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## Transcript of Proceedings

(Reconvened at 9:06 a.m.)
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Good morning.
ALL COUNSEL: Good morning.

## PATRICK HUGH FORSYTH BAILLIE, continued:

## BY MR. WILSON:

Q
A
Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q
A
$Q$

Good morning, Dr. Baillie.
Good morning, sir.
My name is Garrett Wilson and I represent Serge Kujawa in these proceedings.

Doctor, David Milgaard has
become the phantom of this inquiry that bears his
name. Have you ever laid eyes on him in person?
No, I have not.
Not even from a distance?
No.
Strange, isn't it. But you did view a video of
Mr. Milgaard testifying in front of the Guy Morin
Inquiry?
Yes, I did.
Who provided that to you?
Mr. Wolch.
I see. Did he provide any other videos to you?
No, he did not.
Was that as an example of Mr. Milgaard's
performance in this sort of an atmosphere?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

When you were at the Commission offices in December searching for material in the file, were you made aware of the fact that there were a number of videos there of Mr. Milgaard in public appearances over the years?
type of information that were viewed as part of the preparation of the report.

I'm sure that at the time that $I$ had written the report, over the years $I$ have seen segments of news conferences or other comments that he's made, but there were no videos or other sources of that
And $I$ wasn't clear yesterday, did you view that video before or after the report you provided us? Afterwards.

So at the time of doing the report, you had not seen even a video of Mr. Milgaard?

A No, I was not.
Q
But you were aware of one of his public
appearances that you describe on the first page of your report when he spoke in this city in October? Yes.

Did you see a video of that performance?
No, I did not.
But you told us yesterday, made some explanation about Mr. Milgaard's performance on that day. Can you repeat what you told us yesterday, please?

A

Q

A
Well, I'm not sure which part of what I said yesterday you are referring to.

Well, you gave some explanation of how he appeared that day.

No, there was a question that $I$ was asked about his decision to come here. As I had described the third symptom or the third criteria for post-traumatic stress disorder is the avoidance strategies, and so the question that $I$ was asked was about how his appearance here on October 24 th was consistent with that, and $I$ had said that my understanding was that the comments that he was making had been written out and that he was essentially reading from that statement which may have been part of his way of dealing with the
anxiety of that situation.
I see. And from who did you acquire that understanding?

A
Mr. Wolch.
And again, was that conversation before or after the writing of your report?

I believe it was afterwards.
Did you make any attempt to view the video of that performance in October?

I wasn't aware that there was a video.
Did you ask?
No.
I put that question to you, Dr. Baillie, because those of us here who did see that performance on television saw, or thought we saw a very confident, self-possessed and articulate David Milgaard, somewhat inconsistent with the description you are giving us here.

A
I don't think that it's inconsistent in that as $I$ indicated yesterday, there's a significant difference between Mr. Milgaard speaking about other issues that are unrelated to his wrongful conviction and his imprisonment and the questions that he's likely to be asked if he appears here are directly related to those issues. I am aware
that over the years Mr. Milgaard has made a number of public presentations, there was one done in Calgary that $I$ wasn't able to attend that he did in mid November of last year, but again, the context of those presentations is talking about issues that are not directly related to his case. I see. Let me ask a little bit about this post-traumatic stress syndrome. Would it be fair to assume that in the normal case it would dissipate over time from the traumatic incident? For some people it does, yes.

And with some people it does not?
Correct.
We wouldn't know which would apply to Mr. Milgaard though, would we, from your examination?

Well, since $I$ haven't examined him, I wouldn't be able to answer that question, so I rely on somebody who has had contact with him over the last 10 years, that being Mr. Grymaloski.

I see. On page 2 of your report, that's the CV, we have the quotation that you provide from Mr. Wolch, and you were asked some questions yesterday about this hospitalization, but you were able to tell us only that you understand from Mr.

Grymaloski that there were maybe six periods of
hospitalization over the years?

A
Q
A

Q

A
Q
A

Q

A

Q
A
$Q$

A
$Q$

Yes.
But you have no specifics beyond that?
That's correct.
Tell me, Dr. Baillie, when you highlight this
statement of Mr. Wolch's in your report, why
wouldn't you have put a caveat on there that you
were not able to verify this?
I don't think it's my position to be verifying it.
I beg your pardon?
I don't think it's my position to be verifying it.
Well, you give it some credibility by the prominence with which you quote it here don't you?

I give it some credibility because it appears in
the transcripts of the inquiry.
But you extracted it and put it in your report?
Because it directly relates to the issues that $I$ was being asked to address.

I see. Well, we have to keep in mind that Mr. Wolch was your client don't we. You -I would point out that I'm under oath and therefore the opinions that I'm offering are the opinions that $I$ sincerely hold. Who is my client doesn't change my opinion, it's not for sale.

But you weren't under oath when you prepared this
report?
If you would like me to endorse this statement under oath, then $I$ do, it appears in the transcript. I don't know what the dispute is. We'll move on, Doctor, but I'm still on the subject of the hospitalization. You examined the Commission files thoroughly for any evidence of medical attention that Mr. Milgaard received while -- and those files related only while he was in custody; correct?

No, I was able to find some files that went back to when Mr. Milgaard was a youth, but I would also clarify, I can't say that $I$ examined the files thoroughly because, as you are aware, there are over 330,000 (sic) pages of files.

Yes, but there weren't 230,000 pages of medical reports.

Well, they are not in a medical report file; hence, I have to go through a lot of additional information to find what I'm looking for. You were asked yesterday about Mr. Milgaard's appearance before the Supreme Court of Canada in January of 1992. You recall that?

A
Yes.
And were you aware of that appearance at the time
you did your report?

A
Yes, I was. I'll just clarify the document that $I$ was referring to was Mr. Asper's letter of February 24 th, 1992, I referred to it yesterday, so perhaps $I$ could give a document number for anyone who wants to look it up. The document number that $I$ have is 182051 and it refers to testimony that $I$ believe occurred in February of 1992.

Did you make a specific search for any evidence of Mr. Milgaard's hospitalization after his appearance at the Supreme Court in January of 1992?

Court? ,

A
$Q$

No.
At the bottom of page 2 of your report you again refer to the history of hospitalization:
"... possibly six times in the past decade or so, during periods of significant distress in his life, particularly, as you have described ..." The "you" in that sentence is Mr. Wolch; correct? Yes.

You took some information on this hospitalization theory, we'll call it, from Mr. Wolch as well as from Mr. Grymaloski?

Yes.
Page 3, please, you found in your review of the Commission files a number of diagnoses of Mr. Milgaard and you set out a number of them here. Presumably if these diagnoses are correct, they would describe a condition that predated his incarceration?

Not necessarily.
Okay. Well, you don't -- you don't catch a psychopathic personality in prison like a bad cold do you, it's not contagious?

Well, first off, there is no formal diagnosis of
psychopathic personality. Second, as I explained yesterday, personality disorders aren't diagnosed until a person is at least 18 years of age, and since Mr. Milgaard was in custody at age 16 it would be impossible for that condition to have existed prior to his incarceration.

I see. But you are not suggesting that these are disorders that resulted from the trauma of the incarceration?

Well some of the labels are, in my opinion, bizarre because they are not even formal diagnoses, so as I indicated yesterday, the purpose of diagnosis is to facilitate communication between people that agree on the definition of the diagnosis. Since some of these don't have a commonly-agreed upon definition, I'm not sure what the purpose would be in making the diagnosis. A number of them, however, refer to things like situational psychotic illness or acute psychotic reaction that can clearly be stress reactions to circumstances in which Mr. Milgaard found himself at the time that that label was given.

So there is a potpourri there, of labels, and ranging from the serious to no evidence of any
major mental illness?
A
$Q$

A
related to his appearance before the Supreme Court did you say?

MR. WILSON: I am sorry, sir?
COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: Did this relate to his appearance before the Supreme Court?

MR. WILSON: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay. And he was examined in that connection relative to his --

MR. WILSON: What happened, sir, was, as I have been informed by counsel present, an application was made to excuse Mr. Milgaard from testifying, or to at least delay his appearance because of his, the fragility of his medical condition based upon the opinion of a medical practitioner given a day or two previously. When the Court sought to speak with the medical practitioner it was discovered he was out of the country, and had been for some time, and had not been able to render the opinion that had been described. The Court then interviewed Mr. Milgaard personally, Mr. Milgaard described himself as "fine" and "ready to go", and did.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay, thanks.
BY MR. WILSON:
Q Now both Mr. --

MR. WOLCH: Just before we go further, I am not saying that didn't happen, $I$ have no memory of it whatsoever. And if there is some documentation or something? I recall that David was the first witness, but an application to the Court, $I$ just have no memory of it.

MR. WILSON: Well, there will be evidence on this forthcoming in due course, Mr. Commissioner.

MR. WOLCH: Well where can we find it to look at it?

MR. WILSON: Umm, it will be testimony that will be coming before the Commission, the -- I am advised that the proceedings at that point were recorded but were not transcribed, it may be that the recordings are still in existence and could be transcribed but $I$ have not sought to do so, but other counsel who were there remember the incident perfectly well and are quite prepared to testify to it.

MR. WOLCH: Well --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, okay.
MR. WOLCH: Well, can we be told who the source is?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But their evidence
won't be available now, Mr. Wilson, for the purposes of this examination?

MR. WILSON: They won't be available today, but it would -- they will be appearing here in due course, yes.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well I'm concerned, for Dr. Baillie's benefit, that he not be taxed with evidence which we cannot present before the Commission, you know, for the purposes of this hearing.

MR. WILSON: I'm quite prepared to --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: If it was a matter of record, it would be easily done, but since Mr. Wolch will not concede that it happened?

MR. WILSON: I'm quite prepared to advance the calling of the witness who will support it, but $I$ don't know that, once again, it would be a waste of Commission's time.

MR. WOLCH: Might I be told who the witness is?

MR. WILSON: Hmm?
MR. WOLCH: Might $I$ be told who the witness is who would support this?

MR. WILSON: Well, Mr. Murray Brown of the Department of Justice.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, another solicitor. Well, $I$ think the objection is well taken at this point, Mr. Wilson. You will simply have to leave the subject for now.

MR. WILSON: Yes.
BY MR. WILSON:
$Q$

A
$Q$
I'm going to suggest we do that this morning. Mr. Fox suggested yesterday that, had you done so, you might have found some interesting information and, as usual, he is right. 198515, please. There you will see in the -- excuse me -- the style of cause Mr. Milgaard sued Serge Kujawa, Mr. Thomas David Roberts Caldwell, Eddie Karst, Raymond Mackie, and Charles Short, and down below you will see that the respective defendants are represented by three different law firms. Mr. Kujawa is my client here, he was represented there by Mr. Si Halyk, who was also appearing for Mr.

Caldwell. And Mr. Halyk, in the examinations that went one after the other, was first, and if we may turn to what is numbered as page 2 of the examination, it will be the fourth page of it down the way, you will see Mr. Halyk is now opening the examination -- the following page, please -- and asks Mr. Milgaard about his medications. Mr.

Milgaard says he's on Tegretol; are you familiar with that medication?

Tegretol, yes.
Can you tell us about it?
It's used in low doses as a mood stabilizer and, in other doses, can be used for the treatment of seizures.

In other doses it is what?
In higher doses it can be used for the treatment of seizures.

Okay. So when Mr. Wilson says, down at the bottom here:
"... it's a mood stabilizer, is that
what you understand it to be?",
that was essentially correct; is that right?
A

Q Yes.

I see. Next page, please:
"Q And who prescribes your medications to
you?
A At this point $I$ get my medications from the Seymour Clinic in British Columbia.

Q Okay. And is that a psychiatrist who prescribes them to you?

A No, this is just an M.D. at this point ...",

And Mr. Halyk asks:
"Q Are you taking any other medications?
A I have some sleeping medication that I'm allowed to take if $I$ want to, but I don't try to take that as much as -and people sometimes abuse sleeping medications. I don't think that's a good idea."

Mr. Halyk asks:
"Q You didn't take any, for example, last night?

A No. I had a restless sleep last night.

Q Okay. But you didn't take any medication?

A No ..."
The next page, please:
"Q And, generally speaking, how are you feeling today?

A I feel a little bit nervous with everybody. I feel a little nervous.

I know I shouldn't feel nervous, but --

Q No, that's understandable --
A -- I do feel nervous
Q -- but other than nervous, do you feel healthy and well?

A Oh, I'm healthy, definitely healthy.
Q And have you been feeling healthy and well the last, say, week?

A Yeah, I have been.
Q And do you have any problems being examined by me today with respect to the circumstances that you have sued about?

A Well, to be frank with everybody here, I feel very uncomfortable because I don't feel it's necessary that I should be here for five days answering questions because $I$ know I'm not guilty. There is no doubt in my mind."

Would it be fair to say that that response is
rather a useful one in considering a question of Mr. Milgaard's appearance before this Commission ten years later?

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q
I think it reinforces the issue that he is uncomfortable under the circumstances.

In your experience at the bar have you conducted any examinations for discovery?

Well, to be clear, I'm not at bar. As I said yesterday, I'm not a member of the Law Society of Alberta, I'm not a lawyer.

Ah, I missed that. Then you have not. So you wouldn't be aware of the fact that practically every civilian witness who winds up in an examination for discovery is pretty nervous about it.

Well I am aware that most witnesses, whether appearing at an examination for discovery or at trial, are uncomfortable because, for most witnesses, it's an unfamiliar process.

And Mr. Halyk goes on:
"Q ... I sense an understanding --
A I do feel uncomfortable --
Q -- your feeling --
A -- with being here to be honest, to be straight with you."

Next page, and Mr. Halyk says:
"Q Well, and to be honest with you, if you hadn't started the lawsuit you wouldn't have to be here.

A Well, it makes good sense to start a lawsuit if you have no money.

Q But you realize that's why you're here, is because you sued?

A Yes, I do."
Now Mr. Milgaard, $I$ would suggest as far as you know, understands the natural probable consequences of his conduct?

A
Q
Yes.
Did then, still does. But there are some interesting features over here on page 12 of the examination. Mr. Halyk is asking him what he has done to refresh his memory, and:
"A ... I didn't read through all of them. I read through this one, but I had trouble reading through that one because it just kind of, I don't know, made me feel kind of mixed up and stuff a little bit. I get that way from this stuff, just so you know.

Q Yes. Well, generally speaking, how
would you describe your memory today for all of the events --

A I have a good memory.
Q -- involved here?

A The problem is $I$ try and pull on my memory sometimes. If it's sort of like a quick situation I'll sometimes forget things, but it comes back to me.

Q Okay.
A I think I've got a good memory."
Now question 66:
"Q Good. What have you been doing the last three years for employment or otherwise?

A Sort of odd jobs here and there. I get paid for my presentations. I consider myself to some extent sort of like a service person, maybe not as much as like a good social worker or a person involved with different issues, like advocacy things, but I usually take a position, an advocacy-type position, that people should be care or concern over others at any point, and I take my position with this whole
situation of court and the case and all the rest of it to get up and sort of tell my story and suggest that people inside that picture, and that would be care and concern for others, wherever they are, that it's safe to be so.

Q Where do you give these service seminars?

A Well, the problem with it is if you're doing it, you know, every time, time and time again and you're sort of making the same speech, it becomes sort of a rote type thing ...", and he spells that for Mr. Halyk:
"... and, you know, it becomes an agenda thing and you don't want to always have to be going here or going there, so I did quite a bit of it for a while, but I got out. I still do a little bit occasionally. It's a money --"

Mr. Halyk inquires:
"Q ... give me an example of the kind of groups that you would speak to about your situation?

A A tough one, a tough one. First year social workers in The Pas, any sort of association or group that might ask for me, a criminologist situation is a potential, criminologist situations, schools, universities."
"Q And you say you get paid for this?
A Sometimes very well."
So what we're seeing here, Dr. Baillie, is Mr. Milgaard has been working as a professional lecturer on his story?

A
And $I$ do not know what he is referring to when he says "my story", he could be talking about his adjustment after his release, he could be talking about how he gets through day-to-day, it is not clear to me from the two words "my story" that he is referring to the events of January 31st, 1969 or subsequently.

But his story is his incarceration; isn't it? That is your assumption. I do not take -Well, it was your assumption yesterday, when you gave us an example of what his obituary might read?

A
As I indicated, $I$ do not know what he is referring to when he says "my story", I think there are a
number of permutations that come out of that reference.

Q
Nothing there to negate the likelihood or possibility, at least, that what he is talking about is his period of incarceration, his wrongful conviction, and that is the Milgaard story?

As $I$ have indicated, that is a possible
interpretation of "my story".
In which case he is rather practiced at what you say he should have some hesitation at delving into?

A

Q

A
I think that Mr. Milgaard has a general aversion to testifying.

Yeah. Aside from that, though, he would -- he
would be able to testify about the fender bender or the, or the incident that gave rise to the litigation, without triggering the bad memories of the period of incarceration?

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$ Commission as accurate.

Well let's assume that $I$ am; do you see any difficulty in Mr. Milgaard coming to this Inquiry and telling us about what he said, why he said it,
reports about those specific criticisms, I'm
accepting the information that you put before the
Commission as accurate. Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv
what information he based his serious accusations upon?

A

Q
A

Q
A
$Q$
A
Q
A
Q

A
$Q$

A significant difficulty.

I see. So, to go back to my fender bender example, if he was asked "why were you driving 80 miles an hour in a 50 mile an hour zone", that would be a why question he would have difficulty with?

In that context, yes. But, again, the question that you had asked me was whether that would trigger him with recollections of his incarceration, and $I$ think that there is a significant difference between asking him about a fender bender that occurs in 2006, and comments that he made years ago, or may have made years ago, that are directly related to the issues tied to his incarceration.

Well all this is hypothetical, isn't it, Dr. Baillie?

A

In fact, Dr. Baillie, is it not true that you cannot tell this Inquiry with certainty that the reason Mr. Milgaard doesn't want to come here is because he'd rather go back scuba diving in the Greek islands?

A
I have no absolutely no information to suggest to me that that's his motive in not wanting to
testify. As I've indicated, I have relied upon information that Mr. Grymaloski has provided to me, that Mr. Milgaard stated in the appearance before the media on October $24 t h$, --

Q

A

Q

A

Q
A

Q

A
Q

## BY MR. WOLCH:

Just a brief question on a couple of the last questions.

In terms of testifying regarding accusations made, $I$ take it there are accusations made based on personal knowledge in which you can be questioned, and accusations made that you have
no personal knowledge of?

A
$Q$

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

Yes.
For example -- and I'm not saying this has
occurred -- but if David Milgaard was to assert
that Larry Fisher was treated abnormally or received no sentence for committing terrible crimes, questioning him cannot add anything on that point?

Correct.
Now yesterday, Dr. Baillie, you made reference to a letter from David Asper. Now the number $I$ have is 182342, is that the same number you have, I don't know?

I have a slightly different number. I'm sure there are multiple copies.

Now --
Yes, mine doesn't -- my copy does not have the letterhead but the layout appears to be similar, or sorry, identical to what $I$ have.

Okay. Now you were asked questions, and I don't mean any disrespect but I'm not certain which of the two counsel yesterday was asking you this, but you were asked questions about David's ability to have testified for example in the Supreme Court, and how he handled that, and $I$ think you mentioned
that you'd seen a letter that might elaborate on

A
Q

that a bit, and this is the letter you are talking about?

Yes, it is.
And if we can just go through some of it, and this is dated February 24 th, ' 92 , it says here:
"I don't think that there is any doubt
in anyone's mind that David was
unusually uptight on Monday, February
17, 1992. This was evident even before
the proceedings began, and as the day wore on, he became increasingly agitated. I noticed that during the evidence of Det. Karst, David actually left the Courtroom on two or three separate occasions."

What do you see in that?
When people are faced with anxiety it stirs what is commonly referred to as a fight-or-flight response. If it's a situation in which $I$ feel that I may be able to gain control of the situation, $I$ can choose to stay and fight in some form, orally or physically; in situations where $I$ don't feel that $I$ have that level of control, or the opportunity to gain the upper hand, then the
response becomes to run away.
And there's some reference in the next paragraph that Anne Derrick, $I$ guess now Judge Derrick, was present or was going to be there with Donald Marshall to offer assistance or to give best wishes.

Getting on to the next
paragraph, Mr. Asper says:
"The next time that $I$ saw David was during the very early morning hours of February 18, 1992 after he had been detained at the Ottawa police station. By that time, I had contacted Mr. Ken Bond, who was the person on call for the Parole Board. I had been advised that the worker at the house had located David and had detected the smell of alcohol on David's breath. This was obviously something that $I$ wanted to clarify as soon as $I$ got to the police station."

Next paragraph:
"I initially met with a Detective by the name of "Ty", although $I$ cannot remember his last name. I was advised by this
officer that the arresting officers had not detected any odour of alcohol whatsoever, and that this fact would be reflected in their report. They were somewhat concerned about David because he seemed disoriented and jumbled.

After a brief discussion, I believe that this Detective accepted that this was probably David's ordinary demeanour under these kinds of circumstances." And what does that say to you, sir?

A

Q The nex The next paragraph: "In any event, I was taken to the holding cells where $I$ met with David in a booth. There was a glass partition between us, but there was venting beneath the glass that would allow us to converse quite freely. David wanted to speak in a quiet tone, so we both sort of lowered our faces toward the vented area of the booth. For what it is
worth, I did not smell any alcohol whatsoever."

If you can just turn the page:
"I asked David where he had been, and he related that he had sought permission from house staff to go outside. He claimed that the house person had said something to the effect of, "Okay, but don't go far", and David then went out. My assumption at this point was that Terry Richardson had already left, but I did not explore this with David at all. David told me that he went outside at the front of the house, and then went around back where he found what he called a "plywood sort of pod", and then just sat there by himself until he ultimately went inside at about 3:00 a.m.

David was totally confused as
to what he had done to justify his arrest and detention. He was very adamant that he simply wanted to be alone and away from the whole world. He sought refuge on this "pod" at the back
of the house. I might add that it was a relatively warm evening in Ottawa, and David was in fact wearing his winter clothing, including a coat.

David's attitude was that this whole thing was a misunderstanding. He wanted to ... meet Anne Derrick ..." The letter goes on, and I think you've read it and I don't want to have to read the whole letter, but what do you gain from that letter as a whole?

A
$Q$
I wonder if we could pull up 004257 . This is an article dated the 18 th of February, '92, it's out of the Canadian Press, I'm not sure what newspaper this comes from exactly, but $I$ only want to draw your particular attention to the portion here:
"Milgaard had been given permission to attend the Supreme Court hearings, staying at an Ottawa half-way house. He was returned to Stony Mountain ... while Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv
the Court wasn't sitting.
Hearings resumed Monday and Milgaard often appeared agitated in the courtroom.

He stood to try to ask a question during testimony by Ron Wilson, a key witness who helped convict him but has now changed his story.

Chief Justice ... Lamer told
him: "No. You let your lawyers handle things in the courtroom."

During testimony by Eddie
Karst, a former Saskatoon police officer who investigated the Miller murder,

Milgaard left the courtroom and returned
a number of times."
Now what does that suggest to you?
A
Again, repeating Mr. Asper's comment about how Mr.
Milgaard dealt with the testimony of Eddie Karst which was on occasion to leave the courtroom, again, a strategy that he may have been using to deal with anxiety at the time. I think what Mr . Asper's letter and this article point out is reinforcing the comment that I've previously made about different people deal with these situations
in different ways. There may be some people who see an inquiry like this as an opportunity for a particular outcome and are very invested in attending and monitoring every little minutia that occurs. Other individuals may choose to want to distance themselves from the process because it brings up some very painful memories and those painful memories have the potential to cause the individual to suffer significant anxiety and distress.

If we can go to 032534 , this is an article in The Globe and Mail of February the 19th of '92, and I'll just draw your attention to certain portions.
"Mr. Milgaard was clearly showing signs of stress on Monday. He appeared agitated and depressed during the court review, kept walking in and out of the courtroom, and at one point tried to talk to the judges.

He arrived at the halfway house 20 minutes before his 10:30 p.m. curfew ..."

Accompanied by a chap from Rockwood Institution. He then reportedly asked for permission to step outside and get fresh air. He told reporters his
absence was a misunderstanding and basically sat on the back steps from 10:30 to 3:10.

And if you can just give the full page again and if we can go from there down to about there:
"Yesterday, Mr. Neufeld, a Justice
Department lawyer, continued questioning
retired Saskatoon police detective Eddie
Karst who denied that the police had any established theory about the murder."

Also believed that Mr. Milgaard attacked Ms. Miller and intended robbery and not a rape.
"... confirmed that police had first suspected a serial rapist who dragged women at knifepoint into alleyways may have been Ms. Miller's assailant. But this changed once they discovered that Mr. Milgaard and his companions arrived in town without any money and had talked about purse snatching.
"None of the rape cases
involved murder, did they?" Mr. Neufeld asked Mr. Karst.

The lawyer added that several
knifepoint attacks in the same
neighbourhood as Ms. Miller was slain were touchings, pushing... not horrific crimes.

Mr. Karst agreed."
Now, given the tenor of the evidence and Mr. Milgaard leaving and whatever else, what does that tell you and how does that fit in with your diagnosis?

The tenor of the evidence is, appears from this excerpt to suggest that Mr. Karst was still at that time of the opinion that Mr. Milgaard was responsible for the crime and, you know, that the final quotation that you were reading about the other offences involved touchings or pushings and not horrific crimes would seem to suggest that by implication this was, and $I$ don't think anybody would doubt that the murder of Gail Miller was an horrific crime, and once again, Mr. Milgaard was being put to task on that, or at least his name was being associated with that, and his response to it was to get up and leave the room and then spend close to -- well, in excess of four and a half hours that evening sitting outside in minus five degree weather.

And a final clipping $I$ have is 077778 , this is the

StarPhoenix on February 21 st of '92 dealing with the Supreme Court appearance, and here it says his lawyer, David Asper, said Milgaard would likely be admitted to the prison's hospital for medical assessment.
"Corrections officials overreacted to
Milgaard's brief disappearance."
"The reaction is a joke. It's just not
warranted."
The incident has sent
Milgaard -- who takes lithium for a
condition that often leaves him
depressed -- into a "major psychological
tailspin."
"When $I$ saw him at the Ottawa jail ... he just didn't understand what was happening. They're treating him like a terrorist."

Now, the reason I brought all
this up is there was some suggestion that the Supreme Court was something he handled fairly well. Obviously this suggests he didn't handle it too well at all?

A Yes. I think that it's important that the person
who is making the observations, while undeniably Mr. Milgaard's lawyer, one of his lawyers at the time, was also somebody who knew Mr. Milgaard and therefore could offer an opinion about how this had changed the appearance of his client from somebody who had obviously looked forward to his opportunity to deal with the matter before the Supreme Court to somebody who, as a result of some of the evidence that was presented, ended up in what's described as a major psychological tailspin.

And obviously it doesn't advance his case? No.

I mean, for the Court to see or know that the applicant is having problems, etcetera, etcetera, is not something that assists?

A
It becomes a significant distraction to dealing with the issues at hand.

The other area that $I$ wanted to briefly touch on was, and once again, $I$ can't recall who the questioner was, but it was regarding his disorder, when it may have started and the effect of the whole appeal, you recall that was talked about, you know, and you mentioned about it may be that an appeal could be something he would cling to for a portion of time.

If we can go to 000451 and at page 33, now this is March the 9 th of 1970 , so it's quite early on. David is 17, indicates some background, he doesn't appear to have a record, it gives some background of David -- focus on that a bit, I'll go through it fairly quickly just to lay a foundation.

Born and raised in Winnipeg, family moved to Langenburg, father employed at potash, mother does not work, he's the oldest in the family of four, stays with his family in a close knit, good relationship. It says had it not been for their support he would not have been able to survive the ordeal of his trial and conviction. His family are entirely convinced of his innocence and are standing behind him and encouraging him as much as possible.

And if you can get to the next paragraph, it states that he had been going to school prior to offence, had consequently not obtained any steady employment. I'm not sure why that's there, he did have employment. Milgaard states he did not get along with his teachers at school mainly because he fooled around a lot and
caused them a great deal of difficulty. He said he never had difficulty with the subject matter, but became bored with school and was simply looking for some excitement. Apparently he was quite popular with fellow classmates."

This inmate is a quiet, soft-spoken individual who impresses as being a person who is extremely depressed but hides the depression behind a smile. He is holding back a great deal of emotion and on one hand seems to be anxious to express it and yet is almost afraid to do so. He repeatedly insists on his innocence and is convinced that the appeal courts will verify that this is so. He mentioned that he suffered a great deal from the hostility and hatred that he felt in the courtroom throughout the trial. He said that had it not been for his parent's support and encouragement, he would have taken his own life some time ago. When asked about his plans following his appeal, he was somewhat confused and refused to believe that he would still be in the
institution after his appeal had been heard. He is terrified that he may lose his appeal and have to face a lifetime in prison and at this time is convincing himself that suicide is the only answer. Milgaard is still very young and very emotionally immature and will require a great deal of support and encouragement from the staff of this Institution if he is to survive this sentence. During the initial interview he did not in any way give the impression that he was manipulative or that he was trying to erect "innocent" picture." If we can just follow along, please.
If $I$ can just clarify, $I$ think the word was create.

What did I say?
Erect.
Okay.
Create. And on the copy that I have, which is from a different page reference than the piece on the screen, it also has the word "an" added before "innocent" picture.

Oh, I see. Thank you. And the next page, please:
"In fact, he appeared very confused and defenceless and almost incapable of understanding what is happening to him. It is interesting to note that Milgaard has not received any threats or hostility from the rest of the inmate population. In fact, he has several older cons who are protecting him from the homosexual population and helping him find his way around. Milgaard himself shows absolutely no fear of the inmate population and almost feels that he has an ally in their strength." Now, in your experience, how would somebody convicted of a rape/murder fair in general population?

A
Individuals charged with sexual offences fall at the lowest rung in the hierarchy within the institution, so a rapist and murderer is likely to be somebody who is targeted by other inmates for significant violence.

And it says here that some inmates were protecting him before his appeal, he being a 17 year old, relatively good looking young man?

A
Which would strike me, for somebody who has been
convicted of a rape and murder, as being unusual.
But after the appeal, that may not be the case?
Yes.

Then the writer goes on to say that:
"Since Milgaard is placing so much hope on the outcome of his appeal, he has not developed any plans for his future. He has suggested that he would be interested in completing his high school but beyond that he has no definite plans whatsoever. Consequently it is difficult to make any realistic recommendation at this time. One very definite recommendation that can be made, however, is that Milgaard placed under close observation following his appeal. If he should lose his appeal, he may very well become suicidal. A second recommendation which may be made at this time is that he be referred to the Psychiatrist for a complete psychiatric assessment. Surprisingly this was never ordered by the Courts."

And then for progress it says:
"Uncertain and depending entirely on the
care and treatment he receives within this Institution."

Now, how would that fit in with your comments yesterday about the appeal and the onset of the disorder?

This was one of the documents that $I$ was referring to in my answer about how the distress, the horror associated with the traumatic event may be delayed in part because of this extremely strong belief that the appeal process would serve to exonerate him and so in his early days in custody there is this profound hope, belief even beyond a simple hope that the appeal process is going to achieve that outcome for him and therefore some denial of the circumstances in which he finds himself.

And my final question, Mr. Wilson was asking you about the words "David telling his story." Has anyone brought to your attention any time other than in an official capacity such as the Supreme Court that David has talked to anybody, media, anyone, about his personal circumstances? I'm not aware of that, no.

MR. WOLCH: Those are my questions, sir.
MR. HODSON: That appears to be all for Dr. Baillie.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Dr. Baillie, thank you very much for coming and you are excused. Thank you, sir.

MR. WOLCH: Mr. Commissioner, the next witness is Mr. Grymaloski. I'm prepared to start now or --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.
MR. WOLCH: Unless you want the break before we start?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: No, we'll start now, thanks. We can go to about 10:30.

MR. WOLCH: I'm sorry, sir?
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: About 10:30.
JOEL ADAM GRYMALOSKI, sworn:
BY MR. WOLCH:
Mr. Grymaloski, I believe you are a family therapist?

A

And having been there with Mr. Hodson, it's a beautiful office right on the water that looks very nice?

A
$Q$
And a little different than where you grew up?

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$
A
Q

A

Clinical psychology has a clinical internship, a licensed internship involved. I did that in Regina, child and youth mental health. I got hired on, worked there for three years while $I$ was completing my thesis. Worked for about six months
you tell us about your professional working career?
at Swift Current Mental Health. My wife got a job out in Vancouver and $I$ followed her out, worked there in the B.C. Mental Health for just under a year before $I$ started my private practice. That was in 1991.

And you've been continually in that private practice since?

Correct.
And can you tell us generally what your practice consists of, what type of work you do?

Well, I see individuals, couples and families, a wide range and assortment of problems in living and human issues. As relates to my report and this Inquiry, $I$ do work for the Workman's (sic) Compensation Board in Vancouver, the criminal injuries section, $I$ get referrals for that from trauma survivors and victims of violence. I get referrals from the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia, ICBC, the auto insurance, much like our $S G I$ here, for again trauma survivors, accident survivors, and I've had a number of private cases of sexual abuse, incest that have gone before the courts and in preparing clients for testifying.

I see. And $I$ believe you've had contact really
with two of the wrongly convicted?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q
A
and walked around a bit and he told me who he was, and of course $I$ had heard of who he was and $I$ had known of, you know, his history and his past. Is that because of your Saskatchewan background or not?

Sure, that, as well as it's in the national media and that, but certainly also because of my Saskatchewan background, and he asked if $I$ would be interested in seeing him and I said sure, but he said at the time he didn't have any money and $I$ said that would be okay.

So he had no money, but you were prepared to see him?

Correct.
And on what basis would you see him or how was that arranged?

At his interest, at his discretion, at his motivation he would call or just unfortunately just simply drop by and if $I$ was free or available we would spend some time, or at the times when we would make appointments, we might go to a cafe and have coffee or -- we rarely would meet in my office. My office isn't the biggest, but I don't think that's part of the issue, he simply would talk about feeling quite claustrophobic and
confined and would prefer to be outside. From the first meeting was there any indication as to why he wanted help or for what purpose? To basically try and stabilize his life. I believe he had some concerns, although he wouldn't articulate that very well, of the dangers and the high risk situations he would get himself into and I think that was causing some concern for him and he was, in his way, reaching out for help with that.

Dangerous and high risk in what way?
Well, any number of different behaviours he would get himself involved with from going out and long extensive swims in the ocean. As you may know, the tides can be quite strong in the Georgia Strait or what not and a couple of times he got himself caught in that and that scared him, as well as then heading out on the road, going hitchhiking with, you know, literally the shirt on his back and sleeping in the woods, getting himself into difficulties surrounding that. Those sorts of behaviours $I$ believe were starting to cause him some concern.

And you say that you didn't necessarily see him in the office because he found it claustrophobic?

A

Q

A
$Q$
A

Q
2

Correct, too confining. David has, understandably, quite an issue with what he would perceive to be people in authority or people who hold positions of some authority or what not and having an office would look like that, and so to circumvent that $I$ was more than willing to meet him in a cafe or just go for a walk. That would help alleviate his anxiety, to be able to walk. Obviously back then there was, this Inquiry had no connection with this at all?

Correct. This particular Inquiry?
Yes. It wasn't --
No. I certainly had no sense of this pending Inquiry.

Okay. Maybe we can put your report up if $I$ could. Now, I want to thank you because it says here -- I asked you to give a report on the 3 rd of November and here's your report the 4 th of November, and this was asked for in connection with this Inquiry?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What's the doc ID, please?

MR. WOLCH: I'm not sure that it has one.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: 332 --
BY MR. WOLCH:

Q

Q

A

Q

A
In terms of simply my initial objective of developing a trusting relationship, that $I$ was able to do perhaps within the first year of meeting with him, but in terms of any other sort of treatment objectives, $I$ didn't even really make attempts.

Why wouldn't you? could you get with him?

A
David was just not ready. David was still very much in what $I$ would like to call his coping, survival mode which would render him relatively ineffectual at being able to reflect and introspect on what was going on for him. In fact, for the first maybe three, four, five years of seeing David, $I$ simply tried to get him to talk in what we call "I" language, making references to himself rather than reference to anything and everything surrounding him.

Were there times when your conversation might touch on what happened to him or what he went through?

Certainly initially $I$ attempted to do that and that would lead nowhere. Well, it would lead to David becoming quite agitated and calling an end to the session and leaving. If we were in a cafe or if we were talking, he would say, okay, well, $I$ need to be going now and that would be the end of that, so I learned fairly quickly that that was an area that even what $I$ thought was gentle prodding would not produce any viable or useful results and so I dropped that.

You say in your report that, and you have told us, that David tended to drop into your office, touch
base, have a coffee, but on the 25 th of October he said:
"... "no way he was going" to the
inquiry ...",
and he introduced you:
"... to his very pregnant wife and then left." of October when?

Last year, 2000 --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: 2005?
A
-- 2005. He, his whole orientation, I hadn't seen David for maybe a year and a half until that point, $I$ knew that he was in Romania in the rural outback. I had heard from his ex, Marnie, that he really enjoyed living there because it, to quote her, "it was like stepping back into the medieval world", and in my mind that took him away from everything, from his life, from his past, and which is why he spent some time there, and where, then, he met his present wife. And so in, in
dropping by, he was quite adamant that this is his life now and he didn't want anything to -- he didn't want to get himself involved in this.

BY MR. WOLCH:
But you had to call him to get permission to write the report?

Correct.
And can you tell us what occurred then?
Well I -- he came into my office, we spent about half an hour, and $I$ asked him if he wanted to read it and he read it. That was the first time he had heard of PTSD. He did not particularly like that notion. David is a relatively proud -- he doesn't like to think there's anything wrong with him, umm, so he, he wasn't, he wasn't all that pleased with -- I'm not sure why this is emotional -- he wasn't that pleased with my diagnosis. But I didn't attempt to rationalize it with him or anything, $I$ just said these were my, my
conclusions or my summary, and he said "oh, well, I'll think about that". And so I -- what's particularly interesting about that for me is that, that being the first time $I$ had mentioned any sort of a diagnosis to him, how he prior to that, though, would describe his symptoms,
"freezing up, clam up, I don't feel good, it affects me, it hurts my head", he'd describe all the symptoms and symptomology of PTSD without me having ever communicated that to him or, I'm certain, him never really reading that anywhere. So, in preparing the report for here, that would appear to be the first time he ever heard of this --

Correct. Both those two individuals, their expertise were sought in the Sophonow Inquiry, and our reports were cross-examined there.

There is no literature on the
wrongfully convicted in regards to effects and impacts on their life, and that's why $I$ put this particular paragraph in my report, to, well quite frankly, to give it some credence.

Mr. Sophonow, I believe, was incarcerated for roughly four years; is that right?

That's correct, for the murder of a -- the young woman in Winnipeg.

Barbara Stoppel.
Right.
But as $I$ understand it, well $I$ say this for the record's sake, he didn't go through a 690, the Court of Appeal eventually quashed the conviction, but he has been treated as a 690 in terms of Justice Cory, etcetera. But it would be fair to say that his suffering, which $I$ don't minimize at all, would be only a fraction of what David went through?

A
Well, we'd, we would certainly have to play deity to ascertain an individual's stress or duress. What I could say is that Tom Sophonow's situation is, and was, considerably different than David's. Thomas had a family before going -- no, sorry, not before going into prison but upon returning. But before going into prison he had a job, he had a
career, he was a tool die maker, and he had held down a job for quite some period of time, and he had that job to come back to so he was quite -his -- the context from which he came out of was much more stabler than David Milgaard's, and so that does present more support for the individual as opposed to David, and certainly you could say helped alleviate the symptomology of wrongful conviction and the stress and duress of that and the trauma of that.

But as $I$ understand it, and $I$ take it you were probably there, Thomas Sophonow was able to testify at his inquiry?

That is correct.
And how'd he handle it?
Well there were a couple times, in the short day and a half that $I$ was there, when he stormed out of the room, much like this, when $I$ was giving evidence, and obviously something triggered him. But he, much like perhaps I'm hearing about David and his appeals and that appeal process and really clinging onto that, Tom really clung onto this Inquiry and that became his whole raison d'être, his whole reason for being, and which is why he was able to do that.

As well, as his therapist I, right from the get-go $I$ was able to delve into issues with Thomas related to his incarceration and, at the time he was much better emotionally psychologically integrated to be able to deal with that, and so he was, he was, he was able to attend the -- his own inquiry.

Okay. And, also, that Inquiry was awarding compensation?

Correct, the second half of that Inquiry was all about compensation, so that perhaps served as increased motivation.

Mr. Commissioner, I don't know if my clock is fast or not, but pretty close.
(Adjourned at 10:30 a.m.)
(Reconvened at 10:52 a.m.)
BY MR. WOLCH:
Mr. Grymaloski, just a follow-up on something we were talking about earlier. In talking about David and Thomas Sophonow you talked about starting a new life, as commencing a new life. Is there a point of time where the new life starts, that is does there have to be, for example, exoneration or release, or what prompts a "new life"?

A point. There are, if you wish, major milestones along the way that one can look at.

In the Sophonow case it
certainly was his exoneration and then his compensation.

In David Milgaard's situation, though, I think it's substantially different in that the effects are, and were, so much more pronounced that there is no clear delineation of symptoms, if you wish, no major road map or marker point along his way to provide that for him, other than perhaps what is presently, right at this very moment, going on for him in his life, which is his new wife and their new baby.

Now it's fair to say that you have diagnosed David as having post-traumatic stress disorder?

Correct.
Perhaps the report can be brought up on the screen, page 2. Now you have described post-traumatic stress disorder here; could you help us through that, please?

A
Well I, I attempted to give a more what $I$ would suggest is a user-friendly interpretation or analysis of PTSD, and it's not entirely mine, it's

Lawrence Miller's, who has written substantially on PTSD. Umm, and it's best understood as a series of symptoms and accompanying behaviours that doesn't necessarily have to stem from a discreet event, it can, but it can also occur over some period of time.

You say here:
"We must keep in mind that Mr. Milgaard experienced some 22 years of continued traumatizing experiences, starting when he was but a young man, coupled with the complete and total incapacitation of spirit and soul stemming from his innocence."

What are you saying there?
Well, what's important to understand about PTSD is the complete shake-up or breakdown of the human individual's personal world views, personal views and world views, the very way in which we all come to understand how things work, how things go. In PTSD victims or survivors their, that very fabric of how they comprehend and understand their reality is shaken, and so that's kind of like what I am trying to get at there. Having occurred at such a young age and then having it continue, the
incarceration and life behind bars, having to experience that and live with that, all along knowing that you are innocent, would be very traumatizing.

Okay. And then you say:
"As a result of these traumatic experiences there follows a developed characteristic set of emotional symptoms and behavioural patterns of which David Milgaard has manifested a multitude of such expressions:",
and you list the first one as anxiety; can you tell us about that?

Well the -- a very usable metaphor to try and understand David and/or individuals who have experienced PTSD over, or have experienced trauma over a long period of time and are suffering from PTSD, a useful metaphor would be the tsunami and an individual running away from the tsunami. In my mind that's a useful metaphor for David. David's an individual -- it was all impressed on our minds when we observed the tragedy of people running away. Well, for me, David's been running in front of that tsunami for 35 years, trying to get away from it, and that -- that's part and
parcel of literal anxiety or specific anxiety related to concrete specific events, or this free-floating anxiety which is just below consciousness and is always there, and then specific events or occurrences can trigger that and bring it out.

And so all the different
behavioural patterns and symptomology stem from or come from ways in which he has tried to alleviate those symptomology, and specific to that, the anxiety and the intrusion of events and circumstances that have occurred to him. You talk about physiological arousal; can you tell us about that?

A
Well the -- as Dr. Baillie was alluding to and discussed, the fight-or-flight response in us human beings, which is part and parcel of our evolution and our survival, when we run into dangerous situations we become alert and, you know, that yellow alert, if you wish, can go to a red alert where there's impending danger.

Well for someone like David, that physiological, emotional, psychological response style has been turned on for, you know, the years of incarceration, and perhaps the 10, 15
years subsequent to that, and so the -- all the physiological systems associated with that -neuropsychologists talk about the endocrinatic system, hormonal system if you wish, is -- becomes conditioned, becomes habituated to that constant being on alert, impending threat, and it's not something that, you know, when $I$ go to sleep it goes away, it, umm, it's always there.

Okay. You refer to irritability?
Yes. That's part of that physiological arousal. He will -- I see that personally in our sessions where, as $I$ was saying earlier, $I$ will touch on something where he doesn't want to go and he becomes agitated and irritable, and then that's kind of like the end of that and you can see he has turned off, and there is no sense going further, and so we, we don't.

Umm, avoidance/denial, that's what $I$ was trying to get across a little earlier. In terms of showing David my report, he understandably and appropriately has a fair degree of pride and does not like to think this has affected him in any way, but yet it -- it's kind of like a very observable contradiction in that he doesn't really want to touch on any of it or talk
about any of it unless he is the one who initiates it.


Q

A
unless he

Okay. You've got intrusions?
Umm, well, these are the, again, not-so-conscious, always-lurking-behind-consciousness, facts and realities of his experience over the past 30 some odd years that, left untreated, are always there. We -- they may fade in consciousness but they are always there, and so circumstances in his reality can trigger that underlying material and bring it out, which then reinforces his feeling of being out of control. And that's -- that's one of the biggest things that he tries to avoid is that feeling of being out of control. None of us like to have that sort of feeling and so we just avoid stimuli or situations that might bring that about.

In talking with David about this report, upon closing he then gave me a little bit, and said "well, you know, I guess I still do wake up sometimes in the middle of the night in a cold sweat believing I'm still in jail", and so that was -- that was --

I take it that doesn't surprise you at all?
Sorry?

Q
A
$Q$
A

That wouldn't come as a surprise to you?
No, no, no. And $I$ saw that as quite positive in terms of our relationship and David's healing, that he is beginning the process of starting to own some of the symptomology.

Impaired concentration and memory?
Well one of the ways in which all of us human beings deal with emotions is to intellectualize. We learn very early that if we analyse the heck out of something, we limit or diminish the feelings associated with it, and in both Tom Sophonow and David Milgaard, and to some degree in my readings of the individuals from England, the Birmingham 6, they all show examples of that, high analytical, we might say intellectual, kinds of capacities. Well that mechanism, we could call it, becomes taxed, becomes overburdened, if there is overabundance of emotion that's being held down or that's being tried to be suppressed. It taxes that, our cognitive system, and hence, then, the fuzzy, the spacey, the stream of consciousness kind of thinking that David has been known for. Concern about losing his mind?

Yes. That's very much what $I$ was referring to earlier in terms of losing control. It's much
like any of us, or all of us, having a dream and waking up and, you know, giving our head a shake, "oh, wow, that was just a dream", and then the frameworks and the boundaries of our mind are back in place and we're back in touch with reality.

Well, this kind of symptomology
blurs those boundaries between conscious and unconscious, they -- there isn't that kind of like firm grasp that most of us in normal situations will have, and so then that can be very frightening and all part and parcel of that underlying anxiety that is always there that "I'm just one step away from losing all control". Turn to your last page. You talk about withdrawal/isolation?

A
Well, again, that's a principal coping strategy of David's. Earlier with Dr. Baillie you were pointing out how he would take himself away, and all his behaviours of that form, including his world travels, in my mind, are all part and parcel of that as a coping strategy, just trying to remove himself, or my metaphor of running ahead of the tsunami, "I'll just remove myself completely from the area". So that's best seen as, again, a coping strategy for dealing with his pain and
suffering.
And impulsivity and instability?
Again that underlying anxiety, that perpetual need to be holding emotion down and holding it in check, keeping it suppressed, will make any of us unstable and very impulsive. We feel -- we could feel -- David feels something starting to come up and rather than perhaps, in a more normal situation, sitting there and letting it come up, $I$ like to say inhabiting the emotion, David will do something, he -- he -- hence the impulsivity, just get up and act, do something. And that, if you wish, becomes a distraction, becomes a deflection, and, again, another way of coping and dealing with the emotion.

Now you come to your conclusions and recommendations. You say:
"David ... is a trauma survivor like few others."

A

Q Okay. And you state:
"He suffers from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder."

A Uh-huh.

Can you take us through your conclusions? You can obviously borrow from what you have written or elaborate.

Well, as we were just talking about in terms of the symptoms and the behaviours, that has -that's best seen, again, as a syndrome, as a collection. There's nothing discreet or simple about PTSD, and that's certainly highlighted in the literature on PTSD, it takes a -- it requires a real meta, a global kind of approach to dealing with it, because all areas of functioning are affected by it. And so the first objective in trying to provide treatment or be of some effective benefit to such an individual is to, first of all, try and get them to trust you so that they can then open up emotional intimacy. And so that has, that has been my prime objective, and as $I$ say most everything else has been simply crisis management, by that $I$ mean trying to manage the behaviours, trying to manage the symptoms rather than really getting at the roots and the causes of the symptoms and the behaviours --
$Q$ Is it -- go on?
-- and attempts to -- in any kind of treatment modality with any human being you can't mandate
treatment. I guess we can and people can play along and, you know, pretend if you wish, but that certainly isn't my interest, and because that does no good to anybody, and rather trying to force an individual to get into their stuff simply reinforces their maladaptive ways of coping and dealing with it, it just builds up those defences stronger and stronger, and what -- rather, what you want to be doing to be effective is to limit those and lessen those, and so it's -- it's -what $I$ am trying to get at there is a big-stick approach does more harm than good.
$Q$
Just before $I$ finish the report and my questions, I would like to turn for a moment to our meeting in mid to late November in your office with Commission Counsel?

A
Uh-huh.

And how did you see your role in that?
Provide support for David, just help him feel like there was someone there with him, for him at an emotional level.
$Q$
You spent a fair bit of time with him before we got there $I$ think?

A
Yes.

And what was his emotional state?
he was kind of irritable, kind of impatient.
There was noticeable behavioural examples of that or concomitance of that and my role was, you know, just simply trying to say, you know, it's going to be fine, you know, there's nothing adversive about it, it's not going to be confrontational, it's kind of like an exploratory thing, this is going to work, and so just trying to support him and assure him that things would go okay.

And what did you observe taking place in the actual meeting?

Well, as hopefully you remember, it was light and jovial and pleasant. We -- and everybody was a part of that, you know, tried to keep it at that level. There were -- there was an instance when the issue of, oh, something that transpired way back when around the throwing out of the car, and you'll have to forgive me for not knowing any of these details, a little packet or something like that, there was some question, a question brought about that $I$ think as a for instance is what the sort of questions would look like, and if you remember, David got up and started gesticulating with his hands a little bit and got a little bit,
a tad agitated by that and we see that kind of stream of consciousness thinking, that
over-intellectualizing that $I$ talked about, where again it became for a moment a little difficult to follow him, and then he, you know, it -- I think we moved on or changed the subject or what not and he quieted back down and we carried on.

And when the interview was over, what happened then?

David left, David left in a relative hurry. I didn't get to spend any time with him which again is kind of how things have typically always gone. He gave me a phone call a day or two later just saying he was fine and $I$ have not seen him since. I talked to him on the phone just before coming down here and he was screening his calls and he did not take my call, but then he called right back, I guess he maybe recognized my number and he called right back and that's when he told me about the birth of his boy and that he is so far away, to quote him verbatim, he is so far away from this Inquiry, don't talk about it at all to me, $I$ just want to enjoy my baby and bye, and he hung up and that's the last conversation I've had from him. Is there any concern on your part that your being
of assistance to us may affect your relationship?

A

Q

A

Q
Okay. Just going through the second last paragraph:
"Mr. Milgaard has been relatively successful in coping with his history of abuse and trauma through his efforts to normalize his life. This is best reflected by his extensive travels and his new bride and --"

Now born child.
"The demons of his past are still there waiting for a more stable and secure, and consistently so, time in his life for his real work to begin. I am
reinforcing David's present desire to settle down and find a house and a home for his 'baby'."

Can you elaborate on that, please?
A
Well, my second and primary treatment objective is stability, continuity and predictability for David in his life, something of which he has not had anything of, for again ever since he was an adolescent, and so $I$ have certainly encouraged him and reinforced his desires for travelling, I see that as a more adaptive form of coping and dealing with his demons as $I$ say, that underlying, you know, always kept in check emotional baggage of his, but that as he now seeks to provide stability and continuity for his wife and child, it -- and again, this is true with any and all therapeutic relationships and dimensions in my practice, if our life is unstable and unsettled, that serves as a very useful, if $I$ can call it that, distraction from dealing with what perhaps $I$ do need to deal with. Conversely, if we have some stability and continuity in our life, stuff invariably will start to come up and ideally then that's when we're able to start dealing with it.

Okay. You say for David to appear here:
"... would most probably, undo the last 10 years of his work and effort to stabilize his life and move past his traumatizing past. As such it would throw him back into the dark chasm that was so long a part of his life and that he is so valiantly but slowly, climbing his way out of."

And again, what $I ' m$ referring to there is the continuity, stability and predictability of his life which is all related to power of control himself, feeling himself to be in control of his life and his life circumstances. I am suggesting that he is quite adamant at not wanting to be a part of this Inquiry and so in effect being forced to do so would very much put him out of control of that situation and would -- that is David's history, not being in control of his life, and so it would be a replication of what has come before, what his life has been.

MR. WOLCH: Thank you. Mr. Commissioner, those are all the questions I have.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Grymaloski, maybe I missed it, but prior to October the 25 th when you saw Mr. Milgaard, when was the last time
you treated him?

A

That would have been about a year and a half prior, or close to two years.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And was that a series of interviews you had with him then or only one?

No, just one.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And before that?
Oh, probably -- there would have been a couple, I think that was then just before he -- or after he had come back from India, so he would come in and see me once or twice and then go away, I would be out of communication and come back, and that went on and off like that for, well, ever since I've known him.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, thanks, I obviously am getting into some new ground. I thought I had missed something. Perhaps counsel will wish to take that up with you. Cross-examination anyone?

BY MR. ELSON:
Mr. Grymaloski, my name is Richard Elson and I represent the Saskatoon Police Service at this Commission of Inquiry.

I don't mean to be flippant, but

I wanted to draw upon one of the answers that you gave in answering questions put forward by Mr. Wolch, and again, as $I$ say, I don't want to be flippant, but you used the words in describing Mr. Milgaard prior to the interview in November of 2005 as worried, anxious, irritable and impatient, and with the greatest of respect, those are words my wife uses to describe me before a trial. If we were to look at any witness or any participant in any type of judicial or litigious proceedings, would it not be fair to use those words to describe those persons irrespective of whatever mental condition they might have or might not have?

But, sir, with all due respect, you, before a trial, haven't spent 22 years in jail for a crime you did not commit.

I appreciate that, but the significance of the words you use, you indicate that Mr. Milgaard was worried, anxious, irritable and impatient. I appreciate that his background may be different than mine, but those particular words I suggest to you don't carry any particular significance and don't necessarily stand out as hallmark s for whether or not somebody has spent 22 years in
custody for an offence they didn't commit or whether they hadn't spent any time in custody. But your worry and anxiety isn't backed up then by an inability to perform, whereas David's is. And yet his -- and as $I$ understand it, and $I$ only understand this from information received to me from Commission Counsel, the interaction that was had at that time was quite useful for all concerned?

Sorry, the interaction between --
The interaction that was had between Commission Counsel and Mr. Milgaard at that time in November of 2005 was reasonably useful?

Yes.
Now, in your report, and at the first page of your report, second paragraph -- I'm terrible with this -- you indicate the word infrequent and frequent in the same paragraph, you indicated:
"I started seeing David Milgaard back on May $23 r d, 1995$ and have seen him on an infrequent basis every since."

And then in the very next paragraph (sic):
"The first couple of years, visits were fairly frequent but at coffee shops..."

Etcetera. During those first few years -- well,
let me be even more specific. When you first began interacting with Mr. Milgaard in May of 1995, did you open a file at that time?

A
Q

A
$Q$ Yes, I did.

And would you record your clinical findings in that file?

No, they are more -- my note taking is more observational, certainly at the initial phase of a therapeutic relationship.

My understanding of -- I've had occasion to review a few medical records over my time, but my understanding is that clinical records generally record the subjective history a patient gives to the therapist, objective findings made by the therapist in part to confirm whether or not the subjective history is accurate, and then thirdly an assessment and finally a plan. I understand that's known as the SOAP format, subjective, objective, assessment and plan. Do you maintain that same kind of note-taking system in your records?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What was the last word, assessment?

MR. ELSON: Subjective, objective, assessment and plan.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Plan?

MR. ELSON: Plan.

No, I don't.

BY MR. ELSON:
You don't. You are familiar with the SOAP format?
Yes, I am.
You are?
Yeah.
What type of format do you use in maintaining your records?

Well, with someone like David Milgaard, very
little. David would wonder what $I$ was writing. I
took very little notes. Most of our meetings
weren't in my office precisely for the type of
client that David is and David was.
Would you take your file with you when you met him
in the coffee shops --
No.
-- during those first few years?
No, no.
So you would then record your notes from your memory --

A
Correct.
-- after you returned to your office?
Correct.

And those notes at that time, would I be fair in summarizing your evidence as saying your notes would reflect the subjective history that Mr. Milgaard would be providing to you?

I'm not sure what you mean by subjective history. My notes would simply involve my observations of David at that particular point in time.

I stand corrected. So when you say you would record your observations, these would be your observations as opposed to what -- your observations of Mr. Milgaard as opposed to him telling you what he was experiencing?

David rarely would tell me what he was experiencing, we would talk about anything and everything but. That's the whole issue, trying to get David to open up.

All right. Now, do you have your file with you? No, I don't.

Were you asked to bring your file with you?
Yes, I was.
And why did you not bring it?
My file is confidential. David does not want, did
not give me a release of information.
Now, my understanding is that Mr. Wolch arranged for you, or had made the specific request that you
attend this Commission of Inquiry in order for him to lead evidence from you with respect to your opinion as to David Milgaard's condition; is that correct?

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
Q
Correct.
David Milgaard was aware that you were coming to this Inquiry to testify as requested by his lawyer?

Correct.
You did not regard the request by his counsel as a waiver of his right to confidentiality?

I did not.
Did you ask Mr. Milgaard as to whether or not he waived any claim for confidentiality he might have with respect to those records?

Yes.
As a consequence of his lawyer permitting or asking for you to be here?

I don't think it got quite that complicated.
I guess what I'm getting at, Mr. Grymaloski, is it
sounds, with the greatest of respect, somewhat
inconsistent for Mr. Milgaard's counsel to produce
you, in effect -- granted, the Commission Counsel assisted in that respect -- but in a sense you are being produced here primarily at the request of

Mr. Wolch who is Mr. Milgaard's counsel?
Correct.
And yet at the same time Mr. Wolch's client is refusing to permit you to disclose or to produce the record which forms the basis of the opinions you are expressing here today?

Fair.
Does that not strike you as being somewhat inconsistent?

No .
Why not?
My duty and my obligation is to my client. My file is about his personal, very intimate life and affairs and I'm not sure what bearing or how that could have any bearing on this Inquiry. I have not spent any time with David looking at his wrongful conviction, his incarceration or any of that history, there's none of that in my file. But it would be fair to say that your opinion, your report dated November 4th of 2005 would have been based in part on notes contained in your clinical file; is that correct?

A Well, not really. You didn't have the file open before you when you were dictating this report?

A
Q
A

Q

A

2

A
Q

A
Q
A

Q

Not really.
You went totally by memory?
Correct.
All right. We don't have the report here that we can use in one form or another either to confirm or perhaps even challenge some of the conclusions that are set out in this report. You would agree with that?

Well, $I$ would suggest that there's ample evidence of David's behaviour over the years to substantiate my report.

And that evidence would be found in your clinical record?

It's also found in the public record.
I guess what I'm getting at is that it is
conceivable, is it not, that there may be entries
in your clinical record which, if we were to
review, might raise some inconsistencies between
the findings in your clinical record and the
findings set out in your report of November 4, 2005 ?

I would respectfully disagree.
We don't know though do we?
Fair.
And in light of the fact that you didn't produce
your report, we're not going to know?

A
Q

A

Q
A
$Q$
A

A

A

A

BY MR. ELSON:
Mr. Grymaloski, you have those specific -- I
I don't think there was a visit then either.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: 2002 to 2004
inclusive no visits?
Correct.
$Q$
appreciate you didn't describe the dates, but you are able to identify and you feel relatively comfortable with the number of times that you would have seen him in each of those years you've just described in answering my questions and the Commissioner's questions?

Yes. Prior to coming here $I$ had a look at my file just to see if indeed $I$ could follow through with the request or not.

Does your record, does your clinical file simply contain your observations and your own notes or does it also contain any materials, clinical notes or clinical records that came from third parties? No. Just mine.

Let me be more specific, and I think you've already answered the question, but just out of fairness to you let me be specific. We have heard evidence that there have been hospitalizations. I know from time to time it is appropriate for therapists to receive discharge summaries, for example, of hospital admissions. Did you receive any discharge summary of Mr. Milgaard's hospital admissions during the period of time between May of 1995 and the present?

A No, I did not.

Are you aware of any hospital admissions -Yes, I am.
-- between 1995 and the present?
David, on several occasions, had told me that he had checked himself in.

And did you receive any clinical information other than through Mr. Milgaard with respect to the circumstances of those admissions and, in particular, the admitting diagnosis?

No, I did not. He would not divulge that
information to me and $I$ would not pursue that.
All right. Would it not have been helpful for you to have received clinical information with respect to those hospital admissions particularly if they might have been for mental conditions as opposed to physiological ones?

A
Yes, it would have been helpful, but again, as I was alluding to earlier, in terms of a global sort of approach to treatment with PTSD, I would suggest that it would have been more harmful in setting up questions within David as to why I would be pursuing that. The nature of the relationship is really quite significant and important in this respect in terms of trust. The only way that $I$ have any access to David at an
emotionally intimate level is simply because he sees me as safe.

I understand. In seeing you as safe, to use your word, to what extent, if any, do you perceive that you must be David Milgaard's advocate? Well, I'm certainly an advocate for his health and well-being, oh, yes. No, I would certainly agree with that.

All right. And in your opinion, that advocacy role extends to the point of suggesting that Mr . Milgaard ought not to testify before this Commission of Inquiry, am $I$ to understand your evidence correctly in that respect?

Those were David's wishes and a big part of our relationship is me seeking to validate and empower David, help him find his voice, and those were his wishes and that's his desire. I see that as being directly correlated to his health and well-being to his healing and so yes.

Now, in that context, are you aware that there were various requests, some might use the word demand, $I$ don't, but there were certainly various requests from Mr. Milgaard in a number of circumstances certainly prior to 1997 that there be a Commission of Inquiry into his wrongful
conviction. Were you aware that he had previously made a request for a Commission of Inquiry to investigate his wrongful conviction?

A
Q
A
Q

A
$Q$
$Q$

A

Not coming directly from David.
All right.
And --
Have you subsequently been made aware of the fact that Mr. Milgaard had requested the Saskatchewan government to appoint this Commission of Inquiry? I wasn't aware that it was David Milgaard himself. Taking into account the fact that Mr. Milgaard had at least some time in the past made a request for this Commission of Inquiry, would you not see him making that request for this Commission of Inquiry to be created to investigate the circumstances of his wrongful conviction as part and parcel of his attempt to empower himself and to gain control in some respect over his destiny by trying to find out what the heck happened?

Correct.
In that context, as his therapeutic advocate, does
not encouraging him to assist in one form or another with this Commission of Inquiry become part of that therapy?

Yes, it does. I was very supportive of Tom

Sophonow testifying at his inquiry, but there's phenomenal and very significant differences between the two. David is simply just not ready at this point in time to broach all the issues and their surrounding emotional valences, their surrounding emotional values at this point in time and that has been, fortunately or unfortunately, compounded by his new wife and the birth of his child. That has taken preeminence for David and his whole motivation.

I think as Dr. Baillie attempted
to ascertain, David, as with Tom Sophonow, had, in the initial phase of his release, his appeal and compensation as, again as I said earlier, his raison d'être, his reason for being, and that propelled him more into the public and being a spokesperson for his cause.

Presently, again rightfully or wrongfully or correctly or incorrectly, that has changed and his wife and his child and the stability and continuity and predictability of his life has risen in my mind, thankfully, to preeminence in his mindset and in his control as what he wants to be doing in his life.

My understanding, when you raised the Sophonow
case, my understanding of your interaction with Mr. Sophonow is that you had been seeing him over a period of time and it would be fair to say that the circumstances under which you were seeing Mr. Sophonow were, if $I$ might use the phrase, somewhat more in-depth --

Correct.
-- with Mr. Sophonow than they were for Mr. Milgaard?

Correct.

In fact, you had occasion, as $I$ understand it from Mr. Cory's Commission of Inquiry, which I reviewed, you specifically had occasion to employ psychological testing with respect to

Mr. Sophonow; is that correct?
Correct.

And you have not done so with respect to Mr. Milgaard?

Correct.

That psychological testing that you performed with Mr. Sophonow was of some use to you in making your assessment of Mr. Sophonow; is that correct?

Correct.

The other mental health professionals who testified before Mr. Justice Cory, as I understand
it, were Dr. O'Shaughnessy and Dr. Grounds; is that correct?

A
Q
A

Q

A

A
$Q$
BY MR. ELSON:
My understanding is that Dr. O'Shaughnessy, in that case, said much as you've said, and also as Dr. Baillie has said, that there had been really no literature and no studies to identify a wrongful conviction per se as being the triggering traumatic event for post-traumatic stress
referred to in the report, and it's been
highlighted there.
disorder; you would agree with that?
Well I'm, I'm not saying that it's just the wrongful conviction, I'm saying that that represents a cluster of contributing factors. And, primarily, the concern is related to the actual incarceration and the experiences during incarceration, and in Mr. Sophonow's case that was particularly so, because the evidence came out that Mr. Sophonow saw an inmate hang himself while he was incarcerated for a period of time and that played a significant role in Mr. Sophonow's diagnosis; would you agree with that? Well, again, we're trying to parcel out the degree of stressors and the effect, the impact on the human psyche, and $I$ can't do that. That's what I perhaps glibly, or certainly tongue firmly planted in cheek say, one would need to be a deity to be able to ascertain such an effect. I don't think you can parcel out effects so specifically or concretely.

Except, as Dr. Baillie said to us yesterday, it may be appropriate for individuals to deal with tangents that may be, in one form or another, associated with a traumatic event?

A Right.

Q

A
But they are at least sufficiently tangental to the traumatic event that it doesn't stop a person from giving a narration with respect to those tangental things --

Right.
-- or those tangental circumstances?
Correct, sure.
And you would agree with that?
Yes, I would.
Now I understand Dr. Grounds, in his testimony before Mr. Justice Cory, indicated that he had not seen Mr. Sophonow but he, himself, had done work with wrongfully-convicted people, notably the individuals who had been wrongfully convicted with respect to the Birmingham and the Guilford bombings in the United Kingdom?

Correct.
And, indeed, Dr. Grounds testified that it came as a complete surprise to him that these individuals demonstrated signs of post-traumatic stress disorder; do you recall that testimony given by Dr. Grounds?

A
Q
A Unfortunately, $I$ was not there for that. Did you actually see Dr. Grounds' report? No, I did not.

Q
My understanding of Dr. Grounds -- and this is taken, Mr. Commissioner, from the web site with respect to the Cory Inquiry -- my understanding of Dr. Grounds' testimony is that he was very surprised at his findings in the Birmingham and the Guilford cases because, up to that point in time, the only evidence and the only literature that described the traumatic event was done in the context of wars, serious accidents, sexual abuse, and victims of concentration camps or victims of torture?

A
Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A Yes, correct. I agree with that.

No, this is a whole new area
with the wrongfully convicted, there is no psychological, psychiatric literature on it, on with that, sorry, the -It's actually the top of page 2 I think you are referring to; is it not?
the effects of being wrongfully incarcerated.
Now, having said that, it's my understanding that
the wrongfully convicted, in Mr. Sophonow's case and also with respect to the Birmingham and the Guilford bombers in the United Kingdom, had no difficulty testifying at their subsequent

Commissions of Inquiry examining the wrongful convictions in either of those instances?

As did Thomas Sophonow.
As did Thomas Sophonow.
Yeah. But as I'm suggesting, there is -- I don't know the Birmingham 6, but $I$ do know Thomas Sophonow, and there are substantial emotional, psychological differences between these two gentlemen; age, context, social context, and career.

Incidentally, my understanding
of Dr. Grounds' work comes from Thomas Sophonow, who subsequently travelled to England and undertook a couple weeks of treatment with Dr. Grounds.

Q The -- you are aware of Mr. Milgaard's press conference in October of 2005 here in Saskatoon?

A

Q I heard about it, umm, after the fact.

And so he did not speak with you beforehand?

A No, he didn't.
Q
He did not seek your advice as to whether this, therapeutically for him, was a good thing to do? I wish he would have. I'm interested in your answer on that. If he had done so what would your advice have been? To stick to his prepared statement and do no Q and A.

Right. Now for him to actually come into the hearing room where the Commission of Inquiry charged with the responsibility of examining the circumstances of his wrongful conviction, it has previously been described as hubris. That aside, to what extent is that consistent or inconsistent with this avoidance that you referred to in your report and which Dr. Baillie has referred to in his report? You heard that question yesterday. Uh-huh. Well I think, correctly, David, as I've attempted to allude to, really tries to see and think and believe that none of this has had any effect on him, and so my hypothesis, my assumption, is that he perhaps believed he could do that.

You are, as $I$ indicated, you are now aware -- or as you had indicated, you are now aware that Mr.

Milgaard had asked for this Commission of Inquiry.
In your discussions with him about possibly participating in this Commission of Inquiry -- and I say this with the greatest of respect to Mr. Milgaard -- does it come across to you as if he perceives that this is his inquiry, that he can come and go as he pleases and that he can participate as he pleases, that it belongs to him in some way?

A
Right. No, I -- I think that would -- that's a tad unfair. I don't think he's --

Tell me why you feel that's unfair?
Because I don't believe he's that egocentric, I don't see him as being that egocentric, this thing revolves around him. He is definitely trying to move, remove himself or leave it in the past, leave it behind him, he is concerned about due process, he is concerned about what did transpire, but he does not -- it's not that flippant of an attitude or an orientation towards it all.

How can one, in that context then, how can he be concerned about the result, or the proceedings of this Commission of Inquiry, and yet not participate in giving valuable evidence that only he would know?

A
Because he knows his past, he knows his history, he knows how this affects him, his -- and he knows, he has some sense, then, of how potentially debilitating that would be for his wife and his newborn child, and he is -- his whole emphasis on orientation, understandably and in my mind appropriately in terms of David's healing and movement, growth out of this, needs to be orientated in that direction. Irrespective of the consequences that might affect this Commission of Inquiry in that respect? Well --

In other words what $I$ am getting at is that in his, in order for him to be concerned about his own health and welfare, if that diminishes the ability of this Commission of Inquiry to do its job, is that of any concern to Mr. Milgaard? Well, you are asking his therapist that question, and of course you are going to know what my answer is going to be; his health and well-being is more important.

All right. You are aware --
And that of his family, if $I$ may say.
I understand. You are aware, if not before yesterday certainly yesterday you would have been
aware, because it came up in the questioning of Dr. Baillie, that in May of 1996, a year after you first met Mr. Milgaard, he attended in Saskatoon and was examined for discovery by lawyers who were representing adverse parties? I'm not sure if you have any personal familiarity with the examination for discovery process?

I don't.
It's a process whereby counsel on the opposing side are permitted to examine, in this instance Mr. Milgaard as plaintiff, are permitted to examine him with respect to the facts in issue. Now, granted, that was prior to the DNA analysis and the finding by the Government of Saskatchewan that Mr. Milgaard was factually innocent. Having said that, Mr. Milgaard was planning to come in for five days, $I$ think he was here for either $31 / 2$ or 4 days in May of 1996. Let me ask the same question of you as I asked of Dr. Baillie yesterday.

To what extent, if any, is his participation, or was his participation at the examination for discovery in 1996, inconsistent with the avoidance that both you and Dr. Baillie speak of in describing post-traumatic stress
disorder?
Well I think, as Dr. Baillie and myself in terms of my continual reference to raison d'être, back in '96 that was David's whole reason for existing, so that that was his cause, that was his motivation, his primary, fundamental motivation. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What was, sir?

The inquiry or the -- what you were talking about in '96.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: His lawsuit? MR. ELSON: His civil lawsuit.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Make sure he understands.

MR. ELSON: I'm sorry.
BY MR. ELSON:
And that's my fault, Mr. Grymaloski, not yours. The examination for discovery was in the context of a civil lawsuit in which Mr. Milgaard was then seeking compensation, because at that time there had been no finding that Mr. Milgaard was factually innocent.

A
$Q$ Okay.

I should have made that clear to you, in fairness to you, and that was the context in which he was giving evidence. He had not received any
compensation. So if $I$ could give you that context --

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q


Right.
-- again let me, if you've forgotten the question let me put the question to you: To what extent, if any, was it inconsistent for him to attend at the examination for discovery, in the context of that civil lawsuit --

Right.
-- to what extent was that inconsistent with the avoidance mechanism that both you and Dr. Baillie speak of?

I don't see that as being inconsistent at all. David's very livelihood and wherewithal depended upon some kind of compensation, he had no money, and that was very humiliating for him. He was unemployable, that produced a lot of shame for him, and so that was his cause, that was his -that's what he, that was kind of like a life-or-death response.

But this Commission of Inquiry which he has requested, which obviously was part of his cause, --

Right.
-- is now no longer part of his cause now that he
has been compensated?

A
Q

A

Q
A
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q
What was the change? I'm sorry, we don't have your notes --

A
It has lessened.
Are you aware of any consequences to Mr.
Milgaard's mental health as a result of him
testifying at the examinations for discovery in
May of 1996?
There was a number of abhorrent behaviours. He was rather incoherent.

When?
In July of '96. I think that's when he got
himself in trouble for swimming naked or there was some, again, abhorrent, self-destructive kinds of behaviours.

And you attribute that to an examination for discovery two months before?

Well $I$ would attribute that to all, all of that repressed and kept-down quagmire of emotion being tapped into, triggered by the inquiry -examination.

Was there any change in 1997 after the DNA results
were released?
Yes.

Yup.

Q
A
$Q$

A

Q
-- so I'm not able to refer to your notes --

Yup.
-- in asking you that question?

David was a lot more active, physical, he was really looking to take care of himself, he was running more, he was swimming more, he was trying to eat better, he was trying to pull his life together.

You appreciate, Mr. Grymaloski, that this Commission of Inquiry, while mindful of Mr. Milgaard's personal circumstances, that we as the participants before it are eager to find out the information that he can remember from the incidents in question, what he recalls, what he does not recall, and his perspective with respect to certain events, not just my client the police service, but a number of parties with standing here are very interested in what he has to say specifically about their interactions in one form or another with them.

Well, quite frankly, I'm not.

You are not aware of that?

No.

If you --

I don't quite understand that, and I'm sure we
don't have the time to, for you to educate me on that, but --

But if I, if $I$ were to put that to you as a given -- and, granted, that will come up in the course of argument before the Commissioner -- if $I$ put that to you that as a given that there are people interested in his version of events and what facts he can recall of specific incidents, is there not some balance that can be accommodated between Mr. Milgaard's personal interests, on the one hand, and the interest of the Commission of Inquiry he requested on the other? And I ask you, is that balance not reflected in the accommodation that certain parties with standing presented yesterday, when you were here, asking for his evidence to be received on video tape with Commission Counsel, none of the adverse parties questioning him at all but under oath and by video tape under the circumstances I described yesterday; would you not agree with me that that reflects a reasonably good balance between those two interests?

Yes, I do.
Thank you, Mr. Grymaloski. I have no further questions.

A Okay.
MR. HODSON: I see it's noon, maybe I'll just check. Mr. Fox, are you -- I'm sorry, we've got time this afternoon to finish. The witness' flight out is at 6:00 so I would suggest we maybe adjourn until 1:30.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right. Thank you.

MR. HODSON: And just for this afternoon, we will finish with Mr. Grymaloski, we will have Mr. Chartier, and hopefully Dr. Ferris for the last hour.
(Adjourned at 12:01 p.m.)
(Reconvened at 1:37 p.m.)
MR. HODSON: Mr. Commissioner, I've canvassed counsel. The only party who may have questions for Mr. Grymaloski is Garrett Wilson. I'm not sure if he intends to or not and he is not back yet, so what $I$ propose to do, with the indulgence of Mr. Grymaloski, is perhaps have Mr. Chartier have his evidence which should take no more than five minutes and if you could just maybe -- you are welcome to stay here. We'll call Mr. Chartier and then hopefully Mr. Wilson will have returned. So if Mr . Chartier can come
back up?

## GERARD CHARTIER, resworn, continued:

BY MR. HODSON:
certainly wasn't aware of what Mr. Vanin was going to say when you were called back in May, nor was I aware of it from any other documents, and presumably no other counsel were aware of what Mr. Vanin was going to say, otherwise they would have questioned you about it, but that's maybe being presumptuous on my part.

Mr. Vanin testified that in the 1990s, I'll just go through what he testified and then $I$ have two questions for you, Mr. Vanin testified that in the 1990 s he had a discussion with you regarding the David Milgaard case and that you told him that you had secretly listened in and/or taped conversations, a conversation or conversations between David Milgaard and his legal counsel, Calvin Tallis, at the Saskatoon police station, and $I$ think he said either you listened in or arranged for that to happen. And you know who Mr. Cal Tallis is and knew who he was in 1969 did you?

Yes.
Q
Did you arrange for andor listen in and record conversations between David Milgaard and

Mr. Calvin Tallis back in 1969 or 1970 ?
A No, I did not.

Did you tell Mr. Vanin anything of that nature?
No .
We heard your evidence about listening in, or arranging to listen in and record Inspector Roberts' interview of Ron Wilson and Nichol John at the Sheraton Cavalier on or about May $23 r d$, 1969. Do you recall telling us about that?

Yes.
Is it possible that you would have conveyed that information about listening in on Inspector Roberts to Tom Vanin?

I can't recall a definitive discussion with Mr.
Vanin in regards to this. It was common
knowledge.
What was common knowledge?
Well, that there had been, we had listened to a conversation.

MR. HODSON: Thank you, Mr. Chartier, those are all my questions. I will see if any counsel have questions. I think Mr. Pringle, counsel for Mr. Tallis, does.

BY MR. PRINGLE:
Mr. Chartier, we've heard that on May $23 r d, 1969$ conversations between Inspector Roberts and Ron Wilson and Nichol John were listened to by
yourself and your partner. What technique did you use to do that again, please?

Microphone and a tape recorder.
Okay. And the microphone was placed within the room in which they were having their discussions; is that correct?

Through a wall and into the room.
Okay. And the tape recorder was where?
In the room that we were in.
Okay. And the tape recorder would produce a tape of the conversation?

Yes.

And whatever happened to that tape?
That I couldn't tell you. I had nothing to do with that. You have to understand what our job was and the investigators that were there and $I$ had no further dealings with anything along that line.

Okay. Did you ever prepare any police reports indicating your involvement in that episode?

I don't believe so. It would have been a very short one, but $I$ don't think we did.

And who did you turn the tape over to?
That's a -- I don't know if it was turned over to anyone in particular. I suspect someone took the
tape recorder and the tape, not us.
Did you ever see a transcript made from that tape?
No.
Were you ever asked to look at a transcript to see if it was correct or identify it in any fashion?

No.
But there was a tape of that conversation between Inspector Roberts and Nichol John and Ron Wilson? There was a tape recorder. I didn't hear what was on the tape. I suspect, you know, in my own feelings it was a poor transmission and there wasn't too much that could have been taken as -- I shouldn't say evidence, but that you would understand in it. You have to understand that in '69 we were, I became part of NCIU which is the National Criminal Intelligence Unit.

I had been to Ottawa, in fact when this murder took place, and $I$ was advised down in Ottawa what had taken place, came back and these things transpired over time. Our job was not to deal with local particular deals, but this murder got very high profile, so we were asked. We didn't have equipment to listen. I think, I'm not positive, it didn't come from the police service,
we had to go out and buy a tape recorder and that which wasn't a very effective machine as $\operatorname{c}$ can remember I think.

That was the role of the NCIU officers; is that correct?

A
That's right.
Q
To basically provide background information or sometimes various forms of surveillance type of information, but not to personally get involved in
the investigation?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q

A

I did, but there were no notes taken at the time of what $I$ heard and that because $I$ was supposed to be, we were technical assistants, we put the machine in, had it running and then whoever was investigating would look after the rest. I
that conversation that occurred in the room between Inspector Roberts and the parties?
remember hearing things, but to this day $I$ can't tell you what.
$Q$
Did he, did Inspector Roberts know that you were conducting this electronic surveillance?

A

Q

A
Q
A
$Q$

A

Q
But wouldn't there be an issue with respect to the continuity of the tape, wouldn't you have to sign the tape, being the operator, and then somebody else would have to sign for it as, you know, as the continuity of that tape develops?

A
I know what you are saying and there was nothing like that done.

Q
So there was never the intent to use that tape in a courtroom, otherwise you would have been keeping the continuity records of the tape; is that fair
to say?
A
$Q$
And do you know whether there was ever any intent to disclose the contents of that tape to defence counsel?

I don't.
It's unlikely that there was. Do you know?
I don't know.
Now, with respect to this comment that Mr. Vanin
made the other day, he's indicated that you
advised him that you had taped -- secretly
listened to or taped conversations between
Mr. Tallis and Mr. Milgaard. Do you remember
Commission Counsel just told you he said that?
I'm sure you heard about that; right?
I read it in the paper which --
Okay. Do you have any -- can you give me any reason why Mr . Vanin would say something like that about you?

A
I would not even speculate. I had too much
respect for Mr. Tallis to even think about that.
It's just a case of wouldn't do it.
$Q$
But I'm asking about Mr. Vanin, do you have any reason why Mr. Vanin --

A
I can't tell you that. You would have to ask him
that. I don't know why he would do it. I haven't talked to him about it, $I$ didn't tell him this, so I don't know why.

The police station is where $I$ believe Mr. Vanin said that this occurred. Do you know where the lawyers would meet with accused at the police station back in those days?

Oh, yes, $I$ was involved, there was station duty, we would take lawyers in there and it was a little room with barred windows and a secure door, and $I$ remember, you know, $I$ would like to be a fly on the wall, that this was conversation that police officers had when their lawyers came in and talked to people, but --

The same room was used, it was predictable what room would be used?

Oh, yes. No, I shouldn't say that, because a lot of interviews were carried on in the morality office or detective office.

But when somebody would come in, like, if Mr. Tallis wanted to see Mr. Milgaard, the police would tell him what room he would go to; is that fair to say?

A Oh, yes, a situation like that where the lawyer is seeing someone, it was held in this one room in
that building.
Okay. And with respect to the room, of course it's in the police station, it's under the control of the police?

A

But your task at that point in time, even in the early stages of this case -- well, at that time when Mr. Tallis would have been involved, which would be shortly after this incident in the hotel, the Cavalier Hotel room on May $23 r d$, your task would still continue to be to try and get some form of surveillance information on the case; would it not?

A
No.
No?
No. It was a national, NCIU was the national criminal and it dealt with national crimes, gambling at that time, gangs, things like that, and it was getting information on those particular people.

But you got involved in the Milgaard case because it was high profile?

A

Q

A

Q

A

I think because our particular boss at that time, Inspector Woods, felt this was a requirement, and asked that we do that.

And was there -- were you given a reason as to why you were asked to put a listening device in the hotel room and tape record what happened?

I think $I$ had a reason when Cadrain came to me and said that he suspected and it started the deal with Ray Mackie, which apparently had already been going unbeknownst to me, or lots of other people I think, so $I$ knew of what was going on generally.

I had never looked at the file itself at no time. But why were you asked to put a listening device in the hotel room and record what occurred inside that hotel room when Inspector Roberts was interviewing the two potential witnesses? Well, we were asked by our particular boss at that time, Superintendent Woods.

Why?
Because of the information that might be gleaned from that.

And after that happened, were you being asked to try and get other information about the case?

No.
Through other mechanisms?

No.
MR. PRINGLE: Thank you, sir. Those are my questions.

MR. HODSON: I think that is all. Thank you very much again, Mr. Chartier.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks for coming, Mr. Chartier. You are excused.

MR. HODSON: Maybe Mr. Grymaloski can go back. I'm advised by Mr. Wilson that he has no questions, so $I$ think it's Mr. Wolch for any re-examination.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
JOEL ADAM GRYMALOSKI, continued:
BY MR. WOLCH:
I just have a couple of questions. Mr. Elson referred you to Thomas Sophonow and, in particular, to Mr. Sophonow being traumatized by seeing another inmate hanging himself or something to that effect, and you said that would traumatize somebody?

Yes.
Correct?
Uh-huh.
And I take it in that scenario there would be another individual who would be perhaps even more
traumatized, as the person who hung himself? Correct.

MR. WOLCH: Now, Mr. Commissioner, I spoke to Commission Counsel earlier and $I$ do want to refer the witness to two pages of documents and I am asking for a publication ban on these two pages. They are quite sensitive and should not be in the public domain.

MR. HODSON: I advised Mr. Wolch that our practice has been he can seek a publication ban for that, $I$ don't know if any parties wish to make submissions on that, and secondly, the interest of the media who have a right to be informed and if they wish to possibly take a position on it. I think our practice has been that if a publication ban is granted and media wish to challenge it, they have the right to do so by informing me, and if you are inclined -and $I$ have no objection to the publication ban. I'm not exactly sure -- I haven't seen the document yet, but $I$ have no problem with the ban. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What in general is the area affected?

MR. WOLCH: It involves trauma while in custody.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Of Mr. Milgaard? MR. WOLCH: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Anybody take a position contrary to that? No? Very well, there will be a publication ban.

MR. WOLCH: Thank you. This shouldn't take too long. The document is ------. This would be a -----------------------, ----, so we're quite early in the process, from a --------- to the ------ in ------------- re: -----, and it states here:
$\qquad$




----------- .


$--------------------------------\quad$,

----------------------------------------------

And if $I$ can then go to the next page, and this is to a ---------, this is --------- of ----, it's a -------------------------------- I think, and it's to the ---------------- regarding ----- .
$\qquad$


$------------------------------------$
------- .

BY MR. WOLCH:
Now, this would have been not too long after the appeal was turned down. What do you recognize in
that in terms of your diagnosis?
A
Well, a highly-traumatized individual looking to escape, looking to alleviate the trauma, albeit in a very maladaptive way ---------.

Now, finally --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Is that the end of the publication ban? MR. WOLCH: Yes. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay. Back on the publication record then.

BY MR. WOLCH:
Yes. Finally, Mr. Elson asked you about the suggestion for an accommodation of videotaping and people present and $I$ think it can be agreed that's a reasonable position, but what do we do if it doesn't appear to be reasonable to David? How do we handle that?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What was the question?

MR. WOLCH: How do we do it if it's not
reasonable to David, that there's -- if he's in a panic over that suggestion even though we may think it's better than writing, is there any insight you can give us?

Well, further compounding that issue is David's
plans to leave the country in about three months or so, so when $I$ say compound, the time frame is, it's a problem. I want to be perfectly frank, I obviously have a lot of interest in seeing this Commission, this Inquiry being successful, but at the same time $I$ am not -- well, it's a very fine line $I$ walk between losing the trust in my client, David, so $I$ can't engage in any kind of metaphorical arm-twisting to fulfil that wish or that objective of the Commission, but in our meeting that we had with yourself and Mr. Hodson, we talked about laying the seeds with David for the possibility of notching, get up, if you wish, going, moving to videotaping and recording, but in that meeting that we did have, David was fairly, you know, to relatively adamant at not wanting to do that.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I'm not clear about what meeting you are speaking of.

MR. WOLCH: November 17th.

November the 17 th.

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: The one in

Vancouver?

A
At my office.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: With Commission

Counsel?
MR. WOLCH: Correct.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay. And the video/audio was discussed then?

A

A

The idea of answering questions in writing was discussed and David appeared to be favourably inclined to that?

A

Q

A
BY MR. WOLCH:

Correct.
Can you give us any insight as to why he would prefer the more laborious and tougher way of doing it?

Well, David has had, for quite some considerable period of time, aspirations to be a writer, so he feels a lot more comfortable, and he has written and he has produced poetry and is working on material and so he feels a lot more comfortable in that forum and in that jurisdiction, if you wish,
whereas videotaping, it's kind of an unknown variable, feels more like a performance or, you know, him being presented, and if there are unfavourable reactions or responses for him, from him, that would cause him some concern, some trepidation, and so then hence the opposition to it.

I take it also in writing he would be alone I assume?

Correct.
Without the presence of people --
Correct.
-- perhaps surrounding him or whatever?
Correct. It is -- it would be more of a single, solitary kind of activity.

Q
The idea just comes to me the possibility of him talking into a tape recorder, would that be a possibility?

A
That would, yeah, that could be a good compromise perhaps, that it wouldn't seem too intrusive.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I don't -- you better elaborate on that.

MR. WOLCH: Well, the possibility of giving
him a list of questions and he just dictates the answers as best he can into a Dictaphone and gets
it transcribed just to save time. I don't know how many questions there would be, but -COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: He would answer orally to written questions into a tape? MR. WOLCH: Into a Dictaphone by himself, yes.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Hmm?
MR. WOLCH: It's really answering in writing than having a stenographer do it for you. I'm not saying -- that idea just came a second ago, I hadn't thought of it until now as a possibility, that it would save time. I don't think it will necessarily work, but it's an idea. Those are all my questions.

Can $I$ just make a comment on the videotaping. As I tried to present in the morning, a sense of control and predictability is really quite important and significant for David in his growth and development emotionally and psychologically and he is certainly under the impression or the understanding that he will be answering questions which is why it puts me in quite a bind to present the videotaping as the way to go, and I'm not adverse to doing that, but as $I$ said a moment ago, I don't want to argue the point, I'm not going to
argue that point, the metaphorical arm-twisting so to speak, so any kind of a compromise would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you, sir.
MR. HODSON: That is all for Mr. Grymaloski.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Grymaloski, thank you for coming, you are excused. Thank you. Thank you for having me. MR. HODSON: Thank you. Just one final matter, Mr .

Commissioner. I had been asked, there were a couple of letters from counsel to me associated with the application, and a letter from me to Mr. Wolch that $I$ had been asked to put on the record. The first, and this deals with the issue of hospital records, and $I$ will get them ID'd and then quickly go through them. All counsel are aware of these, I sent them out to everybody a number of weeks ago.

The first is a December 5
letter from Mr. Fox to me, it's also copied to Mr. Wolch, and it sets out about the application for an exemption or an accommodation and then refers to the quote of Mr. Wolch in the Inquiry,
it's the same quote that refers to in Dr.
Baillie's report, about David being hospitalised after speaking.

And then Mr. Fox asks if we could get copies of the hospital records pertaining to David's hospitalization over the last few years, including any hospitalization that took place after he spoke about this matter at the conference in Winnipeg, the news conference in Saskatoon, and after discussing the matter with me on November 19th.

Just go to the next page. Now this is my Email of December 13th to Mr. Wolch sending a copy of that letter, the letter was sent to him directly as well, and $I$ have simply relayed the request and indicate please advise if you are planning to include David Milgaard's relevant hospital records as part of the materials filed in support of your application. If not, please advise if you will provide them to the Commission and parties as requested by Mr. Fox.

And the next is a letter dated

December 13th, 2005 from Ms. Knox on behalf of Mr. Caldwell, she has reviewed Mr. Fox's letter
and wants to expand the request for records through the current year for all records since 1993, and suggest you might consider making this request to Mr. Wolch on a more extended basis.

And the next document is my letter of December 16 th to Mr. Wolch that deals with a number of matters relating to Dr. Baillie's evidence. If we can go to the second page, if you could just go right down to the -this part, it says in addition $I$ am enclosing a copy of a letter dated December 13, 2005 from Ms. Knox. She is following up on Mr. Fox's letter of December 5, 2005 wherein he requested David Milgaard's hospital records, and it goes on to talk about Mr. Fox's request and Ms. Knox's request that we go a bit further.

And then $I$ say $I$ understand that Dr. Baillie will be collecting and reviewing Mr. Milgaard's medical and hospital records from the date of Mr. Milgaard's release from prison to the present, which is information that Dr. Baillie provided to me directly. It would seem that David Milgaard's hospital and medical records are relevant documents that should be part of the record for your application. Please
confirm that these records will be provided to the Commission as part of your application. If you or Dr. Baillie would like our assistance in gathering hospital and medical records please advise.

And there is no further, there
is no response to that letter, nor did we get asked to go and obtain, either by subpoena or otherwise, any other records.

So I just want that on the record for -- to indicate what transpired between the date of the application and the calling of these witnesses.

So I think, with that, unless

Mr. Wolch has other evidence I think we would proceed to argument and, presumably, Mr. Wolch will proceed first?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah, Bates numbers or doc. IDs will be assigned to these?

MR. HODSON: Doc. IDs will be assigned to those. I may black out the Email addresses of all counsel on the one Email but, other than that, they will all be available publicly. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks.

MR. WOLCH: Mr. Commissioner, I don't
expect to be all that long.
I think the evidence of Dr. Baillie and Mr. Grymaloski is quite clear and makes it very clear that David is suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder. I don't know how anybody can take quarrel with that. It doesn't require even medical knowledge, really, to understand the trauma here, that it's beyond almost comprehension that somebody could have gone through what David went through, to be wrongly convicted, sentenced, traumatized, nobody ever listening to you, go on and on and on, the trauma is overwhelming. It's heartbreaking to even try to appreciate what this man has been through, it's horrible, and why anybody would be surprised that there are effects and lingering problems is quite hard to comprehend. Clearly, there are serious, serious problems, and it's years of trying to get out of it, to develop and grow and rebuild, that are paramount.

And the suggestion is made
several times that, well, David wanted the Inquiry and now he doesn't want to be here. That's not an inconsistent position. The Inquiry, the Terms of Reference are really to
look into the investigation, determine what occurred, why wasn't Linda Fisher listened to, why was Larry Fisher omitted, what happened. And for David to want the answers to questions is one thing, but to suggest that David can seriously aid in answering those questions is another, as to how much he can help, particularly now, after all he has been through.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: That's not our -in issue any more. You've abandoned the application for -- to be excused, this is --

MR. WOLCH: I appreciate that, but it goes to --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: In fact, he has undertaken to appear and give evidence as directed, on the terms directed by the Commission.

MR. WOLCH: Well --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: It's only the
terms that $I$ am interested in.
MR. WOLCH: Well what I'm saying is that the amount of evidence and the nature of the evidence should have an effect on the accommodation, as to how he is to be accommodated, what is necessary.

And what $I$ am saying, sir, is this; that if you look at the prime areas of concern here, if you look at the -- why witnesses lied or why Fisher did what he did and wasn't found, David has nothing to contribute on that, on those issues. He doesn't know why they lied, doesn't know a thing about Fisher. And I believe in the Terms of Reference you are given the authority, as if you needed it, to refer to transcripts or refer to previous evidence. It's right in the Terms of Reference, $I$ believe, that you can rely on it. Well the fact of the matter is that David has testified before, and under different circumstances where many of the items were canvassed by people very adverse in interest, so they were probing, very probing. Now there was some mention this morning about an application supposedly made by David not to testify at the Supreme Court. Well, leaving aside the fact that $I$ have no knowledge of that at this moment at least, it has to be remembered that David was as innocent then as he is now. He was an innocent person. And it's very difficult to imagine that an innocent person is fearful to testify for what it would do to
him, so that $I$ wish that application had been made, because imagine that you have a person who is factually innocent who is too traumatized to stand up and say "I'm innocent". So it's -works the other way, it's -- he has always been as innocent as he is now. The fact that somebody declared him innocent doesn't make him any more innocent, he was always innocent, at every step of the way he was innocent. When he testified in the Supreme Court he was innocent, when he was examined for discovery he was innocent, he was always innocent.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I'm not sure I follow the argument. I can understand a guilty person not wishing to testify, it's perhaps not as easy to understand why an innocent person would be unwilling to stand up and -MR. WOLCH: The same way a rape victim doesn't want to testify. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Pardon?

MR. WOLCH: The same way a rape victim doesn't want to testify, she's innocent, she doesn't want to testify. If you are a victim, and he was a victim, that's the reason, you are a victim.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes. On that point of course, Mr. Wolch, it is in the public interest to have even unwilling rape victims testify and it's commonly done in the courts.

MR. WOLCH: But --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: It's certainly uncomfortable for them, often these people are deeply traumatized, but in the public interest they are made to testify anyway.

MR. WOLCH: Yes, but -- but, with respect, when the rape victim testifies there may or may not be a guilty person who may go free if there is no testimony. There is a balancing there. Here, David not having to testify, for example, will not set a guilty person free. It doesn't have that kind of consequence that flows from your ordinary case, they are very different in that way.

And it has to be understood
that David today, moving on with his life, will not have a better memory than he had before. It's not that he is going to be able to come up with something that hasn't been canvassed close to the incident. It must be remembered, for example, that it wasn't for about six weeks that
he was ever questioned about the day in question at all.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, I just have -- I'm sorry, Mr. Wolch, --

MR. WOLCH: Sorry?
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- I have to bring you back to the point $I$ was trying to make. This argument you are advancing now seems to go to his being excused from testifying.

MR. WOLCH: Well --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You have to accept, sir, that we believe, we the Commission believe he has relevant evidence to give, and that is why we want him here, that's why we want it to be in the public interest. So never mind your view of whether he has anything to offer or not, it's only a question of how he is going to give his testimony.

MR. WOLCH: Well I think the amount he has to offer, and the value of it, may go to the manner of presentation.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And how is that?
MR. WOLCH: Well if what he has to offer is of a limited, a very limited amount, it can be done in an expeditious way. the, some of the interests. In our perspective the -- and $I$ say this and I'm prepared to back it up -- the only party significantly affected by David is Justice Tallis.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh no, I disagree, sir.

MR. WOLCH: Well if $I$ can --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But I mean go ahead, yeah.

MR. WOLCH: Well, and what I'm saying is I'm sure that can be arranged. Because of what David had to say to Mr. Hodson, I don't see a problem in that, it can be done very quickly and briefly.

But in terms of various parties, if you look at the parties who are interested, as $I$ said before $I$ don't see what David can say. For example, be specific, if you take Mr. Caldwell, David can't talk about disclosure obligations or his dealings or where we focus regarding Mr. Caldwell, he can't say anything about that.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: No.
MR. WOLCH: Mr. Fisher, I'm still at a loss
as to why he even thinks he can ask questions. Mr. Kujawa - -

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: David -- before you leave Mr. Caldwell, David Milgaard could certainly explain to us, I suppose, why he made the accusations he was party to in a press conference with his mother and you?

MR. WOLCH: Well, firstly, that's not part of the Terms of Reference --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, why not?
MR. WOLCH: $\quad-\quad$ essentially.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, no, it relates to the quality of the information which came before the authorities and which should have caused them, so some say, to re-open his case sooner, the third arm of our Inquiry.

MR. WOLCH: That was after the Supreme Court.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, I don't care when it was. After what?

MR. WOLCH: The Supreme Court I think.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.

MR. WOLCH: Well, Linda Fisher was 12 years earlier.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: How -- the press
conference in question was after the Supreme Court of Canada hearings?

MR. WOLCH: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, I stand to be informed on that, certainly.

MR. WOLCH: I'm prepared to be corrected, but I think it was quite a bit after.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well clearly whatever it is, whatever the case, you know, it has to be relevant, obviously.

MR. WOLCH: Well, it's relevant, but for what purpose. It doesn't help in your Terms of Reference.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Was he still in -it was after he was released from custody?

MR. WOLCH: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
MR. WOLCH: So it's way later in the day.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I take your point, yeah.

MR. WOLCH: So it was way later, it can't affect the behaviour.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well -- but, you know, there are other matters. Obviously we have heard in the evidence the hotel or the motel
reenactment and so on.

MR. WOLCH: The motel reenactment was questioned in the Supreme Court at length, it was questioned in his exam for discovery, it's -- he has been questioned up -- every which way to Sunday on those issues.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

MR. WOLCH: I don't see what he can add to that, as to what he said before.

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: Well what could he be questioned on then?

MR. WOLCH: I believe the only thing he has personal knowledge of that could assist us to any degree is conversations with Mr. Tallis.

He has never talked to Mr.

Caldwell, he has never talked to Mr. Kujawa, as far as Mr. Karst is concerned he hasn't made any accusations about Mr. Karst from personal
dealings, he hasn't accused him of being rough with him or terrorizing him.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Uh-huh.

MR. WOLCH: Umm, I think, Mr. Commissioner, if you analyse it you will see that there -- that these are not issues that really advance anything towards your mandate.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So what you are really arguing now is your suggestion in the Notice of Motion that his questioning be resolved by accommodation of examination of what's in the transcripts and then an agreement between counsel as to what remains outstanding?

MR. WOLCH: What issue is there left that has some relevance or importance?

Because if $I$ may, sir, do you have the Notice of Motion, if I could help with that?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: No, I left it in my office.

MR. WOLCH: Perhaps, if it could be brought up, I could help you with that.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But before I forget to ask you, Mr. Wolch, is it your position now that you cannot agree to the compromise solution suggested by other counsel which has been marked?

MR. WOLCH: No, I can't at this point, I can't get my client's permission. I prefer it --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks.
MR. WOLCH: -- but $I$ can't get it. I -- he has agreed to answer in writing, it's a major
step for him, and I, at this point in time with a baby born, to even -- $I$ can't bring him back to this area. That's the problem. It's -- I mean I have been dealing with a damaged client for many, many years, and know how damaged he is from previous dealings, it's always been a problem.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I have the Notice of Motion.

MR. WOLCH: Yes. If you could just turn the page -- and, sorry, the next page. Mr. Commissioner, I'll take you through this if $I$ could, but $I$ don't want to take more time than necessary so if you are familiar with the document, which you probably are, $I$ don't have to bring it up.

But in terms of what David has said, March the 3rd of '69 from 9:30 in the morning to 4:00 p.m. he was interviewed by Detective Karst, there are 16 pages of questions and answers, rough notes, and a schematic.

I believe we've gone through that, sir, did you want me to bring it up at this point or --

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: No, I remember it, yeah.

MR. WOLCH: So that's, that's many hours of questioning reduced to writing very early on when the memory is perhaps freshest.

Then we go to April the 18th, for over an hour interviewed in Winnipeg by Detective Barrett, nine pages of handwritten questions and answers as written by Detective Barrett. There was also a typed version. If we can just scroll down.

There is notes in a notebook describing the events of January 31 st and the relationship with Wilson, John and Cadrain, 314 numbered points, nine handwritten pages, and I'm not certain if you have seen that, sir?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I don't think the notebook is extant, is it?

MR. WOLCH: Sorry, sir?
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I don't think the notebook is extant, is it? There is a transcription of it somewhere in the evidence.

MR. WOLCH: I don't believe it's been -- I think, if we pull it up, you'll see it's a -maybe Mr. Hodson can help us.

MR. HODSON: On the issue of the notebook, there is a typed version of the notebook, there
is a dispute on the evidence, at least previous evidence. I think Mr. Tallis' evidence at the Supreme Court was -- pardon me -- Mr. Milgaard's evidence was "this is the scribbler I gave to him", Mr. Tallis said, "no, it's not, I didn't get a scribbler", and there's some issue that will be addressed by Mr. Tallis, and I would intend to raise it with Mr. Milgaard as well, about when that was prepared. And, secondly, there's an issue about the contents of what's in the scribbler versus what Mr. Tallis said he was told by Mr. Milgaard, so that's an issue that will be canvassed in detail with Mr. Tallis.

MR. WOLCH: Yes, but if you can just have a look at it, you will see what it is. Pull that document up. You will see it's a -- it goes into exceptional detail, sir.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I might be wrong, you will have to correct me, I thought that this, what we see in front -- on the screen in front of us now is not Mr. Milgaard's work, it was someone else's writing?

MR. WOLCH: No, it's dictated by him to somebody with better handwriting, he's -- the person is identified.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, okay.
MR. WOLCH: But --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So it's not the notebook?

MR. WOLCH: No, it's Mr. Tallis told Mr. Merchant that he had given the notebook back, if I recall correctly.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
MR. WOLCH: And that's -- but the most important thing, $I$ do believe, is the content. And, you know, you can just see that you have got conversation with Ron to go on the trip, it goes into exceptional detail as to what occurred from Regina to Saskatoon, all the places. If we could just scroll down a bit, $I$ can't go through it all, but there's over 300 points.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And when was this supposed to have been written?

MR. WOLCH: If you can flip back to the top it says "written in 1969 after the arrest".

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: After the arrest?
MR. WOLCH: Yes. So this -- and the timing can be better-placed if we look at some of the matters in here as you go through it, but it's clearly early on, and he talks about inviting

Nicky on the trip, umm -- just scroll down please. And to give you an example of the thoroughness, down here we're still in Regina, in terms of every little detail that you could possibly imagine.

And keep going to the next
page. It talks about the acid being splashed, used Ron's bathroom, changed into a pair of green striped pants.

My point, sir, is that then he remembered green striped pants, the chance of remembering it now are probably zilch, nil at this point in time all these years later.

He talks about Mrs. Wilson, in my suitcase $I$ had the grey pants with acid on them and burgundy pair. If we could just scroll down, umm, it talks about buying grass in Edmonton, their going there, drove into town, Ron said there was nothing worthwhile, I'm not sure what that's about.

But just keep going down, or to the next page, rather. There is the flashlight we know about. And we're down into the '80s and we still, $I$ don't think, are even into saskatoon, so there's vivid detail remembered then but
hardly expected to be remembered now. Just scroll down, please. It talks about the boulevard, turning, Pleasant Hill, asked for directions, gave us some type of direction. Next recollection is a garage by a bridge we went over, $I$ also remember going around the block with the, $I$ think it says, Bay store on it downtown someplace, we asked an elderly man, quite possibly -- I'm not sure what the word is, directions, and we talk a little while and he gave us some type of direction.

If we go to the next page,
headed down the street, umm, I was looking for a garage, gas station, which $I$ had remembered from previous, goes on with getting the map that we know about. And then going further down, this is the Danchuks are described here as to what occurred there, it's fairly consistent with the Danchuks' evidence, he recalls telling Danchuks that he worked for Maclean's, talks about the tow truck problems.

If we can turn the page, about

Mr. Danchuk, still more on Mr. Danchuk. Arriving at Cadrains', parked on the opposite side of the street. If we can go down, here's the
description of meeting with Cadrain, talking with him, changed from my green striped pants to my other grey ones is right there. He remembers Ron changing pants, Ron gave me the keys to the suitcase -- gave me the keys to put the suitcase back in the trunk while Cadrain was getting ready, I decided to move the car over to the other side of the street, we have had evidence about that.

Just turn the page. Made a
U-turn, talks about moving the car there and Ron getting upset, tow truck driver came, Cadrain decided to come and was with us, there's more description there, talks about waiting for Nicky and Cadrain, Shorty playing a ukulele, talking to the mechanic, which $I$ think we know about that, Shorty paid the bill, we left.

Just turn the page. Shorty,
went to Shorty's friend's place, we've heard from that witness and there's more detail here but we did hear that gentleman testify here, and he says he was mad at Nicky, I took over driving because she was playing up to Shorty, I knew she got scared when I drove fast so I poured it on. We arrived in Calgary, talks about Ron, etcetera,
and more about driving, and etcetera, etcetera.

Go to the next page. More car troubles, got to Edmonton, talks of what occurred there with Sharon Williams. Go down the page. Went back to calgary and were checked out by the RCMP in Banff, were given a meal ticket.

Just turn the page. Something about stealing some beans and drinks from a curling house, dropped Nicky and Shorty off at the Cornwall house, stayed at Ron's house for two days and later stayed at Pat Murray's place, and he got his licence, that's the licence to sell from Maclean's, went to Winnipeg under the supervision of Roger Renaud, and that's the first place $I$ heard of the Gail Miller murder.

I mean, Mr. Commissioner, these are details that were given around the time of the incident. They don't seem to be slanted to, for any particular purpose, and knowing that he was innocent and is innocent certainly has some effect on that, but that is a detailed detail that, $I$ mean, we're now talking 35 years later. How can he possibly add anything to that in terms of what he said back then. Counsel is free to make whatever use they want of that, $I$ mean, in
terms of what he says, but what more can he add except for the 318 points of, on a day that really didn't amount to much from his perspective.

So you have the notebook and if we can go back to the Notice of Motion, and I pause here to say that after this notebook was written we know what happened to David in terms of his incarceration and what he went through and this was written before that obviously.

Now, in document 301675 there's a six page affidavit from David which contains more of his position on many things and I don't know if, Mr. Commissioner, you want to pull it up, but it is available.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What's the doc, please?

MR. WOLCH: 301675, and it's November 25th of 1986, it's a six page affidavit referring to many things, including the reenactment, it's all in the affidavit.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
MR. WOLCH: Maybe just turn the page on the motion.

Now, we have before us also the

Supreme Court evidence and I think it's telling that when Mr. Hodson and $I$ were in Vancouver David could really not even remember the Supreme Court and I've shown you the clippings and the letter from Mr. Asper which show the emotional trauma he was under in terms of being quite traumatized, in and out of the room, and $I$ think it has to be looked at from his perspective as to what he's been through, the pressure, the years of saying I'm innocent, I'm innocent and not being believed, the trauma in jail, all that horror, he just can't handle it, and nevertheless he did answer questions, he answered a lot of questions, and $I$ remind everyone that he was innocent. It wasn't like he was a guilty person taking the stand, he was an innocent person, totally innocent, so in document number 232580 there is, from pages 2 to 39, questions from myself, and then from Mr. Neufeld we have from pages 44 to 227, and $I$ think Mr. Neufeld would be the first to agree that he was very adversarial. I don't say that as a criticism, I say that as a fact, extremely adversarial in cross-exam in that manner.

Then there's document 231940
and Mr. Fainstein cross-examines and -- well, he was from the Department of Justice, I think a fair reading of it was that he had certainly a side he was upholding, he cross-examined from 231 to 312. That's a lot of pages. And then I re-examined for 10 pages as well. So that's a lot of examination on all these issues by parties that were going beyond what would be going here. They were looking at him, you are guilty, you are guilty, and we're going to expose you and whatever else, so it was very probing cross-examination at a time when obviously everything was more fresh, not very fresh, but more fresh in David's mind.

Then we go to May $6 t h$ and 7 th and this is the civil suit that we've heard about and there are approximately 1,423 questions on behalf of the prosecutors and all these are before us that anybody can look at and use as they wish and they have as an exhibit in here, they have the 14 pages of David's notes asking to have his case reviewed -- and scroll down -- just turn the page please, sorry. Then you have on other dates 903 questions asked by counsel for the police officers on that particular day, and
then down here on May the 8th are 282 questions on behalf of Mr. Karst.

Now, the point $I$ make, sir, is that that's an awful lot of questions and answers for a non-event in his life. I mean, it's not like he's being asked to talk about when he acted in self-defence and shot somebody or when he was jumped on and attacked or something that you focus on, he's being asked about something that really was a non-event in his life, a day where nothing happened of note, so how -- those are the kind of memories you don't retain.

That is, if any of us were to think back to 1969 and be asked questions what did you do on the morning of so and so, what happened to you here, what happened to you there, how many memories come back to us, like, how many would come back to us. An important case maybe, if you were asked to describe an important case you adjudicated perhaps then or were counsel for, how many details can you remember, something you knew backwards and forwards back then. People just don't remember. So to expect David to come here and talk about green trousers or purple trousers, it's not going to help us any.

The fact is we have his notes made then. Rightly or wrongly those are the notes he made then. He can't correct them or change them or add anything that has any credibility to alter something at this point in time that $I$ know of, so the point $I$ make is that it's all there. He is prepared to confirm that at all times he did his best to tell the truth. He will confirm that. I always try to tell the truth, but $I$ could be wrong. I can make mistakes. I mean, his position with Mr. Tallis is my memory is mine, his memory is his, he could be right, I don't know. It's just -- he doesn't say that he doesn't believe Mr. Tallis, he doesn't accuse him of anything, he just says he could be right, $I$ could be right, $I$ don't know, we're both attempting to be honest and that's all his position is, so on one hand $I$ say he's answered everything at some point in time, and for the parties, they can look at it and say, look, where didn't he answer this thing or what can $I$ get out of it, and while there may be some things I'm sure you can find in there because of the civil suit, for example, the same parties were in a very different position than they are
now, it was quite adversarial, there was money at risk and everything else, and they sure asked a lot of questions, so everything has been asked. If there's something new coming out, $I$ could understand that, but let's make it brief, identify it, let it pass a threshold perhaps with yourself or Mr. Hodson that it has some more than just passing benefit or has it been asked and answered before. I mean, I would welcome a chance to look at the question and say lookit, he answered it on page so and so, the same question so we narrow it down, because the bottom line is that what you heard this morning is truthful evidence of a very upset individual and it doesn't stretch common sense to appreciate that, one does not have to analyse deeply and greatly to understand the trauma of what David went through and the effect it would have, and he can't be punished for being traumatized; that is, you are not good enough because you are traumatized, and it is pure trauma. There's no hint of disrespect or anything like that. In fact, for what he has been through he's remarkably not containing much, carrying much malice because most individuals would be bitter
beyond belief for what occurred to him.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Wolch, let me ask you this, supposing for the sake of argument I accept what you have said about the utility of his past testimony in various venues and that the remaining questions should be worked out with a view to being as brief as possible and causing him the least amount of grief, do you think that within the four corners of the notice of motion as you've framed it $I$ would be entitled to make an order requiring him to be examined under audio/video in a manner which both of your experts have agreed would be a reasonable compromise?

MR. WOLCH: I think you would, sir, but I think -- I guess the point I'm making is we have to work together, that's really what I'm saying. It's not a matter of adversarial, we're not here, supposedly, $I$ hope, in an adversarial capacity, we have to work together, and to, I think Dr. Baillie put it, to balance, and my suggestion is simply this, that we identify what people really want to know and hopefully what they think hasn't been answered before, they can't find in all those documents, identify it, let's see what it
is.
My preference would be to have written questions, hand them over, get the answers back quickly, that $I$ think $I$ can do, and if they are not satisfactory, take the next step, ask more questions or then ask, look, let's try and get whatever is left on camera, but I think one step at a time. If we can do it quickly with the questions, I'll undertake to go to him as fast as $I$ can, given the birth of the child, and say here are the questions, please try and get them done, like, quickly and get them back so we're one step closer to where we want to be, but I think that when counsel sit down and actually analyse the questions, we'll see that many of them really aren't of that much merit.

For example, and $I$ understand if he was an ordinary witness Mr. Hodson would ask certain questions that he composed before, but some of those questions such as do you have a criminal record, well, we know he doesn't have one, $I$ mean, why do we have to ask that, or things of that nature can be narrowed, and many things we have reports on. Did you tell, I mean, did you tell the police the truth as best you
know it? Yes, I did at the time. I don't know, I don't know what will contribute that much to what you are mandated to look at and I guess my point is that thousands and thousands of questions have been asked already of which we can point to the answer and say yeah, if they want, that's true, that's my position, that's my evidence under oath, and $I$ think the most valuable of all, quite frankly, is that notebook, and it doesn't much matter if David is right as to the one that Justice Tallis saw or not, the point is it is a recollection of a series of events.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Because it's contemporaneous?

MR. WOLCH: Yes, it's the best record of what happened, it's every little detail. Sir, when you have time to look at it you'll see the most minute detail, it's amazing how many small little things are in there, and many of them we've heard here from one source or another, it just all comes together. Today he couldn't even come close to doing that, and, you know, I think you have my point, but my point is I think we have to work together. I hopefully believe that
nobody wants to see him damaged any more. I think the fact that he wants to get on with his life is totally understandable. He lost almost 30 years of his life and he wants to get on with his life and do things and he doesn't want to be, as two doctors explained, back in the prison, he doesn't want to be reminded, he doesn't want to be sitting there and remember sitting down with a psychiatrist who told him he was, actually did it but suppressed it, he doesn't want to go back to that space.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All of which is something $I$ would love to have heard about a year ago, Mr. Wolch.

MR. WOLCH: Sir, I appreciate what you say. I must say that it was on the news report before we started. From the very beginning I told Mr. Hodson we had problems and we'll try to work on it, we'll try to work on it, I explained to him that I've had problems with David from day one in terms of instructions, of talking about the case, we can't talk about it, but I'm not going to desert him if he can't talk to me. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You are not going to what?

MR. WOLCH: I'm not going to desert him because he can't talk to me, I can't punish him because he can't relate and can't give me help. That's been the case since 1986, that he can't get into it. I challenge anybody to find any time he has spoken, other than in the settings we've put out, or ever spoken about jail, he just can't do it, and that's the circumstance, so this Commission of Inquiry was set up in part to help him, it was part of the package of compensation and helping understand what caused, what happened to him and his desire that it doesn't happen to somebody else, but just on that point, when Mr. Hodson mentioned to him, "David, maybe you have some insight as to how to prevent this," he said no, he said, "I'm not competent." I'm not quoting, but "I'm not competent and I don't want the burden of making recommendations that might not work, $I$ don't want that on my conscience." He said, "I can't do it, I'm not capable," and it's very commendable he takes that position, "I just don't know."

I mean, he could easily say how
frustrating it was, but that's a different matter, but he can't help on that because he's
not qualified to understand the system. He can't talk about Department of Justice practice or policy or whatever, it's just not within his area, and there are so many things he doesn't know anything about.

It was interesting when, in one of the questions this morning there was a reference to, well, he can talk about his friends. Well, those are the friends who put him in jail for life. I mean, they are not -- the word friends is a bit of a stretch in terms of what they are, and in terms of Larry Fisher, there isn't a person in this courtroom who doesn't know more about Larry Fisher than David Milgaard, he doesn't know about him, and that's just -- he couldn't sit through the Supreme Court, but rather than looking at that as something negative about David, it's really the effects of what happened to him. It's the result of what happened to him that words cannot do justice to.

The banned report $I$ showed you and things like that, you can't relate to that, it's just impossible as a human being to look at that and understand how anybody could have gone
through that, and I think we should balance, try to get whatever really will help us in a way that doesn't harm him any more and $I$ think we should work together and do that and that's really all I can ask of you, sir, but -- and I do apologize that this matter had not gotten before you sooner, but it's a very difficult issue, it's very difficult to speak about. I don't know what would happen if this got back to David, if anything became public on his personal matters. It's walking a fine line here as Mr. Grymaloski said, you are walking a tremendously fine line. It's only because society damaged him.

Unless you have any questions, sir, that's my position. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you. MR. WOLCH: Thank you. MR. HODSON: Mr. Commissioner, before you call on other counsel, $I$ wonder if $I$ might just touch on a couple of matters.

First of all, I as Commission
Counsel am not taking a position on the application before you. As your counsel, I have facilitated getting the witnesses, etcetera, and so I am not making any submissions regarding the
accommodation, but $I$ do wish to address the one issue that -- I guess two issues that deal squarely with me and my role as Commission Counsel, and that is, one, the Terms of Reference, and two, the questions that would be asked of Mr. Milgaard, and I do not think it's fair to counsel for the other parties to have to justify what questions I might put, it's my job to determine relevance initially, parties can go to you on that, and it's my job to determine who will be witnesses and what questions to ask. October 13th -- or pardon me, October 13th or 16th, 2004 , three months before the Inquiry started, I advised Mr. Wolch in writing that $I$ intended to call David Milgaard as a witness and $I$ have not changed that position. I certainly appreciate the concerns that he has expressed about trying to do that in a way that minimizes any harm to him, so I just want to talk about --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What was that date, I'm sorry?

MR. HODSON: Actually, I've got the letter, I think it's October 16th -- October 13th, 2004, which is three months before we started, so
again, that has been my position from day one, and $I$ certainly have had discussions with Mr. Wolch about how we go about doing that over the years -- over the year -- actually, years is probably correct, about trying to find a way to deal with that, so --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, that of course is, what you say is of course correct and I hope there's no misunderstanding amongst counsel that within the bounds of relevance and, which are determined by our Terms of Reference, the discretion as to what to ask any witness, including David Milgaard, is entirely that of Commission Counsel. When we ask for input or allowed as a possibility input on questions if an accommodation were to be made, questions by other counsel, it was only with respect to matters which might have arisen during Commission Counsel's examination of Mr. Milgaard.

MR. HODSON: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: This is not -this is not a co-operative effort in terms of framing the questions to be put.

MR. HODSON: Yeah, and certainly I, and my concern and the reason $I$ rose is to sort of put
forward my position, which I've put forward before and I'll put forward again. The Terms of Reference require us to look at principally two things, the conduct of the investigation and trial and the reopening. We have stated the reopening spans from 1970 to 1997 , a 27 year period. You and Mr. Wolch had a discussion about the press conference of 1992.

To the extent that Mr. Milgaard has, one, made comments publicly about the conduct of the investigation and trial, in other words, that aspect, that is relevant to the Terms of Reference. Secondly, to the extent that information is provided to the authorities from 1970 to 1997 that bears on the issue of reopening, it is relevant because you must seek to determine whether the investigation should have been reopened earlier than it was and it was 1997 that it was reopened.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: The point being
that the date of Mr. Milgaard's release from prison is not the governing date?

MR. HODSON: That is correct. Secondly, on the issue of questions of witnesses, and certainly we've seen many witnesses that have
both testified on many occasions and do not have much in the way of recall, and what $I$ can say to that, if that's the situation with Mr. Milgaard, I mean, I accept that, but that is something again with other witnesses -- we have called some witnesses to say I don't remember, but it's on the record.

Secondly, to the extent that questions have been answered previously, and Mr. Wolch referred to many; however, the answers are not always consistent, not in any way saying that Mr. Milgaard answered wrongly or anything, but at different times there is different answers and there certainly is, $I$ think, a need to go back and say okay, how can that be reconciled, and if he has no memory so be it, but again, it's not -I mean, the notebook is an example where $I$ can tell you that what we will hear from Mr. Tallis is that there is a difference about the notebook. Peter Carlyle-Gordge testified that he had the notebook in the early '80s I believe, so again -however, that does not mean that $I$ need to spend days upon days with Mr. Milgaard. It would be a careful set of questions in some form, whatever ends up being, whatever accommodation or forum is
ordered, I would ensure that we get to the very specific question, and then the outline that $I$ provided to Mr. Wolch and to others, it is only questions which he has personal knowledge of and that are relevant, and $I$ share his view that to minimize and ask only those questions that are absolutely necessary, that would be my view, but again, $I$ think that's my responsibility, so I wanted to state that so that the parties are not put in the position of having to address that issue which I didn't expect to be part of the accommodation application. So with that, I think it's probably break time, Mr. Commissioner. There are at least four counsel who wish to address you on this.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you very much for saying that. We'll take 15 minutes. (Adjourned at 3:03 p.m.) (Reconvened at 3:24 p.m.)

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: There are several of you counsel $I$ think who wish to cross-examine and --

MR. ELSON: Not cross-examine.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Sorry, argue, and

I just wanted to say that one of our upcoming witnesses is available only for one day and he has some relatively important things to say, so please bear that in mind in your presentations, whether in argument or in cross-examination.

MR. ELSON: Mr. Commissioner, I will be very brief. I have had an opportunity to speak with other counsel who were included in the memorandum yesterday and $I$ think to some extent we've kind of divvied up the submissions that would be made and, for the most part, although there are some exceptions, we will try to make our submissions insofar as our particular clients are engaged.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
MR. ELSON: First of all, just if $I$ can make a general comment, we had said in our memorandum that we did not believe that the evidence filed in support of Mr. Milgaard's application came close to justifying any form of accommodation. Quite frankly, we stand by that, and in terms of any general submissions that we make in that respect, our first concern, and we say this with the greatest of respect, or $I$ certainly say this with the greatest of respect
to Mr. Grymaloski, Mr. Grymaloski obviously has a very good, trusting, therapeutic relationship with Mr. Milgaard, that is a good thing, and it is our hope and prayer that that will assist Mr . Milgaard in whatever he is able to do in the future insofar as his family is concerned and insofar as whatever adjustments are needed to be made in his life.

Having said that, when Mr.
Grymaloski comes before us as an expert giving opinion, it is necessary for us to view his opinion, or to receive his opinion hopefully as an independent expert. Mr. Grymaloski was quite candid in answering my questions that he does perceive himself certainly in the context of this proceeding as being an advocate for David Milgaard in the assessment that he has made.
As a result, it is our
respectful submission that in considering the weight of Mr. Grymaloski's evidence, certain considerations should be had to its lack of independence and to the fact that Mr. Grymaloski quite candidly regards himself as being an advocate for Mr. Milgaard and, as he indicated, an advocate for Mr. Milgaard's wishes.

Dr. Baillie I will candidly acknowledge came across as significantly more independent and in part perhaps that was because he had not had a therapeutic relationship with David Milgaard and indeed did not have the opportunity to meet with Mr. Milgaard in order to provide an assessment.

Having said that, there was a
question with respect to the extent of his independence to the extent that he has hitched up his train, or his caboose to the train of Mr. Grymaloski in the sense that he has adopted certain of Mr. Grymaloski's opinions in the assessment that he has made of David Milgaard, so it is our respectful submission that the weight to be given to the evidence of Mr. Grymaloski and of Dr. Baillie is to be limited in that respect.

It is also to be limited in a second respect and that is with respect to the fact that, to the fact that Mr. Baillie, or Dr. Baillie rather, did not have an opportunity to actually see Mr. Milgaard in order to perform the assessment, and indeed he doesn't describe it as an assessment, he describes it rather as a commentary because it did not involve what he
would typically do and conduct in his practice and that would include a clinical interview as well as psychological testing.

And thirdly, Mr. Commissioner, on January $17 t h$ of this year you had indicated to counsel, and indeed had indicated to Mr. Wolch, that there should be supporting documents with respect to the opinions that were to be received in support of the notice of motion and it was my understanding, and $I$ don't know whether we need to bring the transcript up, but it specifically, I believe, on pages 26 -- I think I wrote them down -- page 21670 through to 21672 of January the 17th, 2006 , and notably $I$ believe at 672 is where it's most important, where you indicated that you shared a concern with Mr. Hodson and indicated, and I quote:
"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."

Here we have a situation where we did not have Mr. Grymaloski's clinical chart with respect to
his interaction with David Milgaard. That would have been very useful for me in conducting the cross-examination of Mr. Grymaloski in that $I$ would be able to draw comparisons and cross-references between the opinions expressed in Mr. Grymaloski's report and those which were contained in his chart. They were not provided. Notwithstanding the fact Mr. Milgaard's counsel, Mr. Wolch, made the arrangement through

Commission Counsel to have Mr. Grymaloski come here and $I$ would have thought, certainly given Justice Picard's decision some years ago in the Hay case in the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench with which you may be familiar, Mr. Commissioner, that to the extent someone puts their health, whether it be their mental health or their physiological health in issue in a litigious proceeding, which we submit Mr. Milgaard did in this case, that they have, by virtue of having done that, waived any right to rely on therapist/patient confidentiality.

So we submit that there should be less weight given to the opinions filed in support of this application on those three grounds.

I listened very carefully to the discussion between yourself and Mr. Wolch, and I listened particularly carefully to the comments made by Mr. Wolch, and $I$ have to say first of all $I$ was somewhat aghast at the comment that this Commission of Inquiry is to be regarded as being for Mr. Milgaard's benefit. It may have that incidental effect.

This Commission of Inquiry belongs to the people of Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan have felt, given the finding that David Milgaard is factually innocent, that the circumstances giving rise to his conviction need to be investigated in order to determine whether or not there was serious wrongdoing by one or more parties or to determine whether or not, notwithstanding the fact that Mr . Milgaard was innocent, he was convicted not as a result of unreasonable care, or not as a result of malice, but perhaps by some mistakes in judgement that have been made from time to time, or perhaps mistakes in judgement that were part of the practice of the day but have now been corrected, or perhaps mistakes in science which have now been corrected. are the things that are wide open, but also part of it -- and this is where $I$ refer to my own client and the extent to which our client is engaged -- what we have learned, I think, from the police testimony that has been presented is that so much of what a police officer does, and so much of what motivates a police officer to proceed in a certain manner in the conduct of an investigation, depends on the impression that a police officer has of either a person or a certain set of facts.

We cannot be unmindful -- and I say this with the greatest of respect, and I don't say this to heap blame or to heap fault on Mr. Milgaard -- but the question that arises is whether or not there were certain conclusions drawn by police officers involved in this investigation which were unreasonable; or were there facts, having regard to Mr. Milgaard's behaviour, having regard to his conduct, or having regard to how others described his behaviour and conduct, that suggested he was a person worthy of suspicion or suggested, if $I$ can be so bold, that he was a person worthy of being
charged with the offence. Those are very important issues.

And when $I$ say that $I$ again
accept, as $I$ must and as I should, that Mr.
Milgaard is factually innocent. But the fact of him being factually innocent does not mean that his conduct is to be disregarded or that his behaviour is to be disregarded. His behaviour may have, notwithstanding his innocence, suggested something contrary to his innocence, and it may have led reasonably to the conclusion of certain persons charged with the investigation of this offence that maybe he was a person well worth looking into.

The other concern $I$ have with
respect to the submission Mr. Wolch makes is that Mr. Wolch says he is innocent, we all accept that, we must accept that, and as I indicated earlier we should accept that, but that does not mean that his credibility should never be assessed in the context of his innocence.

I have never met David

Milgaard, $I$ have never seen him testify under oath. When we look around this room we will realize that, in that respect, $I$ am not alone.

There are people in this room who have seen him testify under oath, but most have not. We have not had an opportunity to assess his credibility. And I don't mean assess his credibility in the context of whether or not he is guilty of this offence, that's not what $I$ mean, but to assess his credibility in determining whether or not there really were things which justified the investigative attention which was drawn to him. In this respect, we have not seen before this Commission of Inquiry Mr. Milgaard's response to the evidence which was received through Sharon Williams, and more particularly through her statement about his conduct prior to January of 1969. This Commission of Inquiry has not had an opportunity to view Mr. Milgaard in describing what he recalls occurred in the motel room in Regina. And, indeed, we must remember that Mr. Wolch vigorously cross-examined Mr. Melnyk with respect to the events that took place in that motel room. The only manner and the only way in which that evidence could reasonably have been challenged by Mr. Wolch with respect to the motel room reenactment is if Mr. Milgaard had provided him
with information that would support Mr. Wolch in asserting the challenge.

Because it is necessary for
this Commission of Inquiry, and for those of us participating as counsel representing parties with standing, to assess Mr. Milgaard's credibility, the importance of that cannot be understated, and we cannot do that simply by receiving the transcripts of the evidence already presented. Moreover, we cannot do that by receiving written answers to written questions posed to Mr. Milgaard. We do not have that opportunity to make that assessment.

It is for that reason that the respondents have made the accommodation proposal that we have. We trust Commission Counsel implicitly to do his job and we have decided, subject to any applications which may be made by individual counsel for the respondents, to forego the absolute right for cross-examination.

And I don't mean to -- I'm
jumping ahead a little bit. One of the things I believe that My Friend Mr. Pringle will be raising with you is the opportunity to bring an application to you, sir, for the right to
cross-examine, depending on what is heard in the video tape evidence, and speaking on behalf of myself and my own client, we do not oppose that.

But, having said that, in the accommodation proposal we had presented to you it has been anticipated that cross-examination would only -- is not really contemplated but it would only be allowed by special application to you for that right. And certainly, speaking on my own client's behalf, $I$ really do not anticipate that there would be any cross-examination that $I$ would ask leave to do in the course of receiving Mr. Milgaard's evidence.

So, with that one caveat, we
implicitly accept that Commission Counsel is going to be able to do a good and thorough job in presenting the evidence and in seeking Mr. Milgaard's testimony.

Does it have some risk to Mr.

Milgaard? Yes, it probably does.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Could I -- just before you get into that, does the proposal still enjoy the support of all other counsel, except Mr. Wolch of course, notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Wolch has forged ahead with his
application and not accepted the proposal beforehand as he might have?

MR. ELSON: Yes, it does. And I have had, and Mr. Pringle can speak for himself, my understanding is that in Mr. Pringle's submission to you he would like to deal with the issue of cross-examination.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Of cross? Subject to that? Okay.

MR. ELSON: And having said that, in all other respects -- and certainly $I$ join with Mr. Pringle in making that request -- I do not see frankly, having regard to the evidence and what I believe the evidence will be, I don't see -- I think it very, very, very unlikely that either myself or my colleague, Mr. Loran, will be up before you asking for leave to cross-examination -- or to cross-examine Mr. Milgaard. So I -- having said that, Mr. Pringle's circumstance is somewhat different, and that of his client is somewhat different than the circumstances of my client, and $I$ shouldn't go any further than that and allow Mr. Pringle to speak for himself.

The -- there is an element of
risk. There is always a risk in putting anyone on the stand. Any witness could break down. Any of the witnesses that have testified to this point could break down, arguably as a consequence of their being called to give evidence, whether in direct examination or whether in cross-examination.

We accept that there may be a heightened risk of a problem for David Milgaard if he were to testify. The question is whether or not what we are to gain, and the value to this Commission of Inquiry, is worth the risk. In our respectful view it is. The question is is it within any risk, and we accept no, it is not. So, therefore, we have come forward with this accommodation for the purposes of minimizing that risk, and we are confident in the ability of Commission Counsel to ask sufficiently probing questions and yet to be sensitive to the interests and the circumstances of Mr. Milgaard in order to minimize that risk, and yet at the same time accommodate the purposes for which this Commission of Inquiry was established.

Subject to any further
questions, Mr. Commissioner, that concludes my
submission.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you, Mr. Elson.

MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, I will restrict myself to commenting, really, or making a submission, really, with respect to a single area, and the single area is the evidence that's been proffered on the application with respect to the need for accomodation.

I share and adopt the concerns raised by my colleague just before me, Mr. Elson, regarding the nature of the medical evidence that we got from Dr. Baillie, but more particularly from Dr. Grymaloski or from Mr. Grymaloski. And I've spent some time debating whether $I$ would raise the issue, but a concern that became particularly pressing for me as I listened to Mr. Grymaloski this morning is that there appears to be a casting of the situation that Mr. Milgaard finds himself in as a proposed witness to this proceeding that's taking him outside what is, I would submit to you in the experience of most of us who have worked with witnesses who have been victims of crime, is really not outside the norm. It is quite normal for persons
who have to come into a court proceeding to talk about traumatic events to become more and more troubled by the prospect of that testimony as the date becomes closer.

Where $I$ don't see any evidence in the record to support a broader issue here, to the extent identified by Mr. Grymaloski, is when we look at the history of this proceeding. And Mr. Commissioner, $I$ just want to draw up for you or call to mind some dates that have governed in these proceedings. There is a document on the Commission web site, it's doc. ID number 324945 , that is a chronology prepared by the staff at the Commission dated January 17th, 2005 of the events that pre-date the whole process that finds us here today, starting with October 21 st, 1968. Mr. Commissioner, if we proceed forward through the pages of that chronology to page 10, which $I$ would believe will be 955 -well, 954 , that will do, the page 10 number -what you will see as you go through the document is that the Government of Saskatchewan first made a commitment to hold a public inquiry into these events in 1997 . And perhaps if we go to the next page we'll find that. Sorry, I didn't bring up
my marked copy because $I$ didn't have a printed copy, but in any event it was in 1997, August 19th, 1997, as we look at the chronology, that Justice Minister Nilson announced that there would be a public inquiry.

The public inquiry was
something that was being asked for by David Milgaard and others on his behalf since the early '90s, and certainly post his release from custody in 1992. It became a confirmed reality for him as an individual when Minister Nilson made that announcement on August 19th, 1997, and over the ensuing months to May 19th, 1999 when a compensation arrangement was announced for him, there was confirmation two years later that the government intended to carry through with the inquiry. That commitment by the Government of Saskatchewan has been continuing and made known to him.

Now I raise these dates,
because if we take it and we parallel it with the notes that $I$ made this morning from Mr. Grymaloski's recollection of the dates that he had contact with Mr. Milgaard, I note, significantly $I$ would suggest to you, a number of
things. In 1997, when the commitment was made by the Minister in August to hold this public inquiry, by his recollection of his records the -- Mr. Grymaloski thought he might have seen Mr. Milgaard one or two times; in 1988 -- or sorry -' 98 he has no recollection or he indicated he doesn't believe he saw him at all; in 1999 it's his belief that he saw him once; in 2000 it's his belief that he may have seen him about three times; in 2001 he might have seen him once, or he might have had a visit he said; he doesn't believe he saw him in 2002, 2003, 2004, or 2005 until October 2005 when a concern was raised because of the press conference he did here.

Mr. Grymaloski is his
therapist, his counsellor. In all this time, and knowing that this eventuality was coming for him -- certainly it was communicated to Mr. Wolch on October 13th, 2004 that he intended to call him as a witness -- we saw no difficulties being manifested by David Milgaard with respect to professing anxiety about the appearance here. It became an issue in very recent times.

And again, Mr. Commissioner, I
would say to you, as any of us at the table who
have gone to Court with victims have been there, in those days and weeks and months as Court dates get closer have been told many many times by people who have traumatic events to relate that they can't possibly do it, they won't be able to do it, only to find that with the right support and encouragement, both from counsel and from any therapist involved with them, that they quite ably are able to do it and, in fact, many of them find it to be an empowering experience to be able to do it. And I caution you to take a look, in assessing this request for accomodation, how this history of David Milgaard's knowledge of this process that he wanted, he asked for and wanted to be part of, has continued very much to be a part of his life but doesn't appear to be reflected in the therapeutic record as we have it from Mr. Grymaloski, and I suggest to you that you give consideration to the proposal that we, as counsel, make around accommodation, because I would suggest to you that the documentary record and the limited medical opinion that we were able to get would suggest that, with the proper supports and structure -- and I think to some extent this was perhaps manifested in the meeting

Commission Counsel had with him some short time ago in Vancouver -- but that with the right support and accommodation the very thing that we need to be achieved here can indeed be achieved with hopefully no harm to Mr. Milgaard, but certainly minimal harm to him.

As to the suggestion of anyone
in the room wanting to cause him harm, this was something that was raised again today by Mr. Wolch, $I$ have assured him on a personal level that my instructions from my client are that $I$ am to do nothing that will potentially cause any harm to Mr. Milgaard. I have to balance that against the issues that he has raised in respect of my client, including the allegations he made against him in a very public press conference in September 1992, and for that reason $I$ feel it is essential that he be able to be questioned, but through the good offices of Commission Counsel rather than through me personally.

MR. PRINGLE: Mr. Commissioner, with
respect to the application for accomodation, I agree with the two previous counsel who discussed this that really, looking at the law, $I$ don't think there is grounds for accomodation. But if
one looks at the unique situation here, perhaps it's a situation where we look for a creative solution to this situation for compassionate reasons, and that is what counsel for the parties have tried to do here.
I, first of all, wish to point out that what we have proposed is something that is not something that's common, it's very unusual, because normally individuals that are in situations of post-traumatic stress such as rape victims or children that have been molested and sexually assaulted for years who are severely traumatized, they still have to go to Court and testify, or at the very least what is required is that a video be prepared from somebody that's saw them fairly recently thereafter, and then they have to come to court and adopt the video and be subject to cross-examination in Court.

And what counsel for the
various parties have suggested here is, I submit, a very -- you know, I hate to use the word "accommodating" -- but it's been very accommodating with respect to a potential solution here. And, having heard the evidence, one cannot help but think that maybe this would
be less stressful for David Milgaard than a prolonged, written question and answer type of approach.

We all know that Mr. Hodson is not an intimidating individual, he is somebody who would question him in a sensitive manner, and --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I don't know if we can stand any more compliments.

MR. PRINGLE: That's the only one he'll get today.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Commission Counsel anyway.

MR. PRINGLE: Yeah. But -- and, also it's, what we're suggesting is that it could be done at a location near where David Milgaard and his wife are currently residing, and so that he doesn't disrupt his lifestyle, doesn't -- nobody is suggesting that he has to come down here. It's a situation where the whole process could be done fairly quickly, and be over with rapidly, rather than a prolonged situation where, you know, questions and answers are answered over a lengthy period of time.

Umm, the -- there's really, if
you -- I don't recall ever, in a Court case, seeing a situation where a witness was allowed to give evidence through a written question and answer. I can't recall. And sometimes we have agreed statement of facts, as you know. That process probably, to go through that with all the counsel here and all the revisions and everything that would have to occur, would probably be -and all the issues that would have to be covered, would probably be as difficult for David as Mr. Hodson going in and doing an oral question and answer with video camera. One would think that, you know, initially if you are in front of the video camera for a couple of minutes you would be aware it's there, but after a while you'd completely forget it's there and it would just be Mr. Hodson and him and whatever other individuals you feel should be there, sir.

Umm, but as far as a written question and answer, $I$ have never seen it done, it's -- it strikes me as a difficult way. And, of course, the disadvantages of a written question and answer in case a question of credibility comes forth is that you, Mr. Commissioner, will not be able to see the
demeanour of Mr. Milgaard, whether he hesitates to answer a question, whether there is a long time, or whether there's flippancy or whether he is seriously answering the question. I mean the video may very well be helpful to David in showing that he is credible, but it's at least a record of what is occurring, and a written question and answer would be a -- situation would be very difficult to put in controls and how that would be -- how that would take place. So it's our proposal that, initially, this process be done by -- as proposed.

But, having heard Mr. Wolch
today asking that previous transcripts be accepted as his evidence, previous statements, the notebook be accepted, I feel constrained to ask for the right at some future point to -- I doubt whether this will occur because Mr. Wolch has reassured me that there shouldn't be an issue between our clients -- but $I$ feel constrained to ask for the right, if necessary, to apply to this Court, if accommodation is granted, for the right of cross-examination if significant differences arise between my client's testimony and Mr. Milgaard.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Is that however the or whatever the form of questioning is, whether it by video or by written $Q$ and $A$ ?

MR. PRINGLE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah.
MR. PRINGLE: Either way I would seek that opportunity, sir. And $I$ wish to emphasize that I doubt whether that will occur. And the last
thing $I$ want to do, and $I$ felt this way right from the start of this Inquiry, is cross-examine David Milgaard, but if something significant does come up where I have to, where I feel for the principles of natural justice that $I$ have to seek the right to cross-examine, then $I$ certainly feel that that should be part -- that should be left open as part of any accommodation that is granted here.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah. That wasn't in the proposal.

MR. PRINGLE: Well --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: It was some form of further questions, was it not?

MR. PRINGLE: It was further questions -- I can't remember exactly how that was worded, but $I$ don't think it was clear, that's for sure.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: It wasn't cross-examination?

MR. PRINGLE: I don't think it really was clear that counsel may seek that right from the way the proposal was written, but I --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Were it to be extended to you, of course, in fairness all counsel should have the same privilege?

MR. PRINGLE: Yes, I think so. Yeah, I agree, $I$ think they would -- I don't think anybody wants to go that far but, if necessary, at least have that right to do that at some future point. Those are my --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Or at least to - I think what it said, wasn't it, that the questions, designated questions, could be submitted to Commission Counsel to put again to Mr. Milgaard?

MR. PRINGLE: Yeah, to put -- you know. But $I$ would like the right not only to -- yeah, thank you -- I would like the right to not only ask Commission Counsel to ask the questions, but I also would like to leave the right open to myself --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.

MR. PRINGLE: -- to conduct questioning if
I feel necessary. And $I$ don't think it will happen, because of comments that Mr. Wolch has made in this Inquiry and to myself I am fairly sure it wouldn't happen, but $I$ just, $I$ feel constrained to ask for that right in case -COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, I understand. MR. PRINGLE: -- I find myself in that circumstance, sir.

Those are my submissions unless you have any questions?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks. No, I don't, no.

MR. PRINGLE: Thank you.
MR. FOX: Mr. Commissioner, I will be -I'll try and be very brief here.

For the record -- and this is,
I obviously only speak on behalf of Mr. Karst, my client -- again, there is no issue about Mr. Milgaard's factual innocence.

The second part of it, there is no issue that he has suffered. I mean we all can look at that. And Mr. Wolch is exactly correct that you couldn't need an expert to recognize that being convicted of an offence that you
didn't commit and being incarcerated for that length of time would cause great suffering, and there is no issue of -- about that, we don't need an expert to tell us that.

But, of course, that doesn't help us deal with the situation. The third thing I observed though, and this is a little bit about why we are here, is that when we look at the history of this matter we see -- we have seen repeated instances, prior to this hearing and at this hearing, where people have spoken on behalf of David Milgaard and have said "this happened" or "that happened", or whatever, and frankly $I$ have some great sympathy for Mr. Milgaard now when he says "well gee, you know what, $I$ can't really comment on that" because, frankly, in some instances he can't, and probably can't because others have spoken for him, and really he may not have had any part in it. But that, unfortunately, leaves us in the difficult situation where those matters have to be dealt with.

As you correctly pointed out,
Mr. Commissioner, relevancy or the relevancy of
his evidence, his ability to give evidence, has
already been determined. And $I$ don't mean to go through that. But certainly Mr. Hodson, in his proposed list of questions, has identified a number of relevant areas.

And a good example of it, one that jumps out of course, is the compact. One might think about questioning him about the compact being thrown out of the car is somehow questioning him about guilt or innocence. From Mr. Karst's perspective, it has nothing to do with guilt or innocence, it only has a question of did that event take place. And of course if it did take place, then if other Crown witnesses also alluded to it, that flies in the face of the suggestion that it was planted there by police. Nothing to do with guilt or innocence, but very much to do with an issue that is extremely relevant to Mr. Karst, but also extremely relevant to this Commission as well.

The issue before you, though, isn't relevancy. That has been determined. The issue is -- and $I$ think it was addressed by Dr. Baillie in his report -- is there any real and substantive harm that might occur to Mr. Milgaard if he is going to testify. And you see that
repeatedly in his report, and of course that report was drafted at a time when the consideration was would he come here and testify versus some other accommodated arrangement, since then the accommodation proposal has been put before you.

In terms of the application
itself, $I$ daresay if we were in a Court of law in a civil setting or a criminal setting, frankly the evidence that's presented before you to even support an accommodation is pretty thin. Dr. Baillie has never spoken with Mr. Milgaard, Dr. Baillie has never reviewed any of the records of Mr. Milgaard as -- at least since 1992 , and as he has indicated quite fairly, what he has provided is a commentary as opposed to an assessment or a report.

There's a rather bold statement made that every time Mr. Milgaard has had to speak about this he has had to be hospitalised. The request has been made for those records. None, not a single one has been produced, and as acknowledged by Dr. Baillie, that would be extremely helpful in making any sort of assessment. once in 2001, didn't see him again between 2002 and 2004, then saw him in the fall of 2005 after this issue arose, and I'm not sure where, how much of assistance any assessment he makes in those circumstances would be, and again pointing out that when he spoke to David in October of 2005 David had never heard the word post-traumatic stress disorder ever mentioned to him. It would be difficult to imagine he has ever been treated for it or assessed to have it if he has never even heard of it.

But I think at the end of the day, I respectfully submit, your decision has been made relatively easy on this, and $I$ say that with respect, but that's because of the testimony of the two witnesses that were called by Mr. Milgaard's counsel. Dr. Baillie's evidence, and it's at pages 23111 to 12 of the transcript, are very clear that the accommodated option that has been now put forward of Mr. Hodson carrying out a videotape examination of the witness would really be a very reasonable one. If you turn to the next page, if $I$ could, he concludes here by saying:
"Apart from that issue --"
And the issue there was whether or not the testimony would of course be in Vancouver or not, and I think all of us agree we don't have any difficulty with that:
"Apart from that issue, I see the proposal as being consistent with one of the options that $I$ presented and therefore I'm comfortable with it.

Q And in your mind, would this represent a reasonable middle ground?

A Yes."
That's really almost a short answer to this application. I listened to Mr. Grymaloski's evidence and $I$ don't think anyone could suggest that he's -- he obviously raises concern about the well-being, but really can't point to anything that would stand in the way of carrying on with the procedure that's suggested there. I think this accommodation represents the working together that was sought by Mr. Wolch, counsel for Mr. Milgaard, and I think that's what's been put before you. The last question Mr. Wolch asked was how do I convince Mr. Milgaard to go
ahead with that and I really thought that because of the undertaking he's given, that convincing has already been completed, he's already agreed to proceed with whatever direction you give, so to that extent $I$ think, and again to use Mr. Wolch's words, that reasonably good balance between the two has been achieved and that is the accommodation that's been proposed.

The last point $I$ make, just in relation to the last item that was discussed by Mr. Pringle, I think probably it's reasonable for your order to contain something along the lines as is presently in the accommodation or at least leave for the parties to apply for further directions or orders depending on what might come out of the interview, because we really, really don't know what will take place at the interview. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I think Mr. Pringle wanted not only the right to re-apply, but a right to cross-examine.

MR. FOX: Yeah, and I think what he was saying with that is that that will really depend on what might come out of that. He can't imagine at this point that something might come up, but maybe it will, and I suppose we're all a little
in that point, and $I$ would think that would have to be a pretty extreme circumstance where that will occur, but obviously none of us will know that until the interview process is completed, so that's the only caveat $I$ add to it, and I think that probably goes without saying, that depending on what transpires there, there's some remote possibility that we might have to come back before you for further directions.

CHAIRMAN: So you support Mr. Pringle's position?

MR. FOX: I do, and I think that, and by all of us, I would suspect that would include counsel for Mr. Milgaard himself who may want to, may want to address it should something occur.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks, Mr. Fox.
MR. FOX: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Any further cross?
Reply?
MR. WOLCH: Yes, briefly, sir.
Dealing first with Mr. Elson's
submission, $I$ don't think he quoted Mr.
Grymaloski correctly, $I$ think Mr. Grymaloski, as
I heard him, said that -- say, rather, that he was an advocate for David's health and
well-being, he specifically didn't adopt the words that he was David's advocate. I'm pretty sure $I$ have that right.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well --

MR. WOLCH: The transcript I think will bear me out.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: He came pretty
close to that. I'll make sure I look it up. MR. WOLCH: Yeah. I'm pretty sure he said that.

Secondly, I found it
interesting in Mr. Elson's submission that he talked about impressions and impressions and things that may have caused police to form impressions such as Sharon Williams who I don't believe adopted it in the stand, but whatever it is, the point is, and $I$ think he's maybe defeating his own cause, the truth of it isn't really what counts, the question, it was said earlier to be relied on is what counts. I mean, if Sharon gets up on the stand and says I don't know anything about that and David says it didn't happen, the point is I'm sure counsel's position will be but we did rely on it then, so I'm not really sure, you know, where he's going with that
in that sense.
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Furthermore, it's interesting
because impression and all of those things is classic tunnel vision, that's your classic example of what tunnel vision is, you've got an impression, but you haven't got evidence, and that's really what that is.

Turning then to, I think the second was Ms. Knox, I'm hoping that she quoted me in error, $I$ think $I$ heard her to say that $I$ had alleged that counsel wanted to harm David; is that -- I don't believe $I$ said that, $I$ think $I$ said the opposite.

MS. KNOX: If I said that, I misspoke and I apologize. The comments that you made toward closing was that you trusted that nobody in the room wanted to harm him and that's what $I$ was referencing.

MR. WOLCH: Okay.
MS. KNOX: If I did --

MR. WOLCH: I thought you said that I said that --

MS. KNOX: If I misspoke myself, then $I$ apologize.

MR. WOLCH: That's fine. I just wanted to
make sure $I$ hadn't said it.
Regarding Mr. Pringle's
position, two things, and this also applies pretty well to most counsel, is the problem $I$ annunciated earlier. It is one thing to say that this is the best concession, the best way to do it, and it's something that we may agree with. The problem, and Mr. Hodson knows this is the problem from firsthand, the problem is what is David's perspective as to what's best for him. That is the problem that $I$ hope to overcome, but it's not easy. David is still so badly damaged that he can only have his own opinion, $I$ can't communicate in that sense, and like $I$ say, if communication was the only issue, then $I$ wouldn't have been his counsel for many years because you can't penalize him for not being able to speak and all $I$ can do is do the best $I$ can for him.

The other point Mr. Pringle
raised about unusual accommodation and writing is unusual, etcetera. Well, there are provisions in the Criminal Code even for reading in evidence, that is, cases can go where the witness is out of the country, people can go to trial on read-in evidence, that does happen, and if -- I didn't
bring it in front of me, but I'm pretty sure he will agree with me that there are provisions with somebody who is deceased, if they out of the country, if they are too ill, to exempt them and to read in --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: There are provisions in civil cases for taking commissioned evidence of course, but it's not -- I think Mr. Pringle's point related to questions of credibility. It's not a very satisfactory procedure when credibility issues are involved.

MR. WOLCH: Well, except that -- I get his point, but there are people who will go to trial on read-in evidence in a criminal case and that's in the Code and it's done.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Uh-huh.

MR. WOLCH: And finally, regarding
Mr. Fox's remarks, he spoke about people speaking on behalf of David and that sort of thing. I think one has to distinguish between remarks where it's David saying this is what happened to me and people saying look, here are the facts, there's something wrong here. It's two different things. When you say here are the facts, then there's people to answer that, it's not personal
knowledge, it's just here are a set of facts, and as far as David is concerned, $I$ don't recall, and I'm sure if we get into it somebody can maybe point out where he has specifically accused anybody of anything, other than the fact he was wrongly convicted and something has to be wrong, and the other point is about, there have been many comments about the evidence, etcetera, etcetera, that was presented. I just would remind you, sir, that $I$ was encouraged to keep costs down and Adrian Grounds was the person $I$ talked about bringing here from England and quite correctly you said that might not be the best idea and there are certain limits that when you say to Dr. Baillie read all these transcripts and everything else, we're talking about an enormous number of hours to be spent on something which I say, with respect, is so obvious. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What's your point, the lack of records?

MR. WOLCH: Well, no, the point is that there aren't more doctors or other doctors. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Nobody suggested there should be more doctors, it's simply the ones that came should have been better equipped
to give an opinion.
MR. WOLCH: Well, with respect, I submit that it's hard to imagine, in Dr. Baillie's case, a more qualified person to give an opinion.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: No question about his qualifications.

MR. WOLCH: And he's prepared to give it, whatever the failings are, he will still give his opinion. If he wasn't comfortable, he wouldn't give it. Mr. Grymaloski is in the position that he is the person that saw David, I mean, he's the person that dealt with him, and it was with no motive for any hearing, for nothing to advance any cause, he saw him just for help, and that's the only reason he was seeing him. It wasn't for any Court procedure or any other type of hearing, but a legitimate cry for help, and one that $I$ expect is totally understandable given the background.

## Those are my remarks.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks very much.
MR. HODSON: I know I'm not going to be popular, but we do have 15 minutes. Dr. Ferris is here and $I$ presume we should start with him today?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, we certainly should, yes.

MR. HODSON: Dr. Ferris?
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Counsel, with respect to the motion, I'll take some time to consider your submissions and the evidence you've presented and I won't promise when it will be delivered, I'll try to pick a time that won't interfere with witness time which has otherwise been allocated, I'll try and prepare a memorandum of decision which $I$ will circulate at that time.

MR. HODSON: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Dr. Ferris?
JAMES ALEXANDER JOHNSTON FERRIS, sworn:
BY MR. HODSON:
Good afternoon, Dr. Ferris. Thank you very much for agreeing to testify before this Commission.
If we could call up 333189,
please, and this is a copy of the curriculum vitae that you provided to me I think a couple of weeks ago; is that correct, a current CV?

Yes, that's correct.
And just by way of background, you reside in New Zealand and have resided there for the last number of years; is that correct?

A Yes. Since July of 2002.
Q
And that you just finished testifying at a trial in Toronto $I$ think and are on your way back to New Zealand Thursday morning; is that correct?

That's correct, yes.
And the entire $C V$ is certainly part of the record and, as I discussed with you before, Dr. Ferris, in this Inquiry one of the purposes or the main purpose in calling you is to have you tell us what you did in connection with this matter. I will be asking you from time to time where you've expressed opinions to express them again. I don't think there's any issue here with respect to your qualifications, so I will just briefly go through that, and other counsel may have some questions for you, but $I$ understand that forensic pathologist, would that be the best description of what you are and what you do?

That's correct.
And can you just tell us what that entails, what does a forensic pathologist do?

Well, in essence, forensic pathology is a branch of laboratory medicine where we, as forensic pathologists, investigate usually sudden, unexplained or unnatural deaths and do this on
behalf of coroners or medical examiners or the police, depending on the jurisdiction, and we conduct postmortem examinations to determine the cause of death, the manner and mechanism of death and relate those to the circumstances of death. And $I$ understand from your curriculum vitae that you've testified literally on hundreds of occasions with respect to homicides or sudden deaths about how the death may have occurred, things of that nature; is that correct?

Correct.
And $I$ understand that as far as your involvement in this matter, that you were initially contacted in 1987, 1988 by Mrs. Milgaard and then counsel for David Milgaard and asked to do some work on their behalf; is that correct?

A That's correct.

And that you did some initial work relating to examining the exhibits from the original trial and trying to obtain a sample so that you could do a DNA comparison between Gail Miller's clothing or stains on her clothing and David Milgaard; is that correct?

A
Q
Yes, a blood sample that was supplied by David.
And we'll touch on some documents a bit later, but
maybe you could just summarize for us what it was you did with respect to the DNA and what the results were?

A
Perhaps if $I$ can give some background to my involvement in DNA work?

Sure.
In 1984 I had been working in Vancouver for just over a year and $I$ was approached by one of our registrars who had a project that suggested that we might be able to use existing technology to identify male from female tissue and that that might have some application in forensic science. At that stage there was no published work anywhere on the use of genetic typing for forensic science. The science, although well established in clinical practice, had not been transferred to forensic, the forensic world. We did the project and submitted it for publication and it was in fact eventually published.

By the time our paper was published, Alex Jeffries from Lester University had been involved in two well-documented legal cases, one was a serial killing in which the genetic typing was used to identify the assailant, and in another case genetic typing had been used
to solve an immigration paternity issue.
At that time in Canada some work
on genetic typing was being done in Calgary and the RCMP were beginning to look at the possible role of genetic typing in forensic science in Canada. There were difficulties as I understand it in determining what the best standard technology might be and they were liaising with the FBI in Quantico and the home office in Britain, both of whom were going in different directions in terms of the technology, and in Vancouver we decided at that stage that we simply couldn't, that type of research was simply beyond our abilities in terms of facility, etcetera, but what we decided to do was to look at how reliable DNA technology might be; in particular, what might cause degradation of DNA so that in fact it could not be used for forensic purposes.

So we got a research grant from the Law Society in British Columbia and some money from the Attorney General's Department in British Columbia and we set up a research lab which was staffed by a research technologist and a Ph.D. student.

If $I$ can just pause there. The term research lab,
is that different than a forensic lab then?
A

Q

A
$Q$

A
We were doing simply experimental work to determine, if you like, what might cause DNA to break down and make it no longer testable. There was quite a bit of local publicity in Vancouver and British Columbia about our work and we were then asked to do a number of paternity cases and we also received a couple of cases from the Vancouver police to see if we could identify anything. It was not that we were expecting that we would give evidence on this, but it was material which we could then use as an appropriate background for our research which we were working on.

Q And -- I'm sorry, carry on.

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A

Q

A

And I think it was as a result of the publicity that went with that lab that Mrs. Milgaard got to hear about us.

Okay.
And she contacted me.
So just so that we understand this then, as far as
the research work you were looking at degradation of DNA, so would that be looking at what happens to human tissue or human material over time when it's on a garment or clothing or on some other substance; is that right?

That's correct, and we were also looking at issues of bacterial contamination.

So that would be that if you have a -- and let me back up. My understanding, in order to do a DNA analysis of some substance, that there has to be some human cell in the substance; is that right, in order to extract the DNA?

Yes. We have to go back to the mid '80's technology which of course it was somewhat different, but in those days in order to be able to extract DNA, you had to have intact nuclei from human cells or from animal cells, and we were obviously looking at human cells, and we required
a stain that would be probably at least the size of a 25 cent piece.

Q
Okay. And so the -- what you would then do, for example, let's take a semen stain on a piece of clothing, putting aside the issue of time and degradation, but your task would be to take that sample and extract from that and try and identify human cells; is that correct?

A
We were trying to identify -- no, not cells, just the DNA. We did not test the samples for, you know, to actually identify the type of tissue. For example, if we were given a seminal stain, we did not identify the seminal stain, that was the role of the RCMP.

Q
A
$Q$

A
A That was the standard laboratory technique of extracting DNA chemically and then going through the standard method of cutting the DNA chemically, separating the fragments, again by
electrophoresis. We then applied radioactive tags to the separated fragments and developed an image using x-ray plates. By modern technology this was extremely primitive, but it was giving us results and, more important, it was giving us results which were important in terms of our research, because we were able in fact to show that in some circumstances using the existing technology in the mid ' 80 s, that DNA could be broken down to the point where it could not be identified.

I see. So if we can then just back up, and then once you go through the process with your quarter-size stain to extract, a successful extraction would give you what, a slide that would have a DNA profile of -It was actually an x-ray plate -An $x$-ray plate? -- that would have had a profile with a number of white bands on that plate which we could then compare with controls and compare one sample with another.

Q And so that once you had that successful extraction that gave you the x-ray plate, you would then compare it with, for example, a suspect or someone else where you would have presumably
blood, $I$ take it blood would easily give you a profile of another subject; is that right?

Well, that -- in theory that would be where the technology was going, but what we were looking at was the problems where, when you did this extraction and you divided the sample by electrophoresis and tried to get separate identifiable bands, instead of getting identifiable bands we were getting smears and that was the problem and that was what we were trying to show, that you couldn't in fact positively identify or compare samples if the DNA had degraded.

And it's my understanding that that was the -- the premise of your research was just that, that over time samples would be degraded such that DNA could not be recovered when earlier it might have been?

A

Q And the $P C R$ came in in the early '90s; is that right?

A
Yes. Well, again, the technology was available I
think in the late ' 80 s, but this whole process of DNA technology in the early days was really, strictly speaking, transfer technology where the science was being used usually in medical research practice and cancer research and then the laboratory methods were being taken over by the forensic scientists and applied to forensic science. Nowadays, of course, the technology has become so sophisticated that the forensic science itself is advancing the technology. Right.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Doctor, could you tell me what the acronym stands for, PCR? It's polymerase chain reaction, and it's a simple process -- well, it's a complex process, but in essence the DNA molecule is capable of making, of copying itself and makes a whole series of mirror images of itself and that can be repeated multiple times so that you can end up with enormous quantities of identifiable DNA from perhaps a single molecule.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

BY MR. HODSON:
$Q$
And so again $I$ think you said late 80 s, early ' 90 s that $P C R$ was a technique that was available
and being used and presumably advanced?

A

Q

That's correct, and by that time our research lab was closed.

Okay. Just to go back a couple of questions and then we'll break for the day. Once you had the sample that had the band, I think you said your results were that it would be smeared, if you had one that wasn't smeared that had the bands, then the purpose would be to compare that $x$-ray plate that had the DNA bands of the substance on the garment, for example, with the DNA profile of someone else; correct?

That's correct, and that's why we were very happy to receive fresh samples from potential paternity cases or police cases where we could actually get good results and not constantly be dealing with failures.

Would it be fair to say that your objective, your research lab, the objective in getting the paternity cases and the couple of cases from the Vancouver police was to assist you in your work; in other words, provide you with live cases where you could research and look at the degradation issue as opposed to doing work for a third party? That's correct, and again, the structure of the
laboratory involved myself, my role was to look at the relevance of the work that we were doing as it might apply to forensic science. I was not a sort of bench scientist doing the techniques myself.

MR. HODSON: This is probably a good spot to break for the day. (Adjourned at 4:30 p.m.)
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| backwards [1] | 23266:4 | $\begin{aligned} & 23205: 5,23205: 20, \\ & 23205: 22,23239: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $23336: 7,23341 \text { :20, }$ | $23150: 18,23292: 13$ |
| $23290: 22$ | bathroom [1] - 23283:8 | 23239:13 | $23346: 21$ | boulevard [1] - 23284:3 boundaries [2] - |
| bacterial [1] - 23350:14 bad [3] - 23143:23, | Bay [1] - 23284:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { behind }[6]-23145: 4 \text {, } \\ & \text { 23175:17, 23176:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { beyond [7]-23140:3, } \\ & \text { 23179:10, 23180:12, } \end{aligned}$ | 23203:4, 23203:7 |
| $23159: 3,23159: 5$ | Bc [1] - 23183:3 beans [1]-2328 | $23198: 1,23201: 5$ | $23268: 8,23289: 8$ | bounds [1] - 23301:10 |
| badly [1] - 23340:12 | beans [1]-23286:8 | $23234: 17$ | $23293: 1,23348: 13$ | boy [1] - 23208:20 |
| baggage [1] - 23210:13 | 23338:6 | beings [2] - 23199:17, | big [2] - 23206:11, | branch [1] - 23345:22 <br> break [7] - $23181 \cdot 8$ |
| Baillie [39]-23134:3, | bearing [2] - 23219:14, | 23202:8 | 23224:14 | $23304: 14,23317: 2$ |
| $23135: 5,23135: 7$ | $23219: 15$ | Beitel [1] - 23132:9 | big-stick [1] - 23206:11 | $23317: 4,23349: 15$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23138:13, 23140:5, } \\ & \text { 23149:7, 23157:9, } \end{aligned}$ | bears [2] - 23135:12, | $\begin{gathered} \text { belief [5] - 23180:9, } \\ \text { 23180:12, 23293:1, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { biggest [2] - 23185:23, } \\ & \text { 23201:13 } \end{aligned}$ | $23355: 5,23356: 6$ |
| 23159:7, 23161:16, | 23302:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 23180: 12,23293: 1 \\ & 23321: 8,23321: 9 \end{aligned}$ | bill [1] - 23285:17 | breakdown [1] - |
| 23161:19, 23163:10, | autiful [1] - 2318 | belongs [2] - 23234:8, | bind [1] - 23263:22 | 23197:17 |
| 23180:25, 23181:1, | $23176:$ | 23310:10 | Birmingham [5] - | breath [1]-23165:18 |
| 23199:15, 23203:17, | 23208:4, 23247:15, | below [2]-23149:21, | 23202:14, 23230:15, | bridge [1] - 23284:5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23226:11, 23228:22, } \\ & 23299 \cdot 21,23233 \cdot 16, \end{aligned}$ | 23299:10, 23318:16, | $23199: 3$ | $23231: 5,23232: 4$ | brief [7] - 23162:20, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23229:21, 23233:16, } \\ & \text { 23236:2, 23236:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $23320: 10,23321: 23$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bench [1] - 23356:4 } \\ & \text { Bench }[5]-23309: 13 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23232:12 } \\ & \text { birth }[31-23208: 20 . \end{aligned}$ | $23166: 7,23173: 7$ |
| $23236: 24,23237: 2$ | become [10] - 23135:12, $23179 \cdot 18$, | Bench [5]-23309:13, 23357:1, 23357:3, | $23226: 8,23294: 10$ | 23292:6, 23293:7, |
| 23238:11, 23266:18, | 23135:12, 23179:18, 23199:19, 23225:23, | 23357:14, 23357:18 | bit [22] - 23139:7, | $\begin{aligned} & 23305: 7,23330: 16 \\ & \text { briefly [4] - 23174:19, } \end{aligned}$ |
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23227:15, 23227:22, } \\ & \text { 23228:2, 23231:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23278:19, 23289:24, } \\ & 23290: 20,23294: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23173:21, 23174:8, } \\ & \text { 23174:14, 23180:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 23159: 20 \\ & \text { cross [28] - 23192:24, } \end{aligned}$ | D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23246:6, 23247:5, | 23299:19, 23299:23, | 23184:7, 23193:13 | 23288:23, 23289 |  |
| 23248:15, 23248:21, | 23300:7, 23301:10, | 23270:19, 23271:10, | 23289:4, 23289:12 | d'être [3]-23194:23, |
| 23249:16, 23281:19, | 23301:17, 23304:15, | 23275:18, 23275:21, | 23304:23, 23304:24 | 23226:15, 23237:3 |
| 23291 :3, 23301 :5, | 23304:22, 23305:8, | 23276:2, 23277:3, | 23305:5, 23308:21, | damaged [5] - 23279:4, |
| 23301:8, 23302:23, | 23308:6, 23308:18, | 23281:3, 23288:1 | 23309:3, 23309:5, | 23279:5, 2329 |
| 23330:23, 23344:21, | 23309:8, 23314:5, | 23288:4, 23298:17 | 23313:20, 23314:20, | 23299:13, 23340:12 |
| 23344:22, 23344:25, | 23314:19, 23315:23, | 23309:13, 23319:1 | 23315:1, 23315:6, | Danchuk [2] - 23284:23 |
| 23345:4, 23345:5, | 23322:7, $23322: 20$ | 23322:1, 23322:2, | 23315:11, 23316:7, | Danchuks [2] - |
| 23345:19, 23346:10, | 23323:23, 23324:4, | 23324:13, 23324:17, | 23316:8, 23316:18, | 23284:17, 23284:19 |
| 23346:16, 23346:17, | 23324:19, 23326:7, | 23324:18, 23326:1, | 23317:7, 23324:18, | Danchuks' [1] - |
| 23346:23, 23350:13, | 23329:4, 23329:8, | 23327:22, 23333:8, | 23327:23, 23328:10, | 23284:19 |
| $23351 \text { :8, 23353:18, }$ | 23334:18, 23335:22, | 23343:16, 23357:1, | 23328:14, 23329:2, | danger [1] - 23199:21 |
| 23355:2, 23355:12, | 23337:14, 23339:11, | 23357:3, 23357:14, | $23336: 20,23337: 18$ | Dangerous [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23355: 13,23355: 25, \\ & 23357: 5 \end{aligned}$ | 23340:4, 23340:16, $\text { 23345:15. } 23346: 14$ | 23357:18 | Cross[1] - 23212:20 | 23186:11 |
| corrected [4] - 23217:8, | counsel's [1] | 23164:15 | 23288:23 | dangerous [1] |
| 23276:6, 23310:24, | 23338:23 | courtroom [8] - | Cross-examination [1] - | dangers [1] - 23186:6 |
| 23310:25 | Counsel's [1] - | 23169:4, 23169:11 | 23212:20 | daresay [1] - 23333:8 |
| Correctional [1] - | 23301:19 | 23169:15, 23169:20, | cross-examination [12] | dark [1] - 23211:5 |
| 23145:9 | counsellor [1] | 23170:18, 23176:18, | - 23289:12, 23305:5, | date [8]-23243:24, |
| Corrections[1] - | 23321:16 | $23250: 24,23298: 13$ | 23309:3, 23314:20, | 23266:20, 23267:12, |
| 23173:6 | country [4]-23146:18, 23260:1, 23340:24 | Courts[1] - 23179:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 23315: 6,23315: 11, \\ & \text { ク3316.7 } 73316 \cdot 18 \end{aligned}$ | 23300:22, 23302:21, |
| 23224:13, | $23341: 4$ | $23183: 23,23272: 4$ | 23317:7, 23324:18, | 23302:22, 23319:4, |
| 23233:18, 23282:7, | counts [2] - 23338:19, | covered [1] - 23326:9 | $23327: 23,23329: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23319:15 } \\ & \text { dated }[6]-23164: 6, \end{aligned}$ |
| 23331:23, 23337:23, | 23338:20 | Cox[1] - 23133:11 | cross-examine [8] - | 23168:18, 23219:20, |
| 23342:13 | couple [15]-23162:20, | create [1] - 23177:17 | 23304:23, 23304:24 | 23265:23, 23266:11, |
| correlated [1] - | 23186:16, 23194:16, | Create[1] - 23177:21 | 23308:21, 23315:1, | 23319:14 |
| 23224:18 | 23212:9, 23214:23, | created [1] - 23225:15 | 23316:18, 23328:10, | dates [6]-23222:1, |
| Cory[5] - 23184:7, | 23221:3, 23232:20, | creative [1] - 23324:2 | 23328:14, 23336:20 | 23289:24, 23319:10, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23193: 15,23227: 25 \\ & 23230: 11,23231: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23255: 15,23264: 13, \\ & 23299: 20,23326: 14, \end{aligned}$ | credence [1] - 23193:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cross-examined [3] - } \\ & 23192: 24,23289: 4 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $23320: 20,23320: 23,$ |
| Corvs [1] - 23227:12 | $23344 \cdot 20349 \cdot 19$ | credibility [11] - |  | 23322:2 |
| costs [1] - 23342:11 | $23355: 4,23355: 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23140: 12,23140: 14, \\ & 23291: 5,23312: 20, \end{aligned}$ | cross-examines [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { David }_{162]}-23131: 4, \\ & \text { 23133:2, 23135:11, } \end{aligned}$ |
| Cotler[1] - 23133:12 | coupled [1] - 23197:11 | 23313:3, 23313:4, | 23289:1 | 23138:16, 23147:4, |
| Counsel[24]-23132:2, | couples [1] - 23183:1 | 23313:7, 23314:7, | cross-references [1] 23309 -5 | 23149:20, 23163:4, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23135: 4,23206: 16, \\ & 23214: 7,23214: 12, \end{aligned}$ | 23147:8, 23148:5, | $\begin{aligned} & 23326: 24,23341: 10 \\ & 23341: 11 \end{aligned}$ | Crown[1]-23332: | 23163:11, 23164:8, |
| 23218:23, 23241:17, | 23185:2, 23235:19, | credible [1] - 23327:6 | cry [1] - 23343:17 | 23165:17, 23166:5, |
| 23251:14, 23256:4, | 23241:5, 23253:2 | Creek[1] - 23184:14 | Csr[8] - 23132:10, | 23166:18, 23166:22, |
| $\text { 23261:1, } 23286: 24$ | $\text { 23272:2, } 23301 \text { :8, }$ | crime [4]-23172:12, | 23132:11, 23357:2, | 23167:4, 23167:9, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23299: 22,23300: 4, \\ & 23301: 14,23309: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23308: 22,23315: 12, \\ & 23315: 24,23326: 22, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23172:18, 23213:16, } \\ & 23318: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23357: 12,23357: 13, \\ & 23357: 16,23357: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 23167:12, 23167:13, |
| 23314:16, 23315:15, | $\text { 23329:7, } 23331: 5,$ | crimes [4] - 23163:7 | curfew [1] - 23170:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23167:20, 23168:3, } \\ & 23173: 3,23175: 4, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23317: 18,23323: 1, \\ & 23323: 19,23325: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23332: 6,23332: 12, \\ & 23333: 1,23335: 3, \end{aligned}$ | 23172:3, 23172:15 | curling [1] - 23286:9 | 23175:6, 23180:17, |
| 23329:17, 23329:22, | $23341: 8,23350: 21,$ | criminal [5] - 23183:15, | $23344: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23180: 20,23184: 2, \\ & 23184: 11,23184: 17, \end{aligned}$ |
| 23344:4 <br> counsel [52] - | $\begin{gathered} 23353: 20,23354: 8 \\ \text { court [2] - 23156:1, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23253: 20,23294: 21, \\ & 23333: 9,23341: 14 \end{aligned}$ | Current[1] - 23183:1 curriculum [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & 23184: 21,23184: 24, \\ & 23187: 1,23189: 1, \end{aligned}$ |
| 23146:10, 23147:18, | 23170:16 | Criminal[2] - 23247:16, | 23344:19, 23346:6 | 23189:7, 23189:16, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23163:22, 23212:18, } \\ & \text { 23018.10 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Court } 466 \text { - 23132:10, } \\ \hline 2111 \text { 120 } 2110.10 \end{gathered}$ | 23340:22 | custody [8]-23141:10, | $23189: 25,23190: 17$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23218:10, } 23218: 22, \\ & \text { 23219:1, } 23236: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23141: 22,23142: 12 \\ & 23143: 1,23145: 15 \end{aligned}$ | criminologist [2] - | $23144: 4,23180: 11$ $23214: 1,23214: 2$ | $23191: 13,23193: 17$ 23194:5, 23194:7, |
| 23242:16, 23244:4, | 23145:18, 23146:2, | $\begin{aligned} & 23157: 4,23157: 5 \\ & \text { crisis [1] - } 23205: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $23256: 25,23276: 15,$ | $23194: 20,23195: 20$ |
| 23244:16, 23245:19, | 23146:5, 23146:16, | criteria [1] - 23137:17 | 23320:9 | 23196:7, 23196:16, |
| 23245:20, 23251:5, | 23146:20, 23147:6, | critical [1] - 23159:17 | cutting [1] - $23351: 24$ | 23198:9, 23198:15, |
| 23264:13, 23264:18, | $23163: 24,23168: 23,$ | criticism [1] - 23288:22 | Cv[3] - 23139:20, | $23198: 20,23199: 22$ |
| 23267:22, 23278:5, | 23169:1, 23173:2, | criticisms [1] - | $23344: 21,23345: 6$ | 23200:20, 23201:18, |
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| 23202:12, 23202:22, | 23220:10, 23224:14, | 23344:11 | 23158:20 | detected [2] - 23165:17, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23204:7, 23204:10, | 23235:7, 23237:4, | declared [1] - 23271:7 | depended [1] - | 23166:2 |
| 23204:18, 23206:19, | 23238:14, 23259:25, | deeply [2] - 23272:8, | 23238:14 | detective [2]-23171:8, |
| 23207:24, 23208:10, | 23265:6, 23289:14, | 23292:16 | depict [1] - 23168:13 | 23252:19 |
| 23210:6, 23210:25, | 23289:21, 23337:25, | defeating [1] | depressed [3] - | Detective [5] - |
| 23214:19, 23216:11, | 23338:2, 23340:10 | 23338:18 | 23170:16, 23173:13, | 23165:23, 23166:8, |
| 23216:12, 23216:15, | day-to-day [1] - | defence [2] - 23251:4 | 23176:8 | 23279:19, 23280:6, |
| 23217:7, 23217:13, | 23157:15 | 23290:7 | depression [1] - | 23280:7 |
| 23217:16, 23217:22, | days [12]-23142:19, | defenceless [1] | 23176:9 | detention [1] - |
| 23218:3, 23218:6, | 23152:21, 23180:11, | 23178:2 | depth [2]-23145:11, | 23167:22 |
| 23219:16, 23223:4, | 23236:17, 23236:18, | defences [1] - 23206:7 | 23227:6 | determine [8] |
| 23223:21, 23223:25, | 23252:7, 23286:11, | defendants [1] - | Derrick [3] - 23165:3, | 23269:1, 23300:9, |
| 23224:5, 23224:16, | 23303:23, 23322:2, | 23149:22 | 23168:7 | 23300:10, 23302:17, |
| $23225: 4,23225: 10,$ | 23350:22, 23354:2 | definite [2]-23179:10, | describe [10] - 23137:3, | 23310:15, 23310:16, |
| $23226 \text { :3, } 23226 \text { :9, }$ | deal [17] - 23169:22, | 23179:14 | 23143:19, 23155:1, | 23346:3, 23349:14 |
| 23226:12, 23233:18, 23240:4, 23244:12 | 23169:25, 23174:7, | definitely [2] - | $23191: 25,23192: 2$ | determined [3] - |
| $23244: 15,23244: 23,$ | 23176:17, 23177:8, | 23152:11, 23234:15 | 23213:8, 23213:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23301:11, 23332:1, } \\ & 23332: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| 23259:16, 23259:21, | 23195:5, 23202:8, | 23144:15, 23144:16 | 23307:23 | determining [2] - |
| 23260:8, 23260:12, | 23210:20, 23229:22, | definitive [1]-23245:12 | described [14] - | 23313:7, 23348:7 |
| 23260:15, 23261:9, | 23247:21, 23254:8, | deflection [1] - | 23137:16, 23143:8, | develop [1] - 23268:19 |
| $23261: 14,23261: 20,$ | 23300:2, $23301: 6$, | 23204:13 | 23146:20, 23146:21, | developed [4]- |
| $23265: 17,23266: 14$ | 23316:6, 23331 :6 <br> Dealing [1] - 23337 | degradation [4]- | 23159:17, 23166:12, | 23179:7, 23198:7, |
| $23266: 23,23268: 4,$ | dealing [14]-23137:25, | $\begin{aligned} & 23348: 17,23350: 8, \\ & 23351: 6,23355: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23174:10, 23196:20, } \\ & \text { 23222:5, } 23231: 8, \end{aligned}$ | 23352:2, 23353:20 <br> developing [1] - |
| 23268:10, 23268:22, | 23145:17, 23158:21, | degraded [2] - | 23233:13, 23241:19, | 23188:20 |
| 23269:4, 23269: | 23173:1, 23174:17, | 23353:13, 23353:16 | 23284:17, 23311:22 | development [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23270: 5,23270: 13, \\ & 23270: 19,23270: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23203: 25,23204: 14, \\ & 23205: 10,23206: 7 \end{aligned}$ | degree [9] - 23172:24 | describes [1] - <br> 23307.24 | $23188: 5,23263: 19$ |
| 23272:14, 23272:20, | $23210: 11,23210: 20,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23182: 8,23182: 10, \\ & 23182: 13,23200: 21 \end{aligned}$ | describing [4] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { develops }[1]-23250: 20 \\ & \text { device }[3]-23249: 9, \end{aligned}$ |
| 23274:5, 23274:13, | 23210:24, 23279:4, | 23202:12, 23229:13, | 23213:4, 23236:25, | 23254:5, 23254:13 |
| 23275:3, 23275:4, | 23355:16 | 23277:14 | 23280:11, 23313:17 | devices [1] - 23253:6 |
| 23279:16, 23287:8, | dealings [4] - 23246:1 | degrees [2]-23182:12, | Describing [1] - | diagnosed [3] - |
| 23287:12, 23288:3, |  | 23182:18 | 23168:12 | 23144:2, 23192:18, |
| 23290:23, 23292:17, | deals [3] - 23247:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { deity [2] - 23193:19 } \\ & \text { 23229:17 } \end{aligned}$ | 23138:18, 23285:1, | 23196:16 <br> diagnos |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23295: 10,23296: 20, \\ & 23297: 14,23298: 14, \end{aligned}$ | 23264:16, 23266:6 | $\text { delay }[2]-23145: 18$ | 23285:14, 23345:17 | $23143: 16,23143: 18$ |
| $23298: 18,232$ | dealt [4]-23169:19 | 23146:12 | Description [1] - | 23144:12, 23145:10, |
| $23300: 15,23301: 13,$ |  | delayed [1] - 23180:8 | 23134:2 | 23145:11 |
| 23306:16, 23307:5, | death [5] - 23238:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { delineation [1] - } \\ & 23196: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { desert [2] - 23296:2 } \\ & \text { 23297:1 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { diagnosis [11] - } \\ & \text { 23143:25, 23144: } \end{aligned}$ |
| 23307:14, 23309:1, | $23346: 4,23346: 5$ | delivered [1] - 23344:8 | designated [1] | 23144:15, 23144:18, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23310:12, 23312:22 } \\ & \text { 23317:9, 23320:7. } \end{aligned}$ | 23346:9 | Delta[1] - 23131:16 | 23329:16 | 23172:8, 23191:17, |
| $23321 \text { :21, 23322:13, }$ | deaths [2]-23345:25, 23346.9 | delve [1] - 23195:2 | desire [3]-23210:1, | $23191: 24,23192: 20,$ |
| 23325:1, 23325:16, | 23346:9 | delving [1] - 23158:10 | 23224:17, 23297:12 | 23223:9, 23229:12, |
| 23326:10, 23327:5, | debilitating [1] | demand [1] - 23224:22 | desires [1] - 23210:10 | 23259:1 |
| 23328:11, 23331:12, | $23235: 4$ | demeanour [2] - <br> 23166.9, 23327.1 | destiny [1] - 23225:18 destructive [1]- | Dictaphone [2] - $23262: 25,23263: 5$ |
| $23334: 7,23334: 8,$ <br> 23338.22 23339:11, | decade [1] - 23143:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23166:9, 23327:1 } \\ & \text { demons [2] - 23209:22, } \end{aligned}$ | 23239:12 | dictated [1] - 23281:23 |
| $23340: 12,23341: 19,$ | deceased [1] - 23341:3 | 23210:12 | Det [1] - 23164:14 | dictates [1] - 23262:24 |
| 23341:21, 23342:2, | cemb | demonstrated [1] - | detail [10]-23243:15 | dictating [1] - 23219:25 |
| 23343:11, 23346:15, | $23265: 13,23265: 24$ | 23230: | $\begin{aligned} & 23281: 13,23281: 17 \\ & 23282 \cdot 13 \\ & 23283 \cdot 4 \end{aligned}$ | die [1] - 23194:1 |
| 23346:22, 23346:24 | $23266: 6,23266: 11$ | denial [1] - 23180:14 | $23283: 25,23285: 20,$ | $23136: 6,23138: 21$ |
| David's [25] - 23163:23, | $23266: 13$ | denied [1] - 23171:9 | $23286: 21,23295: 17,$ | $23161: 10,23303: 19$ |
| $23168: 5,23184: 12$ | decided [5] - 23285:7 | Department [5] | 23295:19 | differences [3] - |
| $23193: 22,23198: 21,$ | 23285:13, 23314:17, | 23148:25, 23171:7, | detailed [1] - 23286:21 | 23226:2, 23232:14, |
| 23198:23, 23202:3, |  | 23289:2, 23298:2, | details [3] - 23207:20, | 23327:23 |
| 23203:17, 23210:1, | decision [4]-23137:16, 23309:12, 23334:14 | 23348:21 | 23286:17, 23290:21 | different [24] - |
| 23211:17, 23214:4, | 23309:12, 23334:14, | departure [1] - | detained [1] - 23165:12 | 23149:23, 23155:20, |
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| 23146:11, 23149:18 excused [5] - 23181:2, <br> 23255:7, 23264:8, <br> 23269:11, 23273:9 <br> Executive [1] - 23132:3 <br> exempt [1] - $23341: 4$ <br> exemption [1] - <br> 23264:24 <br> exhibit [1] - 23289:20 <br> exhibits [1] - 23346:19 <br> existed [1] - 23144:6 <br> existence [2] - <br> 23147:16, 23248:12 <br> existing [3] - 23237:4, <br> 23347:10, 23352:8 <br> exonerate [1] - <br> 23180:10 <br> exonerated [1] - <br> 23184:6 <br> exoneration [2] - <br> 23195:24, 23196:5 <br> expand [1] - 23266:1 <br> expect [4]-23268:1, <br> 23290:23, 23304:11, <br> 23343:18 <br> expected [1] - 23284:1 <br> expecting [2] - <br> 23188:14, 23349:21 <br> expedite [1] - $23261: 8$ <br> expeditious [1] - <br> 23273:25 <br> experience [6] - <br> 23153:6, 23178:14, <br> 23198:2, 23201:6, <br> 23318:22, 23322:10 <br> experienced [3] - <br> 23197:9, 23198:16 <br> experiences [3] - <br> 23197:10, 23198:7, <br> 23229:6 <br> experiencing [2] - <br> 23217:12, 23217:14 <br> experimental [1] - <br> 23349:13 <br> expert [4]-23306:10, <br> 23306:13, 23330:24, <br> 23331:4 <br> expertise [1] - 23192:23 <br> experts [1]-23293:13 <br> explain [1] - 23275:5 <br> explained [3] - 23144:1, <br> 23296:6, 23296:19 <br> explanation [2] - <br> 23137:8, 23137:13 <br> exploratory [1] - <br> 23207:8 <br> explore [1]-23167:12 <br> expose [1] - 23289:10 <br> exposed [1] - 23204:21 <br> express [2] - 23176:12, | ```23345:12 \\ expressed [3] - \\ 23300:18, 23309:5, \\ 23345:12 \\ expressing [1] - \\ 23219:6 \\ expressions [1] - \\ 23198:11 \\ extant [2]-23280:16, \\ 23280:19 \\ extended [2] - 23266:4, \\ 23329:7 \\ extends [1] - 23224:10 extensive [2] - \\ 23186:14, 23209:19 \\ extent [17]-23155:17, \\ 23224:4, 23233:14, \\ 23236:21, 23238:5, \\ 23238:10, 23302:9, \\ 23302:13, 23303:8, \\ 23305:9, 23307:9, \\ 23307:10, 23309:15, \\ 23311:4, 23319:7, \\ 23322:25, 23336:5 \\ extract [4]-23350:19, \\ 23350:23, 23351:7, \\ 23352:13 \\ extracted [1] - \\ 23140:16 \\ extracting [1] - \\ 23351:23 \\ extraction [3] - \\ 23352:14, 23352:23, \\ 23353:6 \\ extreme [1] - 23337:2 \\ extremely [7] - 23176:8, \\ 23180:9, 23288:23, \\ 23332:17, 23332:18, \\ 23333:24, 23352:4 \\ eyes [1]-23135:13``` <br> F <br> fabric [1] - 23197:21 <br> face [2] - 23177:3, <br> 23332:14 <br> faced [1] - $23164: 18$ <br> faces [1] - 23166:24 <br> facilitate [1] - 23144:13 <br> facilitated [1] - <br> 23299:24 <br> facilities [1] - 23145:8 <br> facility [1] - 23348:14 <br> fact [36] - 23136:23, <br> 23153:12, 23161:19, <br> 23166:3, 23168:3, <br> 23178:1, 23178:7, <br> 23189:5, 23220:25, <br> 23225:7, 23225:11, | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 23227: 11,23232: 24, \\ & \text { 23247:18, 23269:14, } \\ & \text { 23270:12, 23270:20, } \\ & \text { 23271:6, 23288:23, } \\ & \text { 23291:1, 23292:23, } \\ & 23296: 2,23306: 22, \\ & 23307: 20,23309: 8, \\ & 23310: 17,23312: 5, \\ & 23315: 24,23322: 9, \\ & 23342: 5,23347: 18, \\ & 23348: 17,23352: 7, \\ & \text { 23353:11, 23353:18 } \\ & \text { factor }[1]-23261: 11 \\ & \text { factors }[1]-23229: 4 \\ & \text { facts }[9]-23201: 5, \\ & 23236: 12,23241: 8, \\ & 23311: 12,23311: 20, \\ & 23326: 5,23341: 22, \\ & 23341: 24,23342: 1 \\ & \text { factual }[1]-23330: 20 \\ & \text { factually }[6]-23236: 15, \\ & 23237: 21,23271: 3, \\ & 23310: 12,23312: 5, \\ & 23312: 6 \\ & \text { fade }[1]-23201: 8 \\ & \text { failings }[1]-23343: 8 \\ & \text { failures }[1]-23355: 17 \\ & \text { Fainstein }[1]-23289: 1 \\ & \text { Fair }[3]-23219: 7, \\ & 23220: 24,23221: 2 \\ & \text { fair }[18]-23139: 8, \\ & 23145: 23,23152: 25, \\ & 23159: 6,23178: 15, \\ & 23193: 15,23196: 16, \\ & 23200: 21,23206: 22, \\ & 23213: 11,23217: 1, \\ & 23219: 19,23227: 3, \\ & 23250: 25,23252: 23, \\ & 23289: 3,23300: 7, \\ & 23355: 18 \\ & \text { fairly }[12]-23173: 22, \\ & 23175: 7,23189: 20, \\ & 23214: 24,23221: 4, \\ & 23221: 5,23260: 15, \\ & 23284: 18,23324: 16, \\ & 23325: 21,23330: 4, \\ & 23333: 15 \\ & \text { fairness }[3]-23222: 17, \\ & 23237: 23,23329: 7 \\ & \text { fall }[2]-23178: 17, \\ & 23334: 3 \\ & \text { False }[1]-23184: 14 \\ & \text { familiar }[5]-23150: 8, \\ & 23216: 5,23243: 19, \\ & 23279: 13,23309: 14 \\ & \text { familiarity }[1]-23236: 6 \\ & \text { families }[1]-23183: 11 \\ & \text { family }[8]-23175: 10, \\ & 23175: 12,23175: 16, \\ & 23181: 16,23193: 23, \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 23235: 23,23306: 6 \\ & \text { far }[11]-23154: 10, \\ & 23167: 9,23188: 17, \\ & 23208: 20,23208: 21, \\ & 23277: 17,23326: 19, \\ & 23329: 11,23342: 2, \\ & 23346: 12,23350: 7 \\ & \text { fashion }[1]-23247: 5 \\ & \text { fast }[3]-23195: 13, \\ & 23285: 24,23294: 10 \\ & \text { father }[1]-23175: 10 \\ & \text { fault }[2]-23237: 16, \\ & 23311: 15 \\ & \text { favourably }[1]- \\ & 23261: 14 \\ & \text { Fbi[1] - } 23348: 9 \\ & \text { fear }[1]-23178: 11 \\ & \text { fearful }[1]-23270: 25 \\ & \text { features }[1]-23154: 15 \\ & \text { February }[11]-23142: 4, \\ & 23142: 8,23164: 6, \\ & 23164: 9,23165: 11, \\ & 23168: 12,23168: 13, \\ & 23168: 18,23170: 12, \\ & 23173: 1,23184: 9 \\ & \text { feelings }[2]-23202: 11, \\ & 23247: 11 \\ & \text { fellow }[1]-23176: 5 \\ & \text { felt }[4]-23176: 18, \\ & 23254: 2,23310: 11, \\ & 23328: 9 \\ & \text { female }[1]-23347: 11 \\ & \text { fender }[4]-23158: 18, \\ & 23159: 1,23161: 1, \\ & 23161: 11 \\ & \text { Ferris }[8]-23134: 21, \\ & 23242: 11,23343: 23, \\ & 23344: 3,23344: 13, \\ & 23344: 14,23344: 16, \\ & 23345: 7 \\ & \text { few }[5]-23204: 18, \\ & 23214: 25,23215: 11, \\ & 23216: 19,23265: 7 \\ & \text { fight }[3]-23164: 19, \\ & 23164: 22,23199: 16 \\ & \text { fight-or-flight }[2]- \\ & 23164: 19,23199: 16 \\ & \text { file }[15]-23136: 22, \\ & 23141: 18,23215: 3, \\ & 23215: 6,23216: 16, \\ & 23217: 17,23217: 19, \\ & 23217: 22,23219: 13, \\ & 23219: 18,23219: 22, \\ & 23219: 24,23222: 7, \\ & 23222: 10,23254: 12 \\ & \text { filed }[4]-23249: 7, \\ & 23265: 19,23305: 19, \\ & 23309: 23 \\ & \text { files }[7]-23141: 7, \\ & 23141: 9,23141: 11, \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 23141:13, 23141:15, 23142:23, 23143:16 final [4]-23172:13, 23172:25, 23180:16, 23264:11 <br> Finally[1] - 23259:12 finally [3] - 23215:17, 23259:5, 23341:17 findings [5] - 23215:5, 23215:14, 23220:19, 23220:20, 23231:5 fine [8] - 23146:22, 23188:16, 23207:6, 23208:14, 23260:6, 23299:11, 23299:12, 23339:25 finish [4]-23160:15, 23206:13, 23242:4, 23242:10 finished [1] - 23345:2 firm [1] - 23203:9 firmly [1] - 23229:16 firms [1] - 23149:23 First[4]-23157:1, 23243:11, 23299:21, 23305:16 first [33] - 23137:3, 23143:25, 23147:5, 23150:2, 23171:13, 23184:21, 23186:2, 23188:21, 23189:6, 23191:11, 23191:23, 23192:7, 23198:12, 23205:12, 23205:15, 23214:15, 23214:23, 23214:25, 23215:1, 23216:19, 23221:3, 23221:7, 23236:3, 23264:16, 23264:21, 23267:17, 23286:14, 23288:21, 23305:23, 23310:5, 23319:22, 23324:6, 23337:21 firsthand [1] - 23340:9 firstly [1] - 23275:8 Fisher[10] - 23133:10, 23163:5, 23269:2, 23269:3, 23270:4, 23270:7, 23274:25, 23275:23, 23298:12, 23298:14 fit [2] - 23172:7, 23180:3 five [6] - 23152:21, 23172:24, 23189:6, 23221:8, 23236:17, 23242:22 flashlight [1] 23283:22 flies [1] - 23332:14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23313:5 } \\ & \text { Guy[1] - 23135:18 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23224:18, 23227:24, } \\ & \text { 23235:15, 23235:20, } \\ & \text { 23239:4, 23309:15, } \\ & \text { 23309:16, 23309:17, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { hence }[4]-23141: 19, \\ & \text { 23202:20, 23204:11, } \\ & 23262: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23181: 21,23242: 2, \\ & 23242: 9,23242: 15, \\ & 23243: 3,23245: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23265: 18,23266: 14, \\ & 23266: 19,23266: 23, \\ & 23267: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 23337：25 | herein［1］－23357：6 | 23256：9，23260：11， | 23265：2，23333：20 |
|  | Health［2］－23183：1， | Hersh［1］－23133：2 | 23264：5，23264：10 | hospitalization［9］－ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { habituated [1] } \\ & \text { 23200:5 } \end{aligned}$ | 2318 | hesitates［1］－23327：1 | $23267: 20,23274: 13$, $23280: 23,23280 \cdot 24$, | 23139：23，23140：1， |
| $\text { half }[7]-23168: 24,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { healthy [4] - 23152:10, } \\ & \text { 23152:11, 23152:12 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { hesitation [1] } \\ & \text { 23158:10 } \end{aligned}$ | $23288: 2,23292: 7,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23141: 6,23142: 11, \\ & 23142: 20,23143: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| 23172：23，23190：17， | heap［2］－23311：15 | hides［1］－ $23176: 9$ | 23294：18，23296：18， | 23143：11，23265：6， |
| 23191：10，23194：17， | hear［5］－23247：9， | hierarchy［1］－ | 23297：14，23299：18， | 23265：7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23195:10, 23212:2 } \\ & \text { half-wav [1] - 23168:24 } \end{aligned}$ | $23249: 18,23285: 21$ <br> 23303．18，23350：4 | 23178：18 | $\text { 23300:23, } 23301: 20 \text {, }$ | hospitalizations［2］ 23142．21 23222．18 |
| halfway [1] - 23170:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 23303: 18,23350: 4 \\ & \text { heard [27] - 23177:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { high [6] - 23179:9, } \\ \text { 23186:7, 23186:11 } \end{gathered}$ | 23308:16, 23325:4, | hostility［2］－23176：17， |
| hallmark［1］－23213：24 | 23185：2，23190：19， | 23202：14，23247：23， | 23326:11, 23326:17, | 23178:6 |
| Halyk［10］－23149：25， | 23191：12，23192：7， | 23253：25 | $\begin{aligned} & 23332: 2,23334: 21, \\ & \text { う३3ム0•8 う३३ム३・クう } \end{aligned}$ | hotel［5］－23253：12， |
| 23150：1，23150：5， | 23222：17，23232：24， | higher［1］－23150：16 | $23344: 3,23344: 12$ | 23254:6, 23254:14, $23254: 15,23276: 25$ |
| $23153: 20,23154: 1$ | $23245: 3,23245: 23$ | highlight［1］－23140：5 | 23344:15, 23354:23, | 23254：15，23276：25 |
| 23154：16，23156：15， | 23249：22，23251：15， | $23205: 8,23228:$ | 23356：5 | 23253：13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23156: 22 \\ & \text { hand }[6]-23164: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $23276: 25,23285: 19$, $23286: 15,23289: 16$, | highly［1］－23259：2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hodson's [2] - 23160:5, } \\ & 23160: 8 \end{aligned}$ | hour［5］－ 23161 ：3， |
| 23174：18，23176：11， | 23292:13, 23295:21, | $-23259$ | hold［4］－23140：23， | 23280:5 |
| $23241: 11,23291: 18$ 23294:3 | 23296：13，23315：1， | Hill［1］－23284：3 | $\begin{aligned} & 23187: 4,23319: 23, \\ & 23321: 2 \end{aligned}$ | hours［4］－23165：10， |
| handle［5］－23169：10， 23173．23，23194：15 | 23334：8，23334：12， <br> 23337：24，23339：10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { himself }[34]-23144: 22, \\ & \text { 23146:22, 23167:17, } \end{aligned}$ | holding［4］－23166：18， 23176：10，23204：4 | 23342:17 |
| 23259：17，23288：12 <br> handled［2］－23163：25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { hearing [8]-23148:10, } \\ & \text { 23194:20, 23233:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23168: 16,23177: 5, \\ & 23178: 11,23180: 15, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { home [2] - 23210:2, } \\ & 23348: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $23167: 6,23167: 7,$ |
| 23173:22 | $\text { 23250:1, } 23331: 11$ | 23186:17, 23186:21, | homicides［1］－23346：8 | $23168: 24,23170: 20,$ |
| hands［1］－23207：25 handwriting［1］－ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23343:13, } 23343: 16 \\ & \text { hearings [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $23189: 9,23191: 3,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { homosexual [1] - } \\ & \text { 23178:9 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23210: 2,23286: 9 \\ & 23286: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| $23281: 24$ <br> handwrit | $23168: 23,23276: 2$ <br> Hearings［1］－ 23169 | $23211: 12,23223: 5 \text {, }$ | Hon［1］－23133：12 honest［3］－23153：24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { how'd [1] - 23194:15 } \\ & \text { hubris [1] - } 23233: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| $23280: 6,23280: 13$ | heartbreaking | $\begin{aligned} & 23225: 10,23225: 17 \\ & 23229: 9,23230: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $23154: 2,23291: 17$ | $\text { Hugh [2] - } 23134: 3$ |
| hang［1］－23229：9 | 23268：13 | 23234：16，23239：11， | Honourable［1］－ | 23135：5 |
| hanging［1］－23255：18 | heck［2］－23202：9 | 23240：5，23255：18， | 23131：6 | human［13］－23183：13， |
| $\text { happy }[1]-23355: 13$ | 23225:19 | $23256: 1,23263: 5$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { hope [8]- 23179:5, } \\ \text { 22180.10 } 22180 \cdot 1 \end{gathered}$ | 23197:17, 23199:17, |
| 23343:3 | 23317:9 | $23316: 4,23316: 24$ | 23293:19, 23301:9, | $23229: 15,23298: 24$ |
| hardly［2］－23142：15， | $\text { held }[3]-23194: 1$ | 23318：20，23337：14 | $23306: 4,23308: 18$ | $23350: 10,23350: 18$ |
| $23284: 1$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 23202:18, 23252:25 } \\ \text { help [20]-23186:3, } \end{gathered}$ | hint [1] - 23292:22 | 23340：11 hopefully | $\begin{aligned} & 23350: 24,23350: 25, \\ & 23351 \text { :8 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 23299:3, 23300:19, | $23186: 9,23187: 8$ | $23357: 2,23357: 13$ | $23207: 13,23242: 1$ | humiliating［1］ |
| $23323: 5,23323: 6$ $23323: 8,23323: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23196: 22,23206: 19, \\ & 23224: 16,23269: 7, \end{aligned}$ | hired［1］－23182：24 | $\begin{aligned} & 23242: 24,23293: 23, \\ & 23295: 25,23306: 12, \end{aligned}$ | 23238:16 <br> hundreds［1］－23346：7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23323:8, } 23323: 13, \\ & \text { 23332:24, } 23339: 11, \end{aligned}$ | 23276:12, 23278:10, | history［13］－23143：4， | 23323:5 | $\text { hung [2] - } 23208: 23 \text {, }$ |
| 23339:17 | $23278: 15,23280: 23,$ $23290: 25,23297: 3,$ | 23211:18, 23215:13, | hoping [2] - 23188:14, | 23256:1 |
| harmful［1］－23223：20 <br> hate［1］－23324：21 | $23297: 9,23297: 25$ | 23215：16，23217：3， | Hopkins［1］－23133： | hurry［1］－23208：10 <br> hurts［1］－23192：2 |
| hatred［1］－23176：17 | $23299: 2,23324: 25,$ | $23235: 1,23319: 8,$ | hormonal［1］－23200：4 | hypothesis［2］－ |
| Hay[1] - 23309:13 | $\begin{aligned} & 23331: 6,23343: 14 \\ & 23343: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $23322: 13,23331: 9$ | horrible［1］－23268：15 <br> horrific［3］－23172：2， | $23158: 13,23233: 21$ |
| 23203:2 | helped [2] - 23169:7, | hitchhiking［1］－ | $23172: 15,23172: 18$ | $23161: 15$ |
| headed [1] - 23284:13 | $\begin{aligned} & 23194: 8 \\ & \text { helpful [5]-23 } \end{aligned}$ | 23186:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { horror [2]-23180:7, } \\ & \text { 23288:12 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| heading［1］－23186：18 | 23223:12. 23223:17. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hmm [2]-23148:21, } \\ & \text { 23263:7 } \end{aligned}$ | hospital［12］－23173： |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23224: 19,23235: 7 \\ & \text { health }[12]-23182: 23 \text {, } \\ & \text { 23192:15, 23224:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23327:5, 23333:24 } \\ & \text { helping [2] - 23178:9, } \\ & \text { 23297:11 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hodson[44]-23132:2, } \\ & \text { 23134:10, 23134:22, } \\ & 23160: 14,23180: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23222: 21,23222: 22, \\ & \text { 23223:1, 23223:14, } \\ & \text { 23264:17, 23265:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Icbc [1]-23183:19 } \\ & \text { Id [2]-23187:21, } \end{aligned}$ |
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| ```23319:12 Id'd [1] - 23264:17 idea [7]-23151:16, 23261:10, 23261:13, 23262:16, 23263:10, 23263:13, 23342:14 ideally [1] - 23210:23 identical [1]-23163:19 identifiable [3] - 23353:8, 23353:9, 23354:20 identified [5] - 23281:25, 23319:7, 23332:3, 23352:10, 23353:22 identify [14] - 23222:2, 23228:23, 23247:5, 23292:6, 23293:22, 23293:25, 23347:11, 23347:24, 23349:20, 23351:7, 23351:9, 23351:11, 23351:13, 23353:12 identifying \({ }_{[1]}\) - 23221:5 Ids [2] - 23267:19, 23267:20 ill [1] - 23341 :4 illness [2] - 23144:19, 23145:1 image [1] - 23352:2 images [1] - 23354:18 imagine [6] - 23270:24, 23271:2, 23283:5, 23334:10, 23336:23, 23343:3 immature [1] - 23177:7 immigration [1] - 23348:1 impact [1] - 23229:14 impacts [1] - 23193:2 Impaired [1] - 23202:6 impatient [3]-23207:2, 23213:6, 23213:20 impending [2]- 23199:21, 23200:6 implication [1] - 23172:16 implicitly [2] - 23314:17, 23315:15 importance [2] - 23278:8, 23314:7 important [13] - 23173:25, 23197:16, 23223:24, 23235:21, 23263:18, 23282:10, 23290:18, 23290:19, 23305:3, 23308:15, 23312:2, 23352:5, 23352:6``` |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 23171:15, 23171:25 | last [22] - 23139:4, | 23331:20 | 23211:20, 23219:13, | 23309:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| knit [1] - 23175:13 | 23139:19, 23151:18, | leaving [3] - 23172:6, | 23226:22, 23226:24, | live [2] - 23198:2, |
| knowing [4] - 23198:3, | 23151:20, 23152:13, | 23189:17, 23270:20 | 23238:20, 23240:7, | 23355:22 |
| 23207:19, 23286:19, | 23155:13, 23162:20, | lecturer [1] - 23157:11 | 23272:20, 23290:5, | livelihood [1] - |
| 23321:17 | 23165:25, 23203:14, | led [2] - 23184:6, | 23290:10, 23296:3, | 23238:14 |
| knowledge [11] - | 23208:24, 23209:13, | 23312:11 | 23296:4, 23296:5, | living [2]-23183:12, |
| 23162:24, 23163:1, | 23211:1, 23211:25, | left [13]-23164:15 | 23298:10, 23306:8 | 23190:20 |
| 23245:14, 23245:15, | 23215:22, 23242:12, | 23167:11, 23169:15, | 23322:16 | local [2] - 23247:22, |
| 23268:7, 23270:20, | 23243:8, 23265:7, | 23190:7, 23201:7, | life-or-death [1] - | 23349:16 |
| 23277:13, 23304:4, | 23328:8, 23335:24, | 23208:10, 23249:12, | 23238:20 | located [1] - 23165:16 |
| 23322:13, 23342:1, | $23336: 9,23336: 10$ | 23278:7, 23278:12, | lifestyle [1] - 23325:18 | location [1] - 23325:16 |
| 23357:6 | 23344:24 | 23285:17, 23294:7, | lifetime [1] - 23177:3 | look [39]-23142:6, |
| known [5] - 23185:3, | late [3] - 23206:15, | 23328:15 | light [2] - 23207:13, | 23142:15, 23147:11, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23202: 22,23212: 15, \\ & 23215: 18,23320: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23354: 1,23354: 24 \\ & \text { law }[4]-23149: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { legal [2] - 23244:15, } \\ & 23347: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23220: 25 \\ & \text { likelihood }[1]-23158: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23187: 5,23196: 3 \\ & 23207: 23,23213: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| knows [5] - 23235:1, | 23166:12, 23323:24, | legitimate [1] - | likely [3] - 23138:24, | 23222:7, 23247:4, |
| 23235:2, 23235:3, | 23333:8 | 23343:17 | 23173:3, 23178:19 | 23249:25, 23269:1, |
| 23340:8 | Law[2]-23153:9, | length [3]-23204:20, | limit [2] - 23202:10, | 23270:2, 23270:3, |
| Knox[9]-23133:5, | 23348:20 | 23277:3, $23331: 2$ | 23206:9 | 23274:17, 23281:15, |
| 23134:17, 23265:24, | Lawrence[1] - 23197:1 | lengthy [2]-23149:9, | limitations [1] - | 23282:23, 23289:19, |
| 23266:12, 23318:4, | lawsuit [6] - 23154:3, | 23325:23 | 23161:17 | 23291:20, 23291:21, |
| 23339:9, 23339:14, | 23154:6, 23237:10, | less [2]-23309:23, | limited [5] - 23273:24 | 23292:10, 23294:6, |
| 23339:20, 23339:23 | 23237:11, 23237:18, | 23325:1 | 23307:17, 23307:18, | 23295:3, 23295:18, |
| Knox's [1] - 23266:15 | 23238:8 | lessen [1] - 23206:10 | 23322:22 | 23298:24, 23302:3, |
| Krogan[1] - 23133:4 | lawyer [8] - 23153:10, | lessened [1] - $23239: 2$ | limits [1] - 23342:14 | 23312:24, 23319:8, |
| Kujawa[6] - 23133:6, | 23171:7, 23171:24, | Lester[1] - 23347:21 | Linda[2]-23269:2, | 23320:3, 23322:11, |
| 23135:10, 23149:19, <br> $23149 \cdot 24,23275 \cdot 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23173: 3,23174: 2, \\ & 23218: 8.23218: 17 \end{aligned}$ | letter [20]-23142:3, | 23275:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 23324: 2,23330: 23, \\ & 23331: 9 . ~ 23338: 8 . \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23149: 24,23275: 2, \\ & 23277: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $23252: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23163:11, 23164:1, } \\ & \text { 23164:2, 23168:8, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { line [5] - 23246:18, } \\ & \text { 23260:7, 23292:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23331: 9,23338: 8, \\ & 23341: 22,23348: 4, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | lawyers [6] - 23169:10, | 23168:10, 23169:23, | 23299:11, 23299:12 | 23348:15, 23351:21, |
| I | 23174:2, 23236:4, | 23264:14, 23264:22, | lines [1]-23336:12 | 23355:23, 23356:1 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 23252: 6,23252: 9, \\ & 23252: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $23265: 14,23265: 23$ | lingering [1] - 23268:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { looked [5]-23149:11, } \\ & \text { 23174:6, 23249:11, } \end{aligned}$ |
| lab [8] - 23348:22, | lay [1] - 23175:7 | 23266:11, 23266:13 | 23262:24, 23274:1 | 23254:12, 23288:8 |
| 23348:25, 23349:1, | laying [1] - 23260:12 | 23267:7, 23288:5, | 23332:3 | looking [19]-23141:20, |
| 23349:2, 23349:11, | layout [1] - 23163:18 | 23300:23 | listen [4] - 23244 :22 | 23142:17, 23142:21, |
| 23350:3, 23355:2, | lead [3]-23189:15, | letterhead [1] - | 23245:4, 23247:24, | 23176:4, 23178:24, |
| 23355:19 | 23218:2 | 23163:18 | 23248:7 | 23219:16, 23240:5, |
| label [1] - 23144:22 | leading [1] - 23168:13 | letters [1] - 23264:13 | listened [10] - | 23259:2, 23259:3, |
| labels [2]-23144:10, | learn [2] - 23202:9, | letting [1] - 23204:9 | 23244:13, 23244:17, | 23284:13, 23289:9, |
| 23144:24 | 23249:6 | level [6]-23158:12, | 23245:16, 23245:25, | 23298:17, 23312:14, |
| laboratory [4] - | learned [2] - 23189:20, | $23164: 24,23206: 21,$ | $23251: 12,23269: 2,$ | 23323:24, 23350:8, |
| $23345: 23,23351: 22,$ | $23311: 5$ | 23207:16, 23224:1, | $23310: 1,23310: 3$ | 23350:9, 23350:13, |
| $23354: 6,23356: 1$ | least [18] - 23144:3, | 23323:10 | $23318: 17,23335: 14$ | $23350: 25,23353: 4$ |
| laborious [1] - | 23145:17, 23146:12, | liaising [1] - 23348:8 | listening [8]-23245:3, | lookit [1] - 23292:11 |
| 23261:18 | 23158:4, 23172:19, | licence [2] - 23286:12 | $23245: 10,23248: 4,$ | looks [2] - 23181:22, |
| lack [2] - 23306:21, | 23225:12, 23230:1, | licensed [1] - 23182:22 | $23249: 9,23253: 6,$ | 23324:1 |
| 23342:20 | 23270:21, 23281:1, | lied [2] - 23270:4, | 23254:5, 23254:13, | Loran[1] - 23316:16 |
| laid [1] - 23135:13 | 23293:8, 23304:15, | 23270:6 | 23268:12 | Iose [3] - 23177:2, |
| Lamer[1] - 23169:9 | 23324:14, 23327:6, | life [38] - 23143:7 | literal [1] - 23199:1 | 23179:17, 23308:23 |
| Lana[1] - 23133:4 | 23329:12, 23329:14, | 23176:22, 23186:4, | literally [2]-23186:19, | losing [4]-23202:23, |
| Langenburg[1] - | 23333:14, 23336:13, | $23190: 23,23191: 2$ | 23346:7 | 23202:25, 23203:13, |
| 23175:10 | 23351:1 | 23193:2, 23195:21, | literature [6]-23188:4, | 23260:7 |
| language [1] - 23189:8 | leave [11] - 23149:4, | $23195: 22,23195: 25,$ | 23192:25, 23205:9, | loss [1] - 23274:25 |
| large [1]-23184:16 <br> Larry6] - 23132:13 | 23234:16, 23234:17, | 23196:14, 23198:1, <br> 23209.18, 23209.24 | $\begin{aligned} & 23228: 23,23231: 7, \\ & 23231: 25 \end{aligned}$ | love [1] - 23296:13 |
| 23133:10, 23163:5, | $23260: 1,23275: 4,$ | 23210:7, 23210:18, | lithium [1] - 23173:1 | low [1] - 23150:12 |
| 23269:3, 23298:12, | 23315:12, 23316:17, | 23210:22, 23211:3, | litigation [2] - | lowered [1] - $23166: 24$ |
| 23298:14 | 23329:23, 23336:14 | 23211:6, 23211:11, | 23158:19, 23159:3 | lowest [1] - 23178:18 |
| Lastı1] - 23190:14 | leaves [2]-23173:12, | 23211:13, 23211:18, | litigious [2] - 23213:10, | lurking [1] - 23201:5 |
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| luxury［1］－23162：13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23304:21, 23304:25, } \\ & \text { 23305:15, 23315:21, } \\ & 23316: 8,23318: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 23311: 9,23313: 22, \\ 23325: 6,23346: 4 \\ \text { map [2] - 23196:11, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { mechanisms [1] - } \\ & 23254: 25 \\ & \text { media }[6]-23159: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23183: 3 \\ & \text { mental }[9]-23145: 1, \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $23325: 8,23325: 1$ | 23284:15 | 23162:4, 23180:20, | $2$ |
| Mac | 23328：1，23328：5， | March［2］－23175：3， 23279－17 | 23185：6，23256：13， | $23223: 15,23227: 24$ |
| $23131: 7,23135: 3$ | 23329:1, 23329:6, | marked［2］－23278：20， | medical［19］－23141：8， | mention［1］－23270：17 |
| 23145：24，23146：4， | 23329：14，23329：25， | 23320：1 | 23141：16，23141：18， | mentioned［8］－ |
| 23146：7，23146：23， | 23330：7，23330：12， | marker［1］－23196：11 | 23142：17，23142：22， | 23163：25，23174：24， |
| 23147：22，23147：25， | 23336：18，23337：16， | Marnie［1］－23190：19 | 23145：22，23146：13， | 23176：16，23184：13， |
| 23148：6，23148：12， | 23337：18，23338：4， | Marshall［2］－23133：13， | 23146：14，23146：16， | 23191：23，23192：13， |
| 23149：1，23181：1， | 23338：7， $23341: 6$, | 23165：5 | 23173：4，23215：11， | 23297：14，23334：9 |
| 23181：7，23181：10， | 23341：16，23342：19， | masters［1］－23182：10 | 23266：19，23266：23， | Merchant［1］－23282：6 |
| 23181：13，23187：21， $23187 \cdot 24,23190: 12$ | 23342：23，23343：5， | matches［1］－23349：8 | 23267：4，23268：7， | merit［1］－23294：16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 231 \\ & 231 \end{aligned}$ | 23343：21，23344：1 <br> 23344：4，23344：13 | material［6］－23136：22， | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23318:12, 23322:22, } \\ & \text { 23346:1 } 23354 \cdot 4 \end{aligned}$ | met［6］－23165：23， |
| $23212: 4,23212: 8$ | $23354: 12,23354: 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23201: 10,23261: 24, \\ & 23308: 20,23349: 23, \end{aligned}$ | medication［3］ | $\begin{aligned} & 23166: 18,23190: 25, \\ & 23216: 16,23236: 3, \end{aligned}$ |
| 23212：16，23215：22， | machine［5］－23248：2， | 23350：10 | 23150：9，23151：11， | 23312：22 |
| 23216：1，23221：15， | 23248：14，23249：24， | materials［2］－ | 23151：23 | meta［1］－23205：10 |
| 23221：19，23221：21， | 23250：13，23250：15 | 23222：12，23265：19 | medications［5］－ | metaphor［4］－ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23228: 11,23228: 14, \\ & 23237 \cdot 7 \text { 23237•10 } \end{aligned}$ | Mackie［2］－23149：21， | matter［18］－23148：12， | $23150: 7,23150: 25$ | 23198:14, 23198:18, |
| 23237:12, 23242:7, | 23254：9 | $23174: 7,23176: 2$ | 23151：2，23151：10， | 23198:20, 23203:22 |
| 23255：6，23255：12， | 23284：20， 232 | 23209：7，23243：7 | 23151：15 | metaphorical［2］－ |
| 23256：22，23257：1， | mad［1］－23285：22 | 23264：11，23265：8， | medieval［1］－23190：21 | method［1］－23351：24 |
| 23257：3，23258：19， | Mail［1］－23170：12 | 23265：11，23270：12， | meet［5］－23168：7， | methods［1］－23354：6 |
| $23258: 22,23259: 6,$ | main [2] - 23184:12, | 23293:18, 23295:10, | 23185:22, 23187:6, | Meyer［3］－23132：11， |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23259: 9,23259: 18, \\ & 23260: 18,23260: 22, \end{aligned}$ | 23345:8 | 23297:25, 23299:6, | 23252：6，23307：6 | 23357：2，23357：17 |
| $23260: 25,232$ | $321$ | 23331：10，23345：10， | meeting［11］－ | Microphone［1］－ |
| 23261：6，23262：21， | 23216:9 | $23346: 1$ <br> matters | $23188: 17,23188: 2$ | $23246: 3$ |
| 23263：3，23263：7， | major［8］－23145：1 | $23276: 24,23282: 24,$ | $23206: 14,23207: 12$ | $23246: 4$ |
| 23264:7, 23267:18, <br> 23267．24，23269．9 | 23173：13，23174：10， | 23299：10，23299：20， | 23260：11，23260：15， | mid［5］－23139：4， |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23267:24, 23269:9, } \\ & \text { 23269:14, 23269:19, } \end{aligned}$ | 23182：4，23182：8， | $23301: 17,23331: 21$ | $23260: 19,23285: 1$ | $23206: 15,23243: 25$ |
| $23271: 13,23271: 20$ | 23196：2，23196：11， | Mclean［1］－23133：3 | 23322：25 | 23350：20，23352：9 |
| 23272:1, 23272:6, | maker［1］－23194： | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Md [1] - 23151:7 } \\ & \text { meal [1] - 23286:6 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { meetings [2]- } \\ & \text { 23188:10, } 23216: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { middle [2] - 23201:21, } \\ & \text { 23335:11 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23273:3, 23273:6, } \\ & \text { 23273:11, 23273:22, } \end{aligned}$ | maladaptive［2］－ 23206：6，23259：4 | mean［33］－23142：14， | Melnyk［1］－23313：20 | Might [2] - 23148:19, |
| $23274: 6,23274: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23206: 6,23259: 4 \\ & \text { male [1] - 23347:11 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23163: 21,23174: 14, \\ & 23204: 20,23205: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { member [1] - } 23153: 9 \\ & \text { members [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23148: 22 \\ & \text { might }[48]-23145: \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23274: 24,23275: 3, \\ & 23275: 10,23275: 12, \end{aligned}$ | malice［2］－23292：25 | 23212:25, 23217:5, | 23159:11 | $23145: 20,23149: 16$ |
| 23275：19，23275：22， | man［4］－23178：24 | $\begin{aligned} & 23274: 9,23279: 3 \\ & 23286: 16,23286: 22, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { memo }[3]-23160: 5 \\ 23160: 8,23243: 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23157: 3,23157: 22, \\ & 23164: 1.23168: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23275: 25,23276: 4, \\ & \text { 23276:8, 23276:14, } \end{aligned}$ | 23197:11, 23268:14, | $23286: 25,23290: 5,$ | memorandum［3］ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23164:1, 23168:1, } \\ & \text { 23185:21, 23189:11, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 23276:17, 23276:19, | $23284: 8$ <br> manage | 23291:11, 23292:9, | $\begin{aligned} & 23305: 9,23305: 18 \\ & 23344: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23201: 16,23202: 15 \\ & 23213: 13,23218: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| 23276：23，23277：7， | 23205:20 | $23297: 23,23298: 10,$ | memories［7］－ | $\begin{aligned} & 23213: 13,23218: 14, \\ & 23220: 18,23221: 17, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23277:10, 23277:21, } \\ & 23278: 1,23278: 12, \end{aligned}$ | management［1］ | 23303:4, 23303:17, | $23159: 3,23159: 5,$ | 23223:15, 23224:21, |
| 23278:16, 23278:23, | 23205：19 | 23303:22, 23312:6, | 23170：7，23170：8， | 23227:5, 23235:10, |
| 23279：7，23279：24， | Manager［1］－23132：4 <br> mandate［2］－23205．25， | $\begin{aligned} & 23312: 20,23313: 4 \\ & 23313: 6,23314: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23243:13, 23290:12, } \\ & \text { 23290:17 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23249: 12,23249: 13 \\ & 23254 \cdot 70 \\ & 23266: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23280: 15,23280: 18, \\ & 23281: 18,23282: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $23277: 25$ | $23327: 4,23330: 22$ | memory［15］－23147：2， | $23281: 18,23297: 18,$ |
| $23282: 3,23282: 8,$ | mandated［1］－23295：3 | $\begin{aligned} & 23332: 1,23338: 20 \\ & 23343 \cdot 11 \quad 23349 \cdot 11 \end{aligned}$ | 23147:6, 23154:17, | 23299:19, 23300:8, |
| 23282：17，23282：21， | $\text { 23198:10, } 23321: 21$ | meant［1］－ $23221: 6$ | $23155: 6,23155: 11$ | $23321: 4,23321: 10$ |
|  | $23322: 25$ | mechanic［1］－ | $23202: 6,23216: 22$ | $23321: 11,23332: 7,$ |
| 23296:12, 23296:24, | manipulative［1］－ | 23285：16 | 23220：2，23272：21， | 23332:24, 23336:15, |
| 23299:16, 23300:21, | 23177:13 | mechanism［3］－ | $\begin{aligned} & 23280: 3,23291: 12, \\ & \text { ग२30२•16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23336:23, 23336:24, } \\ & \text { ク2ア27.8 ク2アイフ.12 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $23301 \text { :7, } 23301 \text { :21, }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { manner [7]- 23273:21, } \\ & \text { 23288:24. 23293:12. } \end{aligned}$ | 23202:16, 23238:11, $23346: 4$ | Mental［2］－23183：1， | 23347:10, 23347:12, |
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| 23348:8, 23348:16, | 23300:15, 23301:13, | 23273:15, 23289:14, | months [7]-23182:25, | 23171:10, 23171:22, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23349:14, 23353:17, | 23301:19, 23302:9, | 23305:4, 23319:10, | 23239:15, 23260:1, | $23172: 17,23179: 1,$ |
| 23356:3 | 23303:3, 23303:12, | 23335:10 | $23300: 13,23300: 25$ | 23193:7, 23247:18, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { mike [2] - 23182:6 } \\ & \text { mile [1] - 23161:3 } \end{aligned}$ | 23303:23, 23306:3, <br> 23306:5, 23306:17, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { mindful }[1]-23240: 10 \\ & \text { minds }[1]-23198: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23320:13, 23322:2 } \\ & \text { mood [2] - 23150:12, } \end{aligned}$ | 23247:22, 23286:15 <br> murderer [1] - 23178:19 |
| miles [1] - 23161:3 | 23306:24, 23307:5, | mindset [1] - 23226:23 | 23150:20 | Murray [1] - 23148:24 |
| milestones [1] - | 23307:6, 23307:14, | mine [5] - 23163:17, | morality [1] - 23252:18 | Murray ${ }^{\text {s }}$ [1] - 23286:11 |
| 23196:2 | 23307:22, 23309:1, | 23196:25, 23213:22, | Moreover [1] | must [8]-23197:8, |
| Milgaard [159]- | 23309:18, 23310:12, | 23222:14, 23291:12 | 23314:10 | 23224:5, 23272:24, |
| 23131:4, 23133:2, | 23310:18, 23311:16, | minimal [1] - 23323:6 | Morin [1]-23135:18 | 23296:16, 23302:16, |
| 23133:3, 23135:11, | 23312:5, 23312:23, | minimize [3] - | morning [15] - 23135:3, | 23312:4, 23312:18, |
| 23135:18, 23136:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23313:17, 23313:25, } \\ & 23314: 12,23315: 20 \end{aligned}$ | 23193:16, 23304:6, | 23135:4, 23135:7, | 23313:19 |
| 23138:17, 23138:21, | 23316:19, 23317:9, | minimizes [1] | 23165:10, 23263:16, | N |
| 23141:8, $23141: 12$, | $\begin{aligned} & 23320: 8,23320: 24, \\ & 23321 \cdot 5 \\ & \hline 2321 \cdot 1 \cdot \end{aligned}$ | minimizing [1] - | 23290:15, 23292:13, |  |
| $23144: 4,23144: 21,$ | $23323: 5,23323: 13,$ | Minister [4]-23133:11, | $23320: 22,23345: 4$ | name [9]-23135:9, |
| 23145:7, 23145:16, | 23325:1, 23325:16, | 23320:4, 23320:11, | Most [1] - 23216:13 | 23135:13, 23165:24, |
| 23146:11, 23146:21, | 23327:1, 23327:25, | 23321:2 | most [15] - 23153:16, | 23165:25, 23172:19, |
| 23149:19, 23150:7, | 23328:11, 23329:18, | minus [1] - 23172:23 | 23153:18, 23188:7, | 23184:18, 23184:19, |
| 23150:8, 23154:10, 23157:10, 23158:6, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23331:12, 23331:15, } \\ & \text { 23332:24, 23333:12, } \end{aligned}$ | minute [1] - 23295:19 | 23203:9, 23205:18, | 23212:22, 23228:12 |
| 23158:18, 23158:23, | 23333:14, 23333:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { minutes [6]-23145:13, } \\ & \text { 23170:21, 23242:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23211: 1,23282: 9, \\ & 23292: 25,23295: 8 \end{aligned}$ | named [1] - 23243:20 narration [1] - 23230:3 |
| 23159:8, 23159:24, | 23334:1, 23335:22, | 23304:18, 23326:14, | 23295:19, 23305:11, | narrow [1] - 23292:12 |
| 23160:19, 23161:21, | 23335:25, 23337:14, | 23343:23 | 23308:15, 23313:2, | narrowed [1] |
| 23162:3, 23163:4, | 23346:14, 23346:15, <br> 23346.22, 23350.3 | minutia [1] - 23170:4 | 23318:22, 23340:4 | 23294:23 |
| 23169:3, 23169:15, | Milgaard's [39] | mirror [1] - 23354:17 misconduct [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { motel [5]-23276:25, } \\ & \text { 23277:2, 23313:18, } \end{aligned}$ | national [4] - 23185:6, |
| 23169:19, 23170:14, | 23135:25, 23137:9, | 23159:10 | 23313:21, 23313:24 | 23253:19, 23253:20 |
| $23171: 11,23171: 18,$ 23172:6, 23172:11. | 23141:21, 23142:11, 23149:9, 23153:2, | missed [4]-23145:25, | mother [2] - 23175:11, | natural [2]-23154:11, |
| 23172:18, 23173:3, | 23173:7, 23174:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23153:11, 23211:24, } \\ & 23212: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 23275:7 <br> motion [4] - 23287:2 | 23328:13 <br> nature $[8]$ - 23160:20 |
| 23173:11, 23174:3, | 23194:5, 23196:7, | misspoke [2] - | 23293:9, 23308:9, | $23223: 22,23245: 1,$ |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| ```23267:1, 23302:14, 23304:3, 23309:7, 23313:25, 23333:15, 23344:20 providing [1] - 23217:4 Province [1] - 23357:3 provisions [3] - 23340:21, 23341:2, 23341:7 psyche [1]-23229:15 psychiatric [3] - 23145:8, 23179:22, 23231:25 psychiatrist [2] - 23151:5, 23296:9 Psychiatrist [1] - 23179:21 psychiatrists [1] - 23228:4 psychological [8]- 23173:13, 23174:10, 23199:23, 23227:14, 23227:20, 23231:25, 23232:14, 23308:3 psychologically [2] - 23195:5, 23263:19 psychology [3] - 23182:9, 23182:11, 23182:21 psychopathic [2] - 23143:23, 23144:1 psychotic [2] - 23144:19, 23144:20 Ptsd [13]-23188:5, 23188:9, 23191:12, 23192:3, 23196:25, 23197:2, 23197:16, 23197:21, 23198:16, 23198:18, 23205:8, 23205:9, 23223:19 public [17]-23136:24, 23137:2, 23139:2, 23159:9, 23184:16, 23220:14, 23226:16, 23256:8, 23272:2, 23272:8, 23273:15, 23299:10, 23319:23, 23320:5, 23320:6, \(23321: 2,23323: 16\) publication [8] - 23256:6, 23256:10, 23256:16, 23256:19, 23257:5, 23259:7, 23259:10, 23347:18 publicity [2] - 23349:16, 23350:2 publicly [3] - 23159:17, 23267:23, 23302:10 published [3] - 23347:13, 23347:19,``` | $\qquad$ <br> Pull [1] - 23281:15 <br> pull [5]-23155:5, <br> 23168:17, 23240:7, <br> 23280:22, 23287:14 <br> punish [1] - 23297:2 <br> punished [1] - <br> 23292:19 <br> pure [1]-23292:21 <br> purely [1] - 23349:2 <br> purple [1]-23290:24 <br> purpose [7]-23144:13, <br> 23144:17, 23186:3, <br> 23276:12, 23286:19, <br> 23345:9, 23355:9 <br> purposes [6] - 23148:2, <br> 23148:9, 23317:16, <br> 23317:22, 23345:8, <br> 23348:18 <br> purse [1] - 23171:20 <br> pursue [1] - 23223:11 <br> pursuing [1] - 23223:22 <br> pushing...not [1] - <br> 23172:2 <br> pushings [1] - <br> 23172:14 <br> put [35]-23138:13, <br> 23140:7, 23140:16, <br> 23159:21, 23172:19, <br> 23187:15, 23193:2, <br> 23209:10, 23211:16, <br> 23213:2, 23238:5, <br> 23241:3, 23241:6, <br> 23243:24, 23249:23, <br> 23253:6, 23254:5, <br> 23254:13, 23264:15, <br> 23285:5, 23293:21, <br> 23297:7, 23298:9, <br> 23300:8, 23301:23, <br> 23301:25, 23302:1, <br> 23302:2, 23304:10, <br> 23327:9, 23329:17, <br> 23329:19, 23333:5, <br> 23334:21, 23335:23 <br> puts [2] - 23263:22, <br> 23309:15 <br> putting [2] - 23317:1, <br> 23351:5 <br> Q <br> Qb[1] - 23132:10 <br> Qc[4] - 23133:2, <br> 23133:6, 23133:8, <br> 23133:13 <br> quagmire [1] - <br> 23239:17 <br> qualifications [3] - <br> 23182:2, 23343:6, |  | ```23301:15, 23301:16, 23301:23, 23302:24, 23303:9, 23303:24, 23304:4, 23304:6, 23306:14, 23314:11, 23317:19, 23317:25, 23325:23, 23328:22, 23328:23, 23329:16, 23329:22, 23330:11, 23332:3, 23341:9, 23345:15, 23355:4 quick[1] - 23155:7 quickly [8] - 23175:7, 23189:20, 23264:18, 23274:14, 23294:4, 23294:8, 23294:12, 23325:21 quiet [2]-23166:23, 23176:6 quieted [1] - 23208:7 Quite[1] - 23305:21 quite [41] - 23147:19, 23148:11, 23148:15, 23156:19, 23166:22, 23175:4, 23176:5, 23185:25, 23186:15, 23187:2, 23189:16, 23191:1, 23193:3, 23194:2, 23194:3, 23202:2, 23211:14, 23214:8, 23218:19, 23223:23, 23240:21, 23240:25, 23256:7, 23257:8, 23261:20, 23263:17, 23263:22, 23268:3, 23268:17, 23276:7, 23284:8, 23288:6, 23292:1, 23295:9, 23306:13, 23306:23, 23318:25, 23322:8, 23333:15, 23342:12, 23349:16 quotation [2] - 23139:21, 23172:13 quote [6] - 23140:13, 23190:20, 23208:21, 23264:25, 23265:1, 23308:17 quoted [2] - 23337:22, 23339:9 quoting [1] - 23297:17``` <br> R <br> radioactive [1] - <br> 23352:1 <br> raise [4]-23220:18, 23281:8, 23318:16, 23320:20 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 23279:24, 23284:6, | 23221:1, 23228:17, | 23354:4, 23354:5, | responsible [1] - | 23250:3, 23254:15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23288:3, 23290:21, | 23230:24, 23231:18, | 23355:2, 23355:19, | 23172:12 | Roberts [1] - 23245:5 |
| 23290:23, 23296:8, | 23233:16, 23233:17, | 23355:23 | rest [3]-23156:2, | Rochelle[1] - 23133:9 |
| 23303:6, 23313:19, | 23249:11, 23265:2, | reside [1] - 23344:23 | 23178:6, 23249 :25 | Rockwood[1] - |
| 23328:24 | 23296:16, 23298:22, | resided [1] - 23344:24 | restless [1] - $23151: 20$ | 23170:23 |
| remembered [6] - | 23309:6, 23332:23, | residing [1] - 23325:17 | restrict [2]-23160:16, | Roger 1 ] - 23286:14 |
| 23270:22, 23272:24, | 23333:1, 23333:2, | residual [1] - 23353:21 | 23318:5 | role [10] - 23206:18, |
| 23283:11, 23283:25, | 23333:17 | resolved [1] - 23278:3 | result [9] - 23174:8, | 23207:4, 23224:10, |
| remembering | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reportedly [1] - } \\ & 23170: 24 \end{aligned}$ | respect [57]-23152:16, | $\begin{aligned} & 23198: 6,23234: 22, \\ & 23239: 4 . \\ & 23298: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23229: 11,23248: 16, \\ & 23248 \cdot 20 \\ & 23300: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| 23283:12 remembers | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reporter[2] - 23357:14, } \\ & \text { 23357:18 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23218: 2,23218: 15, \\ & 23218: 21,23218: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23306:18, 23310:19, } \\ & \text { ?2350. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23348: 5,23351: 14, \\ & 23356: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| remembers [1] $23285: 3$ | 23357:18 | 23218:21, 23218:24, | $23350 \text { :2 }$ | 23356:1 |
| remind [2] - 23288:14, | 23132:10, 23357:3 | $23223: 24,23224: 13,$ | results [8] - 23145:22, | Ron[10]-23169:6, |
| 23342:10 | reporters [1] - 23170:25 <br> Reporters [1] - 23357:1 | 23225:18, 23227:14, | 23189:22, 23239:20, | $23245: 5,23245: 24$ |
| remote [1] - 23337:7 |  | 23230:15, 23231:3, | $23352: 5,23355: 7,$ | 23283:18, 23285:3, |
| remove [3] - 23203:22, | 23142:17, 23159:20, | 23232:4, 23234:4, | 23355:16 | 23285:4, 23285:11, |
| 23203:23, 23234:16 | 23192:24, 23246:19, | 23235:11, 23236:12, | resumed [1] - 23169:2 | 23285:25 |
| Renaud[1] - 23286:14 | 23249:7, 23249:12, | 23240:15, 23248:10, | Resworn[1] - 23134:9 | Roris [2] - 23283:8, |
| $23189: 3$ |  | $23251: 21,23253: 2$ | resworn [1]-23243:2 | 23286:10 <br> room [28]-23172 |
| reopened [2] - | 23212:23, 23335:10 | 23272:10, 23301:17, | retired [2] - 23171:8, | 23194:18, 23233:10, |
| 23302:18, 23302:19 | represented [2] - | 23305:23, 23305:24, | 23243:20 | 23246:5, 23246:7, |
| reopening [3]- | 23149:23, 23149:24 | 23305:25, 23307:9, | Retired[1] - 23133:15 | 23246:9, 23249:10, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23302:5, } 23302: 6, \\ & 23302: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $23236: 5,23314: 5$ | $23308: 8,23308: 25$ | returned [4] - 23168:25, 23169.15, 23216.24 | $23252: 10,23252: 15$ |
| repeat [3]-23137:10, | represents [2] | $23311: 14,23312: 16,$ | 23242:25 | 23252:16, 23252:22, |
| 23145:24, 23160:18 repeated [3] - 23162:6, | 23229:4, $23335: 21$ <br> repressed [1] - | 23313:20, 23313:24, | returning [1] - 23193:24 review [4]-23143:15, | 23253:7, 23253:13, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23331:10, } 23354: 18 \\ & \text { repeatedly [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23239:17 } \\ & \text { request [15] - 23217:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23318:6, 23318:8, } \\ & 23321: 21,23323: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23170: 17,23215: 10, \\ & 23220: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23254: 6,23254: 14, \\ & 23254: 15,23288: 7, \end{aligned}$ |
| 23176:13, 23333:1 | 23218:10, 23218:25, | 23323:22, 23324:23, | reviewed [4] | 23312:24, 23313:1, |
| repeating [1] - | 23222:9, 23225:2 | 23334:16, 23342:18, | 23227:13, 23265:25, | 23313:18, 23313:21, |
| 23169:18 | 23225:12, 23225:14, | 23343:2, 23344:5, | 23289:22, 23333:13 | 23313:24, 23323:8, |
| Repetitive[1] - | 23265:16, 23266:1, | 23345:13, 23346:8, | reviewing [1] - | 23339:17 |
| $23201: 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23266: 4,23266: 15, \\ & 23266: 16,23316: 12 \end{aligned}$ | respectful [4] - | $23266: 18$ | roots [1] - 23205:21 <br> rose [1] - 23301:25 |
| replication [1] | 23322:12, 23333:21 | $23306: 19,23307: 15$ | revisions [1] - 23326:7 | rote [1] - 23156:14 |
| Reply 1 ] - 23337:19 report [54]-23136:11, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { requested }[6] \text { - } \\ & \text { 23218:7, } 23225: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23311: 1,23317: 13 \\ \text { respectfully [2] - } \end{gathered}$ | Richard[1] - 23212:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rough [2]-23277:19, } \\ & 23279: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23136: 13,23136: 16, \\ & 23136: 20.23137: 4 . \end{aligned}$ | $23265: 21,23266: 13$ | respective [1] - | 23167:11 | roughly [1] - 23193:6 <br> Roy3]-23192:15, |
| 23138:6, 23139:20, | requests [2] | 23149:22 | rightfully [1] - 23226:18 | 23228:6, $23228: 7$ |
| 23140:6, 23140:16, | $23224: 21,23224: 23$ | respects [1] - 23316:11 respondents [2]- | $\text { Rightly[1] - } 23291: 2$ | Rpri4] - 23132:11, 23357.2, 23357:16, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23141: 1,23141: 18 \\ & 23142 \cdot 123143 \cdot 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { require }[3]-23177: 7 \\ & 23268: 7,23302: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $23314: 15,23314: 19$ | rise [2] - 23159:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23357:2, 23357:16, } \\ & 23357: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23160: 24,23161: 18, \\ & 23166: 4.23183: 13 \end{aligned}$ | required [2]-23324:14, 23350:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { responding [1] - } \\ & 23160: 20 \end{aligned}$ | risen [1] - 23226:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { run [2]-23165:1, } \\ & \text { 23199:18 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 23187:15, 23187:17, | requirement [1] - | responds [1] - 23136:3 response [9]- | $\begin{gathered} \text { risk [11] - 23186:7, } \\ \text { 23186:11, 23292:2, } \end{gathered}$ | rung [1] - 23178:18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23187:18, 23188:2, } \\ & \text { 23188:4. 23189:24 } \end{aligned}$ | $23254: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { response [9]- } \\ & \text { 23152:25, } 23164: 20 \end{aligned}$ | 23315:19, 23317:1, | running [7]-23188:13, 23198.19, 23198.23 |
| $23191 \text { :6, } 23192: 6,$ | requires [1] - 23205:9 | 23165:1, 23172:20, | $23317: 9,23317: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23198:19, 23198:23, } \\ & \text { 23203:22, 23240:6, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 23192:13, 23193:3, | research [17] | 23199:16, 23199:24, | $23317: 21$ | 23249:24 |
| $23196: 19,23200: 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23348: 13,23348: 19, \\ & 23348: 22,23348: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23238:20, 23267:7, } \\ & \text { 23313:12 } \end{aligned}$ | road [2] - 23186:18, | rural [1] - 23190:18 |
| 23214:15, 23214:16, | $23348: 25,23349: 2$ | responses [1] | robbery [1] - 23171:12 | S |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23219: 20,23219: 25, \\ & 23220: 4,23220: 7, \\ & 23220: 11,23220: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23349: 11,23349: 12, \\ & 23349: 24,23350: 8, \\ & 23352: 6,23353: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23262: 4 \\ & \text { responsibility [2] - } \\ & \text { 23233:11, 23304:8 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Roberts[7] - 23149:20, } \\ & \text { 23245:11, 23245:24, } \\ & 23247: 8,23249: 20, \end{aligned}$ | safe [3] - 23156:6, |


|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23196:20, 23281:20 } \\ & \text { screening [1] - } \\ & \text { 23208:16 } \\ & \text { scribbler }[3]-23281: 4, \\ & \text { 23281:6, 23281:11 } \\ & \text { scroll }[7]-23190: 11, \\ & \text { 23280:9, 23282:15, } \\ & \text { 23283:1, 23283:16, } \\ & \text { 23284:2, 23289:22 } \\ & \text { scuba [1] - 23161:22 } \\ & \text { se [1]-23228:24 } \\ & \text { search }[4]-23142: 10, \\ & 23142: 14,23142: 19, \\ & 23145: 21 \\ & \text { searching }[1]- \\ & \text { 23136:22 } \\ & \text { Seawall }[1]-23184: 14 \\ & \text { Second }[1]-23144: 1 \\ & \text { second }[11]-23179: 19, \\ & 23195: 10,23209: 13, \\ & 23210: 5,23214: 16, \\ & 23258: 20,23263: 10, \\ & 23266: 8,23307: 19, \\ & 23330: 21,23339: 9 \\ & \text { Secondly }[4]- \\ & 23302: 13,23302: 23, \\ & 23303: 8,23338: 11 \\ & \text { secondly }[2]- \\ & 23256: 12,23281: 9 \\ & \text { secretly }[2]-23244: 13, \\ & 23251: 11 \\ & \text { section }[1]-23183: 16 \\ & \text { secure }[3]-23188: 6, \\ & 23209: 23,23252: 10 \\ & \text { Security }[1]-23132: 12 \\ & \text { see }[73]-23135: 23, \\ & 23136: 3,23136: 5, \\ & 23137: 6,23138: 2, \\ & 23138: 14,23139: 7, \\ & 23139: 20,23140: 19, \\ & 23142: 24,23144: 7, \\ & 23145: 20,23149: 18, \\ & 23149: 22,23150: 5, \\ & 23150: 24,23159: 23, \\ & 23160: 3,23160: 19, \\ & 23161: 1,23164: 17, \\ & 23170: 2,23174: 14, \\ & 23177: 25,23183: 11, \\ & 23183: 25,23185: 12, \\ & 23185: 15,23186: 24, \\ & 23200: 11,23200: 15, \\ & 23206: 18,23208: 1, \\ & 23210: 10,23212: 12, \\ & 23222: 8,23224: 17, \\ & 23225: 13,23230: 24, \\ & 23233: 19,23234: 14, \\ & 23338: 13,23242: 2, \\ & 23245: 19,23247: 2, \\ & 23247: 4,23248: 5, \\ & 23252: 21,23274: 13, \end{aligned}$ |  |  | ```share [2] - 23304:5, 23318:10 shared [1] - 23308:16 Sharon [4]-23286:4, 23313:13, 23338:15, 23338:21 Sheraton [1] - 23245:6 shirt [1] - 23186:19 shops [2] - 23214:24, 23216:17 short [4]-23194:16, 23246:22, 23323:1, 23335:13 Short [1] - 23149:21 shorthand [1] - 23357:5 shortly [1] - 23253:12 Shorty [5] - 23285:15, 23285:17, 23285:18, 23285:23, 23286:9 Shorty's [1] - 23285:19 shot [1] - 23290:7 show [4]-23202:14, 23288:5, 23352:7, 23353:11 showed [1] - 23298:22 showing [3] - 23170:14, 23200:20, 23327:6 shown [1] - 23288:4 shows [1] - 23178:11 \(\mathbf{S i}[1]\) - 23149:25 sic [3] - 23141:15, 23183:14, 23214:22 side [4]-23236:10, 23284:24, 23285:8, 23289:4 \(\boldsymbol{\operatorname { s i g n }}[2]\) - 23250:17, 23250:19 significance [2] - 23213:18, 23213:23 significant [13] - 23138:20, 23143:7, 23160:25, 23161:10, 23170:9, 23174:17, 23178:21, 23223:23, 23226:2, 23229:11, 23263:18, 23327:23, 23328:11 significantly [3] - 23274:4, 23307:2, 23320:25 signs [2] - 23170:14, 23230:20 similar [4] - 23136:4, 23145:16, 23163:18, 23166:14 simple [3]-23180:12, 23205:7, 23354:14 simply [23]-23149:3, 23167:23, 23176:3, 23184:24, 23185:19,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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