text { well-earned } \end{aligned}$ |
| 20694:8 | 20707:9, 20708:12 | unfair [2]-20738:18, | usual [1] - 20695:12 | 20734:17 |
| trap [2] - 20832:2 | 20715:12, 20720:10, | 20745:14 | Ute [1] - 20785:20 | well-respected [1] - |
| treating [1] - 20714:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 20721: 24,20724: 22, \\ & 20729: 10,20745: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Unfortunately [2] - } \\ & \text { 20739:3, 20740:6 } \end{aligned}$ | utilized [1] - 20733:21 | 20731:11 |
| ```treatment [1] - 20724:2 tremendous [1] -``` | $\begin{aligned} & 20770: 9,20787: 21, \\ & 20800: 17,20810: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { unfortunately [1] - } \\ & 20735: 23 \end{aligned}$ | V | whatsoever [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20740: 9 \\ & \text { trial }[28]-20686: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20818:23 } \\ & \text { tunnel }[1]-20711 \end{aligned}$ | unhelpful [1] - 20708:5 unique [1] - 20744:23 |  | whereabouts [6] - |
| 20699:10, 20699:24, | turn [7] - 20687:7, | university [1] - | valid [1] - 20796:19 | 20715:13, 20796:8, |
| 20701:7, 20701:17, | 20690:7, 20722:14, | 20801:16 | valuable [1] - 20734:12 | $20800: 3,20800: 18$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20707:10, 20715:21, } \\ & 20736: 14,20739: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 20734:13, 20765:24, | Unless [2] - 20698:21, | value [1] - 20706:1 <br> variety [1] - 20733:1 | white [8]-20707:12, |
| 20742:25, 20743:4, | turned [2] - 20787:1, | 20822:9 | various [4]-20707:18, | 20707:13, 20709:19, |
| 20751:6, 20751:11, | 20787:10 | 20698:19, 20700:12, | 20725:24, 20742:19, | 20726:13, 20726:21 |
| 20751:16, 20754:2, | turning [3] - 20700:3, | $20706: 21,20740: 15,$ | 20743:1 | 20728:8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20754:13, 20758:12, } \\ & \text { 20762:1, 20764:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $20708: 3,20787: 13$ | 20765:3, 20794:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { vehicle [2] - 20741:25, } \\ & 20786: 7 \end{aligned}$ | white-hat [2] - 20726:2, |
| $20766: 5,20773: 12$ | turns [1] - 20788:4 | 20796:18, 20797:23, | vein [1] | 20728:8 |
| 20775:12, 20776:9, | two [9] - 20686 | 20831:24 | venture [1] - 20828:10 | white-hating [1] - |
| 20784:23, 20784:25, | 20695:2, 20697:15, | Unmatched [2] | versa [1] - 20740:8 | $\text { d [1] - } 207$ |
| 20790:1, 20802:13, | 20704:14, 20708:11, | 20682:20, 20682:22 | versus [1] - 20757:24 | whiting [2] - 20710:23, |
| 20817:6 | 20749:9, 20784:24 | unreasonable [1] - | via [1] - 20777:16 | 20711:13 |
| trials [1] - 20742:22 | typed [1] - 20811:13 | $20765: 23$ | vice [1] - 20740:8 | whole [6] - 20688:24, |
| tricked [1] - 20718:15 | types [2]-20742:19, | untrainable [1] - | vicious [1] - 20720:9 | 20694:11, 20701:9, |
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