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(Reconvened at 9:04 a.m.)
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Good morning.
CALVIN FORRESTER TALLIS, continued:
BY MR. HODSON:
Good morning, Mr. Tallis. Just before we begin, Mr. Commissioner, I just wanted to make an introduction of a guest we have joining us at Mr. Pringle's table today, Renee Tulk, who is a second year law student at the University of Saskatchewan, was a first year law student at the University of Alberta last year and was a student of Mr. Pringle's in a class he taught there and is clerking at the Court of Appeal, so she's joining us for part of the day, so welcome.

And, Mr. Tallis, if we could, where we left off yesterday, just if I could briefly recap, we had gone through and you told us what David Milgaard told you about the significant facts of January $30,31, ' 69$ and $I$ was going through a bit of a comparison of what Mr. Milgaard had told you versus what was the Crown's case against him and some of the consistencies and inconsistencies and $I$ think you told us on a couple of occasions that your ethical and
professional responsibilities were such that you could not challenge facts which your client had told you to be true; is that correct?

A

Q

That's correct.

And we had gone through the part, and $I$ was just going through a bit chronologically, and we had touched on their vehicle, where it was that morning, stopping the woman, being stuck and leaving the car. If we could just carry on, the motel, Trav-a-leer Motel incident where they went to get the map, I don't think there was much in the way of dispute as to what David's version was, I mean, $I$ think he said he went in in his stocking feet and I think that was the evidence of other witnesses; is that correct?

Yes, I think that's a fair assessment on your part.

And $I$ think you as well told us on Thursday that Mr. Milgaard was not able to give you a time that he was at the motel and I think you said you went to other sources, or to Mr. Rasmussen who was the Trav-a-leer Motel manager to try and pinpoint the time; is that correct?

Yes.

And then the Danchuks, again Mr. Milgaard told you
about their vehicle getting stuck behind the Danchuks and the visit with the Danchuks, and was there anything there that you felt was inconsistent between what David told you and what others had said about that?

No. I think there was general agreement about what happened at the Danchuk residence as well as the events leading up to getting stuck behind the Danchuk vehicle.

Right. And you also told us yesterday, I think you said you did not see anything significant or incriminating or suspicious about the fact that the Wilson, Milgaard, John vehicle went down the alley as opposed to down a street, I think you told us that didn't figure in your mind as a concern; is that correct?

A
That's correct, and of course I'm sure that my assessment was affected by the statements of Mr . and Mrs. Danchuk, there was no indication of any blood that they saw. Now, that was canvassed and there was no disagreement with that on David's part, indeed there was agreement on his part -Right.
-- with essentially what the Danchuks had said.
And $I$ believe you told us earlier that that, I
think you felt, was significant evidence, that after this rape and murder was supposed to have happened, that shortly after that, that your client was observed by two strangers who had an opportunity to observe him for some time period; is that correct?

A
Yes, I thought it was very significant for the reason that you have mentioned, and also my assessment of Mr. Danchuk in particular was that he was curious as to why they were there and in my assessment of the situation $I$ thought that he would likely take pretty careful notice of anything that looked untoward and that's why at the preliminary hearing and at trial, well, at trial $I$ knew what he would say. At the preliminary hearing $I$ went into his observations and the fact that he did not observe any blood or anything that looked like blood on David. If we can then just move on to the arrival at the Cadrain house, and as far as the changing of clothes, and in particular David Milgaard changing his clothes at the Cadrain house, putting aside people's views on the reason for that, $I$ take it there was no dispute that David had in fact changed his shirt and pants at the Cadrain house?

A
Well, you know, sitting here today, the firm recollection $I$ have is of changing the trousers because of that rip that $I$ described for you. Whether or not he changed his shirt at that time $I$ cannot definitely recall, although in the course of change -- I rather think that he did, but I'm trying my best to recollect without the benefit of any notes.

And again $I$ think the, we had touched on the fact that although Albert Cadrain said he observed blood, and we will see later where Ron Wilson, we'll say he also observed blood, David had told you that he did not have blood on his trousers or on his shirt; correct?

That's right, he didn't have blood -On any clothing?

On any clothing.
And so I think we also --
And I know that I questioned whether or not there was any blood on his hands or person, so I'm quite confident in saying that he told me he had no blood on his person and that would include his clothes.

And $I$ can't recall whether we've touched on this issue, but apart from the blood, would there be
anything in your mind that might be suspicious or of concern to you with the fact that your client would have changed clothes upon arriving at Mr. Cadrain's house, apart from the fact that someone saw blood on them or said they saw blood on them?

A

Q
No, because $I$ understood that he was in, you might say, an embarrassing situation with the split or broken seam that was very significant.

And so again back on what we talked about yesterday, the room that you had to manoeuvre at trial, if $I$ can call it that, in examining witnesses on this issue in light of what Mr. Milgaard told you, $I$ take it that you could not put to witnesses that David did not change his clothes, but rather would focus on the reasons he changed his clothes; is that fair?

A

Now, we had talked as well about David Milgaard driving the vehicle after arriving at Albert
And then secondly, with respect to the observations of blood, you were free to challenge people, witnesses on that observation; is that fair?

Yes.

Cadrain's house and it was, I can't recall how much longer after, but he went out and drove the car around the back alley in the street on one or two occasions and then the car stalled, and I think you told us that his explanation for that was I like to drive; is that correct?

Yes, that's essentially the explanation that he gave me. There wasn't any other that $I$ can recollect.

And I think you told us that you felt some concern
about that fact in that it might be viewed as suspicious by the jury; is that correct?

Yes, I could see where it would arouse suspicion, particularly in the light of what had been found in that vicinity.

And that's the wallet and the toque?
Yeah. I'm thinking more of the wallet.
So again in dealing with that fact in light of what your client told you and from what you told us yesterday about your ethical and professional responsibilities, you could not suggest to any witness that that had not happened; is that right?

A That's correct.

And what --
And that is that he had driven in that area that
we discussed the other day, yesterday I guess it was.

Q
And as far as discarding any items out of the car, I think you told us that Mr. Milgaard said that didn't happen?

That's correct, and of course $I$ was particularly interested in that because of the purse having been found there.

How would you, tell us what your thoughts were as to how you could deal with this fact, let's just talk about that fact, and you said you thought the jury might be suspicious about that or draw an inference. As defence counsel what were your options as to what you could do to try and minimize the impact of that?

Well, they were, in practical terms, they were very limited because the fact of the purse having been found there, or wallet having been found there, was not, could not be realistically disputed. With respect to the toque, I recall there were some questions about colour and so on and I think at the end of the day the toque was pretty well neutralized, but $I$ could be wrong on that.

I think the judge's charge to the jury was to put
no weight on the toque.

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

I see. Well, I thought --
And there's no link to the crime or anything else.
I thought the circumstances that were elicited with respect to the toque rendered it of little or no value.

Now just as far as, $I$ guess there is the issue of the wallet being found there and the jury drawing the inference that it may have come from Mr. Milgaard when he drove the car around the block, I think you told us you could not dispute the fact that Gail Miller's wallet was found there? That's right.

What about an explanation or a reason for the trip around the block, did you explore that as trying to explain sort of an innocent explanation unconnected to the murder?

Well his explanation to me was a, you know, an innocent explanation, "I just decided to drive around because I liked to drive."

And, again, did you have concerns about how the jury, or if Mr. Milgaard testified, what Mr. Caldwell might do with that --

Well --
-- in light of the temperature that morning and
the fact they'd been stuck twice?
A
Well that was a factor that $I$ would have undoubtedly considered in connection with the subsequent advice or recommendation $I$ gave to him, because I knew that counsel for the prosecution would likely engage in a pretty -- in a robust cross-examination on that point. That's the best way $I$ can put it at this stage.

Was there any --
Because, you know, it's very difficult for me to micro-analyse or microdissect all of my mental processes going back that many years. Even if I had the benefit of my notes, I'm not sure that my recollection could be exhumed to the extent that $I$ would like to be able to do it, and I'm sure you would like me to be able to do it as well. But that certainly was something that I appreciated would happen. It seemed to me -- to say it now is, I think, to state the obvious.

And are you able to tell us, either from memory or from looking back at this particular fact, was there anything that you felt you could do to take the sting out of -- I think that was your word on another fact -- out of the negative inference that might be drawn by the jury on this, or it was what
it was?
It was what it was. And if he had, if he had elected to testify, I would have thought the prudent thing to do was to lead it to try to take the sting out of it, even though that would not foreclose a robust cross-examination on the point. If we can then go on to, again, the one other issue was -- or piece of evidence that was part of the Crown's case that $I$ think you may have touched on with Mr. Milgaard was his driving after they left the city. And I think you told us yesterday that -- and please correct me if I'm wrong -- that Mr. Milgaard maybe acknowledged to you that at times he drove fast on the trip, but your focus was on keeping it out on the basis that it would not be admissible evidence regarding the consciousness of guilt, is that correct? Yes. I can't remember all -- I know he told me he liked, generally speaking, he liked to drive fast. But $I$ think you've put it fairly when you indicate that $I$ was focused on keeping this type of thing out because $I$ didn't see how it was relevant and probative on the pivotal issue that was before the Court.

And we --

A

Q
A

Q

A
Q

A

Now $I$ certainly argued that point, and was prepared to argue it at trial, and if $I$ recall correctly $I$ believe it was rendered inadmissible. That's right, and I would --

Or ruled, I should say, inadmissible by the Learned Trial Judge.

Yes, and $I$ will touch on that when we go through that, --

Yes.
-- I think it's the transcript of Ron Wilson. The compact we talked about a fair bit yesterday and I think, just to summarize on that point, $I$ think you have told us yesterday that, in light of Mr. Milgaard's admission to you that there was a compact in the car, that Nichol did take it out of the glove compartment, that he did grab it and throw it out the window, and that he didn't know where it came from or why he did that; --

That's right.
-- I think that's what you told us?
That's right.
And $I$ think you told us that limited your ability to deal with other witness' knowledge on the subject matter; is that correct? Yes.

Now the one other area, admissions to Ron Wilson, and when $I$ go through Mr. Wilson's statement and evidence later today, in his second statement he talks about David Milgaard making an admission to him in Calgary about jabbing a girl, throwing her purse in the garbage, something of that nature. I think you told us yesterday that David Milgaard denied saying anything of that nature to Ron Wilson, and so $I$ take it that that's something that you were unrestrained as far as how you would deal with that fact --

A
Q
-- coming from Ron Wilson? And we'll talk, when we get into Mr. Wilson, about what strategies and options you had for that. Drug use we talked about as well yesterday, and I think you told us that you were able to get from the Crown a concession that there was no evidence to suggest that any of Ron Wilson, Nichol John, or David Milgaard were under the influence of drugs or alcohol on the morning of the murder; correct? Yes, and I think that, generally speaking, the evidence supported that, and certainly David indicated that to me.

Now we also talked a little bit about drug use
both before and after the trip?

A
$Q$

A

2
Let's just talk about -- I think we've now covered most of the significant facts that you would have questioned Mr. Milgaard on and received answers to. Did you, in the course of interviewing him -and this would again be August 4 th, November 11th, and I think December 13th of 1969, or the dates that you were in Prince Albert and otherwise -can you tell us what were your observations as far as his ability to answer your questions, his demeanour, the manner in which he dealt with some of the difficult questions; can you tell us what your observations were?

I think I indicated to you yesterday or the previous occasion that he was not an emotional boy, and $I$ don't say that in a derogatory fashion, and bearing in mind his youth, in a number of --
on a number of instances, and we've discussed it, you know, he wouldn't -- he said "you know, I don't know, $I$ don't remember". That's -- that's the type of thing that occurred. And $I$ think, for example when we were trying to figure out where they had been driving, that he was generally trying to assist me when we were trying to sketch it out. So $I$ can sum it up by saying that $I$ proceeded on the footing that what he told me was correct.

And again, we'll talk about this a bit more when we get into the question of whether or not he should testify, but did you reach any conclusions about how David Milgaard answered your questions and how you thought a jury might react to the, both the substance and the manner in which he answered your questions?

Well $I$ was of the view that he would have difficulty under cross-examination in some of the areas. Now I guess what we're talking here is a gut feeling, and it's hard to put it into words, but you have -- you acquire a sense of things as it goes on, and that's one of the reasons why $I$ revisited some of the areas with him on more than one occasion, because I thought that there were
some areas, that maybe his memory would be revived with respect to certain matters.

And were you satisfied, after your meetings with him, that you had gone through at least the important aspects of the case and the facts with him to try and either refresh his memory and get a response?

I felt that $I$ had spent a great deal of time with him and that there wasn't much more that $I$ could really elicit from him than $I$ had.

Okay. If we can just --
Here again it's, you know, it's very difficult to put into words your assessment of the situation, but --

Let me ask this way. After having spent time with him and questioned him on various significant factors relating to the case against him and hearing his answers, did you have concerns about how or what the jury might think if he would have answered the questions in Court the same way he answered them in the discussions with you?

A Yes, and at the end of the day, at -- I certainly, in our private discussions, I told him that $I$ thought that some of his evidence would help strengthen the Crown's case and, in effect, be
damaging to his position.
And, what, can you give us an example of that? Well the area about the lady, the older lady, -Yes.
-- and the, one of the purposes being to look her over for possibly robbing or stealing her purse. As I've said, I can't remember whether the term "rob" or "stealing the purse" was used now, but that was the gist of it. And of course I thought, in the context of this case, that was quite significant, and $I$ had no doubt that it would be pursued vigorously on cross-examination, and of course the stage would be set because of them having really no money to -- and hitting out on a trip of this nature. Now when $I$ say "no money", of course $I$ knew from discussions that Nichol John had a little money, but when you consider that travel was involved it was minimal.

And, again, we'll come back to this a bit later when we get to dealing with the time of trial and the discussions you had about Mr. Milgaard testifying. Just a couple more points here on, before we finish up, on what you knew from David Milgaard and about David Milgaard going into trial. We have heard some evidence at this

Inquiry that the police obtained a statement of March $20 t h, 1969$ from a lady named Sharon, a young lady named Sharon Williams who was David Milgaard's friend or girlfriend, in fact the young lady that he went to see in Edmonton after they visited Saskatoon on January 31, 1969, and that statement is quite detailed about their
relationship and, I think, says some things that certainly the police have testified caused them to have questions about David Milgaard; were you aware of any of that information from Sharon Williams?

A

Q

A
Q
A
Q

A

Well, I can't recall all the discussion we had about his relationship with his girlfriend, but I certainly knew that he was going up there hoping to see her and that he did, in fact, see her. But I can't recall any dramatic or salacious details which you may be referring to.

I have provided you with a copy -Yes.
-- of the Sharon Williams statement?
Yes.
And did you ever receive that, or were aware of any of its contents, before the trial?

I don't think I, I stand to be corrected, but I
don't think so.
And I don't think the records that we have suggest that you do. Again, just about your knowledge about what Sharon -- about David Milgaard's relationship with, for example, Sharon Williams; would that have come from David himself then? Yes, and $I$ don't remember him describing any untoward conduct with her that attracted my attention. Now I understood that there was a sexual relationship, don't misunderstand me, but as far -- when $I$ refer to "salacious details" I'm thinking about what you have showed me, and I don't have any recollection of information of that nature from him, and $I$ think that everything he told me on that probably pointed, well, in my mind I'm quite certain it pointed to the contrary. And so going into the trial, as far as your information regarding the relationship between David Milgaard and Sharon Williams, there was nothing to suggest that there was anything to be concerned about as far as the case against David Milgaard; is that fair?

That's fair.
And, secondly, we have had an opportunity to see and hear from both Mr. Caldwell and Dr. Ian

McDonald about information they had gathered by way of psychiatric reports, social work reports, information that existed in 1969 about David Milgaard's past. And $I$ believe you may have already told us, but I'll ask you again just to confirm, $I$ think you told us that you did not have any written information regarding David Milgaard's -- any treatment, testing, comments by social workers, anything of that nature, when you went into trial; is that correct?

A

Q

A

No, I did not receive any of that package, if $I$ may use the term. But of course I had discussed, as I mentioned to you, I had discussed with him what I'd call, for want of a better word, his troubled background, and $I$ thought he was quite candid with me about some of his difficulties, and -- but to give you particulars, now, of any brushes he'd had with the law, or treatment and so on, without my notes $I$ couldn't assist you on that with any degree of reliability.

And the decision, or can you tell us, when was the formal decision made by David Milgaard, and I think with your advice, about not testifying at the trial; when was that decision formally made? Well the -- it was formally made after the Crown
had closed its case.
And if we go back to going into the preliminary hearing and going into the trial, can you tell us what your -- whether you would have had views, and whether they were strong views one way or another, as to whether or not David Milgaard would be testifying or whether your advice to him would be "testify" or "don't testify"?

Well, prior to the preliminary hearing $I$ had explained to him the difference between a preliminary hearing and a trial, and indicated to him that at the preliminary hearing we did not, in this case, have to make any decision as to whether or not he ought to testify. But $I$ did discuss it with him at that time, in general terms, as to the factors one has to take into account, and in my mind I'm quite sure $I$ emphasized that, in general terms, that "we don't want to be doing anything that would strengthen the prosecution's case". Now along the way, before the final decision was made, $I$ know that $I$ had talked with him from time to time about it and, you know, once again indicated that "this is an issue that we will have to make a final decision on once the Crown's case is closed".

In your mind, sir -- and let's just talk about the trial first of all -- would it be fair to say that you -- were you leaning one way or the other, as far as your opinion or what your advice would be to him about testifying, prior to the trial starting?

Well I knew there were areas of concern, but I certainly hadn't fastened on any hard view one way or the other, and $I$ think that $I$ indicated that to him in some of our discussions. But as the trial moved along $I$ was continually assessing things, and of course I have no doubt that I considered my -- any previous tentative views that I may have had, but it certainly was something that $I$ was weighing and considering as we moved along. And would that influence or affect how you might deal with a particular witness if in the back of your mind, or the front of your mind, you are thinking "I'm not sure, $I$ have concerns that $I$ am going to be able to call my client on particular points"; would that limit your ability? In a -compare that to a case where you are certain you are able to call your client to testify?

Well we've already discussed the ethical constraints.

Q
A
And, of course, that was something that $I$ had to take into account in conducting the case, but $I$ tried to conduct the case, I suppose, so that I could have the best of both worlds. If he decided, with -- after consultation with me, to testify, that $I$ wouldn't have done anything to undermine him in so testifying.

Okay.
And conversely, that if he elected not to testify,
I wouldn't have done anything that would have undermined his case as $I$ understood it to be. Mr. Tallis, I'd now like to turn to the area of disclosure that you received from the Crown, and I just want to indicate that when $I$ went through the outline at the outset, how $I$ intend to approach this is really in two steps. Right now what I wish to do is to go through and identify the correspondence and exchanges that you had with Mr. Caldwell, get your understanding of the practices at the time and what you had asked for, identify what you received, and proceed on that basis. Obviously -- and please correct me if I'm wrong -at the time of trial, when you are conducting the trial, you would not have knowledge of what you
didn't get; is that fair? .

A
Q
That's right, yeah.
And so later on, once we've completed the trial, I
will go back and go through some of the items that
you did not receive that we now know were there,
or in existence, and question you on what you
might have done. So this part of the disclosure I
simply want to go through and identify and have
you confirm for us the exchange with Mr. Caldwell,
and I'm not sure that there's much in the way of
dispute as to what you received at the time. And
I appreciate, sir, that you don't have your
file --
Yes.
-- to assist you, but we have tried to
reconstruct, from Mr. Caldwell's file and other
documents, what may have passed between you. If
we could start off with 007063 , please?
Yes. I wonder if we could just break for a few
minutes?
Sure, certainly.
And, sorry, but --
No, that's fine.
(Adjourned at 9:38 a.m.)
(Reconvened at 9:46 a.m.)

BY MR. HODSON:

Q
If we could call up 007063 , please, and I'm just going to walk you through, Mr. Tallis, some of the letters back and forth, and we have seen some of these already, and certainly Mr. Caldwell went through them, and $I$ think this is your first letter, this is the one that you copied to Ben Wolff and we went through this. This is where you asked for copies of any witness statements and related reports on this matter and I think you commented on the latter part last day. Just on this issue of witness statements and related reports, can you tell us, what was your understanding at this time of what the practice was as far as witness statements versus, let's say, police reports?

A

Q And what about the contents, I think what you are saying is you could not force the Crown or the Crown was not obliged to provide you with copies of police reports, but what about information that recollection is that police reports as such were not produced and that there were situations where an attempt had been made to get them and counsel were turned back by judicial rulings on it.
might be contained in there, was there any practice or what was your understanding at the time of what you might be entitled to if you went to Court for relief?

A

Q

A
$Q$
And it may be stating the obvious, but would you, in that scenario then, would you be relying on the Crown, and let's just talk generally, not this case, would you then be relying upon the Crown to identify what might be relevant or lead down a chain of inquiry as opposed to defence counsel? A

I don't think there was any legal entitlement to it and you had to, you $I$ think endeavoured to establish a relationship with the prosecution with a view to getting relevant information that might lead you on a chain of inquiry; that is, relevant information that might assist the defence.

And so if there was information in a police report but not in a witness statement, what was your view at the time as defence counsel as what you might be entitled to or not entitled to?

I don't think that, and as I say $I$ haven't briefed
it, but $I ' m$ quite clear in my mind that you weren't entitled to get that information from the prosecution. Yes, you would hope that information of that
nature would be made available.
And in a case where, would there be cases where as defence counsel what you might be putting forward as a defence or thinking about you may not wish to share with the Crown?

Yes, I think you have -- I think you had to be cautious.

And so again in -- let me maybe phrase it this way. As far as identifying what might be, lead defence counsel on a chain of inquiry by reviewing police reports, in your view, sir, would defence counsel be in a better position to do that than Crown counsel?

If we can then go to 007042 . Sorry, just on police notebooks, $I$ think you told us this on the first day, what was the practice as far as disclosure of police officer's notebooks?

My recollection is that they were not disclosed and you couldn't get production of them unless the officer of course referred to them during the course of giving his testimony, that then became an entirely different situation.

Next is the August 15th, 1969 letter from Mr.

Caldwell to you, it refers to your June 10th letter and the conversation and sends the Cadrain, Wilson and John statements, and I think you've already told us that you believe you would have either had copies of these statements or at least been aware of its contents, I think you said likely through Mr. Ben Wolff; is that right?

And then the autopsy report of Dr. Emson. If we can then go to 007038 --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I missed the doc ID.

MR. HODSON: I'm sorry, the doc ID on that is 007042 .

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks. Now we're at 48?

BY MR. HODSON:
No, 038, 007038 , and this is an August 20 th letter from Mr. Caldwell, it references his earlier letter and sends the second statement of Albert Cadrain dated March 5, '69 as well as copies of the Crime Detection Laboratory Reports concerning the examination of the exhibits in this case, and I think you told us earlier, Mr. Tallis, that the practice was that as far as disclosure, that you
would usually get the lab reports relating to the exhibits; is that right?

A

Q

A

Q

A
Well, I know that I looked at it well before the preliminary hearing, that's the best $I$ can say to
We'll deal with this later when we touch on the secretor issue. Do you have a recollection of when, at what stage of your involvement in this matter that that became an issue for you to look at?
you at this time, and $I$ considered it to be a very important issue from David's standpoint, this secretor/non-secretor issue $I$ thought was a very significant point.

And do you recall where you would have got the information on this secretor issue before the prelim?

I don't know whether -- Mr. Caldwell might well have phoned me or $I$ might have spoken to him, but I just cannot say with any degree of precision without having notes to assist me.

Okay. If we can call up 009374 , again this letter refers to copies of the Crime Detection Lab reports. 009374 is, this is a document that was on Mr. Caldwell's file, it says Milgaard lab reports, and if we can go to 009386 , this is a document, it has -- Mr. Caldwell testified about this, it's his handwriting, "omit, different file," and it refers to (V2) (V2)- (V2)----- and (V1)--- (V1)- and then a line through it. Are you able to tell us, Mr. Tallis, whether this lab report was one that was provided to you by Mr . Caldwell?

A
I'm quite satisfied that $I$ did not receive that particular report.

Q Okay. And on what basis are you able to say that?

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q

A

Well, I was first asked $I$ think by Mr. Brown at the Supreme Court of Canada whether or not $I$ had heard of Fisher and the, shall we say, sexual assaults in the area and that really was the first direct information $I$ had about it, they were put to me that way. I'm quite satisfied that $I$ did not receive this.

And if you had received it, what -- can you tell us what you might have done with it?

Well, this, combined with other information that you've shown to me, would have led me to a chain of inquiry about possible involvement.

Let me maybe just back up. If you would have received this with a package of -- this relates to a different file here than the Gail Miller. Yes.
-- what would you have done with it once you got it, would you have made inquiries as to what it was or where it came from or why you got it? Yes, I'm quite sure $I$ would have if it had been included because this has the potential to point to the involvement of someone else other than David as the perpetrator of this offence. Now, I'm finding it hard to isolate this in light of
what you furnished to me about --
No, let me -- and we'll deal with that later, Mr. Tallis.

Yes.
About going through more information on the sexual assaults.

Yes.
I'm just trying to get back to the question of, I think you are saying that having looked at this you are satisfied that you didn't get it and the only question --

A a chain of inquiry that one would have started. Okay. And then apart from this document, again $I$ think you've had a chance to look through the lab reports, and $I$ don't believe there's any issue on this, did you then receive the lab reports relating then to the work that the RCMP lab did in the Gail Miller file?

A
Yes, I'm quite sure $I$ received the lab reports, and in particular $I$ remember, was it corporal or sergeant, I'll say Mr. Paynter's involvement.

And did you know of Mr. Paynter?
Well, he had been involved in cases for quite a number of years, so $I$ think he was well known as an expert witness in dealing with serological matters.

If we can then go to 007037 --
I'm sorry, I didn't notice it, he was a staff sergeant at the time of this.

Yes, that's right. Now, this is August 21, 1969, I just want to go through parts of this and ask you some questions. This is your letter back to Mr. Caldwell, we got it from his file, and we have gone through where he sent you the statements from Cadrain, Wilson and John. You say:
"You have been kind enough to make available to me certain statements of prosecution witnesses and various reports which may be relevant to this particular prosecution. In the event that $I$ do want further witness statements, $I$ will first make a request of you before raising it in Court. However, in the light of our conversation on the afternoon of Wednesday, August 20 th, $I$ would
certainly want you to make it a point to check to see whether or not there are any witnesses that you do not propose to call who may be able to give evidence of assistance to the defence. If the City Police Department have not turned over all of their material to you in this connection $I$ would be obliged if you would look into this matter prior to the completion of the preliminary hearing." We'll pause there, I'll deal with the Dallison case in a moment. Are you able to tell us or shed any light on this matter based on this letter?

No, $I$ have no recollection talking to Mr. Caldwell on that date and without my notes I could not, you know, in good conscience even hazard a guess. I think what Mr. Caldwell has told us, and we'll see this from a later letter, is that as a result of a request from you, and it may well be this letter, he went back, the city police file $I$ think had 95 statements or thereabouts, he did not receive them all was his evidence when he got the file. He then went back and asked for all of the statements as a result of your request and then
went through them with a view to responding to your request. Do you have any recollection of that happening that way?

A

Q
And then this paragraph, you say:
"I might mention that $I$ have always thought that the procedure in a case of this kind is correctly summarized by Lord Denning in the case of Dallison vs Caffery ..."

And I think you told us about that before, and that was an English case that, I think you told us, perhaps set a higher bar for disclosure than did another line of Canadian cases; is that right?

A
Yes. At the time $I$ felt that the English authorities took a more generous view of disclosure, or making available information that might be of assistance to the defence, and it ties in with the comment $I$ made about lead the defence on a chain of inquiry with respect to matters that would be of assistance. If you were -- if you were to ask me today why did I specifically use the Dallison case and not also refer to a number
of other English cases that were along the same theme, I really don't know, but I rather think that $I$ was attracted to Lord Denning's language. If we could then go to 048305, and this is one of your memorandums, Mr. Tallis. Unfortunately there's only one page, it's the front page and it stops in mid sentence at the bottom, and $I$ can't tell you from this document, you identify this as yours, $I$ can't tell you how many pages would have been included with this, but this is a memo September 8, 1969 and at this time almost all of the witnesses have been heard at the preliminary hearing, I think there was a few witnesses that needed to be recalled, but certainly all of the main witnesses had been called, and this memo says:
"On this date $I$ met with Mr. Caldwell for approximately one hour to review this file and discuss the question of additional witnesses that are to be called. I made notes of this in my brief book and these notes appear in the Luboff brief case where you pencilled on my name in white letters. Pull out those notes."

And then go on to, it talks about a few things. When you would meet with Mr. Caldwell, if you are able to tell us from your recollection of this file, or even on your recollection of practices at the time, would a prosecutor show you, for example, police reports or anything of that nature or discuss them or what would be the type of information you might get in a face-to-face meeting with the Crown?

I'm quite sure that one was not allowed access to police reports, but $I$ have no recollection of this particular meeting, but it's obvious to me that I was focusing on certain things and of course $I$ was making notes at the time.

Maybe we'll go through these, Mr. Tallis.
Yes.
Number 1, you say:
"The following points will have to be carefully briefed in preparation for this trial:

1. The admissibility of evidence with respect to commission of other offences by the accused both before and after the alleged murder."

A Yeah. Now, if I could just indicate there, even
though I don't have a recollection of it, that signals to me that $I$ probably had a discussion with Mr. Caldwell about whether or not he was going to try to adduce this type of evidence and $I$ know that $I$ had been concerned about that at a very early stage.

What types of offences or other offences were you concerned about?

Well, $I$ was thinking about, for example, the trip to Saskatoon from Regina, the stop in Davidson and then there had been a stop in Craik. Now, that's one of the things that --

The elevator break-in?
Yes, and that's one illustration of it.
Do you have any recollection of discussing with
Mr. Caldwell offences, any sexual offences, sexual assault offences, things of that nature, that he may have been either aware of or talking to you about and the possible admissibility?

He may have mentioned it, but $I$ cannot recall the discussion, but $I$ notice here that something happened that indicated to me that the prosecution might well be trying to get evidence of this nature in and $I$ had concerns about that even long before this and that's why I'm, I can't say the
exact date this was dictated.
Okay.
But $I$ know that there was a matter of concern and one that had to be carefully considered.

And then again as far as the types of offences, one, the elevator break-in, and are you able to tell us by your memory any other offences before or after the alleged murder that were causing you concern?

Well, there may have been some discussion about sexual matters, but $I$ can't say, $I$ can't say one way or the other on that.

I think $I$ showed you, and we don't need to bring it up, but on August 26 th, 1969 Mr . Caldwell was interviewing Albert Cadrain in connection with his evidence at the preliminary hearing and present were Elmer Ullrich and $I$ believe Mr. Mackie and an incident was provided by Albert Cadrain to Mr. Caldwell and the police about an incident in Calgary involving David Milgaard with some young women in a bathtub involving a fellow, or not involving, that $a$ fellow by the name of Ed Schellenberg may have had information or could corroborate this, and we've heard some evidence about that and what was done. That would be about
a week or two prior to this meeting. Do you have any recollection of that subject matter being raised with you by Mr. Caldwell?

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$
A

Q doesn't --

In number 2 you write:
"The admissibility in evidence of objects found but which cannot be identified or specifically linked to the particular crime - in this connection $I$ am thinking of such items as the toque and so forth. When dealing with items of this nature it seems to me that the main grouping of the evidence or its admissibility will centre around
relevance."

And are you able to shed any light on what this may have referred to other than what's stated?

A
"In this particular case it will be important to have complete production of statements of Crown witnesses and in this connection $I$ may want to have production of the lie detector material."

Let's just talk about the statements of Crown witnesses. Do you know what would have prompted this note?

A
A Well, if there were additional witnesses going to be called that $I$ wasn't aware of, I certainly
would want to have that, and the other thing is if there were additional statements, $I$ mean, one doesn't know, some witnesses might give two, three or four statements, so it's partly a numbers game. So is it fair to say that as far as when you say Crown witnesses, that would be people that the Crown called as witnesses at the trial and you are saying you would want copies of all of the statements given by those people who testified? Yes, and of course in my earlier correspondence I wasn't limiting it just to those.

Right. So number one, you would certainly want statements from anybody who would be a witness for the Crown; is that correct?

And secondly, to the extent that there are witness statements or information from other witnesses who might not be called that might lead you to a chain of inquiry or might assist the defence, you would be seeking that as well; is that correct? Yes.

Q
Now, this last point, and unfortunately we only have half a sentence, it says:
"The admissibility of so-called --"
Actually, sorry, let me just go back to the lie
detector. At what point did you -- at what point and how did you become aware of the involvement of Inspector Art Roberts, the polygraph operator? Without my notes, I can't tell you when I became involved, but it's obvious that $I$ knew about it because later I arranged to have him brought in so I could interview him.

Right. And $I$ think in your very first memo of June 10th, 1969 there was a reference to the polygraph, and certainly when Mr. Wilson testified at the preliminary hearing you questioned him about that, so at this point it looks as though arising out of your meeting with Mr. Caldwell you may have at least made a note to get production of the lie detector material; is that right?

That's what $I$ would infer from it, even though $I$ don't recall the actual discussion.

And then item 4:
"The admissibility of so-called self serving evidence will be very important because in this connection the ..."

And again it ends there. Now, I appreciate we don't have the next page, but are you able to shed any light on what you would have been referring to as self-serving evidence in this
partial memo?

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$ Then if we can go to 007014 . Now, this memorandum is September the 8th, 1969, a Monday. These are Mr. Caldwell's notes of the same day and I just want to ask you a couple of questions. It talks about witnesses to recall at the preliminary hearing, I think they are all police officers, remaining Crown witnesses, and then $I$ see here McLeod, who I think was toxicology RCMP lab, and it says, "(Tallis not requiring)." Would there have been a discussion then between you and Mr. Caldwell as to whether certain witnesses needed to
be called at the preliminary hearing?

A
$Q$

A

Q
A

Q

A

2
,

A
$Q$
A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q

Well I wanted to really cap -- try to capture the atmosphere under which the polygraph was conducted, and maybe statements made to Mr. Roberts, but since you want to go into that later --

Sure.
-- that's the, I think, the appropriate way for me to state it at this point.

And $I$ believe he was brought in and interviewed as opposed to being called as a witness at the preliminary hearing; is that right?

That's correct.
And would that have been a decision that you made after interviewing him, that you did not wish to have him testify at the preliminary hearing? Well, $I$ can sum it up this way, is that after talking to him $I$ was of the firm view that he didn't have anything that would assist David and some of the things -- and I don't remember them all -- would have worked the other way.

Would have been damaging to David's case; is that correct?

Certainly detrimental to it.
Okay. And again, we'll go through that, I think it's maybe easier when we go through Mr.

Wilson's -- your approach to Mr. Wilson.
And then as far as Shirley
Wilson, Ron Wilson's mother, $I$ believe she did testify at the preliminary hearing on the issue of the clothing of David both before and after? Yes.

Do you remember what prompted to have you have Mrs. Wilson brought in?

Well I thought that perhaps she could shed some light on particularly David's trousers, but I think at the end of the day $I$ didn't find anything to be of real assistance there.

If we can go to the next page. I'm not sure if this is a note of Mr. Caldwell's discussion with Mr. Pratt or a note of you discussing it with him, but he was the elevator agent in Aylesbury, and I think they are talking about the flashlight. Again, do you have any recollection of those discussions with Mr. Caldwell?

No, I don't, I --
Do you recall whether the elevator break-in was something that the Crown wanted to put in as evidence?

A
Well I had a sense that, or at least early in the going, that they probably would try to get it in
as -- on the footing that these kids were without funds so that they had a motive to try and get funds by various ways, and one of them, of course, would be a break-in. But then of course there was something else that $I$ knew, and that was what David had told me with respect to looking over the older lady with a possible view to robbing her or --

Q
A
Right.
-- snatching her purse, so I think that $I$ was apprehensive, certainly early in the going, that this is something that might be attempted, and I thought that it could cloud the pivotal issue that

Okay.
-- the trial was all about.
If we could then go to the next page, 007016 .
And, again, this is -- these are Mr. Caldwell's notes of $I$ believe September 8th, 1969. I will be taking you to a letter of September 9 th , the next day, where he writes to you and details information from the file, from witness statements, that he thinks might be helpful to the defence case, etcetera. And $I$ am wondering whether these notes, would that have been
something that he may have discussed with you in person and then followed up with a letter, or -and these may well simply be his notes that used him to -- that he used to write the letter to you. Are you able to tell us whether you would have had a discussion with him where he would have gone over some of the statements and said "lookit", for example Dennis Elliott, "he was the fella who dropped Gail Miller off the night before, Les Spence was the former boyfriend or the boyfriend at the time of death" -- if we could just scroll down -- it's got some other statement numbers, Morris Tkachuk, etcetera. Are you able to tell us either by memory, number 1 , or number 2 if you don't recall, whether practices at the time would be such that you might have had a discussion with the prosecutor about his thoughts on statements that might be of assistance to you?

A

Q Right, as opposed --

A

I don't recall ever discussing this with him but, you know, at this late date $I$ can't rule it out. I rather think that his letter is one that was composed from his own personal notes, but ---- if -- there's nothing in here to indicate that he had been talking to me --

Q I see.
A -- but I wouldn't rule it out.
Okay. If we can go to 168034 , please. And this is Mr. Caldwell's letter of the next day to you, and it's responding to your August 21 letter, and we'll just go through parts of this. You will see that Mr. Caldwell says:
"... since receiving your letter I have obtained all the statements obtained from civilian witnesses in relation to this investigation, totalling ninety-five, and have read these statements over to see whether any of these witnesses would, in my opinion, "...be able to give evidence of assistance to the defence..." as suggested in your letter."

And then notes the statement from Dallison. If we can scroll down. And he writes:
"The duty of a prosecuting counsel, or solicitor, as $I$ have always understood it, is this: if he knows of a credible witness who can speak to material facts which tend to show the prisoner to be innocent, he must either call that
witness himself or make his statement available to the defence."

And would that be the essence of the Dallison case as quoted there?

I haven't read it for a long time. I probably read it as being a little broader than that, along with the other, --

And as --
-- and as I indicated to you, that statements or reports that contain information that would be of assistance.

And so go a bit further than just witnesses?
Yeah, I wouldn't limit it to say -- you know, witnesses can write out statements or 'write with their mouth', as we used to sometimes say, either when it's recorded with tape recordings or just verbals are noted up by police officers that talk to them.

And so, again, $I$ think what you are saying, that in addition to a formal witness statement, sort of any recording or information from a witness that relates to material facts which tend to show the prisoner to be innocent; is that fair?

A Yes, or who -- that would lead one on a chain of inquiry to establish matters that would go to the
innocence of an accused person.
And would that have been your understanding, sir, then, of what you were seeking at the time from the Crown by making the request that you did?

Yes, well I, I was thinking in terms of the English authorities that took a more generous view. Because, you know, on the -- as I recall it, on the other side of the coin, at that time you couldn't compel the prosecution to deliver up witness statements at the preliminary hearing unless they chose to do so. I think I mentioned to you earlier in these proceedings that $I$ recall some of the, at least some of the Provincial Court Judges or magistrates who took the view that the Patterson case and others were such that it was the trial judge who could order production of statements, but that the relevant provision of the Evidence Act that was relied upon did not clothe the magistrate or Provincial Court Judge with that power. Now $I$ haven't briefed this in years, so -No, and $I$ don't want to put you in a position of giving legal opinion.

A
No, and so I -- don't take this as a legal opinion at this stage, but --

But what $I$ would like to ask you though, again,
back in 1969-1970 what your understanding was of what you could get? For example, if Mr. Caldwell had said "no, I'm not giving you anything", I think you told us earlier that you would have to go to the magistrate if it was before the prelim; let's say it's before the trial, what was your understanding of what you might get from a trial judge by way of an order compared to what you were seeking through agreement from Mr. Caldwell? Well the trial judge, of course, had broader powers for -- I mean with respect to production of statements, and so on, if you ran into that type of situation. But, generally speaking, the convention had developed that prosecution were going to make available matters that might well assist the defence, and also make available statements of witnesses, and so forth. Okay. If we can just carry on with this letter, I don't think we need to go through, and in detail we have with Mr. Caldwell. This talks about information regarding other suspects, Les Spence of Perdue, and they were interviewed, one Dennis Elliott, and that:
"Both Dennis Elliott and Les ... Spence were eliminated as suspects in the
murder to the satisfaction of the investigators as the investigation progressed."

And, again, would that -- do you recall whether you did anything with Dennis Elliott and Les Spence as far as how they might assist the defence?

I don't recall anything like that.
And then, the top of the next page, Mr. Caldwell points out:
"You will understand that in my opinion, none of the above constitutes evidence
"...which tends to show the prisoner innocent...". However, you may have a different opinion on this and,
therefore, $I$ have supplied the above information as possibly coming closest
to evidence in that category which $I$ have been able to find on the file." And I touched on this a bit earlier, it would be the Crown prosecutor who would have to go through the file asking the questions "might this", whatever the test would be, whether it's tend to show the prisoner innocent or lead to a chain of inquiry; is that correct?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Yes, the Crown prosecutor would undoubtedly be the one who went through the matters with the investigating officers.

Then, here, it talks about:
"You will recall asking me earlier about a taxi driver who was supposed to have driven Gail Miller and a man to work on the morning of January 31st, and I some time ago supplied you with copies of the two statements by MacRae Fraser to read. I now enclose copies of these statements for your file ..."

If $I$ can just pause there, it would appear that Mr. Caldwell had allowed you to read some witness statements before he actually provided you with the physical copy, is that correct?

He may well have, and from that $I$ would gather that he did.

And was that a practice at the time; do you recall?

I think so. Just as I indicated to you Ben Wolff would often let you read the statements, he wouldn't give them to you but -- or at least $I$ don't think he would give them to you when he wouldn't be handling the case, but he was quite
open about things.
And then, next, it says:
"You also asked for, and $I$ now enclose, copies of the statements by Sandra Danchuk and Walter Joseph Danchuk, both of whom were crown witnesses at the preliminary inquiry."

And I think you've already talked about the voluntariness of that statement. And then he says:
"The above material is forwarded to you in addition to the various copies of statements and reports which I sent you earlier in this connection. I wish to emphasize, however, that if you have any specific inquiries to make of me concerning specific persons whom you may learn of who supposedly can shed any light on the case $I$ will be pleased to track these down for you, to the best of my abilities, in the file or through the investigators."

And, again, would that be the practice of the day by Crown prosecutors?

I think that it was.
And then a mention:
"As requested by yourself, I have added the names of Inspector Roberts ... and, Mrs. Shirley Wilson ... to the list of Crown witnesses as required by the Legal Aid Plan, and ... hope ..."
to have these persons in Saskatoon Wednesday, September $10 t h$. And $I$ believe we may have heard some evidence, Mr. Tallis, that as far as paying the cost to bring in these witnesses to

Saskatoon, that if you had -- I think Mr.
Caldwell told us that he was prepared to do it, but was there an issue about how you would go about paying them if you wished to bring in the witnesses?

I think there was some provision in the Legal Aid Plan of the time for public funding of bringing in of witnesses that were potentially material witnesses, but $I$ could be wrong on that, but I don't recall any problem arising over bringing in those two witnesses and $I$ don't recall any problem arising in bringing in, for example, Ute Frank.

And that was around the time the trial started?
Yeah, but $I$ don't think there was any -- well, I know there was no problem there.

I think what Mr. Caldwell told us, told this
Inquiry, is that if there was a witness -- and I think he referred specifically to Art Roberts, Shirley Wilson, and there may have been others -that if he decided he wasn't going to call them as Crown witnesses, but that you wanted them called, that he said he was prepared to do so as Crown witnesses, $I$ think in part so that you, as defence counsel, wouldn't lose your right to speak last in front of the jury; was that -- do you have any
recollection of that being discussed?


A
$Q$

A

A

I think we probably did discuss it.
And then here, at the bottom, the letter states: "The various Police Officers who were to check their notes for further information will be attending at my office at 12:00 noon on September 10th, at which time we will be able to interview them and you should be able to recall any of them you wish in the afternoon of that date."

Now this would be the day after your meeting with Mr. Caldwell, and are you able to tell us, either by memory or by looking at this letter and considering practices at the time, whether you would have asked Mr. Caldwell to have officers check specific things for you?

Right. So, for example, you might say "can you ask officer $X$ in his notebook whether the witness gave them any specific time", for example? Yes.

And what about interviewing them; do you recall whether, in this case, you would have attended at Mr. Caldwell's office or had interviewed the police officers when they had their notebooks? No, I don't recall anything like that. And would that be something that would be unusual? Well, in my experience it was, because usually that was -- if -- I recall, in this particular case, asking Lieutenant Short briefly about something, it wasn't directly to do with the case, but he made it clear that anything like that would have to be done through the prosecutor's office, through the prosecutor.

But, again, would there be a situation where Mr. Caldwell might call in the police officers with their notebooks and have you in the room and ask some questions?

That's possible, but $I$ don't recall it happening. Okay. And, again, would that be a practice of -just speaking generally, would that be something that would be unusual, or would that be part of the usual practice?

A
Q
In my view it would be unusual.
If we can then go to 007076 , and just -- this is January 12 th, this is a week or so before the
trial, and just go through parts of this. It talks about the indictment -- if we can just scroll up a bit -- about the indictment that was filed that would have had the witnesses on it, and I think that was the practice, that the Crown would list all of the Crown witnesses on the indictment; is that correct?

Yes.
And then, if we can scroll down, he talks about one new witness, being Garry McLeod, the toxicology fellow. And then down, the third paragraph talks about:
"At the moment there is only one witness who was called at the preliminary inquiry whom $I$ do not intend to call at the trial, that being Marie Indyk."

And we'll talk a little bit later about her evidence.

A
Q
Yes.
And then the next page he talks about having
Mrs. Indyk subpoenaed, that Mrs. Shirley Wilson of
Regina is subpoenaed and advised her to stand by:
"I am not sure whether $I$ will call her
as part of my case or not, but perhaps
we can also discuss this ...",
and it talks about the statements of the Danchuks having been forwarded. And then here it says: "As you will further recall, and as I advised you during the preliminary inquiry, Mrs. Cadrain, the mother of Albert Cadrain, appeared in my office one morning during the preliminary inquiry with a paper bag containing a pair of trousers, apparently eaten by acid, which $I$ believe to be the ones worn by Ron Wilson when the group left Regina and changed, by him, at Cadrain's house after the group of three persons reached Cadrain's house on the morning of January 31st. Is it not my intention, at this time, to tender the trousers as an exhibit, however, they are in my office and available at any time should you wish them for any purpose at the trial."

Do you have any recollection of doing anything with those pants or checking them?

A
I have a vague recollection of that. And one of the things, of course, $I$ was interested in was whether if, by chance, they had had anything to do
with David, but they obviously -- they weren't. And I'm thinking in terms of the seam that was split.

Oh, I see.
Yeah.
And so do you think you would have checked those or made inquiries?

I'm quite sure $I$ did at the time.
Then, if we can go to 007074 . This is January 15th, 1970, and this is related to Maurice Cerato, who was a witness who came forward about had bought some pants from David Milgaard. And we have seen this letter before, and they did some checking, and $I$ think the lab indicated they could not verify any blood on this and some statements there. Do you have a recollection of that? Yes, $I$ do, because immediately when $I$ learned of the suggestion of, well, of -- let me back up.

The name Cerato rings a bell in this sense, that $I$ think that David had mentioned that name, and there may have been a Roger, or something like that, to do with his work in selling. Now $I$ can be, $I$ could be wrong on this, but that -- that's a recollection $I$ have. And then, of course, $I$ was very interested in the --
were these blue jeans --
Q
A Do you recall anything else about his evidence and the statement and the manner in which you became aware of it?

A
$Q$ No, I don't, at this stage. Then if we can go to 039537 . And this is January

19th, and $I$ think this is the day the trial maybe started, and there was a copy of various statements, --

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
At least $I$ was aware of what they were going to say, and $I$ think $I$ had a good idea of that even before the preliminary hearing.

Okay. Okay, now $I$ will deal with the motel room reenactment witnesses later on the issue, when we deal with that and how that information was disclosed to you.

I'd now like to turn to your -to talk a bit about your preparation, sir, for the preliminary hearing and trial. And we've already touched on a significant part of that, $I$ think
you've told us certainly what you did in your interview with Mr. Milgaard, how you prepared your questions for various witnesses. If we can just go back to -- and I'd like you to tell us what role Myrna Wilson played? You had told us that she was your assistant at the time, and I think that she participated and attended at parts of the preliminary hearing and trial, can you tell us generally what she did to assist you on this matter?

A
Well she was very heavily involved from a secretarial standpoint, but also on various other aspects. And I may have mentioned to you the other day that $I$, in this case as in some other cases, I actually had her attend quietly at the courthouse, at the preliminary hearing, to take shorthand notes of testimony of some of the crucial or key witnesses. Her shorthand was very good, and she would type up portions that $I$ wanted done promptly for use with respect to other witnesses that would be called, and so forth. And, of course, she was very involved in this because she often, you know, would stay after hours to type up things and so on. I -unfortunately, she passed away several years ago,
and she had a, really a very good grip on the file in so many ways it would take quite a bit of time for me to detail it.

Okay. So I think you are telling us she was a significant part of your team, if $I$ can call it that, as far as putting forward the defence? Yes. She worked very hard at, you know, the various things that $I$ have mentioned to you during the course of you interviewing me, and quite apart from that, she had a very deep interest in the case and continued to have a deep interest in it. Now, what about Mr. Disbery, you told us he was either an articling student or a first year lawyer that participated at, certainly at the trial, and I think in part at the preliminary hearing; is that correct?

A
Yes.
And I think you've described his role. Can I get you to give us a sense of, and again you've already told us that you didn't keep track of hours spent, but from your engagement in June of 1969 through until the conclusion of the trial at the end of January, and that would cover the summer months and as well the Christmas season, can you give us some sense of how much time you
spent on this matter?

A
Well, the best way $I$ can sum it up is to say to you that $I$ spent a great deal of time on this and that included a great deal of time outside of normal working hours. I couldn't put percentages or actual hours on it. If $I$ had my working notes, I probably could give you a better idea, but I know that Miss Wilson worked many, many hours, you know, in the evenings when needed even, you know, early in the going, and throughout, and $I$ felt in this case an obligation to do the briefing of essential points myself. I know Mr. Disbery may have assisted me in some collateral way, but at the end of the day $I$ went through everything and, as $I$ say, did most of the briefing, and even where he briefed points, I reviewed the work. Okay.

Going through some of the transcript that you asked me to read, it brought back the fact that $I$ had prepared a brief covering many points of admissibility which were, some of which were argued and some of which it was unnecessary to argue. I wish that $I$ had the full text of these things, including the draft cross-examinations and so forth that $I$ prepared in the manner in which $I$
described to you earlier, and with respect to the, with respect to the serological chapter of this case, $I$ started well before the preliminary hearing to go into it and actually prepared draft cross-examinations not only in that field, but for other witnesses that $I$ knew that were going to be called, and this was of course based on
information that $I$ had picked up from various sources, and $I$ can't remember all the sources that I had pursued, but $I$ guess the bottom line is I come back to what $I$ said to you earlier, $I$ spent a great deal of time on this case and $I$ felt that, very sincerely that it was my duty not only to David, but $I$ had a duty to the Court, a duty to society and a duty to myself, I had to look myself in the mirror in the morning throughout the course of these proceedings.

If we can just pick up on the secretor issue for a moment. Would you have read up about that subject matter?

A
Yes. I not only read up about it, but I did speak to a medical friend, and as $I$ told you the other day I think it was Dr. Mel Langer, but $I$ could be wrong on that, but $I$ say that because he was one $I$ often turned to for starters on things, and in
addition to the material I dug up, I was also directed to certain material, and $I$ can't recall where it was, but I actually located somewhere, essentially it was a draft cross-examination of a witness in this area and $I$ patterned my cross-examination on that material and $I$ was put in touch with somebody who was an expert in this field, I can't recall who it was now, and I discussed it by phone and felt that $I$ was well briefed for the preliminary, and then of course after the preliminary $I$ reviewed what $I$ got and was told that you can't hope to get any more than what you got.

And that was with your medical advisor?
Medical advisors.
And again just on the literature, $I$ think you may have touched on this, would you have read then some materials that talked about A antigen secretors, things of that nature? Yes, that's what I'm referring to. Let's talk a bit about the polygraph. Did you do any work to try and understand how the polygraph worked?

A
Well, I had had some experience with that before this, $I$ can't recall all the details, but it
wasn't just from reading, but $I$ had had some involvement in a situation where a polygraph was used and that's why $I$ was anxious to get information from Mr. Roberts about the atmosphere under which this was conducted, but I'll be quite candid with you and say that my assessment was that he was not inclined to be helpful, to say the least, and $I$ was not able to elicit anything from him directly that $I$ found to be of assistance. And again, just on Mr. Roberts for a moment, what did he tell you about what he had done as far as the polygraph?

Well, the situation, as $I$ recall, is this, that he represented his position as being essentially that of an expert polygraph operator. He confined himself, so to speak, to the technical aspect of it and didn't range into other areas, if $I$ may put it that way.

Are you talking interrogation and questioning? That's right, you know, in terms of statement taking and so forth.

Did you get a chance to look at the charts or any of his questions?

A
No. I asked him about the questions that he had put and responses and he was not forthcoming on
that and he had a chart there and I think essentially what he said was that, but he wasn't producing it, but he said that, you know, as far as he was concerned, the chart, his conduct of the test indicated that $W i l s o n$ was telling the truth throughout.

With respect to his incriminating statement?
Yes.
Did you -- and what was your level of trust with Mr. Roberts as far as if he were a witness? Well, there was no doubt in my mind that he would not be a witness of assistance to the defence and that it would be a grave mistake to call him because $I$ felt that if $I$ called him, he would probably have been devastating on
cross-examination. Now, this once again is a gut feeling and $I$ put it on that basis to you because I also would have been very apprehensive of any reference to the polygraph being made before the jury.

Why is that?
Well, $I$ think that it might be an inference that a fact finder would make, such as a jury, that, well, if he had a polygraph there, he must have passed the test. Now, there's another aspect
later on, but $I$ think, $I$ don't think you want me to go into that at this stage, I'm thinking of the 9(2) application. If there had been a voir dire I would certainly have argued that the burden was on the Crown to call all material witnesses and that one would then have an opportunity to cross-examine in the absence of the jury, but that's another phase of it.

Sure. So what you are telling us, I think, and please correct me if I'm wrong, that you didn't want $M r$. Roberts in front of the jury, but that you might like a crack at him in a voir dire; is that fair?

That's right.
MR. HODSON: Mr. Commissioner, it's 11
o'clock. I'm wondering if we can maybe take a 10 minute break and then we can then finish up. I don't think we want to go right through. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
(Adjourned at 10:57 a.m.)
(Reconvened at 11:15 a.m.)
BY MR. HODSON:
Mr. Tallis, when we broke we were talking about your preparations for the Court proceedings and I think earlier on we saw a memo where you had
indicated that you were out at the scene where Gail Miller's body was found. Can you tell us sort of what, how many times you went out there, what you did when you were out there, what your observations were?

Well, $I$ can't recall the number of times that $I$ was out there, but $I$ was out there on a number of occasions, and I recall the last occasion when I was out there and that was either just before the trial or during a break in the trial. I did that because the weather conditions were somewhat similar to the conditions that had existed back at the relevant time in '69. I know that $I$ had not only driven there through the general area, and I was familiar with that area because of having been there on a number of occasions, for example, St. Paul's Hospital is always a bit of a landmark to me, and I prepared my own sort of sketch notes of the area and I remember on one occasion checking to see if there was a back door or back entrance to the, I'll call it the Miller house for shorthand, and $I$ remember, for example, walking and driving down the alley between $O$ and $N$, $I$ remember the same thing with respect to the, what I'll call the Cadrain alley, and in particular I

A
$Q$

A
remember noticing that the Cadrain house appeared to me to be what $I$ call, would call a war time house; that is, in appearance, and $I$ must say that

I didn't think of the Cadrain house as having a basement or, if it did, or if $I$ did think about it, $I$ just assumed that with a large family it would still be pretty cramped even if it did have a basement.

Can you explain, you said a war time house, and were there houses that to your knowledge did not have basements that were built at -Well, yes, $I$ had an uncle who, when he got out of the air force, acquired one of them, more in the northwest of town, $I$ was very familiar with that house and it didn't have a basement, and most of them, any that $I$ ran into did not have basements except there came a time when people did dig out the basements, and $I$ know a relative of mine helped dig out one such basement and it was quite a task to get in and do it because at that time most of it was done by hand.

What would you be looking for then when you were walking around the Cadrain house in that area?

Well, $I$ think that one of the things, that my checking of the area confirmed what David had told
me about, that there was an alley there and that he had driven down it, and I'm sure that I also looked at the landmarks, some of them that had been mentioned that he was looking for and the way the house was situated on the street and so on to get the feel for what happened when they drove in that, into that area that morning.

If we then go to Gail Miller's house, you
mentioned checking for a back door. What did you observe and why would you be checking that?

Well, my recollection is that there was a back door, but, you know, $I$ haven't gone back and checked any of the documents or anything like that, but it seems to me that there was something like that that $I$ made a note of and actually sketched out, and I suppose at that time the question of whether or not, you know, the route, the most likely route, $I$ think $I$ mentioned that in one of the memos, that she would go down Avenue 0 to the bus stop.

Yes.
Now, I could not discount the possibility of also going out the back and down the alley because $I$ knew that kids had gone down there and I had spoken to, before trial $I$ had been put in touch
with a lady who had walked down there that morning, and $I$ can't remember her name, but $I$ phoned her and she came in to see me, but she had gone down that alley very early that morning and noticed nothing, but that's something that $I$ recall.

Yeah, and maybe just if we can call up map $B$ and we'll just make sure we're talking about, that we have the alley identified. If we can just -- and this is a map, Mr. Tallis, that $I$ think was used in the Supreme Court, so here's where the body was found. Are you talking about the woman who travelled down the alley, would it be north/south down the alley?

Yes, down that area, but my purpose in, and $I$ was, I interviewed her as a result of information $I$ received from somebody that told me, $I$ can't recall who it was now, but she had gone down there, as $I$ recall it, quite early in the morning and saw nothing untoward. In other words, it was well before the --

Q The body was found?
A
The body was found, and $I$ think it was well before Gail Miller would have left for work on the evidence.

And what did -- what did she tell you about her frequency of use of this alley and others' use of this alley?

Well, it wasn't unusual for her to go down that alley and my recollection is that people in the wintertime there often found, quite often the sidewalk areas, the snow hadn't been cleaned, so it was easier to walk, say, on the travelled portion of the avenues, or kids and other people sometimes walked down the alley where there had been packed snow from travel, and $I$ know when $I$ was over there either just before the trial or during the trial, the sidewalks were not that comfortable to walk on on the occasion $I$ was there and people tended to go down the travelled portion.

And so again when you were out looking, would that be relevant then to the issue of which route Gail Miller may have taken on the morning of her murder, whether it was Avenue 0 , the alley or Avenue N?

That was certainly an aspect of it, yes.
And do you recall, Mr. Tallis, at the time of trial in your preparations, as to the significance, if any, of which route she went and
what information you could gather?
A
Well, $I$ thought it might be of assistance, but, you know, it more or less cut both ways, I couldn't rule out her having gone out the back door and down the alley.

Yes.
But my initial focus was certainly on the Avenue O route.

And just on -- I think the evidence of Ron Wilson, that he thought they got stuck here, Nichol John I think was maybe closer in the alley, and $I$ believe their evidence is that they may have encountered the woman and asked directions, $I$ don't think anybody was able to say that it was Gail Miller, but the woman that they approached for directions would have been along this way. Do you recall what your thoughts were about the plausibility of Gail Miller being over on Avenue $N$ in light of the fact that her house was on Avenue $O$ and there was a bus stop on Avenue $O$ ?

I thought if she wasn't on Avenue 0 , the most likely route that she would have taken would have been going out the back and down the alley.

Okay. And then as far as the area where the body was found and in behind the funeral home, would
you have inspected that area or looked at that area?

A
Yes, I walked through that area and I drove through it and $I$ know on one occasion $I$ had Miss Wilson with me and $I$ actually dictated observations. Now, whether that was during the, before the trial, just before the trial or during the trial $I$ cannot recall. Certainly I'm quite sure that it wasn't this, when I read the part memo, the memo that you have here --

Yes.
A
-- I don't think that was the one that $I$ had dictated.

And I'll take you to that in a moment.
But --
What about the Trav-a-leer Motel, if we can go to map A and just enlarge that, $I$ think this was a map that may have been used at trial. Is that your recollection of where the Trav-a-leer Motel was located in relation to where the body was found?

A
Yes. I was familiar with the location of the Trav-a-leer Motel before this. I never stayed there, but $I$ was familiar with its location because $I$ had taken the 22 nd Street route west of,
going west of Saskatoon and --
Did you drive, did you ever drive from the area where Gail Miller's body was found to the Trav-a-leer Motel to see how long it would take? Yes, I did, on more than one occasion, but $I$ can't recall the clocked minutes now.

And what about the Danchuks', do you recall whether you would have driven in that vicinity as well?

Yes, I did, I wanted to get the feel for these things.

If we could call up 224933, please, and this is your August 20th, 1969 memorandum, and I think you've told us earlier that the handwritten notes do not belong to you?

Yeah.
This would be -- the preliminary hearing started on August $18 t h$ and $I$ think inspector -- pardon me, Officer Kleiv was the only officer who testified on the 18 th and then it was adjourned until August 21st, so it looks as though this would be a couple of days after the prelim started and it talks about:
"An examination of the site at the rear of 221 and 227 Avenue "N" North ..."

And I think that's near where the body was found, "... indicates that a board fence has now been erected where the belt of trees appears on the sketch."

Would that be a sketch that you had made of the area?

It could be, or it could be one that I had received. Now, I should say that I'm not sure that this memo indicates that August 20 th was the date --

I see.
A
-- that $I$ was there, but it certainly recaps observations that $I$ had made. Without my notes I couldn't tell you that it was the day $I$ was there, but certainly this is a memo that $I$ made along the way and $I$ may well have gone out again during the preliminary hearing.

Sir, are you telling us that this memo may have been, you may have visited the site prior to August 20 th and August 20 th may have been the dated that it was typed?

A
Yeah. Well, $I$ know $I$ was there well before this, but on this particular occasion $I$ obviously sat down and dictated a memorandum, but the notes from which it was compiled $I$ cannot tell you.

A

Okay. If we can just scroll down, paragraph 2 talks about your observations of the Cadrain house, and then you say:
"The rear portion of the lot contains a
rough hewn garage and in case some reference is made to a garbage container the only thing $I$ can see is an old burning barrel plus a relatively new ash can at the back of the lot."

Do you recall what significance would have been on the garbage can and where it was located at the Cadrain house?

You know, I've read that memo, but I don't recall that.

And we saw later in the reference to some materials $I$ think from Albert Cadrain many years later about a suggestion that Mr. Milgaard's clothes may have been taken out to the garbage and disposed of. I don't believe there's anything, that $I$ saw anyways, in the statements around '69 and ' 70 in the evidence. Do you have a recollection of that being an issue at the time of trial, that the clothes may have been taken out to the garbage?

I don't recall anything like that coming up, but
why $I$ made this observation at the time $I$ simply cannot recall, but it's certainly there and I'm sure $I$ would have had a reason for it at the time. And then you say, if we can just scroll down a bit, you say:
"In view of the heavy growth at the back of this lot including crabapple trees a good question will arise as to whether the rear lane was passable for traffic." Now if the rear lane was not passable for traffic what concerns, if any, would that present for you? matter of having the full picture. This obviously was in the summertime or early fall when $I$ made these observations, and I noticed that $I$ had spotted crabapple trees there, I don't know why unless they were overhanging or something like that, and --

Okay. If we can go to the next page, paragraph 4, if we could call that out you say:
"If Miss Miller lived south on Avenue O
the logical route for her to follow
would be to ...",
"walk" I presume that should be:
"... north to the intersection of 20 th Street and $O$ and then proceed west for one block because St. Paul is on the north west corner of the intersection of 20th Street and Avenue P. If she was living on Avenue $O$ and north of $20 t h$ Street the logical route for her to follow would be to go south on $O$ to $20 t h$ Street and then cut west on 20 th." Are you able to elaborate on what this paragraph refers to?

A

Q
A
$Q$

A
Well I was always trying to, in discussions particularly with David, and $I$ was always using St. Paul's as sort of a landmark or a focal point. I guess it was just because of my familiarity with the hospital and its location and -Okay. If we can go down to paragraph 6. And,
again, you mention:
"On both Avenue $O$ and Avenue $N$ the streets north and south of $20 t h$ are available to two way traffic and parking is apparently permitted on each side." And, again, would that be relevant to the issue of what -- identifying where a vehicle may have been stuck that morning?

Yes, umm, $I$ remember making sure that it was two-way traffic, and that basically Saskatoon at that time had little, little or no -- little or nothing in the way of one-way streets, whereas Regina did. So this certainly would be reflective of my thoughts about this aspect of the case, and I guess on visibility, and --

Right. And you say here, there you talk about large trees, but:
"... well enough so that people in houses would have no difficulty seeing persons who walk along the street."

A Yes.
And, again, what; can you explain the relevance of that?

A
Well $I$ can only assume that $I$ was thinking about the opportunity for people, potential witnesses,
to observe --
Yes.
-- what was going on. I don't have any particular recollection of the matters on -- in that connection, but --

Okay. You then state:
"Furthermore, the alley where the girl's body was found is an area where visibility is fairly good and questions should be raised as to whether or not the scene as found was consistent with the girl having been raped in a car or house before being dumped in the alley and probably killed there."

And can you explain what your thinking was in making that comment in the memo?

A
Well I didn't rule out, in my mind, the possibility that she may have been raped in a car or a house before being dumped in the alley, and maybe -- and probably killed there. But once again, this was just sort of ruminating on the question, and $I$ think at one stage, although it isn't mentioned here, $I$ wondered if there was more than one person involved in a situation like this. Okay. And can you explain that?

A
Well I thought the -- you know, you had, I think, a young woman in $I$ think good physical condition, and it was obvious that she, I thought, put up quite a battle there, and $I$ wondered if she had been, you might say, abducted. But this was just a -- you know, thoughts that were rambling through my mind, and that maybe two people -- I wasn't thinking in terms of David or anyone else in the car being involved, but $I$ was thinking of the potential involvement of, the likelihood of a third person, albeit an unidentified person or persons being involved in it.

Okay. And, again, the involvement of a car then; was there anything about what you knew of the scene or the facts that would say -- that caused you to think that a car may have been involved or that the rape may have happened in a car or a house?

No, that was speculation on my part.
And then you say:
"There are substantial fluorescent
lights on the west side of Avenue $O$ north of $20 t h$ Street and these should throw a good light in that area during the winter time."

And that would be in front of St. Mary's Church; is that right?

A

Q

A

Q

Yes. Now that, of course, reflected what the lighting was after, you know, after $I$ had been retained. I mean $I$-- but $I$ think you read it that way.

And then paragraph 7 talks about the 22 nd Street and Avenue $P$ and the number of gas stations; can you tell us the significance, if any, that would have had?

Well that was another landmark, so to speak, in that area that $I$ thought might help pinpoint things. It didn't turn out to be of any great significance, but $I$ was certainly, very early in my assessment of the situation, conscious of that service station.

If we can go to the next page. Paragraph 8 you state:
"In dealing with the cross-examination of Miss Nicole John reference should be made to page 3 of her statement of May 24th. She refers to Dave speaking to this girl and then states that they started to drive away and went only about half a block when they got stuck.

They ended up stuck at the entrance to the alley behind the funeral home. She then states that Dave went back in the direction they had spoken to the girl and this is very confusing in the light of the physical evidence and should be explored very carefully. Furthermore on the basis of this girl's statement it is hard to reconcile Miss Miller's dress being down and rumpled with no punctures in it."

If we can just go to this first part here, can you elaborate on what, when you say "it's very confusing" can you elaborate on what you meant by that, or what you would have meant, if you are able to?

A
Well, $I$ really can't read that out of context with the rest of the comment there. I don't recall dictating this memo, and so $I$ don't recall my mental processes that $I$ was going through at the time, so in a sense my reconstruction can't be any better than my recollection. I have no recollection of it, but if you are asking me to, you know, try to infer what was going on?

Yes, please?

A
It goes back to everything that had happened to this girl, if it happened there, there was a tremendous amount of activity. You know, how the -- one of the unique features was the coat had obviously been taken off as $I$ recall it, the dress rolled down, no stab marks in the dress, so the coat had been put back on the young woman and then the stabbings had -- or the stabbing had taken place. And this, of course, was a confusing situation.

Now at the preliminary hearing, of course, Miss John did not go through her statement and adopt it, she did not remember some of the things that $I$ think the Crown hoped to attribute to her.

Okay. And did that --
And, accordingly, $I$ was certainly not going to open it up, at that stage, to refresh her memory by referring to her statement.

Did you have some concerns about the credibility or validity of what Nichol John said happened based on her statement?

A
Well, not just limited to that. Based upon what $I$ knew from David, and based upon what $I$ knew of the physical circumstances -- and when $I$ talk about
the "physical circumstances" I'm referring particularly to the, what $I$ will call the unique situation with respect to her clothes -Yes.
-- and the stabbing wounds that clearly had -- the knife had penetrated the coat, but not the dress, because the dress was down. Now I know I'm stating that rather awkwardly, but --

So is it fair to say, Mr. Tallis, here, I mean at this time when you are dictating this memorandum, you would not have been aware that Ms. John would not be repeating certain parts of her May 24 th statement when she testified?

Now just back on this point about Nichol John saying that after they stopped the woman for directions they went up, and $I$ think she said in the same block, got stuck around near where the
funeral home, tried to push the car out, and then David and Ron left the car. And one of the, one of the things that has been said about that version of events is that if it happened that way, and if Gail Miller was the person that they stopped for directions, that by the time Mr. Milgaard and Mr. Wilson left the car, and in particular if Mr. Milgaard went back towards where they had stopped the woman for directions, that this woman would already be at 20 th Street at the bus stop. Do you follow what $I$ am trying to state to you?

Yes.
And in fact, maybe if we can just bring up the map for a moment, map A might be the best -- sorry, map B. And flip it around and just call out this area here, actually just a bit -- yeah, this area here. And, again, $I$ think if -- and I'm not sure if the evidence was clear on all these points -but that if, where I've drawn the $X$ just south of 21st street on Avenue $N$, if that is where they would have stopped the lady for directions, and in fact if it was Gail Miller, $I$ think then Nichol John's evidence was that they would have got stuck in that area, tried to push the car out, and then

David would have -- David and Ron left, and that David would have gone back in that direction towards where the woman had been stopped for directions. And I think the suggestion has been made that, if that happened that way, this woman would already be at $20 t h$ Street, given the time that would elapse for the car to go into the back alley, get stuck, try to push out, and then leave. And is that something that you considered at the time, or would have raised or dealt with?

Well, I'm sure that in my own mind $I$ canvassed it, but $I$, on the basis of anything that $I$ saw or heard -- well, number one, David of course had told me about an older woman, but where they stopped, they stopped her, but certainly, from talking to him, it wasn't in this immediate area. Okay.

But, secondly, I could not see any really logical basis for Miss Miller to go along 21 st Street to Avenue N and then down.

Okay.
And, if she took a different route than Avenue O, the more logical area for her to go down would be the back alley, through the back door. Now I'm sure this is what was going on in my mind --

Q
A

2
A
Q
And again, the issue of timing, that again according to what -- and I appreciate you've told us that she did not adopt the entirety of her statement -- but as far as your memorandum when you talk about:
"She then states that Dave went back in the direction they had spoken to the girl and this is very confusing ...", I think are your words; I'm trying to find out whether that might have related to the fact that by the time David would have left the vehicle, according to Nichol, the woman that they stopped for directions, if it was in fact on Avenue $N$ between 20 th and 21 st Street, that based on the elapsed time, that she would likely be at the bus stop unless she went back or went a different route, and I'm just trying to find out whether that might have been something that was on your mind at the time?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
A
But of course many types of things occur to you. And I would be the first to say that $I$ was speculating about various aspects of this because, you know, the unique feature of this girl having been, in effect, undressed in the -- in bitterly cold weather in these circumstances, and sexually assaulted, you know, on a bed in the snow, so to speak, naturally gave rise, in my view, to a lot of speculation on my part.

Okay. This is probably an appropriate spot to
break, Mr. Commissioner.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay. (Adjourned at 11:51 a.m.)
(Reconvened at 1:32 p.m.)
BY MR. HODSON:
Q
Mr. Tallis, before the break we were talking about your preparation work and we had gone through your memo about your visits in the area, you also told us about your discussions with experts on the secretor issue and we'll deal with that a bit later. Can you tell us about what steps you might have taken to gather information about some of the either prospective witnesses or potential witnesses?

A
Well, $I$ know $I$ had various sources of inquiry, or I inquired through various sources, and in particular there were people on the west side in Saskatoon that either were friends of mine or acquaintances, you know, who would have alerted me to anything of significance that came to their attention. I've mentioned the one lady that I recall having been mentioned to me by an acquaintance of mine and as a result of that $I$ interviewed her, and then of course I made inquiries in Regina about Wilson, and actually as

I told you, I went down, $I$ was in Regina and actually went to the courthouse, as $I$ recall it he was coming up on something, and then $I$ made, you know, a number of inquiries about him and criminal record and proceedings and so on. Now, I made notes of all these things, but after all these years it's very difficult for me to recount in detail what $I$ did, but $I$ certainly did pursue various avenues.

I think you told us earlier that you did not, for reasons which you stated, interview any of the significant Crown witnesses; namely, Cadrain, Wilson and John. Let's just talk about -- did you interview, do you recall interviewing any of the other witnesses or making inquiries about other witnesses?

A
Well, I think I've told you about interviewing Ute Frank and Roberts and --

Yes.
I certainly made inquiries about other witnesses to get background information on them as best $I$ could.

For example, did you make any effort to talk to any of the Cadrain family members about what they may have observed the morning of January 31, 1969?

A
-- of whether she was the one who did it. I know that $I$ didn't do it directly, but that of course was information that was significant to me because

I didn't want the Crown, I didn't know whether -I assumed the Crown didn't know about it, about this, and $I$ of course kept that confidential as far as $I$ was concerned, but $I$ had to be very careful that $I$ didn't stir things up in that connection because there was always the possibility of the Crown calling the youngster. Okay. When you talk about the young lad and the youngster, are you referring to someone other than Albert Cadrain, a younger sibling?

Yes. My recollection is that he had a younger -a younger sibling, quite young sibling. The evidence that we've heard is that he had a brother at the time who would be five, almost six,
named Ken Cadrain. Do you recall if that would have been the age or the name of the person? Well, $I$ wouldn't recall the name, but $I$ recall the general -- I think the age factor is within my general recollection.

And would it be someone who was present the morning of January 31, 1969 when David Milgaard arrived at the Cadrain house?

Well, I understood that and --
And that's when the observation was made? Yes.

If we can just go back to Miss Wilson, I think you said you believed she may have called

Mrs. Cadrain. Would you have used Miss Wilson for things like that on other files, was that part of what she would do?

A
$Q$ And again, as far as your recollection, and $I$ think you told us that this came from Albert Cadrain's mother, that the youngster had seen blood on David's clothing that morning?

A
Yes. Now, I assumed that he had seen something
that looked like blood.
Q
A

Q
A

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
A
No, I don't. I can't rule it out either way, but, you know, if $I$ were making a guesstimate, $I$ would

Well, $I$ certainly had no knowledge of that at the time, but of course I think you've shown me something which would lend support to that view. I think there was some evidence to suggest that she may not have wanted her young son to be involved in the proceedings. Do you have any recollection of that at the time?
say that $I$ had no indication of that conveyed to me.

Q
Now, did you ever hear from Mr. Caldwell any information at the time that the young Cadrain person, that there might be another person in the Cadrain house that morning who witnessed blood, anything of that nature, who witnessed what he thought was blood?

I can't recall any -- I can't recall any reference being made to that.

I think you had said a bit earlier that you were concerned about stirring the pot, I think were your words.

Yes.
And I think you said, and please correct me if I'm wrong, were you of the view that the Crown and/or the police may not have been aware of this information from the young Cadrain lad?

That's correct.
And so I think you said you kept it confidential.
What was your concern if you had gone out and stirred the pot, and let's say knocked on the door and asked to speak to Mrs. Cadrain or Celine Cadrain or the young Cadrain?

A
Well, $I$ think there is always the risk of creating
a chain of inquiry for the prosecution wing that would be detrimental to David's interests. Were you concerned that the Crown, if they did not know about this information, might find out about it and call this person at trial against David? I was.

And as far as making inquiries of Celine Cadrain, and that was the sister who $I$ think was home that morning, did the information that you received about the young lad and what he observed, did that cause you to reconsider or to change what you might have done as far as talking to Celine Cadrain?

Well, my understanding from talking to David was that Celine was not up when he went in and it was only after that he had changed his clothes and, you know, changed his trousers at least that he did see her, and $I$ think he went upstairs actually to say hello to her if my recollection is correct, and my recollection also from talking to David, now that you've mentioned it, and maybe I mentioned it earlier, is that Mrs. Cadrain was not actually home when they first arrived there. Okay. Just back to steps that you've taken, and I appreciate, sir, that you don't have your file or
your notes, but are you able to tell us, either by recollection or whether it's likely based on your practices, that Miss Wilson would have been involved in perhaps gathering other information or contacting other witnesses or potential witnesses? She may have. That's the one that particularly sticks out in my mind. I think it's likely, but to give you specifics, I cannot do so.

Would you have -- oh, I'm sorry.
No, go ahead.
No, you go ahead.
No, I would say but $I$ can't assist you any further than that at this stage.

This information that you received about what the young Cadrain lad had observed, would you have shared that with David Milgaard?

A

Q

A
I believe I did.
And do you recall any reaction or response he may have had?

Well, throughout he told me, and I can't recall specific reaction, but throughout the whole of this he told me that he had no blood on him, on his person as $I$ said to you this morning, and that includes clothes that were on his person.
$Q$ As far as your -- let's just talk about your, we
talked earlier about your professional and ethical observations and how you approach a witness.

Would the fact that you had this information that another member of the Cadrain household may have observed something that he thought was blood on Mr. Milgaard, would that have changed anything in your mind as far as what tact you could take with Albert Cadrain, for example, on this issue? No, because $I$ had discussed blood generally with David and, as $I$ told you, the answer that $I$ got throughout was there was no blood.

So that you could still take the position with Albert Cadrain that he was mistaken or perhaps lying about his observation?

A Yes.
Q
However, did the knowledge that you had that there
may have been another person who observed that that may not have been known to the Crown and/or police, would that have influenced the manner in which you approached the blood issue and cross-examined Albert Cadrain on the issue?

Well, I certainly wouldn't want to put questions in such a manner that it would arouse any interest in having that lad called.

And $I$ mean again, for example, you wouldn't, I
take it you wouldn't question him saying "well, if you saw it, how come your brother didn't see it?", or something of that nature?

A
Q

A
Q

A


Yes, I'm quite sure $I$ was conscious of it at that
time. I, you know, I can't sort of summon up all the mental processes that $I$ was going through, but

I know that's something that $I$ still recall, in terms of getting that information.

And again, and you may have already stated this or it may be obvious, but if that evidence had been
tendered at the trial, then, is that something that you felt was detrimental to David's interest?

A
Q
No, I --
I'm not sure that would be an admissible question, but --

No, but it would be a risky question in any event.
Were you mindful of this, then, in how you
approached Albert Cadrain and others on the
observations of blood on David's clothes while at
the Cadrain house; were you mindful of the fact
that there may be other evidence out there that was detrimental that the Crown and/or police may not have been aware of?

Well it's very difficult to argue that the evidence of a youngster is inherently
untrustworthy, and it's more difficult to attribute a motive to a youngster of that age. And so, and let me just take that a bit further, in challenging Albert Cadrain $I$ think we talked about what tack you could take and I think you said one would be he was mistaken and, two, he was lying?

Yes.
With a youngster are you saying it's a different tack or a different approach?

I think, in many respects, it poses greater difficulties.

If we can go to 006972 , please. This is the letter of November $14 t h, 1969$-- I'm just carrying on, Mr. Tallis, with your preparations -- this would be after the preliminary hearing and before the trial, in fact this is two days after you met, I think our chronology shows that you met with Mr. Milgaard on November $12 t h, 1969$ in Prince Albert in the correctional centre, so this is two days later. And you are asking for an extra copy of the preliminary hearing transcript, and you give two reasons, 1 it says you:
"... have left my copy of the transcript with David so that he can peruse the
same quite carefully while in Prince Albert."

So I take it, from that, that you would have given David Milgaard a complete transcript of the preliminary hearing to read while he was in jail?

Yes, I know that $I$ gave him a copy of the
transcript, $I$ don't recall, specifically recall writing this letter but $I$ am quite sure that it is so.

And so would you have asked David to do anything with the transcript?

I'm sure that $I$ appreciated that, having sat through the preliminary hearing, it was unreasonable to expect him to remember everything that was said and done during the course of the preliminary, but $I$ did want him to have the opportunity to read this over so that we could discuss any points that occurred to him. Now the records show that you, after the November 12th, '69 meeting you met with him again on December 11th, 1969, a month later. Are you able to tell us from your memory or based on what you see from these, from this letter and the file, whether you would have discussed the preliminary hearing transcript with David Milgaard upon your
return on December 11 th?

I'm quite sure that $I$ did. Without the benefit of this material that you were able to dig up $I$ was always quite sure that $I$ had, $I$ was positive $I$ had visited him before the preliminary hearing, in my mind $I$ was quite sure that $I$ had visited him after the preliminary hearing, when the -- that is after the transcript had been prepared, but until $I$ saw the statements that you produced, and so on, I would not have been able to identify the dates of my visits or give a clear recollection of the fact of the visit. But, having had a look at those, I know that -- and $I$ do recall, on a visit to Prince Albert after $I$ had left the transcript with him, that $I$ did talk about some things in the transcript. I thought, a long time ago, that perhaps I'd talked to him on the phone about it, but $I$ didn't think so, that it was more likely than not that it was in person. So that, essentially, is the way it unfolded.

Now I undoubtedly made some notes of the points that he mentioned. There weren't that many because we'd covered the territory, so to speak, earlier, but $I$ did make some notes, and me -- he -- I think he had
scribbled out one or two sort of notes on sheets that he gave me.

And then if we can go down to the second point in this letter, and the second reason for getting an extra copy of the transcript, you say:
"I feel that I may want to get
independent legal opinions on certain
matters and for this purpose $I$ would like to be able to have an extra copy of the material available, for the perusal of counsel."

Are you able to tell us what that relates to? At this stage, no. I may have wanted to discuss admissibility of evidence issues but, at the end of the day, I did not go outside of the office for
an independent legal opinion. I know that
Mr. J.M. Goldenberg, Q.C., read over that
transcript of the preliminary hearing very
carefully and I discussed it with him.
Q And was he a senior member of your firm, then, at that time?

Yes. Although he wasn't doing any criminal law work at that time he had, as a younger person, done a fair amount of it, and he not only had an interest in this case, but also all the cases that
sort of were going through the office. And $I$, of course, had articled to him so I, you know, didn't have any hesitation spending the time, and he was always there early in the morning, and it was very easy to get some time together to discuss matters. So if we can now go to -- again, just to finish up on your preparation for trial, we're done with that letter, the -- can you tell us, going into trial, and I appreciate that the Crown carries the burden of establishing the case against Mr. Milgaard, but can you tell us what some of your objectives or defence strategies were going into the trial?

Well, to try and summarize it, I guess one of the things that $I$ wanted to do was undermine the credibility or reliability of some of the witnesses that we have mentioned; secondly, to deal with the serological aspect of the evidence because, on balance, $I$ thought that that evidence was of assistance to David.

Okay. And this would be the secretor evidence?
Yes. I call it the serological chapter, if I may, or section of it.

And just on that -- and, again, we'll get into that in more detail -- but would that have been
one of the key parts of your defence going in would be the serological evidence?

A
Yes. Combined, of course, or not only that but the physical circumstances of the homicide, and of course another aspect of it was the time factor, trying to work back from the Trav-a-leer Motel, and based not only on Crown's case but what David had told me, the improbability of a crime of that nature being committed in such a short time frame by him, and that was a major focus --

Was it that you --
-- on the footing that it would be unreasonable to conclude that he could be the perpetrator of this sexual attack and subsequent killing of this young woman. And of course $I$ don't want to be repetitious but, you know, the unique circumstances that $I$ have earlier alluded to are included in that, plus the other factors that I've mentioned, including the time away from the vehicle being very short and, of course, the lack of any tire or spin marks in the area in question, that is spin marks that the police had actually looked for and not found. Now those are, I know I'm not putting these forward in a disciplined way in which $I$ would have had them in my trial brief,

Q
A
$Q$
but I'm just trying to summon up my recollection
$\qquad$ Yes. And that would involve, of course, a consideration of the details that $I$ have just mentioned to you.

Okay. And you also talked about the condition -"the unique characteristics of the homicide", I think were your words, --

Yes.
-- and in particular the clothing, and I think what you said is that that would, I take it would be a factor in the timing as well, and $I$ presume that that would be that whoever committed the crime would have to take off the coat, take off
the dress, put the coat back on, and that it was a bit of an involved scene; is that fair?

A
Q
A

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

Right. If we can now move to the Court proceedings, and $I$ think everybody in this room is familiar with preliminary hearings and its purpose
evidence that was inconsistent with what David Milgaard had told you had happened; is that fair?

Yes, and also inconsistent with the observations of the Danchuks. the witnesses, and would that -- and I think we've covered this, but this would be to challenge the
in the trial, but maybe you could just explain briefly, for the benefit of the record and the public, what was the purpose of the preliminary hearing as compared to the trial, and what was your strategy and objective at the preliminary hearing?

Well the preliminary hearing, of course, involved a consideration of whether there was sufficient evidence adduced by the prosecution to put an accused person on trial. There were two aspects to this that $I$ think bear mentioning.

I wanted, where possible, to tie down the witnesses to their testimony. And here $I$ allude to, for example, Wilson's evidence regarding the time that he was away from the vehicle.

And then there was also the possibility and the fact of getting helpful evidence from the mouths of witnesses. And here, by way of illustration, $I$ refer to the Danchuks and then the Trav-a-leer Motel, in terms of no sign of blood and matters of that nature, and the police officers not finding any tire spin marks and so on. I don't want to belabour this, but I'm just using that as an illustration. were two schools of thought on a preliminary hearing. There were some counsel who thought you don't ask many questions at a preliminary hearing because you tip your hand as to potential defences, and $I$ know there was one practitioner in the province who seemed to do it in a very successful way, but $I$ think on balance most people tried to pursue the course that $I$ did, that $I$ just mentioned to you.

And that would be to pin the witnesses down and to --
If we could --
I mean in this particular case there was every
reason to feel, in my mind, that $M r$. Rasmussen at the Trav-a-leer Motel and Mr. and Mrs. Danchuk had
no potential axe to grind with anybody, and they expressed their recollection to the very best of their ability, and indeed everything the Danchuks told me essentially coincided with what David said on that particular stop.

If we could go ahead, and what I propose to do with the preliminary hearing and trial, Mr. Tallis, is to try and deal with them on some of the key witnesses, and rather than break it up and do the preliminary hearing and the trial, is to take some of the key witnesses and look at how you questioned them at both the preliminary hearing and at the trial.

But, before I do that, can we --
I'd like you to tell us -- and let's focus on the trial -- can you tell us what evidence at the trial, witnesses and/or evidence or issues, that you felt were the most damaging to David Milgaard's position at the trial?

I think if $I$ can take my mind's eye back to the trial -- and it, you know, it's not easy after all these years -- $I$ rather think that the -- and if you'd asked me that question then or shortly after the trial $I$ think that the evidence of Nichol John, as it unfolded, was pivotal, not so much
with respect to the evidence that she gave, but with respect to the demeanour that $I$ think came across to the presiding judge and probably to the jury. The course of her examination certainly could leave the impression that she was trying to protect her friend, and $I$ think that my assessment was to -- is to -- was to some extent borne out by the, $I$ think the trial judge intervened at one point to find out whether or not, if $I$ may use the term, 'somebody from the defence camp had got to her'. Now I don't know whether you want any further elaboration on that or not?
$Q$
A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

No, we will go through --
Because that's just --
Yes.
-- distilling it as best $I$ can --
Yes.
-- for these purposes at this time.
No, and I appreciate that, I was just looking for the key point. And we will go through your examination or cross-examination of her and look at those comments when we deal with her evidence, but when you talk about the demeanour and the fact that, $I$ think you said, the presiding judge's view that someone had got to her, --

A -- of it.

A
Q

A
Q
A

Q
A

Q

A

Q
A
Q

Q

A

Had perhaps got to her.
-- or perhaps got to her, would this be by way of explanation to the fact that she had given a sworn statement saying that she witnessed the murder, and yet at trial said she couldn't remember that or remember telling the police that; is that what you --

Yes, that's what $I$ am referring to.
And so I'm --
What I am -- you can --
Yes.
-- summarize it under the rubric of the Section 9(2) application.

And what about the fact that the jury heard what was in her sworn statement, which she did not adopt, but actually heard the contents and heard a direction from the trial judge to disregard it? Well, I think that's part and parcel of my assessment that $I$ just gave to you, -Okay.
-- that this was a pivotal aspect -Okay.

2 And --
A And others may disagree, but trying to look at it
as objectively as $I$ can -- and $I$ know $I$ wasn't looking at it objectively then --

Q
A
Q

A

Q

A
Q
A
$Q$ , Okay.
-- I think that would be a fair assessment. Okay. And we'll come back to that and spend a bit of time on that. What other pieces of evidence or witnesses that, when you look back, can you say were damaging based on your observations?

Well, $I$ thought that was the most damaging in the context of the case. Now $I$ know Wilson, you know, went out of his way to improve his testimony on the time factor, and even though he'd given evidence under oath at the preliminary hearing where he wasn't rushed or badgered, he literally doubled the time.

And so again on Wilson's evidence, and we'll deal a bit with that, he, I think, gave evidence that David had made some damning admissions to him; -Yes.
-- is that correct?
Yes.
Were you -- back at the time, was it a concern, or what did you make of the fact that it was David's travelling companions and friends that were giving the incriminating evidence, how -- what was your
observation of how that may have played out with the jury, again just based on your observations?

Well trying to look at it as objectively as I can now, $I$ think that this would certainly be a matter that they would weigh and consider, I don't see how they could avoid doing it.

And in your view, would they weigh it unfavourably against David Milgaard?

Well, I think they did, but this is just speculation --

Sure.
A

And that $I$ thought, you know, his acknowledgement that when initially spoken to by the police and so forth, he just laughed at them at any suggestion that he or -- that anyone in the car, and in
particular David, had anything to do with this, and as $I$ recall it, the trial judge, $I$ believe at my request, gave an additional direction in connection with that testimony which $I$ thought probably would carry a fair bit of weight with the jury in assessing his evidence.

Okay. What about, and I haven't gone through this with you yet which I will do once we get to that part of my examination, but the motel room reenactment evidence of Craig Melnyk and George Lapchuk, and we've heard a fair bit about that, but where, generally where did that fit in, did that cause you concern, some concern, did you believe that that was damaging to David Milgaard's case?

A
Well, depending on what view the jury took of it, of course it would be damaging, but $I$ think that fact finders would appreciate the unsavoury nature of some of these people and would take that into account, and $I$ think, I've forgotten now about the nature of the charge to the jury, but $I$ think there was some reference to that, and while the names weren't specifically used, $I$ think that a reference was at least inferentially made to people like the Danchuks and Rasmussen as being
quite a different class of witness from this type of witness.

Okay. What $I$ would now like to do, Mr. Tallis, and we'll start with Albert Cadrain, then go through Ron Wilson and Nichol John, but what I want to do is just go through quickly your preparation, what you would have prepared for to cross-examine these witnesses at the prelim and trial, your approach, and we'll go through parts of the prelim, trial and address to the jury to get a sense of what it was you did with respect to these key witnesses, and if we can start with Albert Cadrain, can you tell us, what was your general impression of Albert Cadrain as a witness? I don't like to belittle any person, but my assessment of him was that he was not too bright. I may be being unfair when $I$ say that, but you've asked me the question.

Yes.
And that's my candid answer to you.
And what about as far as credibility, and again I'm just asking for what your, your recollection of what you would have thought at the time, his credibility, let's say, compared to Ron Wilson or some of the other witnesses. Let's start with

Wilson, how would you -- were you able to compare that?

A
I don't think he would be viewed in the same light as Wilson.

Q
A

Well, $I$ thought a jury would, you know, a fact finder might well focus on his reliability in light of the, in light of what he said with respect to his first discussions with the police on it, and having got that in front of them, $I$ thought that they might very well feel that that
difficult to assess these things. You know, I could be dead wrong on what was important to the jury.

Q

No, I didn't. Now, I must say that before the trial $I$ did just make a general inquiry as to whether or not he had been involved in any untoward incidents up in the Meota/Jackfish Lake area, but that wasn't based on any gossip or rumours about his mental condition, I just wondered if he had got into difficulty, say, through perhaps use of drugs or anything, you know, any difficulties that he might have been in with the law.

Did you --
Just as before, shortly before trial, and I left it until shortly before trial, I made inquiries as to whether or not any of those witnesses had sought the reward money. I thought it was highly unlikely that they would do so, but sometimes greedy people will do strange things and $I$ was initially turned back on the footing that that
information was confidential. I have a
recollection of speaking to Mr. Caldwell and it's perhaps because whoever I spoke to at the Police Commission office may have asked me what was the position of the Crown on this because $I$ was pressing for the information and as I recall it, it was through his good offices that I ascertained that no application had been made by any of those, I'll call, any of the three friends for the reward money, but $I$ did make that inquiry just on the off chance somebody had taken that step.

And I take it that there was no -- I think from the record what we have seen is that it was after the conviction?

A
Yeah. The information $I$ received was that no application had been made by any one of them. Did you make any inquiries as to what type of person Albert Cadrain was or what type of family he came from, anything of that nature?

Well, $I$ know my inquiries indicated that his parents were viewed as quite responsible people and -- that's just a vague recollection that $I$ have now, but as far as other details, $I$ cannot recall. Now, one thing $I$ do recall in this connection is that when $I$ got the jury panel list,

I immediately started to vet it, make inquiries, but the first thing $I$ noticed going through it was that Mr. Cadrain was on the list.

That would be Albert's father?
Yes, and $I$ immediately phoned Mr. Caldwell to make sure that, to get a commitment from him that he would use a stand-aside in that connection, but $I$ also followed it up by, I thought that $I$ really didn't want him even with the jury panel on the opening morning when they were all summoned, so I actually went over to the sheriff's office to arrange to have an appointment made with, get a time for an appointment with the judge to deal with this matter. Naturally, once $I$ got a time I would have had Mr. Caldwell notified too, but the sheriff sort of smiled at me as $I$ came through the door and said $I$ think $I$ know why you are here and then before $I$ hardly got anything out of my mouth he said, well, Mr. Cadrain asked to be excused and the judge has already excused him.

I see.
So that's something that $I$ remember.
Just again as far as your approach to Mr. Cadrain, you talked about, and we'll see this in your examination of him, or cross-examination of him,
the significance that $I$ think you placed upon his discussions with the Regina police before he went into the police station in Saskatoon?

A
Q
 But in talking with David, I wasn't able to come across anything, you know, in terms of whether there was friction or jealousy or anything like that that had arisen, and $I$ really didn't come across anything else.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Could I ask you -excuse me, sir. What exactly did he say to begin with that was different, that was changed later on? This is Albert Cadrain.

A
Yes.
I think that's an area. Did you find out anything or have any notion as to what might -- what might explain Mr. Cadrain's evidence as compared to Mr. Milgaard's information to you that there was no blood, and again, $I$ think yesterday and even this morning we said two possibilities, one is he's mistaken, or two, he's lying?

Well, in light of what he had said initially, naturally $I$ was looking, as $I$ told you, for evidence of some motive for changing his mind. And did you come across anything that might --

Well, when he was, when he had spoke to the police
in Regina, and $I$ think Mr. Hodson has the details of this, he indicated, at least in his testimony, that David had had nothing to do with this killing and that nobody in the car had had anything to do with it and that he literally laughed in their face when they suggested that. Now, I'm not paraphrasing it very well, but I know -- I know it's in there somewhere.

MR. HODSON: Mr. Commissioner, I intend to take Mr. Tallis through his questioning of Mr. Cadrain on this issue.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: That's just fine, I just wanted to record what it was.

BY MR. HODSON:
And I suppose, Mr. Tallis, when $I$ go back and say there's two options, maybe $I$ stand to be corrected, $I$ suppose one is $I$ said he's mistaken, two is he's lying, I suppose a third option that again would be consistent with what Mr. Milgaard was telling you, if that's assumed to be true, is that perhaps he did see blood or something that looked like blood, but that it was unrelated to Gail Miller, I suppose that would be a possibility as well.

A
Well, from my discussions with David, there was no
blood.
Okay.
He certainly left open the possibility that there were, that there were spots of some nature on his trousers that may have been caused by the handing of the battery.

What effect if any did the information that you had from Mrs. Cadrain about the young lad, I think you called it, about his observations of blood, what impact did that have on your thinking on this issue?

A

Q
Well, $I$ proceeded on the footing that what David told me was correct, but as I indicated to you earlier, $I$ did not want to stir matters up to the point where the prosecution might call this boy. Now, and we touched on this a bit earlier, and apart from his interview in Regina, $I$ think the evidence was, and certainly the statement appeared to have come from Albert Cadrain voluntarily; in other words, that he walked into the police station in Saskatoon and said $I$ have information on the murder, $I$ saw blood on David Milgaard that morning and $I$ think he was involved, or words to that effect. Did the fact that he went in voluntarily to the Saskatoon City Police, can you
tell us how that factored into how you might approach this witness at the preliminary hearing and the trial?

A

Well, $I$ have no doubt that $I$ took it into account in drafting my questions. David and $I$ had not been able to really come up with any motive for him doing this, although I think I decided to canvass the fact that he may have considered himself a suspect and that if he was feeling that way, there might be a desire or tendency to shift blame on somebody else, albeit a friend. So you say a suspect. Is that viewed by the Regina police or the Saskatoon police or both? Perhaps by both.

And so again, are you telling us that that would be --

And, you know, I can't read what was going on in his mind, but he may have thought he was a suspect in light of approaches and questioning. And so are you telling us that that fact, being in front of the jury, then might be an explanation as to why he might make up some evidence about a friend to shift the spotlight off of him; is that --

Well, that's, I'm sure, something that $I$ was
thinking about.
If we could go to 018501, and this is a typed version of Albert Cadrain's March 2nd, 1969 statement, this is the first statement that he gave to the Saskatoon City Police. There's no record, Mr. Tallis, of any statement or information from Albert Cadrain in the Regina City Police records. I think there is a vagrancy card with some details about the arrest on vagrancy, but we have never located anything by way of what he was questioned about relating to the Gail Miller matter in any of his answers, so this would be his first statement. We've been through this on a number of occasions, $I$ only want to just touch on some parts of this before we get into your cross-examination of him. Is it fair to say that you would have utilized this statement in your preparations for Mr. Cadrain and how you intended to deal with him?

I'm quite sure $I$ used the information, you know, that I had. If I had this statement at the time, I would have used it and I'm sure that $I$ was aware of the contents in any event.

And going into the preliminary hearing, certainly this would be likely the best indication of what
the witness might say at the preliminary hearing; is that fair?

A

Q


And then if we can scroll down to the next paragraph, and here's the reference about the blood, he says:
"I was getting dressed and I noticed
that Hopy changed his pants \& shirt.
Now I recall that he had blood on his
shirt on the front \& bottom and also saw
blood on his pants."

And then goes on to talk about others changing, and it would appear from this statement that David would have been changing his clothes in front of Albert Cadrain, Ron $W$ ilson and Nichol John; is that correct?

Yes, I think that's --
He says he changed in front of everyone; correct? Yes.

If you can then scroll down to the bottom paragraph and in his statement he says:
"I can't remember actually what he did with his soiled clothes but $I$ think he put them back in the suitcase and took them out to the car."

And again $I$ think that was consistent with what David had told you; is that right?

A

Q

A
leaving Saskatoon around Calgary:
"... a transport came along after some
light blinking \& Hopy talked to the driver and gave him some packages out of our trunk. Then he gave us a fake push \& we went on."

Did you ever find out what this was about, or where did that fit in, if anywhere?

A
From talking to David $I$ didn't think it fit in anywhere. Now, whether there was some kid talk, as $I$ use that term, $I$ can't remember now, but $I$ didn't attach, or David didn't attach any significance to it and $I$ think he certainly questioned whether it took place.

Okay. And then there's a reference here -actually, what do you mean by kid talk?

A Well, just, you know, saying foolish things. Amongst friends?

Yeah.
And then it says:
"Later on Hopy got me alone and asked me
if I was asleep last night, I said I was pretty sure $I$ knew what was going on. He told me he was in the Mafia."

And again, and we touched on this a bit earlier,
but what was your sense of this statement? Is that something -- do you remember what David said about that?

A
I think he said there was nothing to it and probably that it didn't happen, but without my notes $I$ don't recall, but one of the things $I$ do recall was that $I$ didn't think this would be admissible evidence in this particular trial and that led me to challenge its admissibility along the way.

And did you inquire whether this might have been kid talk as you referred to?

I'm sure I did, and I think David probably told me that, you know, he didn't have any recollection of anything like this being said.
$Q$
A
$Q$ Okay.

But my focus quickly came on whether or not it should ever be admitted.

And then the next paragraph, Albert Cadrain is talking about:
"... smoking all that grass I don't
remember too good."
Was this an issue that concerned you about the drug use and the effect that might have on the recollection of some of these witnesses?

A Yes. Of course this could cut both ways in front of a jury, you know, the use of drugs obviously was a matter of concern to them because of the question that was asked with respect to the trip and so on and in my discussions with David he certainly minimized any use of drugs early in the trip. The implication of this is that it was later on in Banff and so on, there's no doubt they were using drugs after they got into Alberta, but I had forgotten the details where they were able to access them or get them.

And again at the bottom here in his statement he says, this is Albert about after he got back from Regina:

```
                            "I talked to my brother Dennis all
            night --"
Or first of all he says a bit earlier:
                            "... and I think he is involved."
```

He's talking about David and the murder.
"I talked to my brother Dennis all night
\& discussed this. We decided to tell
our parents which we did this morning
and they told us to come to the police which we did."

Can you tell us what if any concerns you had
about this part of the statement and, in particular, how it came to be that Albert Cadrain came into the Saskatoon City Police station after talking to his parents?

A

Q

A

Q


Well, this was consistent with the information
that $I$ had received about them being quite responsible people and of course he having come in on his own like that undoubtedly posed some problems for the defence in terms of the, of his veracity as a witness.

And would it, am $I$ correct, is what you are saying is he would tend to be more credible coming in on his own rather than if he had been picked up by the police and sort of involuntarily asked to give information?

I think that certainly was the argument that would be made.

And then if we can scroll down a bit, there's a reference here about:
"Hopy talked about a gun once but I never seen one. I never noticed any blood or knives in the car. I never did see into the trunk."

And again we may have touched on that, but do you recall discussing this aspect of the statement
with Mr. Milgaard?
A
Yes. Well, there was -- he certainly never had any gun or anything like that.

Did he --
I don't recall, you know, without my notes, I couldn't recall the responses, but $I$ think that what he told me was that this was just something that didn't happen.

And again $I$ think the statement indicates that Hoppy talked about a gun --

A
Yeah.
-- as opposed to having one, but do you recall
that?
I really don't.
If we can go to 006723 , this is a second statement
of March 5, '69 that was given three days after
his first statement. If we can go to the next
page, and in this statement he says:
"On the way to Calgary Milgaard talked
mad and indicated he was mad because I
was with his girl. He told me he wasn't
mad."
Again, you had talked earlier about conflict
amongst David Milgaard and the others. Do you
recall whether this part of the statement again
was something that you felt might assist you in cross-examining Mr. Cadrain?

A

Q

A

Q
A

2 , Well, David had indicated to me that there was no friction between them over this issue.

And then again the next page, right at the bottom he says:
"The blood $I$ saw on his clothes was on his shirt tail and on his pants going down. I thought at first he had had a virgin."

Do you recall anything being made of that or any discussions with David about that subject? Well, the bottom line with David was that he didn't have any blood on his clothes or person. Okay.

We had talked about possibilities of sources and so on, but he said he didn't have any on him. If we can scroll down. In this statement Mr. Cadrain, in addition to his observation in this statement, he says:
"Hoppi mentioned he had blood on his clothes \& had to change. I did not see any blood on his shorts."

And, again, do you recall -- and I appreciate what you said, that Mr. Milgaard said he didn't
have blood on his clothes, but here Mr. Cadrain is saying -- attributing a remark to Mr. Milgaard acknowledging that he had blood on his clothes?

A

Q
have bloodon I'm quite sure that David told me that he did not say this. This is certainly inconsistent with everything he told me.

If we can then go ahead to 007869 . And this is the preliminary hearing transcript, and this is Mr. Caldwell examining, and $I$ just want to touch on a few of his questions before $I$ go into your cross-examination. 007873, question 49, Mr. Caldwell asks, and this is about when David arrived, it says:
"Q And who was home at that time?
A My little brother Kenney, and my big sister, she was upstairs in bed and I was sleeping on the couch downstairs."

Would you have taken from this answer, Mr.
Tallis, that Kenny, being the little brother, may have been the person that Mrs. Cadrain had indicated had observed blood on David Milgaard that morning?

I'm sure $I$ did, but $I$ don't recall the name, but the age range that you gave me, if he was in that age range, $I$ would say that that's likely correct.

And the next page, again just touch on a couple of his answers to Mr. Caldwell, and Albert, here, says:
"A Well, they were kind of nervous and running around, I guess, and Hoppy said ' I got blood on my clothes and I have to change' - well, first before that, he said, 'we have to -- we got to get out of town, we're going to Edmonton' ...". And then, on the next page, it says here that: "... he changed right in front of all of us."

And I think that's fairly consistent with his two statements; would you agree?

Yes, $I$ believe so.
Yeah.
Without reading right through them.
Right. And then the next page, at question 71,
Mr. Cadrain talks about -- I think these are, again, David's clothing, and he says acid all over the coat:
"... the crotch of his pants was all
ripped up the back end and he had blood
on his shirt and on his pants."
And certainly the part about the crotch, or the
pants ripped up the back, that would be consistent with what David had told you?

Very much so.
Then to 007879, question 100 -- and, again, this is all Mr. Caldwell, $I$ will tell you when we switch to your cross-examination -- he asks him about Albert has, Albert Cadrain has testified that the -- David Milgaard's soiled clothing went into his suitcase, out to the car, and then he is asked:
"Q Did you see anything done with the suitcase then?

A No, it was put in the back of the car, in the trunk of the car and later on on the trip one night, I'm pretty sure David gave the suitcase to a transport driver or something."

And I think he may have expanded on that and that may have been related to the fake push part of his statement; do you have any recollection of this, Mr. Tallis, and how you might have dealt with that?

Not, not right offhand.
007889. This is just a reference to the driving, and Albert Cadrain is talking about David

Milgaard's driving to Calgary, he says:
"A Well, there was ice an inch thick on the highway and it was dangerous, he was going as fast as the car could go and the girl was screaming and crying her head off, he still wouldn't slow down, he just tried to go faster."

Now I think we've talked about this before, and I think certainly you were going to challenge the admissibility of this evidence, but do you recall whether what Mr. Cadrain says here; can you tell us, would this be consistent with what David Milgaard had told you, or are there some differences?

Well I recall there were differences. He, you know, he said "I like driving fast", but the rest of it I'm sure he challenged.

If we can then go to 007904 . Actually, just go to the previous page. This is where Mr. Caldwell starts examining him about his going to the police, and we have been through most of this, but he talks about working in Regina and $I$ don't think there's any mention there of going to the police or being picked up. I think he talks about being picked up by the police for vagrancy, but not
about any discussion about the Gail Miller matter, and then:
"Q And after you got home to Saskatoon, did you have occasion when you got here to go to the police department?"

And then did you eventually go to see the police, yes. And then the next page, and again talks about him going into the police the next day and giving a statement. So at that, $I$ think that's how that's dealt with, and I'll touch, I'll go in a moment, Mr. Tallis, to your cross-examination on this subject.

If we can actually go to the next page, and this is again Mr. Caldwell at the prelim, they are talking about after, I think, Ron and Nichol left the car in Calgary, and:
"Q And did you have any conversation while you were in the car with him alone?

A Yes, he said, Shorty stay here, so -I want to talk to you. I got to tell you something. They know something, you know, something that $I$ have done.

Q Yes.
A And he said, I'm in the Mafia gang and I got a gun in the back seat here and

I'll show it to you, but he never.
Q Mhmn.
A And he says you go kill those two off and I'll tell you and $I$ just laughed at him, I didn't believe him and he left it at that."

And again just on this, $I$ think this is a bit further than what's in his statement, his statement talks about the Mafia and a gun but not about the comment about going off to kill, $I$ think it's referring to, Ron and Nichol. Do you have a recollection of how you dealt with this information or what you thought of it at the time?

Well, $I$ 'm quite sure David told me that there was just nothing to that.

Did you have any questions, in light of this statement, about Albert Cadrain's credibility?

Well, it certainly concerned me, as to what his motive was for doing what he was doing to a friend.

Q Okay. And if we can go to 007907 . And, again, this is $I$ think where Mr. Caldwell brings up Mr. Cadrain talking about the murder in Regina, and again this is his question:
"Q Now, at any time, from the time when David and the other two came to your house the morning of, through this trip and back to Saskatoon, during any of this time, were you aware of any murder in Saskatoon?

A I was in Regina when $I$ was out in jail and they police, they asked me. That was about the same -- they asked me what time I left Saskatoon, you know.

Q Mhmn.
A And they said that was about the same time as the murder, but $I$ never thought about it.

Q Who said that?
A The policeman."
And then $I$ think you objected regarding the admissibility, presumably, of hearsay evidence. And the next page, there is a reference to the vagrancy charge, and then $I$ think Mr . Caldwell concluded his examination. So then if we can go, if we start here, if we can just scroll down this starts your cross-examination. If we can go to 007915, and there is an exchange here, I don't
know that we have to go through it all, but you were asking Mr. Cadrain about a skirmish or a fight between Ron Wilson and David Milgaard over the keys and them exchanging bad words, fighting for the keys. And, again, would that be trying to identify whether there was friction amongst these people?

Yes.
And that had been, $I$ think you've told us, one of the ideas or thoughts you had going into the proceedings, to see whether there would be some motive or some reason that Wilson or John or Cadrain might be upset at Mr. Milgaard; is that right?

Yes.
And then skip ahead to page 007934 , and this is where you question Mr. Cadrain about exactly where he saw the blood and how significant it was, and again we have been through this. You say he was wearing a sweater:
"Q ... you saw blood on the shirt?
A Yes.
Q ... you didn't see any blood on the sweater?

A No.

Q And the sweater was over the shirt?
A Yes."

And then the next page.
"Q ... as far as the trousers are concerned, you say that there was blood on the front of them?

A Yes."

And then just scroll down to the bottom, you are talking about how much, and you say it:
"A ... a bit of ink and spilling it on you."
"A It sprinkles.

Q And I gather from what you told my learned friend, that this blood was so obvious when you first saw him that you wouldn't have to really look for it to see it?

A Not when he started stripping.

Q ... And you saw it on him, did you, right when he came in?

A No, I never noticed it when he had his coat on and then $I$ noticed it and he said $I$ got some blood on my clothes."

And then $I$ think from reading the transcript, Mr.

Tallis, it sounds like Mr. Cadrain is saying he
saw blood on the shirt but not on the sweater over top, but on the shirttail and on the front of the pants, but that not a lot of it; would that be -- am I -- is that a fair read of that?

I think that's a fair assessment.
And so not -- I think he ended up describing it about an inch and a half diameter, I'll see if I can find that, $I$ think that's in there. Was it your sense that there was not, that the way he described it, that there was not a lot of blood that he saw?

That's correct. And, of course, my view was that what he did say he saw was inconsistent with what the Danchuks had said about seeing no blood. If we can skip ahead to page 007947 and, again, the question of blood comes up.

In reviewing the transcript, Mr.
Tallis, it appears that at least on Mr. Cadrain's, and perhaps some of the others, that in
questioning him, that you would go from one subject matter to another and then back to another subject matter; was that a technique that you were employing in how you cross-examined him?

A
Yes. I was employing what $I$ call, for want of a better term, the skipping technique, to try to
skip from one area to another, because in my experience sometimes a person who had -- who was sort of programmed with their story in a chronological order would not be able to carry through with it if you employed the skipping technique.

If we can then go to 007949 . And again, this is where you had asked him about seminal stains being observed, and he said:
"No, I never noticed any."
And I take it that that would be along the lines of that if the, if he had been involved with Gail Miller in a sexual act, that one might expect to see seminal stains on his clothing; is that fair? A Yes.

Q If we can go to 007951. Again, this is just asking Albert whether he saw any blood on the dash of the vehicle when they left, and we see this -and $I$ won't bring them up -- but with some of the other witnesses who were in the vehicle about whether they observed any blood or anything unusual in the car. And $I$ take it that that would be evidence that you would try and have in front of the jury along the lines that, if Mr. Milgaard had been involved in this crime and had blood on
his clothing as suggested by Albert Cadrain and
Ron Wilson, that one might expect to see it elsewhere in the car?

A
Q

BY MR. HODSON:
If we could go back to 007869 , which is the preliminary transcript, and go to 007954 , $I$ now want to go into the area of your cross-examination of Mr. Cadrain at the preliminary hearing that deals with his visit or stay in the Regina police station and his questioning regarding the Gail Miller murder.

Would it be fair to say, Mr.
Tallis, that other than what was in his statement, which $I$ showed you, that just has a very brief remark, would you have had any other information, for example from the Regina police or anywhere else, between what went on between Mr. Cadrain and the Regina police?

A No.

Q
So would this questioning at the preliminary hearing, would in part this be, for lack of a better word, discovery-type, trying to find out from him what might have happened to see how that might be used at trial; would that be a fair way to --

Yes. I was speculating as to what might have happened, and so if there was anything -So we'll follow through ---- if there was anything of value to be used at trial.

So would it be fair to say that there would be less risk in asking a question where you might not know the answer at a preliminary hearing as opposed to trial, that in other words if you got something you didn't expect it's less harmful at a prelim than at a trial, unless of course you bring out information that the Crown didn't know about; is that fair?

Yes, that's correct.
So here at the bottom, we'll just go through a couple of these, and talking about police officers that came to see him in jail in Regina, and he says:
"A There was a bunch.

Q You say a bunch of policemen?"
Next page:
"Q When we're talking about a bunch of policemen coming to see you, can you tell us how many approximately?

A They were detectives.
Q They were detectives?
A Yes.
Q By that you mean they were in plain clothes?

A Yes.

Q But they introduced themselves to you as detectives, did they?"

And again, would that be significant, the fact that detectives would be seeing a young fellow picked up on a vagrancy charge?

A
Yes.
And then to the next page, he says all of them were in the room with him, how many, and again he says:
"There was five anyway."
Five. Again, did that, was that information that surprised you, that five detectives would be in a room questioning him?

A Well $I$ thought it was quite a number.

Can you recall whether you had doubts about what he was saying?

No, I rather thought that there probably were a number. Now whether five or not would be accurate, $I$ wasn't able to tell, but $I$ certainly knew that he was consistent in saying that there were many or quite a number.

And if you can scroll down, at question 458 you ask him about whether he was manhandled or cuffed around, and he says:
"A No, but they stripped me."
You say:
"Q Oh, well that's maybe just as bad. I take it that you were stripped against your will?

A No."
And then they go on to check him and $I$ think, later on, it's about checking for some drugs. And, again, would that have been significant, this treatment in the police station, as far as your approach to Mr. Cadrain?

A
$Q$ Yes. I wanted to try to capture the atmosphere. And then the next page, please. And then at the bottom you carry on, it says:
"Q You were in a room with these officers,
was this in the room where you were staying or what room was it in?

A No, in the police station.
Q Oh, they came and took you to the police station?

A Yes.
Q And this had nothing to do with the vagrancy charge?

A No.
Q It had to do with the Gail Miller murder, as you found out?

A $\quad$ No.
Q You knew nothing about it?
A I didn't know nothing about it.
Q I see.
A They told me.
Q Oh, they told you. You learned about it?

A Yah."
And then he goes on to talk about when he came home and talked to his brother, and then you go back and say:
"Q Yes. We're not talking about that now. When you were down there with the police officers, you learned of the Gail Miller

```
murder, is that correct?
```

A Yes."

And then about who mentioned it to you, I think one or two. And then if we can skip ahead to 007960 . And again, $I$ just want to touch on the highlights, Mr. Tallis, the entire transcript is in on the record for this Inquiry as to what was questioned. But here at 501 , and this is again talking about while he was with the -- maybe just scroll up. You will see it refers to being interviewed in Regina by a police officer where you were stripped and interviewed, and then you say:
"Q And I take it that on that particular occasion you were questioned with respect to the tragic killing that had taken place in Saskatoon?

A Yes.

Q and I take it that you were asked why you left Saskatoon •••

A Yes.

Q In such a hurry?

A Yes.

Q Isn't that right?

A Yes.

Q And it was pointed out to you that it was rather strange that you had taken off the same morning?

A Yes.

Q Is that correct?
A Yes.
Q And I take it you realized that you were a suspect?

A I never took it then, but when $I$ came home, that's when $I$ put the puzzle together."

And then top of the next page:
"Q You realized that you were a suspect then?

A Yes.
Q Because of something that your mother said to you, I suppose?

A Yes, and she reminded me and I talked to my brother about it.

Q I see. Well now, coming back to when
you were talking to the police officers
in Regina, $I$ presume that you were asked whether you had seen David Milgaard that morning?

A No.

Q You weren't. Were you asked if you had seen Ron Wilson that morning?

A $\quad$ No.
Q Well, were you asked who was with you that morning?

A Oh, yah, yah, I was asked all this."
And he says:
"A You're mixing me up.
Q Just take your time. You were asked by the police officers in this room in Regina if you had seen David Milgaard that morning?

A Say that over again.
Q Were you asked if you had seen David Milgaard that morning?

A The morning -- He never said David Milgaard, he said who were you with ...

Q Who were you with.
A When you left town.
Q I see. And you told them you were with David?

A Yes."
And then it goes on about who else was there:
"Q Well, were you asked if you had seen
anything strange or unusual?
A No.
Q You weren't? In any event, you didn't make any mention to them at that time of having seen blood on David?

A No.
Q And did you make any mention to them at that time of David driving like mad?

A No, I never, no.
Q You never. Well, what did you tell them on that occasion then?

A Well, I said, you know, they were
trying to put the blame on me, so I
looked at them and I laughed, you
know, they said it was around your
place, so they just left it at that and after, when $I$ got home, $I$ put the puzzle together and I said it could be him and it could not be, but I'll just go in case."

And if we can pause there, Mr. Tallis, I think I've read through the significant parts of that. Can you elaborate a bit on where you were going with Mr. Cadrain and what you were trying to achieve with him?

A
I think the best way $I$ can put it -- and, here, this is trying to reconstruct my mental processes because, as I've told you, it's very difficult to exhume them in detail at this late stage -- but number 1, $I$ was trying to establish the potentially compulsive atmosphere that he was under or that he was in, and the fact that if he considered himself a suspect that might, of course, have affected his decision to go to the police in Saskatoon.

But at the same time, and in a sense this may sound a bit contradictory, but I wanted to leave it open to argue that, notwithstanding the compulsory atmosphere that he was in, he did not have -- he did not point to things like blood or other incriminating details when he was clearly asked about this by the police in Regina. So that, in general terms, is the best way that $I$ can put it to you in my reconstruction. Okay.

But there may be additional factors, too, that I had in mind that $I$ can't recall at this stage. And again, just on the next page, there is a few other little -- or items here where I think Mr. Cadrain said that the police also told him. You
say:
"When the blame was being put on you, how did they go about doing it."

And $I$ think this is talking about the Gail Miller murder:
"I mean, you say that they said right in your area, you left town that morning, what else was said to you?

A Well, they said, don't hang around the streets, you know, don't go back to school and go back home and he says don't hang around the streets because you will find yourself dead in an alley."

And, again, would that be along the lines as -of you told us, the compulsive or the nature or the atmosphere?

A
Yes. Now maybe that's not a good term, but it's the one that comes to my mind.
$Q$
Go to 007969. And this is again where you questioned him about when he went in in Saskatoon, again this is at the preliminary hearing, and about hearing about it when he got back to Saskatoon. And at 698, if you can actually scroll down:
"Q And after your mother had talked to you?",
and, again, this is about the murder:
"A Yes, because it had reminded me.
Q I see. Your memory came back then?
A Yes, the blood on the clothes."
You say:
"Q Yes, but when you were talking to the police officers in Regina ....

A Yes.
Q You didn't remember that?

A No, you can't think when you're starving."

And then the next page:
"Q Pardon?
A You can't think when you're starving, I guess.

Q Well, can you think when you're stripped?

A No, maybe that's why."
And, again, would that be what you've told us about trying to establish why he wouldn't have told the Regina police about his observation of blood?

A
Well, as I say, there was sort of two limbs to
this. In a sense $I$ was looking at the possibility of having a choice of which path $I$ went down.

And if we can go to 007977 , and here is a mention about the drugs, and you ask him:
"And $I$ suggest to you that really in your own mind many things aren't too clear as to what was said and done?

A Yes.

Q Because of having had grass?

A Yes.

Q Is that right?
A Yes.

Q And I take it that you in fact told the police, you have said that you don't remember things very clearly because of the use of drugs?

A Yes."

So, again, would this be what you told us earlier about his -- the reliability of his evidence? Yes.

Now to 007990. Down at the bottom you are asking him about the observations of blood, again, and you say:
"Q Were any of your brothers and sisters around when David came in?

A Yes, I had a little brother, Kenney, he was up and making noise.

Q How old is he?
A Three I guess.
Q Three?
A No, no, six.
Q And any others that were around?
A Seleen, my big sister."
Etcetera. Again, would this have been, this line of questioning, would this be related to the information you had from Mrs. Cadrain about observations that a youngster may have seen blood on David Milgaard that morning?

A
Well $I$ was trying to tread cautiously, but -- and also exclude the sister, Celine, from having been there at the relevant time.

And so when you say "exclude her", so that establish that she wasn't there and observed David's clothing before he changed?

That's right.
Were you concerned that she might come back and say that she did see blood?

A
Well, there was always that possibility.
And if she had said that she had not seen blood I think you told us earlier you had concluded that
she only saw David Milgaard, according to what he told you, after he had changed his clothes?

A
$Q$ That's right.

Next page. And there's some questions here, I think $I$ can quickly summarize it, where you ask him about whether he had been with Nichol, and he says yes, he went to Regina with the police and was questioned together with Nichol John; do you recall the significance of that information? Well, I was interested in the circumstances under which he was questioned, and by whom. If we can then now go to the -- call up 179259. And we touched on these earlier, on the first day, and I think you told us these would have been your summary notes of the preliminary hearing that you would have used to assist you in examining these witnesses at trial; is that correct?

Yes. But, more importantly, I had that index made of the transcript to have a quick reference to witnesses; and secondly, with respect to each witness -- I think I told you this before -- I set up a separate segment for trial with a draft examination-in-chief, and in -- or a draft cross-examination $I$ should say, and in that particular file $I$ would have the statements,
memoranda, and in particular a photocopy of the evidence at the preliminary with the section of the summary, the index summary, really fastened on the -- to the top of that particular segment of the transcript.

Okay. And if we can go to the next page, and I think you've told us some of this underlining would have been yours, is this handwriting yours here where it says:
"Watch this"?
I'm quite sure that would be my handwriting.
And so, again, this relates to Albert -- a summary of Albert Cadrain's evidence about his
conversation with David?
A
Yes.
Would that just be a reminder to you about an area to be careful of?

A
$Q$
And then if we can go to the last page, 179284, are you able to -- this is your handwriting, 'jacket, sweater, police in Regina'?

A
Now $I$ know the, $I$ 'm quite certain that, certainly 'jacket, sweater, police in Regina', the phone number, I'm not sure those are my --
$Q$
Actually, $I$ think it says 'page 19', --

A Yes.
Q -- '455'; that may not be yours?
A

Q

A

Q

A any other relevant information $I$ was able to dig up and which would be in my trial brief, but $I$ drafted up a cross-examination with the benefit of the preliminary hearing and any other information that I thought was available there.

And did you -- again, and I appreciate I'm asking you to go back many years, but $I$ think you told us as how you were going to try and deal with Cadrain, to challenge at least the incriminating evidence about the observation of blood. After the preliminary hearing and the information you
received at the preliminary hearing about his stay
in Regina, did you feel you were better off, neutral or worse off than before the preliminary hearing as far as dealing with his incriminating evidence?

I'm sure at the time $I$ thought $I$ was better off. On the basis of what you got out of him?

Yes.
From the --
Yeah.
And maybe that's a bad way of putting it, but the evidence that you elicited relating to his stay in Regina and what he did not tell the police there; is that fair?

That's right.
Now, at the trial, I'll just skip ahead, this is the examination-in-chief, and if we can go to 174916, again $I$ don't propose to go through this, but this is where he gives similar evidence-in-chief at the trial about his observations of blood and David changing his clothes.

Then if we can go to 174934, and
at the bottom, this is Mr. Caldwell examining:
"Q Now, once you got out of Saskatoon did

```
    you see anything of an item being
    handled in the car?
```

A Yes.
Q What was the item?

A A compact.
Q What was the first you saw of the compact?

A When - I think it was Nichol - she picked it up and says "Whose is this?"."

And then scroll down to the bottom, it talks about where everybody was sitting, and:
"Q Who said what?
A David said - no, he just grabbed it and he opened up the window and flung it out.

Q And which window?"
Can't remember. Now, he did not have this in his statements and nor do $I$ believe did he testify about this at the preliminary hearing, and in light of what Mr. Milgaard had told you about the compact, can you tell us what you could have done with -- let me rephrase that, I'm not asking it very well. The fact that he did not have it in his statement, did not testify to it at the
preliminary hearing, one option would be to challenge $h i m$ on his recollection and say why didn't you have that in your statement, why didn't you say it at the preliminary hearing; is that fair?

Yes.
In light of the fact that Mr. Milgaard told you that this event happened, did that preclude you from taking that tact with Mr. Cadrain on this point?

A

Q
Well, $I$ felt $I$ was under an ethical constraint not to suggest a fact which $I$ knew not -- that $I$ knew was not so.

Then if we can go to 174940 , and this, just for the record, $I$ think this is where, this is in the course of Mr. Cadrain's evidence and asked to raise a matter in the absence of the jury, and then the next page, and this is where Mr. Caldwell says:

> "My Lord, this my learned friend suggested is to be raised in the absence of the jury and I intend to ask the witness about a conversation between him and the accused in calgary on one of the occasions they were there during this
whole circuit."
"What does it relate to?"
Mr. Caldwell:
"It relates to remarks made by the accused to this witness about three or four things including Wilson and John what should or might be done with them.

I can give you the gist of it, My Lord."
And then go to the next page, and there's a reference I think to Mr. Tallis, you provided the reference, and this in fact relates to $I$ think the getting a gun, and you recall at the preliminary hearing and in his statement Mr. Cadrain talked about a conversation where he claims David Milgaard told him that Ron and Nichol knew too much, that he had a gun, that he was in the Mafia and that he wanted Albert Cadrain to get rid of them, and it appears here that after reading the questions the judge said:
"No."
"Your Lordship won't hear me on it?"
"I won't allow you to ask the
questions."
And so that would have been the ruling with respect to that information; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q

A
I can't recall specifically, but having read this,
I certainly infer that $I$ had told Mr. Caldwell well in advance that $I$ was going to challenge the admissibility and he of course appreciated that and indicated that the jury should retire so the matter could be dealt with. I'm inclined to the view that we followed the practice, or that $I$ did, that when you are going to raise a point of admissibility, sometimes it's conveyed to the judge and if you have authorities on which you are going to rely, you simply have the registrar or clerk take them in to him, and Chief Justice Bence I know was one of the judges that often preferred to deal with it that way because it saved time and in this case I'm quite sure that he had read the authorities on which $I$ was relying and ruled accordingly.

And, sorry, are you able to tell us either by memory or what your practices were at the time as to whether you either would have or might have submitted authorities on the admissibility of this conversation to Chief Justice Bence prior to this
issue being raised in Court?
A
In looking at the record and so forth, I'm quite sure that $I$ did.

And would that have been a subject matter that you had briefed?

Yes.
And would you have obtained cases on this issue or authorities on this issue?

Yes, I'm quite sure that $I$ had.
Then if we can go to 174950 -- actually, if we can go to 948, go back two pages, so Mr. Caldwell is examining him and he's asked him about, Mr. Cadrain said he first learned about the murder in Regina:
"... then, when you got home on the Saturday night --"

He's talking about Saskatoon,
"-- and went home as you say some of your people were home?

A Yes.
Q And without going into any details did
you learn something more about it?"
And then you said $I$ would like to make some observations, and then the members of the jury leave, if we can go to the next page, and $I$ think
that the gist of this is that Mr. Caldwell was going to ask what he learned about the murder and you then object.
"... I don't know how far this is going. We have it in evidence now that he learned of it at the Regina City Police and it seems to me that it would be improper to start rehashing it again at this stage."
"It seems to me that perhaps at the very best it is open to him to adduce when he first learned of it and he said that was in Regina; but after that it seems to me that there is no purpose and it's not relevant to adduce it."

And again just maybe on the next page, you say at the bottom:
"Well, I think that the only possible purpose that could be served by it is an attempt to bolster in the eyes of the jury the evidence of this witness and it is tantamount to in effect calling
supporting evidence to show - by
analogy, suppose a witness is in the box
and then you call a doctor or something
like that to say - well, this individual isn't bright enough to tell the truth and if he went he or she would tell the truth."

And then $I$ think the judge ended up ruling that he would allow some questions on that. Are you able to recall this issue, Mr. Tallis, or elaborate on any of that?

Well, the only thing $I$ can say, having read it, I certainly wanted to contain the scope of this type of inquiry because $I$ did not think that it was properly admissible, and a great deal, $I$ must say, would depend on how far Mr. Caldwell intended to try to go. I wasn't sure of the scope of the proposed inquiry and $I$ wanted to deal with it without having to stand up in the presence of the jury and say $I$ challenge the admissibility of that evidence. I framed my approach as being a point where $I$ would like to make some observations in the absence of the jury.

And was your concern that Mr . Cadrain would get into what was told to him by others; namely, hearsay about the murder?

A
Yes, I was.
And the next page, $I$ think there's only a couple
more questions, he's asked:
"... when you got home ... did you learn something more about the ... murder than you had learned in Regina?

A Yes.
Q And did you go to the police and tell
them what you knew?
A Yes.
Q When was that?"
The next day, and then that was the end of the examination. Was there anything there in those questions that caused you concern?

Well, I didn't think there was any basis on which the judge would disallow those questions. If we can go to 174956, please, and again this is your cross-examination of Mr. Cadrain, and this is where you have him identify the size of the blood that he observed and you say I'm not going into the colour now, you talk about a pen being shaken just like a sprinkle effect:
"A Yes.
Q . . Rather than blotches? Is that correct?

A No - blotches ... a big blotch."
And then you say.
"Q . . You told me about like a sprinkle?
A Yes - well the same thing ...
Q Pardon?
A Just about the same thing.
Q No, no; when I speak of a blotch I mean
a big area. You previously described it as sort of a sprinkle effect?"
"Q And that's your evidence here under oath today?

A Yes.

Q And no sign of blood on his shorts. . ?"
And then the next page:
"A . . I never noticed any."
"Q Well, you were right there looking?
A Yes.
Q And you saw no sign of seminal stains fresh or otherwise?

A I never noticed any."
And then:
"Q And even a week or two after you got back to Regina you had no recollection whatsoever of seeing any blood on any of David's clothes, did you? Isn't that correct, Witness?

A Yes.

Q That's the truth?
A Yes.
Q And as a matter of fact you had every opportunity to recollect that for the police in Regina, didn't you?

A I never thought nothing of it.
Q No; you were trying to tell them the truth to the best of your ability at that time, weren't you?

A Yes.
Q And at that time you had no recollection of seeing any blood on David?

A No.
Q And that was when you were being questioned?

A Yes.
Q About the Gail Miller murder?
A Yes, but I could tell you why."
And let me just pause there. Again, that would have been your approach with Mr. Cadrain then, to try and establish that he had no recollection of seeing the blood two weeks after the incident when he was questioned by the Regina police?

A Yes.
And then the next page -- he says I can tell you
why, and then the Court says:
"Well you go ahead."
You say:
"I'm not stopping you."
And then Mr . Caldwell has a word with you and you confer, you say:
"In light of what my learned friend has said to me that ought not to be
pursued."
Are you able to tell us what that might have referred to, either by recollection or by looking at that?

A

Q
No, but $I$ infer that probably Mr. Caldwell knew that he would be going into hearsay which he, Mr. Caldwell, thought would probably be inadmissible. Okay. And then just down at the bottom, this is you continuing:
"Q And did the police question you in connection with this matter before you went to jail?

A Yes.
Q And this was in Regina?
A Yes.
Q And as $I$ understand it they were plain clothes police officers ...

A Yes."
And then the next page:
"Q And it was at this time that you were asked whether you had any - well, you were asked whether or not you had seen any blood on David's clothes that morning . . ?

A . . They never asked me.
Q You say they didn't ask you?
A They asked me like there was a murder somewheres around there - around Avenue "N" or somewheres - and they said "you left about the same time" and all this; but it never rang no bell then.

Q I see; well now, as a matter of fact they had you in for questioning because you had left town in such a hurry?

A No, because they were --
Q I see; but were there about five policemen there with you in a room?

A Yes.
Q And I take it that you were being questioned about the Gail Miller murder?

A Yes, I was questioned.

Q And you were endeavouring to tell them the truth to the best of your recollection at the time?

A Yes.

Q And at that time you had no recollection of this blood that we are talking about here today - isn't that correct?

A I don't think so."
So again that would be along the same lines as we have discussed?

A
$Q$
And then the next page, you question him and go through a series of questions and answers here about the police and you start up:
"Q And now, as $I$ understand it, they were going at you pretty hard there, $I$ mean, you weren't being worked over
physically?
A No.
Q But you were being worked over in other ways?

A Yes.
Q Did they strip you?
A Yes.
Q And this was in a cell, was it?

A No.
Q Or in an interviewing room?
A Yes."

And again, would this be along the lines as you
told us when we looked at the preliminary hearing evidence, sort of the coercive atmosphere that he might have been under?

Yes.

And then to page 174962 , and here you ask him again about the Regina police:
"Q And inquiries were made of you as to who your companions were?

A Yes."

And you mentioned Nichol John, Ron Wilson and David Milgaard and he answered yes to each of those. Remember the names of the officers? No.
"Q But in any event $I$ take it that it's fair to say that you realized at that time that you were a suspect?

A No - well, yes.

Q Yes; you did, didn't you?
A Yes."

And then were there any blood tests or hair samples? In Regina? Yes. And then he says no on the next page. earlier you were trying to establish that he thought he was a suspect and that that might be a motive for him to turn on his friends; is that correct?

Yes, for shifting blame.
And then to the next page -- sorry, back to the previous page, and then you say:
"Q And as a matter of fact initially you sort of laughed at them when they suggested that anyone in your group had had anything to do with this murder?

A Yes.
Q And you indicated to them that it just couldn't be as far as you were concerned?

A I can't remember, I'm not sure; I can't say.

Q Well, you said words to that effect?
A Yes.
Q And at that time you were endeavouring to tell them the truth to the best of your ability and recollection?

A Yes; yes."
And so again $I$ think that -- anything to
elaborate on that, Mr. Tallis, or is that similar to what we have talked about as far as your approach and using Mr. Cadrain's visit with the Regina police to discredit his later evidence of observation of blood?

Oh, I think you've fairly covered it. The only thing I would make, observation $I$ would make is on the odd spot on this transcript there is some marginal handwriting here and there, that's not my handwriting.

And I --
And I'm sure that's understood.
Yes, and in fact the Commission used this version of the transcript, I'm not sure whose version it is, but the handwriting was put on later by someone else, so $I$ appreciate you bringing that to our attention, and $I$ think we can ignore the handwriting on the side.

Then again when you get back to, just scroll down, you then talk about his return to Saskatoon and he says, as far as being a suspect:
"A Never meant nothing to me anyway.
Q I see; it never meant anything to you
anyway. Well then, when you got back to

Saskatoon you in effect learned that you were still a suspect?

A No.
Q You didn't?
A No.
Q You had no idea that you were a suspect?
A No.
Q And this was never intimated to you?
A What does intimate mean?
Q Well, it was never suggested to you that you were a suspect?

A Yes, it was suggested on the last - on the preliminary hearing; but well, you've got me mixed up."

And then the next page, again a bit of an exchange here about whether he was a suspect, and:
"Q At the preliminary hearing I suggest to you that you told me that after you returned to Saskatoon you found out you were still a suspect?

A No, you told me that.
Q No, but just a moment - just a moment you were asked whether or not you found out you were a suspect and did you not
indicate . . ?
A . . I said yes then.
Q Fine; and you were under oath at that time?

A Yes?

Q And did that worry you?
A No."
"Q And didn't it worry you in Regina when you were being interviewed by these people?

A No."

And then just down at the bottom:
"Q I take it that it wasn't worry that would cause you to be forgetful in Regina when the police were interrogating you?

A No.

Q Well now, you were questioned by police officers from Saskatoon in Regina, weren't you?

A They brought me down to Regina for questioning - or just brought me down, I guess.

Q Well, when was this?"
"A Yes, after I went to the police and told them everything."

And again can you explain why you would have brought in this issue about the city police later taking him to Regina?

A

Q

Well, $I$ was trying, $I$ think there, to establish that he wasn't attributing the interrogation techniques and so on to his, causing his forgetfulness.

Okay. And then if we can go to 031255, please, and this is the transcript of your address to the jury, Mr. Tallis, and when $I$ was dealing with Dr. Ferris about this $I$ identified, and I'll identify it again, this transcript was prepared in 1992 by a court reporter -- if you can just go to the next page -- and it talks about dots being in there, where several words, a single word or several words were missing in the transcript, so $I$ just want to point that out when $I$ take you to this, in some cases it's not complete, but if we can go to 031282, and this is page 24 of your, the transcript of your address to the jury and $I$ just want to go over what you said based on this transcript to the jury about Albert Cadrain's evidence, and you say:
"We have a series of events here that,
in my submission merit very careful
scrutiny, and $I$ suggest to you that they simply cannot be credited when tested reasonably."

And that may well be credible. "You see --" I think it should be.

Credible.
"You see, we have the suggestion at Cadrain's that David was in a rush, and

I must emphasize this, a rush to get out
of town, and yet we have very clear
evidence that this is not the case, and even after the car was fixed. Now my
learned friend cannot have it both ways and you must, I suggest, look at the
other evidence, look at the factual
situation and not simply divorce just
one aspect of it from the other."
I think this refers to Albert Cadrain's evidence that they were in a hurry, and I didn't take you through the other evidence, but it related to getting the car fixed, looking for Leonard Woytowich, looking for Albert's girlfriend's boots and the trip around town that day. Would that be what you were referring to there?

A

Q

Yes. I think we probably discussed that yesterday
when $I$ was giving evidence and that's certainly what $I$ was referring to.

And if we can go to the top of the next page, you say to the jury:
"Now, one of the areas that $I$ suggest to you must be scrutinized very carefully is the allegation of Cadrain that there was blood on David's clothes, and I am going to put the position as fairly and frankly as $I$ can to you on this. When you are assessing this evidence, I say to you this: Isn't it a strange thing that this boy had no memory, had no memory of that blood not for a few days but for weeks -- and remember that in his case he was questioned by the police in Regina and he does not suggest that he was holding back on them, no suggestion of that. His evidence as I recall was -- and he changed it from the preliminary hearing -- was that he was trying to tell the truth at that time, trying to tell them what he knew, and if I recollect his evidence correctly, he
laughed at them, and was quite clear in his mind at that time that nobody in the car had anything to do with this."

And scroll down a bit:
"Now it is true . . ."
And a break in the transcription:
". . . he was a suspect himself, he
comes back to Saskatoon and you may well
infer that he considered himself a
suspect but $I$ say to you ..."
And then a break,
"... that this is something that warrants very careful consideration ..."

And then the next page, you say here:
"And as $I$ understand it his position here is, and he was being quite sincere about it, and accordingly $I$ say to you that this is evidence which you are entitled and ought to reject, having regard to the circumstances that were outlined in the case before this court. And in this connection you may remember that he was very clear on this, that when he was being questioned in Regina he had no recollection of any garment,
no recollection whatsoever."
And $I$ think that's the end of it. So again, would that fairly summarize, Mr. Tallis, what you were, the position you were taking with respect to Albert Cadrain's evidence and how you attempted to either undermine or minimize the effects of that?

Yes, and $I$ think if $I$ recall correctly, later on $I$ was able to persuade the judge to charge additionally on that point, but that's a separate matter.

Yeah. I will take you -- I decided to do the charge to the jury when we've gone through some of these witnesses and we'll go through some of that --

A I understand. -- because they overlap a bit, but I think there is mention there and $I$ will certainly bring it up for you when we get to that point.

If $I$ can now turn to Ron Wilson.
Can you tell us, sir, your -- and you've already talked a bit about Mr. Wilson, but again, your general impressions of him as a witness, not only what he had to say, but how he had to say it and when he said it?

A
Well, as I said to you earlier, I assessed him as being a treacherous-type person and, looking back, I have no doubt that one of the things that certainly influenced me was how, at the trial, he certainly "improved", if $I$ can put improved in quotation marks, on his testimony on a crucial factor and that is the time element. We've discussed that, so $I$ don't want to belabour it, but that's one of the things that $I$ certainly do recall.

And did you get any sense, and I think we touched on this earlier, based on what David Milgaard told you about the facts of that morning, I think you told us that Ron Wilson, at least in his latter statements, there was a number of items that $I$ think you said, based on David's version of events, were lies; would that be fair? Yes.

And can you tell us, did you explore with David Milgaard, or what did you consider as to reasons that might motivate Ron Wilson to lie?

Well, $I$ think I've outlined the areas that $I$ explored with David and there wasn't anything that one could, that he could directly suggest. I suppose $I$ was the one who was doing the
speculating.
Did you get any sense, and let's put aside theories and talk about what you observed throughout the course of the proceedings, did you get any sense that the police may have improperly influenced Ron Wilson or coerced him to give evidence that was not truthful?

Well, $I$ think one of the reasons $I$ wanted to try and elicit information from Inspector Roberts was to see what had happened because $I$ knew that Mr. Roberts had administered the polygraph to him, but as I've told you earlier, my assessment of Mr. Roberts was quite negative $I$ guess is the best way I can put it and certainly didn't assist in throwing any light on what had been done in the test or any preliminary questions or post-polygraph questions and so forth. Was your, if you can tell us your understanding of when Ron Wilson's, and I'll go through these statements with you, but $I$ think what we'll see is an initial statement back on March 3rd, 1969 and then statements, May 23 rd and 24 th, 1969 that were incriminating of Mr. Milgaard. Do you recall whether you were aware that his incriminating statements came after his polygraph session with

Inspector Roberts, would you have been aware of that?

If $I$ wasn't aware, I may have been suspicious because $I$ think that's why $I$ wanted to interview Mr. Roberts.

And we have not dealt with the motel room reenactment witnesses, Craig Melnyk and George Lapchuk; however, the evidence that is before the Commission is that in fact it was Ron Wilson who volunteered the names of Melnyk and Lapchuk to the police when they were driving him up to the trial in January, 1970 and $I$ think the evidence is that that's how the Crown and the police became aware of it. Were you aware at the time of trial that Mr. Wilson had played a role in having that evidence and information communicated to the authorities?

A

Q
No, I was not aware of that, or had not heard of it until actually you mentioned that there had been testimony adduced at this Commission Inquiry to that effect.

And can you tell us, I appreciate you didn't know it at the time, but if you had, would that have influenced you in any way about what you might have thought of Mr. Wilson or how you might have
approached him?

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
Well, I thought that, particularly after we cut down that time factor in a very significant way, $I$ felt that he really was confirming my assessment of him. Now, I don't like maligning people, but I have to say to you, as $I$ said this morning in all Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv back-stabbing could be another term, but -Did you have any trust in what Mr. Wilson might have to say? demeanour, but he certainly in my view, in the light of what David had told me about things, $I$ considered him to be treacherous, maybe Meyer CompuCourt Reporting
candour, that was my assessment of him.
And did you have any sense as to why he was doing that or what might have prompted him to do that? No, I was never able to put my finger on it, one can always speculate, and David was not able to suggest anything like that. There was no suggestion of any drug deals that had gone bad or any friction over girlfriends or anything with him.

Did you get any sense that Mr. Wilson was a reluctant witness, someone who was there and didn't want to be there?

He didn't come across that way.
How did he come across?
Well he came across as though he was there and he, I think he wanted to portray that he was there giving evidence that was incriminating, and that's all there was to it.

As far as your approach in dealing with Mr.
Wilson, would it be fair to say that you would have looked at the statements that he provided to the police to give you some background and some idea as to where you might go with him on cross-examination?

A
Yes. And I had made, while I don't have the
details in my head, I had made inquiries, as I told you, in Regina, and in particular $I$ learned somehow that he was coming up in court on something as well. And while $I$ told you the other day that he wasn't actually testifying, I remember being there for some type of proceeding, and then later getting information, some information about him, which I'm sure I put in the file. And the thing that $I$ remember particularly was the charge of conspiracy to defraud, or something like that, and $I$ was able to get very clear material that David was not the co-conspirator. I think I mentioned this to you earlier, and $I$ felt that $I$ was able to put that question near the end and not overstep the mark, as far as putting David's character in issue.

Okay. If we could go to -- and I'll take you to that part in the transcript later, Mr. Tallis. 006707 , please. And this is the front page of the March 3rd, '69 statement, if we can go to page 709. So this is Mr. Wilson's, it's a typed version of his statement, it's March 3rd, '69, and it's the first statement that he gave to Inspector Riddell of the RCMP. And I think you've told us, Mr. Tallis, that you would have, number one,
received a copy of this statement, we saw a letter August 15 th, 1969 from Mr. Caldwell to you enclosing a copy of this; and $I$ think you've also testified that you would have been aware of its contents on August 4 th, 1969 , or possibly even had another copy of it at that time; is that correct? Yes.

And would it be fair to say that you would have spent some time going over this statement, both on your own, and with David Milgaard?

Yes, we certainly discussed all the background that's here.

And would you have looked at this statement, or reviewed it, with a view to determining how best to use this statement at trial?

Yes.
And let's just go through parts of it and I'll ask you a bit further on that. Now this is the same day that David Milgaard gave his statement to Mr. Karst in Winnipeg and Nichol John gave her first statement March 11th, 1969. Do you recall either discussing with David Milgaard or trying to ascertain whether or not David Milgaard, Ron Wilson, and Nichol John spoke to each other after their return to Saskatchewan in early February, in
other words talked to each other before they gave statements to the police in early March 1969 ? I'm sure $I$ talked to him about it, and $I$ think the answer was that they had not, that he told me they had -- that he had not been talking to them. Okay. So if we can go down, I just want to go through parts of this, we have been through this before. Mr. Wilson, again, he talks about the Peace Hill district. I think you told us on Thursday that you recalled Pleasant Hill being used by Mr. Milgaard; do you have any recollection of Peace Hill coming up in your discussions with him as being an area where they may have been looking for?

Well I, my recollection is that David used the term "Pleasant Hill", but, you know, that's so long ago, he might have said Peace Hill, but I think it was Pleasant Hill.

Again, if we could just scroll up, and he talks about arriving in Saskatoon on the morning of January 31, '69 at 5:00 or 6:00 a.m., began driving around looking for Albert's house and then we ended up going down this alley and we came across this car that was stuck in the middle of the day, and $I$ think this is the Danchuks. If you
go to the next page, we won't go through all of it, but it does describe -- or the first incident that he describes in the statement is getting stuck at Danchuks, tried for about an hour to get the car out, invited Dave and Nichol into the house. Then to the next page. And then he goes on, $I$ won't go through it, but he goes on to talk about getting their car fixed, then driving to Albert's house, and then at the top -- there is no mention of the Trav-a-leer Motel in the narrative, I won't bother going through it, Mr. Tallis, you can take my word for it as to what's in this statement, we have been through it many times. He then says:
"... started talking about this trip and Albert decided to come with us. Dave went out to get his suitcase because he wanted to change his clothes as they were dirty. When he did this, he drove the car around the block so that it would be parked on the same side as the house. At this time the line to my transmission broke."

And then, down at the bottom, it says:
"The reason Dave changed his clothes was
because they were dirty. I changed my pants because $I$ spilled battery acid on
them. At no time during the time we were in Saskatoon was Dave Milgaard out of my sight for more than one or two minutes, the one time being when he drove the car around the block. This would be well after daylight. I never knew of Dave to have a knife. I am convinced that Dave Milgaard never left our company during the morning we were in Saskatoon. The coat he was wearing, a brown one, is now at my place as it also has acid burns and the pair of pants he changed is now in my car in the back seat."

And at the bottom:
"All during this trip there was never any mention about the murder of a girl in Saskatoon. In fact, I didn't even know about this murder until the police told me today."

Now $I$ went through, quickly, parts of that, Mr. Tallis. You told us yesterday, when we were dealing with the statement that David Milgaard
had given to the police, that in looking at that statement and how you might use it or deal with it, that in addition to what is said in the statement it was also important how it was said and, as well, significant omissions in the statement; do you recall giving that evidence? Yes, I do.

And would the same apply when you, as defence counsel for David Milgaard, are looking at the statement of a witness that's going to testify against Mr. Milgaard?

A

Now if we can go through Ron Wilson's statement and just what's in it and not in it compared to the version of events and the facts as Mr. Milgaard explained them to you, and again $I$ will state as $I$ stated when $I$ did with David Milgaard's statement, this would be -- I take it you would be familiar, Mr. Tallis, with the fact that police statements -- that police officers have different styles in recording statements; is that fair? Yes.

And so if it's a question and answer, or what is in a statement might be based not on what the witness stated, but more on what was asked of him

```
or her; is that fair?
```

With that caveat in mind, if we go through this statement, what $I$ think we can identify as not in this statement but is a fact that you were instructed by Mr. Milgaard, and $I$ want to ask you whether those would be considered significant omissions. The first one would be the theft of a battery in Regina before they left, and the second one would be the elevator break-in, and it -- it's been said that it might be understandable why a young person in jail might not want to volunteer criminal activity to a police officer. Putting that aside, would the fact that those two items are not in this statement, would that be considered to be a significant omission?

A
$Q$
And, just in the context, is it fair to say that that omission might be explainable by the circumstances, in other words that Mr. Wilson was in jail and that he might not want to provide incriminating information to the officer; is that fair?

A Yes. That's, you know, --

And that --
-- that's a suggestion that $I$ can't disagree with.
Now we've heard from some witnesses as well that that goes further, that if this group had been involved in a murder, or one of them had been, they might also not want to volunteer that as well; is that fair?

I suppose that's the other side of the coin that some people might advance.

And, again, the next point would be the talk of robbery and purse snatching on the trip down. In the later statement from Ron Wilson to the police that's included. I think your evidence was, based on what David Milgaard had told you, I think you told us you couldn't recall him telling you about that discussion on the trip but he did tell you about what he thought when they saw the lady for directions; is that fair?

Yes, yes.
And, again, the fact that Mr. Wilson -- or that that information is not in the statement; would that be a significant omission in your view as defence counsel trying to decide how to use this statement?

A I think that was a significant omission.

And, as well, the statement does not talk about the vehicle -- maybe we could just have the statement back up for a moment -- does not mention anything about the vehicle, Ron Wilson, David Milgaard, and Nichol John, stopping a woman and asking for directions that morning when they arrived; would you view that as being a significant omission?

Yes, well that was, $I$ would tie that in with the earlier discussion we had a moment ago about looking the lady over.

Okay. But just the fact that on the trip that morning they actually stopped a lady and asked for directions -- and let's go back a bit, I think, and Inspector Riddell is deceased, he has not been here to testify, but $I$ believe the evidence is that Ron Wilson was being questioned because David Milgaard was considered a suspect, and they were questioning him about their activities this morning -- or that morning to try and determine whether Mr. Milgaard might have been involved in the crime, $I$ think that's the evidence.

A
$Q$ Okay.

So again, in that context, would the fact that this statement, for whatever reason, does not
include the reference to the Milgaard, the David Milgaard vehicle stopping a woman and asking for directions in the morning, would that be a significant omission in your view?

A

Q

There is also no mention in this statement about attending at the Trav-a-leer Motel to get a map; would that be something that you would view as a significant omission? omission in your view in looking at this statement as David Milgaard's defence counsel?

Yes.

A Yes.

Q
Now there are a couple of statements in here that are not omissions but statements that may well be at odds with what David Milgaard told you, and I suppose it depends on, if we can go to page 4 of 006712 , it depends on what Mr. Wilson observed. But there were two where Mr. Wilson says:
"I never knew of Dave to have a knife.", and I think you have told us that Mr. Milgaard told you that he did have a knife on the trip?

Yes, I've described that for you.
And now I suppose it's possible that Mr. Wilson was not aware of that and that might explain why he would say that; is that fair?

Yes.
And on the previous page Mr. Wilson says:
"At no time during the time that we were in Saskatoon was Dave Milgaard out of my sight for more than one or two minutes,
...",
then the next page:
"... the one time being when he drove the car around the block. This would be well after daylight."

And that's the incident at Cadrains. Again, I
don't want to get into wordsmithing, but if this is read that "the only time that David Milgaard left my sight was only for one or two minutes and that's when he drove around the block", again, would that be inconsistent with what David Milgaard had told you?

A
$Q$

A

Q
A
$Q$
Right. If we can maybe just have page 3 at the top and just read it again, $I$ think what -- no, sorry, the bottom of page 3 and the top half of -thank you. If this is read, he says:
"At no time during the time we were in
Saskatoon was Dave Milgaard out of my
sight for more than one or two minutes, course, doesn't really cover that.
$\qquad$
the one time being when he drove the car around the block."

And that's referring to the incident at Cadrains?

A
Q

A
Q

A

Q
A

A Yes.

And I suppose if that's, if what that statement says is that that was the only time that he was out of my sight, that would be inconsistent with what Mr. Milgaard told you; is that fair? Yes.

And I suppose one might also read it by saying "he may have been out of my sight on more than one occasion for one or two minutes, and the one time was when he drove around the block"? And, again, I don't want to get into wordsmithing, but I take it that that would be an issue that might be inconsistent, is that fair, depending on how one reads that? Okay. And, again, would that be inconsistent with what David Milgaard had told you? Yes.

Q

A

Were you concerned about Mr. Wilson being asked the question by either Crown counsel or the Judge as to the reasons for the omissions in the statement?

A

Well $I$ knew it lacked significant details, and with the utmost respect to those who have a contrary view, $I$ didn't see it as that simple.

Okay. We'll maybe pick up on that tomorrow morning.
(Adjourned at 4:30 p.m.)
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 24127:19, 24128:7, | $\begin{aligned} & 23942: 6,23954: 5, \\ & 23964: 18,23975: 14, \end{aligned}$ | 24138:19 <br> endeavoured [1] $23952 \cdot 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23928:14, 23930:1, } \\ & \text { 23937:8, 23937:16, } \end{aligned}$ | 24074:17 examination [31] 23936.7 23937.6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24134:22, 24135:4, } \\ & 24136: 1,24136: 13 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Drug [1] - 23939:15 | 23985:13, 23993:13 | endeavouring | $\begin{aligned} & 23939: 3,23939: 18, \\ & \text { 23939:23, 23942:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23936: 7,23937: 6, \\ & 23941: 19,23943: 12, \end{aligned}$ |
| g [4]-23939:25 | 24000:9, 24004:12 | 24108:1, 24110 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23943:25, 23955:12, } \\ & \text { 23960:4, 23960:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23941: 19,23943: 12, \\ & 23954: 23,23996: 4, \end{aligned}$ |
| 23940:6, 24062:24, | 23:13, 24023:1 | ended [4]-24016: |  | 23996:6, 23998:16,24007:24, 24015:19, |
| 24123:7 | 24027:24, 24030:1 | 24076:6, 24102 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23960:4, 23960:23, } \\ & \text { 23963:21, 23964:4, } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| [9]-23939:20 | 9:21, 24099:23 | 24 | $23964: 23,23965: 16,$ | 24007:24, 24015:19, 24018:20, 24044:4, |
| 23940:9, 24051:15, | 24106:11, 24118:6 | 3969:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 23965: 24,23966: 17, \\ & 23966: 24,23969: 20, \end{aligned}$ | 24044:21, 24048:9, |
| 24063:2, 24063:6, | 24125:22, 24137:2 | ]-23936: |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24053:25, 24058:16, } \\ & \text { 24067:11, 24069:6, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 24063:9, 24081:18, <br> 24090:4, 24090:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { elaborate [6] - } \\ & 24011: 10,24016: 1 \end{aligned}$ | engagement ${ }_{[1]}$ 23993:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23973:23, 23976:15, } \\ & \text { 23980:12, 23980:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24067:11, 24069:6, } \\ & \text { 24071:11, 24073:21, } \end{aligned}$ |
| - 23996:1 | 24016:14, 24086:23 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24073:24, 24078:13, } \\ & \text { 24092:23, 24092:24, } \end{aligned}$ |
| ed [2] - 240 | 11 | 23961.17, 23962 | 23983:24, 23987:18, |  |
| 24013:19 | elaboration 24044:12 | $239$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23990: 21,24003: 25, \\ & \text { 24005:9, 24005:12, } \end{aligned}$ | 24092:23, 24092:24, <br> 24094:17, 24095:17, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { during [19]-23953:22, } \\ & \text { 23988:4, 23988:7, } \end{aligned}$ | elapse [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { enlarge }[1]-24006: 17 \\ & \text { entire }[1]-24083: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24009:21, 24016:6, } \\ & \text { 24019:19, 24019:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24103: 11,24103: 16, \\ & 24123: 24 \end{aligned}$ |
| 23993:8, 24000:10 | psed [1] - 24021:2 | ely [1] - 23953:24 |  | 24123:24 examination-in-chief |
| 24004:13, 24006:6, | cted [2] - 23937:3 | ety [1] - 24021:9 | 24025:24, 24027:20, | examinations [2] - |
| 24006:7, 24008:16, | 23949:10 | 23 | $\begin{aligned} & 24032: 12,24032: 21, \\ & \text { 24032:25, 24036:14, } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 24014:24, 24034:15, | nt [1] - 24 | 23952:14, 23952:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24032:25, 24036:14, } \\ & \text { 24037:18, 24037:19, } \end{aligned}$ | 23994:24, 23995:5 examine [3]-23999:7, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24051: 6,24073: 4, \\ & 24097: 25,24128: 3, \end{aligned}$ | elevator [5] - 23964 23965:6, 23973:16, | 24117:19 | 24037:18, 24037:19, 24037:21, 24038:2, | $\begin{aligned} & 24049: 8,24137: 2 \\ & \text { examined }[3] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 28:11, 24128:18 | 23973:21, 24130:10 |  | 24041:9, 24041:14, 24041:19, 24043:16, |  |
| 24134:17, 24135:23 | 23942:10 | entrance |  | $\begin{aligned} & 24031: 21,24039: 10 \\ & 24076: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| duty [5] - 23976:20, | 4120 | $24000: 20,24016$ |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23995: 13,23995: 14, \\ & 23995: 15 \end{aligned}$ | [2] - 23935:4 | erected [1] - 24008: | 24044:1, 24044:22, | 24076:23 <br> examining [7] - |
|  | eliminate | Esq[2]-23925:7, | 24046:6, 24046:13, <br> 24046:16, 24046:17, | $\begin{aligned} & 24067: 9,24070: 20, \\ & 24092: 16,24095: 24, \\ & \text { 24100:12 } \end{aligned}$ |
| E | 25 | essence [1] - 23977:3 | $24046: 25,24047: 13$ |  |
|  | $23979: 23,23979: 24$ | ential [1] - 23994:12 | 24047:19, 24048:6, | $\begin{aligned} & 24100: 12 \\ & \text { example }[18]-23941: 5, \end{aligned}$ |
| early [12]-23 | 23980:5 | $23929: 24,23933:$ | 24048:10, 24054:7, | 23943:2, 23945:5, |
| 23973:24, 23974:11, | [ ${ }_{1}$ - 23965:17 | 23997:1 | 24054:14, 24056:1 <br> 24057.22, 24062.8 | 23963:6, 23964:9, 23975:8, 23979:2, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23994: 10,24003: 4, \\ & \text { 24003:19, 24010:15, } \end{aligned}$ | elsewhere [1] - 24078:3 | 23998:2, 24035:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24057:22, 24062:8, } \\ & \text { 24070:10, 24073:18 } \end{aligned}$ | 23975:8, 23979:2, <br> 23984:12, 23985:20, |
| 24015:14, 24037:4, | 23932:8 | 24043:4 | $24077: 23,24090: 19$ | 23985:22, 23985:24, |
| 24063:6, 24125:25, | otiona | establish [8] - 23952:7, | 24093:2, 24093:13 | 24000:16, 24000:22, |
| 24126:2 |  | $23977: 25,24087: 5,$ | 24094:12, 24094:2 | 24024:23, 24031:8, |
| easier [2] - 23972:25, | emphasize [2] | 24089:22, 24091:1 | 24095:5, 24095:12, | 24031:25, 24041:14, 24078:22 |
| 24004:8 <br> easy [2] - 24037:5, | 23983:5, 24115:10 | $05: 21,24110: 2$ | 24095:20, $24097: 1$ 24101:5, $24101: 21$ | except [1] - $24001: 17$ <br> exchange [3] - 23950:9, |
| 24043:21 |  |  | 24101:23, 24102:1 |  |
| eaten [1] - 23988:9 | ployed [1] - 24077:5 | 24037: | 04:8, 24109:6 | 24073:25, 24112:16 |
| Ed[1] - 23965:22 | employing [2] | Etcetera [1]-24091:9 | 114 | 23949:19 |
| Eddie [1] - 23925:8 | 24076:23, 24076:24 | etera [3] - 23974:24, |  |  |
| Edmonton [1] - 23944:5 | on [1] - 23954 :9 | 75:13, $23991: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24115:19, } 24115: \\ & 24116: 2,24116: 1 \end{aligned}$ | exchanging ${ }_{[1]}$ -24074:4 |
| $240$ | enclose [2]-23981:11, | cal [5] - 23927:25 | 24116:20, 24116:2 |  |
| Edward [1] - 23923:7 | 23982:3 | 23933:20, 23948:24, 24031:1, 24097:11 | 24117:18, 24118:5 | exclude [2] - 24091:15, $24091: 17$ |
| effect [13] - 23942:25, |  | $23994$ | 24120:7, $24121: 8$ | excuse [1] - 24054:22 <br> excused [2] - 24053:19, |
| 24022:11, 24022:20 | 24059 | 9:1 |  |  |
| 24056:7, 24056:24, | encou | 24032 |  | 24053:20 |
| 24062:24, 24101:22, 24103:20, 24104:7, | 24005:1 | $23,24086: 3$ |  | Executive [1] - 23924:3 <br> exhibit [2]-23988:17, |
| 24110:19, 24112:1, |  | 24097:8, 24109:17 | 24137:3 |  |
| $24121: 21,24136: 22$ | 42:22, 23973:11, | 29:8 | Evidence[1] - 23978:18 | 24122:14 |
| effects [1] - 24118:7 | 24036:14, 24050:12, | 24119:17, 24129:15 | 24095:20 | exhibits [2]-23954:23, 23955:2 |
| effort [1] - 24024:23 | 24068:23, 24103:10 | eventually [1] - 24071 | 24095:20 | exhume [1] - 24087:4 <br> exhumed [1] - 23936:14 |
| either [21] - 23936:20, | $24118: 2,24124: 14$ |  | exact [1] - 23965:1 <br> exactly [2] - 24054:22, |  |
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| ```24038:24, 24039:8 forwarded [2] 23983:1, 23988:2 four [2]-23968:4, 24098:6 \\ Fox[1] - 23925:8 frame [2]-24038:9, 24039:11 framed [1]-24102:18 Frank[2] - 23984:12, 24024:18 frankly [2] - 24050:6, 24116:11 \\ Fraser[1] - 23981:10 \\ Frayer 1] \(^{1}\) - 23925:10 \\ free [1] - 23932:20 frequency [1] - 24004:2 fresh [1] - 24104:17 friction [4]-24054:18, 24066:4, 24074:6, 24123:8 \\ friend [11] - 23944:4, 23995:22, 24044:6, 24057:11, 24057:23, 24072:21, 24075:14, 24097:20, 24106:7, 24115:14, 24138:10 friends [5] - 24023:18, 24046:24, 24052:9, 24061:18, 24110:4 frighten [1] - 24026:18 front [16] - 23948:18, 23962:6, 23984:25, 23999:11, 24015:1, 24050:23, 24057:21, 24059:24, 24060:4, 24060:7, 24063:1, 24068:11, 24075:6, 24076:2, 24077:23, 24124:19 full [2] - 23994:23, 24010:14 funding [1] - 23984:7 funds [2] - 23974:2, 23974:3 funeral [3]-24005:25, 24016:2, 24019:1 furnished [1] - 23958:1 Furthermore[2] 24013:7, 24016:7``` <br> G <br> Gail[24] - 23935:12, 23957:16, 23958:22, 23975:9, 23981:7, 24000:2, 24002:8, 24003:24, 24004:18, 24005:14, 24005:18, |  |  | ```24094:3, 24111:9, 24111:10, 24111:15, 24111:18 handwritten [2] - 23970:13, 24007:14 hang [2] - 24088:9, 24088:12 hard [6] - 23941:21, 23948:8, 23957:25, 23993:7, 24016:9, 24108:16 hardly [1] - 24053:18 harmful [1] - 24079:16 hazard [1] - 23960:17 head [2] - 24070:6, 24124:1 hear [3] - 23945:25, 24028:3, 24098:21 heard [13] - 23943:25, 23957:4, 23962:12, 23965:24, 23983:23, 24020:13, 24025:24, 24045:14, 24045:16, 24048:11, 24121:18, 24131:3 hearing [69] - 23930:14, 23930:16, 23942:18, 23947:3, 23947:9, 23947:11, 23947:12, 23955:25, 23960:10, 23962:13, 23965:16, 23969:11, 23970:20, 23971:1, 23971:12, 23972:11, 23972:15, 23973:4, 23978:10, 23991:17, 23991:24, 23992:8, 23992:16, 23993:15, 23995:4, 24007:17, 24008:17, 24017:11, 24033:16, 24033:22, 24034:5, 24034:13, 24034:25, 24035:5, 24035:7, 24036:18, 24041:4, 24041:6, 24041:7, 24042:3, 24042:4, 24043:7, 24043:10, 24043:12, 24046:13, 24051:6, 24057:2, 24058:24, 24059:1, 24067:8, 24078:14, 24079:2, 24079:14, 24088:22, 24088:23, 24092:15, 24094:11, 24094:18, 24094:25, 24095:1, 24095:4, 24096:20, 24097:1, 24097:4, 24098:13, 24109:5, 24112:13, 24112:18, 24116:22``` |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| ```24068:5 Hopy [4] - 24059:22, 24061:3, 24061:21, 24064:20 Hospital [2]-24000:17, 24011:18 hospital [1] - 24011 :24 Hotel \({ }_{[1]}\) - 23923:16 Hounjet [1] - 23967:11 hour [2] - 23962:18, 24127:4 hours [5] - 23992:24, 23993:21, 23994:5, 23994:6, 23994:8 house [33] - 23930:20, 23930:22, 23930:25, 23932:4, 23933:1, 23988:13, 23988:14, 24000:21, 24001:1, 24001:3, 24001:4, 24001:9, 24001:15, 24001:23, 24002:5, 24002:8, 24005:19, 24009:3, 24009:12, 24011:13, 24013:13, 24013:19, 24014:18, 24026:8, 24028:6, 24032:11, 24059:6, 24060:21, 24073:3, 24126:22, 24127:6, 24127:9, 24127:22 household [1] - 24031:4 houses [2] - 24001:10, 24012:19 Hugh [1] - 23924:12 hurry [3]-24083:22, 24107:18, 24115:20 Ian [1] - 23945:25 ice [1] - 24070:2 Id [2]-23954:12, 23954:13 idea [4]-23991:16, 23994:7, 24112:6, 24123:23 ideas [1] - 24074:10 identified [3] - 23966:19, 24003:9, 24114:12 identify [11] - 23949:18, 23949:21, 23950:8, 23952:23, 23962:8, 24035:10, 24039:11, 24074:6, 24103:17, 24114:12, 24130:4 identifying [2] -``` | ```23953:9, 24012:7 ignore [1] - 24111:17 illness [1] - 24051:5 illustrate [1]-24040:13 illustration [3] - 23964:14, 24041:20, 24041:25 immediate [1] - 24020:16 immediately [3] - 23989:17, 24053:1, 24053:5 impact [2] - 23934:15, 24056:10 implication [1] - 24063:7 important [7]-23942:5, 23956:2, 23967:16, 23969:20, 24040:12, 24051:2, 24129:4 importantly [1] - 24092:18 impression [3] - 24044:5, 24049:14, 24122:9 impressions [1] - 24118:23 improbability \([1]\) - 24038:8 improper [1] - \(24101: 8\) improperly [1] - 24120:5 improve [1] - 24046:11 improved [2] - 24119:5 inadmissible [3] - 23938:3, 23938:5, 24106:15 inch [2] - 24070:2, 24076:7 incident [8] - 23928:10, 23965:18, 23965:19, 24040:9, 24105:22, 24127:2, 24134:25, 24136:3 incidents [1] - 24051:11 inclined [2] - 23997:7, 24099:9 include [2] - 23931 :22, 24133:1 included [5] - 23957:22, 23962:10, 23994:4, 24038:18, 24131:13 includes [1] - 24030:24 including [5] - 23994:24, 24010:7, 24038:19, 24098:6, 24138:14 inconsistencies [1] - 23927:24``` |  | ```23945:18, 23946:1, 23946:3, 23946:7, 23951:25, 23952:8, 23952:10, 23952:11, 23952:17, 23952:25, 23956:6, 23957:6, 23957:11, 23958:5, 23961:19, 23963:8, 23965:23, 23966:9, 23968:17, 23974:22, 23977:10, 23977:21, 23979:21, 23980:17, 23985:6, 23991 :20, 23995:8, 23997:4, 24003:16, 24005:1, 24023:12, 24024:21, 24025:5, 24025:11, 24028:4, 24028:18, 24029:4, 24029:9, 24030:4, 24030:14, 24031:3, 24032:19, 24052:1, 24052:6, 24052:15, 24054:8, 24056:7, 24056:21, 24058:7, 24058:20, 24064:5, 24064:15, 24072:13, 24078:21, 24079:18, 24080:22, 24091:11, 24092:9, 24094:15, 24094:18, 24094:25, 24098:25, 24120:9, 24121:16, 24124:7, 24130:23, 24131:21 inherently [1] - 24032:25 initial [2] - 24005:7, 24120:21 ink [1] - 24075:10 innocence [1] - 23978:1 innocent [6] - 23935:16, 23935:19, 23976:25, 23977:23, 23980:14, 23980:24 inquire [1] - 24062:11 inquired [1] - 24023:16 inquiries [14] - 23957:19, 23983:6, 23989:7, 24023:25, 24024:4, 24024:15, 24024:20, 24029:7, 24051:20, 24052:17, 24052:20, 24053:1, 24109:11, 24124:1 Inquiry [6] - 23923:2, 23923:23, 23944:1, 23984:17, 24083:7, 24121:20 inquiry [20] - 23952:9, 23952:24, 23953:10,``` | ```23957:13, 23958:16, 23961:22, 23968:19, 23977:25, 23980:25, 23982:7, 23982:11, 23987:15, 23988:5, 23988:8, 24023:15, 24029:1, \(24051: 9\), 24052:10, 24102:11, 24102:15 inspected [1] - 24006:1 Inspector [7]-23969:3, 23971:10, 23983:18, 24120:9, 24121:1, 24124:23, 24132:15 inspector [1] - 24007:18 instability [1] - 24051:4 instances [1] - 23941:1 instructed [1] - 24130:6 intend [4] - 23949:16, 23987:15, 24055:9, 24097:22 intended [2] - 24058:19, 24102:13 intention [1] - 23988:16 interest [5]-23993:10, 23993:11, 24031:23, 24032:23, 24036:25 interested [4]- 23934:7, 23988:24, 23989:25, 24092:10 interests [1] - 24029:2 interrogating [1] - 24113:16 interrogation [2] - 23997:19, 24114:6 intersection [2] - 24011:1, 24011:4 intervened [1] - 24044:8 interview [7] - 23969:7, 23985:9, 23992:2, 24024:11, 24024:14, 24056:17, 24121:4 interviewed [9] - 23971:12, 23972:9, 23979:22, 23986:3, 24003:16, 24023:24, 24083:11, 24083:12, 24113:9 interviewing [8] - 23940:13, 23965:15, 23972:14, 23986:1, 23993:9, 24024:14, 24024:17, 24109:2 intimate [1] - 24112:9 intimated [1] - 24112:8 introduced [1] - 24080:12 introduction [1] -``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 23927:8 <br> invariably [1] - <br> 24042:18 <br> investigating [1] - <br> 23981:3 <br> investigation [2] - <br> 23976:11, 23980:2 <br> investigators [2] - <br> 23980:2, 23983:12 <br> invited [1] - 24127:5 <br> involuntarily [1] - <br> 24064:14 <br> involve [1] - 24039:14 <br> involved [21] - <br> 23943:18, 23959:2, <br> 23969:5, 23992:11, <br> 23992:22, 24013:24, <br> 24014:9, 24014:12, <br> 24014:16, 24027:15, <br> 24027:22, 24030:4, <br> 24040:2, 24041:7, <br> 24051:10, 24056:23, <br> 24063:18, 24077:12, <br> 24077:25, 24131:5, <br> 24132:21 <br> involvement [8] - <br> 23955:21, 23957:13, <br> 23957:23, 23958:25, <br> 23969:2, 23997:2, <br> 24014:10, 24014:13 <br> involving [3] - <br> 23965:20, 23965:21, <br> 23965:22 <br> Irene [1] - 23924:9 <br> Isabelle [1] - 23924:5 <br> isolate [1] - 23957:25 <br> issue [38] - 23931:25, <br> 23932:13, 23935:7, <br> 23937:8, 23937:23, <br> 23947:23, 23951:12, <br> 23955:20, 23955:22, <br> 23956:2, 23956:3, <br> 23956:6, 23958:19, <br> 23973:4, 23974:13, <br> 23984:3, 23991:19, <br> 23995:18, 24004:18, <br> 24009:22, 24012:6, <br> 24021:7, 24023:10, <br> 24031:8, $24031: 20$, <br> 24031:21, 24039:5, <br> 24055:11, 24056:11, <br> 24062:23, 24066:4, <br> 24100:1, 24100:7, <br> 24100:8, 24102:7, <br> 24114:3, 24124:16, <br> 24136:15 <br> issues [2] - 24036:14, <br> 24043:17 <br> item [3]-23969:18, <br> 24096:1, 24096:4 |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { June[3] - 23954:1, } \\ \text { 23969:9, 23993:21 } \\ \text { jury [41] - 23933:12, } \\ \text { 23934:12, 23934:25, } \\ \text { 23935:8, 23935:22, } \\ \text { 23936:25, 23941:15, } \\ \text { 23942:19, 23984:25, } \\ \text { 23998:20, 23998:23, } \\ \text { 23999:7, 23999:11, } \\ \text { 24039:13, 24044:4, } \\ \text { 24045:14, 24047:2, } \\ \text { 24048:6, 24048:16, } \\ 24048: 21,24049: 10, \\ 24050: 17,24050: 19, \\ 24051: 3,24052: 25, \\ 24053: 9,24057: 21, \\ 24063: 2,24077: 24, \\ 24097: 17,24097: 22, \\ 24099: 8,24100: 24, \\ 24101: 21,24102: 17, \\ 24102: 20,24114: 11, \\ 24114: 21,24114: 23, \\ 24116: 5,24118: 13 \\ \text { Justice[5] - 23923:6, } \\ 23925: 10,23925: 12, \\ 24099: 15,24099: 25 \end{gathered}$ K Kara $[1]-23924: 5$ Karen $[3]-23924: 10$, 24140:2, 24140:13 Karst $[2]-23925: 8$, $24125: 20$ keep $[2]-23966: 13$, 23993:20 keeping $[2]-23937: 15$, 23937:21 Ken $[1]-24026: 1$ Kenney[2] - 24067:15, $24091: 1$ Kenny $[1]-24067: 19$ kept $[2]-24025: 14$, $24028: 20$ key $[6]-23992: 18$, $24038: 1,24043: 9$, $24043: 11,24044: 20$, $24049: 12$ keys $[2]-24074: 4$, $24074: 5$ kid $[3]-24061: 10$, $24061: 16,24062: 12$ kids $[3]-23974: 1$, $24002: 24,24004: 9$ kill $[2]-24072: 3$, $24072: 10$ killed $[2]-24013: 14$, $24013: 20$ killing $[3]-24038: 14$, | ```24055:3, 24083:16 \\ kind [4] - 23959:15, \\ 23961:9, 24011:15, \\ 24068:4 \\ Kleiv [1] - 24007:19 \\ knife [5] - 23967:9, \\ 24018:6, 24128:9, \\ 24134:8, 24134:10 \\ knives [1] - 24064:22 \\ knocked [1] - 24028:22 \\ knowing [2] - 23955:15, \\ 23955:16 \\ knowledge [7] - \\ 23938:23, 23945:3, \\ 23949:25, 24001:10, \\ 24027:17, 24031:16, \\ 24140:6 \\ known [3] - 23959:3, \\ 24031:18, 24059:9 \\ knows [2]-23976:22, \\ 24047:17 \\ Knox[1] - 23925:5 \\ Krogan [1] - 23925:4 \\ Kujawa[1] - 23925:6``` <br> L <br> lab [13] - 23955:1, <br> 23955:5, 23955:6, <br> 23955:11, 23955:14, <br> 23956:15, 23956:21, <br> 23958:18, 23958:20, <br> 23958:21, 23958:23, <br> 23970:22, 23989:14 <br> Lab[1] - 23956:13 <br> Laboratory ${ }^{1}$ ] - <br> 23954:22 <br> lack [2]-24038:20, 24079:2 <br> lacked [1] - 24138:23 <br> lad [8]-24025:4, <br> 24025:19, 24027:14, <br> 24028:18, 24029:10, <br> 24030:15, 24031:24, <br> 24056:8 <br> ladder [1] - 24047:20 <br> lady [12] - 23943:3, <br> 23944:2, 23944:3, <br> 23944:5, 23974:7, <br> 24003:1, 24019:22, <br> 24023:21, 24131:17, <br> 24132:11, 24132:13 <br> Lake[1] - 24051:11 <br> Lana[1] - 23925:4 <br> landmark [3]- <br> 24000:17, 24011:22, <br> 24015:11 <br> landmarks [1] - <br> 24002:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { lane }[2]-24010: 9, \\ & \text { 24010:10 } \\ & \text { Langer }[1]-23995: 23 \\ & \text { language }[1]-23962: 3 \\ & \text { Lapchuk }[3]-24048: 11, \\ & 24121: 8,24121: 10 \\ & \text { large }[2]-24001: 6, \\ & \text { 24012:17 } \\ & \text { last }[9]-23927: 12, \\ & \text { 23951:11, 23968:22, } \\ & \text { 23984:24, 24000:8, } \\ & \text { 24059:11, 24061:22, } \\ & \text { 24093:19, 24112:12 } \\ & \text { late }[2]-23975: 20, \\ & 24087: 4 \\ & \text { latter }[2]-23951: 11, \\ & 24119: 14 \\ & \text { laughed }[6]-24047: 24, \\ & 24055: 5,24072: 4, \\ & 24086: 14,24110: 10, \\ & 24117: 1 \\ & \text { law }[5]-23927: 10, \\ & 23927: 11,23946: 18, \\ & 24036: 22,24051: 17 \\ & \text { lawyer }[1]-23993: 13 \\ & \text { lead }[8]-23937: 4, \\ & 23952: 9,23952: 23, \\ & 23953: 9,23961: 21, \\ & 23968: 18,23977: 24, \\ & 23980: 24 \\ & \text { leading }[1]-23929: 8 \\ & \text { leaning }[1]-23948: 3 \\ & \text { learn }[4]-23983: 8, \\ & 24027: 8,24100: 22, \\ & 24103: 2 \\ & \text { Learned }[1]-23938: 6 \\ & \text { learned }[19]-23989: 17, \\ & 24059: 14,24059: 16, \\ & 24075: 14,24082: 17, \\ & 24082: 25,24094: 10, \\ & 24097: 20,24100: 13, \\ & 24101: 2,24101: 6, \\ & 24101: 12,24103: 4, \\ & 24106: 7,24112: 1, \\ & 24115: 14,24124: 2, \\ & 24137: 14 \\ & \text { least }[16]-23942: 4, \\ & 23954: 5,23969: 14, \\ & 23973: 24,23978: 13, \\ & 23981: 23,23990: 8, \\ & 23991: 15,23997: 8, \\ & 24029: 17,24048: 24, \\ & 24055: 2,24059: 3, \\ & 24076: 18,24094: 23, \\ & 24119: 14 \\ & \text { leave }[4]-24020: 8, \\ & 24044: 5,24087: 13, \\ & 24100: 25 \\ & \text { leaving }[3]-23928: 9, \\ & 24061: 1,24133: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| led [2] - 23957:12, | 23933:14, 23933:18, | 24044:21, 24045:25, | maligning [1] - | 24013:4, 24036:8, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24062:9 | 23935:25, 23938:13, | 24046:7, 24047:3, | 24122:24 | $24037: 5,24041: 22,$ |
| leer [12]-23928:10, | 23957:25, 23959:23, | 24075:16, 24115:15, | man [1] - 23981:7 | 24056:14 |
| 23928:22, 24006:16, | 23960:13, 23966:5, | 24115:16 | Manager [1] - 23924:4 | Maurice [1] - 23989:10 |
| 24006:19, 24006:23, | 23967:2, $23969: 24$, | looked [13] - 23930:13, | manager [1] - 23928:22 | Mcdonald [1] - 23946:1 |
| 24007:4, 24038:6, | 23973:10, 23983:9, | 23930:18, 23955:24, | manhandled [1] - | Mclean [1] - 23925:3 |
| 24041:21, 24042:25, | 24005:18, 24014:24, | 23958:9, 24002:3, | 24081:9 | Mcleod [2] - 23970:22, |
| 24127:10, 24133:23, | 24016:5, 24050:3, | 24006:1, 24027:1, | manner [7] - 23940:19, | 23987:10 |
| 24135:16 | $24050: 21,24054: 12,$ | $24038: 23,24055: 22,$ | 23941:16, 23990:22, | mean [14] - 23928:13, |
| left [26] - 23927:17, | 24057:19, 24061:3 <br> 24072:17, 24096.2 | 24086:14, 24109:5, | 23994:25, 24031:19, | 23968:2, 23979:11, |
| $24003: 24,24019: 2$ | $24097: 7,24106: 7,$ | looking [23]-23936 | 24031 :23, $24039: 9$ | 24015:5, 24018:9, $24031: 25,24042: 2$ |
| 24019:7, 24020:1, | 24120:15, 24122:16 | 23974:6, 23985:14, | 23932:11 | 24061:16, 24080:9, |
| 24021:17, 24033:24, | lighting [1] - 24015:4 | 24001:22, 24002:4, | map [9]-23928:11, | 24088:6, 24104:5, |
| 24035:14, 24051:19, | lights [1] - 24014:22 | 24004:17, 24044:19, | 24003:7, 24003:10, | 24108:16, 24112:9, |
| 24056:3, 24071:16, | likelihood [2] - | 24046:2, 24054:13, | 24006:17, 24006:18, | 24122:5 |
| 24072:6, 24073:10, | 24014:10, 24138:3 | 24090:1, 24100:2, | 24019:14, 24019:15, | meant [4]-24016:14, |
| 24077:18, 24083:20, | likely [11] - 23930:12, | 24104:14, 24106:11, | 24019:16, 24133:23 | 24016:15, 24111:23, |
| 24085:20, 24086:16, | 23936:6, 23954:7, | 24115:22, 24115:23, | March [12] - 23944:2, | 24111:24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24088: 7,24107: 13, \\ & 24107: 18,24128: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24002: 18,24005: 22, \\ & 24021: 21.24030: 2 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24119: 2,24126: 14, \\ & 24126: 22,24129: 1, \end{aligned}$ | 23954:21, 23982:16, | medical [2] - 23995:22, |
| $24130: 9,24133: 8$ | $24030: 7,24035: 18,$ | $24129: 9,24132: 11$ | 24058:3, 24065:16, | 23996:14 |
| 24135:3 | 24058:25, 24067:25 | 24133:19, 24138:3 | 24124:22, 24125:21, | meet [1] - 23963:2 |
| legal [5] - 23952:5 | limbs [1] - 24089:25 | lookit [1] - 23975:7 | 24126:2, 24138:17, | meeting [7] - 23963:9, |
| 23978:22, 23978:23, | limit [2] - 23948:21, | looks [2] - 23969:12, | 24138:20 | 23963:12, 23966:1, |
| $\begin{gathered} 24036: 7,24036: 16 \\ \text { Legal[2] - 23983:20, } \end{gathered}$ | 23977:13 | 24007:21 | marginal [1] - 24111:9 | 23969:13, 23982:21, |
| $23984: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { limited [3] - 23934:17, } \\ & \text { 23938:22, 24017:23 } \end{aligned}$ | Loran[1] - 23925:7 <br> Lordi4] - 23961:10 | Marie [1] - 23987:16 | $23985: 12,24034: 20$ |
| lend [1] - 24027:19 | limiting [1] - 23968:11 | 23962:3, 24097:20, | mark [1] - 24124:15 | meetings [1] - 23942:3 Mel [1] - 23995:23 |
| lengthy [1] - 23970:11 | line [6] - 23956:20 | 24098:8 | 24038:21, 24038:22, | Melnyk [3] - 24048:10, |
| Leonard[1] - 24115:22 | 23961:15, 23995:10, | Lordship[1] - 24098:2 | 24041:23, 24119:6 | 24121:7, 24121:10 |
| Les[4] - 23975:9, | 24066:13, 24091:9, | lose [1] - 23984:2 | Mary 's [1] - 24015:1 | member [2]-24031:4, |
| 23979:21, 23979:24, | 24127:22 | lower [1] - 24047:19 | material [14] - 23960:7, | 24036:20 |
| 23980:5 | lines [5] - 24077:11, | Lubofft 1$]$ - 23962:23 | $23967: 20,23969: 15,$ | members [2] |
| less [3] - 24005:3, | 24077:24, 24088:15, | lying [4]-24031:14, | 23976:23, 23977:22, | 24024:24, 24100:24 |
| 24079:13, 24079:16 | 24108:9, 24109:4 | 24033:7, 24054:11, | 23983:1, 23984:8, | memo [16]-23962:10, |
| letter [29]-23951:7, | link [1] - 23935:3 | 24055:18 | 23996:1, 23996:2, | 23962:15, 23969:8, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23953: 25,23954: 2, \\ & 23954: 18,23954: 20, \end{aligned}$ | linked [1] - 23966:19 list [4] - 23983:19, |  | $23996: 6,23999: 5,$ $24035: 3,24036: 10$ | $23970: 1,23970: 10,$ $23970: 11,23999: 25,$ |
| 23955:10, 23956:12, | $23987: 6,24052: 25$ |  | $24124: 11$ | 24006:10, 24008:9, |
| 23959:11, 23960:14, | 24053:3 |  | materials [2] - | 24008:15, 24008:18, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23960: 19,23960: 21, \\ & 23974: 20,23975: 2, \end{aligned}$ | literally [2] - 24046:14, 24055:5 | Maccallum [8] - <br> 23923:7, 23927:3, | 23996:18, 24009:16 | 24009:13, 24013:16, |
| $23975: 4,23975: 21$ | 24055:5 | 23954:11, 23954:15 | matter [27] - 23938:24, | 24016:19, 24023:8 |
| $23976: 4,23976: 5$ | literature [1] - 23996:16 lived [2] - 24010.22 | 23999:19, 24023:2, | $23951: 10,23955: 22,$ $23960: 9.23960: 13$ | memoranda [1] - |
| 23976:8, 23976:17, | lived [2] - 24010:22 24011:13 | $24054: 21,24055: 12$ | $23960: 9,23960: 13$ | 24093:1 |
| 23979:18, 23985:3, | ving [1] - 24011:6 | Mackie [1] - 23965:17 | 23992:10, 23994:1, | 23970:15, 24007:13, |
| 23985:14, 23989:13, | located [4]-23996:3, | Macrae [1] - 23981:10 | 23995:20, 24010:14, | 24008:24, 24018:10, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24033: 14,24034: 8, \\ & 24034: 23,24036: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $24006: 20,24009: 11,$ | mad [4] - 24065:20, 24065:22, 24086:8 | 24047:4, 24053:14, | $24021: 10$ |
| $24037: 8,24125: 1$ | 24058:10 | Mafia [4] - 24061:24, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24058:12, 24063:3, } \\ & \text { 24071:1, } 24076: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { memorandums [1]- } \\ & 23962 \cdot 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| letters [2]-23951:4, | 24006:24, $24011: 24$ | 24071:24, 24072:9, | 24076:22, 24097:17, | memory [15] - |
| 23962:24 | logical [4] - 24010:23, | 24098:17 | $24099: 9,24100: 4,$ | $23936: 20,23942: 1,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { level [1] - 23998:9 } \\ & \text { lie }[4]-23967: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $24011: 7,24020: 18$ | magistrate [2] - <br> 23978•19, 23979-5 | $24105: 3,24106: 19$ | 23942:6, 23965:7, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { lie }[4]-23967: 19, \\ & \text { 23968:25, 23969:15, } \end{aligned}$ | $24020: 23$ | 23978:19, 23979:5 <br> magistrates [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24107:16, 24110:9, } \\ & \text { 24118:11, 24138:20 } \end{aligned}$ | $23966: 10,23966: 13$ $23975: 14,23985: 14,$ |
| 24119:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { look [16] - 23943:5, } \\ & \text { 23955:22, 23958:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $23978: 14$ | matters [12]-23942:2, | 24017:18, 24021:3, |
| lies [1] - 24119:17 | 23960:9, 23995:15, | main [2]-23962:15, | 23959:5, 23961:22, | 24034:22, 24089:5, |
| Lieutenant 1 1] - 23986:9 | 23997:22, 24022:7, | $23966: 24$ | $23965: 11,23977: 25,$ | $24099: 22,24116: 14,$ |
| light [28] - 23932:13, | 24035:12, 24043:11, | major [1] - 24038:10 | 23979:15, 23981:2, | 24116:15 |
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| memos [1] - 24002:19 | 23974:23, 23975:16, | 24034:4, 24034:25, | 23998:11, 24013:17, | $23927: 6,23928: 8,$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| mental [7]-23936:11, | 23975:18, 23979:7 | 24037:11, 24040:8, | 24014:7, 24020:11 | $23935: 25,23939: 21,$ |
| 24016:20, 24032:17, | 23979:15, 23980:6, | 24040:20, 24047:8, | $24020: 25,24021: 25$ $\text { 24022:10. } 24030: 7 .$ | $23981 \text { :8, } 23988: 7,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24051: 4,24051: 5 \\ & 24051: 13,24087: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23980: 22,23985: 22, \\ & 23986: 15,23990: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24055:19, 24056:22, } \\ & \text { 24065:1, 24065:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24022:10, 24030:7, } \\ & 24031: 7,24035: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23988:14, 23995:16, } \\ & \text { 24002:7, 24003:2, } \end{aligned}$ |
| mention [12]-23961:7, | 23998:22, 23999:12, | 24065:24, 24066:25, | 24042:21, 24042:24, | 24003:4, 24003:19, |
| 23983:16, 24012:1, | 24005:2, 24014:5, | 24067:2, 24067:21, | 24054:14, 24057:18, | 24004:19, 24012:8, |
| 24070:23, 24086:4, | 24015:12, 24019:15, | 24070:13, 24074:3, | 24087:22, 24088:19, | 24024:25, 24026:7, |
| 24086:7, 24090:3, | 24021:16, 24021:24, | 24074:13, 24077:24, | 24090:6, 24117:2, | 24026:24, 24028:6, |
| 24118:18, 24127:10, | 24023:11, 24028:5, | 24084:23, 24085:11, | 24130:3, 24137:20, | 24029:9, 24030:23, |
| 24128:19, 24132:3, | 24029:4, 24029:12, | 24085:15, 24085:17, | 24137:21 | 24037:4, 24053:10, |
| 24133:22 | 24042:17, 24050:11, | 24091:13, 24092:1, | mind's [1] - 24043:20 | 24054:10, 24056:23, |
| mentioned [25] - | 24050:17, 24050:20, | 24096:21, 24097:7, | mindful [2] - 24032:8, | 24059:7, 24063:22, |
| 23930:8, 23946:13, | 24050:24, 24051:16, | 24098:15, 24109:15, | 24032:11 | 24067:22, 24073:3, |
| 23964:20, 23978:11, | 24054:6, 24054:15, | 24119:12, 24119:20, | minds [1] - 24047:18 | 24084:3, 24084:24, |
| 23989:20, 23992:13, | 24056:15, 24057:1, | 24120:23, 24122:11, | mine [4]-24001:18, | 24085:2, 24085:5, |
| 23993:8, 24002:4, | 24057:10, 24057:21, | 24125:10, 24125:19, | 24023:18, 24023:23, | 24085:12, 24085:15, |
| 24002:9, 24002:18, | 24057:22, 24059:1, | $24125: 22,24125: 23,$ | 24094:6 | 24085:16, 24088:7, |
| 24013:23, 24023:21, | 24062:11, 24062:24, <br> 24066:1, 24069:21 | 24126:11, 24128:4, <br> 24128:10, 24128:25 | minimal [1] - 23943:18 | 24091:13, 24107:7, <br> 24119:13, 24122:25 |
| $24029: 22,24035: 22,$ | 24074:13, 24077:13, | 24129:9, 24129:11, | $23934: 15,24118$ | $24126: 20,24128: 11,$ |
| 24037:17, 24038:19, | 24078:2, 24078:5, | 24129:16, 24130:6, | minimized [1] - 24063:6 | 24132:6, 24132:13, |
| 24039:16, 24042:10, | 24078:6, 24079:4, | 24131:14, 24132:5, | Minister [1] - 23925:10 | 24132:20, 24133:3, |
| 24066:21, 24083:3, | 24079:5, 24079:7, | 24132:18, 24132:21, | minute [1] - 23999:17 | 24139:2 |
| 24109:14, 24121:19, | 24079:13, 24087:8, | 24133:1, 24133:2, | minutes [7] - 23950:20, | Morris [1] - 23975:13 |
| 24124:13 <br> mentioning | $24099: 23,24106: 10,$ | $24134: 4,24134: 9$ | 24007:6, 24128:6, | 23994:15, 24001:15, |
| 24041:11 | 24109:7, 24110:3, | 24134:18, 24135:2, | $24135: 25,24136: 12$ | 24001:21, 24002:18, |
| Meota/jackfish [1] - | 24119:21, 24121:24, | 24135:6, 24135:24, | mirror [1] - 23995:16 | 24005:21, 24042:8, |
| 24051:11 | $\begin{aligned} & 24121: 25,24122: 19, \\ & 24123: 3,24123: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $24136: 8,24136: 24$ | Miss [11] - 23994:8, | 24043:18, 24046:9, |
| merit [1] - 24115:1 <br> met [4]-23962•17 | $24126: 17,24129: 2,$ | Milg | $24006: 4,24010: 22$ | motel [5] - 23928:10, |
| 24033:17, 24033:18, | $24129: 24,24130: 11,$ | 23938:14, 23944:4, | $\begin{aligned} & 24015: 20,24016: 9 \\ & 24017: 12,24020: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $23928: 20,23991: 18,$ |
| 24034:20 | 24130:12, 24130:20, | 23945:4, 23946:4, | 24025:6, 24026:12, | 24048:9, $24121: 6$ |
| Meyer [3] - 23924:11, | $\begin{aligned} & 24130: 22,24131: 6, \\ & 24131: 9,24132: 21, \end{aligned}$ | 23946:7, 24009:17, <br> 24043:19, 24048:14 | 24026:14, 24030:3 | Motel [11] - 23928:10, |
| 24140:2, 24140:19 <br> Mhmn [2] - 24072:2 | $24134: 13,24136: 10$ | $24054: 8,24069: 8,$ | missed [1] - 23954:11 | 24006:19, 24006:23, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mhmn [2] - 24072:2, } \\ & \text { 24073:11 } \end{aligned}$ | $24136: 15,24137: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24070:1, 24129:17, } \end{aligned}$ | missing [1] - 24114:17 | $24007: 4,24038: 6$ |
| micro [1] - 23936:11 | 24137:16 | 24133:20 | mistake [1] - 23998:13 mistaken [4] - | $24041: 21,24042: 25,$ |
| micro-analyse [1] - | Milgaard [104] 23923.4, 23925 | Miller [23] - 23957:16, 23958.22, 23975.9 | 24031:13, 24033:6 | $24127: 10,24133: 23$ |
| $23936: 11$ | 23925:3, 23927:19, | $23981: 7,24000: 21,$ | $24054: 11,24055: 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { mother [6] - 23973:3, } \\ & \text { 23988:5, } 24026: 23, \end{aligned}$ |
| 23936:11 | 23927:21, 23928:19, | 24003:24, 24004:19, | $23945: 10$ | 24059:11, 24084:16, |
| mid [1] - 23962:7 | 23928:25, 23929:13, | 24005:14, 24005:18, | mixed [1] - 24112:14 | $24089: 1$ |
| middle [1] - 24126:24 | $23932: 24,23934: 4$ | $24019: 23,24020: 19$ | mixing [1] - 24085:8 | motivate [1] - 24119:21 <br> motive [8] - 23974•? |
| might [108]-23932:1, | 23935:10, 23935:22, | $24055: 23,24058: 12,$ | Molchanko [1] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { motive [8]-23974:2, } \\ \text { 24033:2, } 24050: 11 \text {, } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23932: 7,23933: 11, \\ & 23934: 12,23935: 23, \end{aligned}$ | 23937:10, 23937:13, | 24071:1, 24077:13, | 23955:7 | 24054:14, 24057:6, |
| 23936:25, 23941:15, | 23939:4, 23939:7, | 24078:17, 24082:10, | 23960:12, 23987:13, | 24072:20, 24074:12, |
| 23942:19, 23948:16, | 23939:20, 23940:3, 23940:12, 23941:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 24082: 25,24088: 4, \\ & 24105: 17,24107: 24 \end{aligned}$ | 23995:19, 23997:10, | $24110: 4$ |
| 23950:7, 23952:1, | 23943:21, 23943:24, | Miller's [5] - 23935:12, | 24006:14, 24019:15, | mouth [1] -24053:18 |
| 23952:3, 23952:8, | 23944:10, 23945:19, | $24000: 2,24002: 8$ | 24071:11, 24112:23, | mouth' [1] - 23977:15 |
| 23952:23, 23953:3, | 23945:22, 23946:22, | 24007:3, $24016: 9$ | $24132: 3,24132: 10$ | mouths [1] - 24041:19 |
| $23953: 9,23956: 8$ | $23947: 6,23956: 15$ | mind [35] - 23929:15, | money [5] - 23943:14 | move [4] - 23930:19, |
| 23956:9, 23957:10, | 23965:20, 23970:7, <br> 23982.21, 23989:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 23932: 1,23940: 25, \\ & 23945: 15,23947: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 23943:15, 23943:17, | $23955: 8,23955: 9,$ |
| 23961:7, $23961: 20$, | 23990:13, 23992:2, | 23948:1, 23948:18, | 24051:22, 24052:10 | $24040: 23$ |
| 23963:8, $23964: 23$, | 24019:7, 24019:8, | 23952:16, 23953:14, | month [1] - 24034:21 | moved [2]-23948:11, <br> 23948:15 |
| 23968:3, 23968:18, | 24026:7, 24030:16, | 23966:13, 23967:5, | months [1] - 23993:24 | 23948:15 |
| 23968:19, 23974:12, | $24031 \text { :6, 24033:19, }$ | 23970:3, 23970:8, | morning [49] - 23927:3, | murder [31] - 23930:2, |
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|  |  | ```Nicole [1] - 24015:20 night [7] - 23975:9, 24059:11, 24061:22, 24063:16, 24063:20, 24069:15, 24100:16 ninety [1] - 23976:12 ninety-five [1] - 23976:12 nobody [2] - 24055:4, 24117:2 noise [1] - 24091:2 none [1] - 23980:12 noon [1] - 23985:7 normal [1] - 23994:5 North [2] - 24007:25, 24011:14 north [5] - 24011:1, 24011:4, 24011:6, 24012:3, 24014:23 north/south [1] - 24003:13 northwest [1] - 24001:14 note [7] - 23967:23, 23969:14, 23971:4, 23971:19, 23973:14, 23973:15, 24002:15 notebook [1] - 23985:23 notebooks [4] - 23953:17, 23953:19, 23986:4, 23986:16 noted [2] - 23970:12, 23977:17 notes [34] - 23931:8, 23936:13, 23946:19, 23955:17, 23956:11, 23960:16, 23962:21, 23962:22, 23962:25, 23963:14, 23969:4, 23970:13, 23970:17, 23974:19, 23974:25, 23975:3, 23975:22, 23976:18, 23985:5, 23992:17, 23994:6, 24000:18, 24007:14, 24008:13, 24008:24, 24024:6, 24030:1, 24035:22, 24035:25, 24036:1, 24062:6, 24065:5, 24092:15, 24140:6 nothing [13] - 23945:20, 23975:24, 24003:5, 24003:20, 24012:12, 24055:3, 24062:4, 24072:16, 24082:7, 24082:13, 24082:14, 24105:6, 24111:23 notice [4] - 23930:12,``` | ```23959:7, 23964:21, 24051:4 noticed [10] - 24003:5, 24010:16, 24053:2, 24059:21, 24064:21, 24075:21, 24075:22, 24077:10, 24104:13, 24104:18 noticing [1] - 24001:1 notified [1] - 24053:15 notion [2] - 24022:10, 24054:6 notwithstanding [1] - 24087:14 November [4] - 23940:14, 24033:14, 24033:19, 24034:19 number [28] - 23940:25, 23941:1, 23959:3, 23961:25, 23966:16, 23967:14, 23968:12, 23971:5, 23975:14, 24000:6, 24000:7, 24000:16, 24015:8, 24020:13, 24024:4, 24039:12, 24058:14, 24080:25, 24081:4, 24081:7, 24087:5, 24093:24, 24119:15, 24122:7, 24124:25, 24135:9 Number [1] - 23963:17 numbers [2] - 23968:4, 23975:12 o'clock [1] - 23999:16 oath [3]-24046:13, 24104:8, 24113:3 object [1] - 24101:3 objected [1] - 24073:17 objective [2] - 24039:6, 24041:5 objectively [3] - 24046:1, 24046:2, 24047:3 objectives [1] - 24037:12 objects [2] - 23966:18, 23967:5 obligation [1] - 23994:11 obliged [2] - 23951:24, 23960:8 observation [10] - 23932:21, 24010:1, 24026:10, 24031:14, 24047:1, 24066:19,``` | ```24089:23, 24094:24, 24111:5, 24111:7 observations [24] - 23930:16, 23932:20, 23940:17, 23940:21, 24000:5, 24006:6, 24008:13, 24009:2, 24010:16, 24031:2, 24032:10, 24040:8, 24040:21, 24046:8, 24047:2, 24050:14, 24050:16, 24056:9, 24090:22, 24091:12, 24095:21, 24100:24, 24102:19, 24122:13 observe [7] - 23930:5, 23930:17, 24002:10, 24013:1, 24040:9, 24040:11, 24042:15 observed [17] - 23930:4, 23931:10, 23931:12, 23991:6, 24024:25, 24029:10, 24030:15, 24031:5, 24031:17, 24067:21, 24077:9, 24077:21, 24091:18, 24103:18, 24120:3, 24122:10, 24134:6 obtain [1] - 24042:13 obtained [4] - 23944:1, 23976:9, 24100:7 obvious [7] - 23936:19, 23952:19, 23963:12, 23969:5, 24014:3, 24032:21, 24075:15 Obviously[1] - 23949:23 obviously [6] - 23989:1, 24008:23, 24010:14, 24011:15, 24017:5, 24063:2 occasion [12] - 23940:23, 23941:25, 24000:8, 24000:19, 24004:14, 24006:4, 24007:5, 24008:23, 24071:4, 24083:15, 24086:11, 24136:12 occasions [6] - 23927:25, 23933:4, 24000:8, 24000:16, 24058:14, 24097:25 occur [1] - 24022:16 occurred [2] - 23941:4, 24034:18 odd [1] - 24111:8 odds [1] - 24134:4 offence [1] - 23957:24 offences [8] - 23963:22,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Page 17

| 23964:7, 23964:16, | 23943:5, 23947:5, | operator [2]-23969:3, | 24071:14, 24073:19, | $23987: 24,23991: 25,$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23964:17, 23965:5, | 23947:16, 23948:3, | 23997:15 | 24074:16, 24075:3, | $23993: 5,23993: 15$ |
| $23965: 7$ | 23948:8, 23951:7, | opinion [7] - 23948:4, | 24076:15, 24080:2, | $24006: 9,24014: 19$ |
| offhand [1] - 24069:23 <br> office [10] - 23985:7, | $\begin{aligned} & 23956: 22,23958: 16, \\ & \text { 23962:4, } 23962: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23976: 14,23978: 22, \\ & 23978: 23,23980: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24080: 18,24081: 23 \\ & 24084: 12,24087: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24016: 12,24022: 24, \\ & 24026: 15,24045: 18, \end{aligned}$ |
| 23986:3, 23986:12, | 23962:18, 23963:10, | 23980:15, 24036:16 | 24089:14, 24092:4, | 24047:12, 24048:9, |
| 23988:6, 23988:18, | 23964:12, 23964:14, | opinions [1] - 24036:7 | 24093:6, 24093:19, | 24051:5, 24051 :6, |
| 24026:20, 24036:15, | 23965:4, 23965:6, | opportunity [8] - | 24097:18, 24098:9, | 24064:1, 24065:25, |
| 24037:1, 24052:4, | 23965:11, 23968:2, | 23930:5, 23945:24, | 24100:25, 24101:16, | 24068:25, 24069:19, |
| 24053:11 | 23968:12, 23970:3, | 23999:6, 24012:25, | 24102:25, 24104:12, | 24079:2, 24124:18 |
| Officer[2] - 23924:12, | 23974:3, 23975:21, | $24034: 17,24039: 11$ | $24105: 25,24107: 2$ | partial [1] - 23970:1 |
| 24007:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23977:24, 23979:22, } \\ & \text { う3981.? } 23987 \cdot 12 \end{aligned}$ | $24042: 15,24105: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24108: 12,24109: 9, \\ & 24109: 25.24110: 7 . \end{aligned}$ | participated [2] - |
| officer [6] - 23953:22, <br> 23985•23, 24007:19, | 23987:10, 23987:13, | opposed [6] 23929•14 | 24109:25, 24110:7, | 23992:7, 23993:14 |
| 24083:11, 24130:13, | $\text { 23988:7, } 23988: 23$ | 23972:10, 23975:23, | 24114:15, 24114:20, | $23930: 9,23930:$ |
| 24130:23 | 23995:24, 23999:6, | 24065:12, 24079:15 | 24116:4, 24117:14, | 23936:21, 23948:17, |
| officer's [1] - 23953:19 | 24000:19, 24001:13, | option [2]-24055:18 | 24124:19, 24124:20, | 23948:20, 23956:25, |
| Officers[1] - 23985:4 | $\begin{aligned} & 24001: 19,24001: 24 \\ & 24002: 19.24006: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $24097: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24127: 1,24127: 6, \\ & 24134: 5.24134: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $23958: 24,23959: 19$ $23963 \cdot 1223966 \cdot 20$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { officers [17] - } 23970 \\ \text { 23977:17. 23981:3. } \end{gathered}$ | $24006: 12,24007: 5$ | options [3] - 23934:14, 23939:15, 24055:16 | 24134:21, 24135:19, | 23967:15, 23986:8, |
| 23985:16, 23986:4, | 24008:7, 24011:3, | order [4] - 23978:16 | 24135:21 | 24000:25, 24008:23, |
| 23986:15, 24041:23, | 24012:12, 24013:22, | 23979:8, 24077:4, | Page [1] - 23926:2 | 24013:3, 24019:8, |
| 24079:22, 24081:25, | 24013:24, 24017:4, | 24137:17 | pages [3]-23962:9, | 24023:17, 24039:21, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24082: 25,24084: 21 \\ & 24085: 10,24089: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24018:18, 24019:2, } \\ & \text { 24020:13, 24023:21, } \end{aligned}$ | others' [1] - 24004:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24100:11, } 24140: 4 \\ & \text { pair [2] - 23988:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24040:10, 24042:23, } \\ & 24043: 5,24048: 1, \end{aligned}$ |
| 24106:25, 24109:16, | 24025:9, 24030 :6, | 23940:16, 23971:19 | 24128:14 | 24062:8, 24064:2, |
| 24113:19, 24129:20 | 24033:6, 24036:1, | 24104:17 | panel [2]-24052:25, | $24083: 14,24092: 25$ |
| offices [1] - 24052:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 24037: 14,24038: 1 \\ & 24039: 9,24042: 6 \end{aligned}$ | ought [3] - 23947:14 | $24053: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24093:1, } 24093: 4, \\ & 24124: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| Official[5] - 23924:10, | 24039:9, 24042:6, <br> 24044:8, 24052:16 | $24106: 8,24117: 19$ | pants [12] - 23930:25, 23988.22 23989.12 | $24124: 2$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24140: 1,24140: 3 \\ & 24140: 14,24140: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $24052: 24,24054: 10$ | outline [1] - 23949:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 23988: 22,23989: 12, \\ & 24059: 22,24059: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { particularly [8]- } \\ \text { 23933:14, } 23934: 6 \end{gathered}$ |
| often [6] - 23981:22, | 24055:17, 24062:6, | $24117: 21,24119: 2$ | 24066:8, 24068:22, | 23973:10, 24011:21, |
| 23992:23, 23995:25, | 24064:21, 24065:12, | outset [1] - 23949:16 | 24068:24, 24069:1, | 24018:2, 24030:6, |
| 24004:6, 24099:16 | $24076: 20,24077: 1$ | outside [2] - 23994:4, | $\begin{aligned} & 24076: 3,24128: 2, \\ & 24128: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $24122: 21,24124: 9$ |
| old [2] - 24009:7, | 24077:13, 24078:2, | $24036: 15$ | 24128:15 <br> paper [1] | 23946:17 |
| older [3] - 23943:3, | $\begin{aligned} & 24083: 4,24088: 19 \\ & 24097: 1,24097: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $24010: 18$ | paragraph [11] - | partly [1] - 23968:4 |
| $23974: 7,24020: 14$ | 24099:16, 24115:18, | overlap [1] - 24118:17 | $\begin{aligned} & 23961: 6,23987: 12, \\ & 24009: 1.24010: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { parts [12] - 23959:10, } \\ & \text { 23976:6, 23987:1, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 24130:16, 24130:20, | $24116: 6,24119: 3$ | [1] | 24011:10, 24011:25, | 23992:7, 24018:12, |
| 24131:22, 24131:25, | 24119:9, $24119: 24$ | 24000:18, 24020:11, | 24015:7, 24018:18, | 24038:1, 24049:9, |
| 24132:8, 24133:4, | 24119:25, 24120:8 <br> 24123:4, 24124:25 | $24064: 8,24064: 13$ | 24059:19, 24060:10, | 24058:15, 24086:22, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24133: 11,24133: 19 \\ & 24133: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $24128: 5,24128: 6$ | 24090:6, 24125:10 | 24062:19 <br> Paragraph [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24125:17, 24126:7, } \\ & 24128: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { omissions [7] - } \\ & 24129: 5,24130: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24128: 13,24130: 8 \\ & 24130: 10,24131: 5, \end{aligned}$ | P | $24015: 17$ <br> paraphrasing | $\begin{aligned} & \text { passable [2] - 24010:9, } \\ & \text { 24010:10 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24130: 18,24134: 3, \\ & 24137: 8,24137: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $24135: 3,24135: 25,$ |  | parcel [1] - 24045:18 | $23992: 25,23998: 25$ |
| 24137:24 |  | 23957:15 | Pardon [2] - 24089:15, | past [1] - 23946:4 |
| omit [1] - 23956:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24136:11, 24136:12, } \\ & \text { 24136:16, 24136:22, } \end{aligned}$ | packages [1] - 24061:4 | $24104: 3$ | Pat [1] - 23925:7 <br> path [1] - 24090:2 |
| $23947: 24,23950: 3$ | $24137: 5,24138: 1$ | packed [1] - 24004:11 | parents [3] - 24052:21, | patterned [1] - 23996:5 |
| 23957:18, 23998:16, | ne-way [1] - 24012:12 | $23969: 23,23973: 13$ | 24063:22, 24064:4 | Patterson [1] - |
| 24013:20, 24021:2, | open [5] - 23982:1, | 23974:17, 23980:9, | parked [1] - 24127:21 | 23978:15 |
| 24048:8, 24050:7, | 24017:18. 24056:3 | 23987:20, 24010:20, | parking [1] - 24012:4 | Paul [1] - 24011:3 |
| 24053:14, 24064:20, | 24087:13, 24101:11 | 24015:17, 24015:21, | part [30] - 23927:15, | Paul's [3] - 24000:17, |
| 24095:25 | opened [1] - 24096:15 | $24060: 24,24065: 18$ | 23928:5, 23928:17, 23929:22. 23937:8 | 24011:17, 24011:22 |
| 23937:7, 23939:1, | opening [2] - 23970:5, | 24066:5, 24068:1, <br> 24068:10, 24068:18, | $23950: 7,23951: 11$ | $23981: 13,24086: 21$ |
| 23941:23, $23941: 25$, |  | 24070:19, 24071:7, | $23984: 23,23986: 21,$ | 24105:19 |
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| paying [2] - 23983:24, | 23983:22, 23988:13, | 23956:4, 23957:22, | 24111:4, 24113:15, | potentially [2] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23984:4 | 24012:20, 24014:12, | 23960:1, 23968:22, | 24113:18, 24113:25, | $23984: 8,24087: 6$ |
| Paynter [2]-23955:6, | 24022:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23969:1, 23969:12, } \\ & \text { „3970.8 } 24011.27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24114: 3,24116: 17 \\ & 24100 \cdot 5 ~ \\ & 24101 \cdot 11 \end{aligned}$ | power [1] - 23978:20 |
| 23959:1 | persuade [1] - 24118:9 | $\text { 23972:8, } 24011 \text { :22, }$ | 24120:5, 24121:11 | powers [1] - 23979:11 |
| Paynter's [1] - 23958:25 <br> Peace [3]-24126:9 | perusal [1] - 24036:1 <br> peruse [1] - 24033:25 | $\begin{aligned} & 24018: 22,24036: 3 \\ & 24040: 15,24044: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 24121:13, 24123:22, | practical [1] - 23934:16 |
| Peace [3] - 24126:9, $24126: 12,24126: 17$ | peruse [1]-24033: <br> phase [1] - 23999:8 | $24044: 20,24056: 15$ | 24129:1, 24129:19 | practice [10] - <br> 23951:14, 23952.2 |
| $\begin{gathered} 24126: 12,24126: 17 \\ \text { pen [1] - 24103:19 } \end{gathered}$ | phase [1] - 23999:8 <br> phone [4] - 23996:9 | 24059:4, 24087:15, | $24129: 20,24130: 13$ | 23951:14, 23952:2 |
| pencilled [1] - 23962:23 | 24026:17, 24035:17, | 24097:10, 24099:3, | 24131:12 | 23981:19, 23983:13, |
| penetrated [1] - | 24093:23 | 24099:11, 24102:18, | policeman [1] | 23986:19, 23986:22, |
| 24018:6 | phone' [1] - 23971 :8 <br> phoned [3]-23956:9, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24114:18, 24118:10, } \\ & 24118: 19,24131: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 24073:16 <br> policemen [3] | $23987: 5,24099: 10$ |
| people [24]-23932:21, 23968:6, 23968:9 | phoned [3] - 23956:9, 24003:3, 24053:5 | pointed [3] - 23945:15, | $24080: 1,24080: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { practices [6] - } \\ & \text { 23949:20. } 23963: 4 . \end{aligned}$ |
| $24001: 17,24004: 5$ | photocopy [1] | $23945: 16,24084: 1$ | $24107: 21$ | $23975: 15,23985: 15$ |
| 24004:9, 24004:15, | 24093:1 | points [11]-23943:22, | polygraph [13] - | 24030:3, 24099 :22 |
| 24012:18, 24012:25, | phrase [1] - 23953:8 | 23948:21, 23963:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23969:3, 23969:10, } \\ & \text { ク2070.) ク200a.n1 } \end{aligned}$ | practitioner [1] - |
| 24014:7, 24023:17, | physical [6] - 23981:16, | 23980:10, 23994:12, | 23972:2, 23996:21, | 24042:6 |
| 24026:19, 24040:8, | 24014:2, 24016:6, | 23994:16, 23994:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23996:22, 23997:2, } \\ & \text { ग3997•17 } 23997 \cdot 15 \end{aligned}$ | Pratt [1] - 23973:15 |
| 24042:8, 24048:19, | 24017:25, 24018:1, | 24019:19, 24034:18, <br> 24035:22, 24059:5 | 23997:12, 23997:15, | precision [1] - |
| 24048:25, 24051:24, | 24038:4 | $24035: 22,24059: 5$ | 23998:19, 23998:24, | 23956:10 |
| 24052:21, 24064:7, | physically [1] - | Police [9]-23925:7, 23960:6, 23985:4 | $\begin{aligned} & 24120: 11,24120: 17 \\ & 24120: 25 \end{aligned}$ | preclude [1] - 24097:8 |
| 24074:7, 24100:19, <br> 24113:10, 24122.24 | 24108:18 | $24052: 3,24056: 25$ | portion [3]-24004:9, | preferred [1] - 24099:16 |
| $24131: 9$ | 24139:1 | $24058: 5,24058: 8$ | $24004: 16,24009: 4$ | preiim [7]-23956:7, |
| people's [1] - 23930:23 | picked [6]-2399 | 24064:3, $24101: 6$ | portions [1] - 23992:19 | 24049:8, 24049:10, |
| percentages [1] - | 24064:13, 24070:24, | police [89]-23944:1 | portray [1] - 24123:1 | 24071:15, 24079:17 |
| 23994:5 | 24070:25, 24080:16, | 23944:9, 23951:16, | posed [1] - 24064:8 | preliminary [79] - |
| Perdue [1] - 23979:22 | 24096:9 | $\begin{aligned} & 23951: 18,23951: 25, \\ & 23952 \cdot 11 \text { 23953.11 } \end{aligned}$ | poses [1] - 24033:11 | $23930: 14,23930: 16$ |
| Perhaps [1] - 24057:14 | picture [1] - 24010:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23952:11, 23953:11, } \\ & \text { 23953:17, 23953:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { position [12]-23943: } \\ \text { 23953:12, 23955:17, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23947: 2,23947: 9 \\ & 23947: 11 \quad 23947: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| 23961 | piece [1] - 23937 :8 | $23960: 21,23963: 6$ | $23978: 21,23997: 14$ | 23947:11, 23947:12, |
| $23987: 24,24030: 4,$ |  | 23963:11, 23965:19, | $24027: 14,24031: 12$ | $\text { 23962:12, } 23$ |
| 24031:13, 24035:17, | pinpoint [2] - 23928:22, | 23966:6, 23970:20, | 24043:19, 24052:5, | 23969:11, 23970:19, |
| 24045:1, 24045:2, | 24015:12 | 23977:17, 23986:4, | 24116:10, 24117:15, | 23971:1, 23971:11, |
| 24051:15, 24052:3, | pivotal [4]-23937:23, | 23986:15, 24027:9, | 24118:4 | 23972:11, 23972:15 |
| 24055:21, 24076:19, | 23974:13, 24043:25, | 24028:17, 24031:19, 24032:13, 24038.22 | positive [1] - 24035:4 | $23973: 4,23978: 10$ |
| 24101:10 | 24045:21 | $24041: 23,24045: 6$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { possibilities [2] - } \\ \text { 24054:10, 24066:1 } \end{gathered}$ | 23982:7, 23982:11, |
| 24133:9, 24133:10 | $24$ | 24047:23, 24050:22, | possibility [9] | 23988:7, 23991:17, |
| permitted [3] - 24012:5, | 24086:16, 24128:13 | 24054:2, 24054:3, | 24002:22, 24013:18, | 23991:24, 23992:8, |
| 24137:7, 24138:4 | placed [1] - 24054:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 24054: 25,24056: 20 \\ & 24057: 13,24059: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $24022: 7,24025: 18$ | 23992:16, 23993:15, |
| perpetrator [2] - <br> 23957.24 24038.13 | plain [2] - 24080:9, | $24063: 23,24064: 14$ | $24041: 18,24055: 23,$ <br> 24056•3, 24090•1 | $\begin{aligned} & 23995: 3,23996: 10, \\ & \text { 23996.11 } 24007 \cdot 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23957:24, 24038:13 } \\ & \text { person [31] - 23931:20, } \end{aligned}$ | 24106:24 | 24070:21, 24070:23, | $\begin{aligned} & 24056: 3,24090: 1, \\ & 24091: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23996:11, 24007:17, } \\ & \text { 24008:17, 24017:11, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 23931:22, 23975:2, | $23984: 7$ | 24070:25, 24071:5, | possible [7] - 23957:13, | 24033:16, 24033:22, |
| 23978:1, 24013:24, | plausibility [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 24071: 6,24071: 8 \text {, } \\ & 24073: 8.24078: 6 . \end{aligned}$ | $23964: 19,23974: 7$ | $24034: 5,24034: 13$ |
| 24014:11, 24019:5, | 24005:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24073:8, 24078:6, } \\ & \text { 24078:15, 24078:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23986: 18,24041: 12 \\ & 24101: 18,24134: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $24034: 16,24034: 24$ <br> 24035:5, 24035:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24022: 13,24026: 2 \\ & 24028: 5,24029: 5 \end{aligned}$ | played [3] - 23992:5, | $24078: 24,24079: 22$ | possibly [3] - 23943:6, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24035:5, 24035:7, } \\ & \text { 24036:18, 24040:25, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 24030:23, 24030:24, | Pleasant [3] - 24126:10, | $24081 \text { :20, 24082:3, }$ | 23980:17, 24125:5 | 24041:3, $24041: 5$, |
| 24031:17, 24035:19, | 24126:16, 24126:18 | 24083:11, 24084:21, | post [1] - 24120:17 | $24041: 7,24042: 2,$ $24042 \cdot 4 \cdot 24043 \cdot 7$ |
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