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## Transcript of Proceedings

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

## CALVIN FORRESTER TALLIS, continued:

```
BY MR. HODSON:
```

Q

Good morning, Mr. Tallis. When we broke yesterday we had started to talk about Nichol John and her evidence and went through the preliminary hearing and we talked a bit about her statement and what was in her statements, what wasn't in her statements and her evidence at the preliminary hearing. Before $I$ go to the trial transcript, if we could call up 179439, please, and just for the record, you told us these would have been the notes that you would have prepared based upon her evidence at the preliminary hearing and I think you told us that these would have been used as a guide for you in preparing your cross-examination questions at trial; is that correct?

Yes. I prefer to call it an index of the testimony with references in it.

And if we can go to 179446, please, just at the bottom, can you tell us whether that is your handwriting?

A
Q

Yes, that certainly is my handwriting.
And maybe we'll just go through these. I think number one says, "Were you shown where the body found on May 23 rd and 24 th, that is --" I'm not sure if $I$ got that. Maybe you better read that for me. It might be a prescription is it?

My prescription I guess.
It says were you shown?
"Were you shown where her body found on May $23 r d$ or 24 th, this is before statement and were you told that the girl had been stabbed a number of times." And then, "purse, wallet, contents of purse, Cavalier, tear on trousers, how was she dressed, toque, long toque - green in it, how long were you and Wilson out there by Shorty's." So would these be reminders of areas that you might want to canvass?

I'm sure that they were not notes that $I$ put on there at the time $I$ prepared this index and summary of the testimony at the preliminary hearing, but somewhere along the way I jotted them down on the master copy, if $I$ may use that term. Okay. If we could now go to the trial transcript, 003050 , please. Just give me a moment, I'm going
to check the date. According to our chronology, I believe the first two witnesses called at the trial, the first was Ron Wilson and the second was Nichol John. Does that accord with your recollection?

I'm sure that you are correct. I don't at this stage recall the order, but just looking at the index --

Actually, I'm sorry, it looks like Thor Kleiv was the first.

A
$Q$
A
Q
A
Wilson, John and Cadrain, I'm sure that's in the right order.

And then if we could go to 003055 , again this just talks about time, 6:30, and then the next page, this is examination-in-chief, $I$ just want to touch on a couple of areas before we get to your cross-examination, and then this is the reference to the two knives that Mr. Wilson said he saw. Yesterday we talked, we spent a bit of time on the bone-handled hunting knife that both $I$ think Ron

Wilson and Nichol John, and I stand to be corrected, but I think they both said they observed that on David Milgaard on the trip from Regina to Saskatoon. We have heard some evidence regarding a bone-handled hunting knife that was found by the police in the alley $I$ think a couple of months after the murder by Constable Oliver and the evidence we've heard is that it was brought to, I think both the preliminary hearing and the trial, but the Crown didn't tender it as evidence, and I think Mr. Caldwell's evidence here before the Commission was that there was nothing to suggest that it was involved in the crime and $I$ think he said that you were aware of it, shown to you and basically it wasn't tendered and returned to the police. Do you have any recollection of a bone-handled hunting knife being found by the police and its involvement in these proceedings? I'm sure $I$ was aware of it because $I$ had talked to David about whether or not there was a second knife and I've already told you about that.

And the fact that Mr. Caldwell had this bone-handled hunting knife and didn't tender it, would you or did you see under any circumstance where it would help your case to tender a second
knife, the bone-handled hunting knife as being found in the back alley in any way to help David Milgaard's defence?

A
Q

A
to David's case?
Well, it might be viewed as tending to confirm some of the statements of Wilson and John, but I use the term might, and I'm sure $I$ was thinking about that, but now to tell you specifically what was going on, $I$ really can't do it, but I'm quite sure that what you've mentioned is correct.

Maybe just take that a bit further. In light of what the evidence of Nichol John and Ron Wilson was about the bone-handled hunting knife, would you be in a position to say, for example, argue that there were two murder weapons and the second one was a bone-handled hunting knife found in the back alley a month later and somehow try to put that forward saying that's a murder weapon too or belonged to the murderer and therefore that exculpates or helps David's case?

A
in my mind at the time. I don't remember going
over to look at it, but I'm sure if Mr. Caldwell
said that he showed it to me at some stage, I'm
sure that $I$ did see it and made a decision with
respect to -- as a matter of fact, I might well
have objected to it being tendered in evidence on
the footing that the Crown was not able to connect
it in any way to the homicide, and it's like
anything else that's found, unless there's some
causal link, $I$ don't think $I$ would want the
proceedings cluttered up with a knife of that
nature or any other knives or instruments that had been found there unless there was something significant from our standpoint.

Okay. If we can go to page 003060 , and again this is Mr. Caldwell's examination, and $I$ just want to touch on what she said in chief about their trip and what she didn't say so that we can put your cross-examination in the $9(2)$ proceedings in context. She talks about seeing a church as a landmark, did you see any people, at what stage was that in relation to the church:
"A It was before $I$ saw the church."
And then if we can go to the next page, she talks about stopping a woman for directions, and I think we've been through this in the statement. Were you able to, as far as how they described, both Ron Wilson and Nichol John described this woman as wearing a dark coat, Nichol John describes it as a cape of that nature, was that consistent with what Mr. Milgaard had told you she was dressed in, the woman they stopped? Well, $I$ think he used the term coat, that's my recollection now, but as far as any other specifics, $I$ don't recall what type of hat he said she was wearing or anything like that.

And then just down at the bottom of that page -I noticed that, I remember Nichol John didn't use the term "girl" as $I$ recall it, she used the term "woman", or slightly different words.

Right.
But -- a lady, but later on she of course referred to her being in the 20 s .

Right. If we can maybe just go to the top of the page, she does:
"A It was a woman."
And down at the bottom, she said:
"A She was approximately in her twenties I figured."

Yes.
So again $I$ think we had Ron Wilson saying girl,
Nichol John saying woman in her 20 s and David
Milgaard saying an older woman which $I$ think you took to be in the early to mid 30 s ; is that correct?

A
Well, I think I -- I think I indicated to you perhaps within the 35 to 40 range.

Oh, I'm sorry.
But, you know, this is very difficult to recollect in specific terms, but that's my sense today, and it was the other day, that it was in that range,
because we spent quite a bit of time, at least I spent quite a bit of time, so did he, talking about how he arrived at the term "older woman", and as I've told you before, the aspects that I raised including a comparison, say, with my own age.

If we can go to page 003065 , and here's where she described after leaving the woman went about half a block to another intersection, and next page, and she describes getting stuck, going around the boulevard on some ice, and then scroll down, we've been through this before, it's a bit confusing, I think she describes getting stuck for a short while before they actually got stuck again behind the funeral home, and $I$ think when the examination is occurring $I$ think there might be some confusion about that and we've been through that.

If we can then go ahead to
003075, and I don't think she was able to say how long they were away from the car, but here's where Mr. Caldwell asks:
"Q So then when Dave got back in the car on what we have been calling the second time at the curb as you say, what happened then?

A Then we drove away."
And then go to the next page:
"Q What is the next place you got to that you can assign a name to or a description?

A Well, I remember getting stuck in another alley which $I$ now know to be behind a funeral home."

It goes on to describe that, and in an alley, and on an incline.

And if we can go to the next page, and here Mr. Caldwell asks her about what happens:
"Q ... what happened when you got stuck at that juncture?

A Well, Dave got out of the car to see if we could get unstuck. He came back into the car and then he told Ron that we couldn't. So then I remember both of them getting out and looking. Other than that $I$ think they tried to push the car; I'm not too sure though."

And then the next page, and then talks, just scroll down, talks about Dave getting out only
for a few minutes, just to the back of the car and then back in, and then at the bottom she says they both got out, so this is the second time. "Q ... okay; are we to understand that on this occasion on the incline where you were stuck that that would be the first time Ron was out, that is when they both went out together?

A Yes."
And then some questions, go to the next page, and then again, as $I$ said, it's a bit confusing, but I think they are getting mixed up, the questioner and the answerer between which occasion, but in any event, when they arrived back -- let me just back up. I think Nichol John talked about when they first got stuck on the incline behind the alley they got out to check for a couple of minutes to try and push them out and then got back in the car, and then here again:
"A Well, Ron went one way and Dave went the other way.

Q ... so this incident we have been talking about up to now was simply a go to the back of the car and look sort of thing, was it?

A Yes."
And now middle of the page, the description, any attention to which way either of them went:
"A Ron went to the left and David went to
the right as the car was facing."
Then the next page, $I$ think this is where we get
into the key area, the question:
"Q Now, what is the next thing that happened?

A Well, $I$ remember Dave getting back into the car. That's about all."

And I've skipped through the transcript,
Mr. Tallis, but this is where in her statement she had described, before David got back, witnessing him grabbing the girl and stabbing her, so now this is the same time frame, she says:
"A Well, I remember Dave getting back into the car, that's about all.

Q And who got back first of the two?
A Well, Ron must have because when Dave got back into the car I moved over to Ron so --

Q You say Ron must have been back before Dave?

A Right.
Q How much before Dave?
A I don't know.
Q How long do you estimate Dave was out on this occasion?

A I don't know ...
Q I take it all you can say is longer at any rate?

A Yes."
And then the next page:
"Q Now, up till the point when Dave got back in on this occasion had you up till this point seen anything of any other person than the two of them and yourself since you got unstuck at the intersection?

A Not that $I$ can recall."
And again, that would be in her statement where she said that she did see David Milgaard and the girl. And then the Court:
"Q And when you were stuck there on this incline $I$ take it from what you said there wasn't any car in front of you ...

A No."
And just scroll down.
"Q Alright; now, when the two of them were back in did you notice anything about say the condition or appearance of either of them?

A Well, Dave looked cold, that's about all.

Q And what happened when they were both back in?

A Then we started driving again."

And then the next page, she's asked about how they got unstuck and she says:
"A I can't recall that."

And then the next page, Mr. Caldwell is asked about how their car got stuck and the judge says: "Surely you must have known whether somebody was pushing you. You remember sitting in the car in the front seat you must have known whether someone was pushing you to get out of there, don't you?

A I don't remember."

And at this point, Mr. Tallis, just trying to get a sense of whether you recall whether Chief Justice Bence at this point -- I think you've told us earlier the atmosphere during Nichol

John's evidence, and we'll get into this in a bit greater detail, but do you recall whether at this point the judge was becoming concerned about Nichol's evidence?

A

Q
A

A

Well, $I$ don't recall this specific area, but reading it over and trying to reflect back, I would say certainly at this stage, even in the, in this stage of the examination-in-chief, his words indicate to me that he was skeptical.

And as far as --
By the words he -- my sense was that he was skeptical of the words "I don't remember".

Right.
And $I$ think that comes through, and while $I$ don't specifically recollect this area of examining, I certainly recollect that in her examination-in-chief $I$ sensed that he was skeptical of the "I don't remember" or inability to recall.

Right. Now, the day earlier, or the day of this evidence Ron Wilson was the prior witness, the Court would have heard Ron Wilson testify that, similarly when they left the car, but that when he got back Nichol was hysterical?

That's correct.

And so I take it Chief Justice Bence would have been aware of that evidence and as well Ron Wilson's other evidence that tended to incriminate Mr. Milgaard, that had already been out at the trial; correct?

Yes.
As far as her statement, Nichol John's statement, would the judge have been aware of the contents of that are you able to tell us at this stage? I don't think he would have been.

Now, when we get --
Because -- and I say that because that statement, I don't think he had read the preliminary hearing, but $I$ don't think that -- that statement would not be on the Court file.

And I suppose at this point though, in light of what Mr. Wilson said, the question may have been if she was hysterical must have been -- I suppose an inference could be drawn that if she was hysterical, she must have seen something; is that a fair inference that the jury might draw?

A Yes, I think the inference you suggest is a reasonable one.

And so is it possible at this point that the judge is concerned that Nichol John maybe is holding
back? I mean, I think you told us yesterday that that may have come out a bit later. May it have started at this point on how they got pushed out? I think so, having read it, this is a reasonable suggestion on your part. I have no difficulty understanding what you are saying.

And I appreciate, I think what you are saying is you can't specifically recall, you can't go back and say yes, $I$ remember this question and $I$ remember at that point that things started to go this way, but looking back at it, I think you've told us you have a general recollection and impression of the judge's demeanour towards her and, based on that, this may have been the start of it; is that a fair summary of your evidence? Yes, and $I$ have a general impression too of the witness' demeanour and that $I$ 'm sure is something that caught the attention of the presiding judge. And can you tell us again at this early stage, I presume that you would have been fairly attentive -- well, throughout the trial, but certainly at this stage you knew at the preliminary hearing that she didn't repeat her evidence --

A That's right.

Q
-- about this part, presumably at trial you didn't know whether she was going to repeat it or not; is that fair?

Yes. You know, you learn to expect the unexpected at times and --

And when she went through this part of her evidence-in-chief with Mr. Caldwell, and I've just gone through parts of it where she says I don't remember, what observations did you make about Nichol John's demeanour in giving that evidence? Well, first of all, this was consistent essentially with what, how she handled herself at the preliminary hearing, but $I$ could see that having regard to the answers and her demeanour people might well feel that she was holding back for some reason, and when $I$ say that, of course, $I$ refer not only to the impression she may have been making on the jury, but also on the presiding judge. Now, I certainly can't look into the judge's mental processes, $I$ have enough difficulty trying to revive my own.

So on this point, just before we leave this then, I think what the judge is saying, even when she describes the incident and what happened, he's picked up on one point, is that lookit, you know,
you've told us about what happened there, you got out of there, surely you must know how you got out of there, you were in the front seat, in a way of doubting -- is it fair to read that that he was --

A

Q

A
Q
A

Q That's why I used the term skeptical.

Yeah, that he was maybe doubting her answer about "I don't remember"?

Yes.
Is that a fair read of that?
Yes, that's what $I$ was trying to convey when $I$ used the term skeptical.

If we can go to 003111, and again just for the record, $I$ don't think we need to go through this, we've covered it before, she talks about the cosmetic bag and again gives similar evidence about the contents of the cosmetic bag or the compact and it being thrown out.

And then if we can go to 003115,
and again this is where she testifies that:
"A Nobody said anything and Dave - all of a sudden Dave grabbed it and he threw it out the window anyway."

And again $I$ think we've touched on that with other witnesses and $I$ think, I'm assuming the same would apply with Nichol John that your
approach on the compact bag with her would be, in cross-examination, to ignore it because you could not dispute it?

A You are correct.
And 003123, again these are questions from Mr. Caldwell confirming that neither Nichol, Ron or David Milgaard were under the influence of liquor or drugs during the morning of January 31, 1969. And then if we can go to 003126, this is where Mr. Caldwell has concluded his examination and asks for an opportunity to raise, and here's where we get into the section 9(2). Yes.

And I think you may have told us this, but would you -- and I think you told us that you would have anticipated this as a possibility and that you would have briefed this area and had a position ready to put forward to the judge?

Yes, I was familiar with the change in the law and I'm quite sure that not only had I followed or sort of tracked this development, but that that was a point that $I$ had to be prepared for, and that's why I'm able to say that at that time there were no reported cases or even unreported cases in this jurisdiction dealing with the application of
section 9(2).
And again, just to sort of refresh our minds about 9(1) and 9(2) of the Canada Evidence Act, 9(2) states:

> "Where the party producing a witness alleges that the witness made at other times a statement in writing or reduced to writing inconsistent with his present testimony, the Court may, without proof that the witness is adverse, grant leave to the party to cross-examine the witness as to the statement and the Court may consider such cross-examination in determining whether, in the opinion of the Court, the witness is adverse."
> And then subsection $9(1)$ allowed a party calling a witness to cross-examine where that witness was hostile or adverse. Is that correct?

Yes, $I$ think you fairly state the situation. And it's my understanding that prior to section 9(2), the challenge was if you had an earlier inconsistent statement that you wished to use to establish the witness was hostile, it was a difficult process to do that, to cross-examine
your own witness before you got the ruling on adversity; is that correct?

A
Q
A
$Q$

Yes.

I'm oversimplifying it, but --
No, but $I$ think that distills the point. The only thing $I$ would add to that is that $I$ think that by that time, although it wasn't involved here, but before section 9(2) came in, I think the Coffin case had been described and been decided in the Supreme Court and trial judges often allowed a fair degree of latitude to Crown counsel in having a witness look at a statement that they had given, read it over of course without doing it out loud, and then inviting them to refresh their memory by looking at the statement.

Now, that wasn't applicable
here, but just so that you understand that $I$ was well aware of the, of that procedure and I'm sure that $I$ had it briefed in case that path had been chosen as an alternative to begin with. Indeed, some -- I recall on occasion some trial judges would direct that that be done first.

And so that just so that $I$ have this right, and please correct me if I'm wrong, that under section 9(2) it was contemplated that in this case, for
example, Mr. Caldwell could take a prior inconsistent statement under 9(2), seek leave of the Court to cross-examine his own witness as to the statement?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Q
A
Q
A
Q
Yeah. Just so we have it clear, under 9(2) you get one crack to cross-examine on the previous
inconsistent statement for the purposes, I presume, of having the witness declared adverse. Once that's done, if successful, then under 9 (1) you are entitled to cross-examine the witness on broad-ranging matters, including the statement? Yes.

If we can then just go through some of these submissions. Mr. Caldwell restates the section. If we can go to the next page, and think, Mr. Tallis, the key issue here and at trial, and we're going to spend some time on this, is the question of whether or not the cross-examination under 9(2), the initial cross-examination, is done in the presence or absence of the jury, and perhaps as well the scope of that initial 9(2) examination; in other words, what witnesses are called and what are the parameters. Is that a fair --

A
$Q$

A

Yeah, I think you've identified the crucial area. And so here Mr. Caldwell submits that he should be, the cross-examination of Nichol John on the earlier statement should be done in the absence of the jury, that was his position, and I believe that was your position as well; correct?

Yes. I think Mr. Caldwell was well aware of the
position that $I$ was taking, I'm sure that $I$ had indicated that to him, and I'm also not only -well, the record makes it quite clear to me that he was in agreement with the procedure that you have just outlined and that is that the matter should be dealt with in the absence of the jury. If we can maybe simplify this a bit because we went through this with Mr. Caldwell, would you agree with the following, that -- I mean, ultimately the Court of Appeal ruled on this issue and set out a test under 9(2), and you are familiar with that test; correct?

Yes. I couldn't recite the seven steps or whatever they are, but $I$ certainly --

And $I$ will show them to you in a moment. Yes.

But that test, is it fair to say that in making submissions to Chief Justice Bence, that both you and Mr. Caldwell, number one, were in agreement on how section $9(2)$ should be applied, and secondly, that your respective submissions, both of you, were consistent with or identical to what the Court of Appeal ultimately ruled how the section should be interpreted; is that fair?

A
I think that's quite an accurate and fair
assessment.
And the judge didn't agree; is that correct?
No, and $I$ think somewhere during the course of the proceedings, $I$ just want to put this in perspective, $I$ think that he indicated that he had discussed it with at least some of his judicial colleagues, and since this was a new section, I thought that the consultation that had occurred reflected, $I$ can't say the view of every member of the trial Court, but at least the view of not only the presiding judge, but some colleagues on the Court who probably were available for consultation in Saskatoon.

I'll go through --
I surmise that from I think a comment perhaps that you had directed my attention to.

Sure, and we'll go through that. If we could just go to 003129, please, and here's where the judge says -- I think his initial position is that based on the previous law:
"... all examinations prior to the enactment of this section for the purpose of determining whether a witness was adverse or not, was always in the presence of the jury."

And $I$ think what he was saying is lookit, if it's a question of determining adversity of a witness, that's done in front of the jury, so his inclination, at least initially, was that this should be as well. He then says he wants a few minutes to consider this because he didn't know it was coming up, and then down at the bottom you say:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ".. I would like to outline my position } \\
& \text { on the interpretation of this section } \\
& \text { and prior to the enactment of this } \\
& \text { section it has always been my } \\
& \text { understanding of the law that before } \\
& \text { counsel could be permitted to } \\
& \text { cross-examine on a previous statement of } \\
& \text { his own witness there had to be a ruling } \\
& \text { by the ... judge . . } \\
& \text { section makes an exception to that rule } \\
& \text { and as I understand it you may, that is } \\
& \text { there is a discretion to grant leave to } \\
& \text { cross-examine a witness as to the } \\
& \text { statement and the court may consider } \\
& \text { such cross eexamination in determining } \\
& \text { whether in the opinion of the court the }
\end{aligned}
$$

                                    witness is adverse."
    And then you go on, if we could scroll down, you say:
"... with deference $I$ find myself in disagreement with Your Lordship's observations ..."

Judge Bence says:
". . but, Mr. Tallis, the thing is so plain. If the legislature . ."

And then you say:
"If Your Lordship would hear me . ."
He says:
". . may I finish - if the legislature
had intended anything otherwise then it
should have been in the section. Do you
want me to read something into the
section that isn't there?"
And then you go on to talk about subsection 9(1), and then the next page, and I'll just touch on, if we can just scroll down -- the entire
transcript is in for the record for the purposes of this Inquiry, Mr. Tallis, so I just want to touch on some of the key parts.

A Yes.

This is you speaking:
"... I think it would be most improper for Your Lordship to permit cross-examination on such a statement in the presence of a jury and then having so permitted that to make a ruling at that stage that the witness is adverse; because if you do it in that manner and I say this with deference - whatever observations you would then make to the jury with respect to your findings suppose you said: Well, having regard to the situation $I$ am not prepared to say that this witness is adverse - I cannot see with respect a jury necessarily following that comment, and it is my contention that there is an issue that must be determined by the Court not by Your Lordship and the jury and that is whether in the light of all the circumstances the witness is adverse; and $I$ say that in considering whether or not the witness is adverse Your Lordship should also look at what she has said here in court, her demeanour, what was said in the
preliminary hearing which is before Your Lordship --"

Etcetera. And then if we can scroll down, $I$ think there's some further disagreement. Maybe go to the next page, here you say:
"I say with respect that when the amendment came out $I$ can honestly say that $I$ have not been able to find a case which deals with the interpretation of this section ..."

And $I$ take it that that was the status of the law at that time, there was not a definitive ruling on this section?

Well, and I think it's during the course of my submissions $I$ indicated that $I$ had been unable to find any case on it, and that included any unreported cases, but of course we didn't have computers in those days where we could dig up cases the way we can now.

And then if we can go to page 00 -I might say, I think Mr. Caldwell and I were in agreement that there were no reported cases, so his research hadn't turned up any either.

Then if we can go to 003135 , and then the judge says, and this is again still in the initial
argument, the judge says:
"I think $I$ had better look at the
statements. Have you any objection to
my looking at the statements now,
Mr. Tallis?"

And you say:
"No."
But you say he should also look at the preliminary hearing. We'll come back to that a bit later. He says:
"Why should $I$ look at the preliminary inquiry evidence?"

You say:
"... because the section vests you with
a discretion. It says "may", not
"must", and in determining whether or
not to grant a request to my learned
friend it is my submission that you must
look at all of the circumstances."
Can you maybe just elaborate on that for us,
Mr. Tallis, on that position?
A
Well, when $I$ talk of all the circumstances, $I$ had in mind that this is the type -- the circumstances should be inquired into in the absence of the jury, and although this was not dealing with the
admissibility of a confession on a voir dire, I thought that it was very important that a voir dire be conducted even though the learned trial judge disagreed almost at the very beginning of the argument, and my reason for that was that $I$ thought that there would then be an obligation on the Crown to call evidence of the relevant circumstances under which this statement was made so that the presiding judge would have those circumstances before him in deciding whether or not to exercise his discretion to permit that type of cross-examination, and $I$ felt that of course the previous testimony that she had given at the preliminary hearing was part of -- part of the circumstances that might be relevant. Now, I've tried to distill it without being too long winded and, if $I$ have, just tell me that I'm being too long winded.

No, that's fine, no. And I think when we go to the actual application of the test, I'll ask you to touch on this issue again.

If we can go to 003139, please.
I think then after, and I've skipped over some of the discussions back and forth, but the record does reflect that you and Mr. Caldwell are in
agreement regarding the exclusion of the jury. The judge then decides to adjourn to consider the point overnight, and the next page, 003140 , he comes back with his ruling.

You had mentioned, Mr. Tallis, that you had a recollection, and $I$ may have missed it in the transcript, it may be in there, that Chief Justice Bence either had or intended to consult some of his colleagues on the bench? Well, I think somewhere he made a reference -Okay.

A
-- to that.
I'll maybe look for it on the break.
But my recollection could be wrong, but -And then again he asks for any further points, you make a submission regarding the Hunt case, and then he goes on to make his ruling.

If we can go to the next page, he says:
"At this stage Mr. Caldwell has not asked to have the witness declared adverse. He has merely asked for permission to cross-examine under the amendment. Presumably he will after such has been done ask that the witness
be declared adverse if he thinks such has been demonstrated.

There is nothing in the section
to state that such cross-examination is for the purpose of determining adversity. If Parliament had intended otherwise it should and $I$ believe would have said so. It provides, however, that I may consider such
cross-examination if the question of adversity arises."

Ask then scroll down:
"I have determined that the
cross-examination under the section
shall take place in the presence of the
jury."
And calls the jury back in.
Now, before $I$ go through what
happened in Mr. Caldwell's examination and your cross-examination of Nichol John, I want to take a look at what the Court of Appeal subsequently concluded was the correct procedure and $I$ want to go through that and get your comments, and then we'll go back and look what actually happened at the trial, what you did based on Chief Justice

Bence's ruling, and secondly, what you could and would have done if he had made the correct ruling that the Court of Appeal said he should have done. Do you follow where I'm going to go?

A
Q

A
$Q$

 Yes.

And if we can go to 009340 , and this is the Court of Appeal, if we can go to 009363 , and in fact one of the grounds of your appeal to the Court of Appeal was the fact that Chief Justice Bence erred in the application of section 9(2); correct? That's correct.

And so this starts at the bottom, we can just skip ahead to 009365 , and $I$ think it might be worthwhile just to go through this. The Court says:
"It is to be noted that the right to cross-examine one's own witness respecting a statement in writing, or reduced to writing, previously made by the witness inconsistent with the evidence given, is not an absolute right. The Judge, in the exercise of his discretion, may or may not grant that permission. This requires some preliminary inquiry by the Judge. That
being so, $I$ think the consideration and disposition of the application in jury trials should be made in the absence of the jury. Allegation in the presence of the jury that the witness had, on another occasion, said something inconsistent with what she said in evidence, when leave to cross-examine is refused, might have a very adverse effect on the jury's deliberations, particularly as to the effect to be given to the evidence of that witness." I think that's one of the points that you had raised that we touched on in front of Chief Justice Bence; correct?

Yes.
And then the next page, the court sets out the seven steps which I think became known as the Milgaard Rule; is that correct, Mr. Tallis? Yes, certainly that was one way of expressing it in shorthand.

Q
And let's just quickly go through them. The first step is:
"(1) Counsel should advise the Court
that he desires to make an
application ..."
Mr. Caldwell did that.
(2) When the Court is so advised, the Court should direct the jury to retire." I think that was partly done.
(3) Upon --"

Actually, the jury did retire to consider the application.
"(3) Upon retirement of the jury, counsel should advise the learned trial

Judge of the particulars of the application and produce for him the alleged statement in writing, or the writing to which the statement has been reduced."

That happened.
(4) The learned trial Judge should read the statement, or writing, and determine whether, in fact, there is an
inconsistency between such statement or writing and the evidence the witness has given in Court. If the learned trial

Judge decides there is no inconsistency,
then that ends the matter. If he finds
there is an inconsistency, he should
call upon counsel to prove the statement or writing."

I think that was done as well.
(5) Counsel should then prove the statement, or writing. This may be done by producing the statement or writing to the witness. If the witness admits the statement, or the statement reduced to writing, such proof would be sufficient. If the witness does not so admit, counsel then could provide the necessary proof by other evidence.
(6) If the witness admits making the statement, counsel for the opposing party should have the right to cross-examine as to the circumstances under which the statement was made. A similar right to cross-examine should be granted if the statement is proved by other witnesses. It may be that he will be able to establish that there were circumstances which would render it improper for the learned trial Judge to permit the cross-examination, notwithstanding the apparent
inconsistencies. The opposing counsel, too, should have the right to call evidence as to factors relevant to obtaining the statement, for the purpose of attempting to show that cross-examination should not be permitted.
(7) The learned trial Judge should then decide whether or not he will permit the cross-examination. If so, the jury should be recalled."

Next page:
"The cross-examination provided for in Section 9(2) must be in the presence of the jury."

So again, that's once it's done. And then at the bottom of the page, we'll just finish up on what the Court ruled:
"In the present case, the learned trial Judge did not pursue the procedure which

I have suggested be followed. After deciding that the statement of Nichol

John previously made, was inconsistent
with the evidence she had given, he
recalled the jury. Proof of the
statement was then made in the presence of the jury.

Had the learned trial Judge not permitted the cross-examination, then $I$ think strong exception could have been taken to the procedure which he followed. In the present case he did allow the cross-examination and there is nothing that took place in the cross-examination of the witness, either by Crown or defence counsel, that would not have occurred had he followed the procedure $I$ have outlined."

And then goes on to say at the bottom:
"Under these circumstances, if he erred
in law, $I$ would apply the curative provisions ..."
-- of the code. So in other words, it was an error that was not significant enough for the Court to reverse the verdict; is that fair? Yes.

So if we can just go back to the previous page and maybe spend a bit of time -- actually, one back, 009367 , and $I$ want to talk about five and six, and in particular six, so let's talk about five and
let's talk about what should have happened.
I think what we know, if $I$ can
just back up, what we know from the facts and the record, that Nichol John was interviewed by a number of police officers prior to May $23 r d$, she was then interviewed by Inspector Roberts on May $23 r d$ at the Cavalier Hotel, was not polygraphed. We've heard some evidence that that interview may have been recorded or listened in by some other police officers based on the information of Mr. Chartier. We also know that she was then kept overnight at the Saskatoon police station and then the following morning she gave a sworn statement to Ray Mackie, and I suppose we could go back even further and say that we know on March 11th, '69 she gave her initial statement to Inspector Riddell and the record also shows that she was interviewed by the police on at least one more occasion in between the two statements.

If we go back, Mr. Tallis, and look at what the Court of Appeal said about -- and talk about the circumstances. Certainly what we know, and I'll take you to this, Nichol John, when she was examined by Mr. Caldwell, or cross-examined, said basically yes, I signed the
statement, $I$ gave the statement, I remember giving it to Mr. Mackie, but $I$ don't remember, $I$ think in essence, telling him certain parts of it, and $I$ don't remember those parts of it happening, and so as far as the giving of the statement, $I$ think she acknowledged that it was hers, but if we can talk for a moment on what you could have or would have done if -- let's talk about paragraph 6, applied. Can you tell us -- for example, let's start off with Nichol John. If you had -if you would have been allowed to cross-examine her in the absence of the jury with respect to the giving of the statement and the circumstances under which the statement was made, can you tell us some of the areas you may have canvassed with her given that opportunity?

A Well, in general terms, it would have been safe to conduct a much more wide-ranging cross-examination and, in particular, to deal with her contact with the polygraph operator and the circumstances there as well as with respect to -- as well as with other police officers. Now, that sums it up because this would be consistent with the position I took, and which $I$ think the judgment on appeal recognized, that the judge should, on this

Inquiry, have an opportunity to consider all of the circumstances, and that would include all the background to the giving of the statement that is in question.

And if it were done in the absence of the jury, as it ought to be done, I'm quite sure that $I$ would have taken the position that the onus was on the Crown to call the evidence of other law enforcement people that were involved, either directly or indirectly, in the taking of this statement. That would include, of course, Mr. Roberts as well as some of the other witnesses that you have mentioned, and if there was a recording of the interviews, then of course I would contemplate that those recordings could be produced and played.

Now, I don't want to be too long
winded about this, but the circumstances under which the statement was given might well be analogous, and I'm sure $I$ would have argued this, to the taking of a confession, and at that time, if my recollection is correct, there was, I think, very respectable authority for the proposition that on a voir dire, to determine the admissibility of a statement, there is a duty or
burden on the Crown to call all the witnesses who had anything to do, either directly or indirectly, with the taking of that statement, and that includes, in some cases, quite a number of witnesses, and unless there's a very good reason for the absence of such a witness and failure to call a witness, then that was the principle that was applied and could, in some circumstances, result in an inference being drawn that if the witness, police witness had been called, he or she would not support the position advanced with respect to admissibility of the confession.

And what would be your objective, and we'll go through in a bit more detail, Mr. Tallis, about who might be called and specific approaches, but in this scenario what would be your objective, what would you be trying to establish in front of the judge with respect to the circumstances under which Nichol John gave her previous inconsistent statement?

Well, to raise the question as to whether or not she had been pressured in any way or whether she had been led into believing certain things, and here in the light of what $I$ now know about some of it from what you have told me, I think the
polygraph operator, particularly if, you know, particularly if the discussions with him had been monitored and recorded even though no polygraph test was administered, that could be very relevant and material.

Now, I appreciate that I'm
speculating here because $I$ don't have all of that information, but $I$ think that $I$ draw the analogy between that and the rule with respect to confessions as $I$ recall it. You will understand what I'm talking about.

Right. In fact, I think if we, apart from that law, the Court of Appeal judgment says you would have the right to call evidence as to factors relevant to obtaining the statement for the purpose of attempting to show the cross-examination should not be permitted because the Court says it may be able, that you will be able to establish that there were circumstances which would render it improper for the learned trial judge to permit the cross-examination, notwithstanding the apparent inconsistencies, and so I think what you are telling us is that yes, the objective would be there to put forward all the circumstances under which the statement was
obtained and then you would urge upon the trial judge to say notwithstanding the inconsistencies, it's not proper to allow the statement?

A
$Q$
A

Q

A
A

That would certainly -- yes, and that would be a relevant consideration in my view that should be, should have been placed before the trial judge in the absence of the jury, because in this particular case I've already told you, I think it after David left the car, that type of -- would that be an analogy there where --
would be very hazardous to start cross-examining in the presence of the jury about a polygraph operator.

Right.
Whether he took the -- whether he administered the test or not.

Right. Let's just talk about, and you had mentioned, and we'll go through this when we look at the actual questioning that took place and the judge's involvement, but you have told us that it was your observation and, you believed, possibly or likely the jury's observation as well, that the judge -- that the judge was of the view that Nichol John was holding back and that that's why she was not repeating the contents of her statements and saying more, that she was trying to hold back, and I appreciate these were your observations, but $I$ think you said a reasonable bystander might take that view that she was trying to help David in holding back information.

If you would have been given an opportunity in the voir dire contemplated by the Court of Appeal regarding the circumstances of the taking of the statement, would that have given you an opportunity to try to persuade the judge that
he might be wrong on that view and that there are other circumstances that might explain why a witness would give a sworn statement saying she witnessed a murder, but then later said she couldn't recall; in other words, something more favourable to Mr. Milgaard's position?

Yes, and $I$ should just say this, that if the Crown declined to call the witnesses as to the circumstances, then as a defence counsel $I$ would have had to make a decision whether or not $I$ would call them even though, in effect, I would be going into the opposing camp, but that's something that we never reached, but $I$ think the judgment of the Court of Appeal certainly contemplated situations where defence counsel might well call witnesses on this issue, but in most cases, when a statement is taken, basically you just have police witnesses around, but suppose the boy's -- this girl's mother or father had been present when the statement was being taken, one might well decide to call the parent or parents if the Crown did not do so, but $I$ still think that at the end of the day this is the type of situation where the burden is on the Crown to call evidence of the circumstances of the taking of the statement.

Based upon your dealings with Mr. Caldwell, and in particular based upon the fact that he brought in Inspector Roberts both for the preliminary hearing and the trial at your request, what is your sense as to, if you would have gone and asked him, if this procedure had been employed, to say would you please call Inspector Roberts and Mr. Mackie and others who may have been involved?

Frankly, $I$ think that if the ruling had gone the way it could have gone on the basis of our joint submission, that there should be a voir dire, I think in all likelihood he would have called him to give evidence on the voir dire.

And so again -- and if he didn't, I know we're speculating, but if he didn't, for example, call Inspector Roberts, you would have the right to call him?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
And let's just talk again about what approach you might take with these witnesses if the jury were
not present. We've talked about Nichol John a little bit. I think you said you would be, be prepared to go into areas that you might not if the jury were present; is that fair?

A
Q

A
$Q$

A

Q
$Q$ That's correct.

For example, in front of the jury you might not want to be too hard on her, is that fair, you wouldn't want the jury to think you were being mean to her, things of that nature?

I think that's a fair assessment.
In the absence of the jury might you consider taking a harder approach with her to try to get to the truth?

Yes, and also, and in the course of that probing, what Mr. Roberts had told her, all this type of background.

Now, let's just talk about the risk that you talked about before in examining Nichol John in the presence of the jury, and there's a couple of things $I$ think you've told us, number one, you would be worried that she might turn on you and adopt the statement and say, okay, sorry, I do remember, $I$ did witness the murder, that would be one scenario. The second scenario we talked about, the concern would be is how do you
challenge the credibility of that part of her statement that she doesn't adopt; in other words, if she doesn't adopt it, it's harder to challenge.

Now, let's go back and deal with
both of those. The first one is the risk of her turning on you. If in the course of this proceeding, if it would have happened, can you tell us what you might have done in the course of that if she did in fact change her evidence in the course of your cross-examination, would you be left with any arguments to keep, to still keep the statement and her evidence out of the jury, away from the jury?

It would be very difficult. I think the trial judge would have ruled that that was the answer, but, you know, I'm speculating here. Would you have available -- and I appreciate that in argument to say that lookit, this is so unreliable because on the one hand you've given a sworn statement, then under oath at the prelim you can't remember, then at the trial you can't remember, then at the trial you do remember, I take it it would give you some --

A
Oh, I would have made that type of argument. I think you've pointed to basically the, oh,
probably the only argument you could make under those circumstances.

And then I suppose if she did adopt it, you would then have the ability to cross-examine her on the credibility of the statement, which I think you told us yesterday you, I think, and correct me if I'm wrong, $I$ think you said you would have been better off, your position would have been better off if she had adopted it and allowed you to cross-examine than how it ended up going in at trial; is that correct?

A
$Q$
Probably, yes.
So that's the one risk. The second one we talked about is in the absence of the jury could you see yourself cross-examining her on the basis of saying lookit, this statement that you supposedly swore is so ridiculous $I$ don't know how you could have said it, and go through some of the things, and how could you say you just witnessed a murder, or just realized you witnessed a murder when you talked to Inspector Roberts, that sounds pretty foolish, things of that nature, is that something that you would have --

Oh, yes, and that's why I mentioned a moment ago you would want to know what Mr. Roberts had told
her and then try to get the circumstances from him or other police officers under which he uttered certain things to her.

Let's talk about Mr. Roberts. Assuming you get him there in the absence of the jury and are entitled to either cross-examine him or examine him, can you tell us what types of things you would ask him or what areas you would cover or what tact, and $I$ appreciate this is -- you are looking back and saying here's what $I$ might have done, but what types of things -- well, let me back up. I think in fairness, you considered his position, you knew what he told you at the time, you were suspicious of him. If you were given an opportunity to cross-examine him in the absence of the jury, what would you have done?

A
Well, of course it would depend a great deal on the examination-in-chief testimony that he would have given had Mr. Caldwell had called him. Right.

But I would have of course probed some of the areas that $I$ mentioned to you yesterday, the types of questions that he put to her, but what details he told her and where did he get those details from, if he got any, and of course you've
mentioned that there probably was a recording of some of these proceedings, and if one had access to that recording that had been over -- had been made, $I$ don't know now what questions $I$ would have asked, but they would have been governed by some of that information that $I$ gather you indicated was probably available at the time.

We've heard some evidence from Mr. Chartier, I don't think from anybody else, that he set up the tape.

A
I see.
But if that were available, then that's something,
if you learned of it in the course of the
examination, you would probe into; is that fair?
That's correct.

What about Mr. Mackie, he is the officer who took the statement. Would you examine him?

Well, I certainly would examine him. Of course, if he was involved in overhearing any of the discussions between Mr. Roberts and Miss John or was aware, you know, of things like that, then of course $I$ would ask him about it, and also ask him about what Mr . Roberts had told him. In other words, there may -- one would want to consider whether there was a chain of information that was
used in ultimately taking the statement.
What about the officers who dealt with Nichol John
on the day or two prior to her meeting with
Inspector Roberts who drove her around and
interviewed her, would you seek to have those officers called?

Well, it would -- my view is that that would be part of the circumstances that should be inquired into and $I$ would expect that that evidence would be called, and $I$ think if the ruling had gone on the basis of our joint submission, I think Mr. Caldwell would likely have called it.

Would you go so far as to go back to March 11th, ' 69 and considered Inspector Riddell, who took the very first statement from Nichol John, as a witness about that statement?

A

Q At this stage that's a little more difficult for me to answer. I'm inclined to think that one could make a persuasive argument that that too was relevant in light of the subsequent statements. If Nichol John's statement of May 24 th had not been, if the jury had not been made aware of the contents of that statement, and $I$ appreciate that the judge gave a direction that they weren't to consider the unadopted portions, can you give us
an assessment of how significant that would have been in the result, and I'm not asking you to guess what the jury might have done differently, but can you tell us, as defence counsel, the significance of the section $9(2)$ proceedings and, in particular, how it was handled and the fact that the May 24 th statement contents, the jury, (a), became aware of them, and (b), how it all played out and the demeanour of Nichol John and the judge with respect to how she was asked about why she couldn't remember those things?

I'm not sure that $I$ can give you an unbiased comment, but I'll do my best to apply the objective bystander test that $I$ mentioned to you. I'll take both, your biased view and your objective bystander.

A
You can have your cake and eat it too then. I know that my personal assessment of it was that this was a devastating turning point in all likelihood and using the objective bystander test, if $I$ may use that term, $I$ think that the reference to that particular statement in some of the contents, crucial contents, in light of the testimony of Mr. Wilson, probably marked a turning point in the proceedings. objectively when $I$ apply this test, but $I$ think, looking back and trying to capture the atmosphere, I have made a fair assessment. Others might take a different view, but from being there, that is the way I would answer the two limbs of your question.

If we can just go a bit further, and once we go through and see what happened, I'll ask you the question again about your observations about how it unfolded and how that may have impacted the jury. Let's go back, and let me put it to you this way, if the statement -- if the Court had ruled that the previous statement could not be used to cross-examine Nichol John, so in other words, all that the jury heard was her evidence that we met a lady, asked for directions, got stuck, then went to the Trav-a-leer -- that David and Ron left, then went to the Trav-a-leer, and there was no evidence whatsoever regarding portions of her statement that she did not adopt, I take it you would have an argument to say, well, lookit, jury, the two people in the car with Mr. Milgaard, surely if Ron Wilson saw and heard all these things and claimed that Nichol was
hysterical and, etcetera, and Nichol John says nothing of the sort, would that undermine Ron Wilson's credibility?

Yes, I think it would undermine his credibility and considerably weaken the prosecution's case. And so conversely, did the fact that her statement did get in front of the jury in the manner that it did, and again we'll talk about that demeanour, in your view did that enhance the credibility of Ron Wilson's evidence in your view?

I think it probably did.
So in addition to -- let's just talk about the damaging impact of Nichol John's, I think you said a devastating turning point with respect to not only the fact that the jury heard the statement, but the circumstances, is it fair to say that in addition to her evidence and how it went in hurting David's case, in addition it may have bolstered other evidence that may have been unreliable?

A
Yes, and $I$ think in the consideration or observations $I$ made, $I$ should have made it clear that part of my assessment involved her demeanour as others likely perceived it in the courtroom. Right, and we'll go through that.

A Yes.
MR. HODSON: This is probably an appropriate spot to break, Mr. Commissioner. (Adjourned at 10:24 a.m.) (Reconvened at 10:48 a.m.)

BY MR. HODSON:
Mr. Tallis, I now want to go, I think we've spent some time looking at what the Court of Appeal said should have happened with respect to the 9(2) proceedings. I now want to go back to the transcript and walk through what did happen, and $I$ want to keep two things in mind that $I$ will ask you about, one is $I$ would like your, you to tell us your recollections of, to give us some idea of the atmosphere in the courtroom based on your recollection, how you perceived it, whether it was your own view or a reasonable bystander's view, and secondly, I'll ask you from time to time to comment on what you might have done if the jury had not been present, so if we can go back to 00 --

Actually, before $I$ do that, Mr. Fox has provided me with a reference about Chief Justice Bence referring to his colleagues, 003128 is the page number. Actually, maybe it's
at the top, maybe just go up to the top. Yeah, here's where he says:
"- the point hasn't come up before me,
it's been discussed amongst my
colleagues and it was felt that $I$ should be or the presiding judge should inquire with respect to the application ...

Etcetera. So again $I$ think that's the reference that in this case Chief Justice Bence may have in fact talked to some of his colleagues; is that your understanding?

A

Q That's the comment that $I$ had in mind when $I$ spoke to you earlier during the course of my testimony. Right. Okay. If we can go back to page 003143, and I think just again I'll restate it, under section 9(2) it's really a two step process. 9(2) is the cross-examination regarding the previous statement to prove that the statement was given and the circumstances and what's contemplated then is the judge then says yes, I will admit the statement, or $I$ will then rule on the adversity of the witness and $I$ will allow a much fuller cross-examination, so here's where he starts, and if we can go to page 003145, and we went through this before, Mr. Tallis, with both Nichol John and

Mr. Caldwell, so I won't cover all of the questions and answers. Here's cross-examination by Mr. Caldwell and talking about the statement:
"Q And did you have the opportunity - who did the writing, by the way?

A Sergeant Mackie did."
And:
"Q And did you have the opportunity to read it over?

A Yes I did.
Q And did you read it over?
A Yes.
Q And did you sign it in due course?
A I think so.
Q Now, Miss John ..."
And I want to pause here because here he's asking her the questions did you sign it, $I$ think so, and the Court says:
"Q ... well, you would know whether you signed it or not?

A Yah, I believe I did, yah." Are you able to tell us whether again your -- and maybe just generally through this part, what was your observations about Chief Justice Bence and his demeanour towards Miss John?

A

2

A

Q
A
$Q$

Well, at that stage it was certainly one of skepticism as $I$ said to you earlier.

And would this --
Skepticism with respect to the answers.
And would this be an example of that?
Yes.
If we can go over the page, 003147, I don't think there's any reference here about the meeting with

Inspector Roberts, at least to this point, and then asked about meeting with Detective Mackie, just to two of us, and where it was located.

And then go to page 003148 , and he actually shows the statement and the judge then intervenes and says:
"May I suggest that you ask about the signatures."

And then to the next page, Mr. Caldwell goes through every page and she confirms her signature, and then the next page:
"Q And I ask you now whether or not you made that statement?

A I did."
And then Mr. Caldwell asks her to read it. And if we can go to the next page. So he's asked Miss John to read it to herself silently and then
he says:
"Q Are pages 3, 4 and 5 true?"
And pages 3, 4 and 5 of the statement are essentially the incriminating parts, or at least the parts that describe observing David Milgaard in the alley, grabbing the girl, stabbing her and things of that nature and the purse in the garbage can, those are contained on pages 3, 4 and 5. She answers:
"A I don't know."
The judge says:
"Q What do you mean you don't know? You signed them?

A Yah, I know I did but I don't know - I don't remember saying that.

Q You signed the pages each one at the bottom of the page?

A Yes.

Q And you gave a detailed statement with respect to what you said had taken place, didn't you?

A Yes.
Q Now, having read it - having read it, does that refresh your memory
sufficiently that you can now tell this

Court what happened on January the 31st?
A No it doesn't; $I$ don't remember saying that."

And again, do you have anything else to add regarding Chief Justice Bence and his demeanour with respect to the witness other than what you've told us? Would this be -- fall into that category of skepticism?

A
I think it would be a sterner type of skepticism at this point, if $I$ may use that term.

And I guess the first question, you know:
"Q "What do you mean you don't know? You signed them?"

Was he upset, was it your observation that he was upset with her?

A
Yes, $I$ believe so.
Then at the end of that Mr. Caldwell says:
"Now, My Lord, if your Lordship pleases, with that question $I$ am ending my cross-examination of this witness and I'm going to next ask Your Lordship for the ruling as to adversity. I suppose, My Lord, ought this statement ... just be marked for identification?"

And then just at this point, if we go back to
what we looked at early, I think what the Court of Appeal said, is that before the section 9(2) process is complete, that you should be given an opportunity to cross-examine, actually in the absence of the jury?

Yes.
But that you should be entitled to cross-examine with respect to giving the statement and the circumstances; correct?

Yes.
Before the judge rules --
Yes.
-- on the adversity. So here Mr. Caldwell says I am done. The judge says:
"Q You recall giving the statement to Detective Sergeant Mackie; you've already admitted that?

A Yes I do."
And then the next page, this is again the judge -- actually, I think this is -- actually, I'm not sure. If we can just go back to the previous page. This in fact, this may be Mr. Caldwell, $I$ may have misread that. Then to the next page, it goes through the giving of the statement that was read over to you, and then if
you can scroll down:
"Did you have any discussions about this statement with anybody outside of the police officers afterwards?

A No.
Q Afterwards?
A Afterwards with what?
Q With anybody afterwards as to what you had said?

A Are you talking about Mr. Caldwell including Mr. Caldwell?"

And from that answer, I'm sorry, I believe this to be the judge.

Yes, that's the way $I$ read it, and I recall that type of question being asked.

Q
Right. So I think if we just, sorry, go back to the previous page, $I$ think Mr. Caldwell is done, he says -- he asks -- he says, I'm ending my cross-examination, and $I$ think from here on is the judge who questions about the giving of the statement, and then the next page, and the judge says:
"Q And you remember quite clearly that it was read over to you?

A Yes.

Q You remember quite clearly that you signed every page?

A Yes.
Q Well, can you tell me why you can't remember what you said on that occasion?

A I don't know.
Q Did you have any discussions about this statement with anybody outside of the police officers afterwards?

A $\quad$ No.
Q Afterwards?
A Afterwards with what?
Q With anybody afterwards as to what you had said?

A Are you talking about Mr. Caldwell including Mr. Caldwell?

Q No, no; I mean anybody else?
A No."

Would that be the exchange? I think you
mentioned earlier about the fact that you
inferred that Chief Justice Bence thought someone
maybe got to Nichol John, someone from David
Milgaard's camp, if $I$ can call it that; is that right?

A
Yes, and I think that's the area that $I$ was
alluding to when $I$ mentioned that to you, but of course this is much more specific than the general statement $I$ made.

And this part that $I$ read to you, was it your perception at the time that he was trying to ascertain or inquiring as to whether or not someone on behalf of David Milgaard, either you or others, got to Nichol John and influenced her to change her evidence from her statement and not remember?

A
$Q$

A
Yes, that's the way $I$ interpreted it.
And again, $I ' m$ not asking you to look into the minds of the jurors, but was it a concern of yours that the jury might have had that view as well?

Yes, and $I$ think $I$ did my best to try to remove that suggestion or minimize the effect of the question.

And so again the fact that this type of question being asked in the presence of the jury as opposed to in the absence of the jury as contemplated by the Court of Appeal, did you find that to be prejudicial?

A
I'm sure I'm not being unbiased when $I$ say this, but $I$ certainly did.

And then once Chief Justice Bence is done, he
says:
"I am declaring this witness to be adverse in the sense that she is hostile within the meaning of "hostility" as referred to in the decision ..." Etcetera, and the statement is marked. Now, let me pause there. You did not have an opportunity to cross-examine her on that before he made that ruling did you?

No. The ruling was made then and there.
In the presence of the jury?
Yes.
And so I take it when we look back at what the Court of Appeal said, in addition to having the jury excluded you were supposed to have the opportunity to cross-examine her before he made that ruling; correct?

A
$Q$

A
Yes.
Now, I suppose, did you give any thought at that time to rising and asking to -- or was the horse out of the barn?

I'm sure $I$ did, but given the fact that it was in the presence of the jury, $I$ had to make a judgment call on that because at that stage you are still thinking of what the jury, you know, how the jury
might be charged later on.
Q
So then Mr. Caldwell goes on and now asks, seeks to cross-examine the witness on the statement and asks for leave under section $9(1)$ to prove that the witness at another time made a statement inconsistent with her present testimony. So now he's asking to cross-examine her as a hostile witness using this previous statement; correct? Yes.

And the judge says very well, which presumably is the leave that Mr . Caldwell is seeking and then he carries on to cross-examine her.

If we can then go to the next page, and then what we have seen, and we've been through this, is that basically Mr. Caldwell goes through the entirety of the statement and asks questions, did you tell Detective Sergeant Mackie the following, and in some cases she said yes.
"Q You remember telling him that?
A Yes.
Q And was that true?
A Yes."
That's an example. And then on the next page, and we're talking -- this is about stopping -actually, go back a page, I'm sorry, about
stopping the woman for directions, and she says yes, that was true, and I told Detective Mackie. Scroll down. And here the judge says:
"Q You distinctly remember saying that?
A Yes, I remember saying that."
Then scroll down, and this is the comment about offered her a ride and the comment the stupid bitch.
"Q Did you tell Sergeant Mackie that?
A Not all of it. I don't remember saying part of it."

And then the judge:
"Q You said you didn't say it - did you say it?

A The first part $I$ said but $I$ don't remember saying the last part here.

Q Well just a minute - that's the kind of thing $I$ suggest you might not easily forget - the expression "Stupid Bitch"?

A I don't remember him saying anything.
Q Well, do you remember telling Sergeant Mackie that?

A $\quad$ No.
Q You're suggesting that he wrote it in then?

A I don't remember saying it."
Would it be fair to characterize that as a testy exchange between the judge and Miss John?

A

Q

A

Q Testy might be too strong a word, but it was certainly in the form of an interrogation in stern terms.

And again, was it your perception that the judge was skeptical of Nichol John's explanation that she could only remember saying part of it?

Yes. I think $I$ would put it this way, by this stage the indication was that there was a high degree of skepticism.

Okay. If we can then go to the next page, we then talk about the statement, about Ron and David leaving.
"Q "Do you remember telling him that?"
Yes. Was it true? And then the judge says:
"Q So he did go back in the direction of the girl?"

And this is referring to David when they left the car for help.
"A Yes."
And he says:
"Q Yesterday you told us you couldn't remember?

A I said that . .
Q You said that one went left and the other . .

A . . one went right. And the girl was coming from . ."

And the judge says:
". . Alright. Go on."
And then the next page --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What page was that, please?

BY MR. HODSON:

I'm sorry, the doc ID is 003157.
And then here we get the next
page, and this is the part where Mr. Caldwell
reads to her about the part of the statement where she says that she saw David get ahold of the same girl he spoke to a minute before, grab her purse, it says:
"Q Did you tell Sergeant Mackie those things?

A I don't remember."
And then the judge:
"Q Do you remember any part of it?
A No.

Q Are you saying you didn't tell Sergeant

Mackie that?
A I'm saying I don't remember if I did or if $I$ didn't.

Q Well, if you did see the accused grab the purse it's something you would have remembered, isn't it? Isn't it?

Witness?
A I don't know.
Q Take a drink of water and stop crying.
A If I could tell you what happened I'd telling you. I don't remember. I can't remember."

Let me pause there. Do you remember that exchange, Mr. Tallis?

Yes, I do.
Can you tell us what your observations were of your perceptions of the judge's demeanour and as well Nichol John's demeanour?

Well, from this particular part of the transcript it's clear that she was crying, and the -- I'm trying to use words to describe it. I think $I$ can fairly describe this as a stern admonition by the judge and I've thought about and it's probably, although maybe my words don't express it well, somewhat like the admonition of a stern father.

Whether that assists you or not, I don't know, but that's what $I$ feel is a fair way of expressing it. I think you used the term testy exchange earlier with respect to the matter and $I$ think testy is probably, conveys a different meaning than the one I'm conveying.

And what about Nichol John at this time, other than the part that she's crying, what was your sense of, $I$ guess her credibility, or what did you observe her for and how do you think a jury might have, or a reasonable bystander might have viewed what was happening to her?

I think that a reasonable bystander or objective bystander, and $I$ think the judge and quite likely the jury thought that her demeanour was such that she was deliberately holding back.

And when you say holding back, what she would be holding back would be the contents of her statement?

Yes. In other words, putting it another way, I could see people feeling that this was not an honest "I don't remember".

Okay. And would it be fair to say that if they believed that it was not an honest "I don't remember", that the only alternative available to
the jury to consider for what she might remember would be in her May 24 th statement?

A $Q$

Yes, I think that's a fair assessment, Mr. Hodson. And I'll come back to that a bit later. If we can just finish up here:
"Q The point is this. You told Sergeant Mackie on March the 22 nd according to this statement."

And $I$ think he's got the month wrong.
"Now are you saying you did tell Sergeant Mackie or you didn't tell him?

A I don't know if $I$ did.
Q Did you see Dave have ahold of the girl? Did you see Dave have ahold of the girl?

A I don't remember anything. My mind is a blank. Nobody understands. Nobody wants to believe me.

Q You remember the other things, don't you?

A Yes I do."
And then the judge says "go ahead".
Then Mr. Caldwell goes
through -- if we can then scroll down -- the statement where she said that Dave reached into one of his pockets.
"Q Did you tell Mackie that?
A I don't remember."
Etcetera. Now, I take it as well, Mr. Tallis, that it would appear from going through this that she remembers parts of her statement; in other words, she has a recollection of observing things that are in her statement that she says yes, I remember that, for example, stopping the woman for directions, I remember that and I remember telling Mr. Mackie that, but that the parts that are very incriminating, it's only those parts where she says $I$ don't remember that and $I$ don't remember telling Mr. Mackie that?

Yes.
And putting aside any reasons for that, would it be fair to say that, again the objective bystander, that that might be suspicious, that a witness would remember only parts of the statement clearly but not others; is that fair?

Yes. I think that the way it unfolded, this could convey, and probably did, the notion of a
selective memory the way it was coming out.
And the suggestion might be why do you only forget those parts that are damaging to your friend, that type of thing?

A

Q

Yes, and I think that's what undoubtedly gave rise, at least in my mind, to the trial judge's high degree of skepticism. If we can go to the next page, please, and Mr. Caldwell, and again they've gone through the incriminating parts which she says she didn't remember, Mr. Caldwell says:
"Q Now, Miss John, I put it to you that that is something that you absolutely would never forget if you saw that happen?

A As far as I'm concerned $I$ don't know what happened. I don't even know if I was on that trip or not."

Do you remember that exchange at all?
No, $I$ don't specifically, but it's clear to me that it took place.

And then the judge says:
"Q Well, you've already given evidence that you were on the trip - very extensively yesterday. Have you forgotten since yesterday that you told us you were on the trip."

And again, $I$ 'm not sure if that's a sarcastic or rhetorical question, do you recall this exchange,
and the answer is:
"A If you just stop and think how much this bothered me - I'm beginning to wonder if I even did it or not."

Do you recall that?

A
$Q$

A

Q

No, I don't recall that specifically, but I'm sure that, you know, that took place as recorded.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: That page number was what, please?

MR. HODSON: That page is 003160 . COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I'm sorry, 160? BY MR. HODSON:

160, yes. And what about the comment where she says, "I'm beginning to wonder if $I$ even did it or not," and I'm not clear, it's hard to tell from the transcript whether that was said in seriousness or whether it was trying to explain that --

It's difficult for me to say now.
Okay. If we can then go ahead to 003162. So we've gone through, and I haven't touched on them all, but basically Mr. Caldwell went through those incriminating parts of the statement, pages 3, 4 and 5, and she said she didn't remember them, nor did she remember telling Mr. Mackie, and then he
gets to the compact and reads to her the statement where she says she saw the compact, and then the next page, Mr. Caldwell asks:
"Q Did you tell Mackie those things?
A Yes I did.
Q And do you remember telling Sergeant Mackie those things?

A Yes.
Q And are those things true?
A Yes."
And the judge says:
"Q How is it you can remember that?
A I don't know. If $I$ had a solution for
it --"
And the judge:
"Alright - go ahead."
Again, would that fall into the same category we've talked about as far as the perception you had of both -- of the judge's demeanour towards the witness?

A Yeah. I would say also indicative of his assessment of the witness.

Q
In other words, how can you remember that detail when you didn't remember the others?

A Yes.

Now to page 003164 and $I$ think Mr. Caldwell is finishing up here and he says:
"Q So that your position today is, as I understand you, that you don't know whether you saw Dave in the alley with the same girl that he had spoken to shortly before for directions?

A No I don't.
Q Alright; and you don't know whether you saw him grab her purse . . ?"

And then the judge:
"Excuse me a minute, just a minute -"
And then says to the witness:
"It's very easy for you to stop crying because you've done it several times when you were asked a question with which you would agree - so would you please stop crying."

Do you have a recollection of that exchange?
Yes, I remember that, and I would characterize
that in my recollection as a very stern
admonition, and $I$ think maybe $I$ 'm even erring on the side of modesty when $I$ use that term.

And again, it appears to be along the lines of how can you remember some things, not the others and
here how come you only cry on the questions that you don't remember?

A
$Q$
Yes, that's what $I$ was trying to capture when $I$ used the term selective memory.

Right. Then if we can go to the next page, and Mr. Caldwell finishes up. No, sorry, just a sec. 478, the previous page, Mr. Caldwell finishes, and then the next page the judge then asks some questions, $I$ think asking about Wilson's evidence.
"Q ... when Wilson returned to the car were you crying?

A I don't know.

Q Were you hysterical?
A I don't know.
Q Were you hysterical and crying at the time during the early hours of that morning?

A No, not as far as $I$ can remember." 'Did you notice any blood? No. Did you notice some on the trousers? No.'
"Q Do you know why the accused and Wilson changed their clothes?

A Yes I do.
Q What was the reason?

A Ron had - acid was eating through his
pants; and Dave's pants were ripped." And then if we can go to the next page, and this is where Mr. Caldwell says:
"And that is, having made the ruling, My
Lord, to ask Your Lordship for leave to prove that the witness made at another time a statement inconsistent with her present testimony; and what $I$ propose of course is calling Sergeant Mackie to deal with parts of that document which is P. 31 for identification. That's what I would ask Your Lordship and I of course will abide by your ruling." And it would appear here that Mr. Caldwell, again going back to 9(2) and 9(1), is looking at calling Mr. Mackie as part of the process to prove the statement, he being the fellow who took the statement, and the Court says no, and I believe, I think the judge has already ruled that it's proven.

A Yes.
Q
A
$Q$ -- based on her statement and before you cross-examined. Is that a correct read of that?

Yes, that's the way $I$ read it.
And scroll down, you say:
"My Lord, if I may, $I$ feel duty-bound to interject here if Your Lordship is going to give the direction which I anticipate your Lordship is going to give. I think it only proper to observe that in my submission to Your Lordship the witness should be out of the courtroom when you give that direction, because $I$ haven't even started my cross-examination."

And I think at this point the judge is going to give the direction to the jury to not consider those parts of Nichol John's statement that she didn't adopt; is that correct?

Yes, $I$ believe this is the sequence of it. And then to the next page. So this is all before you've had a chance to cross-examine; correct? Yes.

The judge then says:
"... that except where the witness has admitted the truth of any particular part of the statement that the contents of the prior statement - the contents of that statement which has been referred
to - are not to be taken as evidence of the truth of the statements contained therein. They are not to be taken as evidence of the truth of the statements contained therein. They merely serve to test the credibility of the witness. I want to make that quite plain now. I will repeat my directions when $I$ come to address you later in my charge ..."

And then called the witness back in, and then you say there's a point $I$ wish to make.

Now, did you have concerns about the fact that, and $I$ think just in fairness, the next part, which we'll go to, I think you go back to the judge and say lookit, I don't think you did a good enough job in that direction to the jury, $I$ want you to go further. But again, did you have any concerns at this time that you had not even cross-examined this witness and the judge was going to give a direction to the jury about the use of the statement? I don't recall one way or the other on that now at this stage. I may well have, but $I$ certainly wanted a strong direction on this point. Whether it was at this stage or not $I$ don't remember,
but --
I want to --
That's the best $I$ can do to assist you.
I raised this point a bit earlier, but $I$ just want
to come back to this, this notion of utilizing a previous inconsistent statement to challenge the credibility of a witness, which is the process we went through, and certainly in cases where a witness might in an earlier statement say $I$ saw Bob do something and in his second, evidence at trial saying $I$ saw John do it, certainly there it's easy to see how you might take the previous inconsistent statement and say lookit, don't believe the witness when she says John did it because earlier she said Bob did it.

Yes.
And so that's pretty straightforward. Where you have a situation as here where Nichol John is basically saying $I$ don't recall -- now, some might debate, and I might debate, whether or not a previous statement that has a recollection is inconsistent with that, but let's assume for the moment it is. If the objective of using the earlier recollection of that statement in challenging the credibility of the witness and
challenging the credibility of the statement "I don't recall", is it fair to say that if you are successful in that and the jury says okay, $I$ don't believe her when she says "I don't recall", that the jury then will have to -- saying, okay, she must recall something, that the only other available recollection before them is the earlier statement which, (a), they are supposed to ignore the truth of it and only use it to challenge the credibility, are they not put in the position of basically accepting the earlier unproven statement as the recollection? I'm not sure if I've stated it that way, and again, is that not the effect of what happened here?

Yes, $I$ think generally speaking that is, and of course as you, I think, illustrated, composed some very practical difficulties.

And $I$ suppose the first one is that the, if $I$ can call it, the substituted recollection, being the earlier one that they are not supposed to accept, if that becomes the -- if they say yes, I don't believe her when she says $I$ don't recall, she recalls something, it must be this, (a), you are precluded from the opportunity of challenging the credibility of that, aren't you, the substance of
the earlier statement?
A
Q

A
Yes.
Because you can't cross-examine a witness about something she says $I$ don't remember --

That's right.
-- seeing or saying.
Yeah.
We may come back to that point. If we could go to the next page, 003169, I think, Mr. Tallis, here you are saying that you don't think the judge's direction was sufficient, it should go further:
"... and make it abundantly clear in language which the jury will understand that those statements are not evidence against the excused ..."

Etcetera. Now, let's just pause there, because the judge did not only here go back and give a direction, but gave a direction to the jury at the end that said please disregard those parts of the statement which he didn't adopt.

Now, in a general sense,
Mr. Tallis, if the jury hears something and then are told by the court or by the judge lookit, you have to disregard that, would it be fair to say that it may be difficult for jurors to take out
of their mind something that they've heard?
Would that be a concern of defence counsel, that notwithstanding the direction, you never know how, what a juror has heard might impact their thinkingi is that fair?

Yes.

And so that's always a risk when they've heard something like that. If we go a bit further, and back to the question that $I$ just asked you, that where they are being asked to find that Nichol John is not credible when she says "I don't recall" and they have this piece of evidence that they are not supposed to consider and they are trying to figure out, okay, well, we don't believe her, can we try and figure out what maybe she did recall and see, again, would you agree that once again there would be a concern that the jurors might, even more so in that case, consider something that they are not supposed to consider?

I think the potential is there because that's a very difficult concept at the best of times, $I$ think, to get across.

And if we can scroll down, I'm not sure where this fits in, but $I$ think $I$ have to read it because you say here:
"Well, Courts of Appeal have been wrong too, My Lord."

And then you go on --
A That was prophetic.

I'm not even going to touch that. But I think what you are saying is Chief Justice Bence had talked about, $I$ think what he was saying is lookit, I used the direction approved by the Court, the Court of Appeal, and then you go further, and if we can go to the next page, I won't read it, $I$ just highlight it because this is part of the record, but again, you go on to urge the judge to be more specific in the direction to the jury at this point.

And then to page 003172, and think, in effect, what you are saying, if $I$ can sum it up, Mr. Tallis, what you were saying to him was you may have given the legal direction to the jury, but $I$ want you to put it in layperson's terms, not legal terms so that the jury understands it $I$ think is what --

Yes, you understand what $I$ was saying, or trying to say at that time.

And so here then the judge comes back and gives another charge, what he says is:
"... the warning $I$ gave you a few minutes ago is a proper one and a correct one but $I$ wish to put it another way ..."

And:
"... the only evidence which can be considered as being against the accused are statements which she has accepted under oath in the witness box as being the truth, and that any statement which she has not admitted as being the truth are not evidence against the accused." Then we go down to the bottom, this is where you start your cross-examination.

Now, at this point, and,
Mr. Tallis, if we compare the position you are in right here at this point in the trial where Chief Justice Bence has already allowed Mr. Caldwell to cross-examine on the statement in the presence of the jury, he's already concluded that the statement was voluntary and that the circumstances are such that he should allow it to go in, he has declared her hostile and he has allowed Mr. Caldwell to cross-examine her as a hostile witness, if you compare that, before you
get up to ask any questions with what the Court of Appeal said should have happened, it may be stating the obvious, but would it be fair to say that you were put in a far worse position at trial than you should have been?

I think that's an objective assessment of the situation.

And then as far as your approach to Miss John at this point, can you tell us, and again I'll go through this with you and it may become evident, but can you shed any light on what concerns you would have had at this point as to where you could go with this witness in light of what just happened?

A
I'm sure that $I$ felt that $I$ had to be very cautious in light of the way matters had unfolded. Did you think you could rehabilitate this witness? Well, she wasn't my witness to begin with, but -so --

Sorry, that's maybe the wrong word.
Yes. In the strict sense of the word, it wouldn't be rehabilitating the witness. I thought I might still be able to get some concessions from her on certain things, but $I$ knew that $I$ had to tread a very cautious path the way things had unfolded.

If she had suddenly come across as very co-operative with me, that would have just, I think, aggravated what was already a bad situation, but $I$ did recognize that $I$ should try to get what $I$ could from her that would be of assistance to David.

Are you saying in effect that you wanted to get some favourable evidence, but if you got evidence that was too favourable, it might backfire and the jury might think that she was simply trying to help you?

Yes, that's something you have to always consider in my view under these circumstances, and one of the things I thought that $I$ could erase was any notion that people representing or supporting David had gotten to her, to use your term. And $I$ think the first question that you asked her was:
"Q Miss John, you have been asked a number of questions here this morning and $I$ must ask you a few. First of all during the course of your questioning here you were asked whether or not you had seen anyone else about this case apart from the police and you mentioned Mr.

Caldwell - and this is no reflection on
Mr. Caldwell, as you know - you remember his Lordship asking you a question about that?"

And then the judge says:
"You're talking about exclusive of the police and exclusive of any counsel."

Next page, you say:
"Q Now, you recall being here as a witness at the preliminary hearing?

A Yes.
Q And at that particular time $I$ believe it's fair to say that you had already met Mr. Caldwell?

A Yes.
Q And is it also accurate to say that the first time you ever saw me to hear my voice was when you were cross-examined by me in the witness box there?

A Yes."
And again, would that be to address the point that you just talked about?

A Yes.

And is it fair to say that you wanted the jury to know that you had not talked to this witness
prior, other than at the preliminary hearing?
A
Yes, because I didn't want any such suggestion visited upon David.

And then as well you go through, the bottom, you ask prior to coming to the prelim you saw the police, you were brought up by the police, with my dad.

The next page, and then a number of questions to show that she had spent a fair bit of time with -- not a fair bit of time, but to the extent that she was involved in this case, she was dealing with the police and the Crown; is that fair?

Yes.
And then the next page, just a couple of points. Let me just pause here for a moment. Back on your earlier point about how, I think you said you were concerned that if she was too co-operative the jury might view that as, and these aren't your words, but perhaps fueling the suspicion that maybe she was holding back to help David; is that fair?

A
Yes. I felt one had to be cautious and try to avoid creating that impression, inadvertently of course.

And again if you were able to, I'm just trying to think here, if you were able to get her to the point of lookit, $I$ now realize, $I$ just, you know, I made that stuff up in the statement, or you got something so favourable in the sense that she recanted the statements, I take it that might be viewed with some skepticism; is that fair?

Yes.
Here's reference, I'll just go through a few questions here to identify what areas you were dealing with her about, that she had testified about being by the funeral home and you say:
"Q Well, was it a policeman that told you it was a funeral home?

A Yes it was."
And then the next page, it looks as though, Mr. Tallis, you were having her go through her contact with the police and perhaps trying to infer or suggest that some of the information in her statement may have come from the police; is that fair?

Yes, or arisen from the contact during the course of being driven around.

Then to 003177, it looks like you then get into meeting at the Cavalier, and I think you've told
us at this point you would be leery of having the polygraph come out; is that fair? I mean, she didn't take the polygraph, but she met with --

A
$Q$

A
$Q$ Q with this police officer whose name you don't recall in the room at the Cavalier Hotel, is it fair to say that this discussion took place before you were with Mackie? In other words, perhaps you don't understand me - you told my learned friend about being with Mackie on the 24 th."

And so here it looks like you are establishing
that before she gave the statement to Mackie, she
was in a room with the police officer at the Sheraton Cavalier discussing matters; is that --

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$ Yes.

Were you concerned about going further on that subject matter?

Yes, I'm sure $I$ was treading cautiously.
And what would you -- again, what would you be concerned about? Why would you not get into some -- for example, $I$ think you told us that you would canvass with her and with Roberts if the jury was not present. Why would you not explore these now?

Well, first of all, $I$ wouldn't want any reference to the polygraph operator to come out, and secondly, one had to be as careful as possible not to elicit too much hearsay that might be damaging. Then on the next page you ask a question here, and I think we have heard evidence, maybe it was even in Inspector Roberts' Supreme Court evidence, where $I$ think he said that he showed the bloody dress to Nichol John, and here you ask the question:
"Q I see; and do you recall now whether the dress --"

And this is about the meeting with the man at the Cavalier, $I$ don't think you ever used his name, I think he was referred to as the man, you say:
"Q I see; and do you recall now whether the dress was held up having blood on it, that is apparent blood stains?"

And the judge answered:
"She doesn't remember any dress."
And then you say:
"Well, I just want to try and see whether or not that refreshes her memory, My Lord."

And again, I'm wondering on that, whether that would be unusual, to have the judge answer the question you put to Miss John?

Well, I think this points up what you raised earlier, and that is if her responses quickly appeared to be quite favourable to my questions, there might be an inference that she had held back, but if she thought it was helping out David, she would say something, and $I$ think this, you know, is a follow-up to the judge's skepticism about the question of this nature in light of what she had said and her demeanour earlier.

And again, would it be fair to say that when the
judge answers the question before she does, saying she doesn't remember any dress, that that might affect her subsequent answer?

A

And then if you can go to 003182, and at the bottom you say:
"Q And is it fair to say that under oath at that time --"

And you are talking to her about the knife she identified and talking about the knife blade, keeping in mind that the knife blade was found under Gail Miller's body and the matching maroon handle was found in a back yard, and you say:
"Q ... at the preliminary that my learned friend showed you a knife blade?

A Yes.
Q And is it fair to say that under oath at
that time you indicated to Mr. Caldwell
that the blade of the maroon handled
knife that you saw in the car was longer
than the broken blade?

A Yes.
Q Yes; and that is the actual knife blade was longer?

A Yes.
Q And you're satisfied with that, are you?
A Yes."

Now let me just pause there. It would seem from this answer that although she identified a maroon-handled paring knife on David Milgaard in the car, she's saying the one she saw, the blade was longer; is that a fair reading of that? Yes.

And that would be considered favourable evidence from Mr. Milgaard's perspective?

I thought so.
Were you concerned that the jury might view that as helping, as being not credible and helping Mr. Milgaard?

A
Well, I suppose there was that risk, but $I$ thought in some of these areas $I$ could pursue them without as great a risk as others.

Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$
Q Okay. If we can go to 003195, I just wanted to ask you here, and again this is your cross-examination, you say:
"Q Well now, apart from Mr. Mackie and a man in the Cavalier Hotel were you interviewed by any other police officers
in Saskatoon?
A Not really."
And again, your reference -- I'm assuming that's Inspector Roberts?

A

And again to 003198, I won't go through this, but again you have similar questions as you did with Ron Wilson regarding Nichol John's use of LSD and hallucinations, and the same question $I$ had with respect to Mr . Wilson, would you be trying to establish in the minds of the jury that Nichol John at the time, around the time she was interviewed by the police had been using LSD and had hallucinations and that maybe inferring that some of what she put in her statement might be an hallucination?

A

Q And again, what you've told us with respect to this issue when you were examining, or cross-examining Ron Wilson, I think you said but there was a risk, the flip side is that the jury
might associate that drug use with David Milgaard; is that fair?

A

Q

A
Q

Actually, then at 003209, I think here you get to, back to the Cavalier.
"Q ... you were told by a police officer there - he was a man in plain clothes I believe?

A Yes."

And then you ask her about the name and she says
yes, Roberts, so it does come out at the end.
And then the next page, the
judge says:
"Q Excuse me, I thought you told me this morning you didn't recall that?"

And she says:
"A I didn't say that; like Mr. Tallis said that $I$ didn't recall his name and $I$ was going to add that but he finished the question too fast."

And then down at the bottom -- actually, we can skip ahead to page 003214 , and here, Mr. Tallis, we get into questions relating to Nichol John's stay at the Saskatoon City Police building on the night of May $23 r d$ and $I$ believe May $22 n d$, and again you spend some time cross-examining her on who took her where, etcetera, and we get to this point:
"Q And is it then that you were taken up to the little room that you described to His Lordship?"

And that's the room where $I$ think she gave the statement to Raymond Mackie. She says:
"A Not right away.
Q ... where were you taken first?"

And she says:
"A To the cells."
And you say:
"Q Pardon?"
She says:
"A To the cells."
And you say:
"Q To the cells - well were you under arrest?

A No, I wasn't.
Q I see; were you put up in the cells?
A Yes."
Now, when $I$ look at the preliminary hearing transcript --

I think you said "put up in the cells".
$Q$
Or put in the cells.
A
Put in the cells.

I'm sorry, "Were you put in the cells." When I look at the preliminary hearing transcript, and I stand to be corrected, but $I$ don't believe this area came up at the preliminary hearing, and I'm wondering, Mr. Tallis, if you are able to recall whether this information about Nichol John being in the police cells, whether this would be the first time you learned of it, at this point in the
cross-examination, or whether you had been aware of that prior?

A
I think $I$ was aware of it prior, but $I$ couldn't tell you how it came about. At the preliminary hearing of course she didn't give the testimony that was expected and indicated she didn't remember in crucial areas and so there wouldn't be the same reason to go into it as there was at this stage.

So it's -- I see. So at the preliminary hearing there would be no reason to question her about the circumstances of giving the statement because the statement didn't go in at the prelim, nor did any of the incriminating contents?

That's right.
And I think you are telling us your memory is that you would have been aware of that fact before the trial?

I'm quite sure that $I$ was.
Then if we can go to the next page, and -- I'm sorry, go right to the top.
"Q ... you weren't arrested for anything?
A $\quad$ No.
Q What cells were you put in?
A In the women's and then $I$ didn't want
to be in there so they put me in the little room where the matron stays.

Q I see; and you were in the charge of a matron there?

A No, I was there by myself.
Q Oh, you were in the room - but they put you in the cells first?"
"Q And how long were you in the cells?
A Only about two minutes.
Q I see; and you complained about that?
A Yes.

Q And then you were in the room where you understand the matron stays?

A Yes.
Q And is this the room just up near the women's cells?

A Yes.

Q Just opposite the women's cells?
A Yes.
Q So that when a woman prisoner is in there the matron has this room to wait in?

A Yes.

Q And you were left in there for some little time, were you?

A Yes."

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

Now, if we pause there, if you were using the procedure that the Court of Appeal said you should have used, your objective in getting into that
was under significant pressure, and one of those aspects to that potential pressure was the fact that she was being held in the cells.
area, I think you told us, would be to try and convince the judge that there are circumstances relating to this statement which should cause you not to allow it to be used in cross-examination; correct?

A

2

A

That's correct, I thought that would support an argument that he ought to exercise his discretion in our favour and not allow cross-examination on the statement.

And what actually happened, $I$ think by the time that you got to cross-examine Nichol John, the statement had already been put before the jury; correct?

That's correct.
So at this point, is it fair to say that putting forward these circumstances, that it would be too late to say judge, look at these circumstances, that statement, the circumstances of that statement being given are unsafe, don't let it go before the jury, it's too late for that; do you agree?

That's right.
So the objective --
In a sense, this was an alternative path in the hope that one could salvage something from the
situation.
Now, let's just talk about, $I$ guess in the eyes of the jury, it might be to say that lookit, the circumstances that gave rise to this statement are somewhat suspect; is that fair, therefore -Yes.

Here might be an explanation as to why she would give a statement that she doesn't now adopt?

And there's a subsidiary aspect to that as well. I thought that evidence of this nature might cause the trial judge to take a slightly different view of the situation and perhaps that could be reflected in the final charge or instructions to the jury.

Did you consider that there might be a risk based on what you had said earlier, that if the jury was of the view and the judge was of the view that she was holding back to help her friend, that somehow this, the fact that she was in jail might have been attributable to that fact; in other words, that she wasn't cooperating with the police, so she had to put her in jail, something of that nature? Was that a consideration?

Oh, I'm sure that $I$ thought of that, but that on balance $I$ thought that if one was careful you
could take a calculated risk in putting the questions of this nature, albeit in a rather limited fashion.

If we can then go ahead to 003219, you ask here:
"Q Well, when you were put in the cell on the night of the 23rd did you complain?

A Not especially."
And the judge:
"Q Well, did you complain at all?
A Well, something happened when $I$ was in
there so they had to bring a matron that night."

The judge says:
"Q But you didn't complain before you went there about the cell.

A No."
The Court:
"The cell block I should say."
"Yes."
And then you go on about the matron. Did you
have any sense of how the judge was viewing this
evidence based on his questions or demeanour or anything of that nature?

A
Well, I think the question he put tended to minimize perhaps the atmosphere that I had
established at least to some extent.
And the next page, there's a reference here about she called the matron, banged on the door.
"Q ... and was that matron Mrs. Tetreault?
A I don't know what her name was."
Would you have talked to the matron to get
information about that night?
I've thought and thought about that because I know you've asked me, and $I$ can't recall whether I talked to the matron or not. I'm inclined of the view that $I$ may well have because I used the name here.

And again, there's some further questions that we've gone through with other witnesses, just further exploring the point.

If we can go to 003224 , and you
ask:
"Q Is it fair to say that at that particular time you didn't know how long you were going to be kept at the station?

A No, I didn't."
And then:
"Q Well now, were you getting - let's put
it this way - were you still unhappy
about being kept there?
A Yes I was.
Q And were you still anxious to get out of the place as quickly as you could?

A Yes."

And then:
"Q Well now, somewhere along the line I suppose that you were told that you were going to be taken up to get a statement from you?

A Yes."

So again, this would be along the lines you discussed earlier about trying to establish the circumstances under which she was kept there?

A
Yes, and of course $I$ don't want to be too
repetitious, but it illustrates the type of thing that, in my view, would be canvassed on a voir dire.

Right. Now, what about the March 11th statement, her first statement, and we went through that, which I think you told us had some significant omissions compared to her May 24 th statement, and I think when we went through it that there were some omissions of things she said on May 24 that were true and not disputed; for example, the
compact, stopping the woman for directions and David leaving the car. Can you tell us why you wouldn't have used the March 11 th statement with her?

A

Well, for essentially the reasons I've given to you on earlier occasions with respect to the other witnesses, but in this particular case I had the information and I thought that $I$ could make better use of that information by putting questions to her. I think that in the circumstances, if one were to have put the statement in, it would have opened up the potential for an awful lot more expansive type of re-examination by Crown counsel and undoubtedly, in my view, the learned trial judge would have asked quite a lot of questions having regard to the way this unfolded. Would there be a risk that that initial statement would be viewed by the judge and perhaps the jury as being consistent with this thought that she was holding back and trying to help a friend? Yes.

And similarly, with respect to the preliminary hearing evidence, $I$ don't think -- at the preliminary hearing she did not, $I$ think what her evidence there was that once they got to the alley
and that David left and got back, she then remembers driving away $I$ think to the Trav-a-leer?

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$
BY MR. HODSON:
Mr. Tallis, $I$ just want to finish up on Nichol John, I finished your cross-examination. If we can go to 031255 which is your address to the jury, and go to 031292, and again just, I'll provide the caution that there are breaks in this transcript that were not able to be transcribed. At the bottom you start about, $I$ think this is where you talk about Nichol John's evidence and
(Adjourned at 11:58 a.m.)
(Reconvened at 1:33 p.m.)
referring to Mr. Caldwell:
"Now he anticipated that $I$ was going to
refer to the circumstances under which
she gave a statement, and members of the
jury $I$ have no intention of rehashing
that. Those circumstances are before
you and they are, in my submission,
factors which you can quite properly
take into account."
And again, some breaks there, and:
"Now my learned friend urged some ... to
you, and once again My Lord will give
you direction as to the relative value
of this particular nature, but certain
... were urged and my learned friend put
it to the witness and quoted, as I
recall it, there was a reference to
seeing the girl stabbed right there.
There was some reference to that. Now
members of the jury $I$ am not going to
rehash the physical evidence ... and is
that statement in that form even ... a
possibility? I suggest to you that it
isn't. After all it is common ground I
think that those stabbing wounds on the
back were inflicted when the coat -after the coat had been taken off, the dress taken down and the coat put back on."

And then some further marks. And let me -- I think, Mr. Tallis, as I read that,
notwithstanding the fact that the part of the Nichol John's statement where she said she saw David grab the girl and stab her was not evidence, it appears that to the jury you indicated that putting aside the circumstances, etcetera, that the stabbing, as put forward in that statement, does not fit with the physical circumstances, is that fair, and in particular the clothing?

Yes.
And I think as well there's a reference to it being from a right-handed person as well, so I take it you would have made the decision to try to address the part of the statement that the jury was not to consider as the truth; is that fair? Yes, and to focus on the physical evidence that you've just alluded to.

So in other words, jury, even though you are not supposed to accept it as evidence in the event
that you look at it, it doesn't fit because, it doesn't fit the evidence for a couple of reasons, one, the dress had to be pulled down first if what Nichol said was true, and secondly, David was left-handed; is that fair?

That's correct, and of course bear in mind that, you know, there were other things said by the Crown about their theory of the killing and this addressed that aspect of it.

And would that be the type of thing you might have put to Nichol John if she would have adopted the statement?

Yes.
I now want to move -- we've covered Cadrain, Wilson and John. I now want to move to the motel reenactment evidence, and if $I$ could call up 007070 , and this is a letter from Mr. Caldwell to you, January 21st, 1970. We've heard from Mr. Caldwell and gone through some documents that suggest the time frame for how this all played out and I just want to go over parts of that with you. So this is January 21, the trial started on January $19 t h$, and Mr. Caldwell says:
"You will recall me advising you, on Sunday, January 18th, that $I$ had learned
that day of an alleged incident in Regina, in which Milgaard was supposed to have stated in front of witnesses that he had stabbed or killed the nurse in Saskatoon."

And then he goes on to say:
"I had Detective Karst go to Regina on January 19th to interview the people supposedly involved ..."

Let me pause there. Do you have a recollection of getting a call like that the eve of the trial, the Sunday before the trial?

No, I don't, but $I$ have no doubt from the material here that I would have.

And then he goes on to say that $I$ arranged to get statements from these people, Craig Melnyk, George Lapchuk and Ute Frank and copies are enclosed, and if we can scroll down:
"I intend to arrange, somehow, to
interview these witnesses in the very
near future and depending on the results of these interviews, as $I$ mentioned to you earlier, $I$ may well attempt to lead evidence in the present trial from one
or more of these three witnesses as to
the admissions allegedly made by Milgaard in their presence."

And we'll get into the statements in the evidence, but was this -- and it sounds like this was new evidence that came to the attention of the authorities a day or two before the start of the trial. Did you give any thought to seeking to adjourn the trial on the basis of this evidence coming to light at this late hour. I'm sure $I$ did, but $I$ can't recall the mental processes that $I$ went through at the time. This was in a time period when we had moved some years before to fixed dates, and adjournments, if opposed, and even if by consent once there had been a date fixed were not easy to come by, and I undoubtedly would have taken into account any publicity that might have attached to such an application, but one of the things that $I$ do remember is that as soon as $I$ got details, I spoke to David about it as soon as possible and I think he was brought down actually a little before the trial. I mentioned to you that $I$ think that it was, that $I$ arranged to have him brought down a little earlier than usual, and the other thing is once $I$ became aware of these witnesses, $I$ know I
immediately caused inquiries to be made in Regina, particularly about Melnyk and Lapchuk. Okay. And we'll come to that once I get to their statements. Maybe if we can call up 007069 and we'll just try and get the time frames down and then we'll get into the substance of their statements. This is a note that Mr. Caldwell prepared, and $I$ can't recall when he prepared it, but $I$ think you said it summarized what he had done with the witnesses, Lapchuk, Melnyk and Frank, and $I$ just want to go through this as far as the time line and see if this accords with your recollection. We've already talked about this, Sunday, January 18, Saskatoon police learned for the first time of an alleged admission by Milgaard in Regina to killing a nurse in Saskatoon.

Same date they advised me, and same date $I$ advised "T", which you said was Tallis, by phone of what $I$ knew of this and that depending on interviews $I$ might call them.

Same date $I$ arranged for
investigator to go to Regina, Monday, January 19 , and interview these persons.

This done Monday, January 19 ,
and on Tuesday, January 20 I received three
statements from these persons.
Wednesday, January 21, I
delivered copies of all three statements to Tallis and advised $I$ would interview them ASAP and may well call evidence from one or more at the trial.

And then had two to Saskatoon Friday, January 23 and interviewed and advised Tallis Saturday, January 24. I would plan on calling these two late in Crown's case.

And we'll come in a bit to Ute Frank, but putting Ute Frank aside, does that sound generally right time wise about, or do you have any reason to dispute that?

A
I have no reason to dispute it, even though on some of the aspects of it $I$ would have no personal knowledge.
$Q$
A
$Q$
I appreciate that, and $I$ should have raised that. As far as talking to, or getting calls from Mr. Caldwell, $I$ know that he contacted me, but in terms of the specific times, $I$ don't recall at this stage.

Is it fair to say that he would have advised you, it appears, the day before the trial, generally of the information that he was going to get interviews, and then according to the letter I
showed you about the third day of the trial I think you got copies of the statements of Melnyk, Lapchuk and Frank, and then $I$ think they were called towards the tail-end of the trial; is that correct?

Yes, Lapchuk and Melnyk.
Melnyk and Lapchuk?
Yes.
If $I$ could call up 178215, please, and $I$ just want
to go through the statements of Melnyk, Lapchuk and Frank and then I'll have some questions about what steps that you took, so the first one is January 19th in Regina, Craig Melnyk, and we've been through these before, Mr. Tallis, so I'll just touch on a couple of points.

He mentions in his statement
that Debbie Hall was in the motel room when this happened, $I$ think she's in Vancouver now, and then the next page, he describes what Mr. Milgaard did in the hotel room as follows, that he grabbed the pillow with his hand and was saying:
"I killed her, $I$ killed her, $I$ fixed her! Then he rolled on the bed awhile \& laughed hysterically."

And then down at the bottom he says, the night $I$
stayed -- sorry, here, he says:
"Knowing David I think he is capable of murder because of his personality. One moment he is real --"

And I'm not sure,
"-- and the next he goes off the deep end."

I'm not sure what that word is. Anybody?
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Nice.
BY MR. HODSON:
Nice? Thank you.
"One minute he is real nice and the next he goes off the deep end. I have never had a fight or any ill feeling towards Hoppy."

So that's his. Next, 155218, this is George Lapchuk's statement of the same date, he also identifies Ute Frank and Debbie Hall being in the room and again his version of events is that he started bugging Hoppy about murdering the nurse and then he said I didn't -- or:
"He said yeh, I did it. Then he blew up \& started to stab with his hand \& asked, "Where's my paring knife." He said yeh,

I stabbed her. I stabbed her 14 times \&
then she died. I got scared \& dropped the subject \& no more was said about it."

And then Ute Frank's statement is 277583 and she describes Debbie Hall as being present and in her statement she simply says:
"I was quite stoned \& sometimes wasn't aware of what was going on around me. I was also hallucinating quite a bit. I recall asking Hopy if he killed that nurse they were talking about \& he just looked at me \& smiled oddly. I had become involved with David on this occasion ..."

Etcetera. So again there's no, that's the only reference of what went on in the motel room. So those would be the three statements that Mr. Caldwell provided. Can you tell us, sir, what you would have done with this information?

Well, with respect to Lapchuk and Melnyk, I may have got some details orally before there were actual statements. I'm not sure of that, but $I$ know what $I$ did do was --

Sorry, would that be from Mr. Caldwell?

A Possibly from him. I think that's where I got some oral details. And depending on when David was brought down, the date he came down, as soon as I became aware of it, this information, I spoke to him; that is, visited with him, here in Saskatoon I'm sure it would be, because I think he was brought down earlier, so it wouldn't be by phone, and discussed whether or not there was an instant in the motel, and he told me that, you know, he didn't recall, he couldn't deny it, but he said that in any event it would be a joke, he said he was stoned $I$ think was the term that he used, which I understood to be based on the use of drugs.
$Q$
Did he recall or acknowledge being in the room with Melnyk, Lapchuk, Ute Frank and Deborah Hall? Well, certainly at one point he emphasized that he thought he was, he thought Ute Frank was essentially a friend of his and, frankly, with respect to Deborah Hall, I sensed he didn't feel the same way about her as he did Ute Frank, and so I found out some information about Lapchuk and Melnyk. Whether it started even before $I$ got the statements or not $I$ can't say, but $I$ did immediately make some inquiries in Regina. went to there. I have a pretty good idea who it was because it would be the logical person $I$ would speak to, and that would be the late Mr. McIntyre, but, you know, $I$ can't recall all the details or anything like that, but that's the most probable thing, but in any event, $I$ got some details and information that would indicate to me they were of an unsavoury nature.

And then with respect to Ute
Hall --
Sorry, Ute Frank?
Ute Frank -- I tried to locate her and Deborah Hall. I couldn't and I spoke to the Crown, Mr. -I'm sure it was Mr. Caldwell or somebody in his office about locating them and making them available to me, and as $I$ recall it, Miss Hall couldn't be located, but the one that David particularly focused on was Ute Frank.

Q

A
Let me just stop you there for a moment. Why did you try and locate those two to interview as opposed to Melnyk and Lapchuk?

Well, having regard to what $I$ believed their character to be, I thought it would be unwise to interview them.

Q

Did David Milgaard give you reason to believe that Ute Frank might be co-operative?

Certainly that was the impression $I$ had, that not only would she be co-operative, but would be inclined to be favourable toward his position, and I think he thought that she would be a pretty reliable person.

So you arranged though Mr. Caldwell then to locate Ute Frank?

Yes, and arranged to have her brought up.
From Regina?
Yes, I'm sure that's where they located her, and she was brought up and I interviewed her in a room at the courthouse, but it was completely separate from Mr. Caldwell. I don't know whether -- at that time $I$ didn't know whether he had talked to her beforehand to any extent, but after talking to her in the room, I learned that he had spoken to her, but $I$ got the impression, or probably not the impression, my recollection is that she told me that she really had not co-operated with him, she had a few words with him, but $I$ then proceeded to discuss matters with her, and she, I thought, opened up quite a bit to me and $I$ had no reason to think that she was trying to mislead me.

She emphasized in our discussions that she had found faith and having found faith she condemned, in her words, the lifestyle that she had been leading as well as the lifestyle of her friends, and that of course included David. I know I probed this with her at some length because $I$ wanted to see whether, at least my assessment of the sincerity of what she was telling me about her approach, and she indicated that she had found something much better than she had been living and that was a different lifestyle.

Now, I don't recall all the details, and $I$ had an inkling from somebody that $I$ spoke to in Regina, and $I$ can't recall who it was, that Ute Frank had given every indication that she had found faith. Now, she may well -- I think she probably used the term Jesus Christ or something like that, but our discussion was conducted in a very civil way and --

Q Did she come across as credible and reliable to you?

A Very much so, and that's why I probed her description of how she had changed her style of living and why she had changed it.
discussion $I$ got the impression, and yet $I$ can't recall why or the basis for it, that something had been said or otherwise when Mr. Caldwell had spoken to her that caused her to be a bit antagonistic toward him, I just can't recall the extent to which $I$ probed that or the nature of the information that gave rise, that she outlined, but -- now, she acknowledged that she had been on drugs, there had been, in effect, a drug party in the room and she was with David, and I'm going into the salacious details of it. Tell us about what she told you about her observations of David in the motel room and, in particular, with respect to the allegation that he had reenacted or admitted the murder?

Well, during the course of our discussion she said that he had reenacted it, and $I$ can't recall all the details, but there were quite a few details that she mentioned and comments that she attributed to him, but $I$ recall that she did not treat it as a joke, $I$ mean, she didn't go overboard the other way, but she treated it seriously and certainly conveyed that information to me. cannot give you all the details that $\quad$ would like to be able to give you, but at the end of the day I realized that her testimony would not be of assistance to David and I discussed the matter with her quite carefully because of what he had told me about her in terms of feeling that she would be co-operative and likely reliable and favourable.

If we can go back just, and again, as far as the details of what she described to you of David Milgaard's actions, would it be consistent with what Mr. Melnyk and Mr. Lapchuk were saying as far as, I think, grabbing a pillow in a stabbing motion, would it be generally of that nature do you recall?

A
Yes. I think that most of what she told me was quite consistent with what $I$ had been given in that connection, but of course she always emphasized that she had found faith, found something much better in terms of a lifestyle and indicated that this was the path she was now going to follow, and she was quite critical of herself as well as her friends for the lifestyle and things that they had been doing. sexual relationship in the motel, she certainly referred to that, but as $I$ say, $I$ wasn't particularly interested in sort of too many salacious details. I'm sure I asked at the time, but --

Q
Just --
-- I can't recall them now.
Just on that point, are you able to tell us whether, and again $I$ think Mr. Melnyk and Mr. Lapchuk as well talked about some of those salacious details, but would it be fair to say that what she had to tell you about what was going on in the motel room would be consistent with what others had said?

Generally speaking, yes, without having my specific notes.

But, for example, she didn't say anything that might cause you to say, okay, well, Melnyk and Lapchuk were wrong about what they said, for example, David was doing when they entered the room or some of the details that might cause you to challenge the credibility of Melnyk and Lapchuk's story?

A No, she didn't.

And as far as what she told you about the words that David spoke as part of this, this reenactment, did she indicate that he had admitted, or had made words to the effect "I stabbed her, $I$ killed her," anything of that nature, "yes, I did it"?

Well, $I$ know that she used words to that effect in describing it to me, but to give you the sequence or the precise words --

And she said that she did not, I think you told us she did not think that David was joking; is that correct?

Well, she took it seriously and so from that I took it that David was not joking in her mind. Did she, or did you ask her whether she felt that David Milgaard had killed Gail Miller?

No, I don't remember whether I did or not, without my notes.

Based on your interview --
With her taking it -- the way she framed it about taking it seriously, $I$ think it's a fair inference that she thought that he may well have. That's the fairest way $I$ can frame it.

Did you, and again $I$ think you told us that David Milgaard told you that he was there, he was stoned
and he couldn't deny it and if it did happen it was a joke?

A
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Ute Frank said she took it as being serious; is that correct?

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q
A

Q

A
Q
A
seemed to open up, I thought, a great deal to me, on why she was changing her lifestyle, or actually had changed it and what she felt was wrong with it and all those details, and $I$ knew that if she was called -- and at that time I thought there was still a good light maybe the Crown will end up calling her, but $I$ thought that if there was this bit of antagonism, they may well elect not to, but if $I$ called her, she would be subject to cross-examination, and $I$ was quite sure what she would say about her assessment of those comments as being taken seriously, and whether she could be persuaded to say that the others took it the same way $I$ couldn't tell you at this time.

Do you know why Mr. Caldwell did not call her as a witness?

A
No, I didn't know why he elected not to call her, but $I$ wondered, and it occurred to me that there was this antagonism that had arisen just based on one or two comments. Let's put it this way, she told me she was telling me the whole story and that she had not told Mr. Caldwell.
$Q$
And did she tell you that?
Oh, yes, and I didn't get what happened that made her feel, $I$ thought, a bit of a sense of
antagonism.
We read her one page statement and there's nothing in that statement along the lines of what she told you other than there's maybe a few details. Did she tell you that she did not tell the police about the full details either?

I think she did, but I'm not sure now.
The evidence that we heard from, I think, both Ute Frank and Mr. Caldwell before this Commission of Inquiry was to the effect that the meeting between Mr. Caldwell and Ms. Frank, that she did not tell him much of anything, that she was stoned and didn't remember anything and didn't want to testify and wouldn't testify and so Mr. Caldwell said he did not think it was anything of value. Her version of that is that she didn't want to testify and therefore told him nothing of value basically. Now, does that, is that consistent with what she told you?

A
No, I don't recall her saying words to that effect. I think she appreciated why I was interviewing her, that is, as a potential witness for the defence, because $I$ had told her, you know, that I had spoken to David, I mean, I laid the background out and $I$ didn't in any way deceive her
as to why I was talking to her.
But as far as what she told you, she did tell you that the story, or the version of events she told you she did not tell Mr. Caldwell and you don't think she told the police that either? That's my recollection now. In light of the fact that Mr. Melnyk and Mr. Lapchuk were called, is it fair to presume that if what she told you she had told the Crown prosecutor, that she would have been a witness at trial?

Yes, I think if she had told the Crown and co-operated with the Crown the way she did with me, she would be a better witness at trial than either Melnyk and Lapchuk because of her new-found faith, and I'm not saying that in a derogatory way of anybody's faith, $I$ just want to make that clear, because that's a very private matter and I don't want to be taken as belittling her faith or anyone else's.

And I think you told us that you found, that the reason that she was telling you these things, to be reliable and credible; is that correct?

A Yes.

Now, let's just go back to Deborah Hall for a
moment. She was mentioned as being the fourth person in all of the statements and the one statement of Mr. Melnyk said that he thought she was in Vancouver. You earlier told us that you tried to locate both Ute Frank and Deborah Hall and you went through Mr. Caldwell to try and find them and you found Ute Frank?

Yes. Well, I first tried to find them myself by, this would be by phone, but $I$ wasn't, so I then, bearing in mind the obligation on the Crown, as I understood it to be, I got ahold of Mr. Caldwell and I thought that there was a likelihood that they wouldn't have too much difficulty locating them.

After you talked to Ute Frank, did you still want to find Deborah Hall?
$A$
Frankly, I didn't see how she would be of assistance because David did not have the high regard for her that he had for Ute Frank and I don't know now why he made some comments, but this is the sense that $I$ had.

Q And the evidence that we have heard is that Deborah Hall, I'm not sure if she ran away from home, but was out of the province at the time, and

I just want to -- if we can call up 047622 , and
this is Deborah Hall's evidence at the Supreme Court reference where she testified under oath about her recollection of what happened in the motel room. If we could go to page 047631 , and here she's being examined by Mr. Wolch, the news comes on, talks about Melnyk and Lapchuk being in the room:
"While David was on the bed and such forth this news telecast came on about Gail Miller. I guess they had said they didn't have any suspects in custody at the time."

And then to the next page, and then she talks about the news cast coming on and Melnyk -"... and said to David, "You did it didn't you?" I recall George Lapchuk chiming in, like kind of cajoling him, saying, "`fess up, Hoppy. You know you did it."

And then down at the bottom, and what was David doing:
"A Well, he was in the process of jumping around on the bed, being a fool and playing with the pillow, kind of punching it up and things at the time he
was asked."
And then the next page:
"Q Tell us exactly what he said to the best of your memory.

A He responded to the question while he was -- and he was actually bouncing on the bed too and punching up this pillow. He said, "Yeah, sure. I stabbed her and fucked her brains out, that's a really good -- you know, it's a really good time for me.

Q He made a comment -- take your time.
A I think -- it was very -- it was a crude remark and it was sarcastically said."

And $I$ think then she went on to say that she took it as a joke or that it was not said seriously. And there was other excerpts that -- just give me a moment. Based on what I've read you there, if you would have been aware of that being Deborah Hall's recollection of events in the motel room, if you would have known that in 1970 would you have called her as a witness at the trial in defence of David Milgaard?

A
I rather doubt it based on what he had told me
about his feelings toward her, and particularly having regard to what Ute Frank had told me and the type of person that she came across as. And what about Deborah Hall's version of what was said by David and what he did in the room, would that be helpful evidence or harmful evidence? Well, it would -- portions of it would certainly be confirmatory.

And then her comment about it was said sarcastically or a joke, would that --

Yes, I don't recall anything, a salacious detail like that being mentioned by Ute Frank.

I think $I$ can say that the remark, her version of what was said goes beyond what Melnyk and Lapchuk testified was said.

Oh, as I said, I don't recall Ute Frank even using that kind of a description --

Putting aside --
-- in terms of the sexual aspect of it.
Putting aside whether it was said sarcastically or jokingly or not, would the words that she attributed to David Milgaard, that is, Deborah Hall, be more damaging than what Melnyk, Lapchuk and Frank attributed to him?

A
Having looked at it, since you brought it up to
show me, I think they probably would have, but I would put it on this basis at least that they would tend to be confirmatory in the sense that you have four people in the room saying that certain comments at least were made, rather than there being some saying that it happened and some saying it didn't happen.

And then $I$ take it the only question might be then
whether it was said seriously or not, or taken seriously or not?

A

Q

A

Q
A
Yeah, that's right.
If we can go to 002134 , I'll go through part of Melnyk and Lapchuk's evidence. Do you recall, based on their evidence, of Melnyk and Lapchuk, was it your view, sir, that they had taken David Milgaard's remarks in the motel room and his conduct as being serious or whether they took it as being in a joking manner?

I haven't read their testimony.
I will go through it for you.
No, my recollection is that they may have come across as taking it seriously and that may today be a misperception on my part, but I'm trying to do my best to recall it for you.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I'm not sure what
we're speaking of, at the Supreme Court or at the trial?

MR. HODSON: No, I'm talking at the trial, I'm sorry, at the original trial.

A Yes.

BY MR. HODSON:
I'll go through parts of the evidence here and then I'll ask you some further questions. Go to 002143 -- actually, to 002144 , again the evidence is similar to what's in the statement, Mr. Melnyk talks about David Milgaard grabbing the pillow, sitting upright:
"A ... and he started hitting the pillow like he was stabbing something.

Q Just a minute please - go ahead?
A He was hitting the pillow like he was stabbing something and he said - I killed her or something fourteen times."
"A I'm not sure if it was - I killed her but 14 times was in there. It was either "I killed her . ." or "I stabbed her 14 times."
"A And then he said: "I fixed her." And then the next page:
"A And then he sort of rolled on his side and started laughing."

And then he was asked:
"Q Now, what happened when this took place?
A The room sort of - just everybody just sat there and just sort of looked in a daze like."

And then to the next page, I think he's asked the question about whether he was on drugs and he said no.

And then if we can go to -actually, this is -- to 002146 , this is where you start cross-examination, and in the
cross-examination $I$ don't believe, Mr. Tallis, that you asked the question of Mr. Melnyk, did you, to the effect that did you think David was joking or did you take it as a joke. Can you tell us why you did not ask that question? Well, earlier you ran through testimony here in chief where $I$ think that there were, you might say, different interpretations that can be put on it, but in the latter part when he described them, all there in a daze, $I$ then, in my sort of analysis now, likely backed off from pursuing that because he, in my view, would probably have said,
if $I$ had put the question directly, "No, I took it seriously." I thought there was a margin of difference there from an earlier comment than the last one.
$Q$

A
Q
And were you influenced at all in exercising your judgment with respect to that question by what Ute Frank had told you of her observations in the room?

I have no doubt that $I$ was.
And if you had received the answer to that question of "No, I don't think he was, I took him seriously," what effect would that have had on your position before the jury about the subject matter, if any, or tell us how that might have affected your case?

Well, $I$ think it would have been damaging. If you can go to 002153 , it appears that you asked some questions here highlighting the fact that David was laughing hysterically when he was doing this:
"Q And you said he started to laugh. I suggest to you that a better
recollection is that he started to laugh, as you describe it hysterically?

A Yah, well, he was laughing.

Q ... well, didn't you tell the police that he turned over on his side and was laughing hysterically?

A Yes."
So would you be trying to send a message that maybe David thought it was a joke through this witness?

A
Yes.
Go to 002155 , you then go through some questions here about Craig Melnyk's criminal past, and I think $I$ can summarize it this way. He was -charges were pending for armed robbery, in fact, it may have been that the day he was in Court testifying for the Crown in the David Milgaard case may have been a date very close to when he was in some Regina proceedings, and I take it that's something you would have been -- you would have found out in your inquiries; is that correct? Yes, I had obtained that information and that's why $I$ was able to put these particular questions. And what were you trying to do with that line of questioning?

A
Well, $I$ was trying to set the stage for possible direction on, I'll say, unsavoury witnesses, or witnesses of unsavoury character would be a better
way of putting it, and in particular to compare the type of people that were some of the main Crown witnesses with what $I$ think $I$ would call, you know, lunch bucket witnesses, who go to work every day, and I'm thinking of Mr. and Mrs. Danchuk, people like that, and some of the other people that were called.

So here --
In other words, witnesses like this and, say, witnesses like Cadrain were far different from witnesses like the ones $I$ have described.

And did you have any sense that Mr. Melnyk and/or Mr. Lapchuk were being motivated to either improve their evidence or fabricate their evidence to get a better deal from the Crown or to get a break on other unrelated matters?

A

Q
And capable of it, but did you have any
information that they had in fact made
arrangements with the Crown to exchange evidence
in this case for a break in their case?
A
Nothing directly like that, but $I$ think that's the kind of thing that would be uppermost -- or would
be in their mind when they were --
Q
A
Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
.
No, particularly in the light of what she would have said about how she had changed her lifestyle and her approach to life, and even though one might not have necessarily asked all those questions, she was a very talkative person about that time, and while I'm not saying she described
this change with evangelistic fervor, she certainly portrayed to me a person who deeply believed in the change that she had made.

I'll just go through parts, here you ask him:
"Q As a matter of fact you didn't tell this story to any police officers until you yourself had been charged with armed robbery, isn't that right. Wasn't it after you were charged with armed robbery?

A Yes."
And skip ahead to 002158 , and here's where you ask him about whether he had ever been asked to be a stooly or a stool pigeon and an informer and getting paid to give evidence for the Crown. I take it both of those things would be to try and advance the position -- you were trying to get the jury to think that these people were unsavoury witnesses?

A
Yes, and $I$ hoped to get a direction from the judge to that effect because $I$ was, during the course of the trial I always tried to keep my eye on potential matters as well for a direction to the jury as well as sorting through and including certain things in the jury address.

Q

A

Q
A

Q

A
Q

A

Q

So what you were hoping to get is that a direction
for the jury not to put much weight on the evidence of Melnyk and Lapchuk?

That's right, and in particular, to scrutinize their evidence very carefully -If we then --
-- when you compare it or weigh it as against some of the other evidence.

Go to 002161, you finish your examination, and I take it that you told us you were careful in where you went with Mr. Melnyk; is that fair?

I tried to be.
Were there some risks that he might, based on your
questions, get into areas that might be more
damaging? You gave us the one example about the joking versus serious that could potentially cause damage. Were there any others?

Well, I didn't want him to, you know, stray too much into David's lifestyle or anything like that.

Now, there was some that you couldn't avoid because it came out about his condition in the room, but $I$ just didn't want other details in there.

Here, once you are done, the judge says:
"Now, Mr. Tallis, I'm not at all
satisfied if $I$ may say so with respect
to some of the information which $I$ think
should be obtained from this man and $I$
thought I'd ask the questions and I
think it would only be fair that $I$ allow
you to cross-examine on anything arising
out of it in view of the seriousness of
this matter -"
And then just scroll down. Do you have any sense
of how the judge viewed the evidence of Melnyk
and Lapchuk, and again, just looking for your
observations as to how their evidence may have
came across, whether it came across as credible
or whether he had some doubts about it?
Well, I really can't recall anything now, but
looking at the intervention, one might infer that
he was interested in probing areas that counsel
had not probed, and when $I$ say counsel, I include
Mr. Caldwell as well as myself.
Okay. He then asks here:
"Q The only time you ever remember
mentioning it to anybody would be about
two weeks ago, is that right?

A Yes.
Q To whom?

A To Ron Wilson.
Q To Ron Wilson?
A Yes."
The same Ron Wilson.
"Q Where were you talking to him?
A Up town in Regina.
Q Was that before he gave evidence in this case, do you know?"

Before the trial.
"Q Who raised the subject?"
A Ron; he was talking about coming up to Saskatoon.

Q Yes? Did he ask you if you knew anything about it or did you volunteer to him?

A I asked him, like . .
Q . . just leave it at that, don't give the conversation. Did he say to you that he knew you knew something about it or anything like that, or did you volunteer it to him?

A I think $I$ volunteered it to him.
Q And when is the next time that you mentioned it to anybody?

A After that occasion?

Q Yes.
A The following Monday.
Q Was that to the police?
A Yes.

Q Did the police come to you or did you go to them?

A They came to me.
Q Where?
A In Regina, like . .
Q . . to your home?
A No; they phoned me ..."
So again this line of questioning I think brought out the fact that it was Ron Wilson who got the information initially right before the trial and gave it to the police and the police contacted them; is that a fair reading of that evidence?

A
Q

A Yes, and that he had volunteered it to Ron Wilson. Can you tell us that exchange or that information, whether it was helpful, harmful to this evidence against your client?

I think that the response that the witness Melnyk, from the witness Melnyk, that he had volunteered the information to Wilson, was probably damaging to the accused. Certainly $I$ can put it at least this way, that it was not helpful.

Q
And so the theory that they had maybe gone to the Crown with some information that I'll trade you a break on my case if $I$ help you over here, the fact that it now looks like they volunteered it to Ron Wilson and Ron Wilson gave it to the police might undermine that argument a bit; is that fair? Yes.

And what about the credibility of Ron Wilson in the eyes of the jury, or let me rephrase that, the fact that it appears Ron Wilson was gathering information and providing it to the police, or obtaining information, what if anything did that do to your views on Ron Wilson and how the jury might view his evidence?

Well, $I$ think that one view of it might be that this type of questioning tended to enhance Wilson's credibility, or reliability, but that's, you know, an assessment that $I$ could be dead wrong on it.

And then to 002164 , Mr. Caldwell in re-examining simply establishes that Mr. Melnyk's armed robbery charges were in Regina and dealing with Regina police and that the Saskatoon City Police were the ones who interviewed him; is that correct?

A Yes.

If we can then go to 006010 , this is Mr. Lapchuk's transcript. Go to 006016 , again he describes, we've been through this, "Where's my paring knife?"

And then the next page, he's asked about what happened when the accused did these things, he said:
"A Well, I was shooked, like I hadn't expected a display like that, you know; and $I$ just started looking at him and I believe everybody else was looking at him also; and then he looked up and saw that everybody - that $I$ was staring at him with my jaw hanging down."

And again, $I$ think in the cross-examination of Mr. Lapchuk you did not ask him the question did you take it as a joke or take it seriously, and would you have the same reasons as Mr. Melnyk? Yes.

MR. HODSON: This is probably an
appropriate spot to break. I'm moving on to a different area, Mr. Commissioner.
(Adjourned at 2:34 p.m.)
(Reconvened at 3:00 p.m.)
BY MR. HODSON:

Q
Sorry, Mr. Tallis, there's just a few more items of Mr. Lapchuk that $I$ should finish up on, and again just for the record, 006026 , and this is Lapchuk talking about:
"Q You're expected to stand trial on what is that that's coming up?

A Forgery and uttering and possession of stolen goods ..."

And I think this may well have been theft, or someone else may have been involved in a theft of David Milgaard's wallet or ID. And again, so you would have had the same approach with Mr. Lapchuk as you did with Mr. Melnyk, trying to put evidence before the jury that they were of unsavoury character?

Yes, I think that's a fair assessment.
And then if we can go to 031302, which is the address to the jury, and here's how you deal with Melnyk and Lapchuk.

Let me just, before we get into that, what was your sense, this was right at the tail-end of the trial, this evidence. Are you able to give us some idea of how you thought it affected the case against Mr. Milgaard?

It's very difficult to assess, but speaking on a
comparative basis, I thought that it had nowhere near the impact that the testimony of Nichol John delivered in the manner in which it was and under the circumstances had. I don't know whether that answers your question, but that's the, that's my sense of things trying to reflect back a good many years. I think if you had asked me that question not too long after that, $I$ would have probably addressed it in much the same way, that is, on a comparative basis.

Would it be fair to say, though, that it was damaging evidence?

I think it was depending on the view that was taken of these people.

And I think what Chief Justice Bence said in his charge to the jury, there were really two issues, one is can you believe Melnyk and Lapchuk when they say David Milgaard said these things, and then if you do, the second test is was David Milgaard serious and truthful when he said them; is that fair?

Yes, and $I$ know that's the type of direction $I$ was hoping to get, at least with respect to the latter part of it.

And so here with Melnyk and Lapchuk you say:
"There's no real discrepancies in the evidence as between them."

And then to the next page, you talk about their background, you say:
"Not only are they not all America, but
they are not all Canadian."
And then go on to say --
I guess Mr. Caldwell baited me a little.
That's right, $I$ think he called them all America, you went one step further.

A

Q
If we can go to the next page -- actually, you know, I think that finishes up. So again, it would be the unsavoury -- the manner in which you chose to deal with that evidence was to, it seems, call into question their character, put in the minds of the jury that there might be reasons to question their modis in testimony, in particular given their trouble with the law and some upcoming charges; is that fair?

Yes.
Q
If we can now turn to the issue of the secretor defence, and, Mr. Tallis, we've heard a fair bit of evidence, we've heard from Mr. Paynter, Mr.

Penkala, Dr. Emson, Dr. Ferris on the subject matter, so that we have canvassed it in a fair bit of detail, and $I$ want to go through with you what your take was at the time about this evidence and how it fit in, and you've already told us about, I think you said before the preliminary hearing you took steps to look at it. Can you tell us maybe just generally what your view was of the frozen semen, or the semen that was found in the snow and how you intended and how you used that at trial to assist Mr. Milgaard's case?

A
Well, $I$ proceeded on the footing that David was a non-secretor and $I$ did so because at that time I thought there was an evidentiary basis for that. That being so, I thought there would be an advantage to him to have the seminal fluid introduced in evidence. Now, of course bear in mind that it had been established that the best evidence with respect to seminal fluid had not been retained as $I$ recall it, so $I$ proceeded on that footing because if he was a non-secretor and that the donor of that seminal fluid sample was a secretor, it would exclude him as the attacker.

Now, I'm trying to summarize, distill it so that $I$ don't go into too much detail
because, as you've said, you already have all that, so I think that's the way $I$ would summarize it.

And $I$ think the issue at the preliminary hearing and trial focused on, and $I$ think what you say was accepted by the Crown and the other witnesses except for the fact that the Crown and some of the witnesses then went further to try and explain -tried to explain how the semen with A antigens could have come from an $A$ non-secretor, and $I$ think the question then became was, I think initially -- let me start off by saying this, that the initial response was, and $I$ think what Staff Sergeant Paynter said, that if it's pure seminal fluid and the fact that there's A antigens in there, then it would have to come from an $A$ secretor?

A

And then $I$ think they went further and said okay, if there was blood, whole blood in the semen and that came from an $A$ non-secretor, an $A$ non-secretor's blood would have A antigens in there and that if the donor got his blood in his
semen in some way, that might explain why $A$ antigens would be in the semen and therefore you could say that semen with $A$ antigens could come from an $A$ non-secretor; is that fair?

Yes, $I$ think that summarizes it $I$ think fairly. And I think the issues that were canvassed with Mr. Paynter and Dr. Emson were focusing on that in the frozen semen, was there blood in there, number one, or could they establish that there was blood in there and, if so, what type of blood?

A
$Q$

A
Yes.
To try and, I guess not discount, but I think the position of some of the people in response to your position was, well, there could be blood in there and that might explain the antigens; is that fair?

Yes, $I$ think you have the benefit of all this other testimony you've heard, but I accept what you've set forth.

Now, on the issue of David's secretor status, we know now $I$ think in 1992 he was tested and it was determined that he is in fact a secretor, and let's just go back to 1969, 1970, and I can tell you that in the evidence presented by the Crown, in particular, by Mr. Paynter, he confirmed that in the saliva test that he conducted, that there
was no A antigens and on that basis he concluded that he was a non-secretor.

Now, there's some, $I$ think when he testified here he said that that doesn't mean you are a non-secretor, it just means on that test you didn't have antigens in there, but $I$ think at trial everybody was proceeding on the basis that he was a non-secretor. Did you have any doubts at that time about whether he was or was not a secretor or did you accept what the Crown had put forward?

A
Well, I had no reason to doubt the results of the test by Mr. Paynter. I knew that he had given expert evidence for many years in the courts in this province, and $I$ think other courts, and I suppose $I$ should also acknowledge that in my view that analysis, which I assumed to be correct, ought to operate in favour of David, and of course he had, David had co-operated fully in making available a saliva sample and there was no suggestion that he had done anything to contaminate it or anything like that, so it had been taken under strict controls, and in the circumstances $I$ proceeded on the footing that David was a non-secretor.

If you had been aware in 1969, 1970, and whether the test was done right or not $I$ 'm not saying, but if the test at that time had shown that David was a secretor, would you have taken a different position with respect to the admissibility of the frozen semen that was tendered?

I might -- I think I probably would have.
We have heard, and $I$ think in particular Dr.
Ferris and perhaps others say that the fact that it was found three or four days after the murder, the risk of contamination was such that from a forensic scientist perspective it was not a reliable piece of evidence to be used to either eliminate or implicate a suspect, and I'm just wondering back in 1969,1970 if you were of the view that this semen was incriminating or damaging to Mr. Milgaard, whether you might have taken steps to challenge its admissibility on that basis or a similar basis?

A
I might have, but how successful I would have been
I cannot say, but as $I$ say, $I$ was, that's
hypothetical from my perspective because $I$ was proceeding on the footing that he was a
non-secretor and $I$ certainly wouldn't want to do anything to take away a potential piece of helpful
evidence from his perspective.
Would it be fair to say that going into trial, and indeed at the preliminary hearing, that you viewed the semen, the frozen semen, as being helpful to David Milgaard's case?

There's no question about that.
And in fact exculpatory?
Yes, and $I$ may add, I think the Crown viewed it as such and that's why, you know, the explanation was considered and advanced for blood in the semen. And let me just understand that. In the absence of evidence of blood being, whole blood being in the semen, are you saying that the Crown viewed it as being exculpatory then?

That was my assessment, and $I$ may be wrong because I can't go into their mental processes on it, but standing back, $I$ would think that was likely, and the fact that it was sent back for retesting, or an additional test, would lend support, I think, to the view that $I$ took.

And when you talk about it being exculpatory, can you tell us, what was your view or your position at the time, are we talking something that is, tends to favour him or would you go so far as to say that it would prove his innocence or prove
that he didn't commit the crime, can you give us some sense of where on the spectrum the weight of this evidence would be?

A

Q

A
Q
A
$Q$

A
And $I$ would say this, and $I$ don't mean to inject improper things, but $I$ remember after the case was, the trial was concluded, and I have no recollection of this, but $I$ remember Miss Wilson saying to me not too long before she passed away, she said, you know, $I$ remember you saying to the sheriff, or whoever it was that was gathering up the exhibits, according to her, but $I$ have no memory of it, made the comment that, you know, these exhibits should be carefully preserved because some day medical science may answer the question that was raised here. Now, I have no recollection of that, but she certainly did, and
that was consistent with my view of the importance of this evidence.

And that discussion would have been after the trial was concluded?

That's right, and usually the sheriff gathered up the exhibits, sheriff or Court official gathered them up, but as I say, I'm passing along another recollection, but it's certainly consistent with my view of the importance of this evidence, and $I$ thought that right from the very beginning and that's why $I$ prepared well in advance to deal with it for the preliminary hearing.

Do I take it from that then that your view was that the scientific evidence, namely, the secretor issue as you then knew it, was something that you felt exonerated David Milgaard, or excluded him as the perpetrator?

A
$Q$
I know that in my partisan thinking that that was my view.

Again, just before we get into Mr. Paynter's, some of his evidence, can we distill it this way, that -- and I mentioned this a bit earlier, that the real issue was whether or not there was blood, whole blood in the frozen semen, that was the focus, because if there was no blood, then there
was no explanation for the $A$ antigens being in the semen other than coming from a secretor?

A
$Q$
$Q$



If we can go to 008027 , and I think you told us, Mr. Tallis, that you read literature, consulted, I that $I$ knew him to be, $I$ did not think that he would present a conclusion that something was human semen unless as a scientist he was sure of that.
think you said you obtained some draft questions from a publication on the subject and that after you -- to prepare your examination of Mr. Paynter, and that after you were done the preliminary hearing you had the questions and answers reviewed by an expert friend?

Yes. I was put in touch by my medical friend here in town with someone who had more expertise in the area, and without my file $I$ can't tell you who it was, but $I$ did it over the phone, so $I$ know it was long distance, but $I$ actually had all the questions and $I$ received great co-operation on it and read them carefully and then of course sought advice.

And then $I$ think you said after you got to Mr. Paynter's answers, or perhaps Dr. Emson's as well, you communicated those to your expert?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
Yes, that's what I'm talking about, I had reviewed them with them.

And I think you told us that he told you that that's as good as you are going to get, or better than you might expect?

Yes. I was told that and $I$ had no reason to doubt it at that time.

If we can go to 008031 , please, again, this is the
preliminary hearing of Mr. Paynter, just a couple of questions here that Mr. Caldwell asked. Actually, if we can just go over to show the question 31 , it says:
"Q Now that's as far as you went in that first examination."

And again, we're talking about Il which was the frozen semen.
"What would that, of itself, indicate to you about the donor?"

He said he found A antigens. He said:
"A This would indicate that if the sample was pure seminal fluid it would have to come from a person of group A blood, who was a secretor."

So again $I$ think that's a point we made earlier, if it's pure seminal fluid with A antigens, it has to come from a secretor.

Then the next page, he talks about, Mr. Caldwell asks:
"A ... I examined the fluid remaining in the vial marked "I 1" for the presence of blood.

Q Alright, had you specifically examined it for the presence of blood the first
time?

A No, sir."
And then the next page, the top, it says at question 40 :
"Q I see. Alright, now, on this occasion, what did you find about the two vials?

A In Exhibit marked "I 1", I conducted what we refer to as a presumptive test for blood. I found this to give a positive result in the case of the one marked "I 1"."

And $I$ think we've heard from a number of witnesses that a presumptive test for blood doesn't necessarily -- a positive presumptive test for blood doesn't necessarily mean it's blood. Do you understand that to be the case, Mr. Tallis?

Yes.
And then if we can skip ahead, 008036 , again just for the record I'll point this out, question 69, sorry, 70 at the bottom, and he's asking if P.36 is Mr. Milgaard's saliva sample.
"A ... I examined the saliva sample ... for
the presence of any blood group ..."
And I think this is where the Crown led evidence
that a person would have to be a secretor to be able to find them, and then scroll down to question 75:
"A I found neither A nor B antigens in the saliva stains."

So is this what you would be relying upon? I think you told us earlier you proceeded on the basis that the Crown's evidence about Mr. Milgaard's secretor status, you accepted that? Yes.

And then if you go to page 008039 , and here I think right off the bat, question 2 , you talk about the testing for blood, what tests, it talks about the hemostix test, checking for blood, is this the only test you used on the articles? No. And then -- actually, $I$ think then the next page you talk about a second test, a hemochromogen crystals test which is a test $I$ think they did on perhaps some of the clothing, but not on the frozen semen; is that correct?

I believe you are right on that.
Then you went through a fairly detailed set of questions about $A, B, O$ and antigens. If you can go to 008042, and again the question that your blood type and grouping doesn't change from birth
to death. Next page, he agrees. And then you ask him some questions about further grouping group A into A1, A2 and A3, and do you recall what the purpose of that was or whether that was just general information or were you going anywhere with that?

A
$Q$

A

Q 47 :
"Q Well now, in this particular case, did you conduct any testing with respect to sub-grouping?

A No, sir."
So it appears that you would have confirmed that
he didn't do any of that?


A
Q

That's right.
And then the next page, he confirms for you at 56 and 58 his report to the police, his opinion that the seminal fluid was probably from a secretor of group A, and if we could go ahead to 008048 , here I think you have some questions about the secretor test on David, the saliva test, and confirms that it was using an accepted test in the field, and the next page, $I$ won't go through it, but again some further questions here on page 008049 confirming the testing he did and whether he did any further tests on the saliva sample, but I think confirming that at least according to Mr. Paynter, the secretor test that he had done on David Milgaard was done in accordance with accepted practices; is that a fair summary? Yes, that was certainly my conclusion based on what he said. If we could then go to 008051, and then in his examination-in-chief $I$ think he had said something about the positive tests for blood, and Il is the frozen sample --

Yes.
-- of the semen. You say:
"Q ... and when you checked "I 1", you indicated to my learned friend that you found a trace of blood, did you?

A This is what was indicated, yes.
Q Now was this a very minute trace of blood?

A I would say it was, there was no color indication in the liquid that ...

Q ... in other words, from a microscopic --"

A

Q "-- macroscopic examination of the liquid, you wouldn't know?

A That is correct."
And then:
"Q What particular test did you use to check for the presence of blood in that fluid?

A This is where $I$ mentioned the Hemostix test, the one used by hospitals to identify ..."

And then to the next page, you ask:
"Q And I take it that would be due to the fact that the amount was so minute?"

He says:
"A There was not sufficient there to attempt a blood grouping in our normal method."

Then you ask:
"Q So that as far as you were concerned, there was no method that you knew of that you could have used to test the blood group of that blood that was there?

A No sir, the test that $I$ use to obtain the antigens in the sample of liquid, is one of the tests that we use in grouping blood stains."

And then goes on to say -- just actually scroll down to 112 -- at 113:
"Q And I take it --"
Again testing the seminal fluid:
"Q And I take it that you found antigens?
A I did. I could not say if they were from seminal fluid or blood."

So in other words, he's saying I can't say
whether or not it's from an $A$ secretor or from type A non-secretor who had blood in his semen.

Then if we can scroll down, you then ask:
"Q But the nature of the antigens that you found indicated to you that they came from a person who would be a secretor?" He says:
"A If they were from the seminal fluid. If they were from the blood, the person would not have to be a secretor."

Again, I think that's what we're talking about.
"Q You just couldn't say one way or the other?

A No, sir, if there was Group A blood there, you would get that reaction, whether or not the person was a secretor."

Next page:
"If there was no blood there, you would not get the reaction unless he was a secretor."

And you say:
"Q So that what you are saying then is that a person with Group A would have had to lose some blood, in some way, under those circumstances?

A Yes sir. There would be traces of his blood in the seminal fluid, if the
seminal fluid was from a person of
Group A."

And again, that would be the situation if that seminal, if that semen was to be attributed to David Milgaard; is that correct, that there would have to be his blood in there?

Yes.
Then you ask:
"Q But would that - you say traces of the blood, does seminal fluid ordinarily have traces of blood in it?

A I couldn't really say on that, I would not suspect so, the pure sample."

Scroll down:
"Q No, what I'm getting at is, this trace of blood would have to come from - in your view, from somewhere other than the emission of ordinary seminal fluid?

A I would suspect it could be contained in the seminal fluid as a result of a strain, or something like that, or the rupture of a blood vessel in the tract where the seminal fluid was emitted from."

And then scroll down to 120, I think then you ask
about:
"Q ... in this particular case, you know of no way that one could test for blood grouping with an amount of blood that you found in this "I 1"?"

So in other words, I think you are confirming that he can't, if there is blood in the frozen semen, he can't group the type, because I think, Mr. Tallis, in your closing address to the jury, one of the suggestions you put forward, that if there was blood in his frozen semen, or in the semen found in the snow, the most likely source would be from Gail Miller; is that correct?

Yes.
And to the next page -- actually, I think we can skip ahead to -- that's all for the preliminary hearing.

So after you examined Mr.
Paynter at the preliminary hearing and based on the discussions with your expert, did you conclude that you had a basis to argue that this frozen semen excluded Mr. Milgaard as a donor?

A
Q
Yes, I did.
If we can then go to trial, the trial transcript, 041925 . Did you consider whether you needed to
have your own expert testimony on this subject matter?

A

Q

A
$Q$

Yes, but the advisors $I$ had indicated to me that $I$ couldn't hope to get anything more than $I$ did have and with that, $I$ thought that $I$ should take their advice and follow through on that basis.

So in other words, use the Crown witnesses to prove the evidence that you needed to exculpate your client?

Yeah.
If we can then go ahead to 041941 , again $I$ won't go through what $I$ went through from the prelim, just on the explanation, that here is where Mr. Caldwell asks him about what he did to confirm that it's human seminal fluid.
"One is a test for an enzyme produced by the male prostate gland known as phosphatase enzyme."

And a microscopic examination. And I take it, Mr. Tallis, you did not take issue with Mr.

Paynter's evidence that this frozen semen was in fact from a human?

No, I didn't.
If we can then go to 041943, and then Mr. Caldwell asks him to explain, again we'll just focus on the
issue of blood, whole blood being in the semen:
"A On this occasion examination was to determine if there was any blood present."
"Q And what was the result of this second examination?

A If I may explain that test. This test is one used by hospitals to test for blood in urine and they find that it is specific for their purpose for testing for blood in this liquid. I have used this test and tested it with several substances and $I$ found that it will give a false positive reaction with certain green vegetables and with leather.

Q What do you mean by a false positive reaction?

A It will give a positive result - the same result with these substances as it will with blood."

And so in other words, $I$ think what he's saying is if you have some semen with leather or leafy vegetables, or certain green vegetables contaminating them, you will get a positive test
for blood; is that right?
A

Q

A
Q
That's my understanding.
So in other words, a positive test on this type of test does not necessarily mean that there's blood in the substance; correct?

That's right.
And then if we scroll down, Chief Justice Bence says:
"Q In other words, it's something from the vegetables that's there and not blood and mistaken for blood, is that what you mean?

A No sir; I'm saying that the test when tested against other substances a few other substances will give a false positive and for that reason $I$ cannot positively say that a substance is blood from using this test alone.

Q It's not much good then, is it?
A Well, we use it as a screening test to eliminate stains and then if it is positive we attempt to do a further test to positively identify it as blood if there is sufficient there."

Again, the next page, and then -- so $I$ think what

Mr. Paynter is saying, you do the hemostix test to get past step 1, if it's positive doesn't mean that there is blood, but then you go do a second test to positively identify it as blood; is that your understanding?

That's right.
And then here he says:
"A I obtained a positive result for blood with this test."

And then he says here.
"Q ... there was insufficient blood in this sample - or coloring in this sample that I was able to attempt any confirmation tests to absolutely prove that there was blood present."

And then the Court says:
"Q It turned out to be useless then, didn't it?

A Chemically I could not say that it was definitely blood there."

And again, would this be the type of evidence that you had expected from Mr. Paynter?

A

Q question:
"Q And as $I$ understand you, Staff, this would be a matter of the quantity you had to work with?

A That is correct, sir.

Q And can you describe or not the quantity of blood revealed to you in this way?"

You then object:
"My Lord, my learned friend is using the question quantity of blood and with the utmost deference . . "

And the judge says:
". . there is no evidence whatsoever of blood."

And you say:
". . and I think accordingly the
question should be framed differently."
And then the Court -- if we can just actually scroll down, the court says:
". . there is no evidence whatsoever of blood."
". . and I think accordingly the
question should be framed differently." I'm sorry, I've read that already. The court says:
"Well, there is no proof of any blood."

And again, would that be the evidence and the direction you were seeking, Mr. Tallis, based on what your advisors had told you?

A

Q
And the next page, Mr . Caldwell goes at it a different way and says:
"Q This was in effect - well, I won't pursue that, My Lord -

Alright now, if indeed there was blood as such - I'm asking about this time in the sample at the time you checked for blood as such . ."

And the judge says:
". . excuse me, but there was no blood."
And then says:
". . you just can't ask hypothetical questions like that unless you're prepared to prove that there was blood there. If you can't prove that there was blood there through some witness or other $I$ won't allow you to pursue it."

And then scroll down, about the test he says:
". . Well, it was positive for blood but he has already said that that might be
false because of the other factors that he mentioned and he said that there wasn't enough to make a positive identification as to whether it was a false positive or not a false positive." And then $I$ think you interject: ". . excuse me, if $I$ may interject here. He even went further, My Lord, and said chemically $I$ would not say it was blood."

Next page, Mr. Paynter says:
"Chemically $I$ could not positively identify it as blood."

So at that point, Mr. Tallis, were you satisfied that the evidence at least before the Court on the issue of whether or not there was blood, based on a scientific test of the semen, that there was no evidence that there was blood in that semen?

A

Q
So the individual who does the scientific testing says $I$ can't say there's any blood in there, there's no evidence that there's blood in the semen, what you told us a bit earlier, that once
you establish that, then $I$ think you were saying there's no way the semen could have come from David Milgaard; is that fair?

A
Q That's right. If we can then go to 041964 , you were asked the question here in your cross-examination confirming:
"Q ... that about 85\% of the population secrete blood grouping factors in ... fluids other than blood."

So I take it -- next page. I take it from that, then, that a non-secretor would be in the minority; is that correct?

That's what $I$ was trying to establish.
If we can go to page 041969 . Actually, go to 041968, just at the bottom. I think Chief Justice Bence interjects:
"I'm sorry, I'm going to have to interrupt you, Mr. Tallis, to clear up a point on this business of being a secretor -"

And then the following couple of pages are some questions:
"Q You said at the time you made your report that in your opinion the seminal
fluid came from a secretor of group
"A"?"
Paynter says:
"A Probably came from a secretor of group
"A", I believe it was."
And then carrying on:
"Q Alright; and if the substance that you found there turned out - that is the free blood, which you thought was free blood - turned out to be not free blood

- you understand what I mean? One of those other substances that you referred to that came from leafy lettuce and so on? If it wasn't blood - if it came from one of those other things, what would that do - confirm or . ."

And then:
"A . . this would indicate that it came from a secretor of group "A", or group A-B, yes, sir.

Q If it was not blood?
A If the substance that gave me this positive test was not blood."

And then:

```
"Q But if it was blood . ."
```

And the answer is:
"A . . if it was blood I could not say whether or not it was a secretor because . . "

And then the judge says:
"Q . . and yet you can't tell me or tell the jury whether it was blood or it wasn't blood, is that right?

A I cannot tell you definitely. In my opinion it probably was blood but I cannot tell you positively.

Q It might not have been blood?
A There is a chance, yes.
Q Alright; so that you can't say definitely then that the person whose seminal fluid you examined on this occasion was a secretor or not a secretor?

A I cannot say, no sir."
And I just want to pause there, Mr. Tallis, and get your comments on that line of questioning and what if any effect that had on your position before the jury about the exculpatory nature of this.

A
Well, $I$ can't recall exactly my reaction, but
reading it over, $I$ think it's fair to say that the questions cut down on the progress that $I$ had made in this area.

If $I$ can maybe restate that to you. I think before the judge asked the question you had established that there was no evidence of blood in the semen and therefore it could not have come from David Milgaard; correct?

Yes.
And I think that's what you were trying to establish. If I look at this question and answer here, what Mr. Paynter is saying is $I$ can't tell you, which is probably correct, but $I$ can't tell you whether this came from a secretor or not, and I suppose to a juror might that be -- let me ask you to --

A
$Q$ Well, $I$ think it undermines what $I$ consider to be the position $I$ had generally established.

And then he goes on to say:
"Alright. I'm sorry I'm a little dense on that, Mr. Tallis, but $I$ had to get it through."

And then you carry on to the next page, 041977 , and you are now asking him about the semen and the colour and about how much blood it would take
to turn the colour pinkish, he says:
"A It would not take a great deal to start giving a pinkish color to the liquid.

Q That's right; and you had enough to do with the samples that it's fair to say that you didn't even detect a pinkish color . .

A . . I did not suspect any blood in it when $I$ first received it, sir.

Q And when you looked at it even later on there was no pinkish coloration or anything like that that the naked eye could see?

A No sir."
So again $I$ take it this would go to the issue of whether or not there was blood in that semen?

A

I've got a number of your judgments $I$ was involved with that I'll deal with at the end.

255230 is Dr. Emson and this is
at the trial, Dr. Emson was the pathologist, and if we can go to 255256 , so -- and $I$ think what we talked about earlier, there was really two components to this question of how can there be blood in an $A$ non-secretor's semen, and we just went through Mr. Paynter's evidence which was look at the substance and have a scientist chemically analyze it and tell me whether or not there's blood in there, which he said no, I can't, and here Dr. Emson is asked the question about medically can a person, how can a person and what is the probability of a person getting his blood in the semen, and this is an examination by Mr. Caldwell, this is at trial, he says:
"Q Now, Doctor, your work involves the examination of seminal fluid and its constituent spermatozoa as you have told us?

A Yes.
Q Are there conditions under which human blood as such can get into seminal fluid or spermatozoa in the male person?

A Yes.
Q Could you tell the Court what they are please?

A One would be local injury to the male genitals.

> A second and quite common
occurrence would be any inflammation
either internal or external of the
male genitals.
Q Are there any other causes?
A There are rarer conditions but $I$ think the injury and the inflammation are the most common ones.

Q You understood my question to be speaking of blood as such as opposed to any constituent of blood?

A Yes - blood cells."
And then it goes on:
"Q If you had some bladder trouble, blood from the bladder that might . . ?

A . . yes, My Lord. Inflammation anywhere in the genital or urinary system."

Let me just pause there. Is that an issue that
you had raised with your expert advisors?

A

Q

Yes, I was aware of this possibility and -Did your advisors tell you whether or not it was possible for a male, or young male to have his blood find its way into his semen in the manner suggested by Dr. Emson?

I was advised that that could be so.
We then go to 2 --
Let's put it this way, that medical people that $I$ had spoken to would not have been able to, at that time at least, to dispute, or would not have disputed what he was saying.

And so that it was possible that that could happen; is that fair?

Yes.
And if you would have called an expert on that subject matter, based on what your advisors were telling you, what would your experts say? Well, they would essentially have supported the position Dr. Emson took and, frankly, that's why $I$ had spent so much time with Mr. Paynter on the tests and the inability to identify blood in a positive way. If we can go to 255272 , this is where you question Dr. Emson about that and you say:
"Q Now, you told my learned friend also
that blood is sometimes located in the seminal fluid of a male person and you told my learned friend, the jury and His Lordship certain things that may cause this. Now, would I be correct - well, have you ever found blood in say a sixteen and a half year old boy where you have tested his seminal fluid - have you personally ever found that condition?

A I don't ever recollect having done it before on a sixteen and a half year old boy.

Q I see; you've never personally done it?
A No.
Q And I take it that - well do you recollect ever having done it on we'll say a seventeen or eighteen year old boy - in that area?

A I'm afraid $I$ can't give you the ages of the patients on whom this has been
done. It is I think accepted medical
knowledge that small amounts of blood
commonly find their way into seminal
fluid of males of any age beyond
puberty, in conditions particularly of slight infection anywhere in the genital or urinary system; and less commonly in the event of external injury." And again, would that have been consistent with what your advisors were telling you?

Yes, and $I$ think the reason the question was framed about whether he had personal knowledge of something like that from his work was deliberate.

And for what purpose?
Well, to at least raise a question perhaps about the reliability of the opinion, although I knew that if $I$ called the people that were advising me, they would have generally had to agree with that. And in fact if you can scroll down, and you say here:
"Q But you haven't personally conducted any tests on any group . . ?

A . . I have never done any series of this."

That's right.
Q If we can go ahead to 031297. The doc ID is 031255, this is the address to the jury -actually, go to page 031298, and I went through
parts of this when Dr. Ferris was here last week, but $I$ want to go through parts of this with you, and this is your address to the jury. First of all you talk about, you say there is no criticism --"
"... this is no criticism of Dr. Emson, but $I$ think it is unfortunate that the sample that was from the vaginal cavity was not saved, because if it had been saved it is quite clear from his evidence that the blood could have been analyzed for grouping."

And you may have already touched on this I think. Are you saying that that would have been a better sample than what was found in the snow?

Yes. And of course if there was blood in the sample and they extract if from the vaginal cavity, the logical check to make would have been the deceased, was it the blood of the deceased, and we've alluded to this.

Right. So that if there was -- I think she was blood type O. If in that sample there was the deceased's blood in that seminal stain, $I$ think the argument made later was that the frozen semen may have come from the deceased as she was laying
in the snow?
A
Q

A
Q
Yes.
And therefore the blood, if there was blood in the semen, it would have come from her?

Yes.
And then if you might be able to help out where we get some of these breaks, Mr. Tallis, if you are able to fill in any of that:
"Now members of the jury there is no suggestion that other than a
non-secretor -- and the possibility of secreting the blood factor in his seminal fluid is great -- ..."

There's a break there, but we did see evidence that it's 85 percent:
"... the effect of that evidence that the seminal fluid contained what are called "A" antigens. Now this may be, and I suggest is something that you should consider pretty carefully, and as you see, if in fact the donor of that seminal fluid was an "A" group secretor, and there was no blood, as such, in the seminal fluid from that person with that "A" grouping, it cannot have been, the
man could not have been the ..."
And then a break. Are you able to shed any light?

A
I'm sure that refers to the accused, David.
Okay. And then you go on to say:
"Now it is suggested that the traces of
blood that Sergeant Paynter found --
that might have been blood -- now
frankly $I$ am not here to argue that
there was ... at that time of the year
and I am not ... anything to suggest
. . ."

Again, I'm not sure, are you able to help us with what might be in there?

A
No, there's something missed there and it's pretty difficult for me to say at this stage.

And then you get on to:
"... when you get down to the question
of reasonableness, first of all,
Dr. Emson points out that the blood in
the seminal fluid in the vagina that he
threw away -- spermatozoa -- could well
have come from Miss Miller's "O" group.
It could have come from her in two ways:
From the inflammation that was referred
to, or from the possible onset of
menstruation; or from the donor. And then let's examine another point in this connection, when that frozen lump was found out in that area that had been ... up, may $I$ suggest to you that if there was blood in this sample, as he thought there might be, he could not say that for sure, but let's forget what ... for the moment and be reasonable about this. Is it not more likely that since he scooped up the area to get the patch where the blood had seeped through, that it was some other blood in the snow? Is this reasonable? I suggest not. And as you see, if the blood that got into that seminal fluid was "O" group, and the donor didn't have any secreted blood in his seminal fluid, then of course, the result would have proved it. There is no suggestion in respect of the sample that that was done."

And then:
"There is no evidence that David is a person who is afflicted with any
condition which caused blood to be in his seminal fluid, and $I$ suggest to you that these other matters that $I$ raised with you are more probable than the possibilities that have been urged upon you."

I pause there. I take it that that would be the possibilities of him getting his own -- that it was his whole blood in the semen; is that correct?

A Yes.

And then down at the bottom, you finish up:
"Now those are factors when you are
assessing the forensic evidence, that I
invite you to consider very critically
and $I$ suggest to you that they tell
heavily in favour of David. They are
factors which are dealt with by honest
and reliable witnesses, and $I$ say this
with regard to the crime detection
laboratory people and the identification
officers who dealt with this ..."

So I take it that as you said earlier, you were getting this evidence from the police witnesses; is that correct?

A

Q
Dr. Ferris gave some evidence, or some commentary about, just generally about whether juries understand forensic-type evidence. Based on your recollection or your observations at the time, did you have any concerns about whether or not the jury followed this evidence or not, and $I$
appreciate you can't go into the minds of the jury, but do you, was it your sense that how this evidence came out and was presented to them was fairly straightforward?

I thought that they followed it quite closely and I suppose that part of my thinking is today and would have been then that Mr. Paynter tended to explain things quite slowly and respond to questions clearly. Furthermore, having regard to the way the trial proceeded with the jury conveying questions that they wanted to have answered, that is, to the judge to look over, and also the fact that they would know that, from observations the judge intervened from time to time to ask questions, I thought that if there was anything unclear in their minds about it, that they collectively, through their foreman, wouldn't
hesitate to ask a question or questions that were bothering them.

So do I take it from that that you had no reason to believe that this evidence wasn't understood by the jury?

A

Q I now want to move on to couple of other witnesses. The first is Shirley Wilson who is Ron Wilson's mother, 032363. She was called, I think you had asked her to come to testify at the preliminary hearing, but then she wasn't called at the trial -- 032363 -- and this is the preliminary hearing evidence, and if you can go to 032370 , and I think your cross-examination related to the coat that David was wearing that morning had been returned to her and she threw it out after talking to Ken Walters and that she had washed the clothing of both David Milgaard and Ron Wilson when they returned and did not -- go to the next page -- was asked, did not see anything like blood stains on it. That may be referring to the coat. And I'm just wondering, Mr. Tallis, was there, if you recall, what the reasons were that you had her
attend at the preliminary hearing and whether there was any reason you didn't have her called at trial or asked to have her called at trial?

A
I recall that in some of the information $I$ had, and perhaps it was in her statement or somewhere else, she had indicated that David had changed his trousers in Regina, $I$ believe my recollection is correct, and I thought that would, calling her on that, with that evidence would undermine what seemed to be a pretty clear situation, that David changed his trousers at Cadrains' because of the rip that we've heard a great deal about, so I thought there was a real risk of confusing the issue on that aspect.

Sir, are you telling us that her evidence at trial might have hurt David's position?

A
Q
A
$Q$
Undermined --
Undermined?
-- the position, yes.
The next one $I$ want to deal with is Marie Indyk, 076620 is the preliminary hearing evidence, we've I think read through some of this, and she had provided a statement to the police about observations on the morning of the murder around St. Mary's Church, describing I think at the
preliminary hearing two women that she encountered that morning, and $I$ think she was also a witness that you asked to have called at the preliminary hearing and at the trial, and in fact at the trial the jury asked to have her evidence read back to them I believe; is that correct?

Yes.
Do you recall what went into your request to have her appear and give evidence?

It's very difficult for me to go through, recall the mental processes $I$ was going through, but trying to reflect back as best $I$ can, I recollect that at the, $I$ believe that at the time when she was there in that vicinity, she didn't recall or mention any vehicle as such that attracted her attention, and I'm not just sure now, but there was an area where she observed I think a young woman?

Yes.
And I'm just not sure now in my mind the exact area, exact location, but $I$ know $I$ was probably thinking that her testimony might indicate that some untoward incident had occurred that would be unrelated to the one that had been described by some of the witnesses and that that would raise a
question possibly about whether this business of any car with young people in it had been involved in anything. I know that my sense of things was that she may not, in the end, have anything to contribute, but having heard her evidence at the preliminary hearing, $I$ didn't see how she could possibly do any harm or undermine David's position. That's the best $I$ can do at this stage. I'm sure there were other thoughts in my mind at the time, but $I$ remembered feeling, when the jury asked to have all her evidence read, I remembered that I was glad that I had asked to have her called.

Okay.
Now, why $I$ felt that way $I$ can't tell you now. If we could just -- $I$ want to quickly deal with a few other witnesses, and $I$ don't propose to call up their transcripts because we've had a chance to look at them, but let's start with -- and they come under the category of people who observed David Milgaard on the morning of January 31, 1969 and I think they were all questioned by you about what they saw, what they observed of Mr. Milgaard, his demeanour, his clothing, the lighting conditions, etcetera, and I think they all gave
evidence that they did not notice anything unusual and did not see any blood on his clothing. The first one would be Robert Rasmussen, the Trav-a-leer Motel operator; correct?

A

And then Walter and Sandra Danchuk $I$ think we've talked about a fair bit, in fact, they both testified before this Commission, and I think you

That's correct.
And that would have been your purpose in questioning him on that?

Yes. And again, what we have read, or had his evidence read in, you questioned him about what he saw and I think what you said to the jury is that with Mr. Rasmussen, if one would expect the murderer to be covered with blood, then you would expect Mr. Rasmussen, who spent a bit of time with him,
$\qquad$

A
did question them in some detail about how long they spent with this group, what the lighting was like, what Mr. Milgaard did, what he didn't do, and whether they observed anything unusual; correct?

That's correct.
And would it be fair -- how did you view the evidence of Walter and Sandra Danchuk to be as far as the importance of that evidence to your case? Well, I thought they were reliable and credible witnesses who supported David's position. They had ample opportunity to observe him and it seemed to me that Walter, Mr. Danchuk in particular, wondered what people were doing around that hour of the morning and $I$ thought it likely that he would be more observant than if it was the middle of the day and, frankly, $I$ thought he came across as that type of person.

Now, these were Crown witnesses and I think what Mr. Caldwell said is that, words to the effect that he called these people because they were relevant witnesses or part of the narrative. Putting that aside, would you -- I mean, if Mr. Caldwell had not called them, would you have called the Danchuks and Mr. Rasmussen?

A
Q

A

Q
A
$Q$

A
Q
A

Q

A

Q
And again $I$ think you questioned him as well about what he observed of the group; is that fair?

A
$Q$
I'm quite sure that $I$ would have.
And again, not that, $I$ don't want to characterize as to whose witnesses they were, but would you have viewed the Danchuks and Mr. Rasmussen as being witnesses favourable to David Milgaard's position?

Yes, I viewed them as honest and favourable to him.

And their evidence being favourable?
Yes.
And as well we have the evidence $I$ think of William Campbell who was the tow truck operator, garage operator at Danchuks'?

Yes.
I think the same approach there; is that correct? Yes.

And then George Davis who was the fellow at the second garage when they were getting the transmission fixed?

Yes.

Yes.
I now want to turn and talk about the decision, or your advice to Mr. Milgaard about testifying, and
we've already talked a fair bit about it when we've covered various areas and you've identified areas and concerns that you had based upon the evidence and based upon some of Mr. Milgaard's actions or statements that you felt might cause him some problems if he testified; correct? Yes.

Can you tell us, just walk us through how that decision happened, when it happened and what went into it in a general way, and then I'll go through some specific items that you've already identified, but $I$ 'm thinking when did the discussion take place, what was discussed and what was Mr. Milgaard's reaction.

Well, $I$ had discussed that, you know, the issue of whether or not he would be called at trial even before the trial started. Before the preliminary hearing I had explained to him in detail the difference between a preliminary hearing and the trial and so I discussed it. I -- you know, I went to Prince Albert $I$ now know on two occasions after the preliminary hearing and I'm sure $I$ discussed it on at least one of those occasions, and then during the course of the trial $I$ know that I discussed it with him, and of course there
came a time when the final decision had to be made and $I$ discussed that with him and reviewed with him the areas that $I$ thought would involve some difficulty for him in cross-examination, and also even if $I$ lead it, which $I$ intended to do in some areas, but $I$ don't want to repeat myself.

And I indicated to him that from my assessment and based on my experience, and in my judgment, that $I$ thought it would be, that it was a situation where $I$ thought it would not strengthen his hand. I thought that some of this evidence would be supportive of the crown theory and on balance $I$ thought that it would be in his interest not to testify.

Now, I'm really narrowing this down because $I$ don't have all the details now and notes or anything, but just to back up for a moment, $I$ was of the view as a counsel that when you come to the question of whether or not a client should testify, he or she was entitled to the benefit of my advice and that of course would be based on my assessment of the Crown's case, my assessment of the testimony that would be elicited from him by me and particularly my assessment of any difficulties he might have explaining some of
the answers that he would give and which I knew he would give to questions that might be put in cross-examination. I think he understood that the cross-examination would be far more robust than the questions $I$ would be asking him, and this was conducted on a very civil basis as between the two of us and I emphasized that I thought counsel should accept the responsibility for giving that kind of advice because $I$ was aware and knew that there were two schools of thought. One was that you should take the time to assess the situation, give advice and take instructions. The other school of thought, and this was certainly a minority view, but at least was held by some leading English barristers, and that is that the decision whether or not to testify was the decision of the client and the client alone, and accordingly, the written instructions were not preceded by any advice as to the course that should be taken.

I recall many years ago reading,
some of them just had a little piece of paper, "I wish to give evidence, $I$ do not wish to give evidence," you strike out the one and sign it, and I didn't subscribe to that view, and I don't know
of any lawyers in Saskatchewan that did at the time.

And so having had that discussion and giving that advice, I didn't take any written instructions at that time. Indeed, I indicated to him that at this stage he was free to talk to his parents about it and to think about it and that $I$ think it was the following day that he indicated to me, and $I$ think maybe his parents were even there at one phase, that they thought he should take the advice that $I$ gave him and indicated that he had decided not to testify. If he had decided to testify, I would not have viewed that as any lack of confidence in me, I understood that to be his right to do so, but of course, as I've said, I thought he was entitled to the benefit of my assessment and advice, and with that, and here I'm summarizing, he did give me written instructions to the effect that $I$ have just outlined.

One of the things $I$ would like to just add is that at no time did $I$ tell him that he had to take my advice. I know there were suggestions at least in some of the writings at that time that counsel might view a decision not
to take the advice as being a loss of confidence and the question then would be how would counsel handle it. I believe that it was before that time there was a situation where counsel called an accused in an open court in front of the jury and said that against my advice $I$ call the accused, and that $I$ think was held to be quite improper, and $I$ think the Supreme Court of Canada commented on that, so nothing like that would ever happen as far as $I$ was concerned, and $I$ would proceed to then examine him in chief because in this case there were no ethical constraints about doing that.

Q And what do you mean by that?
Well, if he had told me that he had done this, then that would alter the situation; in other words, $I$ would not be able to lead evidence from him that he did not, and there was no suggestion to me that he would do anything but respond to the questions that $I$ was going to put, but of course, as I've already indicated to you, there were some areas, let's take, for example, the compact field -- the compact figured, you know, as one of the items in my consideration and questions like, "Well, where did it come from? I don't know.

Well, why did you do it?" That is, why did you throw it out. "I don't know." And these we had gone over, and $I$ knew that the prosecution would really pursue this vigorously. And the same with the looking over of the older lady with a view to maybe robbing or snatching her purse and I knew that would invite not only a robust cross-examination, but a discussion of motive and the need for money and so on, so these are things that $I$ had reviewed with him on more than one occasion, and so that essentially is it. I know that I've distilled it down, but $I$ think that that fairly summarizes the situation.

Now, I can also say this, I
always found that to be a very difficult area in which to give advice, but $I$ didn't think that as a counsel one should shirk away from it, and secondly, I always appreciated that it was a difficult decision for an accused person, whether a young person or an adult, and that is why $I$ would certainly have respected his decision if it had gone the other way and $I$ would have done nothing by way of preamble or otherwise to undermine him in the eyes of the Court and jury. Do you recall whether or not, and again, what Mr .

Milgaard's view was, he ended up, I think you are telling us, accepting your advice and instructing you that he did not wish to testify, but did he express a desire to do so?

A

Q

A

Q

A
No. Of course if he had wanted to testify, I was quite prepared to call him, but in light of my advice, he made the decision not to testify. Did you get any sense from him, though, in the course of your discussions in explaining this to him, that he wanted to get up there and tell his side of the story?

Well, I'm sure that he weighed and considered it in the light of the discussion $I$ had with him, but at the end of the day $I$ think he decided and indicated to me that he decided he was going to take my advice.

Did he at any time -- let's talk prior to this discussion at the end when you are giving him the advice. Prior to that did he indicate to you that he wished to testify?

Well, this had been a discussion that had taken place more than once and we never really got to a situation where he had to make a decision until the appropriate time, so that I'm sure that we weighed the -- well, $I$ know that we discussed the
pros and cons of him testifying and that's really
the best $I$ can do for you without my interview notes of the various chats that we had had before the final sessions.

MR. HODSON: This is probably a good spot to break for the day, Mr. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you. (Adjourned at 4:27 p.m.)
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| 24473:13, 24474:2, | $\begin{aligned} & 24444: 21,24465: 11, \\ & 24467: 21,24483: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $24553: 4$ | $24436: 24,24455: 11,$ | $24439: 16,24523: 24$ |
| 24474:6 <br> handwriting [2] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24467:21, 24483:18, } \\ & \text { 24487:20, 24528:3, } \end{aligned}$ | hoped [1] - 24523:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 24559: 4,24574: 21 \\ & \text { identified [6] - 24378:2, } \end{aligned}$ | inconsistencies [3] - |
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| hanging [1] - 24529:14 hard [3] - $24422 \cdot 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { helped [1] - 24378:10 } \\ & \text { helpful [5] - 24515:6, } \end{aligned}$ | Hoppy [3] - 24497:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24473:12, 24583:2, } \\ & 24583: 12 \end{aligned}$ | inconsistency [3] - |
| hard [3]-24422.7, 24451:15, $24474: 18$ | $24527: 19,24527: 25$ | $24$ | identifies [1] - 24497:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 24409: 20,24409: 23, \\ & 24409: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
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| harm [1] - 24579:7 | $24473 \text { :21 }$ <br> helps [1] - 24377.25 | $24548: 20,24554: 8$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24555: 23,24556: 4 \\ & 24559: 13.24567: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $24395: 2,24395: 12$ $24396 \cdot 1.24407 \cdot 20$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { harmful [2] - 24515:6, } \\ & \text { 24527:19 } \end{aligned}$ | helps[1]-24377:25 <br> hemochromogen [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { hostile [8]-24393:19, } \\ & \text { 24393:24, 24395:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 24559:13, 24567:21 } \\ \text { ignore [2] - 24392:2, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24396:1, } 24407: 20, \\ & \text { 24408:7, } 24411: 23, \end{aligned}$ |
| hat [1] - 24379:24 | 24545:17 | 24441:3, $24442: 7$, | 24459:8 | 24416:19, 24442:6, |
| hazardous [1] - | Hemostix [1] - 24548:19 | 24463:23, 24463:25 | ill [1] - 24497:1 | 24455:7, 24458:6, |
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| $24501: 12,24568: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lose [2] - 24421:19, } \\ & \text {, } 15 \mathrm{n} \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $24543: 22,24544: 7$ | 24499:16, 24499:23, | might [110] - 24374:6, |
| locating [2] - 24500:16, 24512:13 | loss [1] - 24587:1 | marks [1] - 24490:5 | $24505: 10,24505: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24374:18, 24375:11, } \\ & \text { 24377:8, 24377:10, } \end{aligned}$ |
| location [1] - 24578:21 | loud [1] - 24394:13 | maroon [3]-24472:20, | 24505:23, 24507:6, | 24377:12, 24378:19, |
| logical [2] - 24500:3, | Lsd[3] - 24475:11, | 24473:2, 24473:13 | 24507:17, 24508:6, | 24381:16, 24388:21, |
| 24570:18 | 24475:16, 24476:9 | maroon-handled [1] - | 24508:20, 24511:7, | 24390:15, 24402:21, |
| look [27] - 24378:16, | lump [1] - 24573:4 | 24473:13 | 24511:15, 24512:3, | 24404:15, 24407:13, |
| $24383: 24,24390: 19$ | lunch [1] - 24521:4 <br> lying [1]-24507:18 | Mary 's [1] - 24577:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24513:6, 24513:14, } \\ & \text { 24515:14, 24515:23, } \end{aligned}$ | 24408:9, 24415:19, <br> 24416.15, 24419:19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24394:12, } 24401: 23, \\ & 24403: 2,24403: 8 \end{aligned}$ | lying [1] - 24507:18 | ```master [1] - 24374:23 matching [1] -``` | 24516:13, 24516:14, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24416:15, 24419:19, } \\ & 24420: 1,24420: 2, \end{aligned}$ |
| 24403:11, 24403:19, | M | $24472: 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24517:10, 24518:15, } \\ & 24521: 12,24522: 18, \end{aligned}$ | $24420: 15,24420: 20,$ |
| 24406:24, 24413:21, |  | 24492:13 | 24524:3, 24524:11 | 24422:6, 24422:11, |
| 24418:8, 24419:8, | Maccallum [7] - | matron [10] - 24480:2, | 24525:10, 24527:21, | 24422:21, 24423:8, |
| 24429:1, 24440:12, | 24369:7, 24373:3, | $24480: 4,24480: 13$ | 24527:22, 24529:18, | 24425:10, 24428:3, |
| $24441: 13,24478: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24445: 9,24451: 8, \\ & 24451: 11.24516: 25 . \end{aligned}$ | $24480: 21,24484: 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24530: 13,24530: 19, \\ & 24531: 17,24531: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 24429:4, 24431:19, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24478:19, 24482:17, } \\ & \text { 24491:1, 24533:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $24590: 7$ | $24484: 20,24485: 3,$ <br> 24485:4, 24485:6 | Melnyk's [2] - | 24443:18, 24444:4, |
| 24563:11, 24565:9, | Mackie [29]-24413:14, | 24485:10 | 24520:10, 24528:21 | 24447:10, 24447:11, |
| 24575:20, 24579:19 | 24414:2, 24421:7, | matter [14] - 24378:19, | member [1] - 24398:9 | 24448:1, 24449:17, |
| looked [7] - 24386:5, | $\begin{aligned} & 24426: 16,24433: 6, \\ & 24434: 10.24437: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $24397: 5,24409: 24$ | members [3] - 24489:4, $24489: 20.24571: 9$ | 24449:23, 24458:9, 24458:12. 24458:19. |
| 24437:1, 24498:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24434:10, 24437:16, } \\ & \text { 24442:17, 24443:2. } \end{aligned}$ | $24447: 4,24470: 6$ | memory [8] - 24394:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24458:12, 24458:19, } \\ & 24458: 20,24461: 4, \end{aligned}$ |
| $24515: 25,24518: 6$ | $24443: 9,24443: 22$ | $24504: 5,24511: 18$ | $24435: 24,24449: 22$ | 24458:20, 24461:4, <br> 24461:18, 24464:22 |
| 24529:12, 24564:10 | 24445:19, 24446:1, | 24519:14, 24523:5, | 24454:4, 24471:12, | $24465: 9,24465: 10$ |
| $24382: 20,24389: 11$ | 24448:7, 24448:11, | 24553:2, 24557:2, | 24479:16, 24514:4, | 24467:19, 24468:6, |
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| 24434:19, 24434:24, | 24443:16, 24444:9, | 24565:4 |  | 24517:13, 24517:16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24435:17, 24437:19, | 24445:14, 24445:15, | patients [1] - 24568:21 | 24411:9, 24417:21 | pinkish [4] - 24564:1, |
| 24437:22, 24437:24, | 24445:23, 24446:19, | pause [11]-24433:16, | permitted [5] - | 24564:3, 24564:6, |
| 24438:17, 24438:21, | 24447:8, 24455:16, | 24441:7, 24446:13, | 24399:14, 24401:5, | 24564:11 |
| $24439: 2,24442: 14$ $24442: 23,24442: 25$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24456: 23,24457: 14, \\ & 24462: 12.24481: 15 . \end{aligned}$ | 24460:16, 24467:16, | 24411:7, 24412:4, | pinpoint [1] - 24522:12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24442: 23,24442: 25 \\ & 24444: 13,24445: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24462:12, } 24481: 15, \\ & 24490: 7,24490: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24473:11, 24481:23, } \\ & 24492: 10,24562: 20, \end{aligned}$ | perpetrator [1] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { place [12]-24382:3, } \\ 24406: 15,24412: 9, \end{gathered}$ |
| 24445:9, 24445:14, | 24506:2, 24516:12, | 24566:24, 24574:7 | 24540:17 | 24419:9, 24435:21, |
| 24450:4, 24451 :8, | 24516:23, 24518:22, | Paynter [20]-24532:25, | person [28]-24385:14, | 24450:17, 24451:7, |
| 24451:10, 24452:3, | 24531:24, 24575:14, | 24534:14, 24535:7, | 24476:14, 24490:18, | 24469:20, 24486:4, |
| 24453:1, 24454:5, | 24581:22 | 24535:24, 24536:13, | 24500:3, 24501:7, | 24518:4, 24583:13, |
| 24454:7, 24454:8, | particular [24] | 24541:5, 24541:19, | 24512:2, 24515:3, | 24589:22 |
| 24455:2, 24456:17, | 24412:25, 24414:19, | 24542:3, 24543:1, | 24522:24, 24523:2, | placed [1] - 24418:23 |
| 24460:9, 24462:10, | 24418:25, 24421:2, | 24547:15, 24552:19, | 24541:9, 24543:14, | plain [3] - 24400:9, |
| 24462:15, 24466:8, | 24428:6, 24428:22, | 24556:1, 24556:22, | 24545:1, 24550:3, | 24457:7, 24476:22 |
| $24467: 8,24467: 15$ | 24446:19, 24456:22, | 24559:11, 24559:20, | 24550:6, 24550:13, | plan [1] - 24495:8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24468:16, 24470:18, } \\ & 24477: 2,24477: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24466:12, 24485:19, } \\ & 24487: 7,24489: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $24561 \text { :3, 24563:12, }$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24550: 21,24551: 1, \\ & 24562: 15,24565: 14 \end{aligned}$ | played [3] - 24415:16, |
| $24479: 20,24481: 2$ | $24490: 14,24503: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24567: 20,24572: 7, \\ & 24575: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24562: 15,24565: 14, \\ & 24565: 15,24565: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { 24428:9, } 24491: 20$ |
| $24485: 2,24496: 19$ | $24520: 20,24521: 1,$ | Paynter's [5] | $24568: 2,24571: 24$ | playing [1] - 24513:24 |
| 24510:2, 24513:4, | 24524:4, 24532:19, | 24540:20, 24542:16, | 24573:25, 24581:18, | Pm [4]-24488:16, |
| 24513:13, 24514:2, | 24535:24, 24537:8, | 24553:21, 24565:9, | 24588:19, 24588:20 | 24529:23, 24529:24, |
| 24517:25, 24518:8, | 24546:21, 24548:16, | 24576:6 | personal [3] - | 24590:8 |
| 24529:5, 24532:3, | 24552:2, 24581:13 | pending [1] - 24520:12 | 24428:18, 24495:15, | pockets [1] - 24448:25 |
| 24532:13, 24543:19, | particularly [13] - | Penkala [1] - 24533:1 | 24569:9 | point [49]-24385:11, |
| 24544:3, 24545:11, | 24378:11, 24408:11, | people [26]-24379:10, | personality [1] - | 24385:13, 24386:22, |
| 24545:16, 24546:1 | 24417:1, 24417:2, | 24390:15, 24415:9, | 24497:3 | $24386: 24,24387: 3$ |
| 24547:10, 24547: | $24505: 4,24507: 20$ | 24429:23, 24447:21 | personally [3] | 24388:16, 24388:24, |
| 24548:22, 24550:15, | 24515:1, 24522:20, | $24492: 16,24516: 4$ | 24569:18 | $24390: 22,24390: 25$ |
| 24552:15, 24555:25, | 24569:1, 24576:7, | 24521:2, $24521: 6$, | persons [2] - 24494:23, | 24392:22, 24394:5, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24558: 6,24559: 11, \\ & 24560: 11.24560: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 24584:24 | $24521: 7,24521: 18$ | 24495:1 | 24405:3, 24428:19, |
| $24563: 23,24569: 25$ | 24409:11 | 24522:5, 24523:18, | perspective [5] - | $24428: 25,24430: 14$ |
| 24576:22 | partisan [1] - 24540:18 | $24558: 5,24567: 8$ | $24537: 12,24537: 22$ | 24436:10, 24436:25, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Page }[1]-24372: 2 \\ & \text { pages }[7]-24435: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { partly [1] - 24409:5 } \\ & \text { parts [21] - 24390:8, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24569: 14,24574: 21, \\ & 24575: 1,24579: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $24538: 1$ persuade [1] | 24448:6, 24456:12, <br> 24457:11, 24457:24, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24435: 3,24435: 8, \\ & 24435: 16,24451: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24400: 23,24414: 3, \\ & 24414: 4,24435: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24579: 20,24581: 14, \\ & 24581: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $24419: 25$ | $24458: 4,24460: 8$ |
| $24560: 22,24591: 4$ | $24435: 5,24449: 5$ | perceive | $\begin{aligned} & \text { persuaded [1] - } \\ & \text { 24509:13 } \end{aligned}$ | 24462:14, 24463:15, |
| $\text { paid [1] }-24523: 15$ | 24449:10, 24449:11, | 24430:24, 24431:16 | persuasive [1] - | 24464:12, 24466:21, |
| pants [2] - 24455:1 | 24449:18, 24449:24, | percent [1] - 24571:15 | $24427: 19$ | $24467: 17,24468: 3$ |
| paper [1] - 24585:22 <br> paragraph [1]-244 | $24450: 6,24451: 23$ $24455: 10,24456: 1$ | perception [3] - <br> 24440:5, $24444 \cdot 7$ | phase [1] - 24586:10 | 24469:1, 24477:18, |
| parameters [1] - | $24460: 19,24491: 21,$ | 24452:18 | phone [4]-24494:19, $24499: 8,24512: 9,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24478: 25,24482: 15 \\ & 24485: 15,24499: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| 24396:17 | 24517:7, 24523:4, | perceptions [1] - | 24542:10 | 24505:9, 24539:7, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pardon [1] - 24478:4 } \\ & \text { parent [1] - 24420:21 } \\ & \text { parents [3]-24420:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24570: 1,24570: 2 \\ \text { party }[5]-24393: 5, \\ 24393: 11,24393: 17 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24446: 17 \\ & \text { perhaps [16] - } \\ & 24380: 21,24396: 15, \end{aligned}$ | phoned [1] - 24527:11 phosphatase [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 24543: 16,24544: 20, \\ & 24558: 5,24559: 14, \\ & 24560: 20,24573: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| $24586: 7,24586: 9$ | $24410: 15,24503: 10$ | 24380:21, 24396:15, <br> 24398:15, 24467:20, | 24553:18 | 24560:20, 24573:3 <br> pointed [1] - 24423 |
| paring [3] - 24473:13, | passed [1] - 24539:17 <br> passing [1] - 24540:7 | $24468: 18,24469: 21,$ | 24489:21, 24490:13, | points [6] - 24405:15, |
| Parliament [1] - | past [2] - 24520:10, | $\begin{aligned} & 24481: 19,24483: 12, \\ & 24484: 25,24487: 18, \end{aligned}$ | 24490:22 | 24408:13, 24467:15, |
| 24406:6 | 24556:2 | 24537:9, $24539: 9$ | piece [4]-24461:12, | 24572:20 |
| part [33] - 24389:5, | Pat [1] - 24371: | 24542:16, 24545:19, | 24537:13, 24537:25, | Police [3] - 24371:8, |
| 24390:1, 24390:6, | patch [1] - 24573:12 | 24569:12, 24577:5 | $24585: 22$ | 24477:14, 24528:23 |
| 24404:14, 24423:1, | path [4]-24394:19, | period [1]-24493:12 | pigeon [1] - 24523:14 | police [43]-24376:6, |
| 24427:8, $24430: 23$, | 24464:25, 24482:24, | permission [2] - | pillow [7] - 24496:21, | 24376:16, 24376:18, |
| $24433: 23,24440: 4,$ | $24504: 22$ | $24405: 23,24407: 24$ | 24504:14, 24513:24, | $24413: 5,24413: 10$ |
| 24443:11, 24443:15, | pathologist [1] - | permit [5] - 24401:2, | 24514:8, 24517:11, | 24413:12, 24413:18, |
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|  |  | ```24576:14, 24577:1, 24577:21, 24578:1, 24578:3, 24579:6, 24583:17, 24583:19, 24583:22 prepare [1] - 24542:3 prepared [10] - 24373:16, 24374:20, 24392:22, 24401:12, 24422:3, 24494:8, 24540:11, 24558:19, 24589:6 preparing [1] - 24373:19 prescription [2] - 24374:6, 24374:8 presence [18] - 24396:14, 24398:25, 24401:4, 24406:15, 24408:4, 24411:14, 24412:1, 24419:2, 24422:19, 24440:19, 24441:11, 24441:23, 24463:19, 24493:2, 24543:22, 24543:25, 24544:24, 24548:17 present [15] - 24393:8, 24411:19, 24412:7, 24420:19, 24422:1, 24422:4, 24431:20, 24442:6, 24455:8, 24470:12, 24492:24, 24498:5, 24541:21, 24554:4, 24556:15 presented [2] - 24535:23, 24575:11 preserved [1] - 24539:22 presiding [5] - 24389:18, 24390:18, 24398:11, 24404:9, 24432:6 pressure [2] - 24481:20, 24481:21 pressured [1] - 24416:22 Presumably [1] - 24405:24 presumably [2] - 24390:1, 24442:10 presume [3] - 24389:20, 24396:2, 24511:8 presumptive [4] - 24541:6, 24544:8, 24544:13, 24544:14 pretty [7]-24424:21, 24458:17, 24500:2, 24501:6, \(24571: 20\), 24572:15, 24577:10``` |  | producing [2] - 24393:5, 24410:6 progress $[1]-24563: 2$ proof $[4]-24393: 9$, 24410:9, 24410:12, 24557:25 Proof $[1]-24411: 25$ proper $[3]-24418: 3$, 24456:7, 24463:2 properly $[1]-24489: 8$ prophetic $[1]-24462: 4$ propose $[2]-24455: 8$, 24579:17 proposition $[1]-$ $24415: 23$ pros $[1]-24590: 1$ prosecution $[1]-$ $24588: 3$ prosecution's $[1]-$ $24430: 5$ prosecutor $[2]-$ $24395: 13,24511: 10$ prostate $[1]-24553: 17$ prove $[12]-24410: 1$, $24410: 4,24432: 18$, $24442: 4,24455: 6$, $24455: 17,24538: 25$, $24553: 8,24556: 14$, $24558: 19,24558: 20$ proved $[3]-24410: 19$, $24541: 7,24573: 20$ proven $[2]-24455: 20$, $24455: 22$ provide $[2]-24410: 11$, $24488: 22$ provided $[4]-$ $24411: 13,24431: 23$, $24498: 18,24577: 23$ provides $[1]-24406: 8$ providing $[1]-$ $24528: 11$ province $[2]-$ $24512: 24,24536: 15$ Province $[1]-24591: 3$ provisions $[1]-$ $24412: 17$ puberty $[1]-24569: 1$ publication $[1]-$ $24542: 2$ publicity $[1]-24493: 17$ pulled $[1]-24491: 3$ punching $[2]-$ $24513: 25,24514: 7$ pure $[4]-24534: 14$, $24543: 13,24543: 17$, $24551: 13$ purpose $[10]-$ $24398: 23,24406: 5$, $24411: 4,24417: 16$, $24469: 7,24481: 11$, 24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| ```24481:19, 24516:1, 24543:3 showed [4]-24378:17, 24470:21, 24472:23, 24496:1 shown [6] - 24374:3, 24374:9, 24374:10, 24376:14, 24472:8, 24537:3 shows [2] - 24413:17, 24434:13 side [5] - 24453:23, 24475:25, 24518:1, 24520:2, 24589:11 sign [3] - 24433:13, 24433:17, 24585:24 signature [1] - 24434:19 signatures [1] - 24434:16 signed [6] - 24413:25, 24433:20, 24435:13, 24435:16, 24436:13, 24439:2 significance [1] - 24428:5 significant [5] - 24379:3, 24412:19, 24428:1, 24481:20, 24486:21 silently [1] - 24434:25 similar [5] - 24391:15, 24410:18, 24475:10, 24517:10, 24537:19 similarly [2] - 24387:23, 24487:22 simplify [1] - 24397:7 simply [5] - 24383:23, 24465:10, 24498:6, 24504:1, 24528:21 sincere [1] - 24508:24 sincerity [1] - 24502:8 sit [1] - \(24564: 23\) sitting [3]-24369:15, 24386:17, 24517:12 situation [18] - 24393:20, 24401:12, 24420:23, 24458:18, 24464:7, 24465:4, 24472:6, 24483:1, 24483:12, 24522:11, 24551:3, 24577:10, 24584:10, 24585:11, 24587:4, 24587:16, 24588:13, 24589:23 situations [1] - 24420:14 six [2] - 24412:24, 24412:25 sixteen [2] - 24568:7,``` |  |  |  | 24410:17, 24410:19, 24411:4, 24411:22, 24412:1, 24413:13, 24413:16, 24414:1, 24414:5, 24414:13, 24414:14, 24415:3, 24415:11, 24415:19, 24415:25, 24416:3, 24416:20, 24417:15, 24417:25, 24418:3, 24418:17, 24419:24, 24420:3, 24420:16, 24420:20, 24420:25, 24422:22, 24423:2, 24423:12, 24423:20, 24424:5, 24424:16, 24426:17, 24427:1, 24427:15, 24427:16, 24427:21, 24427:23, 24428:7, 24428:22, 24429:13, 24429:14, 24429:21, 24430:6, 24430:15, 24432:18, 24432:21, 24433:3, 24434:13, 24434:21, 24435:3, 24435:19, 24436:23, 24437:8, 24437:15, 24437:25, 24438:3, 24438:21, 24439:8, 24440:3, 24440:9, $24441: 6$, 24442:3, 24442:5, 24442:8, 24442:16, 24444:14, 24445:15, 24447:19, 24448:2, 24448:8, 24448:24, 24449:5, 24449:7, 24449:18, 24451:23, 24452:1, 24455:7, 24455:17, 24455:18, 24455:24, 24456:14, 24456:23, 24456:24, 24456:25, 24457:21, 24458:6, 24458:9, 24458:13, 24458:21, 24458:24, 24459:1, 24459:8, 24459:11, 24460:1, 24460:20, 24463:10, 24463:19, 24463:21, 24468:4, 24468:20, 24469:9, 24470:1, 24472:10, 24475:18, 24477:23, 24479:12, 24479:13, 24481:14, 24482:3, 24482:9, 24482:12, 24482:18, 24482:19, 24483:4, 24483:8, 24486:9, 24486:19, 24486:20, 24486:22, 24487:3, 24487:11, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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