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## Transcript of Proceedings

(Reconvened at 9:05 a.m.)
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Good morning. ALL COUNSEL: Good morning.

MR. HODSON: The next witness,
Mr. Commissioner, is The Honourable Calvin Tallis and I would ask Mr. Tallis to come up to the witness stand, please.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Good morning, Justice Tallis.

## CALVIN FORRESTER TALLIS, Sworn:

```
BY MR. HODSON:
```

$Q$
Good morning, Mr. Tallis. Thank you for agreeing to testify before this Commission of Inquiry. For the record, we know that Mr. Tallis is a party with standing, granted standing in March of 2005 and he is represented by counsel, Alex Pringle and Marshall Hopkins.

And, Mr. Tallis, you were David Milgaard's defence counsel during his original trial and appeal to the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal; is that correct?

A $Q$ of age; is that correct?

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$ Q

I would like to just quickly go through a curriculum vitae that we prepared based on information you provided to us, and the document number is 335413 , and just for the record, this is a document that the Commission prepared based on information we gathered both from our sources and from yours and $I$ think we've had a chance to review this with you. I just want to go through a bit of your background here.

I think 1954, graduated from the
University of Saskatchewan with a combined degree in arts and law, articled with the law firm of Goldenberg \& Taylor and was admitted in 1955; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q
And then 1967 is approximate, received the Queen's Counsel designation, and then admitted to the Law Societies of British Columbia and Northwest Territories in approximately 1973 and 1975; is that correct?

Yes. I haven't checked the precise dates, but those are certainly in the ballpark.

And in 1969, 197 -- let's say 1970, at the time of
Mr. Milgaard's trial, you would have been a practicing lawyer for approximately 15 years; is that correct?

Yes.
Approximately?
Yes.
15 or 16 years. And then 1976 you were appointed to the Supreme Court of the Northwest Territories which also included an appointment to the Supreme

Court of the Yukon Territory and the Courts of
Appeal for the Northwest Territories and the Yukon
Territory; is that correct?
That's correct.
And then 1981 you were appointed to the court of
Appeal of Saskatchewan and continued as a member of the Court of Appeal of the Northwest

Territories and Deputy Justice of the Supreme Courts of the Northwest Territories and Yukon; is that correct?

A

Q

A

A
$Q$

Q

A
$Q$
-

And would that have been back in 1970, do you recall if at that time you were doing any lecturing?

A

Q

A

Q
A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Certainly at various times at the Bar Admission or related seminars or lectures $I$ certainly was involved in that type of work, but just let me make this point, I was one of many. I don't want

Did any of your lecturing either at the College of Law or the Bar Admission Course involve criminal law?
to leave the impression that $I$ was the only one that was involved in this because there were many of the lawyers here in Saskatoon and indeed in other parts of the province that were involved. The third point, I understand that you were a Saskatchewan delegate to the Uniform Law Conference of Canada; is that correct?

Yes, for several years, and I can't tell you the exact number of years, but $I$ remember Mr. J.G. McIntyre, Q.C. and $I$ were $I$ think the delegates from the private bar, if $I$ might use that, in contradistinction to delegates that came from various branches of government.

And again, that would obviously be then prior to 1976; is that correct?

Yes, a number of years prior to '76.
Would it -- again if we use 1970, the time of Mr. Milgaard's trial, would you have been involved in the Uniform Law Conference of Canada at that time?
recall it at that specific time.

Q
I see.
A
$Q$
I think it may well have been before that.
And what work were you doing for the Law Conference?

A
Well, the Uniform Law Conference at that time was dealing, was considering amendments both on the civil side and the criminal side in the context of uniform legislation across the country with respect to provincial statutes, but of course with respect to the criminal law, we had a national Criminal Code as we do now, so it was being approached on a national basis.

And the last item, as $I$ understand it you were a faculty member of the Federation of Law Societies of Canada, Criminal Law Program; is that correct? That's correct.

And can you tell us a bit about that, please? Well, I started out many years ago as a participant; in other words, as a registrant, and then as time went by $I$ was asked to participate as a member of the faculty and $I$ was involved in that for $I$ think about 25 years. The reason $I$ know that is that in 1998 a group of us were given watches that marked the occasion of our service and $I$ happened to have a look at the back of the watch and that's what told me it was in 1998.

So 1973 would have been approximately when you started your association as a faculty member; is that correct?

Somewhere in that neighbourhood, yes.
And what, can you tell us as a faculty member, and again relating to the Criminal Law Program, what did that entail?

Well, it involved each year, and $I$ think many of you have probably seen the volumes that are given to registrants, but it involved consideration of many topics. For example, one year it might focus on evidence, another year it might focus on substantive criminal law and then another year it might focus on the Charter and proceedings related to the Charter and then probably criminal procedure as such in contradistinction to substantive criminal law.

And did you then teach -- I understand that lawyers would attend this on an annual basis, is that correct, lawyers from across Canada?

Yes. The emphasis, $I$ think, was on participation, there were workshops after the panel presentations and so on, and $I$ was involved in that sometimes as a moderator, sometimes as a -- as one who was presenting a paper and various things like that. I don't want to bore you with unnecessary details, but --

And, but it would relate to criminal law matters,
then?

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A

2
,

That was exclusive to the criminal law. And, during my time, Mr. Justice David Watt really was the director of the program with, you know, able assistance from many other people, but he was very heavily involved in it and --

And how many people for example from Saskatchewan,
then, on the faculty were there?
Umm, --
How many would be on the faculty from -- on a year-to-year basis?

I think my recollection is that there were two for most of the years that $I$ was involved. I remember Mr. Kujawa was one of the members and then more recently, after $I$ stepped down as a delegate, as a member from Saskatchewan, Mr. Michael Tochor -Yes.
-- became a member of the faculty, and Mr. Murray Brown became a member of the faculty. Now $I$ hope I haven't missed anybody --

No, that's fine.
-- because there may well have been one or two others in there.

I have a number of areas that $I$ intend to cover with you, Mr. Tallis, relating to your
representation of Mr. Milgaard at the trial. One of the Terms of Reference of this Commission of Inquiry is to inquire into the conduct of the criminal proceedings, and like most witnesses I will try and do it in somewhat of a chronological order, focusing on those areas that are important to the Commission, but $I$ have prepared an outline of where I intend to go with you. If I could call up 335414. And maybe, just for the benefit of the Commissioner and counsel and for the parties and for you, Mr. Tallis, I'll just quickly go through an outline of where $I$ intend to go, and when $I$ intend to go there, so we can get an idea of what we're going to cover.

And, again, the first part, we've already covered the curriculum vitae, but I want to go through some experience, your experience, Legal Aid, what would have been in your file, what you did after the trial as far as reviewing documents. Then $I$ intend to go on to your engagement to defend Mr. Milgaard, and I've prepared a chronology of events that hopefully will assist us in that. Then $I$ want to spend some time about -- on your meetings with Mr. Milgaard -- go to the next page -- and we'll go through in
detail what your recollection is of what Mr. Milgaard advised you of. We'll go through some of his statements to the police, the scribbler, Mr. Milgaard's evidence at the Supreme Court, we'll go through your assessment at the time of various matters relating to David Milgaard. The document also sets out some of the documents.

Then I will turn to your
dealings with the Crown -- the next page -- the disclosure standards and what was actually received we'll go through. We'll then talk about your preparation for the trial and various items there.

Then, when we get to the preliminary inquiry and trial, what $I$ propose to do is rather than go through the preliminary hearing and then go through the trial, $I$ propose to do it together, and by way of the key witnesses, and so we'll touch on what your view was of the most damaging evidence at the time, then we'll go through Mr. Cadrain, Ron Wilson, Nichol John. And what $I$ propose to do is to go through the preliminary hearing and trial and just touch on key parts, and how you approached these witnesses and cross-examined them, and what
information you had at the time and what you were trying to achieve with these witnesses.

The next page is the motel
reenactment. We'll then go through physical
evidence -- the next page -- and I'm afraid we're going to spend a bit more time on the blood-secretor issue which we've heard some evidence about. Then, if we can just scroll down, there is a few other witnesses that -- Art

Roberts, Shirley Wilson, Marie Indyk, and there actually may be a few other witnesses that $I$ will go through with you, and then as well some of the evidence of the other witnesses on points that related to your defence. Then I propose to go through with you in some detail what factors went into both your advice to Mr. Milgaard regarding his decision not to testify, or to testify, and that decision itself. And then, as well, I'll finish up with some questions relating to your observations at the trial.

We'll then go to the appeal and
spend a little bit of time on that. And at this point what $I$ propose to do, Mr. Tallis, is, at least for the first part, focus on what you did at the trial with what you had at the time, so in
other words we will identify what information you had and what you did. I then propose to go through some information that we now have that you, I believe, weren't aware of at the time or may not have been aware of at the time, and we will canvass with you what you might have done had you known of that information. I think I'm over-simplifying it, but that, that's generally the subject area.

Then, the next page, we'll talk a bit about Mr. Fisher's confessions and convictions in October of 1970 and what might have happened there.

Then we'll move into
post-conviction issues and your contact with subsequent counsel for Mr. Milgaard, the Supreme Court reference, RCMP, and then $I$ will touch on some post-conviction commentary that has been made with respect to Mr. Milgaard's defence at trial. And then, finally, just a short bit about the media and miscellaneous. So that's hopefully where $I$ intend to go, sir, over the next few days. If we can start with back in

June of 1969 , it's my understanding that that's when you would have been retained to represent Mr.

Milgaard, is that right?

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
specific number on it, I couldn't. But I think it's fair to say that, like a number of the lawyers in the city here, I'd done a fair amount of work in the field of criminal law as well as on the civil side.

Okay. Just as far as -- I understand as well, sir, that you did some prosecution work?

Oh yes, I had done prosecutions, from time to time I was instructed to handle cases of that nature. It's my understanding, and $I$ think we heard this evidence perhaps from Mr. Caldwell, that at that time certain rural areas had private lawyers that acted as prosecutors from time to time, and is that correct?

That's correct.
And I think he said you may have had the Humboldt area; is that correct?

A
And so you would then -- for example, did you prosecute any murder cases?

Near the very, near the end of my legal career I -- Humboldt was an area, it was, I would call it a very law-abiding area, and in all the times that $I$ can recall it -- and bear in mind that my wife's family comes from that general area -- there was
one case.
Of murder?
Of murder. And that was near the end of my career, --

This --
-- not too far anyway, and I remember it because
Mr. Halyk was counsel for the defence and he was
appointed under the Legal Aid scheme, he was brought in as senior counsel on the matter.

And so again, as far as prosecuting, what other types of case then? Let's just go back to 1970.

At the time of Mr. Milgaard's trial had you prosecuted other serious criminal cases, then, prior to that time?

Well, before that $I$ had been instructed and brought in by the Crown prosecutor at that time in Prince Albert, $I$ couldn't tell you what year, but there was a murder case in the penitentiary and I was asked to handle that and I did assist, and actually led for the prosecution, along with the late Mr. Gordon Kirkby.

And that would be prior to 1970?
I'm quite sure it was.
And then, again, as far as -- let's just go back to your criminal defence work. Prior to 1970
would it be more than 10 cases, serious criminal cases you would have defended, 20, 30; are you able to give us some range?

A

Q
A

Oh, as I said, I couldn't give you the number. But over the years it would be more than that, because I had started doing criminal work, although not of the heavy nature, even during my articling year.

So in 1955 you started criminal work?
Yes. And, as $I$ say, even in those years, even when we were articling, there was sort of an informal arrangement that articling law clerks were permitted to appear before the Provincial Courts -- or then they were called Magistrate's Courts -- even on matters that probably technically required the services of an admitted lawyer. But that was something, and that's how many people started with their interest in Legal Aid, because there was not a Legal Aid Plan in existence at that time other than an ad hoc sort of a plan that had been set up by the local bar and with the blessing of the courts.

And can you tell us about, again prior to 1970, had you appeared before juries or conducted jury trials?

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
A

Q

A
$Q$
A

Oh, I'd been in front of juries many times.
And so --
I couldn't give you a number, but $I$ think it's
fair to say -- and I've tried to reflect on
this -- I think I had appeared in front of every
Queen's Bench judge that was sitting on the Bench at that time, and some of those cases would have been non-jury, but many of them would have been jury cases.

So would it be fair to say that, at the time you conducted David Milgaard's trial, that you had been involved in numerous murder jury trials?

Could you give us a --
I couldn't give you a number now, but once again $I$ want to emphasize there were other lawyers who also had done extensive work --

Yes.
-- in this area, so $I$ don't want to misrepresent my role in the local bar.

Q

A

Q
A

-- assists me, but by that time $I$ know that there was a Legal Aid Plan operating and that the secretary was Mr. Heidgerken, who was the Local Registrar of the Court of Queen's Bench, and my recollection is that the assessment of eligibility for Legal Aid was passed upon by a committee. I don't recall how the committee was formed or created, $I$ don't think there was a statutory basis for it but there may well have been something under regulate -- government regulations, but on that committee $I$ know that members of the private bar who were involved, and I think probably members of the prosecution bar, and as $I$ recall it the members of the committee would vette the applicant in terms of eligibility.

And that had developed from what
I will call the ad hoc arrangement that existed
earlier, and under that arrangement -- and that's what was in place in 1955 -- members of the local bar were asked to put their name on the list and they sort of rotated in terms of phone calls, but in case of more serious offences I think they would go to the more experienced members on the panel, if $I$ may use that term.

For example, in 1955, I don't think $I$ would have been asked would I take a murder case.
$Q$

A
Okay. So --
Umm, people like James Wedge, Q.C. or D.E. Gauley, Q.C., or people like that would have been on it, and $I$ just mention their names to illustrate and not to exclude anybody. But gradually the need to have a more substantial plan evolved, because under that ad hoc plan there was no funding, it was just done -- handled by the local bar, and each office was expected to do its bit, if $I$-you may use that term.

In 19 --
Now I don't know whether I've been --
In 1969 then --
I don't know whether I'm being too long-winded about this, or not, --

Q No.
$A \quad--\quad b u t$ you tell me if $I$ am.
Q

A limited, but at least it was a start.

And of course $I$-- since you are
asking me, if you want it dealt with a bit more comprehensively, even before this funded plan came in there was also a system where, if the judge said "this man needs counsel" and you were sitting in the courtroom, he would probably look down and say "Mr. so and so, I'd like to appoint you to defend this man, will you accept the
appointment?", and the tradition was counsel, I never heard them say "no".

Okay. If we can go back then to, again, 1969-1970; were you a proponent of Legal Aid? Very much so.

And were you involved in the promotion and advancement of Legal Aid and the Legal Aid program?

A
I believe I was. I can remember that when the creation of a more elaborate plan was being
considered $I$ was interviewed by I think it was Mr. Roger Carter, Q.C. and someone else as far as, you know, what $I$ thought should be included in the Legal Aid Plan and various other things. I don't remember all the details of it --
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
Q
A Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv
I was representing an accused, it was a co-accused, and that co-accused was represented by

Mr. Wedge.
Would the fact that you are being retained and either funded or not funded through Legal Aid have any influence on the manner in which you, as counsel, would put forward a defence on the - on behalf of your client?

No. I always took the position that when you undertook a defence you undertook a committed defence regardless of the station in life of an accused person. I felt that anybody charged deserved as good a defence as I could give them and $I$ didn't, in any way, feel that any other approach was justified. And I think I should say this, in my view, was the culture of the bar here in Saskatoon, one that had been passed along to me.

Would there have been any limits at that time, monetary limits or limits on what you could or couldn't do in the defence of Mr. Milgaard, imposed by the Legal Aid Plan? And what I am getting at is was there things that you could have done or would have done but for the fact that the Legal Aid Plan somehow limited you?

A
Well I suppose that when you come to the issue of whether -- you know, getting experts, they had to
be approved. But of course most of us that were involved in the criminal law, you know, had a network of friends in other professions or access to people who -- and $I$ know in my case some of them, even though they weren't lawyers, were committed.

Q

I --
$Q$
A
$Q$
Okay.
I should just say this; that whenever I was appointed under the Legal Aid Plan and even before with respect to a case, and particularly one, a serious case, $I$ did not fob off the responsibility to juniors. I may have had them in with me, but $I$ did the work myself, and --

And we'll talk a bit more about that, because there was a gentleman by the name of Ian Disbery --

A Yes.
Q


A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

元
-- who was either an articling student or first-year lawyer that attended the trial with you?

Yes.
And I think we'll see some correspondence where you sought funding from the Legal Aid plan for him, and they refused, and so you, your firm, provided Mr. Disbery at no cost at the time; is that correct?

That's correct.

And we'll see some documents a bit later about that.

Yes, yes.
And, again, I'll come back to that, Mr. Tallis.
Thank you.
About what role Mr. Disbery may have played. If we can just talk generally about practices at the time, in 1969 and 1970, and private investigators;
were private -- were there private investigators at that time and did defence counsel use private investigators in criminal matters?

I don't recall there being private investigators available at that time.

And I'll touch on this more specifically with
respect to the David Milgaard case --

A

Q
respect to the David Milgaard case
Yes.
-- and ask you what specifically you did. Did you
and other defence counsel, then, have other sources to gather information, intelligence, etcetera?

Yes, that's what you developed through the years. And then if we can go back to again just general practices at the time. What was the use of experts, and in particular forensic and medical experts, to assist in criminal defence? Was that prevalent at the time?

Well, you know, from my personal perspective and also from what $I$ observed, regardless of whether there was funding available or not, I had no difficulty in getting medical opinions or doctors who would direct me to other sources that were helpful, and $I$ can think of one particular doctor that $I$ often went to because he was very committed in this area and would always take the time to go over things with me and indicate to whom $I$ might go, people that he knew even outside of the province.

And would there be cases then, sir, where you might call an expert witness on a particular issue
in the defence of a matter?
A
Yes. Psychiatrists were available and called from time to time.

I would like to now turn to your file, or your lack of file.

Yes.
And you mentioned this, and $I$ want to just start off with maybe having you tell us, based on your memory, and there's some documents I'll show you a bit later, but if you could try and reconstruct for us and tell us what would have been on your physical file at the time, and maybe just walk us through what would have been there, and I'm going to take you later to what we now have, but can you just generally tell us how you would have organized the physical documents and what would have been there?

A
$Q$
Are you thinking of at the end of the day or as the case progressed?

Q Either way is fine, whatever is easiest to explain.

A
Well, $I$ can just explain it in general terms to you. Fairly early in my career $I$ developed what $I$ would call a defence counsel's check list. Now, I've looked to see whether I still had a copy of
it, but $I$ haven't been able to find it, but later that came into pretty common use, but then $I$ would of course set up a file and $I$ had the practice of taking very copious notes in my own handwriting. I wasn't able to do it in shorthand because I didn't have shorthand, but then $I$ would, from those notes, usually dictate a memo and put it in the file, and I did that because if you dictate it from your notes, you get it typed up in very legible form and usually flesh it out a bit better than if you go back and try to read your notes, so that was -- and that of course would be a continuing process as something came up. Now, I'm not saying that $I$ dictated the memo exactly, you know, the same day or something like that, but often the same day.

So, for example, and we'll see a bit later that you had a number of meetings with Mr. Milgaard and I think three one-day meetings, or part of a day meetings when he was in Prince Albert; is that correct?

A Yes. Now --
$Q \quad$ Or --
A I'm able to say that because you were able to dig up some documents.

Q
A

Yeah, and I'll take you to those a bit later. Okay.

But, for example, just generally, your meetings with David Milgaard, would you have taken copious notes then of those?

Extensive handwritten notes.
And then what would you do with the notes?
Then $I$ would have them typed up for my file because $I$ always found at trial, or even at a preliminary hearing, it was much easier to refer to typewritten notes or memoranda than it was to go back to your handwriting. It was a much more disciplined process in my view.

So with respect to your discussions with Mr. Milgaard, would you have had on your file a number of pages of notes or memos or can you give us some idea of what might have been on there at the time? They would have been quite extensive because just to illustrate, $I$ know that very early in the going, now this would be before the preliminary hearing, and particularly at Prince Albert the first time $I$ visited him, maybe even before -I'm sorry, maybe just -- I'm not sure if our sound is -- maybe if you can just --

Oh, okay.

Q Yeah, that's fine.
A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q ould be built up.

And I'll take you through a bit later this morning specifically what you recall Mr. Milgaard telling you about the events of January 30 and 31 , but would that have been captured in your notes and memorandums?

A Oh, yes.
Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

A

Q
A

Q

What about -- and we'll -- your thoughts about other witnesses or strategies, things like that, would you have memorandums regarding that?

I'm quite sure I did.
Would you describe yourself as, or your practice at the time, did you produce a significant number of, if $I$ can call them, internal memorandums with you writing down your thoughts, observations, opinions, things of that nature?

Yes, that was my practice.
And so on -- and again $I$ hate to do this to you, but as far as a number, can you give us some general idea, are we talking 10, 50 memorandums that might have been on this file, 100?

I would say that by the time $I$ was getting ready for trial, there was probably well in excess of 50. Now, some of them would be very short.

Yes.
Some of them would be two or three pages and built up, and I'll explain to you later when you get into it what use $I$ would have made of those in preparing for the trial.

Can you tell us then on your file, what would have been there as far as your trial brief, if $I$ can
call it that?
A
Well, in this case $I$ prepared a brief for the preliminary hearing to begin with and the purpose of that was to develop questions that should be put based on the information that $I$ had obtained, and here $I$ think I'm thinking particularly of the, in terms of detail, the questions that $I$ put to Mr. Paynter and, to a lesser extent, to Dr. Emson. Okay, if $I$ can just pause there. Would that be related to the frozen semen and the secretor issue?

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A

And that was part of the preparation that $I$ undertook at that stage.

Would you have memorandums that would have set out your thoughts and defence strategy on how to deal with that issue?

I would say potential strategy, yes.
Okay.
Strategy for the preliminary hearing and, quite possibly, leading to similar or perhaps other strategy for trial.

And we'll touch on this in detail a bit later, but the secretor issue and the frozen semen, was that a matter that you, did you think that helped or hurt David Milgaard's defence at the time you were preparing for the preliminary hearing?

Well, at that time $I$ was certainly leaning to the view, depending on how it came out, that it would be of assistance to his defence.

And did it end up happening, the evidence coming out in that regard?

Yes, I would say so.
Okay. And again, we'll deal with that in a bit more detail.

Yes.
As far as legal research, what would have been on
your file as far as legal briefing?
A
Well, $I$ know that this was a continuing process as well. If during the course of my reading and work I spotted something that I thought would have been of value, $I$ would have made a memo to put in the file. Suppose, for example, a case came out that I thought might bear on certain issues, or $I$ spotted it, but $I$ did prepare an extensive brief for trial, that is, a brief of law we're talking now, that drew upon the work $I$ had done and $I$ tried to identify in my mind the points that $I$ thought that would possibly come up and which called for argument in front of the judge, and you have invited me to read over some of the trial transcript --

Yes.
-- and I noticed that some of those points are there and were argued. I can't tell you all the points that $I$ had in the brief because you sometimes think of things that may come up that didn't necessarily arise. I tried to anticipate them and have a disciplined brief of law that covered points not only of substantive law, but more important in this case points dealing with issues of evidence, because that was -- for
example, $I$ do remember the issue of bad, of bad driving after leaving Saskatoon being raised along with some other things, presumably with the idea that it would be led by the Crown to establish consciousness of guilt.

Yes.
Well, that was the type of thing that $I$ had briefed in advance so that when the point came up, I could address it, and secondly, the practice was often, depending on the individual judge, but it wasn't uncommon for the judge to indicate through the registrar in advance that if counsel have cases that they are going to raise with respect to any issues or arguments, let me have the names of the cases and the citations, so there was a twofold purpose. You could make the citations available in advance if you were asked for it. And if $I$ might just, and we'll see this a bit later in the transcript when we go through it, but I think some of the points, one was unsavoury witnesses?

Yes.
Q
And $I$ can't recall which specific witnesses that related to, that was an issue that was dealt with. Was that one that was briefed do you think?

A
$Q$
And what -- we'll talk about that a bit later, but
as $I$ understand it, that would be that through
either, through your cross-examination of a
witness or if Mr. Milgaard testified and put his
character in issue as a person not of the type to
have committed an offence like this, that that

And what about the issue of leading evidence of bad character, was that something --

Oh, that was something that was very much on my mind because of the risks of opening the door. And what -- we'll talk about that a bit later, but as I understand it, that would be that through either, through your cross-examination of a witness or if Mr. Milgaard testified and put his character in issue as a person not of the type to have committed an offence like this, that that
would allow evidence of character to come in from the Crown; is that -- have I summarized that correctly?

There's the potential for that, and also early in the going I didn't know whether or not the prosecution were going to try to lead it as part of their case, I didn't think there was any legal basis for it, but $I$ was very conscious of the need to be ready to challenge the admissibility of, what we'll call bad character evidence, if an attempt was made to put it in as part of the Crown's case.

If we can then go ahead then to trial, and I'll have some documents that I'll show you in a moment, can you tell us what, what would have been in your trial brief or your binder as far as how you prepared for each of the witnesses that was going to testify?

My practice was to prepare a draft
cross-examination for each witness and -- I don't know how much detail you want here.

No, please tell us.
All right. I took each witness and I prepared a draft cross-examination of them based on the preliminary hearing evidence and any other
relevant materials $I$ had in my file, so the way $I$ did it was first of all $I$ would prepare an index and summary of the preliminary hearing which of course would cover each of the witnesses and I actually wrote that out on my own as $I$ was going through it. Then $I$ would have it typed up, and I know significant portions $I$ would personally underline, sometimes in red, sometimes in blue and so on, so really what $I$ had was a trial brief that was subdivided into quite a number of sections, each section being for a witness, and in that section $I$ would have a photocopy of that witness' evidence at the preliminary hearing and $I$ would staple a copy of the portion of the index summary covering that witness to the front of it. Okay.

And in addition, $I$ would have the various statements, various memoranda that had been prepared earlier with thoughts that pertained to that witness or might pertain to that witness, so that when $I$ was dealing with the witness in Court I had all the information at my fingertips, and in the cross-examination brief $I$ did not just make a reference to crucial areas at the preliminary hearing where $I$ had answers that $I$ considered
favourable, I actually incorporated the question and answer into my brief to supplement the question that $I$ was going to put and I did that because it allowed one to keep the continuity, and also because $I$ had the exact page reference and question reference there, $I$ could very quickly, if necessary, refer it to the Court and opposing counsel.

And so this would be a case where a witness at trial might be straying from his or her evidence at the preliminary hearing?

A
Q
Yes.
Now, just -- let's talk about these memorandums that you had put in there. For example, let's take three of the key witnesses, Ron Wilson, Nichol John, Albert Cadrain, would you have, in that trial brief then, memorandums where you would have given your thoughts about their evidence, strategies on maybe how to deal with them, your thoughts on the damaging parts, areas you might be able to attack and things of that nature?

A
Yes, I'm sure my reflections were there. I think reflections is the best word $I$ can use at this stage to describe it.

Would these memorandums, let's just talk about the
memorandums, would they be -- how widely would you share those, if at all?

A

Q

A

Q
A

Q

A

A

A
A I'm sorry.
BY MR. HODSON:
And we'll get to that as far as the discussions.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.

Maybe we can deal with that right now. As far as his involvement, David Milgaard's involvement with Gail Miller in any way, what did Mr. Milgaard tell you about that?

A

Q

A
Q
Just on these memorandums, let's talk about the witnesses, and we'll deal a bit more specifically with them later, but Ron Wilson, I understand, sir, that prior to either the preliminary hearing or trial you did some checking up or investigating of Mr. Wilson at another proceeding; is that right?

A
Well, I did some background work in Regina, it wasn't a special trip, but $I$ was there and $I$ made it a point, and $I$ don't have of course my file memoranda on it, but $I$ recall him being up in Court or at something in Regina and that is why, and it refreshed my memory when $I$ read the transcript, and I thought a great deal about this before $I$ asked the question, $I$ found out about his background and criminal record and there was one
item, a conviction $I$ think for conspiracy to
defraud, and $I$ remember making sure that David was not a co-conspirator named in that and that's why I was able to put the question to Wilson. He said he -- I think he said he didn't remember who his co-conspirator was and $I$ knew that $I$ was --

Did you go and observe Mr. Wilson in Court?
I saw him in Court, I'm sure $I$ saw him in Court.
This is in Regina?
Yes. There was something on there where $I$ saw him.

And what was your purpose in going to see him?
Well, $I$ wanted to get background information and $I$ think I -- I'm quite sure I spoke to others about what he was involved in.

Did you observe him in the courtroom, was he giving evidence?

No, no, he wasn't giving evidence, no.
Now, just as far as the file, and I'll come back to this as we go through items, at the end of the case can you give us some idea, are we talking about boxes of documents that would have been part of the file?

A
Well, $I$ know that all my handwritten notes and everything, I didn't throw them out even though
they had been typed up.
Q
A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
I can't remember that now. You know, when you are under the pressure of getting ready for a trial, I'm just -- $I$ know where $I$ wanted to have it for the purposes of the trial, but --

Q
Miss Myrna Frances Wilson, and she was very heavily involved in the work on this case. Okay.

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q

I spoke to her not too long before she died, a few years ago to see if she had any recollection or could assist, as $I$ had spoken to her before, and she just didn't have any memory of it at that time.

At the time of the trial, 1969, 1970, '71, up until the file was concluded when the appeals expired, would you have provided copies of any of your internal memorandum to David Milgaard or to his mother, Joyce Milgaard?

No, I don't think any of the internal memoranda were ever provided.

Would you have provided either David Milgaard or Joyce Milgaard with any of your trial brief?

No, I don't think so. I think that it was in the office.

And when $I$ say "trial brief" I'm talking about your work product, your questions, things of that nature?

No.
There is a reference that I'll get to a bit later about providing the court transcript, the preliminary hearing transcript and $I$ believe maybe the trial transcript you may have provided to them; is that correct?

A
Well yes, I know that $I$ provided a copy of the preliminary hearing, because $I$ wanted him to read it. It's very difficult, $I$ think, to remember everything that was said at the preliminary hearing and $I$ wanted him to have an opportunity to read it over in a more leisurely atmosphere. And I did obtain, I think I obtained a second copy, but if not it would have been a photocopy that we made in the office, because $I$ know that for my trial brief $I$ had to photocopy it to have segments of it for each witness.

Now after 1976 you went to become a judge? Yes.

And the file stayed with your former law firm; is that correct?

Yes, it was there.
And you --
I'm quite sure, when $I$ left, it was there.
And --
Now where it was I can't tell you because we had various storage places.

Would there have been any specific or general instructions you would have left with them regarding retention of the file?

A No.

A

Q

And do you recall, what would have been the practice at that time as far as how long a file of this nature would be retained? We've heard some evidence from Mr. Gary Young, who is a lawyer that you are familiar with, is that -Oh yes, I've known Mr. Young for years.

And I think in late 1980-early 1981 he made contact with your former firm -- and I'll take you through some of these documents -- to get an opportunity to look at the file, and I think what the documents reflect, and Mr. Young's evidence is that part of the file was provided to him, he said no internal memorandums were provided, and that the file was returned, and $I$ think he said about, if I'm not mistaken, 86 or 87 pages, he believes, may have been copied by Mrs. Milgaard and then the file returned.

Apart from that, that access to your file, are you aware of any other times or incidents where your file would have been provided to anybody on behalf of David Milgaard?

A

Then later I, you know, I had searched, I had had some stuff out at the farm home and $I$-- and this is particularly for the Supreme Court reference -I searched everything there, and $I$ know that $I$ spoke to Miss Wilson, and I think I spoke to one of the other senior ladies who was then in the
office, and $I$ think $I$ mentioned $I$ held out little prospect of ever locating anything. Umm -The evidence of Mr. Young suggests that in 1980 or '81, that the file existed at your former firm, and again $I^{\prime} m$ not sure, $I$ don't think he saw all of it, but the correspondence that he received I think suggested that the file existed at that time. Are you able to comment on that, as to whether, based on your recollection or your practices, do you think in 1980 or '81 the complete file would have still been with your law firm?

Well from what $I$-- from having tried to locate it I don't think it did, and I say that because I did -- $I$ know various things, with all the moves that the firm had made, that a fair amount of stuff was destroyed routinely. And $I$ know that because when I, years later when $I$ went to look for a, what $I$ would call a family file, it had been destroyed. That's --
-- my own, on my own family's side, and I didn't -- I just recognized that these things are ultimately destroyed and, if $I$ had known that that one was in the process of being destroyed, I would
have asked to have it saved.
Yeah. After you concluded the file in, I'm -- I presume it would be 1971 or thereabouts, once the leave to appeal to the Supreme Court was dismissed, would that be a fair assumption that that's when the file would have been concluded, or

Yes, but I think it probably, it may well have been around for a while after that.

Yes. Would you have gone back, after you were done with the file, did you ever go back yourself and look at the file, review any documents, make any copies, anything of that nature?

No, no.
And so in 1980, 1980 and 1981 when Mr. Young was making efforts through your former firm, am $I$ to understand that you had no direct involvement in that?

No, I wasn't involved in the searching or anything like that. I was living, as you know, in Yellowknife and there -- I did not conduct any searches in the old office when $I$, on occasions when $I$ was back.

If we could call up 335423, please. And, Mr.
Tallis, what we have done with the assistance of

Mr. Agioritis and Commission staff is gone through what we have collected, the Commission has collected, to try and identify what might be either your original file documents or copies of them, and this is a listing that sets out three different memorandums and the sources, and I'll go to these, the June 10th, August 20th, and September 8th memos.

And the June 10 th we received from David Milgaard's counsel, the August 20 th and September 8th we received from Mrs. Milgaard's -or from Mrs. Milgaard, and the two RCMP documents are the same statement or a copy of the -- pardon me -- the memo that they would have received, again. Either from Mr. Milgaard and Mr. -- and/or David or Joyce Milgaard. If we can just call up, let's call up the first one, 153491, and this is your memorandum of June 10th, 1969; is that correct?

Yes. I think you showed me this one.
Yes.
And it's certainly a memorandum that was typed at my instructions.

Now the handwriting on here, at the top $I$ think that's Joyce Milgaard's initials, the "N" I
believe might have been Mr. Carlyle-Gordge's, and
I think Mr. Carlyle-Gordge testified that was his writing; did you ever meet with Peter

Carlyle-Gordge?
A
No.

Did you ever give him any copies of your file?
No.
The handwriting down here, is that your
handwriting or is that -- are you able to tell?
No, that's, that's not my handwriting.
Do you have any idea, Mr. Tallis, as to where this
memorandum would have come from and how it would
have got to either Joyce Milgaard and/or Peter
Carlyle-Gordge?
No, I don't.
Is this --
I just can say that the origin of this memorandum
would be my file, --
Okay.
-- you know.
In the sense that you would not have given this to anybody?

A
No.
And would this be, again, one of the documents you described before as being a private memorandum?

And we'll go through --

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
A
$Q$
Okay. Now Mr. Young's evidence before the Commission is that he had the file in 1981, and that he did not see any internal memorandums, and I believe his evidence was to the effect that he did not think he saw this document on what he received. So, again, can you shed any light as to how this memorandum was provided to Joyce Milgaard or Peter Carlyle-Gordge?

No, I have no personal knowledge about how that

Yes. This was June loth, so it was a reflection of some of the things that $I$ immediately started thinking about.

If you had been asked to provide this memorandum or, in fact, all your memorandums by either David Milgaard or Joyce Milgaard or their counsel would you have provided them?

I certainly would have provided it to their counsel if I had them.

If you'd been asked?
Yes. I mean $I$ knew, $I$ knew Mr. Young -Yes.
-- and had known him for years, and $I$ wouldn't have had any problem with them being under his control.
happened, and $I$ don't have any other information that would assist on that. I know that my position always was that -- to cooperate with Mr. Young, I mean $I$--

Would -- and is this the type of document -- and, again, we'll go into it -- is that of assistance to you in trying to recall what you were doing back at that time?

Yes, it, it's part of the ongoing process and work. And certainly, if $I$ had my complete file with all the memoranda and my handwritten notes from which the memoranda came and my trial brief it would be of great assistance to me, even after this long lapse of time, to remember things with more precision. But, as you know, I don't have that and I'm doing the best $I$ can to give you my personal recollection.

Certainly. If we could go to 212231, please.
And, again, I'll come back to these memorandums and go through them in detail.

A
Q Okay. I just want to deal with identifying them for now. So 212231.

And while we're waiting for that, the paper copy of the June 10 th memorandum,

I believe you had a chance to look at that, is that correct, the physical copy that we received from David Milgaard?

Yes, I -- you showed that to me.
And I think, please correct me if I'm wrong, but you believed that to be a photocopy as opposed to the original; is that right?

Yes, I think it is.
Yeah. And so this is the August 20 th, ' 69 memorandum and, again, this is a memo, one of your file memos; is that correct?

Yes it is.
And I don't think there's any handwriting. If we could just go to the third page, and again that would be your secretary's initials there, is that correct?

A
$Q$

A

Q

Okay. And would these memorandums, are these the memorandums or the -- of the type you described earlier for us that you would have prepared --

A Yeah.
Q
A
$Q$

Q
BY MR. HODSON:
Mr. Tallis, we'll just finish on the file documents that we have been able to gather from our Commission database. 335424, please. And I'd gone through and shown you the three, the two memorandums and one partial memorandum we have. Yes.

And this is a listing of transcript summaries that you have authored by witness name, and you will see we have the document ID and the source and the box. I think these were all received -- and we can maybe go to the next page -- three from Joyce Milgaard, the rest from David Milgaard. And perhaps we can go -- I've got the, actually the originals here, and $I$ think you have had a chance to look through these documents, have you not, Mr. Tallis, the physical documents?

A Yes, you --
Q I showed those to you.
A
-- you were good enough to show them to me in advance.

And they appear to be -- and, again, we'll go through them in a bit more detail later -- they appear to be photocopies as opposed to originals; is that right?

A
Q
Yes. And we'll maybe call up the -- just hang on one minute -- let's call up 179451. And this is the one for Ronald Wilson. Maybe we can just enlarge that top part. So this would be -- maybe you could just explain briefly what this document is? This is your -- you prepared this document? Yes. This illustrates what $I$ was mentioning to you before as part of my preparation for trial, and while the handwriting in the left-hand corner is not mine there is no doubt that this refers to the preliminary hearing evidence, and this refers to the witness Wilson.

Now as part of my preparation $I$ think $I$ mentioned to you that $I$ made a summary, or you might say an indexed summary of the evidence at the preliminary hearing, and that was of course
part of my preparation for the trial. And once I got the, you might say the master summary prepared, $I$ would make copies of each portion of the summary to affix to the testimony of the specific witness which $I$ had photocopied in the segment for that witness. The underlining -well, first of all, this would be typewritten by my secretary and assistant, Miss Wilson, from notes or a summary or index that $I$ actually wrote out by hand. Then when it came back to me typed up, it's possible $I$ did it even in my handwritten notes, but $I$ think the likely thing is that $I$ then would underline certain portions of it. In other words this is not a typewritten underlining, -Right.
-- it's my underlining with a ruler, and in some cases $I$ know it was my practice to underline some things in red to highlight them. Of course I can't tell you which items $I$ had underlined in red from this copy.

So these would be the key parts of Mr. Wilson's preliminary hearing evidence that you would summarize and underline the most significant parts; is that right?

A
Yes. And that set the stage, of course, for when

I was preparing my brief for cross-examination. I could refer to this and the transcript and actually incorporate into my brief for cross-examination certain questions and answers for quick reference without having to go to the preliminary hearing transcript, but $I$ would be able to in effect say, if $I$ was referring to it, "My Lord, page 271, question so and so".

And if we could then go to 179474 , and this is page 5 of the Ron Wilson summary, are you able to tell us -- just call that part out.

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

Meyer CompuCourt Reporting
Certified Professional Court Reporters serving P.A., Regina \& Saskatoon since 1980
Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv
I would say it is.
And so do $I$ take it, from that, that you would then make notes on this, then, after they were typed up where you wanted to add things or --

Well I think the most likely scenario is that I made this handwritten note when $I$ was preparing the brief for cross-examination at trial.

And then if we can go to 179334 . And again, if we can just call out this middle part, this is part of Ron Wilson's and then it talks, I think, Wilson

| Meyer CompuCourt Reporting |
| :--- |
| Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv |

Yeah. The "NB", checkmark, and then $I$ think:
"How long till they got to Danchuk's";
is that your handwriting?
saying:
"all of them tired",
and then it says:
"would he rape, murder in such a frenzy
if he'd been up all night. Any proof
he's psychotic";
would that be your handwriting?
No, that is not my handwriting.
Do you know whose handwriting it might be?
I do not know.
If we can go to the next page.
I certainly know that it wasn't Miss Wilson's. Okay.

I would have recognized her handwriting.
And then again, and we'll deal with the details of this a bit later, but would that be your notes at the end of that?

A
Yes, that is my handwriting and notes, undoubtedly, that I made. And, once again, I am quite sure that that's the type of note or questions or queries that $I$ wrote up as $I$ was preparing for trial.
$Q$ I should have asked you this before. You talked about your trial briefs and your list of questions for cross-examination of witnesses, and $I$ think
you said you put all of the relevant information into that folio or section, is that right?

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q 2 If we can then go to 335426 , please. This is a document that we prepared this morning, and this is a listing of the exhibits and lab reports which we've identified from our files that are your -that $I$ think were from your file, and again $I$ think the source of them are Joyce Milgaard. And then it says:

```
"original handwriting",
```

and I think if we go through some of these, on some of these lab reports, sir, you have been able to identify your original handwriting; is that correct?

A

Q
And the fact that it would be original
handwriting; can we take it from that, then, that these would be original documents from your file? That's right.

Do you have any idea how the original file documents would have been provided to

Mrs. Milgaard or anybody on her behalf?
No, I --
Maybe I'll just go through and show you some of these. Maybe just put, we'll put them up here, and I'll have you identify the handwriting. Okay. Now that, actually $I$ think that -- actually, John, if we could go back to the front page of that and actually just take the tab off. 225033, if we can just go up to the top, we have seen this document before. Can just slide the document down to show us the top. This is, I think, a May 21, 1969 lab
report, and relating to various matters. If we can just go down to the bottom, please, and is that your handwriting, sir?

A
Yes, it is.
And it says:
"Molchanko will check date of return to Kleiv - should be May $22 / 69$ rather than May 25/69".

So, from that, can you tell us that this would have been an original lab report on your original file?

A

Q
A
Q

A
$Q$

A
Q
A
2
Yes. I haven't actually seen the physical
document this morning, but if this is in the new
ballpoint, that's --
That's the actual document.
Okay.
Would you like to see the document?
No, you've checked it, we don't need to.
If we could then go to the next one, there's just
a couple more here, this is the May $21, \quad$ ' 69 lab
report?
Yeah.
Is there original handwriting on that, John?
Yes, there is.
And that says:
"leave out";
is that your handwriting?

A
Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
Q
And then above:
"blue blanket from funeral home";
is that right? the extent of it. These are all documents, Mr. Commissioner, that are part of the database.

If we could then go to 331925, and I'm just going to go through a few documents that we went through with Gary Young. February 2nd, 1981, and this appears to be, at least from the evidence we've heard and from the documents, the only occasion when your file was provided to anybody on behalf of David or Joyce Milgaard, and it suggests a contact by Mr. Young February 2 nd, 1981; would you have been in touch with Mr. Young at this time?

I can't tell you the date when he phoned me. That's the only, the only contact $I$ had with Mr. Young was by phone. Now whether he spoke to me on more than one occasion $I$ cannot recall.

And would he have asked you, then, for an opportunity to look at your file then? I'm sure he did, and $I$ know my position was that $I$ was quite happy to cooperate with Mr. Young.

So would you have communicated with your former law firm then and advised them to --

A
Yes.
Okay. Is there anything -- okay, I think that's

A

Q

A
$Q$

Q
A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$

Okay.
And then they may have phoned me for confirmation, but I think if Mr. Young told them that, they would have accepted it without reservation. If we can then go to 331923, this is a letter back from Mr. Buckwold indicating that your former firm has no objection to your access to the file and that he will have to review the file so that internal memorandum may be removed, and would that have been the practice at the time, Mr. Tallis, or prior to you going to the bench, about providing access to the files, are you able to elaborate on that?

No, I'm not, because $I$ wasn't involved in that discussion at all.

Okay.
As far as $I$ recall.
And then 331911, and $I$ think this is the letter to Mr. Young from your former firm saying:
"You are free to take the file on the strict condition that you return the file intact to this office upon completion of your review of same." Would you have been involved in any of those discussions?

A
$Q$
A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Well, $I$ know that one of the first persons that $I$ would have talked to, because of the work that she had done on the file and familiarity with it, would be with Miss Wilson, and she didn't have any ideas as to where else $I$ might look, because at that time the office had moved as I recall it. I'm just trying to think of the sequence here. We were in the Avenue Building and then we moved to the Canada Building and that's where I was when I left practice. The material, as far as I know, would have been moved to the Canada Building, although I can't say that $I$ checked everything. Then there were a couple of moves after that, I
believe, of the office that $I$ had nothing to do with.

When you made those inquiries, am $I$ correct to say that you were not able to locate any part of your file?

That's correct, and $I$ know that $I$, somewhere along the way I spoke to I think the oldest employee in the old office because $I$ had some contact with her and she had, she relayed to me that a lot of materials had been routinely destroyed and she was the one $I$ spoke to about the family file -Okay.
-- as to what had happened to it, so that's why that sort of rings a bell.

When you testified before the Supreme Court in David Milgaard's reference in 1992, I think at that time you said to the effect that you were satisfied that you couldn't find the file and that it didn't exist any more; is that right?

Yeah. I held -- I think I said to counsel that I held out little prospect in my discussions and I didn't give up. I mean, $I$ know that $I$, even after I looked in places or relooked in places. The --

And even in recent, in March when $I$ moved all my
stuff out, of this year, I went through anything where there might have been any copies of a brief or anything like that and $I$ couldn't locate anything.

When you testified before the Supreme Court, and I believe you testified to this effect, that you had not looked at any of your file documents in advance of your evidence; is that correct? That's correct.

So the documents that I've gone through with you this morning, being the three memorandums, your part -- parts of your trial brief and the lab reports, would it be fair to say that until you saw them in the last few days you had not seen those since 1970?

That's quite correct.
And if we can just talk a bit about what knowledge you would have acquired about this matter over the years, and let's start in 1976 when you were appointed to the Court, did you take any steps at that point to avoid being informed of matters related to David Milgaard and his quests to have his conviction set aside?

Well, $I$ felt that $I$ was no longer an advocate and that it would be, you know, improper for me to get
involved in any public discussions or any other types of discussion about it because the potential was there for the matter either to go before the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal or the Supreme Court of Canada, so $I$ did not participate in any way in any discussions and felt that it would be, you know, improper for me to continue.

What about, and again I'll put aside what you've done to prepare for your testimony before this Commission, but would you have followed the case and read what was happening over the years?

No, I didn't.
And was that done deliberately?
Yes, it was.
And I think at the Supreme Court of Canada you testified to the effect that you had not read anything prior to your giving evidence; is that correct?

That's correct. I think I mentioned that before $I$ went there as a witness, I did speak to one of the counsel, I believe it was Mr. Fainstein, but I could be wrong on that, to ask whether or not $I$ should read any material in preparation for going, and that included any evidence that had been given before me. My recollection is that there had been
an order for exclusion of witnesses and under the circumstances it would be improper for me to do indirectly what $I$ could not do directly, and so that's the way, that's the way it unfolded, and -So then as far as -- you retired as a judge, I believe, in March, early March, March 5th of 2005 or thereabouts; is that correct?

Yes.
And then after that point $I$ provided you with various materials to read, to assist you in giving evidence; is that correct?

Yes, you've provided me with material from time to time and asked that $I$ read it and I've endeavoured to do that to the best of my ability, and with a view to perhaps assisting in my recollection of things because $I$ didn't have my file.

Right. And so again generally $I$ think what we have provided to you is some of the original trial transcripts, preliminary transcripts, witness statements to the extent that we could reconstruct your file from what we had?

Yes.
And as well other documents that may have been in your possession or you would have been aware of at the time; is that fair?

A Yes.
Q
And then secondly, we also provided you with some police reports and some witness statements relating to sexual assaults, etcetera, information that I don't think you would have seen before; is that correct?

Yes. The first time $I$ saw that was when you provided copies of it and asked if $I$ would be good enough to read it over --

Right.
-- in advance of giving testimony before this Commission.

Q

A

Q
A
And my purpose in that was because I do intend to ask you some questions during the course of this examination about how you might have done things differently had you known about those matters, so again you've had a chance to look at that generally; is that fair?

Yes. I understood that that was your reason for asking me to look at the material.

Yeah.
And $I$ have read it over, but $I$ don't remember everything $I$ read, but $I$ can tell you in general terms that $I$ read the materials that you supplied on that topic.

And I think you've told us, Mr. Tallis, that the fact that you do not have your original file, that that would have been helpful in your recollection of what you did at the time; is that fair?

In my view very helpful because $I$ know that $I$ had taken very careful notes that were later typed up and it's -- I'm well aware of the treachery of memory and I'm giving you my best recollection when it is raised with me.

Right, and $I$ will ask you questions and $I$ will try to be specific and say, ask you what you recall about matters, and if you don't recall I may, as I've done with other witnesses, ask you to tell us what you think you would have done based on your practices at the time or, based on some other documents, whether you can tell us, shed some light on what might have happened even though you don't recall, and I'll try and distinguish that for you when $I$ ask the questions.

Yes.
I would now like to go back and go through a bit of a chronology and $I$ want to start with some source documents. We were able to find a copy of your legal account to Legal Aid back in 1969. If I can call up 065492 , please, and this is a

September 12th, 1969 account to the Legal Aid Committee and this would have been right shortly after the preliminary hearing, and $I$ want to go through this because it may be instructive on some dates, and you've had a chance to look at this, Mr. Tallis, in the last little while; is that correct?

A
$Q$
Yes, you made that available to me. I didn't know that it was even around, so until you showed it to me, I didn't have it.

So maybe we'll just go through parts of this. It appears from this that June 7th, 1969 would have been when you first met Mr. Milgaard; is that likely correct?

Yes.
And then an appearance in Court on June 9th, June 16th and the preliminary hearing adjourned until August 18 th, and then if we can scroll down, we've covered this before with other witnesses, but the preliminary hearing spanned over about three weeks, but not sitting every day. And then here, August 4 th:
"Personal attendance in Prince Albert, Saskatchewan to discuss this matter with David Milgaard and obtain instructions."

And we'll see on a couple of other accounts

A
references to that. Do you have a recollection of going to Prince Albert to meet with Mr. Milgaard while he was there?
And welliseer ander

Yes, I personally, you know, I definitely recall going to Prince Albert before the preliminary hearing. I can't say the date, but I certainly am quite satisfied that August 4 th would be the date taken from my file records at the time, and $I$ recall that because it was very deliberate on my part to want to review the matter in some detail with him before the preliminary hearing and also to explain to him the nature of a preliminary hearing, its purpose and so forth, and also I recall that the staff at the provincial jail where he was held were very co-operative in terms of making an office available to me to spend time with him. In other words, it wasn't just in a cell or a little room.

Would you have explained the case that you thought existed against Mr. Milgaard?

Well, $I$ certainly would have reviewed everything with him, and even before this, I'm quite sure that I had, you know, told him very early -perhaps you are going to go into that later --

Q
A

And what about friends?
Oh, I knew very early, I picked up that his friends were the ones that were pointing him,
pointing to him as the perpetrator and $I$ always sort of put friends in quotation marks because I told him to be very leery of any visits by friends because I thought -- I said, you know, they may bring them in to see you and you may well be confronted with innocent statements being distorted.

And we'll go back to those meetings a bit later. Yes.

So this account, this is September 12th, so this would be the day after the preliminary hearing is finished, so would this reflect then the work that you had done from June 7th, 1969 through until the end of the prelim on September 11th; is that correct?

Yes, in general terms, but --
Just go back.
-- it certainly wouldn't have all the leg work -Right.
-- in there.
So we've got the personal attendance. We then
have the numerous conferences in Saskatoon with David Milgaard and his parents in connection with this matter?

A Yeah.

And I take it those would be either telephone conferences or meetings either in the Saskatoon police cells --

A
And the other thing too is that $I$ recall arranging, for the purposes of the preliminary hearing, to have a little room set aside at the main courthouse here so that we could use it; in other words, David wasn't taken down to the cells below every time there was a little break, and that $I$ arranged, $I$ think, with the courthouse registrar, to have that room made available. It was separate and apart and just across the hallway from the main witness room.

Prior to the preliminary hearing and for the preliminary hearing, were you satisfied that you had adequate time to meet with David Milgaard and deal with him to prepare for the preliminary hearing?

A
Yes, I was. As I say, I think I received good co-operation about the trip to Prince Albert and things like that, but $I$ can't remember all the times I spoke to him, but -- and even throughout the preliminary hearing, which was fragmented or staggered --

A
-- there was time to discuss matters in a little room, and $I$ believe that $I$ arranged to have him brought down a day or so early, but that's my -that's my sense of things, so that it wouldn't be just a question of walking into the courtroom and the opening of the preliminary hearing. In other words, even though $I$ had spent some time with him in Prince Albert, $I$ did talk to him again in advance.

The next item is:
"To numerous conferences with Mr. T.D.R. Caldwell, Agent to the Attorney General to discuss this matter and agree on certain items."

And we'll go through a bit later some of the correspondence, but would there have been a fair bit of communication between you and Mr. Caldwell prior to and during the preliminary hearing? Oh, yes, I'm quite sure there was. Without my file $I$ can't give you specifics, but it wouldn't just be talk about the date for the preliminary, but that would be one thing, but various other matters too.

Would you have had frank discussions with Mr. Caldwell then about the evidence in the case prior
to the preliminary hearing?

A

2

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q

A

Well, I would certainly have talked to him about what he had, what he was going to lead.

Yes.
And so forth.
If we can just scroll down, it says:
"Drawing brief for preliminary hearing with respect to both facts and law."

I take it from that that you would have prepared
a brief before the preliminary hearing?
Yes. Of course I think I've already mentioned some of that to you, part of it focused on the secretor issue and the blood issue and that was quite important, but $I$ did also draft up questions for the various witnesses based on information that $I$ had, and not only from David, but any other materials that $I$ had.

And then next you have:
"To necessary medical-legal consultations in connection with certain evidence that was adduced."

Yeah.
Can you tell us what that generally would have related to?

Well, that generally related to what we've already
talked about, and that is the blood and secretor, non-secretor.
$Q$
And so prior to the preliminary hearing, had you consulted medical experts?

A
Yes, I had.
And do you recall who they were or --
You know, without my file, $I$ think the person that
I spoke to first, but this is just trying to
reconstruct as distinct from recollect -- maybe I should back up. First of all, I had done a fair bit of reading myself before $I$ talked to the doctor, but I think the doctor I spoke to initially was Dr. Mel Langer whom $I$ knew and had known for quite a few years, and while he didn't pretend to be a serologist, I always found him very helpful in areas of medical jurisprudence, and he also put me onto additional writings and then he put me in touch with somebody that he knew, a medical person, and I've racked my brain to try and figure out, you know, recall who it was, but to sort of distill my answer to your question, $I$ did this in advance and that is why $I$ had the ability, so to speak, to prepare questions and what I thought would be hoped-for answers, particularly from Mr. Paynter who was, he was
known to me as a person who had given expert
evidence in many proceedings in my career.
Now, the -- and $I$ appreciate you said that this doesn't cover everything and its got other services and attendances. As far as the fee at the time, was there a tariff that Legal Aid had or how did -- how did they determine or you determine what you would be paid by Legal Aid for the work you did?

I really don't recall now. I'm sure there was some sort of a tariff that was in existence, but $I$ don't know the criteria or how it was calculated, but -- and I may have even talked to someone about it, but $I$ can't say. That wasn't a primary consideration on my part at the time. There was lots of things to be done.

Would this amount, can you tell us how this amount might compare to the work that you had done had it been a non-Legal Aid client, as far as dollar value?

A
Well, if you were billing it on a regular basis, it was a very modest sum compared to what -- but I never liked to dwell on that in Legal Aid cases because $I$ thought that your obligation was to give it full effort regardless of the fee.

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A

Would this fee then, is what you are telling us, that this fee would relate more to what Legal Aid was prepared to pay for the work as opposed to -I think that's a very fair way of putting it. As opposed to a calculation based on how much time you put into it?

Oh, I was never into hourly billing, so $I$ wasn't familiar with it at that time. It was just more I think coming into being a bit when $I$ left practice, but $I$ was never, as such, involved in hourly billing, and I'm not saying that in a derogatory way, but it wasn't part of the way it was done at that time.

If we were to say, and maybe this isn't a fair question, but June, certainly July, August, September, can you tell us what portion of your time was taken up with this matter or devoted to this matter? Are you able to give us any sense of the time you put in, at least during this time period?

The best $I$ can say to you now, without the benefit of my file, is that a major portion of my time was put into it. I know $I$ started working on it right away, you know, from the first time I received instructions and following up various things and
so on, but to -- and in those days $I$ would have spent, you know, a lot of time working at night and weekends and so forth, but, you know, $I$ don't want to sound too noble about this because it was, you know, just a style of practice in those days. Okay. If we can go to 065426, and this is a letter, December 19th, '69 about Mr. Disbery. Did Mr. Disbery attend the preliminary hearing do you recall?

Yes, $I$ believe he did.
And this letter, you are asking the Legal Aid Committee to approve authorization of junior counsel participating in the trial.
"My colleague, Mr. Ian Disbery has done some work on the file and $I$ would request your authorization to have second counsel appear on the matter." And so I take it at this time you felt that you should have Mr. Disbery appear with you at the trial as second counsel?

Yes, I did.
And was that due to the nature of the case then and the amount of work?

There were really two reasons $I$ would say; number 1, is that the nature of the case, the importance
of it from the standpoint of the youngster that was before the court, and secondly, I was always of the view that if you were going to have a functioning Legal Aid plan, that it was incumbent upon senior lawyers to take juniors into court and, in effect, let them move along to their rightful place in the profession so that they, they would have the advantage of having been a participant and spectator at a trial from beginning to end and at least involved in some of the preliminary work.

If we can then go --
Now, one could elaborate a great deal on that, but I don't think that that's what you are looking for.

You felt that having Mr. Disbery as, present at trial was important for you and important for Mr. Milgaard; is that fair?

Yes. It's nice to have somebody there that is taking notes and everything while you are on your feet.
$Q$
Can you tell us a bit --
A
And of course in this particular case $I$ went, $I$ should say $I$ went a bit further than that because at the preliminary hearing, there's at least
certain key parts of it, I had my secretary, who was really a legal assistant, actually sat in, in the spectators but the front area, she had excellent shorthand and she would take shorthand notes of key evidence and $I$ could either get her to type it up, which she would do at night, or even read it to me during a break.

And would you --
A
$Q$
A

Q
And --
Sorry?
And the same thing was done at trial, although it was done quietly, you know, not to be -- make a production of it or anything.

If we can go to 065422. This is a letter January 7th, shortly before the trial, from the Deputy Attorney General advising -- actually, I think it might be to someone else -- but indicating that advising you by telephone, 'The matter has been discussed with the Attorney General and it is agreed that we are not prepared to supply a second counsel in a case such as this, and that our present policy is not to authorize a second counsel in any case where Legal Aid is being supplied.'
made aware of that around that time?

A
Q

A
Q
A
$Q$

I'm quite sure $I$ was.
And, notwithstanding the fact that Legal Aid would not pay for Mr. Disbery, did you have him participate in the trial?

Yes.
In a full-time --
Well he was there, as $I$ recall it, all the time. Now I should make it clear he was a young lawyer at the time and, you know, I assumed full responsibility for what was done in the conduct of the case. I wouldn't want to suggest that any responsibility of it should be fobbed off, by me, onto him.

Okay. If we can then go to 065407. And, again, this is your second account, this is February the 2nd, 1970, so this would run from the preliminary hearing conclusion through to the end of trial, I believe. And if we can just call up some of these items we've got:
"Perusing transcripts of evidence taken at the preliminary hearing", then we have November 12 th and December 11 th, 1969:
"Attending in Prince Albert,

Saskatchewan, at the Provincial
Correctional Centre for Man to interview
David Milgaard and discuss this case with him."

And so from this account can you tell us, do you have a recollection of going to meet with Mr. Milgaard between the preliminary hearing and the trial?

I can put it to you this way. I was positive that
I saw him before the preliminary hearing. I
always thought, in my own mind, that $I$ had seen him at Prince Albert before the trial, and spent time discussing it with him, but until you were able to uncover this document $I$ could never be sure in my recollection as to whether or not discussions took place there or by phone. My thought was that $I$ had attended on him, and this confirms for me that $I$ saw him and spent a fair amount of time with him on two occasions before the trial, and I'm quite satisfied that the date of November 12 th and the date of December 11 th would be taken from my personal file notes.

Q And then, if we can scroll down a bit:
"Preparing brief for cross-examination
of all Crown witnesses at trial."

I think you've told us about that?
A
Yes.
And:
"Preparing brief of law for use at trial
and particularly in connection with questions of admissibility of evidence."

And I think you've told us about that as well?
Yes.
And then the trial, just the dates of trial. Did you also have an opportunity to meet with Mr. Milgaard prior to, I mean the day before and during the course of the trial?

Yes. The same -- during the course of the trial we had the same little room that we used at the preliminary hearing because the preliminary hearing was conducted in the main courtroom, the jury room, and then the trial was conducted there so we had the same access. And I believe that I have a recollection, it could be faulty on this, but I think $I$ arranged to have him brought down a day or so early so that $I$ could chat with him even in the cells at the city police station where he would be held before being brought over to the courthouse for his trial.

Okay. If we can go to the next page, please.

And, again, it talks about meetings with the prosecutor and the fee, and $I$ just want to go back to the covering letter of this, 065410 . And this is your February 2 nd letter to Mr. Heidgerken, you say:
"I would appreciate it if you would submit this statement of account to the appropriate department as soon as possible and I might mention that I am asking for an additional fee for extensive preparation which was required in this particular case. I might mention that the allowance that $I$ have requested over and above the counsel fee that is payable under the provisions of the Legal Aid Plan is a very modest sum when you consider the many hours that $I$ had to spend in preparation."

And, again, would that be an accurate statement of your position at the time?

Very much so.
It appears, from this, that there may have been a tariff payable or a fee payable, like a fixed dollar amount for a matter, does that --

A There may have been a counsel fee. Whether it was
a counsel fee per case or a counsel fee per day $I$ don't recall.

Okay. And, lastly, we'll just finish up 066593. This is an account, I'm not sure if there is a date on this or not, but it relates to the appeal in November of 1970 , and we'll maybe come back to this a bit later. And I think, Mr. Tallis, those are, at least from what we have been able to find, the three accounts that provided some particulars of what you did during this time period. If we can then go to just a couple of other source documents, 267787. And this is the information, the original information from the Court file, and $I$ just want to touch on a couple of items if we can go to the next page. And the first appearance $I$ think is June the $2 n d$ and Mr. Milgaard represented himself, then it was adjourned to June 9th, 1969, which accords with your account, and then you appear for the accused and Wolff, who I understand is Ben Wolff, appeared for the Crown; is that right?

Yes. I wouldn't have any personal recollection of who was there on any particular date but when we looked, when $I$ looked at one of the letters you had I had put a copy to Ben Wolff, and I'm quite
sure, looking at this, that Mr. Wolff appeared on the dates that are mentioned there. And, of course, $I$ knew him quite well from practice. And we've heard some evidence that the practice at the time was that Mr. Wolff, as a city prosecutor, would appear in Magistrate Court for the Crown, and then once the matter went to preliminary hearing that an agent of the Attorney General, usually Mr. Caldwell, would appear; is that correct?

A

Was -- the start of the preliminary hearing, it went fairly quickly, $I$ think within about two months after you were first engaged; was that normal at the time?

A
$Q$
I don't recall anything unusual about it.
If we can then call up 335 --

A It probably was -- you know, I'm just trying to think here -- no, I -- I think -- I don't recall anything unusual about it that -Would you have been anxious to get the matter to Court?

A
Well, $I$ know when you have a person, I'm sure David was anxious to, you know, have matters resolved, and I was, certainly. For whatever reason $I$ know that $I$ started on it right away, you know, on the case. The memoranda that you were able to find certainly indicate to me, and that's my recollection, that $I$ realized that it required attention, and I'm thinking particularly too of the blood and secretor issue that $I$ got -- did work on even before the preliminary hearing. Okay. If we can call up 335405, please. And this is a document that we prepared, Mr. Tallis, based upon documents in the database and information provided by you, and we may refer to it from time to time. I don't want to go, I don't propose to go through it in detail now, but it outlines -I'll maybe just go through parts of it -- outlines when you were first retained, your dealings with -- if we can just scroll down -- your dealings with Mr. Caldwell, your appearances, meetings with

Mr. Milgaard, it was on August the 4 th when disclosure was made. And then, if we can scroll down, you've also put in the dates that you appeared and what witnesses were present. If we can then just go ahead to the next page, again setting out the dates and which witnesses testified on each given day of the prelim. The next page, we've got the two meetings in Prince Albert, and then the next page, for trial we've done the same thing and put the witnesses on dates. So we may need to refer back to this as, just as a guide, so $I$ just want to point this out.

As well we have included
matters -- if you can go to page 410 -- we've included subsequent correspondence with various lawyers and the document IDs.

If we could then go to 006763 .
And this is a letter June 2nd, 1969, I think this would be about a week before you were retained, and it's a letter from Detective Barrett. We have seen some of these documents and heard some evidence that the practice at the time was that officers that were either guarding or observing Mr. Milgaard would prepare reports about what happened, and this one refers to a conversation
between David and Mrs. Milgaard where she was inquiring about Shorty and that she was going to interview Wilson and Nichol John regarding the case, and then the officer advised her that before she attempts to interview any police witnesses she either speaks to the chief of police or her son's lawyer or the agent of the Attorney General; do you have any recollection of that, of being made aware of that, at the time?

A
$Q$

Yes?
-- and the three "friends", I think there would be real risks in me or anybody in the Milgaard family approaching them. There is no doubt in my mind that that sense was confirmed when we got to trial.

Okay. In what respect?
And when Nichol John was in the witness box, and $I$ can't give you the page or anything like that, but I know that $I$ think the Learned Trial Judge asked if somebody had talked to her. And that is why,
of course, I later, in cross-examination, sought to, and $I$ believe did, establish that $I$ had never talked to her outside of the courtroom, and that nobody from the Milgaard family had exerted influence or talked to her.

And, again, just back either generally or specifically with respect to these witnesses, would it be your practice, as defence counsel, not to contact key Crown witnesses before the preliminary hearing or trial?

A
$Q$

Q
I would certainly be very cautious about it and I think, generally speaking, $I$ wouldn't do it. And, again, what would the risks be or why wouldn't you do it?

Well the illustration that $I$ gave you would be one matter that would be very significant. I mean it can taint the whole trial if there's any suggestion that $I$ was being pressured by the accused's counsel or his family or friends or something like that.

Would that have been a general practice of defence counsel at the time then, sir, that as far as dealing with Crown witnesses -- and I appreciate that every case is different and every counsel is different -- but would that have been the
prevailing view at the time?
A
I think most counsel would generally agree with that at the time.

If we can go to 006764 , please. And this is a memo of June 2nd, 1969, I think it's Detective Hanson if I'm not mistaken, but in any event it refers to, on that date, Dr. McDonald, and I think it says:
"... examined above person from 8:10 ...
to 9:30 p.m. in prisoner interview
room."
And we've heard from Dr. McDonald and we've heard from Mr. Caldwell that, at this time, the Crown retained Dr. McDonald to interview Mr. Milgaard. Did you become aware of that after you were retained?

A

Q
A
I'm sure $I$ became aware of it. I'm not sure who told me but $I$ remember, looking back, that $I$ know I had discussed it with David.

And what did you discuss with him?
Well, $I$ can't recall all the details, but $I$ know that we did discuss it, and $I$ know that very early in the going $I$ made it clear $I$ did not want him submitting to any further examinations without him speaking to me, and $I$ said $I$ was quite emphatic
about that.
Q
A
Q

A

A
Well, I suppose I likely assumed the worst, but from talking to David I gathered that he was going
into his background and so forth and so I rather thought that -- I may well have thought at the time that, and $I$ know later on $I$ did, that they maybe were thinking even of using him to call evidence of bad character, which $I$ would have resisted strenuously. Now I, on that $I$ have the benefit of hindsight, I guess, in this sense; that you showed me a document where $I$ think Dr.

McDonald was under subpoena for trial?
Q
A

Q
A

Q
A
$Q$
A

Q

A
Q

McDonald or a psychiatrist interview an accused is in the event that the accused is going to raise a defence of insanity or diminished capacity or something of that nature; do you recall that being the practice of the Crown at the time, to get an early assessment to --

A

Q

Well, that's the Harry, I'm sure it refers to Mr. Harry Walsh.

Q
And:
"... however indicated preference of

Mr. C.F. Tallis in Saskatoon." Do you know how you were selected to be David Milgaard's counsel?

A

Umm, I don't recall any specific discussion about it. I certainly had cautioned David against any visits by them, but that was for, of course, a different purpose.

If we can go back, $I$ want to now go to sort of
"Mrs. Milgaard stated she would be
contacting Nicole John and Ron Wilson to find out their stories on this matter." And this is similar to the last document. Do you recall any discussion with either David Milgaard or Mrs. Milgaard or David Milgaard's father about not contacting witnesses?
your recollection of what you first heard about this case and the evidence against Mr. Milgaard; can you tell us what you recall about that? Well whoever phoned me on behalf of Legal Aid emphasized the need to give him some advice immediately and expressed the hope that $I$ would, in effect, drop everything and go down to see him. I assumed at that time that perhaps there had been duty counsel or something like that, but when you bring up the original information it appears that he was brought before the Court on his own, whether or not somebody had seen him in the -after that $I$ don't know, but somewhere very quickly. And now whether it was after $I$ was at the police station, and it could well have been Mr. Wolff that told me about it, I learned that the "friends" -- and $I$ put "friends" in quotation marks -- had pointed to him as being the perpetrator. So that's why very early, at a very early stage, $I$ was able to caution him in that regard, and $I$ can't recall what particular attendance it was that $I$ was able to pass that on to him, but having looked at the memo of -- or letter of June 10 th with a copy to Mr. Wolff, I'm inclined to the view that Mr. Wolff was the one
who probably gave me the first indication of some of this background. He -- his door was, you know, generally open, and he was always very, very receptive to telling you, and it may well be that if he had -- if there were statements there on the original file that he had that he said, he would say "sit down and read them, I'll be sending them, sending this file over to the prosecution, the Crown prosecutor", but --

Okay.
-- at the courthouse.
I think the letter, 007063 I think is the letter you are referring to, and that's the c.c.?

Yeah, yes.
And this is a letter to Mr. Caldwell?
Yeah.
And I think we saw from the information that on June 9th you appeared for the first time for Mr. Milgaard and that Ben Wolff was the Crown?

Yes.
Is that correct?
Yes. Now I, but I think $I$ saw David on the 7 th, according to the record here.

Yeah.
I may well have gone to the police station to talk
to Ben Wolff and see what he had --
In your experience --
-- before.
-- with Mr. Wolff did he provide or was he in the habit of providing you with information about the Crown's case?

A
$Q$

A

Q
If you can tell us, again, of your first meeting with David Milgaard, would that have been at the police station, then, on June 7th?

A
$Q$
A
Yes.
And what do you recall of that meeting?
Well I, you know, recall a general introduction and discussion. And at that time $I$ had had an indication that it was very important that he get some advice, and $I$ moved to the -- moved into that aspect of it very quickly -- well, not quickly, but "promptly" would be a better term -- so that
he understood his rights and the importance, at that stage, of not discussing it with anyone without first talking to me.

And would you have got a general description from him, then, about his activities on the day of the murder?

Somewhere along the way, yes, but I -- one of the things that he mentioned right away, or I elicited from him, was that he denied any involvement in it. I mean, he told me that he was simply not involved in this, and he didn't suggest -- and none of his "friends" were either.

And those would be the "friends" in quotation marks?

A

BY MR. HODSON:
Good afternoon, Mr. Tallis. I think when we broke at lunch we were talking about, or you told us about your first encounter with Mr. Milgaard, I
think you told us you got a call from Legal Aid that he required some urgent assistance and that you would have met with him $I$ think on June 7 th at the police cells; is that right?

A

A
$Q$

A

Q guilt.

And I think what $I$ will do in a moment, sir, is to have you go through -- is it fair to say that you would have had discussions with David Milgaard on a number of occasions from the time you were retained on June 7 th, 1969 through to the conclusion of his trial?

Well, on the very first meeting, or at least the first portion of it, I of course discussed my general instructions with him which we've already mentioned in rather general terms, so that was canvassed very early in our discussions, and I'm
that you could appear in Court on his behalf?
sure that happened on the very first meeting with respect to not discussing the matter with the police or anyone else unless $I$ was there and consulted with him first, and with respect to the psychiatrist, I think the same applied there. I'm just not sure if, whether that was specifically discussed then or not, but $I$ know that my instructions were very directed, he was not to discuss matters with anyone. I think at that time or shortly after $I$ certainly emphasized the possibility of a visit from his "friends".

And that would be Ron Wilson, Albert Cadrain, Nichol John? That's right. If we could call up 007063 , please, and we talked about this letter a bit this morning. This is your June 10 th, 1969 letter to Mr. Caldwell and it appears to be your first piece of correspondence with him, and at that time $I$ think we've heard evidence that for a serious matter, a criminal charge that was going to go through Queen's Bench, that Mr. Caldwell was the agent to the Attorney General that would be handing it and --

Yes, certainly his office would be the one that would be handling it, and $I$ think he may have been
the sole member of the staff then, but $I$ think there were other members. I believe Mr. Perras was also on staff, but I'm not sure. We've heard evidence to that effect.

Yeah. I recollect there being at least two members of the prosecution staff.

And so let's, a couple of points here in this letter, you say:
"I have not had an opportunity to review the matter in detail but it would assist me if you could let me have copies of any witness statements and related reports on this matter. I realize that

I may not be entitled to them as a matter of law but $I$ can assure you that

I never try to abuse co-operation of
this nature when it is accorded to me.
I often find that it cuts down unnecessary work at the preliminary
hearing. Accordingly $I$ hope that you
will see fit to give my request
favourable consideration."
And we'll talk a bit later about disclosure and standards of the day. At this point would you have had any witness statements, do you know, or

A
any information?
Without -- certainly $I$ had some information because I'm quite sure that by this time $I$ had already cautioned David with respect to his friends.

Right. And as far as you saying, "At this point $I$ realize $I$ may not be entitled to them as a matter of law," what -- can you elaborate on that?

Well, $I$ can put it to you this way, that there was a line of cases that $I$ recall that indicated that you were not entitled to witness statements as a right before the preliminary hearing, or even at the preliminary hearing, but the practice in my view had developed here, perhaps it would be a good thing to call it a convention, of making witness statements available at an earlier stage. I know, for example, Judge Cumming presided over this preliminary hearing and $I$ can remember an issue coming up before him where, not in this case but in another one, where he felt that the Patterson case in the Supreme Court of Canada did not give him the right to order production of statements.

Right. And we'll see a bit later in your letters to Mr. Caldwell the English authorities that you
presented to him that suggested otherwise; is that right?

A

Q

A

Q
A

Q And at that time, as defence counsel, if you wished -- for example, if the Crown prosecutor said no, I won't give you statements, what was your -- what was your recourse?

A
Well, your recourse was essentially to, under some of the authorities, I'm thinking of the Patterson case and so on, and $I$ may be wrong in the name of the case, so you can correct me, that your recourse was to the trial judge, but of course you like to get the information well in advance and, in particular, you want to be able to have as much as possible before the preliminary hearing. And would those be witness statements then for witnesses that the Crown proposed to call at the preliminary hearing and trial?

Well, $I$ don't think it was -- if you took the English authorities, $I$ think that we're talking in terms of disclosure of statements or information that might be helpful to the accused even though the Crown didn't intend to call that evidence, so that's the distinction $I$ would make in response to your question, albeit in a very limited way because -- I don't know whether you want me to elaborate on it now or deal with it later. We'll deal with it a bit later when we get to the letter.

Okay.
Just on this issue of the convention, were there cases at or around this time that you were
familiar with where, either you were involved with or aware of where Crown counsel may not provide any witness statements to defence?

A
$Q$

That's -- my recollection is that the Patterson case -- now, I'm sure there were others, but I haven't gone back and briefed the law that was in that period, you know, for years. I remember another case that we used to rely on, and His Honour Judge Wakeling in the Police Court here, he often leaned on it pretty heavily, and it was the Mohadeo case out of the Privy Council, and in that situation, speaking from memory, the fairness of the proceedings dictated that an accused should get a copy of any statement the co-accused gave and that was sort of one of the building blocks for later arguments about production, and you are much more familiar with how the jurisprudence developed than $I$ am.

I'm not sure if $I$ would agree with that. If we
could go down to the last paragraph here, you say:
"I should perhaps mention that $I$ would
like copies of any psychiatric reports
that you may have obtained with respect
to this boy."
Can we take it from that that you would have been aware at this time that Dr. McDonald had
interviewed Mr. Milgaard for the purposes of possibly a psychiatric assessment or report? I certainly would take it. I don't remember specifically, but $I$ certainly take it from that that $I$ had that in my mind, that there may well be something of that nature. You see, at this time it's very early in the going and $I$ was sort of looking at, trying to look at every aspect of it and I may or may not have mentioned to you that by that time $I$ had developed a check list for defence counsel, that is, for myself --

Yes.
-- various points that one always wants to look at with respect to your role, and that would start of course right at the beginning with getting a copy of the information. That's relatively minor stuff, but important.

We have not seen any report from Dr. McDonald and

I don't think he prepared a written report. Do you recall ever getting anything in writing from the Crown relating to Dr. McDonald and his assessment or interview?

A

Q

That's correct. That signals at least to me, even at this late date, that $I$ had obvious -- I knew that he was in the picture to some extent, but I'm quite sure in my own mind, even though I have no recollection, that $I$ would have talked to him, maybe even the same day $I$ was down there to see David and before the matter came up in Court or the next day.

If we could go to 153491, please, and this is June
correct?

10th, 1969 , so this is the same date as your letter to Mr. Caldwell, copied to Mr. Wolff, this would be one day after your first Court appearance and three days after your first meeting with David Milgaard, and $I$ think just for the record, this handwriting on here $I$ think we've been told by Mr. Carlyle-Gordge is his, where I've circled the JM in the top right $I$ think is Mrs. Milgaard's initials. The balance of the underlining and handwriting I believe would have been Mr.

Carlyle-Gordge's or someone else's. Are you able to verify that? Is any of that yours?

None of that is mine and $I$ don't think any of the underlining is mine either.

And $I$ want to go through this in some detail. This would appear to be your -- at least it's the first memorandum of the three that we have. And you've had a chance to look at this memo in these proceedings?

Yes, I did.
Can you tell us, and again I'll go through this in detail, but where did this information come from? It talks about your thoughts on the case and things to do. Do you remember where you might have got the information from?

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

I have no recollection at this time, but trying to piece things together in the context in which you've advanced it to me, I more and more think that some of it, if not all of it, must have come from Mr. Ben Wolff.

Would any of this have come from David Milgaard, and perhaps, if you like, why don't we go through the memo and maybe I'll --

I don't think that it would have because he did not, until $I$ told him, he did not know about, anything about his friends possibly pointing to him. That's my recollection.

And that would have been the first meeting or the second meeting? Are you able to pinpoint?

I can't pinpoint it, but, you know, I may well have seen him on the 8 th or 9 th when he was in the cells, but --

Let's go through this memo and we'll come back to that point, so:
"In connection with this case it should
be noted for future consideration:

1. I gather that the Crown's case may
hinge to some extent on the statements
of two boys and a girl who was allegedly
in the car with the accused."

Now, I take it that would be Ron Wilson, Albert Cadrain and Nichol John?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

Yes.
And as of June 10th, 1969 would you have been aware that the three of them had given statements to the police?

I don't have any recollection of it, but that's why I think the most likely source would have to be Mr. Wolff.

Would it be, and again --
Now, whether he had statements on the file that he would have read to me or whether he would have told me things based on what he had picked up at the station $I$ cannot say at this time. I would have had very careful notes, you know, of that. Would it have been unusual for Mr. Wolff to show you or let you read a witness statement on a file? No, not at all.

So that's a possibility?
A very good possibility. I mean, I had done that many times with him when $I$ went down there, make it a point to get there early or wait until after he was through in Court and deal with him.

Okay. The memorandum goes on to say:
"There are rumours that these people
were under suspicion and may have even been told by the police that they were under suspicion. If they by chance do give evidence against the accused, then it is of the utmost importance to ascertain the nature of the various statements that they gave to the police. In other words it may well be that the initial statements that were given to the police denied any wrong doing on the part of the accused but that in subsequent interviews they may have changed their mind after they had been told that they were suspected of the crime."

And let me just pause there. Would you have been aware at this time, and we now know that initially at least Nichol John and Ron Wilson gave statements to the police that did not incriminate Mr. Milgaard; Mr. Cadrain's first statement did. Would you have been aware of that at the time do you think or would this be speculation on your part?

A
My own sense is that it's more than speculation, but $I$ don't have any recollection of it.

And why do you think it would be more than speculation?

Well, $I$ suppose this is always the danger of sort of looking at things retrospectively, but the nature of my comments are such there that $I$ think I must have been given some indication and the most likely source would have been Ben Wolff, because $I$ knew Mr. Wolff well enough to say, well, Ben, what have you heard.

I see.
And --
Would he have -- and he would have told you?
I think so.
Okay.
I never, you know, I never doubted that he would.
I always found him to be helpful and candid.
The memorandum carries on:
"In this connection the City Police Department apparently put some of them through a lie detector test and I gather that this might be a very fertile field for cross examination. The Police Commission paid out money to have a polygraph brought in from Calgary, Alberta in this connection."

And again, is this something you think you would have obtained from Mr. Wolff?

A And next:
"From the newspaper reports as to the nature of the stabbing and how the body was dragged, it may be very difficult to see how a boy of this age and size would have had the strength to do what was apparently done when you consider that the girl was likely in reasonably good physical condition. Her condition should be carefully checked out in cross
examination of the doctors and particularly on the question of the weight and so forth."

And again, would you have gone and looked at newspaper reports reporting on the murder?

I'm sure $I$ did, and if $I$ didn't specifically dig them out myself, I'm sure Miss Wilson did, because she was a great reader and read the paper diligently.

Are you able to tell us whether before you were engaged by Mr. Milgaard, what knowledge you would have had of Gail Miller's murder and his subsequent arrest?

At this stage $I$ don't have any recollection other than to say $I$ remember, you know, hearing of the arrest, but to have a recollection of the details is simply beyond me. I have no doubt that $I$ did, you know, hear that there had been an arrest and so forth, but that's the best $I$ can do to assist you on that aspect of the case.

Turn the page, please, paragraph 3:
"The police no doubt have fingerprints
of this young boy and a careful check should be made to see whether or not his fingerprints were discovered on any of
the items that were allegedly stolen and subsequently located. If his fingerprints were not located, then it might be interesting to find out whether or not the fingerprints of any other boy or girl were located on them." And can you tell us what you might have been referring to about items that were allegedly stolen and subsequently located?

A
That would refer to some of the items that were found, or allegedly found.

Belonging to Gail Miller?
Yes. Now, I would characterize that paragraph as just some reflections that $I$ put down for future consideration.

Okay. Now, paragraph 4 --
I was making assumptions there that, you know, fingerprinting and everything had been done, but I'm quite satisfied I didn't have any information on that at that time.

Q Yeah. I think here the first sentence is the police no doubt have fingerprints of this young boy.

A
Oh, I see.
Yeah, you are presuming that they would have
.

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
done --
That's an assumption that $I$ made, that they would have taken them even before he, probably before his arrest.

Paragraph 4:
"It would be desirable to ascertain whether or not any of the witnesses are users of drugs because there is some rumour that the girl believes she was out of the car and simply does not ever remember getting back into the car. This sounds rather strange to me and once again will have to be explored in cross examination."

Again, can you tell us where this rumour may have come from?

You know, I had people that would give me information and so forth, but to identify who passed that rumour onto me $I$ simply cannot recall at this time.

If -- I think you've told us that certainly you
told us --
would have talked to Mr. Wolff to find out whatever you could about, or you think you would have to find out whatever you could about the case. Did you have other sources or contacts around that you might go to to see what they heard?

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A

Q

Well, there were certainly people on the west side that $I$ knew very well and would try to pick up whatever $I$ could from them.

And so might that be the source of the -It's quite possible $I$ would say in this respect. It might even be likely.

And then again, can you elaborate at all -- I'm presuming this is referring to Nichol John and it seems to be fairly specific information about what she had told the police. Is this something that you might have got from Ben Wolff do you think?

I don't think so. I think it's a rumour that $I$ must have picked up somewhere.

Okay. And scroll down, paragraph 5:
"The boy has emphatically denied the commission of this offence and I gather that he has been interrogated by quite a number of police officers. He was apparently questioned some time ago in

Manitoba and then released because they did not have sufficient evidence to hold him. The interesting thing here is that he is $161 / 2$ years of age and apparently he has not waivered from his denial even though he has been interrogated by quite a number of people. On the way back from B.C. they apparently talked to him quite a bit on the plane and kept asking him "didn't it bother his conscious" or words to that effort."

Or effect?
It should be effect.
Effect.

> "I gather that he reiterated that he had not done it and while this might technically be self serving evidence, it does come within the exception to the general rule when you deal with it specifically at the time of his arrest or charge."

And again, the source of this information, are you able to tell us anything more than what you've told us about the remainder of the memo, as to where you would have obtained it from?


A

Q
A
$Q$

A

Q

Well, I think that there is information in there that $I$ would have only really have obtained. Much of it would be from David just reading it in context. Now, the other, the last part dealing with self-serving evidence, that's just a reflection or a thought that $I$ highlighted and we can deal with it later, but $I$ changed my mind about that particular point of --

And --
-- law as applied to this particular case.
What significance did you place on the fact that Mr. Milgaard had emphatically denied the commission of the offence and that despite being interrogated by quite a number of police officers had not made any admissions?

Well I proceeded on the footing that what he told me in that regard was correct.

If we can then go to 065484 , please. This is a letter, again June 10th, 1969 to Mr. Kujawa, and this is again dealing with -- just call out this part. You say here:
"I have had the opportunity to speak to this boy and his mother and also briefly to Lieutenant Short of the Saskatoon City Police."

Would Lieutenant Short have been the source of any of the information that was in your June 10th, 1969 memorandum?

A
I don't think so, because $I$ recall, after $I$ had gone through this material, asking him some relatively minor thing on one occasion and he told me that any response would have to be handled through the prosecutors office. I rather think it involved discussing having him brought down a little early --

I see.
A

Q -- so that $I$ could talk to him. But, certainly, I think he generally observed the protocol that it goes to the prosecutor and then the prosecutor makes the decision.

And then here you ask the Attorney General, you indicate you:
"... understand that the Crown have had . . ."

Mr. Milgaard:
"... examined by a psychiatrist of their choosing. I would like to have a defence psychiatrist appointed and I am wondering if you could authorize such an expenditure. I gather that the Legal

Aid Committee do not have authority to permit me to make these arrangements unless $I$ can be sure that $I$ am going to call the man as a witness and then witness fees can be authorized.

At this stage $I$ feel that $I$
would like to have a very thorough examination made."

Can you explain the purpose of that request?
Well, at that time, $I$ think that $I$ had been alerted to the possibility that the Crown might attempt to adduce evidence of bad character, or propensity evidence, and $I$ wanted to be prepared to deal with that. Now later, of course, I was given to understand that they weren't going to lead it in as part of their case, but $I$ don't recall all the discussions. But you are asking me what $I$ was concerned with, and that's my best recollection, that I --

Q And I don't --
-- that $I$ wanted, I guess, to be ready to meet this type of situation.
$Q$
At this stage -- and $I$ don't want to jump ahead, Mr. Tallis, because we will go through this in detail --

A Yeah.
Q -- your discussions with David Milgaard, but at this point, June 10th, 1969, I think you've told us you would have met with Mr. Milgaard on at least a couple of occasions?

Yeah.
Would you have had information from Mr. Milgaard himself that caused you concern that there might be something in his background that might give rise to number 1 , the Crown leading evidence of bad character or of a propensity to commit the crime; or 2, the need, that you might need to get your own psychiatric evidence to assist you in advising your client?

A
I certainly had information from him very early in the going about his background, I'll say his troubled background, as a youth -- and he still was -- his education, his work record, albeit short. I remember the name Maclean's, I think he'd been selling Maclean's magazine subscriptions, but $I$ don't know whether there were other papers he was selling subscriptions for as well. But $I$ certainly was conscious of the possibility, but $I$ want to make it clear, $I$ would have strenuously resisted any attempt to adduce
evidence of bad character, but if it had gone in, I had in mind $I$ would like to maybe have our own psychiatrist.

And why, on June 10th, '69, what caused you to think that the Crown might lead evidence regarding propensity to commit the crime?

Well, the possibility of leading the evidence.
Possibility?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Particularly from what $I$-- from having found out that he had been interviewed by a Crown psychiatrist even before he had the benefit of counsel.

I see. And was there anything that you recall, again on June 10th, 1969 or your first couple of meetings with Mr. Milgaard, that gave you concern that the Crown might lead that evidence of propensity to commit the crime?

I guess it was just my sense of the possibility -Okay.
-- that $I$ have already articulated to you. Sure. If we could call 006795. This is a handwritten note of Detective Sergeant Mackie to Chief Kettles June 16th, 1969, and I think this actually coincides with a Court appearance date as well, it says:
"During conversation Mrs. Milgaard relayed a message from Mr. Tallis to effect that Dave should watch his conduct as this could be used in court." And, again, $I$ think that's similar to what you have told us before, that you would have given that caution and advice to Mr. Milgaard? That's correct.

Q 007064 , please. Now this is June 23, 1969, a letter from Mr. Caldwell back to you responding to your June 10 th letter, and Mr. Caldwell says:
"I have not, as yet, received any statements, reports ... in a written form concerning this matter, however, when the file arrives ... I will be in touch with you ..."

And so again, at this point in time, it would appear that Mr . Caldwell did not have any of the written statements; does that sound correct?

A

Q

A

Q Well that's correct, that's right, that's exactly -- that's what $I$-- that's how I read his letter. And is it possible, based on your dealings with Mr. Wolff, that Mr. Wolff may have had on his file some statements that may not yet have gone to Mr. Caldwell?

Well, this was a letter of June $23 r d$, my own feeling is that Mr. Wolff would definitely have had some of that on his file.

Yeah. I think Mr. Caldwell's evidence was that until he became involved in the setting of the preliminary hearing, that that's when he would get the file, and $I$ think we heard evidence from Mr. Ullrich that in early July was when the
comprehensive case went over to him.
A
$Q$

A

Yes, Mr. Ben Wolff.
Yeah. Go to 007065 . This is a letter June 25, '69, you back to Mr. Caldwell talking about the adjourn date and that you would like:
"... to speak to the question of a date for the preliminary hearing at that time and perhaps you could appear or have Mr. Wolff give me some indication of a suitable date."

And I understand, at that time, that that was the process, the handoff between Mr. Wolff and Mr. Caldwell would be the time the preliminary hearing date is -- at the time of the preliminary hearing; is that right?

Yes. It was not unusual for Mr. Wolff to speak to it on behalf of the prosecution.

Go to 006797. And this is a letter from Mr. Karst
to Chief Kettles reporting on a meeting between Mr. -- Mrs. Milgaard and David Milgaard. She says:
"Mrs. Milgaard advised that Mr. Tallis thought it unwise to apply for bail at this time. She also confirmed her belief to him that he is innocent of the charge, to which he replied 'there were many things that happened and evidence that would come out at the prelim that they were not aware of'."

And a couple of questions on that. What about the issue of bail for David Milgaard; was that something that you considered or discussed with him?

A
Yes. At that time $I$ don't think The Bail Reform Act was in, and the prospect of getting bail in
these circumstances at that stage, I didn't see any reasonable prospect of it.

Now this comment here, and again $I$ appreciate that these are someone else's words, but is it possible that David Milgaard would be relaying information that you may have told him that there were many things that happened and evidence that would come out at the prelim that they were not aware of? I don't think $I$ would have put it in, quite in that way.

Yes.
But $I$ certainly would have indicated that, you know, "we know some of the things that are going to come out, but that there may well be other things that we're not aware of that will come out."

Now this is July $3 r d$.
Yes.
This would be about three weeks after you were first retained?

Yes, that's right.
Do you think, at this point, you would have been aware of the contents of Ron Wilson's incriminating statement, Nichol John's
incriminating statement, and Albert Cadrain's
incriminating statement?
A
I certainly was aware of the con -- or, you know, I can't say 'precise contents', because without my file $I$ wouldn't know, but $I$ certainly knew that they had given incriminating statements to investigating officers and $I$ think that $I$ knew that they had -- that they were at variance with some of their initial statements.

Now without my file I couldn't recall all of these details, but I'm quite confident that I had a pretty good sense of the main aspects of this. For example one of the statements from Nichol John of May 24 th, 1969 , in the statement which was sworn before a Justice of the Peace I think on that date, where she stated that she witnessed David Milgaard grab I think either Gail Miller or a girl and drag her down the alley with -- and stabbing her; do you recall learning about that evidence or statement early on in your retainer? Yes, $I$-- I -- and $I$ think that some of it probably came, if not all of it, from Mr. Wolff the more $I$ think about it.

And was that something that you -- would you have conveyed that to David Milgaard, then, early on in
your dealings with him?
Oh, yes, I was trying to keep him posted on what $I$ was getting and anything that $I, ~ y o u ~ k n o w, ~ h e a r d$ or picked up anywhere else.

If we can then go to 065483 , please. Just a couple of documents here we'll go through for the record. This is July 7th, 1969 to Mr. Kujawa following up on your possibility of getting an independent psychiatric -- psychiatrist, pardon me, retained by the defence. And then as well 065355, which is --

A
Q

A ,
 When -- somewhere along the line of the time frame I had an indication that the Crown wasn't going to lead evidence of bad character and I didn't pursue this. Now that doesn't mean that $I$ hadn't considered the possibility of getting a psych -psychiatric assistance from a friend of mine -Okay.

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q
A
Q

A
Q
-- which would be at no cost.
So let's just go back on the point, and $I$ think at some point did Mr. Caldwell then tell you "I do not intend to lead psychiatric evidence or evidence suggesting that David Milgaard has a propensity to commit this type of crime"? I'm quite sure of that, that he indicated that to me.

And, in fairness, --
And I think $I$ had indicated to him in our discussions that $I$ would vigorously oppose it if he pursued it, so --

Right, and I think you've told us that -Yeah.
-- you did not view that as being properly admissible; is that right?

That's right, yeah.
So he is not going to call that evidence. Then the other issue you raised, and we'll deal with this in more detail when we talk about the factors that went into your advice to Mr. Milgaard about testifying, is this issue of bad character, and perhaps you can explain to us under what circumstances you thought you might need some psychiatric evidence regarding David Milgaard,
either from a confidant/friend or from a psychiatrist that you would retain?

A
Well if the Crown psychiatrist had testified that this individual, that David was a person of violent disposition and likely to kill or maim, I would clearly want to challenge that assessment, and in order to do so one would want to have the opinion of another practitioner in the field as well as maybe lay people who knew him.

Okay. Now, given that the Crown said they were not going to lead that evidence, what other situation might you have found yourself in where you might have needed psychiatric evidence relating to Mr. Milgaard?

Yeah. At this stage $I$ can only say this; that I had to consider the possibility that if he was called, if $I$ called him as a witness, that he might inadvertently put his character in issue and then the Crown might take the position that they could now lead rebuttal evidence on that.

And can you give us an example of how that might happen, how -- if you -- when you say
"inadvertent" I take it then, when you put his evidence in, you would not put his character into issue?

That's right, $I$ would try to control it.
And why?
Well, because I don't think that it was a relevant consideration, $I$ didn't think it was a relevant consideration with respect to the issue before the Court. And propensity evidence, as I understood it then, was that you don't convict a person on the basis of his bad character, you convict him on the basis of the evidence adduced with respect to this crime. And that's something that $I$ would be very conscious of, not only in my examination-in-chief, but also in cross-examination. I have to -- you have to worry about that too, because a person can be lured into putting their character in issue on cross-examination, and not appreciate the consequences of it.

Let's just talk firstly about, if you had called David Milgaard as a witness, if he would have answered a question either from you or Mr. Caldwell to the effect that "I'm not the type of person that would commit that type of crime"; is that something -- and I appreciate that there's legal argument that goes into it -- but is that the type of thing that might raise the prospect
that the Crown would be entitled to call rebuttal evidence that suggested that he was the type of person that might commit that crime?

A

Q

A
2

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
I think that's a good illustration of how it could unfold.

And so, in that scenario, was one of the reasons you were trying to gather this information would be to assist you in the event that that type of issue came up before the Court?

Yes.
If we can now go ahead to August 4th, 1969, and I just want to call up 065492 on the left side and on the right side if you could put 065407 , and we touched on these earlier. And these are the two accounts that talk about your three in-person meetings with David Milgaard --

Yes.
-- at Prince Albert being August 4th, December 11th, and November 12 th right above. And I think you've told us that that would have been three meetings where you went to Prince Albert and met in person with David Milgaard; is that correct? That's quite correct.

And August 4 th would be before the preliminary hearing, and the November $12 t h / D e c e m b e r ~ 11 t h ~ w o u l d ~$
be after the preliminary hearing but before the trial, correct?

A
Q

Right. And then $I$ think you also told us that during the course of the preliminary hearing, starting August $18 t h$ finishing September 11 th, 1969, that you would have spent many occasions both before, perhaps the day before, or during the proceedings while the Court wasn't sitting, spending time with Mr. Milgaard; is that correct? Yes, and during the breaks or after, you know, before the proceeding got underway in the morning. Would it be fair to say that August 4th, although
it wasn't your first meeting with Mr. Milgaard and not your first discussion, but would this be your first significant sit-down meeting with him where you could go through everything?

A

Q
could not have gone through unless $I$ was aware of their contents. As I said to you earlier, whether I got -- I don't think $I$ got copies from Mr. Wolff, but $I$ may well have sat down and written out essentially everything that was in them, because by the time $I$ went $u p$ on August 4 th $I$ certainly had background information that enabled me to review the whole thing with him, and this was done deliberately to be ready for the preliminary hearing.

And so on your meeting of August 4 th, 1969 with David Milgaard, and perhaps prior, would you have gone through with Mr. Milgaard what Ron Wilson, Albert Cadrain, and Nichol John were saying in these statements --

Yes.
-- about his involvement in the crime?
Yes, I certainly had discussed, discussed that with him even before August 4th.

Now there is also some record that suggests David Milgaard, he provided two statements to the police I believe on March 3rd, 1969 and I think the other one was April 18th if I'm not mistaken, of 1969; would you have been aware -- yeah, it is April 18th, '69 -- would you have been aware of the fact
that Mr. Milgaard gave two statements to the police and, if so, at what stage in your involvement would you have become aware of that? Well very early on $I$ became aware that there were two written statements, but $I$ think that $I$ also became aware that he probably gave oral statements or had been interviewed by the police even before they took written statements.

Okay. And would that be from Mr. Wolff do you think?

I think it probably was.
Okay.
Now I -- the other, and there would be another source too, and that is David himself. I mean early, very early on in one of the early meetings I am quite sure that $I$ asked him about his involvement with the police, and $I$ think $I$ remember him telling me in general terms that there was one statement that he hadn't signed, and of course later on when $I$ looked at those documents $I$ see that there was one that wasn't signed, he didn't wish to sign it as $I$ recall.

Q And on August 4th, 1969, when you went to meet with Mr. Milgaard, can you tell us at that time whether you would have either had copies of his
written statements or been aware of the contents of those written statements?


A

I'm quite safe in saying that $I$ would be aware of the contents. Whether I had actual copies, I do not recall, and the reason $I$ say that is that $I$ don't recall Mr. Wolff actually giving me any copies. I'm just a -- but I'm quite sure I must have got information from him. And as I said to you earlier, he may very well have said "sit down and read it and make some notes", and everything like that.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I'm sorry, Mr. Hodson, was the witness asked this with respect to Mr. Milgaard's own statements?

MR. HODSON: Yes, that was the last question.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: That was the last one? Okay.

MR. HODSON: The March 3rd and April, I think it's 18th, 1969 statements, his two statements.

BY MR. HODSON:

And $I$ think your evidence, sir, was that yes, you would have certainly -- I think you said it's safe to say that you were aware of the contents and
possibly may even have had some notes recounting what was in the statement; is that correct? Yes, yes. And, also, $I$ was aware from talking to him of the fact that he had probably talked to the police on occasions where no statement was actually taken.

Now, we know that from some police reports that we've had a chance to look at, that he talked to the police on occasion. How would you have become aware of that then?

From talking to David, by asking him.
I see, okay.
And here again, if $I$ had my notes, I'm sure that they would indicate the nature of the discussion, content of it, but --

What I would now like to do, Mr. Tallis, is to have you walk through and tell us what it was that you can recall David Milgaard telling you in preparation for the trial, and what $I$ would like to do, and I appreciate, sir, that other than what

I have shown you, you do not have your file notes to indicate on what day he may have told you what items, but $I$ would like to go through it this way, is to tell us generally what you recall him telling you and then $I$ will try and prompt you to
tell us one of two things; number 1, whether the information would have been provided by Mr. Milgaard to you prior to the preliminary hearing or after, if you are able to tell us, and secondly, whether the information was provided by Mr. Milgaard to you early on in the sense of initial meetings or whether it was information that you had to, for lack of a better word, prod or try and get from him on subsequent leaves, okay, and so then that way we'll try and figure out when you received the information and at what point in the proceedings it may have come from. And if we can start with, you told us about, I think you said you would have talked about his general background. What do you recall Mr. Milgaard telling you about his background? Well, $I$ think that $I$ can sum it $u p$ this way as far as difficulties he had had, he had had a troubled youth, and from talking to him he certainly described some conflict with the law, but $I$ don't recall any details at this stage. I think there was something raised about sexual morality and things like that, but that's the best $I$ can do in that area, but he certainly had had a troubled background, and then of course I talked about his
schooling and $I$ recall that he had had some difficulties in that connection, and $I$ know in some of the material there's reference to what social workers had said and so on, but I can't recall those details. I know I had them and spent a fair bit of time talking to him, getting to know him, and then of course his work record, albeit he was very youthful, he had been selling newspaper, or Maclean's subscriptions, and whether there were others, but in this area $I$ spent, $I$ know, quite a bit of time talking about his background, but I really can't assist you any more than that.

Q
Sure. And would you have made notes then of what he told you?

Oh, yes, very copious notes.
Would you have obtained from third parties any documents relating to Mr. Milgaard dealing with social workers, psychiatrists, doctors, anything of that nature?

A
No, I didn't have anything like that. I know that you were good enough to show me some documentation, but $I$ had never seen anything like that or spoken to any of the people that were involved.

And for the record, Mr. Tallis, what I showed you
is some of the documents $I$ believe that Dr.
McDonald had and Mr. Caldwell may have had at the time and I think, and please correct me if I'm wrong, what you are telling us is that you would not have seen any documents relating to Mr. Milgaard's psychological background, any issues he may have had at school with social workers, anything of that nature; is that correct?

That is correct. My source on that was David. Did you talk to his parents at all about this subject?

I may have, but I can't recall any details. I know David was very reluctant to have me discuss certain matters with his parents and I could understand that.

And what, just generally, what types of matters was he --

A
Well, there were, you know, questions of sexual conduct and so forth. I could understand a boy of that age not wanting me to discuss it either in the presence of his mother or, you know, with her, that was my feeling.

And so --
A
And $I$ respected his privacy.
And so these meetings and interviews of David

Milgaard on these subjects, would they take place in the absence of his mother then?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$

informing yourself about what advice you should give to him?

A
Q

A
$Q$
A

Q

A
mean, there were a lot of kids of that age in that era that were doing drugs as they used to say. We've heard the term hippie being used for these young people in the late '60s. Can you tell us, did you have any concerns about how that might play with the jury?

Well, it's certainly not something that one would want to see run to the top of the flag pole because it could deflect attention away from the real issue.

And at that time, 1969, do you recall, Mr. Tallis, whether there was any, sort of in the community any issues with hippies and drugs and things of that nature that might influence a jury?

Well, the possibility was always there and I was quite familiar with small town, rural Saskatchewan, in that area the attitude was very inhospitable to that type of conduct. Not that I'm suggesting the cities cultivated it, but I'm just saying that my recollection is that the view was pretty strict in most of the areas.

It brings up a point, Mr. Tallis, that $I$ had intended to cover later but can ask you now. Did you give any thought to seeking a change of venue of the trial to another location within

Saskatchewan?
A
Yes, this was certainly something that $I$ considered, but on balance $I$ ended up rejecting the notion that maybe one should do it.

And why was that?
Well, I thought that one could get a conscientious and fair-minded jury in Saskatoon where $I$ would certainly have a much better opportunity to vet the members of the jury panel, and secondly, of course, $I$ knew that David had been around Regina quite a bit and that the drug activities that he was in had taken place there, whereas Saskatoon, he hadn't been here very much. As far as outlying communities, outlying judicial centres, I think that it would have been very unwise.

And would that be because Regina, Saskatoon would be the two urban judicial centres, beyond that would be rural?

A

Q
More rural, yes, more rural, and less exposure to drugs and the hippie culture, if $I$ may borrow your term.

I borrowed it from others, so yes, you may. What about outside the province, was that a possibility at the time?

A Well, I don't recall whether it was in or not. I
didn't consider that it was a realistic, that it was a possibility. Now, the Threinen case here involved an application to move a murder trial out of the province and that was rejected and I think is still considered an authority on the question, that it simply was not permissible in law. I cannot recall now whether that case was decided after this case or before.

I think it was 1974 .
I see. Well, in any event, long before that $I$ was of the view, and $I$ think that $I$ had looked into it on some occasion, that it simply was not a point that would be successful.

MR. HODSON: Okay. This may be an
appropriate spot to break, Mr. Commissioner. (Adjourned at 2:44 p.m.)
(Reconvened at 3:09 p.m.)
BY MR. HODSON:
Mr. Tallis, just when we broke we were talking about the possibility of a change in venue and $I$ think you were telling us that you had considered it and decided not to make that application; is that correct?

A
That's correct.
And were there any other matters that you
considered other than what you told us?
A
Well, $I$ think that $I$ mentioned to you that later on the Threinen case came along which dealt with the issue, but before that $I$ had certainly thought about the issue and, among other things, I concluded that it simply would not pass constitutional muster, if $I$ may use that term, in terms of -- that is, in terms of trying to have it transferred to another province.

And as far as within the province, I think you've told us the various reasons why you considered Saskatoon to be a preferable venue then; is that correct?

Yes, within the province $I$ thought Saskatoon was a preferable venue from the standpoint of the defence, and just to go back, when we're talking about change of venue to another province, and when I say that I didn't think it would have ever passed constitutional muster even before the Threinen case, I do not think the law would have enabled Saskatchewan, for example, to move the case to Alberta and prosecute it in Alberta. Okay. If we can then just go back, and $I$ would like to maybe start chronologically a bit from the events of January 30 and 31,1969 and have you
tell us what David Milgaard told you about the events of those two days, perhaps starting in Regina and getting the vehicle ready and the purpose of the trip and how he knew Ron and Nichol.

A
I should preface my remarks by saying that the details evolved over a period of time and I'm not able, and $I$ think you mentioned this, to pinpoint exactly when certain information was given to me, but of course my, on my first interview and when $I$ took instructions from him, I've made it clear that he denied any involvement and also denied that any person in the vehicle had anything to do with that and I'm quite sure that $I$ put those questions directly to him, but then to back up, I can't recall the time in which they left, at which they left Regina, but my recollection is it was sometime after midnight. Before they left they had, had to get ready to go and there was some difficulty with the battery in their car and they got another battery and put it in, so we had a discussion about battery acid.
$Q$ Do you recall what he told you about where they got the battery from?

A
I'm not sure, but $I$ think, to use the term that
some of the kids used then, I think it was borrowed, but that's my recollection.
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q
A
 From someone who knew it was being borrowed? No, I took it to be that it was -Stolen? Stolen.

And so was that something he would have told you then?

If not right then, not too long, you know, at one of the subsequent meetings when $I$ was fleshing out things.

Okay.
And I also asked about whether they were using drugs or liquor on the trip. Now, before that there's no doubt they had been using drugs in Regina, but $I$ don't know how long before, whether it was the day before or not, $I$ just don't remember those details, but they did get on their way, and my recollection is that he had known Wilson for quite some time and they met, they knew Nichol. I don't think he had known her that long, but I'm not sure where he had met her, whether it was in a restaurant or something like that and that she then decided to come with them, that is, I think he had known her before, but that
particular day, and so they started out and I appreciated from talking to him that essentially they didn't have any -- well, they didn't have any money. Nichol I think had a little bit of money, but she was the only one that had any funds at all, and that was very modest.

And did you -- did he tell you what they planned on doing to finance the trip or to pay for expenses along the way?

Well, I recall that they stopped at Aylesbury which is, as you know, west of Chamberlain, and at that time he entered the, what $I$ would call the elevator office. I don't recall the name of the elevator, that is, of the grain company, but I know that at that time there were a number of elevators there, and $I$ don't recall any real details about the time in Aylesbury except they didn't, he didn't get anything by way of money. The purpose of going into the office was to try to find some money in there just in case it was left and then $I$ think you or somebody or some of the material suggested that a flashlight had been taken out.

Yeah.
I have no recollection of any mention of a
flashlight being taken, but $I$ can't say one way or the other on that without my notes.

Sure. And just the evidence we've heard and the statements suggest that a flashlight was taken that Mr . Wilson then later returned to the police. Just back on the elevator, do you recall whether he told you who went into the elevator?

My recollection is that David was the one who went in, but the others certainly knew the purpose of going in and were there, $I$ mean, in the vehicle. And was the purpose of going in to try and find some money?

A That's right.
Do you recall Mr. Milgaard telling you anything about discussions that he and Ron Wilson and/or Nichol John may have had about criminal activity that might be undertaken to get money for the trip?

Okay.
A
You know, $I$ don't have any recollection of that at this time, but he may well have told me about that.

Because they didn't have any money and sort of the subsequent conversation would tend to lend some credence to that, but to say that $I$ have any
recollection of him relating this discussion about snatching purses or something like that to get money, $I$ simply don't recall it at this stage. And in fact $I$ think it was Mr. Wilson's evidence and/or statements that indicated that on the trip from Regina to Saskatoon $I$ think he said that he and David discussed purse snatching and I think perhaps break and enters, although that may not have been consistent with all of his statements, but something along those lines to finance the trip, and you're telling us $I$ think that you don't have a recollection of David telling you that; is that correct?

I don't have a recollection of him telling me about that discussion, but it -- he may well have. If we can just back up for a moment. In Regina $I$ think you talked about the battery and spilling acid on his clothing. Do you recall what he told you about whether he changed his pants in Regina or not?

A
I don't think he changed -- my recollection is that he changed his trousers later in Saskatoon, and that's sort of jumping ahead, but $I$ don't recall any mention of -- in fact, in my mind he did not suggest that he changed his trousers in

Regina.
Okay. If we could -- what did he tell you was the purpose of the trip, where were they going and why were they going to Saskatoon?

Well, I think that they were going to Saskatoon so that he could look up his friend Shorty Cadrain and then they were going to go on to Alberta, or there was some talk $I$ think of maybe even going east, but $I$ think the primary focus was on going to Alberta.

And for what purpose, did he tell you? Well, it was just $I$ think part of the lifestyle at that stage and I believe that, you know, they knew that they could find drugs and things along the way.

And did you ask Mr. Milgaard whether he had a knife on his possession or in the car on the trip between Regina and Saskatoon?

Yes, I recall him telling me that he had a knife, this is before they were at Aylesbury, and the knife he had -- first of all, he said it wasn't a paring knife and in particular it was not the maroon-handled knife that had allegedly been used in the homicide, but he described the knife -- I took it in terms of meaning it had a flexible
blade. I think he may have used the term soft blade and that flexible is my interpretation of it, and this was handy for slipping the lock on many doors at that time, sort of like someone used to use the heavy plastic to do it, but a knife blade often was used.

Did he still have the knife?
No, he didn't know what had happened to it.
And did he describe it any further as far as colour, how big it was, anything of that nature?

It wasn't a very long-bladed knife, but he was quite clear in saying it was not a paring knife type that was like the maroon-handled knife that was presented.

Okay.
Now, I know we discussed this in quite detail, a bit of detail as to -- I was anxious to know what might have happened to it and so on, but -Did -- I'm sorry?
-- he sort of lost track, he lost track of that and was unable to tell me.

Did the fact that he told you he had a knife on the trip between Regina and Saskatoon cause you some concern?

A
Well, I knew that it would be a relevant
consideration and would be a significant area of questioning if he gave evidence. If not, if it wasn't led in chief, it would have certainly involved a significant cross-examination, along with other matters.

Right. Now, the elevator entry, was that something that Mr. Milgaard volunteered to you early on or can you tell us when that would have come out in the discussions?

It didn't come out in the first meeting as $I$ recall it, it wasn't -- it was not too long after, and I've gone through all the documents and everything that you've shown me, and my best recollection is that it came out in discussions well -- before the visit to Prince Albert.

Okay. Now --
And he -- I asked him, of course, you know, what they did along the way because their arrival in Saskatoon was quite a few hours after they left and I have a vague recollection of some mention being made of a stop in Craik, which of course is the next town from Aylesbury if you are travelling from Regina to Saskatoon, but $I$ can't recall any details of what happened there, $I$ just remember the Town of Craik being mentioned, but to fill in
details on that without my notes is just impossible for me.

I think we've seen some mention of the fact that their vehicle may have been stuck there and that's where they stripped the reverse out of the car.

Does that assist your memory at all?
No. I read that and it just doesn't assist me in the discussion as to, number 1, why they were there and, number 2, what happened there and so on.

The elevator break-in $I$ think is mentioned, and $I$ stand to be corrected, but $I$ think it's mentioned in Ron Wilson's, one of Ron Wilson's statements to the police. Is it possible that that issue would have been raised with Mr. Milgaard by you based on what you knew was in the statement?

A
$Q$ It's quite possible, although it may, it's equally possible that $I$ was asking him, you know, very deliberately about where did you stop, what happened and so on.

Then let's talk about their arrival in Saskatoon. What did he tell you about the time of day that he arrived, or was he able to put a time to it?

A He didn't put a specific time. From our discussions $I$ took it to be early morning, and
from the, from our discussion $I$ remember
concluding, although $I$ can't recall the details, that they basically came in the freeway route -Yes.
-- and that they -- and I say that because I think
I remember some reference to the Sears store.
Yes.
A

Q

A
I -- that's right. But then there was -- I tried
to figure -- then from our discussion, and of course he wasn't able to pinpoint anything that much, I concluded that they did go to the west side, which is essentially where he was looking to find his friend Shorty.

Yes.
Pleasant Hill District. I call, I use the term
"west side" to refer to the area west of Idylwyld, or what we used to call Avenue A. And from
talking to him $I$ gathered that at one point they may have been on 22 nd street going west, and the
reason $I$ say that is it was sort of a main
thoroughfare out of town so to speak, and I can't
tell you why $I$ came to that conclusion but
certainly, from our discussion, I realized they may well have been on there and proceeded west for some distance.

If we could maybe call up map A. We have a couple of maps here that might assist us, and I think this was the map, I believe this may have been the map that was used at trial; does this look familiar?

A
Well $I$ can't say that it does, but it's certainly accurate, it reflects the streets as I recall them.

I'm just going to take a look, maybe map $B$ or map C, I can't recall. No, the next map. I'm wondering if we could get one with the freeway on it. Is there a map $C$ ? No, that doesn't help. If we can go back to map A. For Monday, Mr. Tallis, I will find -- we do have some city maps that might assist you. And $I$ think, if $I$ may, I think you said that they would have come in, there would be a number of blocks to the east, this is north, they would have come in on the freeway and turned onto 20 th Street $I$ think you said; is that correct?

A
Yes, that's, that's my sense of things, that they made the turn there and then later got over onto

22 nd.
Do you know where? Based on your discussions with Mr. Milgaard did you arrive or conclude in your mind where -- and let me just pause here. This is presumably before they visited the Trav-a-leer Motel; is that correct?

Oh, yes, we're talking about that.
So this is their arrival and before they get to
the Trav-a-leer Motel; correct?
Yes.
And so I think you are saying you thought that they were on 20 th Street for a while; is that correct?

Turned off there near Sears and drove to the west side, and $I$ have a recollection that they ended up at one point on 22 nd Street, which is sort of a main thoroughfare. Why I have that recollection $I$ cannot tell you, but they -- and then they drove, they were -- moved in a westerly direction, and then $I$ think they were, as $I$ recall it they were driving north and south looking for landmarks that David could see with a view to locating his friend Shorty's place.

So if $I$ have this correct on the map they would go west on $20 t h$ Street, and then north to $22 n d$, west,
and back north and south on the avenues; is that
--

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A

And was he able to tell you precisely where, then, which avenues he was going north and south on between 20 th and 22 nd?

A
Oh, I'm not saying on every one, but on some of them, yeah.

And so somewhere between 20 th and 22 nd Street they were travelling north and south down the avenues looking for Shorty's house?

Yes. And now they may have even crossed over 20 th in places, $I$-- in a southerly direction, $I$ can't remember how that --

And how far west were they; are you able to --
No, I'm not able to pinpoint anything, because I tried to orient it to landmarks. I remember thinking that maybe St. Paul's Hospital would be a significant landmark on the corner of $P$ and $20 t h$, if $I$ recall it.

Yes.
But that didn't assist. And I'm sure I asked about the funeral home and so on, if he remembered that or anything, and it just didn't assist in pinpointing anything like that.

No, he wasn't, and $I$ wasn't able to identify them
based on any landmarks or anything that $I$ knew. Would it be fair in saying, Mr. Tallis, that in doing this one of your concerns would be to find out whether or not they were in the vicinity of where Gail Miller's body was found; is that correct?

Yes, there is no doubt about that, I wanted to know where they had been going and that, that was certainly one of the things $I$ was canvassing. Was it your sense that their vehicle was or may have been travelling in the vicinity between 20 th and 22 nd between, for example, Avenue $N$, Avenue 0 , and in that vicinity?

Well certainly, on the basis of what he told me, it was quite possible, but it could just as easily have been another avenue a little more to the east.

Okay. So it could have been over Avenue $H$, J, it could have been $S$, Avenue $T$ ?

I don't think it was Avenue $H$, because there would have been landmarks there that $I$ think would have been quite identifiable.

In your mind, sir, did you narrow it down to where you thought it might be, or where a jury might believe it to be if Mr. Milgaard were to tell the
jury what he told you about the north-south travels and the avenues between avenue -- 20 th and 22nd Street?

A

Q
A

Q

A

A

A
MR. HODSON: I think my question was the jury.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, the jury?
Yes, the jury. And during the course of this attempt to locate something that would put them onto Shorty's place -- and remember that David was the one who had been to Shorty's, the others hadn't, so he $I$ think was sort of directing where they might go -- they did stop in one of their
travels going $I$ believe it was north and south, we've talked about their -- they talked, pulled alongside a lady and --

BY MR. HODSON:
Let me just pause for a moment.
Okay.
So on the travels on the avenues between 20 th and 22 nd Street going either north or south, on one of
the avenues they, $I$ think you said he told you
they stopped a lady?
A
$Q$
A
Q
A
Q
A

Q
Now we've heard the term "Peace Hill" as well as
"Pleasant Hill"; do you recall if David ever used
the term "Peace Hill"?
A
I don't think David ever used the term "Peace

Hill" in talking to me. I think he knew the term "Pleasant Hill" but $I$ could be wrong in that. Now at this time $I$ take it, Mr. Tallis, that you would have been aware of the statements of Ron Wilson and Nichol John and the significance of the woman being stopped and asked for directions? Yeah, yes.

Can you tell us, just on the exchange with the woman seeking directions, did you try and identify where that may have taken place?

I tried to, but $I$ was unable to pin anything down.
And I think you told us it was on one of the north-south?

Yes, that's my recollection.
And what about the description of this woman, what did Mr. Milgaard tell you about that?

Well this was a, of course a very cold morning, and $I$ don't think he got an opportunity to see her face, but he described her as an older woman. And I spent some time discussing this with him, because age to a 16 or a 17 -year-old person may be something quite different to what $I$ would think, and $I$ wasn't able to pinpoint an age but $I$ do recall trying to equate it "how would she compare, say, to my age" or I believe I said "or to your
mother's", and for some reason $I$ have the idea that, or $I$ concluded from the discussion the individual was probably in the range of 35 to 40 , in his view, but he wasn't able to really see her face because it was so cold that --

What did he base his -- did you ask him how he could say that she was old if he didn't see her face?

A
Well I asked, $I$ know I asked about that, and my sense of things is that on the manner of walking and so forth.

Okay.
Now I know that's not of much assistance to you, but that's the best $I$ can do on that aspect of it.

And as far as the colour of coat this woman was wearing, do you recall what he said about that?

I think he said it was a dark coat.
And do you recall what Mr. Milgaard told you about what he said to this woman?

I don't recall whether he made any comment, whether he told me that he made some comment about her, or not, to his friends.

Q Okay. There was -- I'm sorry?
A
But I do know that during the course of my discussions with him, and $I$ can't pinpoint the
occasion, $I$ asked him, you know, "what was your purpose" or "why did you pull alongside her and ask her this", and there came -- there was a point where he said, "well, I have to admit that $I$ thought of robbing her". Now by that $I$ took him to mean snatch her purse, and I don't recall whether he used the term "rob" or if that's my interpretation of what he said about snatching the purse, but that was a point that I considered very significant --

Okay.

A
-- in terms of, later on, in terms of whether he was called to give evidence.

And could you -- can tell us what would have been your concerns about that piece of information? Well I thought the Crown would be advancing robbery or purse-snatching as a motive for the murder, quite apart from the sexual aspect of the assault that took place in connection with the homicide, and $I$ realized that if he was called as a witness this is evidence that $I$ would probably have to decide to lead in chief with a view to taking the sting out of it, for want of a better impression, because $I$ knew that Crown counsel would robustly cross-examine on the circumstances
of that, and what the real purpose was, and so forth.

There was some evidence in the statement $I$ think of Ron Wilson, and perhaps others, that suggested that as part of this exchange, or when the vehicle left, that Mr. Milgaard either said to the woman or said in the car, quote, "you stupid bitch", quote; do you recall discussing that with Mr. Milgaard and asking whether he said that or not? I have no doubt that $I$ discussed it with him, but I just cannot recall what was said on that point. I have to say I think my focus ended up being on the other aspect of it, but that, that's the best I can do in terms of assisting you on that point of --

At what point in your series of meetings with Mr. Milgaard did the information about his thoughts of robbing this woman; when did he tell you that? Well it came out, $I$ can say it was before the preliminary hearing, but $I$ cannot pinpoint. It did not come out, you know, in our first or second meetings, you know, $I$ know that.

So, after they stopped the woman for directions, what did Mr. Milgaard tell you happened next?

Shorty or Shorty's place, and there came a time when they got stuck. And it was very -- I was never able, in discussions with him, to pinpoint where they got stuck, but they did get stuck, and each one of them got out and went a short distance looking for help.

Q
Sorry, would that be Ron Wilson and David Milgaard?

A
Q
A

And then they came back fairly soon because it was bitterly cold, and a couple of fellows helped get them out, just give them a push, they weren't stuck that bad from what $I$ could gather. And so then they carried on and, as I recall it, they ended up driving out to the Trav-a-leer.

Okay. If we can just pause there and go back to the incident where they got stuck, this would be an incident prior to getting stuck at the Danchuks'?

A
Q
A

And so do you recall what Mr. Milgaard told you about, $I$ guess two questions, both how far in distance where they got stuck compared to where they stopped the woman for directions, or how long after; were you able to determine that?

Well it was, it was further west, from what I could determine, of the spot where he had asked the lady for directions.

If we can just call the map up again for a moment, and I appreciate you've told us you don't know which avenue it was on so I'll pick one in the middle, but $I$ think you said they were travelling north and south and then they were -- were they travelling south or north when they stopped the woman for directions; were you able to determine that?

A
I think it was south but $I$ wouldn't be sure. I can tell you when we were in Prince Albert, when $I$ met with him in Prince Albert I remember trying to sketch out the path working with him, and we just -- I just wasn't able to come up with -Okay. -- anything readily identifiable. So if he, they were going south on one of the avenues, then where, where in connection to where
they stopped the woman for directions, where did he tell you they got stuck?

A
It was west of there, and $I$ can't tell you how many blocks.

And as far as time was it shortly after, minutes after, are you able to --

Not too long after, but not, you know, we're not talking 30 seconds or a minute.

And do you recall him telling you in what -- did they get stuck in the middle of the road, or whereabouts were they that they were stuck, and how were they stuck?

Well $I$ recall him indicating that their tires were not good winter tires, in other words smooth tires, and they -- now $I$ don't recall specifically where he said they got stuck, whether it was sort of at the end of a block or, you know, in between.

Do you recall or would you have asked him whether they were near an alley when they got stuck? Oh, I'm sure $I$ asked about that and, you know, when we -- I talked about whether, you know, they went down an alley or anything, you know, in connection with what $I$ knew, and he said well they, well -- he -- they weren't in any way involved with the girl on the street or in an
alley, or anything like that, and in particular he wasn't.

Q
And as far as the time that he was away from the vehicle; was he able to tell you how long that was?

Yeah. You would have known at the time you were interviewing Mr. Milgaard, I believe from what you have told us, that Ron Wilson's statement indicated that it was after they stopped the woman for directions, after their car got stuck, that David left the vehicle, and for a longer period, and that when he came back that's when $I$ think Mr. Wilson's evidence said he thought the murder was committed, --

Yes.
-- or words to that effect. You would have been aware of that?

A Yes.
Q
Would the fact of Mr. Milgaard's vehicle being stuck then, after asking the woman for directions and him leaving the vehicle, would that be an important matter for you to probe with him? Yes, it was, and not only his leaving but also Wilson's leaving --

Okay.
-- was important.
And did you spend a fair bit of time with Mr. Milgaard trying to pinpoint where they got stuck? Yes, I did. And as I say, I remember in particular in Prince Albert trying to sketch it out, even, at the working session that we had. And would those sketches of yours have been on your file then?

Oh yes.
And would you have had a map that you would have used to assist you do you think?

Oh, I'm sure I did, because that was -- and I may have even, $I$ may well, $I$ may very well have sketched out a map a little bigger, sort of like this but in much larger.

Let me ask you the same question I asked you about where, where you ended up concluding the -- David

Milgaard's vehicle was when it stopped the woman for directions. What about when they got stuck, based on your discussions with Mr. Milgaard, where did you end up concluding that it may have been in relation to where Gail Miller's body was found? Well I, I really couldn't arrive at any conclusion one way or the other where it had got stuck, but I was told by him, by -- David told me that he had had nothing to do with the victim and nothing to do with any of her effects, and so he, he didn't know, but he knew that he wasn't involved there. Right. And if Mr. Milgaard had been called to testify and given evidence about where they got stuck, based on your discussion with him was it possible, at least in your mind, that the jury could conclude that it would have been in the vicinity where Gail Miller's body was found, based upon how Mr. Milgaard described to you where they were when these things happened?

Oh, I think that's a distinct possibility.
And as far as vicinity, $I$ think, would it be the same -- I think you said for the woman asking for directions it would have been a little bit west from that or --

A
It would be some blocks to the east.

Q
A
Q
A

Q

A
Q
A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A

Q

A
know I drove out there at least a couple of times, but $I$ just don't recall now, and he went in in his stocking feet to get some directions and get a map.
told you about that?
Well they pulled into the Trav-a-leer, now whether there was a carport there or not $I$ can't recall, I think there probably was sort of a carport. I

Let me just pause there. You said you drove out to the Trav-a-leer Motel a couple of times? At least a couple of times after $I$ was retained in this.

What about in this area; did you drive around in this area as well?

Oh, I drove that area any number of times.
And for what purpose?
Well, to check over, and $I$ even walked certain parts and $I$ drove back alleys to sort of try to size things up and get some ideas, and then $I$ would talk to him about it again, and so forth. But of course when $I$ first drove over there for that purpose it was no longer January conditions, but $I$ did go back there in the winter of 1970 to look the situation over too.

And --
Because of the, you know, the snowfall and everything gave me a better indication of what it would look like.

Were you trying to get a sense or some landmarks to try and assist Mr. Milgaard in determining where they might have stopped the woman for directions and where they might have got stuck?

A Yes, and $I$ wanted to get oriented myself in a
winter scene, which is what they faced. And, coincidentally, the -- when the trial was on in January it was bitterly cold, and there were a lot of similarities in the weather to when this homicide occurred.

Q
A
$Q$

A

Q
A
$Q$

A
No, I didn't attach any great significance to that. I asked him why, and he thought well maybe
if he went down there he could spot something that would --

Q
Did the fact that Gail Miller's body was found in an alley, did that -- were you asking him about whether he was travelling in alleys that morning; do you recall that?

Oh, yes, we discussed that.
And again, travelling in the Danchuks' back alley, did that cause you a concern in connection with where Gail Miller's body was found and some of the evidence that you thought might be presented against Mr. Milgaard?

I don't -- you know, I may have thought of it at the time, but to reflect now, $I$ can't really recall it being a significant consideration in my mind. I'm sure $I$ asked why would you go down an alley when you had smooth tires and you had already been stuck once.

And what did he respond?
Well, I don't -- I say I'm sure I asked him, but --
$Q$
Okay.
A
$Q$
-- I don't recall it.
If we can just go back to when he and Mr. Wilson left the car back when they got stuck before they
went to the Trav-a-leer and he got, Mr. Milgaard got back to the car, did you ask him about whether there was any discussion with Mr. Wilson or Nichol John or whether he observed anything unusual about Nichol John in the car?

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
 Well, I think that, you know, he and Wilson decided to see if they could maybe help push out, push Danchuk because they couldn't go backwards, go in reverse, and then of course their vehicle stalled too, and then $I$ gather that, you know, he certainly chatted with Mr. Danchuk and, you know, they ended up going into the house at

Mr. Danchuk's invitation.
Were you able to, in your discussions with Mr. Milgaard, able to pinpoint a time of the morning when they would have been travelling in the
north-south avenues and when they encountered the woman and when they got stuck, were you able to get a time frame for that?

Well, $I$ know at the time $I$ tried to work back from the Trav-a-leer in terms of the time. I knew what Mr. --

Rasmussen?
Rasmussen -- I hear it's Mr. Rasmussen, not the RCMP officer?

Yes.
-- had said about the timing, he opened at seven and shortly after that they came, so $I$ worked back from that.

And what did you conclude, based on your discussions, as to, again based on what Mr. Milgaard told you, as to what time frame he and his companions would have been travelling in the north-south avenues and encountering the woman for directions and getting stuck, what time of day did you conclude that would be?

Well, it was certainly before seven o'clock, you
know, $I$ couldn't pin it right down, but as a result of all this discussion and the other material that came to my attention, that gave rise to the argument really that it was improbable and
unreasonable to conclude that, number 1, they had been where it's alleged they were, and that he had the time to do what it was alleged that he had done.

Right. I think at the, in the charge to the jury Chief Justice Bence suggested the window of opportunity was 6:45 to 7:10, or thereabouts, as to when, and $I$ can't recall whether that's -- I think that's when the Milgaard vehicle may have been in the vicinity. Do you recall that?

A

Q

A
Q
A
$Q$
A

Q
A
I think that that is probably accurate.
And does that accord with your recollection of what Mr. Milgaard would have told you about the times, or was he able to tell you about the times?

Well, he wasn't able to tell about the times.
Okay.
Any reconstruction or construction as to the times was something that $I$ had to do.

I see.
Independent of anything that he -- because time really didn't mean that much to these kids, if $I$ may use that term, who left about a little after midnight --

Okay.
-- and so on.

MR. HODSON: This might be an appropriate spot to break for the day.
(Adjourned at 4:00 p.m.)
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| 23671:19, 23691:11, <br> 23718:17, 23719:4 | file [90] - 23632:19, 23649-4 23649-5, | fingertips [1] 23660 -22 | focused [1] - 23703:12 | 23710:7, 23710:10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23718:17, 23719:4, } \\ & \text { 23719:19 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23649: 4,23649: 5, \\ & 23649: 12,23650: 3, \end{aligned}$ | 23660:22 <br> finish [3]-23634:19, | focusing [1] - 23632:6 folio [2] - 23665:16 | full-time [1] - 23710:7 functioning [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { family's [1]-23671:22 } \\ & \text { far [39]-23632:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23650: 8,23651: 8, \\ & \text { 23651:15, 23653:15, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23679:10, 23714:3 } \\ & \text { finished }[1]-23700: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23684:2 } \\ & \text { follow [1] - 23761:13 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23708:4 } \\ & \text { funded }[4]-23643: 10, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23637: 6,23638: 6, \\ & 23638: 10,23638: 24, \end{aligned}$ | 23653:24, 23656:1, <br> 23656.6, 23660.1, | finishing [1] - 23766:18 <br> firm [11]-23624:23, | follow-up [1] - | 23644:16, 23645:3 |
| 23641:2, 23644:2, | 23663:19, 23664:19, | 23647:8, 23668:14, | followed [1] - 23693:10 | $23643: 3,23643: 5,$ |
| 23653:13, 23653:25, | 23664:23, 23666:2, | 23669:12, 23671:4, | following [2] - | 23647:7, 23648:15 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23655: 25,23656: 1, \\ & 23659: 16,23662: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 23666:7, 23666:13, 23667:7, 23668:14, | 23671:12, 23671:16, <br> 23672:16, 23688:24, | $23706: 25,23761: 8$ | $\text { funds }[1]-23783: 5$ |
| 23663:1, 23664:19, | 23668:24, 23669:2, | $\text { 23689:6, } 23689: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { footing [2]-23662:19, } \\ & \text { 23750:16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { funeral [2] - 23687:24, } \\ & \text { 23793:19 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 23669:2, 23689:17, | 23669:14, 23669:16, | firms [1] - 23690:6 | foregoing [1] - 23815:4 | future [2] - 23740:21, |
| 23690:22, 23694:5, 23705:5, 23705:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 23669: 18,23669: 21, \\ & \text { 23669:23, 23669:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { first [48]-23626:18, } \\ \text { 23632:15, 23634:24, } \end{gathered}$ | forensic [1] - 23648:10 | 23746:14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23718:11, 23719:22, } \\ & 23733: 6,23736: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23670: 5,23671: 4, \\ & 23671: 7,23671: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { 23647:3, } 23651: 22,$ | $23756: 6$ | G |
| 23754:10, 23772:17, | 23671:19, 23 | 23673:17, 23678:7, | former [7] - 23668:14, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23778:13, 23780:10, } \\ & \text { 23787:9, 23793:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23672:6, 23672:11, } \\ & \text { 23672:12, 23673:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23678: 16,23681: 7, \\ & 23690: 13,23695: 7, \end{aligned}$ | 23669:12, 23671:4, | Gail[9] - 23663:3, 23745:12, 23746:12 |
| $23798: 15,23801: 11$ | 23674:6, 23674:18, | $23697: 13,23699: 18$ | 23672:16, 23688:23, $\text { 23689:6, } 23689: 19$ | 23760:17, 23794:5, |
| 23802:2, 23803:5, | 23675:18, 23676:10, | 23699:20, 23704:8, | Forrester[2] - 23622:3, | 23806:5, 23806:17, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23804:3, 23804:8, } \\ & \text { 23804:13, 23806:21 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23677:11, 23678:12, } \\ & \text { 23679:10, 23684:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23706: 24,23714: 16, \\ & \text { 23715:22, 23716:23, } \end{aligned}$ | 23623:11 | $23810: 3,23810: 10$ |
| farm [1] - 23670:21 | $23685: 11,23685: 13$ | 23725:1, 23726:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { forth [11] - 23698:14, } \\ & \text { 23703:5, 23707:3, } \end{aligned}$ | Gary [3] - 23669:8, |
| fashion [1] - 23767:9 | 23686:11, 23687:12, | 23726:18, 23727:15, | $23721: 18,23745: 3,$ | 23688:7, 23688:25 |
| father [1] - 23724:19 | 23688:10, 23688:20, | 23728:3, 23728:25, | 23745:19, 23747:22, | gather [10] - 23648:5, |
| faulty [1] - 23712:19 | 23689:7, 23689:8, | 23730:21, 23730:22, | 23774:19, 23798:11, | 23679:11, 23740:22, |
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| judicial [2]-23778:14, | keep [3] - 23661:4, | landmarks [5] - | 23755:8, $23761: 21$, | 23643:22, 23644:4, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23778:17 | $23665: 19,23761: 2$ | 23792:21, 23793:13, | $23762: 4,23763: 11$ | 23644:11, 23644:12, |
| judiciary [1] - 23626:13 | keeping [1] - 23699:5 | 23794:1, 23794:21 | $23763: 20,23799: 22$ | 23644:16, 23645:3, |
| July[5] - 23706:15, | Kendry [1] - 23620:7 | 23808:21 | leading [4] - 23655:9, | 23645:20, 23645:23, $23646: 9.23646: 18$ |
| $23756: 25,23759: 17,$ | kept [5] - 23636:22, | Langer 1 ] - 23704:13 | $\begin{aligned} & 23658: 16,23753: 10 \\ & 23754: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $23646: 9,23646: 18$ 23647:7. 23696:24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23761: 7,23761: 13 \\ & \text { jump [1] - } 23752: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23666: 3,23749: 9 \\ & 23766: 12,23796: 21 \end{aligned}$ | lapse [1]-23676:14 <br> large [1] - 23665:4 | leaned [1] - 23736:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 23647: 7,23696: 24 \\ & 23697: 1,23705: 6, \end{aligned}$ |
| jumping [1] - 23785:23 | Kettles[3] - 23723:13, | larger [1] - 23805:23 | leaning [1] - 23655:16 | 23705:8, 23705:23, |
| June[42] - 23635:24, | 23755:15, 23758:9 | Larry[2] - 23620:14, | Learned[1] - 23718:24 | 23706:2, 23707:11, |
| 23673:7, 23673:9, | key [7] - 23633:18, | 23621:10 | learned [3] - 23662:12, | 23708:4, 23709:23, |
| 23673:18, 23675:2, | 23633:24, 23661:15, | last [8]-23629:9, | 23699:3, 23725:16 | 23710:3, 23713:16, |
| 23676:25, 23697:12, | 23681:21, 23709:1, | 23692:14, 23697:6, | learning [1] - 23760:19 | 23724:5, 23725:4, |
| 23697:16, 23700:13, | 23709:5, 23719:9 | 23724:17, 23737:1, | least [17]-23634:24, | 23729:1, $23751: 25$ |
| 23706:15, 23714:16, | kids [3] - 23777:1, | 23750:4, 23770:15, | 23643:7, 23678:16, | legal [11]-23626:17, |
| 23714:18, 23715:14, | 23782:1, 23813:21 | 23770:17 | 23688:8, 23706:19, | 23637:21, 23655:25, |
| 23717:18, 23720:5, | kill [1] - 23763:5 | lastly [1] - 23714:3 | 23708:10, 23708:25, | 23656:1, 23659:7, |
| 23723:12, 23725:24, | Kirkby[1] - $23638: 21$ | late [4] - 23638:21, | 23714:8, 23730:21, | 23696:24, 23703:19, |
| 23726:18, 23727:17, | $\text { Kleiv }_{[1]}-23686: 7$ | $23669: 11,23738: 18$ | $23732: 5,23738: 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23705: 19,23709: 2, \\ & 23723: 16,23764: 24 \end{aligned}$ |
| 23729:3, 23729:24, | knife [12] - 23786:17, | 23777:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23739:16, 23742:18, } \\ & \text { 23753:5 } 23806 \cdot 15 \end{aligned}$ | 23723:16, 23764:24 <br> legible [1] - 23650:10 |
| 23731:17, 23738:7, | 23786:19, 23786:21, | Law10] - 23625:3, | 23753:5, 23806:15, | legislation [1] - |
| $23744: 12,23750: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23786: 22,23786: 23, \\ & 23786: 24,23787: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23627: 7,23627: 20, \\ & \text { 23628:6, 23628:19, } \end{aligned}$ | 23807:22, 23808:3 | 23629:4 |
| 23751:2, 23753:3, | 23787:7, 23787:11, | 23628:24, 23629:1, | 23672:4, 23687:1 | leisurely [1] - 23668:6 |
| 23754:21, 23755:6, | 23787:12, 23787:13, | 23629:10, 23629:11, | leaves [1] - 23772:9 | lend [1] - 23784:24 |
| 23755:15, 23756:1, | 23787:22 | 23630:3 | leaving [4]-23657:2, | less [1] - 23778:19 |
| 23756:3, 23756:18, | knowledge [7] - | law [35] - 23624:23, | 23805:4, 23805:6, | lesser [1] - 23654:8 |
| 23757:9, 23757:18, | 23675:25, 23677:19, | 23627:21, 23629:6, | 23805:7 | letter [32] - 23689:5, |
| $\text { 23766:5, } 23766: 9$ | $23677: 24,23692: 17$ | 23630:10, 23630:14, | lectured [2]-23626:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23689:18, 23707:7, } \\ & \text { 23707:11. 23709:14. } \end{aligned}$ |
| juniors [2] - 23646:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23724:6, 23745:11, } \\ & \text { 23815:6 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23630: 25,23631: 2, \\ & 23636: 13,23636: 17, \end{aligned}$ | lectures [1] - 23627:23 | 23713:3, 23713:4, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23708:5 } \\ & \text { juries [2] - } 236 \end{aligned}$ | known [11] - 23635:7, 23669:10, 23671:24 | $23636: 18,23637: 4$ $23637: 23,23639: 12$ | lecturing [5] - | $\begin{aligned} & 23717: 18,23717: 20, \\ & 23723: 12,23725: 24, \end{aligned}$ |
| $23640: 1$ | 23675:14, 23695:16, | 23646:2, 23652:15, | 23627:13, 23627:15, | 23726:12, 23726:15, |
| jurisprudence [3] - | 23704:14, 23705:1, | 23656:9, $23656: 22$, | 23627:19 | $23731: 16,23731: 17,$ |
| 23704:16, 23736:6, | 23782:19, 23782:21, | $23656: 23,23658: 8$ | led [3] - 23638:20, | $23732: 8,23735: 22,$ 23738:7, 23738:11. |
| jury [16] - 23639:24, | $\begin{gathered} 23782: 25,23804: 14 \\ \text { Knox[1] - 23621:4 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23658: 10,23668: 14, \\ & 23670: 17,23671: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23657: 4,23788: 3 \\ \text { leer } 191-23792: 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23738:7, 23738:11, } \\ & \text { 23739:2, 23750:19, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 23640:8, 23640:9, | Krogan[1] - 23621:3 | 23688:24, 23690:6, | 23792:9, 23801:18, | 23754:8, $23756: 2$, |
| 23640:12, 23712:17, | Kujawa[4] - 23621:6, | 23703:8, 23712:4, | $23807: 15,23807: 19$ | $23756: 3,23756: 13$ |
| 23777:6, 23777:14 | $23631: 14,23750: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23732:15, 23733:8, } \\ & \text { ク2736•10 ク2750•10 } \end{aligned}$ | $23808: 2,23809: 8$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23756: 18,23757: 9, \\ & 23757: 18,23758: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| $23794: 24,23795: 1$ | 23761:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23736:12, 23750:10 } \\ & \text { 23772:20, 23779:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23811: 1,23812: 5 \\ & \text { leery }[1]-23700: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $23761: 13,23767: 11$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23795: 18,23795: 19, \\ & 23795: 20,23806: 15, \end{aligned}$ | I | 23780:20 <br> law-abiding [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { left [18] - 23627:1, } \\ & 23666: 9,23668: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { letters [2] - 23714:24, } \\ & \text { 23733:24 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 23813:5 |  | 23637:23 | $23668: 23,23680: 18$ | lie [1] - 23743:20 |
| Justice[10] - 23619:6, <br> 23621.11, 23621.14 |  | lawyer [8] - 23625:11, | 23687:14, 23690:22, | Lieutenant 2 ] - |
| 23621:11, 23621:14, $23623: 10,23626: 1$ | 23685:2, 23685:25, 23686.10, 23686.20 | 23639:17, 23647:3, <br> 23669:9, 23670:2, | $\begin{aligned} & 23706: 9,23765: 12 \\ & 23781 \cdot 16 \quad 23781 \cdot 17 \end{aligned}$ | 23750:24, 23751:1 <br> life [1] - 23645:9 |
| $23626: 6,23631: 3,$ | $23687: 11,23692: 12$ | $23710: 9,23718: 7$ | 23781:18, 23783:20, | lifestyle [1] - 23786:12 |
| 23760:15, 23813:6 | laboratory [1] - | 23723:19 | 23788:19, 23800:6, | light [3] - 23662:12 |
| justified [1] - 23645:13 | $23734: 13$ | lawyers [10] - 23628:3, | 23804:19, 23810:25, | 23675:22, 23696:17 |
| K | $23649: 5,23772: 8$ | 23637:3, 23637:12, | $\text { 1] }-23680: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { likely [10] - 23681:12, } \\ & \text { 23682:20, 23697:14, } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | ladies [1] - 23670:25 | $\begin{aligned} & 23640: 21,23646: 5 \\ & 23708: 5,23717: 16 \end{aligned}$ | leg [1] - 23700:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 23721: 16,23741: 8, \\ & 23743: 7,23744: 4, \end{aligned}$ |
| Kara[1] - 23620 :6 | 23796:10, 23796:11, | 23724:9 | 23636:9, 23638:8, | 23744:23, 23748:12, |
| Karen[3]-23620:11, | 23802:8 | lay [1] - 23763:9 | 23639:18, 23639:19, | 23763:5 |
| 23815:2, 23815:13 | Lana[1] - 23621:3 | lead [11]-23659:6, | 23641:1, 23641 :3, | limited [3] - 23643:7, |
| Karst [2] - $23621: 8$, | landmark [1] - | 23703:3, 23752:16, | 23641:10, 23641:14, | 23645:23, 23735:18 |
| 23758:8 | 23793:15 | 23754:15, 23754:22, | 23643:4, 23643:19, | limits [3] - 23645:17, |
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| 23630:9, 23630:11, | 23697:13, 23697:25, | 23673:11, 23673:25, | 23783:20, 23784:12, | 23646:24, 23666:21, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23635:6, 23635:12, | 23698:4, 23698:21, | 23691:16, 23724:3, | 23784:17, 23784:23, | 23679:17, 23723:18, |
| 23648:21, 23648:25, | 23699:17, 23700:23, | 23724:19, 23739:8, | 23785:3 | 23724:4, 23735:3, |
| 23651:17, 23653:15, | 23701:16, 23708:18, | 23754:11, 23770:14, | months [1] - 23715:22 | 23753:19, 23783:13 |
| 23656:7, 23657:18, | 23711:3, 23711:7, | 23774:6, 23776:5, | morality [1] - 23772:22 | named [1] - 23664:3 |
| 23658:14, 23660:20, | 23712:11, 23714:17, | 23805:2, 23806:1 | morning [16] - 23623:3, | names [2]-23642:14, |
| 23661:10, $23661: 20$, | 23715:16, 23717:1, | Miller [3] - 23663:3, | 23623:4, 23623:9, | 23657:14 |
| 23662:13, 23662:17, | 23717:24, 23718:1, | 23746:12, 23760:17 | 23623:13, 23641:5, | narrow [1] - 23794:23 |
| 23665:15, 23665:16, | 23718:17, 23719:4, | Miller 's [6] - 23745:12, | 23652:21, 23684:19, | national [2] - 23629:6, |
| 23673:3, 23674:1, | 23720:14, 23723:14, | 23794:5, 23806:5, | 23686:13, 23692:11, | 23629:8 |
| 23680:24, 23681:2, | 23723:17, 23724:14, | 23806:17, 23810:3, | 23731:16, 23738:11, | nature [23] - 23637:9, |
| 23683:9, 23690:17, | 23724:18, 23724:19, | 23810:10 | 23766:24, 23789:25, | 23639:7, 23653:10, |
| 23692:2, 23695:15, | 23725:2, 23726:19, | mind [17] - 23637:24, | 23797:17, 23810:5, | 23661:21, 23667:19, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23696:17, 23705:18, } \\ & \text { 2370a•17 } 23713 \cdot 9 \end{aligned}$ | 23727:16, 23728:25, | $23656: 11,23658: 19$ | $23811: 24$ | 23669:3, 23670:18, |
| 23709:17, 23713:9, | 23729:22, 23730:8, 23737.8, 23738.9 | $\begin{aligned} & 23711: 11,23718: 18, \\ & 23734 \cdot 12 \quad 23734 \cdot 15 \end{aligned}$ | most [10] - 23631:13, | 23672:13, 23698:13, |
| 23713:12, 23721:5, 23722•10, 23728:16 | 23737:8, 23738:9, 23738:15, 23739.5 | 23734:12, 23734:15, | $23632: 4,23633: 20$ | 23707:22, 23707:25, |
| $23734: 7,23734: 11,$ | $23740: 6,23742: 20,$ | 23742:13, 23750:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23646:1, } 23681: 23, \\ & 23682: 20,23720: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23723:4, 23732:17, } \\ & \text { 23737:13, 23742:6 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 23735:15, 23739:24, | 23745:11, 23750:12, | 23754:2, 23785:24, | 23741:8, 23743:7, | 23743:5, 23744:18, |
| 23743:21, 23744:6, | 23751:20, 23753:2, | 23792:4, 23794:23, | 23777:21 | 23754:15, 23771:14, |
| 23746:4, 23746:7, | 23753:4, 23753:7, | 23806:15, 23810:16 | Most [1] - 23775:23 | 23773:19, 23774:8, |
| 23748:5, 23748:10, | 23755:7, 23755:18, | minded [1] - 23778:7 | Motel [4] - 23792:6, | 23777:14, 23787:10 |
| 23748:12, 23748:17, | 23755:24, 23758:10, | mine [4] - 23680:19, | 23792:9, 23807:15, | Nb [1] - 23682:13 |
| 23749:16, 23752:11, | 23758:12, 23758:21, | 23739:13, 23739:14, | 23808:2 | Near [1] - 23637 :21 |
| $23753: 8,23753: 9,$ | 23759:5, 23760:17, | 23761:24 | motel [1] - 23634:3 | near [4]-23637:21, |
| $23754: 22,23755: 8,$ | 23762:5, 23762:21, | Minister [1] - 23621:11 | mother [4]-23667:10, | 23638:3, 23792:14, |
| $23762: 24,23763: 12,$ | $23762: 25,23763: 14$ | $23751: 6$ | 23775:2 | necessarily [1] - |
| 23763:13, 23763:18, | 23764:19, 23765:16, | minute [2] - 23680:11, | mother's [1] - 23798:1 | 23656:21 |
| 23763:19, 23763:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23765:22, 23766:7, } \\ & \text { 22765.j) } \end{aligned}$ | 23803:8 | motive [1] - 23799:17 | necessary [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23764: 25,23765: 3 \\ & 23777: 5,23777: 14 \end{aligned}$ | 23766:22, 23767:1, <br> 23767:21, 23768:12, | minutes [1] - 23803:5 | move [4]-23635:14, | 23661:7, 23703:19 |
| 23784:17, 23787:18, | 23768:13, 23768:21, | miscellaneous [1] - | 23708:6, 23779:3, | need [9] - 23642:15, |
| $23791 \text { :5, } 23791: 18,$ | $23769: 1,23769: 2$ | 23635:21 | 23780:21 | 23659:8, 23686:18, |
| $23794: 24,23795: 25,$ | $23771: 18,23772: 3$ | misrepresent [1] - | moved [8] - 23690:18, | 23717:11, 23725:5, |
| 23808:23, 23808:24, | 23772:6, 23772:16, | Miss [6] - 23666:23, | $23691 \text { :25, 23715:17, }$ | $23762: 24$ |
| 23810:11, 23811:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23773:17, 23775:1, } \\ & \text { 22775.5277a.7 } \end{aligned}$ | 23670:24, 23681:8, | 23727:23, 23792:19 | needed [1] - 23763:13 |
| 23814:1 | $23775: 22,23776: 7,$ | 23683:12, 23690:16, | moves [2] - 23671:15, | needs [1] - 23643:12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Milgaard [155]- } \\ & \text { 23619:4. } 23621: 2 . \end{aligned}$ | 23784:14, 23786:16 | 23745:7 | 23690:25 | neighbourhood [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23619:4, } 23621: 2, \\ & 23632: 1,23632: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 23788:7, 23789:15, | missed [1] - 23631:20 | murder [16] - 23636:20, | 23630:1 |
| 23632:24, 23633:2, | 23792:3, 23794:25, | mistaken [3] - | 23636:24, 23637:20, | network [1] - 23646:3 |
| 23633:6, 23634:16, | 23797:16, 23798:18, | 23768:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 23638: 2,23638: 3, \\ & 23638: 18,23640: 12, \end{aligned}$ | 23643:17, 23663:5, |
| 23635:16, 23636:1, | 23800:6, 23800:9, | moderator [1] | 23642:10, 23683:4, | $23699: 7,23705: 23$ |
| 23644:10, 23645:19, <br> 23646.7 23648.1 | $\begin{aligned} & 23800: 17,23800: 24, \\ & 23801: 8.23802: 1 . \end{aligned}$ | 23630:21 | $23728: 6,23745: 5,$ | 23706:7, 23706:10, |
| $23650: 18,23651: 4$ | 23804:15, 23805: | modest [3] - 23705:22, | 23745:12, 23779:3, | 23711:14, 23719:2, |
| $23651: 15,23652: 22$ | $23806: 3,23806: 12,$ | 23713:16, 23783:6 | 23795:7, 23799:18, | 23732:16, 23736:4, |
| 23658:23, 23662:6, | 23806:18, 23807:17, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mohadeo [1] - } \\ & \text { 23736:17 } \end{aligned}$ | Murray [1] - 23631 : | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23743:15, 23773:22, } \\ & 23801: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23663: 3,23667: 9 \\ & 23667: 10,23667: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23808: 22,23809: 8, \\ & 23809: 22,23810: 12, \end{aligned}$ | Molchanko [1] - | must [4] - 23740:4, | new [1] - 23686:13 |
| $23667: 14,23669: 20$ | $23811: 1,23811: 13$ | 23686:6 | $\begin{aligned} & 23743: 6,23748: 19, \\ & \text { Г2770•7 } \end{aligned}$ | newspaper [3] - |
| 23669:25, 23673:12, | 23811:24, 23812:16, | moment [7] - 23659:15, <br> 23678:10, 23729:20, | muster [2] - 23780:7, | 23744:17, 23745:5, 23773:8 |
| 23673:15, 23673:16, | 23813:9, 23813:13 | 23767:11, 23785:16, | 23780:19 | next [24] - 23623:5, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23674:13, 23675:7, } \\ & 23675: 23,23677: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Milgaard's [24] - } \\ & \text { 23623:20, } 23625: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $23796: 5,23802: 9$ | Myrna [1] - 23666:23 | $23632: 25,23633: 9$ |
| 23677:20, 23677:21, | 23628:18, 23633:4, | Monday [1] - 23791:16 monetary [1] - | N | $\begin{aligned} & 23634: 3,23634: 5, \\ & 23635: 10,23635: 22, \end{aligned}$ |
| 23677:23, 23679:21, | 23635:19, 23636:21, | 23645:18 | N | $23679: 20,23683: 1$ |
| $23684: 23,23685: 15,$ | $23655: 14,23662: 14,$ | money [9] - 23743:23, |  | 23686:19, 23702:10, |
| 23688:11, 23692:22, | 23663:2, 23673:10, | 23783:4, 23783:18, | name [9]-23642:3, | 23703:18, 23712:25, |
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| 23714:15, 23717:5, | 23651 :6, 23651 :7, | 23705:24, 23736:8 | 23787:6 | ongoing [2] - 23676:9, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23717:8, 23717:9, | 23651:11, 23651:16, | observations [2] - | old [3] - 23672:22, | 23679:2 |
| 23724:9, 23738:24, | 23652:2, 23652:17, | 23634:20, 23653:9 | 23691:8, 23798:7 | open [2]-23726:3, |
| 23744:16, 23788:22, | 23652:24, 23664:24, | observe [2] - 23664:7, | older [1] - 23797:19 | 23727:7 |
| 23791:13, 23800:24, | 23665:5, 23665:20, | 23664:16 | oldest [1] - 23691:7 | opened [1] - 23812:11 |
| 23807:14 | 23670:9, 23676:11, | observed [3] - | once [9]-23640:20, | opening [2] - 23658:19, |
| Next [1] - 23687:4 | 23681:9, $23681: 12$, | 23648:14, 23751:13, | 23666:5, 23672:3, | 23702:6 |
| nice [2]-23708:19, | 23682:18, 23683:16, | 23811: | 23681:1, 23683:19, | operating [1] - |
| 23775:10 | 23683:18, 23696:6, | observing [1] - | 23715:7, 23730:11, | 23641: |
| Nichol [21] - 23633:22, | 23708:20, 23709:5, | 23717:23 | 23747:13, 23810:18 | operation [2] - |
| 23658:4, 23661:16, | 23711:22, 23727:13, | obtain [2] - 23668:7, | Once[1] - 23666:5 | 23701:20, 23732:16 |
| 23718:3, 23718:22, | 23730:2, 23741:15, | 23697:25 | One[1] - 23632:1 | operative [1] - |
| 23731:13, $23741: 2$, | 23770:10, 23771:1, | obtained [7] - 23654:5, | one [88] - 23626:7, | 23698:16 |
| 23742:18, 23748:14, | 23771:13, 23771:21, | 23668:7, 23737:4, | 23627:25, 23628:1, | opinion [1] - 23763:8 |
| 23759:24, 23760:13, | 23773:13, 23773:15, | 23744:2, 23749:25, | 23630:8, 23630:21, | opinions [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23767: 14,23768: 14, \\ & 22781.52780 .01 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23784: 2,23789: 1, \\ & 23815: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $23750: 2,23773: 16$ | $23631: 14,23631: 22,$ | $23648: 16,23653: 10$ |
| $23783: 4,23784: 16$ | nothing [7] - 23662:19, | obvious [1] - 23738:18 | $23645: 15,23646: 1$ | opportunity [9] - |
| 23797:5, 23801:10, | 23662:21, 23670:18, | 23628:14 | 23648:18, 23650:19, | $23688: 20,23712: 10,$ |
| 23811:3, 23811:5 | 23691:1, 23729:7, | occasion [8] - | 23657:20, 23657:25, | 23732:9, 23750:22, |
| Nicole [1] - 23724:15 <br> night [3]-23683.5 | $23806: 9$ <br> noticed [2] - | 23629:20, 23688:10, | $23658: 1,23661: 4$ <br> 23663.25, 23670.24 | $23778: 8,23797: 18$ |
| $23707: 2,23709: 6$ | $23727: 8$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23688:18, 23751:6, } \\ & 23767: 7.23771: 9 . \end{aligned}$ | $23671: 25,23673: 17$ | 23813:7 |
| noble [1] - 23707:4 | notion [1] - 23778:4 | 23779:12, 23799:1 | 23673:20, 23674:24, | opposed [5] - 23646:8, |
| nobody [1] - 23719:4 | notwithstanding [1] - | occasions [7] | 23677:10, 23677:20, | 23677:6, 23680:7, |
| non [3] - 23640:8, | 23710:3 | 23672:22, 23711:19, | 23677:21, 23678:7, | 23706:3, $23706: 5$ |
| 23704:2, 23705:19 | November [5] - | 23715:16, 23729:23, | 23678:20, 23679:14, | opposing [1] - 23661:7 |
| non-jury [1] - 23640:8 | $\begin{aligned} & 23710: 23,23711: 21, \\ & 23714: 6,23765: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23753:5, 23766:19, } \\ & 23771: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23680: 11,23680: 12 \\ & 23684: 4.23686: 19 \end{aligned}$ | oral [1] - 23769:6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { non-legal [1] } \\ & \text { 23705:19 } \end{aligned}$ | $23765: 25$ | $23771 \text { :! }$ | 23688:18, 23690:13, | order [4] - 23632:6, |
| non-secretor [1] - | number [33] - 23624:15, | occurred [1] - 23809:5 | $23691: 11,23693: 20,$ | 23763:7 |
| 23704:2 | 23627:17, 23628:9, | October[1] - 23635:12 | 23702:22, 23708:13, | organized [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { none [2]-23728:12, } \\ & 23776 \cdot 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23628:16, 23631:24, } \\ & \text { 23636:24, 23637:1, } \end{aligned}$ | odd [1] - 23775:3 | 23714:24, 23717:25, <br> 23719:15, 23722:10, | 23649:16 |
| 23776:18 | $23637: 2,23639: 4,$ | of' [1] - 23758:19 | $23722: 25,23723: 9,$ | orient [1] - 23793:13 |
| normal [1] - 23715:23 | 23640:3, 23640:17, | $23748: 22,23750: 13$ | $23725: 25,23728: 7$ | origin [1] - 23674:17 |
| north [14]-23791:20, | 23640:20, 23650:18, | offences [1] - 23642:5 | 23729:18, $23731: 24$, | original [19] - 23623:20, |
| $23792: 21,23792: 25$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23651: 15,23652: 4, \\ & 23653: 7,23653: 13 \end{aligned}$ | office [16] - 23642:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 23733: 20,23736: 21, \\ & 23737: 20.23739: 3 . \end{aligned}$ | 23673:4, 23677:7, |
| 23793:1, 23793:6, | $23660: 10,23669: 5$ | 23666:3, $23666: 8$, | $23751 \text { :6, } 23760: 13$ | 23684:25, 23685:3, |
| 23793:23, 23795:1, <br> 23796:1, 23796:8 | 23669:7, 23707:24, | $\begin{aligned} & 23667: 16,23668: 9, \\ & 23671 \cdot 1 \quad 23672 \cdot 22 \end{aligned}$ | 23763:7, 23765:6, | 23685:7, 23685:9, |
| 23797:13, 23802:13, | $23729: 23,23748: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23671: 1,23672: 22, \\ & 23689: 22,23690: 18, \end{aligned}$ | $23768: 23,23769: 15,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23685: 11,23685: 13, \\ & 23686: 10,23686: 23, \end{aligned}$ |
| 23802:14, 23812:1, | 23749:7, 23750:14, | 23691:1, $23691: 8$, | 23769:19, 23769:21, | 23687:11, 23687:12, |
| 23812:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23753:10, 23772:1, } \\ & \text { ग2782.15 } 22789 \cdot 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { 23698:17, } 23731: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23770: 18,23772: 1, \\ & 23775 \cdot 10 \quad 23775 \cdot 14 \end{aligned}$ | 23694:18, 23696:2, |
| north-south [4]- | $23789: 9,23791: 20$ | 23751:8, 23783:13, | 23776.12, 23777.7 | 23714:13, 23725:10, |
| 23795:1, 23797:13, | $23808: 7,23813: 1$ | 23783:19 | 23778:4, 23778:6, | 23726:6 |
| 23812:1, 23812:18 | numerous [3] - | Officer[1] - 23620:13 | $23782: 9,23783: 5,$ | originals [2]23679:23, 23680 |
| 23625:4, 23625:17, | 23640:12, 23700:22, | $23721: 10,23734: 20,$ | $23784: 1,23784: 8$ | otherwise [1] - 23734: |
| 23625:20, 23625:25, | 23702:11 | $23812: 9$ | 23789:13, 23790:21, | outline [2] - 23632:7, |
| $23626: 2$ <br> note [4] - 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Nunavut [2] - 23626:5, } \\ & 23626: 8 \end{aligned}$ | officers [6] - 23699:20, | 23793:3, 23794:3, | 23632:12 |
| $23682: 21,23683: 20$ |  |  | 23794:9, 23795:23, | [2]-23716:21, |
| 23755:14 | 0 | 23760:6 | 23795:25, 23796:8, | outlying [2] - 23778:13, |
| notebooks [1] - |  | Official[5] - 23620:11, | $23802: 11,23802: 24$ | 23778:14 |
| noted [1] - 23740:21 | o'clock [1] - 23812:21 | $\begin{aligned} & 23815: 1,23815: 3 \\ & 23815: 14,23815: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $23806: 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { outside }[3]-23648: 22, \\ & \text { 23719:3. } 23778: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| notes [38] - 23650:4, | Okeefe [1] - 23621:10 | often [6] - 23648:19, | one-day [1] - 23650:19 | over-simplifying [1] - |
| 23650:7, 23650:9, | objection [1] - 23689:7 | 23650:16, 23657:10, | ones [2] - 23685:5, | $23635: 8$ |
| 23650:11, 23651:5, | obligation [2] - | 23732:18, 23736:16, | 23699:25 | own [15] - 23641:5, |
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| 23741:6, 23742:2, | 23658:13, 23659:4, | 23698:13, 23700:11, | 23630:22 | 23772:12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23742:7, 23742:10, | 23693:2, 23722:5, | 23701:5, 23701:14 | presided [1] - 23733:17 | process [7] - 23650:13, |
| 23742:19, 23744:5, | 23775:15 | 23701:15, 23701:17, | pressure [1] - 23665:23 | 23651:13, 23656:2, |
| 23745:22, 23746:22, | practice [27] | 23701:23, 23702:6 | pressured [1] - | 23671:25, 23676:9, |
| 23748:16, 23748:24, | 23626:19, 23627:1, | 23702:18, 23702:21, | 23719:18 | 23699:5, 23758:2 |
| 23750:14, 23766:7, | 23636:11, 23636:13, | 23703:1, 23703:7, | presumably [3] - | prod [1] - $23772: 8$ |
| 23768:21, 23769:2, | 23650:3, 23653:6, | 23703:10, 23704:3, | 23657:3, 23715:16, | produce [1] - 23653:7 |
| 23769:7, 23769:17, | 23653:11, 23657:9, | 23707:8, 23708:11 | 23792:5 | product [2] - 23662:8, |
| 23771:5, 23771:7, | 23659:19, 23669:2, | 23708:25, 23710:17, | presume [1] - 23672:3 | 23667:1 |
| 23771:9, 23784:5, | 23669:4, 23669:6, | 23710:22, 23711:7, | presuming [2] - | production [7] - |
| 23789:14, 23795:14 | 23681:17, 23689:10, | 23711:10, 23712:15, | 23746:25, 23748:14 | 23709:13, 23733:22, |
| Police [5] - 23621:7, | 23690:2, 23690:22, | 23715:7, 23715:20, | pretend [1] - 23704:15 | 23734:5, 23734:6, |
| 23736:15, 23743:18, | 23706:10, 23707:5, | 23716:15, 23719:10, | pretty [4]-23650:2, | 23734:17, 23734:20, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23743: 22,23750: 25 \\ & \text { nolicy } \end{aligned}$ | 23715:3, 23715:4, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23732:19, 23733:12, } \\ & \text { 23733:13, 23733:18, } \end{aligned}$ | 23736:16, 23760:11, | $23736: 22$ |
| policy [1] - 23709:22 polygraph [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 23715: 19,23717: 22 \\ & 23718: 11,23719: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $23735: 8,23735: 11$ | 23777:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { profession [1] - } \\ & \text { 23708:7 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 23743:24 | 23719:21, 23723:5, | 23756:23, 23757:22, | prevalent [1] - | professions [1] - |
| $23681: 3,23706: 16$ | practices [4] | 23765:24, 23766:1, | 23648:12 | 23646:3 |
| 23706:22, 23730:22 | $\begin{aligned} & 23647: 18,23648: 9 \\ & 23671: 10,23696: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23766:17, 23767:18, } \\ & \text { 23768:10, 23772:3, } \end{aligned}$ | primary [2] - 23705:14, | $23630: 3$ |
| portions [2]-23660:7, $23681: 13$ | practicing [1] - | $23800: 20,23804: 11$ | 23786:9 | program [3] - 23631:4, |
| position [8] - 23645:7, | 23625:11 | preparation [9] | 23650:20, 23651:21, | progressed [1] - |
| 23658:8, 23662:15, | practitioner [1] - | 23633:12, 23655:1, | 23697:23, 23698:3, | 23649:19 |
| 23663:6, 23676:3, | 23763:8 | 23680:17, 23680:22 | 23698:6, 23699:13, | prominent [1] - |
| 23688:21, 23713:20, | pre [1] - 23801:23 |  | 23701:20, 23702:8, | 23723:19 |
| 23763:19 | pre-danchuk [1] <br> $23801 \cdot 23$ | 23713:11, 23713:18, 23771:19 | 23710:25, 23711:12, | promotion [1] - |
| positive [1]-23711:9 <br> possession [2] <br> 23694-24 23786.17 | precise [3] - 23625:7, <br> 23627:15, 23636:2 | prepare [8] - 23656:8, 23659:19, 23660:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 23715: 15,23715: 17, \\ & 23717: 8,23765: 18, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23643:21 } \\ & \text { prompt [1] - 23771:25 } \end{aligned}$ |
| possibility [17] - | 23627:15, 23636:2 <br> precisely [1] - 23793:22 | $23684: 4,23693: 9,$ | 23765:21, 23767:21, | prompted [1] - |
| $23731: 11,23741: 19$ | precision [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23701:17, 23704:23, } \\ & 23717 \cdot 24 \end{aligned}$ | 23802:19, 23805:13 | promptly [1] - 23727:25 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23741: 20,23752: 11, \\ & 23753: 24,23754: 24, \end{aligned}$ | 23676:15 <br> preface [1] - 23781:6 | prepared [19] | Pringle [2] - 23621:13, | proof [1] - 23683:5 |
| 23755:10, 23761:8, | preferable [2] | 23624:13, 23624:16, | prisoner [1] - 23720:10 | $2372$ |
| 23761:23, 23763:16, | 23780:12, 23780:15 | 23632:7, 23632:22, | privacy [2] - 23774:24, | 23753:11, 23754:23, |
| 23777:15, 23778:23, | preference [1] - | 23654:2, 23654:13, 23659:17, 23659:23 | 23775:5 | $23755: 9,23762: 6,$ |
| $23795: 4,23795: 13$ | 23723:25 | $23660: 19,23678: 25$ | private [10]-23628:11, | $23764: 6$ |
| 23806: | Prehodchenko | $23680: 15,23681: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23637:12, 23641:19, } \\ & \text { 23647:19, 23647:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { properly [2] - 23754:16, } \\ & \text { 23762:15 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Possibility [1] - | 23620:14 | $23684: 19,23703: 9$ $23706: 3,23709: 20$ | $23647: 21,23647: 23$ | proponent [1] - |
| 23754:25 | prelim [5] - 23700:14, | 23716:17, 23738:1, | 23662:3, 23674:25 | 23643:19 |
| possible [11] - 23681:11, $23713: 9$ | 23717:7, 23730:13, | 23752:13 | Privy [1] - 23736:17 | propose [7] - 23633:15, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23681:11, 23713:9, } \\ & \text { 23735:8, 23748:11 } \end{aligned}$ | 23758:18, 23759:8 | preparing [5] | pro [1] - 23644:17 | 23633:17, 23633:22, |
| 23756:14, 23759:4, |  | 23653:23, 23655:15, | probe [1] - 23805:5 | 23634:14, 23634:23, |
| 23789:14, 23789:17, | 23633:23, 23651:10, | 23682:1, 23682:21, | procedu | proposed [1] |
| 23789:18, 23794:15, | 23651:20, 23654:3, | 23683:22 | 23626:19, 23630:13 | 23735:10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23806:15 } \\ & \text { possibly [6] - 23655:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $23654: 15,23654: 24,$ <br> 23655:8, 23655:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Preparing [2] - } \\ & 23711: 24,23712: 4 \end{aligned}$ | proceeded [2] - | prosecute [2] - |
| 23656:12, 23737:9, | 23655:8, 23655:15, | presence [1] - 23774:21 | 23750:16, 23791:2 | 23637:20, 23780:22 |
| 23740:11, 23754:11, | 23660:13, 23660:24, | present [4]-23708:16, | $23662: 18,23663: 15$ | $23638: 13$ |
| 23771:1 | 23661:11, 23663:13, | $\begin{aligned} & 23709: 22,23717: 4, \\ & 23721: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $23766: 24$ | prosecuting |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { post [2] - 23635:15, } \\ & \text { 23635:18 } \end{aligned}$ | 23667:23, 23668:2, | 23721:6 presentations [1] - | Proceedings [4] - | 23638:10 |
| 23635:18 <br> post-conviction [2] | 23668:4, 23678:5, 23680:20, 23680.25 | 23630:19 | 23619:12, 23619:23, | prosecution [7] - |
| $23635: 15,23635: 18$ | $23681 \text { :22, 23682:6, }$ | presented [3] | 23622:1, 23623:1 | 23637:7, 23638:20, |
| posted [2]-23699:6, | 23694:19, 23697:3, | 23734:1, 23787:14, | proceedings [7] - | $23641: 21,23659: 6$ |
| $23761: 2$ | 23697:17, 23697:20, | 23810:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23630:11, 23632:4, } \\ & \text { 23705:2, 23736:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23726: 8,23732: 6, \\ & 23758: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| potential [6] - 23655:6, | 23698:6, 23698:12, | presenting [1] - | 23739:19, 23766:21, | prosecutions [1] - |
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|  | 23649:2 <br> psychiatrists [1] - <br> 23773:18 <br> psychological [1] - <br> 23774:6 <br> psychotic [1] - 23683:6 <br> public [1] - 23693:1 <br> pull [1] - 23799:2 <br> pulled [4] - 23796:2, <br> 23796:11, 23807:19, <br> 23809:16 <br> purpose [18]-23654:3, <br> 23657:16, 23664:12, <br> 23695:13, 23698:14, <br> 23721:14, 23724:24, <br> 23752:9, $23781: 4$, <br> 23783:19, 23784:9, <br> 23784:11, 23786:3, <br> 23786:11, 23799:2, <br> 23800:1, 23808:8, <br> 23808:14 <br> purposes [6] - <br> 23665:25, 23701:5, <br> 23722:11, 23722:25, <br> 23737:8, 23754:8 <br> purse [4] - 23785:7, <br> 23799:6, 23799:9, <br> 23799:17 <br> purse-snatching [1] - <br> 23799:17 <br> purses [1] - 23785:2 <br> pursue [2]-23761:17, <br> 23761:21 <br> pursued [1] - 23762:12 <br> push [3] - 23801:15, <br> 23811:16, 23811:17 <br> put [43] - 23636:25, <br> 23642:3, 23645:5, <br> 23650:7, 23654:5, <br> 23654:7, 23656:5, <br> 23658:8, 23658:23, <br> 23659:11, 23661:3, <br> 23661:14, 23664:4, <br> 23684:1, 23685:18, <br> 23693:8, 23700:2, <br> 23704:17, 23704:18, <br> 23706:6, 23706:19, <br> 23706:23, 23711:9, <br> 23714:25, 23717:3, <br> 23717:10, 23725:17, <br> 23733:9, 23743:19, <br> 23746:14, 23757:7, <br> 23759:9, 23763:18, <br> 23763:23, 23763:24, <br> 23765:13, 23781:14, <br> 23781:21, 23789:23, <br> 23789:24, 23795:21, <br> 23796:12 <br> putting [5] - 23646:12, <br> 23687:21, 23706:4, |  | $\qquad$ <br> 23781:14, 23782:20, 23787:12, 23787:16, 23788:19, 23789:17, 23794:15, 23794:22, 23797:22, 23799:18 quotation [3] - 23700:2, 23725:17, 23728:13 quote [2]-23800:7, 23800:8 <br> racked [1] - 23704:19 raise [5] - 23657:13, 23723:2, 23764:25, 23775:18, 23776:13 raised [5] - 23657:2, 23696:9, 23762:19, 23772:22, 23789:15 ran [1] - 23736:4 range [2]-23639:3, 23798:3 <br> rape [1] - 23683:4 rapes [1] - 23636:24 Rasmussen[3] 23812:7, 23812:8 rather [6] - 23633:16, 23686:7, 23721:18, 23730:24, 23747:12, 23751 :8 ratio [1] - 23658:12 Rcmp[4] - 23621:9, 23635:17, 23673:12, 23812:9 read [24]-23650:11, 23656:14, 23663:22, 23668:2, 23668:6, 23687:20, 23693:11, 23693:16, 23693:23, 23694:10, 23694:13, 23695:9, 23695:22, 23695:23, 23695:24, 23709:7, 23726:7, 23741:12, 23741:17, 23744:3, 23745:8, 23756:13, 23770:10, 23789:7 <br> reader [1] - 23745:8 readily [1] - 23802:23 reading [3] - 23656:3, 23704:11, 23750:3 ready [8] - 23653:16, 23659:9, 23665:23, 23752:21, 23754:20, 23768:9, 23781 :3, 23781:19 real [4]-23718:17, 23777:10, 23783:16, 23800:1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| ```23738:5, 23738:21, 23740:1, 23740:12, 23741:7, 23742:25, 23745:14, 23745:16, 23752:19, 23777:20, 23781:17, 23782:2, 23782:19, 23783:25, 23784:8, 23784:19, 23785:1, 23785:12, 23785:14, 23785:21, 23788:14, 23788:20, 23792:15, 23792:17, 23797:14, 23811:8, 23813:12 reconstruct [3] - 23649:10, 23694:20, 23704:9 reconstruction [1] - 23813:17 Reconvened[4] - 23623:2, 23679:8, 23728:21, 23779:17 record [11] - 23623:15, 23624:15, 23652:14, 23663:25, 23726:23, 23739:5, 23753:18, 23761:7, 23768:20, 23773:7, 23773:25 records [1] - 23698:9 recounting [1] - 23771:1 recourse [3] - 23734:25, 23735:1, 23735:5 red [3]-23660:8, 23681:18, 23681:19 reenactment [1] - 23634:4 refer [9]-23651:10, 23658:11, 23661:7, 23682:2, 23716:19, 23717:11, 23718:13, 23746:10, 23790:19 Reference[1] - 23632:2 reference [13] - 23635:17, 23660:24, 23661:5, 23661:6, 23667:21, 23670:4, 23670:22, 23682:5, 23691:16, 23723:14, 23724:12, 23773:3, 23790:6 references [1] - 23698:2 referred [1] - 23734:20 referring [7] - 23682:7, 23726:13, 23734:11, 23746:8, 23748:14, 23757:15, 23757:16 refers [5] - 23680:19,``` |  | ```23734:9, 23734:10 relates [1] - 23714:5 relating [11] - 23630:3, 23631:25, 23633:6, 23634:19, 23686:1, 23695:4, 23738:3, 23763:14, 23773:17, 23774:5, 23785:1 relation [1]-23806:5 relatively [2] - 23737:23, 23751:6 relayed [2] - 23691:9, 23755:19 relaying [1] - 23759:5 released [1] - 23749:1 relevant [6]-23660:1, 23665:13, 23684:1, 23764:3, 23764:4, 23787:25 relooked [1] - 23691:23 reluctant [1] - 23774:13 rely [2]-23641:5, 23736:14 remainder [1] - 23749:24 remanded [1] - 23715:15 remarks [1] - 23781:6 remember [33] - 23628:9, 23631:13, 23638:6, 23643:24, 23644:5, 23644:19, 23657:1, 23658:1, 23664:2, 23664:5, 23665:22, 23668:3, 23676:14, 23695:22, 23701:21, 23720:18, 23733:18, 23736:13, 23737:10, 23739:24, 23745:15, 23747:11, 23753:19, 23769:18, 23782:18, 23788:24, 23790:1, 23790:6, 23793:10, 23793:13, 23795:22, 23802:19, 23805:12 remembered [1] - 23793:19 removed [1] - 23689:9 replicated [1] - 23665:11 replied [1] - 23758:16 report [7] - 23686:1, 23686:10, 23686:21, 23737:9, 23737:25, 23738:1, 23767:14 Reporter[2] - 23815:14, 23815:18 Reporters[2] - 23620:11, 23815:3``` |  | ```23710:13 rest [1] - 23679:21 restaurant [1] - 23782:23 result [1] - 23812:23 retain [2] - 23669:6, 23763:2 retained [15] - 23635:25, 23645:2, 23665:6, 23665:9, 23669:3, 23669:5, 23716:23, 23717:19, 23720:14, 23720:16, 23721:8, 23729:24, 23759:20, 23761:10, 23808:3 retainer [1] - 23760:20 retention [1] - 23668:24 Retired[1] - 23621:15 retired [2] - 23626:12, 23694:5 retrospectively [1] - 23743:4 return [2] - 23686:6, 23689:21 returned [4] - 23669:18, 23669:21, 23690:3, 23784:5 reverse [4] - 23699:9, 23789:5, 23809:19, 23811:18 review [8] - 23624:19, 23672:12, 23678:11, 23689:8, 23689:23, 23698:11, 23732:9, 23768:8 reviewed [1] - 23698:22 reviewing [1] - 23632:20 rightful [1] - 23708:7 rights [1] - 23728:1 rings [1] - 23691:14 rise [2] - 23753:10, 23812:24 risks [3] - 23658:19, 23718:17, 23719:13 road [1] - 23803:10 rob [1] - 23799:7 robbery [1] - 23799:17 robbing [2] - 23799:5, 23800:18 Roberts[1] - 23634:10 robustly [1] - 23799:25 Roger1] - 23644:2 role [3] - 23640:25, 23647:17, 23737:21 Ron[22] - 23633:21, 23661:15, 23663:12, 23665:14, 23665:15, 23682:10, 23682:25,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 23724:15, 23731:12, | 23787:23, 23788:19, | 23660:11, 23660:12, | separately [1] - 23665 : | show [7] - 23649:9, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23741: 1,23742: 18 \\ & 23759: 23,23767: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23788:23, 23789:21 } \\ & \text { sat [2]-23709:2. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23665: 13,23684: 2, \\ & 23684: 8,23684: 13 \end{aligned}$ | September ${ }_{[8]}$ 23673:8, 23673: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23659:14, 23680:3, } \\ & \text { 23685:17, 23685:24, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 23768:13, 23781 | 23768:4 <br> satisfied [6] - 23691:18, 23698:8, 23701:15, | sections [1] - 23660:10 <br> Security [1] - 23620:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23678:2, 23697:1, } \\ & \text { 23700:10, 23700:14, } \\ & \text { 23706:16, 23766:18 } \end{aligned}$ | 23741:16, 23773:21 <br> showed [7] - 23673:20, |
| 23784:15, 23789:13, |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23797: 4,23800: 4, \\ & 23801: 7,23804: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 23698:8, 23701:15, 23711:20, 23746:19, | See [1] - 23624:8 | 23706:16, 23766:18 sequence [2] - | 23677:4, 23680:2, <br> 23685:6, 23697:9, <br> 23721:25, 23773:25 |
| onald [1] - 23680:1 | 23775:17 | 23636:4, 23647:6 | $\begin{gathered} 23690: 19,23729: 16 \\ \text { Serge }_{[1]}-23621: 6 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| room [8] - 23698:19 | saved [1] - 23672: | 3649 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 23721: 25,23773: 25 \\ & \text { shown [3] - 23679:13, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 23701:6, 23701 : | saw [11] - 23664:8 | 23650:17, 23657:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Serge }[1]-23621: 6 \\ & \text { Sergeant }[1]-23755: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 23771:21, 23788:13 } \\ \text { side [10] - 23629:3, } \end{gathered}$ |
| 23701:13, 23702:2, | 4:10, 2367 | 23664:12, 23667 | series [1] - 23800:16serious [5] -23638:13, |  |
| 23712:14, 23712:17, | :21, 23692:14 | 23671:21, 23675:19 |  | side [10] - 23629:3, $23637: 5,23671: 22,$ |
| 23720:11 $\text { roster }[1] \text { - }$ | 23695:7, 23711:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23679:18, } 23686: 17 \\ & \text { 23698:1, } 23700: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { serious [5]-23638:13, } \\ & \text { 23639:1, 23642:5, } \end{aligned}$ | 23748:7, 23765:12, |
| rotated [1] - 23642:4 | 23726:22 | 23725:7, 23727: | serologist [1] - <br> 23704:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 23765: 13,23790: 15, \\ & 23790: 19,23792: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| route [1] - 2379 | scenario [2] - 23682:20 | 23727:11, 23732:2 |  | 23790:19, 23792:15 sign [1] - 23769:22 signals [1]-23738:17 |
| routinely [2] | 23765:6 | :24, 23737 | 23704:15 <br> service [1] - 23629:20 |  |
| 23671:17, 23691:10 | [1] - 238 | 23738:22, 23743:10 | Service [1] - 23621:7services [2]-23639:16, | signals [1]-23738:17 signed [3] - 23723:17, |
| Rprr4]-23620:12, | me [1] - 23638: | 23744:12, 23744:20, |  | $23769: 19,23769: 22$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23815:2, 23815:16, } \\ & \text { 23815:17 } \end{aligned}$ | school [1] - 23774:7 | 23745:24, 23746:24, <br> 23748:5, 23751:11, | services [2]-23639:16, 23705:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { significance }[4] \text { - } \\ & 23734: 14,23750: 11, \end{aligned}$ |
| [1] - 23 | re [1] - 2375 | 23755:5, 23759 |  | 23797:5, 23809:24 |
| ruler [1] - 23681:16 | bler [1] - 23633:3 | 23777-8, 23779-10 | $\begin{aligned} & 23750: 5 \\ & \text { session }[1]-23805: 14 \end{aligned}$ | significant [12] - <br> 23653:7, 23660:7, |
| rumour [4]-23747:9, 23747:15, 23747:23, | scroll [12] - 23634:8, 23678:8, 23678:12, | 23777:8, 23779:10, 23792:22, 23797:18 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 23653: 7,23660: 7, \\ & 23681: 23,23719: 16, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23747:15, 23747:23, } \\ & \text { 23748:18 } \end{aligned}$ | 23678:8, 23678:12, 23687:4, 23697:18, | 23798:4, 23798:7, | 23650:3, 23655:3, <br> 23665:3, 23665:19 | $\begin{aligned} & 23681: 23,23719: 16, \\ & \text { 23767:3, 23767:5, } \end{aligned}$ |
| urs | 23703:6, 23711:23, | 23807:3, 23811:10 | 23665:3, 23665:19, 23681:25, 23692:23, | 23767:6, 23788:1, <br> 23788:4, 23793:15, |
| [2]-23710:17, | 5:13, 23716:24 | 23811:16, 23813: | $23701 \text { :6 }$ |  |
| 23777:8 | 7:2, 23724:12 | [1] - 23738 | sets [3] - 23633:7, 23654-14, 23673.5 | 23788:4, 23793:15, 23799:10, 23810:15 |
| 5] | 23748:20 | seeking [2]-23777:2 |  | similar [4] - 23655:9, |
| 23777:16, 23778:18, | searched [2] | 23 | 23654:14, 23673:5 <br> setting [2] - 23717:6, | 23684:10, 23724:17, |
| 23778:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23670:20, 23670:23 } \\ & \text { searches [1]-23672: } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { segment }[1]-23681 \text { : } \\ & \text { segments }[2] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { setting [2]-23717:6, } \\ & \text { 23756:22 } \end{aligned}$ | 23755:22 <br> similarities [1] - |
| S | searching [1] | 23668:10, | seven [2] - 23812:11, 23812:21 |  |
|  | 3672:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cted }[1]-237 \\ & {[2]-23749: 17} \end{aligned}$ | 23812:21 <br> several [1] - 23628:8 | 23809:4 <br> simplifying [1] - |
| safe [2] | $237$ | $23750$ | $23772: 22,23774: 18$ | $23635: 8$ |
| 23770:24 | ond [10]-23668:7, | Sers | 23799: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { simply [8] - 23728:10, } \\ & \text { 23745:17, 23747:10, } \end{aligned}$ |
| Sandra [1] - 23620:5 | 7:17, 23707:20 | 23 | are | $23747: 23,23779: 6,$ |
| Saskatchewan [18] - | 23709:20, 23709:22 | selling [3] - 23753:20 | shared [1] - 23744:6 | 23779:12, 23780:6,23785:3 |
| 23619:17, 23621:3, | 10:16, 23715:14 | 23753:22, 23773: |  |  |
| 23623:21, 23624:9, | 23724:6, 23740:14 | semen [2] - 23654:10 | 23696:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23785:3 } \\ & \text { sit [3] - 23726:7, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 23624:22, 23625:24, | 000 | 23655:12 | Shirley[1] - 23634:10 Short 2 - $23750 \cdot 24$ <br> Short [2] - 23750:24, | 23767:3, 23770:9 <br> sit-down [1] - 23767:3 |
| 23626:20, 23627:5, | se | nars [1] - 23627:23 |  |  |
| 23628:6, 23631:7, | 23724:6 | sending [2] - 23726:7 | $23751: 1$ <br> short [5] - 23635:20 | sitting [5] - 23619:15, 23640:6, 23643:12, |
| 23631:16, 23693:4, | ondly [5] - 23657:9, | 23726:8 |  |  |
| 23697:24, 23711:1, | 23695:2, 23708:2 | senior [3]-23638:9, | short [5] - 23635:20, 23653:18, 23753:19, | $23697: 21,23766: 21$ |
| 23777:17, 23778:1, 23780:21, 23815:4 | 23772:5, 23778:9 | 23670:25, 23708:5 | 23653:18, 23753:19, $23801: 5,23804: 6$ | 23736:18, 23752:22, |
| Saskatoon [24] | seconds [1] - 23803:8 | $23$ | $01: 5,23804$ <br> orthand [5] - |  |
| 23619:17, 23621:7, | 1:11, 23666 | 06:18, 23718:1 |  | 23763:12, 23808:16 <br> size [2] - 23744:20, |
| 23628:3, 23645:15, | 23681 :8 | $21: 24,23742: 2$ | 23709:4, 23815:5 <br> shortly [5] - 23697:2, | 23808:11 |
| 23657:2, 23700:22, |  | 23755:10, 23760:1 | 23709:15, 23731:10, | 23805:13 |
| $23701: 2,23724: 1$, | 23677:15 | 23772:6, 23775:6 | 23803:5, 23812:12 |  |
| 23750:24, 23766:8, | secretor [8]-23634:7, | 23791:24, 23794:10 | Shorty [4] - 23718:2, | sketched [1] - 23805:22 |
| 23778:7, 23778:12, | $4: 2$ | 23798:10, 23808:21 | 23786:6, 23790:16, | sketches [1] - 23805:15 |
| 23778:16, 23780:12, | 55:12, 23703:13 | t [1] - 23727:8 |  | skill [1] - 23815:6 |
| 23780:14, 23785:6, | 23704:1, 23704:2, | sentence [1]-23746:21 |  |  |
| 23785:22, 23786:4, | 23716:1 | separate [2]-23665:19, | Shorty's [5] - 23792:23, 23793:7, 23795:22, | slipping [1] - 23787:3 <br> small [1] - 23777:16 |
| 23786:5, 23786:18, | section [7]-23658:3, | 23701:12 | 23795:23, 23801:1 |  |
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| smooth [2]-23803:14, | 23714:12, 23741:8, | 23728:16, 23779:15, | 23695:3, 23700:6, | strategy [3] - 23655:4, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23810:17 <br> snatch [1] - 23799:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23743:7, 23744:4, } \\ & \text { 23748:10, 23749:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23802:7, 23810:1, } \\ & 23814: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23726: 5,23732: 12, \\ & 23732: 25,23733: 11, \end{aligned}$ | 23655:6, 23655:10 <br> Strategy [1] - 23655:8 |
| natching [4]- | 23751:1, 23769:14, | spotted [2]-23656:4, | 23733:16, 23733:23, | straying [1]-23661:10 |
| 23785:2, 23785:7, | 23774 | 2365 | 23734:5, 23734:10 | Street [9] - 23790:10, |
| 23799:8, 23799:17 | ces [5] - 23624: | St ${ }_{[1]}-23793: 1$ | 23734:24, 23735: | 23790:22, 23791:22, |
| snowfall [1] - 23808:18 | 23648:5, 23648:17 | sta | 23735:14, 23736:3 | 23792:12, 23792:16, |
| social [3]-23773:4, 23773.18, 23774.7 | 23673:6, 23748:4 | 23744:18, 23760:19 | $\begin{aligned} & 23736: 9,23740: 23 \\ & 23741: 5,23741: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $23792: 25,23793: 5 \text {, }$ |
| Societies [2] - 23625:4, | 23793:1, 23793:6, | $23620: 9$ | 23742:7, 23742:9 | street [1] - 23803:25 |
| 23629:10 | 23793:23, 23795:1 | staff [5] - 23673:1, | 23742:19, 23756:5 | streets [1] - 23791:10 |
| soft [1] - 23 | 23796:1, 23796:8, | 23698:15, 23732:1 | 23756:11, 23756:16 | strength [1] - 23744:21 |
| sole [1]-23732: | 23797:13, 23802:13 | 23732:3, 23732:6 | 23757:6, 23757:10, | strenuously [2] |
| someone [7]-23644:2, | 23802:14, 23802:17, <br> $23802 \cdot 24,23812 \cdot 1$ | stage [16] - 23655:2 | 23757:13, 23760:5, <br> 23760:8, 23760:13, | 23721:23, 23753:25 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23705:13, 23709:17, } \\ & \text { 23739:11, 23759:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23802:24, 23812:1, } \\ & \text { 23812:18 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23661: 24,23662: 3, \\ & 23681: 25,23725: 20 \end{aligned}$ | 23767:13, 23767:22, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { strict [2]-23689:21, } \\ & \text { 23777:21 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 23782:3, 23787:4 } \\ \text { sometime }[1] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { southerly }[1]-23793: 9 \\ & \text { spanned }[1]-23697: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23728: 2,23733: 16, \\ & 23745: 14,23752: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23768:15, 23768:21, } \\ & \text { 23769:1, 23769:5, } \end{aligned}$ | stripped [1] - 23789:5 |
| 23781:18 | speaking [3] - | 23752:23, 23759:1 | 23769:6, 23769:8, | 23801 :2, 23801 :4, |
| sometimes [5] | 23719:12, 23720:25, | 23763:15, 23769:2, | 23770:1, 23770:2, <br> 23770:14, 23770:20 | 23801:16, 23801:20, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23630: 20,23630: 21, \\ & 23656: 20,23660: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23736: 18 \\ & \text { speaks [1] - 23 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23772: 21,23785: 3, \\ & 23786: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23770:14, 23770:20, } \\ & \text { 23770:21, 23784:4, } \end{aligned}$ | 23801:21, 23802:3, 23803:2, 23803:10 |
| somewhat [1] - 23632:5 | special $[1]$ - 23663:18 | staggered [1] | 23785:5, 23785:9, 23789:13, 23797:4 | 23803:11, 23803:12, |
| Somewhere [2] - | specific [14] <br> 23628:21, 2363 | $23701:$ | station [6] - 23645:9, | 23803:16, 23803:19, |
| somewhere [5] | $23652: 7,23657: 23$ | 23811:19 | 23712:22, 23725:15, | 23805:11, 23806:2 |
| 23691:6, 23725:13, | 23668:22, 23669:4, | stand [2]-23623:8 | 23726:25, 23727:17 | 23806:7, 23806:14, |
| 23748:19, 23761:19, | 23681:5, 23696:11 23718:13, 23723:8, | $23789: 12$ | statutes [1] - 23629:5 | 23807:2, 23807:6, |
| son's [1] - 23718:6 | $23724: 21,23730: 2$ | $23633: 10,23732: 2$ | statutory [1] - 23641:16 | 23810:18, 23810:25, |
| soon [2] - 23713:8, | 23748:15, 23789:24 | standing [2] - 23623:16 | stay [1] - 23801:10 | 23812:2, 23812:19 |
| 23801:13 | specifically [10]- | standpoint [2]- | stayed [2]-23668:14 23801:11 | student [1] - 23647:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sorry [2]-23709:10, } \\ & 23801: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 23647:25, 23648:3, 23652:22, 23663:11, | 23708:1, 23780:15 | stepped [1] - 23631:15 | stuff [5] - 23670:11, |
| sorry [7] - 23651:23, | 23719:7, $23731: 6$, | start [10] - 23635:23 | steps [3] - 23690:11, | 23692:1, 23737:24 |
| 23662:23, 23721:4, | 23737:11, 23745:6, | 23643:7, 23644:22 | 23692:20, 23729:13 | stupid [1] - 23800:7 |
| 23727:13, 23770:12, | 23749:20, 23803:15 <br> specifics [1] - 23702.20 | 23649:7, 23692:19 | still [7] - 23649:25, | style [1] - 23707:5 |
| 23787:19, 23798:23 <br> sort [26]-23639:11, | spectator [1] - 23708:9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23696:22, 23715:20, } \\ & \text { 23737:21, 23772:13, } \end{aligned}$ | 23753:17, 23779:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { subdivided [1] - } \\ & 23660: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| 23639:20, 23642:4, | spectators [1] | 23780:24 | 23787:7, 23800:25 | subject [4] - 23635:9, |
| 23690:5, $23691: 14$, | 23709:3 | started [9]-23629:14, | sting [1] - 23799:23 <br> stocking [1] - 23807:24 | 23734:17, 23734:19, |
| $23700: 2,23704: 21,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { speculation }[3] \text { - } \\ & \text { 23742:23, } 23742: 24 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23629: 24,23639: 6 \\ & 23639: 9,23639: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { Stolen [2] - } 23782: 5 \text {, }$ | 23774:11 |
| $23724: 25,23736: 21,$ | 23743:2 | $23675: 3,23706: 23$ | 23782:6 | submit [1] - 23713:7 |
| 23737:14, 23743:3, | spend [7]-23632:23, | 23716:9, 23783:1 | stolen [2]-23746:1, | submitting [1] - |
| 23775:11, 23777:12, | 23634:6, 23634:22, 23658.3, $23698 \cdot 17$ | starting [3] - 23644:19, | 23746:9 <br> stop | $23720: 24$ |
| 23787:4, 23787:20, | 23713:18, 23805:10 | statement [17] - | 23789:19, 23795:25 | subpoena [1] - 23722:1 |
| 23790:23, 23792:16, | spending [2] | 23673:13, 23713:7 | stopped [10] | 23753:21, 23753:22, |
| 23795:24, 23803:16, | 23654:22, 23766:22 | 23713:19, 23736:20, | 23783:10, 23796:10 | 773:9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23805:22, 23807:21, } \\ & 23808: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { spent [8]- 23702:7, } \\ & \text { 23707:2. 23711:12. } \end{aligned}$ | 23741:17, 23742:21, | $\begin{aligned} & 23797: 6,23800: 23, \\ & 23802: 4,23802: 14, \end{aligned}$ | subsequent [7] - |
| sought [2]-23647:7, | 23711:18, 23766:19, | $23760: 1,23760: 14,$ | 23803:1, 23804:17, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23635:16, 23717:15, } \\ & \text { 23742:12, 23745:13, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 23719:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23773:5, 23773:10, } \\ & 23797: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23760: 20,23769: 19, \\ & 23771: 2,23771: 5, \end{aligned}$ | 23806:1, 23808:23 <br> storage [1] - 23668:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23772:9, 23782:10, } \\ & \text { 23784:24 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $23707: 4,23730: 14$ | pilling [1] - 23785:17 | 23789:16, 23800:3, | store [1] - 23790:6 | subsequently [2] - |
| 23756:11 | spoken [4]-23667:3, | 23804:16 | stories [1] - 23724:16 | 23746:2, 23746:9 |
| sounds [1] - 23747:12 <br> source [12] - 23679:18 | 23766:9, 23766:14 23773:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { statements [52] - } \\ & \text { 23633:3, 23660:18, } \end{aligned}$ | strange [1] - 23747:12 strategies [2] - | substantial [1] <br> 23642:16 |
| 23684:23, 23696:23, | spot [6] - 23679:5, | 23684:11, 23694:20, | $23653: 3,23661: 19$ | substantive [3] - |
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|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

