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## Transcript of Proceedings

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

## PETER CARLYE-GORDGE, continued:

## BY MR. HARDY:

A
Good morning, Mr. Carlyle-Gordge.
Good morning.
Just one point of follow-up from yesterday. We
had been speaking of the orange notebook that you
had had in your possession as $I$ understand it that
contained notes by David relating to his
recollection of events on June 31st, 1969, there
around, and I didn't ask you, do you know what
happened to that notebook?
As far as $I$ can recall, $I$ gave it back with a lot
of documents to Mrs. Milgaard.
Okay.
I've looked around. I don't have it.
The next document $I$ wanted to bring your attention
to is a transcription of a discussion you had with
Father Murphy, we mentioned this briefly
yesterday. Do you recall having at least one
discussion with Father Murphy?
I think there were two at least, yeah.

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q

Okay. And $I$ think $I$ asked you yesterday as well, but do you recall when one of those discussions at least happened or when those discussions were taking place?

I would guess '81 or two.
And do you recall going into that interview why you wanted to speak with Father Murphy?

Well, I knew he was the parish priest and he knew the family, he had some connections, and $I$ knew he had some role in, connected with Albert Cadrain in telling him he should go and tell whatever he knew and there was a reward, $I$ knew there was some connection to the reward.

And we're going to --
Yeah.
We're going to see some of that in the
transcription, but just in terms of having that knowledge ahead of time that Father Murphy might know something about Albert, do you recall how you were aware of that?

Not offhand.
Okay. Let's take a look at the transcription, it's document ID 048529, again it's undated, we're not certain when this took place, although I do believe from the context we can gather that it was
prior to any discussion that you had with Albert
which we will also see took place a little bit later in time, but in any event, in summary you begin by asking Father Murphy about the Lorne Mahar case?

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
Uh-huh.
And then at the bottom of the page he states: "Well, they weren't directly involved but ah, one of the boys who became an accessory..."

You say yes. Father Murphy:
"...and he travelled with these people to Calgary, $I$ think as they went after ah, they had performed this murder."

Yourself:
"Wa, would that be Cadrain, Shorty?"
Father Murphy:
"Yes."
Yourself:
"Shorty Cadrain."
Father Murphy:
"Yeah."
Yourself:
"I don't suppose you know where he is nowadays?"

Father Murphy:
"Well his parents are still in
Saskatoon."
And again, is it your recollection, Mr.
Carlyle-Gordge, that you were aware ahead of time that Father Murphy may have knowledge on Albert Cadrain?

A

Q
And you just can't be certain though how you knew he may have that connection?

A
$Q$
I can't think right offhand, no.
Turn to page 048535, Father Murphy states:
"And ah, I, well I, threw some contacts
I had, I, I found out Wil Cadrain was
ah, drawn into it and ah, but he was ah, free and ah, and $I$ know that possibly I could help the kid so I, I called him and had a talk with him and ah, and advised him to go to the police with the information that he had." Uh-huh.

Yourself:
"Right."
Father Murphy:
"Ah, because he had a chance to ah, come in on the reward."

And was this news to you at the time, that Father Murphy had perhaps advised Albert to go to see the police with the information that he had? I don't think it was completely new. I think I was interested in this reward because $I$ was looking for a motive, why did -- by this point I probably decided based on my analysis that none of this stuff happened, they didn't get stuck, there was no blood on the pants, so $I$ was looking for motives and interested in the reward. I have a feeling that even before $I$ phoned him, though, I had a suspicion that he may have got the reward and $I$ wanted to know for sure who got the reward,
yeah.
And as $I$ read this paragraph initially, it seems, at least at the outset, that Father Murphy is suggesting that not only did he advise Albert Cadrain about the reward, but that he actually advised him to go to see the police with whatever information he had?

Yeah, that's the way it reads, although $I$ know at some point I talked to Albert's brother Dennis who I found to be very open about this and there was some confusion about who first persuaded him to go to the police and $I$ seem to remember that when he first came back to Saskatoon after he had been on a trip, I think the family had talked about, oh, you don't know what you missed, there was this big murder, possibly his mother, and his brother Dennis, certainly they talked to each other that night and $I$ think Dennis said, well, he told me about this blood and I said you should go to the police, so precisely who eventually told him, well, you better go down to the station and talk about it, I'm still not positive, but what $I$ suspect is that Dennis and Albert did have this long conversation and that there was some talk of this blood thing in the family and probably the
parish priest heard about stuff and maybe said, well, you know, there's a reward, you know, so precisely who did what, I'm not positive.

Okay. And perhaps that answers some of the following questions that $I$ had. We know in later years that Father Murphy was contacted again respecting his information on this matter, he spoke to the RCMP in 1993, and although there seems to be confusion during your discussion with him, he confirms later in time that in fact it was advice to Albert to go and seek the reward for his involvement as opposed to actually advising Albert to go to see the police.

That makes sense.
Now, from your discussion it sounds like you had reconciled perhaps that same conclusion following other discussions with Dennis as well?

Yeah, I found Dennis very helpful, yeah.
Okay. So you don't recall being left with an impression from Father Murphy that perhaps Albert, as opposed to going in on his own or through discussions with Dennis, had actually been told by Father Murphy to go to the police with his information?

A
I think it was to do with the reward, yeah.

Q Okay. There's a second discussion with Father Murphy, again undated, $I$ don't think we need to look at that given what you've told me, but I will note the page ID where that second discussion takes place, it's at 048542.

The next document I'll bring
your attention to, Mr. Carlyle-Gordge, is correspondence to Tony Merchant from Joyce Milgaard, the document $I D$ is 219484 , you'll see it's a letter to Mr. Merchant from Joyce Milgaard, I won't show you the last page, but it indicates it is from Mrs. Milgaard, and you'll note in just the first paragraph here -- the letter is undated, but it states:
"For over two years now we have been doing our best to go over my son's case and try to have it reopened. David is, frankly, depressed about the progress, as am I. We seem to have reached an impasse and $I$ think it urgent that we draw up a timetable of action before things drift further."

And as the paragraph continues, there's some indication that there's still attempts to contact Nichol and have her co-operate -- if we move into
the second paragraph -- there are still ongoing attempts to try to find Albert Cadrain as well, and at the very bottom of the page, Ute Frank again is mentioned. If we can move to the next page. The letter states:
"After Christmas I would like to come out and see you again, with Peter Carlyle-Gordge, who is equally anxious to trace Cadrain and devise ways of persuading him to talk."

And if we move to the next page, it states: "Peter Carlyle-Gordge is quite willing to use his journalistic talents at the right time to help in any way possible, but first $I$ think we must exhaust all other avenues of tracing people and getting things moving."

And I think, I know that Mrs. Milgaard mentioned Christmas, and perhaps that's Christmas of 1982 , I'm not sure if we can put a definite date on this correspondence, but in terms of that last portion that $I$ read to you, do you know what's being referred to in terms of use of your journalistic talents at the right time?

A Well, I think, you know, if, I think she's
referring to the fact that if we had access to a lawyer and some tracing agency, that might be faster than me spending a lot more time. That probably refers to the kind of thought $I$ was giving to all the people that I thought were important to the case on how the best approach would be made, you know, should she go and see them, should a lawyer go and see them, should there be a conference call or should $I$ go and see them.

And it seems to me, and again you can't speak for Mrs. Milgaard obviously, but it seems to me that something beyond what you had been doing to this point in time is being considered here in terms of the mention of the use of your journalistic talents. Do you have any idea what that might be?

A

Q
A That's all $I$ can tell you really. I don't remember that.

No, fair enough. If we move next to document

219511, you'll see it's a letter dated January 20th, 1983 from Tony Merchant to Mrs. Milgaard, and in the first paragraph it looks like he has obtained --

A

Empire Tracing correspondence to Mr. Merchant with respect to that location, and that document $I D$ is 216086. And then if we turn to 048447 it appears, Mr. Carlyle-Gordge, that the next thing that

And $I$ won't turn to it, but there's, similarly, an
happens is that you attend in Dalmeny to meet with
Albert Cadrain?
A
Uh-huh.
And do you recall that meeting with Mr. Cadrain?
Yeah, vaguely, yup
Do you recall, did you call him ahead of time, or how did you decide to approach that?

I think we just turned up, as far as $I$ remember.
I had a friend in Saskatoon and I asked him to go with me, the unknown male referred to. Yeah, I think we showed up.

And who was the unknown male?
His name is Richard Shirray, and he was married to
a lady I used to know a long time ago at the Free Press called Linda Lee, and I know I stayed with them a couple of times on my visits out here. And I think she actually worked for federal corrections at the time, which seems kind of ironic, looking back.

Q Okay. And you are going to need to bear with me. I'm going to try and help us figure out the timing of some of these meetings, and I'm going to suggest to you that this interview took place on February 18th, 1983, and perhaps briefly we can bring up a document 230185. It's actually a scan
of a tape, you will see Cadrain, Dalmeny, February 18th, 1983, which fits with this transcript. And again, to keep this time frame in mind, $I$ can also advise you that this was a Friday, and do you recall what your mindset was going into this meeting with Mr. Cadrain?

Hmm. Well obviously I wanted to know if he had changed his mind in any way, if -- I would have wanted to ask about the blood in particular I think. I had never met him and I guess I wanted to just find out what he was like, what he felt about David Milgaard, was he still convinced about it, that kind of thing.

And from all that you had learned about him up to this point in time what were you anticipating? I was quite nervous, actually. I didn't really know what to expect. I know I tried to contact, I seem to remember I talked to his mother several times, and they were kind of protecting his whereabouts $I$ remember, and $I$ think $I$ may have written to him and sent the letters to her because she said she would pass them on, something like that. That was a past attempt to find him.

What did I anticipate? Hmm.

Well, you know, my best wish list would have been
if he said "well it might not have been blood", or something like that, but, umm, just from reading things on the page $I$ wouldn't have expected him to be completely normal.

I'm sorry, completely?
Normal.
Okay. And that was from your reading?
Just my general reading of the preliminary
hearing, stuff like that. I can't remember dates as to when $I$ talked to his brother and he -- it may have been prior to this in fact, and certainly he said, 'well, he never was quite normal', or words to that effect, and what happened to him with the trial and the police picking him up every day and keeping him for hours on end, and that went on for a long time, his brother suggested very definitely that that had really, $I$ can't remember the words, screwed up his mind anyway, so --

Q Okay. And we will look at that, and I know it's tough to look back and consider when the timing of all this was.

A
Q
Yeah.
I think the meeting with Dennis might have been after this discussion with Albert --

A
Q
A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q
Ar
And you state:
"Ah, I'm doing a book on four murder cases, ..."

A
Uh-huh.
$Q$

A

```
                    "... one of them is the Gail Miller
                    case. And what I've been doing is
                    interviewing some of the people
                    involved."
```

                            Right.
                            And do you recall making this representation to
                    Mr. Cadrain?
                            Oh yeah, I'm sure I did, yeah.
                            And, at this point in time, was this still your
                                    intention?
                            It was one of the intentions, that \(I\) would at one
                                    point do a book.
                                    Okay.
                                    Yeah.
                                    And \(I\) state that in large part because we had seen
                                    that you completed the essay on the Winnipeg eight book?
    That wasn't the book, though.
Okay.
That was a -- that wasn't specifically an essay about the Milgaard case, although it's in there, that was the history of Joyce Milgaard from 1930 to 1982. It was a biography. Although this case was the first opportunity $I$ had to bring up this case, and of course we were both involved with it,
so it was part of her biography at that time.

Q
A

Q

A

Q
A

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
So I --
So this would be a separate idea I had.
You are still contemplating a book at this point
in time?
Umm, yeah. I was not keen to do it immediately,
but I thought I might, yup.
Would your --
And I had huge amounts of material on the Katie
Harper case, which $I$ hadn't done much with either,
so --
Would your primary attention though at this point,
in terms of contacting Albert, be not so much
thoughts of the book but --
Uh-huh.
-- an attempt to gather information from Albert
relating to the case?
Yeah, it would be research to find out what Albert
Cadrain was all about, sure.
And would this then, in terms of this
representation, would this be your thought on how
you might better be able to get --
Yeah.
-- Albert to talk?

Q

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$
Uh-huh.
Do you recall Albert providing this information to you.

Oh yes, yeah.

And what was your impression of Albert and this information that he was giving to you? Well, you know, right back when $I$ first read the preliminary trial thing, that is the thing that jumped out at me, this Mafia deal. So what this showed to me was it wasn't good news, it showed to me that his belief had, if anything, intensified in the last 12 years since he gave evidence. So that obsessive thinking, that there was a Mafia conspiracy, and $I$ think later on he talks about judges and policeman and even Nichol John, all these people being involved in the conspiracy, it just showed that his delusional state was, if anything, worse.

Okay. I'll turn to 048556. Oh, it's page -- I'm sorry -- page 11. I'll read this portion to you. Albert states:
"Yeah and another thing is, he used to take thirteen year old girls in, when he was that age, into the bath tub and he used to get 'em stoned on something, I don't know what and he used to break their virginity and he used to laugh at them and he, he was possessed. As far as I'm concerned, he is possessed by the
devil. Okay. But we were kids. Okay." Do you recall receiving this information from Mr. Cadrain?

A
$Q$

A

Absolutely, yes.
And did you have similar thoughts as you've just described to me, and reaction?

Yes.
And what do you recall, can you give us a sense of Albert's physical self and manner during the time that you were talking to him on this occasion? Umm, I seem to think he was quite short, I'm short myself, he was short. Umm, this was a conversation $I$ couldn't steer or control, that was the impression I got, because he would get away from subject matter and go rambling on about Calgary and drugs, and he seemed to have an obsessive interest in popping virgins and sex, which that came out. His manner was, umm, disjointed $I$ think, you know, rambling, but there was no way you could kind of interrupt him once he started on, so I kind of just went along and let him talk, you know. I tried to steer it back from time to time, but $I$ was quite happy to let him just talk, because $I$ might learn something new. Turn to page 048459 . Now $I$ won't read all of this
to you, and again we've listened to it previously, but at this point Albert begins to talk of a friend of his, Leonard Gorgchuck, --

A
$Q$

And Albert continues on with the same sort of discussion, and $I$ won't read those portions specifically to you, but -- and maybe you have been describing this for us; you don't seem to have any pointed questions for him?

No.
And was it your decision, then, to just sort of let him speak?

To let him ramble on and try to steer it back. I think what he was doing here, if you look at it closely, it's -- now that $I$ look at it he is kind of demonising Milgaard, which is what happened to Milgaard $I$ think, and $I$ think he's somebody that was delusional and he saw things in black and white. I know he had hallucinations at various times. He, at some point he had talked about seeing a serpent with David's head on it, at some point -- and I can't tell you precisely where I'm speaking from -- he saw colours around David that told him he was a murderer. So there was a lot of really irrational nonsense going on, but $I$ think he saw David as some kind of evil person, and all this stuff about the way he treated women, I took it with a big grain of salt, because that's not the impression $I$ got from talking to people who
worked with David.

Q

A
$Q$ ,

Okay.

He was popular and he was very persuasive and he did have the gift of the gab, but that's a bit different to what, what's being opened up here.

We'll turn to page 29 of this document. Albert
starts near the bottom of the page:
"Now, I don't know, this shit like this never came out in the paper, they hid a lot of stuff. Let me tell you. The story is $I$ don't know Ron Wilson knew anything, $I$ knew $I$ knew nothing. But Nicole John sure did. She must have and I'll tell you why."

Yourself:
"Uhmmm."

Albert:
"She was so freaked out on that trip, okay."

Yourself:
"Uhmmm. "

Albert:
"She was so scared of everything. She clung on to me like a little lost mouse because Milgaard was scared of me. I
was stronger than him, maybe $I$ wasn't $I$ don't know. He always wanted to arm wrestle with me or test me out, check me over eh."

Yourself:
"Uhmmm."
Albert:
"And ah, but as soon as I got in that car she was my girlfriend. I didn't, I didn't even care for her but, she, she stayed by me. And she was scared of that guy. Everytime he looked at her she'd just freaked out."

And do you recall receiving this information?
Yes.
And, again, did you believe Albert's account that Nichol was afraid of David during the trip? No.

Okay. And I know there is a reference, and I'm not going to turn to it, but in the notebook that we had referred to previously I think David had given an indication that he was perhaps somewhat upset with Nichol getting together with Shorty Cadrain on the trip, and he knew ahead of time that Nichol became frightened when he drived in a
wild manner, and he intentionally drove in that fashion --

A

Q

Uh-huh.
-- and thought that he may have frightened Nichol.
Do you recall considering that information or --
I think Roger Renaud, or somebody I interviewed who had worked with Milgaard had talked about that kind of stuff, that he took a car once and he was a bit wild. Umm, the question is what, is do I recall?

I'm wondering, the first question was whether you believed Albert's account that --

That she was terrified?
-- Nichol appeared to be scared of David during the trip?

No, I think he is self-dramatizing in this area. Okay.

And I think there's some kind of sexual jealousy going on at some point too. I have my own theory about Mr. Cadrain, but --

And if we could turn next to page 31. And is that theory that you have just mentioned beyond what you have been describing for me already?

Umm, to some extent. I mean I think you've got to take into account that he was, $I$ think he was
mentally ill, and he was subject to illusion or delusions, and $I$ think my impressions was that he had a weak personality, and he liked to self-dramatize, and there was a certain amount of narcissism involved.

But if you look at the
background of the two -- and, actually, this is the meeting where, towards the end, he does go into some detail about some interesting things about David's past. Albert had been in the Milgaard home, he had met Mrs. Milgaard before, before the murder, and $I$ think he was jealous of David Milgaard. And the reason $I$ say that is his impression -- and $I$ think it's in this
interview -- was that David had been spoiled, spoiled by his mother, and tended to get his own way and what he wanted; whereas Albert, if you look into his background, and I think Dennis talked about some of it, kind of had a chip on his shoulder. He had wanted to have, I think, music lessons and he couldn't, and people baked, he had a large family, the mother baked birthday cakes and made a fuss on the birthdays but not on Albert's birthday, so $I$ think there was an enmity there at a very deep level. more than once is that David, when he was 17 , had an incredibly innocent look about him and he was very, how can $I$ put this, very extroverted and could be very popular, and I think, I think there was some resentment at some subconscious level here.

Now what's very important, towards the end of this -- I'll just quickly do it -- he talks to me about being at the trial and the look on David Milgaard's face which said 'oh, you'll save me buddy, you know, you are my buddy, you'll tell the truth', and Albert is almost taking a perverse pleasure, when he is talking to me, in saying 'but $I$ didn't save him, did I, and you should have seen the look on his face' -- I'm paraphrasing -- 'when he realized that wasn't going to happen'. That's my theory.

And was that a thought process that was ongoing at the time, at this time?

No, no, it's -- to round that out, it's later than this, but --

Q Okay.
A -- yeah.
Let's turn to page 31 of the document, start
reading. You ask:
"Now when he came that morning, you saw blood on him. Can you tell me about that?"

Albert:
"Well ..."
Yourself:
"... Did he have it on his hands too?
Albert:
"Milgaard was a, like I said before, he was smart. He must have been smart because by the time they found the car they didn't find any traces in the car
. . ."

Yourself:
"... I know. There was no trace in it.
Albert:

> "He was smart. I never seen no blood on
his hands and if $I$ did, like, it's a
long time eh."
You state:
"Uhmmm?
Albert:
"But $I$ know there was blood on his
clothing. He had to get it changed."

You state:
"Right."
And there's some reference throughout to Albert's observation of blood on the clothing. The one thing I noted is you didn't seem to pursue this with him to any great extent, and perhaps what I am thinking is you didn't seem to ask Albert "could it have been some other substance, is it possible you didn't see blood", and I'm just wondering what your mindset was in terms of approaching this bit of information that Albert had at the time?

A

Q
him talk. That's all $I$ can tell you. Okay. The next page, 32, I won't read that to you but Albert talks of David breaking the aerial on the vehicle on the way out of Saskatoon; do you recall receiving that information?
Kool-Aid or something". It's not there, I don't know what was in my mind, $I$ was basically letting

A Yes.

Q

A

Q

A
Q 'm guessing, I really am.

Okay. Turn to page 37, Albert is speaking here in relation to his dealings with the police, he states:
"But we, we, ah, they worked me over boy I'm telling you. I was in that, that police station, that little room there and they worked me over, boy. They questioned me and showed me pictures and oh man it was freaky. They worked me over."

A

Q

Uh-huh.

You state:
"You see I talked to Nicole and she said that, she more or less said she was forced to make a statement. That's what she said. That's why she retracted it in court. She was saying that she didn't see it what she said she saw ..."

Albert:
"... Well ..."
You state:
"... And she said the police kept her locked up over night and gave her the third degree."

Albert:
"I believe it. Oh I believe it yeah. They have to."

You state:
"Uhmmm."

Albert:
"Something like this is serious."
You state:
"But she really doesn't remember seeing anything. Like seeing him stab a women."

And at this point in time would I assume correctly that you were perhaps stating what your suspicions were in relation to Nichol John as to the --

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q
A
Q

Absolutely. There's some creativity involved in that statement.

And what was your intention in terms of using that creativity at this point?

Well $I$ was just trying to draw him out more and more, and get him talking about it, so literally $I$ hadn't, of course, had a detailed discussion with Nichol John.

Okay. And you thought perhaps that, by advising that Nichol had been perhaps forced to make her statement, that Albert might be more willing to implicate the police in terms of --

Well I --
-- his own information?
I just wanted to know what he thought about it. Okay.

Yeah.
We'll turn to page 41, full page. There's some mention, $I$ won't read this portion to you, but there's some mention of Albert speaking of Kenny, his younger brother Kenny at the time, and Albert
indicating that Kenny remembers everything and that he remembered -- or remembers seeing blood on David Milgaard. Do you recall considering potential information from Kenny Cadrain at the time?

Yeah, I think I -- umm, seems to me I asked Dennis who else could have seen anything.

Okay.
This doesn't ring a big bell though.
Okay.
No.

Do you recall any attempts to contact Kenny Cadrain or discussions with Kenny?

I don't, no, no.
Okay. And we know as well I think, and you will probably recall, Celine Cadrain was home on the morning in question --

A
Q

A
Q Okay.

A
Yeah.
But no recollection of direct dealings with

Celine?
No, no.
If we turn to page 44 , starting here, again there's some discussions about the police, you state:
"Yeah. Yeah. Now when you went to the police, uhm, did they believe you, first of all? What did you tell them?"

Albert:

> "No they didn't."

You state: "You told them what you had seen?"

Albert:
"They were nice to me until they got me in the cop shop and then they, then they worked me over boy. The didn't believe a word I said. They probably did, but they were trying to find out everything. And they did. You know. Crap. They put me through the mill I'll tell ya."

You state:
"Did they ever suspect you?"
Albert:
"Oh ya."

You state:
"Because she lived near there?"

Albert:
"Oh ya. Of course they did."
You state:
"Did they accuse you at any time?"
Albert:
"In, inside there?"
You state:
"Yeah?"
Albert:
" Oh ya, of course they did."
And do you recall receiving this information from
Mr. Cadrain?

A

Q

A
Actually, yes.
And was this information significant, in your mind?

A
Well, I was still trying to fill in the big picture, and $I$ think it's fairly significant that, you know, he went to them first, he opened up the case, and they didn't believe him. And the other thought $I$ had, actually looking at this whole section, was he seemed to use the words "David was so smart", and that gets back to my theory that he
really felt inadequate in some way to David Milgaard, because he wasn't very smart. In terms, though, of this portion that $I$ have just read to you; did that information fit with your theory at the time?

Oh, probably, yup. Yeah. What I knew was that, you know, the chief Crown people, not including Cadrain, $I$ knew at this point, obviously, that their first statements -- I'm talking about Nichol John, Wilson, David -- when they first gave statements they were all uniform in that nothing had happened, they later changed, Wilson and Nichol's wit -- statements changed to implicate Milgaard and to play a part in the role in convicting him, my question was how could they change that much, so this does tie in to some degree with the whole relationship between Crown witnesses and the police.

Okay. Turn to page 51. Just at the bottom of the page, Albert states:
"... Well what is also freaky,
Mrs. Milgaard's from Winnipeg and she probably says now listen you wanna make yourself ten grand, eh?"

You state:
"No I'm not making ten grand."

Albert:
"Yeah. No it doesn't matter."
You state:
"I have ID by the way if you want me
to."

Albert:
"Na, it doesn't, simply doesn't matter."
What ID would that have been that you would have had at that time?

A
Umm, I don't know. I didn't actually have a Maclean's card or anything like that.
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
Q Okay.

But, you know, I think this whole period was walking on eggshells, as $I$ have said earlier. I didn't want a connection made between me and Mrs. Milgaard, so we're getting -- sorry -- we're getting close to it.

Okay. And I think there's mention on this page of the Rick Shirray that you have identified for us previously as well?

Uh-huh, yup.
If we turn to page 62, and you start:
"Right. Well Nicole is certainly scared
still $I$ know that and that could be for

```
several reasons."
```

Albert:
"She is ..."

You state:
"... Could be for several reasons."

Albert:
"She's. Is she married or anything?"
You state:
" Yes, she got married, in fact she's separated?"

Albert:
"Oh."

You state:
"Her last name is (Dennion ...",
Albert:
"I don't know."
You state:
"But ah, she's says she doesn't remember seeing any, do anything and that's why she retracted the statement and the police had really given it to her ...",

Albert:
"... Ah ..."
You state:
"... And made, made her sign it
basically?"

Albert:
"Yup. I'll tell ya, $I$ wouldn't try to ah, I wouldn't try to protect her ..."

You state:
"... She, she was the eye witness too."
Albert:
"Is that right?"
You state:
"Well according to the statement which she was (unintelligible)."

Albert:
"Yeah."
You state:
"Yeah."
Albert:
"Well you know, I'll tell you. I'm, I'd, I'd stake my life on it she must have seen something because..."

You state:
"... Uhmmm ..."
Albert:
"... She's just too scared to talk."
You state:
"That could be."

And I think maybe we've covered it, but was it clearly your view at the time, Mr. Carlyle-Gordge, that the police had made Nichol John sign the second implicating statement?

A

Q
A

Q

A

Q

A
Q Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv
Okay. And page 73 you will see, in the middle of the page there's some discussion about you contacting Dennis --
Umm, basically, yes.
Okay.
Yeah, yes, that she'd been intimidated to the point where she did.

And do you remember, after all of these discussions with Albert, Albert remaining convinced that Nichol had seen something that morning?

Hmm. I think he was convinced of his own beliefs, basically. He was kind of -- I think there was kind of a wall around him.

Okay. Turn to page 65. Just mention, at the bottom of the page Albert indicates that David actually menaced him with a knife at one point, I believe in Calgary; do you recall receiving that information?

Yeah, rings a bell, yeah.

A Right.
Q -- and asking for some contact information in relation to Dennis, and at a different point there is also some discussion about contacting Leonard Gorgchuck?

Uh-huh.
I think Albert invites you to give him a call. And if we go to the last page, page 82, and you will see the transcript concludes at this point. And perhaps you could summarize for us, Mr. Carlyle-Gordge, after you were done meeting with Albert, what were your overall conclusions in relation to the role that he had played? Frustration, as with most of this case. I don't see any big breakthrough, but I'd learned a bit more about his character and his thoughts and his beliefs. The part that $I$ referred to towards the end, which helps me with my own theory with why would your friend do this to you, you know. I don't think there's anything startling, he didn't say he'd lied, he didn't -- we didn't get into the stains on the pants too much, so it -- what did it confirm? That $I$ really couldn't find him too credible maybe.

Okay. And do you recall what you did with this
information?


A
$Q$

A
Q
A
$Q$

Umm, probably had it typed and added it to the growing pile, and probably gave a copy to Joyce too, yeah.

And you have had a chance to review the transcript; was there anything else significant gathered from Albert that's not captured by the transcript that you recall?

I don't think so.
Okay.
No.
It appears that you follow up on some of the contacts that you were contemplating within the context of this interview?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Could I have the
doc. ID that was being shown to us, the 040 version, please?

MR. HARDY: Okay, sure. What is the doc ID of the one that we were actually reviewing?

MS. BOSWELL (Document Manager): 040654.
MR. HARDY: 040654 .
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks.
BY MR. HARDY:
I turn you firstly, Mr. Carlyle-Gordge, to 325504.
It states Leonard Cadrain at the top, I believe
that's a mistake and it is actually Leonard Gorgchuck, which can be gathered from the context of the transcript. There is a tape mentioned there, 048705 . I'm going to show you a copy of another tape cover which may be able to assist us in terms of placing a date on this conversation, and that tape cover is 230183. That's the second page of that document, if we go to page 2 we see a February $19 t h$ and $20 t h$ reference, Saskatoon. Uh-huh.

Caldwell is mentioned, and as well Leonard Gorgchuck is mentioned, and as I indicated the discussion with Albert $I$ believe was February 18th. And would that make sense to you, likely that you perhaps were following up with

Mr. Gorgchuck shortly following your discussion with Albert?

Yes, it does, yeah.
Okay. If we can go back to the transcript, 325504 , and do you recall what your intention was just at the outset in terms of getting ahold of Mr. Gorgchuck?

A
I think $I$ was just trying to check out whether some of this stuff $I$ had been hearing from Albert was crazy or if there were any truth in any of it,
the stuff to do with Calgary and drug lords and all that stuff.
$Q$
A

Q
-- about whether it would be okay to speak with you, and you indicate that would be fine?

And I'm on page 2 now, if we could just go to the full page, and you actually call back a short time later, Leonard indicates that he has talked to Albert in the meantime and it looks like he's willing to speak to you?

A
Uh-huh.
And if we move to the next page, and you start to have a discussion and the substance of it only
really starts at the very end and you indicate:
"Yeah, but he, he said something about
you taking some pictures down there."
He says:
"Well, yes as a matter of fact --" And the rest of the tape is inaudible. Do you recall what information you gathered from Mr. Gorgchuck?

A
Not really in detail, $I$ have no idea what the rest of that would be about, but obviously it wasn't significant to me anyway in terms of investigating Milgaard. There was nothing --
$Q$
A
Q

A
$Q$

A

Q
And I don't want to go into it too deeply, we had Mr. Gorgchuck testify at this inquiry and he agreed with much of what Albert had to say generally speaking, $I$ think it would be fair to

No, I don't think so. Otherwise I would have followed up further. I don't know.
say, and do you have that recollection of whether Mr. Gorgchuck advised you in the same manner? No, he didn't.

And it's perhaps not fair of me to summarize it in that fashion, he agreed with some of what Albert had to say, but all $I$ can ask you for is what your recollection is in terms of --

My recollection is this wasn't a long conversation
and he was quite leery as you can tell, he had to check, and $I$ certainly don't remember him going into details about stuff going on.

Okay.
I think I asked him for photographs originally I think, yeah.

And did he have --
I just wanted to -- I don't think he told me very much, that's my impression, yeah.

Turn next to document 325634, you'll see this is a transcript of a discussion with Dennis Cadrain, and again to try and place this in time, there's a tape cover that we can take a look at, it's document 230175 , and you'll see the reference there is to February 21st, 1983 which again
appears to closely follow the discussion with Albert; in fact, $I$ guess it would be on the Monday
following that Friday discussion with Albert, and would that --

Yeah, that makes sense.
-- fit with your, or make sense with you?
Yes.
And, Mr. Commissioner, we have this tape, at the time that Mr. Cadrain, Dennis Cadrain testified it had not been processed though through our database. We haven't listened to this information yet and I'm going to propose that we listen to it. It's about 30 minutes long and it's been digitised and synced, so perhaps we can play it at this point. If I didn't confirm that, it wasn't put to Dennis Cadrain. As $I$ say, it wasn't, we didn't have it processed at that point in time, so some of the information, or most of it, we haven't heard previously.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Anyway, it
purports to be an interview between Mr.
Carlyle-Gordge and Dennis Cadrain?
MR. HARDY: That's correct.
(Telephone Interview with DENNIS CADRAIN, By Peter Carlyle-Gordge)

DENNIS CADRAIN: Hello.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Hello, is that

Dennis.
DENNIS CADRAIN: Yes.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: My name is Peter Carlyle Gordge. I write for Maclean's. That is not why I am calling ...

DENNIS CADRAIN: You what.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: I am a writer with
Maclean's.
DENNIS CADRAIN: Oh, yeah, about, I bet you I can guess.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: What.

DENNIS CADRAIN: About Milgaard.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: That's right. I am doing a book on sensational western murders.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Olson, Kattie Harper, Gail Miller is the one $I$ want to include and I was in Dalmeny on the weekend and interviewed Albert and he gave me your phone number..

DENNIS CADRAIN: Oh, yeah.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: In fact he said you had considered a book once. Is that true..

DENNIS CADRAIN: Well, I think it probably would be an interesting story.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah. Well, I've gone through some of the press clippings and I talked to Albert and he mentioned - what I am trying to do is reconstruct the time when the police had the first real break-through and Albert told me about when he came back from Regina he heard that this girl had been killed and things began to fall into place.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Well, actually when he came back he didn't know that the girl that the girl - I told him.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: He said he found out at home anyway...

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, I told him.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: And he had been out of touch with the news, but, or he said he spent that night - it fell into place in his head that night. Do you remember him telling you that night because the next day is when they had the real break-through, when he went to the police.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, well I remember what happened and it sort of, the way it did happen, just a minute. I'll turn down the TV, ok.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Ok, yeah.
DENNIS CADRAIN: I remember, like he came
back and $I$ told him you know, the day, I told him the day you left that murder came out just the day you left town and...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: And it was right close to where you were living. DENNIS CADRAIN: Well, a block and a half away about. PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Right. DENNIS CADRAIN: And uh... PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: And he was surprised.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Well, he didn't think nothing of it, $I$ guess after awhile he said, you know, he said that, well I called him "'Hoppy', Milgaard came to the house and he had blood on his clothes", you know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: He told you this that night.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah.

DENNIS CADRAIN: So I said, well you better phone the cops.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Alright.

DENNIS CADRAIN: So then he phoned the police and, well they spent months like, trying
to ...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Well they, they... DENNIS CADRAIN: ... trying to blame it on him you know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Trying to blame it on ...

DENNIS CADRAIN: Albert.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Albert, right; he told me they gave him the third degree.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, well actually the police, well actually they drove him, like, he is a little bit, uhm, oh $I$ guess you could, a little bit like, mentally unstable. PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Uh-huh. DENNIS CADRAIN: And like, they uh, like the police, like they did it to him, you know. PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: But he volunteered the information to them.

DENNIS CADRAIN: That's right, yeah. PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: And then they turned on him.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, well the, well the other guy is uh, the other guy was such a good, well, Milgaard, he is such a good talker, like, he's...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Well, I want you to...

DENNIS CADRAIN: But you know what, you read about Manson and that you know...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah, I wanted to ask...

DENNIS CADRAIN: You know how he had a power on people.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Right.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Well Milgaard was the same way, you know like he, he could go to a, he could walk into a place that he never knew a sole and then...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Kind of hypno...

DENNIS CADRAIN: ...five minutes later he'd be eating everybody's food and screwing all the women, you know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Kind of hypnotize you.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, well he didn't do it to me but that's, I've saw him, I saw do it, you know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: I was going to ask what you thought of Milgaard cause you had met him once, $I$ think.

DENNIS CADRAIN: I, I've met him, like I've
met him, $I$ knew him for, he stayed at our place for - oh, one time he stayed there about three weeks and $I$ met him on the road somewhere, $I$ forget where - Calgary or somewhere, you know. PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Did he seem violent to you, before this.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Did he.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah.
DENNIS CADRAIN: Oh, I think, uh, I wouldn't say that, $I$ wouldn't say that he seemed violent, I'd say that he had a really high opinion of himself with women. You know what $I$ mean.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Right.
DENNIS CADRAIN: And if he couldn't get a
woman to you know, come across for him...
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Right.
DENNIS CADRAIN: ...that it would really hurt his ego. You know what I mean.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah, I know the
time you mean, right.
DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, so that's, that's,
that's just my impression. I don't know...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Now, did you
actually meet him that day he came to pick up

Albert.
DENNIS CADRAIN: No, I had gone to school. I remember the morning just like it was yesterday, it was like, I don't know, it was ... are you from Saskatchewan.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah.
DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Well, I'm from
England originally.
DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, $I$ know, but I mean where, are you living in Saskatoon or what.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah, in Saskatoon.
DENNIS CADRAIN: Oh, yeah. Well he uh, it was so cold here...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: It was 40 below.
DENNIS CADRAIN: It was 40 below and it was so foggy you couldn't, well $I$ remember getting picked up by a neighbour and taken to high school and, well you couldn't see 10 feet in front of your car that morning, $I$ mean it was just unbelievable anybody would be out walking, never mind, even to catch a bus, you know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah.
DENNIS CADRAIN: It was just so God-damn cold. Yeah, but I missed him, I missed him. I
never saw him that morning. I left for school I guess about 8:00 o'clock or around 8:00 o'clock or something like that and Albert was sleeping there and when $I$ came back at night, you know, after school, he was, my mother told me he had hit the road with Milgaard.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah. Now I am curious, they gave him the third degree. Did the police interview you, too? Were they suspicious.

DENNIS CADRAIN: No. No, no no, no no, they never, they never, like I, I talked to them once, like they came just about every day for a, oh I guess a couple or three months, just about, hey.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: But they were pointing the finger at ...

DENNIS CADRAIN: Like they, they were, had him and interrogating him there for eight-ten hours a day just checking his story out, you know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: They didn't believe him about the, uh....

DENNIS CADRAIN: Well $I$ don't know if they believed him or not but $I, ~ I ~ d o n ' t ~ k n o w ~ w h a t, ~$ what goes on in these, uh, you know? I guess
they have to be sure before they lay a charge, I guess the only reason they could lay a charge was on his say-so, you know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Right, right...
DENNIS CADRAIN: ...so I guess, I don't
know if they were trying to blame it on him or if they were just making sure that it was, his story was good enough to go to a courtroom, you know what $I$ mean, was it consistent enough, you know what $I$ mean.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah, yeah.
DENNIS CADRAIN: I went to the courtroom, I was at the court, I, and, oh, I mean, I didn't like to see what they did to my, to uh, like my brother was just, he's just telling what he saw and he, you know, he was being a good citizen, you know what $I$ mean.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Well, when...
DENNIS CADRAIN: And they shoulda', they shoulda', like he was in the, he had to go to the psychiatric ward after, you know, a couple of, well a few years after that because, I mean they screwed him up, you know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Well, was he scared of David Milgaard.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Oh, I don't think he was scared of him, no.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: No.

DENNIS CADRAIN: No, he can, Albert he could probably handle himself pretty good, you know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: No, no, I only ask because he mentioned that the, the police took him to a farm or somewhere where he would be safe or something.

DENNIS CADRAIN: A farm? Oh, no...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: I think he said a... Did your dad have a farm or something.

DENNIS CADRAIN: No. He was, he went to work outta town.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Oh, maybe that's...

DENNIS CADRAIN: He went to work out of town on a, like $a$, you have to watch what he says too, I wouldn't take everything Albert says as gospel ....

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Well, that's why I thought $I$ would check with you about that night he got back because he said he spent all night
talking to you how it fell into place in his head... .

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: .. . about seeing the blood.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, yeah, well see I mean, $I$ can't say $I$ saw, like I, nobody else, he didn't see anybody else, or nobody else saw it, you know but, uh...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: No, but you remember him telling you about the blood that night.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, yeah, he did, yeah, that's why, that's why I told [pause] that's why I told him to go see the ...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: What was your reaction? Were, were you absolutely shocked cause you had met Milgaard.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Ah, shocked, no, no, I wasn't shocked, like Albert and I, I don't know if he told you, but $I$ was 14 and then he was 15 , hey, we hit the road, hey.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah. Yeah, you were a year younger, yeah.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, it was, we were out in here in $B C$ for, oh, $I$ guess $I$ was out here for
maybe seven-eight months and, like just on our own, and half the time $I$ was just on my own and $I$ seen things and $I$ met people and ...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: You meet all sorts on the road, yeah.

DENNIS CADRAIN: And I mean, especially when you're 14, you know, and I've seen a 15 year old guy just about get killed by a motorcycle gang, $I$ was in the same house out here in Vancouver and $I$ saw, oh, I just seen, oh, I mean - homosexuals trying to God damn, rape you, and you know what $I$ mean, like, $I$ seen everything and I don't think $I$ could be easily shocked you know. Like I wasn't shocked, I was - the murder shocked me, you know what $I$ mean? Like that was a pretty brutal murder, but I ...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Very...
DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, but I don't ah, I don't think $I$ was shocked by it, by it, because I had seen so many things that would, like most people would be shocked by, but $I$ was just, you know, $I$ just seen quite a few things like that...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Well, $I$ think probably what happened with the police, uh, uhm, when he went to them and he told them he had seen
blood on, on Milgaard that they found the other people, the girl and Wilson...

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, yeah...
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: ...and they said they hadn't seen any blood. So they probably didn't believe him.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, well that, that could be it, that could be it, uh. About those guys, $I$ don't know, like $I$ say, $I$ didn't see the blood myself so $I$ can't say anything about it, but, the only thing about when in court they wouldn't say yes, they wouldn't no, they were hostile witnesses. You know, so, if they, if they didn't see blood they could have gone on the stand and said they didn't see blood...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Right...
DENNIS CADRAIN: ...but they had a choice, they just refused to testify, now, to me, to me that's incriminating. I don't know, but that, that didn't help Milgaard's case at all, you know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: No, no well they...
DENNIS CADRAIN: Well they sure didn't, you know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: No, no. Well they
got witnesses later on from Regina, too, but umm. Uh, I was just thinking, if somebody came to my door with, with blood on them, I would ask them what they had done. That's what surprises me. DENNIS CADRAIN: The thing is, the guy was, he was uh, such a unpredictable guy. He would do things, oh, $I$ will tell you something in a minute but...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Sure, anything you can remember, sure.

DENNIS CADRAIN: ...yeah, he was an unpredictable guy, I mean he would, you know, he would go out and maybe, maybe he would have a fight with somebody or, you know, like he wouldn't think nothing of it from the guy because he was... I remember, one time we were walking down the, he was staying at our place and it was say about March, in Saskatchewan, and like, it was maybe five above zero, you know. A nice warm day in Saskatchewan in March, hey, but it was pretty cold, hey.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah.
DENNIS CADRAIN: So here he is, he, we're, we're going downtown for saturday afternoon, that's all you got to do on a saturday afternoon
in Saskatoon. Go walking around downtown, you know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Um-hmm.
DENNIS CADRAIN: So we, we got about, oh Avenue D, somewhere, to, I think the park or what ever, and he is bare feet, he walked bare feet, and there's snow all over the place hey, snow and ice, and he's walking bare feet down town and he says, "God damn it, I'm hungry". So he just walks right into a restaurant, $I$ think it was, I'm quite sure it was the park café. Just walked right into the restaurant and he said, you know, "Look at, I'm hungry. I'm just starving", you know, "can you make me a sandwich". Just like, just like he's there with a twenty dollar bill in his hands. "Sure, what would you like?" He told them, I think a grilled cheese sandwich, or whatever it was, $I$ forget, you know, what kind of sandwich it was. They made it up and he just sat right down there and he ate it and then he says "Thank you very much" and he just left. I mean that, $I$ mean that's a golly son-of-a-bitch really, isn't it.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Damn right.
DENNIS CADRAIN: Uh.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah.

DENNIS CADRAIN: No, that's just the kind of guy he was, $I$ mean, anything that you would get from, anything he would do, you wouldn't be surprised, you know what $I$ mean.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Smooth talk, smooth
talk. Now I think Albert said your sister met him too. I'm not sure what, do you have one sister.

DENNIS CADRAIN: I have two.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Umm, I can't remember what name...

DENNIS CADRAIN: Well, I got two of them...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: What are they called, I forget.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Rita and Celine.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Sorry.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Rita and Celine.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Celine, that must have been the one. You said, I think he said she was home and met him briefly or something.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, that could be too, yeah.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: But she didn't notice the blood.

DENNIS CADRAIN: I don't know if she did or not, because I, $I$ know that she didn't ...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: She wasn't mentioned in the newspapers...

DENNIS CADRAIN: No, she didn't testify anyways, at any case, you know? Albert was the only one to testify, even like, yeah, he was the only one to testify so...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Well that must have been pretty traumatic for you.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Well at the time, like yeah, like $I$ had a teacher, $I$ was going to high school at the time and I had a teacher who uh, he was, well, I don't know if he was, how long have you lived in Saskatoon.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Oh, about four years now.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Oh yeah, you probably would - I don't know if he's still a judge on Reach for the Top - Peter Smith.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Oh, yeah.
DENNIS CADRAIN: I don't know if you'd know him or not but he was quite interested in the case and like him and I would go down there. But, uh, well to me like it, to me, like, you say
it was quite traumatic but to me it was, at that time, like, I guess I would be about 15 - 16 at the time and, but to me it was, $I$ don't know, like some of the things that I've been through and seen, $I$ never, like $I$ thought it was a pretty ugly murder and that, so close to home and everything but $I, I$ never thought really that it was all that big of a deal, you know. I don't know why, like, $I$ just don't know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Well, it was such a brutal thing I think.

DENNIS CADRAIN: It was yeah. It really was and like $I$ know another guy, like he lives out here now like. The police picked him up, I mean they must have picked up quite a few guys and questioned about it.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Oh, I think Albert mentioned a couple, yeah.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, they picked up this other guy our here.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Did you know a Larry Fisher.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, yeah. He used to live in our basement.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Oh, did he.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Really.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Oh. Albert mentioned him, $I$ forget the context exactly. Maybe he said he lived there.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Well, I don't know, well at the time he wasn't living there at the time. I think he had lived there before. He had lived there before, yeah.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah.
DENNIS CADRAIN: But, uh, he was quite a guy too I ....

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: I think he said they questioned, possibly questioned him, I don't know.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, you know like, yeah. Oh, I was going to tell you like, about this, uh, I don't know, like the, $I$ think it's Weekend Magazine. Do you remember that one.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah, sure.
DENNIS CADRAIN: Uh, I would say about, I'd say about 1967 or no, okay, 19..., yeah October, 1967, I don't know, if you look it up, I don't know if you can, $I$ guess you can look up from the....

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: October, '67, yeah.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, I'd say, one of the weekends in October ' 67 .

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah, they have them in the library.

DENNIS CADRAIN: There's uh, there's an article there about uh, it's a hippy house, like they call it a hippy house at the time I guess, it was in Vancouver on 3rd Avenue. And it was 2227 West 3rd, now how is that for a memory. PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Pretty damn good. DENNIS CADRAIN: That's 1967 , hey. PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: You must have a photo, one of those memories.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, I do. And there is an article, it was written by, I believe it was Tom Alderman, $I$ believe it was Tom Alderman and, well, anyways, he wrote this article about the house and the people in it and well it's... Some of the things going on there and at the time, well like, my brother and $I$ were living there at the time, you know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Um—hmm.

DENNIS CADRAIN: But, like, I don't know,
if you just read it about these crazies that are in, I mean, th- th-, he don't even, didn't even
scratch the surface about this place because I read it when $I$ was back at Saskatoon or something and I, I got a hold, I read it, I was reading this magazine, hey. I always read the paper and I read this article about this house. Well it's, it got, I was there the night that it got destroyed by a big motorcycle gang or whatever but....

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Is that right.
DENNIS CADRAIN: But, anyways, if you could see that then you could see why a person wouldn't get a....

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Wouldn't be too shocked by this.

DENNIS CADRAIN: ...that's right, you wouldn't, you know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah.

DENNIS CADRAIN: ...but Albert he's been through, well, him and $I$ both, $I$ guess, we were through quite a lot, but a....

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: But, really that was the big break through for the police when he went ...

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, well they had nothing, they had nothing, so he went and they
pi-- , I don't know if Albert ever told you, but they picked him up, like Milgaard in Winnipeg...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yes.
DENNIS CADRAIN: ...shortly, did Albert tell you that.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: No, but I've read that somewhere, yeah.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah. They picked him up in Winnipeg shortly after Albert went in and told his story and apparently they let him go.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: They let Milgaard go? Yeah, cause they didn't arrest him till ... DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, well I guess. I don't know why. I guess, I guess they figured, I don't know what it was but they let him go cause they figured they didn't have the evidence or whatever, but they still came and picked up my brother every day for their daily little questioning period, you know what I mean? And uh, cause I, I remember they used to come and get him in the morning and take him home at night.

And I used to go talk to him, cause like, we weren't really bad little buggers but we were in, in $a$, you know, $I$ don't know if you know the neighbourhood, but it was sort of ...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: You know I have an idea where it is, yeah...

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, and you know you do a few things, just a few things just to be in with the boys and like the cops would pretty well know you, you know like they would talk to you and that, you know? But, it was hard on Albert, you know, like actually, what, the cops gave him two thousand, or the police or something, had put up a reward for two thousand dollars or something and with two thousand dollars which my brother, he give it to my dad. He didn't even want, like my dad needed some money on the farm or something and my brother didn't want it, he just give it to him, you know. And people, or people, some people might have said well he did it for the God dammed money. He didn't care about money.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: He gave it away.
DENNIS CADRAIN: No, my brother Albert, he doesn't care about money or nothing, you know. But what they did to him, and they give him that lousy God- damned two thousand dollars, and then they, I mean they, pardon me but they fucked his life right up, you know. Cause he, he couldn't handle it, you know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah. Well cops can be pretty damn tough on kids, too.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Well, yeah. But I mean it wasn't only the cops.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: But he was quite sure he'd seen blood and he went, as you say, to the police as a citizen.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, yeah well...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Charming.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Uh.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Charming isn't it.
DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, well I mean it just, uh, that's uh, I mean, and they say who's, who, you know, who the victims are you know, like. There's such a big, well Mrs. Milgaard, I, did you ever meet her.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: No, I've heard of her though.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Well, I don't know, she's, to me she's uh, she's a very nice lady, you know... .

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Uh-huh, you've met her.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Well, yes I have, I, I didn't really...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah, well I know she didn't believe he did it.

DENNIS CADRAIN: No, I know she doesn't, you know, but $I$ think she, she's one of those people you know, like, even if she knew he did it or even if she knew he did it she'd, she, she, I guess she was just feeling it was her duty to uh...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Cause it's her son.

DENNIS CADRAIN: That's right. Yeah, or maybe she had a guilty feeling cause, you know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah, and it's a horrible...

DENNIS CADRAIN: ... because they were divorced and all this, you know...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Horrible crime, yeah.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, but, she, she doesn't want to believe it whether it's true or not you know? Uh, I don't know, she...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Did Albert notice anything else on his trip with Milgaard, you know, that was suspicious.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Well, he was telling me about the, a couple, a couple of other things, uh, about a gunny sack with - but that, there...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: I think he said David pulled a knife on him or something at one point.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, he had told me that too, yeah. Said that he had threatened him or something but, another time he was talking about a truck pulled over and he was flashing his lights, did he tell you about that one.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah, um-hmm, right.
And he had a case or packages or something.
DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, it was supposed to be in a gunny sack or something like that I think and he went in the trunk and give it to the trucker. Like, something like that, to me, to me, I could - I can't - I couldn't see that because it was way up in northern Alberta or something like that, er, seems to me like, they were, they went to Yellowknife $I$ think it was their first. And then from Yellowknife I think they went to uh...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: They went to Edmonton I think.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Edmonton and then Calgary and Regina, I think.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah. I think that was the circle they made.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah, he sounds highly...

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, that was pretty... PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: ...Organized crime, or...

DENNIS CADRAIN: Well, that's what it seemed like but, uh, at the, I just couldn't, when $I$ knew, when $I$, like $I$, when $I$ knew Milgaard from before he hadn't been into that kind of, anything that organized for sure, you know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Right, yeah, well he did mention the mafia to me at one point in my...

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, well see, you see now - [child in the background] - excuse me I got to a two year old here.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Sure, carry on, yeah, you look after her, I'll still be here.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Ok, just a minute.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Ok.
DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, like to me, I, like I don't know if....

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: No, he said he thought Milgaard was mixed up in the mafia,
that's why I gave you a call.
DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, well, he, he thought that, well see, something like that, like, if $I$ was to guess I'd say, $I$ wouldn't believe it but I was, like I say, I wasn't there. I don't know, you know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: No, but you, you met Milgaard and I didn't, so...

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, yeah, that's it $I$, I, knew him a year before and he certainly wasn't a, he was, he would be game for it, he certainly would be game for it but at that, when I, like I didn't meet him that time when he came to town hey.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: No.
DENNIS CADRAIN: So, like he was 17 years old, now you don't, you don't see too many guys at 17 , especially in those days in Saskatchewan, you know, involved in, you know, organized crime like that.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Well I would, I would think not, no.

DENNIS CADRAIN: No, no, I, that there, I don't know. I just, $I$ just don't know, I couldn't say, you know. It seems far fetched to
me but $I$ can't say it's impossible because, I mean, $I$ wasn't there, you know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah, but he saw the blood anyway so that's what we worked on. But, I think $I$ understand why they didn't just take that literally the police, because the other two denied it, denied the blood.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah. I guess they did but $I$ wonder why they didn't deny it in court.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: I don't know but I haven't gone through all the court records.

DENNIS CADRAIN: I think, I think my mother's still got all those transcripts from that, from that. Like, they just refused to testify, they were hostile witnesses and that's it, you know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Right.
DENNIS CADRAIN: They uh, and there would be no reason, if they weren't gonna testify for Milgaard, you know what $I$ mean? They had no reason to fear anybody because there was nobody that was gonna, there was no one that was gonna, uh, threaten them for testifying against Milgaard.

DENNIS CADRAIN: But...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: But they didn't...

DENNIS CADRAIN: ...but they didn't testify for him and they didn't testify against him. Now, they must have, to me, I would say they were threatened by Milgaard.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah.

DENNIS CADRAIN: You know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah, or I think the police gave them a rough time too, as well...

DENNIS CADRAIN: Well, yeah, they could, they probably did yeah. They tried to squeeze them, you know? But it was Nichol John...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Nichol John.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Nichol John and the other guy was....

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Wilson, Ron Wilson...

DENNIS CADRAIN: Ron Wilson and Nichol

John, that's right. But uh, yeah. I think that, well to me, if I, even if $I$ was on the jury, that would, to me that would be, if there was any doubt in my mind $I$ think that woulda' helped me make my mind up, I don't know about you but, huh. PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah, sure.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Did you ever try talk to
them guys.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: I haven't, I don't know where Nichol John is. Wilson is in Regina, I'm planning to see him, but $I$ think she's probably got married.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Oh, yeah, but you could probably trace her down someway.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah, yeah, probably
eventually. Anyway $I$ know you weren't involved really. You, you were there when he first twigged, as it were, you know.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: So, you've given me a good portrait of Milgaard anyway, from what you said.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Well, that's the best that I could do anyways, I, what are you guys gonna' be for a magazine article that your...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: No, I'm planning to do a book of, it will probably be four or five different cases in it. They're all from western Canada. One's a Winnipeg one. I'm thinking of doing a bit on the Olson case out in your part of the world. That's one of the sensational ones too.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, right, that's another son-of-a-gun, hey. Like, imagine that...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Well, there is another book being planned on him, $I$ know...

DENNIS CADRAIN: There's a friend of my wife and $I^{\prime} s, ~ m y ~ w i f e ~ a n d ~ I ~ a n d ~ s h e ~ w e n t ~ t o ~ t h e ~$ same school as him when he was a kid.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: You're kidding, yeah.

DENNIS CADRAIN: No, and she was, I guess about seven or eight years old, like he...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Was he weird then.
DENNIS CADRAIN: Pardon.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Was he weird then.
DENNIS CADRAIN: Well, I guess she didn't really, she didn't really, what she remembers, he give him, she give her, he gave her a ring and that, you know... when they were about seven of eight years old or something. It's pretty weird, you know? But she doesn't really, at the time she thought he was just, just almost normal you know? But he was, but you know, that's funny, you know, it's funny how the - that son-of-a-bitch, geeze they should...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Oh, yeah, he sure
did it. Pity he, pity he's still around.
DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, yeah, that's for sure, uh. There wouldn't be dry eye in the house if that son-of-a-bitch went down, hey.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah, well if he ever, if he ever got out $I$ think he would be looked after pretty fast.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Well, that's for sure.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah.
DENNIS CADRAIN: That's for sure.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Anyway, listen, I won't keep you Dennis. I've got your number if I think of anything else.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Okay, good.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Thanks, thanks for
your time.
DENNIS CADRAIN: Okay.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Okay, bye.

## (End of tape recording)

BY MR. HARDY:
Q
If we could turn to 325634 . You've listened to
that recording now, Mr. Carlyle-Gordge. Would
that be an accurate account of your discussion
with Mr. Cadrain, Dennis Cadrain, on that occasion?

A Yeah.
$Q$
Just a few portions of that interview $I$ want to bring your attention to. You notice on the first page you mention again the book that you were contemplating on sensational western murders and you mention Olson, Katie Harper, Gail Miller, and again I think you confirmed for us in the context of Albert that this was still something that was in your contemplation at the time?

Yeah.
And I hadn't seen mention of Olson previously. Was there a specific reason why you mentioned Olson on this occasion?

I think it had been in the news quite a lot. Okay. And $I$ can't recall, I should know this, whether Dennis was in fact in British Columbia at the time, $I$ was just wondering if you had used it in terms of perhaps making a connection with Dennis or having a thought that -That's possible, yeah.

Okay. If we turn to the next page, 325635, and Dennis you'll recall stated:
"DENNIS CADRAIN: Well, he didn't think nothing of it, I guess --"

And I'm sorry, Dennis is talking about Albert
returning from Regina.
"DENNIS CADRAIN: Well, he didn't think
nothing of it, $I$ guess after awhile he said, you know, he said that, well I called him "'Hoppy', Milgaard came to the house and he had blood on his clothes", you know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: He told you this that night.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah.

DENNIS CADRAIN: So I said, well you
better phone the cops."

Do you recall receiving that information from Dennis?

A
Yes.

And if we move to the next page, 325636 , just continuing at the top here, Dennis states:

```
"DENNIS CADRAIN: So then he phoned the
police and, well they spent months like,
trying to ...
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Well they, they...
DENNIS CADRAIN: ... trying to blame it on
him you know.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Trying to blame
```

it on ...

DENNIS CADRAIN: Albert.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Albert, right; he told me they gave him the third degree. DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, well actually the police, well actually they drove him, like, he is a little bit, uhm, oh I guess you could, a little bit like, mentally unstable.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Uh-huh.
DENNIS CADRAIN: And like, they uh, like the police, like they did it to him, you know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: But he
volunteered the information to them.
DENNIS CADRAIN: That's right, yeah."
And do you recall receiving that information from Dennis?

Yes, that's what happened.
And did this fit with your theory at the time in terms of considering Albert's involvement?

More or less. I didn't realize how long a period of time the police had been picking him up and he filled in that a little bit, but yeah, basically, yeah.

And did you believe Dennis' account that the police had caused Albert to become mentally unstable in terms of their treatment of him? That's difficult. I don't think it would have helped him. Certainly he was living with his brother, he's talking about his brother, and I think he acknowledges in here that he wasn't, even to begin with, very stable. Would I agree with him? Well, I'm of the opinion that if the police were picking me up every day and driving me home, I think that would affect you mentally, yeah. Okay. And you had previously been under the impression, $I$ think you've confirmed for us, that perhaps Albert was mentally unstable when you had reviewed the transcripts?

Yeah, uh-huh.
And just at the bottom of that page $I$ note the comment by Dennis that he compares Milgaard to being Manson like, or something of that nature, when he's describing him as a good talker and such. Do you recall receiving that sort of information?

A
I, I -- you know, I don't from my memory remember Manson being mentioned $I$ don't think, but yeah, that looks accurate to me, yeah.

Q
A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$
A

Q $\square$ And if we go down to the bottom of that page, you'll recall you state, beginning approximately here, again they are talking again about the amusing. Cal
police, or you are talking about the police here, you state:
"PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: But they were pointing the finger at ...

DENNIS CADRAIN: Like they, they were, had him and interrogating him there for eight-ten hours a day just checking his story out, you know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: They didn't believe him about the, uh...

DENNIS CADRAIN: Well I don't know if
they believed him or not but I, I don't know what, what goes on in these, uh, you know? I guess they have to be sure before they lay a charge, I guess the only reason they could lay a charge was on his say-so, you know."

At the top you state:
"PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Right, right...
DENNIS CADRAIN: ...so I guess, I don't
know if they were trying to blame it on
him or if they were just making sure
that it was, his story was good enough
to go to a courtroom, you know what I
mean, was it consistent enough, you know
what I mean.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah, yeah.
DENNIS CADRAIN: I went to the
courtroom, $I$ was at the court, I, and, oh, I mean, I didn't like to see what they did to my, to uh, like my brother was just, he's just telling what he saw and he, you know, he was being a good citizen, you know what $I$ mean.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Well, when...
DENNIS CADRAIN: And they shoulda', they
shoulda', like he was in the, he had to go to the psychiatric ward after, you know, a couple of, well a few years after that because, $I$ mean they screwed him up, you know."

Do you recall receiving that information from Mr. Cadrain?

A

Q Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv

A
Sort of, yeah, I thought Dennis was a really nice person who was quite protective of his brother and talking to a stranger basically in a fairly open
way, you know, about his brother and his problems. I found him very credible.

But just in terms of the comment that Albert had gone voluntarily trying to be a good citizen, did you believe that aspect?

Oh, I see what you are saying. Who knows what motivated Albert. I don't know. I can't really answer your question.

Okay. And were you aware prior to this
discussion, and you've told us about suspicions that Albert was perhaps mentally unstable, were you aware that he had spent time in a psychiatric centre as Dennis indicates here?

I don't think so, no, no. I don't think so.
Was that news to you then at this point?
I think it would have been, yeah, yeah.
I turn your attention to page 325644 , I'll read to you again a portion, Dennis states:
"DENNIS CADRAIN: It was yeah. It
really was and like $I$ know another guy,
like he lives out here now like. The
police picked him up, I mean they must have picked up quite a few guys and questioned about it.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Oh, I think

Albert mentioned a couple, yeah.
DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, they picked up this other guy our here.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Did you know a Larry Fisher.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, yeah. He used to live in our basement.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Oh, did he.
DENNIS CADRAIN: Really.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Oh. Albert
mentioned him, I forget the context
exactly. Maybe he said he lived there.
DENNIS CADRAIN: Well, I don't know,
well at the time he wasn't living there at the time. I think he had lived there before. He had lived there before, yeah.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah.

DENNIS CADRAIN: But, uh, he was quite a
guy too I ...
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: I think he said
they questioned, possibly questioned
him, $I$ don't know."

And do you recall this exchange with Dennis Cadrain?

A
$Q$

A

Not until $I$ reread this transcript, but yes, I would have. I think it's accurate.

Okay. And again it's somewhat difficult to place this in time $I$ know, but do you know at this point in time where you had learned about the name Larry Fisher?

Going strictly on memory, I think Mrs. Cadrain, the mother, might have mentioned they had a couple living in the basement and so $I$ knew the name. Fisher wasn't on my radar screen at all as a -- he was somebody I would like to have met or Linda Fisher to see if they saw anything that day when Milgaard arrived at the house, and also if they had any further reflections on what was going on in the house, what Albert was like, that kind of thing. I know at some point $I$ came across the name in the prosecution files and $I$ know that he caught the bus at the same bus stop as Gail Miller, $I$ learned that at some point. He wasn't on my screen as a suspect really, but somebody, I was sort of interested in meeting either him or his wife.

Okay. And you mentioned Mrs. Cadrain and $I$ know you talked to us previously that you had had discussions with Mrs. Cadrain in your attempts to
locate Albert?

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
No, I'm not sure she did go into any detail, but she had had some kind of -- maybe she had run into
And when you say she mentioned that he had had some problems, can you recall with any more detail than that what she indicated? directly to this case, this murder.

Linda Fisher later after they had moved and caught up on the news. I think they were separated by then.

Had you learned anything about Larry being implicated in rapes or anything of that nature from Mrs. Cadrain during those discussions?

I don't remember them talking about rape, no. And you also mentioned that perhaps you had gathered the name from the police file, and in fairness, I'm jumping around here a little bit, where now you will recall on the Monday following the Friday meeting with Albert, and we'll look at this in a moment, but you may have in fact had a chance to speak with Mr. Caldwell and review his police files during the Saturday and Sunday, and we'll take a peak at that in a while, but your recollection as well is that you saw the name Larry Fisher during your review of Mr. Caldwell's file?

Yeah. What $I$ recall is the address was the same as the Cadrains' and they did talk to him at a bus stop very briefly. It was a very short entry. Okay. And in terms of your inquiry of Dennis here, do you recall what your interest would have been relating to Larry Fisher during this
questioning?

A
$Q$
A
Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

That seemed to pop out. I don't know. Probably the same thing like do you know where he is maybe or -- I really don't know. It looks out of place in there.

And I see you don't have --
Certainly not as a suspect in this case.
You don't ask about Linda $I$ take it on this
occasion --
No.
-- but from what you are telling me you may have been aware of Linda at this point in time as well?

Yeah, I knew they had been a couple in 1969, I knew they had a young daughter too.

Okay. And $I$ see that during your discussion with Dennis, you have stated when the name comes up, you state, oh, Albert mentioned him, I forget the context exactly.

Uh-huh.
And $I$ know that Larry's name, or Larry Fisher's name does not come up in the transcript of your discussion with Albert that we just looked at.

No.
Is it possible that perhaps you were just indicating that and that Albert hadn't in fact
mentioned Larry Fisher or do you recall Albert mentioning --

A

Q

A
Q
A
$Q$


I think I got back to Albert about that. I was still looking for if either of them had a clue where this Fisher guy was. It wasn't very important at the time.

Okay. And again you may not be able to answer that, but at this point in time, again on the Monday following the discussion with Albert on the Friday, had Albert, up to this point in time, advised you anything about Larry Fisher from your recollection?

You mean when $I$ met him?
Exactly.
I don't remember. No, $I$ don't think we got into that.

Okay. Turn to page 325646 , you'll see it's that portion again where they are speaking, Dennis is speaking of how Albert had been treated by the police, he speaks of him being visited every day for daily questioning periods and sort of a general knowledge of perhaps Albert at the time by the police. You recall this portion of the discussion as we just listened to it on the recording?

A Yeah, it's accurate. Yeah, uh-huh.
Q
And again, did you believe Dennis' description of how the police had treated Albert and the effect that that had had on him, do you recall what your mindset was at the time when you were learning this?

Yeah, I think I probably believed him. I think he came over to me as a very caring person, yeah. Okay.

Yeah.
And in the second portion of that highlighted section we'll see mention of Dennis talking about the $\$ 2,000$ reward money?

Uh-huh.
And that Albert had actually given that money away and that he wasn't interested in the money. Do you recall learning that information from Mr. Cadrain?

Yeah, yeah, I do remember that, and, you know, there was some passion in his voice when he said, you know, Albert wouldn't be in it for the money. I would accept that, you know.

Q
Did that run contrary though to some of the theories that you had developed up to that point in time?

A

Q
A
$Q$

A

Well, on that particular time, this is late '83, I don't know what $I$ believed. Certainly in the early stages $I$ was questioning a lot of things like could there have been a motive --Uh-huh.
-- for him to invent this story maybe, so I can't tell you if $I$ put that to rest by that point, but I was glad he told me this, I was very glad he told me this, that that was not a factor to take into account.

Turn to 325647 , you state:
"PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: But he was quite sure he'd seen blood and he went, as you say, to the police as a citizen.

DENNIS CADRAIN: Yeah, yeah well...
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Charming.
DENNIS CADRAIN: Uh.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Charming isn't it."

And I wasn't sure, I was trying to gather the inflection from your voice during the recording, were those comments by you in terms of the use of the word charming there indicative of some misbelief on your point?

No. You know, it's an odd word to stand out
there. I think charming, I think probably there's
a hint of irony in it because he's been discussing what a rough time Albert had with the police and, you know, his mental health after that, and at the same time he's saying he did this as a public duty, he went to the police, so $I$ was being a little bit sarcastic. He ends up in a terrible situation and yet, you know, his brother, who is a very nice person $I$ think, is saying, you know, he did it as a public duty, so charming.

Okay. And I see just below that, and this fits with some of what we discussed already, but you mention that you haven't met Mrs. Milgaard? Right, I did say that. That would be accurate, yeah.

And that would be for the same reasons -- first of all, that would be inaccurate obviously?

It would be wrong and it would be a little white lie or a fib and it was for the same reason, that I don't want him connecting me to that.

Q
A
$Q$ Okay.

I get more information that way.
I turn your attention to 325649, again I don't know if $I$ need to read this portion, we can read it if you would like to refresh your memory on it,
but it's a discussion about the question of Milgaard being mixed up in the Mafia?

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A Umm .

And if $I$ can summarize Dennis' thought on it, I think he tries to be somewhat measured in his account, but generally says that he thinks that that would probably be farfetched -Yeah.
-- given the circumstances?
Yeah, that was my impression.
And in terms of his account, and $I$ don't know if you can recall, but just from your reading Dennis' response here, did this fit with what you were expecting Dennis to say when you raised the issue of Albert mentioning that David was mixed up in the Mafia?

Yeah, I think it did. I think what he was trying to say, or what $I$ came to believe anyway, that David was a bit wild, no question about that, he gives the instance of going into a restaurant, ordering a meal and leaving, and he was no angel, but he was very extroverted, I think I'm getting all that information, but $I$ think what he's saying is, well, $I$ don't think he was really, you know -well, of course he didn't know whether David
committed this murder or not, but $I$ think he was saying as far as he had known him in the past, he didn't think he would be likely to be a Mafia member and that kind of thing. In other words, he's trying to -- he's not saying David is a good, good, good boy, he's saying, you know, there's a bit of wildness there, that's my impression.

Okay. I was just trying to get a sense of your mindset at the time, whether perhaps you are expecting him to reject that thought out of hand, and as $I$ say, he seems a little bit more measured in his response, but --

He was, he was very measured, yeah.

Okay. And if we turn to the last page, 325652 , just in conclusion, that's the end of that transcript, and Dennis Cadrain has testified at the Inquiry, Mr. Carlyle-Gordge, we didn't have a chance to review this interview with him at that time, but he did vaguely recall his meeting with you, and just a couple of points that he noted and I wanted to bring to your attention.

It was a telephone call.

Yes, and he indicated that he believed at the time he was talking to you that he likely thought that Milgaard was still, or Mr. Milgaard was still
guilty.
I think that's probably true.
Did you get that sense from him during that discussion?

Yeah. I think the word you used was a good one, he gave a very measured response. I believe at that time, '83, what other evidence did he have, you know. I think, yeah, a verdict had been reached and he did bring up the whole problem of why didn't David's friends stand up and testify for him, I think he did that very well. He had this impression that everybody refused to testify, you know, was an incorrect bit there, but yeah, he probably did believe it, yeah.

Okay. And the other comment he made, he had been under the impression that you were going to call him again or have a further discussion and he noted for us that he had wanted to tell you about his concerns that Albert testify, that he had concerns about Albert testifying given the state of his mental health, and I guess all I can ask you is was there intent to follow up with Dennis again at any point?

Not that $I$ recall, but I'll have to get to that. Very soon after these talks $I$ was trying to exit
stage left.

Q
A

Q

A
Q
BY MR. HARDY:
I'd like to turn now, Mr. Carlyle-Gordge, to a discussion of your dealings with the prosecutor, Mr. Caldwell.

Uh-huh.
And, again, we'll track through this trying to pinpoint when these discussions took place. I believe the documents will confirm that you discussed the case with Mr. Caldwell in February and March of 1983, and $I$ think there initially was a telephone discussion with Mr. Caldwell on February 19th, 1983, which would be the Saturday following your meeting with Mr. Cadrain. And, again, we'll look at some things in a moment and try and clarify that if we can. What had led you to contact Mr. Caldwell?

A
Umm, again, gathering information. I was curious about the period between the first statements
being given by Nichol John and Wilson and the time period in between the final statements, if you like, that implicated Milgaard. I was interested in filling in the bits there, that would be one thing. Just any general background information on did the police have other suspects, that kind of thing; what were the police doing in March, April, May; umm, any little details I could find to -and don't forget, $I$ was collecting material for a potential book, so that would be one thing. Umm, also, I think $I$ wanted to get a feeling for what was going on in the courtroom just before the trial, the preparation for the trial, only Mr. Caldwell would know that, and $I$ was interested in his views on the case.

Now I think when $I$ contacted him
I didn't specify, well $I$ certainly didn't specify that $I$ had the connection to Mrs. Milgaard, I know that, but Milgaard was an interesting case anyway, even without it being re-investigated, because of the Milgaard ruling it was a quite -- in the law books and so on. So I think $I$ was going there with a kind of softly, softly approach, 'just tell me what you were thinking, what was going on', that kind of thing.

Q

A
$Q$

And can you recall, from everything that you had gathered up to this point in time, what your -what were your views on Mr . Caldwell and the role he had played?

I didn't have any.
And --
Well, I could elaborate on that based on stuff later, but $I$ think certainly by early '83 I definitely had an impression that the Crown's case, based on my own analysis not being a lawyer, based on common sense and logic, was that the Crown's case couldn't work and that it was like trying to ram a square peg in a round hole. That was my personal opinion at that time.

Okay.
But $I$ wasn't going there to confront him about any of that, no.

So you had an impression, and that was what $I$ was going to ask you next, was what your impression was of the case that he had put in during the criminal proceedings, and $I$ guess your view on that has just been stated; would that be correct? Yes. I didn't think it worked on time, geography, motive, or personality.

And this is a touch out of place, I just recalled
the discussion we had had yesterday, before I continue on with my dis -- questions on Mr. Caldwell, you mentioned timing and considering aspects of that nature and $I$ know that there, or I've read that there was an early video reenactment done, and $I$ think maybe there were a couple of these done through the years, but there was an earlier one done that perhaps your wife was involved in; would that be correct?

I don't remember her being involved. I had the feeling that about the time I met Mrs. Milgaard, or just before it or just after it, that she and her family members had made a video pacing out the thing. It could have been after I met her. I don't recall my wife being in it, but it seems to me I have seen that video, and it was to do with the Crown's case; that they spoke to a woman on Avenue $N$ I guess, they then went on, got stuck for a while, got out, and came back to the back lane area, and the purpose of that video was to prove, with timing, that that woman that they'd allegedly spoken to would have been half-way to work by then, she wouldn't have been at the back lane behind the funeral home, which is where this crime was alleged to have taken place with Mr. Milgaard
doing the stabbing.
And $I$ should have covered this with you yesterday. I know you had, in your deliberations, put some emphasis on the evidence of Henry Diewold, the caretaker, and as well --

Uh-huh.
-- the Trav-a-leer manager, Robert Rasmussen? Uh-huh.

And $I$ know $I$ had seen stated a couple of times reference to the Milgaard group arriving at the Trav-a-leer Motel at, I believe you had indicated, was 7:10 a.m.; and do you recall that being quite certainly your view on the matter?

A
Yeah. You know, the manager of that motel -again my memory, memories play tricks -- I have a feeling I tried to find him and $I$ may even have spoken to him, I think he had left the motel as manager but $I$ 'm talking 12 years later. I could be wrong, $I$ don't have a transcript that $I$ interviewed him, but to me it was very significant in terms of what he saw and the timing, very, very important, because $I$ know, $I$ can't go into detail here, but $I$ know roughly what time Gail Miller would have left home, $I$ know roughly what time she caught the bus, you know, there is always a time
lag, you can allow some space, but $I$ know Rasmussen was quite definite that it was very soon after he opened at 7:00, so 10 after 7:00, yeah. And in fairness $I$ think at trial, $I$ reread his evidence, and he had indicated in chief at trial that it was shortly after 7:00 that he recalled the group arriving.

All right.
In the preliminary, and in fact it was following questions by Mr. Tallis, he had indicated that it could have been as late as 7:30 that the group had arrived.

Yes, yeah.
Do you recall being aware of that information?
Yes, I think $I$ was aware of that, yeah.
Okay. And did that, as $I$ say, it seemed to me that you had reached the conclusion that $7: 10$ was the time?

I think soon after 7:00, yeah, 7:10 I think.
And --
And also the caretaker seemed to be thinking it was roughly the same time when he saw this strange vehicle parked there and somebody going back and forth.

Okay. So you recall, in any event, being aware of
the information $I$ just advised you about respecting the --

A
Q
A
Q

A

Q
A

Q

Turn first to a transcript of a telephone discussion. If we could go, please, to 325653.

As $I$ say, this looks to be a telephone discussion with Mr. Caldwell, and if we try to place a date
the general establishment towards Mrs. Milgaard.
Why did I take that approach? I thought probably there would be a better chance of me seeing some other stuff, yeah.
on this, $I$ know the tape reference on this page is 048705 . There's another tape face that we have a copy of of the same interview, and if we could turn please to 230183 and the second page of this document, we see February 19th and 20th, Saskatoon, we looked at this previously, Caldwell, Leonard Gorgchuck.

Yeah, that's my writing $I$ think, yeah.
So is it possible that this telephone discussion took place on February 19th, and again that would be the Saturday following --

A
Q Maclean's.
-- it looks like a large portion of that was inaudible. You had indicated Maclean's magazine, but I take it here you would have spoken of the
book that you were contemplating, as you've advised us?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q
and perhaps not meet with him, but I believe you may have had a chance to look at his file materials?

Uh-huh.
And, again, we'll look at some documents that will Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv
hopefully clarify that.

A
$Q$

A

Q
A

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

Uh-huh.
And we've heard this tape previously, and I understand you have had a chance to review the transcript, --

Yes.
-- Mr. Carlyle-Gordge.
Yes, I have.
And would it be an accurate account of that first discussion with Mr. Caldwell?

Yes, as far as I'm aware, that's what was said.
And did something precede this discussion, was
there correspondence or any previous contact with
Mr. Caldwell?
Well I'm a bit hazy about that. You see, if you just asked me off memory $I$ can only remember being
in his offices once, but I'm willing to accept
that I was there twice based on your analysis.
And don't, don't go just from that, we'll take a
look at documents and see if we can refresh your recollection at all in terms of how those meetings
proceeded. I'm going to turn you to page 325655
and we'll review some of the portions of this
discussion. Mr. Caldwell states:
"Umm, Crown Prosecutor's, we used to
have City and Crown and uh, I got the case and, uh, it was a, and $I$ you know, I don't mean this to sound egomaniacal, but it was a, a real shaky bloody case at the outset."

You state:
"Uh-huh."

Mr. Caldwell:
"There was all kinds of problems with
it. And uh, we had a long preliminary
inquiry in the summer ..."

And you state:
"Right."

Do you recall receiving this information from Mr.

Caldwell?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

2


Yes.

And did you consider this important information?
Interesting information, yeah.
In what respect?

Well the 'real shaky bloody case' stands out.
Okay. You go on in this page to talk about Mr.
Tallis for a short bit?
Yeah.

And I believe you confirmed or us yesterday you never spoke directly -- .

A No.
Q
A
this, we've heard it previously, but Mr. Caldwell talks of Albert Cadrain, and $I$ think he indicates he was the proverbial break in the case?

Uh-huh.
And do you recall receiving that information? Yes, I do, yeah.

And do you recall what your thoughts were in reaction? Uh huh.

No. But $I$ have a memory of writing a letter and asking -- I think he'd become a judge, and I'm certain $I$ wrote to him at some point and said "is there any chance of talking to you", and $I$ never heard back, so $I$ kind of hadn't followed up on Tallis, no.

Okay. If we turn to 325656 , just at the bottom of the page, we've heard this previously, I won't read it to you, but Mr . Caldwell talks about how, during his preparations for the trial, he wanted to give the appearance of being understaffed? Uh-huh.

And do you recall receiving that information? Yes.

And if we move to 325659 , and again $I$ won't read reaction? Cental Booking

A
Well $I$ was just letting him say what he wanted. What were my thoughts at that time? Well obviously at that time $I$ didn't believe Milgaard was guilty and $I$ just wanted his version of things, basically, that's what was going on. My thoughts would have been -- well, this was actually a very cooperative meeting, Mr. Caldwell was very helpful in fact, very positive, and this was his chance to tell his side of the story and $I$ think he'd said, you know, the police worked really hard and $I$ wanted to give them credit. You know, to a degree he was on a little bit of an ego trip during this interview, he wanted some credit for this, and I can't blame him. But my private thoughts were, would have been this is incredibly gullible, how can you believe your own case, you know.

Okay. I'll turn you to 325660, and there's some talk -- and, again, $I$ won't read this to you -but talk of the alleged motel reenactment. Uh-huh.

Some of that evidence. If we turn to the next page on that same point Mr. Caldwell states: "So, we called these two guys as witnesses, and you can do that, but, you
just have to let the defence know as soon as you know. Well, I, that's as soon as $I$ knew, and uh, Tallis like, you know this is nothing $I$ want printed, but, Tallis said "oh, I," you know later, "I understand the police give those guys favours for that" but, they were, one of them at least, was a criminal so he was up on charges in Regina. I'm sure that didn't happen, if it did, that's news to me."

And did this information, $I$ don't know if you can recall, but did this information fit with any of your theories that you had respecting Mr. Melnyk and Mr. Lapchuk?

Well $I$ was certainly suspicious about them coming in at the last minute, but $I$ mean $I$ had no evidence, certainly, that they had done a deal to get lighter sentences or anything like that, I just thought the timing was a bit suspicious. Okay.

A
But I wanted Mr. Caldwell to, you know, give his
version of it.

Okay. And the discussion then continues, and $I$ won't specifically review any further portions of

it, but in terms of that -- and you've shared this
with us to some extent -- but in terms of that first discussion with Mr. Caldwell, what were your impressions with him following, following that first contact?

I think he was being very helpful, and the one thing he didn't know, and certainly not cuz -- you see, as I've said, it was kind of walking on eggshells. My relationship to Mrs. Milgaard was not known to him at that time, and $I$ do remember, I don't know if it was this conversation or one of the early ones when $I$ was first going through the files, he did actually mention, he said "I suppose you know Mrs. Milgaard has been going around, this and that, advertising and such", and I think I said "oh yes, I've read about her", and then the conversation thankfully switched so I never actually -- he never actually said "do you know Mrs. Milgaard, do you work with her". So he was going on the assumption that $I$ was writing about a cut and dried case, and in fact the interview is focused on a cut and dried case, there are no questions in there about "well I think you were wrong", that kind of thing, $I$ wanted to get what was happening at that time.

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

I think there would be a very hasty -- well, I'm surmising, I don't know. Mr. Caldwell was very polite with me. I imagine there would be a reaction, not a good one, a negative one, and access might be denied, possibly. I don't know that for sure, but it certainly could be.
Caldwell was aware of that?

Q
Okay. And $I$ mentioned to you earlier, and we'll, as I say, try to work our way through this, that following this discussion you may or may not -and $I$ 'm going to ask you for your best recollection -- have had an opportunity to review some of Mr. Caldwell's files. And I'm going to turn you to a document, 332045, and you'll see this is a letter to Mr. Caldwell from yourself, --Uh-huh.
-- it's dated February 22nd, and following that same weekend we have been moving along, that would be the Tuesday following that weekend, and there is some mention of a plan, perhaps, to get together again --

Right.
-- with Mr. Caldwell?
Right.
And you indicate, beginning part-way through the paragraph:
"Doubtless you're busy Friday with
prosecutions/office work, but $I$ wonder
if it would be possible for me to spend
a couple of hours Friday finishing off
my note-making from the case files, then
meet with you on the Saturday to do a Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv
proper interview with more of the
colour/personal background."

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv

Okay. And $I$ want to talk to you for a moment about your review of those files.

Uh-huh.
And perhaps we can start; where were you, or where do you recall you were, at the time that you were looking at these files?

Umm, $I$ seem to recall he put me in an office in, I've forgotten the name of the building now, but it's wherever he had offices. If you mentioned a name $I$ could tell you if it's right. And he put
me -- he was very polite, and he put me in a room with the files, and $I$ think we arranged that $I$ would interview him later on tape, yeah.

Okay. And just tell me how, what had led up to that, had he volunteered the files for your review or had you made a specific request?

I think I must have asked, yeah. Yeah.
And what was his response to your request?
It was fine, yeah.
Okay.
Yeah.

And were you alone, then, during your review of the files; can you recall?

Yes, I was, yeah, yeah.
And --
I know I was under a lot of time pressure, I was trying to go -- there were a lot of material, and I had a tape recorder and $I$ just dictated notes. I can't even tell you for certain if I actually looked at everything in the files.

Okay.
A
I looked at a lot, though, and whatever interested me, that's what $I$ made notes about.

Tell me, what do you recall of the files, give me a description, a sense of quantity?

A
I'm trying to picture it. Seems to me that there were maybe, $I$ don't know, three or four, anyway, folders maybe that high. There were a lot of documents, there were witness statement, there were a lot of police notes. I think there was, sketched out, a summation to the jury, umm, and I'm trying to think what else there would have been. There were a lot of witness statements, and it's a bit vague now, but $I$ found some of the police -- what the police were doing right after the murder kind of interesting. And one thing that jumped out at me was some complaints from various women, prior to the murder of Gail Miller, about strange men and sexual innuendos, all that kind of stuff, in this very lane where Gail Miller's body was found. That jumped out at me. And we'll look at some of that information in just a moment, but you have mentioned that you had an opportunity to see some police reports, and I assume up to this point in time you would not have had access to that type of material, perhaps statements, but $I$ am talking more of actual police reports?

A
Yeah. You know, I'm trying to think of what was in those files. I mean a lot of it was typed, and
it wasn't very long, 'we stopped so and so and asked questions and that'. I think there was some handwritten things in there too, and at this distance $I$ really can't tell you much about them. And you mentioned you saw statements in the files? Oh yes, yeah, yeah.

And was it a -- give us a sense of how many statements --

Well --
-- or what the quantity of materials were?
Well certainly the key players, which would be Nichol John and Wilson and Milgaard I suppose, but there were other people like the Rasmussen I guess and the Danchuks, they were important, and there were quite a few statements. Some people may not have appeared at the trial, you know.

And what about material such as handwritten notes or even Mr. Caldwell's notes or preparations, anything of that do you recall seeing?

A I'm almost sure I saw the outline of the case, or maybe for the summation to the jury or something like that, but it's very hard to remember that far back. Whatever is in the transcript of dictated notes, and $I$ can't be sure if that's the complete transcript either at this distance, but certainly
whatever is in that transcript would be what $I$ saw.

Q
notes, $I$ think they are the dictations that you
have just mentioned, the document is ID 174037; do
you recognize that document?

A

Q

A

Q
A

Q

A
Q

A
Q
A
Q

A
$Q$
-- typewriting work as well?
Yes. Probably my wife typed that, I think, but that looks like my typewriter, yup. That is the document, yeah.

And so just in terms of process, as you were making your way through the files, I assume you were dictating this information?

Yes, I was.
Okay. There is a couple of entries, specific entries $I$ want to look at, I see there's some mention at the top about a Marlene Mighton, Charles Joseph Carriere, we then get to this particular entry again relating to Mr. Diewold as you've stated, information that you were interested in at the time?

Uh-huh.
And, again, the 7:10 time is mentioned there? Yes, yeah.

And I'm going to show you an investigation report where $I$ believe that information came from, it's 009330, and you'll see this. First of all the form of the document generally, does that look like the type of --

Yes, that's --
-- documentation --

A

Q

A
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BY MR. HARDY:
Does that look like the type of documentation that you were reviewing at the time?

Yes, it does.
And you will see mention in the middle of the paragraph to Mr. Diewold and some of the information that it looks like you've dictated in your notes. And if we go back to your notes, -Hmm.
-- I'm going to start reading a portion to you here, and I'll read this to you, but it indicates:
"Feb. 3rd police report: Call was made
...",
and an address was stated:
"... and Audry Odnokon was interviewed.
She says that at around Dec. 22 nd and
afterwards she used to take a bus home
from work at 10:30 or $11 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. and get
off the bus at 1400 block, $20 t h$ St. She'd walk north on Ave. O toward 22 nd St. On a number of occasions she'd seen a man in the alley just behind 20 th St. standing in about the mid alley. He would start to come towards her and she always ran. On one occasion her boyfriend was with her and this man came out of the alley and then walked past her going towards $20 t h$ St. He had his collar or scarf over part of his face. He kept looking back at them and finally went West on $20 t h$ St. This man would be in his 40's and heavy set, with broad shoulders, about 6' tall, grey hair and piercing, beady eyes. She further stated that 2 of her girlfriends had been talking and said they had driven down the alley at the back of the funeral home on Friday nite around 10:30 to 11 p.m. and they swung in the alley \& a male person was there, trying to hide something under his arm. This thing he was hiding had a glint to it like some piece of metal. He had stepped into a
yard near the $T$ intersection. The girls names are Barbara Best of 273 St. Paul's Place \& Linda Barron, address not known. These girls have not been questioned. They should be at home at $4 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. tomorrow.' M.H. Bennett, Detective." And do you recall dictating that information from your review of the reports?

Yes.
And that information seems to match investigation report 009232 , if $I$ could bring that up, please. If we could go to the full page, beginning at the bottom of the page, it looks like the exact portion that $I$ have just read to you; would that look like the investigation report that you were looking at at the time?

Yes, $I$ would have looked at that and then dictated from it, yeah.

And you were interested in this information for obvious reasons?

Well it was the same alley, and it was December 22 nd, very close to the murder time. Okay.

Uh-huh.
Go back to your notes, please. Centre of the page
you've dictated:
"Feb. 5/69 police report -- At 6:49 a.m. police checked in 300 block in Ave. O

South, Larry Fisher, 334 Avenue O South, works at Masonry Contractors at the Education Bldg., U. of Saskatchewan; wearing a yellow hard hat; said last Fri he caught the bus at 6:30 a.m. at Ave. O and $20 t h$ Street. He says there was no one else around at that time and he had no information to offer."

And do you recall why you recorded this information or why you took note of this information?

A
Well the -- I'd certainly be fully aware of the address that Milgaard went to, and that's the same address, and $I$ think, you know, the name stuck in my mind because I knew there had been a couple living in the basement, so --

Q

A
Umm, it wasn't hugely important, but I -- it was important in the sense of that time that the police had spoken to this guy who lived in the basement, who $I$ had never spoken to, so --

Perhaps we could turn for a moment to the
investigation report, 183170 , and again it's the same form of document we have been looking at. If we turn to the next page, please, you'll see the entry at this portion of the report --

A Uh-huh.
-- that $I$ have just read to you beside the 6:49 a.m.?

Yeah.
Does that look like the document that you would have looked at at the time that you were making note of this information?

A
$Q$

And am $I$ hearing you correctly, then, that you took note of this one --

A Uh-huh.
-- in particular at least in part because of the address stated?

A
Q
And you had perhaps heard the name Larry Fisher in some other context, you've indicated, as well?

A Yeah, he was somebody who lived at the same address and might have seen Milgaard or knew
something. He wasn't a suspect in my mind. Okay. And $I$ know we saw mention of Larry Fisher's name in the Dennis Cadrain interview. Now this review that you are conducting, if I'm right in the time of it, would have actually been before that discussion with Dennis, perhaps, and it's, in terms of documentation, the first time that we would see that you have taken note of that particular name, although I think you've indicated that perhaps prior to this Mrs. Cadrain may have advised you of Larry and Linda Fisher?

Well my memory says she probably did, yeah, okay. And, going back to the notes, is that your handwriting beside that entry --

Yes.
-- that we've just read?
Yes.
And I've got more questions relating to that, and we're going to come back to that, I just wanted to confirm whether or not that was your handwriting. Yeah.

If we turn to the next page of the notes, you'll see there are several further entries, matters that you took note of during your review?

Q
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q

A
Q

A
Umm, there doesn't seem to be a lot in there about the interaction with Milgaard on Nichol John or anything like that. I'm surprised there's only three pages. I spent a lot of time looking at

I'm not going to review all of those. Is that your handwriting on this page and your markings as well?

Yes, it is.
And $I$ think you made reference to this, but this is the last page, we've looked at three pages. Do you recall whether this would have been a complete set of your notes relating to your review of Mr . Caldwell's files?

How many pages were in it?
There are three, and we can leaf through the three.

No, I'm sure it's not complete.
You think that there was more dictation than what's noted on these three pages?

Well, I'm sure there should have been, yeah.
Okay. And can you recall, for example, and take a moment, please, to review the pages if you would like, can you recall any further information that you gathered from the files that is not noted on these three pages?
files, so I can't answer it. It's a mystery. And again we can take whatever time you need, Mr. Carlyle-Gordge. Do you have -- did you have a chance to read this document prior to this time? Very quickly.

And do you have a general sense of the information that's contained in the document?

Yeah, I think that's accurate, what's in there, yeah.

And so you are having some hesitation. What other types of information did you think you took note of upon your review that's not referenced in the documentation?

Well, information around the statements $I$ think, and especially around when they picked up Milgaard, things like that. I can't be very specific.

Okay. Maybe I'll ask you some --
It just seems awfully short.
Okay. Maybe I'll ask you some specific questions.
I know -- let's just take some examples. By this point in time you've been looking for Ute Frank, for example. Do you recall seeing Ute Frank's statement on Mr. Caldwell's file?

A

And do you recall taking note of that or being interested in that statement?

I think $I$ would be interested in it, yeah.
And do you recall whether you dictated a note relating to that statement?

Probably.
Okay. And what about, there's a statement that we understand was on Mr. Caldwell's files given by a (V4)---- (V4)---. Do you recall that name or seeing a statement by a (V4)---- (V4)---?

Not specifically, no.
And we can bring it up just briefly, it's 006404, and you'll see the name that I've just mentioned to you, and in summary Ms. (V4)--- talks about being accosted by a male on the same morning, January 31st, 1969 at 7:07 a.m. on Avenue H. Do you recall whether you saw that statement during your review?

A
Q

A
Q
I really can't.
Okay. The type of information though that likely you would have taken note of if you had seen it? Yeah, uh-huh.

And there are a couple of other statements that we understand also were included in Mr. Caldwell's files at the time, there was one by a (V11)
(V11)-- and another by an (V9) (V9)----, and they both similarly talk about being confronted by a male in and around that area in and around the time period that we're speaking of. Do either of those names --

A
me to go on my memory, I said some things jumped out at me from the files. What jumped out was this was a really busy back lane and if you had asked me, well, how many references were there to strange men or complaints from women, I would have said quite a few, five or six. Now, I can't say for certain $I$ read this, the name $I$ don't
remember, but $I$ was aware, in fact $I$ followed up and found one of the women who had seen something, I was aware that there seemed to be a cluster of complaints to the police and stuff like that about sexual problems going on.

Okay. And when you recall that, and $I$ know this is difficult, Mr. Carlyle-Gordge, but when you think about it, was it solely in relation to that same vicinity, being the back alley, and goings on in that back alley where Miss Miller's body was found?

A
Well, that's what $I$ was interested in obviously.

Was it confined to that? I can't say for certain. Okay. As I say, the ones I've just mentioned to you, (V4)---- (V4)---, (V11) (V11)--, (V9) (V9)----, these were incidents in and around the same area, but not in the back alley, but none of those names sound familiar in terms of taking note of those during your review of the file?

Not at the time, no, they don't.
Okay. And what about another person we've been talking about, a Sharon Williams, do you recall seeing a statement by Sharon Williams on Mr. Caldwell's file during your review? I'm fairly sure I did. I can't say with 100 percent certainty, but $I$ think $I$ did.

Do you recall taking note of any of that information or does any of that stick in your mind today?

A

Q
I can't remember.

Okay. And you've talked about taking note of some incidents that were happening $I$ think in the alley and we at least referred to a couple of those in fact that are on your notes relating to Audrey Odnokon, Linda Barron and Barbara Best. Do you recall mention of the police considering other sexual attacks in reports that were contained on

Mr. Caldwell's files, and when I say sexual attacks, actual rapes that had occurred in and around that area prior to the Gail Miller murder?

A
Q

A

Q -

No, and $I$ appreciate you are doing your best for me, Mr. Carlyle-Gordge, and three of them have been noted, $I$ think as we've confirmed, Audrey Odnokon who later I believe became Audrey Boutin, Linda Barron and Barbara Best. Do you recall the other three, or the details relating to the other three?

A

Q
No. It's very hazy.
And the names (V1)--- (V1)- or (V2) (V2)-(V2)----- or (V3)-- (V3)------ -- yes, I believe (V3)------ at the time, does that refresh your memory, do you recall seeing any mention of those names or taking note of those names during your review of the files?

Not for sure. I can remember there were, if I had to guess, I would say there were at least six that interested me, complaints, and $I$ followed up with one woman, $I$ remember doing that, but after all this time it's very hard to recall.

No.
Okay. I'll show you a couple of other documents and see if you recall seeing those on Mr.

Caldwell's files. There was a, what we've called a can-say or a preparation document done by the police for the prosecutor leading up to the preliminary hearing, and the document is 105608. I'll have you just take a look at that. You'll see that witnesses required or mentioned at the top re: David Edgar Milgaard, preliminary inquiry, August 18th, 1969, and the document goes on for about 21 pages to summarize anticipated evidence relating to several individuals, and perhaps we can just leaf slowly through the first few pages of this, please. Does that document look familiar at all to you?

Well, I don't want to say with 100 percent certainty, but those were the kinds of things $I$ was looking at in the files, yeah.

And as $I$ say, it's a bit of a summary of
anticipated evidence. This would be something that would have interested you at the time? Oh, yeah, for sure.

Okay. Those specific --
If you are saying did $I$ see this document, $I$ can't tell you with 100 percent certainty, no.

Fair enough.
But $I$ was interested in all that stuff, yeah.



Q

I turn your attention to document 332045, we looked at this letter just a moment ago just in terms of the date, February $22 n d$, and a further meeting that had been planned with Mr. Caldwell during your review?

I can't say that $I$ did or not for sure, no.
following your first discussion. Take a look at this paragraph, please. This is your words, you are stating:
"Your parting remark about the early psychiatric profile on Milgaard ('he might be capable of killing ... but that's a stab in the dark') struck me as most intriguing and $I$ don't think $I$ even got to the medical section, so a Xerox of the relevant page would be very welcome, since $I$ want to build up some kind of picture of the youth \& his lifestyle prior to Jan. 31, 1969.

Perhaps you could include it with the other speeches etc you were forwarding."

Do you recall Mr. Caldwell referring to this information?

A
$Q$

A

Well, it's in the letter there. Yeah, I think, yeah, I do, yeah, I've said there was something in his background, something like that.

What about the specific comment he apparently mentioned to you from the psychiatric profile, "he might be capable of killing ... but that's a stab in the dark"?

I think that was a reference to -- I think that
was a reference to some social worker. I knew David had been in some trouble, he had been car joyriding or something at some point as a teenager, and $I$ think some social worker had done a report, maybe he was in the care of Child and Family Services for a while, something like that and sort of done some assessment, and $I$ think somebody had said that. I don't think they were a professional, but --

And this report you are speaking of, did you see this report?

I have seen it, but you are asking me when probably. I have certainly seen that, yes.

Okay. And I think you mentioned earlier to us yesterday, just in passing, that you did have a portion of some of this type of material that existed relating to Mr. Milgaard and the pre Gail Miller murder --

Yes, I did.
-- situation?

Mrs. Milgaard was, wanted me to see anything that might be relevant, yeah.

And what were those materials as best you can recall?

A
Well, $I$ know there was stuff before the Gail

Miller murder, like, from his childhood, and I also interviewed her for that Winnipeg 8 book about stuff that went on. It may well have been that towards the end of -- I don't even know if she had access to reports that had been done after he was imprisoned, I think eventually she did, and I may have seen one of those.

Okay. And just going back to that, and I was trying to follow your wording in this paragraph, it looks like Mr. Caldwell has made reference to this report and the comment in that report?

A

Q early stuff on David, $I$ know that. Was the actual sentence in there? I can't say that for certain, no.

Do you recall whether there was a follow-up to
this request, did Mr. Caldwell send you a copy of the relevant page or material of that nature?

A

Q

Okay. I turn your attention next to document 050033, and this is a transcription of a meeting that you had with Mr. Caldwell, and again it's somewhat difficult to place in time, but from those letters we know that a further meeting had for you?

I guess it must have been, yeah.
been planned for March?

A
$Q$

A
Q

A

Q
A
Q
A
Q

A
Q

A
Q

Okay. And in terms of the use of the tape during the second meeting, do you recall any discussion about your intentions on how the tape was going to
be used or how the information might be used?
Not specifically. I mean, he knew I wrote for Maclean's and $I$ was interested in a murder book. That's about it.

Okay. And you've had a chance I assume to read through this transcript of this second discussion with Mr. Caldwell?

Yeah, I have read it.
And would you accept it as an accurate account of that second discussion?

Yes, I would.
Just a few portions $I$ want to bring to your attention, the first one is right from the outset, and it looks like the transcription begins midstream, but we'll pick it up in any event at this portion, $I$ 'm going to read some of this to you and then I'll have some questions. Mr. Caldwell states:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { "... sad goings on in Calgary that, you } \\
& \text { know, never got into the trial and I } \\
& \text { think that there's an awful lot of stuff } \\
& \text { like that that's ..." }
\end{aligned}
$$

You state:
"Yeah, $I$ certainly didn't read that in the trial."

Mr. Caldwell:
"Yeah, witness or if you use the
criminal right, I think, unless they
came out in the trial, $I$ really...."

You state:
"In the transcript."
Mr. Caldwell:
"Yes. And, to some extent..."
You state:
"Yeah that came out with Wilson, I know."

Mr. Caldwell:
"Yeah, $I$ think to some extent things that are in police reports that didn't get into evidence. Now, I think it's great if you say the investigation was down this way, boom, boom, boom, so on and then there's at least one place in there where they're talking about rapes where he was a suspect and that was never brought home to him and $I$ think it... it (unintelligible) bloody well, you know slanderous."

You state:

```
"Yeah, it's confusing."
```

Mr. Caldwell:
"Yeah, you know, aside from, those are the only things $I$ wanted to..."

It stops there. Do you have any recollection of this exchange with Mr. Caldwell?

Well, I think it happened, it's on the tape, so the answer is yes, but $I$ think it's very confusing and disjointed and $I$ connect it now in my mind with the Cadrain, the stuff he was talking about in Calgary probably. I wasn't that interested to be honest.

Okay. I did want to ask you what you recall of your understanding relating to the information $I$ just read to you, in what context was Mr. Caldwell stating the portions that I've just read to you, do you have any recollection of that?

A
I think he was just saying you didn't hear everything, you know, it wasn't all there. Now, maybe he was hinting that, you know, they couldn't use some stuff for legal reasons possibly. I don't know why he was telling me this stuff because $I$ was interested really in what was at the trial and what the case was and what was going on. Okay.

A It's a very confused section.

Okay. I'm going to read you a portion of Mr. Caldwell's testimony that was provided at this Inquiry relating to this same entry, and if we could turn, please, to page 17166. As I say, there's some discussion about the portions prior to this that $I$ just read to you. I'm going to pick up midstream here, and this is Mr. Hodson examining Mr. Caldwell again at the inquiry a few weeks back, and Mr. Hodson states:
"So if can just go back up to this part, can you tell us what you are referring to when you say things in the police reports that didn't get into evidence where they are talking about rapes, where he, $I$ think Milgaard, was a suspect and was never brought home to him and might be slanderous?

A I think, Mr. Hodson, that was the matter that Mr . Cadrain had reported that allegedly happened in Calgary involving the bathtubs, etcetera. I was -- I was cautioning Mr. Carlyle-Gordge and $I$ think it's --

Q Maybe just go back up to the top, I think the sad goings on in Calgary.

A These were things that Mr. Milgaard was accused of doing the so-called bathtub episodes, which did not get into the trial in my memory, and $I$ was saying there's an awful lot of stuff like that, and then if you use the -unless it comes out in the trial I really think -- $I$ was cautioning him not to use those things, (a), were not in the trial, and (b), were slanderous. I mean, that's an, in effect, a false accusation against Milgaard is what that is.

Q And we saw a couple of days ago or two weeks ago when we went through your file the August 26 th, 1969 police report dealing with Ed Schellenberg where Albert Cadrain told you about the bathtub incident?

A Yeah, I'm sure we did.
Q And again, is that, I think you told us that was on your prosecution file?

A Yeah, it was, and it, I was trying to impress on Mr. Carlyle-Gordge that it would be slanderous versus Milgaard or
anyone else if you printed things like that that were not, you know, factual or verified. I tried to impress on him there were criminal records on the file of probably three witnesses or so, that he must not print those for similar reasons, $I$ think that's further down. Oh, yeah, where he was a suspect, that was never brought home to him. It bloody well, you know, slanderous is what $I$ said."

And in terms of that exchange again, would you have any reason to dispute Mr. Caldwell's account of what he was advising you at the time?

I think -- I didn't see any relevance to it actually for the purposes $I$ was there for, and of course the only other connection $I$ make to this is when $I$ saw Albert and he was going on and on about Calgary and all this stuff and I had already come to some conclusions already about David Milgaard's character. Why was Mr. Caldwell -- he could be telling the truth, maybe he thought $I$ was interested in that area, but where would I have got that information from? The only place I've heard about this stuff in Calgary, not from the
police files or anything like that, was from Albert.

And $I$ guess that was part of the question, do you recall seeing an investigation report that's mentioned here relating to a Schellenberg and the incident in Calgary involving the bathtub -No.
-- during your review of Mr. Caldwell's files?
No, I do not.
I'll just show you briefly, it's 007028 , I'll let you just briefly take a look at that.

I don't remember seeing this --
Okay.
-- in the files, but it certainly ties in with what Cadrain was trying to tell me in the interview with him.

Okay. And just going back to that portion of Mr. Caldwell's testimony that $I$ just read to you, I'm not sure if $I$ received an answer on this or not, but do you have any reason to disagree with his characterization of the portion of the meeting with you that $I$ previously read to you?

A
No, not really, no.
And just a short further portion of that testimony, if we can go to page 17168, please, and

I had left off here and I'll just continue reading
a short portion to you:
"Q So when you are saying, talking about -- "

Mr. Hodson again is examining:
"Q So when you are saying, talking about rapes where he was a suspect, you are referring to Mr. Milgaard?

A Yeah, and the Schellenberg, the bathtub episode, and that was never brought home to Mr. Milgaard.

Q At the trial?
A Well, period, and it shouldn't be -- I mean, it shouldn't be, you know, printed.

Q Now, later, and I'll be taking you to some documents on this, Mr. Caldwell, later some suggested that what you were saying in this statement to Mr. Carlyle-Gordge is you were talking about the rapes of --"

And the names here that have been removed are
(V1)--- (V1)-, (V2) (V2)- (V2)-----, (V3)--
(V3)------, and I'm not sure what V5 is, but
those first three are correct,
"-- that Mr. Fisher had been convicted of.

A Absolutely --
Q Were you doing so?
A Absolutely not."
And again $I$ don't know if you have a recollection of this or not, Mr. Carlyle-Gordge, but would you have any reason to take issue with Mr. Caldwell's position as he has indicated in this portion that I've just read to you?

A
$Q$
A

Q
I

I found that whole area confusing, the whole thing about Calgary.

Okay. Turn back to the transcript, and I'm just going to identify a few further portions for you. I see the time, Mr. Commissioner, perhaps now is a good time to break.
(Adjourned at 11:57 a.m.)
(Reconvened at 1:33 p.m.)
BY MR. HARDY:
Q

A

2
No, these names don't ring a bell with me at all from the files certainly.

Okay.

Q Good afternoon, Mr. Carlyle-Gordge.
A Good afternoon.
I'm going to return to the transcript of your
second discussion with Mr. Caldwell, 050033 , and there are just a few portions of this transcript that $I$ wanted to review with you. If we could turn to the next page, $I$ won't read it to you, but there is a short bit there speaking of Nichol John's second statement, and Mr. Caldwell had indicated to you at this point his belief that what she had stated in that statement was the truth, and do you recall learning that information from Mr. Caldwell, or his view on that statement? Yes, this is the conversation, yeah.

And do you recall what your thoughts were in reaction to his position on that?

Well, as I said earlier, umm, this wasn't, this interview wasn't confrontation between what I believed and what Mr. Caldwell believed, but I had come to my own conclusions through logical analysis and $I$ wanted to ask things around that subject, particularly Nichol. And I think one of the things that bothered me is why she went on to Edmonton if she -- with Milgaard and so on, it seemed totally illogical to me, so that's about as close as I got. I didn't say "I don't agree with the Crown" or anything like that.

Okay.

A Yeah.
$Q$
If we turn to page 050033 -- or I'm sorry -- page 5 of that document, and again $I$ won't review this with you, the discussion goes on for some time. We'll see at the very bottom of the page, and $I$ think we have seen reference to this previously, Mr. Caldwell's comment about Albert being the hero of the thing other than the police, and the two of you go on to a discussion that covers the issue of the compact being thrown out, the issue of Mr .

Cadrain bringing his information to the police, the motel reenactment, Mr. Caldwell's impressions of Mr. Milgaard generally?

Uh-huh.
If we turn to page 14 of the document, I see a comment here that you make, and you note:
"I suppose one of the most interesting things about it, considering the nature of the crime, is how cool he was about the thing afterwards. That's fascinating."

And would $I$ be correct that that was one of the sort of common-sense inconsistencies that you had drawn from your analysis of the case?

A Well yeah, it's hinting around there, yeah.

Q Okay.
A
$Q$

A

2
A
Q
We'll turn to page 17. There's some general discussion here, Mr. Caldwell is commenting on a couple of things, and perhaps i'll just read a portion of it to you starting at "the police". He states:
"The police, of course, were you know, marvelous. The two, the Lapchuk and Melnyk or whoever they were, were actually were very good. Tallis tried to float the idea that they had been promised considerations by the Regina Police on charges against them if they'd
testify on this and I remember, I was very impressed. I talked to those guys and $I$ said $I$ don't want you leaning either way, $I$ don't want you, you know, trying to nail this fellow. I don't want you backing off. I want you to go tell what you heard and that's all and don't slant it either way and $I$ thought they came through very very well, like they hung in there in the face of very determined cross-examination, you see. And as $I$ look at it again $I$ can see why they felt that way. The one, $I$ can't remember which one, was particularly good and is that ever eery evidence, you know."

A Uh-huh.
And do you recall receiving that information from Mr. Caldwell?

Yes, yes I do, I do remember that.
And what were your thoughts on his impression of Mr. Melnyk and Mr. Lapchuk?

A
I thought he was being quite open with me, and at that time this conversation he said he had had with them saying, you know, "don't lean in favour
this way or that", I would have believed him that that's what he believed and that's what happened. And the transcript ends a short time after this at page 050051 , and then there's one further discussion we'll look at in a moment, but in terms of your overall impression following your meetings with Mr. Caldwell what were some of your thoughts; can you recall?

Yes. Well I -- first of all, to be positive, I think there was no hostility between us. Okay. I wasn't there with any hostile intentions, I was there to find information. I would have said "how gullible can you be", I'm talking about my private thoughts in terms of the logic or illogic of the Crown's case, that nothing held together, and that's one reason $I$ did ask him the question about why, something along "why did" -- I mean $I$ was going along with his view, obviously, in that interview, but "why did Nichol John go to Edmonton", and his response was, "well she was scared of Milgaard", and everybody was saying, well, they were scared of Milgaard, that's why they didn't do this and that, and $I$ just don't buy that. I mean $I$ think she went to Edmonton because she hadn't seen anything and there was nothing
like that going on, but Mr. Caldwell did have an explanation and it was along the lines of, well, he was a very hypnotic character and she was scared of him, sort of, you know.

And do you recall, again, what you did with this information after the conclusion of your meetings? Well I think my wife would have done a transcript, and $I$ probably passed one on to Joyce probably, I don't know exactly when, right after or some time. Because $I$ was kind of getting worn out by this case by this point and didn't stay in it a lot longer actively.

Q And did you feel, after you were done with Mr. Caldwell, that you had learned anything significant that, practically speaking, you might be able to use towards the cause?

Umm, well, not a huge amount. Umm, certainly the stuff in the back lane with the women and these two men, this Audrey one who I did phone and I did interview her, I think her husband came on the phone, it was kind of "what's this all about". But she did specifically mention two men in that back lane, and $I$ wanted a description of the older man. And her two friends, girlfriends who she was no longer in contact with, they had also seen a
man there. But then, almost as an afterthought, she said that she'd seen another man in a car this time, the first older man was thick-set and on foot but then she said "oh yeah, I remember there was a younger guy $I$ was scared of and he was in a car and he made comments to me like 'shall I sock it to you' or something like that", and she remembered it was a two-tone car. So I remember saying "can you describe this man any better", so that was interesting that came out of my review of the files, for me anyway.

And $I$ think we may have a transcript of that discussion that you are referring to and we'll turn to that in a moment. Before we do, there was one further single-page transcription, and I'm not sure if we are able to place it in time, but if we could turn to 225006 , please. And this may be have been in one, in the context of one of the discussions that we've already referred to, but it appears again to be a transcription between yourself and Mr. Caldwell, from the context anyways, and perhaps I'll read a portion of it to you.

A
Hmm.

Mr. Caldwell:
"Are you going to try and see Karst, or phone him?"

Yourself:
"Yes, tomorrow $I$ hope to see Mackie and Karst.

Mr. Caldwell:
"You've got them booked, more or less?
(Offers to help $P$ get in touch with
other people -- says Charlie Short is away; says he thinks the book is a 'worthy thing to be written;' I think it's a fascinating thing. And what I would do is, if you want to phone me or write me, $I$ could get Charlie in here on the phone, courtesy of the Prov. of Sask."

You say:
"Say she want to see Tallis."

Mr. Caldwell:
" (Says it's a little tough; can't say
too much cuz Tallis is on the bench.)

He's a very conservative guy. Like, he and $I$ got along just fine. In fact, we combined forces to put away a guy called Leslie Klassen who murdered a girl here
... It's a long story, but Tallis did what turned out to be a manslaughter or crim-neg. case and I did the 'dangerous sexual offender' on the guy; between us we got him locked away forever. So we've been allies on various things. And he's a very -- I had a funny episode --- (tape ends)."

A
$Q$ did you understand him to be speaking of Mr. Tallis in terms of prosecutorial efforts, or he was offering to help me. Yeah.

And in terms of this information about Mr. Tallis, Cention
working as a prosecutor in assisting Mr. Caldwell; do you recall?

A
know, $I$ was kind of focused on two things at this point; $I$ wanted to either, as I've said before, find that one of the key Crown people would change their story or had made a mistake or -- ten years later; or find the real murderer. That's what I wanted to do.

## What did I understand by this?

I didn't really pay that much attention.
Okay. And I'll show you a document later. There was suggestion, perhaps later on, that Mr.

Caldwell and Mr. Tallis had worked together --
A Uh-huh.

Q

Okay. And we'll look at that document in a short bit.

Okay.
Q
So you've mentioned some follow-up that may have come from this meeting, including some discussion with Audrey Odnokon?

A

Q

Uh-huh.
And I'll turn you to a transcript of what $I$ believe is that telephone discussion, it's 333016. This is a transcription that has been more recently produced, it's located on one of the tapes that had been provided to the Commission. All right.

And we'll see at the top it is a conversation between yourself and Audrey Boutin, and I think that fits with maybe what you had advised us previously?

That's right.
And I won't go through all of it, but the first portion in fact is a discussion about the information that's contained in the police report as we noted in your dictated notes --Uh-huh.
-- about her experience with a fellow who she had described I think as taller, a little bit older --Uh-huh.
-- and a bigger build, and you referred to him just a moment ago. If we turn to page 333019, starting here Ms. Boutin states, 'There was somebody else that came out at me too'. You state, 'Really. No, not at the same place?'

Audrey, 'Yeah, yeah'. You state, 'Oh really. Can you tell me anything about that?' Audrey, 'Well I'. Yourself, 'It could be very useful'. Audrey, 'Okay. It was a late model car, now on cars, I'm not good at cars but in, in the, in, like there was a late model car, kind of appeared to be maybe like a pink, light pink colour'. You state, 'All right'. Audrey, 'And it was a young guy that was driving and he came out, he was waiting in the back alley'. You state, 'Yes'. Audrey, "And umm'. You state, 'And do you know when this was'. Audrey, 'I think that was too, in the fall there, probably December or, cause there was snow on the ground'. You state, 'Oh, okay, that's good'. Audrey, 'And he came out and he had, you know, said a couple of things and I started running'. You state, 'All right, now was he in the car in the back lane'. Next page. I take it that was unintelligible, that portion. You state, 'He, he didn't get out of the car'. Audrey, 'No'. Yourself, 'No'. Audrey, 'He just started driving with the car and the light flicked on when $I$ had gone past'. And you state, 'And was this at night again'.

Audrey, 'Yeah'. You state, 'All right, and you think it was a pink car, the best you can'.

Audrey, 'Pink, and it was two-tone or something like that'. You state, 'Okay. Can you remember anything, you said he was young, can you remember anything else'. Audrey, 'No, I can't because, well I can remember what he said'. You state, Yeah'. Audrey, 'But'. You state, 'I don't want to embarrass you but do you want to tell me what he said or he just made a suggest -- suggestion or what'. Audrey, 'Well, bitch, I like talking to you' in quotes. You state, 'Did he. Fascinating. Do you know if he had dark hair or light other than that'. Audrey, 'I don't know cause it's nighttime, $I$ couldn't see'. You state, 'Yeah and you'. Audrey, 'I started running and his car turned my direction and by the time that he'd caught up with me his was crossing over the boulevard 22 nd and $I$ was at my place'. You say, 'You got back home safe', 'Yeah'. 'Umm, as you say, he was in the car and it was dark and you say he was young, could he have been like around 20, in that area'. Audrey, 'Could have been'. You ask, 'Early twenties'. The next couple of portions
seem somewhat unintelligible.
Audrey says, 'But he, he had
hollered twice'. You state, 'Yeah, two incidents in the same area though, not long'.

And then the conversation
continues for a portion after that until the end of the transcript. And you have had a chance to take a look, generally, at this transcript, have you, --

A
$Q$
A
Q

And this was the information, then, of the second, second individual that Ms. Boutin had spoken to you about then, the description that we have just gone through of the fellow?

A
Yes, she had seen two men, and this was not long before the murder of Gail Miller.

Q Okay. And do you recall what you did with this information?

A
Stored it in my head. Well, I would have got a transcript made, probably given a copy to Joyce 7
too.

Q
A

Q

And then $I$ 'm going to return at this point, Mr. Carlyle-Gordge, to a discussion of your search for Larry and Linda Fisher --

A

Q
Uh-huh.
-- from what you can recall. I'm going to take you through a few documents in that respect that we haven't seen yet, and the first one is a letter that's dated February 25th, 1983, and the document ID is 332585. You will see the date at the top, February 25th, 1983 from Mr. Merchant to Empire Skip Tracing Ltd.?

Right.
And there is a request for a locate for Sharon Ann Williams, and then secondly for Linda Fisher.

Uh-huh.
And the portion relating to Linda Fisher states,
'In 1969 she lived at 334 Avenue O South, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. She married Larry Fisher who is presently in prison for a rape charge.' Uh-huh.

And do you recall whether you had asked Tony Merchant to locate Linda Fisher with the information that's noted in this paragraph? Oh, I'm sure I had or Joyce had, we were still -I was still -- they weren't top priority, but I still wanted to meet the Fishers, yeah. And the date here is February 25th, 1983, and just fitting with what we've previously looked at, this
would be, $I$ guess, the Friday following that rather busy weekend you had previously with your meetings with Albert and Mr. Caldwell?

Okay.
And then the Monday discussions with Dennis --Uh-huh.
-- and Father Murphy, or excuse me, Leonard Gorgchuck during that weekend as well?

Uh-huh.
And so you think that you may have provided this information to Mr. Merchant in terms of --

No, I can tell --
-- trying to get --
I can tell you that for sure. I don't know who had spoke to Mr. Merchant, but we had had a discussion about skip tracing. Umm, I don't think I knew then -- when was this, February, no I didn't -- that he was in prison for a rape charge.

And that's what $I$ wanted next to ask you.
So that couldn't have come from me, --
Is --
-- that information. Maybe Mr. Merchant knew about it, $I$ don't know, $I$ don't know where that came from.

Is it possible that you were aware of that
information at this point, or can you recall?

A
$Q$

A

Q
A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
Q

A
Q

A

Umm, no, I don't recall, no.
And do you have any idea where this information may have come from?

Nope. That's pretty definite, 'he is in prison for a rape charge', well $I$ don't know.

And I'm just thinking --
It says 'he is presently in prison for a rape charge', $I$ would not know that in February '83. So you did not know that in February 1983? No.

And --
I don't believe so.
And you don't have any idea where that information may have come from?

No.
Okay. This would obviously be something that you would be interested in in your efforts, $I$ would assume, at the time?

Well, you know, there were two problems I had going -- I'm talking from, with hindsight now. I didn't know about Fisher's record at this time, about his problems in Winnipeg and elsewhere. The other problem, again looking back with hindsight, and there's irony in this, $I$ know things now that

I didn't know at this time, is that the very year I got involved with this case, 1980, is the very year that Mrs. Fisher had been to the police to make a very serious statement accusing Larry Fisher of murder. I had no record of that, it wasn't in the Caldwell file, so these people were not on my radar screen. They were interesting people, but not as murder suspects.

Okay. And $I$ guess my question was that if you were aware that Larry Fisher, at this time, was in prison for a rape charge, --

Uh-huh.
-- would I assume correctly that that would be information that you would obviously be interested in at the time?

I would be vitally interested if $I$ knew that for sure, yeah.

And Mr. Merchant has testified, I don't think we need to turn to the transcript, he had indicated when a letter of this nature -- not this exact letter but a later letter that we'll look at -was put to him where he may have received instructions to first of all seek out Linda Fisher and also where he may have received the information that we've noted in this paragraph
from, and his best answer that he could provide is that it would have been from Joyce or David. And I guess all $I$ can ask you is that $I$ think you are confirming for us that it wasn't from you?

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q And, again, this is a more recently-transcribed discussion, and we have the audio for it, we did not previously listen to this when we were entering evidence relating to Albert Cadrain, but

I'm going to play it now or ask that it be played now. It's very short, and it's of a discussion between the two of you which apparently takes place two or three weeks after your meeting with Albert Cadrain in Dalmeny?

Uh-huh.
And if we could play that now, please. The document reference is 333013 .
[Conversation between Peter Carlyle-Gordge and Albert Cadrain]

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Is this Albert?
ALBERT CADRAIN: Yeah.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yes, it's Peter
Carlyle-Gordge. I'm the writer who interviewed you two or three weeks ago.

ALBERT CADRAIN: Oh yeah, sure, yeah.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: I'm still doing some research and trying to trace anybody who was um, involved back in '69. One of the names that I've come across is uh, he was interviewed by police, is a Larry Fisher.

ALBERT CADRAIN: Um hmm.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: ...and he's given the same address as yours. Do you know where he is now?

ALBERT CADRAIN: Wouldn't have no idea.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: No?
ALBERT CADRAIN: No, $I$ wouldn't have no idea at all. This Larry Fisher uh...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: What was he, a lodger or something.

ALBERT CADRAIN: A what?
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: A, a boarder?
ALBERT CADRAIN: Yeah, he was a, didn't even know the guy, like he lived down in the basement with his wife and kid, I guess.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah, I know from the records that they did interview him anyway.

I just wondered if you had anything to add?
ALBERT CADRAIN: Well, I'm sure they interviewed quite a few people.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Oh, they did, I know.

ALBERT CADRAIN: And uh, I guess he was just a suspect hey.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah, right, right.
I'm wondering if you had any memories of that time, and after...

ALBERT CADRAIN: I wouldn't know, I wouldn't have nothing to do with the guy, he's a,
a real uh, gangster type.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Is he?
ALBERT CADRAIN: Oh, yeah, from what I hear, from what $I$ hear, hey.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: You mean, you mean like, a criminal?

ALBERT CADRAIN: Yeah.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Oh, really.
ALBERT CADRAIN: Yeah, I suppose uh, I guess they caught him years later, or, I don't know how much longer, later, in uh, rapes and shit like that, hey.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Oh, is that right.
ALBERT CADRAIN: But he's a real weirdo.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Hmm, oh, anyway, I
did talk to Dennis briefly, in Vancouver.
ALBERT CADRAIN: Oh, my brother, yeah.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah, and he hasn't written his book, but he, he gave me a few things he could remember, not much more than you did and he mentioned that the police were very uh, they were picking you up a lot and...

ALBERT CADRAIN: Oh, yeah.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: ...giving you the third degree, picking you up every day?

ALBERT CADRAIN: Oh, yeah they were.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah, anyway, you have no idea where this Fisher guy is now?

ALBERT CADRAIN: Uh uh, $I$ wouldn't have anything...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Okay.
ALBERT CADRAIN: ...to help out that guy ever.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah, alright, I thought I'd give you a try, okay, take care.

ALBERT CADRAIN: Yeah, okay then.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Bye, bye.
ALBERT CADRAIN: Make sure I get a copy, hey.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: I will do, yeah. I may have to, depending on what $I$ come across, $I$ may have to call you again anyway.

ALBERT CADRAIN: Oh, okay.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Okay, Albert, bye, bye.

ALBERT CADRAIN: Bye.
[Tape ends]
$Q$
And again for reference, the transcription of that is 333013. Do you recall that conversation with Albert Cadrain?

A
Vaguely. Where he's talking about Fisher, I really had forgotten about that until $I$ read it recently.

You had forgotten about it?
Sort of, yeah, yeah.
Okay. And does that refresh your memory then in terms of listening to that?

Yes, yeah, $I ' m$ sure $I$ did call him back to ask if he knew where Fisher was.

Do you recall why you would have been asking
Albert about Larry Fisher at that time?
Well, he was a lose end that -- well, I had just
been going through the files too, so I knew the police had talked to him at the bus stop, it was a
lose end that needed tying up, but the stuff he
says later is, with the benefit of hindsight of
course, quite remarkable.
No, absolutely, and in fairness, I'm just trying
to capture your thought at the time as you are
talking with Albert. Did you consider that
information significant as you were speaking with
Albert?
A
No, no, no. I didn't think Albert had much
credibility and $I$ can tell you why. Well, his own
brother had told me not to believe him for one
thing, but after my meeting with him, this is a guy who had told me not only that Milgaard was in the Mafia, but the judge was part of the Mafia conspiracy, that the lead Crown witnesses were in the same conspiracy, the police were in the conspiracy, everybody was in some kind of world-wide conspiracy of organized crime, so although it's very significant reading it now knowing what happened afterwards, at the time $I$ wouldn't have given any credibility to anything he said, and $I$ think he implied in there that it was kind of, some of it was hearsay, he was a weird guy and $I$ don't know this and that, so no, I discounted that.

Q

A
$Q$


A
$Q$

A

Okay.
And certainly Larry Fisher was not, in my mind anyway, a serious suspect.

And when you listened to this again, was that, in terms of Albert mentioning Larry being involved in rapes or anything of that nature, was that information you had gathered from any other source by this point in time?

No.

Okay.
And Fisher -- sorry, Albert had also talked about

David being involved in rapes and things too, so --

So you generally discounted this information then from --

Not a credible person, no. Okay.

But if he knew where $I$ could reach Fisher, I might have been interested.

And there's another conversation that you have with Albert's parents, mainly with Mrs. Cadrain, and again this is a new transcription and it's quite short and we'll listen to this one as well, and $I$ can't put a date exactly on it, but I've included it at this portion, and I'll play that now. The document reference is 333001 .
[Conversation between Peter Carlyle-Gordge and Mr. Cadrain/Mrs. Cadrain]

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Hello, is that Mr. Cadrain.

MR. CADRAIN: Yeah.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: The one who used to be on Avenue O South.

CADRAIN: That's right, yeah.
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: I'm trying to trace
a Linda Fisher and $I$ believe she lived there in
the 19.., late $1960^{\prime} s$. Did she live at uh, on Avenue O South.

CADRAIN: Yes, she lived in our basement, they lived in our basement uh, her husband and her uh, for a while.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Do you know where they are now, where she is now.

CADRAIN: Well, just a minute, uh, my wife might know better than $I$ do here, $I$ know, $I$ know where he is but uh, $I$ don't know where she is. [Mr. Cadrain puts Mrs. Cadrain on]

MRS. CADRAIN: Hello.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Hello, yes, Mrs.

Cadrain.

CADRAIN: Yeah.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Yeah, I'm trying to trace a Linda Fisher and $I$ gather she uh, spent a short time living with you on Avenue O South.

CADRAIN: Yeah, uh huh.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: I have some
information. Do you know where she is.
CADRAIN: Well, could I ask who's speaking, please.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Uh, well, I'm calling for a lawyer's office but $I$ can't

```
disclose the nature of...
```

MRS. CADRAIN: Oh...
PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: ...of the information
I have.
CADRAIN: You a private investigator or... PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: No, no.

CADRAIN: No, no. Well um, I haven't seen
her for a long time but uh, they lived in our basement um, say uh, fifteen years ago.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Fifteen years, yeah. CADRAIN: Yeah.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Do you, you don't know if she's still in Saskatoon though.

CADRAIN: No, I had uh, last time I saw her, well $I$ was enumerating for Henderson, hey, and I believe she lived on Avenue U. PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Avenue U. CADRAIN: Uh, umm... PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: You wouldn't have an address.

CADRAIN: No, not really, but it would be at $U$ South and it could be maybe the 400 Block, I, I'm sure there, there was some old people next door and uh, she, she has a little girl, Tammy that went to Pleasant Hill School, she was six by
then so when they were, when they came to our place when she was six months old, so then she was, she was six at the time and she was going to Pleasant Hill School and I remember going uh, asking the neighbour, you know, who's next door, in the little shack there and they told me, friends or somebody and then $u h, I$ kind of guessed, you know is there a little girl, is that a little girl or, Tammy, so, it had to be her, hey. And I went there and there's a, they weren't answering the door and their, and then $I$, I just kept telling $\qquad$ , and anyways, he, a guy came to the door and uh, he was
$\qquad$ . . .

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: I gather, I gather she is separated.

CADRAIN: Oh, yes, she was, well at the time I asked her, this guy who lived there he, he didn't say he lived there but $u h$, he did, I guess and he uh, he said Linda, he gave me her name, Linda Fisher's here, ______ and anyways he said um, asked about where's uh, Larry, like her, her husband, hey. And he said um, well he's, he's in PA. And $I$ said what's he doing in $P A, I$ never thought, you know, $\qquad$ . And he said
well he's making time. So he was in jail at the time.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: You don't know where he is now.

CADRAIN: No, and I, I saw them once uh, her and another kid, there was a real blond, it certainly wasn't his, $I$ don't know if it's this boyfriend's either, it was a real blond kid and uh, Tammy was coming from the circus, you know and just, they just came by us and uh, that was probably back... ___________-_ I haven't seen anything since, but $I$ heard that he, he or somebody was in North Battleford but $I$ don't know whether he was there or not, I don't know.

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: No, well I'll try the 400 Block anyway.

CADRAIN: Well, $I$ think if you ask you know, uh, it was a little shack, I think it was the 400 or it might have been the 500 because I did from 300 to the 17 th hey, so it was on, I remember it was on the uh, the west side of the street and there's a little shack and there was a good house next door, there was uh, I remember I'd fallen, twisted the ankle, and uh $I$ was bleeding from my eye or forehead or something at
they uh, gave me a bandage, you I wanted to clean it up and, they probably are still there, you know but there was, those older people are probably still around and they probably, he was just next door, but it was a good house, maybe a stucco house or something, and then there's, there's this little shack, you know, beside, I know she was renting because $I$ had to ask that question, $I$ was in the kitchen there for quite a little while, but I, I, don't know, I haven't heard anything from...

PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Well, I'll give it a try anyway, thanks for helping.

CADRAIN: Yeah, well okay, bye, bye. PETER CARLYLE-GORDGE: Bye, bye.
[Conversation ended] Well, I'm guessing that was very early on because I know I had at least two or three conversations with Mrs. Cadrain, and in that one it sounds like I'm a stranger, so --

Yeah, I was going to --

A

Q
-- state that as well, although $I$ was having difficulty reconciling that with your inquiries relating to Linda and Larry Fisher just in terms of everything you and $I$ have worked our way through, the first mention as I noted being perhaps, at least on the documents during your review of Mr. Caldwell's files, we heard Mr. Dennis Cadrain mention his name.

Uh-huh.
But I know you've also allowed that perhaps you had gathered the name from Mrs. Cadrain earlier as well?

Well, as far as my memory goes, yeah. Okay.

Yeah.
Okay. So if you were to place, or try to place this conversation, you think it may in fact have been an earlier conversation before you had talked with Albert?

I think so.
Okay. And do you recall, it seems you are looking in particular for Linda, you do mention and ask briefly where Larry is, but do you remember why you were looking particularly for Linda?

A
I knew they had a little -- well, going back to '69, they had a little girl and $I$ knew or assumed he worked and I thought there might be a better chance that if either of them had seen anything the day the Milgaard party arrived, January 31st, she might have been around more that day. No particular preference, but sometimes women notice more things too.

Okay. And --
I would have wanted to ask them about Albert too if $I$ had met them, so --

Right. And I notice there wasn't discussion about Albert in this conversation. Were there more conversations then than this?

A
Yes, yes, there were later ones where $I$ was saying do you know where he is and stuff like that. They are very protective $I$ think, they weren't going to tell us, even if they knew where Albert was, how to be in touch with him, and I think, I don't even know if there is a transcript of it, there might be, she did finally offer to forward mail to him $I$ think and $I$ think $I$ made reference in the interview with Albert, did you get my letter or something like that.

Okay.
Okay. I'll turn to some notes that were part of the materials that we previously reviewed. The document is 224990 , you recall we took a look at this previously and it was a summary relating to not.

I really can't.
Okay. I'll turn to some notes that were part of


Walter Danchuk and $I$ think you identified some of your notes on this document, although you indicated this was not likely your typewritten work.

A
$Q$

A

No.
And the last page of this, I'm not sure why it was appended to this particular document, but if we go to 224998 , and you can take a look at that, but there's mention of Linda and Larry and various years and it appears various addresses.

Oh, right, yeah.
And is this in your handwriting?
Yes, it is, yeah. Yeah.
And can you place this for us at all in context? I'll have to read it. We were looking for a lot of people and $I$ guess the Fishers were among those. It looks like we're tracing addresses.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I can't hear you, sir.

Sorry. It looks like we're trying to trace addresses and go back to where she had moved from and to. Marriage licenses. It looks like some handwritten reference to some attempt to look for her, that's what it looks like.

BY MR. HARDY:

And again, any ability to place this in time? Oh, no, I don't think so.

Would it fit with the inquiries though that we've been looking at, including your conversation with Mrs. Cadrain?

Well, she was talking about the 400 block and all that. I don't doubt we might have looked then, but I can't say with certainty when that was written.

Okay.
No.
The next document I'll show you is 159890, you'll see it's a StarPhoenix ad and the date is March 26th, 1983?

A
Right.
The body of the ad indicates:
"Linda Fisher - would anyone knowing the recent whereabouts of Linda Fisher (who was married in 1969 to Larry Fisher) and has a daughter, Tammy, please contact Box 410 C, Star Phoenix. The advertiser has important information which may be to her advantage and is anxious to contact Mrs. Fisher as soon as possible. Her last known address was in

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q
A
Q
And if we turn to the next page, there's some notes, a phone number and a mention of Cliff, \$30.

I don't know if that has any significance, but do you recognize what that might be?

No idea, no.
Okay. If we turn to the next page, it's again a
Absolutely not, no.
Okay. If we could turn to 213943, you'll see it's
a copy of an envelope directed to yourself, and
there's an address, 192 Library Place?
Yeah, that's my address at the time.
That would be your address at the time?
Uh-huh.
And if we turn to the next page, there's some
notes, a phone number and a mention of Cliff, \$30.
(don know if that has any significancer but do
you recognize what that might be?
A
$Q$
Uh-huh.
And is that ad familiar to you?
Yeah, I'm pretty sure I placed it. Yeah.
Okay. And again, it looks like you are only
searching for Linda Fisher at this point in time.
Do you recall why that was the case?
There's no significance at all, I don't think so.
We knew they were separated or divorced. No, I
can't think of any significance.
You wouldn't have known where Larry was at this
point in time though?
No idea, no.
Okay. If we turn to the next page, it's again a
copy of an envelope to the StarPhoenix to the box number that was mentioned in the ad, $I$ believe it states L. Fisher at the top and a box number is given, Cando, Saskatchewan?

Uh-huh.
And if we turn to the next page, there's a copy of a handwritten letter from a Bryan which reads:
"To whom it may concern
Regarding your advisement in the Star Phoenix.

Re: Linda Fisher You may contact me at 382-8167 Bryan. For further information as $I$ am her common-law husband. I would like to know more about this matter and if she will need a lawyer etc."

Do you recall reading this letter in response to your ad?

A
There's a lot of mystery surrounding this
response. I don't -- I don't know what happened to that letter right afterwards. I don't recall contacting this person at that time.

Do you recall, though, receiving the letter?
Not really, no.
Okay. And we'll look at a further letter that was
received, apparently with the same package, 213947, that's the next page of this document, March 27th, 1983, I'll read this to you:
"Gentlemen, $I$ am writing in regard to the ad you placed in the Saturday, March 26, edition of the Star Phoenix.

I am wonder who you are? Why you want to get in contact with me, and, what it is all about?

You can contact me at this
address:"

The box number is given, signed Linda Fisher. Do you recall receiving this letter that I've just read to you?

A

Q

A
$Q$

A Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv
I presume $I$ would have done -- mind you, I was getting out of the case by -- when is this? Late
Well, if it was addressed to me, I probably did. Do I recall it? Not clearly. I certainly don't recall following up on it.

Okay. And I realize it's a while ago, but you said not clearly. Do you have some recollection of receiving a letter of this sort?

It's very, very hazy. If in fact $I$ opened it and read it, what happened after that $I$ don't know. Okay.

March. Yeah. I don't know what was going on on
March the $27 t h$ in my life professionally, so I don't know what was happening at that time.

What about the notes, and if we can go to the full page, please, there's some notes at the bottom of the page.

Uh-huh.
Is that your handwriting?
No, I don't think so.
Do you recognize that handwriting?
No.
Okay. Turn to the last page of this package just for completeness, is 213948 , page 6, and again it's just a mention of the StarPhoenix and the box number. I think then you've confirmed for us that you don't have any clear recollection of actually receiving these letters?

Right.
And you definitely have no recollection of acting upon them in terms of contacting Linda or -No, I'm sure $I$ didn't contact her, what $I$ know now I'm sure I didn't, no. What happened to them, I mean, if $I$ received them, $I$ have no idea.

I was going to ask you --
I didn't supply these to the Commission by the
way, so obviously somebody else had a copy of the letter.
$Q$

A

Right. That is my writing, yeah.
And do you have any idea when you would have made that handwritten entry?

Well, it would have to be a long time after the dictated notes and it would have to be at a time when $I$ had already read Linda Fisher's -- probably Linda Fisher's interview with Mrs. Milgaard which, I don't know, 1990. It would have been written in later obviously.

And can you tell us how that might have played
out? I take it then obviously you would have been looking at this document again at a later point in time for some reason?

Yes, yeah. I reviewed it -- we were in England again from '87 to '90, came back in August, 1990, and I went through a lot of -- thinned out things, gave things back. It could have been then. I had taken some material to England just in case I found the energy to do something with it, but $I$ suspect that was written a lot later, like, maybe -- I think once Fisher had been contacted, Mrs. Fisher, and I think Joyce had Centurion involved at that point, she would probably have sent me a copy of that interview, and so I've obviously read what Mrs. Fisher said about going to the police, so it must have been after that. And so you didn't speak with Mrs. Fisher then in 1983 though --

No, not to my recollection.
-- to gather this information?
No. There's a bit of a mystery around that -All right.

A -- whole period.
And one other document that we looked at previously is 224933, and you recall this was a
memo from Mr. Tallis' defence file?
A
Q
Right.
Which I think you confirm was in your possession during your review from, or during the 1981 to 1983 time period, and you identified the Fisher note here beside the burning barrel reference?

Yeah.
Do you have any recollection of --
When I wrote that?
What that entry related to?
Do you know, that handwritten thing could have been written later too, it's possible, because I kept abreast of the case even though I wasn't involved in it. It seems to me there was some story from Joyce about some neighbour or somebody phoning, there was a story going around that Larry Fisher -- so it was later for sure -- had been burning some work clothes, so I'm thinking that's later.

Q Okay. And if we turn to page 3 of that document, you recall the handwritten note that we had previously reviewed largely about Nichol and how your theory on how the rape likely occurred and your suspicion that a car was involved?

A Yeah.

Q
A
$Q$

Q
A
$Q$

A

And we see the last entry, "Check cars, Fisher, Mahar"?

I haven't the foggiest idea. Let me think. I don't know if $I$ was aware whether he had a car or what. He lived in the area, $I$ knew that, but as far as $I$ was concerned at that time period in my mind he wasn't a suspect, so -- I don't know, I probably just said let's check whoever lived near there, you know, did they have cars. I had a lot of suspects, so -- but he wasn't a serious one.

And that was the only question $I$ had following from that, whether you can recall --

What was in my head at the time?
Whether you were considering Mr. Fisher as a
suspect at the time.

A
Q

Okay. And I guess with Tony's inclusion of the request to locate Linda Fisher, would it be fair to say that he was not aware, and of course you

And at what point had you moved to England?
I think we sailed from Montreal in late August or early September. We went from Montreal to London.
You had moved to England by this time?
Yes.
$\qquad$
$\square$
can't speak for him, but that it appears that he wasn't aware of the contact information that you had received apparently from the letters from Linda and Bryan?

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q

Okay. Just a couple of further documents that we can make fairly quick reference to I think.

There's 332997, a single page transcription of a
couple of further calls that you had made, it looks like the top one you are still looking for Audrey Boutin?

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q

A

2

A

Q

Uh-huh.
And I see the bottom one, it appears that you are looking to speak with Mr. Karst?

Uh-huh.
And it's indicated that he wasn't in at this point in time?

Yeah.
Do you have a recollection of whether you ever had the opportunity to speak about the case with Mr . Karst?

Well, I thought I had spoken to two policemen, Mackie and Karst, but $I$ don't see a transcript anywhere, so I don't -- I don't remember Mr. Karst, $I$ don't know what he looked like, but I had it in my mind that $I$ had spoken to him, so probably I didn't, although I still -- I'm not quite certain about it.

Would you have known who Mr. Karst was or the role that he had played?

Yeah. He was one of the lead policemen when Cadrain went there, yeah.

So you have no recollection of actually having a
substantive discussion with him?
No, which doesn't mean it didn't happen, but I don't think so.

And we don't have a transcript of any such discussion. We do have a transcript of a discussion with Detective Raymond Mackie.

Right.
And $I$ take it you do recall speaking with Raymond Mackie?

Yeah. I think I went to his house, yeah.
And do you recall when that was?
Oh, probably around the time $I$ was looking at the Caldwell files.

Okay. And we'll turn to the transcript which is 325616, and I think you probably had an
opportunity to review this transcript previously have you?

I've read it once, yeah.
And would it be an accurate account of the discussion that you would have had with Mr.

Mackie?
Yeah, it would.
Do you recall how you had represented yourself to Detective Mackie, or $I$ should say Mr. Mackie at that point in time, why you contacted him?

A
Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$

Probably about the book $I$ would imagine.
I'll turn to just a couple of portions for your consideration. Page 325621 , there's some brief mention again for, or of Larry Fisher?

Right.
And an inquiry of Mr. Mackie about whether he knew who Larry Fisher was?

Uh-huh.
He indicates he doesn't recall. I suppose this would be in line with the other inquiries you were making in and around this time period?

Yeah, yeah.
Okay. Turn to page 325624 , I'll read this portion to you, you state, and you are talking about Nichol John here and you state:
"And she gave a blow-by-blow and, in the one she denied, she said that she saw the whole thing that night. Saw the stabbing."

Mr. Mackie:
"I think there was some suggestion in it, it wasn't fully detailed, but there was some indication that she probably had seen it. Yeah."

You state:
"Yeah yeah, and then she would refuse to, uh ..."

Mr. Mackie:
"She'd back-up. She would go so far and then she'd back and then she'd go ahead again and she was a difficult witness to deal with."

Do you recall receiving this information from Mr. Mackie?

A
Yes.
And I'm curious in particular about his first comment:
"I think there was some suggestion in
it, it wasn't fully detailed, but there
was some indication that she probably
had seen it. Yeah."
And I assume what you were talking about here was
the statement. Were you surprised at all that
Mr. Mackie wasn't stating more clearly what
Nichol had said in that statement at this point?
Do you have any recollection?
I think he was a bit cagey about everything. No, I can't remember at the time what was going through my head, no. I think there was some suggestion -- seen it? I think what I'm referring
to, "it" is the stabbing, right, she had seen the murder, isn't that --

Q
In fairness, only Mr. Mackie I guess can tell us for certain. I had read it that he was stating that there was some suggestion in the statement, that the statement wasn't fully detailed, but there was some indication that she had probably seen it.

Oh, I see what you are saying, right. Yeah, okay.
And given what we know of that statement, I'm wondering if you recall receiving Mr. Mackie's information on this point and whether you recall what your reaction was.

Uh-huh. No, I don't.
Okay. Just a little bit further down the page, here Mr. Mackie states:
"If I remember right, she was raped by
Milgaard once. In a park in Regina."
Then you state:
"Yeah it was in the books."

Do you recall that portion of the discussion?
And $I$ mean from memory, no, $I$ don't, but that is very interesting that that's in there.

Do you have any idea --
The books had to refer to the files $I$ would think.
$Q$

A

I was going to ask you that next. Do you have any idea what you are referring to here where you refer to books?

I think it would have been the files. I can't imagine any book had been written about him.

So it's possible --
There must have been some police references in there that $I$ read in the files.

Okay.
Yes.
Turn to 325629 , this portion here, Mr. Mackie states:
"Yeah. In fact, I think I suggested to you that $I$ was a little wondering, a
little bit weary of you yourself because I figured well, maybe you're on her team and ..."

And you state:
"No, I'm a ... writer ... you're kicking up."

Mr. Mackie:
"... and trying to ... Not about to
worry about that. No, I talked to Bobs.
I wasn't concerned about ..."

And he continues to express some of his
reservations about your intentions. Were you comfortable with your representations to Mr. Mackie here?

A
Not 100 percent, but this is what I mean by walking on egg shells, thought $I$ was working for Joyce Milgaard, and I guess he had checked I think with Mr. Caldwell hadn't he; isn't that what it says? Yeah. Do I like telling little fibs? No. Did I think it was important to interview this guy? Yes. Did $I$ think he would interview me if he thought $I$ had any connection even though $I$ was doing this for my own purposes to find out more truth and information? I would have thought if he had thought $I$ had any connection, any communication, he would have said go to hell, you know.

Okay. Turn --
Am I comfortable with it? Not really, no. Okay. Turn to page 325632. I just see here there's some mention of Charlie Short. Uh-huh.

Do you recall whether you ever attempted to contact Charlie Short?

A
Doubtless $I$ attempted, but $I$ don't remember anything about that. I can't remember an
interview with him.

Okay. There's several other transcripts relating to various work that you conducted on the file, several of them in fact relate to your inquiries on the Lorne Mahar aspect, and I'm not going to turn to those. I do think you confirmed for us earlier that you in fact had a discussion with Mr. Mahar?

Yeah. It was by telephone.
And what do you recall learning from that discussion?

Well $I$ was trying to gently draw him to the subject of Gail Miller, and it was -- I found it very difficult to do that. He sounded like a man who knew he had had a terrible time, he had a lot of amnesia about that period when he had killed his girlfriend or whatever he did, and $I$ don't know, I think intuitively $I$ felt he is not connected to Miller. I had a desire to find him just to be in contact with him. I was going to ask you if you had a recollection of how your inquiries relating to Mr. Mahar ultimately resolved themselves?

A
In my own heart $I$ decided he wasn't the one.

Okay. And the --
reference to your move to England in 1983?
Right.
And I take it, was that a permanent move at the time, permanent in the sense that that was the intent at the outset?

No. But by the spring of '83 I was getting really burned out, $I$ had put a lot of time into this, but this was only one thing. Umm, I think the Katie Harper case, which $I$ had put even more time into, got resolved finally in about 1982, and it was extremely devastating for my wife and $I$, we didn't like the end of that, so that was one blow. And $I$ was still -- we had a very young family, and $I$ was still writing an enormous amount and $I$ was getting burned out, and $I$ decided that probably I wanted a change of scene and a complete -- not to be looking at legal documents for a while, and we talked about it and decided we would go on a
sabbatical come working holiday, and the Toronto Star fortunately offered me a part-time position as an English correspondent, keeping an eye on -what $I$ had to do was review all the English papers every day and write some features about Margaret Thatcher, things like that. So I think we had made that decision, because $I$ know by May-June we were planning to rent the house out with the intention of coming back some time, obviously. And $I$ was really trying to withdraw, in a sense, from active involvement in this case, because $I$ thought we had gotten nowhere, and I was quite disillusioned. First of all, none of the witnesses $I$ was interested in had changed anything, although there had been some tantalizing words from Mr. Wilson $I$ thought. We hadn't found the murderer, it's like looking for a needle in a haystack. Now with hindsight, you know, many years later, $I$ can see the haystack was the very house that Cadrain lived in and that Milgaard visited. That is painful to know.

What happened to your work that had been compiled up to that point in time?

Well I think $I$ took some of it with me on the ship, umm, I certainly left what I considered
important copies or tapes with Joyce for if -- I mean in a sense $I$ was slightly abandoning it, if that's the word for it, but $I$ knew certainly in '83 that we were right, that there was no way the Crown's case could -- I couldn't prove anything, but there was no way the Crown's case could possibly be true, $I$ knew that with all my being, and $I$ felt completely impotent and frustrated and depressed, even, about it, but $I$ needed a break. So $I$ certainly left materials with her in case, you know, at some point she might have some resources, some help, some lawyers. I thought we were trying to climb Mount Everest with a dead body on our backs, that's how $I$ felt, $I$ was very frustrated.

And, after you moved to England, did you remain involved in any capacity --

A
Yes.
-- in Joyce Milgaard's efforts?
Not in the sense of active involvement, but it bothered me morally, and we were in contact certainly by letter quite a lot, and I think Joyce stayed with us in England twice, in fact she eventually moved to England for a while.

```
                                    In terms of what did I do, I
```

think we got there in September '83, so it was either in late '84 or possibly '85 -- it will be
'85 -- I had wracked my brains on -- we had no resources, that was the whole problem, we were fighting the state with no resources, so I suddenly had the bright idea to write to the Fifth Estate. I didn't know anybody there, but I wrote quite a long letter to the Fifth Estate producers, thinking "well this might be right up your street, this case, here's what $I$ know about it, and it really disturbs me and this is why it disturbs me, you ought to pursue it", something along those lines, and $I$ sent it off to Toronto. And then I heard back from them, they were interested, and they asked me for a skeleton, more detail, who should they talk to, and $I$ remember sending that off to them, and then $I$ kind of lost track of it. But it's my understanding the Fifth Estate did in fact start some investigative work, I wasn't involved in it, and that again $I$ think they did some interviews, and $I$ thought they are the right people, they have got CBC money, they have got staff, they can do what $I$ couldn't do alone or Joyce couldn't do alone, and they did start some work. I kept hearing about that. And they
eventually abandoned it too, and interestingly it's basically for the same reasons $I$ could never break through with the managing editor of Maclean's, that yes it's fascinating, yes the theory is amazing, it looks impossible, but we don't have the bombshell, so they stopped. I'll take you through some documents, and again we'll move chronologically. The first one $I$ want to show to you is a letter from Hersh Wolch, the document is 156666 , you will see the date of the correspondence is April 14th, 1986?

A
Q
A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A Indeed I did. I -- we often talked about the Katie Harper case, oddly enough, driving out to Saskatchewan, and we talked about many things, but

It sounds like this is the beginning of his involvement in the matter?

That would sound about right, ' 86 , yeah.
Did you have any role in terms of Mrs. Milgaard's decision to retain Hersh Wolch on this matter?
she knew of the enormous respect -- I had been involved with Mr. Wolch in the Katie Harper case, and I'm quite certain $I$ said "if you can ever afford to get a lawyer this is the lawyer you need to get", because $I$ had enormous respect for his intelligence. So, yes, I advised her which lawyer to get.

And you respond in a letter 162433, you will see it's a letter to Mr. Wolch from yourself, it's dated April 28th, 1986?

A
$Q$

The second paragraph, $I$ think, goes on to be a suggestion on your part that perhaps the fastest route to obtain materials might be from the Fifth Estate?

That all relevant material, or copies of that material, had been provided to them?

Uh-huh.

You indicate you only have one copy of your own material?

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q

Uh-huh.
And I take it that would have been the case at the time?

Yes, yeah.
And you were wanting to hold onto that material?
Yeah, it was probably the transcript, yup. I know
I had given them a very detailed outline when $I$ first wrote them.

I take you next to 162432, this time it's a letter from David Asper dated June 5th, 1986, again I'll summarize perhaps. He introduces himself in the first paragraph, he notes that he is looking for addresses for some of the key witnesses, Nichol John, Ron Wilson, Albert Cadrain, and then in the last paragraph he indicates an interest in your theories on the case?

Uh-huh.

And you respond at 162430 , a letter from yourself to Mr. Asper, and you give what information you have relating to contact, details on some of the witnesses?

Uh-huh.
And, if we get down to this portion here, perhaps I'll read this to you:
"I can't go into a synopsis of why David
is unlikely to have committed the murder here, except to say that a careful study of the transcripts, timing, distances, temperatures etc. all make it unlikely he did it. Time is critical: the church caretaker saw the likely murderer at 7.10 am in the headlights of a car parked at the murder spot. At this time the trio were many blocks away at the Travel-eer Motel. Physical evidence re. Miller's clothing also suggests she was assaulted in a car (cf.subzero temps. and unlikelihood of an outdoor rape) and pulled her coat up and made a run for it --- then was caught and stabbed. Note evidence re. knife holes in her clothing/back."

And, again, would that be an accurate summary of your view on the case, or some of the high points in terms of your view of the case at that time? Yeah, they would. I didn't -- it's very skimpy, is that. But one thing $I$ had forgotten is I've always been convinced that the attack was in a car, and $I$ do remember now, $I$ did check with some doctors at the Winnipeg Health Sciences Centre at
one point between '81 and '3 as to whether it were even physically possible, at minus 40 , for a man spontaneously to commit the crime like that and rape somebody, and the answer was categorically "don't think so". So that's another bit of research $I$ had done.

Do you know who you had made those inquiries with?
I can't give you a name, but they were people who had to do with people who had suffered from frostbite and, you know, they had an interest in cryogenics.

Okay.

But the -- I'm -- it was a simple question, "at minus 40 do you think it's even likely a man could even do this on a -- standing up in a back lane" and the answer was "no".

Okay. Turn you to the next page of this letter. Just a quick note. I see in the last sentence you mention:
"Cadrain is definitely a romancer and, of course, he did get the $\$ 2000$ police reward."

A Uh-huh.
$Q$
And you still considered that information, then, significant?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
$Q$
I'll turn you next to 156668 , and you will see the date on this correspondence October 2nd, 1989, directed to yourself, the second page of this will propping up, you know.
indicate that it's from Mr. Asper again.

A

Q

Uh-huh.
And perhaps I'll summarize the contents of the letter again for you and read just a portion of it. The -- he notes the application that is being put forward on David's behalf to the Department of Justice, and gives you a bit of a summary of where that's at, he in the second paragraph gives you an update on involvement by the media in the case? Uh-huh.

And then if we turn to the next page, I'll read this portion to you, it indicates:
"A couple of weeks ago, Sandra Bartlette wrote to David and asked that he give Sandra permission to write a book on the case. David has declined to grant this permission for two reasons. First, he feels and unwaivering loyalty to you and would very much prefer that if a book is written that it be written by you.

Secondly, there are lingering suspicions about Sandra arising out of the whole Fifth Estate incident. Both David and Joyce feel very uncomfortable dealing with Sandra because they simply cannot
predict her approach or sympathies.
While I am sure that we could develop some kind of a level of comfort with Sandra, $I$ think that the Milgaards are absolutely correct in suggesting that $I$ write to you to enquire as to whether you might be interested in going ahead with publishing your version of the case. Your efforts in large measure are why we are where we are today and if anyone should benefit from publishing, it seems to me that you would be that person.

I would appreciate your communicating with either myself of Joyce and advising as to your thoughts on this matter. I can tell you that both Joyce and David are very eager to have you become re-involved and I share their belief that you deserve whatever you can get as a result of your efforts."

And do you recall this correspondence from Mr. Asper?

A
Not until $I$ read it recently, no.

And do you have any idea what he was speaking of when he talks of lingering suspicions about Sandra Bartlett?

A
I wasn't really -- $I$ mean $I$ was in England. I don't think they trusted her. I don't, I can't remember exactly why, but they weren't sure, perhaps, if she had some other connections that might not be favourable to David, I think. Some -- I'm really not privy to exactly what the problem was with her, $I$ really don't remember. Did you have any --

A

Q

A
A
Well it was always there in the background. I can't tell you categorically when $I$ said -- I don't know. You know what, my role had evolved by then, $I$ was busy with other things in England and

I think what $I$-- I was quite happy to pass the torch on to people like the Fifth Estate, people who had resources or anybody who could do anything, and $I$ was even happier when she got a lawyer, finally, and that David Asper turned out to be one of them, because in terms of the media, when $I$ first met her $I$ said "stop doing that", you know, "you are making any investigation more difficult because of the hostility". But at the end, of course, the media did play a critical role in helping get to the truth of this case, so Asper was actually the perfect choice, because he had connections, and I give credit to David Asper for getting the media interested. I had failed to do that, even with Maclean's, so --

We'll move into 1990 , and in 1990 we have on record a transcript of a radio broadcast involving the CBC and Peter Leo.

Uh-huh.

And I'll just perhaps bring up the transcript, it's 054119, and I'm not going to read any specific portions but the interview included extracts from your discussions with Mr. Caldwell in 1983. Were you aware of the fact that extracts from that interview were going to be used in an
interview in later years or a broadcast in later years?

A
No. Nobody was more shocked. I found out about this program a few weeks ago. I never heard it and nobody ever told me about it. So, no, I had no connection with it.

And what did you do when you recently found out about it?

I was very annoyed, and $I$ wrote to the CBC, I think $I$ wrote to the ombudsman, and $I$ said "I can't understand how one of my tapes could have been used without my permission." First of all, it's a copyright infringement and you would think CBC would know better, so $I$ was kind of ticked off about it, and $I$ had a letter of apology and sort of an explanation from the senior lawyer of CBC. I have a copy if you would like me to read it. We will turn to it in a moment, but do you have any idea, then, how the tape had made it to the CBC?

A
Well, I have a vague idea now. At the time $I$ think $I$ phoned Joyce and said "do you know anything about this program", and she said "no, I can't remember". But it turns out that whoever made the program had been doing some work
interviewing Joyce, and she had a whole box load of materials including mine, and $I$ think this guy said -- Peter Leo, that's his name, I don't know him -- "do you mind if $I$ look at these, borrow them or whatever", and she probably just said "well sure, go ahead because it might help us", you know. So what happened is he obviously snipped one of my interviews and used it without even seeking permission.

Now if they had approached me -and this is, when was it, in 1990 -1990.
-- so I'd be back in Canada -- I would have declined to let them use that tape. I would, however, have offered them an interview to give my opinions of what, you know, of what was going on. But $I$ was annoyed, because it kind of put me in an embarrassing position, because Mr. Caldwell had certainly only understood that this was for a book or a Maclean's article or something, and $I$ can imagine he was very surprised to hear it, I was very surprised to hear about it, so if he had any objection $I$ don't blame him, quite frankly.

I think we have confirmed you had a number of these tapes, and perhaps you left a number of them
with Joyce, at least those that would be considered important. What authority had you provided in terms of the use of the tapes or what was your anticipated use of those recordings?

I basically, well $I$ knew she had got a lawyer too, they could borrow any of that stuff, Joyce could or the lawyers could, that was fine with me.

In terms of other media, no, I
would want to be knowing about that. That was my work, a lot of time invested, so --

What about the Fifth Estate, had authority been provided to allow the Fifth Estate to use those materials?

Not from me.
You had mentioned in that previous letter that we looked at that you thought perhaps the best route to obtain various materials for Mr. Wolch or Mr. Asper, I can't recall, would have been a direct request to the Fifth Estate?

Yeah, but the Fifth Estate had no permission to use any of my tapes, they were doing original research and doing -- they were interviewing people I suggested. That was their -- no, I never dissolved any copyright on the show, no.

And perhaps you can tell us again; what action did
you recently take in terms of learning this information?

A

Q

A
$Q$

Oh, well $I$ forget, was it October or sometime around there $I$ heard about this and I, well I kind of hit the roof at first, and I thought "what's this all about". So $I$ contacted the $C B C$, and $I$ had a letter of apology from the senior counsel, and an explanation.

And perhaps reference will bring that up. 333218.
And it's in an Email form --
Right.
-- to yourself from Michael Hughes. 'Dear
Mr. Carlyle-Gordge: I've been asked to respond to your Email addressed to CBC's Ombudsman, and would like to say at the outset that CBC regrets any embarrassment you may experience as a result of CBC's broadcast of excerpts of your interview with Mr. Caldwell.

I have spoken with Mr. Leo, who produced the Sunday morning program about David Milgaard in 1990, and he recalls his several conversations and meetings with Mr. Milgaard's mother, Joyce Milgaard, in the course of preparing the documentary. She spoke very highly of you, as she did in her book "A Mother's Story", and of
your role in getting the wheels in motion which ultimately led to David Milgaard's total exoneration.

At the meeting she also showed
Mr. Leo a box containing a number of audio cassettes, one of which was of your interview with Mr. Caldwell. When Mr. Leo asked if he could borrow the cassette for use in his documentary, I doubt if it occurred to either of them that there might be a problem with that. Certainly, none was expressed. In fairness to Mrs. Milgaard, I have to remind myself that at that time her son was still in jail for a murder he did not commit, and she was working with all her energy to free him. I have not spoken to her about this but $I$ wonder if she did not view the interview with Mr. Caldwell as a possible step towards her son's liberation which you had given her and that Mr. Leo could use it if he thought it potentially useful.

> I once again regret any
awkwardness or embarrassment this use may cause you in any way but $I$ can assure you that Mr. Leo's and CBC's intentions were entirely honourable and not in any way of the type and character you
suggest.'
And I haven't referred to your initiating letter, and $I$ don't have a document ID for that, and $I$ believe we may be in possession of -- was it an Email that initiated your concern? Yes, yes it was, yes.

And perhaps $I$ will look for that and get a document $I D$ for that once we've located it.

Okay.
But that would be an accurate account of the response that you received?

Yes, and I can accept that the motives were good, but --

Okay.
-- they still -- you'd think they would have known better.

I turn you next to a further document from 1990, 159819 .

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Excuse me, sir.
Maybe I missed, misheard you, but I thought your theory was that Mr. Leo had 'clipped' -- that's what $I$ heard you said -- 'clipped' the tape from Joyce Milgaard; do you mean stole?

A No. Umm --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: How could his
motives be good if that's what he did?
A
I think what happened was they probably made a copy of a tape and used a snippet of it. I haven't even heard the program, you see, so I don't even know what's in the program.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, no, but I'm interested in what you think happened to get the tape from Joyce Milgaard's hands into Mr. Leo's hands?

Well $I$ was curious about how $C B C$ had ended up with it, yes.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You said you thought that he had 'clipped' it; what do you mean by that?
'Clipped'? Taken a piece out of a copy of it. They made a copy of it, presumably, and then $I$ don't know if they had 30 -seconds or a 60 -second quote they wanted, or something like that.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh. Okay. So you are not implying that he did it without Joyce Milgaard's knowledge?

Oh no, no, no, no, not at all. Not at all.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.
BY MR. HARDY:

Yes, that's the document. I see it's an article
in the Winnipeg Free Press August 1st, 1990 -- I shouldn't say article, a letter -- and it indicates from yourself?

Hmm.

You were in England at the time; that would be correct?

Yes. I had forgotten about this, yeah.
Do you recall writing this letter now, or it was --

Yeah, it was a letter to the editor, yeah. And I'll refer you to portions of it, we'll start with this section, and you indicate:
"I have followed reports of new evidence in the David Milgaard case with considerable interest, since $I$
investigated it over eight years ago and concluded beyond any reasonable doubt
that Milgaard was as innocent of the murder of Gail Miller as $I$ am. Strictly from a timing point of view, it would have been quite impossible for him to have carried out the deed and even the most cursory examination of the trial and statements would convince any reasonable person
that there was something extremely fishy about the evidence of the key Crown witness.

I put all these conclusions in a book ('Winnipeg Eight, published by Queenston House) but nothing happened and David Milgaard has continued to languish in prison, from where he still occasionally writes to me."

A
Uh-huh.
"After 21 years, he still insists he is innocent and cannot understand the delays by the Justice Department in reopening his case. Neither can I.

Saskatoon police chief Joseph

Penkala adds insult to Milgaard's considerable injury by attacking the news media for their role in exposing the shortcomings of the Crown's case and for their "insensitivity ... for the victims of a very heinous crime that occurred in 1969."

Chief Penkala may well be right that the latest publicity is painful for relatives of Gail Miller, but he seems
curiously indifferent to the feelings of David Milgaard's family - in particular those of his mother, Joyce Milgaard, who has fought tirelessly to prove her son's innocence.

In my view David Milgaard is as much the victim of a "heinous crime" as Gail Miller was. The only difference is that the state, not an individual, was the perpetrator of the crime against him."

And would that be an accurate indication of your viewpoint, Mr. Carlyle-Gordge, at this point in time?

Absolutely.

And you continue on in the next paragraph to state:
"If the Saskatoon Police are satisfied that all is well with the Milgaard conviction, why did they contact all the chief witnesses in the early 1980 s advising them not to talk to

Mrs. Milgaard, myself, or anyone else?" I think we've referred to that aspect previously in your testimony, Mr. Carlyle-Gordge?

A Correct, yeah.
Q
Reading on from there:
"Having the opportunity to peruse all the police files relating to this case, I would also like to know why they failed to check the alibi of a man they interviewed about the murder in 1969.

This man, currently in prison for violent rape offences, lived in the vicinity of the murder and told police he was at work on the date of the murder.

They clearly never checked this alibi because his former wife has now come forward and said he was not at work that day and his behaviour was suspicious."

And we can skip over the next portion to the -sorry, here you state:
"It is extremely hard for the state to admit its justice system can sometimes err badly, but the fact remains that it is only as good as the people operating
it. In the Milgaard case, it seems
clear that more than sheer incompetence
is involved. Police threats against Ron Wilson unless he told them exactly what they wanted to hear (true or not), borders on deliberate perversion of the course of justice and are frankly evil." And do you recall, $I$ think we tried to get at this yesterday as well, but do you recall in particular what threats we're referring to here? Well I'm referring to the statements changing and, you know, threatening to "you are going to be charged with the murder, you know, if you don't tell us more", that kind of intimidation that led to the change in the statements.

And do you recall specifically where you had gathered that information?

Umm, specifically, no.

But that was your viewpoint on the matter?

Yeah, that was my viewpoint.

And if $I$ just conclude this letter:
"When Mr. Milgaard is finally exonerated

- as indeed he will be, as surely as
spring follows winter - let us hope the guilty men in this affair are called to account rather than some whitewashing press statement being issued.
critical and important role in exposing
this case and its shortcomings and I
hope they continue to do so, however
uncomfortable it makes Chief Penkala or
anyone else. The state's case is
utterly flawed and $I$ hope it will make
just and generous restitution to both
Mr. Milgaard and his family when the
matter is finally resolved in his
favour, as it will be."

A

Q

A
$Q$
Right.

And, again, that would be an accurate account of
your feelings on the matter at the time?
My very strong feelings at the time, yeah.
This is perhaps a good time to break, Mr.
Commissioner.
(Adjourned at 3:00 p.m.)
(Reconvened at 3:22 p.m.)

BY MR. HARDY:

I turn your attention next, Mr. Carlyle-Gordge, to document 159912. This is another article from the Winnipeg Sun, and you'll note the date, May 26 th, 1991, A Mother's Crusade, Faith in God Keeps Joyce Milgaard Going, and it looks like it was by
yourself, by Peter Carlyle-Gordge, for the Sun?

A

Q

A
$Q$

A Right.

Do you recall writing this article?
Not really. It is my article though, yeah.
And I'm not going to review any specific portions with you. Where would you have been at that -I was back in Winnipeg then, May, '91, come back from England in August, '90 I think, and I wasn't really deeply involved, you know, she had lawyers by that point working on all this stuff, and often, you know, back in '81 and '83 when $I$ was getting to know her, driving around Saskatchewan we would have long philosophical discussions about good and bad and her particular religion, which is Christian Science, so I've always known the spiritual aspect was very important for Joyce, and that Winnipeg 8 book, Two Kinds of Liberty, was about spiritual liberty and the actual freedom of her son.

I turn you to another article as well, 229199, you'll see it says here, I believe, Toronto Star?

A
$Q$
A
$Q$


The title of the article "Clearing his name tops

Milgaard's list," by Peter Carlyle-Gordge, special to the Star?

A
Uh-huh.
Rockwood Institution, and it seems to be based upon an exclusive 90 minute interview that you had at the time with David Milgaard?

Yes, yes, it would be.
And you recall that?
Well, $I$ can recall writing it because $I$ really hadn't written anything about him other than the piece in the Sun. I'm trying to remember if $I$ was actually with him or if $I$ talked to him on the phone. Maybe I went out to the prison to do it, I don't know. I can't remember.

You were living in Winnipeg at this time though? I was.

I'm going to move forward a bit in time, Mr.
Carlyle-Gordge. We're aware that the RCMP
conducted an investigation into alleged
wrongdoings surrounding the Milgaard matter and
their investigation was conducted in or about
1993?
A
Uh-huh.
And do you recall being contacted by the RCMP in that regard?

A Yes, I do.
Q
We'll take a look at $I$ believe what is a transcript of an interview that they had conducted with you, the document is 022240 , you'll note the title page, the reference is statement of Peter Carlyle-Gordge, date, June 17th, 1993, taken by Corporal Templeton, Constable Dyck, Regina R.C.M. Police, and $I$ understand you've had an opportunity to review this transcript previously?

I have, yes.
And are you comfortable with the accuracy of its contents?

Yes.
Just a couple of portions $I$ wanted to bring to your attention for comment, the first being at 022242, speaking about some of your inquiries from the beginning, you indicate:
"I did, yeah. I went to Saskatoon and I went there with Mrs. Milgaard. I made it quite clear to her that $I$ wasn't, she was offering a reward by the way of ten thousand dollars. I made it clear to her that's not why $I$ was involved. There were two reasons. One, I was thinking about a book on unusual murder
cases, including the Katy Harper (phonetic) one. And the other one was Maclean's and in fact that, this is back in nineteen, late nineteen eighty, nineteen eighty-one, and up until I think probably the end of nineteen eighty-two I stayed involved." Uh-huh.

And again would that be an accurate account of your motivation initially for your involvement? Initially, yeah, it would. If we turn to the next page, there's some discussion about your visit with Mr. Caldwell, I'm going to read a portion of what you state. You indicate:
"He very kindly, he was very co-operative by the way, he arranged for me to see the police files on the investigation. Gave me an office downtown in Saskatoon. I think I spent an afternoon there going over the documents. I'm sure they weren't all
there, by the way, the documents but."

And in terms of your indication of your recollection of Mr. Caldwell and your visit with
him, I think you've already confirmed for us previously what you state here, and that would be an accurate account of your recollection?

A

Q

Yes.
And in terms of the comment about you being sure that all of the documents weren't there --Uh-huh.
-- do you recall what you were referring to at this point?

I can't be positive. I might have been thinking of, you know, some other police stuff that perhaps

I shouldn't see. I mean, I had no control over what was there obviously. I don't know exactly what $I$ was thinking when they asked that.

Was it simply a suspicion that you had that you may not have seen all of the police documents?

Well, I think Mr. Caldwell had referred to all
that stuff about Calgary too, you know, with
Milgaard. I really at this distance cannot think what I meant by that. I hadn't seen them all.

Well, $I$ didn't think $I$ would see everything, $I$
thought some would be culled out, you know. Is it
suspicious? No, I don't think so.
Yeah, and $I$ didn't mean to use that word --
No.

Q -- in a way that perhaps it sounded, but I guess what $I$ was asking is, is that just a hunch you had perhaps that --

Oh, yeah.
-- that you hadn't seen all the documents? You had no specific knowledge of that fact?

No, no, no, no.
Near the bottom of the page there's mention of the police report that speaks of Larry Fisher, and if we go on to the next page, you indicate here to the RCMP officers:
"Another thing I did, I talked to Mrs. Cadrain, that's at the house where David went that morning. Um, basically to try and find out if anybody else had been in the house that $I$ could talk to who may have seen or heard anything like that. And $I$ became aware that there were a couple living in the basement, the Fishers, but $I$ wasn't terribly interested in them other than it might have been useful if $I$ could have found them. Just to ask did you hear anything that day or see anything unusual. Um, anyway, I, $I$ couldn't immediately find
them but $I$ think Mrs. Cadrain indicated there he got a murky past. This is probably nineteen eighty-one $I$ talked to her. Um, but I didn't go into that
'cause $I$ wasn't really following that up too."

Uh-huh.

And would that be an accurate account of -Yes.
-- the information you provided? And that was your best recollection of matters relating to your discussion with Mrs. Cadrain?

Yes, uh-huh.

And again $I$ think you tried to recall for us, but in terms of Ms. Cadrain indicating that Mr. Fisher had a murky past, do you have any specific recollection of how she detailed that for you? Well, now I'm thinking now of what Albert said. I knew they split up and stuff and of course there was that one phone call to her. It's kind of a blank, you know, things hadn't gone well with him, stuff like that.

Okay.
He served some time wherever.

Just reading on from where $I$ was, it indicates, or
you indicate:
"With hindsight $I$ think the worst thing that happened with my involvement is
the, at one point, $I$ put an ad in the Saskatoon Star Phoenix trying to locate Linda Fisher. Or Mr. Fisher."

Pause there. You indicate or start to state I think the worst thing that happened with my involvement is --

Well, with hindsight, because by '93 I knew about the interview with Mrs. Fisher, I knew about the 1980 visit to the police and we were so close and yet so far.

Okay. Just moving down the page, reading here, this is again you speaking:
"And we did actually have a call or a letter from Fisher, but um, that could've been early eighty-three. By
that time I'd sort of withdrawn quite a lot from the case and $I$ was going to England for a year. I went there for a sabbatical. So we never actually followed up on Fisher in eighty-two or three. If we had this, this thing may have altered much faster than it did."

The top of the next page, question:
"You mentioned in nineteen eighty-three you received a letter from Linda Fisher or Larry Fisher?"

Answer:
"Now, I have a feeling it was the boyfriend of Linda Fisher, I don't think it was her actually, it was somebody who was living with her or knew her while.

And they basically said what's this all about. Um."

Question:
"Okay, can $I$ just interject for a second. At this time are you still
actively seeking Linda Fisher, ah' advertisements in the paper and that sort of thing?"

Answer:
"Sorry what year are we talking about?"

Question:
"Okay you said you received a letter
from ah' Fisher or a friend of Fisher's in nineteen eighty-three?"

Answer:
"Yeah, probably early eighty three."

Question:
"Early eighty-three?"
Answer:
"I think so."
Question:
"Were you still actively seeking her publicly?"

Answer:
"It was sort of an a back burner. It was something $I$ did and then we got a reply, but $I$ was sort of getting out of the case and I didn't carry on with it."

Question:
"This person that, that wrote you a letter, ah' do you recall a name?"

Answer:
"No. It was a man though."
Question:
"It was a man. Did he indicate in the letter how he came to know about you and in order to write you?"

Answer:
"Oh yeah, they seen the add in the Star Phoenix. Yeah."

Question:
"And what was the content of that
letter?"

Answer:
"It basically said ah' he knew where
Linda Fisher was and what was all this about, could I get in touch."

Question:
"Did you respond to that letter?
Answer:
"No I didn't."
Question:
"Did you make that letter known to Mrs. Milgaard?"

Answer:
"Very recently I think I did, a year ago. Yeah, cause $I$ just found it, it was, I had about two suitcases full of stuff?"

A
Q
That's very interesting.
And just in terms of the initial portion of what $I$ read to you, you seem to have a recollection here of receiving the letter from the boyfriend as you refer to him, and would that be accurate then, you had a recollection at this point in time?

A
In '93, I guess so, yeah, yeah.

Q
A
$Q$

A
Q

A

Q
A

Q

A

Q

A
A
No. I mean, obviously at some point the lawyer had the letter. I can't even remember when they actually found Mrs. Fisher now, but obviously it that aspect? Cen
got put on one side.
And if that is the case, do you have any idea or recollection of what Mrs. Milgaard may have known about your efforts in terms of the advertisement in 1983 and the apparent response from Bryan and Linda at that time?

No, I don't recollect anything.
Okay. And I realize we're just trying to piece this together, but $I$ take it from what you are telling me, that it's a possibility that you had those materials yourself?

Uh-huh.

But perhaps hadn't provided them to Mrs. Milgaard until --

Well --
Q
-- much later?
A
Yeah. I can't remember what was happening to me in March, April, '83 --

No, fair enough.
-- and it could have been shoved to one side and forgotten possibly.

Okay.
A
Also I have to underline, my interest in them, although $I$ was interested in them, it was in a minor way, not as suspects.

Q
Okay. Move to the next page, please, perhaps you confirmed this here, but I'll read it to you:
"So my mind had been on other tracks you see, rather than Fisher. I didn't know anything about Fisher. I didn't know if ah' I didn't know until recently, his record or anything like that."

Uh-huh.
And that would be accurate in terms of what you were aware of in 1993?

Absolutely.
And what you recalled?
Yes.
We'll move to page 022249 , the question is asked, and they are speaking of talking with, or you speaking with -- or talking, excuse me, with Joyce initially, and the question is asked:
"Did she indicate what specifically she was dissatisfied with? Or what her specific concerns may have been?"

Answer:
"Um', not in a very focused way. She thought he'd been railroaded basically." Question:
"Did she indicate what she would base
that on?"
Answer:
"I can't remember. She, I think she was coming at it logically. She said none of the testimony made any sense, as to, you know, did Nichol Demyen see this? Who saw, who went which direction, all that stuff. None of that made sense to her and it bothered her. I suppose as a Mother, she didn't think her son could have done a thing like that, and $I$ confronted her with that, I said, you know you realize I'm not necessarily going to believe there's a miscarriage. I'll have to look into it and see what I think. I, think she had a lot of reasons, but she just didn't, never did believe that he'd actually killed somebody."

And would that be accurate in terms of your description of some of your initial contact with Joyce Milgaard when you became involved in the matter?

A
Yeah. I would add one thing to that, this word railroaded, $I$ know soon after $I$ met Joyce, and I
can't tell you where the information came from, but when David had been convicted in 1970 and went to prison, I know Joyce, and I don't know the source, had information that the people in prison, the convicts knew he didn't do it, they knew he was innocent, he had been set up, I remember Joyce talking about that.

Okay.
Where it came from I don't know.

Okay. I turn you to 022261, just at the top of the page you state at this point:
"Yeah, that always bothered me and still does. I don't know what happened, I can tell you what $I$ think happened. I think the Saskatoon Police probably leaned on them, they were all very young, I know this happens, they were under tremendous pressure. It was a horrible murder, and they were supposed to get some results. And I think they did lean on them. And you know Wilson was in a bit of trouble anyway, at that time $I$ seem to remember, and ah' I think they were pressured. I honestly believe that, I do."

And would this be a good indication of your view
on the police and their dealings with the main witnesses during the course of your work?

Yes, and $I$ was telling this to the police.
Yes.

And there were two other factors, one was finance, and $I$ think that came out in an interview $I$ did, that the police had worked around the murder for a whole month and nothing, they got nothing to go on, and there was something about, you know, we need to get some result, there's a budget, it costs money to keep doing this kind of thing, that's one factor.

The other one I introduced was simply a systemic bias possibly, David Milgaard was what we call a hippie at that time, doing pot and stuff, and let's face it, kind of on the wild side, so $I$ think there was a tendency to demonise him from day one.

Okay. And I didn't direct you to that portion of your discussion with Mr. Mackie, but there is some discussion about the budgetary aspect that you referred to --

Right.
-- in that meeting with Mr. Mackie I believe. If we turn to 022261 -- oh, I'm sorry, is that --
just give me a moment.
A
Uh-huh.
It's page 25 of this document that I'm looking for. That's the one. If we start here, the question is asked:
"Did you interview any of the
investigators of the Gail Miller murder?"

Answer:
"One. And I'm, I'm trying to, I was
trying to remember when you phoned me
the other day whether it was Cast,
(phonetic). I think it was Cast
(phonetic). Yeah, it was him Saskatoon.
And he'd retired whoever it was, he'd
retired. Um, I think it was Cast
(phonetic)."
Question:
"Where did that interview take place?"
Answer:
"At his home."
Question:
"And how did you find this man to be?"
Answer:
"I think he, he, well, he had a memory
problem too. Like everybody does after awhile. But $I$ think he really believed he got the right guy, you know, I think he was genuine. He didn't like David Milgaard, I certainly had that impression from day one. He did not like him. He thought he, he looked innocent but, he had the strong impression that he was a real manipulator. Um, trying to remember what incident he used to illustrate that, can't remember now. But anyway, he just told me what he could remember of the case and he was absolutely sure they got the right guy and he was a very dangerous man indeed, David Milgaard." Question:
"When would that have been?"

Answer:
"And he, he hinted at the psychiatric history, by the way, this policeman did and that people had been around and interviewed previous girlfriends, this kind of thing. And he was a definitely very dangerous person, and not to be
trusted sexually. I certainly got that
from the policeman. Um, but I've never
found any evidence myself."
And I'm wondering in terms of your previous
answers to some of the questions I had, was this
perhaps reference to your discussion with Mr.
Mackie?
"He was very co-operative, I would say
that."
And, sorry, talking of Mr. Caldwell and your
meetings with him:
"He was very co-operative, I would say
that. Um, he certainly made things
available to me. He gave me a long interview and $I$ taped that $I$ remember. He was very proud of the case, you know, he was quite proud of it and he told me also, I remember one thing he told me, that whenever Milgaard's case came up for review, he would send photographs of the murder to the board 'cause he was damned and determined that guy would never get out of prison, you know, as long as he was out. No, I can see his point of view. It was a difficult case he prosecuted and they got what they." And it stops there.

Wanted probably.
And in terms of the mention of Mr. Caldwell sending photographs to the board --

A
Uh-huh.
-- at the time, I didn't see that information in the transcript of the discussions that you had with him, and perhaps I'm mistaken on that, but do you recall him advising you of that information? Oh, yes, absolutely, that is what was said. And do you recall any other details beyond what's written here?

A
No, it kind of came out of the blue, that bit, because I don't remember whether I actually asked about parole, $I$ may have done, but if you'll recall, $I$ first got intrigued by this case because people usually were imprisoned for an average of seven years, he'd been in for 12 by the time $I$ got to the Milgaard case, and he was quite young, and I had often wondered, you know, how come he's not been paroled and such, so that was voluntarily offered information by Mr. Caldwell, and it did kind of surprise me, but it kind of made me understand a bit better why he was still in prison. He did mention sending photographs and this section also reminds me of the tail-end of my interview with Albert Cadrain where he says, I don't have the transcript, but that after the trial was over the police had said to him, Albert, don't you worry about a thing, he's going away forever -- I'm paraphrasing, you know -- kind of we'll look after you, you've got nothing to worry about, he'll never get out. That's what takes me back to that, that's my thought process.

Okay. Move to the next page, 022266, just a brief mention, a question as to whether $I$ believe you had contacted Mr. Tallis in your work.

A

Q

A

Q
A

Q

A

Q

A

Q
A

Q

A

Uh-huh.
As you've confirmed for us, you indicate that you think, or you thought at that point that you had written to him?

Yeah.

And that is your recollection?
Yeah, I'm pretty certain I did write a letter to him, but got no response and I didn't really -Okay.
-- pursue it.
Those are the only portions of the interview that
I wanted to show to you. A few follow-up
documents, the first being 061364, you'll see it's
a letter dated September 3rd, 1993 directed to
yourself enclosing the transcript of the interview
with the RCMP. Do you recall receiving a copy of
the transcript of your interview?
Yeah, I think I do, yeah.
And was it the transcript that we've just looked at?

This document moves backwards, we're looking at the last page of the document, and it's a collection of notes by the RCMP relating to their meeting with you.

Uh-huh.
And it comes in large part from the transcript of the interview that we just looked at, and $I$ won't review that portion of it, but on the next page of this document there is a further update that I'll read to you, and $I$ see the date is January 21 st, 1994 at the top of the page.

Uh-huh.

Again this is an RCMP note and it states:
"This update is to clarify a concern raised by Joyce Milgaard during our interview with her in February 1993 and to outline the final outcome of our investigation into the issue she raised."

It indicates the specific point file number.
"A review of the taped interview with Joyce Milgaard located the concern in question. Mrs. Milgaard spoke about one of the interviews done by Carlyle-Gordge with T.D.R. Caldwell, in which comments
were made that tend to suggest collusion between Tallis \& Caldwell. ("they were doing it together" "they put him away together")

From the material I have reviewed to date, I have come across nothing that would directly or indirectly support this concern." Uh-huh. interview file \& transcribed interview between Caldwell \& Carlyle-Gordge, Caldwell's prosecution file, which contained a variety of papers, such as letters to the N.P.B.)

In an effort to further deal with this concern, $I$ contacted Mr. Carlyle-Gordge by telephone this morning. I outlined the issue raised by Mrs. Milgaard, in that she had taken from one of his interviews with Caldwell, a suggestion that Caldwell \& Tallis had worked together to put someone away, or words to that effect.
Carlyle-Gordge does not recall

Caldwell making such a statement to him and could not see Caldwell doing so."

And do you recall this follow-up conversation with an RCMP officer respecting this issue?

Vaguely.
What do you recall?
Umm, yeah, $I$ think they did get back to me to ask about that. We went through the transcript of my interview with Mr. Caldwell. Then you had an extra page didn't you?

That's right.
And that sounded accurate to me, what was on that page. They were talking about working on some previous thing; were they not?

And we can go back --
To give you a simple answer, I don't ever remember Mr. Caldwell saying they had worked to put David Milgaard away, for instance, no.

And would you have any knowledge of Joyce's concerns apparently expressed to the RCMP at this point in time and the source of her information for those concerns?

A

Q
No.
And $I$ brought that previous transcript to your attention and you and $I$ can only guess whether it
may have come from that particular transcript, and of course we'll ask Mrs. Milgaard herself when she testifies.

A

Okay. Turn to 039220 , this is another report by the RCMP, and I don't, I apologize, have a date on this one, but $I$ believe it's in and around the same time period, and you'll note it states:
"Other issues:
Asper recalled that author Peter Gorge mentioned having seen incident reports in Caldwells files and correspondence in which Caldwell asked the police about the other incidents. This is not supported by our review of the material or our interview with Gorge. Asper
indicated he would confirm this point. No further action will be taken unless verification is received." I'm sorry we don't have more information on this aspect for you, Mr. Carlyle-Gordge, but do you have any knowledge as to what that entry may have related to?

No. I have a feeling I'm in England when this is going on for some reason.

Okay.
No, I can't help.
MR. HARDY: Those are all of the questions that I have for you, Mr. Carlyle-Gordge. My Friends may have some questions for you. I'm not sure if we're venturing at this point into cross-examination?

MR. HODSON: As I stated earlier, Mr. Commissioner, I think we still have to address the issue of the application for next week and $I$ think we were going to do that at four o'clock, but maybe we can have an indication today of who is going to cross-examine, or examine Mr. Carlyle-Gordge, and perhaps order, and then maybe whether we start tomorrow or start for 10 minutes today, I'm not sure. My
understanding is that Ms. Knox intends to examine, Mr. Boychuk may examine, or will?

MR. BOYCHUK: Yeah.
MR. HODSON: Will examine, and that Mr.
Wolch and Ms. McLean are not sure yet, and I think there may be an issue as to order. Have I incorrectly stated any of that? So maybe if we want to -- I'm in your hands whether we start the cross, or the examination today. If we don't, maybe we can sort out order and then start tomorrow at nine and then move on with -- excuse Mr. Carlyle-Gordge and then deal with the -COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, I would like to deal with the issue about the application next week. If Mr. Carlyle-Gordge would just accuse us for a moment, you can remain seated there, and I don't think that will take us very long, and then we can start his cross-examination.

MR. HODSON: Okay. So you want to deal now with the application issues for next week?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.
MR. HODSON: Certainly. Just by -- a bit by way of background. The notice of motion and report of Dr. Baillie was filed Monday; the report of Mr . Grymaloski was filed back in

November. Although it's not referred to in the motion, it's referred to in the report of Dr. Baillie, and $I$ checked with Mr. Wolch today who tells me that he is in fact relying upon the report of Mr. Grymaloski. Earlier, Mr. Commissioner, you had indicated that, as part of this application, that once the motion was filed, that anybody who had evidence in support would appear and give viva voce evidence and be examined, and so today $I$ would propose that we set a date for next week, being Wednesday and Thursday, to hear the application, number 1; and number 2, to have Mr. Grymaloski and Dr. Baillie present, and I'll come back to the procedure in just a moment.

We do have Mr. Henderson
testifying Monday and Tuesday, who is from Seattle, I'm not sure if we'll get done by Tuesday so when $I$ say Wednesday-Thursday I wouldn't mind just a bit of room, we may have to just finish up Mr. Henderson. I want to leave enough time to deal with the application, and in my discussions with counsel I am told that two days may be necessary, so; third, just --
following week, though, don't we?
MR. HODSON: Certainly.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah.
MR. HODSON: And, no, that's fine. I think my concern was to get the application done and dealt with, so if we need the two full days to hear Dr. Baillie and Mr. Grymaloski and we're not done with Mr. Henderson, I guess it's a question of who do we bring back the following week. And maybe $I$ can try and sort that out so that we inconvenience the few -- the fewest people possible.

As far as the application
itself, it's my understanding that Mr. Wolch, since it's his application, would lead the evidence of Dr. Baillie and Mr. Grymaloski, and if there's any other evidence that he intends to file in support, or any other witnesses, but I don't think there is, but I'd ask him to confirm that. And as far as other counsels' involvement, it's my understanding that only those counsel who are opposing or taking issue with some or all of the application would then examine Dr. Baillie and Mr. Grymaloski, keeping in mind that the motion is now one not for an exemption but for an
accommodation, and the motion itself specifies the accommodation, being one of written questions and written answers. So I suspect there may be some who take issue with the accommodation at all, some may take issue with -- not with the accommodation, but the type of accommodation sought in the motion, and $I$ don't want to confuse matters, but Dr. Baillie in his report talks about three possible accommodations, the motion itself refers to one of those. So, again, there may be parties who have different interests. I have been made aware by some counsel of concerns about Dr. Baillie testifying at all, given the fact that he has not talked to Mr. Milgaard or obtained certain records, and I will ask counsel to address that in a moment. I just want to lay out all the issues if $I$ can. The last two points are (1) the -- a request has been made by counsel as to what other files or documents that Dr. Baillie and Mr. Grymaloski may have that are relevant, and $I$ think in the usual course when an expert gives evidence his or her working papers, drafts, etcetera, and communications with counsel are normally produced. I think in the case of Dr.

Baillie, I talked to Mr. Wolch, and I think there's one Email that he sent to Dr. Baillie, that he sent a copy to me, and I'm -- Mr. Wolch has indicated $I$ can send that out to counsel as well as my communications with Mr. Wolch, so I will do that.

And I guess the question $I$ want addressed is that if Dr. Baillie and Mr. Grymaloski, when they come out here, we should address today to make sure what it is that they are bringing with them and if there's any disagreement. So with the case of Dr. Baillie, what files does he have and what should he bring with him, similarly with Mr. Grymaloski, I don't know what he has by way of files or other documents, so that's an issue. And certainly the Commission can serve a subpoena on each of these two gentleman that would specify that they bring all their documents if that's an issue, so $I$ raise that.

And the last point, the
publication ban of the hearing, we should -- and I'm not sure that has to be dealt with today --
but Mr. Wolch asked that Dr. Baillie's report
not be disclosed to the public at least on an
interim basis, and so in the event that anybody -- I'm presuming the application itself will be public unless someone requests a ban on publication of some or all of it, so -- and again, in fairness to the media, if there is going to be a publication ban request media may have an interest in being heard on that.

```
                                    So I just -- sorry for -- I
```

guess what $I$ am doing is raising these issues that $I$ think need to be addressed, and $I$ think probably the first one -- I'm not sure if Mr. Wilson, $I$-- who is the one who raised it with me, wishes to address, is whether the motion should proceed on next week at all. And I'm not sure there's other counsel that wish to speak to it, but maybe Mr. Wilson, if you wish to address that?

MR. WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.

I advised Mr. Hodson that I would like to submit that the material that Mr. Wolch has filed in support of his notice of motion, and in fact the notice of motion itself, are far short of the threshold that was established by the Commissioner some weeks ago.

And, if $I$ may just quickly,
could I ask that a transcript from the 8th of November, page 18531, be brought up. At the bottom:
"If he wants to apply to be excused from testifying on psychological grounds, let him ...",
next page:
"... do so in a respectful and
procedurally appropriate manner, through counsel and with evidence."

Page 18534, please. And here,
Mr. Commissioner, you set out the procedures, and I refer to sub (2) there:
"Mr. Wolch will file a notice of motion ... together with affidavits in support of his application for David Milgaard to be excused from testifying on medical or psychological grounds." Now we have a notice of motion
that, if we were across the street in the courthouse, someone might be moving to have much of it struck on the grounds of the material that's included therein, but $I$ leave that aside, and $I$ stay only on the subject of the supporting report that is filed with the notice of motion,
that of one Dr. Patrick Baillie.
But may $I$ move to the $30 t h$ of
November, page 20577. Now here Mr. Hodson
advises us of the descriptions of the inquiries that he proposes to make of Mr. Milgaard before he goes into some more specific areas, and $I$ want to refer to that item at the bottom in
quotations, because it has particular relevance to my client:
"Both during the Inquiry and prior thereto counsel for David Milgaard and others on his behalf have made allegations of wrongdoing against police, the prosecutor, defence counsel, Crown officials, witnesses and others. As a result, there are a number of subject matters that have become relevant in assessing the conduct of persons involved in the investigation and trial of David Milgaard, as well as the reopening of the investigation into Gail Miller's death. Many of these allegations are based, either in whole or in part, on facts of which David Milgaard has or had personal knowledge.

Accordingly, David Milgaard will be questioned on those subject matters of which he has personal knowledge and which form the factual underpinnings necessary to assess the conduct of persons involved in the investigation, trial and post-conviction time period." And my client is very definitely included in that group who have, over the years since Mr. Milgaard was released from jail, been made the subject of character assassination and defamatory public comments by Mr. Milgaard himself and by his agents and counsel, Mr. Wolch, his mother, Mrs. Milgaard, and David Asper. I say no more on that for the moment.

Now if $I$ may turn to page 20580, and that middle paragraph is Mr. Wolch speaking:
"The point that has to be realized is it's not the testifying that's the problem, it's not the speaking, it's the memories that get triggered from it that is the problem, and $I$ don't think anybody really wants to see David back in hospital, and that's what's happened
in the last few years any time he talks about the incident, he's hospitalised shortly thereafter."

Now very shortly after Mr. Wolch advised the Inquiry according to that statement there, Mr. Fox and Ms. Knox made inquiry through Commission Counsel for the records of the hospital stays that Mr. Wolch is referring to, to be part of the material that would be considered on this motion. To this date nothing has been responded to with respect to that request.

Now page 20593 please. Now at the bottom of the page here, Mr. Commissioner, you are speaking about the kind of supporting medical or psychological evidence that is to be brought forward in support of this application of Mr. Milgaard's:
"My idea is to have one medical person or psychological person or psychiatrist, whoever is chosen by Mr. Wolch and proves to be satisfactorily qualified, to give evidence viva voce, and then there won't be any cross-examination on affidavit or anything like that, everybody can get up who has an interest Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv
... so long as I'm satisfied that the person is prepared to offer something substantive and ...",

I emphasize:
"... based upon adequate exposure to David Milgaard to be able to testify." What has been filed in support of the notice of motion is, as Mr. Hodson says, a report from a Dr. Patrick Baillie, who is a practicing psychologist and a lawyer in the City of Calgary, but who has never laid eyes on David Milgaard, has never talked to him, and has based a speculative sort of opinion upon information provided by Mr. Wolch, some from Mr. Grymaloski, and some from a review of Commission files. There is absolutely no medical information other than what he was able to find in the Commission files, and the most recent of that is 1993, and the most recent psychological material that he could find in the files was a matter before the National Parole Board in 1992. And the report is shot through with supposition, in fact, Mr. Commissioner, that is all it consists of.
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```

talks about --------------
--------------------------- and the likelihood that Mr. Milgaard suffers therefrom, and here is a sentence:



--------1 ."

----------------- - "
is:
$\qquad$


Likely.
"--------------------"
Mr. Wolch that is, his mind:

"

Regarding:





",
quote:

---------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------

that is Mr. Wolch:





And my submission to you, Mr.
Commissioner, is that it falls far short of what you intended we would be dealing with, what counsel intended, expected that we would be dealing with, and it's a bit of an effrontery to bring this motion as presently constituted before this Commission, and it would be an inadvisable waste of time to spend two days next week cross-examining Mr. Baillie, who has nothing to offer us.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: The motion of course, Mr. Wilson, is not now one to be excused from testifying, which was the context in which my remarks were made.

MR. WILSON: Oh, true, but --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: It's a motion to get some accommodation in the manner of testifying and the scope.

MR. WILSON: I refer back to --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.

MR. WILSON: Well, but that accommodation
is based, is made on the same basis.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: It has, yes.

MR. WILSON: There is no question about that.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I mean -- yeah, that's true. Yeah, I take your point.

Mr. Wolch, would you care to
respond?
Unless, sir, $I$ really didn't
know that all this was coming up --

A
Okay.

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: -- and it seems unlikely that there will be further questions for you today. Right.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: If you want to watch the rest of this application from your present seat, you may do so, otherwise you are
excused for the day --
A
Thank you.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- and we'll see you at 9:00 in the morning.

I think I'll pay a visit to somewhere and then come back.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.
MR. WOLCH: Mr. Commissioner, I think you addressed the issue quite clearly with your question, and that is that much of the remarks were based on an application to be excused for a lack of fitness.

> The motion now is for an
accommodation, an accommodation that was granted to a number of witnesses herein, without necessitating even a motion it was done. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But, you know, with the consent of all parties.

MR. WOLCH: Oh, I appreciate that. But until we canvass the issue, it's pretty hard to argue before we've heard from Dr. Baillie.

Now in terms of Dr. Baillie
being two days or whatever it might take, quite frankly $I$ don't intend to be very long with Dr. Baillie, I -- Mr. Commissioner. I believe you
may or will have seen his report by now, I take it?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I do, yeah.
MR. WOLCH: I would submit, at the end of it, that it's a thorough report and can address the issues that are required.

This is not a question of
rocket science as to understanding that a man in jail for 23 years for a crime he didn't commit, questioning why I'm here and going through what David did, would be traumatized. That is not a difficult concept. The comment $I$ hear the most is why isn't he traumatized worse from what he went through. So it's not difficult.

The fact that he would have
post-traumatic stress disorder is not surprising under those circumstances, it fits the criteria. This is not a shocking type of revelation. And Dr. Baillie's report, I submit, is comprehensive. He was asked to put it in in a fairly cursory way, so he will be able to expand upon it when he is here, and $I$ don't think there is any, or can be really, in the end of the day, any dispute over the difficulties that David has from what he went through. It's not a very
difficult concept.
The question is, I submit, whether an accommodation can be given or will be given.

And I think there is something
we have to look at at the end of the day, and that is what David can offer to an Inquiry. And we have listed in the notice of motion all the times he has been questioned over and over again, and all the -- and the availability of all that evidence, and it just seems that if people can identify what areas there may not have been covered or could be covered, that would be very helpful. It's true, though, that some counsel are more effective, possibly, than others in terms of what they might want to cover. Clearly the one most covered -- most affected would be Justice Tallis, because he's the one who actually had direct contact with David in terms of something that hasn't been covered, and that's an area that we'll probably hear from counsel on as to what his position is, and maybe we, hopefully we can work it out, and that's helpful.

I'm a little distressed that
counsel for Mr. Kujawa is so concerned about

David when David has never met Mr. Kujawa, he doesn't even probably know who he is, they have never talked, they have never been in the same room that $I$ know of, he has no personal knowledge one way or the other, and counsel for Mr. Kujawa says "well look, there are accusations". The accusations are not based on David's knowledge, David doesn't know why Mr. Kujawa couldn't put 2 and 2 together on his desk when he had two files, and he can't account for what Mr. Kujawa said to the media about the system of justice and David is a kook and all those things. David can't comment on that, he has nothing to contribute.

And so to have David here to harm him, and when we remember that when the Government of Saskatchewan determined that there was a miscarriage of justice they said "look, we're going to offer compensation, an Inquiry to give you the answers as to why you were put in jail for all those years, and help you get on with your life", that was the whole negotiation back then on those two prongs. So to have him now go through an exercise that will damage him is totally the opposite of what the Inquiry was set up for. simple. When David met with Mr. Hodson and Mr. Hodson said "David, you can contribute", David said "I'd like to if you can just not hurt me", and so all we're asking for is accommodation. Dr. Baillie and Mr. Grymaloski can help us in terms of how we can best get anything out that won't harm David, $I$ know that's what your intention is too, you don't want to harm David, I know that. And so all we're seeking for in the end of the day is an accommodation, but to get it out in the least-damaging way.

And I point out in the notice of motion that David was interviewed by police on two occasions for a long point in time, there is a notebook with all his recollection, there is -he has testified on several occasions, his memory is no better now, it's way worse when he's trying to forget. He will acknowledge he has always tried to tell the truth. If there are contradictions, he can't help that, it was his memory then. Everybody has got contradictions over time. That's his position, he wants to be helpful, he doesn't want to be damaged. It's as simple as that.
o say that Dr. Baillie's report is of no merit, well I leave that to you, I submit it's very helpful, umm, from a very qualified person, and $I$ don't see why it wouldn't be of use when Dr. Baillie can be questioned.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well the sulbmission was that it doesn't meet the threshold established according to my remarks.

MR. WOLCH: Well, sir, only you can answer that.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah.

MR. WOLCH: I think that when you were making your remarks you were being told that it was an application not to contribute to the Inquiry at all. With your advice, and with consultation, it's come to the point where David understands he should try to help, he wants this to be successful, and so he wants an accommodation.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.

MR. WOLCH: The context is totally
different from what your remarks were before.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Uh-huh.

MR. WOLCH: Totally different. And so
the -- in the context of an accommodation $I$ just
emphasize, accommodations, as I say, have been granted before without even a motion, so -- and certain rules have been made. For example, when Mr. Fisher testified there was a rule as to what he could be questioned about, it was posed by yourself at that time, and $I$ believe honoured of course, and there have been that sort of instructions given.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well I didn't have any consideration for Mr. Fisher personally, you understand, that was simply out of recognition of the fact that Fisher had been found guilty by a jury. There was no argument to be made about that point.

MR. WOLCH: No, I'm just saying special rules exist for certain circumstances.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.

MR. WOLCH: And that when we are talking about David we're here on a Commission that has been designed to answer questions for him as to why he was wrongly convicted.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Uh-huh.
MR. WOLCH: That's why we are here, we're not here to damage him.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh no, no, I don't
think that speaks directly to the objection which was made by Mr. Wilson.

MR. WOLCH: Well --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What about the -what about your assertions some time ago that every time David is obliged to speak about these things he ends up in the hospital? They wanted hospital records in support of that.

MR. WOLCH: Well it -- Mr. Grymaloski says that David was hospitalised. That, I guess that comes back to the question why would you make that up, I mean he was hospitalised, I recall him being hospitalised myself.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well why would I accept it unless $I$ have evidence of it?

MR. WOLCH: Well, I'm sure Mr. Grymaloski will be able -- I expect he will be able to say "yes, David came to me then, he had been hospitalised", we had talked about it, Mr. Hodson was present when David told us he was hospitalised.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, you see, the difficulty here is that the application has changed from one for -- of an exemption, or a request for an exemption, into one for a request
for accomodation, but the accommodation -- the grounds for the accommodation seem to go full circle back into one, a question of fitness again, and --

MR. WOLCH: Sorry.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- it's a little difficult to deal with.

MR. WOLCH: It's not all fitness, it's the effect it will have on him.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, that's fitness in a sense, I mean.

MR. WOLCH: Well --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I mean you've abandoned the --

MR. WOLCH: We're not saying he's not fit, we're saying that if he does testify, it will have serious harm on him.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, that's right, and in support of that argument of course $I$ come back to this; that you said every time David is obliged to speak about what happened to him he is hospitalised, the counsel are requesting that if I am to listen to such an arg -- an assertion --

MR. WOLCH: Well --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- I should, they
should have a chance, in fairness, to see the -what records exist in support of that?

MR. WOLCH: Well, I suggest we have counsel who really have next to nothing to ask who now want to invade his privacy again, they want his medical records, it's a private issue.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well will you withdraw the assertion then?

MR. WOLCH: That he has been hospitalised?
No. He has been, it's a fact, it's a matter of fact. I can try and get the records, but it's in three different cities and --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well your client is, according to Dr. Baillie your client is forbidden to -- or has withheld his permission for the release of hospital records.

MR. WOLCH: He was never asked.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Pardon?

MR. WOLCH: I don't think he was asked.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Where did Dr.
Baillie get that then?
MR. WOLCH: I just don't know. I think what he is saying is $I$ haven't talked to him to get it because it was not an issue.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, Mr. Wolch,
it's your -- of course $I$ don't have to remind you of this -- it's your application, you have the onus of proof, and the material you put before me is your business. It becomes a question of weight.

MR. WOLCH: Exactly.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And I do think
that Mr. Wilson's objections were certainly sound in the context of an application to be excused from testifying, because $I$ would have to agree with him that in that context they don't meet the threshold which $I$ set down in my remarks which were recently posted here, --

MR. WOLCH: I agree.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- but it isn't
a - it is a lesser application, if you wish.
The application to be excused has been abandoned, and substituted for that is one for to be afforded some accommodation in the manner in which he testifies and perhaps in the scope of questioning, and from -- in that respect $I$ just point out what $I$ have just said again, Mr. Wolch, that the weight to be attached to the evidence you feel should be submitted is a question for me, as is the question of what you submit, so you
will have to live with what's put up in front of me, and that includes the question in support of whether or not he was hospitalised as you say he was.

MR. WOLCH: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Because of course, obviously, what you have said in argument on that occasion is not evidence.

MR. WOLCH: That's correct.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah. So I think
that that is all $I$ need to say about that.
I am prepared to hear both
Mr. Grymaloski and Dr. Baillie viva voce, to be examined pursuant to the statements they have given to me, $I$ make no comment at all about the weight which might be attached to what $I$ have read thus far.

MR. WOLCH: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.
MR. HODSON: The only other matters, and
maybe I can canvass this with counsel after today, presumably only those counsel who wish to oppose some or all of the motion, presumably, will participate in the examination of Dr. Baillie and Mr. Grymaloski; is that correct?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, that's right. It's Mr. Wolch's application, he will lead the evidence, and those opposing his motion will be entitled, provided they can demonstrate a legitimate interest being engaged, they will be entitled to cross-examine. If there's any doubt about that they should preface their requests with some justification of why they should be allowed to present those questions.

MR. HODSON: And do I take it, from that, that parties who either are neutral or who are in favour of the application, other than Mr. Wolch, will not examine?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: That's correct.

MR. HODSON: And then parties can make submissions that -- presumably after the evidence is in?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: They may do so. I would very much appreciate some advance work being done on that between you and counsel.

MR. HODSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: If any cooperation is possible as between people who are entitled to cross-examination $--\quad$ cross-examine by way of putting one lawyer up instead of four who have
the same thing to say, $I$ would appreciate it.
MR. HODSON: And then lastly the issue of file production of Dr. Baillie and Mr. Grymaloski?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well they should certainly come with any documentation they have supporting what they have said in their -- in Mr. Grymaloski's case his letter, and Dr. Baillie his report.

MR. HODSON: And I will certainly advise them of that. And, again, the concern $I$ have is I do not want to have a witness next Wednesday asked a question and say "well I have got that elsewhere, $I$ can't --", and my concern is that we deal with this all Wednesday so I --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I share that concern, Mr. Hodson. I hope counsel will take this seriously. And the consequences of not bringing supporting material which is reasonably needed to cross-examine, of course, is that the evidence given will lose its weight.

MR. HODSON: Okay. Those are all my points. I'm not sure if any other counsel wish to --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: No, probably not.

They are likely wondering what they can do in terms of -- I expect that there will be more than one, or more than one or two lawyers who will wish to cross-examine, am I right about that? MR. HODSON: Umm, yes, based on the information $I$ have, and $I$ will canvass that and $I$ will determine who is -COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right. We might have to -MR. HODSON: -- part -COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- make some accommodations of our own with these witnesses, because they are all from out of town, when the time comes we will do our best. MR. HODSON: Yes. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So tomorrow morning at 9:00. (Adjourned at 4:23 p.m.)
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|  |  | 12th [2]-21580:5, | 21550:5, 21550:7, | 213947 [1]-21574:2 |
| 21617:8 |  | 21580:15 | 21550:24, 21552:10, | 213948 [1]-21575:13 |
| '91 [1] - 21617:7 | 006404 [1] - 21514:12 | 13th [1] - 21524:6 | 21554:11, 21571:14, | 21429 [1]-21382:5 |
| '93 [2]-21624:10, | 009232 [1]-21508:11 | 14 [3]-21440:20, | 21574:3, 21577:18, | 21462 [1] - 21382:7 |
| 21627:25 | 009330[1] - 21505:21 | 21441:7, 21535:15 | 21578:5, 21579:5, | 21555 [1] - 21382:8 |
| 'all [3] - 21546:8, | $\mathbf{0 2 2 2 4 0}[1]-21619: 4$ | 1400 [1] - 21507:1 | 21580:5, 21580:16, | 21558 [1] - 21382:10 |
| 21546:17, 21547:1 |  | 14th [1] - 21594:11 | 21590:8, 21603:24, | 21561[1] - 21382:11 |
| 'and [4]-21546:8, | $022249[1]-21630: 14$ | 15[3]-21440:20, | 21629:5 | 21566 [1] - 21382:13 |
| 21546:11, 21546:15, | $\begin{aligned} & 022261 \text { [2]-21632:10, } \\ & \text { 21633:25 } \end{aligned}$ | 21441:7, 21447:2 | 1986 [4]-21594:11, | 216082 [1]-21393:9 |
| 21546:25 |  | 156666 [1] - 21594:10 | 21595:10, 21596:10, | 216086 [1]-21393:24 |
| 'but [2] - 21409:15, | 022266[1] - 21638:23 | 156668 [1] - 21599:23 | 21599:14 | 216089 [1] - $21554: 9$ |
| 21548:2 | $039220[1]-21643: 14$ | 159819 [1] - 21609:18 | 1989 [1] - 21599:24 | $21645{ }_{[1]}$ - $21382: 14$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 'but' }[1]-21547: 8 \\ & \text { 'clipped' }[4]-21609: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $040[1]-21424: 16$ <br> 040654 [2] - 21424:20, | 159890 [1] - 21571:12 | 1990 [9]-21576:23, | 219484 [1] - 21390:9 |
|  |  | 159912 [1]-21616:22 | 21577:5, 21603:16, 21605:11, 21605:12, | $219511[1]-21393: 1$ |
|  | $21424: 21$ | $16[1]-21447: 2$ $162430[1]-21596: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21605: 11,21605: 12, \\ & \text { 21607:21, 21609:17, } \end{aligned}$ | 21st [2] - 21428:23, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21610:15 } \\ & \text { 'could [1] - } 21547: 24 \end{aligned}$ | 043477 [1]-21519:4 | $162430[1]-21596: 18$ | $21611: 1$ | 21640:10 |
| 'dangerous [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 048447 \text { [2] - 21393:24, } \\ & 21397: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $162433[1]-21595: 8$ | 1991[2]-21616:24, | $2227 \text { [1] - 21449:9 }$ |
| 21542:3 | $048448 \text { [2] - 21397:14, }$ | 16th [1] - 21393:16 | 21617:23 | $224990[1]-21569: 24$ |
| 'dear [1] - 21607:12'did [1]-21547:12 | $048448 \text { [2] - 21397:14, }$ 21397:15 | 17 [4]-21409:2, | 1992 [2] - 21628:19, | $224998[1]-21570: 8$ |
|  | 048455 [2]-21400:1, | 21457:16, 21457:18, | 21655:21 | $225006{ }_{[1]}^{[1]}$ - 11540:17 |
| 'did [1] - 21547:12 'early [1] - 21547:24 | $\begin{aligned} & 21400: 2 \\ & 048459[1]-21402: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 21536:14 | $\begin{gathered} 1993 \text { [8]-21389:8, } \\ 21618: 22,21619: 6, \end{gathered}$ | $229199[1]-21617: 20$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 'early [1] - 21547:24 } \\ & \text { 'em [1] - 21401:21 } \end{aligned}$ |  | 17166 [1]-21528:4 | 21628:10, 21630:10, | 22nd [6]-21499:10, |
| 'he [5] - 21520:5, 21546:21, 21546:23, | $048529[1]-21384: 23$ | 17168 [1] - 21531 :25 | 21639:14, 21640:16, | 21506:23, 21507:2, |
| 21552:5, 21552:8 | $048535[1]-21386: 23$ | 174037 [2]-21504:21 21576:9 | 21655:18 | 21508:22, 21519:24, |
| 'hoppy' [2]-21432:14, | 048542 [1] - 21390:5 | 17th [3]-21379:21, | 1994 [1] - 21640:11 | $23[1]-21660: 9$ |
| 21464:5 | 048556[1] - 21401:15 | $21565: 20,21619: 6$ | 19th [6]-21425:9, | $230175_{[1]}-21428: 22$ |
| 'in [1] - 21550:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 048705[2]-21425: 4, \\ & 21490: 2 \end{aligned}$ | 183170 [1] - 21510:1 | 21483:19, 21490:5, | 230183 [2]-21425:7, |
| 'it [1] - 21546:3 |  | 18531 [1] - 21651 :2 | 21490:10, 21490:14, | 21490:4 |
| 'just [1] - 21484:23 | 049961 [1] - 21639:24 | 18534 [1] - 21651:11 | 1:33[1]-21533:21 | 230185 [1] - 21394:25 |
| 'no [1] - 21547:6 | $050033 \text { [3] - 21523:22, }$ | 18th [5]-21393:11, | $\text { 1st }[1]-21611: 1$ | 230193 [1]-21524:3 |
| 'no' [2] - 21546:22 | $\begin{aligned} & 21534: 1,21535: 2 \\ & 050051[1]-21538: 4 \end{aligned}$ | 21394:24, 21395:2, |  | 23rd [1] - 21554:11 |
| 'oh [3]-21409:11, |  | 21425:14, 21518:8 |  |  |
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| 25 [1] - 21634:3 | 332997 [1] - 21581:25 | 6th [1] - 21523:8 | accept [5] - 21477:22, | accused [1] - 21529: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 25th [3] - 21550:5, } \\ \text { 21550:7, 21550:24 } \end{gathered}$ | 332999 333001 [1] - 21590: $21561: 15$ | 7 | $\begin{aligned} & 21492: 17,21525: 9, \\ & \text { 21609:12, 21666:15 } \end{aligned}$ | accusing [1] - 21553: |
| $26[1]-21574: 6$ | 333004 [1]-21549:18 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { access [4] - 21392:1, } \\ \text { 21498:24. 21502:21. } \end{gathered}$ | 21663:19 |
| 21571:14, 21616:23 | 33009 [1] - 21590:6 | 7.10 [1]-21597:7 | 21522:5 | 21466 |
| 273 [1] - 21508:2 | 333013 [2]-21555:8, | 73 [1]-21422:23 | accessory [1] | acting [1] - 21575:19 |
| 27th [2]-21574:3, | 21558:24 | 7:00 [4]-21488:3, | 21385:20 | action [3]-21390:21, |
| 21575:2 | 333016 [1] - 21545:3 | 21488:6, 21488:19 | commodation [17] - | 21606:25, 21644:2 |
| 28th [1] - 21595:10 | 333019 [1] - 21545:22 | 7:07 [1]-21514:16 | 21648:1, 21648:2, | active [2]-21591:11 |
| 29 [1] - 21405:6 | 333025 [1] - 21590:6 | 7:10[4]-21487:12, | 21648:4, 21648:6, | 21592:20 |
| 29th [1] - 21617:23 | 333218 [1]-21607:9 | 21488:17, 21488:19, | 21658:3, 21658:7, | actively [3] - 21539:12, |
| 2nd [1] - 21599:24 | $\begin{aligned} & 334 \text { [2]-21509:4, } \\ & 21550: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21505:17 } \\ & \text { 7:30 [2] - 21488:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21659:14, 21661:3, } \\ & \text { 21663:5, 21663:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $21625: 15,21626: 6$ |
| 3 | 34[1]-21412:2 | 21489:4 | 21664:19, 21664:25, 21667:1, 21667:2, | 21517:2, 21522:22, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 37[1]-21412: 16 \\ & 382-8167[1]-21573: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 8 | 21669:19 ${ }_{\text {accommodations [3] - }}$ | ad [7]-21571:13, |
| 21598:1 | 3:22 [1]-21616:19 |  | accommodations [3] - 21648:9, 21665:1, | 21573:2, 21573:18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 30[1]-21429: 11 \\ & 30 \text {-seconds }[1]- \end{aligned}$ | 21449:8, |  | 21673:12 | 74:5, 21624:4 |
|  | 21449:9, 21506:19, | $82[1]-21423: 8$ | accomodation [1] - | add [3] - 21556:14, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21610: 17 \\ & 300[2]-21509: 3, \end{aligned}$ | 21639:14 |  | 21667:1 <br> according [4] - | $\begin{aligned} & 21626: 23,21631: 24 \\ & \text { added }[1]-21424: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21565:20 } \\ & \text { 30th [1] - 21652:2 } \end{aligned}$ | 4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8:00 [2] - 21437:2 } \\ & \text { 8th [1] - } 21651: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $21421: 10,21654: 5,$ | address [21] - |
|  | 4[2] - 21508:5, 21519:8 | 9 | Accordingly ${ }_{[1]}$ | 21508:3, 21509:16 |
| 1st [4]-21383:13, | $40[4]-21436: 15$,$21436: 16,21598 \cdot 2$, | 9 [1] - 21400:3 | accosted [1]-21514:15 | 21510:25, 21555:24, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21514:16, 21568:5, } \\ & 21569: 7 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 21397:10, 21406:16, | 21563:20, 21569:1, |
|  | 21598:14 | 90 [1] - 21618:5 |  | 21571:25, 21572:16, |
| 32 [1]-21411:22 | 40's [1] - 21507:14 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 9:00 [3] - 21383:2, } \\ \text { 21659:4, 21673:17 } \end{gathered}$ | 21407:12, 21407:25, | 21572:17, 21572:18, |
| 325504 [2]-21424:24, | 400 [4]-21563:22, |  | 21462:23, 21466:1, | 21574:11, 21644:19, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21425: 20 \\ & 325616[1]-21583: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 21565:16, 21565:19,21571 : | A | $\begin{aligned} & 21478: 10,21480: 6, \\ & \text { 21480:11, 21492:9, } \end{aligned}$ | 21648:16, 21649:10, |
| $325621[1]-21584: 3$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 21525: 9,21530: 13, \\ & 21583: 19,21609: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21650:13, 21650:16, } \\ & 21660: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| $325624[1]-21584: 13$ | 410[1] - 21571:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { abandoned }[3] \text { - } \\ & 21594: 1,21667: 14 \text {, } \\ & \text { 21669:17 } \\ & \text { abandoning }[1] \text { - } \\ & 21592: 2 \end{aligned}$ |  | addressed [5] - |
| 325629 [1] - 21587:11 | $44{ }_{[1]}$ - 21416:3 |  | 21615:24, 21616:13, | 21574:15, 21607:14, |
| 325632 [1]-21588:19 | 4:23 [1] - 21673:18 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 21620: 9,21621: 3 \\ & 21623: 8,21662: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21649:8, } 21650: 10, \\ & 21659.9 \end{aligned}$ |
| 21462:21 | 5 |  | accuracy [2] | addresses [4] - |
| $325635{ }_{[1]}$ - $21463: 21$ |  |  | 21397:10, 21619:11 | 21570:10, 21570:17 |
| 325636 [1] - 21464:17 | 5[2]-21519:9, 21535:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21674:7 } \\ & \text { able [11] - 21399:22, } \end{aligned}$ | 21462:23, 21466:25, | 21570:21, 21596:13 |
| $325638{ }_{[1]} \mathbf{- 2 1 4 6 7 : 9}$ |  |  | 21472:2, 21477:1, | adds [1] - 21612:16 <br> adequate [1] - 21655:5 |
| $325644[1] \text { - } 21470: 17$ $325646[1]-21476: 17$ | 500 [1]-21565:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { able [11] - 21399:22, } \\ & \text { 21425:5, 21476:7, } \end{aligned}$ | 21479:14, 21490:16, 21492:9, 21513:8, | Adjourned [4] - |
| $325647{ }^{[1]}$ - 21478:11 | 51 [1] - 21418:19 | 21539:16, 21540:16, |  | 21483:6, 21533:20, |
| 325649 [1] - 21479:23 | 5th [1] - 21596:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21554:15, 21655:6, } \\ & \text { 21655:17, 21660:21, } \\ & \text { 21666:17 } \\ & \text { abreast }[1]-21578: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 21525:9, 21548:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21616:18, 21673:18 } \\ & \text { admit }[1]-21614: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| 325652 [1] - 21481:14 |  |  | 21548:13, 21583:19, |  |
| 325653 [1] - 21489:23 | 6 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21597:18, 21609:10, } \\ & \text { 21613:12, 21616:13, } \end{aligned}$ | advance [1] - 21671:19 <br> advantage [1] - |
| $325655[1]-21492: 22$ |  |  | $\text { 21620:9, } 21621: 3,$ | $21571: 23$ |
| $325656[1]-21494: 9$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { absolutely [7] - } \\ & \text { 21440:16, 21559:18, } \end{aligned}$ | 21623:8, 21627:23, <br> 21630:9, $21631: 20$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { advertisement }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 21629:4 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $325659[1]-21494: 17$ $325660[1]-21495: 18$ | 21575:13 | $\begin{aligned} & 21440: 16,21559: 18, \\ & 21601: 5,21635: 14, \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| $325660[1]-21495: 18$ 332044 [1]-21523:5 | 60-second [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 21636: 17,21637: 23, \\ & 21655: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 21636:12, 21642:12 | advertisements [1] - |
| 332045 [2]-21499:7, | $21610: 17$$62[1]-21419: 23$ | Absolutely [8] -$21402: 4,21414: 5$ | 21529:12 accusations ${ }^{2}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21625:16 } \\ & \text { advertiser [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 21519:22 |  |  |  |  |
| 332584 [1] - 21393:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 65[1]-21422: 17 \\ & 6: 30[1]-21509: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21402: 4,21414: 5, \\ & \text { 21519:13, 21533:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $\text { 21662:6, } 21662: 7$ | 21571:21 |
| 332585 [1] - 21550:6 |  | 21533:5, 21572:13, | accuse [2] - 21417:5, | advertising [1] - |
| 332992 [1] - 21590:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6:49 [2]-21509:2, } \\ & 21510: 6 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 21497:15 advice [2] - 21389:11 |
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21394:7, 21484:23, } \\ & \text { 21489:16, 21489:19, } \end{aligned}$ | assassination [1] - 21653:11 | 21517:18, 21517:19, | B | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21472:9, 21473:5, } \\ & 21509: 19,21509: 24, \\ & 21556: 11,21562: 3, \\ & 21562: 4,21563: 9, \\ & \text { 21622:19 } \\ & \text { basis [2] - 21650:1, } \\ & 21658: 8 \\ & \text { bath }[1]-21401: 20 \\ & \text { bathtub [4]-21529:3, } \\ & 21529: 19,21531: 6, \\ & 21532: 10 \\ & \text { bathtubs [1] - 21528:21 } \\ & \text { Battleford [1] - } \\ & 21565: 13 \\ & \text { Bc }[1]-21440: 25 \\ & \text { beady }[1]-21507: 16 \\ & \text { bear }[2]-21394: 20, \\ & 21491: 11 \\ & \text { became }[5]-21385: 19, \\ & 21406: 25,21517: 19, \\ & 21622: 18,21631: 22 \\ & \text { become }[4]-21466: 2, \\ & 21494: 4,21601: 19, \\ & 21652: 17 \\ & \text { becomes }[1]-21669: 4 \\ & \text { been' }[1]-21547: 24 \\ & \text { began }[1]-21431: 8 \\ & \text { begin }[3]-21385: 4, \\ & 21385: 11,21466: 8 \\ & \text { beginning }[5]- \\ & 21467: 24,21499: 18, \\ & 21508: 12,21594: 18, \\ & 21619: 17 \\ & \text { begins }[2]-21403: 2, \\ & 21525: 14 \\ & \text { behalf }[2]-21600: 6, \\ & 21652: 12 \\ & \text { behaviour }[2]- \\ & 21536: 8,21614: 16 \\ & \text { behind }[2]-21486: 24, \\ & 21507: 4 \\ & \text { Beitel }[1]-21380: 10 \\ & \text { belief }[3]-21401: 7, \\ & 21534: 7,21601: 20 \\ & \text { beliefs }[3]-21422: 14, \\ & 21423: 17,21536: 11 \\ & \text { bell }[4]-21415: 9, \\ & 21422: 22,21533: 11, \\ & 21543: 20 \\ & \text { below }[3]-21436: 15, \\ & 21436: 16,21479: 11 \\ & \text { bench }[1]-21541: 21 \\ & \text { Bench }[4]-21674: 1, \\ & 21674: 3,21674: 14, \\ & 21674: 20 \\ & \text { benefit }[2]-21559: 16, \\ & 21601: 11 \\ & \text { Bennett }[1]-21508: 6 \\ & \text { Beresh }[1]-21381: 10 \\ & \text { beside [6] - 21510:6, } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21601: 1 \\ & \text { approached }[1] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { assaulted } \\ & {[1]} \\ & 21597 \cdot 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21545: 9,21546: 1 \\ & 21546: 2,21546: 4 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21605:10 | assertion [2] | 21546:8, 21546:1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| roa | 7:23, 21668:8 | 21546:12, 21546:15 | :18 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21411:11 |  | 21546:22, 21546:23 | 21456:16, 21484:5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| appropria | 21666 | 21547:1, 21547:3 | 21500:2, 21520:20 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21651:9 | assess [1] - $21653: 5$ | 21547:6, 21547:8 | 21602:22, 21645:23 |  |  |  |  |  |
| April[4]-21484:7, |  | 21547:11, 21547:14 | backing [1] - 21537:6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21594:11, 21595:10, | 21 | 21547:16, 21547:23, | cks [1] - 21592:14 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21629:18 |  | 21548:2, 21582: | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |
| area [10]-21407:16, | 21521:7 | Audry [1] - 21506:2 | 21640 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21486:20, 21515:3, | [1] | August[6] - 21518:8, | k... [1] - 21565:11 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21516:5, 21517:3, $21530: 23,21533: 1$ | Assistant[2] - 21380:3, | $\begin{aligned} & 21529: 16,21577: 5, \\ & 21580: 21,21611: 1, \end{aligned}$ | bad [2] - 21451:23, |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21548:4, 21579:1 | ting [1] - 21543:1 | 21617:8 | badly ${ }_{[1]}$ - 21614:22 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21661:21 } \\ & \text { area' }[1]-21547: 23 \end{aligned}$ | associated 21498:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { author }{ }_{[1]}-21643: 19 \\ & \text { authority }[2]-21606: 2, \end{aligned}$ | Baillie [27] - 21645:24, 21646:3, 21646:13, |  |  |  |  |  |
| areas [2]-21652:6, | ume [9] - 2140 | 21606:11 | 21 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21661:12 | 21414:1, 21502:20, | availability [1] | 23, 21648: |  |  |  |  |  |
| [1] - 21667:23 | 21505:6, 21525 | 21661:10 | 21648:13, 21648:20 |  |  |  |  |  |
| argue [1]-21659:21 | 52:19, 21553:13 | available [2] - | 49:1, $21649: 2$, |  |  |  |  |  |
| argument [3] - | 21569:16, 21585:17 | 21491:15, 21637 | 21649:8, 21649:12 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21665:13, 21667:19, | umed [1] - 21568:2 | Ave[3] - 21507:2 | 21652:1, 21655:9, |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21670:7 | assumption | 21509:3, 21509: | 21657:20, 21659:21 |  |  |  |  |  |
| arising [1] - 21600:22 | 21497:20 | Avenue[11] - 21444:5, | 21659:22, 21659:25 |  |  |  |  |  |
| arm [2]-21406:2, | e | 21449:8, 21486:18, | 21663:6, 21664:5, |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21507:23 | 1] - $21444: 20$ | 21509:4, 21514:16 | 21668:14, 21668:2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| arose [1] - 21544:16 | ached [2] - 21669:23 | 21550:14, 21561:22 | 21670:13, 21670:25 |  |  |  |  |  |
| arranged [2]-21501:2, | 70:16 | 21562:2, 21562:18 | 21672:3, 21672:8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21620:17 } \\ & \text { arrest [1] - 21451:12 } \end{aligned}$ | attack [1] - 21597:23 <br> attacking [1] - 21612:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21563:16, 21563:17 } \\ & \text { avenues [1]-21391:16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Baillie's [3]-21649:24, } \\ & \text { 21660:19, } 21664: 1 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| arrived [3]-21472:13, | attacks [2] - 21516:25, | average [1]-21638:5 | baked [2] - 21408:21 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21488:12, 21568:5 } \\ & \text { arriving [2] - 21487:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21517:2 } \\ & \text { attempt [3] - 21395:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { aware [26]-21384:20, } \\ & \text { 21386:15, 21470:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21408: 22 \\ & \text { ban }[3]-21649: 22, \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21488: 7 \\ & \text { article }[13]-21449: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21399:16, } 21570: 23 \\ & \text { attempted [3] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21470:12, 21475:12, } \\ & \text { 21488:14, 21488:15, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21650: 3,21650: 6 \\ & \text { bandage }[1]-21566 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21449:15, 21449:17, | 21549:15, 21588:22, | 21488:25, 21492:11, | Barbara [5] - 21508:2, |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21450:5, 21460:18, | 88:24 | 21498:19, 21509:15, | 21516:23, 21517:20, |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21605:20, 21610:25, | attempting | 21515:14, 21515:16 | 21549:7, 21549:20 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21611:2, 21616:22, | 15:20 | 21524:16, 21524:20 | bare [3]-21444:6, |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21617:3, 21617:4, | attempts [4] | 21544:18, 21551:25, | 21444:8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21617:20, 21617:25 | 90:24, 21391:2 | 21553:10, 21579:15 | barrel [1] - 21578: |  |  |  |  |  |
| aside [2] - 21527:2, | 415:12, 21472:25 | 21580:25, 21581:2 | Barron [6] - 21508:3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21651:23 | ttend [1] - 21394:1 | 21603:24, 21618:18, <br> 21622:18, 21630:10, | 21516:23, 21517:20 <br> 21549.7, $21549 \cdot 15$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ask... }[1]-21434: 5 \\ & \text { aspect }[8]-21470: 5, \end{aligned}$ | attention [18] 21383:20, 21390:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21622:18, 21630:10, } \\ & \text { 21648:12 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21549:7, 21549:15, } \\ & 21549: 20 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21536:7, 21589:5, | $397: 13,21399: 12,$ | awful [2]-21525:21, | Bartlett[1] - 21602:3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21613: 24,21617: 16, \\ & \text { 21628:22, 21633:21, } \end{aligned}$ | 21463:3, 21470:17, | 21529:5 <br> awfully [1] - 21513:19 | Bartlette [1] - 21600:13 $\text { base [1] - } 21630: 25$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21644:5 | 504:19, 21519:3, | awhile [3]-21432:13, | based [13] - 21387:19, |  |  |  |  |  |
| aspects [1]-21486:4 | 21519:22, 21523:5, | 21464:3, 21635:2 | 485:7, 21485:10 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asper [12]-21596:10, | 1523:21, 21525:13, | kwardness [1] - | 21485:11, 21492:18, |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21596:19, 21600:1, | 544:8, 21616:21, | 608:2 | 21618:4, 21652:23, |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21601:24, 21602:18, | 21619:15, 21642:25 | a... [3]-21439:14, | 21655:5, 21655:12, |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21603:5, 21603:11, | 80:14 | 21450:12, 21450:20 | 21658:8, 21659:11, |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21603:13, 21606:18, | audio [2]-21554:23, |  | 21662:7, 21673:5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21643:19, 21643:25, | 608:5 |  | basement [11] |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21653:14 | Audrey[25] - 21516:22, |  | 21447:24, 21471:7, |  |  |  |  |  |


| 21511:14, 21554:11, | 21474:10, 21479:7, | Board [1] - 21655:21 | 21608:5 | $21469: 24,21470: 1$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21566:7, 21576:13, | 21480:19, 21481:7, | board [2] - 21637:8, | boy [4]-21412:19, | 21479:8, 21557:17, |
| 21578:6 | 21481:11, 21482:13, | 21637:17 | 21412:22, 21416:16, | 21559:25 |
| Bessborough [1] - | 21491:10, 21492:15, | boarder [1] - 21556:8 | 21481:6 | brought [7] - 21526:21, |
| 21379:16 | 21493:22, 21495:12, | Bobs[2] - 21381:5, | Boychuk [3] - 21381:8, | 21528:16, 21530:9, |
| best [14]-21390:16, | 21496:20, 21502:9, | 21587:23 | 21645:2, 21645:3 | $21532: 11,21642: 24$ |
| 21392:6, 21395:25, | 21518:17, 21519:6, | body [4]-21502:16, | boyfriend [3]-21507:8, | $21651 \text { :2, } 21654: 16$ |
| 21460:16, 21499:4, | 21519:12, 21534:5, | 21515:23, 21571:16, | 21625:7, 21627:22 | Bruce[1] - $21381: 9$ |
| 21517:16, 21521:23, | 21544:21, 21545:19, | 21592:14 | boyfriend's [1] - | brutal [3]-21441:16, |
| 21547:2, 21554:1, | 21577:21, 21581:12, | bombshell [1] | 21565:8 | 21447:11, 21536:10 |
| 21606:16, 21623:11, | 21585:22, 21586:15, | 21594:6 | boys [2]-21385:19, | Bryan [5] - 21573:7, |
| 21663:7, 21673:14, | 21587:15, 21598:5, | book [31] - 21397:23, | 21452:5 | 21573:12, 21581:4, |
| 21674:6 | 21600:7, 21618:17, | 21398:12, 21398:17, | brains [1] - 21593:3 | 21581:16, 21629:5 |
| Best [5]-21508:2, | 21632:21, 21638:1, | 21398:18, 21399:4, | brake [1] - 21411:18 | buddy [2] - 21409:12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21516: 23,21517: 20 \\ & 21549: 7,21549: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21638: 12,21645: 22, \\ & 21646: 20,21657: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 21399:14, 21430:14, | $\text { break [10] - } 21401: 22 \text {, }$ | budget [1] - 21633:10 |
| $\text { bet }[1]-21430: 9$ | bitch [4] - 21444:22, | $21461: 4,21463: 4$ | $21450: 22,21483: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { budgetary [1] - } \\ & \text { 21633:21 } \end{aligned}$ |
| better [13]-21388:21, | 21461:24, 21462:4, | 21484:10, 21489:10, | 21494:20, 21533:19, | buggers [1] - 21451:23 |
| 21399:22, 21426:4, | 21547:11 | 21489:13, 21491:1, | 21592:9, 21594:3, | build [2] - 21520:11, |
| 21432:21, 21464:13, | bits [1] - 21484:4 | 21522:2, 21525:3, | 21616:16 | 21545:21 |
| 21489:20, 21540:9, | black [1] - 21404:14 | 21541:10, 21557:19, | break-through [2] - | building [1] - 21500:23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21562: 9,21568: 3 \\ & 21604: 14,21609: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { blame [8] - 21433:3, } \\ & \text { 21433:5, } 21438: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21584: 1,21587: 5, \\ & 21600: 15,21600: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $21431 \text { :5, } 21431: 20$ | burned [2] - 21590:14, |
| 21638:12, 21663:18 | $21464: 23,21464: 25,$ | 21602:16, 21602:19, | breakthrough [1] - | burner [1] - 21626:9 |
| Between [2] - 21382:8, | $\begin{aligned} & 21468: 21,21495: 14, \\ & 21605: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $21602: 21,21605: 19,$ | 21423:15 | burning [2] - 21578:6, |
| between [19] | blank [1] - 21623:21 | $21617: 17,21619: 25$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Brian }[1]-21381: 10 \\ & \text { brief [2] - 21584:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21578: 18 \\ & \text { bus [9]-21436:22, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 21418:17, 21419:16, | Bldg [1] - 21509:6 | booked [1] - 21541 :7 | $21638: 23$ | 21472:18, 21474:21, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21429: 19,21467: 18, \\ & 21483: 25,21484: 2, \end{aligned}$ | bleeding [1] - 21565 <br> block [4] - 21432:6, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { books [4] - 21484:22, } \\ & \text { 21586:20, 21586:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { briefly [10] - 21383:22 } \\ & 21394: 24,21397: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21487: 25,21506: 24, \\ & 21507: 1,21509: 8, \end{aligned}$ |
| $21534: 15,21538: 10$ | 21507:1, 21509:3, | 21587:3 | $21445: 21,21474: 22,$ | $21559: 14$ |
| 21540:20, 21542:4, | 21571:6 | boom [3] - 21526:17 | 21514:12, 21531:10, | business [2] - |
| 21545:9, 21555:3, | Block [2] - 21563:22, | borders [1] - 21615:4 | 21531:11, 21557:16, | 21504:17, 21669:4 |
| 21555:9, 21561:16, | 21565:16 | borrow [3] - 21605:4, | 21567:24 | busy [4]-21499:20, |
| 21598:1, $21641: 2$, | blocks [1] - 21597:9 | 21606:6, 21608:8 | bright [1] - 21593:6 | 21515:9, 21551 :2, |
| $21641: 12,21671: 20$ | blond [2] - 21565:6, | Boswell [2] - 21380:5, | bring [20] - 21383:20, | 21602:25 |
| beyond [4]-21392 | 21565:8 | 21424:20 | $21390: 6,21394: 25$ | but... [1] - 21450:8 |
| $21407: 22,21611: 17$ | 21388:19, 21388:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bothered [4] - } \\ & 21534: 20,21592 \end{aligned}$ | 21397:13, 21398:24, | buy [1] - 21538:23 |
| $21637: 24$ | $21395: 9,21396: 1$ | $21631: 9,21632: 12$ | $21482: 9,21508: 11$ | $21558: 21,21566: 15$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { bias [1] - } 21633: 14 \\ & \text { big [9]-21388:15, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21410: 3,21410: 18, \\ & 21410: 24,21411: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bottom [18]-21385:17, } \\ & \text { 21391:3, 21400:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21514: 12,21519: 3, \\ & 21519: 5,21525: 12, \end{aligned}$ | bye [7] - 21462:18, 21558:12, 21558:19, |
| 21404:24, 21415:9, | $21411: 9,21415: 2,$ | 21405:7, 21418:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 21519: 5,21525: 12, \\ & 21603: 20,21607: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21558: 12,21558: 19, \\ & 21558: 20,21566: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21417:19, 21423:15, } \\ & \text { 21447:8, 21450:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21432: 15,21440: 5, \\ & 21440: 11,21442: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21422: 18,21466: 17, \\ & 21467: 23,21494: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 21619:14, 21647:9, | 21566:15 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21450: 22,21453: 15 \\ & \text { bigger [1] - } 21545: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21442: 5,21442: 10, \\ & 21442: 14,21442: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21508:13, 21535:5, } \\ & 21575: 5,21582: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $21657: 17$ | C |
| bill [1] - 21444:15 | 21443:3, 21445:25 | 21622:8, 21636:18, | 21649:11, 21672:19 |  |
| biography [2] - | $21453: 6,21458: 4$ | $21651: 3,21652: 7,$ | British [1] - 21463:16 | Cadrain [300]-21382:5, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21398: 23,21399: 1 \\ & \text { birthday [3] - 21408:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21458: 7,21464: 6, \\ & 21478: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $21654: 13$ <br> boulevar | broad [1] - 21507:14 broadcast [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & 21382: 9,21382: 12, \\ & 21384: 10,21386: 1, \end{aligned}$ |
| 21408:24, 21490:15 | bloody [4] - 21493:4, | 21547:19 | 21603:17, 21604:1, | 21386:5, 21386:17, |
| birthdays [1] - | 21493:20, 21526:22, | Boutin [6]-21517:19, | 21607:17 | 21386:25, 21388:5, |
| 21408:23 | 21530:10 | 21545:9, 21545:23, | brother [19] - 21388:9, | $21391: 2,21391: 9,$ |
| bit [43]-21385:2, | blow [3]-21584:16, | 21548:17, 21549:6, | 21388:16, 21396:10, | 21393:6, 21393:13, |
| 21405:4, 21407:9, | 21590:19 | 21582:3 | 21396:16, 21414:25, | 21394:2, 21394:4, |
| 21411:11, 21423:15, | blow-by-blow [1] - | Box [1] - 21571:21 | 21438:15, 21449:20, | 21395:1, 21395:6, |
| 21433:12, 21433:13, | 21584:16 | box [6]-21573:1, | 21451:18, 21452:11, | 21398:7, 21399:19, |
| $21460: 23,21465: 7$ | blue [2] - 21638:1, | $21573: 3,21574: 12$ | 21452:14, 21452:19, | $21402: 3,21403: 12$ |
| 21465:8, 21465:24, | 21639:21 | 21575:14, 21605:1, | $21466: 6,21469: 6$ |  |
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| 21443:22, 21444:3, | 21555:14, 21555:17, | 21438:4, 21438:11, | 21471:10, 21471:18, | 21485:20, 21486:17, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21444:24, 21445:1, | 21555:23, 21556:2, | 21438:18, 21438:24, | 21471:21, 21478:12, | 21493:2, 21493:4 |
| 21445:6, 21445:11, | 21556:5, 21556:8, | 21439:3, 21439:7, | 21478:16, 21478:18, | 21494:20, 21495:16, |
| 21445:14, 21445:17, | 21556:12, 21556:17, | 21439:9, 21439:14, | 21481:17, 21483:9, | 21497:21, 21497:22, |
| 21445:19, 21445:24, | 21556:21, 21557:2, | 21439:18, 21439:23, | 21492:7, 21513:3, | 21498:10, 21499:24, |
| 21446:3, $21446: 9$, | 21557:5, 21557:8, | 21440:4, 21440:10, | 21515:20, 21517:17, | 21503:20, 21523:9, |
| 21446:16, 21446:21, | 21557:13, 21557:15, | 21440:15, 21440:22, | 21528:23, 21529:24, | 21523:11, 21523:13, |
| 21447:10, 21447:17, | 21557:18, 21557:24, | 21441:4, 21441:17, | 21532:20, 21533:7, | 21527:23, 21535:24, |
| 21447:21, 21447:25, | 21558:2, 21558:6, | 21441:23, 21442:4, | 21533:23, 21548:11, | 21538:15, 21539:11, |
| 21448:2, 21448:9, | 21558:9, 21558:12, | 21442:16, 21442:22, | 21549:24, 21555:9, | 21542:3, 21544:13, |
| 21448:12, 21448:19, | 21558:15, 21558:19, | 21442:25, 21443:9, | 21555:11, 21555:13, | 21553 :2, 21572:7, |
| 21448:25, 21449:3, | 21561:16, 21561:18, | 21443:22, 21444:3, | 21555:14, 21555:17, | 21574:25, 21577:8, |
| 21449:10, 21449:12, | 21561:21, $21561: 24$, | 21444:24, 21445:1, | 21555:23, 21556:2, | 21578:13, 21582:12, |
| 21449:22, 21450:9, | 21562:6, 21562:13, | 21445:6, 21445:11, | 21556:5, 21556:8, | 21590:16, 21591:11, |
| 21450:13, 21450:17, | 21562:16, 21562:20, | 21445:14, 21445:17, | 21556:12, 21556:17, | 21592:5, 21592:6, |
| 21450:21, 21451:3, | 21562:24, 21563:3, | 21445:19, 21445:24, | 21556:21, 21557:2, | 21592:10, 21593:10, |
| 21451 :6, 21451:11, | 21563:6, 21563:10, | 21446:3, 21446:9, | 21557:5, 21557:8, | 21594:24, 21595:2, |
| 21452:1, 21452:18, | 21563:12, 21563:17, | 21446:16, 21446:21, | 21557:13, 21557:15, | 21596:2, 21596:16, |
| 21453:1, 21453:5, | 21563:19, 21564:15, | 21447:10, 21447:17, | 21557:18, 21557:24, | 21597:19, 21597:20, |
| 21453:9, 21453:11, | 21565:3, 21565:15, | 21447:21, 21447:25, | 21558:2, 21558:6, | 21600:9, 21600:16, |
| 21453:17, 21453:22, | 21566:12, 21566:15, | 21448:2, 21448:9, | 21558:9, 21558:12, | 21601:9, 21603:11, |
| 21454:1, 21454:8, | 21580:14, 21590:7, | 21448:12, 21448:19, | 21558:15, 21558:19, | 21611:14, 21612:14, |
| 21454:11, 21454:15, | 21607:13, 21613:13, | 21448:25, 21449:3, | $21561: 16,21561: 18$ | $21612: 19,21614: 4$ |
| 21454:20, 21455:1, | 21613:25, 21616:21, | 21449:10, 21449:12, | 21561:21, 21561:24, | 21614:24, 21616:3, |
| 21455:9, 21455:21, | 21617:1, 21618:1, | 21449:22, 21450:9, | 21562:6, 21562:13, | 21616:6, 21624:20, |
| 21455:25, 21456:3, | 21618:18, 21619:6, | 21450:13, 21450:17, | 21562:16, 21562:20, | 21626:12, 21629:2, |
| 21456:6, 21456:13, | 21640:24, 21641:10, | 21450:21, 21451:3, | $21562: 24,21563: 3,$ | 21635:14, 21637:3, |
| 21456:18, 21456:21, | $21641: 12,21641: 18$ | $21451 \text { :6, } 21451: 11$ | 21563:6, 21563:10, | $21637: 6,21637: 12$ |
| 21457:15, 21457:21, | 21644:13, 21644:23, | 21453:1, 21453:5, | 21563:19, 21564:15, | $21648: 25,21649: 12,$ |
| 21458:3, 21458:10, | 21645:12, 21645:15 | 21453:9, 21453:11, | 21565:3, 21565:15, | 21672:8 |
| 21458:17, 21458:25, | Carlyle-gordge [264] - | 21453:17, 21453:22, | 21566:12, 21566:15, | case' [1] - 21493:20 |
| 21459:2, 21459:7, | 21382:6, 21382:8, | 21454:1, 21454:8, | 21580:14, 21590:7, | cases [5]-21386:19, |
| 21459:9, 21459:14, | 21382:11, 21383:7, | 21454:11, 21454:15, | 21607:13, 21613:13, | 21397:24, 21460:21, |
| 21459:17, 21459:24, | 21386:15, 21390:7, | 21454:20, 21455:1, | 21613:25, 21616:21, | 21489:14, 21620:1 |
| 21460:2, 21460:8, | 21391:8, $21391: 12$, | 21455:9, 21455:21, | 21617:1, 21618:1, | cassette [1] - 21608:8 |
| 21460:13, 21460:19, | 21393:25, 21397:5, | 21455:25, 21456:3, | 21618:18, 21619:6, | cassettes [1] - 21608:6 |
| $21461 \text { :3, } 21461 \text { :8, }$ | 21422:3, 21423:11, | 21456:6, 21456:13, | 21640:24, 21641:10, | Cast[3]-21634:12, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21461: 12,21461: 14, \\ & 21461: 25.21462: 5 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21424: 24,21429: 20, \\ & 21429: 23,21429: 25, \end{aligned}$ | 21456:18, 21456:21, | $21641: 12,21641: 18$ | 21634:13, 21634:16 |
| $21462: 9,21462: 11$ | $21430: 3,21430: 7,$ | $21457: 15,21457: 21$ | 21644:13, 21644:23, | catch [1] - 21436:22 |
| 21462:15, 21462:18, | 21430:11, 21430:13, | 21458:3, 21458:10, | 21645:12, 21645:15 | 21598:4, 21602:23 |
| 21462:22, 21464:8, | 21430:16, 21430:22, | 21458:17, 21458:25, | carried [1] - 21611:22 | Catherine[1] - 21381:5 |
| 21464:11, 21464:22, | 21431:1, 21431:12, | 21459:2, 21459:7, | Carriere[1] - 21505:12 | caught [7] - 21472:18, |
| 21464:25, 21465:3, | 21431:15, 21431:24, | 21459:9, 21459:14, | carry [2] - 21456:18, | 21474:1, 21487:25, |
| 21465:10, 21465:14, $21468: 3,21468: 9,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21432: 4,21432: 8, \\ & 21432: 10,21432: 17 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21459: 17,21459: 24, \\ & 21460: 2,21460: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $21626: 12$ | $21509: 8,21547: 18$ |
| 21468:19, 21469:2, | 21432:20, 21432:23, | $21460: 13,21460: 19,$ | $\text { 21579:1, } 21579: 20$ | 21557:10, $21597: 15$ caused [1] - 21466:2 |
| 21469:10, 21470:25, | 21433:2, 21433:5, | $21461 \text { :3, } 21461 \text { :8, }$ | case [84] - 21385:5, | cautioning [2]- |
| $21471: 4,21471: 8$ | $21433: 8,21433: 14$ | $21461: 12,21461: 14$ | 21390:16, 21392:6, | 21528:22, 21529:8 |
| $21471: 21,21478: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21433:17, 21433:20, } \\ & \text { 21434:1, 21434:4, } \end{aligned}$ | 21462:9, 21462:11, | $\begin{aligned} & 21398: 2,21398: 21, \\ & 21398 \cdot 23 \quad 21398 \cdot 25 \end{aligned}$ | Cbc[9]-21593:22, |
| 21478:16, 21478:18, | $21434: 8,21434: 13$ | 21462:15, 21462:18, | $21398: 23,21398: 25,$ | 21603:18, 21604:9, |
| 21481:17, 21483:9, | 21434:17, 21434:22, | $21462: 22,21464: 8$ | 21417:22, 21423:14, | 21604:14, 21604:16, $21604: 20,21607: 6$ |
| 21492:7, 21513:3, | 21435:5, 21435:8, | 21464:11, 21464:22, | 21442:20, 21446:6, | 21607:15, 21610:10 |
| 21515:20, 21517:17, | 21435:14, 21435:17, | $21464: 25,21465: 3$ | 21446:24, 21455:10, | Cbc's [3] - 21607:14, |
| $21528: 23,21529: 24,$ | 21435:20, 21435:24, | 21465:10, 21465:14, | 21460:23, 21473:20, | 21607:17, 21608:24 |
| $21533: 23,21548: 11$ | $21436: 12,21436: 15,$ | 21468:19, 21469:2, | 21475:7, 21483:16, <br> 21484:15, 21484:19 | Celine[6] - 21415:16, |
| 21549:24, 21555:9, | $21436: 23,21437: 7,$ | $21469: 10,21470: 25$ | 21485:10, 21485:12, | 21415:20, 21416:1, <br> 21445:16, 21445:18 |
| 21555:11, 21555:13, | 21437:15, 21437:21, | 21471:4, 21471 :8, |  | 21445:16, 21445:18, |


| 21445:19 <br> Centre $[2]-21508: 25$, <br> 21597:25 <br> centre $[1]-21470: 13$ <br> Centurion $[1]-$ <br> 21577:12 <br> certain $[16]-21384: 24$, <br> $21386: 20,21408: 4$, <br> $21494: 5,21501: 19$, <br> 21515:13, 21516:1, <br> 21522:23, 21542:18, <br> $21582: 20,21586: 4$, <br> $21595: 3,21639: 7$, <br> $21648: 15,21665: 3$, <br> $21665: 16$ <br> Certainly $[6]-21466: 5$, <br> $21475: 7,21478: 2$, <br> $21608: 10,21645: 22$, <br> $21647: 2$ <br> certainly $[40]-$ <br> $21388: 17,21392: 17$, <br> $21392: 20,21396: 11$, <br> $21419: 24,21428: 10$, <br> $21457: 10,21457: 11$, <br> $21484: 17,21485: 8$, <br> $21487: 13,21496: 16$, <br> $21496: 18,21497: 7$, <br> $21498: 25,21503: 11$, <br> $21503: 25,21509: 15$, <br> $21521: 13,21525: 24$, <br> $21531: 14,21533: 12$, <br> $21539: 17,21560: 16$, <br> $21565: 7,21574: 16$, <br> $21591: 25,21592: 3$, <br> $21592: 10,21592: 22$, <br> $21602: 15,21605: 19$, <br> $21635: 5,21636: 1$, <br> $21636: 25,21643: 8$, <br> $21649: 16,21669: 8$, <br> $21672: 6,21672: 10$ <br> certainty $[5]-$ <br> $21516: 14,21518: 15$, <br> $21518: 23,21522: 21$, <br> $21571: 8$ <br> Certificates $[1]-$ <br> $21674: 1$ <br> certify $[1]-21674: 4$ <br> cf.subzero [1] - <br> $21597: 12$ <br> chance $[18]-21387: 11$, <br> $21397: 6,21424: 5$, <br> $21474: 14,21481: 18$, <br> $21489: 20,21491: 13$, <br> $21491: 18,21491: 22$, <br> $21492: 4,21494: 6$, <br> $21495: 9,21500: 10$, <br> $21513: 4,21525: 5$, <br> $21548: 7,21568: 4$, <br> $21668: 1$ <br> change $[4]-21418: 16$, <br>  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cold [3]-21436:14, } \\ & \text { 21436:25, 21443:21 } \\ & \text { collar }[1]-21507: 11 \\ & \text { collecting [1]-21484:9 } \\ & \text { collection }[1]-21640: 3 \\ & \text { collusion }[1]-21641: 1 \\ & \text { colour' }[1]-21546: 7 \\ & \text { colour/personal [1] - } \\ & \text { 21500:2 } \\ & \text { colours }[1]-21404: 19 \\ & \text { Columbia[1]-21463:16 } \\ & \text { combined [1]- } \\ & \text { 21541:24 } \\ & \text { combining [1] - } \\ & 21543: 14 \\ & \text { comfort }[1]-21601: 3 \\ & \text { comfortable }[3]- \\ & 21588: 2,21588: 18, \\ & 21619: 11 \\ & \text { coming }[5]-21496: 16, \\ & 21565: 1,21591: 9, \\ & 21631: 4,21658: 17 \\ & \text { comment }[14]- \\ & 21466: 18,21470: 3, \\ & 21482: 15,21520: 21, \\ & 21522: 11,21522: 19, \\ & 21535: 7,21535: 16, \\ & 21585: 12,21619: 15, \\ & 21621: 5,21660: 12, \\ & 21662: 13,21670: 15 \\ & \text { commenting }[1]- \\ & 21536: 15 \\ & \text { comments }[5]- \\ & 21478: 22,21540: 6, \\ & 21594: 16,21640: 25, \\ & 21653: 12 \\ & \text { Commission }[14]- \\ & 21379: 2,21379: 14, \\ & 21380: 1,21380: 2, \\ & 21380: 3,21380: 10, \\ & 21545: 6,21575: 25, \\ & 21649: 17,21654: 7, \\ & 21655: 15,21655: 17, \\ & 21657: 18,21665: 19 \\ & \text { Commissioner }[77]- \\ & 21383: 3,21424: 15, \\ & 21424: 22,21429: 6, \\ & 21429: 18,21483: 5, \\ & 21506: 5,21533: 18, \\ & 21570: 18,21609: 19, \\ & 21609: 25,21610: 6, \\ & 21610: 12,21610: 19, \\ & 21610: 23,21616: 17, \\ & 21644: 18,21645: 13, \\ & 21645: 21,21646: 6, \\ & 21646: 25,21647: 3, \\ & 21650: 18,21650: 24, \\ & 21651: 12,21654: 13, \\ & 21655: 23,21657: 13, \\ & 21657: 22,21658: 2, \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | ```21658:6, 21658:9, 21658:12, 21658:19, 21658:23, 21659:3, 21659:7, 21659:8, 21659:17, 21659:25, 21660:3, 21664:6, 21664:11, 21664:20, 21664:23, 21665:9, 21665:17, 21665:22, 21665:25, 21666:4, 21666:14, 21666:22, 21667:6, 21667:10, 21667:13, 21667:18, 21667:25, 21668:7, 21668:13, 21668:18, 21668:20, 21668:25, 21669:7, 21669:15, 21670:6, 21670:10, 21670:19, 21671:1, 21671:14, 21671:18, 21671:22, 21672:5, 21672:16, 21672:25, 21673:8, 21673:11, 21673:16 commit [3] - 21598:3, 21608:13, 21660:9 committed [2] - 21481:1, 21597:1 common [3] - 21485:11, 21535:23, 21573:14 common-law [1] - 21573:14 common-sense [1] - 21535:23 communicating [1] - 21601:15 communication [4] - 21588:15, 21599:15, 21599:17, 21599:19 communications [2] - 21648:24, 21649:5 compact [2] - 21412:3, 21535:10 compares [1] - 21466:18 compensation [1] - 21662:18 compiled [1] - \(21591: 22\) complaints [4] - 21502:12, 21515:11, 21515:17, 21517:13 complete [5] - 21503:24, 21512:7, 21512:13, 21519:6, 21590:23 completed [1] - 21398:16 completely [4] - 21387:16, 21396:4,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| ```21396:5, 21592:8 completeness [1] - 21575:13 comprehensive [1] - 21660:20 concept [2]-21660:12, 21661:1 concern [10] - 21573:8, 21609:5, 21640:14, 21640:22, 21641:8, 21641:17, 21647:5, 21672:11, 21672:14, 21672:17 concerned [5] - 21401:25, 21498:18, 21579:17, 21587:24, 21661:25 concerns [7]-21397:9, 21482:19, 21482:20, 21630:20, 21642:20, 21642:22, 21648:13 conclude [1] - 21615:19 concluded [1] - 21611:17 concludes [2] - 21423:9, 21554:18 conclusion [5] - 21389:16, 21481:15, 21488:17, 21500:8, 21539:6 conclusions [4] - 21423:12, 21530:20, 21534:17, 21612:4 conclusive [1] - 21500:6 conduct [2] - 21652:18, 21653:5 conducted [4] - 21589:3, 21618:19, 21618:21, 21619:3 conducting [1] - 21511:4 conference [1] - 21392:9 confined [1] - 21516:1 confirm [7]-21423:23, 21429:13, 21483:15, 21511:20, 21578:3, 21644:1, 21647:19 confirmed [10] - 21463:7, 21466:13, 21493:24, 21517:18, 21575:15, 21589:6, 21605:24, 21621:1, 21630:2, 21639:2 confirming [1] - 21554:4 confirms [1] - 21389:10 confront [1] - 21485:16 confrontation [1] -``` | 21534:15 confronted $[2]-$ $21515: 2,21631: 12$ confuse $[1]-21648: 7$ confused $[1]-$ $21527: 25$ confusing $[4]-$ $21403: 13,21526: 25$, $21527: 7,21533: 14$ confusion $[2]-$ $21388: 11,21389: 9$ Congram $[1]-21380: 4$ connect $[2]-21473: 19$, $21527: 8$ connected $[2]-$ $21384: 10,21589: 19$ connecting $[1]-$ $21479: 20$ connection $[11]-$ $21384: 13,21386: 18$, $21386: 21,21419: 16$, $21463: 18,21467: 18$, $21484: 18,21530: 17$, $21588: 11,21588: 14$, $21604: 6$ connections $[3]-$ $21384: 9,21602: 7$, $21603: 13$ consent conse $-21659: 18$ $21672: 18$ conservative $[1]-$ $21541: 22$ consider $[3]-$ $21396: 21,21493: 17$, $21559: 20$ considerable $[2]-$ $21611: 15,21612: 17$ consideration $[2]-$ $21584: 3,21665: 10$ considerations $[1]-$ $21536: 24$ considered $[6]-$ $21392: 14,21430: 23$, $21591: 25,21598: 24$, $21606: 2,21654: 9$ considering $[7]-$ $21407: 5,21415: 3$, $21465: 21,21486: 3$, $21516: 24,21535: 18$, $21579: 25$ consistent $[2]-$ $21438: 9,21468: 25$ consists $[1]-21655: 23$ conspiracy $[6]-$ $21401: 10,21401: 12$, $21560: 4,21560: 5$, $21560: 6,21560: 7$ conspiratorial $[1]-$ $21544: 14$ | ```Constable [1] - 21619:7 constituted [1] - 21657:17 consultation [1] - 21664:16 contact [25] - 21390:24, 21395:17, 21415:12, 21415:20, 21423:2, 21483:23, 21491:5, 21492:13, 21497:5, 21539:25, 21549:12, 21571:20, 21571:24, 21573:12, 21574:8, 21574:10, 21575:21, 21581:2, 21588:23, 21589:20, 21592:21, 21596:20, 21613:20, 21631:21, 21661:19 contacted [10] - 21389:6, 21484:16, 21489:9, 21577:11, 21583:25, 21607:6, 21618:24, 21638:25, 21641:17, 21643:11 contacting [5] - 21399:13, 21422:25, 21423:4, 21573:22, 21575:20 contacts [2]-21386:24, 21424:13 contain [1] - 21674:5 contained [6] - 21383:12, 21513:7, 21516:25, 21522:19, 21545:15, 21641:14 containing [1] - 21608:5 contemplating [4] - 21399:4, 21424:13, 21463:5, 21491:1 contemplation [1] - 21463:9 content [1] - 21627:1 contents [2]-21600:3, 21619:12 context [17]-21384:25, 21424:14, 21425:2, 21448:3, 21463:7, 21471:11, 21475:18, 21510:23, 21527:14, 21540:18, 21540:21, 21570:14, 21657:24, 21664:21, 21664:25, 21669:9, 21669:11 continue [4]-21486:2, 21532:1, 21613:16, 21616:4 Continued [1] - 21382:3 continued [2] - 21383:5, 21612:7``` | ```continues [5] - 21390:23, 21404:1, 21496:24, 21548:6, 21587:25 continuing [1] - 21464:18 Contractors [1] - 21509:5 contradictions [2] - 21663:21, 21663:22 contrary [1] - 21477:23 contribute [3] - 21662:13, 21663:3, 21664:14 control [2]-21402:13, 21621:12 conversation [25] - 21388:24, 21402:13, 21425:6, 21427:18, 21428:8, 21497:11, 21497:17, 21524:14, 21524:17, 21524:20, 21534:11, 21537:24, 21542:13, 21544:17, 21545:8, 21548:5, 21558:24, 21561:9, 21566:17, 21566:19, 21567:18, 21567:19, 21568:13, 21571:4, 21642:3 Conversation [6] - 21382:8, 21382:11, 21382:13, 21555:9, 21561:16, 21566:16 conversations [3] - 21566:22, 21568:14, 21607:22 convicted [3] - 21533:1, 21632:2, 21665:21 convicting [1] - 21418:15 conviction [2] - 21613:20, 21653:7 Conviction[1] - 21379:4 convicts [1] - 21632:5 convince [1] - 21611:25 convinced [4] - 21395:12, 21422:12, 21422:14, 21597:23 cool [2] - 21535:19, 21536:3 cooperation [1] - 21671:22 cooperative [2] - 21495:7, 21542:21 coordinator [1] - 21581:11 cop [1] - 21416:15 copies [3]-21592:1,``` | ```21594:15, 21595:21 cops [6] - 21432:22, 21452:5, 21452:8, 21453:1, 21453:4, 21464:13 copy [19] - 21424:3, 21425:4, 21490:3, 21523:1, 21548:25, 21558:13, 21572:15, 21573:1, 21573:6, 21576:1, 21576:5, 21577:14, 21595:24, 21604:17, 21610:3, 21610:15, 21610:16, 21639:16, 21649:3 copyright [2] - 21604:13, 21606:24 Corporal[1] - 21619:7 Correct[2] - 21548:15, 21614:1 correct [13] - 21397:5, 21429:21, 21473:2, 21485:22, 21486:9, 21532:25, 21535:22, 21601:5, 21611:6, 21670:9, 21670:25, 21671:14, 21674:5 corrections [1] - 21394:18 correctly [3] - 21414:2, 21510:16, 21553:13 correspondence [10] - 21390:8, 21391:21, 21393:7, 21393:16, 21393:22, 21492:13, 21594:11, 21599:24, 21601:23, 21643:21 correspondent [1] - 21591:3 corroborated [1] - 21427:15 costs [1] - 21633:11 Cotler[1] - 21381:12 could've [1] - 21624:18 counsel [25] - 21607:7, 21646:23, 21647:21, 21648:13, 21648:16, 21648:19, 21648:24, 21649:4, 21650:15, 21651:10, 21652:11, 21652:14, 21653:13, 21657:15, 21661:14, 21661:21, 21661:25, 21662:5, 21667:22, 21668:3, 21670:21, 21670:22, 21671:20, 21672:17, 21672:23 Counsel[4] - 21380:2, 21380:3, 21383:4, 21654:7``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Page 10


Page 11

| 21415:22, 21422:25, | 21455:4, 21455:11, | 21477:2, 21501:25, | 21515:20, 21523:24, | $21524: 24,21525: 6$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21423:3, 21428:19, | 21455:23, 21456:1, | 21539:23, 21548:18, | 21585:6, 21589:14, | 21525:10, 21528:5, |
| 21429:7, 21429:14, | 21456:5, $21456: 8$, | 21631:21 | 21603:9, 21637:12 | 21534:1, 21535:4 |
| 21429:20, 21429:22, | 21456:15, 21456:20, | Description [1] - | 21660:12, 21660:14, | 21535:9, 21536:15, |
| 21429:24, 21430:1, | 21456:22, 21457:2, | 21382:2 | 21661:1, 21667:7 | $21538: 5,21540: 13$ |
| 21430:2, 21430:6, | 21457:9, 21457:16, | descriptions [1] - | difficulties [1] - | 21544:24, 21545:3, |
| 21430:9, 21430:12, | 21457:23, 21458:8, | 21652:4 | 21660:24 | 21545:14, 21549:24, |
| 21430:15, 21430:21, | 21458:12, 21458:18, | deserve [1] - 21601:20 | difficulty [2] - 21567:3, | 21551:16, 21554:19, |
| 21430:24, 21431:9, | 21459:1, 21459:3, | designed [1] - 21665:20 | 21666:23 | 21554:20, 21554:23, |
| 21431:14, 21431:21, | 21459:8, 21459:11, | desire [1] - 21589:19 | digitised [1] - 21429:11 | 21555:2, 21568:12, |
| 21431:25, 21432:6, | 21459:15, 21459:18, | desk [2]-21524:18, | direct [4] - 21415:25, | 21569:12, 21583:1, |
| 21432:9, 21432:12, | 21459:25, 21460:6, | 21662:9 | 21606:19, 21633:19, | 21583:5, 21583:6, |
| 21432:19, 21432:21, | 21460:12, 21460:16, | destroyed [1] - 21450:7 | 21661:19 | 21583:20, 21586:21, |
| 21432:24, 21433:3, | 21461:1, $21461: 5$, | detail [6] - 21408:9, | Directed [1] - 21594:13 | 21589:7, 21589:11, |
| 21433:7, 21433:10, | 21461:10, 21461:13, | 21427:9, 21473:22, | directed [3] - 21572:15, | 21620:13, 21623:12, |
| 21433:15, 21433:19, | 21461:15, 21462:2, | 21473:24, 21487:22, | 21599:25, 21639:14 | 21633:20, 21633:21, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21433: 22,21434: 2, \\ & 21434: 6,21434: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21462: 8,21462: 10, \\ & 21462: 12,21462: 14 \end{aligned}$ | 21593:15 | direction [4] - | 21636:6 <br> discussions [20] - |
| $21434: 14,21434: 19$ | $21462: 17,21462: 24$ | detailed [6]-21414:11, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21411:16, } 21547: 17, \\ & 21554: 6,21631: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $21384: 2,21384: 3$ |
| 21434:25, 21435:7, | 21463:16, 21463:19, | $21586: 6,21596: 7,$ | directly [6] - 21385:18, | 21389:17, 21389:22, |
| 21435:9, 21435:15, | 21463:22, 21463:23, | 21623:17 | 21473:20, 21493:25, | 21403:7, 21415:13, |
| 21435:18, 21435:22, <br> $21436 \cdot 2$ 21436.7 | $\begin{aligned} & 21463: 25,21464: 2 \\ & 21464: 10,21464: 12 \end{aligned}$ | details [6] - 21428:11, | $\text { 21569:18, } 21641: 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21415: 21,21416: 4, \\ & 21422: 11,21472: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| 21436:10, 21436:13, | 21464:15, 21464:18, | 21473:7, 21484:8, | 21666:1 | $21473: 15,21474: 6$ |
| 21436:16, 21436:24, | 21464:19, 21464:23, | $21637: 24$ | $\text { dis }[1]-21486:$ | 21483:14, 21540:19, |
| 21437:10, 21437:17, | 21465:2, 21465:5, | Detective [3]-21508:6, | disagree [1] - 21531:20 | 21551:5, 21569:10, |
| 21437:23, 21438:5, | 21465:11, 21465:16, | 21583:6, 21583:24 | disagreement [1] - | 21603:23, 21617:13, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21438:12, 21438:19, } \\ & 21439: 1,21439: 4 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21465: 18,21466: 18, \\ & \text { 21467:10, 21468:5, } \end{aligned}$ | determine [1] - 21673:7 | 21649:12 | $21637: 20,21646: 23$ |
| $21439: 8,21439: 13$ | 21468:11, 21468:20, | determined [3] - | disclose [1] - 21563:1 | $21591: 13$ |
| 21439:16, 21439:19, | 21469:3, 21469:11, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21537:11, 21637:9, } \\ & 21662: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { disclosed [1] } \\ & 21649: 25 \end{aligned}$ | disjointed [2] |
| 21440:3, 21440:6, | 21469:23, 21470:13, | devastating [1] - | discounted [2] - | 21402:19, 21527:8 |
| 21440:12, 21440:18, $21440: 24,21441: 6 .$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21470:18, 21470:19, } \\ & 21471: 2.21471: 6 . \end{aligned}$ | 21590:18 | 21560:14, 21561:3 | disorder [1] - 21660:16 |
| 21441:18, 21442:3, | $21471: 9,21471: 13$ | develop [1] - 21601:3 | discussed [2] - | dispute [3] - 21500:7, <br> 21530:13, 21660:24 |
| 21442:7, 21442:17, | 21471:19, 21471:24, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { developed [1] - } \\ & 21477: 24 \end{aligned}$ | 21479:12, 21483:16 <br> discussing [2] - | dissatisfied [1] |
| 21442:23, 21443:5, | 21474:23, 21475:16, | devil [1]-21402:1 | $21385: 7,21479: 2$ | 21630:19 |
| 21443:11, 21443:23, <br> 21444:4, 21444:25, | 21476:18, 21477:12, 21478:15. 21478:17. | $\text { devise [1] - } 21391: 9$ | discussion [77] | dissociate [1] - |
| $21445: 2,21445: 10,$ | $21480: 14,21481: 16$ | dictated [10] - | 21383:21, 21383:24, | 21536:10 |
| 21445:13, 21445:16, | $21482: 22,21511: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21501: 18,21503: 23, \\ & 21504 \cdot 1921506 \cdot 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21385: 1,21389: 9 \\ & 21389: 15.21390: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $21606: 24$ |
| 21445:18, 21445:22, | 21511:6, $21551: 5$, | 21508:17, 21509:1, | $21390: 4,21396: 25,$ | distance [3]-21503:4, |
| 21446:1, 21446:5, <br> 21446:11 21446.18 | 21557:16, 21567:9 | $21514: 4,21545: 16$ | $21397: 7,21397: 10$ | $21503: 25,21621: 19$ |
| $21446: 22,21447: 12,$ | 21467:4, 21469:20, | 21576:10, 21576:20 | $21404: 2,21414: 11$ | distances [1] - 21597:3 |
| 21447:19, 21447:23, | $21477: 2,21480: 4,$ | dictating [2] - 21505:7, $21508 \cdot 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21422: 24,21423: 4, \\ & 21425: 13,21425: 16 \end{aligned}$ | distressed [1] - |
| 21448:1, 21448:5, | 21480:12 | dictation [1] - 21512:14 | $21426: 25,21428: 19$ | 21661:24 |
| 21448:10, 21448:15, 21448-20, 21449:1 | eny [1]-21458:9 | dictations [1] | $21428: 24,21429: 1$ | disturbs [2] - 21593:11 |
| $2144$ |  | 21504:20 | 21462:23, 21470:10, | divorced [2] - |
| 21449:14, 21449:23, | depressed [2] - | didn't... [1] - 21459:2 | $21475: 15,21475: 22$ <br> 21476.9, 21476.24 | $21454: 14,21572: 9$ |
| 21450:10, 21450:15, | $21390: 18,21592: 9$ | Diewold [3] - 21487:4, 21505•13, 21506.13 | 21480:1, 21482:4, | 21424:18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21450: 18,21450: 24, \\ & 21451: 4,21451: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { describe [2] - 21540:9, } \\ & 21599: 3 \end{aligned}$ | difference [1] - 21613:8 | 21482:17, 21483:10, | doctors [1] - 21597:25 |
| 21451:13, 21452:3, | described [2] - | different [9]-21397:16, | 21483:18, 21486:1, | document [68] |
| 21452:19, 21453:3, | 21402:6, 21545:19 | $21405: 5,21423: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21489: 23,21489: 24, \\ & 21490: 9,21490: 13, \end{aligned}$ | 21383:20, 21384:23, $21390: 6,21390: 9,$ |
| 21453:8, 21453:10, | describing [3] - | 21460:21, 21554:5, 21648:11, 21664:22 | 21492:10, 21492:12, | $21392: 25,21393: 23$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21453: 12,21453: 19, \\ & 21453: 24,21454: 3, \end{aligned}$ | 21404:4, 21407:23, | $21664: 24,21668: 12$ | $21492: 24,21496: 24$ | $21394: 25,21397: 15$ |
| 21453:24, 21454:3, <br> 21454:9, 21454:13 | $21466: 20$ | difficult [13] - 21466:4, | 21497:3, 21499:3, | 21397:16, 21400:2, |
| 21454:17, 21454:23, | description [5] - | 21472:3, 21498:4, | 21511:6, 21520:1, | 21405:6, 21409:25, |
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| 21425:8, 21428:18, | 21486:7, $21486: 8$, | 21535:24 | 21538:20, 21538:24 | embarrass [1] - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21428:22, 21490:5, | 21496:18, 21518:2, | dried [2]-21497:21, | Education [1] - 21509:6 | 21547:9 |
| 21499:7, 21504:21, | 21521:4, $21521: 7$, | 21497:22 | Edward [1] - 21379:7 | embarrassing [1] - |
| 21504:22, 21505:4, | 21522:5, 21539:7, | drift [1] - 21390:2 | eer [1] - 21597:10 | 21605:18 |
| 21505:22, 21510:2, | 21539:13, 21574:24, | drived [1] - 21406:25 | eery [1] - 21537:15 | embarrassment [2] - |
| 21510:9, 21513:4, | 21576:3, 21598:6, | driven [1] - 21507:18 | effect [5] - 21396:13, | 21607:16, 21608:22 |
| 21513:7, 21518:2, | 21631:11, 21638:3, | driving [5] - 21466:10, | 21477:3, 21529:12, | embroidered [1] - |
| 21518:4, 21518:8, | 21640:24, 21646:18, | 21546:9, $21546: 23$, | 21641:24, 21667:9 | 21599:6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21518: 12,21518: 22, \\ & 21519: 1,21519: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21647: 5,21647: 8, \\ & 21659: 16,21671: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21594: 24,21617: 12 \\ \text { drove }[3]-21407: 1, \end{gathered}$ | effective [1] - 21661:15 | emphasis [1] - 21487:4 |
| 21519:6, 21519:8, | door [7] - 21443:3, | $21433: 11,21465: 6$ | $21641: 16$ | $21655: 4,21665: 1$ |
| 21519:9, 21519:19, | 21563:24, 21564:5, | drug [2]-21400:17, | efforts [6]-21542:25, | Empire[5] - 21393:11, |
| 21519:22, 21523:21, | 21564:11, 21564:13, | $21426: 1$ | 21552:18, 21592:19, | 21393:22, 21550:7, |
| 21524:5, 21535:3, <br> 21535:15, 21543:12 | $21565: 23,21566: 5$ | drugs [1] - $21402: 16$ | $21601 \text { :9, } 21601 \text { :22, }$ | 21554:10, 21580:6 |
| $21544: 9,21544: 20$ | doting [1] - 21643:7 <br> doubt [6]-21427:17 | dry [1] - 21462:3 | 21629:4 | enclosing [1] - |
| 21549:18, 21550:5, | $21459: 22,21571: 7,$ | during [34]-21389:9, | effrontery [1] - | 21639:15 |
| 21555:8, 21561:15, | 21608:9, 21611:17, | 21407:14, 21474:6, | egg [1] - 21588: | 21408:8, 21409:9, |
| 21569:24, 21570:2, | 21671:6 | 21474:15, 21474:18, | eggshells [2] - | 21423:18, 21426:8, |
| 21570:7, 21571:12, | Doubtless [2] - | 21474:25, 21475:15, | 21419:15, 21497:9 | 21427:1, 21481:15, |
| 21574:2, $21576: 8$, | 21499:20, 21588:24 | 21478:21, 21482:3, | ego [2]-21435:19, | 21522:4, 21548:6, |
| 21577:2, 21577:24, | Douglas [1] - 21380:2 | 21485:20, 21491:19, | 21495:12 | 21559:12, 21559:15, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21578:20, 21594:10, } \\ & 21609: 3,21609: 8, \end{aligned}$ | down [24]-21385:12, | 21494:12, 21495:13, | egomaniacal [1] - | $21590: 19,21603: 10$ |
| 21609:17, 21610:25, | $\begin{aligned} & 21388: 21,21427: 3, \\ & 21431: 23,21443: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $21501: 12,21511: 24$ | 21493:3 | $21620: 6,21638: 14$ |
| 21616:22, 21619:4, | $21444: 8,21444: 20,$ | 21516:12, 21517:9, | $21437: 18,21441$ | $21661: 6,21663: 11$ |
| 21634:3, 21640:1, | 21446:24, 21460:7, | 21519:10, 21519:20, | 21461:11, 21461:19, | End [2]-21382:7, |
| 21640:2, 21640:9 | 21462:4, 21467:23, | 21524:19, 21524:23, | 21468:7, 21611:16 | 21462:19 |
| Document [3] - | $21491: 10,21507: 19$ | $21531 \text { :8, } 21551 \text { :8, }$ | Eight [1] - 21612:5 | Ended [1] - 21382:13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21380: 5,21380: 6, \\ & 21424: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $21524: 4,21524: 10$ | $21567: 7,21578: 4$ | eight-ten [2] - | ended [2] - 21566:16, |
| documentary $[2]$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21524: 11,21526: 17, \\ & 21530: 8,21556: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21579: 5,21633: 2, \\ & 21640: 15,21652: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $21437: 18,21468: 7$ | $21610: 10$ |
| 21607:24, 21608:8 | 21586:15, 21596:23, | duty [3] - 21454:7, | $21620: 5,21620: 7,$ | 21538:3, 21542:8, |
| documentation [5] - | 21624:14, 21636:18, | 21479:6, 21479:10 | 21623:3, 21624:18, | 21558:22, 21666:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21505: 25,21506: 9, \\ & 21511: 7,21513: 13, \end{aligned}$ | 21669:12 <br> downtown [3] | Dyck [1] - 21619:7 | $21624: 23,21625: 2$ | Ends [1] - 21382:10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21672:6 } \\ & \text { documents [21] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21443:24, 21444:1, } \\ & 21620: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $E$ | 21626:2 | $21608: 14$ |
| 21383:17, 21483:15, | Dr [29]-21645:24 |  | 21620:5, $21623: 3$ | England [18] - 21436:9, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21491: 25,21492: 20, \\ & 21502: 4,21517: 24, \end{aligned}$ | 21646:2, 21646:13, <br> $21647 \cdot 7$ 21647:16 |  | eighty-three [4] - | $21577: 4,21577: 8$ |
| 21532:17, 21550:3, | $21647: 23,21648: 8,$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { early [12] - 21478: } \\ \text { 21485:8, } 21486: 5, \end{gathered}$ | 21624:18, 21625:2, | 21580:17, 21580:18, |
| $21567: 7,21581: 23,$ | 21648:13, 21648:20, | 21497:12, 21520:4, | $21625: 23,21626: 2$ <br> eighty-two [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & 21580: 20,21590: 8, \\ & 21592: 16,21592: 23, \end{aligned}$ |
| $21590: 24,21594: 7$ | $21648: 25,21649: 2,$ | $21522: 22,21566: 21$ | $21620: 7,21624: 23$ | $21592: 24,21599: 20,$ |
| $21621 \text { :6, } 21621: 16$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21649:8, 21649:12, } \\ & \text { 21649:24, 21652:1, } \end{aligned}$ | 21567:1, 21580:22, | either [17]-21399:10, | 21602:4, 21602:25, |
| $21622: 5,21639: 13$ | $21655: 9,21659: 21,$ | 21613:21, 21624:18, 21625:25 | 21427:18, 21472:21, | $21611: 5,21617: 8$ |
| 21648:20, 21649:16, | 21659:22, 21659:24, | Early [1] - 21626:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 21476: 4,21503: 25 \\ & 21515: 4,21537: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21624: 21,21628: 12, \\ & 21644: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| 21649:19 | 21660:19, 21663:6, | $\text { ears [1] - } 21400: 21$ | $21537: 8,21544: 2$ | English [2] - 21591:3, |
| dollars [4] - 21452:10, | $\begin{aligned} & 21664: 1,21664: 5, \\ & 21668: 14,21668: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { easily [1] }-21441: 13 \\ & \text { eating [1] }-21434: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $21549: 10,21565: 8,$ | $21591: 4$ |
| 21452:11, 21452:22, | $21670: 13,21670: 24$ | Ed [1] - 21529:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21568:4, 21593:2, } \\ & \text { 21601:15, 21608:9, } \end{aligned}$ | enmity [1]-21408:2 enormous [3] - |
| $21619: 22$ | 21672:3, 21672:8 | Eddie [1] - 21381 :8 | $21652: 23,21671: 11$ | 21590:21, 21595:1, |
| domestic [1] - 21590:2 | drafts [1] - $21648: 23$ | $\operatorname{Edgar}_{[1]}-21518: 7$ | elaborate [1] - 21485:7 | 21595:5 |
| Don[1] $21380: 12$ <br> Donald [2] - 21674:2, | dramatize [1] - 21408:4 <br> dramatizing [1] - | edition [1] - 21574:6 | else' [1] - 21547:6 | enquire [1] - 21601:6 |
| 21674:19 | 21407:16 | editor [3]-21491:6, | elsewhere [2] - | entering [1] - 21554:25 |
| done [25] - 21399:10, | draw [3]-21390:21, | $21594: 3,21611: 10$ <br> Edmonton [6] - | $\begin{gathered} 21552: 23,21672: 14 \\ \text { Email [4] - 21607:10, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { entirely [1]-21608:24 } \\ & \text { entitled [3]-21671:4, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 21403:19, 21423:11, | 21414:9, 21589:12 | $21412: 5,21455: 22$ | 21607:14, 21609:5, | $21671: 6,21671: 23$ |
| 21443:4, 21486:6, | drawn [2] - 21387:1, |  | $21649: 2$ | entries [4]-21505:9, |


| ```21505:10, 21510:13, 21511:23 entry [15] - 21474:22, 21505:13, 21510:4, 21510:14, 21511:14, 21528:3, 21576:13, 21576:14, 21576:18, 21578:10, 21579:1, 21579:4, 21580:9, 21580:12, 21644:6 enumerating [1] - 21563:15 envelope [2] - 21572:15, 21573:1 episode [2] - 21532:10, 21542:8 episodes [1] - 21529:3 equally [1] - \(21391: 8\) er [1] - 21455:17 err [1] - 21614:22 especially [3] - 21441:6, 21457:18, 21513:15 Especially [1] - 21519:16 Esq [5] - 21380:3, 21381:7, 21381 :8, 21381:9, \(21381: 10\) essay [2] - 21398:16, 21398:20 established [2] - 21650:23, 21664:8 establishment [1] - 21489:18 Estate[11] - 21593:7, 21593:8, 21593:18, 21595:13, 21595:19, 21600:23, 21603:2, 21606:11, 21606:12, 21606:19, 21606:20 etc [3]-21520:15, 21573:16, 21597:4 etcetera [2] - 21528:21, 21648:24 evasive [1]-21411:15 event [6] - 21385:3, 21397:2, 21488:25, 21525:15, 21554:14, 21650:1 events [1] - 21383:13 eventually [6] - 21388:20, 21460:9, 21491:9, 21522:6, 21592:24, 21594:1 Everest \([1]\) - 21592:13 everybody's [1] - 21434:15 Everytime [1] - 21406:12 evidence [33] - 21401:8,``` |  | excused $[7]-21651: 4$, <br> $21651: 17,21657: 23$, <br> $21659: 1,21659: 11$, <br> $21669: 9,21669: 17$ <br> Executive $[1]-21380: 4$ <br> exemption $[3]-$ <br> $21647: 25,21666: 24$, <br> $21666: 25$ <br> exercise $[1]-21662: 23$ <br> exhaust $[1]-21391: 15$ <br> exist $[2]-21665: 16$, <br> $21668: 2$ <br> existed $[1]-21521: 17$ <br> exit $[1]-21482: 25$ <br> exonerated $[1]-$ <br> $21615: 20$ <br> exoneration $[1]-$ <br> $21608: 3$ <br> expand $[1]-21660: 22$ <br> expect $[3]-21395: 17$, <br> $21666: 17,21673: 2$ <br> expected $[2]-21396: 3$, <br> $21657: 15$ <br> expecting $[2]-$ <br> $21480: 14,21481: 10$ <br> experience $[3]-$ <br> $21545: 18,21549: 8$, <br> $21607: 16$ <br> expert $[1]-21648: 22$ <br> explanation $[3]-$ <br> $21539: 2,21604: 16$, <br> $21607: 8$ <br> exposing $[2]-$ <br> $21612: 18,21616: 2$ <br> exposure $[1]-21655: 5$ <br> express $[1]-21587: 25$ <br> expressed $[2]-$ <br> $21608: 11,21642: 20$ <br> Expresso $[1]-21400: 7$ <br> extent $[5]-21407: 24$, <br> $21411: 6,21497: 2$, <br> $21526: 8,21526: 13$ <br> extra $[1]-21642: 10$ <br> extracts $[2]-21603: 23$, <br> $21603: 24$ <br> extremely $[3]-$ <br> $21590: 18,21612: 1$, <br> $21614: 20$ <br> extroverted $[2]-$ <br> $21409: 4,21480: 22$ <br> eye $[4]-21421: 6$, <br> $21462: 3,21565: 25$, <br> $21591: 3$ <br> eyes $[2]-21507: 16$, <br> $21655: 11$ <br>  <br> 21545:18, 21549:8, <br> 21607:16 <br> expert [1] - 21648:22 <br> explanation [3] - <br> 21539:2, 21604:16, <br> 21607:8 <br> exposing [2] - <br> 21612:18, 21616:2 <br> exposure [1]-21655:5 <br> express [1] - 21587:25 <br> expressed [2] - <br> 21608:11, 21642:20 <br> Expresso[1] - 21400:7 <br> extent [5] - 21407:24, <br> 21411:6, 21497:2, <br> 21526:8, 21526:13 <br> extra [1] - 21642:10 <br> extracts [2]-21603:23, <br> 21603:24 <br> extremely [3] - <br> 21590:18, 21612:1, <br> 21614:20 <br> extroverted [2] - <br> 21409:4, 21480:22 <br> eye [4]-21421:6, <br> 21462:3, 21565:25, <br> 21591:3 <br> eyes [2] - 21507:16, <br> 21655:11 | ```21490:2, 21507:11, 21537:10, 21633:16 face' [1] - 21409:16 fact [42] - 21389:10, 21392:1, 21396:11, 21412:6, 21412:10, 21420:9, 21426:12, 21427:5, 21428:25, 21430:22, 21463:16, 21474:13, 21475:25, 21488:9, 21495:8, 21497:21, 21515:14, 21516:22, 21524:16, 21541:23, 21545:14, 21549:14, 21549:19, 21567:18, 21574:21, 21587:13, 21589:4, 21589:7, 21592:23, 21593:19, 21603:24, 21614:22, 21620:3, 21622:6, 21646:4, 21648:14, 21650:21, 21655:22, 21660:15, 21665:12, 21668:10, 21668:11 factor [2] - 21478:9, 21633:12 factors [1] - 21633:5 facts [1] - 21652:24 factual [2] - 21530:2, 21653:4 failed [2]-21603:14, 21614:6 Fair[1] - 21518:24 fair [6] - 21392:25, 21427:25, 21428:4, 21467:5, 21580:24, 21629:19 fairly [5] - 21417:20, 21469:25, 21516:13, 21581:24, 21660:21 fairness [7] - 21474:10, 21488:4, 21559:18, 21586:3, 21608:11, 21650:5, 21668:1 Faith[1] - 21616:24 fall [2] - 21431:8, 21546:13 fallen [1] - 21565:24 falls [1] - 21657:13 false [1] - 21529:12 familiar [3] - 21516:6, 21518:13, 21572:3 familiarity [1] - 21519:17 family [8] - 21384:9, 21388:14, 21388:25, 21408:22, 21486:13, 21590:20, 21613:2, 21616:9``` | ```Family[1]-21521:6 far [16]-21383:16, 21394:8, 21401:24, 21457:25, 21481:2, 21492:11, 21503:22, 21567:14, 21579:17, 21585:4, 21624:13, 21647:13, 21647:20, 21650:22, 21657:13, 21670:17 farfetched [1] - 21480:7 farm [4]-21439:11, 21439:13, 21439:15, 21452:13 fascinating [3]- 21535:21, 21541:12, 21594:4 Fascinating[1] - 21547:13 fashion [3] - 21407:2, 21428:5, 21643:12 fast [1] - 21462:7 faster [2] - 21392:3, 21624:25 fastest [1] - 21595:17 Father[20]-21383:22, 21383:24, 21384:7, 21384:18, 21385:4, 21385:13, 21385:21, 21386:2, 21386:6, 21386:11, 21386:16, 21386:23, 21387:10, 21387:13, 21388:3, 21389:6, 21389:20, 21389:23, 21390:1, 21551:7 favour [3]-21537:25, 21616:11, 21671:12 favourable [1] - 21602:8 favours [1] - 21496:7 fear [1] - 21458:21 features [1]-21591:5 Feb[2] - 21506:19, 21509:2 February[21] - 21393:16, 21394:24, 21395:1, 21425:9, 21425:13, 21428:23, 21483:16, 21483:19, 21490:5, 21490:10, 21490:14, 21490:15, 21499:10, 21519:24, 21550:5, 21550:7, 21550:24, 21551:17, 21552:9, 21552:10, 21640:16 federal [1] - 21394:17 feelings [3]-21613:1, 21616:14, 21616:15``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| feet [4]-21436:19, | 21501:24, 21502:25, | 21594:8, 21595:12, | fitness [4] - 21659:12, | 21638:19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $21444: 6,21444: 8$ | $21503: 5,21505: 6$ $\text { 21512:9. } 21512: 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21596: 8,21596: 12, \\ & 21603: 7,21607: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $21667: 3,21667: 8,$ | forget [9]-21435:4, |
| $21440: 1$ | 21513:1, 21514:8, | 21619:15, 21638:4, | fits [4] - 21395:2, | 21448:3, 21471:11, |
| fellow [3] - 21537:5, | 21514:25, 21515:8, | 21639:13, 21650:11 | 21479:11, 21545:10, | 21475:17, 21484:9, |
| 21545:18, 21548:19 | 21517:1, 21517:10, | firstly [2]-21397:14, | 21660:17 | 21607:3, 21663:19 |
| felt [7]-21395:11, | 21518:1, 21518:16 | 21424:2 | fitting [1] - 21550:25 | forgotten [7] - |
| 21418:1, 21537:13, | 21519:11, 21531:1, | Fisher[80] - 21381:10, | five [5] - 21434:14, | 21500:23, 21559:2, |
| 21589:18, 21592:8, | 21531:8, $21531: 14$, | 21447:22, 21471:5, | 21443:19, 21460:20, | 21559:4, 21597:22, |
| 21592:14, 21602:14 | 21533:12, 21540:11, | $21472: 6,21472: 10$ | $21515: 12,21590: 5$ | 21602:13, 21611:7, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { fetched }[1]-21457: 25 \\ & \text { few }[23]-21397: 13 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21559:13, 21567:8, } \\ & \text { 21576:11, 21583:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21472: 12,21473: 4 \\ & 21474: 1,21474: 18 \end{aligned}$ | flashing [1] - 21455:7 <br> flawed [1] - 21616:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 21629: 21 \\ & \text { form [5]-21505:22, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 21438:22, $21441: 22$, | 21586:25, 21587:4, | 21474:25, 21476:1, | flicked [1] - 21546:24 | 21510:2, 21542:17, |
| 21447:15, 21452:4, | 21587:8, 21614:4, | 21476:5, 21476:11, | float [1] - 21536:23 | 21607:10, 21653:4 |
| 21463:2, 21469:14, | 21620:18, 21643:21, | 21509:4, 21510:22, | fluid [2] - 21411:18 | former [1] - 21614:14 |
| 21470:23, 21503:15, | 21648:20, 21649:13, | 21511:11, 21533:1, | focused [3]-21497:22, | forth [1] - 21488:24 |
| 21515:12, 21518:12, | 21649:15, 21655:15, | 21549:25, 21550:11, | 21544:1, 21630 :22 | fortunately [2] - |
| 21525:12, 21528:8, | $\begin{aligned} & 21655: 18,21655: 20, \\ & 21662: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $21550: 13,21550: 15$ | foggiest [1] - 21579:14 | $21498: 16,21591: 2$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21533: 17,21534: 2, \\ & 21550: 3,21556: 16, \end{aligned}$ | fill [1] - 21417:19 | $21553: 5,21553: 10$ | foggy [1] - 21436:17 | forward [5] - 21568:21, 21600:6, $21614 \cdot 15$ |
| 21557:19, 21604:4, | filled [1] - 21465:24 | $21553: 23,21554: 16$ | folder [1] - 21639:21 <br> folders [1] - 21502:3 | 21618:17, 21654:16 |
| 21639:12, 21647:11, | filling [1] - 21484:4 | 21555:21, 21556:4, | follow [10]-21383:9, | forwarding [1] - |
| $21654: 1$ | final [2] - 21484:2, | $21558: 3,21559: 1$ | 21424:12, 21428:24, | $21520: 15$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { fewest }[1]-21647: 11 \\ & \text { fib }[3]-21479: 19 . \end{aligned}$ | 21640:17 finally [6] | $\begin{aligned} & 21559: 9,21559: 11, \\ & 21560: 16,21560: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $21473: 18,21482: 22$ | fought [1] - 21613:4 |
| $21498: 7,21498: 11$ | 21568:21, 21590:17, | $21561: 7,21561: 25$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21522: 9,21522: 25 \\ & 21544: 23,21639: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $21446: 16,21460: 20$ |
| fibs [1] - 21588:8 | 21603:5, 21615:20, | 21562:17, 21567:4, | $21642: 3$ | 21502:2, 21644:20, |
| fifteen [1] - 21563:9 | 21616:10 | 21571:17, 21571:18, | follow-up [6] - 21383:9, | 21671:25 |
| Fifteen[1] - 21563:10 | finance [1]-21633:5 | 21571:19, 21571:24, | 21473:18, 21522:25, | Fox[1] - 21654 :6 |
| Fifth[11]-21593:6, | fine [6] - 21397:17, <br> 21426•16, $21501 \cdot 9$ | 21573:11, 21574:12, | 21544:23, 21639:12, | frame [1] - 21395:3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21593: 8,21593: 18, \\ & 21595: 13.21595: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $21541: 23,21606: 7$ | 21576:14, 21577:11, | 21642:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Frank[3] - 21391:3, } \\ & 21513: 22.21580: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21595:13, 21595:18, } \\ & \text { 21600:23, 21603:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $21647: 4$ | 21577:12, 21577:15, | followed [6] - 21427:21, 21494:7, 21515:14, | FranKs [1] - 21513:23 |
| 21606:11, 21606:12, | finger [2] - 21437:16, | 21577:17, 21578:5, | 21517:13, 21611:13, | frankly [4]-21390:18, |
| $21606: 19,21606: 20$ | 21468:4 <br> finish | 21579:12, 21579:25, | 21624:23 | 21605:23, 21615:5, |
| fight [1] - 21443:14 | finish [1]-21646:21 finishing [1] - 21499:23 | $21580: 10,21580: 24$ | following [23] - | 21659:24 |
| fighting [1] - 21593:5 | finishing [1] - 21499:23 <br> First[4]-21505.21 | $21584: 4,21584: 7$ | 21389:5, 21389:16, | Frayer [1] - 21381:11 |
| figure [1] - 21394:21 <br> figured [3]-21451:14, | $21591: 13,21600: 17$ | $21622: 9,21623: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21425:15, 21425:16, } \\ & \text { 21429:1, 21474:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { freaked [2]-21405:18, } \\ & \text { 21406:13 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $21451: 16,21587: 16$ | $21604: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21624: 6,21624: 11, \\ & 21624: 17,21624: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $21476: 9,21483: 20$ | freaky [2] - 21412:24, |
| file [19]-21474:9, | first [49]-21388:11, | $21625: 3,21625: 4$ | 21488:9, 21490:11, | 21418:21 |
| 21474:19, $21491: 22$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21388:13, 21390:13, } \\ & \text { 21391:15, 21393:3. } \end{aligned}$ | 21625:7, 21625:15, | $21497: 4,21499: 3$ | Free[2] - 21394:14, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21500:10, 21513:24, } \\ & \text { 21516:7, 21516:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $21398: 24,21401: 3$ | $21625: 22,21627: 5$ | 21499:10, 21499:12, | 21611:1 <br> free [2] - 21387 |
| 21529:15, 21529:22, | 21407:11, 21416:7, | 21628:25, 21630:4, | $21551: 1,21574: 17$ | $21608: 14$ |
| 21530:5, 21553:6, | 21417:21, 21418:9, | $21665: 10,21665: 12$ | 21579:22, 21623:5, | freedom [1] - 21617:18 |
| 21578:1, 21589:3, | 21418:10, 21426:13, <br> 21431:5, 21455:19 | Fisher's [6] - 21475:20, | 21647:1, 21647:9 | Fri[1] - 21509:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21640: 20,21641: 11, \\ & 21641: 13,21647: 18, \end{aligned}$ | 21460:10, 21463:3, | $21511: 2,21552: 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { follows [2]-21393:6, } \\ & \text { 21615:22 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Friday[8]-21395:4, } \\ & \text { 21429:1, 21474:12, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 21651:14, $21672: 3$ | $21467: 15,21479: 16$ <br> 21483:25, 21489:22 | $\begin{aligned} & 21576: 21,21576: 22, \\ & 21625: 22 \end{aligned}$ | food [1] - 21434:15 | $21476: 10,21499: 20$ |
| filed [6] - 21645:24, | $21492: 9,21497: 3$ | Fishers[4] - 21473:8, | foot [1] - 21540:4 | 21499:23, 21507:20, |
| $21645: 25,21646: 7$, $21650: 20,21651: 25$, | 21497:5, 21497:12, | $21550: 23,21570: 16,$ | forbidden [1] - | 21551:1 |
| 21655:7 | $21511: 7,21518: 11$ | 21622:20 | 21668:15 <br> forced [2] - 214 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { friend }[6]-21394: 9, \\ & \text { 21403:3, 21403:8, } \end{aligned}$ |
| files [48] - 21472:17, | $\begin{aligned} & 21520: 1,21524: 19 \\ & 21525: 13,21532: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fisher's [1] - 21564:21 } \\ & \text { fishy [1] - 21612:1 } \end{aligned}$ | 21414:14 | 21423:19, 21461:5, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21474:15, 21497:13, } \\ & \text { 21499:6, 21499:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21525: 13,21532: 25, \\ & 21538: 9,21540: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\text { fit }[7]-21418: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { forces [2] - } 21541: 24 \text {, } \\ & 21543: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $21625: 22$ <br> friends [3] - 21482:10 |
| 21500:17, 21500:21, | 21545:13, 21550:4, | 21429:4, 21465:20, | foregoing [1] - 21674:4 | friends [3] - 21482:10, $21539: 24,21564: 7$ |
| 21501:2, 21501:5, | 21553:23, 21567:6, | 21480:13, 21496:13, | forehead [1] - 21565:25 | Friends[1] - 21644:14 |
| 21501:13, $21501: 20$, | 21569:17, 21585:11, | 21571:3, 21667:15 |  |  |
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| 06:25, 21407:4 | 21536:14 generally [6] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21383:7, 21386:15, } \\ & \text { 21390:7, 21391:8, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21454:15, 21454:20, } \\ & \text { 21455:1, 21455:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21613:13, 21613:25, } \\ & \text { 21616:21, 21617:1, } \\ & \text { 21618:1, 21618:18, } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| om... [1] - 21566:11 | $21427: 25,21480: 6,$ | $21391: 12,21393: 25,$ | $21455: 21,21455: 25,$ |  |
| 21670: |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21397:5, 21422:3, } \\ & \text { 21423:11, 21424:24, } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 21618: 1,21618: 18, \\ & 21619: 6,21640: 24, \end{aligned}$ |
| [1] - 21598:10 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21456:3, 21456:6, } \\ & \text { 21456:13, 21456:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21619: 6,21640: 24, \\ & 21641: 10,21641: 12, \end{aligned}$ |
| strated [2] - 21592:8 | 21548:8, 21561:3 generous [1] - 21616:8 | 21429:20, 21429:23, | $\begin{aligned} & 21456: 13,21456: 18, \\ & 21456 \cdot 2121456.24 \end{aligned}$ | $21641: 18,21641: 25,$21644:5, 21644:13, |
| 1592:15 |  | 21429:25, 21430:3, | $\begin{aligned} & 21457: 7,21457: 15, \\ & 21457: 21,21458: 3, \end{aligned}$ |  |
| ustration | 21649:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 21430: 7,21430: 11, \\ & \text { 21430:13, 21430:16, } \end{aligned}$ |  | 21644:5, 21644:13, 21644:23, 21645:12, |
| 21423:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gentlemen }[1] \text { - } \\ & 21574: 4 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 21457: 21,21458: 3, \\ & \text { 21458:10, 21458:17, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21645:15 } \\ & \text { Gorgchuck[12] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| fucked [1] - 21452:23 |  | 21430:13, 21430:16, 21430:22, 21431:1, 21431:12, 21431:15 | $21458: 25,21459: 2,$ |  |
| fucking [1] - 21400:20 <br> full [7] - 21414 :22 | gently [1] - 21589:12 <br> genuine [1] - 21635:4 | $\begin{aligned} & 21431: 12,21431: 15, \\ & \text { 21431:24, 21432:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21459:7, 21459:9, } \\ & \text { 21459:14, 21459:17, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gorgchuck [12]- } \\ & \text { 21403:3, } 21403: 9, \end{aligned}$ |
| 426:19, 21508 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { geography }[1] \text { - } \\ & 21485: 23 \end{aligned}$ | 21432:8, 21432:10, <br> 21432:17, 21432:20, | $21459: 24,21460: 2,$ | 21423:5, 21425:2, |
| 5.4 |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21425:12, 21425:16, } \\ & \text { 21425:22, 21427:8, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 647:6, 21667 : | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gibson[1] }-21381: 9 \\ & \text { gift }[1]-21405: 4 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 21460: 8,21460: 13, \\ & 21460: 19,21461: 3, \end{aligned}$ | 21427:23, 21428:2, |
| fully [4]-21509: |  | 21433:5, 21433:8, | $\begin{aligned} & 21460: 19,21461: 3, \\ & 21461: 8,21461: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21490: 7,21551: 8 \\ & \text { Gorge }[2]-21643: 19, \end{aligned}$ |
| 21584:22, 21585:14, 21586:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { girl [10]-21431:7, } \\ & \text { 21431:10, 21431:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21433:14, 21433:17, } \\ & \text { 21433:20, 21434:1, } \end{aligned}$ | 21462:5, 21462:9, | 21643:25 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21586: 6 \\ & \text { funeral [2] - 21486:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21431:10, 21431:11, } \\ & \text { 21442:2, 21541:25, } \end{aligned}$ | 21434:4, 21434:8,21434:13, 21434:17, | 21462:11, 21462:15, | gospel [1] - 21439:22 |
| 21507:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21543:17, 21563:24, } \\ & 21564: 8,21564: 9, \end{aligned}$ |  | 21464:8, 21464:11, <br> 21464:22, 21464:25, |  |
| funny [3]-21461:22 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21434:13, 21434:17, } \\ & \text { 21434:22, 21435:5, } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 21461:23, 21542:7 | 21568:2 | 21435:8, 21435:14, $21435: 17,21435: 20$, | 21464:22, 21464:25, $21465: 3,21465: 10,$ |  |
|  | 21589:17 | $21435: 24,21436: 6,$ $21436: 8,21436: 12,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21465: 14,21468: 3, \\ & 21468: 9,21468: 19, \end{aligned}$ | 21419:1, 21581:10 grant [1] - 21600:16 granted [2]-21659:14, |
|  | girlfriends [3] - 21507:17, 21539:24, | 21436:15, 21436:23, | 21469:2, 21469:10, |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 21507: 17,21539: 24, \\ & 21635: 23 \end{aligned}$ | 21437:7, 21437:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 21470: 25,21471: 4, \\ & 21471: 8,21471: 10, \end{aligned}$ | 21665:2 |
| gab [1] - 21405 Gail $[18]-2138$ | 21635:23 <br> girls [3] - 21401:19, | 21438:11, 21438:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 21471: 8,21471: 10, \\ & 21471: 18,21471: 21, \end{aligned}$ | great [2]-21411:6, |
| 21398:1, 21430:17, | 21508:1, 21508:4 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21478:12, 21478:16, } \\ & \text { 21478:18, 21481:17, } \end{aligned}$ | grey [1] - 21507:15 |
| 21463:6, 21472:18, | 21406:22, 21420:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21439:7, 21439:9, } \\ & \text { 21439:14, 21439:18, } \end{aligned}$ |  | ground' [1] - 21546:14 |
| 21487:23, 21502:13, | $\begin{aligned} & 21406: 22,21420: 21, \\ & \text { 21460:13, 21477:15, } \end{aligned}$ |  | 21513:3, 21515:20, |  |
| 21502:15, 21517:3, | 21480:9, 21482:20, | 21440:10, 21440:15, <br> 21440:22, 21441:4, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21517:17, 21528:23, } \\ & \text { 21529:24, 21532:20, } \end{aligned}$ | grounds [5] - 21498:10, |
| 21548:21, 21589:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21484:1, 21514:8, } \\ & 21548: 25,21555: 23, \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 21651:22, 21667:2 |
| 21611:19, 21612:25, | 21560:10, 21573:4, | 21441:17, 21441:23, | 21533:7, 21533:23, | group [4]-21487:10,21488:7, 21488:11, |
| 21613:8, 21634:7, | $\begin{aligned} & 21574: 12,21576: 5, \\ & 21586: 10,21596: 7, \end{aligned}$ | 21442:4, 21442:16, | 21548:11, 21549:24, |  |
| 21652:22 |  | 21443:9, 21443:22, <br> 21444:3, 21444:24, | 21555:13, 21555:14, | 21653:9 |
| game [2]-21457:11, 21457:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 21586: 10,21596: 7, \\ & \text { 21608:18, 21648:14, } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | growing [1] - 21424:3 Grymaloski[16] - |
| 21457:12 <br> gang [3] - 21403:10, | $\begin{aligned} & 21661: 3,21661: 4, \\ & 21665: 8,21670: 15, \end{aligned}$ | 21444:3, 21444:24, <br> 21445:1, 21445:6, | $21556: 2,21556: 5,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Grymaloski[16] - } \\ & \text { 21645:25, 21646:5, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 21441:9, 21450:7 | 21672:21 <br> glad [2] - 21478:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21445:11, 21445:14, } \\ & \text { 21445:17, 21445:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21556: 8,21556: 12, \\ & 21556: 17,21556: 21, \end{aligned}$ | 21646:13, 21647:7, |
| gangster [1] - 21557:1 |  | 21445:24, 21446:3, | 21557:2, 21557:5, | 21647:16, 21647:2 |
| Garrett [1] - 21381:6 <br> gather [8]-21384:25, |  | $\begin{aligned} & 21446: 9,21446: 16, \\ & 21446: 21,21447: 10, \end{aligned}$ | 21557:8, 21557:13, | $\begin{aligned} & 21648: 21,21649: 9, \\ & 21649: 14,21655: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| 21392:17, 21399:16, | God[5]-21436:24, |  | $21557: 24,21558: 2,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21663:6, 21666:9, } \\ & \text { 21666:16, 21670:13, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 21478:20, 21562:17, | $\begin{aligned} & 21441: 11,21452: 16, \\ & 21452: 22,21616: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21446:21, 21447:10, } \\ & \text { 21447:17, 21447:21, } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 21564:15, 21577:20 | God-damn [1] -$21436: 24$ | 21448:9, 21448:12, | $21558: 12,21558: 15$ |  |
| gathered [10] - |  | 21448:19, 21448:25, | 21558:19, 21561:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Grymaloski's [1] - } \\ & \text { 21672:8 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21412:13, 21424:7, } \\ & \text { 21425:2, 21427:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { goings [3]-21515:22, } \\ & 21525: 19,21528: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21449:3, 21449:10, } \end{aligned}$ | 21558:19, 21561:16, <br> 21561.18, 21561.21, | guess [60] - 21384:5, |
| 21474:9, 21485:2, | golly [1] - 21444:22 <br> gonna [3]-21458:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21449:12, 21449:22, } \\ & \text { 21450:9, 21450:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $21561 \text { :24, 21562:6, }$ |  |
| 21512:20, 21560:21, |  | $21450: 17,21450: 21$ | 21562:13, 21562:16, 21562:20, 21562:24, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21395:10, 21428:25, } \\ & \text { 21430:10, 21432:13, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21567:12, } 21615: 15 \\ & \text { gathering [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 21458:22 <br> gonna' [1] - 21460:17 | $21$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 21433: 12,21437: 2, \\ & 21437: 13,21437: 25, \end{aligned}$ |
| 21483:24 | good'[1] - 21546:15 | 21451:11, 21452:1 21452:18, 21453:1 | 21563:10, 21563:12, 21563.17, 21563:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21438:2, 21438:5, } \\ & 21440: 25,21447: 2, \end{aligned}$ |
| geeze [1] - $21461: 24$ | Gordge [1] - 21430:4 gordge [266] - 21382:3, | 21453:5, 21453:9, | $21564: 15,21565: \text { ? }$ |  |
| general [6] - 21396:8, |  | 21453:11, 21453:17, | 21565:15, 21566:12 | 21448:23, 21449:7, |
| 21476: | $\begin{aligned} & 21382: 6,21382: 8, \\ & 21382: 11,21383: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21453: 22,21454: 1, \\ & 21454: 8,21454: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21566:15, 21580:14, } \\ & \text { 21590:7, 21607:13, } \end{aligned}$ | 21450:19, 21451:13, <br> 21451:14, 21454:7, |
| 21489:18, 21513:6, |  |  |  |  |
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| [3] - 21383:13, | killing [2]-21520:6,21520:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Kook }[1]-21662: 12 \\ & \text { Kool }[1]-21411: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21648:18, 21649:21, } \\ & 21654: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { leaving }[1]-21480: 21 \\ & \text { led }[4]-21483: 22, \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21596:10, 21619:6 |  |  |  |  |
| june [1] - 21591:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 21520: 23 \\ & \text { kind [51] - 21392:4, } \end{aligned}$ | Kool[1]-21411:19 <br> Kootaid [1] - 21411:19 | lastly [1] - 21672:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 21501: 4,21608: 2, \\ & 21615: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| y [4]-21459:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21394:18, 21395:13, } \\ & 21395: 19,21402: 20, \end{aligned}$ | Krogan[1] - 21381:4 <br> Kujawa[6] - 21381:6, | Late ${ }^{1}$ ] - 21574:25 <br> late [8]-21478:1, |  |
| 21502:6, 21503:21 |  |  |  | Lee[ [1] - $21394: 15^{\text {d }}$ |
| 665: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21395:19, 21402:20, } \\ & \text { 21402:21, 21404:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Kujawa[6] - 21381:6, } \\ & 21661: 25,21662: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { late [8] - 21478:1, } \\ & \text { 21488:11, 21546:4, } \end{aligned}$ | leer [3] - 21487:7, |
| justice [4]-21614:21, | $21404: 22,21407: 8,$ | 21662:5, 21662:8, | $\begin{aligned} & 21488: 11,21546: 4, \\ & 21546: 6,21562: 1, \end{aligned}$ | 21487:11, 21536: |
| 21615:5, 21662 | 21407:18, 21408:19, 21422:15, 21422:16, | 21662:10 | 21580:21, 21593:2, 21620:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { leery [1] - 21428:9 } \\ & \text { left [12] - 21389:19, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 662:17 |  | $L$ |  |  |
| [6] - 21 | 21422:15, 21422:16, <br> 21444:18, 21445:2, |  | latest ${ }_{[1]}$ - 21612:24 | $\begin{aligned} & 21432: 2,21432: 3, \\ & 21437: 1,21444: 21, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21381: 11,21381: 13, \\ & \text { 21600:7, 21612:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21456: 11,21472: 15, \\ & 21473: 25,21481: 4, \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { latter }[1]-21523: 10 \\ & \text { laugh [1] - } 21401: 23 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 661:18 | 21484:6, 21484: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lack [1] }-21659: 12 \\ & \text { lady [2] - 21394:14, } \end{aligned}$ | law [3]-21473:13, | $\begin{aligned} & 21487: 24,21532: 1, \\ & 21591: 25,21592: 10, \end{aligned}$ |
| justification [1] - | 21484:25, 21494:7 |  | 21484:21, 21573:14 lawyer [13] - 21392:2, |  |
| 216 | 21497:8, 21497:2 | 21453:20 |  | $21605: 25$ <br> legal [2] - $21527: 20$, |
|  | 21502:11, 21502:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{l a g}_{[1]}-21488: 1 \\ & \text { laid }[1]-21655: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21392: 8,21485: 10, \\ & 21573: 16,21595: 4, \end{aligned}$ |  |
| K | 1536:8 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 21590: 24 \\ & \text { legitimate [1] - } 21671: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21544:1, } 21546: 6, \\ & \text { 21560:6, 21560:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lana }[1]-21381: 4 \\ & \text { lane }[7]-21486: 19, \end{aligned}$ | 21604:16, 21606:5, | Leolf] - 21603:18, |
| Kara[1] - 2138 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lane }[7]-21486: 19, \\ & 21486: 23,21502: 15, \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Karen [3] - 21380:11 | 4:7, 21593:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21515:9, 21539:18, } \\ & \text { 21539:23, 21598:15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21628:23, 21655:10, } \\ & 21671: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 21608:5, 21608:7, |
| 21674:2, 21674:13 | 21601:3, 21604:14 |  | lawyers [5] - 21576:6, | 21608:19, 21609:21 |
| Karst [8] - $21381: 8$ | 05:17, 21607:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lane' }[1]-21546: 18 \\ & \text { languish }[1]-21612: 8 \end{aligned}$ | 21592:12, 21606:7, | Leds [2] - 21608:23, 21610:8 |
| 21541:1, 21541 :5, | 21615:12, 21623:20 |  | 21617:9, 21673:3 <br> lawyer's [1] - 21562:25 | 21610:8 |
| 21582:6, 21582:13, | 33:11, 21633:16 | languish [1] - 21612:8 <br> Lapchuk[3] - 21496:15, |  | Leonard[10] - 21403:3, |
| 21582:15, 21582:17, | 21635:24, 21638:1 | 21536:20, 21537:22 | $\text { lay }[5]-21438: 1 \text {, }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21403:8, 21423:4, } \\ & \text { 21424:25, 21425:1, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 21582:21 | 21638:11, 21638:19 | large [5] - 21398:15, | 21438:2, 21468:15, 21468:16, 21648:17 |  |
| Katie [5] - 21399:9 | -14 | 21408:22, 21490:23, |  | 21425:11, 21426:11, |
| 21463:6, 21590:15, | Kind[2] - 21434:13 $21434 \cdot 17$ | 21601:9, 21640 | lazily [1] - 21467:16 | $21426: 20,21490: 7$,21551:7 |
| 21594:24, 21595:2 | kindly [1] - 21620:16 | Larry 371 - $21380 \cdot 14$ | lead [4]-21560:4, |  |
| Kattie[1]-21430:16 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 21582: 23,21647: 15, \\ & 21671: 2 \end{aligned}$ | Leslie[2]-21541:25, |
| Katy[1]-21620:1 keen [1] - 21399:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { kinds [2] - 21493:9, } \\ & \text { 21518:15 } \end{aligned}$ | 21381:10, 21447:21, |  | $\begin{aligned} & 21543: 15 \\ & \text { less [3] - 21413:4, } \end{aligned}$ |
| keen [1] - 21399:6 keep [4]-21395:3, | Kinds[1] - 21617:17 <br> kitchen [1] - 21566:9 | 21473:4, 21474:4, | leading [1] - 21518:3 | $21465: 22,21541: 7$ |
| 21462:12, 21467:17, |  | 21474:18, 21474:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { leaf [2] - 21512:11, } \\ & 21518 \cdot 11 \end{aligned}$ | lesser [1] - 21669:16 |
| 21633:11 | $\text { Klassen [2] - } 21541: 25,$ | 21475:20, 21476:1, | lean [2] - 21537:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lessons [1] - 21408:21 } \\ & \text { letter [62] - 21390:10, } \end{aligned}$ |
| keeping [3] - 21396:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21543:15 } \\ & \text { knife [3] - 21422:19, } \end{aligned}$ | 21476:11, 21509:4, | leaned [1] - 21632:15 |  |
| 21591:3, 21647:24 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21510:22, 21511:2, } \\ & \text { 21511:11, 21549:25, } \end{aligned}$ |  | $21390: 13,21391: 5,$ |
| Keeps[1] - 21616:24 | 21455:2, 21597:16 |  | leaning [2] - 21392:20, | 21392:19, 21393:1, |
| 21414:25, 21415:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { knowing [3] - 21560:9, } \\ & \text { 21571:17, 21606:9 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21553:10, 21555:21, } \\ & \text { 21556:4, 21559:11, } \end{aligned}$ | 21537:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21393:10, 21494:3, } \\ & \text { 21499:8, 21500:3, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 21415:4, 21415:12, | knowledge [12] - |  | learn [1] - 21402:24 <br> learned [7]-21395:14, | $\begin{aligned} & 21499: 8,21500: 3, \\ & 21519: 23,21520: 18, \end{aligned}$ |
| 21415:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21384:18, 21386:16, } \\ & \text { 21476:22, 21610:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21556:4, 21559:11, } \\ & \text { 21560:16, 21560:19, } \end{aligned}$ | 21423:15, 21472:5, | $\begin{aligned} & 21523: 6,21523: 10, \\ & 21550: 4,21553: 20, \end{aligned}$ |
| kept [5] - 21413:12, |  | $21564: 22,21567: 4,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21472: 19,21474: 4, \\ & 21523: 15,21539: 14 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 21507:12, 21564:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21476:22, 21610:21, } \\ & \text { 21622:6, 21642:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21567: 24,21570: 9, \\ & \text { 21571:19, 21572:11, } \end{aligned}$ |  | 21553:21, 21554:12, |
| 21578:13, 21593:25 | $21644: 6,21652: 25$ |  | learning [5] - 21477:5, | 21554:13, 21568:23, 21573:7, 21573:17, |
| key [4]-21503:11, 21544:3, 21596:13, | 21653:3, 21662:4, | 21584:4, 21584:7, | 21477:17, 21534:9, | 21573:7, 21573:17, 21573:21, 21573:23, |
| 21612:2 | 21662:7, 21674:6 <br> known [10] - 21481:2, | Larrys [1] - 21475:20 | 21589:10, 21607:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21573:21, 21573:23, } \\ & \text { 21573:25, 21574:13, } \end{aligned}$ |
| kicking [1] - 21587:19 | $\begin{aligned} & 21497: 10,21508: 3, \\ & 21571: 25,21572: 11, \end{aligned}$ |  | 383:25, 21384 | $\begin{aligned} & 21574: 20,21576: 2, \\ & 21580: 3,21592: 22, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { kid }[5]-21387: 3 \text {, } \\ & 21461: 7,21556: 11 \end{aligned}$ |  | last [22] - 21390:11, | 21388:3, 21496:8, |  |
| 21565:6, 21565:8 | 21617:15, 21627:12, | $\begin{aligned} & 21391: 21,21401: 8, \\ & 21420: 14,21423: 8, \end{aligned}$ | 21517:12, 21526:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21593:8, 21594:9, } \\ & 21595: 8,21595: 9, \end{aligned}$ |
| kidding [1] - 21461 :8 | 21629:3 <br> knows [1] - 21470:6 | $21481: 14,21496: 17,$21509:7, 21512:6, | $21566: 22,21567: 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21596:9, 21596:18, } \\ & \text { 21598:17, 21599:11, } \end{aligned}$ |
| kids [2] - 21402:1, |  |  | 21606:1, 21649:25, |  |
| 21453:2 | know... [5] - 21434:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21509:7, 21512:6, } \\ & \text { 21543:13, 21563:14, } \end{aligned}$ | 21663:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 21600: 4,21602: 12, \\ & 21604: 15,21606: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| kill [1] - 21400:13 | 21435:23, 21453:21, | $21570: 6,21571: 25,$ | least-damaging [1] - |  |
| killed [4]-21431:7, | 21454:14, 21461:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21575:12, 21579:1, } \\ & \text { 21596:15, 21598:18, } \end{aligned}$ | 21663:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21604:15, 21606:15, } \\ & \text { 21607:7, 21609:3, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $21441: 8,21589: 16,$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Knox[3]-21381:5, } \\ \text { 21645:1, 21654:6 } \end{gathered}$ | 21596:15, 21598:18, 21628:15, 21640:2 | leave [3]-21646:21, | $\begin{aligned} & 21611: 2,21611: 8 \\ & \text { 21611:10, 21615:19, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 21631:18 | 21645:1, 21654:6 | 21628:15, 21640:2, | 21651:23, 21664:2 |  |
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| 21514:13, 21515:13, | 21497:18, 21509:24, | 21406:17, 21406:23, | 21516:6, 21516:15, | $\text { Npb [1] - } 21641: 15$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21564:20, 21567:9, | 21525:20, 21526:21, | 21406:25, 21407:4 | 21516:19, 21517:9, | number [20] - 21400:3, |
| 21567:12, 21579:12, | 21528:16, 21530:9, | 21407:14, 21414:3, | 21535:16, 21578:6, | 21430:20, 21462:12, |
| 21598:8, 21605:3, | 21532:10, 21543:4, | 21414:12, 21414:14, | 21578:21, 21598:18, | 21507:3, 21510:13, |
| 21617:25, 21626:15, | 21564:25, 21594:2 | 21418:9, 21422:4, | 21599:3, 21616:23, | 21549:19, 21572:21, |
| 21636:10 | 21604:4, 21606:23, | 21422:12, 21459:13, | 21619:4, 21640:13, | 21573:2, 21573:3, |
| names [10]-21508:2, | 21614:13, 21624:22, | 21459:14, 21459:15, | 21643:1 | 21574:12, 21575:15, |
| 21515:5, 21515:6, | 21631:17, 21636:2, $21637 \cdot 10 \quad 21638 \cdot 21$ | 21459:18, 21460:3, | Note [1] - 21597:16 | $21605: 24,21605: 25,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21516: 6,21517: 5, \\ & 21517: 9,21532: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21637: 10,21638: 21, \\ & 21655: 11,21655: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21484: 1,21503: 12, \\ & 21512: 23,21534: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { note-making [1] - } \\ & \text { 21499:24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21608: 5,21640: 20, \\ & 21646: 12,21646: 13, \end{aligned}$ |
| 21533:11, 21555:19 | $\begin{aligned} & 21662: 1,21662: 3 \\ & 21668: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21534: 19,21538: 19, \\ & 21578: 22,21584: 15, \end{aligned}$ | notebook [4] - <br> 21383.10, $21383 \cdot 15$ | 21652:16, 21659:15 |
| name... [1]-21445:12 narcissism [1] - | new [5] - 21385:14, | 21585:20, 21596:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21383:10, 21383:15, } \\ & 21406: 20,21663: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 0 |
| 21408:5 | 21387:16, 21402:24, | 21631: | noted [11] - 21411:5, |  |
| National [1] - 21655:21 nature [9]-21466:19, | $\begin{gathered} 21561: 11,21611: 13 \\ \text { news [8] - 21387:13, } \end{gathered}$ | Nichol's [1] - 21418:13 <br> Nicole [3] - 21405:13, | $21481: 20,21482: 18,$ | o'clock [3] - 21437:2, |
| 21474:5, 21486:4, | 21401:6, 21431:16, | 21413:3, 21419:24 | 21517:18, 21545:16, | 21644:21 |
| 21523:2, 21535:18, | 21463:14, 21470:15, | night [15] - 21388:18 | 21550:20, 21553:25, | objection [2] - |
| 21553:20, 21560:20, | 21474:2, 21496:11, | 21413:13, 21431:17, | 21567:6, 21643:12 | $21605: 23,21666: 1$ |
| 21563:1, 21599:16 near [4] - 21405:7, | 21612:18 newspap | $\begin{aligned} & 21431: 18,21431: 19, \\ & 21432: 18,21437: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { notes [29] - 21383:12, } \\ & \text { 21501:18, 21501:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { objections [1] - } \\ & \text { 21669:8 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 21417:1, 21508:1, | $21412: 4$ | $21439: 24,21439: 25$ | $21502: 5,21503: 17$ | obliged [2] - 21666:6, |
| 21579:19 | newspapers... [1] - | 21440:11, 21450:6, | 21503:18, 21503:24, | 21667:21 |
| Near [1] - 21622 :8 | 21446:4 | $21451 \text { :21, 21464:9, }$ | $21504: 20,21506: 15,$ | observation [1] - |
| necessarily [2] - | Next [1] - 21546:19 | $21546: 25,21584: 18$ | $21508: 25,21511: 13,$ | $21411: 4$ |
| $21628: 6,21631: 13$ | next [58] - 21383:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { nighttime [1] - } \\ & 215 \Delta 7 \cdot 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21511: 22,21512: 8, \\ & 21516: 22,21545: 16, \end{aligned}$ | obsessive [2] - 21401:9, 21402:17 |
| necessary [2] - <br> 21646.24 21653 | $\begin{aligned} & 21390: 6,21391: 4, \\ & 21391: 11,21392: 25, \end{aligned}$ | nine [1] - 21645:1 | $21549: 4,21569: 22$ | obtain [2] - 21595:18, |
| necessitating [] | 21393:15, 21393:25, | nineteen [7]-21620:4, | $21570: 2,21572: 21,$ | 21606:17 |
| 21659:16 | 21407:21, 21411:22, | 21620:5, 21620:6, | 21575:4, 21575:5, | obtained [2] - 21393:4, |
| need [12]-21390:2 | 21426:24, 21428:18, | $21623: 3,21625: 2$ | 21576:10, 21576:20, | $21648: 15$ |
| 21394:20, 21479:24, | $21431: 19,21463: 21,$ <br> 21464:17 21485:19 | 21625:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 21579: 6,21596: 12, \\ & 21600: 5,21640: 3, \end{aligned}$ | obvious [3] - 21498:9, |
| $21513: 2,21549: 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21464:17, 21485:19, } \\ & \text { 21495:22, 21510:3. } \end{aligned}$ | nite [1] - 21507:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 21600: 5,21640: 3, \\ & 21674: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $21508: 20,21581: 7$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21553: 19,21573: 16, \\ & 21595: 4,21633: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $21511: 22,21523: 21$ | Nobody [2] - 21581:10, 21604:3 | nothing [23] - 21405:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Obviously[1] - } \\ & \text { 21602:18 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 21647:6, 21650:10, | 21534:4, 21547:25, | nobody [4]-21440:7 | 21418:11, 21427:12, | obviously [26] - |
| 21670:11 | 21551:19, 21554:18, | $21440: 8,21458: 21,$ | 21432:13, 21443:15, | 21392:12, 21395:7, |
| needed [5] - 21452:13, | $\begin{aligned} & 21563: 23,21564: 5, \\ & 21565: 23,21566: 5, \end{aligned}$ | 21604:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 21450: 25,21452: 20, \\ & 21463: 24,21464: 3, \end{aligned}$ | 21418:8, 21427:10, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21559:15, 21592:9, } \\ & 21599: 21,21672: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $21571: 12,21572: 20,$ | None[1]-21631:8 | $21496: 4,21538: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21467:14, 21467:21, } \\ & \text { 21473:9, 21479:17, } \end{aligned}$ |
| needle [1] - 21591:17 | 21572:25, 21573:6, | 21516:5, 21591:13, | 21538:25, 21556:25, | 21489:12, 21495:3, |
| neg [1] - 21542:3 | $21574: 2,21581: 20$ | $21608: 10,21631: 4$ | $21612: 6,21633: 8$ | $21515: 25,21524: 14,$ |
| negative [1] - 21498:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21587:1, } 21596: 9, \\ & 21598: 17,21599: 23 \end{aligned}$ | nonsense [1] - $21404: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21638: 20,21641: 7, \\ & 21654: 10,21657: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21538: 18,21543: 25, \\ & 21552: 17.21553: 14 . \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { negotiation [1] - } \\ & 21662: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21598: 17,21599: 23, \\ & 21600: 11,21609: 17, \end{aligned}$ | normal | 21662:13, 21668:4 | 21576:1, 21576:24, |
| neighbour [3] - | $21613: 16,21614: 18$ | $21461: 21,21536: 2,$ | notice [14] - 21445:25, | 21577:1, 21577:15, |
| 21436:18, 21564:5, | $\begin{aligned} & 21616: 21,21620: 12, \\ & 21622: 10,21625: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $21536: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21454: 20,21463: 3 \\ & 21568: 7,21568: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21591: 9,21605: 7, \\ & 21621: 13,21628: 23, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21578:15 } \\ & \text { neighbourhood [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $21630: 1,21638: 23$ | Normal [1] - 21396:6 <br> normal' [1] - 21396:12 | $21645: 23,21650: 21,$ | $21628: 25,21670: 7$ |
| $21451: 25$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21639: 24,21640: 8, \\ & 21644: 19,21645: 14 \end{aligned}$ | normally [1] - 21648:25 | $\begin{aligned} & 21650: 22,21651: 14, \\ & 21651: 19,21651: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { occasion [7] - } \\ & 21402: 10,21462: 25, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { nervous [2] - 21395:16, } \\ & \text { 21498:15 } \end{aligned}$ | $21645: 20,21646: 11,$ | North [1] - 21565:13 <br> north [1] - 21507:2 | $21655: 7,21661: 8$ | 21463:13, 21475:9, |
| neutral [1]-21671:11 | $21650: 14,21651: 7$ | northern [1] - 21455:16 | $21663: 13$ | 21504:10, 21507:7, |
| never [38]-21395:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21657:19, 21668:4, } \\ & 21672: 12 \end{aligned}$ | note [26] - 21390:4, | November [4] - 21617:23, 21646:1 | $21670: 8$ |
| 21396:12, 21405:9, | nice [5] - 21416:14, | 21390:12, 21466:17, | $21651 \text { :2, } 21652: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { occasionally [1] - } \\ & 21612: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21410:18, 21434:11, } \\ & 21436: 21,21437: 1, \end{aligned}$ | 21443:19, 21453:20, | $\begin{aligned} & 21499: 24,21509: 13, \\ & 21510: 11,21510: 17, \end{aligned}$ | nowadays [1] - | occasions [3] |
| 21437:11, 21447:5, | 21469:23, 21479:9 | $21511: 8,21511: 24,$ | 21386:10 | 21507:3, 21663:15, |
| $21447: 7,21493: 25$ | Nichol [30] - 21390:25, | 21513:11, 21514:1, | nowhere [1] - 21591:12 | $21663: 17$ |
| 21494:6, 21497:17, |  | 21514:4, 21514:21, |  | occurred [4] - 21517:2, |
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| araphrasing [2] - | Patrick [2] - 21652:1, | 21500:19, 21502:21, | 21405:3, 21467:6 | 21453:5, 21453:9, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21409:17, 21638:19 <br> Pardon [2] - 21461:13, | $\begin{aligned} & 21655: 9 \\ & \text { Paul's [1]-21508:: } \end{aligned}$ | 21510:22, 21511:6, 21511:10, 21518:11, | peruse [1] - 21614:3 <br> perverse [1] - 21409:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21453:11, 21453:17, } \\ & \text { 21453:22, 21454:1, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 21668:18 | use [1] - 21624:7 | 21519:5, 21524:9 | perversion [1] | 1454:8, 214 |
| pardon [1] - 21452:23 | 440:1 | 21 | 2161 | 21 |
| parents [2] - 21386:12, | 21544:8 | 21536:16, 21540:22 | 231] - 21382:3, | $21455: 1,21455: 9$ |
| 21561:10 | 21659:5 | 21544:10, 21567: | 21382:6, 21382:8, | 21455:21, 21455:25, |
| parish [2] - | peak [1] - 21474:16 | 2 | 21382:11, 21383:5 | 21456:3, 21456 |
| 21389:1 | uliar [1] - 21590:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 21595: 17,21596: 11 \\ & 21596: 23,21600: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21391: 7,21391: 12, \\ & 21429: 22,21429: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21456: 13,21456: 18, \\ & 21456: 21,21456: 24, \end{aligned}$ |
| 21444:11, 215 |  | $21602: 7,21603: 20$ | $21430: 3,21430: 7,$ | 21457:7, 21457:15 |
| ked [2] - 21488:23, | 21612:23, 21616:5 | 21605:25, 21606: | 21430:11, 21430:13 | $\begin{aligned} & 21457: 21,21458: \\ & 21458: 10,21458: \end{aligned}$ |
| 21597:8 | le [43]-21385:14, | 21606:25, 21607: | 21430:16, 21430:22 | $21458: 10,21458: 1$ $21458: 25,21459: 2,$ |
| Parole [1] - 21655:21 parole [1] - 21638:3 | 21385:22, 21391:16, 21392:5, 21398:3, | $\begin{aligned} & 21609: 7,21616: 16, \\ & 21617: 23,21621: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21431: 1,21431: 12, \\ & 21431: 15,21431: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21458: 25,21459: 2 \\ & 21459: 7,21459: 9, \end{aligned}$ |
| paroled | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \\ & 21 \end{aligned}$ | 21622:1, 21622:3 | 21432:4, 21432:8 | 459:14, 21459:17, |
| part [22] - 21398:15, | 21408:21, 21418:7 | 21629:13, 21630:1 | 21432:10, 21432:17 | 21459:24, 21460:2 |
| 21399:1, 21418:14, | 21434:7, $21441: 3$, | 21636:6, 21636 | 21432:20, 21432:23, | 21460:8, 21460 |
| 21423:17, 21460:23, | 21441:21, 21442:2 | 21637:21, 21644:2 | 21433:2, 21433:5 | 21460:19, 21461 |
| 21499:18, 21507:11, | 21449:18, 21452:15 | 21 | 21433:8, 21433:14, | 1:8, 2146 |
| 21510:19, 21528:10, | 21452:16, 21454:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { period [14] - 21419:1 } \\ & \text { 21451:19, } 21465: 22, \end{aligned}$ | 21433:17, 21433:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21461:14, } 21461: 25, \\ & \text { 21462:5, 21462:9, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $21531: 3,21542: 13$, $21542 \cdot 14,21543: 20$, | 21467:7, 21503:13, $21503: 15,21541: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21451: 19,21465: 22, \\ & \text { 21483:25, 21484:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21434: 1,21434: 4, \\ & \text { 21434:8, 21434:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21462:5, 21462:9, } \\ & \text { 21462:11, 21462:15, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $21560: 3,21569: 22$ | $21543: 25,21544:$ | 21515:4, 21532:13 | 21434:17, 21434:22, | 21462:18, 21464:8 |
| 21591 :2, 21595:17 | 21553:6, 21553 | 21577:23, 21578: | 21435:5, 21435: | 21464:11, 214 |
| 21640:6, 21646:6, | 21556:16, 21563:23, | 21579:17, 21584:1 | 21435:14, 21435:17, | 21464:25, 2146 |
| 21652:24, 21654:9, | 21566:3, 21570:16 | 21589:16, 21643:17 | 21435:20, 21435:24, | 465:10, 214 |
| 21673:10 | 21593:22, 21598:8 | 21653:7 | 21436:6, $21436: 8$, | 21468:3, 21468:9 |
| part-time [1] - 21591 :2 | 21598:9, 21603:2 | $\text { oeriods [1] - } 21476: 2$ | 21436:12, 21436:15, | $\begin{aligned} & 21468: 19,21469: 2, \\ & 21469: 10,21470: 25, \end{aligned}$ |
| part-way [1] - 21499:18 | 21606:23, 21614:23 | $\begin{gathered} \text { permanent [2] - } \\ \text { 21590:10, } 21590: \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21436:23, 21437:7, } \\ & \text { 21437:15, 21437:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21469: 10,21470: 25, \\ & 21471: 4,21471: 8, \end{aligned}$ |
| participate [1] $21670: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \\ & 21 \end{aligned}$ | permission [6] - | 21438:4, 21438:11, | 21471:10, 21471:18, |
| particular | $21661: 11,21671: 2$ | 21600:15, 21600:1 | 21438:18, 21438:24, | 471:21, 21478:12, |
| 21395:9, 21 | per [1]-21580:6 | 21604:12, 21605:9 | 21439:3, 21439:7 | 478:16, 21478:18, |
| 21505:13, 21510:19, | percent [4]-21516:14, | 21606:20, 21668:1 | 21439:9, 21439:14, | 21555:9, 21555:1 |
| 21511:9, 21543:12, | 21518:14, 21518:23, | perpetrator [1] | 21439:18, 21439:23, | 21555:13, 21555:17, |
| $21549: 5,21567: 23,$ | 21588:4 | 21613:10 | 21440:4, 21440:10 | 21555:23, 21556:2, |
| 21568:7, 21570:7, | ect [1] - 21603:12 | person [17]-21404:22, | 21440:15, 21440:22 | 21556:5, |
| 21585:11, 21613:2, | perfectly [2]-21536:2, | 21450:11, 21469:24 | 21441:4, 21441:17 | 21556:12, 21556:17, |
| 21615:8, 21617:14, | 21536:3 | 21477:8, $21479: 9$ | 21441:23, 21442: | 21556:21, 21557:2 |
| 21643:1, 21652:8 | performe | 21507:22, 21516:9 | 21442:16, 21442:22, | 21557:5, 21557 |
| particularly [3] | $213$ | 21561:5, 21573:22 | 21442:25, 21443:9 | 21557:13, 21557:15, |
| 21534:19, 21537 | Perhaps [3] - 21483:4, | 21601:13, 21611:25 | 21443:22, 21444:3, | 21557:18, 21557:24, |
| 21567:25 | $21509: 25,215$ | 21626:14, 21635:25 | 21444:24, 21445:1 | 21558:2, 21558:6 |
| parties [4]-21648:11, | perhaps [69] | 21654:18, 21654:19 | 21445:6, 21445:11, | 21558:9, 21558:12, |
| 21659:18, 21671:11, | $\text { 21387:14, } 2138$ | 21655:2, 21664:4 | 21445:14, 21445:17, | $\begin{aligned} & 21558: 15,21558: 19, \\ & 21561: 16,21561: 18, \end{aligned}$ |
| 21671:15 | 21389:16, 21389:20, | $\begin{gathered} \text { personal [4] } \\ 21485: 14,21 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21445:19, 21445:24, } \\ & \text { 21446:3, 21446:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21561:16, 21561:18, } \\ & \text { 21561:21, } 21561: 24, \end{aligned}$ |
| parting [1] - 21 | $21391: 19,21393: 8$ | $\text { 21653:3, } 21662: 2$ | 21446:16, 21446:20, | 21562:6, 21562:13, |
| party [1]-2156 | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \\ & 21 \end{aligned}$ | personality [2] | $21446: 21,21447: 10$ | 21562:16, 21562:20, |
| 21603:1 | 21414:13, 21414:14 | 21408:3, 21485 | 21447:17, 21447:21, | 21562:24, 21563:3, |
| passed [1] - 21539:8 | 21415:19, 21423:10 | personally [1] | 21447:25, 21448:2 | 21563:6, 21563:10, |
| $\text { passing [1] - } 21521: 15$ | 21425:15, 21428:4, | 21665:10 | $\begin{aligned} & 21448: 9,21448: 12 \\ & 21448: 19,21448: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21563:12, 21563:17, } \\ & \text { 21563:19, 21564:15, } \end{aligned}$ |
| passion [1]-21477:20 | 21429:12, 21463:18, | $2165$ | 21449:3, 21449:10, | 21565:3, 21565:15, |
| past [7] - 21395:23, | 21466:14, 21470:11, | ad | 21449:12, 21449:22, | 21566:12, 21566:15, |
| 21403:21, 21408:10, $21481 \cdot 2$ 21507.9 | $21476: 22,21481:$ | $388: 11$ | $21450: 9,21450: 13,$ | 21603:18, 21605:3, |
| $\text { 21623:2, 2162\} }$ | $21486: 8,21490: 13,$ | persuading [1] | 21450:17, 21450:21, | 21617:1, 21618:1, |
| past' [1] - 21546:24 | $21491: 12,21491: 21$ | 21391:10 | 21 | 21619:5, 21643:19 |
| $\text { Pat }[1]-21381: 7$ | 21499:13, 21500:10, | persuasive [2] - | $21451: 11,21452: 1,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { philosophical [1] - } \\ & \text { 21617:13 } \end{aligned}$ |


| Phoenix [5] - 21571:21, | 21431:17, 21434:11, | 21485:2, 21494:5, | 21478:14, 21479:3, | 21397:14, 21404:2, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21573:10, 21574:6, | 21435:1, 21440:1, | 21495:23, 21502:20, | $21479: 6,21484: 6,$ | 21463:2, 21492:23, |
| $21624: 5,21626: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21443:17, 21444:7, } \\ & \text { 21450:1, 21472:3. } \end{aligned}$ | $21513: 22,21519: 16$ | $21484: 7,21495: 10$ | $21496: 25,21525: 12$ |
| 21430:19, 21432:22, | 21475:4, 21483:14 | 21534:7, 21536:5, | 21502:10, 21502:19, | 21533:17, 21534:2, |
| 21464:13, 21539:19, | 21485:25, 21486:25, | 21539:11, 21544:2 | 21502:22, 21506:19, | 21547:25, 21584:2, |
| 21539:21, 21541:2, | 21489:25, 21490:10, | 21549:22, 21549:23, | 21509:2, 21509:3, | 21603:22, 21611:11, |
| 21541:13, 21541:15, | 21523:24, 21526:18, | 21552:1, 21560:22 | 21509:23, 21515:17, | 21617:5, 21619:14, |
| 21572:21, 21618:13, | 21530:24, 21540:16, | 21572:6, 21572:12, | 21516:24, 21518:3, | 21639:11 |
| 21623:20 | 21545:25, 21555:4, | 21577:2, 21577:13, | 21526:14, 21528:12, | portrait [1] - 21460:14 |
| phoned [6] - 21387:23, | 21564:2, 21567:17 | 21579:12, 21580:20, | 21529:16, 21531:1, | posed [1] - 21665:5 |
| 21432:24, 21464:19, | 21569:11, 21569:13, | 21581:18, 21582:8, | 21535:8, 21535:11, | position [6]-21533:9, |
| 21549:13, 21604:22, | 21570:14, 21571:1, | 21583:25, 21585:20, | 21536:17, 21536:19, | 21534:13, 21591:2, |
| 21634:11 | 21634:19 | $\text { 21586:12, } 21591: 23,$ | 21545:15, 21553:3, $21555 \cdot 2021557.21$ | $\text { 21605:18, } 21661: 22,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { phonetic [4]-21620:2, } \\ & \text { 21634:13. } 21634: 14 . \end{aligned}$ | place' [1] - 21547:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 21592: 11,21598: 1, \\ & 21602: 21,21611: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21555: 20,21557: 21 \\ & 21559: 14.21560: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $21663: 23$ |
| 21634:17 | 21574:5 | 21613:13, 21617:10, | 21577:16, 21587:7, | $21389: 3,21495: 8$ |
| phoning [1] - 21578:16 | placing [1] - 21425:6 | 21621:9, 21624:4, | 21598:21, 21612:15, | 21538:9, 21621:10 |
| photo [1]-21449:13 | plan [1] - 21499:13 | $21627: 24,21628: 23,$ | $21614: 4,21614: 10$ | possessed [2] - |
| photographs [4]- | planned [4]-21461:4, | $\begin{aligned} & 21632: 11,21637: 12, \\ & 21639: 3,21640: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21620: 18,21621: 11, \\ & 21621 \cdot 1621627 \cdot 9 \end{aligned}$ | 21401:24, $21401: 25$ |
| 21428:13, 21637:7, | $21519: 25,21523: 7$ | $\text { 21639:3, } 21640: 20,$ | 21621:16, 21622:9, $21624: 12,21628: 3$ | possession [3]- |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21637:17, 21638:13 } \\ & \text { physical [1]-21402:9 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21524:1 } \\ & \text { planning [3]-21460:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21642: 21,21644: 1, \\ & 21644: 15,21649: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21624:12, 21628:3, } \\ & \text { 21633:1, 21633:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21383: 11,21578: 3 \\ & 21609: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| Physical [1] - 21597:10 | $21460: 19,21591: 8$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21653: 19,21658: 13, \\ & 21663: 13.21663: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21633:7, 21638:17, } \\ & 21643: 22,21652: 14 \end{aligned}$ | possibility [1] - |
| physically [1] - 21598:2 | $\begin{gathered} \text { play }[7]-21418: 14, \\ \text { 21100.10 } 21187 \cdot 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21663: 13,21663: 15, \\ & 21664: 16,21665: 14, \end{aligned}$ | 21663:14 | 21629:10 |
| pick [3] - 21435:25, | $21555: 1,21555: 7$ | 21669:22 | policeman [3] | $21391: 14,21411: 9$ |
| $21525: 15,21528: 7$ | $21561: 14,21603: 10$ played [6] - 21423:13 | pointed [1] - 21404:5 <br> pointing [2] - 21437:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21401:11, 21635:21, } \\ & 21636: 2 \end{aligned}$ | 21463:20, 21475:24, |
| 21447:14, 21447:15, | 21485:4, 21555:1, | 21468:4 | policemen [2] - | 21499:22, 21551:25, |
| $21447: 19,21451: 2$ | $21576: 25,21582: 22,$ | $\text { points [4] - } 21481: 20 \text {, }$ 21597:19. 21648:18. | 21582:14, 21582:23 | $21571: 24,21578: 12,$ |
| $21451 \text { :8, } 21451: 17$ | 21616:1 <br> players [1]-21503: | $\begin{aligned} & 21597: 19,21648: 18, \\ & 21672: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { polite [2]-21498:22, } \\ & 21501: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21587:6, 21598:2, } \\ & \text { 21608:17, 21628:20, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $21471: 2,21513: 15$ | Pleasant [2] - 21563:25, | Police [6] - 21381:7, | pop [1] - 21475:2 | 21647:12, 21648:9, |
| picking [5] - 21396:14, | 21564:4 | $21536: 25,21613: 18$ | popping [1] - 21402:17 | 21671:23 |
| 21465:23, 21466:10, | pleasure [1] - 21409:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 21615: 1,21619: 8, \\ & 21632: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { popular [2] - 21405:3, } \\ & 21409: 5 \end{aligned}$ | possibly [13] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21557: 22,21557: 25 \\ & \text { picture }[3]-21417: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Pm [7]-21506:25, } \\ \text { 21507:21, } 21508: 5, \end{gathered}$ | police [98] - 21387:5, | portion [42]-21385:13, | $\begin{aligned} & 21386: 19,21387: 2, \\ & 21388: 16,21448: 13, \end{aligned}$ |
| 21502:1, 21520:12 | $21533: 21,21616: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21387: 15,21388: 6, \\ & 21388: 12,21388: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $21391: 22,21401: 16,$ <br> 21414.23, 21418:3 | $21471: 22,21491: 8$ |
| pictures [3] - 21403:8, | 21616:19, 21673:18 | 21389:13, 21389:23, | $21470: 18,21476: 18$ | 21498:24, 21527:20, 21592:7, 21593:2, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21412: 23,21427: 3 \\ & \text { piece }[4]-21507: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { point }[92]-21383: 9 \text {, } \\ & \text { 21387:18, 21388:9, } \end{aligned}$ | 21396:14, 21412:17, | $21476: 23,21477: 11$ | 21629:21, 21633:14, |
| 21610:15, 21618:11, | 21392:14, 21392:21, | 21412:21, 21413:12, | $21479: 24,21490: 23,$ | 21661:15 |
| 21629:8 | 21395:15, 21398:9, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21414:16, 21416:4, } \\ & \text { 21416:7, 21418:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21506:17, 21508:14, } \\ & 21510: 4,21521: 16, \end{aligned}$ | post [2] - 21653:7, |
| piercing [1] - 21507:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 21398: 12,21399: 4, \\ & 21399: 12.21403: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $21420: 21,21422: 3,$ | 21523:10, 21525:16, | 21660:16 |
| pile [1] - 21424:3 | $\begin{aligned} & 21399: 12,21403: 2 \\ & 21404: 16,21404: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $21431 \text { :5, } 21431 \text { :20, }$ | 21528:1, 21531:17, | 21653:7 |
| $21547: 2$ | 21407:19, 21412:8, | 21432:25, 21433:11, | 21531:21, 21531:24, | post-traumatic [1] - |
| pinpoint [1] - 21483:14 | $21412: 10,21414: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21433:16, 21437:9, } \\ & 21439: 10.21441: 24 . \end{aligned}$ | $21532: 2,21533: 9,$ <br> $21536.17,21540 \cdot 22$ | $21660: 16$ |
| pique [1] - 21473:19 | 21414:8, 21418:8, 21422:9. 21422:19 | $21447: 14,21450: 22$ | 21544:16, 21545:14, | posted [1] - 21669:13 |
| piqued [1] - 21473:16 | 21423:3, 21423:9, | $21452: 9,21453: 7,$ | $21546: 20,21548: 6,$ | postponed [1] - 21595:14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pity [1] - 21462:1 } \\ & \text { pity [1] - } 21462: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 21429:13, 21429:15, | 21458:6, 21459:10 | $21550: 13,21561: 14$ | pot [1] - 21633:15 |
| Place [2] - 21508:3, | 21455:3, 21456:14, | $21464: 20,21465: 6,$ <br> 21465.12, 21465.23 | 21584:13, 21586:21, | potential [2]-21415:4, |
| 21572:16 | 21467:11, 21470:15, | 21465:12, 21465:23, | 21587:11, 21596:23, | 21484:10 |
| place [37] - 21384:4, | 21472:4, 21472:16, | $\begin{aligned} & 21466: 2,21466: 9, \\ & 21468: 1,21469: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 21600:4, 21600:12, 21614:18, 21620:14 | potentially [1] - |
| 21384:24, 21385:2, | $\begin{aligned} & 21472: 19,21475: 12, \\ & 21476: 8,21476: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $21470: 22,21474: 9$ | $21627: 20,21633: 19,$ | 21608:19 |
| 21390:5, 21394:23, | $21477: 24,21478: 7$ | 21474:15, 21476:20, | 21640:8 | power [1] - $21434: 7$ |
| 21397:11, 21400:17, | $21478: 24,21482: 23,$ | $21476: 23,21477: 3,$ | portions [17] - | practically [1] - |



Page 28


Page 29



Page 31



| ```suffered [1] - 21598:9 suffers [1] - 21656:3 suggest [7]-21394:23, 21467:6, 21491:17, 21547:10, 21609:1, 21641:1, 21668:3 suggested [4] - 21396:16, 21532:18, 21587:13, 21606:23 suggesting [3] - 21388:4, 21500:6, 21601:5 suggestion [9] - 21544:10, 21547:10, 21584:21, 21585:13, 21585:25, 21586:5, 21595:17, 21628:16, 21641:22 suggests [2] - 21426:13, 21597:11 suitcases [1] - 21627:17 summarize [7] - 21423:10, 21426:11, 21428:4, 21480:4, 21518:9, 21596:11, 21600:3 summary [7] - 21385:3, 21400:4, 21514:14, 21518:17, 21569:25, 21597:18, 21600:7 summation [2] - 21502:6, 21503:21 summer [1] - 21493:11 Sun[3]-21616:23, 21617:1, 21618:11 Sunday [2] - 21474:15, 21607:20 supply [1] - 21575:25 Support [1] - 21380:9 support [11] - 21641:8, 21646:8, 21647:18, 21650:21, 21651:15, 21654:16, 21655:7, 21666:8, 21667:19, 21668:2, 21670:2 supported [1] - 21643:24 supporting [4] - 21651:24, 21654:14, 21672:7, 21672:19 suppose [9]-21386:9, 21497:13, 21503:12, 21535:17, 21536:5, 21536:9, 21557:9, 21584:9, 21631:9 supposed [2] - 21455:11, 21632:19 supposition [1] - 21655:22``` | $\qquad$ <br> surface [1]-21450:1 <br> surmising [1] - <br> 21498:21 <br> surprise [1] - 21638:11 <br> surprised [8] - <br> 21432:11, 21445:5, <br> 21467:13, 21512:24, <br> 21585:18, 21602:12, <br> 21605:21, 21605:22 <br> surprises [1] - 21443:4 <br> surprising [1] - <br> 21660:16 <br> surrounding [2] - <br> 21573:19, 21618:20 <br> suspect [15] - <br> 21388:23, 21416:22, <br> 21472:20, 21475:7, <br> 21511:1, 21526:20, <br> 21528:16, 21530:9, <br> 21532:7, 21556:20, <br> 21560:17, 21577:10, <br> 21579:18, 21580:1, <br> 21648:3 <br> suspects [4]-21484:6, <br> 21553:8, 21579:21, <br> 21629:25 <br> suspicion [3] - <br> 21387:24, 21578:24, <br> 21621:15 <br> suspicions [4] - <br> 21414:3, 21470:10, <br> 21600:21, 21602:2 <br> suspicious [6] <br> 21437:9, 21454:22, <br> 21496:16, 21496:20, <br> 21614:17, 21621:23 <br> Sussex [1] - 21580:17 <br> switched [1] - 21497:17 <br> swung [1] - 21507:21 <br> sympathies [1] - <br> 21601:1 <br> synced [1] - 21429:12 <br> synopsis [1] - 21596:25 <br> system [2] - 21614:21, <br> 21662:11 <br> systemic [1] - 21633:14 <br> T <br> Ts [1] - 21643:7 <br> tail [1] - 21638:14 <br> tail-end [1] - 21638:14 <br> talents [3] - 21391:13, <br> 21391:24, 21392:16 <br> talker [2]-21433:24, <br> 21466:20 <br> talks [12]-21401:10, <br> 21409:10, 21411:23, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21545:3, 21589:9, } \\ & \text { 21641:18 } \\ & \text { Telephone[2]- } \\ & \text { 21382:5, 21429:22 } \\ & \text { temperatures [1]- } \\ & \text { 21597:4 } \\ & \text { Templeton[1] - 21619:7 } \\ & \text { temps [1] - 21597:12 } \\ & \text { ten [6] -21418:24, } \\ & \text { 21419:1, 21437:18, } \\ & \text { 21468:7, 21544:4, } \\ & \text { 21619:21 } \\ & \text { tend [1]-21641:1 } \\ & \text { tended [1]-21408:16 } \\ & \text { tendency [1]-21633:17 } \\ & \text { terms [69] -21384:17, } \\ & 21391: 21,21391: 23, \\ & 21392: 14,21399: 13, \\ & 21399: 20,21411: 10, \\ & 21414: 7,21414: 16, \\ & 21418: 3,21425: 6, \\ & 21425: 21,21426: 11, \\ & 21427: 11,21428: 7, \\ & 21463: 18,21465: 21, \\ & 21466: 3,21470: 3, \\ & 21474: 23,21478: 22, \\ & 21480: 11,21487: 21, \\ & 21490: 21,21491: 8, \\ & 21492: 21,21497: 1, \\ & 21497: 2,21498: 2, \\ & 21505: 5,21511: 7, \\ & 21516: 6,21519: 24, \\ & 21524: 23,21530: 12, \\ & 21538: 5,21538: 14, \\ & 21542: 23,21542: 25, \\ & 21543: 11,21551: 11, \\ & 21554: 8,21559: 7, \\ & 21560: 19,21567: 4, \\ & 21575: 20,21592: 25, \\ & 21594: 21,21597: 20, \\ & 21603: 6,21606: 3, \\ & 21606: 8,21607: 1, \\ & 21620: 24,21621: 5, \\ & 21623: 15,21627: 20, \\ & 21628: 15,21629: 4, \\ & 21630: 9,21631: 20, \\ & 21636: 4,21636: 14, \\ & 21637: 16,21659: 22, \\ & 21661: 16,21661: 19, \\ & 21663: 7,21673: 2 \\ & \text { terrible }[2]-21479: 7, \\ & 21589: 15 \\ & \text { terribly }[1]-21622: 20 \\ & \text { terrified }[1]-21407: 13 \\ & \text { test }[1]-21406: 3 \\ & \text { testified }[5]-21429: 7, \\ & 21481: 16,21553: 18, \\ & 21663: 17,21665: 4 \\ & \text { testifies }[2]-21643: 3, \\ & 21669: 20 \end{aligned}$ | ```testify [15] - 21427:23, 21442:18, 21446:5, 21446:7, 21446:8, 21458:15, 21458:19, 21459:3, 21459:4, 21482:10, 21482:12, 21482:19, 21537:1, 21655:6, 21667:16 testifying [10] - 21458:23, 21482:20, 21646:17, 21648:13, 21651:5, 21651:17, 21653:20, 21657:24, 21658:4, 21669:10 testimony [5] - 21528:2, 21531:18, 21531:25, 21613:25, 21631:5 Testimony[1] - 21379:14 th [1] - 21449:25 Thankfully[1] - 21498:5 thankfully [1] - 21497:17 that' [3] - 21503:2, 21547:4, 21547:14 Thatcher[[] - 21591:6 that... [2]-21441:22, 21461:2 that's [25] - 21434:20, 21435:22, 21435:23, 21439:18, 21439:23, 21440:13, 21442:19, 21443:25, 21444:22, 21445:2, 21453:13, 21456:8, 21457:1, 21457:9, 21458:4, 21458:15, 21459:19, 21460:16, 21461:1, 21461:22, 21462:2, 21462:8 Thats [9] - 21430:13, 21433:19, 21443:4, 21449:11, 21454:9, 21460:24, 21462:10, 21465:16, 21561:23 themselves [1] - 21589:23 them... [1]-21445:13 then... [1]-21434:12 theories [3] - 21477:24, 21496:14, 21596:16 theory [12] - 21403:5, 21403:6, 21407:19, 21407:22, 21409:18, 21417:25, 21418:5, 21423:18, 21465:20, 21578:23, 21594:5, 21609:21 thereafter [1] - 21654:3``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| therefore [2] - | 21555:4, 21555:15, |  | 21379:12, 21383:1 | tremendous [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21412:11, 21500:4 | 21566:22, 21624:18, | $21511: 24,21513: 11,$ | transcript [54] | 21632:17 |
| therefrom [1]-21656:3 | 21624:24, 21625:2, | 21569:11, 21569:13, | 21395:2, 21397:6, | trial [21]-21396:14, |
| therein [1]-21651:23 <br> thereto [1]-21652:11 | $\begin{aligned} & 21625: 23,21625: 25, \\ & 21626: 2,21648: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 21569:24, } 21591: 24 \\ \text { Top[1] - } 21446: 20 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21397: 19,21423: 9, \\ & 21424: 6,21424: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21401: 4,21409: 10 \\ & 21484: 13.21488: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| there... [1] - 21454:25 | 21668:12 | top [20]-21385:10 | 21425:3, 21425:19, | 21488:5, 21494:12, |
| there's [6]-21444:7, | threshold | 21397:17, 21424:25, | 21428:19, 21472: | 21503:16, 21525:20, |
| 21449:5, 21564:10, | 21650:23, 21664:7, | 21464:18, 21467:10, | 21475:21, 21481:16, | 21525:25, 21526:4, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21565: 22,21566: 6, \\ & 21566: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21669: 12 \\ \text { threw [1] } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21468:18, } 21505: 11 \\ & 21518: 7,21519: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21487:19, 21489:22, } \\ & \text { 21490:17, 21492:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21527: 23,21529: 4, \\ & 21529: 7.21529: 10 . \end{aligned}$ |
| There's [3] - 21449:5, | throughout [1] - | 21528:24, 21543:5, | 21503:23, 21503:25, | 21532:12, 21611:24, |
| 21453:15, 21461:5 | $21411: 3$ <br> throwing | $\begin{aligned} & 21545: 8,21550: 6 \\ & 21550: 22,21573: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21504: 1,21524: 8, \\ & 21525: 6.21526: 6 . \end{aligned}$ | 21638:17, 21652:20, |
| $21442: 22,21464: 22$ | thrown [1] - 21535:10 | 21582:2, 21595:12, | 21533:16, 21533:25, | tricks [1] - 21487:15 |
| the... [1]-21448:24 | Thursday[1] - 21646:12 | 21625:1, 21632:10, | 21534:2, 21538:3, | tried [10]-21395:17, |
| thick [1] - 21540:3 | thursday [1] - 21646:19 | 21640:11 | 21539:7, 21540:12, | 21400:13, 21402:22, |
| thick-set [1] - 21540:3 | th- [1] - 21449:25 | $\text { torch [1] - } 21603: 2$ | 21548:8, 21548:25, | $\begin{aligned} & 21459: 12,21487: 16, \\ & 21530: 3,21536: 22, \end{aligned}$ |
| 21411:7, 21412:5, | tie [1] - 21418:16 | Toronto[3]-21591:1, | 21553:19, 21568:20, 21582:15, 21583:4 | 21615:6, 21623:14 |
| 21443:2, 21460:22, | ties [1] - 21531:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 21593: 13,21617: 21 \\ & \text { total [1]-21608:2 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21582: 15,21583: 4 \\ & 21583: 5,21583: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21663: 20 \\ & \text { tries [1] - 21480:5 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21484:24, 21488:21, } \\ & 21552: 7,21578: 18, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { timetable [1] - 21390:21 } \\ & \text { timing [8] - 21394:21, } \end{aligned}$ | totally [3] - 21534:22, | 21583:16, 21596:6, | triggered [1] - 21653:22 |
| 21593:9, 21619:25, | 21396:21, 21486:3, | $21662: 24,21664: 21$ <br> Totally[1] - 21664:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21603:17, 21603:20, } \\ & \text { 21619:3, 21619:9, } \end{aligned}$ | trio [1] - 21597:9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21621: 10,21621: 14, \\ & 21623: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21486: 21,21487: 21, \\ & 21496: 20,21597: 3, \end{aligned}$ | Totally[1] - 21664:24 touch [6]-21431:16, | 21637:20, 21638:16, | $\begin{gathered} \text { trip [9]-21388:14, } \\ \text { 21403:7, 21405:18 } \end{gathered}$ |
| thinks [2]-21480:6, | 21611:20 | $21485: 25,21541: 8$ $\text { 21568:19. } 21599: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21639:15, 21639:17, } \\ & \text { 21639:19, 21640:6, } \end{aligned}$ | 21406:17, 21406:24, $\text { 21407:15. } 21427: 16$ |
| 21541:10 | tirelessly [1] - 21613:4 | $\begin{aligned} & 21568: 19,21599: 9 \\ & 21627: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21639: 19,21640: 6, \\ & 21642: 8,21642: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21407:15, 21427:16, } \\ & 21454: 21,21495: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| thinned [1] - 21577:6 <br> third [6] - 21413:14, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { title [2]-21617:25, } \\ & 21619: 5 \end{aligned}$ | touching [1] - 21602:13 tough [3] - 21396:21, | $21643: 1,21651: 1$ <br> transcription [13] - | trouble [2] - 21521:2, 21632:21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21433: 9,21437: 8, \\ & 21465: 4,21557: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { today [12]-21516:17, } \\ & \text { 21601:10, 21628:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $21453: 2,21541: 20$ | 21383:21, 21384:17, | truck [1] - 21455:7 |
| 21646:24 | 21644:22, 21644:25, | toward [1] - 21507:2 | 21384:22, 21523:22, | trucker [1]-21455:14 |
| thirteen [1] - 21401:19 <br> thorough [1] - 21660:5 | $21645: 9,21646: 3$ <br> 21646:10, 21649:10 | towards [9]-21408:8, <br> 21409:9, 21423:17 | $\begin{aligned} & 21525: 14,21540: 15 \\ & 21540: 20,21545: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { true [11] - 21412:12, } \\ & \text { 21430:23, 21454:18, } \end{aligned}$ |
| thoughts [13]- | $21649: 23,21658: 21$ | 21489:18, 21507:6, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21549:14, } 21558: 23, \\ & 21561: 11,21581: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $21467: 14,21482: 2$ |
| 21399:14, 21402:5, | 21670:22 | $\begin{aligned} & 21507: 10,21522: 4 \\ & 21539: 16,21608: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21561: 11,21581: 25, \\ & 21674: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21592: 7,21615: 3 \\ & 21658: 1,21658: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21423: 16,21494: 24, \\ & 21495: 2,21495: 6, \end{aligned}$ | Today[1]-21599:1 together [10] - | town [7]-21432:3, | transcripts [6] | $21661: 14,21674: 5$ |
| 21495:15, 21534:12, | $21406: 23,21499: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21439: 17,21439: 20 \\ & 21444: 8,21457: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21458: 13,21466: 1 \\ & 21589: 2,21590: 4 \end{aligned}$ | trunk [1] - 21455:13 <br> trusted [2] - 21602:5, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21538: 14,21579: 11, \\ & 21601: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21629: 9,21641: 3 \\ & 21641: 4.21641: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $21543: 6,21673: 13$ | transmission | $21636: 1$ |
| thousand [5] - 21452:9, | $21651: 15,21662: 9$ | trace [8] - 21391:9, | 21411:18 <br> traumatic [3] - | $21530: 22,21534: 9$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21452: 10,21452: 11, \\ & 21452: 22,21619: 22 \end{aligned}$ | Tom[2] - 21449:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21410:16, 21460:7, } \\ & 21555: 18,21561: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $21446: 10,21447: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21588:13, 21603:11, } \\ & 21663: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| threaten [1]-21458:23 threatened [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & 21541: 4,21644: 24 \\ & 21645: 11,21673: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21562: 17,21570: 20, \\ & 21581: 5 \end{aligned}$ | traumatized [2] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { truth' [1] - 21409:13 } \\ & \text { try [20] - 21390:17, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $21455: 5,21459: 6$ threatening [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { tone }[2]-21540: 8 \text {, } \\ & 21547: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { traces }[1]-21410: 13 \\ & \text { tracing }[4]-21391: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21660:11, 21660:13 } \\ & \text { Trav[3]-21487:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21391: 2,21394: 21, \\ & \text { 21404:9, } 21421: 3, \end{aligned}$ |
| 21615:10 | Tony[4]-21390:8 | 21392:2, 21551:16, | 21487:11, 21536:2 | 21421:4, 21428:20, |
| threats [2]-21615:1, | 21393:2, 21393:12, | $21570: 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Trava-leer [3] - } \\ & 21487: 7,21487: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21459: 25,21483: 22 \\ & 21489: 25,21499: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21615: 8 \\ & \text { three }[26]-21 \end{aligned}$ | 21550:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tracing[4]-21393:12, } \\ & 21393: 22,21550: 8, \end{aligned}$ | 21536:2 | 21489:25, 21499:2, $21541: 1,21558: 10$ |
| 21437:13, 21502:2, | too' [1] - 21545:2 | 21554:10 | Travel[1] - 21597:10 | 21565:15, 21566:13, |
| 21504:15, 21512:6, | took [19]-21384:24, | track [2] - 21483:13, | Traveleer [1] - | 21567:17, 21622:15, |
| 21512:11, 21512:12, | 21385:2, 21394:23, | 21593:17 | travelled [1] - 21385:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21647:10, 21664:17, } \\ & \text { 21668:11 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 21512:15, 21512:21, | 21397:11, 21403:22, | tracks [1] - 21630:3 | treated [3]-21404:23, | Trying[2] - 21433:5 |
| 21512:25, 21517:17, | $21404: 23,21407: 8$ | transcribed [2] - | $21476: 19,21477: 3$ | Trying[2] - 21433:5, $21464 \cdot 25$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21517: 21,21517: 22, \\ & 21530: 5,21532: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21439: 10,21483: 14 \\ & 21489: 16,21490: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 21554:22, 21641:11 <br> Transcript[2] - | treatment [1] - 21466:3 | trying [50]-21414:9, |
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| 21416:18, 21417:19, | 21620:12, 21632:10, | 21502:25, 21505:2, | 21660:17 | 21479:7, 21480:2, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21425:23, 21431:4, | 21633:25, 21653:16 | 21506:4 | underline [1] - | 21480:15, 21482:9, |
| 21432:25, 21433:3, | Turn[19]-21386:23, | types [1] - 21513:11 | 21629:23 | $21482: 10,21482: 22$ |
| 21438:6, 21441:11, | 21397:14, 21402:25, | typewriter [1] - 21505:3 | underpinnings [1] - | 21485:2, 21494:7, |
| 21464:21, 21464:23, | 21412:16, 21418:19, | typewriting [2] - | 21653:4 | 21496:9, 21498:17, |
| 21467:6, 21467:8, | 21422:17, 21428:18, | 21505:1, 21542:17 | understaffed [1] - | 21501:4, 21502:20, |
| 21468:21, 21469:21, | 21476:17, 21478:11, | typewritten [1] - | 21494:13 | 21508:11, 21513:15, |
| 21470:4, 21478:20, | 21489:22, 21533:16, | 21570:3 | understood [1] - | 21514:12, 21515:14, |
| 21480:17, 21481:5, | 21575:12, 21580:3, |  | 21605:19 | 21517:13, 21518:3, |
| 21481:8, $21482: 25$, | 21584:13, 21587:11, | U | uniform [1] - 21418:11 | 21519:5, 21520:11, $21522 \cdot 25 \quad 21.525 \cdot 15$ |
| $21501: 17,21502: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21588:17, 21588:19, } \\ & 21598: 17,21643: 14 \end{aligned}$ |  | unintelligible [4] 21421:11, 21526:22, | $\begin{aligned} & 21522: 25,21525: 15 \\ & 21528: 7,21528: 10, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21502:7, 21502:24, } \\ & 21507: 22,21522: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { turned [5] - 21394:8, } \\ & \text { 21433:20. } 21542: 2 . \end{aligned}$ | ugly [1] - 21447 :6 | $21546: 20,21548: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21528: 24,21544: 23, \\ & 21547: 18,21557: 22, \end{aligned}$ |
| $21529: 23,21531: 15,$ | 21547:17, 21603:5 | $21405: 21,21406: 6$ | Universal [1] - 21580:4 | $21557: 25,21559: 15,$ |
| 21537:5, 21549:10, | turns [1] - 21604:24 | 21410:22, 21413:19, | unknown [2] - | 21566:2, 21574:17, |
| $21551: 13,21555: 18$ 21559:18, 21561:24. | $\mathbf{T v}[2]-21431: 23$ | 21:21: | $21394: 10,21394: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21585:4, 21587:20, } \\ & 21591: 23.21593: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21559: 18,21561: 24, \\ & 21562: 16,21570: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21595: 13 \\ \text { twenties' } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { uh... [6] - 21432:9, } \\ \text { 21437:22, 21454:7, } \end{gathered}$ | Unless [1] - 21658:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 21591: 23,21593: 9, \\ & 21597: 14,21598: 15, \end{aligned}$ |
| $21587: 22,21589: 12,$ | twenty [1] - 21444:15 | $21455: 20,21468: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { unless [6] - 21526:3, } \\ & \text { 21529:7, 21615:2, } \end{aligned}$ | 21599:22, 21603:20, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21591:10, 21592:13, } \\ & \text { 21618:11, 21624:5, } \end{aligned}$ | twice [2] - 21492:18, | $21556: 4$ ultimate | $21644: 2,21650: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21607: 9,21610: 10, \\ & 21620: 5,21623: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| 21629:8, 21634:10, | twice' [1] - 21548:3 | $21589: 23,21608: 2$ | 21666:15 unlikelihood [1] - | 21623:19, 21624:23, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21634: 11,21635: 10 \\ & 21663: 18 \end{aligned}$ | twigged [1] - 21460:11 | $\text { Um' [1] - } 21630: 22$ | 21597:13 | $\begin{aligned} & 21632: 6,21637: 6, \\ & 21639: 12,21642: 3, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\text { tub [1] - } 21401 \text { :20 }$ | twisted [1] - 21565:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Um-hmm [2]-21444:3, } \\ & \text { 21449:22 } \end{aligned}$ | unlikely [3] - 21597:1, | $21646: 21,21651: 2$ |
| Tuesday[4] - 21379:21, | Two[1] - 2161 | 21449:2 | 21597:4, 21658:20 | $21654: 25,21658: 17,$ |
| 21499:12, 21646:17, | 21384:5, 21390:15, | Umm [32]-21399:6, | 21443:6, 21443:12 | 21662:25, 21666:7, |
| 21646:19 | 21408:7, 21445:10, | 21402:11, 21402:12, | unstable [6] - 21433:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21666:12, 21670:1, } \\ & 21671: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\text { 21393:21. } 21393: 24$ | 21445:13, 21452:9, | 21407:9, 21407:24, | 21465:9, 21466:3, | update [3]-21600:9, |
| $\text { 21400:1, } 21401: 15$ | 21452:10, 21452:11, | 21411:14, 21411:16, <br> 21419:11, 21422:6 | 21466:14, 21470:11, | $21640: 9,21640: 14$ |
| $\text { 21405:6, } 21406: 20,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21452: 22,21456: 17, \\ & 21458: 6,21495: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $21424: 2,21445: 11$ | 21599:5 <br> unusual [2]-21619:25, | upset [1] - 21406:23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21407:21, 21409:25, } \\ & 21414: 22, ~ 21416: 3 . \end{aligned}$ | $21500: 4,21504: 15$ | $21480: 3,21483: 24,$ | 21622:24 | upside [1] - 21524:4 <br> urgent [1] - 21390:20 |
| $21419: 23,21424: 24,$ | 21529:14, 21535:8, | 21484:10, 21492:25, | unwaivering [1] - | $\text { useful r2 - } 21608 \cdot 20$ |
| 21431:23, 21462:21, | 21536:20, 21539:19, | $21$ | 21600:18 | 21622:22 |
| 21463:21, 21470:17, | 21540:8, 21544:1, | 21512:22, 21522:20, | $21$ | useful' [1] - 21546:3 |
| 21479:23, 21481:14, | 21547:3, 21548:3, | 21539:17, 21543:3, | 21394:11, 21394:25, | usual [1] - 21648:22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21483: 9,21490: 4 \\ & 21490: 17.21492: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $21548: 20,21552: 20,$ | $21543: 24,21551: 16$ | 21395:14, 21396:14, | Ute [4] - $21391: 3$, |
| $21494: 9,21495: 1$ | 21555:3, 21555:4, | 21552:2, 21590:15, | 21396:18, 21398:24, | 21513:22, 21513:23, |
| 21495:22, 21499:7, | 21555:15, 21566:22, | 21609:24, 21615:16 | 21400:20, 21405:5, |  |
| 21504:19, 21509:25, | $21600: 17,21619: 24,$ | umm [9]-21396:2, | $21417: 21$ |  |
| 21510:3, 21511:22, | 21620:7, 21624:23, | 21402:18, 21415:6, | 21425:15, 21427:21, | V |
| 21523:21, 21528:4, | 21646:23, 21647:6, | 21502:6, 21534:14 |  |  |
| 21534:4, 21535:2, | 21648:18, 21649:18, | 21591:25, $21664: 3$ | 21447:14, 21447:15, | V1 [4]-21517:5, |
| $21535: 15,21536: 14$ | 21657:19, 21659:23, | umm' [1] - 21546:11 | 21447:19, 21448:22, | 21532:23 |
| $21545: 2,21545: 22$ | 21662:9, 21662:22, | umm... [1] - 21563:18 | 21448:23, 21451:2, | V11 [4] - 21514:25, |
| $21553: 19,21554: 18$ | 21663:15, 21673:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { unbelievable [1] - } \\ & 21436: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $21451: 8,21451: 17$ | 21515:1, 21516:3 <br> V2 [6] - 21517:5, |
| 21569:22, 21572:14, | $21547: 3$ | uncomfortable [2] | 21455:16, 21456:25, | 21517:6, 21532:23 |
| $21572: 20,21572: 25,$ | tying [1] - 21559:15 | 21600:24, 21616:5 | $21459: 23,21465: 23,$ | V3 [5] - 21517:6, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21573: 6,21576: 7, \\ & 21578: 20,21583: 14, \end{aligned}$ | type [9]-21502:21, | undated [3]-21384:23, | 21466:10, 21469:16, | 21517:7, 21532:23, $21532: 24$ |
| 21584:2, 21589:6, | $\begin{aligned} & 21505: 23,21506: 9, \\ & 21514: 20,21521: 16, \end{aligned}$ | under [8] - 21466:12, | $\begin{aligned} & 21470: 22,21470: 23, \\ & 21471: 2,21473: 12, \end{aligned}$ | V4 [7] - 21514:9, |
| 21590:5, 21599:10, | 21557:1, 21608:25, | 21482:16, 21501:16, | 21473:18, 21474:2, | 21514:10, 21514:14, |
| $21599: 23,21600: 11,$ | $21648: 6,21660: 18$ | 21504:4, 21507:23, | 21475:16, 21475:21, | $21516: 3$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21604: 18,21609: 17, \\ & 21616: 21,21617: 20, \end{aligned}$ | typed [4] - 21424:2, | 21543:9, 21632:17, | 21476:10, 21477:24, | V5 [1] - 21532:24 |
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