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## Transcript of Proceedings

(Reconvened at 9:05 a.m.)
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Good morning.
ALL COUNSEL: Good morning.
MS. MONAR ENWEANI: Good morning,
Mr. Commissioner. Our first witness today is
Howard Shannon. Mr. Shannon, please come
forward, and Mr. Shannon is represented by legal
counsel, Mr. Martin Johnson is here with him today.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Johnson.
Right over here, Mr. Shannon, please.
HOWARD STERLING SHANNON, sworn:

## MS. MONAR ENWEANI:

$Q$
A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
Q
A
Q

Good morning, Mr. Shannon.
Good morning, Vanessa.
Thank you for coming and agreeing to testify. Mr.
Shannon, can you tell us where you currently
reside?
Kelowna, British Columbia.
And what is your age, sir?
62.

And are you presently working?
Yes.
And can you tell me a little bit about your
occupation?
A

Q

All right. You had your own sales crew then at the time did you?

I was responsible for one that sort of came directly under me, as well as three or four other young guys, like Roger Renaud, for example, I think there were two more besides Roger at the time.

All right. And $I$ take it that your position involved quite a bit of travel?

Yes, it did.
And that was exclusively in Western Canada? Yes.

All right.
At that time.
Okay. And I understand that in the course of your employment you came to meet David Milgaard; is that correct?

A
$Q$

A
Yes. It was here in Saskatoon. I had come in from Edmonton and Roger Renaud, who was a sub supervisor, had come in from, $I$ think he had come in from Regina, but just prior to that he had been
in Manitoba, and $I$ drove in here to Saskatoon to the motel that they were staying at and we were staying and that was the first time $I$ saw David Milgaard. He was sitting up and -- it was an older motel that had a motel on one side, a motel, and you drove through the, underneath sort of $a$ canopy type of thing and David was sitting up there with another boy playing a guitar. I drove
in and he was just a young kid. We started to unpack and $I$ was looking at these two young guys up there and $I$ was about to ask Roger about it and the police drove into the motel and Roger was busy with them and $I$ was busy unpacking. The police took one of the young guys away. It turned out to be David Milgaard.

All right.

Yeah.

At the time did you have any idea why the police wanted to question him?

Not right then $I$ sure didn't. I asked Roger, I went over and asked him what it was all about and he told me that, about this murder that had happened and he told me that they were questioning this young guy and Roger was, you know, he said he didn't do anything like that at all, just something was really wrong, and that was how we kind of left it, and $I$ went on about the business of unpacking, $I$ remember $I$ was having some problems with one of the trailers, and a short time after that Roger, $I$ would say maybe an hour, hour and a half, he got a call, I'm not sure from, whether it was the police or from David, and we went to the police station to pick up David.

All right. In terms of when this happened, do you have a recollection --

Yes.
-- of the time or the date?
I don't have a recollection of the exact date, no, but this all happened at the same time when $I$ drove in and it was in the middle of the day sort of thing.

We've seen documents that indicate Mr. Milgaard was questioned by the police in Saskatoon in April of 1969 .

A
$Q$
A
That would be right, yes.
All right.
So we went to the police station to pick him up and we met with a policeman up there and he was an older man, $I$ don't know his name, but he was a bit of a crusty old guy, $I$ guess we all get a bit crusty as we get older, but he had a very different -- he kind of was looking at him as being kind of a cool kid when in fact $I$ remember sitting and listening to him talking with the boy and talking with Roger and my impression was that he wasn't a cool kid at all, he was just a kid trying to -- just a kid defending himself kind of thing, you know.

A
A
$Q$

Q You went --
He wasn't cool, not a bit, but that was the impression that the chap, you know, the detective I presume he was. The purpose for going to the police station at that time, was that to pick up David? Pick him up and bring him back to the hotel, yes. All right. Once you had left the police station, did you have any discussion with David Milgaard? We probably had some discussion, but I don't recall what the discussion at that point, from the police station back was. Roger and I had talked going down to the police station about, you know, my feelings were that even being questioned about this -- just a few years prior to that Tony Merchant and Howard Adams from Toronto, our head office at Maclean's, and Fred Brown were very involved in setting up the Direct Sellers Act here in Saskatchewan, it was the first Direct Sellers Act in the country, and they were adamant about the type of people that would be canvassing and, you know, they were very concerned to make sure that they qualified to be licensed properly in the province, and I told Roger how I thought, you know, even being questioned about something like
that, perhaps we should just let him go and at least tell Fred Brown about this.

And you did speak to Mr. Brown?
Yes, we went down that week. Roger was put off that I felt that way because he really liked this young guy and had had him for a few months, which I wasn't aware of at all, $I$ never really was aware of who was working with Roger over in Manitoba. We went down to see Fred and I told Fred what I knew of it and Fred asked me what $I$ thought of the boy and $I$ said 'I think he's just an innocent kid, I don't think he had anything to do with it,' is what I told Fred, but I said 'you make the decision,' and Roger spoke with him and Fred called me into his office and Roger was still there talking with him and Fred said, you know, 'I think that you are right, Howard, $I$ think it's probably better that we do let him go.'

All right. So he was let go for a period of time?
Yes.
And he rejoined you later on; is that correct?
Yes. Fred moved the marketing team to Edmonton
and it wasn't very long after we were up in
Edmonton, perhaps a week or two weeks, we got a
telegram, you know, it was the last of the days
where they pedaled up to the motel with a
telegram. It was words to the effect that David Milgaard was arriving with his brother on such and such a train at such and such a time and you are to pick him up sort of thing and we are going to employ him, and his mother has been in to see me and it was quite a lengthy thing, you know, he was adamant that $I$ was to pick him up and that was that and employ him. His mom had come in and was quite put off that he was fired for really no reason, you know, and threatened to go to the labour board, $I$ recall something in there about the labour board or labour relations or something to that effect, but at that point that was the telegram.

I believe Roger went down and got the boys and $I$ recall when they got to the motel David was very happy, like, he was a very happy kind of kid, and Roger had two of his, his two little young boys there and $I$ recall seeing David with the young boys, just, like, baby boys, you know, Darcy and Keith were very young, and David was so pleased to see these two little boys, you know, and he was just a kid himself. Like I say, we had so many, many of them started very
young canvassing in those years, and he just seemed like a very normal kid, happy to be back at his job. That was that.

He was -- unlike things I had
read about him about being around girls, he was just a super kid around the girls, he was very, very nice and polite when $I$ was there and $I$ never saw David to be anything other than a very typical -- I have a 16-year-old myself, came a little late in our life, our third child, but he's 16 and really my 16 -year-old is not much different than Mrs. Milgaard's 16-year-old.

Q Mr. Shannon, you speak of being in Edmonton. Do you recall being in Prince George in May of 1969 ? Yeah. That was --

And can you tell me what you recall about May 30 th of 1969?

A
When he was arrested, yes. Well, we got a telegram, of course we always got a telegram to move the team wherever Maclean's wanted the demographics, they would move these marketing teams, and dispatched us to, I think the itinerary was Prince George -- Kelowna, or Kamloops rather, those two cities, and we left for there. We weren't there very long, $I$ think only a few days
when we had arrived and I got a call from fred Brown really early in the morning, I think it was around six o'clock, 6:30 in the morning, and Torchy Schell, Sergeant Torchy Schell was on the phone with him. Torchy Schell was a fellow that we had all come to know, or at least $I$ had, he was an RCMP officer, but he was also kind of a scout for the Leafs back in those days, and in those years we travelled throughout the province and we would always run into Torchy, you know, he would be at the Estevan games or the Weyburn game or something like that, so $I$ knew him reasonably well, and of course he would kid with me often about the direct sales kids and the problems that he would perceive that they were and that sort of thing, but he was a very nice man, and he called me, along with Fred Brown, and told me that -- he asked me first if $I$ had David Milgaard with me and I assured him I did.

He told me that he had to know where I was staying. I told him where we were staying, about seven miles out of Prince George, north on highway 97 and the name of the motel, and he said, 'look, Howard,' he said, 'we've got a warrant for murder for this David Milgaard.' I
said -- gee, I don't know what I said to him, something like 'you've got to be kidding' or something like that, 'the kid couldn't kill nobody,' you know, nothing like what he was accused of, and him and Fred talked with me about it. He said he would like to send the police out. I told him not to do something like that, I said Roger's children are here, we had a whole pile of the young girls here, $I$ said that would be just a terrible thing to do, I said 'I'll just go wake him up and take him in,' and he said no, he said, you know, it's murder and on and on and that sort of thing and $I$ said, you know, 'Torchy, you guys have just got this one really wrong, it's just a kid here, it's nothing like you think,' so he agreed, he said, 'well, you know, $I$ can't stop you,' sort of thing, something to that effect, he was actually kind of agreeable, and Mr. Brown certainly was.

So I think $I$ woke Roger Renaud up and told Roger what the circumstances were and I believe that Roger went and talked to him. I know I got showered and got cleaned up and Dave got cleaned up and just everything was quite normal. I went and saw the motel owner because he
had been peaking through the window, I presumed he had been listening to the telephone call, and I recall talking to Roger about getting David's young brother sent home right away on a bus, also I talked with him about taking over the sales staff, where to send people, that kind of thing.

David joined me, I told David what the circumstances were. I don't think he had any -- I don't think the idea of a warrant really sunk in, what that meant to David. I understood they were going to arrest him, a warrant being a warrant.
$Q$
You specifically told him that there was a warrant out for his arrest?

A
Yeah, I told him about the whole phone call, I told him everything, and Mr. Brown had called and explained everything to him, including what Sergeant Schell told me, so David said -- and I told Dave, I said "Dave, the best thing is to go in there and get it cleaned up and, you know, it's obviously a mistake, and deal with this". David wasn't too friendly about me, you have to remember, because $I$-- he looked at me as a 16-year-old, I was the fellow who kind of let him go, you know, causing his mum to have to, you
know, or his mum was quite ticked about it and made sure that the young guy got his job back, you know. So going into town, $I$ mean the only thing $I$ do remember about going into town is his attitude, he had a very -- he was a really nice kid, he wasn't -- he had a little bit of a chip, you know, trying to be around the other boys, but when he was with me he was a very, very nice kid, and he said "Mr. Shannon, I didn't do this", you know, that kind of talk, you know, and I said -- I told him $I$ didn't believe he did either.

We got to the police station, and it wasn't a very good situation then, they -we, Dave and $I$ went in there and $I$ explained to them who David -- David had come in to surrender and to deal with this warrant for murder, and the fellow asked -- talked to David a little bit, and then $I$ told him about the phone call, and he went away and came back and he said "no", he said, "we don't have anything like that here". So David kind of got upset at me then, he says "well what in the, you know, heck are you doin'", you know, and he was really put off at me, and he was going out the door. I said "David, just a minute", you know, $I$ said to the guy, $I$ said, "you go and call
this Sergeant Torchy Schell". What took place then was unreal. David was standing off to one side, kind of put off with me, and $I$ was standing on the other side, and the police came running around, several of them, about six of them at least, and jumped right over top of the counter, great big, huge police, pounced on David and myself, and they brought out leg irons and put them around his legs up here above his knees and down below on his ankles, or big, huge, giant handcuffs type of thing, and he was just a little guy, 16. So, I mean, you to have picture this, you know, it was -- and of course the big fellow who was over me, he was -- he didn't hit me but he was sure prepared to, I'll tell you.

Yeah.

A We -- they took him away and told me to leave, and basically that was it. And David was mad and uttering stupid stuff and, you know, and -- but you could see the kid was just totally terrified. Yeah. So you, I take it then, returned to the motel in Prince George?

A
Yes, I did.
And was your understanding that David was being taken back to Saskatoon?

A
$Q$

I didn't know what was happening at that point. I just assumed that. I tried to reach Mr. Brown all that morning and didn't have any success at all. All right. That, $I$ take it, would have been the last time that you saw David Milgaard?

I saw, the last time $I$ ever saw him, I saw him one more time after that in my life.

All right. Umm --
But that was the last $I$ saw him that day. Right.

That day, what did happen that day was the radio station was, it was such a big thing on the radio, every 15,30 minutes they would come out with how he was captured up there, this went on for hours and hours, and in those days Prince George wasn't a very big place, you know. But I, finally I phoned the radio station and told them that he had not been captured, he had come in and surrendered, and about an hour later these two big policemen came out, they were native policemen, great big fellows, one of them that had kind of lumbered over me, and told me to get this bunch of rabble the heck out of this community, and "do it now", kind of thing. So we packed, I packed everyone up that evening and re-organized everything, I had
gotten hold of Mr. Brown and he was really upset about that, and we had re-organized all these young people and got out of there.

All right. After 1969, do you recall what your next involvement in this matter was?

Yeah. It was just a coincidence of -- in all the world. My girlfriend, became my wife, that we were coming in from Thunder Bay, I had been transferred to Toronto shortly after that, and I was working out of our Maclean's head office, and --

What time was this, or what year, do you have a recollection?

This was about the early '70s, the very early '70s, the first time I think I met Mrs. Milgaard then. It was just a coincidence in a million. We came in to see one of my supervisors in Winnipeg that was living at a thing called the South Winds Apartment Block, and it was on the Pembina Highway, and we came in, it was late at night, we were really tired, we had driven a long way, and stopped in to see Barry LaForge, and he was with Mrs. Milgaard in the hallway. And Mrs. Milgaard confronted me, I had never met Mrs. Milgaard in my life, but she was -- she was very distraught, she
was very upset at me, that -- telling me that she, that her son was innocent and all that sort of thing. And of course Roger Renaud had gone to all of these trials because he was -- he knew. He knew, you know, he really was involved there, but I hadn't. I didn't know anything after, I had never seen David again and $I$ had never been to any trials or nothin' like that, and $I$ had certainly never knew Mrs. Milgaard, but here this little lady was in the hallway, and it turned into a terrible situation, she was crying and her -- I believe she told me then, or possibly the next time, that her husband had left her up in Northern Saskatchewan, some town, Langenburg, she had no money, and her son was sentenced to life in prison under something, and it was -- it was terrible. We went into Barry LaForge's apartment, this went on for a long time, she was -- she -- it was the most pitiful thing you had ever seen, my girlfriend was crying, we were all, we were so upset.
$Q$
At that time did Mrs. Milgaard request assistance from you?

A
She did. She had nothing. I think we gave -- my wife says we gave her $\$ 500$ so -- I recall giving
her some money $I$ think to help at that time, but it was a personal thing, like nothing to do with David, it was a personal thing. I never saw Mrs. Milgaard again until some years later she contacted me again, and this time it was more to -- a sensible, a much more sensible of a conversation, but she needed help to try to get a lawyer and to try to do some things to try to constructively help.

And do you recall when that meeting -That would have been in about, $I$ would think, '77, '70 -- '77-'78, somewhere right in there. And I did help Mrs. Milgaard then, and I thought that was the end of it, I didn't think there was any more to it. I never saw David or anything after that, I always -- my wife and I just often thought of this young guy.

Right. If we could call up doc. ID 155237.
On the screen?
Yeah.
Oh, I'm sorry, okay.
Mr. Shannon, your name appears at the top of this document with the date of February 3rd, 1981?

A That's better. Okay. 1981?

Yes.

A Okay.

Q

A
$Q$
A
Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
A
conversation but, having looked at all the things, it's exactly what $I$ would have said, you know. I, he says $I$ took him down there, but as far as $I$ was concerned it was strictly voluntary. It certainly was. He didn't -- he wasn't captured, for goodness sakes, he -- I told him what was happening and he came in and voluntarily surrendered, that was the end of the situation. So this document accurately reflects the conversation that you would have had --

A
$Q$

A the page reads:
"Do you remember anything that David said at the time, in Prince

George?"
"No, just that he said that he didn't do
it and that was all there was to it.
And, you know, he insisted on it."
And the next page, 155240 .
A Uh-huh.

This appears to be you speaking, you say:
"Yeah, and, uh, when $I$ told him that
this time it was a warrant for his
arrest, he just said to me 'Mr. Shannon,
I'm just innocent; $I$ just didn't do
that.' you know. And that was basically his attitude."

A If $I$ could take you further down the page. Uh-huh.
"Do you recall anything about that time in Saskatoon? (discusses rapes)", And I believe that's Peter speaking, and your answer:
"Yeah, there was a couple of very
similar, prior to this thing, , 2 of them
I believe. It was during those years
(60s). In Saskatoon there was a great
deal of hysteria about it, there really was. And $I$ don't know, $I$ remember that police that questioned him in Saskatoon, they -- it was a pretty tough old seasoned cop. you know, and he said to me something to the effect that 'this kid is so cool', you know. (can't recall his name). I just remember he was a pretty callous old guy and he said to me 'This kid is so cool'. But somehow or other, I remember thinking at the same time that he had the kid figured wrong, that the kid was cool alright, but it wasn't because the kid was 'smart' or was sneaky or anything, or outwitting him -- It was just a case of plain naive. If you understand what I mean. They felt the kid was something other than what he was."

And --
That's just the way it was.
Q -- I just want to ask you, here, you mention being aware of prior rapes; can you tell me --

A
Well Mr. Brown, you know, Fred Brown, you know, our -- the Regional Manager from Mclean's, he
would keep us aware of anything of significance because we had young girls canvassing in the province and throughout western Canada, so any kinds of incidents to do with direct sales, licensing, problems, issues, Fred would make me aware of these various things regardless of if $I$ would be say Edmonton, Calgary, wherever $I$ would be he would send us out pretty comprehensive information, as he had it, to make us aware. At that time did you have any understanding of why you were being asked of your knowledge of these prior rapes?

You know, $I$ don't -- I don't recall that. Just the -- you know, we were made aware by Maclean's of situations because we had a lot of young people canvassing, and so it was important that we knew, you know, whatever was an issue such as something like that.

All right. If $I$ could -- if we could bring up doc. ID 332564.

A
Q
Okay.
Mr. Shannon, this appears to be a note of a telephone conversation between yourself and Mr. Merchant, $I$ believe Mr. Merchant has identified it as such, and it's dated April 28th, --

A
Q

Uh-huh.
-- the year isn't on it but the document is from 1981; do you recall contacting Tony Merchant at this time?

Yeah.
And for what purpose?
What happened was that in my discussion with this Peter Carlyle-Gordge, he seems to have deleted out
a good portion of this transcript that he has, telephone conversation or the -- or even the meetings that he taped. We discussed helping David and Mrs. Milgaard and how to go about doing it was, you know, in my opinion the -Mrs. Milgaard had kind of used the money as wisely as I'm sure she felt she should use it with a lawyer, $I$ 'm not sure the chap's name, but $I$ felt that they should have used -- that maybe, if we were going to continue to try to help her, I asked you to -- Peter to contribute money and that I would go half if he would go half sort of thing, you know, $I$ was certainly prepared to help out a bit, and that portion, $I$ haven't been able to find that, he deleted it or whatever, but he told me he did not want to contribute financially, he wasn't in any position to do that. I told him -- and,
ironically, Roger Renaud had just come back a short time before that and Roger and I had talked about that they needed to get somebody like a Tony Merchant. And the reason $I$ had suggested Tony Merchant, he had been Maclean's lawyer for many years and he was a great young fellow and a really smart young, you know -- in my opinion he had -one of the very bright guys, and I explained that to Peter, that this man really was a very good person and possibly the best that they could get because he had some great connections, and $I$ told him I'd have to speak to Mr. Brown. I wasn't working for Fred at that time, or Fred had retired, I should say, and I had started my own company in 176 , so $I$ told him that $I$ would speak to Mr. Brown to see if $I$ could -- if it was all right for me to speak to Tony Merchant. So I did, and Mr. Brown was a bit put off that $I$ had gotten myself involved in all this again, but he did agree that $T o n y$ Merchant would be the best person for me to see, and that's why $I$ went ahead and pursued it and contacted him. And in terms of the deposit, it was just exactly what it was, a deposit. Umm, it --
$Q$ Well --

A

Q

A
$Q$
A

Q

A
$Q$

We -- I explained to him everything, I told him about this Peter trying to help, Mrs. Milgaard's attempts to try to do what she could, and he agreed to do what he could do, and we had a, about a seven-year relationship after that, you know, there was --

Was the idea for Mr. Merchant to assist in any way possible or were there -- was there a specific objective in terms of --

Well, to assist in any way possible really was, from my perspective, you know, --

All right.
-- to try to get this young guy out of there, you know.

All right. If we could bring up doc. ID 332575. Mr. Shannon, this is a letter dated June 4th, 1982 to you from Tony Merchant.

Can you blow it up for me?
Just reading from the first paragraph:
"There are, as you know, a number of curiosities about the Milgaard case. We have not, however, been able to establish any sort of breakthrough."

And down at the bottom of that page:
"I am continuing to work under the
direction of Mrs. Milgaard."
Is it fair to say that you weren't instructing Mr. Merchant?

A lots of, you know, telephone conversations. He, as the years went by he had -- he became, I think, quite frustrated with Mrs. Milgaard, he -- he alluded that to me, like you know, he alluded that to me. He was having a very difficult time, I think, in trying to assist because of some perhaps personality conflict or something, I really never understood what it was all about, but $I$ could tell that Tony was very, very upset from time to time, you know, with his efforts to try to help and get this matter dealt with, you know.
No, I wasn't instructing Mr. Merchant at all, I totally left it to him. And he had, he was working with Mrs. Milgaard and with this chap Peter from -- the writer, and really that was basically the way it was going, although Tony and I talked a fair amount, he kept me abreast of what was happening, that's for sure.

Through reporting letters?
Umm, not just letters, lots of telephone calls, Okay.

That was the way $I$ heard it.

Q
If we could bring up doc. ID 012907. Mr. Shannon, I believe this is a copy of a letter which you wrote, it's dated April $20 t h$ of 1983, and it appears by this letter you are making an offer of employment to Mr. Milgaard; do you recall writing this letter?

Yeah. (Witness reading) Yeah, what happened was in the early, like as $I$ mentioned earlier, about '79 Renaud came back to work, he was bilingual and he approached me to do a contract with us and he wanted to work in Quebec and that worked out. He, he was very much in touch with David Milgaard and saw him a lot, he would travel up to the penitentiaries to visit him and that sort of thing. One particular time $I$ was in Kingston with Bob Clark, one of our supervisors that came from Kingston area, and Roger asked me to go along with him to -- if I'd like to, and $I$ told him sure I'd come over, so $I$ went over and visited with David. It was a quite an experience, and Roger seemed to have a great rapport with him, and $I$ was just quite shocked about some things, you know. But in terms of this letter, he had gotten shot or something like that, trying to break out or something. It was the idea that to try to get him
a parole, like you know, to try to get him out, you know, he had served so many years.
$Q$

A

Q
A Uh-huh.

And it was the only time $I$ ever saw David Milgaard from the time when the police had arrested him, and $I$ don't know if many of you have been to a penitentiary, $I$ hadn't, and it was really quite a sight, quite a thing.

Uh-huh.
He was absolutely a young man growing up in a -the wrong place, and it was quite a situation, I felt really compelled to try to get him out. And in addition to this letter, there was another call from Tony regarding this sort of thing, where he had been involved in drugs in the penitentiary for some period of time and wasn't even able to speak, I think, with Mr. Merchant, you know.

Perhaps I could refer you to a document. If we could bring up document 217537, --Uh-huh.
-- Mr. Shannon, this is a copy of a letter dated October 25th, 1983 addressed to you, it's from Mr. Merchant.

Okay.
Perhaps I'm mistaken, I believe the doc. ID that I
am looking at is 219537. Thank you. Mr. Merchant writes:
"I am sending a copy of this letter to Mrs. Milgaard. She probably already knows about the difficulties which arose on approximately October 11.

By the 11th of October David
was noted by the staff to be
uncommunicative and essentially somewhat
'spaced out'. This situation had apparently existed for some time before that date but the problem was sufficiently serious that by October 11 he was told to stay in his cell for the day. Drugs are quite common in the institution and it was thought that he might simply have been on some kind of drugs or having problems as a result of involvement with drugs.

By Thursday it was apparent
that he was not having a drug problem but that there was a mental breakdown of some sort and on October 14 he was transferred to a psychiatric centre. He is now under medication."

A
Q Merchant writes:
"The incident will set back David's release by a very considerable period of time. That remains to be seen and $I$ quite frankly intend to wait a month or so before even contacting Mr. Steinburg once again."

Yeah. Well, $I$ took a bit of a dim view about that, I didn't -- I wasn't too pleased about it. However, you know, my wife had a different point of view, and my wife and $I$ talked about this, and at that time -- and she felt that if we didn't get him out of there, that he might commit suicide, and that kind of -- Linda and $I$, by that time, had been -- made quite a commitment that we were going to do what we could.

In addition, Roger Renaud had contributed some monies to help us with some of the costs, which really was pretty darn good because he was a single dad with two little kids out there in Quebec, and so Roger did what he could to help, which was excellent, really, and he was a person who genuinely believed in this kid.

Q
A

Q
A
$Q$

A

Q
A

Uh-huh.
Roger was a fellow who was a street-smart sort of young guy, to tell you the truth he's the type of fellow that could read somebody at 100 paces with his eyes closed, I've never met a guy like Roger Renaud. But he was very much in favour of trying to help this young guy, $I$ can tell you, -If --
-- and this was the period of time when Roger was -- really came up to the plate, you know. If we can bring up doc. ID 216123. Mr. Shannon, this again is another letter addressed to you from Mr. Merchant dated February 27th, 1984, and at this time he is writing:
"I don't know whether you want to
reconsider financing David's situation."
At some point had you made a decision --
Well I think that probably was part and parcel of my dim view.

Right.
You see, I talked with Tony about it and explained to him, you know, how $I$ kind of felt about that, they all knew how $I$ felt about that, but $I$ also understood from -- you know, I had taken into account the fact that he could have committed
suicide, you know, --

Q

A
$Q$
A
Q

A
Q

A

Q
A
Q

A

Q
A

Tony had done so much work, like I paid for a considerable amount of work, of course, and it would -- and it may appear like it was a good deal of money, and I suppose it was at the time, but he
had done -- and I stress this -- yeoman's work. He did five times the monies that he ever billed me for. He, Mr. Merchant was unbelievably committed to this, he -- the more he got into it the more he was determined to see it through, and he was very, very disappointed in the end with his relationship -- and $I$ hate to say this -- but with Mrs. Milgaard. He was just frustrated, and I felt that, and I guess I should just come out and say it, he was -- he had reached practically the end of his rope, $I$ think, with it all, you know. I didn't really -- I just left it up to him, I told him that -- I don't recall the discussion on whether to continue or not to continue, but $I$ do recall leaving it basically up to Mr. Merchant. All right.

You know, we left it open, $I$ mean $I$ think if he would have come back to me and said there was hope I'm quite sure -- by that time, you know, I was doing quite well with my -- my business had grown considerably and we had -- you know, there were times during this period that $I$ would like to say that $I$-- there was, you know, we had our oldest son born, my youngest daughter born, there was some tough times with all this stuff, but we
managed reasonably well, and were able to see our commitment through. And $I$ was inspired by two people, Roger Renaud's commitment, Roger being a different sort of chap, but Mr. Merchant's commitment was tremendous.

If $I$ could just refer to a page of Mr. Merchant's testimony from last week, it's page 20475 .

I haven't seen anything, I haven't read any of Mr.
Merchant's --

No, I just, I have one quick question for you,
Mr. Shannon.

All right.
Mr. Merchant mentioned, at the middle of the page here, he states:
"... and I asked him how he knew him, what the relationship was, and David had worked for him when David was illegally at large in Toronto."

There, Mr. Merchant is speaking of how you came
to know David; is this correct?

A
$Q$
Yes. You didn't have any association with
Mr. Milgaard in 1980 during his escape?
No, no, heavens no.
All right.

Nothing like that at all.
If we could bring up doc ID 269317, Mr. Shannon, this is a copy of a book written by Mrs. Milgaard called "A Mother's Story, The Fight To Free My Son David," and if I could just refer you to a passage in the book starting at page 269423, Mrs. Milgaard writes:
"Our detective work took a bizarre twist when a businessman who had worked with David at Maclean Hunter offered to pay our legal bills. The only condition was that we had to drop our lawyer, Gary Young, and higher high-profile Regina lawyer Tony Merchant. The reasoning, we were told, was that Tony Merchant, the son-in-law of federal Liberal cabinet minister Otto Lang, brought with him much-needed political connections. We were very happy with Gary Young, but the offer seemed generous and the money was badly needed. Besides, perhaps a political insider might pull some strings and there was clearly a political dimension to David's predicament. It wasn't until a few
years later that we learned that the businessman, whom we considered so generous, had actually applied to collect reward money for urging David to turn himself in to the police back in 1969. Was he now suddenly feeling guilty? Or was he trying to trick us?" Were you aware of this passage in Mrs. Milgaard's book prior to today?

Yes. A few years ago $I$ was at a health club and $I$ picked up her autobiography, or what I thought was her autobiography, and $I$ thought $I$ would read it because $I$ never heard from Mrs. Milgaard after. There was an occasion where Mrs. Milgaard approached me while she was working with Mr. Merchant to ask for some special assistance to deal with a private investigator $I$ believe and she wanted to go to Vancouver to, and required monies to do that, and it was a considerable amount of money because it was a very, very important thing to her to investigate this young lady, I don't know the name. I had never heard from Mrs. Milgaard after that meeting, I had actually never saw her again until today.

Now, this, I picked up this book
and $I$ can tell you that in the first book, there was another book written where Mrs. Milgaard referred to me as an angel and I thought that was very, very nice. However, she wasn't supposed to tell a soul that $I$ was doing this and funding this situation.

You had asked that your name not be disclosed? Yes, that's right, and in terms of their remarks about the political dimensions and all this and Mr. Merchant, $I$ never saw him as a high profile fellow at all, $I$ saw him as a very smart young lawyer working for Maclean's that $I$ felt would be in the best position to help Mrs. Milgaard, and I talked with, as I said earlier, with Mr. Brown to make sure he felt the same way and that it was all right with him that $I$ approached Maclean's lawyer, so that part of it. Now, in terms of this other business of this reward, that devastated me, it devastated me.

You had never applied at any time for the reward? Never ever, ever -- I don't even know if I knew there was a reward. In fact, when you told me it three days ago, you said to me the police had a reward for $\$ 2,000$ and the police were the ones who called me to see if David was working and David
voluntarily went in and surrendered, so I could not imagine how they would want to reward me for that. I never applied for nothing. I knew nothing and applied for absolutely nothing, and this morning Mrs. Milgaard apologized to me for that and I gratefully accept her apology. I must say that at the time it devastated me and my family. I was shocked. I'm very appreciative that Mrs. Milgaard acknowledged this. I don't know where she is here, but $I$ thank you again, Ms. Milgaard, I appreciate your apology very, very much. I want my children to know $I$ would never be that kind of man.

I have no further questions for you, Mr. Shannon. There may be others who do.

A Thank you. That's fine.
BY MS. MCLEAN:
Good morning, Mr. Shannon. My name is Joanne McLean, which $I$ think gets me a job at Maclean's. I am Mrs. Milgaard's lawyer.

Okay.
Q
I was actually going to start off by repeating on the record her apology to you, but $I$ want to explore a little bit about just how that kind of thing happens.

A
Q

I think so. I think my memory could be a bit off on it as well.

And David was in fact, as we'll hear evidence later, he was in fact shot while unlawfully at
large, he had been out for several months and he was in fact shot in the back later.

A
$Q$
A
Q

Q

She sought out her own legal fellow and did her own thing. She -- when Peter came to see me, that's when $I$ learned that Mrs. Milgaard had reached sort of dead-end streets again and Peter explained that to me.

Right. So when Mr. Merchant got involved, one of the first things he did, or one of the things he did in the early days was try and find out who got the reward that was offered for the arrest and conviction of David Milgaard. Could we look at 106849, please. This is a letter that Mr.

Merchant wrote to the Saskatoon Police Services board in -- I'm sorry, it's the Saskatoon Police Commission at that time.

A

Q

Uh-huh.
Document 106852 , please, and about two months later he gets a response from the chief of police on September the 14 th indicating that he had canvassed it with the Saskatoon Board of Police Commissioners and they've:
"... 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 that's in 1981.

A
Q

And this is an application, it says in the first line:
"I would like to apply for the $\$ 2000$ reward offered for information leading to the arrest of David Milgaard --"

And then he goes on to say:
"David Milgaard came to my home on May 29th, 1969, presumably selling magazine subscriptions. My wife and I signed for a subscription to Maclean's while he was in our house, but as parts of his sales pitch and background story sounded
ambiguous we phoned the police immediately after he departed." He goes on to say that he had some contact with the police and then:
"The following day we heard on the news of Milgaard's arrest and subsequently contacted the local RCMP who advised us to contact you directly regarding a reward, as this was out of their jurisdiction.

I have enclosed a copy of Maclean Reader Service receipt and order which are both signed by Milgaard." And that is in fact his application for the reward. You will be happy to know he did not receive it.

A

Q

A $Q$

Yeah. Well, it's a stretch, but -You know, some of her sources bore very ripe and accurate fruit and some of it was not.

A I'm certain. My heart absolutely goes out to Mrs. Milgaard and her son. I was hurt by what was said, but $I$ never ever -- as parents of our own children, we can't even imagine what Mrs. Milgaard has been through.

Thank you. And again, on behalf of Mrs. Milgaard, her apologies, on behalf of the entire Milgaard family thank you so much for what you did. You're welcome. I was pleased to do it.

MR. HARDY: There's no re-examination, Mr. Commissioner, and perhaps we could take the morning break now. Our next witness is Dr. McDonald. I don't see him here yet, but we will hopefully find him on the break.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks, Mr. Shannon, for coming here.

You are very welcome, sir. (Adjourned at 10:02 a.m.) (Reconvened at 10:20 a.m.)

MR. HARDY: Our next witness is Dr.
McDonald.
IAN MCLAREN MCDONALD, sworn:
MR. HARDY: Mr. Commissioner, Dr. McDonald is here with his legal counsel Anne Wallace.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, Ms. Wallace.

MS. WALLACE: Good morning.
BY MR. HARDY:
$Q$

A

Q
A
Q

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q
A

Good morning, Dr. McDonald, thank you for
attending today to give testimony. I understand
you currently reside in Saskatoon?
I do.
And how old are you, sir?
77.

And am $I$ correct that you've worked throughout
your career as a psychiatrist?
Yes.
And have you been employed as well throughout that
time period at the University of Saskatchewan?
Yes, until 1995.
Okay. And did your positions at the University of
Saskatchewan include head of psychiatry?
Yes.
And that was for a period of time from 1971 until 1983?

Yes.
And am $I$ correct that you were the dean of medicine as well?

Yes.
And that was from 1983 until 1993?
Right.

And I take it throughout your career then during your time with the university that you have practiced clinical psychiatry?

Right.
And would you have been practicing clinical psychiatry then in 1969?

Yes.
And would your work in 1969 also include forensic psychiatry?

A

Q

A
Well, $I$ finished my training at the University of Colorado, at Denver, Colorado, and part of my instruction there was in forensic psychiatry under Dr. John MacDonald who was an
internationally-known forensic psychiatrist, so when I left Colorado and came to Saskatoon, word got around that $I$ had had that experience, and really there wasn't much work in this area, so this wasn't a full-time task for me, it was kind of a fringe activity, and $I$ was involved in a few capital cases.

And perhaps tell us the circumstances that would
call for that sort of work and what you might engage in on those occasions?

A
Well, usually the issues were fitness to stand trial and responsibility, whether there's any issue of sanity or insanity, there would be those two issues in capital cases.

So in large part this related then to assessments of accused individuals?

A
Q
And was your work in that respect performed on behalf of the Crown in most instances or also for the defence?

A
$Q$
A
It wasn't -- it was whoever called me.
So for both?
Yes.
And how often would you be called upon to conduct those sorts of assessments?

Not very often. Saskatoon was a rather quiet, small city and relatively peaceful. There were a few capital cases $I$ could count on my fingers of one hand $I$ think.

Q And perhaps you've touched on this already, but I'll ask the question, can you give us an idea, a general idea of the role that psychiatry had to play in the criminal process in 1970 from your
recollection?
A
Well, in Saskatchewan the tradition was that psychiatry was involved in capital cases right from the outset under the leadership of Dr. McKerracher who was the first professor of psychiatry and Dr. Sam Watson who was in charge of psychiatric services in Saskatchewan, they were both committed to diverting mentally ill people from the criminal justice system, and this would be being there first on the scene to see whether the person was obviously psychotic or mentally retarded to the point where they would not be able to understand the nature of the proceedings, and also called upon by either side to give evidence on the question of whether the person was insane, legally insane at the time of the offence, but primarily the first is to divert people who shouldn't be in the criminal justice system. And, Dr. McDonald, I understand that you had some direct involvement with the David Milgaard case in 1969 ?

A
$Q$
And can you tell us what your recollection is in that respect of your earliest involvement?

Now, I have to preface my remarks, that was 36
years ago and an awful lot has happened in my professional life since then, so $I$ don't remember great details. What $I$ do remember was my office got a call either from the Crown prosecutor or his office that Mr. Milgaard had been apprehended, was being brought to the police station, and they were requesting an early assessment of him by myself.

And do you recall having a direct conversation with any particular individual in this respect,
and when $I$ say that, $I$ mean in terms of receiving the request to see Mr. Milgaard, do you recall speaking with Mr. Caldwell directly?

That initial interview was to get an idea of whether he was fit to stand trial.

And where did that interview take place? It was in the police station.

And do you recall who was present?
Just Mr. Milgaard and myself.
I'm going to show you a document for some context. If we could bring up document 006764 , please, and, Dr. McDonald, this appears to be an internal memo of the Saskatoon Police Service, it's directed from a Detective Hanson to Chief of Police James Kettles regarding prisoner David Milgaard. You'll see at the outset of the paragraph:
"On June 2, 1969, Dr. MacDonald examined alone person from 8:10 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. in prisoner interview room."

And would that generally fit with your recollection, the date being June $2 n d$, and it appears the time of the interview being in the evening of that date?

A

Q

A
Well, $I$ wasn't sure of the date or the time, but $I$ will accept that.

And can you tell us a little more about that interview? What do you recall?

Well, first of all, it was suggested to me that the police would like to be present during the interview and the reason expressed, as $I$ recall, was their concern about Mr. Milgaard being an escape risk and $I$ told him that $I$ didn't usually
have policemen in interviews and they accepted that.

And what about your discussions with Mr. Milgaard during the course of the interview, can you tell us what you recall of those?

Not a great deal. He was co-operative. I didn't think he was guarded, withholding information. I was surprised by the amount of information he was offering to me.

And, for example, do you recall any specific comments made by Mr. Milgaard in the course of the interview?

Well, at that time he had given me enough of his history that $I$ knew that he had had a troubled past. I wasn't concerned about him from a psychiatric standpoint, $I$ didn't think he was violent or a threat. I thought we had a good interview. I was really just trying to see if he was able to function psychologically, his cognition and thinking.

And we saw from the document it would appear that the interview took approximately an hour or an
hour and 20 minutes, and can you give us any more detail in terms of how you would have proceeded through the course of the interview? You've mentioned you would have gathered a history, I take it, from Mr. Milgaard?

Yes, yes.

Can you tell us sort of what you recall of how that interview proceeded?

Quite frankly, no, other than it was interrupted an hour and 20 minutes by the police telling me they had other activities for Mr. Milgaard. For example, do you feel that you were able to get a complete history from Mr. Milgaard in terms of his past?

No, but $I$ got a fair amount of history.

And - -

And I also, before we left, I asked him to sign release of information slips for a number of agencies that he had mentioned during the course of the interview and $I$ recall those being Yorkton Psychiatric Centre, Winnipeg Child Guidance Clinic and $I$ think it was Munroe Wing and the Paul Dojack Centre in Regina.

So your recollection is that Mr. Milgaard specifically mentioned these institutions?

A Yes.

Q
A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
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And in what respect was he mentioning them?
Well, in the course of the interview as to his past history.

And am $I$ taking it from what you are saying that he was advising you that he had attended at these institutions?

Yes.
And you mentioned, did you have Mr. Milgaard sign some documents then relating to that information?

Yes. The standard release of information form which we use at the hospital which designates who the request is going to and for what reason and is signed by Mr. Milgaard and witnessed by myself.

And I take it Mr. Milgaard willingly signed those documents?

Yes, he did.
And how did the interview conclude? I think you mentioned that there was an interruption?

There was a knock on the door. That's how it concluded.

And what happened; do you recall?
The policeman told me they had needed Mr. Milgaard for some other activity.

And I take it then that you were, or you were
intending to spend more time with Mr. Milgaard?
A
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
Q
A

Q
Okay. And I take it you were also able to conclude that he was fit, so to speak, to stand trial?

A
.
Yes, on that evening. Of course you would have to repeat that evaluation immediately before the
trial itself to ensure that his fitness was maintained during that period of time, over that period of time, between the initial interview and the starting of the Court proceedings.

Okay. Did you take notes during this interview? Yes.

And do we have those notes still today?
No, we don't.
They've been destroyed?
They are not -- yes, I guess they were.
Okay. And I take it --
See, the point was he was no longer my patient or a person of interest to me the next day when he informed me that he had been advised by his lawyer not to continue talking to me.

Okay. And $I$ want to ask you questions about that in a moment, but you mentioned earlier that you were able to draw perhaps -- and I'm using my own words, so correct me if I'm wrong -- perhaps a preliminary conclusion that Mr. Milgaard had a behaviour disorder. Did $I$ hear that correctly?

And that was from your discussions with Mr. Milgaard during this interview?

A From the history he presented to me.

And I realize again, and $I$ thank you that you are trying your best to do this, but can you recall any particulars about the information that he was providing to you that allowed you to reach that sort of preliminary conclusion?

Oh, one of the first things he mentioned to me was that he, I think he was asked to leave kindergarten class because of behaviour problems and subsequent to that he had other troubles in the school system. As an adult psychiatrist, that was quite unusual, for me to hear somebody who was requiring professional help at age five or six.

And that's a specific recollection of information that you gathered from Mr. Milgaard?

Yes.
And anything else that you can specifically recall?

A

Q
Well, he told me about being in Yorkton Psychiatric Centre and he mentioned Munroe Wing and I think Dojack Centre it's called in Regina, or was called.

And would his mention of those institutions, without further details, have assisted you in reaching your conclusions somehow that he may be suffering from a behaviour disorder?

A
Oh, yes, yes, the idea that he had trouble so early in life and persisted until he was certainly in Yorkton, not counting the offence that he was going to be charged with.

Okay. And in the context of this interview, and $I$ guess perhaps immediately afterwards, or at that time, did you speak to anyone else with respect to your meeting with Mr. Milgaard, and I'm thinking, and maybe we'll go through a couple of categories, but any investigators, for example, at the police station following your interview?

No.
Do you recall speaking with any family members of Mr. Milgaard's in and around the time of the interview?

No.
And did you report to anyone respecting that first interview?

No. I reported following the aborted second interview.

Okay, and $I$ do want to ask you about that in just a moment. I'm going to show you a couple of documents before we go there. If I can turn first, please, to 006762 , and you'll see again it's another internal memo, Dr. McDonald, a

Saskatoon Police Service memo, and it looks to be from a Detective McCorriston again to the Chief of Police James Kettles, the date being June 2 nd --

A
Q

Can you magnify that?
Yeah, I'm going to take you to the parts I want in just a moment, but the date is again June 2 nd, 1969. If we could look at the first paragraph, you'll note that it indicates from 12:20 p.m. to 12:45 p.m., June 2nd, David Milgaard was visited by his mother Joyce Milgaard, and if we can go down, please, to this paragraph, it indicates: "Mrs. Milgaard stated she did not wish her son to be examined by any doctor or psychiatrist prior to her consultation with a lawyer. She indicated they are of Christian Science faith and these types of medical examinations are against their religious belief."

Now, I believe the time of your interview would have been after this apparent meeting between David and his mother Joyce. At the time of your interview, were you aware of a request from Mrs. Milgaard that she not be seen by a doctor or a psychiatrist?

No, I was not.

And if you were aware of that request, would you have proceeded with your interview?

If I would, I would ask Mr. Milgaard himself. He was 16, he could make up his own mind, whether he wanted to see a doctor or not.

Okay. And perhaps just one more document to give that some clarification, if we could turn to 006765 , again an internal police memo, it looks like Herman Dimmitt is reporting to the chief of police, and if we could move down the page a bit, please, it looks like Mr. Milgaard advised his mother as to the visit that he had had with you on June 2nd. There's no further information relating to that.

Dr. McDonald, turning to the issue of a possible second meeting with Mr. Milgaard, can you tell us your recollection in that regard?

The only thing I remember from that was meeting Mr. Milgaard in an office, $I$ imagine it was the same office, and he was very polite to me and politely informed me that he had been advised by his lawyer Mr. Tallis not to have further discussions with Dr. McDonald.

And how soon after your first meeting with Mr.

Milgaard would that have taken place?

A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q
A
$Q$
?

I think it was the next day.
Okay. And was that the extent then of your meeting with Mr. Milgaard, simply that exchange that you've just mentioned?

Yes.
You didn't have an opportunity otherwise to discuss any further details with Mr. Milgaard or otherwise?

No. I respected his request.
So you did, though, want a second meeting with
him. Was that, I take it then, to complete what you intended to complete during your first meeting?

At least that.
And when you say at least that, what do you mean?
If $I$ was asked to report on the issue of
responsibility for his actions, I would have needed more time to go into details relating to the crime, his knowledge and his mental state at the time of the alleged incident, and that would have taken another two to four hours I would think.

So perhaps even a further meeting after this second meeting?

A Oh, yes.
Q
Okay. And bear with me as $I$ make my way through this, I'm not familiar with psychiatry in this respect, but would part of your task then be in fact to try and make some sort of determination of whether Mr. Milgaard was capable of the crime that he had been accused of?

Not really that. It would -- state of mind at the time of the crime.

So it wouldn't be then inquiries directed towards an opinion sort of on the ultimate question then $I$ take it?

No, it's not fact finding as to whether he did it or did not.

And is it then solely directed towards issues, as you say, of competence, or if perhaps a defence of insanity or something of that nature arose in the course of the trial, would that be what your efforts were directed towards addressing?

A If the defence of insanity had been raised, that certainly would be one reason for going into it.

Q
And --
But frequently prosecutors want answers to both things, fitness to stand trial, and some idea about mental state at the time of the alleged
offence.
So what, in effect, could you say about Mr. Milgaard, then, after your first meeting and then your second brief meeting? What were you in a position to, for example, report to Mr. Caldwell or any other individual about Mr. Milgaard?

Well, at that day he was fit to stand trial, but that was only valid for that day; that there was no overt evidence of any major psychiatric disorder; that there was suggestive evidence of a behavioural disorder, and that would have been it. Okay. And you mentioned those authorization forms that you had Mr. Milgaard sign; what did you do with those forms?

The next morning my secretary mailed them out to the -- these various centres.

And when you say "the next morning" is that following your first interview?

That's right. So I imagine that would have been Tuesday if the interview was on Monday.

And, again, did you provide any sort of report, following your attempted second meeting did you provide any sort of report, do you recall, to Mr. Caldwell?

A
I don't have it on record. My recollection is I
wrote about a two or three-line report stating that the interview sessions had been terminated at the -- Mr. Milgaard's request, and that the only thing I could say based on that, that they -- he was fit to stand trial. Very brief.

Okay. And I realize that I've been dwelling on this for a little bit, but would you have been in a position, for example, to offer a diagnosis of Mr. Milgaard's condition following your meetings with him?

A

Q
Based on that information alone $I$ would have thought yes, I could say that he would -- had a behaviour disorder.

You felt you had gathered enough information for that purpose?

From him, yes.
And what in effect then, perhaps you should tell us, is a behaviour disorder?

Well there are three general types of emotional problems; one is a -- disorders which cause the patient pain or discomfort, and these are the, some of the psychoses and some of the neuroses; other disorders which cause the patient discomfort because of the restrictions imposed by the disorder on the patient, we'll take obsessive
compulsive neurosis; and the third group in which the problems aren't -- don't affect the patient directly but affect others, and we'd call these personality disorders.

Meaning behaviour disorders; is that the third category?

Meaning -- yeah, yes.
And can you give us some examples of, for example, an individual who you consider suffering from a behaviour disorder; what are we looking at with respect to that individual?

Well, when their behaviour interferes with the people around them, whether it's the family or the community.

Can you give us some examples?
Well, antisocial personality is the classic one. But, practically seeing, how are we seeing this manifest itself in the person's day-to-day life? Well it's usually problems with reliability either as an employee, a family member, or a spouse; antisocial behaviour, getting in trouble with authority, either the law or people they relate to; umm, inability to form sustaining relationships over time, lack of responsibility, inability to plan for the future, seemingly no
concern about the implications of their behaviour on their future or the future of others.

And would this, then -- and $I$ realize you can't recall specifics necessarily -- but this was the sort of information that you had gathered from Mr. Milgaard when you had met with him?

Yes.
Okay. You had mentioned providing perhaps, I think you said you recall, perhaps a short written report to Mr. Caldwell, and we haven't seen that document, $I$ 'm not saying it doesn't exist. We do have reference to the examination, if we could look at 066541 , please. You will see it's an invoice directed to Mr. Caldwell regarding Mr. Milgaard, and it says:
"Examination and report",
and from yourself. And $I$ think perhaps we've covered it, but in terms of the report, would it be that short note that you mentioned to us that you may have provided to Mr. Caldwell?

Yes, yes.
So not in terms of a more comprehensive report of any nature?

A
No.
In written form?

Police Department investigation report dated
February 19th, that should be 1969, this is during the course of the investigation into the murder of

Gail Miller. I'm going to read this to you, Dr.
McDonald, it's a report by Lieutenant Penkala, and he states:
"On February 18th, 1969, I contacted
Dr. Ian MacDonald, Department of
Psychiatry, University of Sask.,
regarding this case. The purpose of the consultation was to obtain professional opinion on the type of person who may be capable of this type of crime.

Dr. MacDonald was advised of
the general facts concerning this case and was shown photographes of the scene and the victim.

Dr. MacDonald will submit a written report of his opinions in this case, he did not offer an opinion at the time and preferred to further study the facts."

Do you have any recollection of a discussion with Lieutenant Penkala of this nature, Dr. McDonald?

And it sounds like it perhaps, at least as Lieutenant Penkala is reporting, it may have been a face-to-face meeting. I only say that because it appears that you were shown photographs at the time; but none of what $I$ have just read to you refreshes your memory as to any sort of meeting? Not at all. It would be most unusual for me to engage in this kind of activity. I have no competence --

And I wanted to ---- in this area.

Yeah, I wanted to ask you that next, then. I take it, from what you have just said, this isn't the type of task you would have agreed to perform?

Do you recall, for example, any discussions with the prosecutor, Mr. Caldwell, leading up to either the preliminary hearing or the trial?

A
Well I told him about a document $I$ received from Yorkton Psychiatric Centre and the statement that
appeared in one, one of the recordings of a meeting, and that's the only discussion $I$ had with him.

Can you tell us about that; is this the same meeting you referred to earlier in your testimony, then, when you perhaps came -- ran into Mr. Caldwell?

Yes, yes.
Okay. And tell us about that then; what transpired?

Well in the recording of the meeting one social worker -- excuse me, and $I$ think she was cited by name -- was quoted as making the observation that "if David doesn't get help he's going to kill somebody, period. But that's just a stab in the dark, period."

And that is the comment you recall reading in this report?

A
$Q$

A
Oh, it was among the documents forwarded to me by the Yorkton Psychiatric Centre in response to my written request of, $I$ guess, June the $3 r d$. And the document itself, did you say, I think you
mentioned minutes of a meeting?

A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q

A

Yes, of a -- discussing Mr. Milgaard's case. And do you have any recollection of where in particular, on the face of the document, this comment was?

Between the borders.
Okay. And have you told us everything you can about the context of that comment as best you could gather from the document?

Yes, it was a number of general comments that were recorded by whoever was taking the minutes of the meeting.

Okay. And you advised Mr. Caldwell, then, of this comment?

Yes.
And can you tell us about that?
Well I thought it was an incredible comment. A., it's a -- we're talking about a man who has been charged or suspected of stabbing a woman to death on a, I don't know what, a winter morning when it was dark, around 7:00. I mean it was very sick humour if you looked at it. This $I$ found a shocker, and $I$ showed it to Mr. Caldwell and he shared my reaction, he thought this was bizarre. For what purpose were you showing it to Mr.

Caldwell?

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A

I don't think we even discussed it, I thought we shared our reaction to it. He, as $I$ recall, he was so shocked that anybody would record this as having any other reaction. I did not think it had
Caldwell at the time that you were advising him of the comment?
made any impact on him as a valid assessment of Mr. Milgaard.

Is it, and $I$ realize you cannot speak for Mr. Caldwell, but is it possible that he could have been left with that impression, perhaps not having the expertise that you did with respect to such matters?

I suppose anything is possible.
Okay. And I know that you have had a chance -and we have materials that you have provided to the Commission, Dr. McDonald, in the form of your file as it still exists today, and $I$-- we will talk about that more at a later point in your testimony. I understand, though, you have had a chance to review those materials again for purposes of your testimony, and $I$ take it that that comment isn't contained in your materials as they still exist?

It is not.
Okay. And, again, I'll cover that perhaps in a little bit more detail when $I$ talk about your file. If we could turn, please -- I should first ask you; do you have any other recollection of any other matters discussed with Mr. Caldwell in preparing for the preliminary hearing or the
trial?
A
$Q$

A

No, I think that was the only one, that it -- that impressed me as worthy of passing on to him.

And do you recall Mr. Caldwell reviewing the other documents that you were -- were in your possession at that time?

I have a recollection, $I$ think, that he wanted to see the file, the documents, and it's my
recollection as saying that $I$ would not let them out of my custody, after all they were professional documents and they should be limited circulation from professional to professional, but

I agreed that if he wanted to and came up to my office, that my secretary would let him look at them, and $I$ think that's the extent.

Okay. And --
I have no idea of whether this actually happened but $I$ suspect it did.

Okay. I'm going to turn your attention to document ID 007024. And Dr. McDonald, we've previously identified this document in the course of Mr. Caldwell's testimony, and it is some of Mr. Caldwell's notes in preparation for the preliminary hearing, and it looks to be a to-do list of sorts. And I'm going to direct your
attention to item number 3 -- I'm sorry, I guess I can read it as it is, my apologies. It states, 'McD re John and hysterical amnesia-off/on?'; do you have any recollection of discussing such an issue with Mr. Caldwell?

No, I have no recollection.
And again, in talking about prior to the criminal proceedings in the form of the preliminary hearing and the trial taking place, do you have any recollection of -- at all of talking to Mr. Caldwell about the witness, Nichol John? I can't recall.

And I'll take you to some testimony that Mr.
Caldwell gave in the course of these hearings. If
we could turn, please, to page 16083 of the transcript I'm going to read this to you. Mr. Hodson is examining Mr. Caldwell, as $I$ say this just took place a short time ago in the course of these hearings, Dr. McDonald:
"Q And then if we could go down, number 3, it says 'McD', which I presume is McDonald, 're John and hysterical amnesia off/on'; can you tell us what that means?

A Well I knew a very limited amount
about the three or four different kinds of amnesia from the Hartridge murder trial, and obviously, here, evidently $I$ wanted to ask Dr. McDonald about Nichol John and hysterical amnesia. I think the 'off/on' would refer to the episode in which, having been shown the clothing of Gail Miller, she now recalled something which she didn't moments before, is the -- is my reading of that, sir.

Q ... Nichol John testified on September the 4th, '69 at the preliminary hearing, and I'm not sure, but it appears that these notes may have been prior to that. And so does this, would this note relate to the issue of her remembering the murder when she met with Inspector Roberts, is that what you think that refers to?

A Well, yeah, but not that Dr. McDonald was in any way a witness or involved in that, but whether that would be a sensible explanation of why one minute she couldn't remember and having
been -- shortly thereafter shown the clothes, she purported to remember and described the murder to some extent." And does any of what $I$ have just read to you, Dr. McDonald, refresh your memory as to a possible conversation you had with Mr. Caldwell?

A
Q
A No, it doesn't.

And can you tell us what 'hysterical amnesia' is? Well, it's an amnesia that patients in the hysterical dissociated states have for the living situation which they are, they may forget about being in a fight or forget about some traumatic situation. Umm, it's an amnesia that frequently, if not invariably, recovers over time, as opposed to an organic amnesia which occurs with the head injuries, and maybe most multiple seizures, in which there is no recovery.

And Mr. Caldwell mentions the Hartridge trial and perhaps your prior involvement in that matter; do you recall being involved in that capacity in perhaps a previous trial with Mr. Caldwell where that issue arose?

A
I remember the trial, $I$ don't remember the specific issue, but $I$ think $I$ know what it refers to.

Q

Well that, the name, would be part of the records. I remember Dr. Andrews' name is part of the discharge documentation, it's signed by him, and he is a Clinical Director so he would sign most of these documents for any patient departing. So perhaps -- sorry -- perhaps likely, then, that
you had received pursuant to the authorizations?
you might have advised Mr. Caldwell of Dr. Andrew?

A
$Q$

A
Q

A

Q
you might have advised Mr. Caldwell of Dr. Andrew?
I suppose.
I see.
Doesn't stand out in my mind, memory.
And in terms of the records that you have received, and we have been talking about the Yorkton records, how soon after your request for those records were they received; do you recall? I thought within two to four weeks.

Okay. And again, we'll make reference to some of these materials at a later point in your testimony, we've identified them in the course of the -- these proceedings to some extent. I'm going to direct your attention to some further excerpts from the testimony of Mr. Caldwell. If we could turn, please, to page 16010, this is again with respect to that same entry that we were discussing, I'll read a portion of this to you. It states:
"Q And then I, which $I$ think is -- you tell me if I'm not using the correct full names, but, 'Ian McDonald re Dr. Andrew, Yorkton, and his medical history.'

A That's all correct, sir.
Q And what does that refer to?

A Oh, I assume someone suggested that a Dr. Andrew of Yorkton had a medical history, or some of it, on David Milgaard is the way $I$ take that.

Q Is --

A That would be part of the whole effort of being ready to deal with any defence of drunkenness or insanity in the murder trial if it happened.

Q So would this be you getting Dr. McDonald to get this information Or --

A It would, but $I$ can't see any evidence that anything happened on that. There's no check mark."

And $I$ wanted to ask; is it possible that you had only pursued these records from the Yorkton Psychiatric Centre, or otherwise, after you had been requested to do so by Mr. Caldwell?

A

Q
And you've talked about consent forms, and I'm just hoping you can tell us a little bit about that time period; would it have been possible for Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv about their records was that letter $I$ sent out on June the 3 rd and their response to it.
you, as a medical professional, to request the records that we have been speaking about directly without a signed authorization?

It would not have been ethical --

Okay. And --
-- or legal, according to the College of Physicians and Surgeons, you should get a signed release.

So at that time you required a signed release? Yes.

And that's the manner in which you proceeded in this case?

Yes.

I turn your attention next to document 049715 .
And we've previously identified this document in the course of the hearings, Dr. McDonald, it is a summary prepared for Mr. Caldwell by the Saskatoon Police Service and the case preparation officer in particular, who was Elmer Ullrich at the time. And if we can turn, please, to page 049735 of that document $I$ just note for reference in the middle of the document it states:
"Dr. Andrew ... Psychiatry, Yorkton,
Sask. Has previously examined Milgaard and knows his medical history. No
statement."

And, other than Mr. Caldwell do you recall discussing with anyone else Dr. Andrew, or the existence of Dr. Andrew, and Mr. Milgaard's medical history?

A
Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
Q

No.
You didn't advise the police, then, of Dr. Andrew or Mr. Milgaard's medical history?

I don't think so. I'd have no reason to.
Okay. That wouldn't be something that you would ordinarily have done in that circumstance?

No, not ordinarily, no, not at all.
And it's very possible that the case preparation officer could have gathered that information from Mr. Caldwell himself but $I$ just wanted to ask you that question. And $I$ understand, Dr. McDonald, you did not testify at the preliminary hearing or the trial of David Milgaard?

That's right.
I'm just going to show you a document 006942 , please. This is a list of witnesses, the document originally having been prepared, as I understand the evidence, by, again, the case preparation officer, Elmer Ullrich, and we see notes on the document otherwise, some of which $I$ think have
been identified as Mr. Caldwell's. If we could turn to the next page, please, and we see reference to yourself, 'Dr. Ian McDonald, excused by Mr. Caldwell'; and do you recall why you were excused from testifying?

A

Q
A
Q

A

Q

A

Q
A
And, by that time, $I$ had really disassociated myself from the whole case.

And when you say "by this time", this is just
prior to the preliminary hearing, so we're talking perhaps a month and a half or two months after your meeting with Mr. Milgaard; what do you mean when you say you have dissociated, you had dissociated yourself entirely from the case?

I had done what $I$ had to do, I communicated what I
-- my conclusion, and I didn't feel I had any further part in the proceedings.

Okay. I'm going to refer you to some further notes by Mr. Caldwell. If we could go, please, to document 006929, and these are notes, I believe it has been confirmed, in preparation for trial, and if we could turn, please, to page 006936 , again Mr. Caldwell's notes, number $56--$ or 57 , that one reads:
"McD - can this accused be locked up as psychopath?"

And then in brackets the answer being " (no)." Do you recall any sort of discussion of this nature with Mr. Caldwell?

No, I don't recall that.
And again, it's a to-do list, I'm not sure that we can take anything more from that, other than in brackets it seems that some sort of response has been gathered from somewhere.

A

2

A

Q

This isn't to say it didn't happen, I just don't recall it.

Okay.
Again, it's 36 years ago.
Sure. And let's take a look at Mr. Caldwell's testimony relating to the entry. If we can turn, please, to page 16347 , start mid sentence here, if you can follow along:
"57, 'McD,' who I assume is McDonald, 'conversation this a.m., he locked up as psychopath' ..."

Mr. Caldwell answers:
"A Yeah, that would be Dr. McDonald, and I have 'can this accused be locked up as a psychopath,' and I see the answer no. That was also written by me, but $I$ assume $I$ had, you know, consulted Dr. McDonald.

Q And what would -- what do you mean by locked up as psychopath?

A Well, that would be something in the range of dangerous sexual offenders which $I$ was involved with a couple of those. There were very clear prerequisites when you tried to launch
those things and what $I$ knew of Mr . Milgaard at that point led me to wonder if he could be, if that could happen, and it clearly couldn't." Does any of that refresh your memory as to a possible consultation?

Q
No, it doesn't. Dangerous sexual offender is an entirely different issue.

Okay. But if Mr. Caldwell had asked you the question of whether or not you could offer an opinion on whether Mr. Milgaard was a psychopath at that time, how would you have responded to such an inquiry?

Well, it was my impression that he was a sociopath. Psychopath is, does not have much credence in psychiatric terminology, sociopathy was more accepted at that time, so $I$ would have -my hunch was, based on the evidence that Mr. Milgaard gave me, was that he suffered from a behaviour disorder more, most likely sociopath, than having a psychosis or a significant mental illness.
$Q$
What would have been, at that time, your definition of a psychopath?

A
I can't remember. In '69 we went through a series
of reviews of the nomenclature in psychiatry
starting with the Diagnostic Statistical Manual,
the famous DSM, and $I$ think we were in either DSM
I or DSM II. We're now in DSM IV. In those days a psychopath really ranged from moderate degrees of people who were nuisances within the community because they were unreliable and got into petty thefts to extreme psychopaths who would be the serial killers of today, so that was -- to help you understand this, there's a textbook which I was trying to find on psychiatry and on the chapter headed psychopathy, there's a quotation from somebody who said, "I can't define a hippopotamus, but $I$ know one when $I$ see one," and this is sort of the rule in psychiatry of that day, there is no clear-cut definition.
It was a very broadly used term then at this point
in time? time as to whether Mr. Milgaard was a psychopath,

would you have perhaps then offered your conclusion that he perhaps was a sociopath?

Yes, $I$ would say a sociopath.
Do you recall any sort of discussion of that nature --

No.
-- with Mr. Caldwell?
None at all.
I'm going to ask you a little bit more about those definitions in a moment, but $I$ think that's satisfactory for this portion.

Do you recall having any other
form of involvement in the criminal process
relating to Mr. Milgaard other than what we've discussed?

A
Q

A
Yes. I was not involved in the preliminary or in the trial.

Q
Okay. Do you recall learning of Mr. Milgaard's conviction?

A I don't recall. I'm sure I did.

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

Do you recall having a reaction to that news at all?

None.

Okay. And the next record we have of your involvement in this matter, Dr. McDonald, surrounds certain communications that were passing between yourself, Mr. Caldwell and the National Parole Board during the 1970s. Generally speaking, do you recall your involvement in that regard?

Yes, I do.
Okay. And we'll make our way through some documents that speak to that. I would like to turn first to document 000753 , and you'll see it's a letter -- actually, if we could go to the full document, please. It's a letter from yourself to Mr. Caldwell, the date being June 5th, 1972, I'm going to read portions of this to you, deal with the first paragraph first:
"In recent telephone conversations, you have asked me for a diagnostic label for the above noted. Having reviewed my file, which is based on one interview with this individual, plus reports from Yorkton Psychiatric Center, the Munroe

Wing, Regina and the Child Guidance Clinic of greater Winnipeg, I would conclude that this young man was suffering from a severe behaviour disorder which $I$ would think best be called sociopathic personality. I did not find any evidence of formal psychiatric disorder, e.g.
schizophrenia."
The first part of that paragraph refers to some recent telephone conversations. Do you recall discussions with Mr. Caldwell in and around this time period relating to this matter?

Not in detail. I think in general I understood that he was anxious to get, send a message to the National Parole Board about his concerns about his patient and he was looking for some evidence that would support his recommendation and $I$ think he was leaning on me to give a report on Mr. Milgaard and this is my response. Now, the hidden message in this is if any person, other professionals read this report, $I$ played out the extent of my examination, the basis for arriving at a conclusion, and they may say, well, one interview was not enough, and relying on this external view
is helpful, but is that sufficient. In a sense it's a heads up.

Q
Okay. And $I$ think $I$ want to pursue some of those details with you. Firstly, though, you are referring to your file and reports from a number of the institutions that $I$ 've just read to you. Is it safe to assume that you had records at the time of this letter from each of these institutions?

A

In fairness, $I$ remember Yorkton and the Child Guidance more clearly than Munroe Wing and it may have been that it was later coming in.

And again, would these records have been records that you gathered in close proximity to your original meeting with Mr. Milgaard?

A
They would have been in response to the requests that went out the morning after my interview with Mr. Milgaard.

Okay. And you conclude that this young man was
suffering from a severe behaviour disorder which I would think best be called sociopathic personality?

A

Q

And when you say limited, that's what you've set out previously --

A
$Q$

A
But you would agree with me that you are offering a conclusion in relation to Mr. Milgaard?

A
$Q$
Okay. And is there anything else you can tell us in terms of how you would characterize that conclusion? How were you intending it to be read?

A Well, they had had to evaluate, give weight to it based on what $I$ said were the conditions that led me to conclude that.

Okay. And --

A
You must remember, we see a lot, in the course of our work we see a lot of patients and we arrive at conclusions based on a number of facts which aren't necessarily stated in documents. For instance, you learn about human behaviour, you find clues that recur in certain groups of patients and that helps you, it helps you arrive at conclusions. For instance, a neurologist noting a limp on the right lower limb knows from his experience that's something going on in the left frontal or motor area of the brain. He doesn't need an $x$-ray, he really does need to do a neurological examination based on his experience, that's a safe conclusion to come to in the majority of cases. There will be cases where it's not right, but your diagnosis is really a probability, and so that's what I'm saying, I had seen enough behaviour disorders and the history up until Yorkton was indicative of a problem of behaviour going back to age five.

And the fact that you weren't able to complete the range of meetings that had been planned with Mr. Milgaard did not impact then your ability to offer this conclusion?

A

Q
A
I think the odds are, based on the information he gave me and the information from the other sources, that $I$ could come to that conclusion in '72, rather than in '69 where I did not have these collateral sources of information, so I felt much more comfortable in ' 72 making that diagnosis than in '69.

Would you have been in a better position to make the diagnosis if you had a further opportunity to meet with Mr. Milgaard?

In '69?
Yes.
Not without a collateral source of information.
And, I'm sorry, perhaps I'm not clear. Even at this point, when you are offering the conclusion, would you have been more comfortable with offering the conclusion that you've put forward if you had had the opportunity to meet with Mr. Milgaard and assess him to completion?

I don't think so. I think I got enough from him, but I wanted other information, you know. Like in your operation here, you have to test the credibility of information. You do that by getting collateral sources of information, whether
it's documents or written reports and so on to try to see if this is consistent with the evidence given, and all this re-affirmed my clinical impression.

You were relying, in effect, then, upon the written report?

No, my initial record wasn't on -- in '69 it was on my clinical experience.

Okay, fair enough. So your conclusion based upon that meeting as well as the written record that you had received?

Yes. You mean for the '72?
Yes.
Yes.
Yes. And so do I read it correctly, you mentioned severe behaviour disorder, is that the same thing then as sociopathic personality?

Yes.
And you've described it -- have we covered sociopathic personality then? You had previously described for us indicators of a behaviour disorder. Did those same descriptors then apply for a sociopathic personality?

A
Yes.
And sociopathic personality doesn't carry any more
weight or significance than severe behaviour disorder?

A
Q

And would your conclusion here have been
influenced by the fact that Mr. Milgaard had been convicted by this time of murder?

A
$Q$

A
No.
And what was your understanding, Dr. McDonald, as to how this information was going to be used, in particular your conclusion?

Oh, $I$ knew it was going to the National Parole
Board, but $I$ had worked with the National Parole Board for years, seeing clients at Prince Albert, and $I$ know that they vet these opinions very
carefully, and by laying it out this way, they would see whether this met their standards for acceptable evidence. Usually, in my experience, the National Parole Board asks for a second opinion by another psychiatrist.

And you say laying it out in these circumstances. Have we covered that already, do you mean the qualifier that you put on it in terms of one interview?

Yes.

And the records you've reviewed?
Yes. You see, many of the people seen by the National Parole Board have spent years in the penitentiary service, they've had multiple examinations by psychologists and psychiatrists and prison officials, so there's a wealth of data available for them to make their decisions, whatever. The question is in this case $I$ had very limited contact with Mr. Milgaard and the only other thing that sort of re-affirmed my clinical impression based on that one contact were the supportive data from these other places which laid out the problems that had existed from age five on to 14.

Okay. If we could move down to the second
paragraph of that letter, I'll read this one as well:
"I would think that if the parole authorities are interested in following up this case, that they might be advised to contact Yorkton Psychiatric Center which has a fairly voluminous file on him. Munroe Wing also has some valuable information and of course, the Winnipeg Child Guidance Clinic has reports of evaluations done in November, 1960, when Mr. Milgaard was in primary school. Finally, the Department of Social Welfare provided information with respect to Mr. Milgaard's stay in the Correctional School in Regina, in the spring of 1966 . This might also be useful."

Do you recall whether you had a copy of the fairly voluminous file from Yorkton Psychiatric Centre at the time?

A
I'm not happy with the adjective voluminous, but yes, $I$ did have a copy of the file from Yorkton. And did you have what you understood to be the complete records of the other places mentioned?

No, I don't say the complete records. Whatever they chose to send me.

Yeah, I meant to phrase it with that qualifier, what you understood to be, in effect, the records that related to Mr. Milgaard's stay at these particular institutions?

Yes.
Okay. And do you remember any of the other records in particular? I know we've seen the Yorkton records, or some of them in the course of this hearing. For example, do you remember in particular the Munroe $W$ ing records?

No, I don't remember that.
And what about the Winnipeg Child Guidance Clinic's?

I do remember that.
And what do you remember of those records?
Well, $I$ was surprised that they would send on the record, to cover the page with blue, I was interested because it was on the letterhead of the Winnipeg General where $I$ did a lot of my medical training, so that's why it stood out in my mind, and that's about it.

Why were you surprised to get the records from there?

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Well, I think the one thing was that Mr. Milgaard was reported to have been a behavioural problem in kindergarten, and $I$ think subsequently for other grades, and as $I$ mentioned before, this really struck me as early onset of behavioural problems, and a behaviour disorder really relates to almost a lifetime pattern of behaviour. In sociopathy, one of the criteria, the symptoms must appear by the age of 15 and they certainly did with Mr. Milgaard.

And I had wanted to ask you that. You reminded me
of a previous question $I$ had, whether or not this was a diagnosis that could be applied to a teenager, and $I$ take it from your answer just now that it could be?

A

Q
A
Q
A
$Q$
It could be in those days. Now I think you have to survive to 18 before they will allow this diagnosis.

Why is that, for today's purposes?
Decided by committee.
And do you have any insight into that decision?
None at all. I guess they hope in adolescence
that all people have a chance to change for the better.

I'm going to turn your attention to some
correspondence that followed this letter from yourself, Dr. McDonald, and if we could bring up document 067384 , this is a letter from Mr.

Caldwell dated June 14th, 1972, the chairman of
the National Parole Board, regarding David Edgar Milgaard, Saskatchewan Penitentiary. We've previously reviewed this correspondence in the course of Mr. Caldwell's testimony. I turn your attention in particular to page 067386 , I'll read a portion to you, Dr. McDonald:
"In preparing this case, I had the
privilege of reading Milgaard's entire psychiatric history, which, as it happened, was very well documented since his early youth. He had been in constant trouble since kindergarten days, and the file even contains predictions by social workers who had examined Milgaard, that he would one day kill somebody."

Does that information that Mr. Caldwell is relaying there fit with your recollection of the document that we were discussing, Dr. McDonald?

Yes, except predictions by "a" social worker, as I recall it was a single person.

Singular?
Yes, and $I$ think she was identified by name.
And I think Mr. Caldwell clarified that in some of his testimony, and we'll turn to some of that testimony now in respect of that paragraph $I$ just read, page 17043 , please, starting at the very bottom, this is again Mr. Caldwell being examined in the course of these hearings, Dr. McDonald.
"Q And then you go on to say --"
On the next page we see the paragraph that I've just read to you, and continuing on after that
quoted paragraph:
"Let me just go back to say "in
preparing the case $I$ had the privilege
of reading the entire psychiatric
history"?
A Yes.
Q Where would you have gotten that from?
A Well Dr. McDonald must have collected those so-called chart from those four sources that he mentioned, --

Q Yes.
A -- and $I$ would have read it in his custody, if you will, and there was a comment at the end of one of these reports that he would some day kill someone, by a social worker, that's how that evolved."

And do you recall Mr . Caldwell reading the entire psychiatric history in your custody prior to trial?

I don't recall him reading it in my custody. I think $I$ referred to it before when he -- I think he came up to the office and whether it was in the presence of my secretary or not, the document did not leave the office or the ward.

You would accept his recollection then though that he likely had an opportunity to review your file materials?

A
Q

And why would that be?
Well, I thought it would document -- the statement was unsupported by anything. It was like when you are at a ball game and somebody says kill the ump, you don't lay charges about them, you have to take it in context and see how serious people are, and this was, $I$ thought, an off-the-cuff comment by the social worker, at least that's what I attributed it.

Q Okay. If we could go back to the page in the letter we were referring to, 067386 , there's another short portion here I'll bring to your attention, just one sentence in the midst of that
section. Mr. Caldwell states:
"While $I$ no longer have his psychiatric history available to me, it was an extremely lengthy record of continual trouble with educational institutions, persons attempting to help him, etcetera."

And does that fit with your recollection of the contents of those materials, Dr. McDonald? Well, taken as a whole, it would be fairly lengthy, but in terms of psychiatric records individually, they weren't "fairly lengthy." Sorry --

I don't think the individual reports were extraordinarily long or lengthy, but they were complete.

Okay. And just down at the bottom of the page, I'll read this paragraph to you as well:
"Milgaard was examined for the Crown by Doctor I.M. McDonald, who is now Professor and head of the Department of Psychiatry at University Hospital, Saskatoon, and it is Doctor McDonald's opinion that Milgaard is suffering from a severe behaviour disorder best called
a sociopathic personality. Doctor McDonald points out that if your officers are interested in following up this case, the Yorkton Psychiatric Centre has a fairly voluminous file on Milgaard, with other information being available through Munroe Wing of Regina General Hospital, the Winnipeg Child Guidance Clinic and the Department of Welfare for the Province of Saskatchewan with respect to Milgaard's stay in Regina Correctional School in the spring of 1966."

Now, were you aware that your conclusion, as you offered in your correspondence in 1972, was going to be used by Mr. Caldwell in this fashion?

A

Q
Q

And you were comfortable with the use of that information then in that respect?

I'm not sure $I$ was comfortable, but I agreed to it. the way $I$ did, pointing out it was based on a one hour and 20 minute interview, plus the reports that I had received. Yeah, I knew that was going forward.

A

Q Okay.

A

Q

A
Q

I thought to professionals who were viewing my letter, they would say one hour and then this other documentation, and really what I'm saying by this, you make your own judgment, you get the documents that I looked at and see whether you agree.

And I think we've covered it, I don't think you specifically refer to the interview being one hour in your letter, but you do mention that it was one interview with the individual.

One interview, all right. No.
Okay. I'm going to refer you to some further passages of Mr. Caldwell's testimony at this hearing relating to the comment that we've been discussing by a social worker in one of the documents. If we could turn to page 17622, please, and in particular -- I'm sorry, page 17623 starting here, I'll give you some context to this, Dr. McDonald, that you perhaps won't be aware of. They were discussing a 19 -- or some 1983 notes by Mr. Caldwell where on one of the pages was written in quotes "a stab in the dark" and Mr. Hodson was examining:
"Q And then down at the bottom it says, "A
stab in the dark." Do you know what that refers to?

A Yeah, that's that note by a social worker on the psychiatric file saying I think some day he may kill someone, but that would only be a stab in the dark, that's what that refers to.

Q And do you have a recollection of reading that summary?

A Yes, I did, in the materials $I$ believe that Dr. McDonald had.

Q I see. And when would you have read that then?

A Sometime after he got the so-called chart in from those three or four other institutions, $I$ must have gone up and read it in his office I assume."

And you too then recall that comment having that phrase, "A stab in the dark," Dr. McDonald?

Very much so.
Okay. I'm going to read you another portion at 18313. This is Mr. Wolch, now, examining Mr. Caldwell, again in the course of these hearings. We begin here, it reads:
"Q Okay. And I just want to take you back, then, to 067384 ...",
and that's the letter, Dr. McDonald, we have been referring to from Mr. Caldwell to the parole board?

Yes.
"... and the third page, 86. There's a prediction here he will kill again. Here we are."

And they read that paragraph, again, that $I$ had brought to your attention. And the answer of Mr. Caldwell then follows that quoted paragraph:
"A Mr. Wolch, $I$ can explain that, if you will. There was a report by a social worker of two or three or however many pages. The very last paragraph said, I believe, that some day he will kill somebody, but this is just a stab in the dark, that jumped out at -- and it's not on this file, Mr. Wolch, to the best of my -- and I know that existed. I saw it at the time and the particular terminology was --

Q All $I^{\prime} m$ saying to you, sir, is that if you go through all the reports, and as
you know most reports review previous
reports --
A Yes.
Q -- it's obviously you are always looking at previous reports --

A Yeah.
Q -- and the prison psychiatric file which is three or four feet high --

A Yeah.
Q -- I have never come across anything like that.

A Uh-huh.
Q And don't know where it comes from, that's all I'm saying.

A Mr. Wolch, the one thing I just
mentioned, $I$ have known about all the way through, and it was such an unusual terminology, it ended a report in my memory and, you know, was very striking, and to my eye, Mr. Wolch, it's not in this material."

And, again, $I$ think we've covered it, Dr.
McDonald, but you share Mr. Caldwell's
recollection in that respect?
A I do.

And am $I$ hearing you correctly that it was that aspect that stood out for you as well?

Oh yes.
The 'stab in the dark' portion?
Both.
Okay. I'm going to turn your attention to some further communications relating to the parole authorities and Mr. Caldwell and yourself that followed. These are 1974 matters, and firstly I'll have you look at a document, doc. ID 006837. This is a note of a telephone attendance, you will see your name, 'Ian McD', the date being September 24th, 1974, and I believe this has been confirmed to be in Mr. Caldwell's writing, so it appears to be a message from yourself. And the written portion states, 'Write him with a signed release from M', I take to be McDonald, 'to release all, any info McD might have to release his psychiatric history.' And then the last part, 'if not $P$ board', and I think Mr. Caldwell suggested that might mean parole board, 'might conclude he is not', and again $I$ think Mr. Caldwell suggested the last word was "rehabilitated".

MS. KNOX: The actual note is 'signed release from $\mathrm{M'}^{\prime}$, my client tells me that means
'signed release from Milgaard'.

BY MR. HARDY:
Q
Oh, I'm sorry, if -- I read that wrong. I'm sorry, that probably is obvious.

Did you want me to read that to
you again, Dr. McDonald, or do you have the --
A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A

2

A No.
-- gist of it?
Yes.
And you recall leaving a message of this nature? No.

Okay. And do you recall any ongoing discussions with Mr. Caldwell relating to this issue into the mid-1970s?

I don't recall. I'm sure we talked about it from time to time.

And you'd agreed with me, though, that if indeed this is a message left by you, that you are now inviting a request for your records?

Yes. Again, this is going back to the point that these were records obtained on a professional basis under a release signed by Mr. Milgaard. We were taking another step. I did not feel that original approval for Mr. Milgaard extended beyond '69 to '74, that we would have to go through it
again. It was really protecting his rights. Right. But you were comfortable in terms of releasing those records, yourself, upon receipt of a written release?

Yes.
Okay. And just in terms of the last portion I've read to you, 'if not parole board might conclude he is not rehabilitated', I don't know if you have any recollection of that matter or any ability to assist us with that comment; would that be a comment that you were providing at that time? No.

You are quite certain of that? Yeah, yeah.

And how would you characterize that, then? And I know you can only speculate for us, but do $I$ take from that that you are suggesting this was Mr. Caldwell's comment, then, at the end of this note? I don't know whose comment it was.

Okay. Not your comment?
That's not mine.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What was the comment again?

MR. HARDY: I'm sorry, Mr. Commissioner, I'm referring to the very last portion of the
note, after the invitation has been made to seek the records, and it says, 'if not parole board might conclude he is not rehabilitated', and I believe that if -- that's referring to the fact that if Mr. Milgaard does not provide the release.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks.

BY MR. HARDY:
Let me take you now to a letter from, a further letter from Mr. Caldwell to the parole board dated September 27 th, 1974 , and that document is 006833 . And, again, it's to the Chairman of the National Parole Board regarding David Milgaard from Mr. Caldwell. I'll just look at these paragraphs, I'll read this to you, Dr. McDonald:
"On June 14, 1972, I wrote a rather
lengthy letter to Mr. Street ...", the former chairman:
"... and enclosed photographs concerning the above prisoner, and as a result of speaking with you at Banff, on my return to Saskatoon I contacted Dr. ...

McDonald, Professor of Psychiatry at

University Hospital, Saskatoon, with
respect to the whereabouts of Milgaard's
psychiatric history, which is a rather extensive and well-documented one, as set out at the bottom of page 3 and the top of page 4 of my letter of June 14 , 1972 .

Dr. McDonald advises me that he still has all the psychiatric history pertaining to Milgaard on his file, and says that if you will contact him, enclosing a signed release from Milgaard, authorizing the release of any information Dr. McDonald might have pertaining to his psychiatric history, Dr. McDonald would then be in a position to forward all these materials to you for placement on your file, so that they will be available to the Board when the question of parole of this prisoner comes up."

And I don't know if you could help us with this but would you assume at this point in time then, in 1974, Dr. McDonald, that you still had the complete collection of records that we previously referred to in the context of your letter of 1972 ?

A

2

A
$Q$

Well, if I advised Mr. Caldwell that at that time, I must have known that they were there.
okay.
In 174.

I'm going to read on in the next paragraph. It states:
"I would strongly urge that you attempt to obtain such a release from Milgaard and get this material on your file, since it presents a very well-documented history of Milgaard's psychiatric make-up going back to his very early youth. I would assume that if Milgaard would not sign such a release thereby preventing the board, in due course, from having access to the largest possible set of reference materials upon which to judge whether he was once again fit to be in society, that the Board might conceivably take this refusal as some evidence that he was not rehabilitated."

And $I$ point that out simply to note that it seems to echo the telephone message that we have previously looked at, and I think your position
quite clearly on that was that was not a thought that you had expressed at the time, or at this point in time?

A

Q
 another document that hopefully will give us some clarification. If we could turn to 039513, please, and you will see again it's some telephone messages, $I$ think, that have all been stapled to a single page. I'm just going to refer you to a
couple of them, the first one being in the top right-hand corner. And you will see, again this is a message or a writing by Mr. Caldwell as we've confirmed in his testimony, it's dated September 8th, 1977, and he writes, 'Ask McD if material he will send includes that mentioned on page 4 of my letter to Street of June 14th, 1972', and I don't think we need to turn back to that letter, I can advise you that the material he is speaking of there is a list of material from the various institutions that are mentioned in that letter. And then if we can go to this message, which is just a couple of days after that message $I$ read to you, again in Mr. Caldwell's writing appears to be a message from yourself dated September 12th, 1977, it states, 'McD has given her names of the places Milgaard has been in and told her to write all the various places direct.' So would it appear by this time, Dr. McDonald, that you had decided that it might be best that the parole authorities seek out the various records directly from the institutions noted?

Yes. I think at that time, by this time, I was getting a little tired of being involved. After
all, I had closed the case on June the 3rd, '69, this is eight years later and we're still getting correspondence, and $I$ thought $I$ was not going to be sort of the conduit for this, that it would have to be contact between the board and the original sources.

Okay.
That was really getting out of the --
And that's your recollection with respect to this matter?

Yeah, I'm sure that's what it was, yeah. It's not my recollection but $I$ suspect that was my thinking.

Okay. Fair enough. Do you recall any further dealings respecting the parole authorities, at all, other than what we've outlined here?

Not that $I$ recall.
Okay. Mr. Commissioner, I know we're just a touch early, but $I$ think this is probably a good time to break.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Sure. (Adjourned at 11:53 a.m.)
(Reconvened at 1:30 p.m.)
BY MR. HARDY:
Good afternoon, Dr. McDonald. I would like to
start this afternoon by talking about the file that you provided to the Commission in preparation for your testimony, and we've taken a look at those documents, and again for reference sake I'll mention those document IDs again; 325155, 325157, 325159, 325166, 325172, 325173, 325175, 325182, 325190, and 325194. And you have had a chance I take it, Dr. McDonald, to again review those materials that exist in the file that you still have today?

A
$Q$
And do $I$ assume correctly that the files, so to speak, that you had on this matter in 1969-1972 was much larger than what currently exists in your materials today?

Certainly larger.
And do you -- can you tell us what happened to the rest of the material?

A
$Q$
In words of one syllable, no.
Can you give us any speculation on the matter, what may have happened through the years to that material?

A
Over the past 36 years?
Yes?
I've moved office about seven or eight times, I
have had at least eight secretaries, all of whom are dedicated to organizing my life, which means cutting out excess filing. I lost track of the file from '69 until '83 when a folder with the contents, most of the contents that are there today was delivered from the Department of Psychiatry to the Dean's Office, and it was put away there by myself and ten years later discovered by myself, rediscovered when $I$ was leaving that office and going back to the Department of Psychiatry.

In calling it a file $I$ would have this caveat. On June the 3 rd we did not register Mr. Milgaard as a patient of mine or register him as a file in the Department of Psychiatry, University Hospital, if it was it would be tagged, it would be indexed, and there would be a trace of it recorded. To me this was no longer a case, on June the 3rd, as soon as Mr. Milgaard said he was -- he had been instructed not to say anything further, so $I$ was out of the picture.

When the -- when this happened
it was obviously put away in an open file, whatever it is, and kept there. It was delivered
to me in '83 with a bunch of other loose material, meaning correspondence that went back to 1958 that somehow had got stored away and out of sight in a couple of small filing cabinets with 5 by 6 index cards of patient information which was delivered to my home in '93 and is still there.

Okay. And you mentioned some 1958 documentation, I don't think $I$ have seen anything of that nature, did you mean --

Personal correspondence.
Okay. Was that --
Exclusive of this or any other forensic.
So in terms of what we received as your file -and I'll continue to use that word if you don't mind -- in terms of your file, $I$ take it that some of what you've just described to us wasn't on that file? You've -- and, again, I'm just taking from what you mentioned about a 1958 reference? Oh, yeah, none of that. This was separate. The Milgaard folder was separate, and it wasn't indexed, it was in just a file folder, and I -that my 5 by 6 cards that made patient notes of that one interview were discarded. I can't say when they were discarded but it was when $I$ knew that my information would not be required again,
which I think was well before '74. I think probably at the time the verdict came down, or shortly thereafter, $I$ got rid of this material. Some of the materials, certainly the material from Yorkton was there in '72 or ' 74 , the material from the Child Guidance Clinic was there, whether the other materials from Regina were there I don't know, $I$ don't remember. All $I$ know is when $I$ came to take it out of my -- the Dean's Office on June 30th, 1993, that that material that you have had in your possession was all that remained. Okay. And I take it, then, you didn't have a direct hand in the culling of those file materials or of a -- I'm not sure what the right word to use is -- but of the disposing of those file materials over the years?

Some I would have, but $I$ don't know. I, for instance the Yorkton thing, I don't know why that's missing. I suppose that one speculation is I may have taken it out to show somebody, but -and didn't get it back in. But no, there is no intentional culling by myself.
$Q$
Okay. And, no, and $I$ didn't mean to imply that with my question. You mentioned the one document; is that the document with the prediction by the
social worker --

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

2

A
$Q$

Q
A

Q

A

Yes.
-- that you are referring to?
Yes.
And I'm just trying to get a handle on this; would there have been any design or method, with respect to the disposal of materials through the years, that you are aware of?

I suspect some of my secretaries had designs and methods which related to a lot of my material, but they saved me from accumulating too much stuff that need not be kept.

Okay. And, again, were you speculating when you were talking about the one document that we've been discussing with the prediction by the social worker -- excuse me -- as to what might have happened to that document?

I have no, I have no idea.
Okay.
I was shocked to find it missing when $I$ reviewed the file after '93.

In 1993?
Yes.
Okay. So, and just taking a look at what has continued to exist on that file -- and again, Dr.

McDonald, I believe you've confirmed for us that you've again reviewed those materials, the surviving materials; --

A
Q
A
Q

A
$Q$

A

Q
Uh-huh.
-- would that be correct?
Uh-huh, yes.
And that, based upon that information alone, would you still be comfortable with the conclusion that you offered in 1972 in your letter?

Yes.
Okay. And in terms, again, of what has survived, so to speak, it would also be fair to say, I assume, that Mr . Caldwell would have had access to those materials during the time periods that we were discussing prior to trial?

He would have had access on that one occasion when I think he came up, to my recollection he came up to the department and looked at the file, but not any other occasion.

And in terms of the additional material $I$ can advise you, Mr. Commissioner, we have taken a search of sorts for that material within our database, and what we've used as our parameters for searching is anything dated pre-1969 that might relate to Mr. Milgaard's mental health or
records of that nature, and we have found some further documents, and in large part those documents were provided by the parties, and in -in fact in all instances that was the case.

We had gone to the further effort, $I$ can advise you, of subpoenaing records from the Yorkton Mental Health Region, and we received materials from them, and again that material in large part duplicated what existed already on our database in terms of pre-1969 material.

We also received records from
the National Parole Board relating to whatever they may have accessed in terms of pre-1969 records, and again, that material had already been duplicated in our database.

I've created a document so that we can keep track of these additional materials that we've located and if we could bring up, please, document ID 332987 . And again, Mr. Commissioner, this is simply a document, a Commission document that we have created, and it identifies only pre-1969 records relating to Mr. Milgaard that are not presently located on Dr. McDonald's file as he provided to us. I should
make a couple of comments respecting the document.
You will see the Source column
in most instances only refers to a single source, and that should not be taken as indicative of that source being the sole source, it's the source that associates with the document ID that we have mentioned. As you can see, much of this material was found within Mr. Milgaard's material, copies of some of the material was found within the Government of Saskatchewan material as well. And I misspoke earlier, there was a single document, additional document that we received, the first entry from the Sunrise Health Region relating to the Yorkton matters, and we've included that document, as well, that wasn't previously on our database.

I should also state our search
is not exhausted at this point in time, and with respect to these new materials, I'm going to be referring to some of them. I -- there may still be an issue with respect to a publication ban, I know that we had talked about that with respect to the other pre-1969 materials that exist on Dr. McDonald's file, but perhaps we can leave that to the submissions of the other parties.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

BY MR. HARDY:

Do you recognize any of those documents as having once existed on your original file? And I'm sorry, Dr. McDonald, $I$ had understood that you had taken the time to review the collection of materials that we had identified as additional materials that had not been located on your file as it was provided to us; would I be correct in that?

A
Q too.
$Q$
And Dr. McDonald, you have had an opportunity -and, again, $I$ 'm referring to the additional materials that are identified by this document -you have had an opportunity to review those materials?

Yes. Briefly.

Yes.
Okay. Yeah. And I'm only saying that because I see you are looking at the screen, you won't see the actual materials there.

No, I'm just trying to recognize the source.
I see. I'm sorry.

Sure, if we could enlarge?

A
$Q$

A

Q
A
$Q$

A He discharged in February '67.

The November 15th, 1966, I don't remember seeing the EEG result.

The next one, document bearing reference to Yorkton Regional High School, no, I don't remember the -- this document. I would only have had that from the Yorkton Psychiatric Centre, because that was a specific request, and $I$ did not go to the educational reports on Mr. Milgaard.

And the confidential report, the
next one, late '66 or '67 of the educational psychologist, $I$ don't remember seeing that.

April 5th, 67, I have a hunch that $I$ did see that, $I$ could -- you know, I don't
remember clearly.
And we can bring up that document, Dr. McDonald, if it would assist in terms of looking at -No, I'm just going back to my memory. Yeah.

What I recall.
Please continue then.
The report by Dr. Conway, no, I don't remember that.

Okay. If we can go to the next page, there might be a couple of further entries.

The -- as far as $I$ can tell, the record from Regina Qu'Appelle Health Region dated November 30th, 2005 related to admissions for physical diseases, had nothing to do with the Munroe Wing as I recall. I don't remember that last document, sequence of events and transfer summary, no. And do you know, the document that's being referred to there, are you recalling reviewing it prior to testifying today?

Well, I saw it at noon.
Okay. I just want to be sure we're talking of the same document, whether you have a recollection of that document. I should have also mentioned, Mr. Commissioner, that we did also subpoena as
well the Regina Qu'Appelle Health Region relating to the Munroe Wing reference and we did receive back a collection of material, as Dr. McDonald has confirmed, that largely related to some injures that Mr. Milgaard had suffered and did not relate though to attendance at the Munroe Wing, but we have provided access to those documents to the other parties.

And, Dr. McDonald, if you can follow me through on this, if we again consider what material exists on your file today as provided to the Commission, and if $I$ ask you to consider what you recall of the other material that once existed on your file, can you recall anything specific that impacted your conclusion in 1972?

A
No.
Nothing specific out of those documents?
I can't recall Munroe Wing or the Dojack, Paul Dojack Centre.

Q And again, it's with -- I'm asking this with respect to the additional materials, not the ones that we have on your file today, and $I$ simply want to be certain that there's nothing that stands out in your mind within those materials as being
significant or important for the conclusion that you offered in 1972.

As I recall from reviewing it a few minutes ago, no, nothing that was contrary.

Okay. There is one document $I$ do want to bring to your attention, Dr. McDonald, and I'm doing so only because it's specifically referenced within the Yorkton material that exists on your file today, and I'll refer you first to a couple of portions from the Yorkton material, as $I$ say, that does exist on your file as provided to the Commission. If we could turn, I believe it's to document 325175 , and you'll perhaps recognize this document, Dr. McDonald. The only portion $I$ wanted to refer your attention to was this first paragraph which notes:
"This situation was referred by Mr. P. Tomashewski, Educational Psychologist, with the Yorkton - Melville Health Region, with Dr. Zbeetnoff acting as the referring physician."

And if we could then, please, turn to page 325182 dated December 8th, 66 , just the first portion, summary recording:
"On November $23 r d, 1966$, Dr. Andrews,

Paul Tomashewski, Educational
Psychologist with the Yorkton - Melville Public Health Region, and this worker conferenced this case at Y.P.C.

Discussed at this meeting was some of the boy's rather disturbing background, as well as observations of this boy while at the Yorkton Psychiatric Centre. Also discussed extensively were the results of Mr. Tomashewski's personality and psychological tests.
(Mr. Tomashewski had seen the boy at the Langenburg High School on November 7 and also conducted testing here at the Psychiatric Centre on November 18.) See file for more explicit information re psychological tests."

If we could then turn to page 171901 of document 171899 and this was part of the additional material that $I$ provided to you, Dr. McDonald, for your review. You'll see the dates referenced, November 7 and $18 t h$, and as well the indication that this is a report by the educational psychologist, Yorkton - Melville Health Region No. 10, and it would appear to be
associated with the entries that $I$ just read to you from the Yorkton materials that exist on your file. Do you recognize this document as having previously existed on your file, Dr. McDonald?

A
$Q$

A

Q No, I don't.

And is it your belief that this document did not previously exist on your file?

No, I don't. All I'm saying is $I$ don't recognize it.

Okay. And perhaps what I'll do is $I$ just want to briefly look at portions of this document, and in particular there's some introductory comments --

MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, I rise only, not to interrupt, but just to indicate for the record that the documents that we have beginning with the number 171899, and I had discussed this with Mr. Hardy, each page of them appears to be an incomplete document. If we take them and compare them to other versions, it's cut off about halfway down the page, so in referring the Doctor to them, it might be important that he know that each of the pages would appear to be an incomplete of what he may have had in 1969, 1970, but for -- and it appears just to be a copying error, but each page is sort of cut off at the
same halfway mark as you go through.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I see.

MS. KNOX: So $I$ think it might be a copying error, but each of these doesn't represent what was likely the full document in its original version, unless there's a full copy somewhere that $I$ don't have.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
MR. HARDY: Thank you, Ms. Knox, I was going to point that out, it becomes quite apparent on this document as it reads into the next page, but thank you nonetheless.

I think Mr. Wolch wanted to
make a submission.

MR. WOLCH: Mr. Commissioner, just the general concern that our position has not changed that if there is a document that someone will say that they saw and it affected their course of conduct, then we say yes, they should be allowed to do that, but if we're just going to go fishing through reports that nobody claims to have seen and that may be well out of context, I'm not sure what the benefit is, and I've heard nothing to indicate that there's something here that somebody will have relied upon to affect a course
of conduct and I simply point that out.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, yes, I don't think we've heard the end of that inquiry. We're still trying to determine whether the doctor recognized it as having been part of his file.

MR. WOLCH: I thought he said he didn't know. Maybe I'm wrong.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So far he said he didn't know, but we're not finished. With respect to this last one he said that he doesn't recognize it and can't say it was ever on his file and then Mr. Hardy I believe was interrupted, so just continue, please.

BY MR. HARDY:
Q
Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. Just a couple of questions relating to the document, Dr. McDonald, and I note that there's some introductory comments and $I$ note as well there is a diagnosis referencing behaviour disorder, and I'm wondering if that refreshes your memory at all in terms of something that you may have relied upon at the time that you had material in your possession prior to 1972?

A
No.
Okay.

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

There are times when $I$ call for psychological testing, but we don't do it routinely. We use it, for instance, in assessing competence. People in medicine, surgery, and this is where $I$ do my work within a tertiary care hospital, and competence to individuals?
make decisions, medical decisions and decisions regarding finances and so on, but we don't routinely use psychological testing, and it rarely replaces your clinical judgment.

Okay. I'm going to move on, Dr. McDonald, and review other portions of your material. We've been talking about pre-1969 material and there's some post-1969 material on your file as it exists today and that you provided to the Commission, and the first document I'm going to show you is document ID 325166, and do you recognize that document, Dr. McDonald?

Yes, with the notation at the top left-hand corner, CBC internal.

And what is this document?
I suspect -- I recognize it. I'm not sure to its origin. I suspect it's material that came to me along with other material from Mr. Eric Malling of the CBC. I think he was doing, researching for the Fifth Estate, I think that was the program he was with. My -- I'm not clear, but my guess would be this came to me along with some report, the Vancouver pathologist $I$ think directed to Mr. Wolch, I think Dr. Ferris was the author, and Eric Malling directed me via phone message to pass this
on to Dr. Emson who was the professor of pathology when $I$ was dean, and $I$ did this, but $I$ think Eric passed on this particular item, plus other pages at that time, and $I$ think that is around $\quad 89$ as $I$ recall, having reviewed the file.

And so this isn't a document that you created, Dr. McDonald?

No, not at all.
And did Eric Malling tell you anything else about this document when he provided it to you?

No, not really. I can't recall what transpired in the phone call with him. I knew he was researching this and $I$ guess he's letting me know. I told him, advised him the same way I advised the National Parole Board, if you are interested in doing background for it, you should contact the sources that $I$ had contacted, Yorkton Psych Centre, Munroe Wing, Paul Dojack.

And what was your relationship with Mr. Malling, how did Mr. Malling know you at this time? Do you want the long story?

Not too long. Okay. Mr. Malling took out my wife's cousin, they were both students at the University of Saskatchewan. I think they both worked with the

Sheaf. This is where Mr. Malling was getting his early journalism experience and fortunately my wife's cousin was a good, reliable babysitter and we had five children, we needed respite time from them and they would come over, so we knew Eric that way, and $I$ guess Eric may have had a card $x-r a y$ that he kept names of people on, but he later, after he grew up, he called me from time to time asking for advice as to where he should go for information on medical issues, so we had that connection.

And was this communication --

I would like to add also among our circle of friends, and it's too bad you didn't know this before, was Mr. Tony Merchant.

Right, I think $I$ heard that. And would this communication then be of that sort of nature that you just mentioned to me, Mr. Malling seeking perhaps some assistance from you?

A
$Q$
What did you understand Mr. Malling was doing at the time?

A
Oh, I think they were trying to do a program on Mr. Milgaard.

And do you have a specific recollection of reviewing this document?

A
Q

Well, they were there before they arrived at my office.

Q
A
$Q$
That is not your handwriting then?
No.
And you've taken a look at the markings and handwriting throughout this document?

Yes, yes.
And is any of it your --
None.
-- work? And are you aware whether, I think I
need to ask this question as well, is the
handwriting your thoughts that were perhaps being written down by someone else?

I would doubt it. No, I think this is generated, wherever it was, CBC, it looks like the same kind of writing style in the light according to that
note on the upper left-hand part of page 1. Okay. And do you recall, again with respect to this document, was Mr. Malling asking you to do something in particular in relation to this document, Dr. McDonald?

I don't recall at all that. He wasn't asking me advice on this, no.

Okay. Let's look at a couple of the other materials, $I$ think you've mentioned --

Just --
Yes?

I think he was passing this along for my information, along with the letter to Dr. Emson, I suppose was for my edification if nothing else. Okay. And perhaps we should look at some of these other documents that may have been associated with this same communication, and I'm going to show you first, again this is material that is on your present day file, document ID 325194, you've had an opportunity to review this document?

Yes, I have.
It's a report $I$ believe by Dr. Rockstro?
Yes.
Was this received from Mr. Malling as well?
I think it came in the same package.

And did you have any idea or knowledge at the time where Mr. Malling had received this document from?

I was rather intrigued because this is highly
confidential material and the Canadian
Correctional Service had very strict regulations about releasing this information and here it was a highly confidential document being transmitted from CBC to me.

And did you ask Mr. Malling how he had obtained this document?

No.
You didn't. And what did Mr. Malling want you to do with this document?

Nothing. I think again this is for edification.
Let's take a look at a couple of the other materials. Next would be 325157 , do you recognize this document, Dr. McDonald?

Bring it up?
Sure, if we could maybe enlarge the first portion.
Oh, yes.
And that's directed to you from Dr. Emson?
That's right.
And it looks like it's referring to the report of Dr. Ferris?

Which I mentioned, yes.

Which also exists on your file --

A
Q

A
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A
Q
A

Q

A
Q Yes.
-- as document 325195, and we don't need to bring that one up. And can you tell us, you told us a little bit about this already, but can you tell us what led to this material being in your possession?

I was a conduit between Eric Malling and
Dr. Emson. Dr. Emson, having received Malling's request through me, decided to reply to Malling through me.

And I see there's a fax copy to Eric Malling at the top. Do you recognize that handwriting?

I recognize the initials.
And --
It's one of my many secretaries.
So this was likely sent back to Mr. Malling at your direction?

Yes.
Let's look as well at 325155 , please, this is a fax sheet, Dr. McDonald, three pages apparently were sent to Mr. Malling, and I'm assuming perhaps that this may have been related to the fax comment that we saw on the other document, and would you agree with me on that?

A
$Q$
A

I suspect it probably is Dr. Emson's response. Okay. Did you send any of your file material to Mr. Malling?

No.

Okay. And did you provide him with any other information relating to Mr. Milgaard?

He asked me what $I$ thought of doing a documentary
on David Milgaard and I said, well, if you are going to do it, make sure you do the whole profile, and suggested that the sources he could get more information were the sources I've told everybody.

You were inviting him to access the materials from the various institutions that we're speaking of? Yes, that he should go to them for this information. Put another way, $I$ was not going to provide it.

Okay. Did you have a concern that he would report on the matter without having reviewed those materials?

I've been concerned by reports that have been rather superficial, and by that meaning not going into the total background.

And --
So I thought -- I really felt that if he was going
to put an article up for public view, that he should be well fortified to answer all questions, that he should have the whole story.

Q

A
Q
A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
Q
A
$Q$

A
Q
A
$Q$

I'm going to refer you to a further document, one
last page that's found within your file materials,
325190, and it's actually page 325193 of this
document. I know you and I had taken a look at
this together. Do you recognize that page at all?
I haven't the foggiest idea of what this is.
No idea what that relates to?
Not at all.
That's not your handwriting?
Not my handwriting.
Okay.
And it was by itself as $I$ recall.
Yes, it is just a single page, that's right.
Yeah.
And, Dr. McDonald, I understand that you discussed
this matter with the RCMP in 1993 during an
investigation that they were conducting?
I was interviewed by the RCMP.
And you recall that interview?
I do.
I'm going to refer you to notes that were taken in relation to that interview, the document is
$034527 . Y$ Y've had an opportunity, Dr. McDonald, have you, to consider these notes prior to testifying today?

A
Yes.
I would like to take you through some portions. Again, these are notes by an RCMP officer relating initially to attempts to contact you and, as we get into the document further, relating to a meeting that took place with you, and you'll see the date being February, 1993. If we could move forward, please, to page 034528 , and the first paragraph is just an introduction of yourself. I'll read some portions to you from this document. The second paragraph reads:
"Dr. McDonald advised that when he is asked to see a subject it can involve his seeing the person for three sessions. In this particular case he only saw Milgaard once and that interview lasted a little over an hour. Dr. McDonald advised that his records have since been destroyed in this case." The only question $I$ want to ask you from that paragraph, Dr. McDonald, did you provide the RCMP with access to the file materials that you have
provided to us in 1993?
A
I don't recall. What $I$ was talking about then was my clinical notes.

Okay. I'm going to read on to the next paragraph: "Dr. McDonald interviewed Milgaard at the Saskatoon City Police Station. He recalls the police being apprehensive about Milgaard, with regards to the security of him. There appeared to be a concern that he may try to escape. Dr. McDonald recalled a reference to that, however, he could not be specific about that."

And that's accurate information, Dr. McDonald?

They are not the only police force that requested to be within the room and sometimes it makes sense.

Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
Q
A
$Q$

Do you have any other specific recollection relating to this perception that you had at that time?

No, no.
Okay.
I -- well, recollection is $I$ found Mr. Milgaard to be a very polite young man, easy to talk to, received me as pleasantly as the circumstances would allow. I was not at all anxious about being with him. I had nothing that $I$ could see or hear that made me feel that he was a threat to escape or do anything.

I'll skip past the next paragraph, if we could go to the bottom of the page, it states:
"An interesting point: Dr. McDonald
indicated that he often finds people
that he interviews to protest their
innocence right off the bat. In
Milgaard's case, he did not."
Can you recall providing this information to the
RCMP in 1993?
I don't.
You don't remember that?
But that doesn't mean that $I$ didn't say it.
Do you accept likely that you advised them of
that?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
Oh, yeah, I remember that. We didn't really get to that point of discussing. Our discussion took place around his early life and we didn't touch upon the alleged crime, guilt or innocence or anything, $I$ just was really trying to get the background to establish the context for this man, young man, so maybe in the third hour or the fourth hour $I$ would get to the issue of the offence, attitude towards his mental state at the time, but not in this first hour and 20 minutes. But correct me if I'm wrong, Dr. McDonald, this seems to be a specific recollection that you had and by reading this, and again please give us your input, it seems that you found that noteworthy in some respect?

I don't recall it being particularly noteworthy. You don't recall thinking that at the time?
Sure, sure.
And is this a recollection that you have, of having that thought or consideration back at the time that you were meeting with Mr. Milgaard? That what?

This observation that you shared, that Mr.
Milgaard did not protest his innocence?

A
$Q$

A
Yes. Mr. Tallis suggested he didn't want his client interviewed any further.

I've always been impressed by
how -- 'easy' is not the term $I$ would like to use -- but how it's been, I guess, easy to interview people charged with serious offence, and lawyers know it, and they don't try to abort this at all. On the one hand, if they are concerned
the RCMP?
I do that.
And I'm assuming, from what you've told us, that you weren't closely following the trial or the conduct of the defence; can you give us any clarification with respect to that comment?
about fitness, maybe they would like to go ahead with it; but then when you get into dealing with the state of the mind of the accused at the time $I$ think lawyers are taking a gamble on what will be revealed in discussing the circumstances, and I've always wondered why they haven't -- if they were fairly convinced that insanity wasn't a defence at the time $I$ wouldn't like to see a psychiatrist, who $I$ don't know listening to what the accused may choose to drop in an interview situation.

So I take it it's that particular aspect that you are impressed by regarding Mr. Tallis?

Well I have to say that I had another experience with Mr. Tallis as a witness in a marital dispute involving a lawyer of some repute, and $I$ was treating his wife and $I$ was asked to give testimony, and Mr. Tallis, after I gave him testimony, asked to see my notes.

That's another thing, I have never seen, I've been in practice for 50 years, and a lawyer has never asked to -- Mr. Tallis, I'm sure, didn't ask after that because I couldn't read those notes.

I'll take you to the next page, top of the page. What I am saying, I have known Mr. Tallis really
on the bench, $I$ was in front of him in a hearing in the Northwest Territories when he was on the bench, and he has been a very careful, credible, very ethical practitioner, in my limited experience.

Yes.
Okay. I take you to the next paragraph:
"Dr. McDonald had no complaints about Saskatoon City Police. He feels they handled the matter well. The only S'toon P.D. member he recalls dealing with was Penkala \& he expressed no concerns in regards to him."

And in particular, in relation to the comment about Lieutenant Penkala, $I$ think you advised us earlier that you did not recall the specific interaction that's referred to in the report I
brought to your attention; do you recall specific dealings with Lieutenant Penkala during the investigation otherwise?

A

Q

A
$Q$
A

Not, not this. I had had dealings with him before, and $I$ had formed an opinion on his professionalism before, but no, I can't remember that episode with Mr. Penkala and the pictures. So are we to take this, then, as perhaps just a general comment about Lieutenant Penkala? Yes, as well as the city police, $I$ can't remember saying they handled the case well. I had nothing to do with it beyond the hour and 20 minutes $I$ spent with Mr. Milgaard in the police station, I know -- you know, this is -- could be taken out of context and say 'they were careful during the investigation', I don't, I have no opinion on that whatsoever.

You had no knowledge of any such matters?
No. In fact $I$ would have to tell you that, after I sent the note on June the 3rd to Mr. Caldwell to the extent that $I$ would not be pursuing this further, $I$ did not really follow the case at all other than to -- a casual view through the StarPhoenix, but $I$ do not follow Court cases as a rule.


Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q
A
Q

Okay. Continue on down the page. Next paragraph: "Beyond Mr. Caldwell's request ... the only other person that he recalls contacting him about this case was reporter Eric Malling, who he believes was doing some investigative reporting on the Milgaard matter. Dr. McDonald recalls suggesting to Malling that there was a lot more to Mr. Milgaard than the papers presented."

Do you recall providing that information to the RCMP?

Yes, in that general way that $I$ discussed earlier, that he should get the total picture.

And it says:
"... more to Mr. Milgaard than the papers presented ..."?

Right.
What papers are you referring to?
Well, the StarPhoenix.
Okay. Newspaper articles?
Yes.
And I'm going to take you back just for a moment to the reappraisal report that we had looked at earlier, again it's 325166, and I see the one
comment in writing at the top. It says:
"There is more to this",
and again, $I$ think you've answered but $I$ did feel compelled to bring you back to this again, Dr. McDonald; is that potentially your comment? I take it that's not your handwriting, you've confirmed for us?

Well, as a general statement, I just said that I felt there was more to the story than the papers presented.

I'm wondering about this specific comment, is -that's not in your handwriting I think you've confirmed?

And is it possible that you could have relayed that comment to someone who was dealing with this document before it came to your attention? Well the only person would be Mr. Malling. Okay. If we could go back to the RCMP notes, please, page 034532, I'll read you the next paragraph. It states:
"Dr. McDonald recalled from the Yorkton Psychiatric Centre file on Milgaard, a reference to the effect "that if he
(Milgaard) doesn't get help he is going to kill someone.""

Do you recall providing that information to the RCMP ?

A

Q

A
Q
A
Q
A
$Q$

A
I don't know why $I$ would exclude it. There are two elements to that, one is the reference to the prediction that he is going to kill somebody, and that the other thing with that is just it's a stab in the dark, which was eerily apropos of what had transpired. And I don't think anybody in this room would have read that and, knowing that background, wouldn't have had the same reaction.

And $I$ guess what $I$ am wondering, and maybe we can ask it a little bit more widely, at any point when you would have been advising someone of that
comment that you recalled, would you have included the 'stab in the dark' portion?

A

Q

> F
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I don't recall. The person $I$ recall talking to, the police, $I$ don't know if $I$ included that or not. I don't know. I don't think $I$ would have left it out for any conscious or deliberate reason. I know, when $I$ read it to Mr. Caldwell initially or showed him it, that that was -- I was equally interested in the 'stab in the dark'. Okay. I'll take you to the next paragraph. It states:
"In review of Milgaard, Dr. McDonald found no major psychiatric disorder. For example Schizophrenia. Milgaard was not psychotic. He saw Milgaard more in the terms of having a personality disorder. Feeling that Milgaard was a Sociopath."

And that confirms, $I$ think, the information that you previously advised us of. And I'll read on to the next paragraph:
"Note: According to Dr. McDonald,
denial, even over a lengthy period of
time, is consistent with a person
suffering from a sociopathic
personality."

Do you recall providing this information to the RCMP in 1993?

A

I don't recall it. This is what $I$ am saying probably happened.

Okay. I'll turn you to the next page, and I'm not going to -- the next paragraph, I think, deals with some discussions on sodium pentothal, and perhaps the RCMP officers were asking you some specific questions on that. I'm going to bring your attention, though, to the bottom of the page. It states:
"Dr. McDonald was not called to give evidence, (actually excused) because he had nothing of value to say. There was no question as to Milgaard's sanity.

Milgaard made no admissions to him during the interview."

And that would have been information you provided to the RCMP?

A
Q
And the next sentence:
"Dr. McDonald feels that Milgaard was capable of this murder."

And did you provide that information to the RCMP in 1993?

A
I'm sure $I$ did.
And on what basis?
Anybody is capable of this murder, or the vast majority of people, under what circumstances and under what conditions. It's a kind of a fatuous statement.
$Q$

A

Q
Would it be fair -- was this your view in 1993, and specifically with respect to Mr. Milgaard? Well I didn't think that he was a dangerous, he was a -- he -- a potential murderer, but people do all kinds of things.

It just strikes me that the comment likely would have been recorded because you had raised it as having some additional significance for yourself, and $I$ just want to be sure $I$ pursue that fully
with you.
A
Q
A

And, again, thank you for being patient with me as I ask questions in this area. Just, I -- I think about some of the other comments $I$ have seen in the documents. There is a comment, for example, "there's more to Mr. Milgaard than the papers

But everybody is, you know, if you join up, if you are an American soldier and end up in Iraq, you would do a lot of things you wouldn't normally do. The circumstances change but the potential is there.
presented"?

A
Q
A

Q

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

And I think I've answered that.
Yes.
And we're talking about his background, that's all I'm talking about.

Okay. And nothing, though, of that nature that compelled you to make this comment to the RCMP in 1993 ?

In the nature that 'he is a ticking bomb'? No.
Okay. Do you think at this time, and if I'm
hearing you correctly it seems to me that you are perhaps saying that if you were making this comment, that you would have been saying "is Mr. Milgaard capable of murder? Well, anybody is capable of murder."

I would think so.
And is that what you are telling me, that you think that's the purpose for which it was recorded on this document?

Oh, I'm not sure the purpose it was recorded, I didn't do the recording.

The context of it being recorded would be of that nature though?

I would hope so.
Okay. Nothing further that you can recall in
relation to that?
No.
Move on to the next paragraph:
"Dr. McDonald indicated that Serge
Kujawa is an old friend. Nothing
learned in that area."
And would that be correct information that you
were providing to --
Mr. Kujawa and $I$ served on the Lieutenant
Governor's Review Board for over 25 years
together, yes he is a good friend, was and still is.

Okay. Thank you, Dr. McDonald. I'm just about through, I'll turn your attention to one further document, it's 162295. And I can't tell you who the author of this document is, $I$ could make a guess that it's Robert Bruce who was offering some assistance to the Milgaards, although I stand to be corrected on that. You will see that your name is identified at the top of the page, and the only comment I'm particularly interested in is the last comment, and it says:
"Spoke with Eric Malling to scuttle orig. 5th Estate. according to Sandra Bartlett."

And do you have any idea what this comment may be referring to?

A
I -- my guess is it refers to my warning to Eric to do a complete work-up.

Okay.
I didn't tell him to scuttle it. I would not advise anybody how to do their business.

Okay. If you can just give me a moment, Dr. McDonald, $I$ want to check on one further document. Those are all the questions I have, Dr. McDonald, thank you. My Friends may have some questions for you.

Mr. Commissioner, I haven't
canvassed an order, but $I$ don't know if you want to take a break at this particular time? This is our last witness for today.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, it wouldn't be a bad idea to take a break now and arrange order of cross-examination. How many, can you indicate how many, one, two, three, four?

MR. HARDY: I see four.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah.
(Adjourned at 2:32 p.m.)
(Reconvened at 2:49 p.m.)
MR. HARDY: We've decided upon an order,

Mr. Commissioner, and Mr. Gibson will be starting.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.
BY MR. GIBSON:
Dr. McDonald, my name is Bruce Gibson, I'm for the RCMP, and I'm just going to chat with you briefly about your contact with the RCMP back in 1993, already coming on, $I$ guess, 13 years ago now.

I take it at that time, prior to
the RCMP showing up and visiting with you about this case, you hadn't had a great deal of opportunity or cause to go back and look at the work that you had done on the Milgaard file?

And if we could just put up that investigation report, 044621 , and if we could just go to the next page on that. And, again, it looks like the RCMP came out and visited with you March 1st of 1993, and $I$ believe your recollection was that it was somewhere around that time that you sat down with the RCMP; correct?

A
As far as $I$--
Q
As far as you can recall?
Yeah, $I$ can't disagree with this.
All right. And do you recall Officer Einar

Jorgenson; do you remember the gentleman at all?

A
$Q$

A

Q
A
Q
interview that he had with you; correct?
A
Yeah, with the exception to the statement about predicting Milgaard would kill.

Okay. And again if we can just have a look at that portion of this document, just try to find that, if we can go to page 044627 and it's just at the bottom there, and we'll go on to the next page, it says:
"Dr. McDonald feels that Milgaard was capable of this murder."

And, again, your recollection of that is you thought, at the time, that you may have or may not have included in your comment with Officer Jorgenson that that was just a 'stab in the dark', that's something that you had read in the past; correct?

A
$Q$ pager it says: I'm sorry, go back?

All right. When you were, when you were discussing this with Officer Jorgenson and he wrote down Milgaard was capable of the murder, and we've just gone through that:
"Dr. McDonald feels that Milgaard was capable of the murder.",
if $I$ recall your evidence with Mr. Hardy you said that you may have also included, in that, that
that was just a 'stab in the dark', referencing back --

A
$Q$

A

Okay.
-- because $I$ can in no way predict who is going to be a murderer or not. This is really black art, anybody saying that somebody is going to do something or not, because -- and I said of the example currently we have law-abiding, God knows, God-fearing American soldiers going over there and committing atrocities which nobody anticipated. But things, as Mr. Brunsfeld (ph) said, 'stuff happens', and so I can't say that Mr. Milgaard was not capable or was capable, anybody could do it under specific circumstances.

And in the circumstances --

This is just life.

Okay. And in the circumstances that you spoke with Officer Jorgenson you, again, were speculating that anyone was capable of doing that? Under the circum -- special circumstances.

All right. And at that point in time, if you recall, Mr. Milgaard was out of jail, there was a good deal of press about him; correct?

I guess.

And there was no DNA which would have -- which clearly would absolve him of the crime; correct?

I don't know.
You don't recall that at the time then?
I've really not followed this case that carefully.
So again, now that $I$ have managed to muddy the waters completely here, if $I$ understand you correctly, that the comment that you would have made to Officer Jorgenson, you don't dispute that you made that comment, but then again in clarification you are saying that that's something, that you were speculating that Mr. Milgaard, or anyone in the right circumstances, could be capable of a crime like that?

A

Q

A
Q All right.

A I wasn't even thinking about it.

MR. HARDY: Bruce, I'm sorry, I think that you had started in with -- the 'stab in the dark'
comment didn't relate to this portion that you were referring to.

MR. GIBSON: Oh, it did not? My error.
MR. HARDY: No, it was the earlier portion about the prediction from the social worker, and we --

MR. GIBSON: Okay.
MR. HARDY: -- can get the page for you if you like.

MR. GIBSON: Okay.
MR. HARDY: But he wasn't referring to the 'stab in the dark' with this entry that is up on the screen now.

MR. GIBSON: Okay. My apologies. It's not crucial for me, for my purposes.

BY MR. GIBSON:
But in 1993 you would agree that the Miller murder wasn't solved?

A
Well in retrospect it wasn't, no.
$Q$
Mr. Milgaard had been released?
A
I, quite frankly $I$ don't remember what was -- I was within three months of stepping down as Dean, a major shift in my life. I guess I was focused on that more than what had happened 30 years before.

Q

Okay. And in your -- again, and I'm not going to belabour this any further, in your discussion with the RCMP, then, it was your view that it was possible that Mr. Milgaard, or anyone in the right circumstances could commit such a crime; is that fair to say?

Oh yes. I don't think it should be inscribed in the Charter of Rights, but it --

Okay.
-- it's one of the things that can happen.
And do you recall, when you met with the RCMP, did they explain to you the purpose for meeting with you? Did they explain to you that they were investigating allegations of a police cover-up or prosecutorial wrongdoing when they met with you? I don't recall it being expressed in that terms, but they, they told me what they were there for. I mean I've -And, again, if we look at the synopsis here of the RCMP continuation report -- and, again, I'm not going to belabour that with you, doctor -- but there is no reference in the synopsis as to whether Mr. Milgaard was capable of the murder or not. The focus appeared to be on your dealings with Mr. Milgaard, the time that you spent with
him, approximately an hour when you went to see him at the Saskatoon City Police station, and again --

A
Q

## BY MR. LORAN :

Good afternoon, Dr. McDonald. I'm Pat Loran, and I'm on for the Saskatoon Police Service, and I just wanted to ask you about one matter. I think Mr. Hardy alluded to it after lunch.

Can I ask for document 009327?
Perhaps we can blow this up a bit, enlarge it.
Thanks. Do you recall this document having been put to you before lunch?

Yes, I do.
Would it be fair to say, Dr. McDonald -- I think
it was your evidence but correct me if I'm wrong -- that back in 1969 you would have been one of the few individuals in Saskatoon, in the Saskatoon area with expertise to give psychiatric opinions of the sort that's referred to here; would that be fair to say?

What $I$ am suggesting to you, this isn't psychiatric opinion.

All right. Would you have been one of the go-to people at the time?

For general questions, but I'd, I --
You object --
You know, this is a special area of expertise which -- it can be found primarily in the States, I think the FBI has some expertise in this area, but I don't think, I don't think people go to a psychiatrist to see "can you tell me the, what's the personality of a person who, multiple stabbing of a person, you know, at 7:00 a.m. on a February or January morning with 35 below", no, $I$ don't. You are uncomfortable with the suggestion that you would have been qualified to give this opinion; is that what $I$ hear you saying?

A
$Q$ I'm just not qualified, period.

Okay. But would it be fair to say that you would
have been one of the people in Saskatoon that enforcement agencies would have turned to for psychiatric opinions at this time?

A
Q

A
$Q$

Q

## BY MS. KNOX:

Dr. McDonald, I've introduced myself to you, for the record I'm Catherine Knox and I act as counsel for Mr. Caldwell, who has been known to you for many years and who you knew to be the prosecutor on the file. And I, although I brought a pile of papers with me, $I$ don't intend to be very long, I just have a few areas that $I$ want to touch on with you.

You indicated in your evidence that after you did the interview with Mr. Milgaard
on June 2nd, 1969 , and you got the message on June 3rd that his lawyer didn't want you talking to him any more, that basically that was the end of your involvement in the active part of the case prior to preliminary inquiry and trial; did $I$ understand you correctly in that regard?

Yes, apart from that time somewhere between June the 2 nd and when the preliminary took place where I told Mr. Caldwell, answered his inquiry as to whether we had got the reports.

Okay. I'm just going to ask to bring up document number 0 -- oh, just give me a moment while $I$ check my number here -- 105629. Dr. McDonald, contained in Mr. Caldwell's file, which was retained and has been provided to the Inquiry, is a subpoena which was issued to you requiring your attendance at the preliminary inquiry on the $18 t h$ of August, 1969. Now the note that was shown to you this morning indicates that you were excused and that you didn't in fact have to attend, but do you remember getting a subpoena with the possibility that you might be needed at the preliminary inquiry?

No, I don't remember that.
Okay. Then would I -- I'm -- I'll suggest to you,
and see if you agree with me, that in the early stage when a person is arrested for an offence like this, and a psychiatrist, a forensic psychiatrist does as you did, you went in to assess the issue of fitness, that depending on the defences that may be offered your opinion might become important because you had, in fact, seen the individual soon after his arrest and you did formulate an opinion that he was fit for trial? Yes, yeah.

That's a practice that you would be familiar with --

A

Q
A
$Q$

A

2
A
$Q$



Sure, yeah, yeah.
-- as a psychiatrist?
But remember that $I$ would insist on assessing him immediately before the trial, so that has a life expectancy of one second, it's valid for the moment $I$ saw him but $I$ would want to -- things can happen --

Okay.
-- even in six weeks or in eight weeks, so $I$ would
want to see him immediately the night before the opening of the trial.

Yeah. And I, if $I$ can follow you, the subpoena is issued so that you are available, if Mr. Tallis
had raised the issue of fitness, before you would give an opinion, if $I$ am hearing what you are saying, in the Court, you would want to see him again?

A
Q

A
$Q$
A

Q

A
$Q$ file.

Okay. Now, sir, with respect to the information that you obtained, and again if $I$ understood you correctly this morning, after you saw Mr. Milgaard be needed?

That's in Mr. Caldwell's file but it's not in my
on June 2 nd and you got the authorizations to access his medical records, it was your decision, a medical decision as it were, to get your secretary to request those, you didn't do it at the request of the Crown, you did it -Yes.
-- as a practicing psychiatrist?
It was my practice to do that.
Okay.
If there's any indication of previous medical, or particularly psychiatric treatment, I would automatically try to access this information. And again, in the event that down the road you might be needed to do further work or give expert opinion in respect of this?

It's a part of my practice with patients who haven't been in a criminal justice system, everyday patient. If they come into my initial assessment and they record they've been seen by doctors, psychiatrists, social workers or anybody else, even for people that I'm seeing for independent medical assessments or compensation boards, $I$ get permission to access their other records. I'm a great believer in collateral information.

Thank you. And, sir, in obtaining collateral information, and you can reflect beyond this case if you wish, but is it your experience when you send a request to a fellow psychiatrist or a psychiatric institution like the Yorkton Psychiatric Centre, or any other, asking for a file on an individual who has given you his authorization, that you would expect to receive their full file?

Whatever is relevant to my request.
Yeah.
On the form requesting information, you have to be specific of what information you are asking about, is it for the previous admission investigations, previous medical record, medical experience, and you designate that and send it to whoever the agency is or agent and it's good for that reason only, and this is the, when the patient/client/inmate signs it, specific permission for a specific bit of information, it's not a net that you throw out to see what you can bring in.

But in relation to an institution like the Yorkton Psychiatric Centre where he had been a patient I think from November 14 th of ' 66 until February,
'67, you are dealing with him in '69, would you anticipate that you would get the full file in relation to that single admission because he did only have the one admission and stay there?

A
times you reaction that you had to the statement that was included in a social worker report in the file about the possibility that, or the prediction,
albeit wrongly, that one day Mr. Milgaard might kill somebody, or would kill somebody but that it was only a stab in the dark, you've described drawing it to other people's attention. At one point in time you indicated that it was in the vein of humour, but later in your testimony today you've described it as being eerily apropos of what transpired in 1969, and I caveat that by saying what everybody, or a lot of people believed that Mr. Milgaard had in fact stabbed a woman to death, that in that context in 1969, 1970, '71, '72, for people who had a belief that in fact he had done this, it was kind of eery wasn't it? It certainly was.

And in your conversation with Mr. Caldwell, would you agree with me that he was one of the people who found it kind of eery?

Oh, yes.
He didn't treat it as ha, ha, joke, joke, he took that as being very --

It was a mixture. I think, I'm not speaking for Mr. Caldwell, but $I$ thought we were of one mind, that it was extraordinary --

Yeah.
-- a social worker would make an observation like
this. I felt it was extraordinary that anybody would record it for posterity.
$Q$
And in terms of recording it, sir, I looked for a document, and $I$ can't find one, and $I$ don't know if $I$ found it in documentary evidence or it was told to me, but is it your memory that this comment was contained in a chronology of a case conference?

A
Q
Yes.
That there were in fact various participants in a meeting?

A
$Q$

With a list of attendance of a number of professionals?

A
Right.
Q
And one of them who was doing the recording, recording this as being raised in the meeting and reported in the meeting as a prediction?

Q

A Right.
And, sir, you were referred earlier to a letter where Mr. Caldwell in writing to the parole board used the plural, social workers. Given that he saw a case conference report, would his use of social workers perhaps not be an overstatement or inappropriate given that it was made in the context of a meeting with several people as opposed to the written musings of one person? You mean several people said that? Several people were in the room when the conference was held that it was recorded, it was a group discussion?

That doesn't apply to authorship of the remark. No, not to authorship of the remark, but that it was in the presence of -That's all $I$ was interested in, is the authorship. Okay. Now, sir, just bear with me a moment, I have to go through my notes here. In 1972, and I can bring up the document if you need it, but you'll recall that you responded to an inquiry from Mr. Caldwell and you gave him the diagnosis for Mr. Milgaard that confirmed a severe behavioural disorder and the sociopathic diagnosis. You were aware, were you not, when you
did that letter to him, that he was going to convey that information that he was obtaining from you to the National Parole Board?

A
Q

A
Q

Q

A

As well as the other centres that you got the information from that he reviewed in your office? and also his behaviour in the Yorkton Psychiatric Centre.
$Q$ about this person?

Well, $I$ think it was based on the evidence brought from other centres of a long history of offences,

A Yes, yes.
Q
But it was based on information that he came to learn through prosecuting him and through the file that you were able to gather in respect of his past history?

I assume so.
Yes. Mr. Caldwell made the observation in one of his letters to the parole board that it was very unusual to find such a well-documented history on an individual from such a young age of behavioural problems dating to kindergarten, and you passed comment on that today. Was he right, that it was unusual to find that well documented a history on a young person back in 1969?

Oh, two things, to find documented history from any organizations in '69 would be unusual. Uh-huh.

To find this length of a history of this sort of behaviour which affected the home, the school and the community, starting at age five, in my experience -- and that's all I'm saying, I don't know of Mr. Caldwell's experience -- but my experience was it was unusual, and $I$ think $I$ said that earlier today.

Okay. And would it be the kind of information,
being so unusual even in your experience, that might have coloured your discussions with Mr. Caldwell as to the significance that it might have in assessing David Milgaard's future behaviour? Umm, let's go back a bit. Okay.

These documents were up until the time he was 14 or 15. The current DSM IV indicates that you can't make this diagnosis until 18.

Right.
Symptoms should be there before 15 , but that doesn't mean there can't be change. Some people do change. A lot don't. Uh-huh.

But, you know, you don't put the final diagnosis until they are 18. Now, when we saw him, this is well before DSM IV and we were making the diagnosis well before 18. I don't know Mr. Caldwell's understanding of the records, I don't know lawyers' understanding of medical records or psychiatric records, but $I$ know my understanding, and that's what $I$ can speak for.

Q Okay. I'm going to bring up 006845 if I can, which is your June 5th letter, before $I$ ask you this next question. Just bring out the second
paragraph. Was there a particular reason or any reason in corresponding to Mr . Caldwell in respect of your telephone discussions that you expressed the view that, and I'll paraphrase here, this isn't your language, that he should encourage or suggest to the parole authorities that they should look at the past records if they were interested in following up on the case, did you consider those records to be an important tool for parole authorities to have in their possession?

A

Okay. And the subsequent correspondence indicates that Mr. Caldwell did in fact do as you suggested in his letter to the parole board in ' 72 and '74, he suggested they should get the records and then he followed up with you and you suggested that the authorities should get an authorization and go directly to source to get the reports, but did you continue to share with Mr. Caldwell your belief that these records might be of some importance or that they should be considered in assessing David

Milgaard within the parole prison system?
A

Q

A
I don't know if he based his report on discussions with me or what he based it on, but $I$ would say that was what $I$ was hoping. I wanted to get out of the conduit here, $I$ was getting tired of people going through other agencies through me. I was by this time department head, I had a lot in my hands other than going over old cases from which I abandoned years before, so $I$ was hoping this would take place between the National Parole Board and these other agencies as communication should. But -- and I appreciate that, and $I$ know that in 1977 you did that. My only point in my question to you though is you shared the view, or you encouraged -- and maybe encouraged is the wrong word, you supported Mr. Caldwell in the belief that this information should be accessed by the parole service?

A Yes.
Q
So he wasn't just going off half-cocked, there was a forensic opinion that he had access that said these records could be important?

Yes.

Okay. Now, sir, in the -- and I'm going to bring up now if I could 006838. Oh. Could I bring up the page after that, please? No.

Mr. Commissioner, if you could just bear with me, I have a copy of something that's in the binder -oh, there it is. Thank you. If I could bring out this little telephone message pad for you, and Mr. Hardy has referred you to that, and this is in reference to a discussion that Mr. Caldwell had with you in 1974 -- September, 1974 , where he documented that there should be a signed release from Mr. Milgaard to get the institutional reports that you had obtained on him from his past, you see the text of that. What Mr. Caldwell appears to have documented is that you should write him or someone should write him, Mr. Caldwell or somebody should write him with a signed release from Milgaard to release all and any info McDonald might have pertinent to his psychiatric history, and this is information that Mr. Caldwell recorded
in 1974 after an apparent telephone discussion with you, which is basically repeating what you put in your letter in ' 72 you will agree. Now, you indicated that you don't think you said the last part, 'if not - board might consider he's not rehabilitated,' and I'm interested in that sentence only in the context of earlier evidence. You said you do or did work for the National Parole Board as part of your practice?

A As a consultant, yes.

Yes. Would it be fair, as a consultant, for you, or to say to you that the parole board would in fact consider someone's refusal to release their full psychiatric history as perhaps an indication of less than full interest at rehabilitation? I would have no opinion on that.

Okay. So in your experience with the parole board, you don't know whether or not that in fact would be the case?

A

Q I don't think that issue ever was raised in any of the cases $I$ was involved in.

If you were doing a psychiatric assessment for the parole board on anybody, let's put Mr. Milgaard aside, would you want to have the full psychiatric history?

A
Q

A

Q
A
$Q$

A

Q
A
$Q$
Okay. I'm finished with that document, thank you. Now, Dr. McDonald, just a final couple of questions. During the course of your dealings with Mr. Caldwell, and we've touched on that through '69 when David Milgaard was arrested through to 1972 when he talked to you about sending information to the parole board, '74 when he talked to you again about the parole board, and 1977, would it be fair to say that you, you knew
and continued to know that he held the belief that Mr. Milgaard was guilty of the murder of Gail Miller?

Oh, yes.
Did you at any point in time in your capacity, and I'm not suggesting that you should have, but for the record did you at any point in time in your dealings with Mr. Caldwell attempt to suggest to him that he was wrong, that he might be wrong or to dissuade him from his view of the case?

No.
Okay. So in all the dealings you had with him, you responded to his inquiries with the understanding that he believed this young man was guilty of the murder of Gail Miller?

Yes.

```
                MS. KNOX: Thank you.
```

BY MR. WOLCH:

Dr. McDonald, I'm Hersh Wolch and I'm David Milgaard's lawyer. I only have a few questions for you I think.

During your testimony, you quite correctly referred to having met with Mr. Milgaard, but really you were meeting with a young kid, weren't you, as opposed to Mr. Milgaard?

A
Q

A

Q
A
Q

A
$Q$

A

Q
A

Q

A One of my colleagues who was a judge said the important thing was recognize which lawyer must be paid.

That's a lot of magazine subscriptions.

A Yes.
Q In any event, though, it is --

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q

A
Q

A
that he has to be careful, which is a standard warning in all these cases, or my standard warning.

Q
A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q
Wouldn't it be better for you to have an open dialogue with him in order to make an assessment?

A
$Q$

A
Like what?
Well, if you could say to the patient, look, it's between you and me, you can reveal whatever you want, I'm not going to repeat it, wouldn't that be a better way of getting to determine the mental state of the person?

I regard a twofold thing, to also, if there's any evidence of mental illness, then to pursue further to see whether he was legally able to be
responsible for his actions.
Okay, but that's premised on his saying to you I did it?

Not necessarily.
Well, how could you determine whether he's responsible for actions if you don't know if the actions occurred?

Well, you can find out his mental state, it really comes down to doing that, finding his cognition, his ability to think, his ability to reason, you find out if he's subject to mood swings, his innate intelligence, all of these things.

But you had no difficulty talking to him, he was co-operative?

No, $I$ had no difficulty at all.
He understood your questions?
Yes, he did.
He answered them appropriately?
He did.
It strikes me that it might take you five or 10 minutes to realize that he can talk to his lawyer and instruct his lawyer and $I$ don't know why you have to go further than that.

A
Because $I$ might run $u p$ against a man like you in Court.

Q Yeah.

A
$Q$

A
Q
A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$
I would want to have enough information to answer your many different approaches to the same question.

Okay, but we're talking here about fitness, not about the defence.

Mine?
Not your fitness, David's fitness.
Yes, that's right.
Okay.
This may satisfy you as a lawyer, but there are other lawyers it wouldn't satisfy, they would want to have more information.

No, I'm just wondering about why any lawyer would even ever consent to his client going to see you when anything he says could be used in Court later on.

You should ask your colleagues. I wondered that too.

Okay. And David signed documents saying you can get medical, you can get previous history forms and background and things like that?

Yes, he did.
Did you explain to him as to who might have access to those reports?
I'm not independent when I'm going into these things, somebody has requested, and I'm accountable to them for my assessment. But David wouldn't know that you were a Crown agent, you didn't say I'm here for the Crown;
would that be fair?
A
Q
A

Q

A

Q
I can't remember exactly the words --
Okay.
-- again.
But you certainly didn't tell him that you would share his history with the Crown?

I'm sure not. Well, I implied that this may occur, may crop up in the Court, so it's not without consequences.

Had Mr. Tallis said look, Doctor, I want to see all those reports, will you give me a copy, what would you have said?

Fine.
So you would have showed it to him too?
A
$Q$
Sure.
But you didn't bring it to his attention that you had them?

I wasn't in touch with Mr. Tallis.
Okay.
He didn't call me.
Doctor, I'm not being critical, I'm trying to get the facts.

A

Q

A
I know.
But you didn't bring it to his attention?
Nor did he bring to my attention that he didn't
want -- it works two ways.
Okay. It's hypothetical, but had the police come to you and said $I$ want to see those records, would you have turned them over?

No.
Now, you indicated the records you got showed David to be, $I$ think your words, a trouble-maker, he seemed to be running away all the time, that kind of stuff?

Yeah.
Okay.
These were records that we obtained from these other sources.

Right. Now, I think we're all aware of the fact that virtually every school in the country there are quite a few trouble-makers. Would you agree with that?

Oh, of course. Every block.
On every block, yeah. You know, I picked up the paper yesterday, they are fighting in schools with mace or whatever else.

Well, you come from Winnipeg, you know what's happening there.

That was Winnipeg's paper.
That's right.

Broke into my old school and maced the kids, that was yesterday.

The police, the teachers --
No, another school.
Another school.
I mean, if you've got a history of all those kids, every one of them would have a history now of macing and fighting and God knows what?

Danny O'Mack against St. John's?
Calvin.
Oh, even worse.
That's right. So you've got kids in trouble all the time really, lots of them?

A
Yeah.
And lots of them have violence, they are fighting in the school yards, they are pulling out knives, who knows what, I mean, you must come across that quite a bit in assessing young people in your career. It's not surprising?

A
Oh, at this -- you have got to be kidding, it's an
entirely different world than it was in '69, entirely different.
$Q$
What I'm getting at is that it seems to be focused on the fact that there's lots of material on David, but isn't what's more important the content
of the material?

A
$Q$

A

For example, would it have been important to even know that he was gainfully employed and working with several individuals who would speak rather highly of him at the time?

A
You mean that's significant?
Yeah. Isn't that true?
Well, material significance has to be seen in the broader context. You are not just taking into account one elopement from home, a lot of kids run away from home, but repeated, if repeated break-ins, it's a pattern.

There's a big difference between a kid who runs away from home and is a smart aleck in school to a kid who is stabbing classmates and running a gang, there's quite a difference?

Yes, there is.
Okay. Did you make any effort or was it brought to your attention what David was doing just prior to his arrest in terms of work?

No.

And doing what?

Selling magazine subscriptions for Maclean's. It's a job that a number of famous people had in those days starting off.

And it's a job that a lot of infamous people had as well.

Pardon me?
And a job that a lot of infamous people did. Oh yes.

I've come across people who got into this and it was a scam.

Well, $I$ can name you a senator and a multi-billionaire who did it, but -Well one would be questionable.

Touché. But my point is that had you learned he was gainfully employed, and we have had a couple of witnesses here who have told us about it, very decent people who would speak well of him at that time; would that not be information you would want to have?

Okay.
Yeah.
But you never had that information?
I didn't have that information. I suppose, if I had carried on the interviews, it might have come
up.
And $I$ take it, with the benefit of hindsight, you could see, now, how particularly difficult interviews with yourself and other psychiatrists would be when the interviewer is perceived to believe that the interviewee is guilty of rape and murder? It's very difficult to be interviewed when the person seems to believe you are guilty? But I didn't believe that he was guilty of rape or murder, $I$ knew nothing about it.

Okay. But you knew he was charged with this?
Yes, I knew he was charged.
And --
That's a difference, I understand.
And it's a huge difference. But it's pretty difficult, is it not, to cast that totally aside? In terms of determining competence, no, that's not difficult.

No, but competence you are correct, that I mean he's competent?

Yes.
But in terms of determining his make-up or anything about him?

Well the information we got in the past, of course, is -- far antedated this alleged event --

Q
A
$Q$

A

Right.
-- where -- that's why it was past history. Age 5 had nothing to do with that.

Well you've got the past history, then you've got a gap, a recent gap the last year or two before he saw you?

Sure, yes.
But what $I$ am saying is $I$ just don't know how, as a psychiatrist, you can just cast aside the fact that a number of people are saying he's guilty of a vicious rape and a murder in assessing him?

I hadn't had the opinions of people saying he was guilty of vicious. When $I$ went in to see him that night $I$ knew he had been apprehended, that he was suspected, but $I$ didn't know that he was guilty of that. And $I$ tend to block out what the police tell me, and in fact they didn't tell me much, all they asked me at this time was about whether they could sit in the interview room with me.

Well you, as a psychiatrist have you seen people who have been convicted of that kind of crime, have you talked to?

And I take it the conviction affects how you deal with that person or what you believe; would it not?

A

Just one last thing, this, $I$ just want to deal briefly with the 'stab in the dark' comment. Now that comment, I take it, could or should be retrievable from really three written sources; that is your file; the file, the originating file from whomever sent it to you; and the penitentiary services who would have received it from the originator in getting David's background. Those are three reasonable places to look --

A Yes, yes.

Q -- for that written comment; correct?

A
Q

A

Q
-- with the passage of time that became a memory of having been in a report; is that not a possible scenario? You mentioned the sense of humour, I think you volunteered that, that it was a joking comment between two professionals that, as years
go by --
Is this, in effect, a repressed memory is what you are suggesting?

Well, it's more realistic than some I've heard.
I'm saying not a repressed memory, but that as time goes by you remembered that comment, but it didn't come from a report, because first of all you say it's an inappropriate comment, there is no bases for it, in other words even if it's inappropriate there should be a history giving rise to it; and the three sources that would have it in writing, none of them have it?

I can't explain the last. I remember reading it, I remember it literally jumping off the page at me, and when Caldwell, Mr. Caldwell asked me "had the reports arrived" I mentioned this to him, and I think he saw it again for himself when he came to my office to look at the reports.

But you can't explain --
I can't.
-- the remarkable fact that three sources don't
have it?
A
$Q$
A
$Q$

No, $I$ can't explain it.
Those are all my questions, Mr. Commissioner. MR. HARDY: I have no questions on
re-examination, Mr. Commissioner, although there was the issue of a publication ban, potentially, with respect to those additional materials. I don't know if the parties have any submissions on that but $I$ did want to raise it before we conclude.

MR. WOLCH: I would prefer to keep the ban.
MR. HARDY: Mr. Wolch has indicated a preference to keep the ban, it's similar to the materials that we had the ban in relation to before?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, I don't think the existing ban covered the materials that you are --

MR. HARDY: No, I -- correct.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But it should. So if you have the numbers to announce, for the sake of the record, it would be --

MR. HARDY: I can announce them. The numbers are page 332960 of document 332946 -actually, let me back up, $I$ don't think that's probably the right way to do it, I'll just say the doc. IDs; 332946, 171899, 027690, 171899-I'm, that's a repeat -- 171919, 027697, 332968, 332969,032347 .

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you. There will be a publication ban for each of those documents.

MR. HARDY: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: That's it? Thank you very much, Dr. McDonald, you are excused. Thank you.

MR. HARDY: That is our last witness for the day.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

```
(Adjourned at 3:45 p.m.)
```
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| $\begin{aligned} & 21120: 21,21130: 21 \\ & ' 70[1]-20947: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 'torchy [1] - 20940:13 | $11[2]-20959: 6$, 20959.13 | 1969 [24]-20931:4, |  |
| '70 [1] - 20947:12 <br> '70s [2] - 20945:14, | 'we've [1] - 20939:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20959:13 } \\ & 11: 53[1]-21048: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20934:11, 20938:14, } \\ & \text { 20938:17, 20945:4, } \end{aligned}$ | 2 [1] - 20980:10 |
| '71 [1] - 21110:11'72 [7] - 21023:5, | 'write [1] - 21040:16 | 11:53 [1] - 21048:2 <br> 11th [1] - 20959:7 | 20966:6, 20972:10, | 20 [7]-20982:1, |
|  | 'you [1] - 20936:13 | 12 [1] - 21088:4 <br> 12:20 [1] - 20988.8 | 20972:21, 20976:6, | 20982:10, 21035:19, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { '72[7]-21023:5, } \\ & \text { 21023:7, 21024:12, } \end{aligned}$ | 'you've [1] - 20940:2 | 12:45[1] - 20988:9 | 20976:8, 20978:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21066:2, 21079:18, } \\ & \text { 21083:12, 21095:18 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 21116:18, 21119:3 | 0 | 12th [1] - 21047:16 | 20997:2, 20997:7, | 2005 [2]-20926:21, |
| 21045:4, 21052:1, |  |  | 21017:18, 21063:23, | 21059:14 |
|  |  | 13th [1]-20971:5 | 21102:2, 21104:1, | 20475 [1]-20964:7 |
| 21052:5, 21116:18, | 0 [1]-21104:12 | [5] - 20959:23, | 21104:18, 21109:15, | 20930 [1] - 20929:4 |
| 21120:23 | 000753 [1]-21018:14 | 21026:24, 21043:16, | 21110:8, 21110:11, | 20968 [1] - 20929:5 |
| '76 [1] - 20954:15 | 006762 [1] - 20987:24 | 21044:4, 21115:7 | 21114:14 | 20975 [1] - 20929:7 |
| '77 [1] - 20947:11 | 006764 [1] - 20980:4 | 14th [6]-20971:17, | 1969-1972 [1] - | 20th [1] - 20957:3 |
| '77-78 [1]-20947:12 | 006765 [1] - 20989:8 | 21030:18, 21047:7, | 21049:13 | 21094 [1] - 20929:8 |
| '79 [1] - 20957:9 | 006831 [1] - 21046:5 | 21058:2, 21058:11, | 1970 [3]-20977:25, | 21101 [1] - 20929:9 |
| '80s [1] - 20973:19 | 006833 [1] - 21043:11 | 21108:25 | 21063:23, 21110:11 | 21103 [1]-20929:10 |
| '83 [2] - 21050:4, | 006837 [1] - 21040:10 | 15 [4]-20944:13, | 1970s [2] - 21018:8, | 21121 [1] - 20929:11 |
| 21051:1 | 006838 [1]-21118:7 | 21029:23, 21115:8, | 21046:6 | 216123 [1] - 20961:11 |
| '87 [1] - 20962:18 | 006845 [1] - 21115:23 | 21115:11 | 1971 [1]-20975:18 | 216145 [1] - 20962:6 |
| '89 [1] - 21068:4 | 006929 [1] - 21013:11 | 155237 [1] - 20947:18 | 1972 [13]-21018:17, | 217537 [1] - 20958:19 |
| '93 [2] - $21051: 6$, | 006936 [1] - 21013:13 | 155239 [1] - 20949:20 | 21030:18, 21035:15, | 219537 [1]-20959:1 |
| 21053:21 | 006942 [1]-21011:20 | 155240 [1] - 20950:3 | 21043:16, 21044:5, | 219538 [1] - 20960:2 |
| 'ask [1] - 21047:5 | 007024 [1] - 21003:20 | 15th [2]-20962:9, | 21044:25, 21047:7, | 23rd [1] - 21061 :25 |
| 'can [1]-21014:14 | 007049 [1] - 21007:5 | 21058:13 | 21054:9, 21060:16, | 24th [1]-21040:13 |
| 'conversation [1] - | 009327 [2] - 20996:25, | $16[3]-20938: 11$ | 21061:2, 21065:23, <br> $21112 \cdot 19$ 21120.22 | $25[1]$ - 21092:10 |
| 'dr [1] - 21012:3 | 21101:20 | 20943:12, 20989:4 | $1974 \text { [8] - 21040:9, }$ | 25th [1] - 20958:22 |
| 'easy' [1] - 21080:21 | $012907 \text { [1] - 20957:1 }$ $027690[1]-21138: 23$ | 16-year-old [5] - 20938:9, 20938:11, | 21040:13, 21043:11, | $269423 \text { [1] - 20965:6 }$ |
| 'he [1] - 21091 :9 | $027697 \text { [1] - 21138:24 }$ | 20938:12, 20941:24, | 21044:22, 21046:11, | 27th [2]-20961:13, |
| 'hysterical [1] - 21006:8 | 032347 [1] - 21138:25 | 21122:3 | 21118:15, 21119:1 | 21043:11 |
| 'i'll [1] - 20940:10 | $034527 \text { [1] - } 21076: 1$ | 16-year-olds [1] - | 1977 [6]-21046:13, | 28th [1] - 20952:25 |
| 'ian [2] - 21008:22, | 034528[1]-21076:11 | 20950:13 | 21047:5, 21047:16, 21117:20, 21120:25 | 29th [1] - 20972:21 |
| 21040:12 'if $[4]-21040 \cdot 19$ | 034532 [1] - 21085:21 | 16010 [1] - 21008:16 | $1980 \text { [1] - 20964:23 }$ | 2:32 [1] - 21093:23 |
| $21042: 7,21043: 2 .$ | 039513 [1]-21046:22 | $16083[1]-21004: 15$ $162295[1]-21092 \cdot 15$ | $1981 \text { [6] - 20947:23, }$ | 2:49 [1] - 21093:24 |
| 21119:5 | 044621 [1] - 21094:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 162295[1]-21092: 15 \\ & 16347{ }_{[1]}-21014: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 20947:24, 20953:3, | 20988:3, 20988:6, |
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| Caldwell's [17] - | 20955:21, 20970:8, | 21046:7, 21060:24 | chronology [2] - | 21077:3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21001:12, 21003:22, | 20978:20, 20997:10, | certainly [15] | 21070:4, 21111:7 | clinically [1] - 20984:13 |
| 21003:23, 21012:1, | 20997:15, 20997:20, | 20940:19, 20946:8, | circle [1] - 21069:13 | cloaking [1] - 21095 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21013:14, 21014:5, } \\ & \text { 21030:22, 21036:14, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21000: 2,21001: 4 \\ & \text { 21007:2, 21010:12, } \end{aligned}$ | 20948:16, 20949:4, 20953:21, 20987:2, | circulation [2]21003:12, 21029:3 | close [1] - 21020:20 <br> closed [2] - 20961:5, |
| 21039:23, 21040:14, | 21010:18, 21011:13 | 20991:21, 21029:23, | circum [1] - 21097:21 | 21048:1 |
| 21042:18, 21047:14, | 21011:23, 21012:24 | 21052:4, 21090:13, | circumstance [1] | closely [1] - 21080:15 |
| 21084:2, 21104:14, | 21013:5, 21023:1 | 21106:17, 21110:14 | 21011:11 | 1006:2 |
| 21106:21, 21114:22, | 21026:18, 21027:5 | 21113:8, 21120:10, | circumstances | hing [1] - 21005:8 |
| 21115:19 | 21030:25, 21032:3 | 21128 | 20940:21, 20941:8 | club [1]-20966:10 |
| Calgary[1] - 20952:7 | 21035:4, 21048:1, | Certainly [1] - 21049:16 | 20976:12, 20976:25, | clues [1]-21022:6 |
| California [1] - 21066:9 | $\begin{aligned} & 21050: 19,21055: 4, \\ & 21062: 4,21076: 18, \end{aligned}$ | Certificates [1] | 21026:6, 21078:8, | co [2] - 20981 :6, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { callous [1] - 20951:9 } \\ & \text { Calvin[1] - } 21130: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 21062:4, 21076:18, <br> 21076:22, 21078:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 21140: 1 \\ & \text { certify }[1]-21140: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21081: 5,21089: 14, \\ & \text { 21090:19, 21097:15, } \end{aligned}$ | 21125:14 |
| Canada[3]-20928:12, | 21083:11, 21083:22 | chairman | 21097:16, 21097:18, | 20981:6, 21125:14 |
| 20932:4, 20952:3 | 21084:4, 21094:11 | 21030:18, 21043:18 | 21097:21, 21098:13, | cocked [1]-21118:2 |
| Canadian[1] - 21072:4 <br> Candace [1] - 20927:4 | $\begin{aligned} & 21098: 5,21104: 4, \\ & \text { 21106:6, 21108:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chairman[1] - } \\ & 21043: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 21100:5 <br> cited [1] | cognition [2] - |
| cannot [1] - 21002:3 | 21111:7, 21112:5, | chance [5] - 20948:2 | cities [1] - 20938:24 | coincidence [2] - |
| canopy [1] - 20932:24 <br> canvassed [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21116:8, } 21119: 19 \\ & 21121: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21002: 9,21002: 15, \\ & 21030: 12,21049: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { city }[3]-20977: 19, \\ & 21083: 10,21101: 5 \end{aligned}$ | 20945:6, 20945:16 |
| 20971:18, 21093:14 canvassing [4] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cases [10] - 20976:24, } \\ & \text { 20977:6, 20977:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { change [5] - 20969:8, } \\ & \text { 21030:12, 21090:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { City[3]-21077:6, } \\ \text { 21082:17, 21101:2 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21023:14, 21023:25, } \\ & 21107: 24,21108: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 20935:21, 20938:1, | 20978:3, 21022:15 | 21115:12, 21115:13 | claims [1] - 21064:21 | colleagues |
| 20952:2, 20952:16 capable [16] - 2099 | $\begin{aligned} & 21083: 24,21117: 15, \\ & 21119: 21,21124: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { changed }[1]-21064: 16 \\ & \text { chap }[3]-20935: 3 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { clarification [4] - } \\ \text { 20989:7, } 21046: 24 \end{gathered}$ | $21122: 22,21126: 18$ |
| 20997:13, 21089:8, | 1133:1 | 20956:6, 20964 | 21080:17, 21098:11 | ollected [1] - $21032: 8$ |
| 21089:13, 21091:14, | 21134:9 | ap's [1] - 20953:16 | clarified [1] - 21031:17 | collection [4]- |
| 21091:15, 21096:10, |  | chapter [1]-21016:1 | clarify [1] - 21020:13 | 21044:23, 21046:17 |
| 21096:20, 21096:23, | categories | characterize [2] - | Clark[1] - 20957:16 | 21057:12, 21060:3 |
| 21097:14, 21097:20, | category [1] - 20994:6 | $21021 \text { :20, } 21042: 15$ | class [1] - 20986:8 | College[1] - 21010:6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21098:14, 21098:17, } \\ & \text { 21100:23 } \end{aligned}$ | Catherine [2] - 20928:5, | charge [1] - 20978:6 charged [5] - 20987: | classic [1] - 20994:16 | Colorado [3] 20976:15, 20976:19 |
| capacity [2] - 21006:20, | $\begin{aligned} & 21103: 17 \\ & \text { causing [1] - 20941:25 } \end{aligned}$ | 21000:19, 21080:23, | 21131:14 | coloured [1] - 21115:2 |
| 21121:5 <br> capital [4]-20976:24, <br> 20977:6, 20977:20, | Cavalier[1]-20926:16 caveat [2] - 21050:13, | 21133:11, 21133:12 <br> charges [1] - 21033:17 <br> chart [2]-21032:9, | $\begin{gathered} \text { cleaned [3] - 20940:23, } \\ \text { 20940:24, 20941:20 } \\ \text { clear [4]-21014:24, } \end{gathered}$ | Columbia [1] - 20930:20 column [1] - 21056:2 comfortable [8] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20978:3 } \\ & \text { captured [4] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21110: 8 \\ & \mathbf{C b c}_{[4]}-21067: 14 \end{aligned}$ | 21037:15 <br> Charter $[1]$ - 21100:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21016:16, 21023:15, } \\ & 21067: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 21023:7, 21023:17, 21033:9, 21033:12, |
| 20944:14, 20944:18, | 21067:19, 21070:24, | chat [1] - 21094:6 | clear-cut [1] - 21016:16 | 21035:22, 21035:24, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20949: 5,21016: 21 \\ & \text { card }[1]-21069: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21072: 8 \\ & \text { cell }[1]-20959: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { check }[3]-21009: 15 \\ & 21093: 9,21104: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { clearly [6] - 20965:23, } \\ & \text { 21015:4, 21020:17. } \end{aligned}$ | $21042: 2,21054: 8$ |
| cards [2]-21051:5, | Center[2]-21018:25, | Chief [2] - 20980:7 | 21046:1, 21059:1, | coming [6] - 20930:17, <br> 20945•8, 20969•20 |
| 21051:22 | 21 | 20988:2 | 21098:2 | $\text { 974:16, } 21020 \text { : }$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { care }[1]-21066: 25 \\ & \text { career }[3]-20975: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { centre }[1]-20959: 24 \\ & \text { Centre }[19]-20982: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { chief [2]-20971:16, } \\ & \text { 20989:9 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Clerk[1] - 20927:10 } \\ & \text { client [3] - 21040:25, } \end{aligned}$ | 21094:8 <br> comment [56] |
| 20976:1, 21130:19 | 20982:23, 20986:19, | child [1] - 20938:10 | 21080:19, 21126:1 | 20999:17, 21000:5 |
| careful [3] - 21082:3, | 20986:20, 20998:25 | Child [8] - 20982:21 | clients [1] - 21025:24 | 21000:8, 21000:14, |
| 21083:15, 21124:1 | 20999:23, 21009:18 | 21019:1, 21020:16, | Clinic [6] - 20982:21, | $21000: 17,21001: 10$ |
| carefully [2] - 21026:1, | 21027:21, 21035:5 | $21027: 10,21028: 1$ | 21019:2, 21027:10, | 21001:21, 21002:17, |
| 21098:5 | 21058:9, 21058:18 | 21029:12, 21035:8, | 21029:12, 21035:9, | 21032:14, 21033:6, |
| Carlyle[4]-20948:12, | 21060:20, 21062:8, | 21052:6 | $21052:$ | 21033:11, 21033:19, |
| 20948:13, 20949:12, | 21062:15, 21068:18 | children [5] - 20940:8 | Clinic's [1] - 21028:15 | 21036:15, 21037:19, |
| 20953:8 | 21085:24, 21108:6, | 20968:12, 20974:4, | Clinical [2] - 21007:13, | 21042:10, 21042:11, |
| Carlylegordge [4] - | 21108:24, 21113:23 | 21029:1, 21069:4 | 21007:23 | 21042:18, 21042:19, |
| 20948:12, 20948:13, | centres [3]-20992:16, | chip [1] - 20942:6 | $\text { clinical }[10]-20976: 3 \text {, }$ | $21042: 20,21042: 23,$ |
| 20949:12, 20953:8 | 21113:21, 21113:2 | $\mathbf{e}_{[1]-21081: 10}$ | $\text { 20976:5, } 21001: 16$ | 21073:23, 21077:17, |
| carried [1] - 21132:25 | certain [7]-20971:7, | $\text { chose }[1]-21028: 2$ | 21024:3, 21024:8, | $21080: 17,21082: 6,$ |
| $\text { carry [1] - } 21024: 25$ | 20974:1, 21018:6, | Chris [1] - 20928:8 | $21026: 20,21066: 1,$ | $21082: 22,21083: 9,$ |
| $\text { case }[42]-20951: 16,$ | 21022:6, 21042:13, | Christian [1] - 20988:16 | 21066:15, 21067:4, | 21085:1, 21085:5, |
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| ```21085:11, 21085:17, 21086:8, 21086:14, 21087:1, 21088:7, 21089:22, 21090:7, 21090:24, 21091:7, 21091:13, 21092:21, 21092:22, 21093:1, 21096:13, 21098:8, 21098:10, 21099:1, 21111:7, 21111:14, 21114:12, 21135:17, 21135:18, 21136:1, 21136:25, 21137:6, 21137:8 comments [8]- 20981:11, 20981:13, 21000:10, 21056:1, 21063:12, 21065:17, 21090:8, 21090:23 Commission [13] - 20926:2, 20926:14, 20927:1, 20927:2, 20927:3, 20927:10, 20971:3, 21002:11, 21049:2, 21055:22, 21060:12, 21061:12, 21067:9 Commissioner [37] - 20930:3, 20930:6, 20930:11, 20974:11, 20974:15, 20974:23, 20974:25, 21042:22, 21042:24, 21043:7, 21048:18, 21048:21, 21054:21, 21055:21, 21057:1, 21059:25, 21063:13, 21064:2, 21064:8, 21064:15, 21065:2, 21065:8, 21065:15, 21093:13, 21093:17, 21093:22, 21094:1, 21094:3, 21118:9, 21137:24, 21138:1, 21138:12, 21138:16, 21139:1, 21139:4, 21139:5, 21139:10 Commissioners [1] - 20971:19 commit [2] - 20960:15, 21100:5 commitment [4] - 20960:17, 20964:2, 20964:3, 20964:5 committed [3] - 20961:25, 20963:4, 20978:8 committee [1] - 21030:9 committing [1] -``` | ```21097:11 common [1] - 20959:15 communicated [1] - 21013:6 communication [5] - 21033:7, 21069:12, 21069:17, 21071:17, 21117:18 communications [2] - 21018:6, 21040:7 community [5] - 20944:23, 20994:14, 21016:6, 21090:13, 21114:20 company [1] - 20954:15 compare [1] - 21063:19 compelled [3] - 20958:12, 21085:4, 21091:7 compensation [1] - 21107:22 competence [7] - 20991:16, 20998:9, 21066:23, 21066:25, 21122:18, 21133:17, 21133:19 competent [4] - 21082:10, 21123:10, 21133:20 complaints [1] - 21082:16 complete [10] - 20982:13, 20984:12, 20990:12, 20990:13, 21022:21, 21027:25, 21028:1, 21034:16, 21044:23, 21093:4 completely [1] - 21098:7 completion [1] - 21023:20 comprehensive [2] - 20952:8, 20995:22 compulsive [1] - 20994:1 conceivably [1] - 21045:20 concern [6] - 20980:24, 20995:1, 21064:16, 21074:18, 21077:10, 21123:21 concerned [5] - 20935:22, 20949:4, 20981:18, 21074:21, 21080:25 concerning [2] - 20997:15, 21043:19 concerns [2] - 21019:16, 21082:21 conclude [9] -``` | ```20983:18, 20984:22, 21019:3, 21020:25, 21021:24, 21040:21, 21042:7, 21043:3, 21138:6 concluded [1] - 20983:21 conclusion [21] - 20985:20, 20986:5, 21013:7, 21017:2, 21019:24, 21021:17, 21021:21, 21022:14, 21022:24, 21023:4, 21023:16, 21023:18, 21024:9, 21025:15, 21025:21, 21035:14, 21054:8, 21060:15, 21061:1, 21127:4, 21127:7 conclusions [6] - 20984:10, 20984:15, 20984:18, 20986:24, 21022:3, 21022:8 condition [2] - 20965:11, 20993:9 conditions [2] - 21021:23, 21089:15 conduct [4] - 20977:16, 21064:19, 21065:1, 21080:16 conducted [1] - 21062:14 conducting \({ }_{[1]}\) - 21075:20 conduit [3]-21048:4, 21073:8, 21117:12 conference [3] - 21111:8, 21112:5, 21112:12 conferenced [1] - 21062:4 confidential [3] - 21058:21, 21072:4, 21072:7 confidentiality [2] - 21124:7, 21124:9 confirm [1] - 21012:16 confirmed [9] - 21012:15, 21013:12, 21040:13, 21047:4, 21054:1, 21060:4, 21085:7, 21085:13, 21112:23 confirming [1] - 21082:11 confirms [1] - 21087:19 conflict [1] - 20956:19 confronted [1] - 20945:24 Congram[1] - 20927:4``` |  | ```content [2]-21130:25, 21131:4 contents [5] - 21029:13, 21034:9, 21050:5, 21066:7 context [14]-20980:3, 20987:5, 21000:8, 21033:18, 21036:19, 21044:24, 21064:22, 21079:14, 21083:15, 21091:22, 21110:11, 21112:8, 21119:7, 21131:8 continual [1] - 21034:4 continuation [1] - 21100:20 Continue [1] - 21084:1 continue [9] - 20953:18, 20963:14, 20985:15, 21020:14, 21051:14, 21059:7, 21065:13, 21116:23 continued [3] - 20962:3, 21053:25, 21121:1 continuing [3] - 20955:25, 21031:25, 21046:6 contract [1] - 20957:10 contrary [1] - 21061:4 contribute [2] - 20953:19, 20953:24 contributed [1] - 20960:20 conversation [11] - 20947:7, 20948:8, 20948:24, 20949:1, 20949:10, 20952:23, 20953:10, 20979:8, 21006:6, 21103:10, 21110:15 conversations [4] - 20956:13, 21018:20, 21019:11, 21136:10 convey [1] - 21113:2 conveying [2] - 21117:4, 21117:5 convicted [2] - 21025:17, 21134:21 conviction [5] - 20970:24, 20971:12, 20971:24, 21017:24, 21135:1 Conviction[1] - 20926:4 convinced [1] - 21081 :7 Conway[1] - 21059:8 cool [4] - 20934:20, 20934:23, 20935:2, 20951:13``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| Cool' [2] - 20951 : 7, | country [2] - 20935:20, | 21004:7, 21017:13, | 21087:9, 21096:15, | 20978:20, 20980:8, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20951:10 | 21129:15 | 21107:17 | 21097:1, 21098:25, 21099:12, 21135:17 | 20988:9, 20988:21, 20999.14 21007.2 |
| copies [1] - 21056:8 | 20987:9, 20987:22 | 21123:6, 21123:8 | darn [1] - 20960:21 | 21009:3, 21011:18, |
| copy [11] - 20957:2, | 21014:23, 21047: | 21 | data [2]-21026:16, | 21030:19, 21043:13, |
| 20958:21, 20959:3, | 21047:13, 21051:4 | cal [1] - 21128:2 | 21026:2 | 74:8, |
| 20965:3, 20973:11, | 21056:1, 21059:11 | crop [1] - 21128:8 | database [4] | 1115:4, 21116:2 |
| 21027:19, 21027:23, | 21061:9, 21065:15, | cross [1]-21093:19 | 21054:23, 21055:10, | 21120:21, 21121:19, |
| 21064:6, 21073:12, 21118:10, 21128:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21066:5, } 21071: 8, \\ & \text { 21072:15, 21109:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cross-examination [1] - } \\ & \text { 21093:19 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21055:16, 21056:16 } \\ & \text { date [15] - 20934:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\text { 21123:5, } 21126: 20,$ $21127: 24,21129: 7,$ |
| copying [2] - 21063:24, 21064:3 | $\begin{aligned} & 21120: 18,21132: 15 \\ & \text { course }[33]-20932: 8 \end{aligned}$ | Crown[10]-20977:11, 20979:4, 21034:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20934:5, 20947:23, } \\ & \text { 20948:15, 20959:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21130: 25,21131: 18, \\ & 21136: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| corner [2] - 21047:2, | 20938:19, 20939:13, <br> 20943:13, 20946:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21107:5, 21127:6, } \\ & \text { 21127:16, 21127:17, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20980:14, 20980:16, } \\ & \text { 20980:17, 20988:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { David's [6] - 20941:3, } \\ & \text { 20960:4, } 20961: 16, \end{aligned}$ |
| correct [29] - 20931:6, | 20962:23, 20981:4, | $21127: 24,21127: 25,$ | 20988:6, 21007:5, | 20965:24, 21126:8, |
| 20932:10, 20936:21, | 20981:11, 20982:3, | $21128: 6$ | 21018:17, 21040:12, | $21135: 23$ |
| 20948:7, 20964:20, 20969:5, 20975:9, | 20982:19, 20983:3, 20984:24, 20991:18 | crucial [1] - 21099:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21076:10, 21088:4 } \\ & \text { dated [15] - 20952:25, } \end{aligned}$ | day-to-day [1] - 20994:18 |
| 20975:21, 20985:19, | 20997:3, 21003:21, 21004:14, 21004:18 | 20934:18 | 20955:16, 20957:3, <br> 20958.21, 20961:13 | days [11] - 20936:25, 20938:25, 20939:8, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21008:21, 21008:24, } \\ & \text { 21054:5, 21057:15, } \end{aligned}$ | 21008:12, 21010:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { crying [2] - 20946:11, } \\ & \text { 20946:20 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20958:21, 20961:13, } \\ & \text { 20962:9, 20972:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20938:25, 20939:8, } \\ & \text { 20944:15, 20967:23, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 21079:19, 21092:7, | 21012:14, 21022:1, | Csis[1] - 21095:6 | 20997:1, 21030:18, | 20970:22, 21016:4, |
| 21094:21, 21095:17, | 21027:9, 21028:10, | Csr [8] - 20927:1 | 21043:10, 21047:4, | $\text { 21030:5, } 21031 \text { :6, }$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21096: 1,21096: 16, \\ & 21097: 24,21098: 2, \end{aligned}$ | 21030:22, 21031:22, <br> 21037:24, 21045:15, | 20927:12, 21140:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21047:16, 21054:24, } \\ & \text { 21059:13, 21061:23 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21047:13, 21132:3 } \\ & \text { dead }[1]-20970: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| 21098:19, 21102:1, | 21064:18, 21064:25, | 21140:18, 21140:19 | dates [1] - 21062:21 | dead-end [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21122: 9,21127: 2, \\ & 21133: 19,21136: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21120: 19,21127: 5, \\ & 21129: 18,21133: 25 \end{aligned}$ | cuff [1] - 21033:19 | dating [1] - 21114:11 <br> daughter [1]-20963:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20970:18 } \\ & \text { deal [12] - 20941:21, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 21138:15, 21140:5 <br> corrected [2]-21058:7, | Court[14]-20927:11, 20985:4, 21082:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { culling [2]-21052:13, } \\ & \text { 21052:22 } \end{aligned}$ | Dave [4] - 20940:23, 20941:19, 20942:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20942:16, 20951:1, } \\ & \text { 20962:24, 20966:17, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 21092:19 | 21083:24, 21106:3, | 20 | vid [85] - 20926:4, | 20981:6, $21009: 7$ |
| Correctional [3] - $\text { 21027:16, } 21035:$ | 21126:16, 21127:5, | current [1] - 21115:8 | 20928:2, 20928:11 | 21018:18, 21094:1 21097:24, 21135:1, |
| 21072:5 <br> correctional | $\begin{aligned} & 21128: 8,21140: 1, \\ & 21140: 3,21140: 14, \end{aligned}$ | 21032:13, 21032:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20932:20, 20932:24, } \\ & \text { 20933:7, 20933:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21135:16 } \\ & \text { dealing [6] - 21007:1, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21029:8 } \\ & \text { correctly [10] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21140:20 } \\ & \text { cousin [2] - 21068:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cut }[3]-21016: 16, \\ & 21063: 19,21063: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20933: 25,20935: 6, \\ & 20935: 9,20937: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21070: 6,21081: 2, \\ & 21082: 19,21085: 17, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20985: 21,21001: 9, \\ & \text { 21024:15, 21040:1, } \end{aligned}$ | 21069:3 <br> cover [3] - 21002:20 | cutting [1] - 21050:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20937:18, 20937:21, } \\ & \text { 20937:23, 20938:8, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21109:1 } \\ & \text { dealings [9] - 21048:15, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21049:12, 21091:11, } \\ & \text { 21098:8, 21104:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21028:19, 21100:14 } \\ & \text { cover-up [1] - 21100:14 } \end{aligned}$ | D | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20939:18, 20939:25, } \\ & \text { 20941:7, 20941:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21082:12, 21083:2, } \\ & \text { 21083:4, 21100:24, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $21106: 25,21121: 23$ <br> correspondence [8] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { covered [7]-20995:18, } \\ & \text { 21017:18, 21024:19, } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20941:18, 20941:21, } \\ & \text { 20942:15, 20942:17, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21101: 5,21120: 19, \\ & 21121: 8,21121: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| 20962:15, 21030:15, | 21026:7, 21036:8, | damaging [1] | 20942:20, 20942:24, | deals [1] - 21088:16 |
| 21030:21, 21035:15, | 21039:22, 21138:13 | 21123:18 | 20943:2, 20943:7, | dealt [1] - 20956:23 |
| $21048: 3,21051: 2,$ | created [3] - 21055:17, 21055:22, 21068:6 | danger [1]-21090:9 | 20943:18, 20943:24, 20944:5, 20946:7, | dean [2]-20975:21, |
| 21051:10, 21116:16 corresponding [1] $21116 \cdot 2$ | credence [1] - 21015:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { dangerous [2] - } \\ & \text { 21014:22, 21089:19 } \end{aligned}$ | 20947:3, 20947:15, | 21068:2 <br> Dean[1]-21099:22 |
| 21116:2 <br> costs [1] - 20960:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { credibility [1] - } \\ & 21023: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dangerous [1] - } \\ & \text { 21015:7 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20948:10, 20948:18, } \\ & \text { 20949:22, 20953:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dean's [2]-21050:7, } \\ & \text { 21052:9 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Cotler[1] - 20928:12 <br> Counsel[3] - 20927:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { credible }[1]-21082: 3 \\ & \text { crew }[1]-20931: 19 \end{aligned}$ | Danny [1] - 21130:9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20957:12, 20957:19, } \\ & \text { 20958:4, 20959:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { death [2]-21000:19, } \\ & \text { 21110:11 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 20927:3, 20930:4 | crime [10]-20990:20, 20991:6, $20991 \cdot 9$ | dark [10] - 20999:16, | 20964:16, 20964:17, <br> 20964:20, 20965:5, | December [2] - <br> 20926:21, 21061:23 |
| 20974:24, 21103:17, | 20997:13, 21079:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21000:21, 21036:23, } \\ & \text { 21037:1, 21037:7, } \end{aligned}$ | 20965:10, 20966:4, | decent [1] - 21132:17 |
| 21122:20, 21122:21, | 21098:2, 21098:14, | 21037:20, 21038:19, | 20967:25, 20969:4, | decided [3]-21047:20, |
| 21123:3, 21123:6 | 21100:5, 21113:7, | 21086:19, 21110:3, | 20969:11, 20969:24, | 21073:10, 21093:25 |
| count [1] - 20977:20 <br> counter [1] - 20943:6 | 21134:21 <br> criminal [6] - 20977:25, 20978:9, 20978:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 21136: 15 \\ & \text { dark' }[9]-21040: 4, \end{aligned}$ | 20971:12, 20971:24, <br> 20972:18, 20972:20, | Decided [1] - 21030:9 decision [5] - 20936:14, 20961:17, 21030:10 |


| ```21107:2, 21107:3 decisions [5] - 21012:17, 21026:17, 21067:1 dedicated [1] - 21050:2 deep [2]-21113:6, 21113:9 deep-seated [2] - 21113:6, 21113:9 defence [9] - 20977:12, 20991:16, 20991:20, 21009:8, 21080:16, 21081:7, 21122:12, 21123:18, 21126:6 defences [1] - 21105:6 defending [1] - 20934:24 define [1]-21016:13 defined [1]-21122:19 definition [2] - 21015:24, 21016:16 definitions [1] - 21017:10 degrees [1] - 21016:5 deleted [2] - 20953:8, 20953:23 deliberate [1] - 21087:6 delivered [3] - 21050:6, 21050:25, 21051:5 demographics [1] - 20938:21 denial [1]-21087:23 Denver [1] - 20976:15 departed [1] - 20973:2 departing [1] - 21007:24 Department [8] - 20997:1, 20997:8, 21027:13, 21034:21, 21035:9, 21050:6, 21050:11, 21050:15 department [2] - 21054:18, 21117:14 deposit [2] - 20954:23, 20954:24 described [7] - 21006:3, 21024:19, 21024:21, 21051:16, 21109:22, 21110:3, 21110:7 Description [1] - 20929:2 descriptors [1] - 21024:22 design [1] - 21053:6 designate [1] - 21108:16 designates [1] - 20983:12 designs [1] - 21053:9``` | ```destroyed [2] - 20985:9, 21076:22 detail [4] - 20949:17, 20982:2, 21002:21, 21019:14 details [6] - 20979:3, 20986:23, 20990:8, 20990:19, 21007:15, 21020:4 detective [2] - 20935:3, 20965:8 Detective [2] - 20980:7, 20988:2 determination [1] - 20991:5 determine [4] - 21065:4, 21122:9, 21124:21, 21125:5 determined [1] - 20963:5 determining [3] - 21122:11, 21133:17, 21133:22 devastated [3] - 20967:18, 20967:19, 20968:7 devices [1] - 21095:11 diagnosis [15] - 20984:12, 20993:8, 21021:7, \(21021: 9\), 21022:16, 21023:7, 21023:10, 21030:2, 21030:7, 21065:18, 21112:22, 21112:25, 21115:9, 21115:15, 21115:18 Diagnostic [1] - 21016:2 diagnostic [1] - 21018:21 dialogue [1] - 21124:16 difference [4] - 21131:12, 21131:15, 21133:14, 21133:15 different [11] - 20934:19, 20938:11, 20960:12, 20964:4, 21005:1, 21015:8, 21122:11, 21122:15, 21126:3, 21130:21, 21130:22 difficult [9]-20956:17, 21090:12, 21090:13, 21133:3, 21133:7, 21133:16, 21133:18, 21135:9 difficulties [1] - 20959:5 difficulty [5] - 21123:12, 21123:13,``` | ```21125:13, 21125:15 \(\operatorname{dim}[2]\) - 20960:10, 20961:19 dimension [1] - 20965:24 dimensions [1] - 20967:9 Dimmitt[1]-20989:9 Direct [2]-20935:18, 20935:19 direct [10] - 20931:17, 20939:14, 20952:4, 20978:20, 20979:8, 20996:13, 21003:25, 21008:14, 21047:19, 21052:13 directed [9] - 20980:6, 20991:10, 20991:15, 20991:19, 20995:14, 21046:13, 21067:23, 21067:25, 21072:21 direction [2] - 20956:1, 21073:18 directly [7] - 20931:22, 20973:8, 20979:12, 20994:3, 21010:2, 21047:22, 21116:22 Director [3] - 20927:4, 21007:13, 21007:23 disagree [1] - 21094:24 disappointed [1] - 20963:6 disassociated [1] - 21012:23 disbursements [1] - 20962:11 discarded [2] - 21051:23, \(21051: 24\) discharge [1] - 21007:22 discharged [1] - 21058:12 disclosed [1] - 20967:7 discomfort [2] - 20993:21, 20993:23 discovered [1] - 21050:9 discuss [1] - 20990:8 discussed [8] - 20953:11, 21001:22, 21002:24, 21017:15, 21062:9, 21063:16, 21075:18, 21084:13 Discussed [1] - 21062:5 discusses [1] - 20950:19 discussing [12] - 21000:2, 21004:4, 21008:18, 21011:3, 21031:12, 21036:16,``` |  | ```21040:10, 21138:23 doctor [6] - 20988:13, 20988:23, 20989:5, 21065:4, 21100:21, 21136:12 Doctor[6] - 21034:20, 21034:23, 21035:1, 21063:21, 21128:10, 21128:21 doctor/patient [1] - 21124:5 doctors [1] - 21107:20 Document[4] - 20927:5, 20927:6, 20927:7, 20971:15 document [123]- 20947:23, 20948:3, 20949:9, 20949:16, 20949:18, 20953:2, 20958:18, 20958:19, 20962:13, 20972:2, 20980:3, 20980:4, 20981:24, 20989:6, 20995:11, 20996:16, 20996:23, 20998:24, 20999:21, 20999:25, 21000:4, 21000:9, 21001:8, 21003:20, 21003:21, 21007:5, 21010:14, 21010:15, 21010:21, 21010:22, 21011:20, 21011:21, 21011:25, 21013:11, 21018:14, 21018:16, 21029:5, 21030:17, 21031:12, 21032:24, 21033:14, 21040:10, 21043:11, 21046:5, 21046:8, 21046:21, 21049:5, 21052:24, 21052:25, 21053:14, 21053:17, 21055:17, 21055:20, 21055:21, 21055:22, 21056:1, 21056:6, 21056:11, 21056:12, 21056:15, 21057:5, 21058:6, 21058:8, 21058:15, 21058:17, 21059:2, 21059:16, 21059:18, 21059:23, 21059:24, 21061:5, 21061:13, 21061:14, 21062:18, 21063:3, 21063:6, 21063:11, 21063:18, 21064:5, 21064:11, 21064:17, 21065:16, 21066:6, 21067:10, 21067:11, 21067:12, 21067:15, 21068:6,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 21068:10, 21070:2, | down [27] - 20935:13, | 21072:24, 21073:9, | earliest [3] - 20978:24, | employ [2] - 20937:6, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21070:15, 21071:3, | 20936:4, 20936:9, | 21073:21, 21074:1, | 21058:4, 21058 :6 | 20937:9 |
| 21071:5, 21071:19, | 20937:16, 20943:10, | 21075:18, 21076:1, | early [14] - 20939:2, | employed [3] - |
| 21071:20, 21072:2, | 20949:3, 20950:16, | 21076:15, 21076:21, | 20945:14, 20957:8, | 20975:12, 21131:22, |
| 21072:7, 21072:10, | 20955:24, 20969:8, | 21076:24, 21077:5, | 20970:22, 20979:7, | 21132:15 |
| 21072:13, 21072:17, | 20969:21, 20988:11, | 21077:10, 21077:14, | 20987:2, 21029:19, | employee [1] - |
| 21073:3, 21073:24, | 20989:10, 21004:20, | 21078:15, 21079:19, | 21031:4, 21045:12, | 20994:20 |
| 21075:4, 21075:7, | 21026:25, 21034:17, | 21080:8, 21082:16, | 21048:19, 21069:2, | employer [1] - |
| 21075:25, 21076:8, | 21036:25, 21052:2, | 21084:7, 21085:4, | 21079:11, 21105:1 | 20973:21 |
| 21076:13, 21085:18, | 21063:20, 21070:22, | 21085:23, 21087:12, | easy [2]-21078:7, | employment [2] - |
| 21091:19, 21092:15, | 21084:1, 21094:20, | 21087:22, 21088:22, | 21080:22 | 20932:9, 20957:5 |
| 21092:16, 21093:9, | 21095:13, 21095:22, | 21089:7, 21092:4, | echo [1] - 21045:24 | Emson [5] - 21068:1, |
| 21095:20, 21096:5, | 21096:20, 21099:22, | 21092:13, 21093:8, | Eddie [1] - 20928:8 | 21071:13, 21072:21, |
| 21101:20, 21101:22, | 21107:13, 21125:9 | 21093:11, 21094:5, | Edgar [1] - 21030:19 | 21073:9 |
| 21103:8, 21104:11, | Dr [131]-20974:12, | 21096:9, 21096:22, | edification [2] - | Emson's [1] - 21074:1 |
| 21111:4, 21111:18, | 20974:20, 20974:23, | 21101:16, 21101:25, | 21071:14, 21072:14 | enclosed [2] - |
| 21112:20, 21120:17, | 20975:3, 20976:17, | 21103:16, 21104:13, | Edmonton [5] - | 20973:11, 21043:19 |
| 21138:20 | 20978:4, 20978:6, | $\begin{aligned} & 21120: 18,21121: 19, \\ & 21139 \cdot 6 \end{aligned}$ | 20932:15, 20936:22, | enclosing [2] - |
| $21074: 7,21111: 5$ | $20980: 10,20987: 25$ | draw [4] - 20984: | 20936:24, 20938:13, | 21044:10, 21046:15 |
| documentation [4] - | 20989:15, 20989:24, | 20984:16, 20984:18, | educate [1] - 21066:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { encountering [1] - } \\ & 20996: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| 21007:22, 21036:4, | 20997:4, 20997:8, | 20985:18 | educational [4] - | encourage [1] - |
| $21051: 7,21066: 4$ | 20997:14, 20997:18, 20997:24. 20998:17. | drawing [1] - 21110:4 | $21034: 5,21058: 20$ | 21116:5 |
|  |  | driven [1] - 20945:21 | 21058:22, 21062:24 | encouraged [2] - |
| 21031:3, 21044 :2, | 21002:11, 21003:20, 21004:19, 21005:4 | drop [2] - 20965:12, | Educational [2] - | 21117:22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21045: 10,21114: 9 \\ & 21114: 13,21114: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $21005: 21,21006: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21081: 10 \\ & \text { drove }[5]-20932 \end{aligned}$ | $21061: 18,21062: 1$ | end [11] - 20947:14, |
| $21118: 16,21118: 20$ | 21007:9, 21007:10, | 20932:23, 20932:25 | Edward [1] - 20926:7 | 20949:8, 20962:20, |
| documents [29] - | 21007:11, 21007:13, | 20933:4, 20934:7 | eerily [2] - 21086:19, | $20970: 18,21032: 14$ |
| 20934:9, 20983:10, | 21007:21, 21008:1, | drug [1] - 20959:21 | 21110:7 | 21042:18, 21065:3, |
| 20983:16, 20987:23, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21008:22, 21009:2, } \\ & \text { 21009:11, 21010:16, } \end{aligned}$ | drugs [3] - 20958:15, | eery [2] - 21110:13, | 21090:18, 21104:3 |
| 20999:22, 21003:5, <br> 21003:8, 21003:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21009:11, 21010:16, } \\ & \text { 21010:23, 21011:3, } \end{aligned}$ | 20959:18, 20959:19 | 21110:17 | ended [5] - 20962:18, |
| $21007: 24,21018$ | $21011: 4,21011: 7,$ | Drugs [1] - 20959:15 | effect [13] - 20937:2, | 20962:21, 20984:8, |
| 21022:4, 21024:1, | 21011:16, 21014:13, | d | 20937:14, 20940:17, | 21039:18 |
| 21029:2, 21036:6, | 21014:18, 21018:5, | Dsm [6]-21016:3, | $20992 \text { :2, 20993:17, }$ | enforcement [1] - |
| 21036:17, 21049:4, | 21025:19, 21030:16, | 21016:4, 21115:8, | 21024:5, 21025:4, | 21103:2 |
| 21055:2, 21055:3, | $\begin{aligned} & 21030: 24,21031: 12, \\ & 21031: 22,21032: 8, \end{aligned}$ | 21115:17 | 21028:4, 21085:25, | engage [2]-20977:2, |
| 21057:9, 21058:8, $21060: 7,21060: 18$ | $21034: 9,21036: 20$ | due [1]-21045:15 | 21124:13, 21137:2 | 20998:8 |
| 21063:15, 21071:16, | 21037:11, 21037:20, | duplicated [2] | effort [3]-21009:6, | enlarge [3]-21057:25, |
| 21090:5, 21090:24, | $21038: 3,21039: 22,$ | During [2] - 21120:19, | efforts [2] - 20956:22, | ensure [1] - 20985:1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21115:7, } 21126: 20, \\ & 21139: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21041: 6,21043: 15, \\ & 21043: 22,21044: 6, \end{aligned}$ | 21121:22 | 20991:19 | entail [2] - 20931:14, |
| doin' [1] - 20942:22 | 21044:12, 21044:14, | $20963: 22,20964: 23,$ | Eg [1] - 21019:8 eight [4]-21048:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21122:15 } \\ & \text { entire [4] - 20974:7, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dojack [5] - 20982:22, } \\ & \text { 20986:20, 21060:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21044:22, 21046:6, } \\ & \text { 21047:19, 21048:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $\text { 20976:1, } 20980: 22,$ | $21049: 25,21050: 1,$ | 21031:1, 21032:4, |
| $21060: 20,21068: 18$ | $21049: 8,21053: 25$ | 20981:4, 20982:19, | 21105:21 | 21032:18 |
| Don [1] - 20927:12 | $21055: 24,21056: 23,$ | 20985:24, 20990:13, | either [8] - 20942:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { entirely [4]-21013: } \\ & \text { 21015:8, 21130:21, } \end{aligned}$ |
| Donald [2] - 21140:2, | $21059: 2,21059: 8$ | 20997:2, 21018:8, | 20978:14, 20979:4, | $21130: 22$ |
| done [11] - 20948:19, | $21060: 3,21060: 9$ | 21083:2, 21083:15, | 20994:19, 20994:22, $20998: 22 \quad 21016 \cdot 3$ | entries [2] - 21059:11, |
| 20950:15, 20962:22, | 21061:6, $21061: 14$, | $21089: 2$ | $21095: 7$ | entry [4]-21008:17, |
| 20963:1, 20971:7, | $21061 \text { :20, } 21061: 25,$ | duties [1] - 20931:13 | elements [1] - 21086:16 | 21014:6, 21056:13, |
| 21011:11, 21013:6, 21027:11, 21090:6, | $\begin{aligned} & 21062: 20,21063: 4 \\ & \text { 21065:16, 21066:8, } \end{aligned}$ | dwelling [1] - 20993:6 | Elmer [2] - 21010:19, | 21099:12 |
| 21094:13, 21110:13 | 21067:5, 21067:12, | E | $21011: 24$ <br> elopement [1] | Enweani [4] - 20927:3, 20929:4 20930.5 |
| door [2] - 20942:24, | 21067:24, 21068:1, |  | $21131: 9$ | $20930 \cdot 14$ |
| doubt [1] - 21070:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 21071: 13,21071: 22, \\ & 21072: 17,21072: 21, \end{aligned}$ | Eamon [1] - 20928:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { emotional [1] - } \\ & \text { 20993:19 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { episode [2]-21005:7, } \\ & 21083: 7 \end{aligned}$ |

Page 10

|  | ```21128:2 Exactly [1] - 21101:5 examination [7] - 20974:10, 20995:12, 21019:23, 21021:9, 21022:13, 21093:19, 21138:1 Examination [1] - 20995:16 examinations [2] - 20988:17, 21026:15 examined [6] - 20980:10, 20988:13, 21010:24, 21031:8, 21031:21, 21034:19 examining [3]- 21004:17, 21036:24, 21037:23 example [15] - 20931:23, 20981:10, 20982:12, 20987:10, 20992:5, 20993:8, 20994:8, 20996:11, 20996:12, 20998:21, 21028:11, 21087:14, 21090:24, 21097:9, 21131:21 examples [2] - 20994:8, 20994:15 excellent [1] - 20960:24 except [2] - 20969:18, 21031:13 exception [2]-21080:2, 21096:2 excerpts [1] - 21008:15 excess [1] - 21050:3 exchange [1] - 20990:4 exclude [1] - 21086:15 Exclusive [1] - 21051:12 exclusive [1] - 21090:7 exclusively [1] - 20932:4 excuse [2] - 20999:12, 21053:16 excused [8] - 21012:3, 21012:5, 21012:19, 21012:20, 21088:23, 21104:19, 21106:9, 21139:6 Executive [1] - 20927:4 exhausted [1] - 21056:18 exist [8]-20995:11, 21002:18, 21049:9, 21053:25, 21056:23, 21061:11, 21063:2, 21063:7 existed [7] - 20959:11, 21026:23, 21038:21,``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21055:9, 21057:10, } \\ & 21060: 14,21063: 4 \\ & \text { existence }[1]-21011: 4 \\ & \text { existing }[1]-21138: 13 \\ & \text { exists }[6]-21002: 12, \\ & 21049: 14,21060: 11, \\ & 21061: 8,21067: 8 \text {, } \\ & \text { 21073:1 } \\ & \text { expect }[2]-21108: 8, \\ & 21109: 11 \\ & \text { expectancy }[1]- \\ & 21105: 17 \\ & \text { experience }[17]- \\ & \text { 20957:20, 20976:20, } \\ & 21022: 10,21022: 13, \\ & 21024: 8,21026: 3, \\ & 21069: 2,21080: 3, \\ & 21081: 13,21082: 5, \\ & 21108: 3,21108: 15, \\ & 21114: 21,2114: 22, \\ & 21114: 23,21115: 1, \\ & 21119: 17 \\ & \text { experiences }[1]- \\ & 21082: 7 \\ & \text { expert }[1]-21107: 14 \\ & \text { expertise }[4]-21002: 6, \\ & 21102: 4,21102: 13, \\ & 21102: 15 \\ & \text { explain }[7]-21038: 13, \\ & 21100: 12,21100: 13, \\ & 21126: 24,21137: 13, \\ & 21137: 19,21137: 23 \\ & \text { explained }[7]- \\ & 20941: 17,20942: 14, \\ & 20948: 18,20954: 8, \\ & 20955: 1,20961: 21, \\ & 20970: 19 \\ & \text { explanation }[1]- \\ & 21005: 24 \\ & \text { explicit }[1]-21062: 16 \\ & \text { explore }[1]-20968: 24 \\ & \text { express }[1]-21123: 21 \\ & \text { expressed }[6]- \\ & 20980: 23,21046: 2, \\ & 21082: 20,21100: 16, \\ & 21116: 3,21123: 12 \\ & \text { extended }[1]-21041: 24 \\ & \text { extensive }[1]-21044: 2 \\ & \text { extensively }[1]- \\ & 21062: 9 \\ & \text { extent }[6]-20990: 3, \\ & 21003: 15,21006: 3, \\ & 21008: 13,21019: 22, \\ & 21083: 21 \\ & \text { external }[1]-21019: 25 \\ & \text { extraordinarily }[1]- \\ & 21034: 15 \\ & \text { extraordinary }[2]- \\ & 21110: 23,21111: 1 \\ & \text { extreme }[1]-21016: 8 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 20985:14, 20988:15, | 21034:15, 21043:17, | 20993:1 | M | 21073:17, 21073:22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20989:23, 21081:15, | 21087:23 | list [6] - 21003:25, |  | 21074:3, 21084:5, |
| 21081:21, 21104:2, | less [1] - 21119:15 | 21007:8, $21011: 21$, |  | 21084:8, 21085:19, |
| 21121:20, 21122:23, | letter [39]-20955:16, | 21013:22, 21047:10, | M' [2]-21040:17, | 21092:23, 21116:12 |
| 21123:13, 21125:21, | 20957:2, 20957:4, | 21111:20 | 21040:25 | Malling 's [1] - 21073:9 |
| 21125:22, 21126:11, | 20957:6, 20957:23, | listening [3] - | Maccallum [21] - | man [16]-20934:16, |
| 21126:14 | 20958:13, 20958:21, | 20934:21, 20941:2, | 20926:7, 20930:3, | 20939:16, 20954:9, $20958 \cdot 10 \quad 20968 \cdot 13$ |
| $21081: 4,21126: 12$ | $20970: 25,20972: 6$ | literally [1] - 21137:14 | 20974:25, 21042:22, | 21000:18, 21019:3, |
| lawyers' [1] - 21115:20 | 21009:21, 21012:7, | living [2]-20945:18, | 21043:7, 21048:21, | 21020:25, 21078:7, |
| lay [1]-21033:17 | 21018:15, 21018:16, | 21006:10 | 21057:1, 21064:2, | 21079:14, 21079:15, |
| laying [2] - 21026:1, | 21020:8, 21021:13, | loath [1] - 21029:2 | 21064:8, 21065:2, | 21121:14, 21122:7, |
| 21026:6 | 21027:1, 21030:15, | local [1] - 20973:7 | 21065:8, 21093:17, | 21122:8, 21123:16, |
| leadership [1] - | 21030:17, 21033:23 | located [3] - 21055:19, | 21093:22, 21094:3, | 21125:24 |
| 20978:4 | $21036: 3,21036: 10$ | $21055: 24,21057: 14$ | 21138:12, 21138:16, | managed [2] - 20964:1, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { leading [2]-20972:17, } \\ & \text { 20998:22 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21038:3, 21043:9, } \\ & \text { 21043:10, 21043:17, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { locked [4]-21013:16, } \\ & \text { 21014:10, 21014:14, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21139: 1,21139: 5, \\ & 21139: 10 \end{aligned}$ | Manager [2] - 20927:5, |
| Leafs[1] - 20939:8 | 21044:4, 21044:24, | 21014:20 | Macdonald [5] - | 20951:25 |
| leaning [1]-21019:19 | 21047:7, 21047:8, | look [26]-20970:24, | 20976:17, 20980:10, | manager [1] - 20931:9 |
| learn [2]-21022:5, | 21047:11, 21054:9, | 20988:7, 20995:13, | 20997:8, 20997:14, | managing [1] - |
| 21114:3 | 21071:13, 21112:2, | 21003:14, 21014:5, | 20997:18 | 20931:17 |
| learned [4] - 20966:1, | 21113:1, 21115:24, | 21040:10, 21043:14, | mace [1] - 21129:21 | manifest [1] - 20994:18 |
| 20970:17, 21092:6, | 21116:18, 21119:3 | 21049:3, 21053:24, | maced [1] - 21130:1 | Manitoba [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21132:14 } \\ & \text { learnina [1] - ? } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { letterhead [1] - } \\ & \text { 21028:20 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21063: 11,21070: 14, \\ & 21071: 8.21071: 15 \end{aligned}$ | macing [1] - 21130:8 <br> Maclean [3]-20931.5, | $\begin{gathered} \text { 20932:18, } 20936: 8 \\ \text { manner [1] - } 21010 \end{gathered}$ |
| least [10] - 20936:2, | letters [4] - 20956:11, | 21072:15, 21073:20, | 20965:10, 20973:12 | Manual [1] - 21016:2 |
| 20939:6, 20943:6, | 20956:12, 20996:8, | 21075:7, 21094:12, | Maclean 's [13] - | March [2]-20962:9, |
| 20985:22, 20990:15, | 21114:8 | 21096:4, 21100:19, | 20931:9, 20931:16, | 21094:18 |
| 20990:16, 20998:1, | letting [2]-21068:13, | 21116:7, 21123:22, | 20935:17, 20938:20, | marital [1] - 21081:14 |
| 21033:20, 21050:1, | 21069:20 | 21124:11, 21124:18, | 20945:10, 20952:14, | mark [2] - 21009:15, |
| 21070:5 | Liberal[1] - 20965:16 | 21128:10, 21135:24, | 20954:5, 20967:12, | 21064:1 |
| leave [4]- 20943:17, | librarians [1] - 21025:9 <br> licensed [1] - 20935.23 | 21137:18 | 20967:16, 20968:19, | marketing [3] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20986: 7,21032: 25, \\ & 21056: 24 \end{aligned}$ | licensing [1] - 20952:5 | 20949:1, 20996:23 | $21132: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20931:17, 20936:22, } \\ & 20938: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| leaving [3] - 20963:15, | Lieutenant[8] - | 21000:22, 21036:6, | mad [1] - 20943:18 | markings [1] - |
| 21041:10, 21050:10 | 20997:5, 20997:24, | 21045:25, 21054:18, | Magazine [1]-20931:9 | 21070:14 |
| led [3] - 21015:2, | 20998:2, 21082:23, | 21084:24, 21111:3 | magazine [3] - | Martin [1] - 20930:9 |
| 21021:23, 21073:6 <br> left [15] - 20933•19 | $21092: 9,21103: 12$ | 20934:19, 20959:1, | 20972:21, 21122:25, $21132: 1$ | material [42] - |
| 20935:8, 20938:24, | life [12]-20938:10, | 20994:10, 21019:17, | magnify [1] - 20988: | $21047: 5,21047: 9$ |
| 20946:13, 20956:5, | 20944:7, 20945:25, | 21029:1, 21039:4, | mailed [1] - 20992:15 | 21047:10, 21049:18, |
| 20963:12, 20963:17, | 20946:15, 20979:2, | 21057:19, 21059:3, | maintained [1] - | $21049: 22,21051: 1$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20976:19, 20982:17, } \\ & \text { 21002:5, 21022:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20987: 2,20994: 18 \\ & 21050: 2,21079: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21123: 7 \\ & \text { looks [7] - 20988:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $20985: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21052: 3,21052: 4 \\ & 21052: 5,21052: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21002: 5,21022: 11, \\ & 21041: 18,21067: 13, \end{aligned}$ | 21097:17, 21099:23, | 20989:8, 20989:11, | 21087:13, 21099:23 | $21053: 10,21054: 20$ |
| 21071:1, 21087:6 | 21105:16 | 21003:24, 21070:24, | majority [2]-21022:15, | 21054:22, 21055:9, |
| left-hand [2] - | lifetime [1] - 21029:21 | 21072:23, 21094:17 | 21089:14 | 21055:11, 21055:15, |
| 21067:13, 21071:1 | light [1] - 21070:25 | loose [1] - 21051:1 | make-up [2]-21045:12, | 21056:7, 21056:8, |
| leg [1] - 20943:8 | likely [7] - 21007:25, | Loran[4] - 20928:7, | 21133:22 | $21056: 9,21056: 10$ |
| legal [6]-20930:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21015:20, 21033:2, } \\ & 21064: 5,21073: 17, \end{aligned}$ | $\text { 20929:9, } 21101: 15,$ | maker [1]-21129:7 | $21060: 3,21060: 11$ |
| 20965:11, 20970:15, 20971:7. 20974:24. | 21064:5, 21073:17, $21078: 25,21089: 22$ | 21101:16 <br> lost [1] - 21050:3 | makers [1]-21129:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 21060: 13,21061: 8, \\ & 21061: 10.21062: 20 . \end{aligned}$ |
| 21010:6 | limb [1] - 21022:9 | lower [1]-21022:9 | Malling [25] - 21067:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 21061: 10,21062: 20, \\ & 21065: 22,21067: 6, \end{aligned}$ |
| legally [2] - 20978:16, | limited [6] - 21003:11, | lumbered [1] - | 21068:19, 21068:20, | $21067: 7,21067: 8$ |
| $21124: 25$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21004: 25,21021: 9, \\ & 21021: 10.21026: 19 . \end{aligned}$ | 20944:21 | $21068: 23,21069: 1,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21067:17, 21067:18, } \\ & \text { 21071:18. } 21072: 4 . \end{aligned}$ |
| legs [1] - 20943:9 | $\begin{aligned} & 21021: 10,21026: 19, \\ & 21082: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lunch [2]-21101:19, } \\ & 21101: 23 \end{aligned}$ | 21069:18, 21069:22, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21071:18, 21072:4, } \\ & \text { 21073:6, 21074:2, } \end{aligned}$ |
| length [1] - $21114: 18$ lengthy [8] - 20937:7, | $\operatorname{limp}[1]-21022: 9$ |  | $21071: 3,21071: 24,$ | $21130: 24,21131: 1$ |
| 20948:24, 21034:4, | Linda[1] - 20960:16 |  | 21072:12, 21073:8, | 21131:3, $21131: 7$ |
| 21034:11, 21034:12, | line [2] - 20972:15, |  | 21073:10, 21073:12, | materials [40] - |
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| 21002:10, 21002:15, | 21036:20, 21037:11, | 21074:22 | 21015:5, 21039:19, | 21041:10, 21041:18, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21002:17, 21008:11, | 21037:20, 21038:3, | Meaning [2] - 20994:5, | 21059:4, 21065:20, | 21045:24, 21047:3, |
| 21033:3, $21034: 9$, | 21039:23, 21040:17, | 20994:7 | 21111:6, 21111:17, | 21047:13, 21047:14, |
| 21037:10, 21044:15, | 21041 :6, 21043:15, | means [3]-21004:24, | 21136:21, 21137:2, | 21047:15, 21067:25, |
| 21045:17, 21049:9, | 21043:23, 21044:6, | 21040:25, 21050:2 | 21137:5 | 21104:1, 21106:16, |
| 21049:15, 21052:4, | 21044:12, 21044:14, | meant [2] - 20941:10, | mental [9]-20959:22, | 21118:12 |
| 21052:7, 21052:13, | 21044:22, 21046:6, | 21028:3 | 20990:20, 20991:25, | messages [1] - |
| 21052:15, 21053:7, | 21047:20, 21048:25, | measure [1]-21122:17 | 21015:21, 21054:25, | 21046:24 |
| 21054:2, 21054:3, | 21049:8, 21054:1, | medical [21] - | 21079:17, 21124:21, | met [13]-20932:12, |
| 21054:14, 21055:8, | 21057:3, 21057:11, | 20988:17, 21007:9, | 21124:24, 21125:8 | 20934:15, 20945:15, |
| 21055:18, 21056:19, | 21059:2, 21060:3, | 21007:12, 21008:23, | Mental [1] - 21055:7 | 20945:24, 20961:5, |
| 21056:23, 21057:5, | 21060:9, $21061: 6$, | 21009:2, 21010:1, | mentally [2]-20978:8, | 20969:4, 20970:11, |
| 21057:7, 21057:13, | 21061:14, 21062:20, | 21010:25, 21011:5, | 20978:11 | 20995:6, 21005:18, |
| 21057:14, 21057:20, | 21063:4, 21065:16, | 21011:8, 21025:8, | mention [4]-20951:22, | 21026:2, 21100:11, |
| 21060:22, 21060:25, | 21066:8, 21067:5, | 21028:21, 21067:1, | 20986:22, 21036:10, | 21100:15, 21121:23 |
| 21063:2, 21071 :9, | 21067:12, 21068:7, | 21069:10, 21107:2, | 21049:5 | method [1] - 21053:6 |
| 21072:16, 21074:13, | 21071:5, 21072:17, | 21107:3, 21107:10, | mentioned [32] - | methods [1] - 21053:10 |
| 21074:20, 21075:5, | 21073:21, 21075:18, | 21107:22, 21108:15, | 20957:8, 20964:13, | Meyer [3] - 20927:12, |
| 21076:25, 21138:3, | 21076:1, 21076:15, | 21115:20, 21126:21 | 20982:4, 20982:19, | 21140:2, 21140:19 |
| 21138:10, 21138:13 | $\begin{aligned} & 21076: 21,21076: 24, \\ & 21077: 5.21077: 11 . \end{aligned}$ | medication [1] - | 20982:25, 20983:9, | mid [2] - 20973:19, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { matter [17] - 20945:5 } \\ \text { 20956:23, 21006:19 } \end{gathered}$ | $21077: 14,21078: 1$ | 20959:25 | $\begin{aligned} & 20983: 19,20985: 17, \\ & 20986: 6.20986: 19 \end{aligned}$ | 21014:7 |
| 21018:5, 21019:13, | 21079:19, 21080:8, | 20975:22, 21066:24 | 20990:5, 20992:12, | 21041:14 |
| 21042:9, 21048:10, | 21082:16, 21084:7, | meet [3] - 20932:9, | 20995:8, 20995:19, | middle [3] - 20934:7, |
| 21049:13, 21049:20, | 21085:5, 21085:23, | 21023:11, 21023:19 | 21000:1, 21024:15, | 20964:13, 21010:21 |
| 21066:18, 21074:19, | 21087:12, 21087:22, | meeting [37] - | 21027:25, 21029:18, | midst [1] - 21033:25 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21075:19, 21080:10, } \\ & \text { 21082:18, 21084:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21088: 22,21089: 7 \\ & 21092: 4,21092: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 20947:10, 20966:23, | 21032:10, 21039:16, $21047: 6,21047: 11$ | might [40]-20959:17, |
| $\text { 21088:12, } 21101: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21092:4, 21092:13, } \\ & \text { 21093:9, 21093:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $20987: 8,20988: 20$ | 21047:6, 21047:11, $21051 \cdot 7 \cdot 21051 \cdot 18$ | $20960: 15,20965: 22,$ |
| matters [6] - 21002:7, | $21094: 5,21096: 9,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20989:16, 20989:19, } \\ & \text { 20989:25, 20990:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21051: 7,21051: 18, \\ & 21052: 24,21056: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20969:15, 20977:1, } \\ & \text { 21008:1, } 21021: 6, \end{aligned}$ |
| 21002:24, 21040:9, | 21096:22, 21101:16, | 20990:11, 20990:14, | 21059:24, 21069:18, | 21027:5, 21027:17, |
| 21056:14, 21083:18, | $21101 \text { :25, 21103:16, }$ | 20990:24, 20990:25, | 21071:9, 21072:25, | 21040:18, 21040:21, |
| $21122: 16$ | 21104:13, 21118:23, | 20992:3, 20992:4, | 21136:23, 21137:16 | 21042:7, 21043:3, |
| Mccorriston [1] - | 21120:18, 21121:19, | 20992:22, 20996:12, | mentioning [1] - | 21044:12, 21045:20, |
| 20988:2 | 21139:6 | 20996:18, 20998:3, | 20983:2 | 21047:20, 21053:16, |
| Mcd [4]-21007:9, | Mcdonald 's [3] - | 20998:6, 20999:2, | mentions [1] - | 21054:25, 21059:10, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21013: 16,21040: 18 \\ & 21047: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21034: 23,21055: 25, \\ & 21056: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $20999: 5,20999: 11$ | $21006: 18$ | $21063: 21,21064: 3$ |
| Mcd' [1] - 21040:12 | Mckerracher [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 21000: 1,21000: 12 \\ & 21013 \cdot 321020 \cdot 21 \end{aligned}$ | Merchant [31] - <br> 20935•16, 20952.24 | $21104: 22,21105: 6,$ |
| Mcdonald [109] - | 20978:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 21013: 3,21020: 21 \\ & 21021: 13,21024: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20935:16, 20952:24, } \\ & \text { 20953:3, 20954:4, } \end{aligned}$ | 21106:19, 21107:14, |
| 20929:6, 20974:13, | Mclaren [2]-20929:6, | 21062:5, 21076:9 | 20954:5, 20954:17, | 21115:3, 21116:24, |
| 20974:21, 20974:22, | 20974:22 | 21079:5, 21100:12, | 20954:20, 20955:7, | 21118:24, 21119:5, |
| $20974: 23,20975: 3$ | Mclean [4] - 20928:3, | $21111: 11,21111: 24$ | 20955:17, 20956:3, | $21121: 9,21123: 5,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20978:19, 20980:5, } \\ & \text { 20987:25, 20989:15, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20929:5, 20968:17 } \\ & \text { 20968:19 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21111: 25,21112: 8, \\ & 21121: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $20956: 4,20958: 17$ $20958: 23,20959: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21123: 19,21125: 20, \\ & 21125: 24,21126: 24, \end{aligned}$ |
| 20989:24, 20997:5, | $\text { Mclean's [1] - } 20951: 25$ | meetings [4] | 20960:3, 20961:13, | 21132:25, 21135:9, |
| 20997:24, 20998:17, | mean [25] - 20942:3, | 20953:11, 20993:9, | 20962:10, 20962:16, | 21136:13 |
| 21002:11, 21003:20, | 20943:12, 20951:18, | 20996:3, $21022: 22$ | 20963:3, 20963:15, | miles [1] - 20939:22 |
| 21004:19, 21004:22, | 20963:17, 20979:10, | Melville [3]-21061:19, | 20964:13, 20964:19, | Milgaard [204] - |
| 21005:4, 21005:21, | 20990:16, 21000:21, | 21062:2, 21062:24 | 20965:14, 20965:15, | 20926:4, 20928:2, |
| 21006:5, 21007:11, | 21013:3, 21014:19, | member [2] - 20994:20, | 20966:16, 20967:10, | 20928:3, 20932:9, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21008: 22,21009: 11, \\ & 21010: 16,21011: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $21026: 7,21040: 21$ | 21082:19 | $\begin{aligned} & 20970: 8,20970: 20, \\ & 20971: 1.21069: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 20932:13, 20932:21, |
| 21012:3, 21014:9, | 21046:18, 21051:9, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { members [1] - } \\ & \text { 20987:13 } \end{aligned}$ | Merchant 's [4] | 20935:9, 20937:3, |
| 21014:13, 21014:18, | 21052:23, 21078:24, | memo [5] - 20980:5, | 20964:4, 20964:6, | 20939:18, 20939:25, |
| 21018:5, 21025:19, | 21100:18, 21112:10, | $20987: 25,20988: 1$ | 20964:9, 20969:3 | 20944:5, 20945:15, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21030: 16,21030: 24 \\ & 21031: 12,21031: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21115:12, 21122:2, } \\ & \text { 21130:6, 21130:17, } \end{aligned}$ | 20989:8, 21103:10 | Meronek [1] - 21046:15 <br> message [15] - | $20945: 23,20945: 24,$ <br> 20946:9, 20946:22 |
| $21032: 8,21034: 9,$ | $21131: 5,21133: 19$ | memory [13] 20969:22, 2099 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { message [15] - } \\ & \text { 20979:13, 21019:15, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20946: 9,20946: 22, \\ & 20947: 4,20947: 13, \end{aligned}$ |
| 21034:20, 21035:2, | meaning [2]-21051:2, | $21006: 5,21008: 4$ | 21019:20, 21040:15, | 20948:23, 20953:12, |
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| neuroses [1] - | 21064:12 | 21062:13, 21062:15, | odds [1] - 21023:2 | older [3] - 20932:22, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20993:22 | noon [1] - 21059:21 | 21062:22, 21108:25 | off-the-cuff [1] - | 20934:16, 20934:18 |
| neurosis [1] - 20994:1 | normal [2] - 20938:2, | nuisance [1] - 21090:11 | 21033:19 | oldest [1] - 20963:23 |
| never [22] - 20936:7, | 20940:25 | nuisances [1] - 21016:6 | off/on [1] - 21004:3 | once [5] - 20960:9, |
| 20938:7, 20945:24, | normally [1] - 21090:19 | number [18] - 20955:20, | off/on' [1] - 21004:23 | 21045:18, 21057:10 |
| 20946:7, 20946:9, | north [1] - 20939:23 | 20972:3, 20982:18, | offence [7] - 20978:16, | 21060:14, 21076:19 |
| 20947:3, 20947:15, | Northern [1] - 20946:13 | 21000:10, 21004:1, | 20987:3, 20992:1, | Once[1] - 20935:8 |
| 20956:19, 20961:5, | Northwest [1] - 21082:2 | 21004:20, 21007:7, | 21079:17, 21080:23, | One[5] - 20957:15, |
| 20966:13, 20966:22, | not' [1] - 21040:22 | 21013:14, 21020:5, | 21090:14, 21105:2 | 21025:8, 21036:12, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20966: 23,20967: 10, \\ & 20967: 20.20968: 3 . \end{aligned}$ | notation [1] - 21067:13 | $\begin{aligned} & 21022: 3,21058: 1 \\ & \text { 21063:16. } 21103: 6 \end{aligned}$ | offences [1] - 21113:21 | 21111:13, 21122:22 |
| 20968:12, 20974:3, | $\begin{gathered} \text { note [18]-20952:22 } \\ \text { 20988:8, 20995:19, } \end{gathered}$ | 21104:12, 21104:13, | offend [1]-21113:12 offender [1] - 21015:7 | 20932:22, 20933:6, |
| 21039:10, $21081: 20$, | 21005:16, 21007:4, | 21111:20, 21132:2, | offenders [1] - | 20933:21, 20940:14, |
| 21081:21, 21132:23 | 21010:21, 21037:3, | 21134:10 | 21014:22 | 20943:2, 20944:6, |
| Never [1] - 20967:21 | 21040:11, 21040:24, | numbers [2] - | offer [8] - 20957:4, | $20944: 21,20945: 17$ |
| new [1] - 21056:19 news [2] - 20973:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21042:18, 21043:1, } \\ & \text { 21045:23, 21065:17 } \end{aligned}$ | 21138:17, 21138:20 | 20965:20, 20993:8, | $20954: 8,20957: 16$ |
| 21018:1 | 21065:18, 21071:1, | 0 | 21015:10, 21022:23, | 20970:7, 20970:20, |
| Newspaper [1] - <br> 21084-21 | 21083:20, 21086:6, |  | 21101:9 | $20970: 21,20977: 21,$ 20984:15, 20986:6 |
| 21084:21 | 21104:18 | o'clock [1] - 20939:3 | offered [10] - 20965:10, | $\text { 20989:6, } 20991 \text { :21, }$ |
| 21084:1 | ed [4] - 20959:8, | Okeefe [1] - 20928:10 | 21001:8, 21017:1 | 20993:20, 20994:16, |
| next [37] - 20945:5, | 21018:22, 21021:14, | Ómack [1] - 21130:9 | 21035:15, 21046:12, | 20999:1, 20999:11, |
| 20946:12, 20950:3, | 21047:23 | $\text { object [1] - } 21102: 12$ | $21054: 9,21061: 2$ | 21003:2, 21005:24, |
| 20960:2, 20974:12, <br> 20974-20, 20985.13 | notes [27] - 20985:5, | objective [2]-20955:9, | 21105:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21013:14, 21016:14, } \\ & \text { 21018:23. } 21019: 24 . \end{aligned}$ |
| 20990:2, 20992:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20985:7, 21003:23, } \\ & 21005: 15,21011: 24, \end{aligned}$ | obligation [1] - 21127:6 | $\begin{gathered} \text { offering [5] - } 20981 \text { :9 } \\ \text { 21021:16, } 21023: 16, \end{gathered}$ | $21021: 13,21026: 8 \text {, }$ |
| 20992:17, 20998:12, | 21013:10, 21013:11, | observation [4] - | 21023:17, 21092:17 | 21026:21, 21027:1, |
| 21010:14, 21012:2, | 21013:14, 21036:21, | 20999:13, 21079:7, | office [16] - 20935:17, | 21029:15, 21029:22, |
| $\text { 21018:4, } 21031: 24,$ $21045 \cdot 5.21046: 5$ | $21051 \text { :22, 21061:16, }$ | $21110: 25,21114: 7$ | 20936:15, 20945:10, | $\begin{aligned} & 21031: 8,21032: 14, \\ & 21033: 25,21035: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| 21058:15, 21058:22, | $21075: 24,21076: 2,$ | 21062:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20979:3, 20979:5, } \\ & \text { 20989:20, 20989:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $21036: 3,21036: 9,$ |
| 21059:10, 21064:12, | 21076:6, 21077:3, | obsessive [1] - | 21003:14, 21032:23, | 21036:10, 21036:16, |
| 21066:6, 21077:4, | 21081:18, 21081:23, | 20993:25 | 21032:25, 21037:17, | $21036: 22,21039: 15,$ |
| 21078:13, 21080:5, | 21085:20, 21095:5, | obtain [2]-20997:11, | 21049:25, 21050:10, | $\begin{aligned} & 21044: 2,21046: 8, \\ & 21047: 1,21049: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| $21081: 24,21082: 15,$ | $21095: 22,21095: 23,$ | 21045:8 | 21070:11, 21113:25, | $21051: 23,21052: 19$ |
| 21087:21, 21088:15, | 21095:25, 21106:8, 21112:19, 21140:6 | obtained [6] - $21041: 21,210$ | 21137:18 | $21052: 24,21053: 14$ |
| 21088:16, 21089:6, | noteworthy [2] | 21090:5, 21106:24 | 21052:9 | 21054:16, 21058:15, |
| 21092:3, 21094:17, | 21079:22, 21079:24 | 21118:18, 21129:12 | Officer[7] - 20927:13, | $21058: 22,21061: 5,$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 21096: 7,21115: 25 \\ \text { nice }[5]-20938: 7, \end{gathered}$ | nothin' [1] - 20946:8 | obtaining [2] - 21108:1, | $21094: 25,21095: 23$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21065: 10,21073: 4 \\ & 21073: 16,21075: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| 20939:16, 20942:5, | nothing [22] - 20940:4, | 21113:2 | 21096:13, 21096:19, | 21077:19, 21080:25, |
| $20942: 8,20967: 4$ | 20947:2, 20968:3, | $21041: 4$ | officer [7] - 20939:7, | $21084: 25,21086: 16$ $21090: 7.21092: 14$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Nichol [3] - 21004:11, } \\ & \text { 21005:5, 21005:12 } \end{aligned}$ | $20968: 4,21001 \text { :8, }$ $\text { 21012:6, } 21058: 2,$ | obviously [5] - <br> 20941:21, 20978:11 | 21010:18, 21011:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 21090: 7,21092: 14 \\ & 21093: 9,21093: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| night [3] - 20945:20, | $\begin{aligned} & 21012: 6,21058: 2 \\ & \text { 21059:15, } 21060: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $21005: 3,21039: 4,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21011: 24,21076: 6 \\ & 21077: 17,21095: 4 \end{aligned}$ | 21095:16, 21100:10, |
| $21105: 22,21134: 14$ | $21061: 4,21064: 23$ | $21050: 24$ | officers [3] - 21035:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21101:18, 21102:2, } \\ & \text { 21102:9, 21103:1, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $21064: 21,21097: 11$ | 21071:14, 21078:10, 21083:11, $21088 \cdot 24$ | occasion [3] - <br> 20966-14 21054 | 21088:18, 21095:6 | 21105:17, 21109:4, |
| nomenclature [1] | $21090: 4,21091: 6,$ | 21054:19 | $21140: 1,21140: 3$ | 21110:1, 21110:4, |
| $21016: 1$ | $21133: 10,21134: 3$ | occasions [1] - 20977:2 | $21140: 14,21140: 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21110:16, } 21110: 22, \\ & 21111: 4,21111: 23, \end{aligned}$ |
| none [5] - 20998:5, | Nothing [5] - 20965:1, | occupation [1] - | officials [1] - 21026:16 | $21112: 9,21114: 7$ |
| $21001 \text { :5, } 21051: 19$ | $21060: 18,21072: 14$ | $20931: 1$ | often [5] - 20939:13, | $21127: 8,21130: 7$ |
| $21085: 14,21137: 12$ | $21091: 25,21092: 5$ | occur [1] - 21128:8 | 20947:16, 20977:16, | $21131: 9,21132: 13$ |
| None[6]-21001:18, | noting [1] - 21022:9 | occurred [1] - 21125:7 | 20977:18, 21078:16 | $21135: 16,21136: 4$ |
| 21007:3, 21017:8, | November [10] - | occurs [1] - 21006:15 | old [7] - 20934:17, | ones [2] - 20967:24, |
| 21018:3, 21030:11, | 21027:11, 21058:2, | October[5] - 20958:22, | $20951: 4,20951: 9$ | $21060: 22$ |
| nonetheless [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 21058: 11,21058: 13, \\ & 21059: 13,21061: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20959:6, 20959:7, } \\ & \text { 20959:13, 20959:23 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20975:7, 21092:5, } \\ & 21117: 15,21130: 1 \end{aligned}$ | ongoing [2] - $21001: 4$ |
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|  | ```21105:2, 21112:9, 21113:19, 21114:14, 21122:12, 21124:22, 21133:8, 21135:2, 21135:5, 21135:10 person's [1] - 20994:18 person(s [1] - 20971:22 personal [3] - 20947:2, 20947:3, 21113:14 Personal [1] - 21051:10 personality [15] - 20956:19, 20994:4, 20994:16, 21019:6, 21021:3, 21024:17, 21024:20, 21024:23, 21024:25, 21025:12, 21035:1, 21062:10, 21087:16, 21088:1, 21102:18 Personality [1] - 21066:9 personally [1] - 21033:12 persons [1] - 21034 :6 perspective [1] - 20955:11 pertaining [2] - 21044:8, 21044:13 pertinent [1] - 21118:24 Peter [11] - 20948:10, 20948:12, 20948:13, 20950:20, 20953:8, 20953:19, 20954:9, 20955:2, 20956:7, 20970:16, 20970:18 petty [1]-21016:7 ph [1] - 21097:12 phone [6] - 20939:5, 20941:15, 20942:18, 20948:8, 21067:25, 21068:12 phoned [2]-20944:17, 20973:1 photographes [1] - 20997:16 photographs [2] - 20998:4, 21043:19 phrase [2]-21028:3, 21037:20 phrased [1] - 21035:17 physical [1]-21059:14 physician [1] - 21061:21 Physicians [1] - 21010:7 Pick [1] - 20935:7 pick [5] - 20933:25, 20934:14, 20935:6, 20937:5, 20937:8 picked [3] - 20966:11,``` |  |  | ```positions [1] - 20975:15 possession [5] - 21003:5, 21052:11, 21065:22, 21073:7, 21116:10 possibility [3] - 21104:22, 21106:19, 21109:25 possible [17] - 20948:16, 20955:8, 20955:10, 20989:16, 21002:4, 21002:8, 21006:5, 21009:16, 21009:25, 21011:13, 21015:6, 21045:17, 21085:16, 21100:4, 21136:7, 21136:10, 21136:22 possibly [2] - 20946:12, 20954:10 post [1] - 21070:6 post-1969[1] - 21067:8 post-incarceration [1] - 21070:6 posterity [1] - 21111:2 potential [2] - 21089:20, 21090:20 potentially [2] - 21085:5, 21138:2 pounced [1] - 20943:7 practically [2] - 20963:10, 20994:17 practice [6] - 21081:20, 21105:11, 21107:8, 21107:16, 21109:15, 21119:9 practiced [1] - 20976:3 practicing [2] - 20976:5, 21107:7 practitioner [1] - 21082:4 prairie [1] - 20931:9 pre-1969 [6] - 21054:24, 21055:10, 21055:14, 21055:23, 21056:23, 21067:7 precedes [1] - 21046:9 predicament [1] - 20965:25 predict [1] - 21097:5 predicting [1] - 21096:3 prediction [7] - 21038:8, 21052:25, 21053:15, 21086:17, 21099:5, 21109:25, 21111:25 predictions [2] - 21031:7, 21031:13 preface [1] - 20978:25``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| prefer [1] - 21138:7 | previously [13] - | professor [2]-20978:5, | 21066:19, 21070:5, | 21015:24, 21016:5, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| preference [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20996:24, 21003:21, } \\ & \text { 21010:15, 21010:24, } \end{aligned}$ | 21068:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21087:13, 21102:4, } \\ & \text { 21102:8, 21103:3, } \end{aligned}$ | 21016:25 |
| preferred [1] - 20997:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21010:15, 21010:24, } \\ & \text { 21021:11, 21024:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Professor [2] - } \\ & \text { 21034:21, 21043:23 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21102:8, 21103:3, } \\ & \text { 21107:11, 21108:5, } \end{aligned}$ | Psychopath [1] - 21015:15 |
| Prehodchenko [1] - | 21030:21, 21044:23, | profile [3]-20965:13, | 21115:21, 21118:24, | psychopath' [1] - |
| 20927:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21045:25, 21056:15, } \\ & \text { 21063:4, 21063:7, } \end{aligned}$ | 20967:10, 21074:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21119:14, 21119:22, } \\ & \text { 21119:24, 21120:3 } \end{aligned}$ | 21014:11 |
| 21123:18 | 21087:20 | 21069:24 | Psychiatric [17] - | 21016:8 |
| preliminary [16] 20985:20, 20986:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { primarily [4] - } \\ & \text { 20978:17, 21066:1 } \end{aligned}$ | proper [1] - 21113:13 <br> properly [1]-20935:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20982:21, 20986:19, } \\ & \text { 20998:25, 20999:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { psychopathy [1] } \\ & \text { 21016:12 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 20998:19, 20998:23, | 21102:14, 21122:20 | prosecuting [1] - | 21009:18, 21018:25, | psychoses [1] - |
| 21002:25, 21003:24, | primary [1] - 21027:12 | 21114: | 21027:6, 21027:20 | 20993:22 |
| 21004:8, 21005:13, | Prince [8] - 20938:14, 20938:23, 20939:22, | prosecutor [4] | 21035:4, 21058:9, 21058:18, 21062:8, | psychosis [1] - |
| 21013:1, 21017:21, | 20943:22, 20944:15, | $21101: 8,21103: 19$ | 21062:15, 21085:24, | psychotic [3] |
| 21104:5, 21104:8, | 20949:23, 20972:12, | prosecutorial [1] - | 21108:6, 21108:24 | 20978:11, 20984:14, |
| 21104:17, 21104:23 <br> premised [1] - 21125:2 <br> preparation [6] - | 21025:24 <br> prison [5] - 20946:15, <br> 21026:16, 21039:7, | 21100:15 <br> prosecutors [1] - <br> 20991:23 | 21113:22 <br> psychiatrist [17] - <br> 20975:10, 20976:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21087:15 } \\ & \text { public [2]-21075:1, } \\ & 21120: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21003: 23,21010: 18, \\ & 21011: 13,21011: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21117:1, 21135:6 } \\ & \text { prisoner [4]-20980:8, } \end{aligned}$ | protecting [1] - 21042:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20986:10, 20988:14, } \\ & \text { 20988:24, 21026:5, } \end{aligned}$ | Public [1] - 21062:3 |
| $21013: 12,21049: 2$ | 20980:12, 21043:20, | 21079:8 | $\begin{aligned} & 21081: 8,21102: 17, \\ & 21105: 3,21105: 4, \end{aligned}$ | 21056:21, 21138:2, |
| 20998:18 prepared [5] | private [1] - 20966:17 <br> privilege [2]-21031:1, | 20992:23, 21043:5, <br> 21074:5, 21074:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21105:14, 21107:7, } \\ & \text { 21108:4, 21117:7, } \end{aligned}$ | pull [1] - 20965:22 |
| 20943:15, 20953:21, | 21032:3 | 21076:24, 21089:9 | 21134:9, 21134:20, | $2100 \text { - ני }$ |
| 21010:17, 21011:22, | probability [1] | provided [18] | 21135:1 | purpose [12] - 20935:5, |
| 21082:10 <br> preparing [3] - | 21022:17 <br> problem [4]-20959:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20995:20, 21002:10, } \\ & \text { 21027:14, 21049:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { psychiatrists [4]- } \\ & \text { 21026:15, 21066:14, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20953:6, 20979:20, } \\ & \text { 20993:15, 20997:10, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 21002:25, 21030:25, | 20959:21, 21022:19, | 21055:3, 21055:25, | 21107:20, 21133:4 | 21000:25, 21091:18 |
| 21032:3 <br> prerequisites [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 21029: 16 \\ & \text { problems [11] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21057:15, 21060:7, } \\ & \text { 21060:12, 21061:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { psychiatry [12] - } \\ & \text { 20975:16, 20976:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21091: 20,21100: 12, \\ & 21122: 8,21127: 1, \end{aligned}$ |
| 21014:25 <br> presence [2] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20933:21, 20939:14, } \\ & \text { 20952:5, 20959:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21062: 20,21067: 9, \\ & 21068: 10,21077: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20976:6, 20976:9, } \\ & \text { 20976:16, 20977:24, } \end{aligned}$ | 21127:4 |
| 21032:24, 21112:16 | 20986:8, 20993:20, | 21086:12, 21086:13, | 20978:3, 20978:6, | 21002:16, 21030:8, |
| present [3]-20980:1, | 20994:2, 20994:19, | 21089:3, 21104:15 | 20991:3, 21016:1, | 21095:21, 21099:15, |
| 20980:22, 21071:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21026:23, 21029:19, } \\ & \text { 21114:11 } \end{aligned}$ | providing [10] $20986 \cdot 4,20995 \cdot 8$ | 21016:11, 21016:15 Psychiatry [7] - | $21120: 11,21127: 2$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { presented [5] - } \\ & \text { 20985:25, } 21084: 10 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | proceeded [4] | $21021: 7,21042: 1$ | 20997:9, 21010:23, | pursuant [1] - 21007:19 |
| 21084:17, 21085:10, | 20982:2, 20982:8, | 21078:20, 21080:11, | 21034:22, 21043:23, | 21020:3, 21046:11, |
| $21091: 1$ <br> presently [2] | 20989:2, 21010:11 proceedings [6] - | $\begin{aligned} & 21084: 11,21086: 3, \\ & 21088: 2,21092: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21050:7, 21050:11, } \\ & \text { 21050:16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21089:25, 21124:24 } \\ & \text { pursued [2] - 20954:22, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 20930:23, 21055:24 | 20978:13, 20985:4, 21001:14, 21004:8 | Province [2] | psychological [5] - 21062:11, 21062:17, | 21009:17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { presents [1] - 21045:10 } \\ & \text { press [1] - 21097:24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21001: 14,21004: 8, \\ & \text { 21008:13, 21013:8 } \end{aligned}$ | 21035:10, 21140:3 province [3] - | $21066: 21,21067: 3,$ | pursuing [1] - 21083:21 <br> Put [1] - 21074:16 |
| presumably [1] - | Proceedings [4] - | 20935:24, 20939:9, | 21113:11 <br> psychologically [1] - | put [18]-20936:4, |
| 20972:21 <br> presume [2] - 20935:4, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20926:12, 20926:23, } \\ & \text { 20929:1, 20930:1 } \end{aligned}$ | 20952:3 proximity | psychologically [1] - $\text { 22: } 20981$ | 20937:10, 20942:23, 20943:3, 20943:8, |
| 21004:21 | process [2]-20977:25, | 21020:20 | psychologist [7] - | 20954:18, 20969:3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { presumed }[1]-20941: 1 \\ & \text { pretty }[5]-20951: 4 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21017:13 } \\ & \text { professional [8] } \end{aligned}$ | Psych [1] - 21068:17 psychiatric [32] - | 21066:15, 21109:7, | $\begin{aligned} & 21016: 24,21023: 18, \\ & \text { 21026:8, 21050:7, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 20951:9, 20952:8, | 20979:2, 20986:12, | 20959:24, 20978:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21109:9, 21109:14, } \\ & 21109: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $21050: 24,21075: 1,$ |
| $20960: 21,21133: 15$ <br> preventing [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20997:11, 21003:11, } \\ & \text { 21003:12, 21010:1, } \end{aligned}$ | 20981:19, 20992:9, 21015:16, 21019:8, | Psychologist [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21094:15, } 21101: 23, \\ & \text { 21115:15, 21119:3, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 21045:15 <br> previous [8]- | 21041:21 <br> professionalism [1] - | 21031:2, 21032:4, 21032:19, 21034:2, | $\begin{aligned} & 21061: 18,21062: 2 \\ & \text { psychologists [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | 21119:23 |
| $21006: 21,21030: 1,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21083:6 } \\ & \text { professionals [4] - } \end{aligned}$ | 21034:11, 21037:4, <br> 21039:7, 21040:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 21026: 15,21066: 14 \\ & \text { psychopath }[7] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | Q |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21107: 10,21108: 14, \\ & 21108: 15,21126: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21019: 21,21036: 2, \\ & 21111: 21,21136: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21044:1, 21044:7, } \\ & \text { 21044:13, 21045:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21013: 17,21014: 15, \\ & 21014: 20,21015: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $\mathbf{Q b}_{[1]}$ - 20927:11 |
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| $\qquad$ <br> Qc <br> 20928:6, 20928:11 <br> Qu'appelle [2] - <br> 21059:13, 21060:1 <br> qualified [3] - <br> 20935:23, 21102:22, <br> 21102:24 <br> qualifier [2] - 21026:8, <br> 21028:3 <br> Quebec [2] - 20957:11, <br> 20960:23 <br> Queen's [4] - 21140:1, <br> 21140:3, 21140:14, <br> 21140:20 <br> questionable [1] - <br> 21132:13 <br> questioned [5] - <br> 20934:10, 20935:14, <br> 20935:25, 20951:3, <br> 21082:8 <br> questioning [1] - <br> 20933:15 <br> questions [17] - <br> 20968:14, 20985:16, <br> 21065:16, 21066:5, <br> 21075:2, 21088:19, <br> 21090:22, 21093:10, <br> 21093:12, 21095:4, <br> 21102:11, 21103:6, <br> 21120:19, 21121:20, <br> 21125:16, 21137:24, <br> 21137:25 <br> quick [1] - 20964:10 <br> quickly [1] - 20996:16 <br> quiet [1] - 20977:18 <br> Quite[1] - 20982:9 <br> quite [28]-20932:2, <br> 20937:7, 20937:10, <br> 20940:24, 20942:1, <br> 20948:17, 20948:24, <br> 20956:15, 20957:20, <br> 20957:22, 20958:7, <br> 20958:8, 20958:11, <br> 20959:15, 20960:7, <br> 20960:17, 20963:19, <br> 20963:20, 20986:11, <br> 21042:13, 21046:1, <br> 21064:10, 21099:21, <br> 21121:22, 21129:16, <br> 21130:18, 21131:15 <br> quotation [1] - <br> 21016:12 <br> quoted [3] - 20999:13, <br> 21032:1, 21038:12 <br> quotes [1] - 21036:23 |  |  | ```21081:25, 21083:22, 21097:6, 21098:5, 21121:24, 21122:2, 21125:8, 21127:15, 21130:13, 21135:19 reappraisal [1] - 21084:24 reason [14]-20937:11, 20954:4, 20980:23, 20983:13, 20991:21, 21001:11, 21011:9, 21087:7, 21108:17, 21113:16, 21116:1, 21116:2, 21122:13, 21125:10 reasonable [2] - 21095:24, 21135:24 reasonably [3] - 20939:12, 20964:1, 21136:4 reasoning [1] - 20965:14 reasons [2] - 20970:8, 21120:8 recalled [4] - 21005:9, 21077:11, 21085:23, 21087:1 recalling [1] - 21059:19 receipt [2] - 20973:12, 21042:3 receive [3] - 20973:16, 21060:2, \(21108: 8\) received [17] - 20971:10, 20971:22, 20998:24, 21007:19, 21008:6, 21008:8, 21024:11, 21035:20, 21051:13, 21055:8, 21055:12, 21056:12, 21071:24, 21072:2, 21073:9, 21078:8, 21135:22 receiving [2] - 20979:10, 21046:14 recent [3]-21018:20, 21019:11, 21134:5 recognize [14] - 21057:9, 21057:21, 21061:13, 21063:3, 21063:8, 21065:11, 21067:11, 21067:16, 21070:8, 21072:16, 21073:13, 21073:14, 21075:8, 21122:23 recognized [1] - 21065:5 recollection [46] - 20934:2, 20934:5, 20945:13, 20978:1, 20978:23, 20980:14,``` |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 21028:17, 21028:24, | 21099:11 | 21060:4, 21073:23, | remained [2] - | 20995:22, 20996:14, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21029:7, 21029:12, | refers [7] - 21005:20, | 21109:6 | 21052:11, 21106:19 | 20997:1, 20997:5, |
| 21029:13, 21034:11, | 21006:24, 21019:10, | relates [2] - 21029:20, | remains [1] - 20960:6 | 20997:19, 20999:18, |
| 21041:19, $21041: 21$, | 21037:2, 21037:7, | 21075:10 | remark [2]-21112:14, | 21019:19, 21019:22, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21042: 3,21043: 2, \\ & 21044: 23.21046: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21056: 3,21093: 3 \\ \text { reflect [1]-21108: } \end{gathered}$ | relating [22] - 20983:10, 20989:13, 20990:19, | 21112:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 21024: 6,21038: 14, \\ & 21039: 18,21058: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| 21046:17, 21047:22, | reflects [1] - 20949:9 | 21014:6, 21017:14, | 21136:5, 21137:2 | 21059:8, 21062:23, |
| 21055:1, 21055:6, | refresh [2] - 21006:5, | 21019:13, 21029:8, | remarks [2]-20967:8, | 21067:22, 21071:22, |
| 21055:12, 21055:15, | 21015:5 | 21036:15, 21040:7, | 20978:25 | 21072:23, 21074:18, |
| 21055:23, 21076:21, | refreshes [2]-20998:6, | 21041:13, 21055:13, | remember [51] - | 21082:25, 21084:24, |
| 21107:2, 21107:24, | 21065:20 | 21055:23, 21056:13, | 20933:20, 20934:20, | 21094:16, 21100:20, |
| 21109:6, 21115:19, | refusal [2]-21045:20, | 21058:2, 21060:1 | 20941:23, 20942:4, | $21109: 24,21112: 5$ |
|  | 21119:13 | 21065:16, 21074:6 | $\text { 20949:22, } 20951 \text { :2, }$ | 21117:9, 21136:22, |
| 21116:19, 21116:24, | refused [1] - 21120:2 | 21076:6, 21076:8, | 20951:8, 20951:11, | 21137:7 |
| 21117:8, 21118:4, | 21018:10, 21103:8, | 21109:16 | 20989:19, 20996:5, | 21029:16, 21111:25 |
| 21127:12, 21129:3, | 21104:6, 21124:23 | relation [10]-21021:17, | $21005: 25,21006: 2$ | reporter [1] - 21084:5 |
| 21129:6, 21129:12 <br> recovers [1]-21006:14 | regarding [9] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21066:12, 21071:4, } \\ & \text { 21075:25, 21082:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $21006: 23,21007: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reporter[2] - 21140:14, } \\ & 21140: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| recovery [1] - 21006:17 | 20980:8, 20995:14 | 21092:1, 21106:17, | 21022:1, 21028:8, | Reporters[2] - |
| recur [1]-21022:6 | 20997:10, 21030:19, | 21108:23, 21109:3, | 21028:11, 21028:13, | 20927:11, 21140:3 |
| rediscovered [1] - | 21043:13, 21067:2, | 21138:10 | 21028:16, 21028:17, | Reporters [1] - 21140:1 |
| $\begin{gathered} 21050: 9 \\ \text { refer [15] } \end{gathered}$ | 21081:12 | relations [1] - 20937:13 | 21029:7, 21046:18, | reporting [4] |
| 20964:6, 20965:5, | 20952:6 | 20955:5, 20962:16 | 21058:17, 21058:23, | 20998:2, 21084:6 |
| 21005:7, 21008:25, | regards [2]-21077:8, | 20963:7, 20964:16 | 21059:1, 21059:8, | reports [23]-21018:24, |
| 21013:9, 21033:6, | 21082:21 | 21068:19, 21124:5 | 21059:16, 21078:23, | 21020:5, 21021:14, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21036: 9,21036: 13, \\ & 21046: 9.21046: 25 . \end{aligned}$ | $\text { Regina } 12] \text { - 20932:17, }$ | relationships [1] - <br> 20994-24 | $\begin{aligned} & 21079: 9,21083: 6, \\ & 21083: 10.21090: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21024:1, } 21027: 10, \\ & 21032: 15.21034: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| $21061 \text { :9, } 21061: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20965:13, 20982:23, } \\ & \text { 20986:20, 21019:1, } \end{aligned}$ | relatively [1] - 20977:19 | 21095:1, 21098:20, | $21035: 19,21038: 25,$ |
| $21075: 4,21075: 24$ <br> reference [16] - | 21027:16, 21029:8, | relay [1] - 21001:19 | $\begin{aligned} & 21099: 21,21104: 21, \\ & 21104: 24,21105: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21039: 1,21039: 2, \\ & 21039: 5,21058: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 21035:7, 21035:12, |  |  | 21064:21, 21074:21 |
| 21010:21, 21012:3, | 21052:7, 21059:13, | relaying [1]-21031:11 | 21128:2, 21137:13 | 21104:10, 21109:8, |
| 21045:17, 21049:4, | region [1] - 20931:10 | 20971:21, 20982:18 | 21137:14 | 21116:22, 21118:17, |
| 21051:18, 21058:16, | Region[7] - 21055:7, | 20983:11, 21010:8, | remembered [1] - | 21126:25, 21128:11, |
| $21060: 2,21066: 8$ | 21056:13, 21059:13, | 21010:9, 21040:16, | $21137: 6$ | 21137:16, 21137:18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21077: 11,21085: 25, \\ & 21086: 8,21086: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $\text { 21060:1, } 21061 \text { :20, }$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21040: 17,21040: 18 \\ & 21040: 25,21041: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { remembering [1] - } \\ & \text { 21005:17 } \end{aligned}$ | represent [1] - 21064:4 representations [1] - |
| $21100: 22,21118: 14$ | $\text { 21062:3, } 21062: 25$ | $21041: 22,21042: 4$ | reminded [1] | 21113:17 |
| referenced [2] - | 21058:16 | 21043:6, 21044:10, | 21029:25 | represented [1] - |
| $21061: 7,21062: 22$ | register [2] - 21050:14, | 21044:11, 21045:8, | Renaud[8] - 20931:23, | 20930:8 |
| referencing [2] - <br> 21065:19, 21097:1 | 21050:15 | 21045:14, 21109:14, | 20932:15, 20940:20, | repressed [2] - |
| referred [14] - 20967:3, 20999:5, 21025:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { regulations [1] - } \\ & \text { 21072:5 } \end{aligned}$ | 21118:22, 21118:23, $21119: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20957:9, 20960:19, } \\ & 20961: 6 \end{aligned}$ | repute [1] - 21081:15 <br> request [21] - 20946: |
| $21032: 22,21044: 24,$ | $21040: 23,21045: 22,$ | released [2] - 20972:5, | Renauds [1] - 20964:3 | 20979:11, 20983:13, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21059:19, 21061:17, } \\ & \text { 21082:25, 21102:5, } \end{aligned}$ | 21119:6 | 21099:20 | repeat [3] - 20984:25, | 20988:22, 20989:1, |
| 21103:10, 21112:2, | $21042: 8,2104$ | 21072:6 | repeated [2] - 21131:10 | $20999: 24,21008: 7$ |
| 21116:11, 21118:13, | rehabilitation [2] - | relevant [1] - 21108:10 | repeating [2] - | 21010:1, 21041:19, |
| referring [16] - 21020:5, | $21119: 15,21120: 5$ $\text { rejoined [1] - } 20936 \text { : }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reliability [1] - 20994:19 } \\ & \text { reliable }[1]-21069: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20968:22, 21119:2 } \\ & \text { replaces [1] - 21067:4 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21046: 14,21058: 19 \\ & \text { 21073:10, 21077:19, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 21033:10, 21033:23, | relate [6] - 20994:22, | $\text { relied }[3]-21064: 25$ | replied [1] - 21136:14 | 21084:2, 21107:4, |
| 21038:4, 21042:25, | 21005:16, 21054:25, | $21065: 21,21066: 1$ | reply [1] - 21073:10 | 21107:5, 21108:4, |
| 21043:4, 21053:3, <br> 21056.20, 21057:4 | $21060: 5,21077: 19$ | religious [1] - 20988:18 | report [36] - 20987:17, | $\text { 21108:10, } 21123: 8$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21056: 20,21057: 4, \\ & 21061: 21,21063: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $21099: 1$ | rely [2] - 21066:16, | 20990:17, 20992:5, 20992:21, 20992:23, | ```requested [4] - 21009:19, 21077:23``` |
| $21072: 23,21084: 19$ | related [8]-20977:7, | 21066:18 relying [2]-210 |  | $21127: 18,21127: 22$ |
| 21093:2, 21099:2, | 21058:6, 21059:14, | 21024:5 | 20995:16, 20995:18, | requesting [3] - |



| 21062:21, 21064:2, | 21047:4, 21047:16, | 21117:21 | similar [2] - 20950:23, | 21019:6, $21021: 2$, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21070:7, 21073:12, | 21118:15 | Sheaf [1] - 21069:1 | 21138:9 | 21024:17, 21024:20, |
| 21076:9, 21076:16, | sequence [1] | sheet [1] - 21073:21 | simply [7] - 20959:17, | 21024:23, 21024:25, |
| 21078:10, 21081:8, | 21059:17 | Sheraton [1] - 20926:16 | 20990:4, 21045:23, | 21025:12, 21035:1, |
| 21081:18, 21084:25, | Serge [2] - 20928:6, | shift [1] - 21099:23 | 21055:21, 21060:23, | 21087:25, 21112:24 |
| 21090:10, 21092:19, | 21092:4 | shocked [4] - 20957:22, | 21065:1, 21103:9 | Sociopathy [1] - |
| 21093:21, 21101:1, | Sergeant [3] - 20939:4, | 20968:8, 21001 :24, | single [7] - 20960:22, | 21025:11 |
| 21102:17, 21105:1, | 20941:18, 20943:1 | 21053:20 | 21031:14, 21046:25 | sociopathy [2] - |
| 21105:22, 21106:3, | serial [1] - 21016:9 | shocker [1] - 21000:23 | 21056:3, 21056:11, | 21015:16, 21029:21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21108:21, } 21118: 19, \\ & 21123: 8.21124: 25, \end{aligned}$ | series [1] - 21015:25 | short [6] - 20933:21, | $21075: 16,21109: 3$ <br> Singular [1]-21031•15 | sodium [1] - 21088:17 <br> soldier [1] - 21090:17 |
| $21126: 15,21128: 10$ | serious [3] - 20959:13, | $20$ | Singular [1]-21031:15 | So |
| 21129:3, 21133:3, | served [3] - 20958:2 | 21033:24 | sitting [4] - 20926:1 | sole [1] - 21056:5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21134: 13 \\ & \text { seeing [9] - 20937:20 } \end{aligned}$ | $21092: 9,21106: 16$ service [3]-21026: | shorthand [1] - 21140:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20932:21, 20932:24, } \\ & \text { 20934:21 } \end{aligned}$ | solely [1] - 20991:15 |
| 20994:17, 21020:13, | $21046: 15,21117: 25$ | $21006: 1,21052:$ | situation [12] - | someone [9]-21009:1, |
| 21025:24, 21058:14, | Service [7] - 20928:7, | shot [4]-20957:23 | 20942:13, 20946:11 | 21032:16, 21037:5, |
| 21058:23, 21076:17, | 20973:12, 20980:6, | 20969:12, 20969:25 | 20949:8, 20958:11 | 21064:17, 21070:22, |
| $\begin{gathered} 21107: 21 \\ \text { seek [2] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20988:1, 21010:18, } \\ & 21072: 5,21101: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 20970:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 20959: 10,20961: 16, \\ & 20967: 6,20979: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21085: 17,21086: 2, \\ & 21086: 25,21118: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| 21047:21 | $21$ | sh | $21006: 11,21006: 13$ | sometime [3] - |
| seeking [1] - 21069:18 seemingly [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { services [2] - 20978:7, } \\ & 21135: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $21011: 20,21052: 20,$ | $21061: 17,21081: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20962:18, 20969:19, } \\ & \text { 20973:18 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 20994: 25 \\ \text { seizures } \end{gathered}$ | sessions [2] - 20993:2, | showed [4] - 21000:23, | 20952:15 | Sometime [1] <br> 21037:14 |
| Sellers [2] - 20935:18, | $\text { set }[4]-20$ | 21129:6 | $20943: 5,20986: 12$ | sometimes |
| 20935:19 | 21021:10, 21044:3 | showered [1] - | 21105:21 | 21077:24 |
| selling [1]-20972:21 | 21045:17 | 20940:23 | skill [1] - 21140:6 | somewhat [1] - 20959:9 |
| Selling [1] - 21132:1 <br> senator [1]-21132.11 | setting [1] - 20935:18 | showing [2] - 21000:25, | skip [2] - 21078:13, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { senator }[1]-21132: 11 \\ & \text { send }[10]-20940: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { seven }[3]-20939: 22, \\ & 20955: 5,21049: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21094:10 } \\ & \text { shown [5] - 20997:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21080:5 } \\ & \text { slice [2] - 21116:15, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20947: 12,21013: 25, \\ & 21064: 6,21094: 20, \end{aligned}$ |
| 20941:6, 20952:8, | seven-yea | 20998:4, 21005:8 | 21127:8 | 21104:7 |
| 21019:15, 21028:2, | 20955:5 | 21006:1, 21104:18 | slips [1] - 20982:1 | son [6] - 20946:2 |
| 21028:18, 21047:6, | Several [1] - 21112:11 | sick [1] - 21000:21 | small [2] - 20977:19, | 20946:15, 20963:24, |
| 21074:2, 21108:4, | several [6] - 20943:5 | side [4]-20932:2 | 21051:4 | 20965:16, 20974:2, |
| 21108:16 | 20970:1, 21112:8, | 20943:3, 20943:4 | smart [4] - 20954:7 | 20988:13 |
| sending [2]-20959:3, | 21112:10, 21127:11 | 20978:14 | 20961:2, 20967:11, | Son [1] - 20965: |
| 21120:23 | 21131:23 | sight [2] - 20958:8 | 21131:13 | son-in-law [1] - |
| sense [5] - 21001:14, | severe [6] - 21019: | 21051:3 | sneaky [1] - 20951:15 | 20965:16 |
| 21020:1, 21077:25, | 21021:1, 21024:16, | sign [6]-20982:17 | so-called [2]-21032:9, | soon [4]-20989:25, |
| 21127:15, 21136:23 | 21025:1, 21034:25, | 20983:9, 20992:13, | 21037:14 | 21008:7, 21050:19, |
| sensible [3] - 20947:6, | 21112:23 | 21007:23, 21045:14 | social [19] - 20999:11, | 21105:8 |
| 21005:24 | sexual [2] - 21014:22, | 21077:21 | 21031:7, 21031:13, | Sorry [1] - 21034:13 |
| sent [8] - 20941:4 | 21015:7 | signed [15] - 20972:22, | 21032:16, 21033:20, | sorry [14]-20947:21, |
| 20962:9, 20996:8, | Shannon [23] - 20929:3, | 20973:13, 20983:14, | 21036:16, 21037:3, | 20971:2, 21004:1, |
| 21009:21, 21073:17, | 20930:7, 20930:8, | 20983:15, 21007:22, | 21038:14, 21053:1, | 21007:25, 21023:15, |
| 21073:22, 21083:20, | 20930:12, 20930:13, | 21010:3, 21010:7, | 21053:15, 21090:8, | $21036: 18,21041: 3$ |
| $21135: 21$ | $20930: 15,20930: 18$ | 21010:9, 21040:16, | $\text { 21099:5, } 21107: 20$ | $21041: 4,21042: 24$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { sentence [4]-21014:7, } \\ & \text { 21033:25, 21089:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20938:13, 20942:9, } \\ & \text { 20947:22, 20950:8, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21041: 22,21044: 10, \\ & 21046: 16,21118: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21109: 7,21109: 24, \\ & 21110: 25,21111: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21057: 11,21057: 22, \\ & 21058: 5,21096: 17, \end{aligned}$ |
| $21119: 7$ | $20952: 22,20955: 16$ | $21118: 22,21126: 20$ | $21112: 4,21112: 6$ | $21098: 24$ |
| sentenced [1] - | 20957:1, 20958:21, | significance [8] | Social[1] - 21027:13 | sort [39] - 20931:21, |
| 20946:15 | $20961: 11,20962: 6,$ | 20952:1, 21001:17, | society [1] - 21045:19 | 20932:23, 20934:7, |
| sentiment [1] - | 20964:11, 20965:2, | 21025:1, 21029:14, | Sociopath [1] - | 20937:5, 20939:15, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21001: 19 \\ & \text { separate }[3]-21051: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20968:14, 20968:18, } \\ & \text { 20974:16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21086: 11,21089: 24, \\ & 21115: 3,21131: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 21087:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 20940: 12,20940: 17, \\ & 20946: 2,20953: 20, \end{aligned}$ |
| 21051:20, 21122:14 | share [3] - 21039:23 | significant [3] | 21015:15, 21015:20, | 20955:23, 20957:14, |
| September [7] - | $21116: 23,21128: 6$ | 21015:21, 21061:1, | 21016:22, 21017:2, | 20958:14, 20959:23, |
| 20971:17, 21005:12, | shared [4] - 21000:24, | $21131: 5$ | $21017: 3,21025: 13$ | $20961 \text { :2, } 20964: 4$ |
| 21040:12, 21043:11, | 21001:23, 21079:7, | signs [1] - 21108:19 | sociopathic [10] - | 20970:18, 20976:12, |


|  |  |  | ```21068:21, 21075:3, 21085:9, 21116:14 Street [2] - 21043:17, 21047:7 street [1] - 20961:2 street-smart [1] - 20961:2 streets [1] - 20970:18 stress [1] - 20963:1 stretch [1] - 20973:23 strict [1] - 21072:5 strictly [1] - 20949:4 strikes [2] - 21089:22, 21125:20 striking [1] - 21039:20 strings [1] - 20965:23 strongly [1] - 21045:7 struck [1] - 21029:19 students [1] - 21068:24 study [1] - 20997:21 stuff [4] - 20943:19, 20963:25, 21053:11, 21129:9 stupid [1] - 20943:19 style [1] - 21070:25 sub [2] - 20931:15, 20932:15 subject [2]-21076:16, 21125:11 submission [1] - 21064:14 submissions [2] - 21056:25, 21138:4 submit [1] - 20997:18 subpoena [7] - 21059:25, 21104:16, 21104:21, 21105:24, 21106:7, 21106:10, 21106:13 subpoenaing [1] - 21055:6 subscription [2] - 20931:2, 20972:23 subscriptions [3] - 20972:22, 21122:25, 21132:1 subsequent [2] - 20986:9, 21116:16 subsequently [2] - 20973:6, 21029:17 success [1] - 20944:3 suddenly [1] - 20966:6 suffered [2]-21015:19, 21060:5 suffering [6] - 20986:25, 20994:9, 21019:4, 21021:1, 21034:24, 21087:25 sufficient [1] - 21020:1 sufficiently [1] -``` | ```20959:13 suggest [4]-21104:25, 21106:18, 21116:6, 21121:8 suggested [11] - 20954:4, 20980:21, 21009:1, 21040:20, 21040:22, 21074:10, 21080:18, 21090:10, 21116:17, 21116:19, 21116:20 suggesting [6] - 21020:12, 21042:17, 21084:8, 21102:7, 21121:6, 21137:3 suggestion [2]- 21102:21, 21123:11 suggestive [2] - 20984:19, 20992:10 suicide [2]-20960:15, 20962:1 summary [5] - 21010:17, 21037:9, 21059:17, 21061:24, 21106:10 sunk [1] - 20941:10 Sunrise [1] - 21056:13 super [1]-20938:6 superficial [1] - 21074:22 supervising [1] - 20931:15 supervisor [2] - 20931:12, 20932:16 supervisors [3] - 20931:16, 20945:17, 20957:16 Support [1] - 20927:9 support [2] - 21001:7, 21019:18 Supported [1]-21066:4 supported [1] - 21117:23 supportive [1] - 21026:22 suppose [6] - 20962:25, 21002:8, 21008:2, 21052:19, 21071:14, 21132:24 supposed [1] - 20967:4 Surgeons [1] - 21010:7 surgery [1] - 21066:24 surmised [1] - 21001:14 surprised [4] - 20981:8, 21028:18, 21028:24, 21029:5 surprising [1] - 21130:19 surrender [1] -``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |




Page 29


