

Commission of Inquiry
Into the Wrongful
Conviction of David Milgaard
before
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE
EDWARD P. MacCALLUM

Transcript of Proceedings
and
Testimony before the Commission
sitting at the
Sheraton Cavalier Hotel at
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

On Tuesday, October 3rd, 2006

Volume 192

Inquiry Proceedings



Commission Staff:

Mr. Douglas C. Hodson,	Commission Counsel
Ms. Candace D. Congram,	Executive Director
Ms. Sandra Boswell,	Document Manager
Ms. Kara Isabelle,	Document Assistant

Support Staff:

Ms. Irene Beitel,	Clerk to the Commission
Ms. Karen Hinz, CSR, and	Official Q.B. Court Reporters
Mr. Don Meyer, RPR, CSR, CRR, CBC,	
Mr. Jerry Wilde,	Security Officer
Mr. Jay Boechler,	Inland Audio Technician



Appearances:

Mr. Hersh Wolch, Q.C., **for** Mr. David Milgaard
Ms. Joanne McLean, **for** Ms. Joyce Milgaard
Ms. Lana Krogan-Stevely, **for** Government of Saskatchewan
Ms. Catherine Knox, **for** Mr. T.D.R. (Bobs) Caldwell
Mr. Jay Watson, Esq., **for** Mr. Serge Kujawa
Mr. Rick Elson, Esq., **for** the Saskatoon Police Service
Mr. Chris Boychuk, Esq., **for** Mr. Eddie Karst
Mr. Bruce Gibson, Esq., **for** the RCMP
Mr. David Frayer, Q.C., Ms. Jennifer Cox, **for** Minister of
Justice (Canada), The Hon. Vic
Toews
Mr. Julian Roy, Esq., **for** the Association in Defence
of the Wrongly Convicted
(AIDWYC)



INDEX OF PROCEEDINGS

DESCRIPTION:

PAGE:

DAVID WILLIAM KYLE, CONTINUED

- BY MR. HODSON	40161
- BY MR. ROY	40296
- BY MS. MCLEAN	40367
- BY MR. ELSON	40424
- BY MS. KNOX	40438



Transcript of Proceedings

(Reconvened at 9:01 a.m.)

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Good morning.

ALL COUNSEL: Good morning.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Kyle.

DAVID WILLIAM KYLE, continued:

BY MR. HODSON:

Q Good morning, Mr. Kyle. I thought maybe we would just pick up on a couple of topics we discussed yesterday afternoon that I'm not sure we quite finished.

The first one dealt with this notion of the floodgates argument and that, I think, my understanding is that at the time your Commission was put in place there were some who were concerned that this would give rise to a floodgate of applications; is that right?

A I think that's right, yes.

Q And can you comment on, and I think you described the number of applications, but over the course of your nine years on the Commission, did you notice an increase in the number of applications that came in?

A It seems that the rate of applications remained remarkably constant throughout the life of the



1 Commission, and that extends up to the present
2 time, that new applications come in at the rate of
3 between 70 and 80 a month, and that's been
4 remarkably consistent over the life of the
09:02 5 Commission.

6 If I might just assist, and I
7 don't want to get stuck too much into numbers
8 because they can be confusing, but if we take as a
9 rough figure that something in the order of 8,000
09:02 10 applications have been dealt with and cases
11 closed, of those 8,000, about a third of them
12 don't get off first base because they are
13 applications made by applicants who have not
14 previously appealed, and we were looking yesterday
09:03 15 at section 13 of the 1995 *Criminal Appeal Act*
16 which requires there to have been a previous
17 appeal and the Commission cannot make a reference
18 other than in exceptional circumstances where
19 there hasn't been an appeal, so something in the
09:03 20 order of a third of the applications received are
21 closed without any referral because that previous
22 appeal condition is not met.

23 Q Sorry, if I can just pause there. Would those
24 applicants be entitled to go to the Court of
09:03 25 Appeal for an extension of time?



1 A Yes.

2 Q And seek the remedy without going through your
3 gate, so to speak?

4 A Yes, and of course if they do that and are refused
09:03 5 an extension of time in which to appeal, they then
6 qualify -- then they get over the first hurdle as
7 far as we're concerned.

8 Of the remaining, the
9 applications which then remain after that third is
09:04 10 knocked out, the Commission introduced a process
11 for, in which it endeavours to identify, in
12 relation to each application received, whether it
13 appears on the basis of the issues raised that the
14 case can be closed; in other words, brought to
09:04 15 completion, the investigation and review can be
16 done with a modest amount of effort which we fix
17 at five working days, so if we think a case can be
18 closed with five caseworker days of effort on
19 investigation and review, they will be dealt with
09:04 20 somewhat more quickly than applications which
21 require a more extensive investigation and review,
22 and of the applications which remain after the
23 appeal cases have been knocked out, something in
24 excess of half, approaching two-thirds of the
09:04 25 remainder are dealt with by this more streamlined



1 and quicker process. I mean, it might be thought
2 that these are cases which are more likely to
3 result in a non-referral, but in fact the rate of
4 referral is approximately the same for the cases
09:05 5 which are fast-tracked.

6 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So how much of the
7 remaining two-thirds gets through the fast track?
8 A About between a half and two-thirds.

9 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Of the two-thirds?
09:05 10 A Yes.

11 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I see. And what
12 kind of a population pool are we speaking about
13 for this 70 to 80 cases per month?

14 A The population of the United Kingdom at the amount
09:05 15 I think, if you exclude Scotland, is about 65
16 million.

17 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And you don't take
18 Scottish cases?

19 A No, Scotland has its own separate commission.

09:05 20 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, I see. So how
21 much -- what was the sum again, 70, 80 million?

22 A It's about 65 million I think is the population of
23 Great Britain at the moment.

24 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay, thank you.
09:06 25 Excluding Scotland?



1 A Yes.

2 BY MR. HODSON:

3 Q And maybe I should have clarified that earlier,
4 your Commission deals with cases in England, Wales
09:06 5 and Northern Ireland; correct?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And that Scotland has a similar commission, which
8 we won't get into, but they have a commission
9 that's similar in nature to your Commission?

09:06 10 A Yes.

11 Q So just on the numbers, about 70 to 80 a month; is
12 that right?

13 A Yes.

14 Q The number. And the third that are fast-tracked,
09:06 15 the five working day matter, that some of those
16 then do get referred?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And so in five working days you are able to review
19 a file and determine that a reference ought to be
09:06 20 made?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And can you give us some idea, what types of cases
23 are those, or what is it that jumps out of those
24 cases that allows a reference to go that quickly?

09:06 25 A Well, the cases which result in a reference where



1 it appears from, on the face of the application
2 when it's received that there is some stunningly
3 significant point which appears to give rise to
4 concerns about the safety of the conviction, and
09:07 5 that point can be easily identified and explained
6 without there having to be any significant further
7 investigation.

8 Q Okay. And it's also my understanding that the,
9 when the CCRC was created, that you also deal with
09:07 10 convictions out of the Magistrates' Court?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Which is, I think, my understanding, is a -- would
13 be lesser offences? The Crown court deals with
14 serious or more serious indictable offences and
09:07 15 the Magistrates' Court is lesser offences?

16 A Yes.

17 Q And so of those 70 to 80 a month, some of those
18 would be from Magistrates' Court?

19 A Very few.

09:07 20 Q Very few?

21 A Yes.

22 Q Is it fair to say that most of the applications
23 you would receive would be for serious crimes?

24 A That's true, yes.

09:07 25 Q And that you don't get the -- not to differentiate



1 between crimes, but a conviction for, you know,
2 traffic offences or things of that nature are
3 generally not matters that come to your
4 Commission?

09:08 5 A Generally that is the case, although the
6 interesting thing, if I can just introduce a
7 lighter note here, is that those people who do
8 apply having been convicted of traffic offences in
9 the Magistrates' Court, there seems to be no other
09:08 10 class of person who feels so aggrieved about the
11 injustice of their situation than the person
12 convicted of careless driving, but very few, I
13 mean, I think less than 8 percent of the
14 applications come from the Magistrates' Court.

09:08 15 Some of them are quite
16 serious, we had one which I had dealings with in
17 my last year at the Commission which involved a
18 number of asylum seekers being prosecuted for
19 offences related to traveling on false
09:08 20 documentation to get to the United Kingdom and
21 they in fact pleaded guilty in the Magistrates'
22 Court, but we referred the case on the basis that
23 as it appeared to us, the prosecution was an
24 abusive process because it was in breach of the
09:09 25 United Kingdom's treaty obligations under the



1 refugee convention, so some of the cases in the
2 Magistrates' Court can be significant, but we
3 don't get very many applications.

4 Q Would it be correct to say that most of the cases
09:09 5 would be homicides, sexual assaults, fraud,
6 burglary, serious crimes of that nature?

7 A Yes. In percentage terms, by far the greatest
8 number of applications relate to serious sexual
9 offences.

09:09 10 Q We talked yesterday a bit about the media and I'm
11 wondering if you could tell us how the CCRC dealt
12 with the media when you were created and,
13 secondly, to comment on what has happened as a
14 result of the CCRC being in place for nine years
09:10 15 and how the media has taken part in the process.

16 A Yes, I would be happy to do that. It's something
17 which I gave thought overnight after you,
18 Mr. Commissioner, had raised the matter of media
19 interest, and I thought it might be relevant if I
09:10 20 just mentioned that prior to the establishment of
21 the CCRC, there were a number of investigative
22 journalists who took an interest in miscarriage of
23 justice cases, and two television programs in
24 particular, a BBC program called *Rough Justice* and
09:10 25 an independent television program called *World in*



1 Action had a great deal to do with investigating
2 and broadcasting programs about possible
3 miscarriages of justice.

4 Indeed it was *World in Action*
09:10 5 which I think was very significant in uncovering
6 the problems which had arisen in the *Birmingham 6*
7 case, but the *Rough Justice* program on the BBC did
8 a number of series over a number of years in which
9 they identified cases which they believed to be
09:11 10 miscarriage of justice and they did, a number of
11 cases did get back to the Court of Appeal as a
12 result of the investigation done by those
13 programs.

14 When the Commission, the CCRC
09:11 15 came into existence, we did have a meeting with a
16 number of people who had been concerned with
17 investigating miscarriage of justice which
18 included investigative journalists and reporters
19 from *Rough Justice* and *World in Action* and what we
09:11 20 were interested to hear from them was we said to
21 them, right, well, we're new, we're about to
22 embark on this exercise, what advice do you have
23 for us about investigating miscarriage of justice,
24 and they were able to give us the benefit of their
09:12 25 experience, but interestingly, the common theme



1 was if there has been a miscarriage of justice,
2 you always get a smell of it.

3 Now, if you are having to
4 choose which case you investigate for the purpose
09:12 5 of making a television program, you can indulge
6 yourself in the exercise of seeing whether you
7 think the case has a smell about it. We can't do
8 that because we're not restricted in the number of
9 cases -- if we receive an application we have to
09:12 10 review it, we can't pick and choose which ones we
11 do, so that -- but that was quite an interesting
12 observation from the journalists who made these
13 programs.

14 What is significant is *Rough*
09:12 15 *Justice* -- I don't think since the beginning of
16 the Commission's existence the *World in Action* has
17 done any exposés on miscarriage of justice. *Rough*
18 *Justice* did another series, but to all intents and
19 purposes, that particular program has now fizzled
09:13 20 out and, indeed, the presenter of *Rough Justice*,
21 David Jessel, is now a member of the Criminal
22 Cases Review Commission.

23 Q Okay. And so prior to the CCRC being in place
24 then, is it my understanding then that the media
09:13 25 in England would have played a fairly significant



1 role in publicizing the plight of people alleging
2 wrongful conviction and putting in the public
3 domain the basis of that claim?

4 A That is right, but there is a link here between
09:13 5 something we were talking about yesterday again in
6 response to the Commissioner's interest in this
7 particular area, that we were talking about
8 whether the Commission prefers to control and deal
9 with its own investigations and would prefer
09:13 10 private investigators or journalists not to become
11 involved.

12 There was a particular case
13 which was the subject of a *Rough Justice*
14 investigation, the case of *Anthony Steele*, which
09:14 15 happens to be a case which I was responsible for
16 prosecuting when I was in the director of public
17 prosecutions' office. He was convicted of the
18 murder of a young woman who was walking on her way
19 to work along a disused railway line which was a
09:14 20 foot path in Yorkshire and she was battered to
21 death with a rock and Anthony Steele was arrested
22 as a result of eye witness evidence that he had
23 been seen walking down the valley side towards the
24 path and he confessed to the murder and he was
09:14 25 prosecuted and convicted.



1 The first appeal was, the
2 ground of appeal was that -- related to the
3 turning off of the life support machine and
4 whether that was a break in the chain of causation
09:14 5 which the Court of Appeal gave very short shift
6 to. *Rough Justice* did an investigation and I
7 remember watching the program thinking as I
8 watched it, well, this is mere argument, it's not
9 really introducing anything new and, furthermore,
09:14 10 insofar as the witnesses who the program
11 interviewed were being asked whether they really
12 seen what they said they had seen at trial, I
13 couldn't help noticing that the geography of the
14 area and the lines of sight seemed to have changed
09:15 15 quite radically because of new housing
16 development, and so the line which *Rough Justice*
17 appeared to be pursuing around this seemed to be
18 flawed because of a number of matters. That --
19 the *Rough Justice* program didn't result in any
09:15 20 further action.

21 When the Commission came into
22 existence, Anthony Steele applied to the
23 Commission. I, of course, had nothing to do with
24 the case because I had been, I had had this
09:15 25 earlier responsibility for it, but the focus of



1 the Commission's investigation was on the
2 reliability of Anthony Steele's confession because
3 by the time the Commission was considering the
4 case, there had been considerable advances in
09:15 5 psychiatric and psychological understanding of the
6 way in which people confess to offences they
7 haven't committed and indeed the case was referred
8 to the Court of Appeal on the basis of new
9 psychological evidence as to the reliability of
09:16 10 the confession and Mr. Steele's conviction was
11 quashed on that basis.

12 Q Okay. And so over the course of the nine years,
13 then, you were involved in the Commission did you
14 see the role of journalists change then? What
09:16 15 was -- did there seem to be more of an acceptance
16 that the Commission would be investigating and
17 uncovering these matters?

18 A That seems to have been the case so far, yes.
19 There was a brief production of another television
09:16 20 program called *Clear My Name*, the object of which
21 appears to be to bring to the public's attention
22 the existence of a case which was thought to be a
23 possible miscarriage of justice, and inviting
24 anybody who may have anything to offer to come
09:16 25 forward. So there was no direct investigation by



1 the program as such, it was simply "if there's
2 anyone out there who can say anything about this
3 case, please get in touch", but I'm not aware of
4 any of those cases being transmitted on to the
09:17 5 Commission.

6 Q If we can go back to 339726, which is the
7 legislation that we were going through yesterday,
8 and talk about Section 15 of the Act which says:

9 "Where a direction is given by the Court
09:17 10 of Appeal under Section 23A(1) of the
11 1968 Act or ... the 1980 Act the
12 Commission shall investigate the matter
13 specified in the direction in such
14 manner as the Commission think fit."

09:17 15 And can you explain what this section deals with
16 and how has it been deployed by the Court of
17 Appeal and the Commission?

18 A The purpose of this section is to allow the Court
19 of Appeal, in any case which the Court of Appeal
09:17 20 is dealing with, whether or not it results from a
21 reference from the Commission -- so it applies
22 with equal effect to appeals which are being
23 addressed in the ordinary way -- it allows the, if
24 the Court of Appeal requires some sort of factual
09:18 25 investigation to be made, then the Court can ask



1 the Commission to act as a sort of investigative
2 arm for the Court in order to make those factual
3 inquiries.

4 And I think the purpose behind
09:18 5 this particular provision was given the existence
6 of an independent body, which the CCRC clearly
7 was, this was an opportunity to have necessary
8 factual investigations in the course of an appeal
9 hearing being made independently, so that it
09:18 10 wasn't necessary for the Court to invite either
11 the defence or the prosecution to try and make the
12 inquiries themselves. It is not a power which the
13 Court has used a great deal.

14 An example I can think of,
09:18 15 which arose in the course of an ordinary appeal,
16 was where there had been a suggestion of jury
17 bias. And I think in Canada, as in England, the
18 question -- the process of making investigations
19 of juries is actually quite complicated, because
09:19 20 you are not allowed to ask them about what
21 happened in the course of their deliberations.
22 And it was clearly, the Court of Appeal thought,
23 an appropriate case in which the Commission should
24 be asked to make inquiries to ascertain whether
09:19 25 there had, in fact, been any transactions amongst



1 the jury members which might indicate bias.

2 Q Okay. And so is that a case, then, that the
3 Commission did investigate?

4 A Yes.

09:19 5 Q And then you'd report back?

6 A And we'd report back, yes.

7 Q Yes. Just on the issue of juries, and putting
8 aside the policy issues that might arise if the
9 Commission were allowed to talk to jurors -- and I
09:19 10 don't want to get into that -- but assume for the
11 moment that you could, would that be something of
12 benefit to the Commissioners in investigating
13 miscarriages of justice, to be able to speak to
14 jurors?

09:20 15 A I think that's an incredibly difficult question.
16 I mean the sort of immediate off-the-cuff thought,
17 I think, of anybody is, well, if you are trying to
18 find out whether someone may have been wrongfully
19 convicted wouldn't it be wonderful if we knew
09:20 20 exactly how it was that the jury went about its
21 task, particularly of course, I suppose, in areas
22 where, if the jury have been charged by the judge
23 in the course of the trial to disregard a piece of
24 evidence which they heard but perhaps they
09:20 25 shouldn't have heard, and there remains the



1 possibility that in spite of that the jury might
2 have had -- might have taken account of that piece
3 of evidence, then I suppose you could say, well,
4 wouldn't it be useful to be able to ask the jury
09:21 5 "didn't you do what the judge told you?" But I
6 suspect there are so many powerful arguments which
7 one could, which could be employed the other way,
8 that I would hate to sit here and give a view one
9 way or the other.

09:21 10 Q Yes, and I've tried to preface my question by
11 saying that there may well be a number of policy
12 or principle reasons why the state would not want
13 to have jurors subjected to questions about why
14 they decided a certain way, but if we can put
09:21 15 those aside?

16 A Uh-huh.

17 Q I'm just trying to understand whether the ability
18 to talk to jurors -- for example, in the United
19 States they have a different system and jurors are
09:21 20 not only talked to, I think they are interviewed
21 publicly after -- and from your case of
22 investigation would there be some cases there
23 where it might be helpful to know what -- again,
24 keeping in mind that there might be powerful
09:21 25 reasons, as you say, not to --



1 A Uh-huh.

2 Q -- but just as far as information-gathering?

3 A Well I suppose the answer to that is if you're --
4 if you ignore the policy reasons for not doing it,
09:22 5 yes, it would seem to follow there may be cases
6 which doing it could be -- could provide you with
7 relevant information.

8 Q If we can go to the next page, please. Section 16
9 talks about the prerogative of mercy, and it's my
09:22 10 understanding that with the creation of the CCRC
11 the Home Secretary retained the -- Her Majesty's
12 prerogative of mercy; correct?

13 A Uh-huh.

14 Q And so that there are, in addition to the CCRC,
09:22 15 the Home Secretary was able to pardon people or
16 provide -- exercise the prerogative of mercy?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And can you give us a general idea, is that --
19 when and how is that prerogative exercised over
09:22 20 the course of the CCRC?

21 A Well, the specific powers under Section 16 have
22 never been exercised, the Home Secretary has never
23 asked the Commission to assist him and we've never
24 invited the Home Secretary to consider the issue
09:23 25 of a pardon.



1 I think, as we were
2 considering yesterday in the context of the Royal
3 Commission report, the residual Royal Prerogative
4 of Mercy has, I think, probably taken an even more
09:23 5 residual position now, with the creation of the
6 CCRC, and in particular the CCRC's powers to
7 review and refer back cases which arose in the
8 Magistrate's Court, which was not a power which
9 had been open to the Home Secretary under the
09:23 10 previous regime.

11 But I think, again as the
12 Royal Commission observed, I think one of the
13 areas in which the Royal Prerogative of Mercy was
14 exercised was in relation to the discovery that
09:24 15 there was some flaw in processes applied to
16 drivers who were thought to have driven with
17 excess alcohol, and so the Home Secretary took the
18 view that the easiest way of dealing with that was
19 to compile a list of everybody who'd been
09:24 20 convicted on the basis of this flawed process and
21 simply issue a pardon to all of them, which was
22 the, at that time, that was the only thing that
23 could be done.

24 The only case which I can
09:24 25 think of at the moment in my own experience where



1 a pardon has been given in a more serious case
2 was, again, in this case of Derek Bentley, who was
3 convicted and hanged for the murder of a police
4 officer in 1953. And very many years later, as
09:24 5 part of a response to ongoing concern about that
6 and the suggestion that Derek Bentley, who was 19
7 when he was hanged, should never have been hanged,
8 he was posthumously given a pardon in relation to
9 sentence, but not in relation to conviction.

09:25 10 As I say, it's a
11 rarely-exercised power, the exercise of the
12 prerogative of mercy, and I think, with the
13 existence of the CCRC, it will be even rarer.

14 Q Go to the next page, please. This talks about
09:25 15 supplementary powers and I think it gives the
16 Commission the power to access documents from a
17 public body; is that correct?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And can you just elaborate on that? What can you
09:25 20 get, what areas can you get documents, and what --
21 where can you not?

22 A Well the 'public body' is further defined, I
23 think, in Section 22. And 'public body' is given
24 a wide definition and it really covers anybody,
09:26 25 any public body, which is publicly funded and



1 which exercises public functions. So it includes
2 the police, the -- I'm thinking the start of an
3 investigation and working outwards -- the power to
4 obtain documents from police, prosecution, courts,
09:26 5 social services, arises because of Section 17,
6 and providing our request is reasonable -- and
7 we've never been challenged over the
8 reasonableness of any of our requests -- we can
9 require the production of any material which we
09:26 10 think may assist in the exercise of our functions.

11 And further on in Section 17
12 there is a provision which says that a request
13 which the Commission made can't be defeated by any
14 suggestion that what we're looking for is secret,
09:26 15 confidential, or in other circumstances would not
16 be discloseable. So if the material is held by a
17 public body as defined, and we reasonably think it
18 might assist us as a Commission in the exercise of
19 our functions, then we can demand it and get it.

09:27 20 Q Let's talk about a couple of areas. The
21 prosecutor's file, would that be a source, would
22 you normally get the prosecutor's file in most
23 applications?

24 A In most applications, in -- by -- if it's a case
09:27 25 which has got into the category of application



1 which requires a fuller and more extended review
2 then, almost invariably, the prosecution files
3 would be obtained.

4 Q And what about the police files?

09:27 5 A Them too.

6 Q What about --

7 A Particularly, of course, because the question of
8 the prosecution's compliance with its disclosure
9 obligations remains a very fertile source of
09:27 10 investigative activity, and to find out, you
11 investigate that by finding out what the police
12 had, what they'd told the prosecution about, and
13 what the prosecution disclosed, and you'd find
14 that by looking at their material.

09:28 15 Q Would that be one of the very early steps, then,
16 of your investigation would be to review the
17 police file and the Crown file?

18 A Yes, it would be, yes.

19 Q What about defence counsel; would you try and
09:28 20 access his or her file?

21 A We would, but of course Section 17 doesn't apply
22 to defence lawyers because they are not public
23 bodies.

24 Q Presumably, the applicant would have the ability
09:28 25 to get authorization for you to get --



1 A Oh, indeed. And the ap -- the very first
2 application which -- form which the applicant
3 completes has a section on it in which he is
4 invited to waive any privilege which might attach
09:28 5 to his lawyers and their files. So the starting
6 point is that we would ask, if we wanted to get
7 them and it was necessary to have a look at them,
8 then we would be -- we would be pre-armed with a
9 waiver of privilege.

09:29 10 Q And I may have touched on this yesterday, but have
11 there been many cases where an applicant would
12 refuse to waive solicitor/client privilege with
13 respect to communications with his or her defence
14 counsel?

09:29 15 A If there have been, they are no more than a
16 handful, I'm -- in -- I didn't come across that
17 situation in any case that I ever dealt with.

18 Q Go to the next page, please. Section 19 talks
19 about:

09:29 20 "Where the Commission believe that
21 inquiries should be made for assisting
22 them in the exercise of any of their
23 functions in relation to any case they
24 may require the appointment of an
09:29 25 investigating officer to carry out the



1 inquiries.",

2 and it goes on to the next page. If we can look
3 at, I think it talks here about being able to go
4 to another police force than the one that
09:30 5 originally investigated the case, is that
6 correct, or is that a different section?

7 A No, that is the provision which enables the
8 Commission to require the appointment of a person
9 serving in a police force different to that which
09:30 10 carried the -- carried out the original
11 investigation.

12 Q And you talked about this a bit yesterday; does
13 the Commission rely on external police forces to
14 assist in your investigation?

09:30 15 A It does but, as I was saying yesterday, the
16 principle objective of the Commission in any
17 investigation is to do the investigation itself,
18 and in the great majority of cases that is what
19 happens, even though it may involve the Commission
09:30 20 inviting some form of external assistance in the
21 provision of further evidence or information which
22 generally will include -- will involve
23 commissioning expert reports in forensic science
24 or pathology or matters of that nature, but it may
09:31 25 extend to asking the police for further



1 assistance. If it's something which is a
2 self-contained "please, will you make this Inquiry
3 for us and report back to us", we will ask the
4 police to do that without going through the
09:31 5 formality of requiring the appointment of an
6 investigating officer.

7 The purpose of this section is
8 to allow us to call upon the resources, usually of
9 a police force. In fact, I think every time we've
09:31 10 requested the appointment of an investigating
11 officer it has been a police officer. It doesn't
12 have to be, it can be an officer from any public
13 body, of which I suppose an example would be if it
14 was a serious or complex fraud we could, in
09:31 15 theory, ask for the appointment of an
16 investigating officer from a serious fraud office.
17 But, in practice, all of the investigating
18 officers we have used have been police officers.

19 And what we're looking for is
09:32 20 a total investigative resource to be applied to
21 certain types of cases, and we identify criteria
22 in which we would usually look for the appointment
23 of an investigating officer under Section 19, and
24 I think from recollection they were essentially
09:32 25 three:



1 one was if the level of investigation was
2 going to be so great that it was completely
3 unrealistic to expect the Commission's resources
4 to be able to deal with it;

09:32 5 secondly was any investigation which, in
6 order to obtain information, was going to require
7 the particular exercise of police powers such as
8 arrest, interview under caution, obtaining search
9 warrants, because those are powers which the
09:33 10 police officers have but which the Commission
11 doesn't;

12 and the third category was any investigation
13 which looked as if, by its nature, it was going to
14 be looking into allegations of misconduct, such as
09:33 15 perjury or perverting the course of justice,
16 committed by the officers who investigated the
17 original case.

18 So, against those, those are
19 the sorts of criteria which the Commission would
09:33 20 apply, and the application of those criteria has
21 resulted in the making of 41 appointments under
22 Section 19 out of all the cases which the
23 Commission has dealt with.

24 Q Can you tell us, to what extent does the
09:33 25 Commission get involved in investigating another



1 perpetrator? And let me just give you a bit more
2 background there. Would you agree that in most
3 cases where a person alleges wrongful conviction
4 or a miscarriage of justice, that if they are
09:34 5 correct in their assertion, then someone else
6 committed the crime for the most part; is that a
7 fair premise?

8 A Well the assumption must be, of course, if
9 somebody hasn't committed it someone else has.

09:34 10 Q Right.

11 A Umm, as I was saying yesterday, very few of our
12 applicants actually take the trouble to say in
13 their application "I am innocent of this offence,
14 I am factually innocent of it". But leaving that
09:34 15 aside, as we were developing at some length
16 yesterday, what the Commission is concerned to do
17 is to investigate the safety of our applicant's
18 conviction, and that is the focus of the
19 investigation. It may be, in some of them, that
09:34 20 it is a necessary part of that investigation to
21 inquire into the possibility of identifying or
22 establishing the commission of the -- the actual
23 commission of the offence by someone else, but we
24 wouldn't be going into the investigation trying to
09:35 25 establish a prosecutable case against someone



1 else. That is, and remains, the responsibility of
2 the police, not the Commission.

3 So, if I can give you an
4 example, I have -- there are two examples I can
09:35 5 give. One is a, what one might regard as being a
6 relatively run-of-the-mill type of case, if I can
7 put it that way, the other was a much more
8 notorious case in England.

9 But the first was a young man
09:35 10 who was at the university, he was a law student
11 convicted of armed robbery on a shop, and he was
12 arrested by police officers who were called to the
13 scene. He was carrying his law books, but he
14 seemed to fit the description of one of the -- he
09:36 15 seemed to fit the description of the robber and,
16 also, he was wearing shoes, the imprint of which
17 matched a footprint, or the sole of which matched
18 a footprint in the soil out -- in soil outside the
19 shop. So he was prosecuted and convicted and his
09:36 20 defence was "I didn't do it, what happened was I
21 was just walking past the shop and someone came
22 out" -- I can't remember if he said he knew this
23 other person or not, but that may not matter. But
24 his defence, what he said was "this person came
09:36 25 running out of the shop, threatened me, and said



1 'I want to swap shoes with you', and so I did
2 that, and that's how I come to have shoes which
3 match the imprint".

4 Now this defence probably
09:36 5 didn't sound particularly plausible, and it
6 certainly wasn't one which the jury thought much
7 of, and he was convicted, the first appeal
8 dismissed. He comes to the Commission, and the
9 first thing we do is to have these shoes tested
09:37 10 for DNA, and lo and behold, you know, there is a
11 significant amount of DNA on these shoes which is
12 not his. Again, I can't remember whether the DNA
13 which we found was matched to anyone else, but to
14 us that was not a significant point. We told the
09:37 15 police we had got this DNA, and they might wish to
16 investigate as to whether they could find the
17 person who had the DNA which was in these shoes,
18 but from our point of view we now had the
19 evidence, the fresh evidence, which we felt was
09:37 20 sufficient to give rise to the real possibility
21 that the Court of Appeal would quash the
22 conviction because, whereas his defence had seemed
23 highly unlikely at the time of trial, all of a
24 sudden here was some hard DNA evidence which
09:37 25 actually gave some credence to what he was saying.



1 So we referred the case to the Court of Appeal and
2 his conviction was quashed.

3 So that was a situation where
4 our, the nature of our investigation necessarily
09:38 5 embraced the possibility of somebody else having
6 committed the offence and, indeed, the evidence
7 which we obtained tended to suggest that that may
8 have been the case, but our purpose was served by
9 doing what I've described. We weren't, as a
09:38 10 Commission, concerned to go on to try and identify
11 who that perpetrator might have been and ensure
12 that he was investigated for the robbery.

13 The other example -- I don't
14 want to waste the Commission's time, I'm --

09:38 15 Q No, you're quite fine, please carry on?

16 A -- on stories, but there was a notorious case in
17 United Kingdom some ten years ago where the deputy
18 headmaster of a school in the south of England was
19 convicted of the murder of a young 13-year-old
09:38 20 girl who was his foster daughter. He and his
21 family, I think he had four natural children, who
22 at the time were aged from -- there was a baby and
23 then I think the eldest child at the time was 12
24 or thereabouts. But they had this girl who had
09:39 25 been fostered with them, who by all accounts,



1 seemed to be settling into the family very well,
2 and she was murdered in a particularly unpleasant
3 way. She was beaten about the head with an iron
4 bar as she was sitting in the garden of the family
09:39 5 home painting some French doors, and eventually
6 her father -- the name of the case was Shawn
7 Jenkins -- Mr. Jenkins was prosecuted and
8 convicted of her murder. And I think one of the
9 significant pieces of evidence which resulted in
09:39 10 his conviction was the appearance of blood on his
11 clothing, which was said to have come from his
12 foster daughter as he'd hit her.

13 I mean there were a number of
14 strange things about the case, not least if you
09:40 15 batter someone over the head and she was bleeding,
16 the victim was very heavily bloodstained, as to
17 why there wasn't more blood on the father. And he
18 said, anyway, that when he'd got -- when he found
19 his daughter -- he denying responsibility -- he
09:40 20 thought she was still alive and he cradled her and
21 he thought she was still breathing. But he was
22 convicted of murder.

23 And as you might imagine with
24 this type of case, in the -- when the case was
09:40 25 initially reported, but in the press, there was a



1 sort of underlying suggestion that maybe there had
2 been some sort of sexual motivation behind the
3 relationship between Mr. Jenkins and this young
4 girl. In fact there was absolutely none, but it
09:41 5 had the effect of turning his wife against him,
6 which in turn had the effect of having a severely
7 adverse impact so far as the conduct of his
8 defence was concerned around the question of
9 whether two of his children should give evidence
09:41 10 on his behalf, because on the prosecution case the
11 time available for Mr. Jenkins to have killed his
12 foster daughter was no more than four minutes,
13 because he'd brought one of his children home from
14 a music lesson and four minutes later they had
09:41 15 driven off somewhere else and then returned and,
16 according to him, found the body. So there was a
17 very, very short time frame in which he could have
18 done this, and I think the defence would very much
19 have liked to have called these two girls to give
09:41 20 evidence and they didn't for reasons I'll come
21 onto for a moment.

22 But one of the, another very
23 strange and never satisfactorily-explained part of
24 the case was that the pathologist, when the
09:42 25 postmortem was conducted, discovered a piece of



1 plastic, the sort of plastic which comes from bin
2 liners, --

3 Q Yes?

4 A -- yeah, stuffed deep up one of the child's
09:42 5 nostrils, and that -- that, to this day I don't
6 think that has ever been really explained.

7 But the significance of it --
8 and this was something which was known at trial --
9 was that there was another man who was known to
09:42 10 have been in the area where the family lived,
11 there was park land adjacent to the house, and he
12 was known to have been in this park at around the
13 material time, someone who had some strange
14 propensity for stuffing plastic into holes,
09:43 15 usually into electrical outlets. Now that was
16 known at the time of trial but the police
17 investigated that at the time and there was --
18 they were satisfied that actually, at the time
19 when this murder must have taken place, he wasn't
09:43 20 in a position to have been the perpetrator, so he
21 was rejected by the police as a suspect and the
22 defence, although they were aware of it, weren't
23 really able to make very much of it at trial.

24 When the case came to the
09:43 25 Commission there were three broad strands which



1 the Commission investigated, one of which related
2 to this man with the propensity for
3 sticking/stuffing plastic in holes, and we were
4 able to find new evidence which actually
09:44 5 significantly diminished the earlier evidence
6 providing him, effectively, with an alibi. So we
7 were able to make some inroads into the alibi of
8 this particular person and that was something
9 which, when we referred the case, we relied on as
09:44 10 part of our reasoning for referring the case.

11 The other strand of the
12 investigation which we pursued related to
13 scientific evidence concerning the blood
14 spattering and how that might have occurred.

09:44 15 And the third line was to deal
16 with the question of these two young girls, who by
17 now were in their late teens, as to what had been
18 going on with them as to -- which had precluded
19 them from giving evidence because, effectively,
09:44 20 their mother had refused to allow them to give
21 evidence and she had been telling the police, in
22 the period between Mr. Jenkins' arrest and trial,
23 about what the girls had been saying to her about
24 their father's behaviour, all of which tended to
09:45 25 be pretty adverse to Mr. Jenkins. But the defence



1 lawyers were unable to explore this because they
2 were not allowed to interview the girls, and so
3 although defence counsel believed that the girls
4 could give evidence which was extremely helpful to
09:45 5 their father, he couldn't run the risk of calling
6 them because he didn't actually know what they
7 were going to say. He had every reason to think
8 that they may have been manoeuvred, in the
9 intervening months between the offence and the
09:45 10 trial, into being hostile towards their father,
11 and he had no way of finding out what the position
12 actually was, so they weren't called.

13 So we investigated that at the
14 Commission and, again linking this back to
09:45 15 something, what we were talking about yesterday,
16 we weren't that interested in what their
17 recollection of the incident was because we're, by
18 now, seven or eight years on, and in any case
19 their interview, their interviews at the time had
09:46 20 fortuitously been video recorded so we knew what
21 they could have said if they were consistent with
22 their evidence. What we were interested to find
23 out is what they had to say about all these
24 behaviours of their father which their mother had
09:46 25 ascribed to them, so we obtained the consent of



1 the Family Division High Court to interview these
2 two girls, and did so, and, to a certain extent,
3 were able to demonstrate, through their mouths,
4 that a lot of what they were reported to have said
09:46 5 which was hostile to their father, in fact, they
6 didn't -- they did not agree with. So a
7 significant part of the reference back to the
8 Court of Appeal, in addition to the blood and the
9 man with the plastic, was the fact that the
09:47 10 defence had been unfairly deprived of the
11 opportunity of calling evidence which was
12 favourable to the defence.

13 When it eventually got to the
14 Court of Appeal, one of the first things the court
09:47 15 did was to make a request to the Commission under
16 Section 15 for further inquiries into the man and
17 the plastic and, in particular, into his
18 psychiatric record, so we did that for the Court
19 of Appeal and reported back to them with the
09:47 20 further information about this man.

21 In the event, the Court of
22 Appeal attached little significance to the man
23 with the plastic and, as I say, that appeared, the
24 appearance of the plastic deep in her nostril
09:47 25 remains to this day a very strange and unexplained



1 part of the case.

2 The Court of Appeal was not
3 that persuaded either by the arguments around the
4 two girls' evidence and what won the day for Mr.
09:48 5 Jenkins was the fresh evidence on the blood
6 splattering, so in this particular instance the
7 Court of Appeal ordered, quashed the conviction
8 and ordered a retrial. Mr. Jenkins was retried.
9 As a result, the first jury failed to agree, so he
09:48 10 was tried again and acquitted.

11 Q Okay. So that would be a case then where, I guess
12 from the Court of Appeal inquiries, would be made
13 about another possible perpetrator?

14 A Yes.

09:48 15 Q Can you comment on, and again I'll give you, I
16 think you have a general understanding of the
17 Larry Fisher -- Larry Fisher's involvement in the
18 David Milgaard case?

19 A Uh-huh.

09:48 20 Q He was part of the first application, and I think
21 the ground put forward, at least in part, was
22 David Milgaard -- there had been a miscarriage of
23 justice because Larry Fisher had committed the
24 crime, not David Milgaard?

09:49 25 A Uh-huh.



1 Q Can you tell us generally, how would the
2 Commission deal with an application of an inmate
3 who says I was wrongfully convicted and I think X
4 committed the crime and here's why I think so --

09:49 5 A Uh-huh.

6 Q -- and if you can prove that X did the crime, then
7 I didn't, and so that type of ground. First of
8 all, is that something that the Commission would
9 normally receive, that type of argument, and
09:49 10 secondly, how would you approach that?

11 A Well, I think interestingly, from my recollection,
12 I don't think that the Commission has ever
13 received an application in such stark terms. I
14 can think of an example which I'll come onto in a
09:49 15 moment where another name has come into the frame
16 subsequent -- subsequent to -- in a slightly
17 different way, but I don't think that the
18 Commission has ever been, ever had an application
19 which is quite so stark in its terms, "I didn't do
09:49 20 it, I'm nominating a named person as being
21 responsible."

22 Where it has arisen has been
23 more in the circumstances of the two examples that
24 I've given, that there is a suggestion -- that
09:50 25 there is an inference from the way the application



1 is framed that someone else has done it, but it
2 may not be someone known to the applicant, but
3 assume there was such an application. Well, the
4 Commission would embark on an inquiry to see to
09:50 5 what extent evidence could be found which tended
6 to support the suggestion which was being made,
7 but as I say, the objective that the Commission
8 was following was to find that evidence which
9 would be sufficient to meet the Commission's test
09:50 10 for referral and the focus would be on new
11 evidence tending to show that our applicant had
12 been wrongly convicted.

13 Now, if that involved
14 endeavouring to show that somebody else had
09:51 15 committed the offence, all we would be looking for
16 would be sufficient evidence to suggest that that
17 was a possibility and a sufficiently significant
18 possibility to give rise to real -- to doubt as to
19 whether our application, our applicant was in fact
09:51 20 the perpetrator. As I said earlier, what we
21 wouldn't be doing is trying to prove a
22 prosecutable case.

23 Now, I can envisage a
24 circumstance, but it has never happened, in which
09:51 25 that might be necessary, and I think that would



1 almost certainly be a circumstance in which we
2 would have asked for the appointment of an
3 investigating officer.

4 Q So just back on the first point then, if the
09:51 5 Commission would investigate and find that the
6 possible involvement of a third party might be a
7 basis to say that the conviction of the applicant
8 is unsafe, that would be the extent of your
9 investigation?

09:52 10 A Yes, yes. So, I mean, if I take what I understand
11 to be the position of Larry Fisher --

12 Q Yes.

13 A -- that I think if I was putting this in the
14 context of an investigation by the CCRC, we would
09:52 15 have -- the first thing -- or we would hope that
16 we would have found from a review of all the
17 police files that Larry Fisher's wife had made,
18 had suggested to the police that she thought her
19 husband might be responsible, so we would then be
09:52 20 looking and saying, well, what was the police
21 response to that, and the investigations we
22 carried out would develop from there and
23 presumably we would then reach the point which was
24 reached when the application went before the
09:52 25 Supreme Court here in 1992, that here was a man



1 who, in relation to whom there was certainly
2 substantial reason to think that he was a
3 plausible suspect for this offence, particularly
4 having regard to previous convictions in a matter
09:53 5 of that nature. I mean, I can't sit here and say
6 we would definitely have found our test to have
7 been satisfied because that would depend on the
8 rest of the case, and of course there's an awful
9 lot more to this case than simply the Larry Fisher
09:53 10 dimension, but what we would be looking at was we
11 have now found this new evidence which was
12 probably available at the time if anyone had made
13 the links, but whether that's, those links were
14 made right or not and whatever the situation was,
09:53 15 there was information about this suspect which
16 wasn't disclosed to the defence at trial and we
17 think that had this information been available to
18 them, they could have deployed it effectively to
19 suggest that there was a reasonable doubt about
09:53 20 Mr. Milgaard's guilt, and if that was the case, we
21 might welcome the conclusion that our real
22 possibility test was satisfied and refer to the
23 Court of Appeal for them to consider.

24 Q And so would it be correct to say that your focus
09:53 25 would not be on whether or not Larry Fisher



1 committed the crime or David Milgaard committed
2 the crime, but whether the information relating to
3 Larry Fisher that had not been known by defence,
4 if it had been known, what effect if any it would
09:54 5 have on the jury's verdict?

6 A Yes, could it have been deployed effectively to
7 induce the sort of doubt which the defence would
8 be interested to induce in the minds of the jury.

9 Q And so really looking at the safety of Mr.
09:54 10 Milgaard's original conviction with this new
11 information being other sexual assaults and Mr.
12 Fisher's involvement in those assaults, could that
13 information have made a difference at Mr.
14 Milgaard's trial, that would be the focus?

09:54 15 A That would be the focus, and it would of course
16 be, I think it would take into account the fact
17 that Mr. Fisher lived close by to, I think he
18 lived in the same building as one of the
19 significant Crown witnesses in the case.

09:54 20 Q Yes, that's correct.

21 A Yes. So, you know, it's -- it clearly is not --
22 as matters were known when the application was
23 considered by the Supreme Court in the early
24 1990s, it certainly was not an off-the-wall
09:55 25 suggestion that here was another plausible



1 candidate and it might have been possible for the
2 defence to deploy that information effectively in
3 Mr. Milgaard's defence had they known about it at
4 the time.

09:55 5 Q And so would you look at questions as to whether
6 or not evidence about Mr. Fisher would have been
7 admissible at David Milgaard's trial?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And, secondly, we've heard a fair bit of evidence
09:55 10 about similar act and whether or not the other
11 rapes committed by Mr. Fisher are similar to Gail
12 Miller's murder which I think many witnesses have
13 said goes to the question of whether or not the
14 Fisher evidence is significant enough to have
09:55 15 raised a doubt. Is that something that you would
16 have pursued as well?

17 A Yes, I'm sure.

18 Q And then I take it, though, your test is not to
19 say that it would have affected the verdict of the
09:56 20 jury, but rather is it something that might be
21 expected to affect the verdict?

22 A Yes.

23 Q And in fact even one step removed, is there a real
24 possibility that the Court of Appeal might
09:56 25 conclude that this evidence might have affected



1 the verdict; is that a fair way to put it?

2 A Yes, I mean, you get quite a convoluted sentence,
3 but what we would be saying, asking ourselves is,
4 is there a real possibility that the Court of
09:56 5 Appeal will receive this fresh evidence and,
6 having received it, is there a real possibility
7 that they will conclude that it might have
8 resulted in the jury reaching a different verdict.

9 Q And it's correct to say then that you would leave
09:56 10 it up to the -- if you decided that there was the
11 real possibility, you would leave it up to the
12 Court of Appeal to decide -- I guess maybe the
13 tougher question is would it have affected the
14 verdict, and the Court of Appeal would decide,
09:56 15 number one, whether to receive the evidence and,
16 two, to decide how it might have affected the
17 safety of the verdict?

18 A Yes. I mean, the Court of Appeal would be asking
19 "might", they wouldn't be asking "would" I don't
09:57 20 think, and I think the test the Court of Appeal
21 applies, which is identified in the House of Lords
22 case of *Pendleton*, is that if they have any
23 difficulty with fresh evidence because, I mean,
24 some fresh evidence will be utterly overwhelming
09:57 25 in showing that the conviction is unsafe, other



1 fresh evidence may be equally overwhelming the
2 other way, but the grey area, and this would be a
3 grey area, this type of evidence, the House of
4 Lords in *Pendleton* said in those situations the
09:57 5 Court of Appeal should ask itself to test their
6 own view of it, what impact that evidence might
7 have had on the jury.

8 Q And just to finish up on that point then, I take
9 it that you would not need to investigate Larry
09:57 10 Fisher as a suspect to the point of trying to
11 establish that he committed the crime?

12 A Well, not in the circumstances that we've been,
13 we've just been talking about, no. I mean, the
14 reality in Mr. Milgaard's case now, if an
09:58 15 application on the basis -- if one hypothesizing
16 an application from someone convicted in the sorts
17 of circumstances which Mr. Milgaard was and the
18 circumstances are, as we now know them to be;
19 namely, that there is available at the time the
09:58 20 application is made to the Commission exhibits
21 available, forensic examination, the first thing
22 the Commission would now do would be to have those
23 existing, those still existing forensic exhibits
24 examined for DNA because of the ongoing
09:58 25 improvement in DNA techniques, so it's quite



1 likely that in 2006 a review by the Commission of
2 a murder of this nature in the late 1970s would
3 start with a DNA analysis of available exhibits,
4 and given what we now know about the outcome of
09:59 5 the DNA analysis which was done in Mr. Milgaard's
6 case, the Commission would presumably discover
7 fairly quickly that the semen at the scene did not
8 come from Mr. Milgaard and that, irrespective of
9 whether or not that DNA could be matched to
09:59 10 someone else, that would be a knock-down reason
11 for referring the case back to the Court of
12 Appeal.

13 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You did say
14 however, sir, that you would have asked for the
09:59 15 appointment of an investigating officer given the
16 circumstances of the case?

17 A I'm sorry, if you understood me to have said that,
18 that was not what I intended to say. What I
19 intended to say was if we thought it was necessary
10:00 20 to conduct an investigation which was -- in order
21 to conduct the inquiries necessary for our
22 purposes, it was also necessary to investigate the
23 actual involvement of someone else --

24 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.

10:00 25 A -- which might involve arresting that person and



1 questioning them, and we have done that in one of
2 our cases. It wasn't specifically about trying to
3 prove that someone else had done it, but someone
4 else who might have had a criminal involvement in
10:00 5 the offence in question was identified and so we
6 asked the police to arrest and interview that
7 person under caution. If that was necessary for
8 our part of it, for our investigations, we would
9 probably invite the appointment of an
10:00 10 investigating officer to do it.

11 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Uh-huh.

12 A But in this case, our initial step would be to see
13 to -- this was an offence in which a woman was
14 raped and murdered. There was evidence that we
10:01 15 would see as part of our review of the history of
16 the case that there was blood grouping evidence
17 given around the frozen semen samples found in the
18 snow and we might reasonably assume that there
19 could have been further relevant forensic evidence
10:01 20 on clothing, so we would find out what was
21 available to be examined now and -- because of an
22 offence of this nature almost invariably results
23 in the deposit of relevant bodily fluids which can
24 be examined, we would do that first, and we
10:01 25 wouldn't need an investigating officer to do that,



1 we would simply get on to the Forensic Science
2 Service and say will you take these exhibits from
3 me and examine them.

4 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And assuming the
10:01 5 need for an investigating officer, your choice of
6 a policeman interests me. Inasmuch as we've
7 heard evidence in this case that the mere mention
8 of a policeman being involved in the
9 investigation of matters where police were
10:02 10 alleged to have committed a wrongdoing raised a
11 suspicion of bias and --

12 A Yes.

13 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And so do I take
14 it then that you just, you approach the matter
10:02 15 from a different point of view, from the
16 presumption of regularity, that the police will
17 do what they are supposed to never mind the
18 criticism from suspicious people?

19 A Yes, and this is -- there have been occasions when
10:02 20 precisely this problem has arisen and we deal with
21 it at an early stage as part of the ongoing
22 management of our applicants, because the reality
23 is that if you are wanting to have a full-scale
24 investigation of something to be done by
10:02 25 experienced investigators, you can say -- you can



1 ask the applicant, well, who actually do you think
2 is going to do it, who do you suggest has the
3 necessary expertise and powers other than a police
4 officer, which is usually a question which they
10:03 5 can't satisfactorily answer.

6 The next thing after that, or
7 maybe even before asking that question, is to make
8 sure that they understand absolutely that if the
9 Commission requires the appointment of an
10:03 10 investigating officer, that investigation is going
11 to be carried out under the direction and
12 supervision of the Commission and the actual
13 process of getting one of these investigating
14 officer reviews underway is an extensive and
10:03 15 protracted one and involves a considerable amount
16 of discussion with the police around the nature of
17 the investigation, the sort of officer we would be
18 looking for to investigate it, and once we've
19 identified a suitable investigating officer, we
10:04 20 work out terms of reference for the investigation
21 with them and the ongoing investigation is
22 supervised and directed by Commission staff.

23 So it isn't a question of
24 saying to the police we would like you to
10:04 25 investigate this, get on with it and let us know



1 what you find out, it's much more closely confined
2 than that, and as I say, the final thing which we
3 can do to, both to improve the likely
4 effectiveness of the investigation and in passing
10:04 5 allay the applicant's fears about all of this is
6 to require the appointment of a police officer
7 from a different police force.

8 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.

9 A And I might say that in two of the cases which I
10:04 10 dealt with when I was at the Commission where we
11 did require the appointment of an investigating
12 officer, that circumstances arose in the course of
13 that investigation where we were not 100 percent
14 impressed with the way in which our investigating
10:05 15 officer had gone about certain of the inquiries
16 and we simply got him to do them again.

17 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

18 A So any foot dragging or how he might express it by
19 the investigating officer would be acted on by the
10:05 20 Commission.

21 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

22 BY MR. HODSON:

23 Q Do I understand, Mr. Kyle, that again -- just back
24 to the, this analysis of the Larry Fisher crimes
10:05 25 and whether that information might have affected



1 the verdict of the jury. Would that be something
2 that, and I appreciate this is just a very general
3 discussion, but would you normally go to Mr.
4 Fisher then and interview him or would you go --
10:05 5 would you rely upon the record of his offences?
6 In other words, here's the information about this
7 man, would it matter to you whether or not he
8 denied his involvement or the rest of the matters
9 that might link him to that crime?

10:06 10 A Well, our starting point, I suppose in a way this
11 should be, we would adopt the same sort of
12 approach and strategy to the investigation,
13 bearing in mind we know what our objective is,
14 which is to see whether we can obtain new evidence
10:06 15 which calls the safety of the conviction into
16 doubt, that's the objective. We would start with
17 the -- we would start at the beginning and work
18 outwards, and interviewing Larry Fisher as part of
19 the objective we wanted to serve is likely to be a
10:06 20 long way down the road in terms of earlier
21 investigative activity and what we would be
22 looking for, because what we would be looking for
23 is what, in some respects, whether Larry Fisher
24 admits or denies the offence and, frankly, if the
10:07 25 Commission just knocked on his door and said would



1 you -- we think you may have murdered Gail Miller,
2 what do you say about that, likely he would tell
3 us to go away and deny it, there would be a lot of
4 proprietary investigation before any question of
10:07 5 interviewing Larry Fisher arose, and if there was
6 a need to interview Larry Fisher, then, as I've
7 indicated to the Commission a moment ago, I think
8 that by that point an interview of Larry Fisher,
9 if it was that sig -- if we needed to do that as
10:07 10 part of our investigation, would necessarily then
11 involve the introduction of a dimension to the
12 investigation which included investigating Larry
13 Fisher for the actual commission of the offence
14 and that's a police matter, so that's why I say we
10:07 15 would be looking at that stage to ask for the
16 appointment of an investigating officer.

17 Q But do I understand that those cases would be rare
18 where your investigation leads you to engage a
19 police force to investigate another alleged
10:08 20 perpetrator?

21 A Yes.

22 Q Can you comment on, just on how the Commission
23 deals with weighing the credibility of evidence or
24 information that you seek to gather? Is there --
10:08 25 again, keeping in mind your objective is the real



1 possibility whether the Court of Appeal might find
2 a basis to find the verdict unsafe, when you look
3 at evidence of witnesses, what is your -- what do
4 you do -- do you weigh the evidence, is it
5 something that you let the Court of Appeal decide,
6 or how do you weed out that which might be not
7 credible?

8 A Well, I think in this context, as indeed in many
9 others, you quite rightly pointed out on a number
10 of occasions the Commission is a gateway into the
11 Court of Appeal and because real possibility is
12 not defined in the act and has been given a broad
13 definition by the high court in the case of ex
14 parte Pearson, we approach our work on the basis
15 that we are a wide gateway, we're not -- we see
16 the real possibility test as being a relatively
17 low threshold, it's not a hugely difficult hurdle
18 for an applicant to overcome.

19 As we were looking at the
20 figures, the two-third/one-third split in the
21 Court of Appeal suggests that there is a
22 reasonable application of that real possibility
23 test, but in assessing the weight of evidence and
24 the impact it's likely to have and its
25 credibility, the Commission has to have regard to



1 precisely the same matter that the Court of Appeal
2 is going to have because one of the factors the
3 Court of Appeal has to take into account when
4 considering whether to receive fresh evidence is
10:10 5 whether it's capable of belief and that may, in
6 some respects, have some subjective elements to
7 it, but generally speaking, assessing whether a
8 witness is capable of belief is something which
9 the Commission does on an objective,
10:10 10 evidence-based basis, so we will be looking for
11 essentially just how credible does this evidence
12 appear, is it supported.

13 This goes back to what we were
14 saying yesterday with witnesses who recant or
10:10 15 co-accused who try to suggest after the event that
16 their partner in crime was innocent, we know that
17 the Court of Appeal is cynical about that and is
18 unlikely to find capable of belief a bare
19 assertion by a witness that something is different
10:10 20 now to what it was, and so the assessment of
21 credibility of evidence, I mean, it's not really
22 capable in a scientific analysis to how one goes
23 about it, but it is a matter of taking the
24 evidence that you've got and assessing how
10:11 25 credible it is in the context of the case as a



1 whole.

2 Q Okay. Go to 339755, please, and I obtained this
3 from the web site, I think this is the current
4 application that's used for inmates; is that
10:11 5 correct?

6 A It certainly looks like it, yes.

7 Q And if we can just go to page 339759, and it looks
8 like this is the part, if you can just enlarge the
9 top part, talking about -- would it be fair to say
10:11 10 that this application is geared towards the inmate
11 or the convicted person?

12 A Uh-huh.

13 Q As opposed to perhaps their counsel?

14 A Yes, it is. I mean, the majority of applications
10:12 15 are received completed by the applicants
16 themselves or by friends of theirs and so the
17 language of the application is deliberately chosen
18 to make it easy for applicants to fill in
19 themselves.

10:12 20 Q And here it says:

21 "Please use this space to tell us what
22 you think went wrong and what is new
23 about your case. If there is nothing
24 new, but you think there are
10:12 25 'exceptional circumstances' that we



1 should know about, please tell us what
2 the circumstances are and what you can
3 show us to support what you say."

4 A Uh-huh.

10:12 5 Q And you commented on this yesterday and I think
6 you said generally that the grounds that the
7 Commission investigates are often quite different
8 than what the applicant puts forward?

9 A Yes. In some cases the applicant will --
10:13 10 applicants will put their finger on what seems to
11 have gone wrong and will be able, in their own
12 terms, to identify issues which the Commission
13 subsequently thinks are significant. In other
14 cases applicants may not say anything, they will
10:13 15 fill in this part of the form, but it won't
16 actually identify anything which could conceivably
17 impact on the safety of the conviction, and in
18 other cases it may be a mixture, and then when the
19 Commission comes to review the case and decide on
10:13 20 the nature of the investigation and the extent of
21 it, that will include consideration being given by
22 the Commission as to whether there are any
23 relevant issues which the applicant simply hasn't
24 mentioned at all but which ought to be looked at.

10:14 25 Q And I think you told us yesterday, and maybe even



1 again this morning, that your objective or your
2 focus is to investigate those grounds that you
3 think, if established, would provide a remedy; in
4 other words --

10:14 5 A Yes.

6 Q -- your focus is on what might get you through the
7 gateway?

8 A Absolutely right, and it is now, and it probably
9 wouldn't surprise anyone, that in the very early
10:14 10 days of the Commission, before we had really got a
11 grip on our own process and procedures, and in
12 particular where there was no Commission member
13 involvement with the case review manager in the
14 structuring and conduct of the investigation, that
10:14 15 we were finding that our case review managers were
16 full of enthusiasm to expose wrongful convictions
17 and were investigating anything and everything
18 which the applicant told them, and anything and
19 everything of issues which they, the case review
10:14 20 managers, identified, and what we were finding was
21 that an awful lot of time was being spent
22 investigating issues which, even if they had been
23 factually resolved in the applicant's favour,
24 could never have made any difference to the safety
10:15 25 of the conviction, so the development of the



1 Commission's processes and working methods has
2 been around this attempt to identify at an early
3 stage what it is about the case which, were it to
4 be resolved in the applicant's favour, could
10:15 5 genuinely be said to have an impact on the safety
6 of the conviction, but that is the focus of the
7 investigation.

8 Q If we can go to 339668, please. This is a
9 document again from the CCRC web site that just
10:15 10 goes through the application phases, and I'll just
11 generally deal with this, and I think you talked,
12 the first step:

13 "Is it a valid application?"

14 And that is whether the appeals have expired, or
10:16 15 if there has been no appeal --

16 A Yeah.

17 Q -- then it's a no. If it's yes, then it looks
18 like:

19 "Review amount of work required."

10:16 20 And that is, is it a five day fast-track?

21 A Yes.

22 Q Or is it something else?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And then case review -- and I'll get into this in
10:16 25 a moment, that would be the substantial



1 investigative work?

2 A Yes.

3 Q And then a provisional view; it's my understanding
4 the Commission would create a provisional view of
10:16 5 either reference or no reference; correct?

6 A Yes. I mean I'm, certainly when I was at the
7 Commission the provisional view and the response
8 to provisional review related only to those cases
9 where we were provisionally deciding not to refer.

10:16 10 Q Okay.

11 A Now it may be that they have changed in the 12,
12 well, certainly that was still the case in March
13 last year when I was there as the case review
14 manager.

15 Q So --

16 A So if they've changed their position now to give a
17 provisional view of a reference, then I'm not
18 aware of it.

19 Q Yeah. There may be elaboration later on. So, in
10:17 20 any event, it's those cases where a reference
21 would not be made, then there would be a
22 provisional view and an opportunity of the
23 applicant to respond to that before a final
24 decision is made?

10:17 25 A Indeed. And there have been cases where we have



1 responded, we have considered the response to our
2 provisional view and changed our mind, and made a
3 reference.

4 Q There have been cases?

10:17 5 A Yes.

6 Q Go to the next page. It talks a bit about the
7 process, and I want to spend a bit of time on case
8 review, it says:

9 "Once a case is allocated to a
10:17 10 caseworker (usually called a Case Review
11 Manager or a Case Worker) the review
12 begins. At this stage the caseworker
13 will examine the issues raised in the
14 application, as well as any issues the
10:17 15 caseworker spots, to see if there might
16 be anything that could give grounds for
17 referring the case. In most cases we do
18 all the work on a case ourselves, but we
19 do have the power to appoint an
10:18 20 investigating officer (usually from the
21 police) to carry out investigations for
22 us."

23 And is it correct that this is where the legwork
24 would be done, by the case review manager?

10:18 25 A Yes.



1 Q And --

2 A Under the guidance of a member of the Commission.

3 Q So one Commission member would be assigned to
4 oversee the case review manager or the
10:18 5 caseworkers' investigation; --

6 A Yes.

7 Q -- is that correct? And that investigator or
8 caseworker would gather, that would be the person
9 who would gather the documents, review
10:18 10 transcripts, review the files. And you talked,
11 yesterday, about creation of -- and I can't
12 remember what you called it -- whether it was a
13 plan or an investigation plan --

14 A A case plan, yes.

10:18 15 Q -- or a case plan; can you tell us a bit about
16 that?

17 A Well the object of the case plan is to identify
18 all the issues which had been raised by the
19 applicant or by the Commission, and in its early
10:18 20 stages that, of course, would include issues which
21 had been raised by the applicant which the
22 Commission then judges not to be of significance
23 to the safety of the conviction and, therefore,
24 not meriting any further investigation or review,
10:19 25 and the case plan will identify those issues and



1 it will record the decisions which are taken by
2 the case review manager and the Commission member
3 as to what issues should be investigated and how
4 that investigation should be started, you know,
10:19 5 how that -- how the -- what the components of
6 those, of the investigation against each issue,
7 should be.

8 And the case plan remains a
9 living document in the sense that as the
10:19 10 investigation progresses, outcomes are recorded
11 and any new lines of investigation are then put
12 into the case plan, and so as the investigation
13 progresses the steps which have been taken, and
14 their outcomes, are recorded in the case plan.
10:20 15 And the -- there is a -- there is a monitoring
16 exercise which the Commission has introduced.

17 Because one of the matters
18 which the Commission is particularly concerned
19 about, and something we touched briefly on
10:20 20 yesterday, is how long these investigations take,
21 and some of them can take a considerable amount of
22 time. What the Commission is anxious to know is
23 are they taking a long time because they genuinely
24 are taking a long time, or are they taking a long
10:20 25 time because, for some reason or another, the



1 investigation has lost its impetus. Which may
2 happen, for example, if you ask for further
3 scientific examination to be done and you send the
4 stuff off to be examined and it doesn't come back,
10:20 5 and so you've got a chunk of time in which
6 actually nothing is happening on the investigation
7 at all, but the overall length of time that the
8 investigation takes is ticking on. So the
9 Commission had just started introducing a
10:21 10 procedure, as I left from being a member of the
11 Commission, whereby I think, I think after every
12 six -- if six months had gone by since work
13 started on one of these cases requiring an
14 extended review, and that case hadn't been put up
10:21 15 for decision, then a case review committee of
16 three Commission members would be assembled and
17 they would require to be brought up to date on
18 what had been happening in the investigation and
19 why it was that, six months after work had
10:21 20 started, no -- the case hadn't been put up for
21 decision. And that would be the opportunity for
22 Commission members not actually involved in the
23 investigation to take stock of the position and we
24 found, when we first started doing this, that the
10:22 25 prospect of a case review committee prompted a



1 considerable amount of activity on the case in the
2 weeks before that case review committee actually
3 met so that, by the time the case review committee
4 met, the case was actually put to them for
10:22 5 decision.

6 So that it's -- but that,
7 that, effectively, is what the case plan is about,
8 it's to provide the control mechanism for the case
9 review manager and the Commission member to
10:22 10 self-monitor, if I can put it that way, what they
11 are doing and why, and it also provides a record
12 of what's been going on, so that if it is a case
13 in which a case review committee is assembled,
14 they can see what's been done.

10:22 15 Q If we can go to the next page, provisional view,
16 and I think this will clarify what we've talked
17 about earlier. It says:

18 "When we reach a provisional view that
19 there are no grounds to refer a case,
10:23 20 the person who has made the application
21 to us will normally be given 20 working
22 days to respond to the provisional
23 view."

24 So it appears that --

10:23 25 A Then nothing has changed.



1 Q -- nothing has changed?

2 A Yeah.

3 Q If we can go to 339667. And this is simply a Case
4 Statistics, and I think this is up to August 31,
10:23 5 2006, that we obtained from your web site, and I
6 think it's consistent with the numbers you've
7 provided. Yours may have been --

8 A I'm happy to say that they are, they are the same
9 numbers, yeah.

10:23 10 Q Yes.

11 A It doesn't always happen in these situations.

12 Q Yes. So these would be, up until the end of
13 August, the 'Total applications', 'Open' would
14 be -- what would 'Open' mean; do you know?

10:23 15 A 'Open' means that they are awaiting review.

16 Q Okay. And --

17 A In other words, they are sitting on the shelf,
18 waiting to be allocated for review.

19 Q Okay. And then 420 'Actively being worked on'?

10:24 20 A Yes.

21 Q And 'Completed', 8,260 would be rejected, and that
22 would be -- or dismissed, but that would include
23 ineligible --

24 A Yes, which is about a third of that number, I mean
10:24 25 the actual number of dismissed as being ineligible



1 is 2,346.

2 Q And then 340 referrals to the Court of Appeal?

3 A Yes.

4 Q And it looks as though some are still in the que,
10:24 5 but of the 287 that were heard by the Court of
6 Appeal, 198 convictions were quashed and 89 were
7 upheld; --

8 A Yes.

9 Q -- is that correct?

10:24 10 A Yes.

11 Q That's probably a good spot, Mr. Commissioner.

12 A I might just say, for the sake of completeness on
13 that point, that --

14 Q Yes?

10:24 15 A -- within those figures there will be the very few
16 cases which have been referred, summary
17 convictions of the Magistrate's Court, which have
18 been referred to the Crown Court by the
19 Commission, and also referrals, equally few in
10:25 20 number, which have been made on the grounds of
21 sentence only.

22 Q Okay, both -- so primarily convictions. Of the
23 198 that are quashed, and we talked a bit about
24 this yesterday, --

10:25 25 A Uh-huh.



1 Q -- they would be quashed because the verdict is
2 not safe; --

3 A Yes.

4 Q -- correct? And as far as the factual innocence
10:25 5 -- or let me back up. I take it, once the
6 conviction is quashed, these people would be in
7 the position of being innocent; --

8 A Yes.

9 Q -- correct? Innocent because there is no longer a
10:25 10 conviction?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And as far as the factual innocence, or I think
13 your term was "innocence in the absolute sense",
14 am I to understand your evidence that that would
10:25 15 not be something that your Commission would look
16 into, nor would the Court of Appeal consider in
17 granting the remedy?

18 A That's right.

19 Q If we could break?

10:25 20 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Uh-huh.

21 (Adjourned at 10:25 a.m.)

22 (Reconvened at 10:50 a.m.)

23 BY MR. HODSON:

24 Q Just call up 339667 again. I think at the break,
10:50 25 Mr. Kyle, you were telling me that of these 198



1 cases that were quashed by the Court of Appeal
2 there were seven new trials ordered; is that
3 correct?

4 A That appears to be so. I've just been through the
10:50 5 list of the referred cases and their outcomes and
6 I've -- on a quick review of that list there
7 appears to be seven cases in which the Court of
8 Appeal has quashed the conviction and, also, gone
9 on to order a retrial.

10:50 10 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Only seven, did I
11 hear correctly?

12 A Seven, yes.

13 BY MR. HODSON:

14 Q And what, and I appreciate we're speculating a bit
10:51 15 about what the Court of Appeal is doing and why it
16 is doing it, but is there any theme as to where
17 the Court of Appeal will order a retrial as
18 opposed to just quashing the conviction? Is there
19 anything that you can provide to assist us in
10:51 20 understanding what cases the English Court of
21 Appeal would order a new trial?

22 A I think the main consideration in any case is
23 going to be whether the Court of Appeal considers
24 that it would be possible for any retrial to be
10:51 25 fair, and that, of course, would be 'fair' in the



1 widest sense, whether it would be possible, taking
2 account of both the prosecution position and the
3 defence position, for any further trial to be a
4 fair one. And the sort of considerations which
10:51 5 are going to arise there are the length of time
6 since the offence giving rise to the criminal
7 proceedings, the nature of the evidence, the
8 extent to which it depends on witness
9 recollection, because -- and, of that, I think
10:52 10 probably the time lapse is likely to be the most
11 significant, because lapse of time is likely to
12 have the most significant impact on whether an
13 ensuing trial can be fair or not.

14 Q And so, in the *David Milgaard* case, I think the
10:52 15 Supreme Court -- well not I think -- the Supreme
16 Court did advise the federal minister to set aside
17 the conviction which happened in 1992, --

18 A Uh-huh.

19 Q -- so 23 years after the crime. Just, again based
10:52 20 on your general understanding of the English Court
21 of Appeal cases, would it be correct to assume
22 that in England it would be highly unlikely that
23 the English Court of Appeal would order a new
24 trial 23 years later?

10:52 25 A Umm, yes, I think so, particularly given what I



1 understand to be the nature of the -- and
2 character of the evidence which was involved in
3 this particular case.

4 Q Can you tell us whether, again just generally,
10:53 5 whether those applicants who get a remedy from the
6 Commission, go to the Court of Appeal and have
7 their conviction quashed without a new trial,
8 whether those people are put in a state of -- or
9 perceive that they are in a state of legal limbo;
10:53 10 in other words that they have been convicted once,
11 it's been quashed, but they haven't been found not
12 guilty? Do you follow that? I'm just wondering
13 if there is -- and the reason I raise that, it's
14 one of the items this Commission has heard about a
10:53 15 bit, that where an accused is -- has been
16 convicted, and then later the conviction has been
17 set aside, that there might still be a cloud or
18 some uncertainty over that person's perceived
19 guilt or innocence?

10:53 20 A Uh-huh.

21 Q And I'm just wondering in England, where your
22 Commission sends cases to the Court of Appeal and
23 a remedy is granted, do the applicants express the
24 same concern that they have not been exonerated
10:54 25 sufficiently by having the conviction quashed?



1 A They may have that concern because it's easy, it's
2 quite easy to envisage why someone who's in that
3 situation might think that in their inner souls,
4 if I can put it that way, but it's very unusual
10:54 5 for an applicant to express such feelings
6 outwardly. Most, in my experience, are quite
7 prepared to accept that the quashing of the
8 conviction entitles them to tell anybody who's
9 interested that they are innocent.

10:54 10 Q And having a second trial and being acquitted, in
11 your view, would that give that person any better
12 status as far as being innocent?

13 A Well not as a matter of -- it wouldn't make any
14 different legal position. It would be -- I --
10:55 15 whether it would actually make any factual
16 difference to the individual applicant, I don't
17 know, but of course in very many of these cases
18 the applicant might be sufficiently realistic to
19 appreciate that if there was a retrial, he might
10:55 20 find himself reconvicted. And, you know, the
21 notion that applicants will say "well I'm not
22 satisfied with this outcome, I wish to be retried
23 so that I can clear my name through an acquittal
24 by a jury", that's easy to say, but you can't
10:55 25 actually guarantee that outcome.



1 Q But, again, would -- from a legal sense, though, I
2 think what you are telling us, that an acquittal
3 by the jury puts that person in no different legal
4 position than that person was in before the trial,
10:56 5 because the conviction had been quashed?

6 A Absolutely, yes.

7 Q Can you comment at all on -- well, let's just talk
8 for a moment about compensation, and I don't want
9 to get into it in too much detail because I
10:56 10 think -- it's my understanding that that's dealt
11 with quite separate and apart from the CCRC?

12 A Yes, it is.

13 Q And I have tried to locate some information on
14 that, I'm not going to put it to you, I may end up
10:56 15 filing it with the Commission and providing it to
16 the parties.

17 A Uh-huh.

18 Q But it's my understanding that there is
19 legislation in England -- and if I can find the --

10:56 20 A Section 133 of the *Criminal Justice Act 1988*.

21 Q Right. And it's actually Section 133, but it
22 says:

23 "When a person has been convicted of a
24 criminal offence and when subsequently
10:56 25 his conviction has been reversed or he



1 has been pardoned on the ground that a
2 new or newly discovered fact shows
3 beyond a reasonable doubt that there has
4 been a miscarriage of justice the
10:57 5 Secretary of State shall pay
6 compensation for the miscarriage of
7 justice to the person."

8 And then it's my understanding of the law that,
9 where the CCRC refers a case to the Court of
10:57 10 Appeal and the Court of Appeal quashes a
11 conviction, that that person then would be
12 entitled to apply to the Secretary of State for
13 compensation pursuant to that statute; is that
14 correct?

10:57 15 A Umm, well, he'd certainly be in a position to
16 apply because he has now -- the convicted person
17 has now had his conviction quashed.

18 But the legis -- the
19 particular section in the legislation, whilst it's
10:57 20 mandatory in its terms as to the entitlement to
21 compensation so the only issue is going to be the
22 amount of compensation, the language of the
23 section is quite tightly drawn and it depends on
24 the applicant being able to show to the Home
10:58 25 Secretary, who is responsible for the payment of



1 compensation, that, as a result of some new or
2 newly-discovered fact, it can be said that, beyond
3 a reasonable doubt, there has been a miscarriage
4 of justice. And as I understand the way in which
10:58 5 the Home Secretary approaches his interpretation
6 of that section, 'miscarriage of justice' is given
7 the narrow sort of meaning that we were talking
8 about yesterday, and what the Home Secretary would
9 be looking for is to be satisfied beyond
10:58 10 reasonable doubt that the person who is making the
11 claim for the compensation is factually innocent.

12 Q Okay. And so that would be something separate and
13 apart from what the CCRC deals with?

14 A Absolutely. And I hope that if, sort of, one
10:59 15 thing stands out from the evidence that I have
16 been giving to this Commission, I think the two
17 questions are entirely separate. Whether or not
18 somebody has been wrongfully convicted, I think,
19 is a matter of quite wide interpretation, as I was
10:59 20 endeavouring to explain yesterday. Whether
21 someone who has been wrongfully convicted is
22 entitled to compensation is an entirely separate
23 question, and that's a matter for which the
24 criteria can be set as a wholly distinct exercise
10:59 25 and, as it happens, the legislation in the



1 Criminal Justice Act 1988, I think, is being
2 treated by the Home Secretary as effectively
3 saying "compensation will be paid if I'm satisfied
4 beyond reasonable doubt that this applicant is
10:59 5 factually innocent, and not otherwise".

6 Until, I think, the spring of
7 last year, the Home Office also applied a system
8 of making ex gratia payments of compensation, in
9 other words outside the statutory scheme, but I
11:00 10 understand, from inquiries which I've made, that
11 the system of -- or the willingness of the -- or,
12 yeah, the system's making ex gratia payments has
13 actually been stopped.

14 And I think the -- some
11:00 15 support for what I am suggesting about the narrow
16 interpretation to be given to 'miscarriage of
17 justice' in Section 133 is supported by a decision
18 of the House of Lords in a case called *Mullen*, who
19 applied for compensation after his conviction was
11:00 20 quashed by the Court of Appeal, where, on any
21 view, the evidence against Mr. Mullen for being
22 responsible for terrorist offences was
23 overwhelming, but he had managed to remove himself
24 from the jurisdiction of the English courts and
11:01 25 was, in fact, in Zimbabwe. He was returned to the



1 United Kingdom and put on trial in circumstances
2 which the courts categorized as being absolutely
3 outrageous, there was collusion between the
4 security services in both countries to get him
11:01 5 back to England without going through the proper
6 extradition process, the belief being that if the
7 United Kingdom applied for Mr. Mullen's
8 extradition from Zimbabwe the political defence
9 argument would be raised and a lot of time would
11:01 10 pass while that was sorted out. So he was
11 effectively --

12 Q Kidnapped?

13 A -- kidnapped and brought back to England from
14 Zimbabwe, and that was characterized as quite
11:01 15 outrageous conduct by the Court of Appeal, which
16 quashed his conviction on the basis that the
17 prosecution, from the outset, had been an abuse of
18 process.

19 He applied for compensation
11:02 20 under the statutory provision and was refused by
21 the Home Office on the basis that, even though the
22 prosecution itself had been an abuse, there was
23 certainly no fact or newly-discovered fact which
24 suggested that he had been the victim of a
11:02 25 miscarriage of justice, implicit in that is



1 miscarriage of justice means being factually
2 innocent, and therefore we're not going to pay
3 compensation, and that decision of the Home Office
4 was upheld by the House of Lords.

11:02 5 Q And do I take it from your evidence, sir, that you
6 have a fairly strong view that the issue of
7 factual innocence, and looking at whether the
8 remedy granted by CCRC and ultimately by the Court
9 of Appeal in tying that to a compensation claim,
11:02 10 that those matters should be kept very separate?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And maybe asked another way, if, in the CCRC work,
13 that one of the elements imported into what you
14 were doing was either looking at factual innocence
11:03 15 or trying to devise a remedy that would put the
16 applicant in a better position to get compensation
17 once the process is done, that you would view that
18 as being counterproductive; is that fair?

19 A Well, I would, because I think the work, the
11:03 20 actual work of the Commission, would be made
21 immeasurably more difficult if the objective -- if
22 the Commission's objective and the test which had
23 to be applied as to whether a case should go back
24 to the Court of Appeal in any sense rested on
11:03 25 establishing factual innocence.



1 Q Let me put it to you this way. Under your current
2 system it's my understanding that an individual
3 who gets a remedy, gets to the Court of Appeal and
4 has the conviction quashed, is in a position of
11:04 5 being a legally innocent person?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And in a position, a better position to seek
8 compensation from the Home Secretary, than he was
9 before the process; correct?

11:04 10 A That's true, yes.

11 Q And that whether he is entitled to compensation is
12 another matter dealt with by another minister --
13 another agency, --

14 A Yes.

11:04 15 Q -- correct, that may well deal with factual
16 innocence?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And if we go back, if in your system that what was
19 necessary to deal with, in addition to getting the
11:04 20 conviction set aside, to also deal with factual
21 innocence and/or entitlement to compensation, if
22 that was sort of put in as part of it, is it fair
23 to say that your bar would be much higher?

24 A I think inevitably, yes.

11:04 25 Q And so that in other words, if the granting of a



1 remedy meant automatic compensation and factual
2 innocence, are you -- I think you are telling us
3 that there would be quite a different set of
4 standards applied to your review?

11:05 5 A I think that's right, yes.

6 Q And a much higher bar?

7 A But I -- and also, the point I was making, I think
8 that to align the two concepts that way would be
9 wrong in principle.

11:05 10 Q And why is that?

11 A Simply because I think the question of whether --
12 there is much -- there is much more to being --
13 having a record of a conviction against you, in
14 terms of its impact on your life generally, than
11:05 15 the question whether you should -- whether you get
16 any monetary compensation for having been
17 prosecuted in the first place. And if you haven't
18 been rightly convicted in the wider sense, as I
19 was describing it yesterday, then you should not
11:05 20 have that conviction recorded against you because
21 of the impact it is likely to have on virtually
22 the whole aspect of -- virtually every aspect of
23 your life.

24 Q And can you comment on whether those people who go
11:06 25 through the CCRC and get a remedy, is it correct



1 that the -- or comment on this. Is compensation
2 on factual innocence something that they raise
3 with you, or is it generally understood that
4 that's to be dealt with after the CCRC and the
11:06 5 Court of Appeal deals with the conviction?

6 A I'm -- I think it very rare, indeed, for
7 applicants to be concerned, at the stage they
8 apply to the Commission about compensation, and if
9 they are they don't tend to express it.

11:06 10 Q Okay. If we can call up 339389. And this is an
11 article, Mr. Kyle, that you wrote for the *Drake*
12 *Law Review* in 2004; is that correct?

13 A Yes.

14 Q I just want to go through parts of it. We've
11:06 15 covered much of what is in here, but if we can go
16 to page 391, and actually just go to the top. And
17 again, talking about wrongful convictions, you
18 say:

19 "Why do these things happen?

11:07 20 No doubt, the higher the profile of the
21 case, the greater the risk of
22 miscarriage of justice, fuelled by
23 public concern and resulting pressure on
24 investigators to 'get those
11:07 25 responsible.' There is the potential



1 for tunnel vision once a suspect is in
2 the frame, accompanied, at worst, by
3 determination to produce the evidence by
4 whatever means or, less culpably, by
11:07 5 ignoring the possibility that the wrong
6 suspects have been arrested. The quest
7 of any criminal jurisdiction, faced with
8 incidents of miscarriages of justice, is
9 to discover whether there is a systemic
11:07 10 problem to be addressed or whether some
11 idiosyncratic reason can be attributed
12 to the individual case. It is
13 significant that each of the cases
14 mentioned above was investigated and
11:07 15 prosecuted at a time when there was no
16 legislation defining and regulating the
17 exercise of police powers, particularly
18 relating to the detention and
19 questioning of suspects, and when there
11:08 20 was no adequate definition of the
21 prosecution's obligations to disclose
22 unused material that might assist the
23 defence."

24 And the cases that are referred to earlier in the
11:08 25 article are the, I think, the blockbuster cases,



1 --

2 A Yes.

3 Q -- the terrorist cases?

4 A Yeah.

11:08 5 Q Just comment on a couple of things. First, the
6 comment here about whether some idiosyncratic
7 reason can be attributed to the individual case,
8 or a systemic problem, and maybe just elaborate on
9 that comment please?

11:08 10 A Well what I had in mind when I was making that
11 particular observation in this article by
12 reference back to the blockbuster cases, which had
13 already been described, when you look at the
14 reasons why those cases turned out to be appalling
11:08 15 miscarriages of justice, they were symptomatic of
16 significant systemic problems which existed in the
17 criminal justice system at the time, particularly
18 in relation to the way in which the police went
19 about investigating cases and dealt with the
11:09 20 questioning of suspects, because in all the cases
21 there was some form of fabrication of police
22 evidence around interview notes and confessions
23 which were allegedly made; and, also, systemic
24 problems arising out of the fact that the defence
11:09 25 were deprived of the opportunity to explore



1 possibly exculpatory aspects of the case because
2 relevant information simply wasn't disclosed,
3 particularly in the context of the scientific
4 evidence which was relied on. So that, that was
11:09 5 the context in which I made that particular
6 comment.

7 Because there are clearly
8 cases where things go wrong, where it is simply a
9 matter of something having going wrong, gone wrong
11:10 10 in that particular case, and it can't be
11 attributed at all to be a systemic failure of some
12 aspect of the criminal justice system, and I think
13 the point I endeavour to make in this particular
14 article is that the intervening introduction,
11:10 15 particularly of the *Police and Criminal Evidence*
16 *Act* of 1984, and various other substantial
17 developments such as the creation of the Crown
18 Prosecution Service, have been quite fundamental
19 in overcoming the sort of systemic deficiencies
11:10 20 which gave rise to those blockbuster cases.

21 Q So do I take it from that that in light of those
22 legislative changes that arose in the blockbuster
23 cases, some of the systemic issues that were
24 evident in those cases -- maybe eliminated is too
11:11 25 strong a word, but had been reduced?



1 A Substantially reduced, yes, and I think one of
2 the -- if I don't make the point clearly in the
3 article, then I certainly make it now, that one of
4 the longer-term benefits, if I can put it that
11:11 5 way, of the existence of the Criminal Cases Review
6 Commission which gets to look at, as we've seen,
7 some eight or 900 cases a year in which something
8 has been set to go wrong, is that the Commission
9 itself is a body which is in a position to monitor
11:11 10 what is going on with the investigation and
11 prosecution of offences and ought to be able to
12 contribute as time goes on to the early
13 identification of any further systemic problems
14 which may be becoming apparent.

11:11 15 Q And so do I take it from that that in the course
16 of your work, if themes develop as to potential
17 problems, that obviously those matters go to the
18 Court of Appeal and become public, that that
19 operates as a bit of a check and balance for
11:12 20 authorities who may be investigating and
21 prosecuting crimes?

22 A Well, that's certainly true, I mean, that will
23 happen in individual references which we make, but
24 I see no reason why the Commission shouldn't
11:12 25 undertake a responsibility of reporting in a more



1 generic sense either through its annual report or
2 directly with the relevant body such as the
3 director of public prosecutions or the Home Office
4 or the Association of Chief Police Officers, there
11:12 5 are bodies such as those who are responsible for
6 their individual aspects of the criminal justice
7 system, and if the Commission were to detect what
8 appeared to be a developing systemic problem in
9 the way either the police or the prosecuting
11:13 10 authorities went about, were going about their
11 work, then they should flag them off.

12 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Do they do so,
13 sir?

14 A It has rather taken the view up until now that
11:13 15 because the cases which have been reviewed by the
16 Commission have been, have extended over half a
17 century, the initial years that the Commission has
18 been dealing with cases which have gone back into
19 the 1950s, in fact the earliest case, we made a
11:13 20 reference of a case which had been prosecuted in
21 1927, we thought our test had been met and the
22 Court of Appeal disagreed and we didn't get a lot
23 of praise from the Court of Appeal for referring a
24 1927 conviction, but certainly some of the real
11:13 25 old dog s of the miscarriage of justice system, if



1 I can put it that way, like *Derek Bentley*, *James*
2 *Hanratty*, *Ruth Ellis*, all of which were in the
3 1950s and '60s, they have occupied a considerable
4 amount of the Commission's investigative review
11:14 5 and decision-making activity and they have had the
6 effect of playing a significant part, I think, in
7 helping to restore confidence in the operation of
8 the criminal justice system, because however much
9 the Court of Appeal may dislike dealing with old
11:14 10 cases, and they are at pains to point out on
11 occasions we do think the Commission would be
12 better spending its time on more recent cases, but
13 where you have these cases which are a blot on the
14 landscape and have been for years, the Commission
11:14 15 has taken the view that they should be dealt with,
16 but the effect of that has been that we don't
17 really, or haven't had, it may be that now the
18 situation is beginning to become more
19 contemporaneous, if I can put it that way, all
11:14 20 these old cases now seem to have been cleared out
21 of the system by and large, so the cases which the
22 Commission is now dealing with are going to be,
23 across the board, more contemporaneous which
24 should allow a better analysis of what is actually
11:15 25 happening now.



1 I mean, for example, I
2 mentioned, there is reference in this article I
3 think, and certainly in the Royal Commission
4 report, to the West Midlands serious crime squad
11:15 5 which was operating in the late 1970s, early 1980s
6 and there was some quite dreadful investigative
7 misconduct going on in those, in cases handled by
8 that particular squad which was set up to deal
9 with a spate of armed robberies which was the,
11:15 10 sort of the vogue crime in the West Midlands at
11 that time, serious mishandling of supergrasses.
12 Do you understand what I mean by supergrass? It's
13 an informant who is a heavy-weight criminal
14 involved in very many offences which informs on
11:16 15 hundreds of people and gets a very light sentence,
16 and there was serious mishandling of two
17 supergrass informants by that squad.

18 BY MR. HODSON:

19 Q Sorry, is that supergrass?

11:16 20 A Supergrass. Yes, if you grass on somebody, then
21 you inform on them, and a supergrass is someone
22 who does it to a very extensive level.

23 Q Okay.

24 A Additionally, the methods which were used for
11:16 25 interrogating suspects throughout, in the



1 disturbing information, that suspects would have
2 plastic bags put over their heads and virtually
3 suffocated before making their confessions.

4 Now, a great deal of the
11:16 5 Commission's time has been spent on cases arising
6 out of the investigations of the West Midlands
7 serious crime squad, but in terms of systemic
8 problem, the intervention of the *Police and*
9 *Criminal Evidence Act 1984* means that the
11:17 10 opportunity for wholesale misconduct of that
11 nature by a police squad is virtually unthinkable
12 now.

13 Q Are you telling us, Mr. Kyle, and again just your
14 views, that by the Commission detecting and
11:17 15 remedying wrongful conviction, that the Commission
16 may also be assisting in the prevention of
17 wrongful convictions?

18 A Well, I would like to think that over the longer
19 term that is one of the benefits of an
11:17 20 organization like the Commission because it will,
21 albeit on a relatively small form, because, after
22 all, 800 cases a year out of the total number
23 prosecuted is a relatively small number, but it
24 will have some finger on the pulse of what is
11:18 25 going on in terms of investigating and prosecuting



1 crime.

2 Q Are you able to comment on whether or not the
3 existence of the Commission may have an effect on
4 either investigators, prosecutors or others
11:18 5 involved in the criminal justice system; in other
6 words, knowing that if something goes wrong,
7 someone is there to check it?

8 A Oh, I think that -- I think it will -- I think it
9 does and has been seen to have that effect in
11:18 10 terms of -- there are cultural issues involved
11 here. If an investigator thinks he might be able
12 to get away with something by some form of
13 improper practice, then knowing that the
14 Commission is there is likely to be a factor which
11:18 15 might deter him from doing so, and we have had
16 cases where, and I'll call it idiosyncratic
17 misconduct has occurred, and if we discover it and
18 there is publicity about it, then it's likely to
19 have a deterrent effect, so I think there is the
11:19 20 positive effect of knowing that there is a body
21 which is likely to be interested in the process by
22 which people are prosecuted and convicted and also
23 the sort of individual deterrent on the way in
24 which investigations are carried out, and I'll
11:19 25 give you an example where we have, where that sort



1 of idiosyncratic discovery has been made, was a
2 case which depended on identification evidence,
3 always recognized as a fertile source of possible
4 miscarriages of justice, and the Defendant
11:19 5 concerned had said, well, he had been caught on a
6 camera -- it was an arson case and there was a
7 camera and the arsonist, whoever he was, was
8 caught on camera, and it was the usual thing, not
9 very clear, you couldn't see features clearly, and
11:20 10 he said that's not me because the figure in that
11 video is wearing a white T-shirt and I was wearing
12 a black T-shirt that night and I can prove that
13 because I was at a nightclub and there was
14 security cameras at a nightclub and that will show
11:20 15 me wearing a black T-shirt, so that was his
16 defence at trial, and the position which the
17 police adopted in that case was, well, there may
18 well have been a security camera at the nightclub,
19 but -- and it was somewhat unclear as to whether
11:20 20 the evidence was the camera wasn't working that
21 night or, if it was, the film, the tape has been
22 mislaid, which is fine as far as it went.

23 Well, he applied to us after
24 conviction and our case review manager went to the
11:21 25 police station concerned and simply went through



1 all the material in the police station relevant to
2 that investigation and found the tape from the
3 security camera and, you know, the way in which
4 the evidence had come out suggested that that was
11:21 5 a deliberate concealment.

6 Now, a cynic would say all the
7 Commission, all the existence of the Commission
8 will do is make police officers a bit more careful
9 if they are wanting to conceal evidence, but
11:21 10 equally, you know, the fact that there is a body
11 which is going to be thorough and is going to look
12 very carefully at these things, and there have
13 been cases maybe of more substance, there was a
14 case involving a terrorist offence in Northern
11:21 15 Ireland where the suggestion had been made that
16 the officers had shown, in interview, the
17 Defendant a list of names which they wanted this
18 particular Defendant to tell them about as having
19 been involved in terrorist offences, the deal
11:22 20 being, well, if you tell us about all these
21 people, we'll go easy on you or we won't prosecute
22 you, and this was completely denied by the police.
23 Well, when our case review manager went to
24 Northern Ireland and reviewed all the police
11:22 25 material, there was this list of names which had



1 always been denied as being in existence, so, you
2 know, the thoroughness of the investigation I
3 think is a factor.

4 Q Are --

11:22 5 A And one of the, if I can just sort of finish again
6 on a slightly lighthearted note, is that the
7 Defendant who was wrongly identified, so he said,
8 in relation to the security video which was found,
9 the Court of Appeal did order a retrial in that
11:22 10 case and when the retrial came up he pleaded
11 guilty.

12 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Would you give me
13 the citation, the name of that act of 1984 again,
14 sir?

11:23 15 A The *Police and Criminal Evidence Act*.

16 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: *The Police and --*

17 A -- *Criminal Evidence Act*.

18 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Is that on our
19 database, Mr. Hodson?

11:23 20 MR. HODSON: Yes, it is. I believe it's in
21 the documents that were put up for Mr. Kyle. If
22 they are not, we certainly have it and --

23 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: If anybody has the
24 doc. ID, I would like to write it down.

11:23 25 MR. HODSON: I'm not sure if I have it.



1 I'll maybe get it at the break.

2 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right.

3 MR. ELSON: I've got it.

4 MR. HODSON: Have you got it?

11:23 5 MR. ELSON: 339900.

6 MR. HODSON: 339900.

7 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks very much.

8 BY MR. HODSON:

9 Q On this issue of idiosyncratic reasons, are there
11:23 10 cases, Mr. Kyle, where references are made to the
11 Court of Appeal and convictions are quashed where
12 you find that there has been no deliberate
13 wrongdoing by any of the participants in the
14 original investigation and trial?

11:23 15 A I think that is frequently the case.

16 Q In the sense that -- would that be a non-systemic
17 or would that -- how would you describe that as
18 being -- of those -- is that what you meant by
19 idiosyncratic reason, or did I misread that?

11:24 20 A I -- well, I think there are two ways in which you
21 could look at idiosyncratic reasons. If -- I
22 mean, generally speaking, in the absence of any
23 deliberate misconduct or I guess any deliberate
24 failure by someone to do what they should do,
11:24 25 then -- and assuming that there are no, that there



1 are no systemic deficiencies such as, well, I did
2 this because, you know, I'm a police officer,
3 there is no, there is nothing which tells me what
4 I should or should not do when I'm interviewing a
11:24 5 suspect, therefore, what I did I thought was all
6 right. In the absence of any sort of systemic
7 deficiency of that sort, the sort of idiosyncratic
8 reason why a case may result in a wrongful
9 conviction is because, it's either going to be
11:25 10 because there is a one-of act of failure to act
11 properly or it is going to result from the fact
12 that someone, someone somewhere in the system,
13 whether it's the police, the prosecutor, the
14 Defendant or the trial judge has done -- has not
11:25 15 done, to the full extent, that which should have
16 been done, and that need not be deliberate, it may
17 just be a mistake.

18 Q And so again, so I understand it, the majority of
19 the cases where a remedy is granted are cases
11:25 20 where there has been no misconduct or deliberate
21 wrongdoing by anybody involved, i.e., police,
22 witnesses, Crown prosecutor; is that correct?

23 A That's correct, yes.

24 Q And that in cases where -- are there some cases
11:26 25 where presumably mistakes would be made, good



1 intention mistakes that end up resulting in a
2 miscarriage of justice?

3 A Yes.

4 Q And are there some cases where just due to the
11:26 5 nature of the case it may have been that the
6 system worked how it was supposed to, but just
7 arrived at the wrong result?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And are those -- are there many of those?

11:26 10 A Of which, the latter?

11 Q The latter one where at the end of the day it is a
12 case where the system worked how it was supposed
13 to, but it just arrived at the wrong result based
14 on information that was found out later?

11:26 15 A Yes.

16 Q If we can go to 339392, a couple of questions
17 here, and you talk about, you say:

18 "Of equal importance is the question of
19 why it took so long for the miscarriages
11:26 20 of justice represented by these cases to
21 be remedied."

22 And I think Judith Ward was the lady you told us
23 about yesterday?

24 A Uh-huh.

11:27 25 Q Being in jail for quite some time. And just your



1 comment on that. I think you told us yesterday
2 that -- let's take a look at the David Milgaard
3 case. It was 20 -- almost 20 years after the
4 offence?

11:27 5 A Uh-huh.

6 Q I think 19 or 18 years after the conviction before
7 the conviction was first reviewed by authorities.
8 Can you comment on the difficulty, based on your
9 experience with the Commission, in looking at a
11:27 10 matter 19 years, 20 years after the event compared
11 to five years or 10 years?

12 A Or ideally even less than that.

13 Q Or, sorry, at an earlier date.

14 A Well, yes. I think there is quite a significant
11:27 15 point here because the longer which has elapsed
16 between offence and conviction and subsequent
17 review which exposes a miscarriage of justice --
18 well, actually that's rather putting the cart
19 before the horse. The ability to expose a
11:28 20 wrongful conviction and a miscarriage of justice
21 is, the ability to do that is adversely affected
22 by the length of time which elapses because
23 memories dim, relevant evidence may disappear and
24 generally the ability to find out what went on and
11:28 25 what can still be done to identify the new



1 evidence is made all the more difficult the longer
2 the time which elapses. For example, I mean, just
3 take routine destruction of documentation, the
4 police and indeed all other public bodies in the
11:28 5 United Kingdom have destruction of document
6 policies which means that if a case at the moment
7 is more than five years old, it's quite likely
8 that the Crown court file will have been
9 destroyed, if the Defendant wasn't sentenced to a
11:29 10 term of imprisonment of longer than five years the
11 Crown prosecution file would have been destroyed,
12 and as may the police file, so simply by operation
13 of routine destruction policies, length of time
14 can make a difference, and that's in addition to
11:29 15 the problem which arises over expecting witnesses
16 to recollect what's going on, but the point -- the
17 point I was emphasizing at this point in the
18 article is that given that in most, I think in all
19 of the cases which gave rise to the establishment
11:29 20 of the Commission, the basis on which the
21 convictions were quashed was clear evidence of
22 misconduct in relation to the interviewing of
23 suspects and the recording of confessions and
24 clear and significant deficiencies in the process
11:30 25 of scientific examination of relevant exhibits and



1 disclosure affecting them, so what was discovered
2 and presented to the Court of Appeal in the 1990s
3 was, if anyone had chosen to look at it, equally
4 discoverable and presentable to the Court of
11:30 5 Appeal at a very, very much earlier stage, and the
6 question arises why is it in such cases, when
7 there's no shortage of people saying that these
8 are miscarriages of justice, we do have people
9 here who have been wrongfully convicted, why is it
11:30 10 that it takes from the mid 1970s through to 1991
11 before the remedy of the exposure is a miscarriage
12 of justice and quashing the convictions actually
13 happens, to which the obvious answer is that
14 during that period, although there was a lot of
11:30 15 noise and a lot of investigative journalism, there
16 was in place within the United Kingdom's criminal
17 justice system no mechanism to pick up the
18 messages which were being flashed out and sounded
19 loud and clear and get stuck in to doing something
11:31 20 about them.

21 Q If we can -- the bottom of this paragraph you say:
22 "However, because it is idle to pretend
23 that things will not go wrong in even
24 the best regulated criminal justice
11:31 25 system, there is a question of critical



1 cultural importance. Will whatever
2 mechanism that is adopted to address the
3 cries of those who claim to have been
4 wrongly convicted have at its heart the
11:31 5 will to own up to mistakes and learn
6 lessons, or will it strive to preserve
7 the status quo?"

8 And I'm wondering if you can just elaborate on
9 that comment?

11:31 10 A Well, I think that is a comment which is very much
11 related to what I have just said, that is the
12 question. The point I seek to make is that if a
13 country or a jurisdiction has a criminal justice
14 system in which it is confident, then it will
11:32 15 recognize that however good the system is, things
16 are going to go wrong from time to time, that is
17 the way of the world, and it may be going wrong
18 because there is some fundamental defect of a
19 systemic nature, in which case that can be
11:32 20 addressed, or it may be that an individual case
21 has gone wrong for reasons which are peculiar to
22 that particular case, but either way, my view is
23 that a mature criminal justice system recognizes
24 that and doesn't feel threatened by looking at
11:32 25 those cases, and if they do turn out to have



1 resulted in a wrongful conviction, ensuring that
2 some early steps are taken to identify that and
3 put it right, and I pose the question in this way
4 because without expressing a particular view one
11:33 5 way or another, if you have cases where there has
6 been outright police misconduct and systemic
7 failure to disclose in a number of cases which are
8 being portrayed publicly as being miscarriages of
9 justice and they take 20 odd years to put right,
11:33 10 one comment which might be made is that that is
11 the consequence of a criminal justice system which
12 is frightened at looking into possible mistakes
13 and doing something about it, whereas if you have
14 a system which, when these types of cases arise,
11:33 15 immediately picks them up and investigates them
16 thoroughly and makes an informed, independent,
17 objective decision after a thorough investigation
18 as rapidly as possible, then that can draw the
19 comment this is a mature criminal justice system
11:34 20 which is not threatened by the fact that things
21 will occasionally go wrong.

22 Q And are you able to comment, again from your
23 experience on the CCRC, as to whether you've
24 noticed a cultural change in the criminal justice
11:34 25 system in England from 1997 to date?



1 A Well, I think I can only answer that by reference
2 to the way in which the reputation of the
3 Commission appears to have developed over that
4 period and the fact that it now appears to have a
11:34 5 position within the criminal justice system where
6 its value and the contribution it can make to
7 maintaining confidence in the criminal justice
8 system is recognized, particularly in those
9 areas -- I have in mind the media in particular
11:34 10 and members of parliament, and the parliamentary
11 oversight committee is like the home affairs
12 committee, do appear to rate quite positively what
13 the Commission is doing.

14 I make the point later in the
11:35 15 article that one of the concerns which might be
16 expressed is, well, if you have so many
17 applications and you only refer 4 percent of them
18 to the Court of Appeal, doesn't that mean that you
19 are failing in your job, which is an easy comment
11:35 20 to make because it's based simply on the figures,
21 and our response to that is, well, we're always
22 looking to make sure that cases which ought to go
23 through the gate do so, but do bear in mind that
24 we don't pick and choose which cases we
11:35 25 investigate, they all get a thorough investigation



1 to the extent which appears to be necessary having
2 regard to the case and the issues which are
3 raised, and although it will always be the case
4 that there may be wrongful convictions which
11:35 5 simply cannot, by any amount of investigation, be
6 exposed as such. The fact that any applicant says
7 that they've been wrongfully convicted is picked
8 up by the Commission, thoroughly investigated and
9 a decision made at the end of that investigation,
11:36 10 it is equally valid to suggest that a thorough
11 investigation of complaints of wrongful conviction
12 which turn out to be unfounded is as valuable to
13 contributing to maintain confidence in the
14 criminal justice system as exposing those where
11:36 15 the convictions can be shown to be wrong.

16 Q Okay. You made the comment that there are some
17 cases where, despite the investigative efforts,
18 wrongful convictions cannot be disclosed; is
19 that -- did I hear that right?

11:36 20 A Cannot be exposed.

21 Q Cannot be exposed. And do I take it from that
22 that there are some cases where you simply cannot,
23 for whatever variety of reasons, expose a wrongful
24 conviction where there may well be one?

11:37 25 A I think inevitably that may be the case, yes,



1 because it's difficult to know -- that's right,
2 because all you can say is our investigation
3 hasn't revealed any basis for saying that the
4 Court of Appeal is likely to find this to be a
11:37 5 wrongful conviction.

6 That slip of the tongue you
7 made there is itself quite -- it reminds me of a
8 case where you are saying we can't disclose
9 wrongful convictions. We have had a case where
11:37 10 the reason why a conviction was unsafe involved
11 matters of such sensitivity that we were unable to
12 tell the applicant what our reasons for referring
13 his case to the Court of Appeal were, although we
14 did give reasons to the Court of Appeal in a
11:37 15 confidential annex which was hand delivered, and
16 the Court of Appeal duly delivered a judgment
17 quashing the conviction saying we know what the
18 reasons are, but they are too sensitive, so to
19 this day the Defendant doesn't know why he's been
11:37 20 acquitted, simply that he has.

21 **Q** And I take it we aren't going to know either?

22 **A** You certainly aren't.

23 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Excuse me, Mr.
24 Kyle, it strikes me that this attitudinal change
11:38 25 as represented by the establishment of the



1 Commission provides an alternative to some
2 intractable problems in law reform touching the
3 jury system. For example, everybody involved in
4 the system knows that juries are sometimes
11:38 5 influenced when they shouldn't be and return
6 verdicts which they shouldn't do.

7 A Uh-huh.

8 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But it's
9 practically impossible to do anything about the
11:38 10 jury system, it's such an entrenched perceived --
11 at least it's such an entrenched right of every
12 citizen.

13 A Uh-huh.

14 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So if one simply
11:38 15 accepts that they are going to make mistakes once
16 in a while but we have a means of addressing
17 those mistakes later on, that's a valuable thing;
18 is it not?

19 A I think so, yes.

11:38 20 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes. And a jury
21 system is surely not the only problem which
22 arises from time to time, statutory law of course
23 creates problems as well?

24 A Uh-huh.

11:38 25 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: At the same time



1 it seeks to redress or to meet other problems.

2 A Uh-huh.

3 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: We see that in our
4 evidence acts and so forth.

11:39 5 A Yes.

6 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And so reforming
7 those is a matter of great difficulty, but
8 perhaps it's not all that necessary if you have
9 this mechanism.

11:39 10 A Well, certainly I think having this mechanism
11 helps, and, sir, you touch on an interesting point
12 there which I might just pick up on, that the
13 Royal Commission on Criminal Justice, amongst
14 other things, touched on the question of whether
11:39 15 the law should be changed to allow adverse
16 inferences to be drawn from a Defendant's failure
17 to answer questions when he's interviewed or
18 failing to give evidence at trial and there was a
19 firm recommendation of the Royal Commission that
11:39 20 there should be no such change.

21 That recommendation was
22 ignored by the government which legislated for the
23 drawing of adverse inferences from silence in the
24 *Criminal Justice and Public Order Act* of 1994 and
11:40 25 that particular statutory change which was highly



1 controversial has resulted in very many
2 applications to the Commission, very many
3 applications to the European Court of Human Rights
4 to which our domestic courts are now subject
11:40 5 because of the *Human Rights Act* of 1998,
6 considerable difficulty in the Court of Appeal in
7 sorting out exactly what, how that law should be
8 applied, and, in particular, how judges should be
9 required to charge the juries on those issues, so
11:40 10 that's quite an interesting example of something
11 which the Royal Commission said keep your hands
12 off.

13 The government chose a
14 different course and it has actually resulted in a
11:41 15 deal of work for the Commission which has, or
16 certainly had, unless the position has changed
17 which of course it may well do as courts
18 interpret, but certainly when I left the
19 Commission we thought we had reached the position
11:41 20 where we had managed to get the Court of Appeal to
21 bring their two-stranded dividing authority
22 together and have a reasonably clear idea as to
23 what was going to be, what was necessary, so I
24 think that probably is a concrete example, the
11:41 25 point that you were making, that the Commission --



1 this was not about fresh evidence or anything like
2 this, it was about fairness of trials which is
3 equally important and, in my view, having a fair
4 trial is just as significant in terms of rightful
11:41 5 conviction as anything else and the Commission was
6 able to play a significant part in the
7 development, understanding and proper
8 interpretation of that particular piece of
9 controversial legislation.

11:41 10 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.

11 BY MR. HODSON:

12 Q Just on the issue of changes in the law, Mr. Kyle,
13 can you comment on what happens when the law
14 changes, for example on how witnesses are
11:42 15 interviewed from the time of investigation and
16 conviction to when the CCRC looks at it, whether
17 there is a change in either the statutory or the
18 common law, in other words that had the law that
19 was in effect when you looked at the case been in
11:42 20 effect at the time of investigation and trial,
21 there might well have been a different result?

22 A Uh-huh. The general position is that a change to
23 the law which is affected by statute cannot be
24 backdated unless the statute expressly applies for
11:42 25 that to happen, which, in the sort of changes



1 which we're particularly considering, doesn't tend
2 to happen. So a statutory change means that an
3 applicant can't benefit from the fact that some --
4 that the law has changed as a result of statute.

11:42 5 If, however, there is a
6 restatement of common law then, on the legal
7 fiction that at any given time the common law as
8 it is now stated is as it has always been, means
9 that an applicant can benefit from stated changes
11:43 10 in the common law. And that, that was reinforced
11 by the Court of Appeal's judgement in the *Derek*
12 *Bentley* case, which was the young man hanged for
13 the murder of the police officer in 1953. When
14 the Court of Appeal quashed his conviction in 1988
11:43 15 -- sorry -- 1998, following a reference by the
16 Commission, the Lord Chief Justice, at the start
17 of the judgement, made quite clear that whilst
18 statutory change could not benefit an applicant,
19 an appellant retrospectively, changes to the
11:43 20 common law could. And, in particular, the Court
21 said that, in those circumstances, whether or not
22 Derek Bentley had had a fair trial had to be
23 judged by today's standards, and not by the
24 standards which were applicable in 1953.

11:44 25 It doesn't take a towering



1 intellect to realize that there are considerable
2 risks involved in that, because it's quite likely
3 that you could take any case prosecuted in the
4 1950s and find something wrong with it by today's
11:44 5 standards, but the Lord Chief Justice didn't think
6 that that was going to be too much of a problem
7 and it doesn't seem to have been one.

8 Q Would, in addition to the changes in law, would
9 the reasons for the changes also be a factor in
11:44 10 your inquiries? And let me maybe give you an
11 example. We've heard some evidence that, in this
12 case, in 1969 the manner in which young people
13 were dealt with by authorities --

14 A Uh-huh.

11:44 15 Q -- was, at the time, different than, for example,
16 20 years later?

17 A Uh-huh.

18 Q Now that may well be as a result of statutory
19 change and/or common law, --

11:45 20 A Uh-huh.

21 Q -- but again, if you could comment on the
22 situation where in 1990, looking back at how young
23 people were dealt with by authorities 20 years
24 earlier, --

11:45 25 A -- uh-huh.



1 Q -- if the law had changed --

2 A Uh-huh.

3 Q -- and that they would not have been dealt with
4 the same way, and the reason being that dealing
11:45 5 with them the old way may result in evidence that
6 might be unreliable; --

7 A Uh-huh.

8 Q -- can you comment on how that type of change
9 would be in play to the CCRC?

11:45 10 A Well I think that in that sort of situation the --
11 if there is the -- if there is a change to the
12 law, be it statutory or as a result of developing
13 common law, the underlying reason is actually
14 going to be very significant, because if you're
11:45 15 looking in years after the event to the way in
16 which young people were treated when they were
17 being interviewed, whether as witnesses or
18 whatever, and you're looking at the reliability of
19 the evidence which they produced as a result, if
11:46 20 it can be said years later that the factual
21 circumstances which led to the change in the law
22 operated in that particular witness' case, then
23 you're not so much relying on a change of the law
24 to explain why you're taking a view about their
11:46 25 reliability, you're simply saying that the



1 circumstances giving rise to unreliability apply
2 in -- to this particular witness, and
3 incidentally, it was precisely because of those
4 sorts of circumstances which led to the change in
11:46 5 the law.

6 Did -- is -- have I -- is that
7 sort of confusing?

8 Q Yes, no, and I guess one further question then.
9 If that were the case, is that something that
11:47 10 would be new, that the Commission could then send
11 to the Court of Appeal?

12 A Oh yes, I think so, because you'd be -- you'd --
13 what you would be saying was, well, back in --
14 back at the time when this happened the
11:47 15 significance of what was being done simply wasn't
16 understood so there was no -- the -- no
17 representations were made to the Court or no part
18 of the defence case challenged the reliability of
19 this particular witness on the basis of facts
11:47 20 which may well have been known at the time, but
21 when you look at them now in the light of
22 developing knowledge as to how witnesses react to
23 this sort of treatment, you understand that there
24 is a new argument around the potential credibility
11:47 25 of these witnesses.



1 Q And would it be a case, then, of saying, if we can
2 use the Ron Wilson/Nichol John by way of an
3 example, that 20 years later you might say "with
4 what we now know it may be, it may be that the
11:48 5 information that was obtained from them through
6 the interviewing process or the polygraph is not
7 as reliable as we thought it was 20 years ago"?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And not to say that they are lying or not, not to
11:48 10 say that the police have committed misconduct or
11 not, but that just the circumstances under which
12 the evidence was obtained causes us to think it
13 may not be --

14 A Reliable.

11:48 15 Q -- safe, reliable, and therefore the verdict may
16 not be safe?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And that would be something that may well provide
19 the basis to go to the Court of Appeal and say
11:48 20 "the conviction is not safe because what we now
21 know, our understanding now of how interviewing
22 techniques, etcetera, may affect the credibility
23 or reliability of the information"?

24 A Yeah, I think that would be right. I mean, you
11:48 25 know, we would never -- if the CCRC, if the



1 Commission was looking at the sort of circumstance
2 which arise in Mr. Milgaard's case in the context
3 of evidence given by Nichol John and Ronald
4 Wilson, then the sorts of inquiries which you're
11:49 5 alluding to around their vulnerability as young
6 people, with the lifestyle and characteristics
7 that they had and the way in which they were --
8 their -- the evidence was obtained from them over
9 a protracted period involving all sorts of
11:49 10 activities by the investigating officers,
11 including exposure to a polygraph test, I mean all
12 of those things would be legitimate areas for
13 investigation in the light of current knowledge
14 about the susceptibility and vulnerability of
11:49 15 young people who find themselves in the hands of
16 the authorities. And if -- if, as a result of
17 that investigative process, it appeared that the
18 sort of superimposition, if I can put it that way,
19 of current knowledge about vulnerable people gives
11:50 20 rise to a new argument affecting their, the
21 reliability of the evidence they ultimately gave,
22 then that could be a factor which was relevant to
23 whether the Commission found its test of referral
24 to the Court of Appeal was met.

Q

And, just on that, would -- and you're familiar



1 with Nichol John and the statement that she gave
2 claiming that she witnessed the murder and the
3 fact that she did not repeat it in Court?

4 A Uh-huh.

11:50 5 Q You're familiar with that?

6 A Yes.

7 Q Would that approach that you just talked about
8 allow you, then, to bring into play, again, the
9 Nichol John statement, even though the jury didn't
11:50 10 hear it for proof of its contents, --

11 A Uh-huh.

12 Q -- but in other words to put that back before the
13 Court even though the Court of Appeal dealt with
14 that as a ground of appeal back in 1970?

11:50 15 A Well I -- obviously that would depend on the
16 circumstances, but I think I -- what the
17 Commission would be anxious to do is to take a
18 holistic view of the case and the product of its
19 investigations and the Commission would recognize,
11:51 20 of course, that the aspect of the Nichol Johnston
21 (sic) evidence and statement which was addressed
22 as a ground of appeal in the first appeal related
23 to a procedure under what I understand was a
24 relatively new piece of legislation in Canada
11:51 25 regarding potentially hostile witnesses, so the



1 issue for the Court of Appeal was a fairly narrow,
2 narrowly-confined one.

3 Now in the absence of any
4 changes in the law and the interpretation of that
11:51 5 provision which might benefit an applicant, the
6 CCRC would recognize that there is no mileage in
7 trying to go back to the Court of Appeal to get it
8 to reconsider its decision on the process which
9 was adopted at trial, but taking a holistic view
11:52 10 of the case, and particularly that aspect of the
11 evidence, namely the evidence which was given by
12 the two people who were with Mr. Milgaard on the
13 morning of the murder, it may well be that as the
14 issues arise out of the wider investigation into
11:52 15 reliability and vulnerability which could have an
16 impact on both of them, so you wouldn't be going
17 back to the Court of Appeal re-arguing the
18 question of was the process correctly handled in
19 determining whether she was a hostile witness or
11:52 20 not, it would be around the generality of their
21 evidence, the vulnerability of both of them, and
22 the extent to which the evidence and the
23 information which was available to the jury -- and
24 that would include having available to it the
11:52 25 statement she made even though the jury was told



1 not to pay any attention to it -- all of that, I
2 think, would, on a holistic analysis, be
3 significant to the decision which the Commission
4 made.

11:53 5 Q And, again, would that -- and we talked about this
6 a bit yesterday where, if you found a new ground,
7 it might allow you to go in and explore something
8 that had been before the jury; is that correct?

9 A Well, I think so. I think what I am, what I was
11:53 10 trying to say was that the discovery of the ground
11 which justifies the reference may well also
12 entitle the Commission to say, as part of its
13 reasoning, that, because of the discovery of this
14 ground which underpins the reference itself, it
11:53 15 may well be appropriate, then, to put other
16 aspects of the case which may have been considered
17 by the jury, may even have been considered by the
18 Court of Appeal, into the context of the new -- of
19 the new evidence or the new argument which is
11:54 20 being put forward, which may enable a different
21 perception of the significance of that earlier
22 aspect of the case, which was the point I was
23 trying to illustrate with Sally Clark.

24 Q For example, this was one which I think I had
11:54 25 raised with you earlier about whether or not



1 Nichol John's statement, having been read to the
2 jury not for proof of its contents but rather to
3 question her credibility, whether that might have
4 contributed in some way to increasing the
11:54 5 credibility and reliability of Ron Wilson's
6 evidence?

7 A Well I think -- I mean, as I say, we're
8 hypothesizing to an extent here -- but if the
9 Commission found additional bases and made -- and
11:54 10 let's assume for the sake of argument that there
11 were, you know, applying current understanding
12 about the treatment of vulnerable witnesses it was
13 possible to present either new evidence or a -- or
14 new argument, or a combination of both, to suggest
11:55 15 that Ronald Wilson's credibility was -- or the
16 reli -- or the reliability of Ronald's evidence
17 was questioned, and that was a basis and part of
18 the reasoning for the Commission making a
19 reference, then it would be legitimate for the
11:55 20 Commission to point out that the jury had to
21 assess Ronald Wilson's credibility at the time
22 without the benefit of what we now say is current
23 understanding of issues affecting that
24 reliability. And, furthermore, the Commission
11:55 25 might point out, although in the context of Nichol



1 John the jury were told to disregard her
2 statement, we don't know what the jury did with
3 that admonition from the judge and there has to be
4 a risk, particularly. And bearing in mind that we
11:56 5 know that there are other reasons why Ronald
6 Wilson's evidence should be regarded as
7 unreliable, there has at least to be a risk that
8 the jury may have consciously or subconsciously
9 said "well, Ronald Wilson has to be telling the
11:56 10 truth because he is saying much the same thing as
11 Nichol John said in her statement, which we've
12 heard about".

13 So that's what I am trying
14 rather inelegantly to describe as taking a
11:56 15 holistic view of the situation, where it is
16 legitimate, as part of one's reasoning behind the
17 basis for a reference, to draw in other aspects of
18 the case which may have already been addressed
19 either at trial or on appeal.

11:56 20 Q I see it's 12:00, Mr. Commissioner, probably an
21 appropriate spot to break.

22 I'll canvass, I shouldn't be
23 too much longer, I'll maybe just canvass with
24 other parties. I don't think we'll have any
11:57 25 difficulty finishing by 4:30, but I will check.



(Adjourned at 11:57 a.m.)

(Reconvened at 1:30 p.m.)

BY MR. HODSON:

Q Mr. Kyle, just to pick up on a couple of points we talked about this morning. Can you just explain for us the mechanics of once the Commission makes a reference to the Court of Appeal, they prepare a statement of reasons; is that correct, that goes to the court?

A Yes.

Q And that would be the grounds upon which the Commission thinks there's a real possibility the appeal may succeed?

A Yes.

Q And so, for example, on a fresh evidence, would it be the Commission has uncovered the following fresh evidence that may well affect the verdict, the new evidence is summarized as follows, something like that?

A Yes, together with an articulation of the Commission's evaluation of the impact of that evidence on the case.

Q And then I take it the appellant then, or the applicant then would become an appellant in the normal sense and would have to file -- would they



1 then file a notice of appeal?

2 A They would file grounds of appeal.

3 Q Or grounds of appeal. And presumably as well they
4 would then apply to the Court of Appeal for leave
01:33 5 to call fresh evidence?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And the court then would deal with that
8 application and if they allowed it, then would
9 hear the fresh evidence and then consider the
01:33 10 appeal?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And the Crown would appear as respondent?

13 A Yes.

14 Q And so once you send the reasons over, the normal
01:33 15 mechanics of an appeal take over?

16 A They do.

17 Q I have a question about the Commission members and
18 the term of appointment. What is the length of
19 appointment for Commission members? Is there any
01:33 20 limit?

21 A There's a statutory limit of 10 years, but within
22 that period of 10 years Commission members can be
23 appointed for any term which is thought
24 appropriate, so if it happens that the 14 I think
01:34 25 members who were appointed when the Commission was



1 founded, seven were initially appointed for three
2 years and seven for five, I think the reasoning
3 behind that, although I never spoke to the
4 chairman directly about it, was that if the
01:34 5 hypothetical situation were to arise that when
6 Commission members came to the end of their term
7 none of them wished to apply for another
8 appointment, then continuity would be lost.

9 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Is it full-time
01:34 10 work, sir?

11 A It's full time or part time. When I was at the
12 Commission I think -- these figures may be wrong,
13 but I think there were five or six that were full
14 time and the remainder were part time.

01:34 15 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So it's a fairly
16 costly institution then to fund is it?

17 A Well, the allocation of funding from the Home
18 Office is, at the moment, in the order of 8
19 million pounds sterling.

01:35 20 Q An annual budget?

21 A Annual budget, yes. And just to respond directly
22 to the question which you were asking, Mr.
23 Commissioner, as in any organization, a
24 substantial amount of that funding goes on paying
01:35 25 the staff who work for it.



1 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes. Inasmuch as
2 it would represent quite an incursion into ones
3 career, is it difficult to find members to sit on
4 the Commission?

01:35 5 A I don't believe so. I think that certainly when
6 the Commission was established, I think there was
7 something approaching a thousand applications --

8 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh.

9 A -- for membership on the Commission. I think now
01:35 10 when -- because at that particular time the search
11 was on for the entire body of Commission members
12 whereas now vacancies arise in a more structured
13 manner, so at any given time the Commission may be
14 looking for two or three new appointments.

01:36 15 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I see. Thank you.

16 BY MR. HODSON:

17 Q Can you comment on the proportion of the Court of
18 Appeal's work load that is represented by the
19 Commission's referrals?

01:36 20 A It's quite significant. If we've referred
21 something in the order of 30 or 40 cases a year,
22 and I'm not entirely sure, I had the figure of 10
23 percent in my mind, but I think it's probably
24 going to be less than that, but it is still a
01:36 25 significant amount of work for the Court of Appeal



1 which we generate.

2 Q If we can go to 339396 which is again --

3 A Can I just raise --

4 Q Sure, yeah.

01:37 5 A As I say, I'm not clear on the figures, but I
6 think there are some figures in the Royal
7 Commission report which do refer to the work load
8 of the Court of Appeal and very many people who
9 apply for leave to appeal to the Court of Appeal
01:37 10 are refused leave and so they never get to a full
11 hearing, so the -- I think the proper way to, if
12 we wanted to look at the actual proportion of work
13 which the Court of Appeal deals with, it would be
14 making a comparison between the number of cases
01:37 15 referred by the Commission and the number of cases
16 which the court hears at a full appeal hearing.

17 Q And so after conviction in the Crown court then,
18 an accused, a convicted person does not have a
19 right of appeal?

01:38 20 A No, unless the trial judge certifies that leave to
21 appeal should be given, which rarely happens, it
22 is usually necessary for a convicted person to
23 apply for leave to appeal, and the majority of
24 those applications are dealt with by a single
01:38 25 judge of the Court of Appeal.



1 Q And any -- can you give us any idea of the
2 proportion -- are those usually granted, not
3 granted? Any idea of what percentage?

4 A I don't I'm afraid, but I believe that in the
01:38 5 section in the Royal Commission report dealing
6 with appeals, there is certainly figures relating
7 to the situation as it was in the 1990s, but I'm
8 sure that information, if it was necessary, should
9 be readily available.

01:38 10 Q Sure. But it would -- can you tell us, is leave
11 something that's not granted as a matter of right,
12 though, that's it's not --

13 A No, no, not at all, it isn't. I mean, I think the
14 position remains that considerably more people are
01:39 15 refused leave than granted, but of those who are
16 granted leave to appeal, the success rate in the
17 Court of Appeal is quite high.

18 Q And back to your *Drake Law Review*, you talk here,
19 and I think you've touched on this, but I just
01:39 20 want to have you confirm this, you say:

21 "All would surely agree that convicting
22 somebody of a crime he or she simply did
23 not commit is a miscarriage of
24 justice -- what might be described as a
01:39 25 wrongful conviction of an innocent



1 person in the absolute sense. But what
2 about the situation when, after
3 conviction, new evidence comes to light
4 that, had the jury heard it, might have
01:39 5 induced some doubt about guilt? Or the
6 situation when there has been a flaw in
7 the trial process? Most people would
8 probably accept that these situations
9 are indicative of miscarriages of
01:39 10 justice, but they would say that whether
11 it is a miscarriage of justice depends
12 on the agree of doubt induced to the
13 significance of the process flaw -- the
14 most extreme view being that "people
01:39 15 should not get off on technicalities."
16 Fortunately, the expression miscarriage
17 of justice is nowhere to be found in the
18 Criminal Appeal Acts 1968 and 1995 in
19 their application either to the
01:40 20 Commission or to the Court of Appeal.
21 This is fortunate because it means that
22 in order to do its job, the Commission
23 does not have to concern itself with
24 questions of guilt or innocence in the
01:40 25 absolute sense (only rarely, in the



1 Commission's experience, does new
2 evidence of a wholly exonerating nature
3 come to light) and because the
4 Commission is not forced to debate the
01:40 5 meaning of miscarriage of justice either
6 when reaching its decisions or when
7 discussing its role in the wider context
8 of the criminal justice system as a
9 whole."

01:40 10 And I think you've pretty much reiterated that
11 here, Mr. Kyle. Is there anything you wish to
12 add to what's noted there?

13 A No, I don't think so. I mean, I think that
14 paragraph encapsulates concisely and, I hope,
01:40 15 coherently the views that I've been expressing
16 whilst I've been giving evidence to the Commission
17 about my view that what the Commission, and indeed
18 the Court of Appeal should be interested in, is
19 whether somebody has been rightly or wrongly
01:41 20 convicted having regard to the rules under which
21 persons are prosecuted and the requirements of a
22 fair trial and the standard of proof which have to
23 obtain rather than debating the somewhat more
24 difficult question as to what anyone might
01:41 25 understand by the term miscarriage of justice.



1 Q If we can go to page 398, and I believe here this,
2 the notion of real possibility if I understand it,
3 you say:

4 "...is not defined by the statute..."

01:41 5 But if we can go down to the bottom footnote,
6 here it appears that in the *Pearson* case, did the
7 court describe a real possibility as being:

8 "... more certain than an outside chance
9 or a bare possibility, but which might
01:42 10 be less than a probability, or a
11 likelihood, or a racing certainty."

12 Now, is that the court language of what the
13 court's view of what real possibility means?

14 A It is. I think that case was the first
01:42 15 application for judicial review which was heard in
16 the high court and that is what the court had to
17 say about a real possibility. I mean, it may not,
18 when you read it, actually seem to be particularly
19 helpful in defining what a real possibility
01:42 20 actually is because you are covering a whole
21 spectrum of possibilities there from outside
22 chance through to racing certainty and all points
23 in between, but the flavour of that observation
24 the Commission takes to endorse its view that the
01:42 25 threshold of a real possibility is properly set at



1 a relatively low level.

2 Q Go to 339404, you talk here, you say:

3 "Only a small number of applicants to
4 the Commission who have been convicted
01:43 5 in more recent times complain of
6 deliberate police malpractice in the
7 form of fabricating evidence, planting
8 evidence, or otherwise "sitting them up"
9 for crimes they did not commit. Most
01:43 10 are concerned to persuade the Commission
11 that, for one reason or another, they
12 did not have a fair trial, often
13 accompanied by complaints that their
14 lawyers did not understand the case, did
01:43 15 not follow their instructions, did not
16 ask the right questions in
17 cross-examination, or did not call
18 witnesses who should have been called.
19 From the Commission's perspective, cases
01:43 20 that result in referral tend to fall two
21 broad categories. The first is cases in
22 which relevant new evidence appears,
23 occasionally if rarely being wholly
24 exculpatory, but more often being of a
01:43 25 nature that, had it been heard by a



1 jury, might reasonably have caused them
2 to come to a different verdict."

3 And then you go on to describe:

4 "The second category, more closely
01:44 5 aligned to the types of issues raised by
6 applicants themselves, involves some
7 flaw in the investigation, prosecution,
8 or trial process not brought about by
9 malice but rather, in plain terms,
01:44 10 because someone has not done his or her
11 job properly -- and this may well be
12 something to which the defence lawyers
13 have contributed."

14 And it goes on to say:

01:44 15 "In today's complex criminal justice
16 system, opportunities for falling down
17 on the requirements of fair trial are
18 legion, but it is not the simple fact of
19 failure that counts, but its safety to
01:44 20 the safety of the conviction, taking
21 account of the whole circumstances of
22 the case."

23 And I think you touched on most of this earlier,
24 but would that be an accurate summary then of
01:44 25 what your experience was with the Commission as



1 far as the types of cases that were advanced and
2 the grounds that were advanced before you?

3 A Yes, it is.

4 Q Anything you wish to add to what's stated there?

01:45 5 A No. I think the only point I think I would make,
6 that whereas applicants are frequently obtained to
7 think that they owe their misfortunes to the
8 failures of their lawyers, that is very rarely the
9 case, and certainly very extremely rarely is it
01:45 10 the case that the Commission has referred cases
11 back to the Court of Appeal based substantially on
12 the question of the competence of counsel who
13 represented the Defendant at trial.

14 Q If we can go to document 339381, and just rotate
01:45 15 that, please. This is an article by Graham
16 Zellick, and Mr. Zellick is the current chair of
17 the Criminal Cases Review Commission; correct?

18 A Yes, he is.

19 Q And if we can go to page 383, and are you familiar
01:46 20 with this article generally? I think it dealt
21 with, I think responding to some criticism that
22 had been leveled at the Commission by authors
23 Nobles and Schiff --

24 A Uh-huh.

01:46 25 Q -- about matters, and there's just one point I



1 want to ask you about. On the next page -- go to
2 the next page, please, and I think Mr. Zellick
3 here is referring to criticisms that may have been
4 in an article or may have come from the court and
01:46 5 the eight concerns attributed to the court by
6 Nobles and Schiff, so if I read that correctly, I
7 think the authors may have taken from a court
8 decision some criticism, but the one here is
9 *Restricting the re-interviewing of witnesses*, and
01:46 10 Mr. Zellick writes:

11 "We note the sensitivities and
12 difficulties here, and the observations
13 of the court, but we must carry out our
14 reviews as we see fit, and this may on
01:47 15 occasion require the re- interviewing of
16 witnesses whether by us or by the police
17 on our behalf. The court is right to
18 point out the dangers."

19 And do I take it from that that the Commission
01:47 20 does not go out and re-interview witnesses as a
21 matter of course and that when it does, the Court
22 of Appeal has concerns about that, or am I
23 misreading that?

24 A No, I think you are reading that correctly, the
01:47 25 Commission doesn't routinely re-interview



1 witnesses, and I think that we have alluded to
2 some of the difficulties which can arise with
3 re-interviewing of witnesses, particularly if it
4 appears that the purpose of the re-interview is
01:47 5 simply to get a different story from the witness
6 to that which they may have told at trial, and I
7 think that's consistent with what I was saying
8 this morning about the fact that if -- we were
9 talking this morning specifically about the
01:48 10 possibility of re-interviewing -- of interviewing
11 other suspects, but it would apply, the same sort
12 of process principles would apply to
13 re-interviewing witnesses, that you would only
14 consider re-interviewing witnesses if -- at a
01:48 15 fairly late stage in the investigation, and that
16 for some precise purpose related to something
17 which had been found during the course of the
18 investigation. The Commission certainly wouldn't
19 start off by saying, well, let's go back and speak
01:48 20 to all prosecution witnesses and see whether they
21 will tell us a different story, that would be a
22 completely futile exercise.

Q

23 I'm done with that article. Just a couple more
24 questions, and we may have touched on this, sorry
01:48 25 if we have, but the oral hearings before the



1 Commission, --

2 A Yes.

3 Q -- do you allow the applicant and/or his lawyer to
4 come forward and make oral presentations to the
01:49 5 Commission before you make your decision on
6 whether to provide a reference?

7 A It is not part of the general process by which the
8 Commission makes decisions to allow oral
9 representations by the applicant or indeed anyone
01:49 10 else. From the experience, from my experience
11 when I was actually at the Commission, I think
12 that we offered the opportunity for counsel
13 representing an applicant to come and make oral
14 representations to the committee which was making
01:49 15 the decision and in that particular case the basis
16 of the application involved -- it wasn't a case I
17 was personally concerned with, but as I understand
18 it, the nature of the application involved a
19 particular abstruse point of law and its
01:49 20 application to the case and the decision-making
21 committee acceded to the suggestion by the
22 applicant's counsel that it would assist the
23 decision-making committee's understanding of the
24 point to hear from counsel.

01:49 25 Q Does the Commission often get legal advice?



1 A Umm, no, not often. The Commission is full of
2 lawyers, in amongst Commission members and its
3 case review managers, and the Commission has two
4 full-time legal advisors.

01:50 5 Q And to the extent that legal advisors, would they
6 then provide advice to the commission or to a case
7 manager, or what role do they play?

8 A They are available to provide advice at any stage
9 of the review and, subsequently, decision-making
01:50 10 process.

11 Q And is that advice generally disclosed to an
12 applicant on an unsuccessful application?

13 A No, because -- the advice is not generally
14 disclosed in discrete form because the nature of
01:51 15 the issue and the Commission's view of it will be
16 expressed in the statement of reasons.

17 Q And you may have touched on this yesterday, but
18 the -- when, in the course --

19 A Could I just supplement --

01:51 20 Q Sure?

21 A -- that observation by if, however, the Commission
22 were to instruct independent legal advice from
23 outside the Commission, then in those
24 circumstances the advice to the Commission which
01:51 25 was obtained externally would, would probably be



1 disclosed to the applicant as part of the
2 disclosure of the evidence and information on
3 which the decision was based.

4 Q If, in the course of the investigation, I think
01:51 5 you told us that, for example, if you uncovered a
6 new piece of information that may form the basis
7 of a remedy, that it would not be your practice to
8 contact the applicant or his counsel and say
9 "lookit, here's what we've uncovered, we're
01:52 10 following up, we've identified a new suspect", for
11 example, "and we're following up", and I think you
12 told us, generally, that would not be your
13 practice?

14 A Umm, no. We might. What I was saying was that we
01:52 15 don't routinely, during the investigation,
16 disclose the fruits of investigation on a
17 piecemeal basis unless there is a reason which
18 assists the furtherance of the investigation to be
19 achieved by disclosing that information to the
01:52 20 applicant and inviting comments. We would,
21 otherwise, leave disclosure of the fruits of the
22 investigation to the point when we were
23 communicating either the decision on a referral,
24 or the provisional conclusion on a potential
01:53 25 non-referral.



1 However, that's not the same
2 as keeping the applicant informed of what we're
3 doing by way of investigation. We would endeavour
4 to tell the applicant what's -- what investigative
01:53 5 steps are being taken, but the nature of that, of
6 what we tell applicants about the progress of the
7 investigation, would have to take into account the
8 fact that we would not wish to raise expectations
9 which may subsequently be dashed.

01:53 10 So it would be a matter for
11 the discretion of the case review manager and the
12 assigned Commission member, in any individual
13 case, to determine in what form an applicant
14 should be kept abreast of the ongoing
01:53 15 investigation.

16 **Q** Okay. Thank you, Mr. Kyle, those are my questions
17 for now.

18 I think next is, is it Mr. Roy
19 or Ms. McLean? And perhaps I could ask counsel
01:54 20 just to identify who you are and which client you
21 represent so Mr. Kyle knows which interest you
22 represent.

23 **BY MR. ROY:**

24 **Q** We're going to have to lower this mike about a
01:54 25 foot from where Mr. Hodson was standing for me.



1 Good afternoon, sir.

2 A Good afternoon.

3 Q Good afternoon, Mr. Commissioner.

4 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Good afternoon.

01:54 5 BY MR. ROY:

6 Q My name is Julian Roy and I'm counsel for AIDWYC,
7 the Association in Defence of the Wrongly
8 Convicted.

9 And, fortunately, your, Mr.
01:54 10 Commissioner, your counsel has done a very
11 thorough job of canvassing the evidence from this
12 witness and I don't have a lot of questions, much
13 shorter than what I had originally intended.

14 What I want to start with is
01:55 15 something that came up, just a housekeeping matter
16 that came up just a few minutes ago when Mr.
17 Hodson was asking you questions, and that's about
18 the stats in terms of the case -- the amount of
19 contributions the CCRC makes in terms of the Court
01:55 20 of Appeal's workload.

21 A Yes.

22 Q And there is a passage in Professor Zellick's
23 article that addresses this issue, --

24 A Oh, good.

01:55 25 Q -- and I just thought I'd bring it to your



1 attention so you could confirm that this is in the
2 ballpark in terms of --

3 A Of my understanding?

4 Q Yes.

5 A Yes.

6 Q But Mr. Zellick reports, in his article, that in
7 2003 to 2004, for example, that the Court of
8 Appeal heard 582 conviction appeals, --

9 A Uh-huh.

01:55 10 Q -- and 1,938 sentence appeals, and there were
11 leave applications in the range of 6,000.

12 A Yes.

13 Q All right. And in terms -- in that year there
14 were 34 referrals from the CCRC?

01:56 15 A Yes.

16 Q Is that consistent with the normal pattern over
17 the period of time, that --

18 A As I understand, that would be consistent, yes.

19 Q All right.

20 A Yes.

21 Q But the article does go on to point out that,
22 leaving aside the rather low numbers in terms of
23 the Court of Appeal's total workload, --

24 A Uh-huh.

01:56 25 Q -- that the CCRC cases tend to be more complicated



1 and occupy more of the Court's time than ordinary
2 appeals; is that --

3 A That would be generally true, yes.

4 Q All right. I --

01:56 5 A I think those figures you've just given me tend to
6 suggest my 10 percent figure wasn't far out.

7 Q No, no, I didn't think so, I just thought I would
8 put more meat on the bones.

9 A No, I'm grateful to you.

01:56 10 Q All right. Now another housekeeping matter that
11 arose just before lunch hour, you made reference
12 to the fact that the government institutions which
13 hold records often have destruction schedules in
14 terms of --

01:57 15 A Yes.

16 Q -- how long they keep documents?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And you mentioned five years for the Court files
19 where a sentence is not more than five years; is
01:57 20 that correct?

21 A Umm, I was -- I wouldn't want to be taken to
22 giving the strict figures of each organization's
23 --

24 Q Yes.

01:57 25 A -- destruction policies, and I --



1 Q You don't need to for the purpose of my question.

2 A And I think I was actual talking about the Crown
3 Prosecution Service files.

4 Q I see.

01:57 5 A Their destruction policies, for example the great
6 bulk of Crown Prosecution Service files are
7 destroyed within -- are destroyed 12 months after
8 conviction, but longer retention periods will
9 apply depending on the length of sentence and I
01:57 10 think perhaps, in some cases, the category of
11 case, the type of case.

12 Q All right. What I am -- what I want to ask you
13 about is whether or not there's been any
14 consideration to reforming the way governments
01:58 15 structure their retention of records in light of
16 the work that the CCRC does?

17 A The current retention periods which are applied by
18 the agencies most closely involved with the
19 operation of the criminal justice system, that is
01:58 20 the Crown Prosecution Service, the courts, the
21 police, have been settled upon taking into account
22 the fact that there is a possibility of an
23 application to the Criminal Cases Review
24 Commission.

01:58 25 So, for example, I think that



1 many -- that some of the retention policies for
2 these organizations will extend the period by
3 reference to the fact that an application has been
4 made to the Criminal Cases Review Commission,
01:58 5 which is fine, of course, providing the
6 application has been made. But if the application
7 hasn't been made and isn't made until after the
8 point of time at which that organization's policy
9 destruction -- document destruction policy comes
01:59 10 into effect, then of course the material has been
11 lost already.

12 Q Yes. And has there been any discussion about
13 changing that rule in terms of accommodating the
14 situation where a conviction review application
01:59 15 occurs long after the document is scheduled to be
16 destroyed?

17 A Well the, I believe that there was -- that there
18 was discussion which took that into account, --

19 Q I see.

01:59 20 A -- but the preponderance of opinion was that the
21 factors in favour of a shorter restructuring -- a
22 shorter destruction period outweighed the
23 retention of all papers against the outside chance
24 that somebody might, many years later, wish to
01:59 25 challenge the safety of the conviction.



1 Q All right. But you would agree with me that in
2 any event, if a system such as is in the U.K. were
3 to be contemplated somewhere else, that some
4 attention would have to be also paid to the
02:00 5 retention of documents?

6 A Oh, I think so, yes.

7 Q All right. Now I want to ask you about the
8 situation concerning forensic evidence --

9 A Uh-huh.

02:00 10 Q -- and biological samples, for example.

11 A Uh-huh.

12 Q What is the situation concerning -- is there a
13 uniform policy in England concerning the retention
14 of those types of samples for review by your body
02:00 15 or, perhaps, others?

16 A Umm, well certainly the Forensic Science Service,
17 which is the major provider of -- as its name
18 suggests -- Forensic Sciences Services will have a
19 retention and destruction policy. Again, I'm not
02:00 20 sure exactly what it is.

21 Q And has there been communication between the CCRC
22 and the Forensic Sciences Services to --

23 A I don't know whether there's been specific contact
24 between them.

02:00 25 Q All right. But in terms of if any kind of system



1 were to be contemplated somewhere else, is that
2 also an issue that ought to be considered as well?

3 A I think it's something which ought to be
4 considered.

02:01 5 I mean one of the things we
6 have discovered as a matter of practical
7 experience is that, notwithstanding the existence
8 of specific document retention policies, not all
9 organizations adhere to them absolutely and,
02:01 10 therefore, sometimes by chance we find that there
11 is material still existing in a case which,
12 possibly, you might expect no longer to be around.

13 Q Yes?

14 A But, certainly, the question of retaining material
02:01 15 and the length of time for which material is
16 retained, I mean the bottom line of this, of
17 course, is we're talking about storage space as
18 much as anything else.

19 Q Yes.

02:01 20 A Storage of material is, it takes up a lot of
21 physical space, so it's about the ability to
22 restore it -- sorry -- to hang onto it and keep
23 it, and I think the approach which would underpin
24 any consideration of this is that the system
02:02 25 should enable people to make applications relating



1 to their case, whether it's for appeal or an
2 application to, in our case, the Criminal Cases
3 Review Commission, as promptly as they can and as
4 soon as they are in a position to do so. Of
02:02 5 course, that begs the question as to whether, at
6 the time the application is made, the necessary
7 further evidence can be found, and if it's a case
8 where the ability to produce fresh evidence which
9 called into question the safety of the conviction
02:02 10 depends on advances in science, that may not
11 happen immediately.

12 Q I see.

13 A But there is nothing you can do about that.

14 Q All right. But, in any event, you would agree
02:02 15 with me that those issues that surround
16 advancements in forensic evidence, and how we
17 store samples, is something we ought to pay
18 considerable attention to if we are to consider a
19 competent conviction review process?

02:03 20 A Well, the availability of material to be
21 re-examined in the course of any subsequent review
22 is an important consideration.

23 Q Thank you. Now, rather than taking you into
24 the -- line by line through the mechanics of how
02:03 25 you investigate in your case review process, I



1 want to try and elicit from you some of the
2 guiding principles that seem to animate the rules
3 that are in place there. All right?

4 A Uh-huh.

02:03 5 Q Now the first principle that I want to ask you
6 about is the notion of independence --

7 A Yes.

8 Q -- that you told Mr. Hodson about.

9 A Uh-huh.

02:03 10 Q Now would you agree with me that the notion of
11 independence, as you understand it and in terms of
12 how it's understood in the context of the CCRC in
13 England, is that independence goes beyond actual
14 independence to the issue of whether or not a body
02:03 15 is perceived to be independent?

16 A Yes.

17 Q All right. And that concern about the perception
18 of independence is something that has been taken
19 into account in terms of how the CCRC was
02:04 20 structured; is that correct?

21 A Yes.

22 Q All right. Now you would agree with me that, in
23 terms of the ability of the CCRC to do its work,
24 the perception that it has -- enjoys amongst
02:04 25 stakeholders and other members of the public is



1 critical in order for it to do its work properly;
2 is that right?

3 A Yes.

4 Q Now, if I could just put a little bit more meat on
02:04 5 the bones in terms of the relationship between the
6 Home Office and the CCRC, because the CCRC does
7 come, generally, within the purview of the Home
8 Office; is that correct?

9 A Yes. The actual status of the CCRC is that of
02:04 10 non-departmental public body.

11 Q Yes?

12 A It's -- essentially the delivery of public sector
13 activity, if it's not to be done directly by a
14 government department, is increasingly given out
02:05 15 to either non-departmental public bodies, of which
16 the Commission is one, or executive agencies.

17 Now the significance, the
18 significant difference between the two is that an
19 executive agency has a management board which
02:05 20 includes, on it, people from the government
21 department of which the agency is an executive
22 agency, whereas with a non-departmental public
23 body the governance of the organization is
24 entirely internal.

02:05 25 So the governance of the



1 Criminal Cases Review Commission is undertaken by
2 the Commission as a board, with a chief executive,
3 but there is no representation on the management
4 of the Commission, as a matter of governance, from
02:05 5 the Home Office.

6 Q All right. So in terms of the two models that
7 were sort of available in England in terms of
8 structuring the CCRC, --

9 A Uh-huh.

02:06 10 Q -- the one that didn't include any involvement of
11 government officials was the one that was chosen;
12 is that correct?

13 A That's correct.

14 Q And that was a very deliberate choice; was it not?

02:06 15 A I would think so.

16 Q All right. Now, from the point of view of
17 perception of independence, it's very important
18 that it be clear that there isn't any type of
19 government direct involvement in terms of how
02:06 20 cases are reviewed; is that right?

21 A That's right.

22 Q And that was why the choice that -- was made to
23 keep government people out of the direct
24 management of the CCRC; is that right?

02:06 25 A But it would still have been possible, even if the



1 Commission had been established as an executive
2 agency, to ensure that the government department
3 had no involvement in -- had no actual involvement
4 in casework or casework decisions, but the process
02:06 5 of keeping it absolutely separate is made that
6 much easier --

7 Q Yes.

8 A -- if there is no involvement of the Home Office
9 directly in the management of the Commission.

02:07 10 Q And it also makes things clear, from a perception
11 point of view, because it's a little more
12 difficult to convey to the public that there's
13 independence when there's actually government
14 people sitting on the board?

02:07 15 A I think that may be true, yes.

16 Q Thank you. Now I believe the Commissioner asked
17 you some questions, towards the end of the day,
18 about whether or not there was an actual rule that
19 would prohibit a politician or an elected official
02:07 20 from contacting somebody on -- a Commissioner on
21 the CCRC and attempting to influence them
22 concerning a case; --

23 A Uh-huh.

24 Q -- do you remember being asked about that?

02:07 25 A I do, yes.



1 Q And I think your answer was that there wasn't any
2 specific rule that dealt with that issue?

3 A No, that -- no, there isn't. And, I mean,
4 anybody, whoever they are, I suppose, could seek
02:07 5 to contact the Commission to ask about cases.

6 Indeed, Members of Parliament
7 frequently write to the Commission on behalf of
8 their constituents, asking what's happening and
9 what's going to be done and maybe even making
02:08 10 suggestions about what should be done. Now the
11 Commission would not regard that sort of approach
12 by Members of Parliament as being improper, I
13 mean, that is what Members of Parliament are there
14 to do, to represent the interests of their
02:08 15 constituents.

16 What would be inappropriate,
17 and I've no doubt would draw sort of immediate
18 condemnatory action by the Commission, would be if
19 anybody in the Home Office, either official or
02:08 20 minister, sought to contact the Commission wearing
21 their departmental hats, if I can put it that way,
22 and endeavour to discuss cases or their progress.

23 Q All right. So there's nothing wrong with an MP,
24 on behalf of a constituent, asking for information
02:09 25 from the organization, but it's a completely



1 different matter for somebody in an executive or
2 ministerial capacity to attempt to contact the
3 Commission with a view to influencing its
4 decisions; is that right?

02:09 5 A Yes.

6 Q And even though that's not written down anywhere
7 that's a principle that's well-recognized within
8 the civil service, and the notion that there isn't
9 to be political interference --

02:09 10 A Yes.

11 Q -- with civil servants, okay. So that's a matter
12 of sort of conventional principles of
13 Parliamentary democracy and there is no specific
14 --

02:09 15 A It would be a constitutional issue I think.

16 Q Yes. Now in terms of the contact that is
17 permissible between the Home Office and the CCRC I
18 understand that the Home Office is entitled, in
19 fact obligated, to give policy or strategic
02:09 20 direction to the CCRC?

21 A No. The relationship between the Home Office and
22 the Commission is around the fact that the Home
23 Office provides the funding for the Commission,
24 and to that extent the Commission is obliged to
02:10 25 account for its uses of the funding that it is



1 given through the Home -- through -- to the Home
2 Office, and ultimately through the Home Office to
3 Parliament. So the Home Office has legitimate
4 interests in, for example, how many Commission
02:10 5 members the Commission wishes to appoint, what
6 other staff resources are to be appointed, and
7 generally to approve the Commission's strategic
8 documents in the form of corporate and business
9 plans, but they are related to what I described a
02:10 10 moment ago as governance issues, to make sure that
11 the Commission is intending to make proper use of
12 the funding which is allocated by the Home Office.
13 And, of course, the amount of that funding is
14 going to depend on the Commission's ability to
02:11 15 persuade the Home Office that its corporate plans,
16 or the strategies which it intends to adopt, are
17 sensible and workable.

18 Q All right. So, in terms of the reporting
19 relationship between the CCRC and the Home Office,
02:11 20 it's purely with respect to financial matters and
21 not with respect to the meat of what the CCRC does
22 on a day-to-day basis; is that right?

23 A That's right. I mean, the nature of the
24 relationship is around governance issues, not
02:11 25 about how it deals with casework.



1 Q And, again, this is a deliberate choice in terms
2 of ensuring a perception of independence on the
3 part of the CCRC?

4 A Well, it's actual independence and the perception,
02:11 5 yes.

6 Q Thank you. Now you gave evidence yesterday
7 concerning the Runciman report and the debate
8 concerning whether or not the Home Secretary
9 should be the one that is involved in conviction
02:12 10 reviews, and you gave evidence that the Runciman
11 report -- and we saw the Runciman report --

12 A Yes.

13 Q -- recommended strongly that that issue of
14 conviction review be removed from the Home
02:12 15 Secretary; is that right?

16 A Yes.

17 Q All right. Now you gave a couple of reasons why
18 that was recommended, and one of them was the
19 notion of a separation of powers between the
02:12 20 executive and the judiciary?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And another of the reasons you gave was what was
23 perceived to be a conflict between the Home
24 Secretary's responsibility for policing and
02:12 25 prosecution on the front end --



1 A Uh-huh.

2 Q -- versus repairing potential miscarriages of
3 justice on the back end; is that right?

4 A Yes.

02:12 5 Q I'm going to suggest another reason, from a
6 perception point of view, why a political or
7 elected official may not be in the position to be
8 in charge of conviction reviews.

9 A Uh-huh.

02:13 10 Q And that's the issue of, by nature of an elected
11 official, they have to be responsive to public
12 opinion to some extent?

13 A Uh-huh.

14 Q Would you agree with that?

02:13 15 A That would certainly be an issue because, again,
16 the -- the -- what I think is -- lies -- underpins
17 the position which the English CCRC operates under
18 is the -- is this whole concept of independence.
19 And we, I think, would say that the makeup of the
02:13 20 Commission and the way in which it works means
21 that it doesn't have to have any ulterior motive
22 in mind, or any un -- or any external pressure in
23 mind.

24 You suggest one, which is that
02:13 25 if a minister is making decisions on whether to



1 allow a case through the gateway, that person may
2 be influenced by external pressures around public
3 concern about the case or whatever, but there are
4 other, there are other aspects to the business of
02:14 5 independence, one of which, of course, is that we
6 don't act for the applicant either, so we're not
7 susceptible to having to take into account any
8 particular interest there either.

9 But the suggestion you make, I
02:14 10 think, or the point you make about somebody making
11 decisions who may be susceptible because he had
12 other pressures on him or other factors which may
13 influence his decision-making, is a valid one.

14 Q Thank you.

02:14 15 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Roy, do you
16 suggest that there's any difference between 2 and
17 3?

18 MR. ROY: I --

19 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Between separating
02:14 20 the prosecution end and the review end and
21 between the, from a perception point of view,
22 making that distinction?

23 MR. ROY: Yes, I do, I do.

24 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay. Perhaps you
02:14 25 could just suggest it again?



1 BY MR. ROY:

2 Q Well, in terms of the type of conflict in the
3 second scenario that the Commissioner has just
4 mentioned, the conflict between being both the
02:15 5 prosecutor and the policeman and being the person
6 who fixes the miscarriage of justice, there seems
7 to be a conflict in terms of those roles?

8 A Yes. As a, just as a, for the purpose of
9 exactitude, the Home Secretary is not, and never
02:15 10 has been, responsible for the prosecution process.
11 That's the responsibility of the Attorney General.

12 Q Policing?

13 A But the Home Secretary is responsible for
14 policing, law and order, and the management of the
02:15 15 prison service, the management of the privation
16 service, in other words virtually everything which
17 directly impacts on ensuring that the people who
18 commit offences are investigated and dealt with
19 appropriately. The bit in the middle about
02:15 20 prosecuting is another ministerial responsibility.

21 Q Okay.

22 A But it's that -- I think the point you're making
23 is that that front-end responsibility for a huge
24 chunk of the administration of the criminal
02:16 25 justice system, all of which is directed towards



1 detection and punishment, is in -- it's
2 inappropriate for somebody with those
3 responsibilities also to be expected to make im --
4 appropriate decisions in relation to the fact
02:16 5 that, notwithstanding everything that's gone
6 before, someone has still been wrongly convicted.

7 Q Yes. And the nature of the conflict is that the
8 people that the Home Secretary manages, in terms
9 of the police may be partly responsible for how
02:16 10 the person ended up being wrongfully convicted,
11 and there is a bit of a conflict between whether
12 or not the Home Secretary would be prepared to
13 pronounce that in a given case; is that right?

14 A Well, I think so. I mean I'm sure the Home
02:16 15 Secretary, acting entirely honourably and
16 honestly, would nonetheless hope, in any given
17 case, that all the other aspects of the process
18 for which he is responsible have worked and,
19 therefore, is less able to take -- to stand back
02:17 20 --

21 Q Yes.

22 A -- and take a dispassionate view of someone who
23 says "I'm sorry, Home Secretary, you're wrong, it
24 hasn't worked."

02:17 25 Q And whether or not the Home Secretary, any given



1 Home Secretary, is able to do that, from a
2 perception point of view there is -- there might
3 be a perception on the part of the public or the
4 applicant that that separation that would be
02:17 5 necessary to do both jobs could be put into
6 practice; is that --

7 A Yes.

8 Q Okay. But the third point is a concern about the
9 vulnerability of the Home Secretary to political
02:17 10 pressure from the public. For example, the
11 terrorism cases are a good example?

12 A Uh-huh.

13 Q That a concern or a fear generally amongst the
14 public about terrorism might apply some pressure
02:17 15 in terms of the Home Secretary's ability to review
16 a conviction, a potentially wrongful conviction,
17 in a terrorism case; right?

18 A Yes.

19 Q Okay.

02:17 20 A Perhaps I could -- this was something -- and I
21 think the point you make is absolutely right, and
22 it's a valid one, and commentators would say that
23 that -- it is that which lay at the heart of the
24 reasons why some of these cases took so long for
02:18 25 anyone to get a grip of them and deal with them.



1 But I also have in mind the
2 fact that, in a case which related to the
3 conviction of the Guildford 4, which is another of
4 the blockbuster cases, I seem to recall that there
02:18 5 was some civil proceedings arising out of that in
6 which Lord Denning, who was then one of the -- who
7 was then one of our most senior and respected
8 judges, threw out the civil litigation on the
9 basis that in order to allow this action to
02:18 10 proceed it would necessarily involve an assumption
11 that the police officers in this case had been
12 involved in misconduct, and that would be,
13 frankly, unthinkable.

14 So it, it's not just a
02:18 15 political and ministerial problem, it -- in that
16 particular case, at least in the eyes of one
17 particular judge, the notion that police officers
18 may have been guilty of misconduct in relation to
19 an investigation was unthinkable and the civil
02:19 20 proceeding was stayed on that basis.

21 Q I see. It's another reason to put the
22 responsibility of reviewing convictions in the
23 hands of a body that's dedicated to that role?

24 A Well it certainly, it's certainly a re -- it
02:19 25 certainly tends to illustrate and illuminate why



1 it is that, if the mechanisms for investigating
2 and hopefully redressing miscarriages of justice
3 are left with whoever it may be, but who had --
4 who is trying to balance off one ill against
02:19 5 another, then you might -- you can tend to get
6 some skewed thinking around where you -- what your
7 objectives are.

8 Q And this, the point of the CCRC is you don't
9 engage in that form of balancing, you have a
02:20 10 inquisitorial type of approach where you --

11 A Absolutely, I --

12 Q -- investigate the facts and go where they take
13 you?

14 A Absolutely. And that was one of the most
02:20 15 refreshing aspects which I found when I started
16 work as a Commission member. Having spent most of
17 my professional career up until that time
18 prosecuting, where all the time you were doing
19 your best to prosecute in a fair and appropriate
02:20 20 manner but, all the time, you had to wonder about
21 whether what you were doing was somehow going to
22 have some adverse effect on the ability to
23 prosecute a case successfully, one of the most
24 refreshing things about being at the Commission
02:20 25 was that all those sorts of concerns and fears



1 simply evaporated. We just went out and did what
2 was necessary, and then we made what we will of
3 what we found, because we didn't have to worry
4 about damaging anybody's interests.

02:20 5 Q Now, your article, and Mr. Hodson has already
6 taken you to the passage that I was going to take
7 you to, but I want to put it to you again for
8 emphasis, is -- and that's the passage on page 60.
9 Page 660 rather?

02:21 10 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Can I have the
11 doc. number, Mr. Roy, please?

12 MR. ROY: I'm sorry, it's 339389.

13 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And that's not
14 merely the page number, that's the document
02:21 15 number is it?

16 MR. ROY: That's the document number, and
17 the page number is 339392.

18 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.

19 BY MR. ROY:

02:21 20 Q And it's right above -- it's the passage right
21 above the title where it says the Royal Commission
22 on Criminal Justice.

23 A Yes.

24 Q And what you pose at the end of that paragraph is
02:21 25 sort of a choice between two ideas:



1 "Will whatever mechanism that is adopted
2 to address the cries of those who claim
3 to have been wrongly convicted have at
4 its heart the will to own up to mistakes
11:31 5 and learn lessons..."

6 on the one hand?

7 A Uh-huh.

8 Q "...or will it strive to preserve the
9 status quo?"

02:22 10 A Yes.

11 Q And in terms of how the CCRC and how it's
12 structured, how it tries to answer that question
13 in the way it does its work, it tries to show a
14 will to own up to mistakes and learn lessons in
02:22 15 terms of mistakes made by the criminal justice
16 system; is that right?

17 A Yes. I mean, I think what I would say about
18 the -- those I think are the questions, and you
19 can either have a situation -- and it may not be
02:22 20 quite as stark as this, but for the purpose of
21 illustration you can look at either end of the
22 spectrum and you have a criminal justice system in
23 which the possibility of mistakes being made is
24 thought to be very threatening and damaging and
02:22 25 therefore you do your best to try and pretend that



1 they don't happen, or you have a robust and mature
2 criminal justice system which recognizes that
3 mistakes will happen and is prepared to do
4 something about them. I'm not making any
02:23 5 particular comment as to where the English
6 criminal justice system fitted on that particular
7 end of the spectrum, but the mechanism which has
8 been adopted in the United Kingdom is the creation
9 of the Commission and that mechanism, I would say,
02:23 10 tends very strongly to suggest that the -- that
11 the United Kingdom's criminal justice system
12 intends to recognize that mistakes will happen and
13 do something about them rather than try to bury
14 them and pretend they don't.

02:23 15 Q All right. And I want to take you to certain
16 aspects of the CCRC's work that I'm going to ask,
17 that I'm going to suggest confirm what you just
18 said, that it tends to show a new willingness on
19 the part of United Kingdom to have the will to own
02:24 20 up to mistakes and learn lessons.

21 The first part that I want to
22 ask you about is the, what the CCRC's practices
23 are concerning outreach, in terms of trying to
24 reach out to the community and solicit
02:24 25 applications from potentially wrongfully



1 convicted.

2 A Uh-huh.

3 Q I take it that in order to be effective, the CCRC
4 has to engage in some form of public education
02:24 5 about what its role is?

6 A Uh-huh.

7 Q And it's even more important that stakeholders are
8 properly educated about the CCRC's role; correct?

9 A Uh-huh.

02:24 10 Q And you would agree with me that potential
11 applicants are potentially a difficult audience to
12 reach in terms of that public education message
13 that has to go on?

14 A Yes.

02:24 15 Q And part of the reason for that is from time to
16 time -- it's not uncommon for the potential
17 applicants to actually be in custody; is that
18 right?

19 A A lot of them are, yes.

02:25 20 Q Yes. And when they are in custody, they are
21 isolated from their normal social networks?

22 A Yes.

23 Q And they are a difficult audience to reach for
24 that reason; correct?

02:25 25 A Yes.



1 Q And the other issue is because of their experience
2 in the system, there may be a lack of trust of
3 authorities?

4 A Yes.

02:25 5 Q And there also may be issues of poverty as well
6 and lack of resources?

7 A Yes.

8 Q So the CCRC can't sit back and be an obscure
9 little government organization in some office
02:25 10 somewhere, it has to actually go out into the
11 community and reach people; is that right?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And are you able to elaborate for us on some of
14 the things that the CCRC does in that regard?

02:25 15 A Well, certainly I can talk about some of them.
16 You are right about of course that many of the
17 applicants are in prison and therefore the ability
18 to make people who are in prison aware of the
19 Commission has to take account of the
02:26 20 circumstances of their being in prison, but
21 certainly on various levels there is a lot of
22 information about the Commission in the public
23 domain. We've looked at some length at the
24 Commission's web site, for example, which may or
02:26 25 may not be available to prisoners depending on the



1 institution that they are in, but certainly we
2 have, in every prison, literature about the
3 Commission which is certainly in the hands of the
4 appropriate prison staff who deal with the
02:26 5 reception of prisoners and with the probation
6 officer in the prison who we encourage to make
7 prisoners aware, as part of the induction process
8 of being in prison, about the existence of the
9 Commission and make, giving them to understand
02:27 10 that there is, the Commission is there if they
11 believe that they may have been wrongfully
12 convicted and wish to make applications, so that's
13 how we can deal with -- how we can make the prison
14 population aware of our existence.

02:27 15 I mean, in some respects, if
16 I'm talking about making individuals who feel
17 they've been wrongly convicted aware of the
18 Commission's existence, that in some respects is
19 easier with prisons than it is for people who
02:27 20 don't get custodial sentence because there you are
21 just dealing with the population at large.

22 Q If you are prepared to go out to the prisons and
23 distribute the material there, then they are, in
24 some sense, an easier population to reach?

02:27 25 A I think so, yes, and we have from the outset made



1 conscientious efforts to ensure that the
2 literature about the Commission and the processes
3 which people need go through to apply to the
4 Commission are available throughout the prison
02:28 5 institutions in England, Wales and Northern
6 Ireland.

7 There are also organizations
8 who represent the interests of persons who may
9 have been wrongfully convicted, groups of
02:28 10 solicitors, for example, organizations such as
11 Justice, and again the Commission, from the
12 outset, has taken positive steps to embrace
13 stakeholders who come into those categories to
14 ensure that they are aware of our existence so
02:28 15 that they in turn can disseminate information
16 about the Commission, and from time to time we
17 will have -- we will have stakeholder liaison
18 meetings with organizations of that nature not
19 only from the point of view of making sure that
02:29 20 they know of our existence, but also from the
21 point of view of discussing with them how we're
22 doing, which is something which I refer to later
23 in that *Drake* review article where I point out
24 that although the Commission believes that it is
02:29 25 carving out a good and positive place for itself



1 within the criminal justice system, it certainly
2 doesn't receive universal acclamation on
3 everything it does, and we are interested to know
4 what the concerns are and respond to them as best
02:29 5 we can, and one of the ways of doing that is to
6 have this engagement with organizations which are
7 interested in the matter of wrongful convictions.

8 Q And this is all consistent with a more proactive
9 as opposed to a reactive approach that was perhaps
02:29 10 the case in the past?

11 A I would say so, yes.

12 Q Thank you. Now, I also notice from your web site
13 and your application form that there seems to be a
14 real effort to ensure that the form is written in
02:30 15 ordinary language, and the form is document
16 339755, Mr. Commissioner, and in fact on the face
17 of the --

18 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: 337 was it?

19 MR. ROY: 339755.

20 BY MR. ROY:

21 Q And if you look on the bottom left-hand corner of
22 the document, you've actually got a seal of
23 approval concerning the ease of the language that
24 you use?

02:30 25 A Yes, from the Plain English Campaign, yes.



1 Q All right.

2 A And the design of the document was done in
3 conjunction with the Plain English Campaign to
4 make sure that it did achieve that objective.

02:30 5 Q And you do the same thing in terms of your web
6 site, you try to not just speak to the lawyers or
7 the professionals in the community, you try to
8 speak directly to the potential applicants; is
9 that right?

02:30 10 A Oh, that's absolutely right, because, as I say,
11 the huge bulk of our applications come from
12 applicants directly with no involvement of the
13 legal fraternity at all.

14 Q Now, in addition to the outreach that you do, the
02:31 15 proactive steps that the Commission takes doesn't
16 stop just with soliciting the applications, it
17 also happens after the applicant makes his
18 application; is that correct?

19 A Sorry, in what respect, the --

02:31 20 Q Well, in terms of the proactive approach that the
21 Commission takes doesn't stop with just soliciting
22 the application, it continues right throughout the
23 process; is that correct?

24 A That's so, yes.

02:31 25 Q It doesn't, for example, depend on the applicant



1 going out and gathering his own evidence; correct?

2 A No. I mean, as I was endeavouring to explain, I
3 hope in a coherent way, that in some respects to
4 expect the applicant to do that can be counter
02:31 5 productive.

6 Q For example, the last thing that you would want to
7 do is come up with a long check list of documents
8 that the applicant has to come up with before his
9 application can get off the ground; correct?

02:32 10 A We wouldn't think to do that. We encourage
11 applicants to send us whatever they've got and
12 anything they think they would like us to look at.

13 Q Yes.

14 A But we certainly don't make it a precondition of
02:32 15 how we go about investigating, that they should
16 send any particular material to us. We regard it
17 as our responsibility to get hold of the necessary
18 information. However, of course, if the applicant
19 has got material which only he has, then obviously
02:32 20 we would want to, we would want him to send us
21 that, but we would discover that I think during
22 the course of the investigation and review, so --
23 for example, if I take a case which I dealt with
24 last year when I was back at the Commission as a
02:32 25 case review manager, it was a case in which, one



1 of the many cases involving a conviction for
2 sexual offence, and the applicant suggested that
3 he had very many letters and cards from the
4 children he was convicted of assaulting, all of
02:33 5 which would indicate that there had been no abuse
6 at all, so he was the only person who had that
7 material, so the only way we were ever going to
8 see it would be if he gave it to us, which he did.

9 Q But leaving that aside, you don't make the
02:33 10 applicant jump through a bunch of hoops and gather
11 up all of his own documents before the application
12 can even get considered; right?

13 A No, no, all we need is to know that there's an
14 application.

02:33 15 Q Yes. So beyond actually just filling out the very
16 short form that you have and submitting it, the
17 applicant really doesn't have to do a heck of a
18 lot more to get his application considered?

19 A No.

02:33 20 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I just have one
21 question I would like to ask, Mr. Roy, about
22 that. In a typical sexual assault case, sir,
23 that would not be very onerous, I suggest, for
24 the taxpayer. However, if you take a complicated
02:33 25 fraud case, for example, that went on for months



1 and months and months, the appeal book might be a
2 very expensive thing to duplicate, and if you
3 thought as a Commission you needed that, then you
4 are simply billing the taxpayer for it aren't
02:34 5 you, whereas the normal rules of appeal require
6 an appellant, at least here I think, require an
7 appellant to provide at least the basic court
8 record in support of his appeal. I mean, how are
9 we to guard against extravagant expense brought
02:34 10 by vexatious litigants or trivial complaints in
11 that respect?

12 A I'm not sure I fully understand it, and it may be
13 because of differences of procedures.

14 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, perhaps,
02:34 15 yes, but take a typical criminal appeal, for
16 example --

17 A Yes.

18 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- in the province
19 where I come from, it involves duplicating the
02:34 20 trial record, and depending on the length of the
21 trial obviously, the expense is either small or
22 perhaps very significant.

23 A Well, we would expect -- I mean, if I understand
24 you correctly, so when an applicant, when a
02:35 25 convicted person applies for leave to appeal, then



1 as part of that process there will be obtained a
2 transcript of the judge's summing up to the jury,
3 maybe even transcripts of evidence which has been
4 given. Is that the sort of documentation you are
02:35 5 referring to?

6 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: That's the sort of
7 thing, yes.

8 A Well, we would get that simply by asking for the
9 Court of Appeal file.

02:35 10 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, the Court of
11 Appeal file, I see. Okay, that answers my
12 question.

13 A Yes. And in fact that process is made
14 immeasurably more easy now than it was because we
02:35 15 obtained some particular funding for setting up an
16 IT link with the Court of Appeal which now means
17 that their documentation can be obtained
18 electronically.

19 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, okay.

02:35 20 A So we don't have to re-invent the wheel every
21 time.

22 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Uh-huh.

23 A But again, it will depend on what documentation
24 was obtained. This is why I say we set such a
02:36 25 premium in the early stage of investigation to



1 gather in all the existing material relating to
2 the case.

3 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, surely.

4 A So that we don't have to start from scratch with
02:36 5 getting transcripts if they've already been
6 obtained.

7 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Uh-huh. Go ahead,
8 Mr. Roy.

9 BY MR. ROY:

02:36 10 Q But the bottom line in terms of being accessible
11 and being proactive, keeping in mind that you are
12 often dealing with people who are in custody who
13 don't have the ability to go out and gather all
14 the materials that may once have been accessible
02:36 15 to them, you take care of that for the applicants?

16 A We will if necessary, and some of them are great
17 hoarders and some of them will send in, they will
18 have the judge's summing up and they will have all
19 the transcripts in the cell with them and they
02:36 20 will send them to us, but if they don't or
21 haven't, then the likelihood is that any
22 documentation which they might have had of that
23 nature will already be available for us to obtain
24 from other sources without having to go back to
02:36 25 the drawing board.



1 Q But that's not going to hold -- but the bottom
2 line is that the applicant's failure to produce
3 these documents is not going to hold up his
4 application process is it?

02:37 5 A Well, it's not going to prevent him, it's not
6 going to prevent his application being considered,
7 but if one takes -- for example, the Commissioner
8 a moment ago was referring to a fairly
9 straightforward case, let's assume that we have an
02:37 10 applicant who suggests he has been wrongfully
11 convicted of a sexual offence and the issue, the
12 pointed issue is some flaw in the trial judge's
13 summing up which may either have been missed last
14 time on appeal or may need to be reviewed in the
02:37 15 light of some change to the law, if the applicant
16 sends us a copy of the summing up, then we'll have
17 it immediately and we won't have to spend time
18 trying it find it from some other source, so it
19 may be that the review can proceed more quickly if
02:37 20 the applicant sends us the documents than if he
21 doesn't, but it makes no difference to our actual
22 willingness to review the case.

23 Q It might slow it down, but it doesn't stop it in
24 its tracks?

02:38 25 A Yes, that's right.



1 Q Thank you. Now, I want to ask you about some of
2 the principles that come out of your case review
3 process.

4 A Uh-huh.

02:38 5 Q And I noticed from the web site that you have
6 very, very comprehensive written guidelines and
7 policies concerning how the case review process
8 works; is that correct?

9 A Yes.

02:38 10 Q And I actually counted, there were around 40
11 written policies --

12 A Right.

13 Q -- which the Commission has generated concerning
14 how it does its work.

02:38 15 A I'll certainly take your word for it on the
16 number.

17 Q All right. And I take it that generating very
18 detailed policies such as those are a significant
19 expenditure of the Commission's resources?

02:38 20 A Yes, they are. I mean, when I was there -- I
21 mean, this was something which I took a particular
22 interest in when I was at the Commission and
23 whilst I was at the Commission the majority of
24 that work was undertaken by the case work
02:39 25 operation group which consisted of a



1 representatives from amongst the Commission
2 members and the case review manager and we would
3 either identify or pick up on matters which were
4 drawn to our attention by the Commission as to
02:39 5 being areas in which either policy or procedural
6 guidance would be helpful. As far as I know, that
7 group still exists, but it's supplemented by a
8 legal advisory group, so I think you'll find when
9 you look at these 40 things, that they are divided
02:39 10 into operational and legal matters.

11 Q All right. Now, in terms of what principles come
12 out of all that policy and guideline work the
13 Commission has done, I'm going to suggest to you
14 one of the things that comes out of it is the
02:39 15 notion of consistency, in that there's a great
16 effort made to ensure that all applications are
17 dealt with along the same, in the same way in
18 terms of there's a tiered approach, but all the
19 applications follow the basic similar structure;
02:40 20 is that not correct?

21 A Certainly. I mean, the Commission's objective is
22 to be as open and transparent as possible about
23 its processes and procedures and one way in which
24 that is done of course is to make publicly
02:40 25 available the procedural and legal guidance on



1 which the Commission staff operate and the topics
2 which are selected as being, as meriting some form
3 of written documentation tend to be those where it
4 is thought that consistency of approach is
02:40 5 important. I mean, the Commission has never had
6 what some organizations do have which is a 25
7 volume manual of procedure and guidance because
8 the sort of work which the Commission does doesn't
9 really lend itself to having every aspect of it
02:41 10 documented in such a way, but there are facets of
11 what the Commission does which, in which guidance
12 to ensure consistency of approach and hopefully
13 outcome is important, and those are the sorts of
14 areas which are covered by the documents to which
02:41 15 you've referred.

16 Q Now, in terms of the message of consistency that
17 sends, would it -- I'm going to suggest to you in
18 terms of the message it sends, is that an
19 applicant doesn't need to have his lawyer writing
02:41 20 to the Commission constantly to have his file
21 moving forward through the process; is that right?

22 A We would certainly hope not, that that doesn't
23 need to be the case, yes.

24 Q And it doesn't suggest to an applicant that he has
02:41 25 to have his MP call the Commission to inquire



1 about his file either does it?

2 A No.

3 Q Because the applicant can actually see that
4 there's a written process, a detailed process that
02:42 5 his application is going to follow?

6 A Uh-huh.

7 Q And which leads to the issue of transparency that
8 you alluded to?

9 A Uh-huh.

02:42 10 Q It's also important from the point of view of the
11 Commission's work to convey that -- be open about
12 how it considers the applications; is that
13 correct?

14 A Yes.

02:42 15 Q It shouldn't be a mystery to the applicants or
16 members of the public how the decision-making
17 actually occurs?

18 A Not at all, no. I mean, right from the outset the
19 Commission's concern was to ensure that it
02:42 20 developed processes and working methods which were
21 appropriate to the work it was doing and that they
22 should -- they should be publicly available.

23 Q And you told us in your evidence about a written
24 case plan in terms of how an investigation is
02:43 25 planned?



1 A Uh-huh.

2 Q And that's a written document obviously?

3 A Yes.

4 Q And that document is added to record all the
02:43 5 different steps that are taken and conclusions
6 that flow from the documents?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Yes?

9 A Uh-huh.

02:43 10 Q And that is a method of ensuring that the way
11 investigations are conducted is transparent;
12 correct?

13 A It's a document which enables the way in which an
14 individual case is being conducted can be
02:43 15 communicated to the applicant, yes.

16 Q Yeah.

17 A And we don't make the world at large generally
18 aware of what we're doing in every individual
19 case, the documentation which we do publicize to
02:43 20 make, in furtherance of the transparency objective
21 is around policies and procedures as opposed to
22 the handling of individual cases.

23 Q All right. But there are rules that govern which
24 documents are to be considered by a Commissioner
02:43 25 when determining an application; is that correct?



1 A There are certain -- there are processes which
2 guide the thought processes of both the assigned
3 Commission member and the case review manager as
4 to the documentation they should look for and
02:44 5 there are some -- there are some processes which,
6 if you like, they are set in stone. So, for
7 example, the minute an application is received, as
8 sure as night follows day the Commission's
9 administrative staff will be in touch with the
02:44 10 Court of Appeal asking them to download their
11 file, and that documentation should produce enough
12 information at a very early stage to enable the
13 Commission member who screens the case to decide
14 whether it's going to require an extended review
02:44 15 or whether it can be dealt with in a shorter time
16 to be able to make that sort of decision, but when
17 that screen, it's call a screening process, when
18 that screening process takes place, it's up to the
19 individual Commission member then to form his own
02:45 20 view as to what further documentation may be
21 required.

22 Q All right. But in terms of -- there is an actual
23 standard form for recording decisions; is there
24 not?

02:45 25 A Yes, there's a case record.



1 Q And that case record will include all the
2 documents that were considered; yes?

3 A It is -- it will -- the case record will include a
4 reference to the documentation which has been
02:45 5 obtained so that -- particularly, of course, so
6 that if another member of staff takes over the
7 case, they can immediately see by looking at the
8 case record what has been done and what material
9 is available, but the document which records in
02:45 10 detail what information is being considered and
11 the impact that it has on the Commission's
12 decision will be the statement of reasons which is
13 compiled when the decision is made.

14 Q All right. We're going to get to that in a
02:46 15 moment. Now, the decision, or the document that
16 records the decision provides reasons relating the
17 documents that were considered and how they
18 figured into the decision that was made; is that
19 right?

02:46 20 A That's right. I mean, the structure of the
21 statement of reasons is one which we designed at a
22 fair, at an early stage and it is quite a
23 comprehensive document and in all cases it will
24 set out the nature of the prosecution of defence
02:46 25 case at trial, it will set out a summary of what



1 happened at the first appeal hearing, what the
2 grounds of appeal were and the outcome. It will
3 then identify the nature of the investigative
4 steps which have been taken; in other words, it
02:46 5 will identify what documents have been obtained
6 and what other investigative steps have been taken
7 such as the interviewing of witnesses or the
8 commissioning of expert reports, and then having
9 set the stole out in that way, it will then have a
02:47 10 section which will be shorter or longer, depending
11 on the nature of the case, called the analysis and
12 reasons, which draws together all the material,
13 information and facts in the case as they may
14 impact on the safety of the conviction and sets
02:47 15 out the Commission's reasoning against each of the
16 relevant issues as to what new information has
17 been obtained and what impact that is thought to
18 have.

19 Q So it's clear from written documentation why a
02:47 20 decision is made in terms of an application?

21 A Yes.

22 Q Another principle that I'm going to ask you
23 questions about is the idea of fairness.

24 A Uh-huh.

02:47 25 Q I take it that there is common-law in England that



1 would govern the fairness of your process; is that
2 correct?

3 A Yes, which is now of course also supplemented by
4 article 6 of the European Convention on Human
02:48 5 Rights.

6 Q And the CCRC functions sort of as an
7 administrative or quasi-judicial body; is that
8 correct?

9 A Well, we see ourselves as making quasi-judicial
02:48 10 decisions in the sense that the basis of
11 separation of investigation from decision-making
12 functions and the fact that the decision to refer
13 a case or not to the Court of Appeal has a
14 quasi-judicial flavour to it, but particularly by
02:48 15 reference to article 6 of the convention of the
16 right to a fair trial and, more particularly, the
17 subsidiary rights there around being represented
18 by counsel of choice and being able to call
19 witnesses, etcetera, and matters of that nature,
02:49 20 we do not regard our process as being a process to
21 which article 6 directly applies.

22 Q All right. Now, the provisional decision is one
23 of the primary means, am I right, in ensuring that
24 the applicant has -- ensuring fairness to the
02:49 25 applicant?



1 A We think so, yes, and that's not a new concept,
2 it's one which applied to the procedure which was
3 adopted by the Home Secretary, that as a matter of
4 fairness, if the Commission is thinking that there
02:49 5 is no basis for a referral, the applicant should
6 be given prior notice of that as a provisional
7 conclusion together with the reasons why that
8 provisional conclusion has been reached and to be
9 given the opportunity of making further
02:49 10 representations about it.

11 Q And the reasons in the provisional notice would be
12 consistent with the reasons for decision that
13 you've just elaborated on previously; is that
14 right?

02:50 15 A The --

16 Q In terms of the level of detail that would be
17 required?

18 A It would be exactly the same, yes.

19 Q Okay. So the applicant, before a final decision
02:50 20 is made, is given a lot of detail concerning why
21 the Commission has made the decision that it has?

22 A Yes, why it's reached the provisional conclusion,
23 yes.

24 Q Yes. And then he or she is given an opportunity
02:50 25 to add further evidence or make submissions?



1 A Yes.

2 Q And it's only then that a final decision is made;
3 is that correct?

4 A Yes.

02:50 5 Q And am I right in saying, I've tried to follow the
6 various tiers of your process --

7 A Uh-huh.

8 Q -- am I right in saying that no application can be
9 dismissed finally without the provisional reasons
02:50 10 being provided and an opportunity to be heard?

11 A That's correct.

12 Q So regardless of how the application is
13 classified, the applicant always has that right to
14 be heard -- to hear the reasons for why his
02:50 15 application is likely to be dismissed and have an
16 opportunity to make submissions about that?

17 A Yes.

18 Q I want to ask you about another principle that
19 arises from your procedures, and that's the issue
02:51 20 of timeliness.

21 A Uh-huh.

22 Q You would agree with me that the timeliness of the
23 resolution of these applications is an issue that
24 affects the perception of the CCRC?

02:51 25 A Yes.



1 Q And, obviously, any -- most government agencies
2 would like more resources, but there are limits,
3 obviously?

4 A Yes, all government agencies would like more
02:51 5 resources, and they'd all like to do things
6 quicker than they do but, at the same time,
7 maintaining the required standard.

8 Q But, to deal with the scarcity of resources, you
9 actually have a formal procedure for prioritizing
02:51 10 the applications; is that correct?

11 A That is correct, yes, yeah.

12 Q And in fact the cases that are in custody get --
13 or are potentially given more priority?

14 A Than those at liberty, yes.

02:52 15 Q Yes. And, also, the issues concerning
16 deterioration of evidence, --

17 A Yes.

18 Q -- those cases are given more priority; right?

19 A Yes.

02:52 20 Q And once the application is -- starts its path
21 towards being considered, reviewed, and resolved,
22 --

23 A Uh-huh.

24 Q -- there are written rules that prescribe the
02:52 25 various stages that the application goes through;



1 yes?

2 A Yes.

3 Q And there is actually an assigned person, a case
4 manager, that's responsible for moving it along
02:52 5 that process; is that correct?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And that case manager is actually supervised by
8 one of the Commissioners; right?

9 A Yes.

02:52 10 Q And it's not the same Commissioner that makes the
11 decision on the application?

12 A Correct.

13 Q And the supervision of the Commissioner ensures
14 that there is some form of accountability in terms
02:52 15 of processing the cases in a timely fashion?

16 A That is certainly one of the reasons, an
17 associated reason. And the reason why we adopted
18 the role of assigned Commission member to the case
19 review process was that, apart from having a
02:53 20 mechanism for monitoring the progress of the
21 investigation and review, as with so many other
22 aspects of human endeavour it's quite often
23 sensible to have two heads working on a problem
24 than one. And particularly on this all-important
02:53 25 question of trying to identify issues which might



1 go somewhere and how the investigation might be
2 effectively conducted, we thought that having the
3 combined experience of a case review manager and a
4 Commission member on that process was also a valid
02:53 5 one.

6 Q And then you also have a mechanism for flagging
7 the applications that have been in the process for
8 more than six months?

9 A Yes.

02:54 10 Q And those are given special considerations; is
11 that right?

12 A They come before a case review committee. Again,
13 that case review committee may well consist of the
14 assigned Commission member as one of the members
02:54 15 as this is not part of any statutory process or is
16 related to the independence of decision-making, it
17 is simply about case management. And that case
18 review committee will review what is being done
19 with that case, how close it is to being brought
02:54 20 to the stage where a decision can be made, and
21 whether there needs to be any pressure applied or
22 escalation procedures adopted externally to ensure
23 that any external work is also progressed.

24 Q Now I want to ask you about the mechanisms of
02:54 25 accountability for people that work at the



1 CCRC and --

2 A Uh-huh.

3 Q -- Commissioners. I understand that there is a
4 complaint process?

02:54 5 A Yes.

6 Q And you, or the CCRC, ensures that all applicants
7 are aware of the complaint process?

8 A I believe so. I believe that the documentation
9 which is sent out to applicants on receipt of the
02:55 10 application would include the complaints leaflet.

11 Q And in terms of, regardless of the merits of most
12 of the complaints that you might receive, having a
13 complaint process sends an important message that
14 you are prepared to be accountable for the work
02:55 15 that you do; is that right?

16 A That's certainly the objective, yes. The
17 difficulty, of course, is getting applicants to
18 understand that the complaints process is not a
19 mechanism by which they can simply ask for a
02:55 20 decision which they don't like to be reviewed, the
21 complaints mechanism is about making sure that the
22 process of review leading to the decision has been
23 conducted in accordance with the Commission's
24 procedures.

02:55 25 Q But, regardless of the reality that you're going



1 to get a lot of meritless complaints, it's
2 important to have a complaint process?

3 A Undoubtedly, yes.

4 Q And you also have a code of conduct that affects
5 all Commissioners and staff?

6 A Yes. It certainly affects all Commissioners, the
7 -- no, I think you are right, yes, I think there
8 is a code of conduct which does cover everybody.

9 Q Yes. And that deals with issues of conflict of
10 interest, potentially?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And, again, this is --

13 A So, for example, I mentioned the fact that when
14 the case of *Steele* came to the Commission, which
15 had been one case, a case which I had prosecuted
16 in the director of the prosecutions office, I had
17 absolutely nothing to do with either the review or
18 the investigation of that case.

19 Q Again, the code of conduct and ensuring that all
20 Commission members and staff are bound by it is
21 with a view to enhancing the perception of the
22 CCRC?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Now I want to ask you some questions about what
25 you described as an interdisciplinary approach



1 that the CCRC takes.

2 A Uh-huh.

3 Q And you've already given evidence about the
4 composition, and there is actually a requirement
02:57 5 that there be lay people --

6 A Yes.

7 Q -- on the Commission?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Now would you agree with me that this, the
02:57 10 requirement that there be non-lawyers involved in
11 this process of reviewing convictions, is also
12 important from the point of view of perceptions?

13 A I think so, because as I was explaining yesterday,
14 although much of the work of the Commission does
02:57 15 have a heavy legal flavour to it, nonetheless,
16 there is a risk that the taking a too-legalistic
17 approach to particularly the review and
18 investigation carries with it the risk of the
19 consideration of the issues being too narrow and
02:58 20 too -- and too legalistic if it's only done by
21 lawyers. Lawyers like to think in terms of
22 process and rules of evidence and matters of that
23 nature, and you may well miss important points
24 which will be spotted, or at least raised for
02:58 25 consideration by people who are not lawyers.



1 Q And, in terms of the environment at the CCRC,
2 there's an opportunity for the lay people and the
3 lawyers to actually communicate and develop in a
4 collegial environment; is that right?

02:58 5 A Yes.

6 Q So that the non-legalistic and the non-restrictive
7 approach of the lay people, there is an
8 opportunity for that to have an influence on the
9 people who are lawyers at the Commission?

02:58 10 A Oh, absolutely, yes.

11 Q And that's an intentional --

12 A Yes.

13 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Roy, it's
14 about time for our afternoon break, are you going
02:58 15 to be a little while longer?

16 MR. ROY: Umm, I won't be done in 5
17 minutes, so --

18 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay. Let's take
19 our break now then.

02:58 20 *(Adjourned at 2:58 p.m.)*

21 *(Reconvened at 3:17 p.m.)*

22 BY MR. ROY:

23 Q Good afternoon, Mr. Commissioner.

24 I want to move on to another
03:17 25 issue, and that's the alternate suspect issue --



1 A Uh-huh.

2 Q -- where, through the Commission's work, it
3 appears that there may be another person that's
4 actually committed the offence for which the
03:18 5 applicant has been convicted.

6 A Uh-huh.

7 Q All right?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And if the, if document 339587 could be put on
03:18 10 screen, please. This is the CCRC's formal
11 memorandum concerning the Section 19 appointment
12 of a police officer?

13 A Yes.

14 Q And you gave evidence earlier about how Section 19
03:18 15 works, and I don't want to go over that again, but
16 if you look at paragraph 3, paragraph 3 sets out
17 the considerations --

18 A Uh-huh.

19 Q -- for the appointment of a police officer under
03:18 20 Section 19?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And if you go to the second, I won't take you
23 through the first three, but if you look at the
24 fourth bullet point on the top of the second
25 page --



1 A Uh-huh.

2 Q "Where there are grounds to
3 suspect that a person, who is not
4 involved in an official capacity in the
03:19 5 investigation of offences or the
6 prosecution of offenders, has committed
7 a serious offence in such circumstances
8 that if there were to be sufficient
9 evidence there is a real possibility
03:19 10 that the person would be prosecuted."

11 A Yes.

12 Q Now that would cover the situation of an alternate
13 suspect?

14 A Yes.

03:19 15 Q But, if you look back at paragraph 3, there is no
16 mandatory obligation on the part of the CCRC to
17 actually appoint a police officer, the language is
18 "may", not "shall"; correct?

19 A Yes.

03:19 20 Q So even when there is a, according to this
21 memorandum, even if there is an alternate suspect
22 who may be worthy of a police investigation there
23 is no obligation, under this memo, to engage
24 Section 19 and have a police officer appointed,
03:19 25 although it's an option?



1 A Yes.

2 Q Okay. Now --

3 A Well this document is endeavouring to, as it
4 indicates, set out a non-exhaustive list of
03:20 5 factors which may be taken into account in
6 deciding whether it's a case in which a Section 19
7 investigating officer appointment should be made.

8 I mean the underlying
9 objective so far as the Commission's work is
03:20 10 concerned remains the same, which is to
11 investigate whether or not our applicant's
12 conviction is safe or unsafe, and whether there
13 may be grounds for referring the conviction back
14 to the Court of Appeal.

03:20 15 Now you're absolutely right
16 that the fourth bullet point, the fourth factor
17 there which would, which might well tend to
18 indicate that an appointment of an investigating
19 officer would be desirable is very apt to include
03:20 20 the circumstance where another person may be in
21 the frame for having committed the offence. The
22 re -- but the terms of reference which, and the
23 scope and ambit of the investigation which was
24 agreed with the investigating officer on
03:20 25 appointment, would be clearly directed towards the



1 Commission's objectives and responsibilities.

2 The reason why we would ask
3 for an investigating officer is not so that we can
4 then control an investigation designed to bring
03:21 5 another person to justice but to make sure that
6 the way in which the investigation is conducted to
7 serve the Commission's purposes does not, at the
8 same time, prejudice the possibility of bringing
9 someone else to justice at a later stage.

03:21 10 Q All right. Now when you have a Section 19
11 appointment --

12 A Uh-huh.

13 Q -- I think what's implicit in your answer is that
14 a police officer, under Section 19, may be wearing
03:21 15 more than just one hat; is that correct?

16 A Yes, yeah.

17 Q He's wearing a hat as an agent, effectively, of
18 the CCRC, pursuing the investigation with respect
19 to the wrongful conviction; yes?

03:21 20 A Yes.

21 Q But he also, he never takes off his hat of the
22 powers and duties that a police officer ordinarily
23 has?

24 A Correct.

03:21 25 Q So that if a police officer appointed under



1 Section 19, while doing the work on behalf of the
2 Commission, --

3 A Uh-huh.

4 Q -- comes across criminal offences, he is obligated
03:22 5 to pursue that in the ordinary way a police
6 officer would?

7 A Yes.

8 Q And that's expected and understood by the
9 Commission when they make these appointments; yes?

03:22 10 A Yes.

11 Q All right. So there's very little danger, in the
12 case of a Section 19 appointment, that a potential
13 alternate suspect is going to fall through the
14 cracks and end up not being investigated by
03:22 15 anybody?

16 A One would certainly hope so.

17 Q No. And there's another memo that I want to bring
18 to your attention that bears on this issue, and
19 that's at 339444, 339444. And the memo is
03:22 20 entitled *Crimes Discovered During the Review*.

21 A Uh-huh.

22 Q Are you somewhat familiar with this memo?

23 A Umm, I believe so. I see that this is version
24 four, which means that there's been three earlier
03:22 25 versions, so the document number of 614,000, I



1 would think, would be within the time when I was
2 at the Commission. Yes, okay, I'm familiar with
3 there having been a formal memorandum on this
4 subject. Whether this document is identical to
03:23 5 the one which was around when I was at the
6 Commission, I wouldn't like to say, but yes, I'm
7 generally familiar that there is a -- there has,
8 for some time, been a policy which the Commission
9 applies where crimes are discovered during the
03:23 10 review.

11 Q Yes. And, according to the first three paragraphs
12 of the introduction, it appears to cover just this
13 type of situation where there is a potential
14 alternate suspect; correct?

03:23 15 A Can I just quickly read through it?

16 Q Yes, please.

17 A (Witness reading) I'm sorry, could you repeat the
18 question?

19 Q What I am asking is, or I'm suggesting to you that
03:24 20 this memo also covers the situation where there is
21 an alternate suspect?

22 A Well I imagine that, yes, it would. It would
23 cover it if, during the course of the
24 investigation, the Commission discovered, from
03:24 25 interviewing of witnesses, that another -- that an



1 alternative suspect was being put up at that
2 stage, yes.

3 Q Yes. And this is, leaving aside a Section 19
4 appointment, --

03:24 5 A Yes.

6 Q -- this would cover an investigation where it's
7 just the Commission doing their own investigation;
8 yes?

9 A Yes.

03:24 10 Q All right. And if you look at the last sentence
11 of the second paragraph --

12 A Uh-huh.

13 Q Well, more generally, the introduction recognizes
14 that there is a bit of a paradox or a difficulty
03:24 15 in terms of ensuring that witnesses are open and
16 candid when they are interviewed by your
17 investigators?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And the tension between that and potentially
03:24 20 reporting offences to the authorities; yes?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And in terms of how that tension is resolved, in
23 the last sentence of paragraph 2:

24 "However, the Commission is a public
03:25 25 body and an integral part of the



1 criminal justice system - it cannot
2 simply ignore the fact that it is aware
3 of a crime having been committed."

4 Do you see that?

03:25 5 A Yes.

6 Q So there is a balancing or a tension between
7 reporting and not reporting, keeping in mind the
8 broader mandate of the CCRC; yes?

9 A Yes.

03:25 10 Q But if you go further down in the memo, under
11 *General Principles*, there are guiding principles
12 with respect to whether an offence ought to be
13 reported?

14 A Yes.

03:25 15 Q And if you look at the second bullet point under
16 paragraph 4 it appears that where there is an
17 actual referral to the Court of Appeal, --

18 A Uh-huh.

19 Q -- which would be likely in the case of a viable
03:25 20 alternate suspect; yes?

21 A Yes.

22 Q That the police are normally informed?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And that would trigger the police duty to
03:26 25 investigate crime and prosecute offenders; yes?



1 A Yes.

2 Q And if you go further, if you go to page 2 of the
3 memo, and the first complete bullet point on that
4 page.

03:26 5 A Uh-huh. Is that the one which begins:

6 "The Commission will take into account
7 ..."?

8 Q Yes.

9 A "... the age and seriousness of the crime
03:26 10 and may also have regard to the Code for
11 Crown Prosecutors."

12 Q And what that refers to is the fact that the more
13 serious the crime that the alternate suspect has
14 committed, the more likely it is that there is
03:26 15 going to be an obligation to report; yes?

16 A Yes.

17 Q And if you go further down in the memo, please, at
18 page 3, please, at the top of page 3 there is a
19 section entitled *Procedure* --

03:26 20 A Yes.

21 Q -- that sets out an actual formal procedure that's
22 supposed to happen when a member of the CCRC
23 discovers that a criminal offence has been
24 committed?

03:27 25 A Yes.



1 Q And there is a process where the investigation's
2 advisor is to be notified?

3 A Yes.

4 Q And a Commissioner is to be involved; yes?

03:27 5 A Yes.

6 Q And they are to consider the issue of whether or
7 not it ought to be reported, keeping in mind the
8 factors that were enumerated in the paragraphs
9 earlier?

03:27 10 A Yes.

11 Q And that decision, as to whether or not to make
12 the report, is actually formally logged and
13 recorded; right?

14 A Uh-huh.

03:27 15 Q Yes?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Again, these are formal procedures that are
18 dedicated to ensure that where there is an
19 alternate suspect, or somebody has committed a
03:27 20 serious criminal offence, that that person doesn't
21 simply fall through the cracks because the CCRC is
22 concerned with a different mandate; yes?

23 A Yes, that's correct. And when I -- the -- this
24 particular formal memorandum certainly isn't
03:27 25 limited to alternative suspects.



1 Q No.

2 A But, if there were to be an alternative suspect to
3 whom the anticipated circumstances envisaged by
4 this formal memorandum applies, then this
03:28 5 procedure would be apt to cover it, yes.

6 Q And the bottom line is, because the CCRC has taken
7 the effort to be detailed in the way that it
8 designs its procedures, it actually has
9 contemplated this very situation; correct?

03:28 10 A It certainly contemplated that, as part of its
11 investigation, it may come across and expose the
12 commission of criminal activity by persons whom it
13 has -- who have been considered during its review,
14 and that would certainly include an alternative
03:28 15 suspect.

16 Q If we --

17 A Or could include.

18 Q If we could go to page 4 of the memo, please.
19 Actually, if you could back up to page 3, please,
03:28 20 I'm sorry. The memo also, at paragraphs 11 and
21 12, even deals with a situation where the police
22 come to the Commission looking for information or
23 evidence about a criminal offence; --

24 A Yes.

03:29 25 Q -- correct?



1 A Yeah.

2 Q So, in a situation where the police have become
3 interested in an alternative suspect, --

4 A Yes.

03:29 5 Q -- there is a procedure that deals with them
6 coming to you --

7 A Uh-huh.

8 Q -- to get information that you've gathered through
9 your investigation of the wrongful conviction;
03:29 10 right?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Again, there are guidelines that deal with the
13 situation to make sure that a potential offender,
14 an alternative suspect or not, is -- does not
03:29 15 simply fall through the cracks between the CCRC
16 and the police; is that right?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Now you referred, in your evidence, to an
19 educative function that the CCRC has the potential
03:30 20 to provide to other actors within the criminal
21 justice system?

22 A Uh-huh.

23 Q I, in listening to your answer, it didn't strike
24 me that there's any formal provision for this
03:30 25 process of education to occur?



1 A True.

2 Q And that happens on sort of an informal or ad hoc
3 level?

4 A It would. I -- yes, in the sense that it's
03:30 5 something which I believe the Commission thinks it
6 could usefully do once it has the necessary
7 information, evidence, experience in which to do
8 it and would see that as being, if you like, a
9 voluntary benefit which the Commission could
03:30 10 provide to the criminal justice system.

11 Q Yes. And you earlier testified that a lot of the
12 Commission's work in the early part of its mandate
13 was dealing with some more historic cases, so the
14 educative function was somewhat limited by that;
03:31 15 yes?

16 A Yes. Not only because there were fewer people
17 having to focus and concentrate on casework, which
18 of course remains the Commission's core function,
19 but also because of the absence of empirical
03:31 20 evidence on which to make those sorts of comments.

21 Q But now, with the Commission entering its tenth
22 year, I suppose --

23 A Yes.

24 Q -- it's dealing with more contemporaneous cases,
03:31 25 there should be more ability to do that?



1 A Well, certainly, there should be the availability
2 of empirical evidence and the scope to identify,
3 from that, whether there are matters of a generic
4 nature which can usefully be fed back into the
03:31 5 system.

6 Q Do you see a role for having that function that
7 we're talking about actually specifically
8 enshrined in statute to make it a requirement for
9 (a) the CCRC to report on such matters, and (b)
03:32 10 for the other actors in the system to actually
11 receive the report and listen to it?

12 A Umm, that would certainly be a possibility, and as
13 it happens that is a statutory responsibility
14 which is being placed on the fairly
03:32 15 recently-created Independent Police Complaints
16 Commission. The *Police Reform Act* of 2002, which
17 creates the Independent Police Complaint
18 Commission, embodies, as part of the statutory
19 function of the IPCC, the guardianship role in
03:32 20 relation to the treatment and investigation and
21 com -- but not only dealing with police
22 complaints, but also dealing with policing matters
23 generally, which might improve the quality of
24 policing. So the idea of having such a function
03:32 25 embodied in statute would not be a new one.



1 Whether it's -- whether it would be necessary to
2 do it in relation to the Commission, that may be
3 something which will arise out of the extent to
4 which the Commission, in fact, is able to do it.

03:33 5 **Q** So there is models or precedent for such an
6 approach to be taken; yes?

7 **A** Yes, in the sense that the IPCC, which is also a
8 non-departmental public body, has a specific remit
9 in relation to the oversight or investigation of
03:33 10 complaints of police misconduct, is also given
11 this sort of umbrella role of contributing to the
12 better quality of policing --

13 **Q** And in terms --

14 **A** -- in the United Kingdom.

03:33 15 **Q** And in terms of ensuring that the expertise of the
16 CCRC, in terms of cases of wrongful conviction,
17 that having a formal structure would ensure that
18 that expertise gets distributed through the
19 system, and you don't think that that's a bad
03:33 20 idea; do you?

21 **A** No, I don't.

22 **Q** No? Okay. I thank you very much for your
23 patience, Mr. Commissioner. Those are my
24 questions.

03:34 25 **BY MS. McLEAN:**



1 Q Good afternoon. I'm going to keep moving this
2 mike until it hits the ground. Thanks.

3 Good afternoon, sir. Joanne
4 McLean is my name, I represent Joyce Milgaard, for
03:35 5 the record, the mother of David Milgaard. And I
6 should also indicate for the record we've met
7 before, at the *Morin Inquiry* back in 1997, when
8 you testified there.

9 Now, at that time, the
03:35 10 Criminal Cases Review Commission had really just
11 started going?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And you didn't have much of a track record but an
14 awful lot of good wishes?

03:35 15 A That's right.

16 Q But now some, now that there is a bit of a track
17 record, what I want to do is revisit some of the
18 advantages that an investigative body such as the
19 CCRC would have had, particularly in this case,
03:35 20 which would have helped or been of some assistance
21 to Mrs. Milgaard in her efforts to free her son.

22 A Uh-huh.

23 Q And, also, to help this Commission make some
24 recommendations to free others, and it's in that
03:35 25 context that I'd ask the questions.



1 A Uh-huh.

2 Q And I should also advise you that in 1998 there
3 was some solicitation by the Department of
4 Justice, Minister of Justice, for potential
03:35 5 reforms to what was then 690 of the *Criminal Code*,
6 and as part of that process Mrs. Milgaard
7 testified at the Standing Committee into -- the
8 Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights
9 that was --

10 A Uh-uh.

11 Q -- dealing with the proposed legislation, and one
12 of the things that they ended up concluding was
13 that they would await the recommendations of this
14 Inquiry before really trying to tackle serious
03:36 15 reforms beyond what was proposed and what has now
16 become 696.1.

17 A Uh-huh.

18 Q And we've also had evidence and acknowledgements
19 that 696.1, as it now stands, is very little
03:36 20 beyond a codification of the procedures that were
21 in place in Section 690; do you understand that?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Okay. Now Mrs. Milgaard was in the position where
24 she was a newcomer to the justice system and, like
03:36 25 a lot of people, was of the belief that the system



1 would free the innocent.

2 A Uh-huh.

3 Q There was very little done in the way of activism
4 or attempts to go beyond the system until 1980,
03:37 5 and it was a matter of David exhausting his
6 appeals to the Court of Appeal, and to have his
7 application to the Supreme Court dismissed. In
8 1980 he had escaped from a temporary release, and
9 in the course of being apprehended some months
03:37 10 later, he was shot in the back. At that point, so
11 it's 1980, is when Mrs. Milgaard's campaign really
12 comes to life to get him out.

13 Now at that time, 1980, she
14 had, and the family had, and David had, nothing
03:37 15 but his knowledge and his assertions that he was
16 utterly innocent, their observations of the trial
17 and the evidence that had come forward at the
18 trial, and their analysis of the impossibility of
19 some of the evidence that was led at the trial.
03:38 20 The concern is 'how do we get David Milgaard out
21 of jail'. So if they'd come to a body such as the
22 CCRC in 1980, asserting nothing but "I'm innocent,
23 the witnesses lied", and that that is some
24 knowledge that David would have had because the
03:38 25 witnesses that I'm referring to here, Nichol John



1 and Ron Wilson, --

2 A Uh-huh?

3 Q -- are people who were with him --

4 A Uh-huh.

03:38 5 Q -- who gave, nonetheless, incriminating evidence
6 against him at the trial, so he knows that they
7 lied.

8 A Yes.

9 Q Okay. So, in those circumstances, what would the
03:38 10 Commission be able to do or what would they have
11 done?

12 A Well I am -- I would imagine that the application
13 from Joyce Milgaard on behalf of her son -- as I
14 understand it you're saying she was unrepresented
03:39 15 at that particular time?

16 Q Yes.

17 A She had no legal assistance at all?

18 Q Assume that to be the case.

19 A Right. Well she, presumably, would have completed
03:39 20 one of our application forms and set out, as best
21 she could, what the nature of the application was
22 and, on the circumstances as you've described
23 them, the application form would presumably have
24 been along the lines of "my son has been -- is in
03:39 25 prison, having been convicted of a murder which he



1 did not commit", would probably explain something
2 about the circumstances giving rise to that
3 conviction, and given that the application form
4 specifically invites an applicant to say "what do
03:39 5 you think went wrong in your case" I would imagine
6 that the summary on the application form would
7 make specific reference to the fact that "one of
8 the reasons why my son was convicted of this
9 offence was because the -- his two friends, Nichol
03:40 10 John and Ronald Wilson who were with him on the
11 morning that the murder was committed, gave
12 evidence to the jury which is simply untrue." I
13 imagine that that would be the core of the
14 application.

03:40 15 Q What steps would the Commission then take to
16 investigate that case?

17 A Well, we would be put on notice that the applicant
18 was -- the applicant's mother is saying my son is
19 innocent and that there are at least two witnesses
03:40 20 in the trial who have given false evidence. At
21 that stage, and just sort of thinking back to what
22 the Commissioner was saying earlier about
23 documentation coming in, there may be no
24 documentation at all accompanying that
03:41 25 application.



1 Q Uh-huh.

2 A So we would immediately embark on the process of
3 gathering in documentation which would tell us
4 about the criminal proceedings to date.

03:41 5 Q And would that include the police files from the
6 Saskatoon police?

7 A In the circumstances of this case. I mean, I
8 appreciate that I'm answering this question with
9 more knowledge of the case than I would actually
03:41 10 have had if this application was being received,
11 but imagine that I was the screening member of
12 this particular application; in other words, I was
13 looking at this application to see where do we go
14 from here, so I would -- by the time I came to
03:42 15 screen this application, I would expect to have
16 the Court of Appeal file, so I would know what the
17 issues were in the appeal, but more importantly,
18 of course, I would have the judge's summing up to
19 the jury which is a very good starting point to
03:42 20 get some idea as to what the case was about, what
21 the evidence was and what the issues were, but I
22 would also, of course, see from the Court of
23 Appeal file that there had been an issue at trial
24 which was dealt with at the first appeal around
03:42 25 Nichol John's evidence and I would instantly see,



1 based on the nature of the application, that
2 witnesses had lied, that I find a situation where
3 when Nichol John gets into the witness box, she
4 gives evidence in which she's effectively saying I
03:42 5 don't remember anything, but has previously made a
6 statement in which apparently she witnessed David
7 Milgaard committing the murder, so already I would
8 be beginning to get some idea, some feel for what
9 the -- what was inside this case which was
03:43 10 relating to what I had been told in the
11 application and I think the likelihood is that if
12 I had been the Commission member who was screening
13 this application, I would immediately be saying
14 this is a case which is going to require an
03:43 15 extensive investigation. There is an allegation
16 that witnesses lied, there's already an indication
17 from the Court of Appeal file that there are
18 concerns around how a witness' evidence was
19 obtained and gets into a statement in one form and
03:43 20 then she turns up at court and says I can't
21 remember anything, so without a shadow of a doubt,
22 I think, I would then be saying, as part of the
23 screening process, this case needs a full review,
24 which means there is bound to be a lapse of time
03:44 25 before a case review manager is assigned to it and



1 the investigation starts, but in the meantime, we
2 must obtain the police files and the Crown
3 prosecution service files.

4 Q Okay. And in this particular case when you obtain
03:44 5 those files, at least the initial files from the
6 Saskatoon police, upon reading them, and I'm not
7 so concerned about the time that it might take to
8 do this --

9 A Let's just assume that that's happened, yes.

03:44 10 Q Yes. -- upon reading them, you would certainly
11 learn from those files that there was also
12 involvement of the RCMP in Saskatoon, the Calgary
13 Police Service --

14 A Uh-huh.

03:44 15 Q -- and the Regina police?

16 A Right.

17 Q And that there was also obviously some involvement
18 with the head of the prosecution service in Regina
19 as well as Saskatoon?

03:45 20 A Yes.

21 Q And you would obtain all of those files as part of
22 being prepared to review the case in its entirety;
23 would you not?

24 A Well, that I think would be something which would
03:45 25 happen downstream.



1 Q Yeah.

2 A Because at the state I'm asking for the police
3 files, that's to get what I think is the core
4 material in which will enable the case review
03:45 5 manager to start an effective process of review
6 and get the case plan going, so the involvement of
7 -- and of course this is peculiar to your own sort
8 of structure over here which doesn't particularly
9 apply for me.

03:45 10 Q Yes.

11 A But putting myself in the situation of doing this
12 in Canada, I'm the case review manager, I look at
13 the police files which have been obtained which
14 will be from the Saskatoon police directly
03:45 15 connected with the investigation. As case review
16 manager, I will see that there are other police
17 forces, both the federal force and other
18 provincial forces who have had a hand in this, I
19 would be interested to look at them too.

03:46 20 Q Yes, that's why I prefaced it with I'm not so
21 concerned about how much time it would take, but
22 ultimately as part of doing the full investigation
23 of the case, what you would want to have is the
24 files of all of the police services that were
03:46 25 involved?



1 A Yes.

2 Q And all of the Crown prosecuting offices that were
3 involved?

4 A Yes.

03:46 5 Q And in the allegation of the witnesses lied, an
6 area of prime concern would be the circumstances
7 of taking the statements from the witnesses?

8 A Yes.

9 Q So again, with what you know now that you wouldn't
03:46 10 have known at the outset, you would have learned
11 from the, from those files things that were known
12 to various police officers and which became known
13 to the Milgaard family in about 1992 about the
14 police questioning, and that's specifically, and
03:47 15 this may be more than you understand about the
16 evidence, the witnesses, Nichol John and Ron
17 Wilson, were questioned by an outside police
18 officer purportedly with the aid of a polygraph
19 and the evidence concerning what really happened
03:47 20 according to that officer was given in 1992 and it
21 included things like showing these two witnesses,
22 who were 16 and 17, bloody clothing from the
23 victim.

24 A Uh-huh.

03:47 25 Q Autopsy pictures, putting the witnesses together



1 and discussing with them his theories about what
2 happened.

3 A Uh-huh.

4 Q And also you would have learned I guess in a
03:48 5 preliminary investigation of the type of
6 questioning, you would have learned that Nichol
7 John, who was 16, had been brought to the
8 Saskatoon Police Service and had been left
9 overnight in a police cell before her interview
03:48 10 with Inspector Roberts --

11 A Uh-huh.

12 Q -- and before she gave any incriminating
13 statements. And Mrs. Milgaard, in her efforts
14 later, discovered that the matron of the jail had
03:48 15 some comments to make about Nichol John's
16 condition --

17 A Uh-huh.

18 Q -- and apparent trauma at her night in jail.
19 Those are the kind of things that might really
03:48 20 cause some concerns about whether or not accurate,
21 reliable statements were obtained from these
22 witnesses?

23 A Well, I would have thought so and -- because they
24 are clearly factors which surround the eventual
03:49 25 statement which Nichol John made, and having



1 explored those circumstances and I hope -- it's
2 difficult not to sort of confuse hindsight
3 evidence into the fact that there you are, you
4 don't actually know anything to start off with and
03:49 5 you've got to build up the pictures as you go on,
6 but I would certainly hope that the investigation
7 which the Commission undertook sort of building up
8 the picture would lead it fairly rapidly through
9 the police files and through inquiries which would
03:49 10 then be made around the documentation and people
11 who were concerned with the interviewing of that
12 particular witness, that we would build up the
13 picture which you've just outlined, and once we
14 had that picture, then, if I was the case review
03:50 15 manager or considering the fruits of what I was
16 finding, I would be saying to myself at that
17 stage, well, there are obvious concerns here
18 around how the evidence was taken from this
19 witness and the circumstances in which it was
03:50 20 taken. I know for a fact that when she came to
21 give evidence at trial she said she couldn't
22 remember anything which is going to raise the
23 question, as it would have done had the jury been
24 considering this to the fullest extent, when she
03:50 25 says she can't remember, is that a deliberate lie



1 or is it that she genuinely can't remember, in
2 which case how does it come about that she has
3 made a statement in which she asserts that she
4 witnessed the murder, and we're beginning to -- we
03:50 5 would be beginning to build up a picture around
6 the taking of that statement which, with a young
7 and vulnerable person with the sort of
8 circumstances you are describing are likely to
9 raise concerns in the mind of a case review
03:51 10 manager at the Commission who is investigating the
11 case, and one of the things which I think would be
12 immediately concerning is the next step in the
13 investigation, would be to find out how much of
14 this information which we've now discovered was
03:51 15 not only known at the time, but given that these
16 are matters on which those responsible for
17 defending David Milgaard would have been quite
18 entitled to cross-examine about when dealing with
19 the matter of Nichol John's credibility, how much
03:51 20 did they know at the time of the trial, so that
21 would be an essential question I think which we
22 would be wanting to answer.

23 Q

24 If I can just jump ahead, light years, Nichol John
25 testified not only that she didn't remember events
03:52 that were outlined in the statement, she also



1 testified that she didn't remember giving parts of
2 the statement, and what was done by the justice
3 officials that were investigating this file many
4 years later was attempts to obtain from Nichol
03:52 5 John her recollection of the statement under
6 hypnosis. Do you think there would have been some
7 merit or some serious interest given to trying to
8 obtain her memory of the questioning itself?

9 A I do find that very difficult to answer because
03:52 10 the concepts, the concepts of either putting
11 people under hypnosis or applying polygraph tests
12 is so alien to me, we simply don't do it, that my
13 initial reaction is that if I was an investigator
14 at the Commission looking at this, I wouldn't be
03:53 15 thinking in terms of putting witnesses under
16 hypnosis.

17 Q Okay.

18 A But that is simply because of my lack of
19 experience of doing that and the fact that we
03:53 20 don't do it in general. I think that on occasions
21 where the police as an investigative method have
22 sought to sort of go along the lines of putting
23 witnesses under hypnosis, they usually come to --
24 they are usually viewed with a fair amount of
03:53 25 disfavour, so I find it very difficult to answer



1 that question.

2 Q Okay.

3 A From my own experience, I wouldn't be thinking of
4 putting witnesses under hypnosis.

03:53 5 Q Nor would I, and I would hope nobody would now.

6 A And I also made the point of course earlier when
7 dealing sort of generically with the way the
8 Commission goes about its work, we wouldn't be
9 rushing to interview witnesses years after the
03:54 10 event about recollections of the events until we
11 got a very solid basis on which to do that.

12 Q If we can leave hypnosis out of it then --

13 A Thank you.

14 Q -- would you think there's as much reason to be
03:54 15 concerned about her lack of memory of the
16 questioning as there is about her purported lack
17 of memory of witnessing a murder?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And the approach to resolving this would certainly
03:54 20 consist of more than asking the police officers if
21 they had done anything wrong, you would be
22 investigating looking for documentation and
23 looking for records?

24 A Yes.

03:54 25 Q One of the things that you would have found in



1 that file, sir, is a document that was disclosed
2 in 1991 or 1992. Could I have 006799, please.
3 This is referred to as the Mackie summary and I
4 don't know if this is a document -- have you been
03:55 5 shown this document in your preparation at all,
6 sir?

7 A I don't believe so.

8 MR. HODSON: I don't believe that was
9 provided to him, no.

03:55 10 BY MS. McLEAN:

11 Q Okay. Last page, please, and I'm not going to ask
12 you to read it or to follow it factually, I simply
13 want to indicate to you that it's a five page
14 document, the last page of which is a summary of a
03:55 15 mixture of facts and of police theories.

16 A This is a document you say which came into
17 existence in 1991?

18 Q As far as the representatives of Mr. Milgaard are
19 concerned it was in the police files.

03:55 20 A All right, but it was a document which had been
21 prepared by the police at the time of the
22 investigation?

23 Q Yes.

24 A Thank you.

03:55 25 Q To the best of our abilities to date it, it was



1 prepared approximately one week before the
2 statements of Nichol John and Ron Wilson.

3 A Yeah.

4 Q The inculpatory statements of Nichol John and Ron
03:56 5 Wilson.

6 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just a minute,
7 please.

8 MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, I rise without
9 discussion with any other counsel for the
03:56 10 parties, but we have a general, I think a general
11 sense among some of us that of the propriety of
12 engaging this witness in commenting on these
13 documents given, you know, the purpose for which
14 his attendance was called at the inquiry, and I'm
03:56 15 not able to articulate in a full sense what the
16 concerns are, but we haven't yet even established
17 a full factual basis as to when all of the pages
18 of this document were put into place and to
19 present it to this witness in this fashion and
03:56 20 ask for his comment on it, it seems to me to
21 serve no useful function for the purposes of the
22 job of the analysis that you have to do at this
23 inquiry.

24 I don't know if other counsel
03:56 25 wish to speak to it, but generally behind me and



1 in front of me we have a grave sense of unease as
2 to the path that we're going down here, the
3 purpose for which we're going down it and whether
4 this is an appropriate use or area to take this
03:57 5 witness into and I state that for the record.

6 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you. Do you
7 have any comment about that?

8 MS. McLEAN: Well, I simply, for starters,
9 haven't asked the witness to comment on it. The
03:57 10 date we have established in my submission was
11 clearly before the statements had been made by
12 Ron Wilson and Nichol John and the evidence of
13 the RCMP officers that testified were to the
14 effect that they had used this document in a
03:57 15 meeting when deciding who should be the suspect.
16 What I wanted to ask this witness is for his
17 comment on what effect that kind of document
18 would have on his assessment of the statements.

19 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: As a Commissioner
03:57 20 you mean?

21 MS. McLEAN: Yes.

22 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Of the CCRC?

23 MS. McLEAN: Yes, if it would have
24 triggered any inquiries or any concerns.

03:57 25 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, I have the



1 perception that the witness has a very keen
2 appreciation of the purpose for which he is here
3 and if he doesn't think it's a question he's
4 competent to answer, he'll surely tell you, so go
03:58 5 ahead and ask.

6 MS. McLEAN: I'm sure he will.

7 BY MS. McLEAN:

8 Q And the other factual thing I should tell you,
9 sir, is that both Nichol John and Ron Wilson had
03:58 10 given statements to the police, as had David
11 Milgaard, in the very early stages of the
12 investigation, the three of them had been
13 questioned separately and essentially said the
14 same thing, that they came, they left, nothing
03:58 15 happened, and then we have the Mackie summary here
16 that emerges sometime prior to the second
17 statement.

18 What my question to you would
19 be, if you found a document of this nature that
03:58 20 essentially predicted what the witnesses said in
21 their second statements, would that trigger some
22 inquiries or concerns?

23 A Well, I think I can best answer that by taking
24 into account what I know is the purpose behind
03:59 25 your question and also having regard to the



1 comment which was made a moment ago, that the
2 general area of concern which has been flagged up
3 from the initial investigation, from the initial
4 application through the initial stages of the
03:59 5 Commission's investigation and ongoing as the
6 Commission's investigation progresses is that
7 there are issues which the Commission should
8 investigate around the, not only the evidence
9 which was actually given at trial, but also the
03:59 10 circumstances in which this evidence was obtained,
11 and the Commission would know from what it had
12 already discovered, that both or all -- I think
13 this document also included -- is it Shorty
14 Cadrain, was that his name?

04:00 15 Q That's his nickname. Is formal name is Albert.

16 A Albert Cadrain, but Nichol John and Ronald Wilson,
17 we would know that they had originally made
18 statements saying we didn't see anything happening
19 which had somehow translated it at a later stage
04:00 20 to, in the case of Ronald Wilson and Nichol John
21 certainly, we witnessed something and incriminated
22 David Milgaard.

23 Q Okay, if I could just --

24 A So our investigation would be around the
04:00 25 circumstances, how does it come about that you get



1 from one position to another, and my own concerns
2 would be raised by references to hypnosis or
3 polygraph for reasons I've already mentioned, but
4 the suggestion that -- what emerges from this
04:00 5 document is the suggestion we haven't got the
6 story that we think they ought to be telling, so
7 let's have them all together and see if we can get
8 them to tell a true story. I mean, this is a
9 document which I think would undoubtedly be
04:01 10 relevant to the Commission's consideration and
11 investigation of the issue generally of Nichol
12 John and Ronald Wilson as witnesses who
13 contributed to the conviction of David Milgaard.

14 Q Okay. If I could interject one correction to what
04:01 15 you said, there is not a transformation in the
16 statement of Albert Cadrain.

17 A No, I'm sorry.

18 Q His had been --

19 A Yes, I appreciate that, but he wasn't -- I don't
04:01 20 think he was, in any event, suggested that he
21 would have been in a position to see anything.

22 Q In terms of the murder?

23 A Again, I think we're getting into difficulties
24 with the point which was raised because I'm being
04:01 25 asked to make comments about a situation about



1 which I have limited factual information, but in
2 terms of the fact that clearly the reliability and
3 truthfulness of evidence which was given at trial
4 by these two witnesses, which on any view must
04:02 5 have been, certainly so far as Ron Wilson was
6 concerned, and there were issues around the way in
7 which Nichol's evidence was -- came to the
8 attention of the jury, therefore, there are
9 general concerns, that would be a significant
04:02 10 issue for the Commission to investigate, and this
11 document I hope would be one which sparked
12 interest and attention in the mind of whoever was
13 investigating that there was, that this was an
14 aspect which would need to be looked into.

04:02 15 Q Okay. If we could have page 1 of the same
16 document, sir. At the beginning of this document
17 there is a reference to a (V1)- rape, (V1)- being
18 the surname of what we now know to be one of Larry
19 Fisher's victims.

04:02 20 A Uh-huh.

21 Q And then there are references to the Miller file
22 being Gail Miller, that Miss (V1)- had been shown
23 an identification, photographs, that her attacker
24 was a A group secretor, which is the same group as
04:03 25 David Milgaard and, as it happens, Larry Fisher.



1 A Uh-huh.

2 Q Would seeing those trigger some investigation or
3 ought it to trigger some investigation as to
4 whether or not there is another suspect out there?
04:03 5 There appears to be some kind of linking between
6 the murder and another rape.

7 A Well, it would be difficult to say on simply
8 reading that knowing exactly what it imported, but
9 I think that in this -- if the Commission were
04:03 10 investigating this particular case, then
11 references such as this would spark inquiry,
12 what's this about, what are we talking about here.

13 Q And other documents that you would have found in
14 the file, sir, would contain the reports of the
04:04 15 RCMP officers who were involved in assisting in
16 the case and those documents turned up here at the
17 inquiry in 2005 outlining theories that the same
18 person who had been committing rapes in Saskatoon
19 had been responsible for the murder?

04:04 20 A Uh-huh.

21 Q There would have been documents authored in 1969
22 by various Saskatoon officers -- well, at least
23 one in particular, maybe more, connecting the
24 murder to the rapes. Would that kind of thing
04:04 25 trigger an inquiry by the Commission into the



1 potential existence of another suspect for the
2 murder?

3 A I would think the answer to that would be yes
4 because the Commission would be anxious to know to
04:05 5 what extent, given the fact that the police, the
6 information which is being derived from the police
7 documentation is that there were, the
8 consideration was being given to other suspects
9 which is not in itself an unusual occurrence.

04:05 10 Indeed the requirements on the police when they
11 are investigating criminal offences is to pursue
12 all reasonable lines of inquiry and if they don't,
13 they run the risk of being criticized for being
14 too closed in their investigation, but the issue
04:05 15 for the Commission would be whether there is
16 sufficient substance in any belief or
17 investigation into other suspects which would have
18 potentially given rise to the ability of the
19 prosecution to discharge the standard of proof
04:06 20 required of them and, in particular, whether
21 information about these other suspects had been
22 disclosed to the defence at the time.

23 Q And you also would have seen in there a statement
24 from Linda Fisher that had come in 1980, one
04:06 25 officer had assigned it for follow-up and no



1 follow-up had been done. Would there be some
2 follow-up by the Commission into the allegations
3 of Linda Fisher that her ex-husband was a likely
4 candidate for the murder given his predilection
04:06 5 for rape and the location where they lived at the
6 time of the murder?

7 A Well, I think the Commission's initial reaction to
8 seeing that would be the question who is Larry
9 Fisher, what's all this about.

04:07 10 Q And there would have been some inquiries made as
11 to who is Larry Fisher and --

12 A -- what is all this about, yes, and depending on
13 what all that reveals, well, as I say, being
14 careful not to confuse, sort of overlay this with
04:07 15 hindsight, the answer to that question on inquiry
16 might be that the Commission is satisfied that
17 actually there's no significance to it whatsoever,
18 in which case it would be dropped as a line of
19 investigation on any view.

04:07 20 Alternatively, the Commission
21 might come to the view this appears to have a
22 degree of significance and so we want to find out
23 more about all of this and evaluate the strength
24 of the suggestion that Larry Fisher is an
04:07 25 alternative suspect and then again say, well, if



1 this is the information which there was about him
2 and we think that it may have had a significance
3 in terms of introducing another suspect into the
4 proceedings as a means of inducing doubt as to
04:08 5 whether David was responsible were the defence in
6 a position to do that; in other words, did they
7 know about it.

8 Q And you might have found also in the file other
9 documents that were not disclosed to the defence
04:08 10 that related to people that were in a position to
11 see the location at which David Milgaard
12 supposedly accosted Gail Miller but did not, and
13 also evidence from, or statements from witnesses
14 that made a Crown theory at trial all but
04:08 15 impossible, that kind of thing that could have
16 been used to attack Crown theories at trial is
17 something that would be of great interest?

18 A Well, of great interest to the Commission in any
19 case, and this would be no different, would be to
04:09 20 have in mind the obligations on the prosecution in
21 relation to disclosure of unused material, and if
22 you have a situation where, on the prosecution
23 case that an event happened where if there were
24 other people around at the relevant time they
04:09 25 would have seen something and there are statements



1 from people who were there at the relevant time
2 who didn't see anything, then that is evidence
3 which tends to undermine the prosecution case, is
4 therefore disclosable under the *Criminal Procedure*
04:09 5 *and Investigations Act* of 1996, and so if it
6 wasn't disclosed, then that would be an issue
7 which the Commission would then have to take
8 account of and evaluate in terms of whether that
9 non-disclosure was material to the safety of the
04:10 10 conviction.

11 Q Okay.

12 A But again, you are asking there, we have now moved
13 in a sense away from the potential unreliability
14 and concerns around the witnesses Nichol John and
04:10 15 Ronald Wilson into the general responsibilities of
16 the prosecution in relation to disclosure by used
17 material, and in a case of this nature,
18 particularly which has been a complex
19 investigation, undoubtedly one of the issues which
04:10 20 would be identified clearly on the case plan is
21 check compliance with disclosure, of disclosure
22 obligations.

23 Q And this would be something that comes to you, or
24 comes to the person who is reviewing the case on
04:10 25 behalf of the Commissioner, it's not something



1 that is asserted necessarily by the applicant?

2 A I daresay that in -- I don't, I make no comment
3 about Joyce Milgaard's ability to express herself
4 in this case, but for many applicants they would
04:10 5 be unlikely to be able to articulate, and we --
6 "would you please check that the prosecution had
7 complied with their disclosure obligations".

8 I mean it is -- since we know,
9 as I indicate in the article which I did for the
04:11 10 *Drake Law Review*, that non-disclosure of material
11 which should have been disclosed was a very
12 significant factor in the reason why Judith Ward
13 was wrongly convicted, and that our experience in
14 the Commission is that failure to comply with
04:11 15 disclosure obligations, either by design or by
16 mistake, remains a problem in cases where wrongful
17 conviction is alleged, it is also -- it is, I
18 would say, axiomatic in a review of a case of this
19 nature that the prosecution would be interested to
04:11 20 make -- I'm sorry -- that the Commission would be
21 interested to make sure that it was aware of all
22 of the material that was available to the
23 prosecuting authorities, and insofar as it was
24 material which wasn't relied on by the Crown, that
04:12 25 it had been properly disclosed.



1 Q And unlike the applicant, who has to go and ferret
2 out information themselves, this would be
3 information that you could obtain sort of, if not
4 all at once, you can have your package together
04:12 5 before beginning to really evaluate the strength
6 of the case in terms of a referral?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Could I have 000002, please. What Joyce Milgaard
9 actually did in 1981 was go to a lawyer, and
04:12 10 subsequently to a second lawyer, and she was
11 eventually told that, in effect, "what you need to
12 have to get your case re-opened is a bombshell,
13 you need to have something that you can drop on
14 the Department of Justice that will cause the case
04:13 15 to be re-opened, otherwise you're stuck", and
16 thereafter what Mrs. Milgaard did was her own
17 investigation, assisted at times by lawyers, at
18 times by journalists, one in particular, and
19 eventually wound up at the offices of Mr. Wolch
04:13 20 who has represented David since 1986.

21 There was an application made
22 to the Minister of Justice under what is now 696,
23 was 690, and at the time of the application was
24 617, and that's the application to the Minister of
04:13 25 Justice for consideration of the application. And



1 the first thing I wanted to point out is in the --
2 could I have, please, the second page -- sorry, it
3 must have been on the first -- yes, sorry. There
4 is an indication in the letter which accompanies
04:14 5 the application that this application is being
6 made on a scientific basis, and it's evidence that
7 was obtained by one Dr. Ferris, and attached to
8 the application is the report of Dr. Ferris. Now,
9 if that was received by the Commission, that would
04:14 10 be reviewed by consultation with expert witnesses?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And if we have the second page of it, please,
13 there's an indication in the letter that:

14 "In preparing the
04:15 15 Application, we have deliberately
16 attempted to be as concise as possible
17 and at the same time present the matter
18 in an objective fashion."

19 It goes on to say that, as an example of
20 questions that their counsel is prepared to
21 answer:

22 "... the witness, Nicole John, whose
23 statement gave rise to what is now known
24 in our courts as a Milgaard application,
04:15 25 gave a statement that was prejudicial to



1 David Milgaard. We are in a position to
2 factually demonstrate the errors in that
3 statement and that it cannot possibly be
4 true, but we have not done that because
04:15 5 Nicole John testified in Court that the
6 statement was not true."

7 That, in itself, is a little bit fuzzy. She
8 didn't adopt the statement, she didn't formally
9 deny it, because she was taking the position she
04:15 10 didn't remember. Okay?

11 But would the assertion by
12 counsel that her statement, given to the police
13 on the second occasion, was factually impossible,
14 could not possibly be true; would that trigger
04:16 15 some inquiries or investigations by the
16 Commission?

17 A Yeah, well, the content -- the circumstance in
18 which this letter is written, of course, is
19 counsel effectively being in the position of the
04:16 20 case review manager in the Commission, because
21 here the -- as I understand it what is being
22 suggested in this application is to the Minister
23 of Justice saying "minister, I'd like you to
24 consider this application and decide whether it
04:16 25 affords you grounds for sending the case back for



1 a further hearing"?

2 Q Yeah.

3 A So, in actual fact, what Mr. Wolch is doing in the
4 course of this letter is saying "I am" -- or, by
04:17 5 analogy, he is presenting an application to the
6 minister, as the decision-maker, in much the same
7 way as the case review manager would present an
8 investigated case to decision-making members for a
9 decision at the Commission.

04:17 10 But assuming that this was a
11 letter by Mr. Wolch to the Commission saying "I'm
12 representing David Milgaard and I've looked into
13 this case, and one of the issues which I think is
14 significant here is that there are errors in
04:17 15 Nichol's statement which can't possibly be true",
16 and I would expect that if the application was
17 being supported by counsel such as Mr. Wolch that
18 assertion would be amplified and explained, what,
19 what -- why it is thought that that is to be the
04:18 20 case, then that would become an issue drawn to the
21 Commission's attention by legal counsel
22 representing Mr. Milgaard which we would then
23 consider it would be appropriate to investigate.

24 And indeed, when I was talking
04:18 25 yesterday about applications who are



1 represented -- applicants who are represented when
2 they come to the Commission, the Commission is
3 greatly assisted if an application is supported by
4 counsel who is able to draw attention to issues
04:18 5 such as this because it means that we are already,
6 you know, we hit the ground running, if I can put
7 it that way, in terms of issues which may well be
8 significant.

9 Now, of course, we may
04:18 10 disagree with counsel. I mean, I'm not saying we
11 would in this case, because it seems to me that,
12 given that a significant feature of this case
13 generally is around the credibility of Nichol John
14 and a suggestion that there are things she said
04:19 15 which can't possibly be true, it's un -- it would
16 be difficult to dismiss those without some further
17 investigation. But there may be circumstances in
18 which lawyers acting for an applicant raise an
19 issue and say "we think this is significant" and
04:19 20 we may immediately say "we don't think it is".

21 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But you also said
22 that you would expect counsel to amplify it, what
23 he said there, in other words give the reasons
24 for --

04:19 25 A Well, all that's being suggested here is that



1 there are aspects, there are errors in the
2 statement that can't possibly be true. I mean I
3 would imagine, looking behind this document, that
4 counsel would articulate what aspects of the
04:19 5 statement are said to be untrue. I mean, I don't
6 know.

7 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But, if he didn't
8 articulate that, would the Commission take any
9 further investigative steps?

04:19 10 A Well we would probably write back to Mr. Wolch in
11 these circumstances and say "please, could you
12 help us by amplifying those aspects of the
13 statement which you say can't possibly be true,
14 and why you say that's the case, so that we can
04:20 15 know the context of where the investigation should
16 be going".

17 BY MS. McLEAN:

18 Q Yes. And that, Mr. Commissioner, is the
19 invitation that's put in the letter. It says
04:20 20 that:

21 "In preparing the
22 Application, we have deliberately
23 attempted to be as concise as possible
24 ...",
04:20 25 and:



1 "We are certainly prepared to elaborate
2 on any point of concern or answer any
3 query that may arise or that we have
4 perhaps not foreseen. For example, ...
04:20 5 Nichol John ..."

6 A Uh-huh. But, as I was saying, we agreed between
7 us earlier this letter was written in the context
8 of -- this was effectively the document on which
9 Mr. Wolch was hoping, on his client's behalf, that
04:20 10 the minister would make a decision to refer.

11 Q Not this document, the accompanying --

12 A The accompanying application.

13 Q Yes.

14 A Yes, absolutely, the accompanying application.

04:21 15 Q And --

16 A Whereas we are looking at it in a slightly
17 different context, that this is -- the
18 accompanying application to this letter was, in
19 fact, the application to the Commission, "please,
04:21 20 would you investigate this case and then, in due
21 course, make a decision on it?"

22 Q Yes.

23 A So the bit, if you like, the intended added value
24 of the Commission is that the Commission would be
04:21 25 taking this forward in an investigative sense in



1 addition to making a decision on a referral.

2 Q Yes.

3 A And that, I think, is the essential point.

4 Q Okay. Now in the CCRC regime it costs nothing but
04:21 5 a stamp to get your application in?

6 A It's --

7 Q Unless it's dropped off?

8 A Essentially, yes.

9 Q So in the, in this system that was in place in
04:22 10 Canada, and still is, the applicant has to rely on
11 either their own work, their own efforts and their
12 time and expense in, you know, trying to contact
13 witnesses, which you've said may actually
14 undermine an effective investigation, long
04:22 15 distance phone calls --

16 A It can do so in some cases, yes.

17 Q -- long distance phone calls, travel, paying
18 experts, assembling all the information; then they
19 also could be open to accusations that they have
04:22 20 been putting in their application piecemeal, one
21 bit at a time, as it's discovered? You appreciate
22 that's a weakness of the do-it-yourself system?

23 A I'm -- I'll -- if you say it is I'm sure that's
24 probably right, yes.

04:22 25 Q Well, an applicant investigating their own case



1 certainly doesn't have the luxury of sitting down
2 and examining every single piece of available
3 information and assembling a cogent argument for
4 presentation when their goal is to get somebody
04:23 5 out of jail ASAP. It may very well be that they
6 submit what appears to be significant as and when
7 they receive it?

8 A I think you certainly -- I -- the comment I'd make
9 on that is that the, given the sort of preparatory
04:23 10 work that the Commission does in terms of finding
11 out about how we've got to where we are at the
12 point where the application is made, and then
13 looking at the sorts of issues which arise in the
14 application, it is much easier for the Commission
04:23 15 to take a strategic overview of the case and the
16 issues which require investigation, investigating,
17 than it would be for an individual applicant to do
18 the same.

19 Q Whereas an individual applicant would simply be
04:24 20 saying "here's some evidence, here's some new
21 stuff, overturn my conviction, let me out, send me
22 back to the Court", rather than trying to
23 assemble, necessarily, every single conceivable
24 thing that they -- could be said about the case?

04:24 25 A It would be far more difficult, it's far more



1 difficult for an applicant, even with legal
2 advice, to take the sort of strategic overview of
3 investigating a possible wrongful conviction.

4 Q And, in terms of investigating the case, the
04:24 5 applicant sometimes has the luxury of lawyers that
6 will work for either pro bono or for very little
7 money, --

8 A Uh-huh.

9 Q -- or has to go to advocacy groups such as
04:24 10 AIDWYC, --

11 A Uh-huh.

12 Q -- Centurion Ministries is one in the United
13 States that does similar work, I think Justice was
14 doing some in the U.K. --

04:24 15 A Yes.

16 Q -- before the CCRC?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And I mean the group Justice, not the concept
19 justice.

04:25 20 A Yes, the group Justice, yes.

21 Q And, by nature of having to gather the information
22 and assist the applicant in putting forward the
23 arguments to a decision-maker, lawyers or advocacy
24 groups could be vulnerable to an accusation that
04:25 25 they are partisan?



1 A Well yes, they certainly could, they certainly
2 could be. But I think, actually, the real
3 disadvantage is not so much about whether they are
4 partisan or not, although I accept that that is a
04:25 5 possibility, but it is the difficulty which they
6 have, particularly if the case is complex and
7 there are a large number of issues, the
8 investigation of which could take a number of
9 different approaches. The -- it's this, the
04:25 10 difficulty of obtaining, of having the strategic
11 overview which is necessary, I think that's the
12 biggest problem.

13 Q And one of the things that did in fact happen here
14 which -- so where the Centurion Ministries was
04:26 15 involved in obtaining the second recantation of
16 Ron Wilson, where he reverted back to his original
17 statement --

18 A Uh-huh.

19 Q -- that nothing inculpatory had been said or done
04:26 20 by David in relation to the murder, and that was
21 viewed by people in authority as having been
22 suspicious and there were questions raised as to
23 whether or not Mr. Wilson had received more than
24 religion for his recantation?

04:26 25 A Yes.



1 Q And even an investigation, as late as 1993-1994,
2 as to whether or not Joyce Milgaard had paid him
3 to recant?

4 A Yes.

04:26 5 Q That is something that could not be said if the
6 investigation was being done by an independent
7 body and not by people who are necessarily either
8 the applicant, related to the applicant, or an
9 advocacy group acting on behalf of the applicant?

04:27 10 A I think, broadly speaking, that has to be right.

11 Q And, also, the decision-maker, to the extent that
12 those kinds of skeptical views are held by people
13 advising the decision-maker, you're in a position
14 where the person who's making a decision about
04:27 15 whether or not to refer a case back to the Court
16 of Appeal is potentially being influenced by the
17 opinions of people that are adverse to the
18 decision to send it back?

19 A Umm, yes, that's right, and which was a point that
04:27 20 we developed a moment ago when Mr. Roy was
21 standing where you are, but yes.

22 Q And in terms of acting in a reactive or a
23 proactive fashion, Mr. Roy was asking you some
24 questions about going out to let potential
04:28 25 applicants know about what you do and what you can



1 do, it's very difficult for an applicant to even
2 know what to do without some sort of a proactive
3 approach on behalf of people that have the power
4 to refer a case; is it not?

04:28 5 A Yes.

6 Q And, if a person had no involvement whatsoever in
7 the crime they would have very, very little
8 information to contribute and, potentially, very
9 little idea about where to go to produce the
04:28 10 evidence that's needed to get back into a Court?

11 A I would think so.

12 Q And that leads to things like you said, where they
13 may get the idea that they need to get a
14 recantation, they may run around attempting to
04:28 15 find out if the witnesses will change their story
16 and tell the truth?

17 A As they see it, yes.

18 Q And you've given evidence already of how that
19 could actually backfire or result in not getting
04:29 20 information that actually is helpful to a --

21 A Well, yes, because you are potentially -- I mean
22 if, at the end of the road, the willingness of the
23 Court of Appeal to receive fresh evidence is going
24 to depend on an assessment of whether the witness'
04:29 25 evidence is capable of belief, then uncontrolled



1 interviews with that witness, particularly if it's
2 done in circumstances which give rise to the
3 suggestion or possibility that some form of
4 improper or partisan, or even worse, payment has
04:29 5 been made to that witness to give that evidence,
6 you are potentially adding to the burden of
7 establishing that witness is capable of belief if
8 the Court of Appeal is going to receive it.

9 Q Or you might even, in some cases you might have
04:30 10 the situation where the interviews by well-meaning
11 lawyers or well-meaning journalists or
12 well-meaning family members might damage an
13 effective interview, they may, by asking the wrong
14 questions or by providing information, they may
04:30 15 damage a witness' recollections that are of value?

16 A That is certainly true, and they also might have
17 caused damage to the witness' willingness to
18 participate in the investigation thereafter,
19 because the witness may be irritated by having
04:30 20 been interviewed in a way that they -- in a manner
21 that they don't like and don't appreciate, and are
22 not very happy to find a case review manager from
23 the Commission then asking to interview them as
24 well.

04:30 25 Q Another thing that happens if you force the



1 applicant to get their own expert, or scientific
2 evidence, is that they may become quite wedded to
3 the opinion offered by the expert and be resistant
4 to any attacks upon it; --

04:31 5 A Yes.

6 Q -- correct?

7 A Yes.

8 Q And if the issue is taken out of the hands of the
9 applicant by having an independent body seek
04:31 10 scientific or other expert opinion and, where
11 necessary, multiple opinions, there can be a lot
12 more confidence by the applicant in the opinions
13 that are ultimately rendered; could there not?

14 A Well, that should be the case, yes. Of course, if
04:31 15 the expert opinions which are obtained by the
16 Commission are adverse to the applicant, then he
17 may not feel quite so keen about them, but --

18 Q He may not like them, but they wouldn't be in
19 opposition to an expert opinion he had obtained on
04:31 20 his own?

21 A Absolutely.

22 Q So you might feel very different about it if you
23 had an expert opinion and then somebody later,
24 like a year later, told you it was wrong --

04:31 25 A Yes.



1 Q -- or dismissed it --

2 A Yes.

3 Q -- when you had every reason to believe in what an
4 expert had told you?

04:32 5 A Yes.

6 Q And then another thing that happens with somebody
7 trying to gather enough evidence to put before a
8 decision-maker is a failure to deliver enough to
9 them. How do you know when enough is enough? And
04:32 10 we saw that, in the application that Mr. Wolch
11 made, that application put forward medical
12 evidence which was said to settle the issue
13 scientifically, --

14 A Yes.

04:32 15 Q -- and in light of that it was submitted that
16 there is other things we can put forward, there
17 are arguments we can make, we don't know if we
18 should do them?

19 A Uh-huh.

04:32 20 Q So that's an issue for somebody that's making an
21 application and gathering their own evidence and
22 putting it before the fact-finder; how much is
23 enough?

24 A Yes, that's right.

04:32 25 And, of course, one of the



1 aspects of the Commission is that although the
2 separation, there is a clear separation between
3 the investigation and the decision-making, if a
4 case is put to the decision-making committee for
04:33 5 decision and the committee thinks that there is
6 not a basis on which to refer the case, but it is
7 perfectly at liberty, and indeed does and should,
8 look to see whether there are aspects of the
9 investigation which have been already carried out
04:33 10 which it, the decision-making committee, thinks
11 could have been done to greater effect, or there
12 are things which should have been done which
13 haven't, or matters of that nature, or it can
14 suggest, if one takes Mr. Wolch's letter saying
04:33 15 "we've got things we might have looked at that we
16 haven't", then the decision-making committee has
17 the opportunity of discussing, with the case
18 review manager, whether there should be some sort
19 of further investigation and the case brought back
04:34 20 to the decision-making committee at a later stage.
21 So there remains, although there is a separation
22 of function, the decision can -- the
23 decision-making committee is not going to say,
24 when presented with a case for decision, "sorry,
04:34 25 we're not going to refer this case and that's it,



1 even though we can see that there might be other
2 aspects of investigation which can be carried
3 out".

4 Q The other thing that was discovered in course of,
04:34 5 I guess in the course of publicity about this
6 case, was the Fisher connection, which was known
7 to the representatives of David Milgaard in 1990,
8 and that's the discovery of the Linda Fisher
9 evidence and the telephone call to counsel for
04:34 10 David Milgaard indicating Larry Fisher's
11 identification, and that took place in February of
12 1990 as far as the phone call is concerned.

13 A Uh-huh.

14 Q If that evidence had, instead, been discovered by
04:35 15 an independent body within the files, the police
16 files or the prosecution files, that would
17 certainly take away any attack or any argument
18 that was suspicious of the motives of people in
19 coming forward with that information; do you
04:35 20 understand me?

21 A Umm, well, not really. I mean what -- what -- I
22 can understand the fact that it came very late.

23 Q Okay. If Linda Fisher is coming forward in
24 1980, --

04:35 25 A Yes.



1 Q -- ten years after the murder, --

2 A Yes.

3 Q -- saying "I suspect my husband" --

4 A Yes.

04:35 5 Q -- "he's a serial rapist", --

6 A Yes.

7 Q -- "we live down the street, I think David
8 Milgaard is innocent", --

9 A Uh-huh.

04:35 10 Q -- and that evidence is discovered for the first
11 time by the applicant --

12 A Uh-huh.

13 Q -- in 1990 --

14 A Yes.

04:36 15 Q -- or later and is put forward, and that's
16 investigated by an adverse party --

17 A Uh-huh.

18 Q -- like Department of Justice and it's assessed as
19 "what took her so long to come forward", the ten
04:36 20 years, --

21 A Uh-huh.

22 Q -- and then the Sidney Wilson telephone call takes
23 place in February of 1990 to Mr. Wolch's office,
24 and it's an anonymous phone call by somebody
04:36 25 giving a false name who indicates that "Larry



1 Fisher is your guy", --

2 A Uh-huh.

3 Q -- and there is a lot of investigation by the
4 authorities as to "who is this Sidney Wilson and
04:36 5 why is he coming forward now"; so my question is
6 if that information had, instead of being
7 communicated to defence counsel, if that had
8 instead been discovered by an independent body
9 within the files there may not be so many
04:37 10 questions about "why is this person coming forward
11 now", because you'd have the information in there
12 about the serial rapes, about the connection of
13 the rapes to the murder, and you may look at it
14 more as valuable evidence rather than a tactic
04:37 15 that is being put forward to get somebody out of
16 jail?

17 A Well, understanding the way in which you put that,
18 the underlying proposition is that, as part of a
19 review by a body such as the Commission, the
04:37 20 existence of that information in police files
21 would have been discovered at the time of the
22 Commission's investigation, it wouldn't have lain
23 undiscovered until some years later when that, the
24 existence of that information is drawn to the
04:37 25 attention of Mr. Milgaard's lawyers by whatever



1 means .

2 So the motivation for drawing
3 how that information came to be communicated to
4 Mr. Milgaard's lawyers would be irrelevant,
04:38 5 because it simply wouldn't have happened, and the
6 question for the Commission would be "well, there
7 is that information in the police files, what
8 significance does it have to the safety of the
9 conviction and what investigation should be
04:38 10 carried out in relation to it".

11 Q Okay. One of the criticisms that was bandied
12 about in the early days of the CCRC, and has been
13 raised as a criticism of switching to that kind of
14 a system here, is that it would create just
04:38 15 another level of appeal or create a body that is
16 substituting their judgement for jury judgement,
17 the jury's verdict. How would you respond to
18 criticisms or questions of that nature as a member
19 of the Commission?

04:39 20 A Well, I don't think that particular criticism, if
21 made, has a great deal of force because the
22 Commission isn't there to substitute its opinion
23 for that of the jury. It is made quite clear in
24 the statute which sets up the Commission that the
04:39 25 basis for referring a case, letting a case through



1 the gateway and getting it back to the Court of
2 Appeal, is dependant on there being something new
3 which, almost by definition, means it wasn't
4 considered by the jury. So it's not substituting
04:39 5 the Commission's view for that of the jury, it is
6 a matter of the Commission evaluating the impact
7 of the new information which the Commission
8 receives and asking itself whether there is a real
9 possibility of the Court of Appeal finding that
04:39 10 that information, far from being a substitute for
11 the jury verdict, is something which can
12 legitimately be said to have an impact on whether
13 the jury would have reached the verdict that they
14 did had they been aware of that new information.

04:40 15 Q And that may also involve a reassessment of some
16 evidence that was obviously accepted by the jury,
17 and whether or not it would be necessarily
18 accepted by them now, given the fresh arguments or
19 the fresh evidence?

04:40 20 A Yes.

21 Q And I don't have the numbers in front of me, but
22 when the CCRC started, you inherited an awful lot
23 of files from the Home Office?

24 A 279 I believe, or 280 are the figures, but it was
04:40 25 around the 280 mark.



1 Q And some of those were applications that had been
2 sitting there for some time. Now, did you also
3 get in the early days, or maybe even now still,
4 submissions of cases that had been previously
04:41 5 denied by the Home Office?

6 A I think the answer to that is, to that question is
7 yes, but I have no idea how many.

8 Q Okay. So if you only think of it, then I don't
9 think you can answer my next question, which was
04:41 10 that some of them were subsequently referred by
11 the CCRC to the Court of Appeal --

12 A I'm sorry --

13 Q -- and you do not know the answer to that?

14 A I do not know the answer to that. I would be
04:41 15 guessing.

16 Q I believe it appears in the annual reports, but I
17 don't have them.

18 A Excellent. If they do, then they are a matter of
19 public record and can easily be consulted. I
04:41 20 mean, I wouldn't be surprised if that were the
21 case, but I can't say for certain one way or the
22 other.

23 Q And some of them -- well, some of the referrals
24 were cases that had previously been in the Court
04:42 25 of Appeal though, you can definitely answer that



1 one, Bentley?

2 A Been in the Court of Appeal?

3 Q Previously. It's, in effect, a resubmission to
4 the Court of Appeal.

04:42 5 A Well, yes, because of qualifying conditions there
6 should have been a previous unsuccessful appeal.

7 Q I don't know where my head was at that moment.

8 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You mean
9 previously been in the Court of Appeal after
04:42 10 trial but not as a part of the review process?

11 MS. McLEAN: Yes.

12 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

13 BY MS. McLEAN:

14 Q So as a bottom line, do you agree with me that a
04:42 15 system that says you do all the work and we might
16 react to it cannot possibly be seen as being fair?

17 A Well, my experience with the Commission is that a
18 body which takes a proactive view to investigation
19 is the more likely to identify cases where there
04:43 20 has been a wrongful conviction.

21 Q And more likely to be seen as fair?

22 A I think that's --

23 Q As a fair process?

24 A Yes.

04:43 25 Q And once you've passed the threshold in the CCRC,



1 once you pass the threshold that there's a real
2 possibility that the Court of Appeal would allow
3 the case, it's not discretionary any more, is it,
4 you must refer it?

04:43 5 A We have a discretion whether or not to refer a
6 case even though there is a real possibility, and
7 somewhere in the Commission's documentation,
8 getting back to Mr. Roy's questioning, there is a
9 formal memorandum on the exercise of the
04:43 10 Commission's discretion in those circumstances,
11 but all things being equal, the finding of a real
12 possibility that a conviction will be found to be
13 unsafe will result in a referral.

14 Q What sort of circumstances would give rise to a
04:44 15 finding that there's a real possibility that the
16 Court of Appeal will find it to be unsafe and then
17 not have the case be referred to the Court of
18 Appeal?

19 A I think the Commission's policy in relation to the
04:44 20 exercise of its discretion is founded largely on
21 the question that whether -- sorry, I'm being
22 attacked by some insect here -- whether or
23 not there -- whether there is the absence of any
24 tangible benefit either to the applicant or more
04:44 25 likely to the applicant's surviving family, or an



1 absence of tangible benefit to the criminal
2 justice system, so the circumstances in which the
3 Commission is likely to exercise its discretion
4 not to refer is where there is no surviving
04:45 5 applicant; in other words, the applicant is dead
6 and the application is being made by someone on
7 his behalf.

8 Q Who may well have an interest in an acquittal?

9 A Who may have an interest in acquittal, but if it's
04:45 10 a very remote interest and the case doesn't itself
11 raise any issue of significance to the wider
12 benefit of the criminal justice system, then that
13 would be a circumstance in which the Commission
14 might exercise its discretion not to refer.

04:45 15 Q Or perhaps, I don't want to call them trivial
16 offences, but certainly less serious offences
17 where a sentence has already been served?

18 A Well, if you have a surviving applicant, the fact
19 that he had a conviction at all may be very
04:46 20 damaging to him --

21 Q Uh-huh.

22 A -- or her, so simply because they've served a
23 sentence or haven't, or didn't receive a custodial
24 sentence at all wouldn't necessarily be a reason
04:46 25 for exercising the discretion not to refer.



1 Certainly if the application was an appeal against
2 sentence only and the sentence had been served in
3 its entirety, we might take the view that, and
4 certainly I think the Court of Appeal would be
04:46 5 highly critical if we started sending cases down
6 where there was absolutely nothing of any
7 practical significance to the applicant.

8 I know that we, I mean, I was
9 thinking while you've been asking about this, we
04:46 10 did have a case in which the convicted person was
11 long dead, that the application to us was made by
12 two very, the last two very elderly surviving
13 members of the family, and we're talking about a
14 case which goes back half a century or more I
04:47 15 think, and I believe that it was one of the rare
16 cases in which the Royal Prerogative of Mercy had
17 already been exercised by the Home Secretary and a
18 considerable amount of monetary compensation paid
19 to the two elderly survivors. We took the view
04:47 20 that given the fact of the pardon, which to all
21 intents and purposes has the same effect in
22 proclaiming that person's innocence of the offence
23 of which he had been convicted, coupled with the
24 fact that there appeared to be no tangible benefit
04:47 25 to the criminal justice system or to these elderly



1 surviving relatives in having the conviction
2 quashed in the Court of Appeal as opposed to
3 having been the subject of pardon, coupled with
4 the fact that a considerable sum had been paid by
04:48 5 way of compensation, that we would exercise our
6 discretion not to refer that case.

7 Q In the case of a surviving applicant, the
8 applicant himself or herself is alive, --

9 A Yes.

04:48 10 Q -- is there, are there circumstances in which
11 having met that threshold, that the court is,
12 there's a reasonable prospect that the Court of
13 Appeal will find it to be an unsafe conviction,
14 are there circumstances where that would not be
04:48 15 referred by the Commission?

16 A I can't think of any, no.

17 Q Assuming that the applicant is alive?

18 A Yeah, because there has to be a benefit to an
19 applicant who is alive in having a conviction
04:48 20 which has been obtained wrongfully taken away from
21 the record.

22 Q Has to be a benefit?

23 A I think so.

24 MS. McLEAN: Thank you, sir. Those are all
04:49 25 my questions.



1 MR. ELSON: Mr. Commissioner, I appreciate
2 the hour and I trust that this witness has to get
3 back and I hope not to be too long.

04:49 4 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: It's 10 to five is
5 it?

6 MR. ELSON: I believe it is.

7 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay, thanks.

8 MR. ELSON: I shouldn't be very long,
9 there's just two matters I want to pick up on.

04:49 10 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: That's fine.
11 Anybody need a break before we continue? No?

12 MR. ELSON: I don't know whether the
13 witness needs a break at all.

14 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Are you okay, Mr.
04:49 15 Kyle?

16 A I'm fine at the moment. I'll shout if I think I
17 need one.

18 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Please do, yes.

19 BY MR. ELSON:

04:49 20 Q Mr. Kyle, my name is Richard Elson and I am the
21 counsel for the Saskatoon Police Service in this
22 matter. I simply wanted to cover two areas.

23 The first is with respect to
24 the *Drake Law Review* article, and I don't think we
04:49 25 need to put it up, but I was particularly



1 intrigued by your distinction between wrongful
2 convictions arising as a result of systemic
3 reasons as compared to wrongful convictions
4 arising as a result of idiosyncratic reasons.

04:50 5 A Uh-huh.

6 Q And I couldn't help but think that, and it's a
7 phrase that I've often used in court in other
8 context, notably in civil context, and that is
9 that sometimes bad things happen notwithstanding
04:50 10 the reasonable efforts of reasonable people, and I
11 take it that included in the idiosyncratic reasons
12 that you've identified, there are circumstances in
13 which the investigators, the prosecutors, the
14 system of justice functioned, the individuals
04:50 15 within that system of justice acted reasonably
16 having regard to the information they had, but
17 notwithstanding the functioning of the system and
18 the reasonableness of people's conduct, wrongful
19 convictions still occurred. Is that a fair
04:50 20 assessment as one of the examples in which a
21 wrongful conviction can occur for idiosyncratic
22 reasons?

23 A Yes.

24 Q So in that respect, when you were answering Mr.
04:51 25 Hodson's questions and you said that in those



1 cases of idiosyncratic reasons mistakes are made,
2 those mistakes could be errors of judgment that
3 occurred despite the exercise of reasonable care;
4 for example, in the case of police investigators?

04:51 5 A Undoubtedly, and one of the areas where I think
6 that is undoubtedly a valid observation and
7 remains so is in relation to the exercise of
8 judgment by the disclosure officer in relation to
9 identifying material which the police have
04:51 10 gathered in the course of the investigation which
11 is potentially disclosable to the defence and
12 should therefore be drawn to the prosecuting
13 authority for that purpose. If -- it is and
14 remains quite possible for the disclosure officer
04:51 15 to reach a wrong but nonetheless genuinely held
16 judgment about that, and therefore the effect of
17 that will be that material which should be
18 disclosed isn't and maybe if there's an
19 application to the Commission, the Commission will
04:52 20 then discover that because the Commission will
21 look at all that material and will be able to have
22 it, do a gap analysis, if you like, of what
23 material was held and what was disclosed and see
24 what wasn't, and if significant material which
04:52 25 should have been disclosed wasn't, that may well



1 be the result of an honest but erroneous judgment
2 by the disclosure officer.

3 Q And if we could use another example, and perhaps
4 one less formal than that of a disclosure officer,
04:52 5 but a police investigator who is questioning a
6 witness, not a suspect --

7 A Uh-huh.

8 Q -- for example, if we are -- there are various
9 approaches, and I'm sure in your experience, not
04:52 10 only with the Commission but also as a prosecutor,
11 you were aware of various approaches that a police
12 investigator can take to the questioning of a
13 witness not a suspect, and in part it might depend
14 on -- you would agree with me that in part the
04:53 15 approach taken would depend on the assessment an
16 investigator is making of a given interviewee, if
17 you will?

18 A Yes.

19 Q So if a police officer makes an assessment of a
04:53 20 potential witness and comes to the conclusion that
21 it would be very appropriate to employ persistent
22 questioning in this witness, that would not
23 necessarily be an unreasonable thing to do, but if
24 the witness were one of those feckless,
04:53 25 irresponsible individuals who was prompted and



1 provoked by that persistent questioning to
2 implicate an innocent person, that could occur
3 notwithstanding the exercise of totally reasonable
4 care on the part of the investigator. Would you
04:53 5 agree with that?

6 A It could, yes.

7 Q Now, I wanted to ask a question that dealt more
8 specifically with the experience of the
9 Commission. I noted from Section 14 of the
04:54 10 *Criminal Appeals Act* that the consideration by the
11 Commission whether or not to order a reference
12 does not, and it's already been observed I believe
13 in the questioning by Mr. Roy, it does not depend
14 on an application by the person convicted, it can
04:54 15 be done in the absence of an application by the
16 person convicted; is that correct?

17 A Yes.

18 Q So I take it then that at least in theory perhaps,
19 and you can advise as to whether or not it occurs
04:54 20 in practice, in theory you can have a reference
21 which is prompted as a result of representations
22 from third parties, someone other than the person
23 convicted of the offence?

24 A Yes, that in theory is right. Perhaps I can just
04:54 25 amplify that a little bit. As you quite correctly



1 observe, Section 14 of the Act allows the
2 Commission to make a reference in the absence of
3 an application, but in practice, of course, before
4 the Commission is in any position to make a
04:55 5 reference, that there has to be some sort of
6 investigation and review, and the real question
7 here is whether the Commission is going to embark
8 on investigations or reviews as a -- talking
9 entirely pragmatically, will the Commission embark
04:55 10 on the investigation and review which might lead
11 to a reference without an application, because
12 even in those cases where the Commission has done
13 that, by the time the Commission is at the point
14 of making a decision to refer the case, it's
04:55 15 almost certain that the affected convicted person
16 will by then know that the Commission is thinking
17 of referring the case, so by the time we get to
18 actually refer the case, the applicant will have
19 said yes, I would like you to do that. I don't
04:56 20 think we ever had a case where the applicant has
21 actually said no, I don't want you to refer my
22 case.

23 Q I can appreciate that.

24 A So getting back -- sorry, I --

04:56 25 Q No, go ahead.



1 A I was just going to say that the real question for
2 the -- arising out of this is the extent to which
3 the Commission would embark on an investigation
4 and review which is not prompted by the convicted
04:56 5 person themselves and that can happen. The fact
6 that there is concern about the safety of the
7 conviction may be drawn to our attention by, from
8 a source other than the applicant. In fact, the
9 applicant may be completely unaware that there is
04:56 10 some concern about the safety of the conviction
11 and that external third party source, if I put it
12 that way, could indeed include the police, and I
13 can think of at least one case where the impetus
14 which has prompted an investigation, and I can't
04:57 15 remember the precise circumstance or what the
16 nature of the concern was, but it was a concern
17 which had come to the attention of the police in
18 the context of another investigation which the
19 police force concerned considered has a knock-on
04:57 20 effect to the safety of the conviction as somebody
21 who had been convicted, so the police force
22 concerned drew that to the Commission's attention
23 and the Commission then took that forward as an
24 investigation.

04:57 25 Q I wanted to pursue that avenue in a moment, but



1 other than police officers, what other third
2 parties have presented information to the
3 Commission which has prompted it to consider the
4 possibility of ordering a reference other than
04:57 5 police officers? Has the Crown, for example,
6 brought information to the Commission?

7 A Yes. Again, I can't remember specific cases, or I
8 can't entertain what the factual circumstances of
9 the case, but yes, there have been a least one
04:58 10 occasion where the Crown has drawn the
11 Commission's attention to its concern about the
12 safety of the conviction.

13 Q And prior to the *Criminal Appeal Act*, prior to the
14 Commission coming into existence as set out in the
04:58 15 *Criminal Appeal Act*, what avenues, if any, existed
16 for police officers or Crown prosecutors who had
17 received information which may cast some doubt as
18 to the propriety of a prior conviction, what
19 avenues did they have in the past prior to the
04:58 20 enactment of this particular provision of the
21 *Criminal Appeal Act*?

22 A Well, I can think of two possible avenues, but I
23 have no experience of what actually happened in
24 practice. I mean, I'll think while I'm answering
04:59 25 the question as to when I was in the prosecution



1 service whether I was ever faced with this
2 situation. Indeed, even as I say I'll think about
3 it I think I've come up with the answer. The
4 avenues were either to approach the Home Office
04:59 5 with a view to the extent to which the Home
6 Secretary might have exercised his part or refer
7 back to the Court of Appeal, or, and I think this
8 is certainly something which I did when I was in
9 the prosecution service, would be to make the
04:59 10 lawyers who represented the convicted person at
11 trial aware of the concern and invite them to take
12 whatever action they thought they ought to on
13 behalf of their client.

14 Q Now, getting back to the other example in which
04:59 15 you indicated that a police officer, or that the
16 police actually brought information to the
17 attention of the Commission, and I understand that
18 that was not done, or that was done without the
19 applicant, or without the convicted person even
05:00 20 being aware that the police had made that
21 representation; is that correct?

22 A Yes.

23 Q We have the situation that you've already heard
24 about, at least in part from the other two counsel
05:00 25 who have cross-examined you, of the circumstance



1 in which Linda Fisher one day in the summer of
2 1980 walked into the Saskatoon Police Department
3 and gave information to an officer which
4 implicated her husband and, of necessity,
05:00 5 suggested that perhaps David Milgaard was not
6 guilty of the offence in question.

7 A Yes.

8 Q We have also heard evidence before this Commission
9 of Inquiry that no one is aware of any police
05:00 10 force, certainly in Canada, that had any policy at
11 that time or indeed since for dealing with the
12 disposition of or how to deal with exculpatory
13 evidence that is brought in well after the person
14 is convicted, been convicted and well after the
05:01 15 appeal period have either been exhausted or have
16 expired. Is there now as a result of the
17 Commission coming into existence in the United
18 Kingdom policies, or are there policies in place
19 for police officers or police departments to refer
05:01 20 such potentially exculpatory evidence to the
21 Commission for its consideration in deciding
22 whether a reference ought to be done?

23 A I'm not aware of there having been any formal
24 policy adopted by any police force either on its
05:01 25 own or in consultation with the Commission, I'm



1 simply not aware of there being such a policy, but
2 the -- but the fact that the Commission does exist
3 and is known by the police to exist and has
4 resulted in a matter being referred to the
05:02 5 Commission when it arose in the way I've described
6 perhaps means that the police would recognize the
7 Commission as being a possible source for drawing
8 concerns, drawing concerns of that nature to its
9 attention. I mean, I suppose it's -- it's a bit
05:02 10 of a statement of the obvious to say that the
11 police are only going to do that if they actually
12 do some initial evaluation of what they are told
13 and decide yes, there is something which should be
14 concerning us here.

05:02 15 Q But the question that arises, and Mr. Roy and I
16 have had discussions about this and I promised him
17 I would ask the question, should there be an
18 obligation on the part of police who receive
19 exculpatory evidence totally by happenstance years
05:02 20 after conceivably that somebody has been convicted
21 and the appeal period has either been expired or
22 exhausted, should there be an obligation to
23 present that to an entity such as the Commission,
24 assuming Canada decides to venture down that road
05:03 25 and create a similar Commission as that which



1 exists in the United Kingdom, should there be that
2 opportunity in the United Kingdom, for example?

3 A Well, it's an interesting -- that is certainly an
4 interesting proposition and it's not one to which
05:03 5 I've previously directed my mind I have to say,
6 but I think my initial reaction to that is that if
7 somebody is convicted and there is no other basis,
8 which there isn't we'll assume, to get the safety
9 of that conviction reconsidered other than through
05:04 10 the activities of the Commission, then it would
11 seem to me to be a perfectly sensible line to
12 adopt, that if the police, or indeed anybody else,
13 whether it's the prosecution or the police become
14 aware of information which they judge to be, to
05:04 15 have substance to it, that that is a matter which
16 should be drawn to the attention of the
17 Commission.

18 Q All right. Us lawyers sometimes are very good at
19 advocating the cause of the devil, and let me be
05:04 20 the devil's advocate in this instance. The
21 criticism has been made that if one does that, if
22 one lets the police make the assessment of that
23 evidence, because the police were involved in the
24 initial investigation that led to the conviction,
05:04 25 they are going to be careful to protect the



1 integrity of that first investigation which led to
2 the conviction?

3 A Uh-huh.

4 Q And as a consequence of that, their evaluation of
05:05 5 that exculpatory evidence which comes to them by
6 happenstance would be suspect?

7 A I can see the --

8 Q By the way, I don't make that criticism, that
9 criticism has been made. What would your response
05:05 10 be to that criticism?

11 A Well, I suppose one way of overcoming that
12 particular criticism would be just to, if we were
13 moving towards the circumstance of having some
14 sort of understood policy along these lines, would
05:05 15 be to say, well, don't do any judgment here, let
16 the Commission make that judgment.

17 MR. ELSON: Thank you, Mr. Kyle. I have no
18 further questions.

19 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But by denying the
05:05 20 discretion of the officer, of course, who
21 received the complaint, you wouldn't necessarily
22 ward off any desire by him to conceal it, he
23 could simply file it away of course.

24 A And pretend it never --

25 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.



1 A Well, of course, yes.

2 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Don't the results,
3 sir, have to repose, as we always do, a good deal
4 of confidence in the upright behaviour of our
05:06 5 police forces and their members?

6 A Well, I think -- I'm sure that's right, and I
7 think this is about sort of culture around the
8 operation of the whole criminal justice system as
9 a whole. If -- what I was saying earlier about a
05:06 10 mature and responsible criminal justice system
11 being prepared to acknowledge that mistakes happen
12 and to address them, and the -- and I use the
13 words "mistakes happen" there advisedly, because
14 if you have anyone involved in the process from
05:07 15 investigation through to trial who is deliberately
16 and maliciously out to act in an improper manner,
17 then it doesn't matter what the general culture
18 is, that case is going to cause a particularly
19 idiosyncratic problem, but if the culture is a
05:07 20 healthy one and extends throughout the criminal
21 justice system, then that will extend to the
22 police, and if individual police officers are
23 imbued within that culture with the notion that
24 the system is keen to identify and remedy mistakes
05:07 25 and this isn't about blaming people for what's



1 gone wrong, then you are more likely to encourage
2 the sort of openness which the questioning which
3 I've just been addressing can happen.

4 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks.

05:07 5 A But ultimately you are absolutely right, it
6 depends on the willingness of individual police
7 officers in those circumstances to come forward
8 with the information when they get it.

9 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

10 **BY MS. KNOX:**

11 Q Thank you. Sir, for the record, my name is
12 Catherine Knox and we have not met other than to
13 see you passing in the hall. Also for the record
14 I want you to be aware that my role at this
05:08 15 inquiry is as counsel for the former trial
16 prosecutor T.D.R. Caldwell.

17 A Uh-huh.

18 Q Sir, are you aware that the circumstance or the
19 fact that the Crown was able to establish that
05:08 20 David Milgaard was factually innocent of causing
21 the death of Gail Miller was because the
22 prosecutor, my client, contrary to practices,
23 ordered that the exhibits from the trial be held
24 so that they were available some 28 years after
05:08 25 his conviction?



1 A I think the answer to that is in discussions I had
2 with Mr. Hodson in preparation, that proposition
3 you've just made rings a bell.

4 Q Okay.

05:09 5 A And of course I accept it as being the case.

6 Q And indeed the evidence is and the documents, or
7 the exhibits when they were found had a note
8 sitting on them in the court vault that they were
9 not to be destroyed by order of my client, Mr.
05:09 10 Caldwell?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Okay. Now, if we could step back for a moment,
13 and I just have a brief few questions, let me
14 reassure you and the Commissioner of that, but if
05:09 15 we could step back for the moment, that the
16 circumstances of this case in part through, in
17 large part through the actions of my client
18 allowed in 1997 that the factual innocence of
19 David Milgaard was established, and you as a
05:09 20 Commission were dealing with an application from
21 somebody in the early -- late '80s, early '90s,
22 where the allegations were or the assertion was
23 I'm innocent, the information to be looked at was
24 the court record and the police investigation, the
05:09 25 evidence of witnesses, how their statements were



1 obtained and so forth, and that was essentially
2 the application that was presented to your
3 Commission, --

4 A Uh-huh.

05:10 5 Q -- but in the course of the necessary
6 investigation that your Commission would have to
7 do as part of the review to determine if the
8 matter would be referred to the Court of Appeal it
9 became -- a number of facts became clear, and I'll
05:10 10 try to list them.

11 Number 1, it quickly became
12 clear that the applicant, advocates on his behalf
13 and his legal counsel were putting forward, either
14 individually or collectively, allegations or
05:10 15 assertions about the conduct of the police and the
16 Crown that were probably false, i.e., they were
17 saying, for example, a witness statement hadn't
18 been disclosed when in fact the records showed
19 that it had; that they were putting forward a
05:10 20 recantation taken from a witness like Ron Wilson
21 by an experienced private investigator, but
22 mysteriously they couldn't produce the audiotape
23 of the interview of him where the recantation
24 occurred; they were putting forward allegations
05:11 25 that the Crown had made key evidence disappear,



1 i.e., a knife that could have been the murder
2 weapon; they were putting forward scientific
3 evidence and relying on scientific evidence where
4 the records showed a full, factual history had not
05:11 5 been given to their expert, and I'm thinking of
6 stains in a snowbank that an expert said could be
7 dog urine when, in fact, the record showed that
8 there were human pubic hairs in those samples at
9 the time they were found in 1969; might that kind
05:11 10 of misinformation, some of it deliberate, some of
11 it admitted to be knowingly false, some of it
12 maybe negligently managed, cause the possibility
13 that your Commission might not refer for review a
14 matter that should have gone for review?

05:12 15 A I think all I can say, I can really say in answer
16 to that, is that the decision which the Commission
17 makes whether or not to refer a case is going to
18 depend -- is going to be made at the end of the
19 Commission's investigation. And in the course of
05:12 20 that investigation, no doubt the Commission would
21 be invited to take account in support of the
22 application to suggest that there had been a
23 wrongful conviction, all the matters that you have
24 just described.

25 Q Uh-huh.



1 A Now the mere fact that the Commission came to the
2 conclusion that some of the grounds on which the
3 application had been made were wholly
4 inconceived -- and this is not an uncommon
05:13 5 occurrence, I mean applicants are quite capable of
6 making wild assertions about what they think has
7 gone wrong which are completely without foundation
8 and are found to be so on investigation -- but the
9 fact that an applicant makes assertions which are
05:13 10 wholly unfounded, either because they are totally
11 rash or specifically because they are made
12 specifically with an intent to deceive; if the
13 Commission exposes, during the course of its
14 investigation, that some of the issues which have
05:13 15 been raised are without any foundation at all and,
16 indeed, may be mischievous, it's not actually
17 going to have any impact at all on the question
18 whether or not the question should be referred to
19 the Court of Appeal if, as a result of the
05:13 20 investigation the Commission does carry out, there
21 are sustainable grounds, there are sustainable
22 bases on which to say the real possibility test
23 has been met.

24 So the applicant is not going
05:14 25 to be prejudiced simply because he is wild and



1 mischievous.

2 **Q** Okay. But is it not true, sir, that being wild
3 and mischievous, particularly when some of that
4 mischief comes from learned counsel, could
05:14 5 potentially prejudice an outcome? Pearls of truth
6 can get lost in the mess that need not have been
7 created.

8 **A** Well that, that of course, I mean I don't intend
9 to be disrespectful, I think that is almost a
05:14 10 truism, yes.

11 **Q** Thank you.

12 MR. WOLCH: Mr. Commissioner, I don't have
13 any questions, but I do wish to object to the
14 framing of the last group of questions where My
05:14 15 Friend has confused what was part of an
16 application to the Department of Justice to what
17 appeared in the media at various times, and it's
18 a complete distortion to suggest that certain
19 questions that My Friend raised were put to the
05:15 20 Department of Justice. Mr. Williams clearly
21 indicated at this Commission that misconduct was
22 not a key in what he was determining, it was
23 Fisher, Wilson, the improbability, etcetera,
24 etcetera. And My Friend is talking here about
05:15 25 supposedly wild accusations, many of which we



1 still maintain are true.

2 The odd inaccuracy should not
3 be put to this witness without putting the whole
4 picture. If My Friend is going to say, for the
05:15 5 hundredth time, "the statement of Ron Wilson was
6 disclosed", My Friend is not saying all -- the
7 other individual being attacked that morning,
8 she's not putting the eye witnesses to the scene
9 of the offence, supposedly, that wasn't
05:16 10 disclosed. You can't take out one incident and
11 not talk about all the lack of disclosure.

12 But the lack of disclosure
13 was not what was being argued, it was the merits.
14 It's totally distorted. My Friend has taken an
05:16 15 argumentative approach to put forward facts that
16 aren't accurate and distort, and that's what
17 occurred in those questions. They have no -- it
18 doesn't help the Commission at all.

19 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well what does
05:16 20 help the Commission, I think, is the witness'
21 answer to the effect that, notwithstanding
22 information which might have been less than
23 reliable, the Commission would choose to take the
24 higher ground and allow an application -- or
05:16 25 accept an application to refer on the basis of



1 the grounds which had been shown to be
2 sustainable.

3 MR. WOLCH: I appreciate that, and I thank
4 you.

05:16 5 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So that's his
6 answer, basically.

7 MR. WOLCH: Thank you.

8 MR. HODSON: I think that is all.

9 If I may thank you, Mr. Kyle,
05:17 10 for travelling here and spending time on the
11 weekend preparing, and your providing evidence
12 before this Commission, thank you very much.

13 A Okay.

14 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And Mr. Kyle, for
05:17 15 my part, I just want to note that you are the
16 last of the very many viva voce witnesses to
17 appear before us. And I have followed an
18 invariable practice, up to this moment at least,
19 of thanking all witnesses in precisely the same
05:17 20 words so as not to leave any impression that I
21 was accepting one's testimony in preference to
22 another's, but for you I'm going to make an
23 exception, sir. Given the fact that you have
24 come all the way from the United Kingdom and been
05:17 25 so very patient with us, and not wishing at all



1 to comment in any way upon the weight of the
2 evidence you have given, I would just like to
3 offer you a special note of thanks for all you've
4 done. Thank you, sir.

05:17 5 A Thanks very much, Mr. Commissioner.

6 And could I just end by saying
7 I have been delighted to have had the opportunity
8 to come and give that evidence to the Commission
9 and I am grateful to you, sir, and everyone here,
05:18 10 being prepared to sit a bit later this evening so
11 that I can complete my evidence today.

12 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay. Thank you.

13 MR. HODSON: Thank you.

14 (*Adjourned at 5:18 p.m.*)
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25



OFFICIAL QUEEN'S BENCH COURT REPORTERS' CERTIFICATES:

We, Karen Hinz, CSR, and Donald G. Meyer, RPR, CSR, CRR,
CBC, Official Queen's Bench Court Reporters for the
Province of Saskatchewan, hereby certify that the
foregoing pages contain a true and correct transcription
of our shorthand notes taken herein to the best of our
knowledge, skill, and ability.

_____, CSR

Karen Hinz, CSR

Official Queen's Bench Court Reporter

_____, RPR, CSR, CRR, CBC

Donald G. Meyer, RPR, CSR, CRR, CBC

Official Queen's Bench Court Reporter



'	40181:11, 40182:21, 40377:22 18 [1] - 40256:6 19 [16] - 40180:6, 40183:18, 40185:23, 40186:22, 40256:6, 40256:10, 40353:11, 40353:14, 40353:20, 40354:24, 40355:6, 40356:10, 40356:14, 40357:1, 40357:12, 40359:3 192 [1] - 40157:22 1927 [2] - 40245:21, 40245:24 1950s [3] - 40245:19, 40246:3, 40269:4 1953 [3] - 40180:4, 40268:13, 40268:24 1968 [2] - 40174:11, 40285:18 1969 [3] - 40269:12, 40390:21, 40441:9 1970 [1] - 40274:14 1970s [3] - 40206:2, 40247:5, 40258:10 198 [3] - 40226:6, 40226:23, 40227:25 1980 [9] - 40174:11, 40370:4, 40370:8, 40370:11, 40370:13, 40370:22, 40391:24, 40413:24, 40433:2 1980s [1] - 40247:5 1981 [1] - 40396:9 1984 [3] - 40243:16, 40248:9, 40252:13 1986 [1] - 40396:20 1988 [3] - 40232:20, 40235:1, 40268:14 1990 [5] - 40269:22, 40413:7, 40413:12, 40414:13, 40414:23 1990s [3] - 40202:24, 40258:2, 40284:7 1991 [3] - 40258:10, 40383:2, 40383:17 1992 [5] - 40200:25, 40229:17, 40377:13, 40377:20, 40383:2 1993-1994 [1] - 40407:1 1994 [1] - 40265:24 1995 [2] - 40162:15, 40285:18 1996 [1] - 40394:5 1997 [3] - 40260:25, 40368:7, 40439:18 1998 [3] - 40266:5, 40268:15, 40369:2 1:30 [1] - 40279:2	2	391 [1] - 40240:16 398 [1] - 40287:1 3:17 [1] - 40352:21 3rd [1] - 40157:21	8,000 [2] - 40162:9, 40162:11 8,260 [1] - 40225:21 80 [5] - 40162:3, 40164:13, 40164:21, 40165:11, 40166:17 800 [1] - 40248:22 89 [1] - 40226:6
0			4	9
000002 [1] - 40396:8 006799 [1] - 40383:2		2 [3] - 40314:16, 40359:23, 40361:2 2,346 [1] - 40226:1 20 [9] - 40224:21, 40256:3, 40256:10, 40260:9, 40269:16, 40269:23, 40272:3, 40272:7 2002 [1] - 40366:16 2003 [1] - 40298:7 2004 [2] - 40240:12, 40298:7 2005 [1] - 40390:17 2006 [3] - 40157:21, 40206:1, 40225:5 22 [1] - 40180:23 23 [2] - 40229:19, 40229:24 23a(1 [1] - 40174:10 25 [1] - 40337:6 279 [1] - 40417:24 28 [1] - 40438:24 280 [2] - 40417:24, 40417:25 287 [1] - 40226:5 2:58 [1] - 40352:20	4 [4] - 40261:17, 40318:3, 40360:16, 40363:18 40 [3] - 40282:21, 40335:10, 40336:9 40161 [1] - 40160:4 40296 [1] - 40160:5 40367 [1] - 40160:6 40424 [1] - 40160:7 40438 [1] - 40160:8 41 [1] - 40186:21 420 [1] - 40225:19 4:30 [1] - 40278:25	900 [1] - 40244:7 9:01 [1] - 40161:2
1		3	5	A
1 [2] - 40389:15, 40440:11 1,938 [1] - 40298:10 10 [6] - 40256:11, 40280:21, 40280:22, 40282:22, 40299:6, 40424:4 100 [1] - 40210:13 10:25 [1] - 40227:21 10:50 [1] - 40227:22 11 [1] - 40363:20 11:57 [1] - 40279:1 12 [4] - 40190:23, 40219:11, 40300:7, 40363:21 12:00 [1] - 40278:20 13 [1] - 40162:15 13-year-old [1] - 40190:19 133 [3] - 40232:20, 40232:21, 40235:17 14 [3] - 40280:24, 40428:9, 40429:1 15 [2] - 40174:8, 40196:16 16 [4] - 40178:8, 40178:21, 40377:22, 40378:7 17 [4] - 40181:5,		40318:3, 40360:16, 40363:18 40335:10, 40336:9 40160:4 40160:5 40160:6 40160:7 40160:8 40186:21 40225:19 40278:25	5 [1] - 40352:16 582 [1] - 40298:8 5:18 [1] - 40446:14	abilities [1] - 40383:25 ability [17] - 40177:17, 40182:24, 40256:19, 40256:21, 40256:24, 40303:21, 40304:8, 40305:23, 40311:14, 40317:15, 40319:22, 40324:17, 40333:13, 40365:25, 40391:18, 40395:3, 40447:7 able [30] - 40165:18, 40169:24, 40176:13, 40177:4, 40178:15, 40184:3, 40186:4, 40193:23, 40194:4, 40194:7, 40196:3, 40216:11, 40233:24, 40244:11, 40249:2, 40249:11, 40260:22, 40267:6, 40316:19, 40317:1, 40324:13, 40340:16, 40343:18, 40367:4, 40371:10, 40384:15, 40395:5, 40400:4, 40426:21, 40438:19 abreast [1] - 40296:14 absence [8] - 40253:22, 40254:6, 40275:3, 40365:19, 40420:23, 40421:1, 40428:15, 40429:2 absolute [3] - 40227:13, 40285:1, 40285:25 absolutely [13] - 40192:4, 40209:8, 40236:2, 40303:9, 40308:5, 40317:21, 40328:10, 40350:17, 40352:10, 40355:15, 40402:14, 40422:6, 40438:5
			6	
		3 [7] - 40314:17, 40353:16, 40354:15, 40361:18, 40363:19 30 [1] - 40282:21 31 [1] - 40225:4 337 [1] - 40327:18 339381 [1] - 40290:14 339389 [2] - 40240:10, 40320:12 339392 [2] - 40255:16, 40320:17 339396 [1] - 40283:2 339404 [1] - 40288:2 339444 [2] - 40357:19 339587 [1] - 40353:9 339667 [2] - 40225:3, 40227:24 339668 [1] - 40218:8 339726 [1] - 40174:6 339755 [3] - 40215:2, 40327:16, 40327:19 339759 [1] - 40215:7 339900 [2] - 40253:5, 40253:6 34 [1] - 40298:14 340 [1] - 40226:2 383 [1] - 40290:19	6 [4] - 40169:6, 40343:4, 40343:15, 40343:21 6,000 [1] - 40298:11 60 [1] - 40320:8 614,000 [1] - 40357:25 617 [1] - 40396:24 65 [2] - 40164:15, 40164:22 660 [1] - 40320:9 690 [3] - 40369:5, 40369:21, 40396:23 696 [1] - 40396:22 696.1 [2] - 40369:16, 40369:19	
			7	
			8	
			8 [2] - 40167:13, 40281:18	



<p>Absolutely [6] - 40217:8, 40232:6, 40234:14, 40319:11, 40319:14, 40410:21 abstruse [1] - 40293:19 abuse [3] - 40236:17, 40236:22, 40330:5 abusive [1] - 40167:24 acceded [1] - 40293:21 accept [5] - 40231:7, 40285:8, 40406:4, 40439:5, 40444:25 acceptance [1] - 40173:15 accepted [2] - 40417:16, 40417:18 accepting [1] - 40445:21 accepts [1] - 40264:15 access [2] - 40180:16, 40182:20 accessible [2] - 40333:10, 40333:14 acclamation [1] - 40327:2 accommodating [1] - 40301:13 accompanied [2] - 40241:2, 40288:13 accompanies [1] - 40397:4 accompanying [5] - 40372:24, 40402:11, 40402:12, 40402:14, 40402:18 accordance [1] - 40349:23 according [4] - 40192:16, 40354:20, 40358:11, 40377:20 accosted [1] - 40393:12 account [17] - 40177:2, 40202:16, 40214:3, 40229:2, 40289:21, 40296:7, 40300:21, 40301:18, 40305:19, 40310:25, 40314:7, 40324:19, 40355:5, 40361:6, 40386:24, 40394:8, 40441:21 accountability [2] - 40347:14, 40348:25 accountable [1] - 40349:14 accounts [1] - 40190:25 accurate [3] - 40289:24, 40378:20, 40444:16 accusation [1] - 40405:24 accusations [2] -</p>	<p>40403:19, 40443:25 accused [3] - 40214:15, 40230:15, 40283:18 achieve [1] - 40328:4 achieved [1] - 40295:19 acknowledge [1] - 40437:11 acknowledgements [1] - 40369:18 acquittal [4] - 40231:23, 40232:2, 40421:8, 40421:9 acquitted [3] - 40197:10, 40231:10, 40263:20 Act [19] - 40162:15, 40174:8, 40174:11, 40232:20, 40235:1, 40243:16, 40248:9, 40252:15, 40252:17, 40265:24, 40266:5, 40366:16, 40394:5, 40428:10, 40429:1, 40431:13, 40431:15, 40431:21 act [8] - 40175:1, 40203:10, 40213:12, 40252:13, 40254:10, 40314:6, 40437:16 acted [2] - 40210:19, 40425:15 acting [4] - 40316:15, 40400:18, 40407:9, 40407:22 Action [4] - 40169:1, 40169:4, 40169:19, 40170:16 action [4] - 40172:20, 40309:18, 40318:9, 40432:12 actions [1] - 40439:17 activism [1] - 40370:3 activities [2] - 40273:10, 40435:10 activity [6] - 40182:10, 40211:21, 40224:1, 40246:5, 40306:13, 40363:12 actors [2] - 40364:20, 40366:10 Acts [1] - 40285:18 acts [1] - 40265:4 actual [18] - 40187:22, 40206:23, 40209:12, 40212:13, 40225:25, 40237:20, 40283:12, 40300:2, 40305:13, 40306:9, 40308:3, 40308:18, 40312:4, 40334:21, 40340:22,</p>	<p>40360:17, 40361:21, 40399:3 ad [1] - 40365:2 add [3] - 40286:12, 40290:4, 40344:25 added [2] - 40339:4, 40402:23 adding [1] - 40409:6 addition [7] - 40178:14, 40196:8, 40238:19, 40257:14, 40269:8, 40328:14, 40403:1 additional [1] - 40277:9 Additionally [1] - 40247:24 address [3] - 40259:2, 40321:2, 40437:12 addressed [5] - 40174:23, 40241:10, 40259:20, 40274:21, 40278:18 addresses [1] - 40297:23 addressing [2] - 40264:16, 40438:3 adequate [1] - 40241:20 adhere [1] - 40303:9 adjacent [1] - 40193:11 Adjourned [4] - 40227:21, 40279:1, 40352:20, 40446:14 administration [1] - 40315:24 administrative [2] - 40340:9, 40343:7 admissible [1] - 40203:7 admits [1] - 40211:24 admitted [1] - 40441:11 admonition [1] - 40278:3 adopt [4] - 40211:11, 40311:16, 40398:8, 40435:12 adopted [9] - 40250:17, 40259:2, 40275:9, 40321:1, 40322:8, 40344:3, 40347:17, 40348:22, 40433:24 advanced [2] - 40290:1, 40290:2 advancements [1] - 40304:16 advances [2] - 40173:4, 40304:10 advantages [1] - 40368:18 adverse [8] - 40192:7, 40194:25, 40265:15, 40265:23, 40319:22,</p>	<p>40407:17, 40410:16, 40414:16 adversely [1] - 40256:21 advice [9] - 40169:22, 40293:25, 40294:6, 40294:8, 40294:11, 40294:13, 40294:22, 40294:24, 40405:2 advise [3] - 40229:16, 40369:2, 40428:19 advisedly [1] - 40437:13 advising [1] - 40407:13 advisor [1] - 40362:2 advisors [2] - 40294:4, 40294:5 advisory [1] - 40336:8 advocacy [3] - 40405:9, 40405:23, 40407:9 advocate [1] - 40435:20 advocates [1] - 40440:12 advocating [1] - 40435:19 affairs [1] - 40261:11 affect [3] - 40203:21, 40272:22, 40279:17 affected [8] - 40203:19, 40203:25, 40204:13, 40204:16, 40210:25, 40256:21, 40267:23, 40429:15 affecting [3] - 40258:1, 40273:20, 40277:23 affects [3] - 40345:24, 40350:4, 40350:6 affords [1] - 40398:25 afraid [1] - 40284:4 afternoon [9] - 40161:10, 40297:1, 40297:2, 40297:3, 40297:4, 40352:14, 40352:23, 40368:1, 40368:3 age [1] - 40361:9 aged [1] - 40190:22 agencies [4] - 40300:18, 40306:16, 40346:1, 40346:4 agency [5] - 40238:13, 40306:19, 40306:21, 40306:22, 40308:2 agent [1] - 40356:17 aggrieved [1] - 40167:10 ago [8] - 40190:17, 40212:7, 40272:7, 40297:16, 40311:10, 40334:8, 40387:1,</p>	<p>40407:20 agree [16] - 40187:2, 40196:6, 40197:9, 40284:21, 40285:12, 40302:1, 40304:14, 40305:10, 40305:22, 40313:14, 40323:10, 40345:22, 40351:9, 40419:14, 40427:14, 40428:5 agreed [2] - 40355:24, 40402:6 ahead [4] - 40333:7, 40380:23, 40386:5, 40429:25 aid [1] - 40377:18 Aidwyc [3] - 40159:15, 40297:6, 40405:10 albeit [1] - 40248:21 Albert [3] - 40387:15, 40387:16, 40388:16 alcohol [1] - 40179:17 alibi [2] - 40194:6, 40194:7 alien [1] - 40381:12 align [1] - 40239:8 aligned [1] - 40289:5 alive [4] - 40191:20, 40423:8, 40423:17, 40423:19 all-important [1] - 40347:24 allay [1] - 40210:5 allegation [2] - 40374:15, 40377:5 allegations [5] - 40186:14, 40392:2, 40439:22, 40440:14, 40440:24 alleged [3] - 40208:10, 40212:19, 40395:17 allegedly [1] - 40242:23 alleges [1] - 40187:3 alleging [1] - 40171:1 allocated [3] - 40220:9, 40225:18, 40311:12 allocation [1] - 40281:17 allow [13] - 40174:18, 40185:8, 40194:20, 40246:24, 40265:15, 40274:8, 40276:7, 40293:3, 40293:8, 40314:1, 40318:9, 40420:2, 40444:24 allowed [5] - 40175:20, 40176:9, 40195:2, 40280:8, 40439:18 allows [3] - 40165:24, 40174:23, 40429:1</p>
--	---	---	---	--



<p>alluded [2] - 40292:1, 40338:8</p> <p>alluding [1] - 40273:5</p> <p>almost [7] - 40182:2, 40200:1, 40207:22, 40256:3, 40417:3, 40429:15, 40443:9</p> <p>alternate [9] - 40352:25, 40354:12, 40354:21, 40357:13, 40358:14, 40358:21, 40360:20, 40361:13, 40362:19</p> <p>alternative [8] - 40264:1, 40359:1, 40362:25, 40363:2, 40363:14, 40364:3, 40364:14, 40392:25</p> <p>Alternatively [1] - 40392:20</p> <p>ambit [1] - 40355:23</p> <p>amount [16] - 40163:16, 40164:14, 40189:11, 40209:15, 40218:19, 40222:21, 40224:1, 40233:22, 40246:4, 40262:5, 40281:24, 40282:25, 40297:18, 40311:13, 40381:24, 40422:18</p> <p>amplified [1] - 40399:18</p> <p>amplify [2] - 40400:22, 40428:25</p> <p>amplifying [1] - 40401:12</p> <p>analogy [1] - 40399:5</p> <p>analysis [10] - 40206:3, 40206:5, 40210:24, 40214:22, 40246:24, 40276:2, 40342:11, 40370:18, 40384:22, 40426:22</p> <p>animate [1] - 40305:2</p> <p>annex [1] - 40263:15</p> <p>annual [3] - 40245:1, 40281:20, 40418:16</p> <p>Annual [1] - 40281:21</p> <p>anonymous [1] - 40414:24</p> <p>another's [1] - 40445:22</p> <p>answer [28] - 40178:3, 40209:5, 40258:13, 40261:1, 40265:17, 40309:1, 40321:12, 40356:13, 40364:23, 40380:22, 40381:9, 40381:25, 40386:4, 40386:23, 40391:3, 40392:15, 40397:21,</p>	<p>40402:2, 40418:6, 40418:9, 40418:13, 40418:14, 40418:25, 40432:3, 40439:1, 40441:15, 40444:21, 40445:6</p> <p>answering [3] - 40373:8, 40425:24, 40431:24</p> <p>answers [1] - 40332:11</p> <p>Anthony [4] - 40171:14, 40171:21, 40172:22, 40173:2</p> <p>anticipated [1] - 40363:3</p> <p>anxious [3] - 40222:22, 40274:17, 40391:4</p> <p>anyway [1] - 40191:18</p> <p>ap [1] - 40183:1</p> <p>apart [3] - 40232:11, 40234:13, 40347:19</p> <p>appalling [1] - 40242:14</p> <p>apparent [2] - 40244:14, 40378:18</p> <p>Appeal [128] - 40162:15, 40162:25, 40169:11, 40172:5, 40173:8, 40174:10, 40174:17, 40174:19, 40174:24, 40175:22, 40189:21, 40190:1, 40196:8, 40196:14, 40196:19, 40196:22, 40197:2, 40197:7, 40197:12, 40201:23, 40203:24, 40204:5, 40204:12, 40204:14, 40204:18, 40204:20, 40205:5, 40206:12, 40213:1, 40213:5, 40213:11, 40213:21, 40214:1, 40214:3, 40214:17, 40226:2, 40226:6, 40227:16, 40228:1, 40228:8, 40228:15, 40228:17, 40228:21, 40228:23, 40229:21, 40229:23, 40230:6, 40230:22, 40233:10, 40235:20, 40236:15, 40237:9, 40237:24, 40238:3, 40240:5, 40244:18, 40245:22, 40245:23, 40246:9, 40252:9, 40253:11, 40258:2, 40258:5, 40261:18, 40263:4, 40263:13, 40263:14, 40263:16, 40266:6,</p>	<p>40266:20, 40268:14, 40271:11, 40272:19, 40273:24, 40274:13, 40275:1, 40275:7, 40275:17, 40276:18, 40279:7, 40280:4, 40282:25, 40283:8, 40283:9, 40283:13, 40283:25, 40284:17, 40285:18, 40285:20, 40286:18, 40290:11, 40291:22, 40298:8, 40332:9, 40332:11, 40332:16, 40340:10, 40343:13, 40355:14, 40360:17, 40370:6, 40373:16, 40373:23, 40374:17, 40407:16, 40408:23, 40409:8, 40417:2, 40417:9, 40418:11, 40418:25, 40419:2, 40419:4, 40419:9, 40420:2, 40420:16, 40420:18, 40422:4, 40423:2, 40423:13, 40431:13, 40431:15, 40431:21, 40432:7, 40440:8, 40442:19</p> <p>appeal [43] - 40162:17, 40162:19, 40162:22, 40163:5, 40163:23, 40172:1, 40172:2, 40175:8, 40175:15, 40189:7, 40218:15, 40274:14, 40274:22, 40278:19, 40279:13, 40280:1, 40280:2, 40280:3, 40280:10, 40280:15, 40283:9, 40283:16, 40283:19, 40283:21, 40283:23, 40284:16, 40304:1, 40331:1, 40331:5, 40331:8, 40331:15, 40331:25, 40334:14, 40342:1, 40342:2, 40373:17, 40373:24, 40416:15, 40419:6, 40422:1, 40433:15, 40434:21</p> <p>Appeals [4] - 40268:11, 40282:18, 40297:20, 40298:23</p> <p>appealed [1] - 40162:14</p> <p>Appeals [1] - 40428:10</p> <p>appeals [7] - 40174:22, 40218:14, 40284:6, 40298:8, 40298:10, 40299:2, 40370:6</p>	<p>appear [4] - 40214:12, 40261:12, 40280:12, 40445:17</p> <p>appearance [2] - 40191:10, 40196:24</p> <p>Appearances [1] - 40159:1</p> <p>appeared [7] - 40167:23, 40172:17, 40196:23, 40245:8, 40273:17, 40422:24, 40443:17</p> <p>appellant [5] - 40268:19, 40279:23, 40279:24, 40331:6, 40331:7</p> <p>applicable [1] - 40268:24</p> <p>applicant [101] - 40182:24, 40183:2, 40183:11, 40199:2, 40199:11, 40199:19, 40200:7, 40209:1, 40213:18, 40216:8, 40216:9, 40216:23, 40217:18, 40219:23, 40221:19, 40221:21, 40231:5, 40231:16, 40231:18, 40233:24, 40235:4, 40237:16, 40262:6, 40263:12, 40268:3, 40268:9, 40268:18, 40275:5, 40279:24, 40293:3, 40293:9, 40293:13, 40294:12, 40295:1, 40295:8, 40295:20, 40296:2, 40296:4, 40296:13, 40314:6, 40317:4, 40328:17, 40328:25, 40329:4, 40329:8, 40329:18, 40330:2, 40330:10, 40330:17, 40331:24, 40334:10, 40334:15, 40334:20, 40337:19, 40337:24, 40338:3, 40339:15, 40343:24, 40343:25, 40344:5, 40344:19, 40345:13, 40353:5, 40372:4, 40372:17, 40395:1, 40396:1, 40400:18, 40403:10, 40403:25, 40404:17, 40404:19, 40405:1, 40405:5, 40405:22, 40407:8, 40407:9, 40408:1, 40410:1, 40410:9, 40410:12, 40410:16,</p>	<p>40414:11, 40420:24, 40421:5, 40421:18, 40422:7, 40423:7, 40423:8, 40423:17, 40423:19, 40429:18, 40429:20, 40430:8, 40430:9, 40432:19, 40440:12, 40442:9, 40442:24</p> <p>applicant's [9] - 40187:17, 40210:5, 40217:23, 40218:4, 40293:22, 40334:2, 40355:11, 40372:18, 40420:25</p> <p>applicants [31] - 40162:13, 40162:24, 40187:12, 40208:22, 40215:15, 40215:18, 40216:10, 40216:14, 40230:5, 40230:23, 40231:21, 40240:7, 40288:3, 40289:6, 40290:6, 40296:6, 40323:11, 40323:17, 40324:17, 40328:8, 40328:12, 40329:11, 40333:15, 40338:15, 40349:6, 40349:9, 40349:17, 40395:4, 40400:1, 40407:25, 40442:5</p> <p>Application [2] - 40397:15, 40401:22</p> <p>application [117] - 40163:12, 40166:1, 40170:9, 40181:25, 40183:2, 40186:20, 40187:13, 40197:20, 40198:2, 40198:13, 40198:18, 40198:25, 40199:3, 40199:19, 40200:24, 40202:22, 40205:15, 40205:16, 40205:20, 40213:22, 40215:4, 40215:10, 40215:17, 40218:10, 40218:13, 40220:14, 40224:20, 40280:8, 40285:19, 40287:15, 40293:16, 40293:18, 40293:20, 40294:12, 40300:23, 40301:3, 40301:6, 40301:14, 40304:2, 40304:6, 40327:13, 40328:18, 40328:22, 40329:9, 40330:11, 40330:14, 40330:18, 40334:4, 40334:6, 40338:5, 40339:25, 40340:7,</p>
---	--	--	---	--



<p>40342:20, 40345:8, 40345:12, 40345:15, 40346:20, 40346:25, 40347:11, 40349:10, 40370:7, 40371:12, 40371:20, 40371:21, 40371:23, 40372:3, 40372:6, 40372:14, 40372:25, 40373:10, 40373:12, 40373:13, 40373:15, 40374:1, 40374:11, 40374:13, 40387:4, 40396:21, 40396:23, 40396:24, 40396:25, 40397:5, 40397:8, 40397:24, 40398:22, 40398:24, 40399:5, 40399:16, 40400:3, 40402:12, 40402:14, 40402:18, 40402:19, 40403:5, 40403:20, 40404:12, 40404:14, 40411:10, 40411:11, 40411:21, 40421:6, 40422:1, 40422:11, 40426:19, 40428:14, 40428:15, 40429:3, 40429:11, 40439:20, 40440:2, 40441:22, 40442:3, 40443:16, 40444:24, 40444:25</p> <p>applications [37] - 40161:17, 40161:20, 40161:22, 40161:24, 40162:2, 40162:10, 40162:13, 40162:20, 40163:9, 40163:20, 40163:22, 40166:22, 40167:14, 40168:3, 40168:8, 40181:23, 40181:24, 40215:14, 40261:17, 40266:2, 40266:3, 40282:7, 40283:24, 40298:11, 40303:25, 40322:25, 40325:12, 40328:11, 40328:16, 40336:16, 40336:19, 40338:12, 40345:23, 40346:10, 40348:7, 40399:25, 40418:1</p> <p>applications' [1] - 40225:13</p> <p>applied [14] - 40172:22, 40179:15, 40185:20, 40235:7, 40235:19, 40236:7, 40236:19, 40237:23, 40239:4, 40250:23, 40266:8, 40300:17, 40344:2,</p>	<p>40348:21</p> <p>applies [7] - 40174:21, 40204:21, 40267:24, 40331:25, 40343:21, 40358:9, 40363:4</p> <p>apply [17] - 40167:8, 40182:21, 40186:20, 40233:12, 40233:16, 40240:8, 40271:1, 40280:4, 40281:7, 40283:9, 40283:23, 40292:11, 40292:12, 40300:9, 40317:14, 40326:3, 40376:9</p> <p>applying [2] - 40277:11, 40381:11</p> <p>appoint [3] - 40220:19, 40311:5, 40354:17</p> <p>appointed [6] - 40280:23, 40280:25, 40281:1, 40311:6, 40354:24, 40356:25</p> <p>appointment [24] - 40183:24, 40184:8, 40185:5, 40185:10, 40185:15, 40185:22, 40200:2, 40206:15, 40207:9, 40209:9, 40210:6, 40210:11, 40212:16, 40280:18, 40280:19, 40281:8, 40353:11, 40353:19, 40355:7, 40355:18, 40355:25, 40356:11, 40357:12, 40359:4</p> <p>appointments [3] - 40186:21, 40282:14, 40357:9</p> <p>appreciate [10] - 40211:2, 40228:14, 40231:19, 40373:8, 40388:19, 40403:21, 40409:21, 40424:1, 40429:23, 40445:3</p> <p>appreciation [1] - 40386:2</p> <p>apprehended [1] - 40370:9</p> <p>approach [22] - 40198:10, 40208:14, 40211:12, 40213:14, 40274:7, 40303:23, 40309:11, 40319:10, 40327:9, 40328:20, 40336:18, 40337:4, 40337:12, 40350:25, 40351:17, 40352:7, 40367:6, 40382:19, 40408:3, 40427:15, 40432:4, 40444:15</p>	<p>approaches [4] - 40234:5, 40406:9, 40427:9, 40427:11</p> <p>approaching [2] - 40163:24, 40282:7</p> <p>appropriate [11] - 40175:23, 40276:15, 40278:21, 40280:24, 40316:4, 40319:19, 40325:4, 40338:21, 40385:4, 40399:23, 40427:21</p> <p>appropriately [1] - 40315:19</p> <p>approval [1] - 40327:23</p> <p>approve [1] - 40311:7</p> <p>apt [2] - 40355:19, 40363:5</p> <p>area [8] - 40171:7, 40172:14, 40193:10, 40205:2, 40205:3, 40377:6, 40385:4, 40387:2</p> <p>areas [10] - 40176:21, 40179:13, 40180:20, 40181:20, 40261:9, 40273:12, 40336:5, 40337:14, 40424:22, 40426:5</p> <p>argued [1] - 40444:13</p> <p>arguing [1] - 40275:17</p> <p>argument [11] - 40161:13, 40172:8, 40198:9, 40236:9, 40271:24, 40273:20, 40276:19, 40277:10, 40277:14, 40404:3, 40413:17</p> <p>argumentative [1] - 40444:15</p> <p>arguments [5] - 40177:6, 40197:3, 40405:23, 40411:17, 40417:18</p> <p>arise [11] - 40176:8, 40229:5, 40260:14, 40273:2, 40275:14, 40281:5, 40282:12, 40292:2, 40367:3, 40402:3, 40404:13</p> <p>arisen [3] - 40169:6, 40198:22, 40208:20</p> <p>arises [6] - 40181:5, 40257:15, 40258:6, 40264:22, 40345:19, 40434:15</p> <p>arising [6] - 40242:24, 40248:5, 40318:5, 40425:2, 40425:4, 40430:2</p>	<p>arm [1] - 40175:2</p> <p>armed [3] - 40183:8, 40188:11, 40247:9</p> <p>arose [7] - 40175:15, 40179:7, 40210:12, 40212:5, 40243:22, 40299:11, 40434:5</p> <p>arrest [3] - 40186:8, 40194:22, 40207:6</p> <p>arrested [3] - 40171:21, 40188:12, 40241:6</p> <p>arresting [1] - 40206:25</p> <p>arrived [2] - 40255:7, 40255:13</p> <p>arson [1] - 40250:6</p> <p>arsonist [1] - 40250:7</p> <p>article [22] - 40240:11, 40241:25, 40242:11, 40243:14, 40244:3, 40247:2, 40257:18, 40261:15, 40290:15, 40290:20, 40291:4, 40292:23, 40297:23, 40298:6, 40298:21, 40320:5, 40326:23, 40343:4, 40343:15, 40343:21, 40395:9, 40424:24</p> <p>articulate [4] - 40384:15, 40395:5, 40401:4, 40401:8</p> <p>articulation [1] - 40279:20</p> <p>Asap [1] - 40404:5</p> <p>ascertain [1] - 40175:24</p> <p>ascribed [1] - 40195:25</p> <p>aside [9] - 40176:8, 40177:15, 40187:15, 40229:16, 40230:17, 40238:20, 40298:22, 40330:9, 40359:3</p> <p>aspect [8] - 40239:22, 40243:12, 40274:20, 40275:10, 40276:22, 40337:9, 40389:14</p> <p>aspects [15] - 40243:1, 40245:6, 40276:16, 40278:17, 40314:4, 40316:17, 40319:15, 40322:16, 40347:22, 40401:1, 40401:4, 40401:12, 40412:1, 40412:8, 40413:2</p> <p>assault [1] - 40330:22</p> <p>assaulting [1] - 40330:4</p> <p>assaults [3] - 40168:5, 40202:11, 40202:12</p> <p>assemble [1] - 40404:23</p> <p>assembled [2] -</p>	<p>40223:16, 40224:13</p> <p>assembling [2] - 40403:18, 40404:3</p> <p>asserted [1] - 40395:1</p> <p>asserting [1] - 40370:22</p> <p>assertion [5] - 40187:5, 40214:19, 40398:11, 40399:18, 40439:22</p> <p>assertions [4] - 40370:15, 40440:15, 40442:6, 40442:9</p> <p>asserts [1] - 40380:3</p> <p>assess [1] - 40277:21</p> <p>assessed [1] - 40414:18</p> <p>assessing [3] - 40213:23, 40214:7, 40214:24</p> <p>assessment [7] - 40214:20, 40385:18, 40408:24, 40425:20, 40427:15, 40427:19, 40435:22</p> <p>assigned [8] - 40221:3, 40296:12, 40340:2, 40347:3, 40347:18, 40348:14, 40374:25, 40391:25</p> <p>assist [9] - 40162:6, 40178:23, 40181:10, 40181:18, 40184:14, 40228:19, 40241:22, 40293:22, 40405:22</p> <p>assistance [4] - 40184:20, 40185:1, 40368:20, 40371:17</p> <p>Assistant [1] - 40158:5</p> <p>assisted [2] - 40396:17, 40400:3</p> <p>assisting [3] - 40183:21, 40248:16, 40390:15</p> <p>assists [1] - 40295:18</p> <p>associated [1] - 40347:17</p> <p>Association [3] - 40159:13, 40245:4, 40297:7</p> <p>assume [8] - 40176:10, 40199:3, 40207:18, 40229:21, 40277:10, 40334:9, 40375:9, 40435:8</p> <p>Assume [1] - 40371:18</p> <p>assuming [4] - 40208:4, 40253:25, 40399:10, 40434:24</p> <p>Assuming [1] - 40423:17</p>
--	--	---	---	--



assumption [2] - 40187:8, 40318:10 asylum [1] - 40167:18 attach [1] - 40183:4 attached [2] - 40196:22, 40397:7 attack [2] - 40393:16, 40413:17 attacked [2] - 40420:22, 40444:7 attacker [1] - 40389:23 attacks [1] - 40410:4 attempt [2] - 40218:2, 40310:2 attempted [2] - 40397:16, 40401:23 attempting [2] - 40308:21, 40408:14 attempts [2] - 40370:4, 40381:4 attendance [1] - 40384:14 attention [19] - 40173:21, 40276:1, 40298:1, 40302:4, 40304:18, 40336:4, 40357:18, 40389:8, 40389:12, 40399:21, 40400:4, 40415:25, 40430:7, 40430:17, 40430:22, 40431:11, 40432:17, 40434:9, 40435:16 attitudinal [1] - 40263:24 Attorney [1] - 40315:11 attributed [4] - 40241:11, 40242:7, 40243:11, 40291:5 audience [2] - 40323:11, 40323:23 Audio [1] - 40158:12 audiotape [1] - 40440:22 August [2] - 40225:4, 40225:13 authored [1] - 40390:21 authorities [10] - 40244:20, 40245:10, 40256:7, 40269:13, 40269:23, 40273:16, 40324:3, 40359:20, 40395:23, 40415:4 authority [3] - 40266:21, 40406:21, 40426:13 authorization [1] - 40182:25 authors [2] - 40290:22, 40291:7	automatic [1] - 40239:1 Autopsy [1] - 40377:25 availability [2] - 40304:20, 40366:1 available [21] - 40192:11, 40201:12, 40201:17, 40205:19, 40205:21, 40206:3, 40207:21, 40275:23, 40275:24, 40284:9, 40294:8, 40307:7, 40324:25, 40326:4, 40333:23, 40336:25, 40338:22, 40341:9, 40395:22, 40404:2, 40438:24 avenue [1] - 40430:25 avenues [4] - 40431:15, 40431:19, 40431:22, 40432:4 await [1] - 40369:13 awaiting [1] - 40225:15 aware [22] - 40174:3, 40193:22, 40219:18, 40324:18, 40325:7, 40325:14, 40325:17, 40326:14, 40339:18, 40349:7, 40360:2, 40395:21, 40417:14, 40427:11, 40432:11, 40432:20, 40433:9, 40433:23, 40434:1, 40435:14, 40438:14, 40438:18 awful [4] - 40201:8, 40217:21, 40368:14, 40417:22 axiomatic [1] - 40395:18	bare [2] - 40214:18, 40287:9 base [1] - 40162:12 based [8] - 40214:10, 40229:19, 40255:13, 40256:8, 40261:20, 40290:11, 40295:3, 40374:1 bases [2] - 40277:9, 40442:22 basic [2] - 40331:7, 40336:19 basis [34] - 40163:13, 40167:22, 40171:3, 40173:8, 40173:11, 40179:20, 40200:7, 40205:15, 40213:2, 40213:14, 40214:10, 40236:16, 40236:21, 40257:20, 40263:3, 40271:19, 40272:19, 40277:17, 40278:17, 40293:15, 40295:6, 40295:17, 40311:22, 40318:9, 40318:20, 40343:10, 40344:5, 40382:11, 40384:17, 40397:6, 40412:6, 40416:25, 40435:7, 40444:25 batter [1] - 40191:15 battered [1] - 40171:20 Bbc [2] - 40168:24, 40169:7 bear [1] - 40261:23 bearing [2] - 40211:13, 40278:4 bears [1] - 40357:18 beaten [1] - 40191:3 became [4] - 40377:12, 40440:9, 40440:11 become [9] - 40171:10, 40244:18, 40246:18, 40279:24, 40364:2, 40369:16, 40399:20, 40410:2, 40435:13 becoming [1] - 40244:14 beginning [8] - 40170:15, 40211:17, 40246:18, 40374:8, 40380:4, 40380:5, 40389:16, 40396:5 begins [2] - 40220:12, 40361:5 begs [1] - 40304:5 behalf [13] - 40192:10, 40291:17, 40309:7, 40309:24, 40357:1, 40371:13, 40394:25,	40402:9, 40407:9, 40408:3, 40421:7, 40432:13, 40440:12 behaviour [2] - 40194:24, 40437:4 behaviours [1] - 40195:24 behind [7] - 40175:4, 40192:2, 40278:16, 40281:3, 40384:25, 40386:24, 40401:3 behold [1] - 40189:10 Beitel [1] - 40158:8 belief [8] - 40214:5, 40214:8, 40214:18, 40236:6, 40369:25, 40391:16, 40408:25, 40409:7 believes [1] - 40326:24 bell [1] - 40439:3 Bench [4] - 40447:1, 40447:3, 40447:14, 40447:20 benefit [14] - 40169:24, 40176:12, 40268:3, 40268:9, 40268:18, 40275:5, 40277:22, 40365:9, 40420:24, 40421:1, 40421:12, 40422:24, 40423:18, 40423:22 benefits [2] - 40244:4, 40248:19 Bentley [6] - 40180:2, 40180:6, 40246:1, 40268:12, 40268:22, 40419:1 best [8] - 40258:24, 40319:19, 40321:25, 40327:4, 40371:20, 40383:25, 40386:23, 40447:6 better [6] - 40231:11, 40237:16, 40238:7, 40246:12, 40246:24, 40367:12 Between [1] - 40314:19 between [32] - 40162:3, 40164:8, 40167:1, 40171:4, 40192:3, 40194:22, 40195:9, 40236:3, 40256:16, 40283:14, 40287:23, 40302:21, 40302:24, 40306:5, 40306:18, 40310:17, 40310:21, 40311:19, 40312:19, 40312:23, 40314:16, 40314:21, 40315:4, 40316:11, 40320:25,	40359:19, 40360:6, 40364:15, 40390:5, 40402:6, 40412:2, 40425:1 beyond [9] - 40233:3, 40234:2, 40234:9, 40235:4, 40305:13, 40330:15, 40369:15, 40369:20, 40370:4 bias [3] - 40175:17, 40176:1, 40208:11 biggest [1] - 40406:12 billing [1] - 40331:4 bin [1] - 40193:1 biological [1] - 40302:10 Birmingham [1] - 40169:6 bit [24] - 40168:10, 40184:12, 40187:1, 40203:9, 40220:6, 40220:7, 40221:15, 40226:23, 40228:14, 40230:15, 40244:19, 40251:8, 40276:6, 40306:4, 40315:19, 40316:11, 40359:14, 40368:16, 40398:7, 40402:23, 40403:21, 40428:25, 40434:9, 40446:10 black [2] - 40250:12, 40250:15 blaming [1] - 40437:25 bleeding [1] - 40191:15 blockbuster [5] - 40241:25, 40242:12, 40243:20, 40243:22, 40318:4 blood [6] - 40191:10, 40191:17, 40194:13, 40196:8, 40197:5, 40207:16 bloodstained [1] - 40191:16 bloody [1] - 40377:22 blot [1] - 40246:13 board [5] - 40246:23, 40306:19, 40307:2, 40308:14, 40333:25 Bobs [1] - 40159:5 bodies [4] - 40182:23, 40245:5, 40257:4, 40306:15 bodily [1] - 40207:23 body [28] - 40175:6, 40180:17, 40180:25, 40181:17, 40185:13, 40192:16, 40244:9, 40245:2, 40249:20,
---	---	--	---	---



40251:10, 40282:11, 40302:14, 40305:14, 40306:10, 40306:23, 40318:23, 40343:7, 40359:25, 40367:8, 40368:18, 40370:21, 40407:7, 40410:9, 40413:15, 40415:8, 40415:19, 40416:15, 40419:18 body' [2] - 40180:22, 40180:23 Boechler [1] - 40158:12 bombshell [1] - 40396:12 bones [2] - 40299:8, 40306:5 bono [1] - 40405:6 book [1] - 40331:1 books [1] - 40188:13 Boswell [1] - 40158:4 bottom [8] - 40258:21, 40287:5, 40303:16, 40327:21, 40333:10, 40334:1, 40363:6, 40419:14 bound [2] - 40350:20, 40374:24 box [1] - 40374:3 Boychuk [1] - 40159:8 breach [1] - 40167:24 break [9] - 40172:4, 40227:19, 40227:24, 40253:1, 40278:21, 40352:14, 40352:19, 40424:11, 40424:13 breathing [1] - 40191:21 brief [2] - 40173:19, 40439:13 briefly [1] - 40222:19 bring [6] - 40173:21, 40266:21, 40274:8, 40297:25, 40356:4, 40357:17 bringing [1] - 40356:8 Britain [1] - 40164:23 broad [3] - 40193:25, 40213:12, 40288:21 broadcasting [1] - 40169:2 broader [1] - 40360:8 broadly [1] - 40407:10 brought [12] - 40163:14, 40192:13, 40223:17, 40236:13, 40289:8, 40331:9, 40348:19, 40378:7, 40412:19, 40431:6, 40432:16, 40433:13	Bruce [1] - 40159:9 budget [2] - 40281:20, 40281:21 build [3] - 40379:5, 40379:12, 40380:5 building [2] - 40202:18, 40379:7 bulk [2] - 40300:6, 40328:11 bullet [4] - 40353:24, 40355:16, 40360:15, 40361:3 bunch [1] - 40330:10 burden [1] - 40409:6 burglary [1] - 40168:6 bury [1] - 40322:13 business [2] - 40311:8, 40314:4	40354:4 cards [1] - 40330:3 care [3] - 40333:15, 40426:3, 40428:4 career [2] - 40282:3, 40319:17 careful [3] - 40251:8, 40392:14, 40435:25 carefully [1] - 40251:12 careless [1] - 40167:12 carried [8] - 40184:10, 40200:22, 40209:11, 40249:24, 40412:9, 40413:2, 40416:10 carries [1] - 40351:18 carry [5] - 40183:25, 40190:15, 40220:21, 40291:13, 40442:20 carrying [1] - 40188:13 cart [1] - 40256:18 carving [1] - 40326:25 case [309] - 40163:14, 40163:17, 40167:5, 40167:22, 40169:7, 40170:4, 40170:7, 40171:12, 40171:14, 40171:15, 40172:24, 40173:4, 40173:7, 40173:18, 40173:22, 40174:3, 40174:19, 40175:23, 40176:2, 40177:21, 40179:24, 40180:1, 40180:2, 40181:24, 40183:17, 40183:23, 40184:5, 40186:17, 40187:25, 40188:6, 40188:8, 40190:1, 40190:8, 40190:16, 40191:6, 40191:14, 40191:24, 40192:10, 40192:24, 40193:24, 40194:9, 40194:10, 40195:18, 40197:1, 40197:11, 40197:18, 40199:22, 40201:8, 40201:9, 40201:20, 40202:19, 40204:22, 40205:14, 40206:6, 40206:11, 40206:16, 40207:12, 40207:16, 40208:7, 40213:13, 40214:25, 40215:23, 40216:19, 40217:13, 40217:15, 40217:19, 40218:3, 40218:24, 40219:12, 40219:13, 40220:7, 40220:9, 40220:17, 40220:18, 40220:24, 40221:4, 40221:14,	40221:15, 40221:17, 40221:25, 40222:2, 40222:8, 40222:12, 40222:14, 40223:14, 40223:15, 40223:20, 40223:25, 40224:1, 40224:2, 40224:3, 40224:4, 40224:7, 40224:8, 40224:12, 40224:13, 40224:19, 40228:22, 40229:14, 40230:3, 40233:9, 40235:18, 40237:23, 40240:21, 40241:12, 40242:7, 40243:1, 40243:10, 40245:19, 40245:20, 40250:2, 40250:6, 40250:17, 40250:24, 40251:14, 40251:23, 40252:10, 40253:15, 40254:8, 40255:5, 40255:12, 40256:3, 40257:6, 40259:19, 40259:20, 40259:22, 40262:2, 40262:3, 40262:25, 40263:8, 40263:9, 40263:13, 40267:19, 40268:12, 40269:3, 40269:12, 40270:22, 40271:9, 40271:18, 40272:1, 40273:2, 40274:18, 40275:10, 40276:16, 40276:22, 40278:18, 40279:22, 40287:6, 40287:14, 40288:14, 40289:22, 40290:9, 40290:10, 40293:15, 40293:16, 40293:20, 40294:3, 40294:6, 40296:11, 40296:13, 40297:18, 40300:11, 40303:11, 40304:1, 40304:2, 40304:7, 40304:25, 40308:22, 40314:1, 40314:3, 40316:13, 40316:17, 40317:17, 40318:2, 40318:11, 40318:16, 40319:23, 40327:10, 40329:23, 40329:25, 40330:22, 40330:25, 40333:2, 40334:9, 40334:22, 40335:2, 40335:7, 40335:24, 40336:2, 40337:23, 40338:24, 40339:14, 40339:19, 40340:3, 40340:13, 40340:25, 40341:1, 40341:3, 40341:7,	40341:8, 40341:25, 40342:11, 40342:13, 40343:13, 40347:3, 40347:7, 40347:18, 40348:3, 40348:12, 40348:13, 40348:17, 40348:19, 40350:14, 40350:15, 40350:18, 40355:6, 40357:12, 40360:19, 40368:19, 40371:18, 40372:5, 40372:16, 40373:7, 40373:9, 40373:20, 40374:9, 40374:14, 40374:23, 40374:25, 40375:4, 40375:22, 40376:4, 40376:6, 40376:12, 40376:15, 40376:23, 40379:14, 40380:2, 40380:9, 40380:11, 40387:20, 40390:10, 40390:16, 40392:18, 40393:19, 40393:23, 40394:3, 40394:17, 40394:20, 40394:24, 40395:4, 40395:18, 40396:6, 40396:12, 40396:14, 40398:20, 40398:25, 40399:7, 40399:8, 40399:13, 40399:20, 40400:11, 40400:12, 40401:14, 40402:20, 40403:25, 40404:15, 40404:24, 40405:4, 40406:6, 40407:15, 40408:4, 40409:22, 40410:14, 40412:4, 40412:6, 40412:17, 40412:19, 40412:24, 40412:25, 40413:6, 40416:25, 40418:21, 40420:3, 40420:6, 40420:17, 40421:10, 40422:10, 40422:14, 40423:6, 40423:7, 40426:4, 40429:14, 40429:17, 40429:18, 40429:20, 40429:22, 40430:13, 40431:9, 40437:18, 40439:5, 40439:16, 40441:17 Case [3] - 40220:10, 40220:11, 40225:3 cases [122] - 40162:10, 40163:23, 40164:2, 40164:4, 40164:13, 40164:18, 40165:4, 40165:22, 40165:24, 40165:25, 40168:1, 40168:4, 40168:23,
---	--	--	--	--



<p>40169:9, 40169:11, 40170:9, 40174:4, 40177:22, 40178:5, 40179:7, 40183:11, 40184:18, 40185:21, 40186:22, 40187:3, 40207:2, 40210:9, 40212:17, 40216:9, 40216:14, 40216:18, 40219:8, 40219:20, 40219:25, 40220:4, 40220:17, 40223:13, 40226:16, 40228:1, 40228:5, 40228:7, 40228:20, 40229:21, 40230:22, 40231:17, 40241:13, 40241:24, 40241:25, 40242:3, 40242:12, 40242:14, 40242:19, 40242:20, 40243:8, 40243:20, 40243:23, 40243:24, 40244:7, 40245:15, 40245:18, 40246:10, 40246:12, 40246:13, 40246:20, 40246:21, 40247:7, 40248:5, 40248:22, 40249:16, 40251:13, 40253:10, 40254:19, 40254:24, 40255:4, 40255:20, 40257:19, 40258:6, 40259:25, 40260:5, 40260:7, 40260:14, 40261:22, 40261:24, 40262:17, 40262:22, 40282:21, 40283:14, 40283:15, 40288:19, 40288:21, 40290:1, 40290:10, 40298:25, 40300:10, 40307:20, 40309:5, 40309:22, 40317:11, 40317:24, 40318:4, 40330:1, 40339:22, 40341:23, 40346:12, 40346:18, 40347:15, 40365:13, 40365:24, 40367:16, 40395:16, 40403:16, 40409:9, 40418:4, 40418:24, 40419:19, 40422:5, 40422:16, 40426:1, 40429:12, 40431:7</p> <p>Cases^[8] - 40170:22, 40244:5, 40290:17, 40300:23, 40301:4, 40304:2, 40307:1, 40368:10</p> <p>casework^[4] - 40308:4, 40311:25, 40365:17</p>	<p>caseworker^[5] - 40163:18, 40220:10, 40220:12, 40220:15, 40221:8</p> <p>caseworkers'^[1] - 40221:5</p> <p>cast^[1] - 40431:17</p> <p>categories^[2] - 40288:21, 40326:13</p> <p>categorized^[1] - 40236:2</p> <p>category^[4] - 40181:25, 40186:12, 40289:4, 40300:10</p> <p>Catherine^[2] - 40159:5, 40438:12</p> <p>caught^[2] - 40250:5, 40250:8</p> <p>causation^[1] - 40172:4</p> <p>caused^[2] - 40289:1, 40409:17</p> <p>causes^[1] - 40272:12</p> <p>causing^[1] - 40438:20</p> <p>caution^[2] - 40186:8, 40207:7</p> <p>Cavalier^[1] - 40157:16</p> <p>Cbc^[4] - 40158:10, 40447:3, 40447:18, 40447:19</p> <p>Cccr^[77] - 40166:9, 40168:11, 40168:14, 40168:21, 40169:14, 40170:23, 40175:6, 40178:10, 40178:14, 40178:20, 40179:6, 40180:13, 40200:14, 40218:9, 40232:11, 40233:9, 40234:13, 40237:8, 40237:12, 40239:25, 40240:4, 40260:23, 40267:16, 40270:9, 40272:25, 40275:6, 40297:19, 40298:14, 40298:25, 40300:16, 40302:21, 40305:12, 40305:19, 40305:23, 40306:6, 40306:9, 40307:8, 40307:24, 40308:21, 40310:17, 40310:20, 40311:19, 40311:21, 40312:3, 40313:17, 40319:8, 40321:11, 40323:3, 40324:8, 40324:14, 40343:6, 40345:24, 40349:1, 40349:6, 40350:22, 40351:1, 40352:1, 40354:16, 40356:18, 40360:8, 40361:22,</p>	<p>40362:21, 40363:6, 40364:15, 40364:19, 40366:9, 40367:16, 40368:19, 40370:22, 40385:22, 40403:4, 40405:16, 40416:12, 40417:22, 40418:11, 40419:25</p> <p>Cccr's^[5] - 40179:6, 40322:16, 40322:22, 40323:8, 40353:10</p> <p>cell^[2] - 40333:19, 40378:9</p> <p>Centurion^[2] - 40405:12, 40406:14</p> <p>century^[2] - 40245:17, 40422:14</p> <p>certain^[10] - 40177:14, 40185:21, 40196:2, 40210:15, 40287:8, 40322:15, 40340:1, 40418:21, 40429:15, 40443:18</p> <p>Certainly^[2] - 40336:21, 40422:1</p> <p>certainly^[62] - 40189:6, 40200:1, 40201:1, 40202:24, 40215:6, 40219:6, 40219:12, 40233:15, 40236:23, 40244:3, 40244:22, 40245:24, 40247:3, 40252:22, 40263:22, 40265:10, 40266:16, 40266:18, 40282:5, 40284:6, 40290:9, 40292:18, 40302:16, 40303:14, 40313:15, 40318:24, 40318:25, 40324:15, 40324:21, 40325:1, 40325:3, 40327:1, 40329:14, 40335:15, 40337:22, 40347:16, 40349:16, 40350:6, 40357:16, 40362:24, 40363:10, 40363:14, 40366:1, 40366:12, 40375:10, 40379:6, 40382:19, 40387:21, 40389:5, 40402:1, 40404:1, 40404:8, 40406:1, 40409:16, 40413:17, 40421:16, 40422:4, 40432:8, 40433:10, 40435:3</p> <p>certainty^[2] - 40287:11, 40287:22</p> <p>Certificates^[1] - 40447:1</p>	<p>certifies^[1] - 40283:20</p> <p>certify^[1] - 40447:4</p> <p>chain^[1] - 40172:4</p> <p>chair^[1] - 40290:16</p> <p>chairman^[1] - 40281:4</p> <p>challenge^[1] - 40301:25</p> <p>challenged^[2] - 40181:7, 40271:18</p> <p>chance^[4] - 40287:8, 40287:22, 40301:23, 40303:10</p> <p>change^[17] - 40173:14, 40260:24, 40263:24, 40265:20, 40265:25, 40267:17, 40267:22, 40268:2, 40268:18, 40269:19, 40270:8, 40270:11, 40270:21, 40270:23, 40271:4, 40334:15, 40408:15</p> <p>changed^[10] - 40172:14, 40219:11, 40219:16, 40220:2, 40224:25, 40225:1, 40265:15, 40266:16, 40268:4, 40270:1</p> <p>changes^[9] - 40243:22, 40267:12, 40267:14, 40267:25, 40268:9, 40268:19, 40269:8, 40269:9, 40275:4</p> <p>changing^[1] - 40301:13</p> <p>character^[1] - 40230:2</p> <p>characteristics^[1] - 40273:6</p> <p>characterized^[1] - 40236:14</p> <p>charge^[2] - 40266:9, 40313:8</p> <p>charged^[1] - 40176:22</p> <p>check^[6] - 40244:19, 40249:7, 40278:25, 40329:7, 40394:21, 40395:6</p> <p>chief^[1] - 40307:2</p> <p>Chief^[3] - 40245:4, 40268:16, 40269:5</p> <p>child^[1] - 40190:23</p> <p>child's^[1] - 40193:4</p> <p>children^[4] - 40190:21, 40192:9, 40192:13, 40330:4</p> <p>choice^[6] - 40208:5, 40307:14, 40307:22, 40312:1, 40320:25, 40343:18</p> <p>choose^[4] - 40170:4, 40170:10, 40261:24,</p>	<p>40444:23</p> <p>chose^[1] - 40266:13</p> <p>chosen^[3] - 40215:17, 40258:3, 40307:11</p> <p>Chris^[1] - 40159:8</p> <p>chunk^[2] - 40223:5, 40315:24</p> <p>circumstance^[10] - 40199:24, 40200:1, 40273:1, 40355:20, 40398:17, 40421:13, 40430:15, 40432:25, 40436:13, 40438:18</p> <p>circumstances^[43] - 40162:18, 40181:15, 40198:23, 40205:12, 40205:17, 40205:18, 40206:16, 40210:12, 40216:2, 40236:1, 40268:21, 40270:21, 40271:1, 40271:4, 40272:11, 40274:16, 40289:21, 40294:24, 40324:20, 40354:7, 40363:3, 40371:9, 40371:22, 40372:2, 40373:7, 40377:6, 40379:1, 40379:19, 40380:8, 40387:10, 40387:25, 40400:17, 40401:11, 40409:2, 40420:10, 40420:14, 40421:2, 40423:10, 40423:14, 40425:12, 40431:8, 40438:7, 40439:16</p> <p>circumstances'^[1] - 40215:25</p> <p>citation^[1] - 40252:13</p> <p>citizen^[1] - 40264:12</p> <p>civil^[6] - 40310:8, 40310:11, 40318:5, 40318:8, 40318:19, 40425:8</p> <p>claim^[5] - 40171:3, 40234:11, 40237:9, 40259:3, 40321:2</p> <p>claiming^[1] - 40274:2</p> <p>clarified^[1] - 40165:3</p> <p>clarify^[1] - 40224:16</p> <p>Clark^[1] - 40276:23</p> <p>class^[1] - 40167:10</p> <p>classified^[1] - 40345:13</p> <p>clear^[15] - 40231:23, 40250:9, 40257:21, 40257:24, 40258:19, 40266:22, 40268:17, 40283:5, 40307:18, 40308:10, 40342:19,</p>
---	---	--	--	--



<p>40412:2, 40416:23, 40440:9, 40440:12 Clear^[1] - 40173:20 cleared^[1] - 40246:20 clearly^[12] - 40175:6, 40175:22, 40202:21, 40243:7, 40244:2, 40250:9, 40355:25, 40378:24, 40385:11, 40389:2, 40394:20, 40443:20 Clerk^[1] - 40158:8 client^[5] - 40296:20, 40432:13, 40438:22, 40439:9, 40439:17 client's^[1] - 40402:9 close^[2] - 40202:17, 40348:19 closed^[5] - 40162:11, 40162:21, 40163:14, 40163:18, 40391:14 closely^[3] - 40210:1, 40289:4, 40300:18 clothing^[3] - 40191:11, 40207:20, 40377:22 cloud^[1] - 40230:17 co^[1] - 40214:15 co-accused^[1] - 40214:15 Code^[2] - 40361:10, 40369:5 code^[3] - 40350:4, 40350:8, 40350:19 codification^[1] - 40369:20 cogent^[1] - 40404:3 coherent^[1] - 40329:3 coherently^[1] - 40286:15 collectively^[1] - 40440:14 collegial^[1] - 40352:4 collusion^[1] - 40236:3 com^[1] - 40366:21 combination^[1] - 40277:14 combined^[1] - 40348:3 coming^[8] - 40364:6, 40372:23, 40413:19, 40413:23, 40415:5, 40415:10, 40431:14, 40433:17 comment^[34] - 40161:19, 40168:13, 40197:15, 40212:22, 40232:7, 40239:24, 40240:1, 40242:5, 40242:6, 40242:9, 40243:6, 40249:2, 40256:1, 40256:8,</p>	<p>40259:9, 40259:10, 40260:10, 40260:19, 40260:22, 40261:19, 40262:16, 40267:13, 40269:21, 40270:8, 40282:17, 40322:5, 40384:20, 40385:7, 40385:9, 40385:17, 40387:1, 40395:2, 40404:8, 40446:1 commentators^[1] - 40317:22 commented^[1] - 40216:5 commenting^[1] - 40384:12 comments^[4] - 40295:20, 40365:20, 40378:15, 40388:25 Commission^[372] - 40157:2, 40157:14, 40158:1, 40158:2, 40158:8, 40161:15, 40161:21, 40162:1, 40162:5, 40162:17, 40163:10, 40165:4, 40165:9, 40167:4, 40167:17, 40169:14, 40170:22, 40171:8, 40172:21, 40172:23, 40173:3, 40173:13, 40173:16, 40174:5, 40174:12, 40174:14, 40174:17, 40174:21, 40175:1, 40175:23, 40176:3, 40176:9, 40178:23, 40179:3, 40179:12, 40180:16, 40181:13, 40181:18, 40183:20, 40184:8, 40184:13, 40184:16, 40184:19, 40186:10, 40186:19, 40186:23, 40186:25, 40187:16, 40188:2, 40189:8, 40190:10, 40193:25, 40194:1, 40195:14, 40196:15, 40198:2, 40198:8, 40198:12, 40198:18, 40199:4, 40199:7, 40200:5, 40205:20, 40205:22, 40206:1, 40206:6, 40209:9, 40209:12, 40209:22, 40210:10, 40210:20, 40211:25, 40212:7, 40212:22, 40213:10, 40213:25, 40214:9, 40216:7, 40216:12, 40216:19,</p>	<p>40216:22, 40217:10, 40217:12, 40219:4, 40219:7, 40221:2, 40221:3, 40221:19, 40221:22, 40222:2, 40222:16, 40222:18, 40222:22, 40223:9, 40223:11, 40223:16, 40223:22, 40224:9, 40226:19, 40227:15, 40230:6, 40230:14, 40230:22, 40232:15, 40234:16, 40237:20, 40240:8, 40244:6, 40244:8, 40244:24, 40245:7, 40245:16, 40245:17, 40246:11, 40246:14, 40246:22, 40247:3, 40248:14, 40248:15, 40248:20, 40249:3, 40249:14, 40251:7, 40256:9, 40257:20, 40261:3, 40261:13, 40262:8, 40264:1, 40265:13, 40265:19, 40266:2, 40266:11, 40266:15, 40266:19, 40266:25, 40267:5, 40268:16, 40271:10, 40273:1, 40273:23, 40274:17, 40274:19, 40276:3, 40276:12, 40277:9, 40277:18, 40277:20, 40277:24, 40279:6, 40279:12, 40279:16, 40280:17, 40280:19, 40280:22, 40280:25, 40281:6, 40281:12, 40282:4, 40282:6, 40282:9, 40282:11, 40282:13, 40283:7, 40283:15, 40284:5, 40285:20, 40285:22, 40286:4, 40286:16, 40286:17, 40287:24, 40288:4, 40288:10, 40289:25, 40290:10, 40290:17, 40290:22, 40291:19, 40291:25, 40292:18, 40293:1, 40293:5, 40293:8, 40293:11, 40293:25, 40294:1, 40294:2, 40294:3, 40294:21, 40294:23, 40294:24, 40296:12, 40300:24, 40301:4, 40304:3, 40306:16, 40307:1, 40307:2, 40307:4, 40308:1, 40308:9,</p>	<p>40309:5, 40309:7, 40309:11, 40309:18, 40309:20, 40310:3, 40310:22, 40310:23, 40310:24, 40311:4, 40311:5, 40311:11, 40313:20, 40319:16, 40319:24, 40320:21, 40322:9, 40324:19, 40324:22, 40325:3, 40325:9, 40325:10, 40326:2, 40326:4, 40326:11, 40326:16, 40326:24, 40328:15, 40328:21, 40329:24, 40331:3, 40335:13, 40335:22, 40335:23, 40336:1, 40336:4, 40336:13, 40337:1, 40337:5, 40337:8, 40337:11, 40337:20, 40337:25, 40340:3, 40340:13, 40340:19, 40344:4, 40344:21, 40347:18, 40348:4, 40348:14, 40350:14, 40350:20, 40351:7, 40351:14, 40352:9, 40357:2, 40357:9, 40358:2, 40358:6, 40358:8, 40358:24, 40359:7, 40359:24, 40361:6, 40363:22, 40365:5, 40365:9, 40365:21, 40366:16, 40366:18, 40367:2, 40367:4, 40368:10, 40368:23, 40371:10, 40372:15, 40374:12, 40379:7, 40380:10, 40381:14, 40382:8, 40387:7, 40387:11, 40389:10, 40390:9, 40390:25, 40391:4, 40391:15, 40392:2, 40392:16, 40392:20, 40393:18, 40394:7, 40395:14, 40395:20, 40397:9, 40398:16, 40398:20, 40399:9, 40399:11, 40400:2, 40401:8, 40402:19, 40402:24, 40404:10, 40404:14, 40409:23, 40410:16, 40412:1, 40415:19, 40416:6, 40416:19, 40416:22, 40416:24, 40417:6, 40417:7, 40419:17, 40421:3, 40421:13, 40423:15, 40426:19,</p>	<p>40426:20, 40427:10, 40428:9, 40428:11, 40429:2, 40429:4, 40429:7, 40429:9, 40429:12, 40429:13, 40429:16, 40430:3, 40430:23, 40431:3, 40431:6, 40431:14, 40432:17, 40433:8, 40433:17, 40433:21, 40433:25, 40434:2, 40434:5, 40434:7, 40434:23, 40434:25, 40435:10, 40435:17, 40436:16, 40439:20, 40440:3, 40440:6, 40441:13, 40441:16, 40441:20, 40442:1, 40442:13, 40442:20, 40443:21, 40444:18, 40444:20, 40444:23, 40445:12, 40446:8 commission^[8] - 40164:19, 40165:7, 40165:8, 40187:22, 40187:23, 40212:13, 40294:6, 40363:12 Commission's^[45] - 40170:16, 40173:1, 40186:3, 40190:14, 40199:9, 40218:1, 40237:22, 40246:4, 40248:5, 40279:21, 40282:19, 40286:1, 40288:19, 40294:15, 40311:7, 40311:14, 40324:24, 40325:18, 40335:19, 40336:21, 40338:11, 40338:19, 40340:8, 40341:11, 40342:15, 40349:23, 40353:2, 40355:9, 40356:1, 40356:7, 40365:12, 40365:18, 40387:5, 40387:6, 40388:10, 40392:7, 40399:21, 40415:22, 40417:5, 40420:7, 40420:10, 40420:19, 40430:22, 40431:11, 40441:19 Commissioner^[106] - 40161:3, 40161:5, 40164:6, 40164:9, 40164:11, 40164:17, 40164:20, 40164:24, 40168:18, 40206:13, 40206:24, 40207:11, 40208:4, 40208:13, 40210:8, 40210:17, 40210:21, 40226:11,</p>
--	---	--	--	---



<p>40227:20, 40228:10, 40245:12, 40252:12, 40252:16, 40252:18, 40252:23, 40253:2, 40253:7, 40263:23, 40264:8, 40264:14, 40264:20, 40264:25, 40265:3, 40265:6, 40267:10, 40278:20, 40281:9, 40281:15, 40281:23, 40282:1, 40282:8, 40282:15, 40297:3, 40297:4, 40297:10, 40308:16, 40308:20, 40314:15, 40314:19, 40314:24, 40315:3, 40320:10, 40320:13, 40320:18, 40327:16, 40327:18, 40330:20, 40331:14, 40331:18, 40332:6, 40332:10, 40332:19, 40332:22, 40333:3, 40333:7, 40334:7, 40339:24, 40347:10, 40347:13, 40352:13, 40352:18, 40352:23, 40362:4, 40367:23, 40372:22, 40384:6, 40384:8, 40385:6, 40385:19, 40385:22, 40385:25, 40394:25, 40400:21, 40401:7, 40401:18, 40419:8, 40419:12, 40424:1, 40424:4, 40424:7, 40424:10, 40424:14, 40424:18, 40436:19, 40436:25, 40437:2, 40438:4, 40438:9, 40439:14, 40443:12, 40444:19, 40445:5, 40445:14, 40446:5, 40446:12 Commissioner's [1] - 40171:6 Commissioners [5] - 40176:12, 40347:8, 40349:3, 40350:5, 40350:6 commissioning [2] - 40184:23, 40342:8 commit [4] - 40284:23, 40288:9, 40315:18, 40372:1 committed [22] - 40173:7, 40186:16, 40187:6, 40187:9, 40190:6, 40197:23, 40198:4, 40199:15,</p>	<p>40202:1, 40203:11, 40205:11, 40208:10, 40272:10, 40353:4, 40354:6, 40355:21, 40360:3, 40361:14, 40361:24, 40362:19, 40372:11 committee [18] - 40223:15, 40223:25, 40224:2, 40224:3, 40224:13, 40261:11, 40261:12, 40293:14, 40293:21, 40348:12, 40348:13, 40348:18, 40412:4, 40412:5, 40412:10, 40412:16, 40412:20, 40412:23 Committee [2] - 40369:7, 40369:8 committee's [1] - 40293:23 committing [2] - 40374:7, 40390:18 common [9] - 40169:25, 40267:18, 40268:6, 40268:7, 40268:10, 40268:20, 40269:19, 40270:13, 40342:25 common-law [1] - 40342:25 communicate [1] - 40352:3 communicated [3] - 40339:15, 40415:7, 40416:3 communicating [1] - 40295:23 communication [1] - 40302:21 communications [1] - 40183:13 community [3] - 40322:24, 40324:11, 40328:7 compared [2] - 40256:10, 40425:3 comparison [1] - 40283:14 compensation [24] - 40232:8, 40233:6, 40233:13, 40233:21, 40233:22, 40234:1, 40234:11, 40234:22, 40235:3, 40235:8, 40235:19, 40236:19, 40237:3, 40237:9, 40237:16, 40238:8, 40238:11, 40238:21, 40239:1, 40239:16,</p>	<p>40240:1, 40240:8, 40422:18, 40423:5 competence [1] - 40290:12 competent [2] - 40304:19, 40386:4 compile [1] - 40179:19 compiled [1] - 40341:13 complain [1] - 40288:5 Complaint [1] - 40366:17 complaint [5] - 40349:4, 40349:7, 40349:13, 40350:2, 40436:21 complaints [10] - 40262:11, 40288:13, 40331:10, 40349:10, 40349:12, 40349:18, 40349:21, 40350:1, 40366:22, 40367:10 Complaints [1] - 40366:15 complete [3] - 40361:3, 40443:18, 40446:11 completed [2] - 40215:15, 40371:19 completely [6] - 40186:2, 40251:22, 40292:22, 40309:25, 40430:9, 40442:7 completeness [1] - 40226:12 completes [1] - 40183:3 completion [1] - 40163:15 complex [4] - 40185:14, 40289:15, 40394:18, 40406:6 compliance [2] - 40182:8, 40394:21 complicated [3] - 40175:19, 40298:25, 40330:24 complied [1] - 40395:7 comply [1] - 40395:14 components [1] - 40222:5 composition [1] - 40351:4 comprehensive [2] - 40335:6, 40341:23 conceal [2] - 40251:9, 40436:22 concealment [1] - 40251:5 conceivable [1] - 40404:23 conceivably [2] - 40216:16, 40434:20</p>	<p>concentrate [1] - 40365:17 concept [3] - 40313:18, 40344:1, 40405:18 concepts [3] - 40239:8, 40381:10 concern [20] - 40180:5, 40230:24, 40231:1, 40240:23, 40285:23, 40305:17, 40314:3, 40317:8, 40317:13, 40338:19, 40370:20, 40377:6, 40387:2, 40402:2, 40430:6, 40430:10, 40430:16, 40431:11, 40432:11 concerned [23] - 40161:16, 40163:7, 40169:16, 40187:16, 40190:10, 40192:8, 40222:18, 40240:7, 40250:5, 40250:25, 40288:10, 40293:17, 40355:10, 40362:22, 40375:7, 40376:21, 40379:11, 40382:15, 40383:19, 40389:6, 40413:12, 40430:19, 40430:22 concerning [17] - 40194:13, 40302:8, 40302:12, 40302:13, 40308:22, 40312:7, 40312:8, 40322:23, 40327:23, 40335:7, 40335:13, 40344:20, 40346:15, 40353:11, 40377:19, 40380:12, 40434:14 concerns [18] - 40166:4, 40261:15, 40291:5, 40291:22, 40319:25, 40327:4, 40374:18, 40378:20, 40379:17, 40380:9, 40384:16, 40385:24, 40386:22, 40388:1, 40389:9, 40394:14, 40434:8 concise [2] - 40397:16, 40401:23 concisely [1] - 40286:14 conclude [2] - 40203:25, 40204:7 concluding [1] - 40369:12 conclusion [7] - 40201:21, 40295:24, 40344:7, 40344:8,</p>	<p>40344:22, 40427:20, 40442:2 conclusions [1] - 40339:5 concrete [1] - 40266:24 condemnatory [1] - 40309:18 condition [2] - 40162:22, 40378:16 conditions [1] - 40419:5 conduct [10] - 40192:7, 40206:20, 40206:21, 40217:14, 40236:15, 40350:4, 40350:8, 40350:19, 40425:18, 40440:15 conducted [6] - 40192:25, 40339:11, 40339:14, 40348:2, 40349:23, 40356:6 confess [1] - 40173:6 confessed [1] - 40171:24 confession [2] - 40173:2, 40173:10 confessions [3] - 40242:22, 40248:3, 40257:23 confidence [5] - 40246:7, 40261:7, 40262:13, 40410:12, 40437:4 confident [1] - 40259:14 confidential [2] - 40181:15, 40263:15 confined [2] - 40210:1, 40275:2 confirm [3] - 40284:20, 40298:1, 40322:17 conflict [7] - 40312:23, 40315:2, 40315:4, 40315:7, 40316:7, 40316:11, 40350:9 confuse [2] - 40379:2, 40392:14 confused [1] - 40443:15 confusing [2] - 40162:8, 40271:7 Congram [1] - 40158:3 conjunction [1] - 40328:3 connected [1] - 40376:15 connecting [1] - 40390:23 connection [2] - 40413:6, 40415:12</p>
---	---	---	---	---



<p>conscientious [1] - 40326:1</p> <p>consciously [1] - 40278:8</p> <p>consent [1] - 40195:25</p> <p>consequence [2] - 40260:11, 40436:4</p> <p>consider [10] - 40178:24, 40201:23, 40227:16, 40280:9, 40292:14, 40304:18, 40362:6, 40398:24, 40399:23, 40431:3</p> <p>considerable [10] - 40173:4, 40209:15, 40222:21, 40224:1, 40246:3, 40266:6, 40269:1, 40304:18, 40422:18, 40423:4</p> <p>considerably [1] - 40284:14</p> <p>consideration [12] - 40216:21, 40228:22, 40300:14, 40303:24, 40304:22, 40351:19, 40351:25, 40388:10, 40391:8, 40396:25, 40428:10, 40433:21</p> <p>considerations [3] - 40229:4, 40348:10, 40353:17</p> <p>considered [17] - 40202:23, 40220:1, 40276:16, 40276:17, 40303:2, 40303:4, 40330:12, 40330:18, 40334:6, 40339:24, 40341:2, 40341:10, 40341:17, 40346:21, 40363:13, 40417:4, 40430:19</p> <p>considering [6] - 40173:3, 40179:2, 40214:4, 40268:1, 40379:15, 40379:24</p> <p>considers [2] - 40228:23, 40338:12</p> <p>consist [2] - 40348:13, 40382:20</p> <p>consisted [1] - 40335:25</p> <p>consistency [4] - 40336:15, 40337:4, 40337:12, 40337:16</p> <p>consistent [8] - 40162:4, 40195:21, 40225:6, 40292:7, 40298:16, 40298:18, 40327:8, 40344:12</p> <p>constant [1] - 40161:25</p>	<p>constantly [1] - 40337:20</p> <p>constituent [1] - 40309:24</p> <p>constituents [2] - 40309:8, 40309:15</p> <p>constitutional [1] - 40310:15</p> <p>consultation [2] - 40397:10, 40433:25</p> <p>consulted [1] - 40418:19</p> <p>contact [7] - 40295:8, 40302:23, 40309:5, 40309:20, 40310:2, 40310:16, 40403:12</p> <p>contacting [1] - 40308:20</p> <p>contain [2] - 40390:14, 40447:5</p> <p>contained [1] - 40185:2</p> <p>contemplated [4] - 40302:3, 40303:1, 40363:9, 40363:10</p> <p>contemporaneous [3] - 40246:19, 40246:23, 40365:24</p> <p>content [1] - 40398:17</p> <p>contents [2] - 40274:10, 40277:2</p> <p>context [18] - 40179:2, 40200:14, 40213:8, 40214:25, 40243:3, 40243:5, 40273:2, 40276:18, 40277:25, 40286:7, 40305:12, 40368:25, 40401:15, 40402:7, 40402:17, 40425:8, 40430:18</p> <p>continue [1] - 40424:11</p> <p>Continued [1] - 40160:3</p> <p>continued [1] - 40161:6</p> <p>continues [1] - 40328:22</p> <p>continuity [1] - 40281:8</p> <p>contrary [1] - 40438:22</p> <p>contribute [2] - 40244:12, 40408:8</p> <p>contributed [3] - 40277:4, 40289:13, 40388:13</p> <p>contributing [2] - 40262:13, 40367:11</p> <p>contribution [1] - 40261:6</p> <p>contributions [1] - 40297:19</p> <p>control [3] - 40171:8, 40224:8, 40356:4</p> <p>controversial [2] -</p>	<p>40266:1, 40267:9</p> <p>Convention [1] - 40343:4</p> <p>convention [2] - 40168:1, 40343:15</p> <p>conventional [1] - 40310:12</p> <p>convey [2] - 40308:12, 40338:11</p> <p>convicted [60] - 40167:8, 40167:12, 40171:17, 40171:25, 40176:19, 40179:20, 40180:3, 40188:11, 40188:19, 40189:7, 40190:19, 40191:8, 40191:22, 40198:3, 40199:12, 40205:16, 40215:11, 40230:10, 40230:16, 40232:23, 40233:16, 40234:18, 40234:21, 40239:18, 40249:22, 40258:9, 40259:4, 40262:7, 40283:18, 40283:22, 40286:20, 40288:4, 40316:6, 40316:10, 40321:3, 40323:1, 40325:12, 40325:17, 40326:9, 40330:4, 40331:25, 40334:11, 40353:5, 40371:25, 40372:8, 40395:13, 40422:10, 40422:23, 40428:14, 40428:16, 40428:23, 40429:15, 40430:4, 40430:21, 40432:10, 40432:19, 40433:14, 40434:20, 40435:7</p> <p>Convicted [2] - 40159:14, 40297:8</p> <p>convicting [1] - 40284:21</p> <p>Conviction [1] - 40157:4</p> <p>conviction [104] - 40166:4, 40167:1, 40171:2, 40173:10, 40180:9, 40187:3, 40187:18, 40189:22, 40190:2, 40191:10, 40197:7, 40200:7, 40202:10, 40204:25, 40211:15, 40216:17, 40217:25, 40218:6, 40221:23, 40227:6, 40227:10, 40228:8, 40228:18, 40229:17, 40230:7, 40230:16,</p>	<p>40230:25, 40231:8, 40232:5, 40232:25, 40233:11, 40233:17, 40235:19, 40236:16, 40238:4, 40238:20, 40239:13, 40239:20, 40240:5, 40245:24, 40248:15, 40250:24, 40254:9, 40256:6, 40256:7, 40256:16, 40256:20, 40260:1, 40262:11, 40262:24, 40263:5, 40263:10, 40263:17, 40267:5, 40267:16, 40268:14, 40272:20, 40283:17, 40284:25, 40285:3, 40289:20, 40298:8, 40300:8, 40301:14, 40301:25, 40304:9, 40304:19, 40312:9, 40312:14, 40313:8, 40317:16, 40318:3, 40330:1, 40342:14, 40355:12, 40355:13, 40356:19, 40364:9, 40367:16, 40372:3, 40388:13, 40394:10, 40395:17, 40404:21, 40405:3, 40416:9, 40419:20, 40420:12, 40421:19, 40423:1, 40423:13, 40423:19, 40425:21, 40430:7, 40430:10, 40430:20, 40431:12, 40431:18, 40435:9, 40435:24, 40436:2, 40438:25, 40441:23</p> <p>convictions [21] - 40166:10, 40201:4, 40217:16, 40226:6, 40226:17, 40226:22, 40240:17, 40248:17, 40253:11, 40257:21, 40258:12, 40262:4, 40262:15, 40262:18, 40263:9, 40318:22, 40327:7, 40351:11, 40425:2, 40425:3, 40425:19</p> <p>convoluted [1] - 40204:2</p> <p>copy [1] - 40334:16</p> <p>core [3] - 40365:18, 40372:13, 40376:3</p> <p>corner [1] - 40327:21</p> <p>corporate [2] - 40311:8, 40311:15</p> <p>correct [61] - 40165:5,</p>	<p>40168:4, 40178:12, 40180:17, 40184:6, 40187:5, 40201:24, 40202:20, 40204:9, 40215:5, 40219:5, 40220:23, 40221:7, 40226:9, 40227:4, 40227:9, 40228:3, 40229:21, 40233:14, 40238:9, 40238:15, 40239:25, 40240:12, 40254:22, 40254:23, 40276:8, 40279:8, 40290:17, 40299:20, 40305:20, 40306:8, 40307:12, 40307:13, 40323:8, 40323:24, 40328:18, 40328:23, 40329:1, 40329:9, 40335:8, 40336:20, 40338:13, 40339:12, 40339:25, 40343:2, 40343:8, 40345:3, 40345:11, 40346:10, 40346:11, 40347:5, 40354:18, 40356:15, 40358:14, 40362:23, 40363:9, 40363:25, 40410:6, 40428:16, 40432:21, 40447:5</p> <p>Correct [2] - 40347:12, 40356:24</p> <p>correction [1] - 40388:14</p> <p>correctly [6] - 40228:11, 40275:18, 40291:6, 40291:24, 40331:24, 40428:25</p> <p>costly [1] - 40281:16</p> <p>costs [1] - 40403:4</p> <p>Counsel [2] - 40158:2, 40161:4</p> <p>counsel [31] - 40182:19, 40183:14, 40195:3, 40215:13, 40290:12, 40293:12, 40293:22, 40293:24, 40295:8, 40296:19, 40297:6, 40297:10, 40343:18, 40384:9, 40384:24, 40397:20, 40398:12, 40398:19, 40399:17, 40399:21, 40400:4, 40400:10, 40400:22, 40401:4, 40413:9, 40415:7, 40424:21, 40432:24, 40438:15, 40440:13, 40443:4</p> <p>counted [1] - 40335:10</p>
--	---	---	--	---



<p>counter [1] - 40329:4</p> <p>counterproductive [1] - 40237:18</p> <p>countries [1] - 40236:4</p> <p>country [1] - 40259:13</p> <p>counts [1] - 40289:19</p> <p>couple [7] - 40161:9, 40181:20, 40242:5, 40255:16, 40279:4, 40292:23, 40312:17</p> <p>coupled [2] - 40422:23, 40423:3</p> <p>course [68] - 40161:20, 40163:4, 40172:23, 40173:12, 40175:8, 40175:15, 40175:21, 40176:21, 40176:23, 40178:20, 40182:7, 40182:21, 40186:15, 40187:8, 40201:8, 40202:15, 40210:12, 40221:20, 40228:25, 40231:17, 40244:15, 40264:22, 40266:14, 40266:17, 40274:20, 40291:21, 40292:17, 40294:18, 40295:4, 40301:5, 40301:10, 40303:17, 40304:5, 40304:21, 40311:13, 40314:5, 40324:16, 40329:18, 40329:22, 40336:24, 40341:5, 40343:3, 40349:17, 40358:23, 40365:18, 40370:9, 40373:18, 40373:22, 40376:7, 40382:6, 40398:18, 40399:4, 40400:9, 40402:21, 40410:14, 40411:25, 40413:4, 40413:5, 40426:10, 40429:3, 40436:20, 40436:23, 40437:1, 40439:5, 40440:5, 40441:19, 40442:13, 40443:8</p> <p>Court[161] - 40158:9, 40162:24, 40166:10, 40166:15, 40166:18, 40167:9, 40167:14, 40167:22, 40168:2, 40169:11, 40172:5, 40173:8, 40174:9, 40174:16, 40174:18, 40174:19, 40174:24, 40174:25, 40175:2, 40175:10, 40175:13, 40175:22, 40179:8, 40189:21, 40190:1,</p>	<p>40196:1, 40196:8, 40196:14, 40196:18, 40196:21, 40197:2, 40197:7, 40197:12, 40200:25, 40201:23, 40202:23, 40203:24, 40204:4, 40204:12, 40204:14, 40204:18, 40204:20, 40205:5, 40206:11, 40213:1, 40213:5, 40213:11, 40213:21, 40214:1, 40214:3, 40214:17, 40226:2, 40226:5, 40226:17, 40226:18, 40227:16, 40228:1, 40228:7, 40228:15, 40228:17, 40228:20, 40228:23, 40229:15, 40229:16, 40229:20, 40229:23, 40230:6, 40230:22, 40233:9, 40233:10, 40235:20, 40236:15, 40237:8, 40237:24, 40238:3, 40240:5, 40244:18, 40245:22, 40245:23, 40246:9, 40252:9, 40253:11, 40258:2, 40258:4, 40261:18, 40263:4, 40263:13, 40263:14, 40263:16, 40266:3, 40266:6, 40266:20, 40268:11, 40268:14, 40268:20, 40271:11, 40271:17, 40272:19, 40273:24, 40274:3, 40274:13, 40275:1, 40275:7, 40275:17, 40276:18, 40279:7, 40280:4, 40282:17, 40282:25, 40283:8, 40283:9, 40283:13, 40283:25, 40284:17, 40285:20, 40286:18, 40290:11, 40291:21, 40297:19, 40298:7, 40298:23, 40299:18, 40332:9, 40332:10, 40332:16, 40340:10, 40343:13, 40355:14, 40360:17, 40370:6, 40370:7, 40373:16, 40373:22, 40374:17, 40398:5, 40404:22, 40407:15, 40408:10, 40408:23, 40409:8, 40417:1, 40417:9, 40418:11, 40418:24, 40419:2, 40419:4, 40419:9,</p>	<p>40420:2, 40420:16, 40420:17, 40422:4, 40423:2, 40423:12, 40432:7, 40440:8, 40442:19, 40447:1, 40447:3, 40447:14, 40447:20</p> <p>court [23] - 40166:13, 40196:14, 40213:13, 40257:8, 40279:9, 40280:7, 40283:16, 40283:17, 40287:7, 40287:12, 40287:16, 40291:4, 40291:5, 40291:7, 40291:13, 40291:17, 40331:7, 40374:20, 40423:11, 40425:7, 40439:8, 40439:24</p> <p>court's [1] - 40287:13</p> <p>Courts [1] - 40299:1</p> <p>courts [7] - 40181:4, 40235:24, 40236:2, 40266:4, 40266:17, 40300:20, 40397:24</p> <p>cover [7] - 40350:8, 40354:12, 40358:12, 40358:23, 40359:6, 40363:5, 40424:22</p> <p>covered [2] - 40240:15, 40337:14</p> <p>covering [1] - 40287:20</p> <p>covers [2] - 40180:24, 40358:20</p> <p>Cox[1] - 40159:10</p> <p>cracks [3] - 40357:14, 40362:21, 40364:15</p> <p>cradled [1] - 40191:20</p> <p>create [4] - 40219:4, 40416:14, 40416:15, 40434:25</p> <p>created [4] - 40166:9, 40168:12, 40366:15, 40443:7</p> <p>creates [2] - 40264:23, 40366:17</p> <p>creation [5] - 40178:10, 40179:5, 40221:11, 40243:17, 40322:8</p> <p>credence [1] - 40189:25</p> <p>credibility [11] - 40212:23, 40213:25, 40214:21, 40271:24, 40272:22, 40277:3, 40277:5, 40277:15, 40277:21, 40380:19, 40400:13</p> <p>credible [3] - 40213:7, 40214:11, 40214:25</p> <p>cries [2] - 40259:3,</p>	<p>40321:2</p> <p>crime [20] - 40187:6, 40197:24, 40198:4, 40198:6, 40202:1, 40202:2, 40205:11, 40211:9, 40214:16, 40229:19, 40247:4, 40247:10, 40248:7, 40249:1, 40284:22, 40360:3, 40360:25, 40361:9, 40361:13, 40408:7</p> <p>crimes [7] - 40166:23, 40167:1, 40168:6, 40210:24, 40244:21, 40288:9, 40358:9</p> <p>Crimes[1] - 40357:20</p> <p>Criminal[25] - 40162:15, 40170:21, 40232:20, 40235:1, 40243:15, 40244:5, 40248:9, 40252:15, 40252:17, 40265:13, 40265:24, 40285:18, 40290:17, 40300:23, 40301:4, 40304:2, 40307:1, 40320:22, 40368:10, 40369:5, 40394:4, 40428:10, 40431:13, 40431:15, 40431:21</p> <p>criminal [47] - 40207:4, 40229:6, 40232:24, 40241:7, 40242:17, 40243:12, 40245:6, 40246:8, 40247:13, 40249:5, 40258:16, 40258:24, 40259:13, 40259:23, 40260:11, 40260:19, 40260:24, 40261:5, 40261:7, 40262:14, 40286:8, 40289:15, 40300:19, 40315:24, 40321:15, 40321:22, 40322:2, 40322:6, 40322:11, 40327:1, 40331:15, 40357:4, 40360:1, 40361:23, 40362:20, 40363:12, 40363:23, 40364:20, 40365:10, 40373:4, 40391:11, 40421:1, 40421:12, 40422:25, 40437:8, 40437:10, 40437:20</p> <p>criteria [4] - 40185:21, 40186:19, 40186:20, 40234:24</p> <p>critical [3] - 40258:25, 40306:1, 40422:5</p>	<p>criticism [10] - 40208:18, 40290:21, 40291:8, 40416:13, 40416:20, 40435:21, 40436:8, 40436:9, 40436:10, 40436:12</p> <p>criticisms [3] - 40291:3, 40416:11, 40416:18</p> <p>criticized [1] - 40391:13</p> <p>cross [3] - 40288:17, 40380:18, 40432:25</p> <p>cross-examination [1] - 40288:17</p> <p>cross-examine [1] - 40380:18</p> <p>cross-examined [1] - 40432:25</p> <p>Crown[25] - 40166:13, 40182:17, 40202:19, 40226:18, 40243:17, 40254:22, 40257:8, 40257:11, 40280:12, 40283:17, 40300:2, 40300:6, 40300:20, 40361:11, 40375:2, 40377:2, 40393:14, 40393:16, 40395:24, 40431:5, 40431:10, 40431:16, 40438:19, 40440:16, 40440:25</p> <p>Crr[4] - 40158:10, 40447:2, 40447:18, 40447:19</p> <p>Csr[8] - 40158:9, 40158:10, 40447:2, 40447:12, 40447:13, 40447:18, 40447:19</p> <p>cuff [1] - 40176:16</p> <p>culpably [1] - 40241:4</p> <p>cultural [3] - 40249:10, 40259:1, 40260:24</p> <p>culture [4] - 40437:7, 40437:17, 40437:19, 40437:23</p> <p>current [8] - 40215:3, 40238:1, 40273:13, 40273:19, 40277:11, 40277:22, 40290:16, 40300:17</p> <p>custodial [2] - 40325:20, 40421:23</p> <p>custody [4] - 40323:17, 40323:20, 40333:12, 40346:12</p> <p>cynic [1] - 40251:6</p> <p>cynical [1] - 40214:17</p>
--	--	--	---	--



<p>D</p> <p>damage [3] - 40409:12, 40409:15, 40409:17</p> <p>damaging [3] - 40320:4, 40321:24, 40421:20</p> <p>danger [1] - 40357:11</p> <p>dangers [1] - 40291:18</p> <p>daresay [1] - 40395:2</p> <p>dashed [1] - 40296:9</p> <p>database [1] - 40252:19</p> <p>date [6] - 40223:17, 40256:13, 40260:25, 40373:4, 40383:25, 40385:10</p> <p>daughter [4] - 40190:20, 40191:12, 40191:19, 40192:12</p> <p>David [36] - 40157:4, 40159:2, 40159:10, 40160:3, 40161:6, 40170:21, 40197:18, 40197:22, 40197:24, 40202:1, 40203:7, 40229:14, 40256:2, 40368:5, 40370:5, 40370:14, 40370:20, 40370:24, 40374:6, 40380:17, 40386:10, 40387:22, 40388:13, 40389:25, 40393:5, 40393:11, 40396:20, 40398:1, 40399:12, 40406:20, 40413:7, 40413:10, 40414:7, 40433:5, 40438:20, 40439:19</p> <p>day-to-day [1] - 40311:22</p> <p>days [7] - 40163:17, 40163:18, 40165:18, 40217:10, 40224:22, 40416:12, 40418:3</p> <p>dead [2] - 40421:5, 40422:11</p> <p>deal [25] - 40166:9, 40169:1, 40171:8, 40175:13, 40186:4, 40194:15, 40198:2, 40208:20, 40218:11, 40238:15, 40238:19, 40238:20, 40247:8, 40248:4, 40251:19, 40266:15, 40280:7, 40317:25, 40325:4, 40325:13, 40346:8, 40364:12, 40416:21, 40433:12, 40437:3</p>	<p>dealing [18] - 40174:20, 40179:18, 40245:18, 40246:9, 40246:22, 40270:4, 40284:5, 40325:21, 40333:12, 40365:13, 40365:24, 40366:21, 40366:22, 40369:11, 40380:18, 40382:7, 40433:11, 40439:20</p> <p>dealings [1] - 40167:16</p> <p>deals [11] - 40165:4, 40166:13, 40174:15, 40212:23, 40234:13, 40240:5, 40283:13, 40311:25, 40350:9, 40363:21, 40364:5</p> <p>dealt [26] - 40161:12, 40162:10, 40163:19, 40163:25, 40168:11, 40183:17, 40186:23, 40210:10, 40232:10, 40238:12, 40240:4, 40242:19, 40246:15, 40269:13, 40269:23, 40270:3, 40274:13, 40283:24, 40290:20, 40309:2, 40315:18, 40329:23, 40336:17, 40340:15, 40373:24, 40428:7</p> <p>death [2] - 40171:21, 40438:21</p> <p>debate [2] - 40286:4, 40312:7</p> <p>debating [1] - 40286:23</p> <p>deceive [1] - 40442:12</p> <p>decide [8] - 40204:12, 40204:14, 40204:16, 40213:5, 40216:19, 40340:13, 40398:24, 40434:13</p> <p>decided [2] - 40177:14, 40204:10</p> <p>decides [1] - 40434:24</p> <p>deciding [4] - 40219:9, 40355:6, 40385:15, 40433:21</p> <p>decision [64] - 40219:24, 40223:15, 40223:21, 40224:5, 40235:17, 40237:3, 40246:5, 40260:17, 40262:9, 40275:8, 40276:3, 40291:8, 40293:5, 40293:15, 40293:20, 40293:23, 40294:9, 40295:3, 40295:23, 40314:13, 40338:16, 40340:16,</p>	<p>40341:12, 40341:13, 40341:15, 40341:16, 40341:18, 40342:20, 40343:11, 40343:12, 40343:22, 40344:12, 40344:19, 40344:21, 40345:2, 40347:11, 40348:16, 40348:20, 40349:20, 40349:22, 40362:11, 40399:6, 40399:8, 40399:9, 40402:10, 40402:21, 40403:1, 40405:23, 40407:11, 40407:13, 40407:14, 40407:18, 40411:8, 40412:3, 40412:4, 40412:5, 40412:10, 40412:16, 40412:20, 40412:22, 40412:23, 40412:24, 40429:14, 40441:16</p> <p>decision-maker [5] - 40399:6, 40405:23, 40407:11, 40407:13, 40411:8</p> <p>decision-making [15] - 40246:5, 40293:20, 40293:23, 40294:9, 40314:13, 40338:16, 40343:11, 40348:16, 40399:8, 40412:3, 40412:4, 40412:10, 40412:16, 40412:20, 40412:23</p> <p>decisions [10] - 40222:1, 40286:6, 40293:8, 40308:4, 40310:4, 40313:25, 40314:11, 40316:4, 40340:23, 40343:10</p> <p>dedicated [2] - 40318:23, 40362:18</p> <p>deep [2] - 40193:4, 40196:24</p> <p>defeated [1] - 40181:13</p> <p>defect [1] - 40259:18</p> <p>defence [33] - 40175:11, 40182:19, 40182:22, 40183:13, 40188:20, 40188:24, 40189:4, 40189:22, 40192:8, 40192:18, 40193:22, 40194:25, 40195:3, 40196:10, 40196:12, 40201:16, 40202:3, 40202:7, 40203:2, 40203:3, 40229:3, 40236:8, 40241:23, 40242:24, 40250:16, 40271:18,</p>	<p>40289:12, 40341:24, 40391:22, 40393:5, 40393:9, 40415:7, 40426:11</p> <p>Defence [2] - 40159:13, 40297:7</p> <p>Defendant [8] - 40250:4, 40251:17, 40251:18, 40252:7, 40254:14, 40257:9, 40263:19, 40290:13</p> <p>Defendant's [1] - 40265:16</p> <p>defending [1] - 40380:17</p> <p>deficiencies [3] - 40243:19, 40254:1, 40257:24</p> <p>deficiency [1] - 40254:7</p> <p>defined [4] - 40180:22, 40181:17, 40213:12, 40287:4</p> <p>defining [2] - 40241:16, 40287:19</p> <p>definitely [2] - 40201:6, 40418:25</p> <p>definition [4] - 40180:24, 40213:13, 40241:20, 40417:3</p> <p>degree [1] - 40392:22</p> <p>deliberate [11] - 40251:5, 40253:12, 40253:23, 40254:16, 40254:20, 40288:6, 40307:14, 40312:1, 40379:25, 40441:10</p> <p>deliberately [4] - 40215:17, 40397:15, 40401:22, 40437:15</p> <p>deliberations [1] - 40175:21</p> <p>delighted [1] - 40446:7</p> <p>deliver [1] - 40411:8</p> <p>delivered [2] - 40263:15, 40263:16</p> <p>delivery [1] - 40306:12</p> <p>demand [1] - 40181:19</p> <p>democracy [1] - 40310:13</p> <p>demonstrate [2] - 40196:3, 40398:2</p> <p>denied [4] - 40211:8, 40251:22, 40252:1, 40418:5</p> <p>denies [1] - 40211:24</p> <p>Denning [1] - 40318:6</p> <p>deny [2] - 40212:3, 40398:9</p> <p>denying [2] - 40191:19, 40436:19</p>	<p>department [3] - 40306:14, 40306:21, 40308:2</p> <p>Department [6] - 40369:3, 40396:14, 40414:18, 40433:2, 40443:16, 40443:20</p> <p>departmental [5] - 40306:10, 40306:15, 40306:22, 40309:21, 40367:8</p> <p>departments [1] - 40433:19</p> <p>dependant [1] - 40417:2</p> <p>depended [1] - 40250:2</p> <p>deploy [1] - 40203:2</p> <p>deployed [3] - 40174:16, 40201:18, 40202:6</p> <p>deposit [1] - 40207:23</p> <p>deprived [2] - 40196:10, 40242:25</p> <p>deputy [1] - 40190:17</p> <p>Derek [5] - 40180:2, 40180:6, 40246:1, 40268:11, 40268:22</p> <p>derived [1] - 40391:6</p> <p>describe [4] - 40253:17, 40278:14, 40287:7, 40289:3</p> <p>described [9] - 40161:19, 40190:9, 40242:13, 40284:24, 40311:9, 40350:25, 40371:22, 40434:5, 40441:24</p> <p>describing [2] - 40239:19, 40380:8</p> <p>description [2] - 40188:14, 40188:15</p> <p>Description [1] - 40160:2</p> <p>design [2] - 40328:2, 40395:15</p> <p>designed [2] - 40341:21, 40356:4</p> <p>designs [1] - 40363:8</p> <p>desirable [1] - 40355:19</p> <p>desire [1] - 40436:22</p> <p>despite [2] - 40262:17, 40426:3</p> <p>destroyed [6] - 40257:9, 40257:11, 40300:7, 40301:16, 40439:9</p> <p>destruction [10] - 40257:3, 40257:5, 40257:13, 40299:13, 40299:25, 40300:5,</p>
--	--	---	--	---



<p>40301:9, 40301:22, 40302:19 detail [4] - 40232:9, 40341:10, 40344:16, 40344:20 detailed [3] - 40335:18, 40338:4, 40363:7 detect [1] - 40245:7 detecting [1] - 40248:14 detection [1] - 40316:1 detention [1] - 40241:18 deter [1] - 40249:15 deterioration [1] - 40346:16 determination [1] - 40241:3 determine [3] - 40165:19, 40296:13, 40440:7 determining [3] - 40275:19, 40339:25, 40443:22 deterrent [2] - 40249:19, 40249:23 develop [3] - 40200:22, 40244:16, 40352:3 developed [3] - 40261:3, 40338:20, 40407:20 developing [4] - 40187:15, 40245:8, 40270:12, 40271:22 development [3] - 40172:16, 40217:25, 40267:7 developments [1] - 40243:17 devil [1] - 40435:19 devil's [1] - 40435:20 devise [1] - 40237:15 difference [7] - 40202:13, 40217:24, 40231:16, 40257:14, 40306:18, 40314:16, 40334:21 differences [1] - 40331:13 different [26] - 40177:19, 40184:6, 40184:9, 40198:17, 40204:8, 40208:15, 40210:7, 40214:19, 40216:7, 40231:14, 40232:3, 40239:3, 40266:14, 40267:21, 40269:15, 40276:20, 40289:2, 40292:5, 40292:21, 40310:1,</p>	<p>40339:5, 40362:22, 40393:19, 40402:17, 40406:9, 40410:22 differentiate [1] - 40166:25 difficult [18] - 40176:15, 40213:17, 40237:21, 40257:1, 40263:1, 40282:3, 40286:24, 40308:12, 40323:11, 40323:23, 40379:2, 40381:9, 40381:25, 40390:7, 40400:16, 40404:25, 40405:1, 40408:1 difficulties [3] - 40291:12, 40292:2, 40388:23 difficulty [9] - 40204:23, 40256:8, 40265:7, 40266:6, 40278:25, 40349:17, 40359:14, 40406:5, 40406:10 dim [1] - 40256:23 dimension [2] - 40201:10, 40212:11 diminished [1] - 40194:5 direct [3] - 40173:25, 40307:19, 40307:23 directed [4] - 40209:22, 40315:25, 40355:25, 40435:5 direction [4] - 40174:9, 40174:13, 40209:11, 40310:20 directly [10] - 40245:2, 40281:4, 40281:21, 40306:13, 40308:9, 40315:17, 40328:8, 40328:12, 40343:21, 40376:14 Director [1] - 40158:3 director [3] - 40171:16, 40245:3, 40350:16 disadvantage [1] - 40406:3 disagree [1] - 40400:10 disagreed [1] - 40245:22 disappear [2] - 40256:23, 40440:25 discharge [1] - 40391:19 disclosable [2] - 40394:4, 40426:11 disclose [4] - 40241:21, 40260:7, 40263:8, 40295:16</p>	<p>discloseable [1] - 40181:16 disclosed [19] - 40182:13, 40201:16, 40243:2, 40262:18, 40294:11, 40294:14, 40295:1, 40383:1, 40391:22, 40393:9, 40394:6, 40395:11, 40395:25, 40426:18, 40426:23, 40426:25, 40440:18, 40444:6, 40444:10 disclosing [1] - 40295:19 disclosure [18] - 40182:8, 40258:1, 40295:2, 40295:21, 40393:21, 40394:9, 40394:16, 40394:21, 40395:7, 40395:10, 40395:15, 40426:8, 40426:14, 40427:2, 40427:4, 40444:11, 40444:12 discover [5] - 40206:6, 40241:9, 40249:17, 40329:21, 40426:20 discoverable [1] - 40258:4 discovered [17] - 40192:25, 40233:2, 40234:2, 40236:23, 40258:1, 40303:6, 40358:9, 40358:24, 40378:14, 40380:14, 40387:12, 40403:21, 40413:4, 40413:14, 40414:10, 40415:8, 40415:21 Discovered [1] - 40357:20 discovers [1] - 40361:23 discovery [5] - 40179:14, 40250:1, 40276:10, 40276:13, 40413:8 discrete [1] - 40294:14 discretion [9] - 40296:11, 40420:5, 40420:10, 40420:20, 40421:3, 40421:14, 40421:25, 40423:6, 40436:20 discretionary [1] - 40420:3 discuss [1] - 40309:22 discussed [1] - 40161:9 discussing [4] -</p>	<p>40286:7, 40326:21, 40378:1, 40412:17 discussion [5] - 40209:16, 40211:3, 40301:12, 40301:18, 40384:9 discussions [2] - 40434:16, 40439:1 disfavour [1] - 40381:25 dislike [1] - 40246:9 dismiss [1] - 40400:16 dismissed [7] - 40189:8, 40225:22, 40225:25, 40345:9, 40345:15, 40370:7, 40411:1 dispassionate [1] - 40316:22 disposition [1] - 40433:12 disregard [2] - 40176:23, 40278:1 disrespectful [1] - 40443:9 disseminate [1] - 40326:15 distance [2] - 40403:15, 40403:17 distinct [1] - 40234:24 distinction [2] - 40314:22, 40425:1 distort [1] - 40444:16 distorted [1] - 40444:14 distortion [1] - 40443:18 distribute [1] - 40325:23 distributed [1] - 40367:18 disturbing [1] - 40248:1 disused [1] - 40171:19 divided [1] - 40336:9 dividing [1] - 40266:21 Division [1] - 40196:1 Dna [11] - 40189:10, 40189:11, 40189:12, 40189:15, 40189:17, 40189:24, 40205:24, 40205:25, 40206:3, 40206:5, 40206:9 do-it-yourself [1] - 40403:22 doc [2] - 40252:24, 40320:11 document [41] - 40218:9, 40222:9, 40257:5, 40290:14, 40301:9, 40301:15, 40303:8, 40320:14,</p>	<p>40320:16, 40327:15, 40327:22, 40328:2, 40339:2, 40339:4, 40339:13, 40341:9, 40341:15, 40341:23, 40353:9, 40355:3, 40357:25, 40358:4, 40383:1, 40383:4, 40383:5, 40383:14, 40383:16, 40383:20, 40384:18, 40385:14, 40385:17, 40386:19, 40387:13, 40388:5, 40388:9, 40389:11, 40389:16, 40401:3, 40402:8, 40402:11 Document [2] - 40158:4, 40158:5 documentation [21] - 40167:20, 40257:3, 40332:4, 40332:17, 40332:23, 40333:22, 40337:3, 40339:19, 40340:4, 40340:11, 40340:20, 40341:4, 40342:19, 40349:8, 40372:23, 40372:24, 40373:3, 40379:10, 40382:22, 40391:7, 40420:7 documented [1] - 40337:10 documents [24] - 40180:16, 40180:20, 40181:4, 40221:9, 40252:21, 40299:16, 40302:5, 40311:8, 40329:7, 40330:11, 40334:3, 40334:20, 40337:14, 40339:6, 40339:24, 40341:2, 40341:17, 40342:5, 40384:13, 40390:13, 40390:16, 40390:21, 40393:9, 40439:6 dog [2] - 40245:25, 40441:7 domain [2] - 40171:3, 40324:23 domestic [1] - 40266:4 Don [1] - 40158:10 Donald [2] - 40447:2, 40447:19 done [50] - 40163:16, 40169:12, 40170:17, 40179:23, 40192:18, 40199:1, 40206:5, 40207:1, 40207:3, 40208:24, 40220:24, 40223:3, 40224:14,</p>
--	--	---	--	--



40237:17, 40254:14, 40254:15, 40254:16, 40256:25, 40271:15, 40289:10, 40292:23, 40297:10, 40306:13, 40309:9, 40309:10, 40328:2, 40336:13, 40336:24, 40341:8, 40348:18, 40351:20, 40352:16, 40370:3, 40371:11, 40379:23, 40381:2, 40382:21, 40392:1, 40398:4, 40406:19, 40407:6, 40409:2, 40412:11, 40412:12, 40428:15, 40429:12, 40432:18, 40433:22, 40446:4 door [1] - 40211:25 doors [1] - 40191:5 doubt [17] - 40199:18, 40201:19, 40202:7, 40203:15, 40211:16, 40233:3, 40234:3, 40234:10, 40235:4, 40240:20, 40285:5, 40285:12, 40309:17, 40374:21, 40393:4, 40431:17, 40441:20 Douglas [1] - 40158:2 down [16] - 40171:23, 40206:10, 40211:20, 40252:24, 40287:5, 40289:16, 40310:6, 40334:23, 40360:10, 40361:17, 40385:2, 40385:3, 40404:1, 40414:7, 40422:5, 40434:24 download [1] - 40340:10 downstream [1] - 40375:25 Dr [2] - 40397:7, 40397:8 dragging [1] - 40210:18 Drake [5] - 40240:11, 40284:18, 40326:23, 40395:10, 40424:24 draw [4] - 40260:18, 40278:17, 40309:17, 40400:4 drawing [5] - 40265:23, 40333:25, 40416:2, 40434:7, 40434:8 drawn [9] - 40233:23, 40265:16, 40336:4, 40399:20, 40415:24, 40426:12, 40430:7, 40431:10, 40435:16	draws [1] - 40342:12 dreadful [1] - 40247:6 drew [1] - 40430:22 driven [2] - 40179:16, 40192:15 drivers [1] - 40179:16 driving [1] - 40167:12 drop [1] - 40396:13 dropped [2] - 40392:18, 40403:7 due [2] - 40255:4, 40402:20 duly [1] - 40263:16 duplicate [1] - 40331:2 duplicating [1] - 40331:19 during [8] - 40258:14, 40292:17, 40295:15, 40329:21, 40358:9, 40358:23, 40363:13, 40442:13 During [1] - 40357:20 duties [1] - 40356:22 duty [1] - 40360:24	40246:16, 40249:3, 40249:9, 40249:19, 40249:20, 40267:19, 40267:20, 40301:10, 40319:22, 40385:14, 40385:17, 40396:11, 40412:11, 40419:3, 40422:21, 40426:16, 40430:20, 40444:21 effective [4] - 40323:3, 40376:5, 40403:14, 40409:13 effectively [13] - 40194:6, 40194:19, 40201:18, 40202:6, 40203:2, 40224:7, 40235:2, 40236:11, 40348:2, 40356:17, 40374:4, 40398:19, 40402:8 effectiveness [1] - 40210:4 effort [5] - 40163:16, 40163:18, 40327:14, 40336:16, 40363:7 efforts [6] - 40262:17, 40326:1, 40368:21, 40378:13, 40403:11, 40425:10 eight [3] - 40195:18, 40244:7, 40291:5 either [40] - 40175:10, 40197:3, 40219:5, 40237:14, 40245:1, 40245:9, 40249:4, 40254:9, 40259:22, 40263:21, 40267:17, 40277:13, 40278:19, 40285:19, 40286:5, 40295:23, 40306:15, 40309:19, 40314:6, 40314:8, 40321:19, 40321:21, 40331:21, 40334:13, 40336:3, 40336:5, 40338:1, 40350:17, 40381:10, 40395:15, 40403:11, 40405:6, 40407:7, 40420:24, 40432:4, 40433:15, 40433:24, 40434:21, 40440:13, 40442:10 elaborate [5] - 40180:19, 40242:8, 40259:8, 40324:13, 40402:1 elaborated [1] - 40344:13 elaboration [1] - 40219:19	elapsed [1] - 40256:15 elapses [2] - 40256:22, 40257:2 elderly [3] - 40422:12, 40422:19, 40422:25 eldest [1] - 40190:23 elected [3] - 40308:19, 40313:7, 40313:10 electrical [1] - 40193:15 electronically [1] - 40332:18 elements [2] - 40214:6, 40237:13 elicit [1] - 40305:1 eliminated [1] - 40243:24 Ellis [1] - 40246:2 Elson [11] - 40159:7, 40160:7, 40253:3, 40253:5, 40424:1, 40424:6, 40424:8, 40424:12, 40424:19, 40424:20, 40436:17 embark [6] - 40169:22, 40199:4, 40373:2, 40429:7, 40429:9, 40430:3 embodied [1] - 40366:25 embodies [1] - 40366:18 embrace [1] - 40326:12 embraced [1] - 40190:5 emerges [2] - 40386:16, 40388:4 emphasis [1] - 40320:8 emphasizing [1] - 40257:17 empirical [2] - 40365:19, 40366:2 employ [1] - 40427:21 employed [1] - 40177:7 enable [4] - 40276:20, 40303:25, 40340:12, 40376:4 enables [2] - 40184:7, 40339:13 enactment [1] - 40431:20 encapsulates [1] - 40286:14 encourage [3] - 40325:6, 40329:10, 40438:1 end [19] - 40225:12, 40232:14, 40255:1, 40255:11, 40262:9, 40281:6, 40308:17, 40312:25, 40313:3, 40314:20, 40315:23,	40320:24, 40321:21, 40322:7, 40357:14, 40408:22, 40441:18, 40446:6 endeavour [4] - 40243:13, 40296:3, 40309:22, 40347:22 endeavouring [4] - 40199:14, 40234:20, 40329:2, 40355:3 endeavours [1] - 40163:11 ended [2] - 40316:10, 40369:12 endorse [1] - 40287:24 engage [4] - 40212:18, 40319:9, 40323:4, 40354:23 engagement [1] - 40327:6 engaging [1] - 40384:12 England [16] - 40165:4, 40170:25, 40175:17, 40188:8, 40190:18, 40229:22, 40230:21, 40232:19, 40236:5, 40236:13, 40260:25, 40302:13, 40305:13, 40307:7, 40326:5, 40342:25 English [8] - 40228:20, 40229:20, 40229:23, 40235:24, 40313:17, 40322:5, 40327:25, 40328:3 enhancing [1] - 40350:21 enjoys [1] - 40305:24 enlarge [1] - 40215:8 enshrined [1] - 40366:8 ensuing [1] - 40229:13 ensure [11] - 40190:11, 40308:2, 40326:1, 40326:14, 40327:14, 40336:16, 40337:12, 40338:19, 40348:22, 40362:18, 40367:17 ensures [2] - 40347:13, 40349:6 ensuring [9] - 40260:1, 40312:2, 40315:17, 40339:10, 40343:23, 40343:24, 40350:19, 40359:15, 40367:15 entering [1] - 40365:21 entertain [1] - 40431:8 enthusiasm [1] - 40217:16 entire [1] - 40282:11
---	--	--	--	---



<p>entirely [6] - 40234:17, 40234:22, 40282:22, 40306:24, 40316:15, 40429:9</p> <p>entirety [2] - 40375:22, 40422:3</p> <p>entitle [1] - 40276:12</p> <p>entitled [8] - 40162:24, 40233:12, 40234:22, 40238:11, 40310:18, 40357:20, 40361:19, 40380:18</p> <p>entitlement [2] - 40233:20, 40238:21</p> <p>entitles [1] - 40231:8</p> <p>entity [1] - 40434:23</p> <p>entrenched [2] - 40264:10, 40264:11</p> <p>enumerated [1] - 40362:8</p> <p>environment [2] - 40352:1, 40352:4</p> <p>envisage [2] - 40199:23, 40231:2</p> <p>envisaged [1] - 40363:3</p> <p>equal [3] - 40174:22, 40255:18, 40420:11</p> <p>equally [6] - 40205:1, 40226:19, 40251:10, 40258:3, 40262:10, 40267:3</p> <p>erroneous [1] - 40427:1</p> <p>errors [4] - 40398:2, 40399:14, 40401:1, 40426:2</p> <p>escalation [1] - 40348:22</p> <p>escaped [1] - 40370:8</p> <p>Esq [5] - 40159:6, 40159:7, 40159:8, 40159:9, 40159:13</p> <p>essential [2] - 40380:21, 40403:3</p> <p>essentially [6] - 40185:24, 40214:11, 40306:12, 40386:13, 40386:20, 40440:1</p> <p>Essentially [1] - 40403:8</p> <p>establish [3] - 40187:25, 40205:11, 40438:19</p> <p>established [6] - 40217:3, 40282:6, 40308:1, 40384:16, 40385:10, 40439:19</p> <p>establishing [3] - 40187:22, 40237:25, 40409:7</p> <p>establishment [3] -</p>	<p>40168:20, 40257:19, 40263:25</p> <p>etcetera [4] - 40272:22, 40343:19, 40443:23, 40443:24</p> <p>European [2] - 40266:3, 40343:4</p> <p>evaluate [3] - 40392:23, 40394:8, 40396:5</p> <p>evaluating [1] - 40417:6</p> <p>evaluation [3] - 40279:21, 40434:12, 40436:4</p> <p>evaporated [1] - 40320:1</p> <p>evening [1] - 40446:10</p> <p>event [10] - 40196:21, 40214:15, 40219:20, 40256:10, 40270:15, 40302:2, 40304:14, 40382:10, 40388:20, 40393:23</p> <p>events [2] - 40380:24, 40382:10</p> <p>eventual [1] - 40378:24</p> <p>eventually [4] - 40191:5, 40196:13, 40396:11, 40396:19</p> <p>Evidence [4] - 40243:15, 40248:9, 40252:15, 40252:17</p> <p>evidence [176] - 40171:22, 40173:9, 40176:24, 40177:3, 40184:21, 40189:19, 40189:24, 40190:6, 40191:9, 40192:9, 40192:20, 40194:4, 40194:5, 40194:13, 40194:19, 40194:21, 40195:4, 40195:22, 40196:11, 40197:4, 40197:5, 40199:5, 40199:8, 40199:11, 40199:16, 40201:11, 40203:6, 40203:9, 40203:14, 40203:25, 40204:5, 40204:15, 40204:23, 40204:24, 40205:1, 40205:3, 40205:6, 40207:14, 40207:16, 40207:19, 40208:7, 40211:14, 40212:23, 40213:3, 40213:4, 40213:23, 40214:4, 40214:10, 40214:11, 40214:21, 40214:24, 40227:14, 40229:7, 40230:2, 40234:15, 40235:21,</p>	<p>40237:5, 40241:3, 40242:22, 40243:4, 40250:2, 40250:20, 40251:4, 40251:9, 40256:23, 40257:1, 40257:21, 40265:4, 40265:18, 40267:1, 40269:11, 40270:5, 40270:19, 40272:12, 40273:3, 40273:8, 40273:21, 40274:21, 40275:11, 40275:21, 40275:22, 40276:19, 40277:6, 40277:13, 40277:16, 40278:6, 40279:15, 40279:17, 40279:18, 40279:22, 40280:5, 40280:9, 40285:3, 40286:2, 40286:16, 40288:7, 40288:8, 40288:22, 40295:2, 40297:11, 40302:8, 40304:7, 40304:8, 40304:16, 40312:6, 40312:10, 40329:1, 40332:3, 40338:23, 40344:25, 40346:16, 40351:3, 40351:22, 40353:14, 40354:9, 40363:23, 40364:18, 40365:7, 40365:20, 40366:2, 40369:18, 40370:17, 40370:19, 40371:5, 40372:12, 40372:20, 40373:21, 40373:25, 40374:4, 40374:18, 40377:16, 40377:19, 40379:3, 40379:18, 40379:21, 40385:12, 40387:8, 40387:10, 40389:3, 40389:7, 40393:13, 40394:2, 40397:6, 40404:20, 40408:10, 40408:18, 40408:23, 40408:25, 40409:5, 40410:2, 40411:7, 40411:12, 40411:21, 40413:9, 40413:14, 40414:10, 40415:14, 40417:16, 40417:19, 40433:8, 40433:13, 40433:20, 40434:19, 40435:23, 40436:5, 40439:6, 40439:25, 40440:25, 40441:3, 40445:11, 40446:2, 40446:8, 40446:11</p> <p>evidence-based [1] - 40214:10</p>	<p>evident [1] - 40243:24</p> <p>ex [4] - 40213:13, 40235:8, 40235:12, 40392:3</p> <p>ex-husband [1] - 40392:3</p> <p>exactitude [1] - 40315:9</p> <p>exactly [5] - 40176:20, 40266:7, 40302:20, 40344:18, 40390:8</p> <p>examination [4] - 40205:21, 40223:3, 40257:25, 40288:17</p> <p>examine [3] - 40208:3, 40220:13, 40380:18</p> <p>examined [6] - 40205:24, 40207:21, 40207:24, 40223:4, 40304:21, 40432:25</p> <p>examining [1] - 40404:2</p> <p>example [47] - 40175:14, 40177:18, 40185:13, 40188:4, 40190:13, 40198:14, 40223:2, 40247:1, 40249:25, 40257:2, 40264:3, 40266:10, 40266:24, 40267:14, 40269:11, 40269:15, 40272:3, 40276:24, 40279:15, 40295:5, 40295:11, 40298:7, 40300:5, 40300:25, 40302:10, 40311:4, 40317:10, 40317:11, 40324:24, 40326:10, 40328:25, 40329:6, 40329:23, 40330:25, 40331:16, 40334:7, 40340:7, 40350:13, 40397:19, 40402:4, 40426:4, 40427:3, 40427:8, 40431:5, 40432:14, 40435:2, 40440:17</p> <p>examples [3] - 40188:4, 40198:23, 40425:20</p> <p>Excellent [1] - 40418:18</p> <p>exception [1] - 40445:23</p> <p>exceptional [1] - 40162:18</p> <p>excess [2] - 40163:24, 40179:17</p> <p>exclude [1] - 40164:15</p> <p>Excluding [1] - 40164:25</p> <p>exculpatory [6] - 40243:1, 40288:24, 40433:12, 40433:20,</p>	<p>40434:19, 40436:5</p> <p>Excuse [1] - 40263:23</p> <p>executive [7] - 40306:16, 40306:19, 40306:21, 40307:2, 40308:1, 40310:1, 40312:20</p> <p>Executive [1] - 40158:3</p> <p>exercise [20] - 40169:22, 40170:6, 40178:16, 40180:11, 40181:10, 40181:18, 40183:22, 40186:7, 40222:16, 40234:24, 40241:17, 40292:22, 40420:9, 40420:20, 40421:3, 40421:14, 40423:5, 40426:3, 40426:7, 40428:3</p> <p>exercised [6] - 40178:19, 40178:22, 40179:14, 40180:11, 40422:17, 40432:6</p> <p>exercises [1] - 40181:1</p> <p>exercising [1] - 40421:25</p> <p>exhausted [2] - 40433:15, 40434:22</p> <p>exhausting [1] - 40370:5</p> <p>exhaustive [1] - 40355:4</p> <p>exhibits [7] - 40205:20, 40205:23, 40206:3, 40208:2, 40257:25, 40438:23, 40439:7</p> <p>exist [2] - 40434:2, 40434:3</p> <p>existed [2] - 40242:16, 40431:15</p> <p>existence [22] - 40169:15, 40170:16, 40172:22, 40173:22, 40175:5, 40180:13, 40244:5, 40249:3, 40251:7, 40252:1, 40303:7, 40325:8, 40325:14, 40325:18, 40326:14, 40326:20, 40383:17, 40391:1, 40415:20, 40415:24, 40431:14, 40433:17</p> <p>existing [4] - 40205:23, 40303:11, 40333:1</p> <p>exists [2] - 40336:7, 40435:1</p> <p>exonerated [1] - 40230:24</p> <p>exonerating [1] - 40286:2</p>
--	---	--	--	--



<p>expect [7] - 40186:3, 40303:12, 40329:4, 40331:23, 40373:15, 40399:16, 40400:22</p> <p>expectations [1] - 40296:8</p> <p>expected [3] - 40203:21, 40316:3, 40357:8</p> <p>expecting [1] - 40257:15</p> <p>expenditure [1] - 40335:19</p> <p>expense [3] - 40331:9, 40331:21, 40403:12</p> <p>expensive [1] - 40331:2</p> <p>experience [20] - 40169:25, 40179:25, 40231:6, 40256:9, 40260:23, 40286:1, 40289:25, 40293:10, 40303:7, 40324:1, 40348:3, 40365:7, 40381:19, 40382:3, 40395:13, 40419:17, 40427:9, 40428:8, 40431:23</p> <p>experienced [2] - 40208:25, 40440:21</p> <p>expert [12] - 40184:23, 40342:8, 40397:10, 40410:1, 40410:3, 40410:10, 40410:15, 40410:19, 40410:23, 40411:4, 40441:5, 40441:6</p> <p>expertise [3] - 40209:3, 40367:15, 40367:18</p> <p>experts [1] - 40403:18</p> <p>expired [3] - 40218:14, 40433:16, 40434:21</p> <p>explain [6] - 40174:15, 40234:20, 40270:24, 40279:5, 40329:2, 40372:1</p> <p>explained [4] - 40166:5, 40192:23, 40193:6, 40399:18</p> <p>explaining [1] - 40351:13</p> <p>explore [3] - 40195:1, 40242:25, 40276:7</p> <p>explored [1] - 40379:1</p> <p>expose [4] - 40217:16, 40256:19, 40262:23, 40363:11</p> <p>exposed [3] - 40262:6, 40262:20, 40262:21</p> <p>exposes [2] - 40256:17, 40442:13</p>	<p>exposing [1] - 40262:14</p> <p>exposure [2] - 40258:11, 40273:11</p> <p>exposés [1] - 40170:17</p> <p>express [5] - 40210:18, 40230:23, 40231:5, 40240:9, 40395:3</p> <p>expressed [2] - 40261:16, 40294:16</p> <p>expressing [2] - 40260:4, 40286:15</p> <p>expression [1] - 40285:16</p> <p>expressly [1] - 40267:24</p> <p>extend [3] - 40184:25, 40301:2, 40437:21</p> <p>extended [4] - 40182:1, 40223:14, 40245:16, 40340:14</p> <p>extends [2] - 40162:1, 40437:20</p> <p>extension [2] - 40162:25, 40163:5</p> <p>extensive [4] - 40163:21, 40209:14, 40247:22, 40374:15</p> <p>extent [19] - 40186:24, 40196:2, 40199:5, 40200:8, 40216:20, 40229:8, 40254:15, 40262:1, 40275:22, 40277:8, 40294:5, 40310:24, 40313:12, 40367:3, 40379:24, 40391:5, 40407:11, 40430:2, 40432:5</p> <p>external [6] - 40184:13, 40184:20, 40313:22, 40314:2, 40348:23, 40430:11</p> <p>externally [2] - 40294:25, 40348:22</p> <p>extradition [2] - 40236:6, 40236:8</p> <p>extravagant [1] - 40331:9</p> <p>extreme [1] - 40285:14</p> <p>extremely [2] - 40195:4, 40290:9</p> <p>eye [2] - 40171:22, 40444:8</p> <p>eyes [1] - 40318:16</p>	<p>40242:21</p> <p>face [2] - 40166:1, 40327:16</p> <p>faced [2] - 40241:7, 40432:1</p> <p>facets [1] - 40337:10</p> <p>fact [66] - 40164:3, 40167:21, 40175:25, 40185:9, 40192:4, 40196:5, 40196:9, 40199:19, 40202:16, 40203:23, 40233:2, 40234:2, 40235:25, 40236:23, 40242:24, 40245:19, 40251:10, 40254:11, 40260:20, 40261:4, 40262:6, 40268:3, 40274:3, 40289:18, 40292:8, 40296:8, 40299:12, 40300:22, 40301:3, 40310:19, 40310:22, 40316:4, 40318:2, 40327:16, 40332:13, 40343:12, 40346:12, 40350:13, 40360:2, 40361:12, 40367:4, 40372:7, 40379:3, 40379:20, 40381:19, 40389:2, 40391:5, 40399:3, 40402:19, 40406:13, 40411:22, 40413:22, 40421:18, 40422:20, 40422:24, 40423:4, 40430:5, 40430:8, 40434:2, 40438:19, 40440:18, 40441:7, 40442:1, 40442:9, 40445:23</p> <p>fact-finder [1] - 40411:22</p> <p>factor [6] - 40249:14, 40252:3, 40269:9, 40273:22, 40355:16, 40395:12</p> <p>factors [6] - 40214:2, 40301:21, 40314:12, 40355:5, 40362:8, 40378:24</p> <p>facts [6] - 40271:19, 40319:12, 40342:13, 40383:15, 40440:9, 40444:15</p> <p>factual [20] - 40174:24, 40175:2, 40175:8, 40227:4, 40227:12, 40231:15, 40237:7, 40237:14, 40237:25, 40238:15, 40238:20, 40239:1, 40240:2,</p>	<p>40270:20, 40384:17, 40386:8, 40389:1, 40431:8, 40439:18, 40441:4</p> <p>factually [9] - 40187:14, 40217:23, 40234:11, 40235:5, 40237:1, 40383:12, 40398:2, 40398:13, 40438:20</p> <p>failed [1] - 40197:9</p> <p>failing [2] - 40261:19, 40265:18</p> <p>failure [9] - 40243:11, 40253:24, 40254:10, 40260:7, 40265:16, 40289:19, 40334:2, 40395:14, 40411:8</p> <p>failures [1] - 40290:8</p> <p>fair [23] - 40166:22, 40187:7, 40203:9, 40204:1, 40215:9, 40228:25, 40229:4, 40229:13, 40237:18, 40238:22, 40267:3, 40268:22, 40286:22, 40288:12, 40289:17, 40319:19, 40341:22, 40343:16, 40381:24, 40419:16, 40419:21, 40419:23, 40425:19</p> <p>fairly [9] - 40170:25, 40206:7, 40237:6, 40275:1, 40281:15, 40292:15, 40334:8, 40366:14, 40379:8</p> <p>fairness [5] - 40267:2, 40342:23, 40343:1, 40343:24, 40344:4</p> <p>fall [4] - 40288:20, 40357:13, 40362:21, 40364:15</p> <p>falling [1] - 40289:16</p> <p>false [5] - 40167:19, 40372:20, 40414:25, 40440:16, 40441:11</p> <p>familiar [6] - 40273:25, 40274:5, 40290:19, 40357:22, 40358:2, 40358:7</p> <p>family [9] - 40190:21, 40191:1, 40191:4, 40193:10, 40370:14, 40377:13, 40409:12, 40420:25, 40422:13</p> <p>Family [1] - 40196:1</p> <p>far [19] - 40163:7, 40168:7, 40173:18, 40178:2, 40192:7, 40227:4, 40227:12, 40231:12, 40250:22,</p>	<p>40290:1, 40299:6, 40336:6, 40355:9, 40383:18, 40389:5, 40404:25, 40413:12, 40417:10</p> <p>fashion [4] - 40347:15, 40384:19, 40397:18, 40407:23</p> <p>fast [4] - 40164:5, 40164:7, 40165:14, 40218:20</p> <p>fast-track [1] - 40218:20</p> <p>fast-tracked [2] - 40164:5, 40165:14</p> <p>father [6] - 40191:6, 40191:17, 40195:5, 40195:10, 40195:24, 40196:5</p> <p>father's [1] - 40194:24</p> <p>favour [3] - 40217:23, 40218:4, 40301:21</p> <p>favourable [1] - 40196:12</p> <p>fear [1] - 40317:13</p> <p>fears [2] - 40210:5, 40319:25</p> <p>feature [1] - 40400:12</p> <p>features [1] - 40250:9</p> <p>February [2] - 40413:11, 40414:23</p> <p>feckless [1] - 40427:24</p> <p>fed [1] - 40366:4</p> <p>federal [2] - 40229:16, 40376:17</p> <p>feelings [1] - 40231:5</p> <p>felt [1] - 40189:19</p> <p>ferret [1] - 40396:1</p> <p>Ferris [2] - 40397:7, 40397:8</p> <p>fertile [2] - 40182:9, 40250:3</p> <p>few [8] - 40166:19, 40166:20, 40167:12, 40187:11, 40226:15, 40226:19, 40297:16, 40439:13</p> <p>fewer [1] - 40365:16</p> <p>fiction [1] - 40268:7</p> <p>figure [4] - 40162:9, 40250:10, 40282:22, 40299:6</p> <p>figured [1] - 40341:18</p> <p>figures [10] - 40213:20, 40226:15, 40261:20, 40281:12, 40283:5, 40283:6, 40284:6, 40299:5, 40299:22, 40417:24</p> <p>file [26] - 40165:19,</p>
---	--	--	---	---



40181:21, 40181:22, 40182:17, 40182:20, 40257:8, 40257:11, 40257:12, 40279:25, 40280:1, 40280:2, 40332:9, 40332:11, 40337:20, 40338:1, 40340:11, 40373:16, 40373:23, 40374:17, 40381:3, 40383:1, 40389:21, 40390:14, 40393:8, 40436:23 files [28] - 40182:2, 40182:4, 40183:5, 40200:17, 40221:10, 40299:18, 40300:3, 40300:6, 40373:5, 40375:2, 40375:3, 40375:5, 40375:11, 40375:21, 40376:3, 40376:13, 40376:24, 40377:11, 40379:9, 40383:19, 40413:15, 40413:16, 40415:9, 40415:20, 40416:7, 40417:23 filing [1] - 40232:15 fill [2] - 40215:18, 40216:15 filling [1] - 40330:15 film [1] - 40250:21 final [4] - 40210:2, 40219:23, 40344:19, 40345:2 finally [1] - 40345:9 financial [1] - 40311:20 finder [1] - 40411:22 fine [5] - 40190:15, 40250:22, 40301:5, 40424:10, 40424:16 finger [2] - 40216:10, 40248:24 finish [2] - 40205:8, 40252:5 finished [1] - 40161:11 finishing [1] - 40278:25 firm [1] - 40265:19 First [2] - 40198:7, 40242:5 first [34] - 40161:12, 40162:12, 40163:6, 40172:1, 40183:1, 40188:9, 40189:7, 40189:9, 40196:14, 40197:9, 40197:20, 40200:4, 40200:15, 40205:21, 40207:24, 40218:12, 40223:24, 40239:17, 40256:7, 40274:22, 40287:14,	40288:21, 40305:5, 40322:21, 40342:1, 40353:23, 40358:11, 40361:3, 40373:24, 40397:1, 40397:3, 40414:10, 40424:23, 40436:1 Fisher [31] - 40197:17, 40197:23, 40200:11, 40201:9, 40201:25, 40202:3, 40202:17, 40203:6, 40203:11, 40203:14, 40205:10, 40210:24, 40211:4, 40211:18, 40211:23, 40212:5, 40212:6, 40212:8, 40212:13, 40389:25, 40391:24, 40392:3, 40392:9, 40392:11, 40392:24, 40413:6, 40413:8, 40413:23, 40415:1, 40433:1, 40443:23 Fishers [5] - 40197:17, 40200:17, 40202:12, 40389:19, 40413:10 fit [4] - 40174:14, 40188:14, 40188:15, 40291:14 fitted [1] - 40322:6 five [14] - 40163:17, 40163:18, 40165:15, 40165:18, 40218:20, 40256:11, 40257:7, 40257:10, 40281:2, 40281:13, 40299:18, 40299:19, 40383:13, 40424:4 fix [1] - 40163:16 fixes [1] - 40315:6 fizzled [1] - 40170:19 flag [1] - 40245:11 flagged [1] - 40387:2 flagging [1] - 40348:6 flashed [1] - 40258:18 flavour [3] - 40287:23, 40343:14, 40351:15 flaw [5] - 40179:15, 40285:6, 40285:13, 40289:7, 40334:12 flawed [2] - 40172:18, 40179:20 floodgate [1] - 40161:17 floodgates [1] - 40161:13 flow [1] - 40339:6 fluids [1] - 40207:23 focus [10] - 40172:25, 40187:18, 40199:10,	40201:24, 40202:14, 40202:15, 40217:2, 40217:6, 40218:6, 40365:17 follow [10] - 40178:5, 40230:12, 40288:15, 40336:19, 40338:5, 40345:5, 40383:12, 40391:25, 40392:1, 40392:2 follow-up [3] - 40391:25, 40392:1, 40392:2 followed [1] - 40445:17 following [5] - 40199:8, 40268:15, 40279:16, 40295:10, 40295:11 follows [2] - 40279:18, 40340:8 foot [3] - 40171:20, 40210:18, 40296:25 footnote [1] - 40287:5 footprint [2] - 40188:17, 40188:18 force [12] - 40184:4, 40184:9, 40185:9, 40210:7, 40212:19, 40376:17, 40409:25, 40416:21, 40430:19, 40430:21, 40433:10, 40433:24 forced [1] - 40286:4 forces [4] - 40184:13, 40376:17, 40376:18, 40437:5 foregoing [1] - 40447:5 forensic [6] - 40184:23, 40205:21, 40205:23, 40207:19, 40302:8, 40304:16 Forensic [4] - 40208:1, 40302:16, 40302:18, 40302:22 foreseen [1] - 40402:4 form [26] - 40183:2, 40184:20, 40216:15, 40242:21, 40248:21, 40249:12, 40288:7, 40294:14, 40295:6, 40296:13, 40311:8, 40319:9, 40323:4, 40327:13, 40327:14, 40327:15, 40330:16, 40337:2, 40340:19, 40340:23, 40347:14, 40371:23, 40372:3, 40372:6, 40374:19, 40409:3 formal [13] - 40346:9, 40353:10, 40358:3,	40361:21, 40362:17, 40362:24, 40363:4, 40364:24, 40367:17, 40387:15, 40420:9, 40427:4, 40433:23 formality [1] - 40185:5 formally [2] - 40362:12, 40398:8 former [1] - 40438:15 forms [1] - 40371:20 forth [2] - 40265:4, 40440:1 fortuitously [1] - 40195:20 fortunate [1] - 40285:21 fortunately [1] - 40297:9 Fortunately [1] - 40285:16 forward [25] - 40173:25, 40197:21, 40216:8, 40276:20, 40293:4, 40337:21, 40370:17, 40402:25, 40405:22, 40411:11, 40411:16, 40413:19, 40413:23, 40414:15, 40414:19, 40415:5, 40415:10, 40415:15, 40430:23, 40438:7, 40440:13, 40440:19, 40440:24, 40441:2, 40444:15 foster [3] - 40190:20, 40191:12, 40192:12 fostered [1] - 40190:25 foundation [2] - 40442:7, 40442:15 founded [2] - 40281:1, 40420:20 four [4] - 40190:21, 40192:12, 40192:14, 40357:24 fourth [3] - 40353:24, 40355:16 frame [4] - 40192:17, 40198:15, 40241:2, 40355:21 framed [1] - 40199:1 framing [1] - 40443:14 frankly [2] - 40211:24, 40318:13 fraternity [1] - 40328:13 fraud [4] - 40168:5, 40185:14, 40185:16, 40330:25 Framer [1] - 40159:10 free [3] - 40368:21, 40368:24, 40370:1 French [1] - 40191:5 frequently [3] -	40253:15, 40290:6, 40309:7 fresh [16] - 40189:19, 40197:5, 40204:5, 40204:23, 40204:24, 40205:1, 40214:4, 40267:1, 40279:15, 40279:17, 40280:5, 40280:9, 40304:8, 40408:23, 40417:18, 40417:19 Friend [6] - 40443:15, 40443:19, 40443:24, 40444:4, 40444:6, 40444:14 friends [2] - 40215:16, 40372:9 frightened [1] - 40260:12 front [4] - 40312:25, 40315:23, 40385:1, 40417:21 front-end [1] - 40315:23 frozen [1] - 40207:17 fruits [3] - 40295:16, 40295:21, 40379:15 fuelled [1] - 40240:22 full [15] - 40208:23, 40217:16, 40254:15, 40281:9, 40281:11, 40281:13, 40283:10, 40283:16, 40294:1, 40294:4, 40374:23, 40376:22, 40384:15, 40384:17, 40441:4 full-scale [1] - 40208:23 full-time [2] - 40281:9, 40294:4 fuller [1] - 40182:1 fullest [1] - 40379:24 fully [1] - 40331:12 function [8] - 40364:19, 40365:14, 40365:18, 40366:6, 40366:19, 40366:24, 40384:21, 40412:22 functioned [1] - 40425:14 functioning [1] - 40425:17 functions [6] - 40181:1, 40181:10, 40181:19, 40183:23, 40343:6, 40343:12 fund [1] - 40281:16 fundamental [2] - 40243:18, 40259:18 funded [1] - 40180:25 funding [7] - 40281:17, 40281:24, 40310:23,
---	--	--	---	---



40310:25, 40311:12, 40311:13, 40332:15 furtherance [2] - 40295:18, 40339:20 furthermore [2] - 40172:9, 40277:24 futile [1] - 40292:22 fuzzy [1] - 40398:7	generated [1] - 40335:13 generating [1] - 40335:17 generic [2] - 40245:1, 40366:3 generically [1] - 40382:7 genuinely [4] - 40218:5, 40222:23, 40380:1, 40426:15 geography [1] - 40172:13 Gibson [1] - 40159:9 girl [3] - 40190:20, 40190:24, 40192:4 girls [6] - 40192:19, 40194:16, 40194:23, 40195:2, 40195:3, 40196:2 girls' [1] - 40197:4 given [59] - 40174:9, 40175:5, 40180:1, 40180:8, 40180:23, 40198:24, 40206:4, 40206:15, 40207:17, 40213:12, 40216:21, 40224:21, 40229:25, 40234:6, 40235:16, 40257:18, 40268:7, 40273:3, 40275:11, 40282:13, 40283:21, 40299:5, 40306:14, 40311:1, 40316:13, 40316:16, 40316:25, 40332:4, 40344:6, 40344:9, 40344:20, 40344:24, 40346:13, 40346:18, 40348:10, 40351:3, 40367:10, 40372:3, 40372:20, 40377:20, 40380:15, 40381:7, 40384:13, 40386:10, 40387:9, 40389:3, 40391:5, 40391:8, 40391:18, 40392:4, 40398:12, 40400:12, 40404:9, 40408:18, 40417:18, 40422:20, 40427:16, 40441:5, 40446:2 Given [1] - 40445:23 goal [1] - 40404:4 govern [2] - 40339:23, 40343:1 governance [5] - 40306:23, 40306:25, 40307:4, 40311:10, 40311:24 Government [1] -	40159:4 government [13] - 40265:22, 40266:13, 40299:12, 40306:14, 40306:20, 40307:11, 40307:19, 40307:23, 40308:2, 40308:13, 40324:9, 40346:1, 40346:4 governments [1] - 40300:14 Graham [1] - 40290:15 granted [8] - 40230:23, 40237:8, 40254:19, 40284:2, 40284:3, 40284:11, 40284:15, 40284:16 granting [2] - 40227:17, 40238:25 grass [1] - 40247:20 grateful [2] - 40299:9, 40446:9 gratia [2] - 40235:8, 40235:12 grave [1] - 40385:1 Great [1] - 40164:23 great [12] - 40169:1, 40175:13, 40184:18, 40186:2, 40248:4, 40265:7, 40300:5, 40333:16, 40336:15, 40393:17, 40393:18, 40416:21 greater [2] - 40240:21, 40412:11 greatest [1] - 40168:7 greatly [1] - 40400:3 grey [2] - 40205:2, 40205:3 grip [2] - 40217:11, 40317:25 ground [13] - 40172:2, 40197:21, 40198:7, 40233:1, 40274:14, 40274:22, 40276:6, 40276:10, 40276:14, 40329:9, 40368:2, 40400:6, 40444:24 grounds [16] - 40216:6, 40217:2, 40220:16, 40224:19, 40226:20, 40279:11, 40280:2, 40280:3, 40290:2, 40342:2, 40354:2, 40355:13, 40398:25, 40442:2, 40442:21, 40445:1 group [9] - 40335:25, 40336:7, 40336:8, 40389:24, 40405:18,	40405:20, 40407:9, 40443:14 grouping [1] - 40207:16 groups [3] - 40326:9, 40405:9, 40405:24 guarantee [1] - 40231:25 guard [1] - 40331:9 guardianship [1] - 40366:19 guess [6] - 40197:11, 40204:12, 40253:23, 40271:8, 40378:4, 40413:5 guessing [1] - 40418:15 guidance [5] - 40221:2, 40336:6, 40336:25, 40337:7, 40337:11 guide [1] - 40340:2 guideline [1] - 40336:12 guidelines [2] - 40335:6, 40364:12 guiding [2] - 40305:2, 40360:11 Guildford [1] - 40318:3 guilt [4] - 40201:20, 40230:19, 40285:5, 40285:24 guilty [5] - 40167:21, 40230:12, 40252:11, 40318:18, 40433:6 guy [1] - 40415:1	hard [1] - 40189:24 hat [3] - 40356:15, 40356:17, 40356:21 hate [1] - 40177:8 hats [1] - 40309:21 head [4] - 40191:3, 40191:15, 40375:18, 40419:7 headmaster [1] - 40190:18 heads [2] - 40248:2, 40347:23 healthy [1] - 40437:20 hear [7] - 40169:20, 40228:11, 40262:19, 40274:10, 40280:9, 40293:24, 40345:14 heard [16] - 40176:24, 40176:25, 40203:9, 40208:7, 40226:5, 40230:14, 40269:11, 40278:12, 40285:4, 40287:15, 40288:25, 40298:8, 40345:10, 40345:14, 40432:23, 40433:8 hearing [5] - 40175:9, 40283:11, 40283:16, 40342:1, 40399:1 hearings [1] - 40292:25 hears [1] - 40283:16 heart [3] - 40259:4, 40317:23, 40321:4 heavily [1] - 40191:16 heavy [2] - 40247:13, 40351:15 heavy-weight [1] - 40247:13 heck [1] - 40330:17 held [5] - 40181:16, 40407:12, 40426:15, 40426:23, 40438:23 help [6] - 40172:13, 40368:23, 40401:12, 40425:6, 40444:18, 40444:20 helped [1] - 40368:20 helpful [5] - 40177:23, 40195:4, 40287:19, 40336:6, 40408:20 helping [1] - 40246:7 helps [1] - 40265:11 hereby [1] - 40447:4 herein [1] - 40447:6 herself [2] - 40395:3, 40423:8 Hersh [1] - 40159:2 High [1] - 40196:1 high [3] - 40213:13, 40284:17, 40287:16
G			H	
Gail [5] - 40203:11, 40212:1, 40389:22, 40393:12, 40438:21 gap [1] - 40426:22 garden [1] - 40191:4 gate [2] - 40163:3, 40261:23 gateway [5] - 40213:10, 40213:15, 40217:7, 40314:1, 40417:1 gather [8] - 40212:24, 40221:8, 40221:9, 40330:10, 40333:1, 40333:13, 40405:21, 40411:7 gathered [2] - 40364:8, 40426:10 gathering [4] - 40178:2, 40329:1, 40373:3, 40411:21 geared [1] - 40215:10 General [2] - 40315:11, 40360:11 general [13] - 40178:18, 40197:16, 40211:2, 40229:20, 40267:22, 40293:7, 40381:20, 40384:10, 40387:2, 40389:9, 40394:15, 40437:17 generality [1] - 40275:20 generally [26] - 40167:3, 40184:22, 40198:1, 40214:7, 40216:6, 40218:11, 40230:4, 40239:14, 40240:3, 40253:22, 40256:24, 40290:20, 40294:11, 40294:13, 40295:12, 40299:3, 40306:7, 40311:7, 40317:13, 40339:17, 40358:7, 40359:13, 40366:23, 40384:25, 40388:11, 40400:13 Generally [1] - 40167:5 generate [1] - 40283:1			hairs [1] - 40441:8 half [4] - 40163:24, 40164:8, 40245:16, 40422:14 hall [1] - 40438:13 hand [4] - 40263:15, 40321:6, 40327:21, 40376:18 handful [1] - 40183:16 handled [2] - 40247:7, 40275:18 handling [1] - 40339:22 hands [5] - 40266:11, 40273:15, 40318:23, 40325:3, 40410:8 hang [1] - 40303:22 hanged [4] - 40180:3, 40180:7, 40268:12 Hanratty [1] - 40246:2 happenstance [2] - 40434:19, 40436:6 happy [3] - 40168:16, 40225:8, 40409:22	



<p>higher [4] - 40238:23, 40239:6, 40240:20, 40444:24</p> <p>highly [4] - 40189:23, 40229:22, 40265:25, 40422:5</p> <p>himself [3] - 40231:20, 40235:23, 40423:8</p> <p>hindsight [2] - 40379:2, 40392:15</p> <p>Hinz [3] - 40158:9, 40447:2, 40447:13</p> <p>historic [1] - 40365:13</p> <p>history [2] - 40207:15, 40441:4</p> <p>hit [2] - 40191:12, 40400:6</p> <p>hits [1] - 40368:2</p> <p>hoarders [1] - 40333:17</p> <p>hoc [1] - 40365:2</p> <p>Hodson [25] - 40158:2, 40160:4, 40161:7, 40165:2, 40210:22, 40227:23, 40228:13, 40247:18, 40252:19, 40252:20, 40252:25, 40253:4, 40253:6, 40253:8, 40267:11, 40279:3, 40282:16, 40296:25, 40297:17, 40305:8, 40320:5, 40383:8, 40439:2, 40445:8, 40446:13</p> <p>Hodson's [1] - 40425:25</p> <p>hold [4] - 40299:13, 40329:17, 40334:1, 40334:3</p> <p>holes [2] - 40193:14, 40194:3</p> <p>holistic [4] - 40274:18, 40275:9, 40276:2, 40278:15</p> <p>Home [51] - 40178:11, 40178:15, 40178:22, 40178:24, 40179:9, 40179:17, 40233:24, 40234:5, 40234:8, 40235:2, 40235:7, 40236:21, 40237:3, 40238:8, 40245:3, 40281:17, 40306:6, 40306:7, 40307:5, 40308:8, 40309:19, 40310:17, 40310:18, 40310:21, 40310:22, 40311:1, 40311:2, 40311:3, 40311:12, 40311:15, 40311:19, 40312:8, 40312:14,</p>	<p>40312:23, 40315:9, 40315:13, 40316:8, 40316:12, 40316:14, 40316:23, 40316:25, 40317:1, 40317:9, 40317:15, 40344:3, 40417:23, 40418:5, 40422:17, 40432:4, 40432:5</p> <p>home [3] - 40191:5, 40192:13, 40261:11</p> <p>homicides [1] - 40168:5</p> <p>Hon [1] - 40159:11</p> <p>honest [1] - 40427:1</p> <p>honestly [1] - 40316:16</p> <p>Honourable [1] - 40157:6</p> <p>honourably [1] - 40316:15</p> <p>hoops [1] - 40330:10</p> <p>hope [12] - 40200:15, 40234:14, 40286:14, 40316:16, 40329:3, 40337:22, 40357:16, 40379:1, 40379:6, 40382:5, 40389:11, 40424:3</p> <p>hopefully [2] - 40319:2, 40337:12</p> <p>hoping [1] - 40402:9</p> <p>horse [1] - 40256:19</p> <p>hostile [4] - 40195:10, 40196:5, 40274:25, 40275:19</p> <p>Hotel [1] - 40157:16</p> <p>hour [2] - 40299:11, 40424:2</p> <p>House [4] - 40204:21, 40205:3, 40235:18, 40237:4</p> <p>house [1] - 40193:11</p> <p>housekeeping [2] - 40297:15, 40299:10</p> <p>housing [1] - 40172:15</p> <p>huge [2] - 40315:23, 40328:11</p> <p>hugely [1] - 40213:17</p> <p>Human [4] - 40266:3, 40266:5, 40343:4, 40369:8</p> <p>human [2] - 40347:22, 40441:8</p> <p>hundreds [1] - 40247:15</p> <p>hundredth [1] - 40444:5</p> <p>hurdle [2] - 40163:6, 40213:17</p> <p>husband [4] - 40200:19, 40392:3, 40414:3, 40433:4</p>	<p>hypnosis [7] - 40381:6, 40381:11, 40381:16, 40381:23, 40382:4, 40382:12, 40388:2</p> <p>hypothesizing [2] - 40205:15, 40277:8</p> <p>hypothetical [1] - 40281:5</p> <p style="text-align: center;">I</p> <p>Id [1] - 40252:24</p> <p>idea [13] - 40165:22, 40178:18, 40266:22, 40284:1, 40284:3, 40342:23, 40366:24, 40367:20, 40373:20, 40374:8, 40408:9, 40408:13, 40418:7</p> <p>ideally [1] - 40256:12</p> <p>ideas [1] - 40320:25</p> <p>identical [1] - 40358:4</p> <p>identification [4] - 40244:13, 40250:2, 40389:23, 40413:11</p> <p>identified [10] - 40166:5, 40169:9, 40204:21, 40207:5, 40209:19, 40217:20, 40252:7, 40295:10, 40394:20, 40425:12</p> <p>identify [18] - 40163:11, 40185:21, 40190:10, 40216:12, 40216:16, 40218:2, 40221:17, 40221:25, 40256:25, 40260:2, 40296:20, 40336:3, 40342:3, 40342:5, 40347:25, 40366:2, 40419:19, 40437:24</p> <p>identifying [2] - 40187:21, 40426:9</p> <p>idiosyncratic [13] - 40241:11, 40242:6, 40249:16, 40250:1, 40253:9, 40253:19, 40253:21, 40254:7, 40425:4, 40425:11, 40425:21, 40426:1, 40437:19</p> <p>idle [1] - 40258:22</p> <p>ignore [2] - 40178:4, 40360:2</p> <p>ignored [1] - 40265:22</p> <p>ignoring [1] - 40241:5</p> <p>ill [1] - 40319:4</p> <p>illuminate [1] - 40318:25</p>	<p>illustrate [2] - 40276:23, 40318:25</p> <p>illustration [1] - 40321:21</p> <p>imagine [7] - 40191:23, 40358:22, 40371:12, 40372:5, 40372:13, 40373:11, 40401:3</p> <p>imbued [1] - 40437:23</p> <p>immeasurably [2] - 40237:21, 40332:14</p> <p>immediate [2] - 40176:16, 40309:17</p> <p>immediately [8] - 40260:15, 40304:11, 40334:17, 40341:7, 40373:2, 40374:13, 40380:12, 40400:20</p> <p>impact [16] - 40192:7, 40205:6, 40213:24, 40216:17, 40218:5, 40229:12, 40239:14, 40239:21, 40275:16, 40279:21, 40341:11, 40342:14, 40342:17, 40417:6, 40417:12, 40442:17</p> <p>impacts [1] - 40315:17</p> <p>impetus [2] - 40223:1, 40430:13</p> <p>implicate [1] - 40428:2</p> <p>implicated [1] - 40433:4</p> <p>implicit [2] - 40236:25, 40356:13</p> <p>importance [2] - 40255:18, 40259:1</p> <p>important [12] - 40267:3, 40304:22, 40307:17, 40323:7, 40337:5, 40337:13, 40338:10, 40347:24, 40349:13, 40350:2, 40351:12, 40351:23</p> <p>importantly [1] - 40373:17</p> <p>imported [2] - 40237:13, 40390:8</p> <p>impossibility [1] - 40370:18</p> <p>impossible [3] - 40264:9, 40393:15, 40398:13</p> <p>impressed [1] - 40210:14</p> <p>impression [1] - 40445:20</p> <p>imprint [2] - 40188:16, 40189:3</p> <p>imprisonment [1] - 40257:10</p>	<p>improbability [1] - 40443:23</p> <p>improper [4] - 40249:13, 40309:12, 40409:4, 40437:16</p> <p>improve [2] - 40210:3, 40366:23</p> <p>improvement [1] - 40205:25</p> <p>inaccuracy [1] - 40444:2</p> <p>inappropriate [2] - 40309:16, 40316:2</p> <p>Inasmuch [2] - 40208:6, 40282:1</p> <p>incident [2] - 40195:17, 40444:10</p> <p>incidentally [1] - 40271:3</p> <p>incidents [1] - 40241:8</p> <p>include [14] - 40184:22, 40216:21, 40221:20, 40225:22, 40275:24, 40307:10, 40341:1, 40341:3, 40349:10, 40355:19, 40363:14, 40363:17, 40373:5, 40430:12</p> <p>included [5] - 40169:18, 40212:12, 40377:21, 40387:13, 40425:11</p> <p>includes [2] - 40181:1, 40306:20</p> <p>including [1] - 40273:11</p> <p>inconceived [1] - 40442:4</p> <p>increase [1] - 40161:22</p> <p>increasing [1] - 40277:4</p> <p>increasingly [1] - 40306:14</p> <p>incredibly [1] - 40176:15</p> <p>incriminated [1] - 40387:21</p> <p>incriminating [2] - 40371:5, 40378:12</p> <p>inculpatory [2] - 40384:4, 40406:19</p> <p>incursion [1] - 40282:2</p> <p>Indeed [5] - 40169:4, 40219:25, 40309:6, 40391:10, 40432:2</p> <p>indeed [16] - 40170:20, 40173:7, 40183:1, 40190:6, 40213:8, 40240:6, 40257:4, 40286:17, 40293:9,</p>
--	---	--	---	--



<p>40399:24, 40412:7, 40430:12, 40433:11, 40435:12, 40439:6, 40442:16</p> <p>independence [12] - 40305:6, 40305:11, 40305:13, 40305:14, 40305:18, 40307:17, 40308:13, 40312:2, 40312:4, 40313:18, 40314:5, 40348:16</p> <p>independent [9] - 40168:25, 40175:6, 40260:16, 40294:22, 40305:15, 40407:6, 40410:9, 40413:15, 40415:8</p> <p>Independent [2] - 40366:15, 40366:17</p> <p>independently [1] - 40175:9</p> <p>Index [1] - 40160:1</p> <p>indicate [6] - 40176:1, 40330:5, 40355:18, 40368:6, 40383:13, 40395:9</p> <p>indicated [3] - 40212:7, 40432:15, 40443:21</p> <p>indicates [2] - 40355:4, 40414:25</p> <p>indicating [1] - 40413:10</p> <p>indication [3] - 40374:16, 40397:4, 40397:13</p> <p>indicative [1] - 40285:9</p> <p>indictable [1] - 40166:14</p> <p>individual [18] - 40231:16, 40238:2, 40241:12, 40242:7, 40244:23, 40245:6, 40249:23, 40259:20, 40296:12, 40339:14, 40339:18, 40339:22, 40340:19, 40404:17, 40404:19, 40437:22, 40438:6, 40444:7</p> <p>individually [1] - 40440:14</p> <p>individuals [3] - 40325:16, 40425:14, 40427:25</p> <p>induce [2] - 40202:7, 40202:8</p> <p>induced [2] - 40285:5, 40285:12</p> <p>inducing [1] - 40393:4</p> <p>induction [1] - 40325:7</p> <p>indulge [1] - 40170:5</p>	<p>inelegantly [1] - 40278:14</p> <p>ineligible [2] - 40225:23, 40225:25</p> <p>inevitably [2] - 40238:24, 40262:25</p> <p>inference [1] - 40198:25</p> <p>inferences [2] - 40265:16, 40265:23</p> <p>influence [3] - 40308:21, 40314:13, 40352:8</p> <p>influenced [3] - 40264:5, 40314:2, 40407:16</p> <p>influencing [1] - 40310:3</p> <p>inform [1] - 40247:21</p> <p>informal [1] - 40365:2</p> <p>informant [1] - 40247:13</p> <p>informants [1] - 40247:17</p> <p>information [69] - 40178:2, 40178:7, 40184:21, 40186:6, 40196:20, 40201:15, 40201:17, 40202:2, 40202:11, 40202:13, 40203:2, 40210:25, 40211:6, 40212:24, 40232:13, 40243:2, 40248:1, 40255:14, 40272:5, 40272:23, 40275:23, 40284:8, 40295:2, 40295:6, 40295:19, 40309:24, 40324:22, 40326:15, 40329:18, 40340:12, 40341:10, 40342:13, 40342:16, 40363:22, 40364:8, 40365:7, 40380:14, 40389:1, 40391:6, 40391:21, 40393:1, 40396:2, 40396:3, 40403:18, 40404:3, 40405:21, 40408:8, 40408:20, 40409:14, 40413:19, 40415:6, 40415:11, 40415:20, 40415:24, 40416:3, 40416:7, 40417:7, 40417:10, 40417:14, 40425:16, 40431:2, 40431:6, 40431:17, 40432:16, 40433:3, 40435:14, 40438:8, 40439:23, 40444:22</p>	<p>information-gathering [1] - 40178:2</p> <p>informed [3] - 40260:16, 40296:2, 40360:22</p> <p>informs [1] - 40247:14</p> <p>inherited [1] - 40417:22</p> <p>initial [11] - 40207:12, 40245:17, 40375:5, 40381:13, 40387:3, 40387:4, 40392:7, 40434:12, 40435:6, 40435:24</p> <p>injustice [1] - 40167:11</p> <p>Inland [1] - 40158:12</p> <p>inmate [2] - 40198:2, 40215:10</p> <p>inmates [1] - 40215:4</p> <p>inner [1] - 40231:3</p> <p>innocence [14] - 40227:4, 40227:12, 40227:13, 40230:19, 40237:7, 40237:14, 40237:25, 40238:16, 40238:21, 40239:2, 40240:2, 40285:24, 40422:22, 40439:18</p> <p>innocent [19] - 40187:13, 40187:14, 40214:16, 40227:7, 40231:9, 40231:12, 40234:11, 40235:5, 40237:2, 40238:5, 40284:25, 40370:1, 40370:16, 40370:22, 40372:19, 40414:8, 40428:2, 40438:20, 40439:23</p> <p>Innocent [1] - 40227:9</p> <p>inquire [2] - 40187:21, 40337:25</p> <p>inquiries [17] - 40175:3, 40175:12, 40175:24, 40183:21, 40184:1, 40196:16, 40197:12, 40206:21, 40210:15, 40235:10, 40269:10, 40273:4, 40379:9, 40385:24, 40386:22, 40392:10, 40398:15</p> <p>Inquiry [6] - 40157:2, 40157:23, 40185:2, 40368:7, 40369:14, 40433:9</p> <p>inquiry [9] - 40199:4, 40384:14, 40384:23, 40390:11, 40390:17, 40390:25, 40391:12, 40392:15, 40438:15</p> <p>inquisitorial [1] -</p>	<p>40319:10</p> <p>inroads [1] - 40194:7</p> <p>insect [1] - 40420:22</p> <p>inside [1] - 40374:9</p> <p>insofar [2] - 40172:10, 40395:23</p> <p>Inspector [1] - 40378:10</p> <p>instance [2] - 40197:6, 40435:20</p> <p>instantly [1] - 40373:25</p> <p>instead [3] - 40413:14, 40415:6, 40415:8</p> <p>institution [2] - 40281:16, 40325:1</p> <p>institutions [2] - 40299:12, 40326:5</p> <p>instruct [1] - 40294:22</p> <p>instructions [1] - 40288:15</p> <p>integral [1] - 40359:25</p> <p>integrity [1] - 40436:1</p> <p>intellect [1] - 40269:1</p> <p>intend [1] - 40443:8</p> <p>intended [4] - 40206:18, 40206:19, 40297:13, 40402:23</p> <p>intending [1] - 40311:11</p> <p>intends [2] - 40311:16, 40322:12</p> <p>intent [1] - 40442:12</p> <p>intention [1] - 40255:1</p> <p>intentional [1] - 40352:11</p> <p>intents [2] - 40170:18, 40422:21</p> <p>interdisciplinary [1] - 40350:25</p> <p>interest [14] - 40168:19, 40168:22, 40171:6, 40296:21, 40314:8, 40335:22, 40350:10, 40381:7, 40389:12, 40393:17, 40393:18, 40421:8, 40421:9, 40421:10</p> <p>interested [13] - 40169:20, 40195:16, 40195:22, 40202:8, 40231:9, 40249:21, 40286:18, 40327:3, 40327:7, 40364:3, 40376:19, 40395:19, 40395:21</p> <p>interesting [6] - 40167:6, 40170:11, 40265:11, 40266:10, 40435:3, 40435:4</p> <p>interestingly [2] -</p>	<p>40169:25, 40198:11</p> <p>interests [5] - 40208:6, 40309:14, 40311:4, 40320:4, 40326:8</p> <p>interference [1] - 40310:9</p> <p>interject [1] - 40388:14</p> <p>internal [1] - 40306:24</p> <p>interpret [1] - 40266:18</p> <p>interpretation [5] - 40234:5, 40234:19, 40235:16, 40267:8, 40275:4</p> <p>interrogating [1] - 40247:25</p> <p>intervening [2] - 40195:9, 40243:14</p> <p>intervention [1] - 40248:8</p> <p>interview [18] - 40186:8, 40195:2, 40195:19, 40196:1, 40207:6, 40211:4, 40212:6, 40212:8, 40242:22, 40251:16, 40291:20, 40291:25, 40292:4, 40378:9, 40382:9, 40409:13, 40409:23, 40440:23</p> <p>interviewed [7] - 40172:11, 40177:20, 40265:17, 40267:15, 40270:17, 40359:16, 40409:20</p> <p>interviewee [1] - 40427:16</p> <p>interviewing [16] - 40211:18, 40212:5, 40254:4, 40257:22, 40272:6, 40272:21, 40291:9, 40291:15, 40292:3, 40292:10, 40292:13, 40292:14, 40342:7, 40358:25, 40379:11</p> <p>interviews [3] - 40195:19, 40409:1, 40409:10</p> <p>intractable [1] - 40264:2</p> <p>intrigued [1] - 40425:1</p> <p>introduce [1] - 40167:6</p> <p>introduced [2] - 40163:10, 40222:16</p> <p>introducing [3] - 40172:9, 40223:9, 40393:3</p> <p>introduction [4] - 40212:11, 40243:14, 40358:12, 40359:13</p>
--	--	---	--	--



invariable ^[1] - 40445:18 invariably ^[2] - 40182:2, 40207:22 invent ^[1] - 40332:20 investigate ^[23] - 40170:4, 40174:12, 40176:3, 40182:11, 40187:17, 40189:16, 40200:5, 40205:9, 40206:22, 40209:18, 40209:25, 40212:19, 40217:2, 40261:25, 40304:25, 40319:12, 40355:11, 40360:25, 40372:16, 40387:8, 40389:10, 40399:23, 40402:20 investigated ^[13] - 40184:5, 40186:16, 40190:12, 40193:17, 40194:1, 40195:13, 40222:3, 40241:14, 40262:8, 40315:18, 40357:14, 40399:8, 40414:16 investigates ^[2] - 40216:7, 40260:15 investigating ^[48] - 40169:1, 40169:17, 40169:23, 40173:16, 40176:12, 40183:25, 40185:6, 40185:10, 40185:16, 40185:17, 40185:23, 40186:25, 40200:3, 40206:15, 40207:10, 40207:25, 40208:5, 40209:10, 40209:13, 40209:19, 40210:11, 40210:14, 40210:19, 40212:12, 40212:16, 40217:17, 40217:22, 40220:20, 40242:19, 40244:20, 40248:25, 40273:10, 40319:1, 40329:15, 40355:7, 40355:18, 40355:24, 40356:3, 40380:10, 40381:3, 40382:22, 40389:13, 40390:10, 40391:11, 40403:25, 40404:16, 40405:3, 40405:4 investigation ^[158] - 40163:15, 40163:19, 40163:21, 40166:7, 40169:12, 40171:14, 40172:6, 40173:1, 40173:25, 40174:25, 40177:22, 40181:3,	40182:16, 40184:11, 40184:14, 40184:17, 40186:1, 40186:5, 40186:12, 40187:19, 40187:20, 40187:24, 40190:4, 40194:12, 40200:9, 40200:14, 40206:20, 40208:9, 40208:24, 40209:10, 40209:17, 40209:20, 40209:21, 40210:4, 40210:13, 40211:12, 40212:4, 40212:10, 40212:12, 40212:18, 40216:20, 40217:14, 40218:7, 40221:5, 40221:13, 40221:24, 40222:4, 40222:6, 40222:10, 40222:11, 40222:12, 40223:1, 40223:6, 40223:8, 40223:18, 40223:23, 40244:10, 40251:2, 40252:2, 40253:14, 40260:17, 40261:25, 40262:5, 40262:9, 40262:11, 40263:2, 40267:15, 40267:20, 40273:13, 40275:14, 40289:7, 40292:15, 40292:18, 40295:4, 40295:15, 40295:16, 40295:18, 40295:22, 40296:3, 40296:7, 40296:15, 40318:19, 40329:22, 40332:25, 40338:24, 40343:11, 40347:21, 40348:1, 40350:18, 40351:18, 40354:5, 40354:22, 40355:23, 40356:4, 40356:6, 40356:18, 40358:24, 40359:6, 40359:7, 40363:11, 40364:9, 40366:20, 40367:9, 40374:15, 40375:1, 40376:15, 40376:22, 40378:5, 40379:6, 40380:13, 40383:22, 40386:12, 40387:3, 40387:5, 40387:6, 40387:24, 40388:11, 40390:2, 40390:3, 40391:14, 40391:17, 40392:19, 40394:19, 40396:17, 40400:17, 40401:15, 40403:14, 40404:16, 40406:8, 40407:1, 40407:6, 40409:18, 40412:3, 40412:9,	40412:19, 40413:2, 40415:3, 40415:22, 40416:9, 40419:18, 40426:10, 40429:6, 40429:10, 40430:3, 40430:14, 40430:18, 40430:24, 40435:24, 40436:1, 40437:15, 40439:24, 40440:6, 40441:19, 40441:20, 40442:8, 40442:14, 40442:20 investigation's ^[1] - 40362:1 investigations ^[13] - 40171:9, 40175:8, 40175:18, 40200:21, 40207:8, 40220:21, 40222:20, 40248:6, 40249:24, 40274:19, 40339:11, 40398:15, 40429:8 Investigations ^[1] - 40394:5 investigative ^[19] - 40168:21, 40169:18, 40175:1, 40182:10, 40185:20, 40211:21, 40219:1, 40246:4, 40247:6, 40258:15, 40262:17, 40273:17, 40296:4, 40342:3, 40342:6, 40368:18, 40381:21, 40401:9, 40402:25 investigator ^[8] - 40221:7, 40249:11, 40381:13, 40427:5, 40427:12, 40427:16, 40428:4, 40440:21 investigators ^[7] - 40171:10, 40208:25, 40240:24, 40249:4, 40359:17, 40425:13, 40426:4 invitation ^[1] - 40401:19 invite ^[3] - 40175:10, 40207:9, 40432:11 invited ^[3] - 40178:24, 40183:4, 40441:21 invites ^[1] - 40372:4 inviting ^[3] - 40173:23, 40184:20, 40295:20 involve ^[6] - 40184:19, 40184:22, 40206:25, 40212:11, 40318:10, 40417:15 involved ^[30] - 40167:17, 40171:11,	40173:13, 40186:25, 40199:13, 40208:8, 40223:22, 40230:2, 40247:14, 40249:5, 40249:10, 40251:19, 40254:21, 40263:10, 40264:3, 40269:2, 40293:16, 40293:18, 40300:18, 40312:9, 40318:12, 40351:10, 40354:4, 40362:4, 40376:25, 40377:3, 40390:15, 40406:15, 40435:23, 40437:14 involvement ^[17] - 40197:17, 40200:6, 40202:12, 40206:23, 40207:4, 40211:8, 40217:13, 40307:10, 40307:19, 40308:3, 40308:8, 40328:12, 40375:12, 40375:17, 40376:6, 40408:6 involves ^[3] - 40209:15, 40289:6, 40331:19 involving ^[3] - 40251:14, 40273:9, 40330:1 Ipcc ^[2] - 40366:19, 40367:7 Ireland ^[4] - 40165:5, 40251:15, 40251:24, 40326:6 Irene ^[1] - 40158:8 iron ^[1] - 40191:3 irrelevant ^[1] - 40416:4 irrespective ^[1] - 40206:8 irresponsible ^[1] - 40427:25 irritated ^[1] - 40409:19 Isabelle ^[1] - 40158:5 isolated ^[1] - 40323:21 issue ^[39] - 40176:7, 40178:24, 40179:21, 40222:6, 40233:21, 40237:6, 40253:9, 40267:12, 40275:1, 40294:15, 40297:23, 40303:2, 40305:14, 40309:2, 40310:15, 40312:13, 40313:10, 40313:15, 40324:1, 40334:11, 40334:12, 40338:7, 40345:19, 40345:23, 40352:25, 40357:18, 40362:6, 40373:23, 40388:11, 40389:10, 40391:14, 40394:6, 40399:20,	40400:19, 40410:8, 40411:12, 40411:20, 40421:11 issues ^[40] - 40163:13, 40176:8, 40216:12, 40216:23, 40217:19, 40217:22, 40220:13, 40220:14, 40221:18, 40221:20, 40221:25, 40222:3, 40243:23, 40249:10, 40262:2, 40266:9, 40275:14, 40277:23, 40289:5, 40304:15, 40311:10, 40311:24, 40324:5, 40342:16, 40346:15, 40347:25, 40350:9, 40351:19, 40373:17, 40373:21, 40387:7, 40389:6, 40394:19, 40399:13, 40400:4, 40400:7, 40404:13, 40404:16, 40406:7, 40442:14 items ^[1] - 40230:14 itself ^[14] - 40184:17, 40205:5, 40236:22, 40244:9, 40263:7, 40276:14, 40285:23, 40326:25, 40337:9, 40381:8, 40391:9, 40398:7, 40417:8, 40421:10
J				
jail ^[5] - 40255:25, 40378:14, 40378:18, 40404:5, 40415:16 jail' ^[1] - 40370:21 James ^[1] - 40246:1 Jay ^[2] - 40158:12, 40159:6 Jenkins ^[7] - 40191:7, 40192:3, 40192:11, 40194:25, 40197:5, 40197:8 Jenkins ^[1] - 40194:22 Jennifer ^[1] - 40159:10 Jerry ^[1] - 40158:11 Jessel ^[1] - 40170:21 Joanne ^[2] - 40159:3, 40368:3 job ^[5] - 40261:19, 40285:22, 40289:11, 40297:11, 40384:22 jobs ^[1] - 40317:5 John ^[26] - 40272:2, 40273:3, 40274:1,				



40274:9, 40278:1, 40278:11, 40370:25, 40372:10, 40374:3, 40377:16, 40378:7, 40378:25, 40380:23, 40381:5, 40384:2, 40384:4, 40385:12, 40386:9, 40387:16, 40387:20, 40388:12, 40394:14, 40397:22, 40398:5, 40400:13, 40402:5 Johrls [4] - 40277:1, 40373:25, 40378:15, 40380:19 Johnston [1] - 40274:20 journalism [1] - 40258:15 journalists [7] - 40168:22, 40169:18, 40170:12, 40171:10, 40173:14, 40396:18, 40409:11 Joyce [6] - 40159:3, 40368:4, 40371:13, 40395:3, 40396:8, 40407:2 judge [8] - 40176:22, 40177:5, 40254:14, 40278:3, 40283:20, 40283:25, 40318:17, 40435:14 judge's [4] - 40332:2, 40333:18, 40334:12, 40373:18 judged [1] - 40268:23 judgement [4] - 40268:11, 40268:17, 40416:16 judges [3] - 40221:22, 40266:8, 40318:8 judgment [7] - 40263:16, 40426:2, 40426:8, 40426:16, 40427:1, 40436:15, 40436:16 judicial [4] - 40287:15, 40343:7, 40343:9, 40343:14 judiciary [1] - 40312:20 Judith [2] - 40255:22, 40395:12 Julian [2] - 40159:13, 40297:6 jump [2] - 40330:10, 40380:23 jumps [1] - 40165:23 juries [4] - 40175:19, 40176:7, 40264:4, 40266:9	jurisdiction [3] - 40235:24, 40241:7, 40259:13 jurors [5] - 40176:9, 40176:14, 40177:13, 40177:18, 40177:19 jury [42] - 40175:16, 40176:1, 40176:20, 40176:22, 40177:1, 40177:4, 40189:6, 40197:9, 40202:8, 40203:20, 40204:8, 40205:7, 40211:1, 40231:24, 40232:3, 40264:3, 40264:10, 40264:20, 40274:9, 40275:23, 40275:25, 40276:8, 40276:17, 40277:2, 40277:20, 40278:1, 40278:2, 40278:8, 40285:4, 40289:1, 40332:2, 40372:12, 40373:19, 40379:23, 40389:8, 40416:16, 40416:23, 40417:4, 40417:5, 40417:11, 40417:13, 40417:16 jury's [2] - 40202:5, 40416:17 justice [79] - 40168:23, 40169:3, 40169:10, 40169:17, 40169:23, 40170:1, 40170:17, 40173:23, 40176:13, 40186:15, 40187:4, 40197:23, 40233:4, 40233:7, 40234:4, 40236:25, 40237:1, 40240:22, 40241:8, 40242:15, 40242:17, 40243:12, 40245:6, 40245:25, 40246:8, 40249:5, 40250:4, 40255:2, 40255:20, 40256:17, 40256:20, 40258:8, 40258:12, 40258:17, 40258:24, 40259:13, 40259:23, 40260:9, 40260:11, 40260:19, 40260:24, 40261:5, 40261:7, 40262:14, 40284:24, 40285:10, 40285:11, 40285:17, 40286:5, 40286:8, 40286:25, 40289:15, 40300:19, 40313:3, 40315:6, 40315:25, 40319:2, 40321:15, 40321:22,	40322:2, 40322:6, 40322:11, 40327:1, 40356:5, 40356:9, 40360:1, 40364:21, 40365:10, 40369:24, 40381:2, 40405:19, 40421:2, 40421:12, 40422:25, 40425:14, 40425:15, 40437:8, 40437:10, 40437:21 Justice [33] - 40157:6, 40159:11, 40168:24, 40169:7, 40169:19, 40170:15, 40170:18, 40170:20, 40171:13, 40172:6, 40172:16, 40172:19, 40232:20, 40235:1, 40265:13, 40265:24, 40268:16, 40269:5, 40320:22, 40326:11, 40369:4, 40369:8, 40396:14, 40396:22, 40396:25, 40398:23, 40405:13, 40405:18, 40405:20, 40414:18, 40443:16, 40443:20 justice [2] - 40234:6, 40235:17 justifies [1] - 40276:11	40416:13, 40441:9 kinds [1] - 40407:12 Kingdom [13] - 40164:14, 40167:20, 40190:17, 40236:1, 40236:7, 40257:5, 40322:8, 40322:19, 40367:14, 40433:18, 40435:1, 40435:2, 40445:24 Kingdom's [3] - 40167:25, 40258:16, 40322:11 knife [1] - 40441:1 knock [2] - 40206:10, 40430:19 knock-down [1] - 40206:10 knock-on [1] - 40430:19 knocked [3] - 40163:10, 40163:23, 40211:25 knowing [4] - 40249:6, 40249:13, 40249:20, 40390:8 knowingly [1] - 40441:11 knowledge [7] - 40271:22, 40273:13, 40273:19, 40370:15, 40370:24, 40373:9, 40447:7 known [17] - 40193:8, 40193:9, 40193:12, 40193:16, 40199:2, 40202:3, 40202:4, 40202:22, 40203:3, 40271:20, 40377:10, 40377:11, 40377:12, 40380:15, 40397:23, 40413:6, 40434:3 knows [3] - 40264:4, 40296:21, 40371:6 Knox [5] - 40159:5, 40160:8, 40384:8, 40438:10, 40438:12 Krogan [1] - 40159:4 Krogan-stevely [1] - 40159:4 Kujawa [1] - 40159:6 Kyle [21] - 40160:3, 40161:5, 40161:6, 40161:8, 40210:23, 40227:25, 40240:11, 40248:13, 40252:21, 40253:10, 40263:24, 40267:12, 40279:4, 40286:11, 40296:16, 40296:21, 40424:15, 40424:20, 40436:17,	40445:9, 40445:14 L lack [7] - 40324:2, 40324:6, 40381:18, 40382:15, 40382:16, 40444:11, 40444:12 lady [1] - 40255:22 lain [1] - 40415:22 Lana [1] - 40159:4 land [1] - 40193:11 landscape [1] - 40246:14 language [6] - 40215:17, 40233:22, 40287:12, 40327:15, 40327:23, 40354:17 lapse [3] - 40229:10, 40229:11, 40374:24 large [5] - 40246:21, 40325:21, 40339:17, 40406:7, 40439:17 largely [1] - 40420:20 Larry [23] - 40197:17, 40197:23, 40200:11, 40200:17, 40201:9, 40201:25, 40202:3, 40205:9, 40210:24, 40211:18, 40211:23, 40212:5, 40212:6, 40212:8, 40212:12, 40389:18, 40389:25, 40392:8, 40392:11, 40392:24, 40413:10, 40414:25 Last [1] - 40383:11 last [12] - 40167:17, 40219:13, 40235:7, 40329:6, 40329:24, 40334:13, 40359:10, 40359:23, 40383:14, 40422:12, 40443:14, 40445:16 late [7] - 40194:17, 40206:2, 40247:5, 40292:15, 40407:1, 40413:22, 40439:21 latter [2] - 40255:10, 40255:11 law [30] - 40188:10, 40188:13, 40233:8, 40264:2, 40264:22, 40265:15, 40266:7, 40267:12, 40267:13, 40267:18, 40267:23, 40268:4, 40268:6, 40268:7, 40268:10, 40268:20, 40269:8,
K				
Kara [1] - 40158:5 Karen [3] - 40158:9, 40447:2, 40447:13 Karst [1] - 40159:8 keen [3] - 40386:1, 40410:17, 40437:24 keep [5] - 40266:11, 40299:16, 40303:22, 40307:23, 40368:1 keeping [7] - 40177:24, 40212:25, 40296:2, 40308:5, 40333:11, 40360:7, 40362:7 kept [2] - 40237:10, 40296:14 key [2] - 40440:25, 40443:22 Kidnapped [1] - 40236:12 kidnapped [1] - 40236:13 killed [1] - 40192:11 kind [9] - 40164:12, 40302:25, 40378:19, 40385:17, 40390:5, 40390:24, 40393:15,				



<p>40269:19, 40270:1, 40270:12, 40270:13, 40270:21, 40270:23, 40271:5, 40275:4, 40293:19, 40315:14, 40334:15, 40342:25 Law^[4] - 40240:12, 40284:18, 40395:10, 40424:24 lawyer^[4] - 40293:3, 40337:19, 40396:9, 40396:10 lawyers^[22] - 40182:22, 40183:5, 40195:1, 40288:14, 40289:12, 40290:8, 40294:2, 40328:6, 40351:10, 40351:21, 40351:25, 40352:3, 40352:9, 40396:17, 40400:18, 40405:5, 40405:23, 40409:11, 40415:25, 40416:4, 40432:10, 40435:18 Lawyers^[1] - 40351:21 lay^[4] - 40317:23, 40351:5, 40352:2, 40352:7 lead^[2] - 40379:8, 40429:10 leading^[1] - 40349:22 leads^[3] - 40212:18, 40338:7, 40408:12 leaflet^[1] - 40349:10 learn^[5] - 40259:5, 40321:5, 40321:14, 40322:20, 40375:11 learned^[4] - 40377:10, 40378:4, 40378:6, 40443:4 least^[16] - 40191:14, 40197:21, 40264:11, 40278:7, 40318:16, 40331:6, 40331:7, 40351:24, 40372:19, 40375:5, 40390:22, 40428:18, 40430:13, 40431:9, 40432:24, 40445:18 leave^[15] - 40204:9, 40204:11, 40280:4, 40283:9, 40283:10, 40283:20, 40283:23, 40284:10, 40284:15, 40284:16, 40295:21, 40298:11, 40331:25, 40382:12, 40445:20 leaving^[4] - 40187:14, 40298:22, 40330:9, 40359:3</p>	<p>led^[5] - 40270:21, 40271:4, 40370:19, 40435:24, 40436:1 left^[6] - 40223:10, 40266:18, 40319:3, 40327:21, 40378:8, 40386:14 left-hand^[1] - 40327:21 legal^[18] - 40230:9, 40231:14, 40232:1, 40232:3, 40268:6, 40293:25, 40294:4, 40294:5, 40294:22, 40328:13, 40336:8, 40336:10, 40336:25, 40351:15, 40371:17, 40399:21, 40405:1, 40440:13 legalistic^[3] - 40351:16, 40351:20, 40352:6 legally^[1] - 40238:5 legion^[1] - 40289:18 legis^[1] - 40233:18 legislated^[1] - 40265:22 legislation^[8] - 40174:7, 40232:19, 40233:19, 40234:25, 40241:16, 40267:9, 40274:24, 40369:11 legislative^[1] - 40243:22 legitimate^[4] - 40273:12, 40277:19, 40278:16, 40311:3 legitimately^[1] - 40417:12 legwork^[1] - 40220:23 lend^[1] - 40337:9 length^[10] - 40187:15, 40223:7, 40229:5, 40256:22, 40257:13, 40280:18, 40300:9, 40303:15, 40324:23, 40331:20 less^[9] - 40167:13, 40241:4, 40256:12, 40282:24, 40287:10, 40316:19, 40421:16, 40427:4, 40444:22 lesser^[2] - 40166:13, 40166:15 lesson^[1] - 40192:14 lessons^[4] - 40259:6, 40321:5, 40321:14, 40322:20 letter^[9] - 40397:4, 40397:13, 40398:18, 40399:4, 40399:11,</p>	<p>40401:19, 40402:7, 40402:18, 40412:14 letters^[1] - 40330:3 letting^[1] - 40416:25 level^[6] - 40186:1, 40247:22, 40288:1, 40344:16, 40365:3, 40416:15 leveled^[1] - 40290:22 levels^[1] - 40324:21 liaison^[1] - 40326:17 liberty^[2] - 40346:14, 40412:7 lie^[1] - 40379:25 lied^[5] - 40370:23, 40371:7, 40374:2, 40374:16, 40377:5 lies^[1] - 40313:16 life^[6] - 40161:25, 40162:4, 40172:3, 40239:14, 40239:23, 40370:12 lifestyle^[1] - 40273:6 light^[10] - 40243:21, 40247:15, 40271:21, 40273:13, 40285:3, 40286:3, 40300:15, 40334:15, 40380:23, 40411:15 lighter^[1] - 40167:7 lighthearted^[1] - 40252:6 likelihood^[3] - 40287:11, 40333:21, 40374:11 likely^[25] - 40164:2, 40206:1, 40210:3, 40211:19, 40212:2, 40213:24, 40229:10, 40229:11, 40239:21, 40249:14, 40249:18, 40249:21, 40257:7, 40263:4, 40269:2, 40345:15, 40360:19, 40361:14, 40380:8, 40392:3, 40419:19, 40419:21, 40420:25, 40421:3, 40438:1 limbo^[1] - 40230:9 limit^[2] - 40280:20, 40280:21 limited^[3] - 40362:25, 40365:14, 40389:1 limits^[1] - 40346:2 Linda^[5] - 40391:24, 40392:3, 40413:8, 40413:23, 40433:1 line^[12] - 40171:19, 40172:16, 40194:15, 40303:16, 40304:24,</p>	<p>40333:10, 40334:2, 40363:6, 40392:18, 40419:14, 40435:11 liners^[1] - 40193:2 lines^[6] - 40172:14, 40222:11, 40371:24, 40381:22, 40391:12, 40436:14 link^[3] - 40171:4, 40211:9, 40332:16 linking^[2] - 40195:14, 40390:5 links^[2] - 40201:13 list^[8] - 40179:19, 40228:5, 40228:6, 40251:17, 40251:25, 40329:7, 40355:4, 40440:10 listen^[1] - 40366:11 listening^[1] - 40364:23 literature^[2] - 40325:2, 40326:2 litigants^[1] - 40331:10 litigation^[1] - 40318:8 live^[1] - 40414:7 lived^[4] - 40193:10, 40202:17, 40202:18, 40392:5 living^[1] - 40222:9 lo^[1] - 40189:10 load^[2] - 40282:18, 40283:7 locate^[1] - 40232:13 location^[2] - 40392:5, 40393:11 logged^[1] - 40362:12 longer-term^[1] - 40244:4 look^[29] - 40183:7, 40184:2, 40185:22, 40203:5, 40213:2, 40227:15, 40242:13, 40244:6, 40251:11, 40253:21, 40256:2, 40258:3, 40271:21, 40283:12, 40321:21, 40327:21, 40329:12, 40336:9, 40340:4, 40353:16, 40353:23, 40354:15, 40359:10, 40360:15, 40376:12, 40376:19, 40412:8, 40415:13, 40426:21 looked^[8] - 40186:13, 40216:24, 40267:19, 40324:23, 40389:14, 40399:12, 40412:15, 40439:23 looking^[36] - 40162:14, 40181:14, 40182:14,</p>	<p>40185:19, 40186:14, 40199:15, 40200:20, 40201:10, 40202:9, 40209:18, 40211:22, 40212:15, 40213:19, 40214:10, 40234:9, 40237:7, 40237:14, 40256:9, 40259:24, 40260:12, 40261:22, 40269:22, 40270:15, 40270:18, 40273:1, 40282:14, 40341:7, 40363:22, 40373:13, 40381:14, 40382:22, 40382:23, 40401:3, 40402:16, 40404:13 lookit^[1] - 40295:9 looks^[5] - 40215:6, 40215:7, 40218:17, 40226:4, 40267:16 Lord^[3] - 40268:16, 40269:5, 40318:6 Lords^[4] - 40204:21, 40205:4, 40235:18, 40237:4 lost^[4] - 40223:1, 40281:8, 40301:11, 40443:6 loud^[1] - 40258:19 low^[3] - 40213:17, 40288:1, 40298:22 lower^[1] - 40296:24 lunch^[1] - 40299:11 luxury^[2] - 40404:1, 40405:5 lying^[1] - 40272:9</p>
M				
<p>Maccallum^[81] - 40157:7, 40161:3, 40161:5, 40164:6, 40164:9, 40164:11, 40164:17, 40164:20, 40164:24, 40206:13, 40206:24, 40207:11, 40208:4, 40208:13, 40210:8, 40210:17, 40210:21, 40227:20, 40228:10, 40245:12, 40252:12, 40252:16, 40252:18, 40252:23, 40253:2, 40253:7, 40263:23, 40264:8, 40264:14, 40264:20, 40264:25, 40265:3, 40265:6, 40267:10, 40281:9, 40281:15, 40282:1, 40282:8,</p>				



<p>40282:15, 40297:4, 40314:15, 40314:19, 40314:24, 40320:10, 40320:13, 40320:18, 40327:18, 40330:20, 40331:14, 40331:18, 40332:6, 40332:10, 40332:19, 40332:22, 40333:3, 40333:7, 40352:13, 40352:18, 40384:6, 40385:6, 40385:19, 40385:22, 40385:25, 40400:21, 40401:7, 40419:8, 40419:12, 40424:4, 40424:7, 40424:10, 40424:14, 40424:18, 40436:19, 40436:25, 40437:2, 40438:4, 40438:9, 40444:19, 40445:5, 40445:14, 40446:12 machine [1] - 40172:3 Mackie [2] - 40383:3, 40386:15 Magistrate's [2] - 40179:8, 40226:17 Magistrates' [7] - 40166:10, 40166:15, 40166:18, 40167:9, 40167:14, 40167:21, 40168:2 main [1] - 40228:22 maintain [2] - 40262:13, 40444:1 maintaining [2] - 40261:7, 40346:7 Majesty's [1] - 40178:11 major [1] - 40302:17 majority [5] - 40184:18, 40215:14, 40254:18, 40283:23, 40335:23 maker [5] - 40399:6, 40405:23, 40407:11, 40407:13, 40411:8 makeup [1] - 40313:19 malice [1] - 40289:9 maliciously [1] - 40437:16 malpractice [1] - 40288:6 man [10] - 40188:9, 40193:9, 40194:2, 40196:9, 40196:16, 40196:20, 40196:22, 40200:25, 40211:7, 40268:12 managed [3] - 40235:23, 40266:20,</p>	<p>40441:12 management [8] - 40208:22, 40306:19, 40307:3, 40307:24, 40308:9, 40315:14, 40315:15, 40348:17 Manager [2] - 40158:4, 40220:11 manager [26] - 40217:13, 40219:14, 40220:24, 40221:4, 40222:2, 40224:9, 40250:24, 40251:23, 40294:7, 40296:11, 40329:25, 40336:2, 40340:3, 40347:4, 40347:7, 40348:3, 40374:25, 40376:5, 40376:12, 40376:16, 40379:15, 40380:10, 40398:20, 40399:7, 40409:22, 40412:18 managers [3] - 40217:15, 40217:20, 40294:3 manages [1] - 40316:8 mandate [3] - 40360:8, 40362:22, 40365:12 mandatory [2] - 40233:20, 40354:16 manner [6] - 40174:14, 40269:12, 40282:13, 40319:20, 40409:20, 40437:16 manoeuvred [1] - 40195:8 manual [1] - 40337:7 March [1] - 40219:12 mark [1] - 40417:25 match [1] - 40189:3 matched [4] - 40188:17, 40189:13, 40206:9 material [32] - 40181:9, 40181:16, 40182:14, 40193:13, 40241:22, 40251:1, 40251:25, 40301:10, 40303:11, 40303:14, 40303:15, 40303:20, 40304:20, 40325:23, 40329:16, 40329:19, 40330:7, 40333:1, 40341:8, 40342:12, 40376:4, 40393:21, 40394:9, 40394:17, 40395:10, 40395:22, 40395:24, 40426:9, 40426:17, 40426:21, 40426:23, 40426:24 materials [1] - 40333:14</p>	<p>matron [1] - 40378:14 matter [39] - 40165:15, 40168:18, 40174:12, 40188:23, 40201:4, 40208:14, 40211:7, 40212:14, 40214:1, 40214:23, 40231:13, 40234:19, 40234:23, 40238:12, 40243:9, 40256:10, 40265:7, 40284:11, 40291:21, 40296:10, 40297:15, 40299:10, 40303:6, 40307:4, 40310:1, 40310:11, 40327:7, 40344:3, 40370:5, 40380:19, 40397:17, 40417:6, 40418:18, 40424:22, 40434:4, 40435:15, 40437:17, 40440:8, 40441:14 matters [24] - 40167:3, 40172:18, 40173:17, 40184:24, 40202:22, 40208:9, 40211:8, 40222:17, 40237:10, 40244:17, 40263:11, 40290:25, 40311:20, 40336:3, 40336:10, 40343:19, 40351:22, 40366:3, 40366:9, 40366:22, 40380:16, 40412:13, 40424:9, 40441:23 mature [4] - 40259:23, 40260:19, 40322:1, 40437:10 McClean [15] - 40159:3, 40160:6, 40296:19, 40367:25, 40368:4, 40383:10, 40385:8, 40385:21, 40385:23, 40386:6, 40386:7, 40401:17, 40419:11, 40419:13, 40423:24 mean [62] - 40164:1, 40167:13, 40176:16, 40191:13, 40200:10, 40201:5, 40204:2, 40204:18, 40204:23, 40205:13, 40214:21, 40215:14, 40219:6, 40225:14, 40225:24, 40244:22, 40247:1, 40247:12, 40253:22, 40257:2, 40261:18, 40272:24, 40273:11, 40277:7, 40284:13, 40286:13, 40287:17, 40303:5, 40303:16,</p>	<p>40309:3, 40309:13, 40311:23, 40316:14, 40321:17, 40325:15, 40329:2, 40331:8, 40331:23, 40335:20, 40335:21, 40336:21, 40337:5, 40338:18, 40341:20, 40355:8, 40373:7, 40385:20, 40388:8, 40395:8, 40400:10, 40401:2, 40401:5, 40405:18, 40408:21, 40413:21, 40418:20, 40419:8, 40422:8, 40431:24, 40434:9, 40442:5, 40443:8 meaning [5] - 40234:7, 40286:5, 40409:10, 40409:11, 40409:12 means [20] - 40225:15, 40237:1, 40241:4, 40248:9, 40257:6, 40264:16, 40268:2, 40268:8, 40285:21, 40287:13, 40313:20, 40332:16, 40343:23, 40357:24, 40374:24, 40393:4, 40400:5, 40416:1, 40417:3, 40434:6 meant [2] - 40239:1, 40253:18 meantime [1] - 40375:1 meat [3] - 40299:8, 40306:4, 40311:21 mechanics [3] - 40279:6, 40280:15, 40304:24 mechanism [12] - 40224:8, 40258:17, 40259:2, 40265:9, 40265:10, 40321:1, 40322:7, 40322:9, 40347:20, 40348:6, 40349:19, 40349:21 mechanisms [2] - 40319:1, 40348:24 media [7] - 40168:10, 40168:12, 40168:15, 40168:18, 40170:24, 40261:9, 40443:17 medical [1] - 40411:11 meet [2] - 40199:9, 40265:1 meeting [2] - 40169:15, 40385:15 meetings [1] - 40326:18 member [20] - 40170:21, 40217:12,</p>	<p>40221:2, 40221:3, 40222:2, 40223:10, 40224:9, 40296:12, 40319:16, 40340:3, 40340:13, 40340:19, 40341:6, 40347:18, 40348:4, 40348:14, 40361:22, 40373:11, 40374:12, 40416:18 members [22] - 40176:1, 40223:16, 40223:22, 40261:10, 40280:17, 40280:19, 40280:22, 40280:25, 40281:6, 40282:3, 40282:11, 40294:2, 40305:25, 40311:5, 40336:2, 40338:16, 40348:14, 40350:20, 40399:8, 40409:12, 40422:13, 40437:5 Members [3] - 40309:6, 40309:12, 40309:13 membership [1] - 40282:9 memo [10] - 40354:23, 40357:17, 40357:19, 40357:22, 40358:20, 40360:10, 40361:3, 40361:17, 40363:18, 40363:20 memorandum [6] - 40353:11, 40354:21, 40358:3, 40362:24, 40363:4, 40420:9 memories [1] - 40256:23 memory [3] - 40381:8, 40382:15, 40382:17 mention [1] - 40208:7 mentioned [8] - 40168:20, 40216:24, 40241:14, 40247:2, 40299:18, 40315:4, 40350:13, 40388:3 mercy [4] - 40178:9, 40178:12, 40178:16, 40180:12 Mercy [3] - 40179:4, 40179:13, 40422:16 mere [3] - 40172:8, 40208:7, 40442:1 merely [1] - 40320:14 merit [1] - 40381:7 meriting [2] - 40221:24, 40337:2 meritless [1] - 40350:1 merits [2] - 40349:11, 40444:13 mess [1] - 40443:6</p>
--	---	---	---	--



<p>message [4] - 40323:12, 40337:16, 40337:18, 40349:13</p> <p>messages [1] - 40258:18</p> <p>met [9] - 40162:22, 40224:3, 40224:4, 40245:21, 40273:24, 40368:6, 40423:11, 40438:12, 40442:23</p> <p>method [2] - 40339:10, 40381:21</p> <p>methods [3] - 40218:1, 40247:24, 40338:20</p> <p>Meyer [3] - 40158:10, 40447:2, 40447:19</p> <p>mid [1] - 40258:10</p> <p>middle [1] - 40315:19</p> <p>Midlands [3] - 40247:4, 40247:10, 40248:6</p> <p>might [97] - 40162:6, 40164:1, 40168:19, 40176:1, 40176:8, 40177:1, 40177:2, 40177:23, 40177:24, 40181:18, 40183:4, 40188:5, 40189:15, 40190:11, 40191:23, 40194:14, 40199:25, 40200:6, 40200:19, 40201:21, 40203:1, 40203:20, 40203:24, 40203:25, 40204:7, 40204:16, 40204:19, 40205:6, 40206:25, 40207:4, 40207:18, 40210:9, 40210:18, 40210:25, 40211:9, 40213:1, 40213:6, 40217:6, 40220:15, 40226:12, 40230:17, 40231:3, 40231:18, 40231:19, 40241:22, 40249:11, 40249:15, 40260:10, 40261:15, 40265:12, 40267:21, 40270:6, 40272:3, 40275:5, 40276:7, 40277:3, 40277:25, 40284:24, 40285:4, 40286:24, 40287:9, 40289:1, 40295:14, 40301:24, 40303:12, 40317:2, 40317:14, 40319:5, 40331:1, 40333:22, 40334:23, 40347:25, 40348:1, 40349:12, 40355:17, 40366:23, 40375:7, 40378:19, 40392:16,</p>	<p>40392:21, 40393:8, 40409:9, 40409:12, 40409:16, 40410:22, 40412:15, 40413:1, 40419:15, 40421:14, 40422:3, 40427:13, 40429:10, 40432:6, 40441:9, 40441:13, 40444:22</p> <p>mike [2] - 40296:24, 40368:2</p> <p>mileage [1] - 40275:6</p> <p>Milgaard [42] - 40157:4, 40159:2, 40159:3, 40197:18, 40197:22, 40197:24, 40202:1, 40205:17, 40206:8, 40229:14, 40256:2, 40275:12, 40368:4, 40368:5, 40368:21, 40369:6, 40369:23, 40370:20, 40371:13, 40374:7, 40377:13, 40378:13, 40380:17, 40383:18, 40386:11, 40387:22, 40388:13, 40389:25, 40393:11, 40396:8, 40396:16, 40397:24, 40398:1, 40399:12, 40399:22, 40407:2, 40413:7, 40413:10, 40414:8, 40433:5, 40438:20, 40439:19</p> <p>Milgaard's [12] - 40201:20, 40202:10, 40202:14, 40203:3, 40203:7, 40205:14, 40206:5, 40273:2, 40370:11, 40395:3, 40415:25, 40416:4</p> <p>mill [1] - 40188:6</p> <p>Miller [5] - 40212:1, 40389:21, 40389:22, 40393:12, 40438:21</p> <p>Miller's [1] - 40203:12</p> <p>million [4] - 40164:16, 40164:21, 40164:22, 40281:19</p> <p>mind [20] - 40177:24, 40208:17, 40211:13, 40212:25, 40220:2, 40242:10, 40261:9, 40261:23, 40278:4, 40282:23, 40313:22, 40313:23, 40318:1, 40333:11, 40360:7, 40362:7, 40380:9, 40389:12, 40393:20, 40435:5</p>	<p>minds [1] - 40202:8</p> <p>minister [7] - 40229:16, 40238:12, 40309:20, 40313:25, 40398:23, 40399:6, 40402:10</p> <p>Minister [5] - 40159:10, 40369:4, 40396:22, 40396:24, 40398:22</p> <p>ministerial [3] - 40310:2, 40315:20, 40318:15</p> <p>Ministries [2] - 40405:12, 40406:14</p> <p>minute [2] - 40340:7, 40384:6</p> <p>minutes [4] - 40192:12, 40192:14, 40297:16, 40352:17</p> <p>miscarriage [26] - 40168:22, 40169:10, 40169:17, 40169:23, 40170:1, 40170:17, 40173:23, 40187:4, 40197:22, 40233:4, 40233:6, 40234:3, 40236:25, 40237:1, 40240:22, 40245:25, 40255:2, 40256:17, 40256:20, 40258:11, 40284:23, 40285:11, 40285:16, 40286:5, 40286:25, 40315:6</p> <p>miscarriages [11] - 40169:3, 40176:13, 40241:8, 40242:15, 40250:4, 40255:19, 40258:8, 40260:8, 40285:9, 40313:2, 40319:2</p> <p>mischief [1] - 40443:4</p> <p>mischievous [3] - 40442:16, 40443:1, 40443:3</p> <p>misconduct [13] - 40186:14, 40247:7, 40248:10, 40249:17, 40253:23, 40254:20, 40257:22, 40260:6, 40272:10, 40318:12, 40318:18, 40367:10, 40443:21</p> <p>misfortunes [1] - 40290:7</p> <p>mishandling [2] - 40247:11, 40247:16</p> <p>misinformation [1] - 40441:10</p> <p>mislaid [1] - 40250:22</p> <p>misread [1] - 40253:19</p> <p>misreading [1] -</p>	<p>40291:23</p> <p>Miss [1] - 40389:22</p> <p>miss [1] - 40351:23</p> <p>missed [1] - 40334:13</p> <p>mistake [2] - 40254:17, 40395:16</p> <p>mistakes [18] - 40254:25, 40255:1, 40259:5, 40260:12, 40264:15, 40264:17, 40321:4, 40321:14, 40321:15, 40321:23, 40322:3, 40322:12, 40322:20, 40426:1, 40426:2, 40437:11, 40437:13, 40437:24</p> <p>mixture [2] - 40216:18, 40383:15</p> <p>models [2] - 40307:6, 40367:5</p> <p>modest [1] - 40163:16</p> <p>moment [21] - 40164:23, 40176:11, 40179:25, 40192:21, 40198:15, 40212:7, 40218:25, 40232:8, 40257:6, 40281:18, 40311:10, 40334:8, 40341:15, 40387:1, 40407:20, 40419:7, 40424:16, 40430:25, 40439:12, 40439:15, 40445:18</p> <p>monetary [2] - 40239:16, 40422:18</p> <p>money [1] - 40405:7</p> <
--	--	---	---



<p>40387:14, 40387:15, 40414:25, 40424:20, 40438:11 named [1] - 40198:20 namely [2] - 40205:19, 40275:11 names [2] - 40251:17, 40251:25 narrow [4] - 40234:7, 40235:15, 40275:1, 40351:19 narrowly [1] - 40275:2 narrowly-confined [1] - 40275:2 natural [1] - 40190:21 nature [42] - 40165:9, 40167:2, 40168:6, 40184:24, 40186:13, 40190:4, 40201:5, 40206:2, 40207:22, 40209:16, 40216:20, 40229:7, 40230:1, 40248:11, 40255:5, 40259:19, 40286:2, 40288:25, 40293:18, 40294:14, 40296:5, 40311:23, 40313:10, 40316:7, 40326:18, 40333:23, 40341:24, 40342:3, 40342:11, 40343:19, 40351:23, 40366:4, 40371:21, 40374:1, 40386:19, 40394:17, 40395:19, 40405:21, 40412:13, 40416:18, 40430:16, 40434:8 necessarily [10] - 40190:4, 40212:10, 40318:10, 40395:1, 40404:23, 40407:7, 40417:17, 40421:24, 40427:23, 40436:21 necessary [26] - 40175:7, 40175:10, 40183:7, 40187:20, 40199:25, 40206:19, 40206:21, 40206:22, 40207:7, 40209:3, 40238:19, 40262:1, 40265:8, 40266:23, 40283:22, 40284:8, 40304:6, 40317:5, 40320:2, 40329:17, 40333:16, 40365:6, 40367:1, 40406:11, 40410:11, 40440:5 necessity [1] - 40433:4 need [19] - 40205:9, 40207:25, 40208:5,</p>	<p>40212:6, 40254:16, 40300:1, 40326:3, 40330:13, 40334:14, 40337:19, 40337:23, 40389:14, 40396:11, 40396:13, 40408:13, 40424:11, 40424:17, 40424:25, 40443:6 needed [3] - 40212:9, 40331:3, 40408:10 needs [3] - 40348:21, 40374:23, 40424:13 negligently [1] - 40441:12 networks [1] - 40323:21 never [16] - 40178:22, 40178:23, 40180:7, 40181:7, 40192:23, 40199:24, 40208:17, 40217:24, 40272:25, 40281:3, 40283:10, 40315:9, 40337:5, 40356:21, 40436:24 new [45] - 40162:2, 40169:21, 40172:9, 40172:15, 40173:8, 40194:4, 40199:10, 40201:11, 40202:10, 40211:14, 40215:22, 40215:24, 40222:11, 40228:2, 40228:21, 40229:23, 40230:7, 40233:2, 40234:1, 40256:25, 40271:10, 40271:24, 40273:20, 40274:24, 40276:6, 40276:18, 40276:19, 40277:13, 40277:14, 40279:18, 40282:14, 40285:3, 40286:1, 40288:22, 40295:6, 40295:10, 40322:18, 40342:16, 40344:1, 40366:25, 40404:20, 40417:2, 40417:7, 40417:14 newcomer [1] - 40369:24 newly [3] - 40233:2, 40234:2, 40236:23 newly-discovered [2] - 40234:2, 40236:23 next [12] - 40178:8, 40180:14, 40183:18, 40184:2, 40209:6, 40220:6, 40224:15, 40291:1, 40291:2, 40296:18, 40380:12, 40418:9 Nichol [28] - 40273:3,</p>	<p>40274:1, 40274:9, 40274:20, 40277:1, 40277:25, 40278:11, 40370:25, 40372:9, 40373:25, 40374:3, 40377:16, 40378:6, 40378:15, 40378:25, 40380:19, 40380:23, 40381:4, 40384:2, 40384:4, 40385:12, 40386:9, 40387:16, 40387:20, 40388:11, 40394:14, 40400:13, 40402:5 Nichol's [2] - 40389:7, 40399:15 nickname [1] - 40387:15 Nicole [2] - 40397:22, 40398:5 night [4] - 40250:12, 40250:21, 40340:8, 40378:18 nightclub [3] - 40250:13, 40250:14, 40250:18 nine [3] - 40161:21, 40168:14, 40173:12 Nobles [2] - 40290:23, 40291:6 nobody [1] - 40382:5 noise [1] - 40258:15 nominating [1] - 40198:20 non [13] - 40164:3, 40253:16, 40295:25, 40306:10, 40306:15, 40306:22, 40351:10, 40352:6, 40355:4, 40367:8, 40394:9, 40395:10 non-departmental [4] - 40306:10, 40306:15, 40306:22, 40367:8 non-disclosure [2] - 40394:9, 40395:10 non-exhaustive [1] - 40355:4 non-lawyers [1] - 40351:10 non-legalistic [1] - 40352:6 non-referral [2] - 40164:3, 40295:25 non-restrictive [1] - 40352:6 non-systemic [1] - 40253:16 none [2] - 40192:4, 40281:7</p>	<p>nonetheless [4] - 40316:16, 40351:15, 40371:5, 40426:15 normal [5] - 40279:25, 40280:14, 40298:16, 40323:21, 40331:5 normally [5] - 40181:22, 40198:9, 40211:3, 40224:21, 40360:22 Northern [4] - 40165:5, 40251:14, 40251:24, 40326:5 nostril [1] - 40196:24 nostrils [1] - 40193:5 notably [1] - 40425:8 note [6] - 40167:7, 40252:6, 40291:11, 40439:7, 40445:15, 40446:3 noted [2] - 40286:12, 40428:9 notes [2] - 40242:22, 40447:6 nothing [15] - 40172:23, 40215:23, 40223:6, 40224:25, 40225:1, 40254:3, 40304:13, 40309:23, 40350:17, 40370:14, 40370:22, 40386:14, 40403:4, 40406:19, 40422:6 notice [6] - 40161:21, 40280:1, 40327:12, 40344:6, 40344:11, 40372:17 noticed [2] - 40260:24, 40335:5 noticing [1] - 40172:13 notified [1] - 40362:2 notion [10] - 40161:13, 40231:21, 40287:2, 40305:6, 40305:10, 40310:8, 40312:19, 40318:17, 40336:15, 40437:23 notorious [2] - 40188:8, 40190:16 notwithstanding [6] - 40303:7, 40316:5, 40425:9, 40425:17, 40428:3, 40444:21 nowhere [1] - 40285:17 Number [1] - 40440:11 number [35] - 40161:20, 40161:22, 40165:14, 40167:18, 40168:8, 40168:21, 40169:8, 40169:10, 40169:16, 40170:8, 40172:18,</p>	<p>40177:11, 40191:13, 40204:15, 40213:9, 40225:24, 40225:25, 40226:20, 40248:22, 40248:23, 40260:7, 40283:14, 40283:15, 40288:3, 40320:11, 40320:14, 40320:15, 40320:16, 40320:17, 40335:16, 40357:25, 40406:7, 40406:8, 40440:9 numbers [6] - 40162:7, 40165:11, 40225:6, 40225:9, 40298:22, 40417:21</p>
O				
<p>object [3] - 40173:20, 40221:17, 40443:13 objective [17] - 40184:16, 40199:7, 40211:13, 40211:16, 40211:19, 40212:25, 40214:9, 40217:1, 40237:21, 40237:22, 40260:17, 40328:4, 40336:21, 40339:20, 40349:16, 40355:9, 40397:18 objectives [2] - 40319:7, 40356:1 obligated [2] - 40310:19, 40357:4 obligation [5] - 40354:16, 40354:23, 40361:15, 40434:18, 40434:22 obligations [7] - 40167:25, 40182:9, 40241:21, 40393:20, 40394:22, 40395:7, 40395:15 obliged [1] - 40310:24 obscure [1] - 40324:8 observation [5] - 40170:12, 40242:11, 40287:23, 40294:21, 40426:6 observations [2] - 40291:12, 40370:16 observe [1] - 40429:1 observed [2] - 40179:12, 40428:12 obtain [11] - 40181:4, 40186:6, 40211:14, 40286:23, 40333:23, 40375:2, 40375:4,</p>				



<p>40375:21, 40381:4, 40381:8, 40396:3 obtained [27] - 40182:3, 40190:7, 40195:25, 40215:2, 40225:5, 40272:5, 40272:12, 40273:8, 40290:6, 40294:25, 40332:1, 40332:15, 40332:17, 40332:24, 40333:6, 40341:5, 40342:5, 40342:17, 40374:19, 40376:13, 40378:21, 40387:10, 40397:7, 40410:15, 40410:19, 40423:20, 40440:1 obtaining [3] - 40186:8, 40406:10, 40406:15 obvious [3] - 40258:13, 40379:17, 40434:10 obviously [9] - 40244:17, 40274:15, 40329:19, 40331:21, 40339:2, 40346:1, 40346:3, 40375:17, 40417:16 occasion [3] - 40291:15, 40398:13, 40431:10 occasionally [2] - 40260:21, 40288:23 occasions [4] - 40208:19, 40213:10, 40246:11, 40381:20 occupied [1] - 40246:3 occupy [1] - 40299:1 occur [3] - 40364:25, 40425:21, 40428:2 occurred [6] - 40194:14, 40249:17, 40425:19, 40426:3, 40440:24, 40444:17 occurrence [2] - 40391:9, 40442:5 occurs [3] - 40301:15, 40338:17, 40428:19 October [1] - 40157:21 odd [2] - 40260:9, 40444:2 off-the-cuff [1] - 40176:16 off-the-wall [1] - 40202:24 offence [30] - 40187:13, 40187:23, 40190:6, 40195:9, 40199:15, 40201:3, 40207:5, 40207:13, 40207:22, 40211:24, 40212:13, 40229:6, 40232:24,</p>	<p>40251:14, 40256:4, 40256:16, 40330:2, 40334:11, 40353:4, 40354:7, 40355:21, 40360:12, 40361:23, 40362:20, 40363:23, 40372:9, 40422:22, 40428:23, 40433:6, 40444:9 offences [20] - 40166:13, 40166:14, 40166:15, 40167:2, 40167:8, 40167:19, 40168:9, 40173:6, 40211:5, 40235:22, 40244:11, 40247:14, 40251:19, 40315:18, 40354:5, 40357:4, 40359:20, 40391:11, 40421:16 offender [1] - 40364:13 offenders [2] - 40354:6, 40360:25 offer [2] - 40173:24, 40446:3 offered [2] - 40293:12, 40410:3 Office [23] - 40235:7, 40236:21, 40237:3, 40245:3, 40281:18, 40306:6, 40306:8, 40307:5, 40308:8, 40309:19, 40310:17, 40310:18, 40310:21, 40310:23, 40311:2, 40311:3, 40311:12, 40311:15, 40311:19, 40417:23, 40418:5, 40432:4 office [5] - 40171:17, 40185:16, 40324:9, 40350:16, 40414:23 officer [50] - 40180:4, 40183:25, 40185:6, 40185:11, 40185:12, 40185:16, 40185:23, 40200:3, 40206:15, 40207:10, 40207:25, 40208:5, 40209:4, 40209:10, 40209:14, 40209:17, 40209:19, 40210:6, 40210:12, 40210:15, 40210:19, 40212:16, 40220:20, 40254:2, 40268:13, 40325:6, 40353:12, 40353:19, 40354:17, 40354:24, 40355:7, 40355:19, 40355:24, 40356:3, 40356:14,</p>	<p>40356:22, 40356:25, 40357:6, 40377:18, 40377:20, 40391:25, 40426:8, 40426:14, 40427:2, 40427:4, 40427:19, 40432:15, 40433:3, 40436:20 Officer [1] - 40158:11 officers [21] - 40185:18, 40186:10, 40186:16, 40188:12, 40251:8, 40251:16, 40273:10, 40318:11, 40318:17, 40377:12, 40382:20, 40385:13, 40390:15, 40390:22, 40431:1, 40431:5, 40431:16, 40433:19, 40437:22, 40438:7 Officers [1] - 40245:4 offices [2] - 40377:2, 40396:19 official [5] - 40308:19, 40309:19, 40313:7, 40313:11, 40354:4 Official [5] - 40158:9, 40447:1, 40447:3, 40447:14, 40447:20 officials [2] - 40307:11, 40381:3 often [9] - 40216:7, 40288:12, 40288:24, 40293:25, 40294:1, 40299:13, 40333:12, 40347:22, 40425:7 old [5] - 40245:25, 40246:9, 40246:20, 40257:7, 40270:5 on' [1] - 40225:19 once [15] - 40209:18, 40227:5, 40230:10, 40237:17, 40241:1, 40264:15, 40279:6, 40280:14, 40333:14, 40346:20, 40365:6, 40379:13, 40396:4, 40419:25, 40420:1 Once [1] - 40220:9 one [126] - 40161:12, 40167:16, 40177:7, 40177:8, 40179:12, 40182:15, 40184:4, 40186:1, 40188:5, 40188:14, 40189:6, 40191:8, 40192:13, 40192:22, 40193:4, 40194:1, 40196:14, 40202:18, 40203:23, 40204:15, 40205:15, 40207:1, 40209:13,</p>	<p>40209:15, 40214:2, 40214:22, 40221:3, 40222:17, 40223:13, 40229:4, 40230:14, 40234:14, 40237:13, 40244:1, 40244:3, 40248:19, 40252:5, 40254:10, 40255:11, 40260:4, 40260:10, 40261:15, 40262:24, 40264:14, 40269:7, 40271:8, 40275:2, 40276:24, 40288:11, 40290:25, 40291:8, 40303:5, 40306:16, 40307:10, 40307:11, 40312:9, 40312:18, 40313:24, 40314:5, 40314:13, 40317:22, 40318:6, 40318:7, 40318:16, 40319:4, 40319:14, 40319:23, 40321:6, 40327:5, 40329:25, 40330:20, 40334:7, 40336:14, 40336:23, 40341:21, 40343:22, 40344:2, 40347:8, 40347:16, 40347:24, 40348:5, 40348:14, 40350:15, 40356:15, 40358:5, 40361:5, 40366:25, 40369:11, 40371:20, 40372:7, 40374:19, 40380:11, 40384:1, 40388:1, 40388:14, 40389:11, 40389:18, 40390:23, 40391:24, 40394:19, 40396:18, 40397:7, 40399:13, 40403:20, 40405:12, 40406:13, 40411:25, 40412:14, 40418:21, 40419:1, 40422:15, 40424:17, 40425:20, 40426:5, 40427:4, 40427:24, 40430:13, 40431:9, 40433:1, 40433:9, 40435:4, 40435:21, 40435:22, 40436:11, 40437:20, 40444:10 One [4] - 40188:5, 40357:16, 40382:25, 40416:11 one's [2] - 40278:16, 40445:21 one-of [1] - 40254:10 onerous [1] - 40330:23 ones [2] - 40170:10,</p>	<p>40282:2 ongoing [6] - 40180:5, 40205:24, 40208:21, 40209:21, 40296:14, 40387:5 open [5] - 40179:9, 40336:22, 40338:11, 40359:15, 40403:19 opened [2] - 40396:12, 40396:15 openness [1] - 40438:2 operate [1] - 40337:1 operated [1] - 40270:22 operates [2] - 40244:19, 40313:17 operating [1] - 40247:5 operation [5] - 40246:7, 40257:12, 40300:19, 40335:25, 40437:8 operational [1] - 40336:10 opinion [7] - 40301:20, 40313:12, 40410:3, 40410:10, 40410:19, 40410:23, 40416:22 opinions [4] - 40407:17, 40410:11, 40410:12, 40410:15 opportunities [1] - 40289:16 opportunity [16] - 40175:7, 40196:11, 40219:22, 40223:21, 40242:25, 40248:10, 40293:12, 40344:9, 40344:24, 40345:10, 40345:16, 40352:2, 40352:8, 40412:17, 40435:2, 40446:7 opposed [5] - 40215:13, 40228:18, 40327:9, 40339:21, 40423:2 opposition [1] - 40410:19 option [1] - 40354:25 oral [4] - 40292:25, 40293:4, 40293:8, 40293:13 Order [1] - 40265:24 order [19] - 40162:9, 40162:20, 40175:2, 40186:6, 40206:20, 40228:9, 40228:17, 40228:21, 40229:23, 40252:9, 40281:18, 40282:21, 40285:22, 40306:1, 40315:14, 40318:9, 40323:3, 40428:11, 40439:9</p>
---	--	---	--	---



<p>ordered [4] - 40197:7, 40197:8, 40228:2, 40438:23</p> <p>ordering [1] - 40431:4</p> <p>ordinarily [1] - 40356:22</p> <p>ordinary [5] - 40174:23, 40175:15, 40299:1, 40327:15, 40357:5</p> <p>organization [5] - 40248:20, 40281:23, 40306:23, 40309:25, 40324:9</p> <p>organization's [2] - 40299:22, 40301:8</p> <p>organizations [7] - 40301:2, 40303:9, 40326:7, 40326:10, 40326:18, 40327:6, 40337:6</p> <p>original [5] - 40184:10, 40186:17, 40202:10, 40253:14, 40406:16</p> <p>originally [3] - 40184:5, 40297:13, 40387:17</p> <p>otherwise [4] - 40235:5, 40288:8, 40295:21, 40396:15</p> <p>ought [13] - 40165:19, 40216:24, 40244:11, 40261:22, 40303:2, 40303:3, 40304:17, 40360:12, 40362:7, 40388:6, 40390:3, 40432:12, 40433:22</p> <p>ourselves [3] - 40204:3, 40220:18, 40343:9</p> <p>outcome [6] - 40206:4, 40231:22, 40231:25, 40337:13, 40342:2, 40443:5</p> <p>outcomes [3] - 40222:10, 40222:14, 40228:5</p> <p>outlets [1] - 40193:15</p> <p>outlined [2] - 40379:13, 40380:25</p> <p>outlining [1] - 40390:17</p> <p>outrageous [2] - 40236:3, 40236:15</p> <p>outreach [2] - 40322:23, 40328:14</p> <p>outright [1] - 40260:6</p> <p>outset [5] - 40236:17, 40325:25, 40326:12, 40338:18, 40377:10</p> <p>outside [7] - 40188:18, 40235:9, 40287:8, 40287:21, 40294:23, 40301:23, 40377:17</p>	<p>outwardly [1] - 40231:6</p> <p>outwards [2] - 40181:3, 40211:18</p> <p>outweighed [1] - 40301:22</p> <p>overall [1] - 40223:7</p> <p>overcome [1] - 40213:18</p> <p>overcoming [2] - 40243:19, 40436:11</p> <p>overlay [1] - 40392:14</p> <p>overnight [2] - 40168:17, 40378:9</p> <p>oversee [1] - 40221:4</p> <p>oversight [2] - 40261:11, 40367:9</p> <p>overturn [1] - 40404:21</p> <p>overview [3] - 40404:15, 40405:2, 40406:11</p> <p>overwhelming [3] - 40204:24, 40205:1, 40235:23</p> <p>owe [1] - 40290:7</p> <p>own [25] - 40164:19, 40171:9, 40179:25, 40205:6, 40216:11, 40217:11, 40259:5, 40321:4, 40321:14, 40322:19, 40329:1, 40330:11, 40340:19, 40359:7, 40376:7, 40382:3, 40388:1, 40396:16, 40403:11, 40403:25, 40410:1, 40410:20, 40411:21, 40433:25</p>	<p>paid [5] - 40235:3, 40302:4, 40407:2, 40422:18, 40423:4</p> <p>pains [1] - 40246:10</p> <p>painting [1] - 40191:5</p> <p>papers [1] - 40301:23</p> <p>paradox [1] - 40359:14</p> <p>paragraph [9] - 40258:21, 40286:14, 40320:24, 40353:16, 40354:15, 40359:11, 40359:23, 40360:16</p> <p>paragraphs [3] - 40358:11, 40362:8, 40363:20</p> <p>pardon [7] - 40178:15, 40178:25, 40179:21, 40180:1, 40180:8, 40422:20, 40423:3</p> <p>pardoned [1] - 40233:1</p> <p>park [2] - 40193:11, 40193:12</p> <p>Parliament [4] - 40309:6, 40309:12, 40309:13, 40311:3</p> <p>parliament [1] - 40261:10</p> <p>Parliamentary [1] - 40310:13</p> <p>parliamentary [1] - 40261:10</p> <p>part [59] - 40168:15, 40180:5, 40187:6, 40187:20, 40192:23, 40194:10, 40196:7, 40197:1, 40197:20, 40197:21, 40207:8, 40207:15, 40208:21, 40211:18, 40212:10, 40215:8, 40215:9, 40216:15, 40238:22, 40246:6, 40267:6, 40271:17, 40276:12, 40277:17, 40278:16, 40281:11, 40281:14, 40293:7, 40295:1, 40312:3, 40317:3, 40322:19, 40322:21, 40323:15, 40325:7, 40332:1, 40348:15, 40354:16, 40359:25, 40363:10, 40365:12, 40366:18, 40369:6, 40374:22, 40375:21, 40376:22, 40415:18, 40419:10, 40427:13, 40427:14, 40428:4, 40432:6, 40432:24, 40434:18, 40439:16, 40439:17, 40440:7,</p>	<p>40443:15, 40445:15</p> <p>parte [1] - 40213:14</p> <p>participants [1] - 40253:13</p> <p>participate [1] - 40409:18</p> <p>particular [52] - 40168:24, 40170:19, 40171:7, 40171:12, 40175:5, 40179:6, 40186:7, 40194:8, 40196:17, 40197:6, 40217:12, 40230:3, 40233:19, 40242:11, 40243:5, 40243:10, 40243:13, 40247:8, 40251:18, 40259:22, 40260:4, 40261:9, 40265:25, 40266:8, 40267:8, 40268:20, 40270:22, 40271:2, 40271:19, 40282:10, 40293:15, 40293:19, 40314:8, 40318:16, 40318:17, 40322:5, 40322:6, 40329:16, 40332:15, 40335:21, 40362:24, 40371:15, 40373:12, 40375:4, 40379:12, 40390:10, 40390:23, 40391:20, 40396:18, 40416:20, 40431:20, 40436:12</p> <p>particularly [29] - 40176:21, 40189:5, 40191:2, 40201:3, 40222:18, 40229:25, 40241:17, 40242:17, 40243:3, 40243:15, 40261:8, 40268:1, 40275:10, 40278:4, 40287:18, 40292:3, 40341:5, 40343:14, 40343:16, 40347:24, 40351:17, 40368:19, 40376:8, 40394:18, 40406:6, 40409:1, 40424:25, 40437:18, 40443:3</p> <p>Particularly [1] - 40182:7</p> <p>parties [5] - 40232:16, 40278:24, 40384:10, 40428:22, 40431:2</p> <p>partisan [3] - 40405:25, 40406:4, 40409:4</p> <p>partly [1] - 40316:9</p> <p>partner [1] - 40214:16</p> <p>parts [2] - 40240:14, 40381:1</p>	<p>party [3] - 40200:6, 40414:16, 40430:11</p> <p>pass [2] - 40236:10, 40420:1</p> <p>passage [4] - 40297:22, 40320:6, 40320:8, 40320:20</p> <p>passed [1] - 40419:25</p> <p>passing [2] - 40210:4, 40438:13</p> <p>past [3] - 40188:21, 40327:10, 40431:19</p> <p>path [4] - 40171:20, 40171:24, 40346:20, 40385:2</p> <p>pathologist [1] - 40192:24</p> <p>pathology [1] - 40184:24</p> <p>patience [1] - 40367:23</p> <p>patient [1] - 40445:25</p> <p>pattern [1] - 40298:16</p> <p>pause [1] - 40162:23</p> <p>pay [4] - 40233:5, 40237:2, 40276:1, 40304:17</p> <p>paying [2] - 40281:24, 40403:17</p> <p>payment [2] - 40233:25, 40409:4</p> <p>payments [2] - 40235:8, 40235:12</p> <p>Pearls [1] - 40443:5</p> <p>Pearson [2] - 40213:14, 40287:6</p> <p>peculiar [2] - 40259:21, 40376:7</p> <p>Pendleton [2] - 40204:22, 40205:4</p> <p>people [58] - 40167:7, 40169:16, 40171:1, 40173:6, 40178:15, 40208:18, 40227:6, 40230:8, 40239:24, 40247:15, 40249:22, 40251:21, 40258:7, 40258:8, 40269:12, 40269:23, 40270:16, 40273:6, 40273:15, 40273:19, 40275:12, 40283:8, 40284:14, 40285:7, 40285:14, 40303:25, 40306:20, 40307:23, 40308:14, 40315:17, 40316:8, 40324:11, 40324:18, 40325:19, 40326:3, 40333:12, 40348:25, 40351:5, 40351:25, 40352:2, 40352:7,</p>
	<p>P</p>			
	<p>package [1] - 40396:4</p> <p>page [28] - 40178:8, 40180:14, 40183:18, 40184:2, 40215:7, 40220:6, 40224:15, 40240:16, 40287:1, 40290:19, 40291:1, 40291:2, 40320:8, 40320:14, 40320:17, 40353:25, 40361:2, 40361:4, 40361:18, 40363:18, 40363:19, 40383:11, 40383:13, 40383:14, 40389:15, 40397:2, 40397:12</p> <p>Page [2] - 40160:2, 40320:9</p> <p>pages [2] - 40384:17, 40447:5</p>			



<p>40352:9, 40365:16, 40369:25, 40371:3, 40379:10, 40381:11, 40393:10, 40393:24, 40394:1, 40406:21, 40407:7, 40407:12, 40407:17, 40408:3, 40413:18, 40425:10, 40437:25</p> <p>people's [1] - 40425:18</p> <p>per [1] - 40164:13</p> <p>perceive [1] - 40230:9</p> <p>perceived [4] - 40230:18, 40264:10, 40305:15, 40312:23</p> <p>percent [5] - 40167:13, 40210:13, 40261:17, 40282:23, 40299:6</p> <p>percentage [2] - 40168:7, 40284:3</p> <p>perception [14] - 40276:21, 40305:17, 40305:24, 40307:17, 40308:10, 40312:2, 40312:4, 40313:6, 40314:21, 40317:2, 40317:3, 40345:24, 40350:21, 40386:1</p> <p>perceptions [1] - 40351:12</p> <p>perfectly [2] - 40412:7, 40435:11</p> <p>Perhaps [3] - 40314:24, 40317:20, 40428:24</p> <p>perhaps [15] - 40176:24, 40215:13, 40265:8, 40296:19, 40300:10, 40302:15, 40327:9, 40331:14, 40331:22, 40402:4, 40421:15, 40427:3, 40428:18, 40433:5, 40434:6</p> <p>period [10] - 40194:22, 40258:14, 40261:4, 40273:9, 40280:22, 40298:17, 40301:2, 40301:22, 40433:15, 40434:21</p> <p>periods [2] - 40300:8, 40300:17</p> <p>perjury [1] - 40186:15</p> <p>permissible [1] - 40310:17</p> <p>perpetrator [6] - 40187:1, 40190:11, 40193:20, 40197:13, 40199:20, 40212:20</p> <p>persistent [2] - 40427:21, 40428:1</p>	<p>person [54] - 40167:10, 40167:11, 40184:8, 40187:3, 40188:23, 40188:24, 40189:17, 40194:8, 40198:20, 40206:25, 40207:7, 40215:11, 40221:8, 40224:20, 40231:11, 40232:3, 40232:4, 40232:23, 40233:7, 40233:11, 40233:16, 40234:10, 40238:5, 40283:18, 40283:22, 40285:1, 40314:1, 40315:5, 40316:10, 40330:6, 40331:25, 40347:3, 40353:3, 40354:3, 40354:10, 40355:20, 40356:5, 40362:20, 40380:7, 40390:18, 40394:24, 40407:14, 40408:6, 40415:10, 40422:10, 40428:2, 40428:14, 40428:16, 40428:22, 40429:15, 40430:5, 40432:10, 40432:19, 40433:13</p> <p>person's [2] - 40230:18, 40422:22</p> <p>personally [1] - 40293:17</p> <p>persons [3] - 40286:21, 40326:8, 40363:12</p> <p>perspective [1] - 40288:19</p> <p>persuade [2] - 40288:10, 40311:15</p> <p>persuaded [1] - 40197:3</p> <p>perverting [1] - 40186:15</p> <p>phases [1] - 40218:10</p> <p>phone [4] - 40403:15, 40403:17, 40413:12, 40414:24</p> <p>photographs [1] - 40389:23</p> <p>phrase [1] - 40425:7</p> <p>physical [1] - 40303:21</p> <p>pick [8] - 40161:9, 40170:10, 40258:17, 40261:24, 40265:12, 40279:4, 40336:3, 40424:9</p> <p>picked [1] - 40262:7</p> <p>picks [1] - 40260:15</p> <p>picture [5] - 40379:8, 40379:13, 40379:14, 40380:5, 40444:4</p>	<p>pictures [2] - 40377:25, 40379:5</p> <p>piece [7] - 40176:23, 40177:2, 40192:25, 40267:8, 40274:24, 40295:6, 40404:2</p> <p>piecemeal [2] - 40295:17, 40403:20</p> <p>pieces [1] - 40191:9</p> <p>place [15] - 40161:15, 40168:14, 40170:23, 40193:19, 40239:17, 40258:16, 40305:3, 40326:25, 40340:18, 40369:21, 40384:18, 40403:9, 40413:11, 40414:23, 40433:18</p> <p>placed [1] - 40366:14</p> <p>Plain [2] - 40327:25, 40328:3</p> <p>plain [1] - 40289:9</p> <p>plan [13] - 40221:13, 40221:14, 40221:15, 40221:17, 40221:25, 40222:8, 40222:12, 40222:14, 40224:7, 40338:24, 40376:6, 40394:20</p> <p>planned [1] - 40338:25</p> <p>plans [2] - 40311:9, 40311:15</p> <p>planting [1] - 40288:7</p> <p>plastic [9] - 40193:1, 40193:14, 40194:3, 40196:9, 40196:17, 40196:23, 40196:24, 40248:2</p> <p>plausible [3] - 40189:5, 40201:3, 40202:25</p> <p>play [4] - 40267:6, 40270:9, 40274:8, 40294:7</p> <p>played [1] - 40170:25</p> <p>playing [1] - 40246:6</p> <p>pleaded [2] - 40167:21, 40252:10</p> <p>plight [1] - 40171:1</p> <p>Pm [4] - 40279:2, 40352:20, 40352:21, 40446:14</p> <p>point [65] - 40166:3, 40166:5, 40183:6, 40189:14, 40189:18, 40200:4, 40200:23, 40205:8, 40205:10, 40208:15, 40211:10, 40212:8, 40226:13, 40239:7, 40243:13, 40244:2, 40246:10, 40256:15, 40257:16,</p>	<p>40257:17, 40259:12, 40261:14, 40265:11, 40266:25, 40276:22, 40277:20, 40277:25, 40290:5, 40290:25, 40291:18, 40293:19, 40293:24, 40295:22, 40298:21, 40301:8, 40307:16, 40308:11, 40313:6, 40314:10, 40314:21, 40315:22, 40317:2, 40317:8, 40317:21, 40319:8, 40326:19, 40326:21, 40326:23, 40338:10, 40351:12, 40353:24, 40355:16, 40360:15, 40361:3, 40370:10, 40373:19, 40382:6, 40388:24, 40397:1, 40402:2, 40403:3, 40404:12, 40407:19, 40429:13</p> <p>pointed [2] - 40213:9, 40334:12</p> <p>points [3] - 40279:4, 40287:22, 40351:23</p> <p>police [138] - 40180:3, 40181:2, 40181:4, 40182:4, 40182:11, 40182:17, 40184:4, 40184:9, 40184:13, 40184:25, 40185:4, 40185:9, 40185:11, 40185:18, 40186:7, 40186:10, 40188:2, 40188:12, 40189:15, 40193:16, 40193:21, 40194:21, 40200:17, 40200:18, 40200:20, 40207:6, 40208:9, 40208:16, 40209:3, 40209:16, 40209:24, 40210:6, 40210:7, 40212:14, 40212:19, 40220:21, 40241:17, 40242:18, 40242:21, 40245:9, 40248:11, 40250:17, 40250:25, 40251:1, 40251:8, 40251:22, 40251:24, 40254:2, 40254:13, 40254:21, 40257:4, 40257:12, 40260:6, 40268:13, 40272:10, 40288:6, 40291:16, 40300:21, 40316:9, 40318:11, 40318:17, 40353:12, 40353:19, 40354:17, 40354:22, 40354:24, 40356:14,</p>	<p>40356:22, 40356:25, 40357:5, 40360:22, 40360:24, 40363:21, 40364:2, 40364:16, 40366:21, 40367:10, 40373:5, 40373:6, 40375:2, 40375:6, 40375:15, 40376:2, 40376:13, 40376:14, 40376:16, 40376:24, 40377:12, 40377:14, 40377:17, 40378:9, 40379:9, 40381:21, 40382:20, 40383:15, 40383:19, 40383:21, 40386:10, 40391:5, 40391:6, 40391:10, 40398:12, 40413:15, 40415:20, 40416:7, 40426:4, 40426:9, 40427:5, 40427:11, 40427:19, 40430:12, 40430:17, 40430:19, 40430:21, 40431:1, 40431:5, 40431:16, 40432:15, 40432:16, 40432:20, 40433:9, 40433:19, 40433:24, 40434:3, 40434:6, 40434:11, 40434:18, 40435:12, 40435:13, 40435:22, 40435:23, 40437:5, 40437:22, 40438:6, 40439:24, 40440:15</p> <p>Police [13] - 40159:7, 40243:15, 40245:4, 40248:8, 40252:15, 40252:16, 40366:15, 40366:16, 40366:17, 40375:13, 40378:8, 40424:21, 40433:2</p> <p>policeman [3] - 40208:6, 40208:8, 40315:5</p> <p>policies [12] - 40257:6, 40257:13, 40299:25, 40300:5, 40301:1, 40303:8, 40335:7, 40335:11, 40335:18, 40339:21, 40433:18</p> <p>policing [5] - 40312:24, 40315:14, 40366:22, 40366:24, 40367:12</p> <p>Policing [1] - 40315:12</p> <p>policy [16] - 40176:8, 40177:11, 40178:4, 40301:8, 40301:9, 40302:13, 40302:19, 40310:19, 40336:5,</p>
---	---	---	---	--



<p>40336:12, 40358:8, 40420:19, 40433:10, 40433:24, 40434:1, 40436:14 political [5] - 40236:8, 40310:9, 40313:6, 40317:9, 40318:15 politician [1] - 40308:19 polygraph [5] - 40272:6, 40273:11, 40377:18, 40381:11, 40388:3 pool [1] - 40164:12 population [6] - 40164:12, 40164:14, 40164:22, 40325:14, 40325:21, 40325:24 portrayed [1] - 40260:8 pose [2] - 40260:3, 40320:24 position [36] - 40179:5, 40193:20, 40195:11, 40200:11, 40219:16, 40223:23, 40227:7, 40229:2, 40229:3, 40231:14, 40232:4, 40233:15, 40237:16, 40238:4, 40238:7, 40244:9, 40250:16, 40261:5, 40266:16, 40266:19, 40267:22, 40284:14, 40304:4, 40313:7, 40313:17, 40369:23, 40388:1, 40388:21, 40393:6, 40393:10, 40398:1, 40398:9, 40398:19, 40407:13, 40429:4 positive [3] - 40249:20, 40326:12, 40326:25 positively [1] - 40261:12 possibilities [1] - 40287:21 possibility [40] - 40177:1, 40187:21, 40189:20, 40190:5, 40199:17, 40199:18, 40201:22, 40203:24, 40204:4, 40204:6, 40204:11, 40213:1, 40213:11, 40213:16, 40213:22, 40241:5, 40279:12, 40287:2, 40287:7, 40287:9, 40287:13, 40287:17, 40287:19, 40287:25, 40292:10, 40300:22, 40321:23, 40354:9,</p>	<p>40356:8, 40366:12, 40406:5, 40409:3, 40417:9, 40420:2, 40420:6, 40420:12, 40420:15, 40431:4, 40441:12, 40442:22 possible [19] - 40169:2, 40173:23, 40197:13, 40200:6, 40203:1, 40228:24, 40229:1, 40250:3, 40260:12, 40260:18, 40277:13, 40307:25, 40336:22, 40397:16, 40401:23, 40405:3, 40426:14, 40431:22, 40434:7 possibly [9] - 40243:1, 40303:12, 40398:3, 40398:14, 40399:15, 40400:15, 40401:2, 40401:13, 40419:16 posthumously [1] - 40180:8 postmortem [1] - 40192:25 potential [17] - 40240:25, 40244:16, 40271:24, 40295:24, 40313:2, 40323:10, 40323:16, 40328:8, 40357:12, 40358:13, 40364:13, 40364:19, 40369:4, 40391:1, 40394:13, 40407:24, 40427:20 potentially [15] - 40274:25, 40317:16, 40322:25, 40323:11, 40346:13, 40350:10, 40359:19, 40391:18, 40407:16, 40408:8, 40408:21, 40409:6, 40426:11, 40433:20, 40443:5 pounds [1] - 40281:19 poverty [1] - 40324:5 power [7] - 40175:12, 40179:8, 40180:11, 40180:16, 40181:3, 40220:19, 40408:3 powerful [2] - 40177:6, 40177:24 powers [9] - 40178:21, 40179:6, 40180:15, 40186:7, 40186:9, 40209:3, 40241:17, 40312:19, 40356:22 practical [2] - 40303:6, 40422:7 practically [1] - 40264:9</p>	<p>practice [9] - 40185:17, 40249:13, 40295:7, 40295:13, 40317:6, 40428:20, 40429:3, 40431:24, 40445:18 practices [2] - 40322:22, 40438:22 pragmatically [1] - 40429:9 praise [1] - 40245:23 pre [1] - 40183:8 pre-armed [1] - 40183:8 precedent [1] - 40367:5 precise [2] - 40292:16, 40430:15 precisely [4] - 40208:20, 40214:1, 40271:3, 40445:19 precluded [1] - 40194:18 precondition [1] - 40329:14 predicted [1] - 40386:20 predilection [1] - 40392:4 preface [1] - 40177:10 prefaced [1] - 40376:20 prefer [1] - 40171:9 preference [1] - 40445:21 prefers [1] - 40171:8 prejudice [2] - 40356:8, 40443:5 prejudiced [1] - 40442:25 prejudicial [1] - 40397:25 preliminary [1] - 40378:5 premise [1] - 40187:7 premium [1] - 40332:25 preparation [2] - 40383:5, 40439:2 preparatory [1] - 40404:9 prepare [1] - 40279:7 prepared [12] - 40231:7, 40316:12, 40322:3, 40325:22, 40349:14, 40375:22, 40383:21, 40384:1, 40397:20, 40402:1, 40437:11, 40446:10 preparing [3] - 40397:14, 40401:21, 40445:11 preponderance [1] - 40301:20 Prerogative [3] -</p>	<p>40179:3, 40179:13, 40422:16 prerogative [5] - 40178:9, 40178:12, 40178:16, 40178:19, 40180:12 prescribe [1] - 40346:24 present [6] - 40162:1, 40277:13, 40384:19, 40397:17, 40399:7, 40434:23 presentable [1] - 40258:4 presentation [1] - 40404:4 presentations [1] - 40293:4 presented [4] - 40258:2, 40412:24, 40431:2, 40440:2 presenter [1] - 40170:20 presenting [1] - 40399:5 preserve [2] - 40259:6, 40321:8 press [1] - 40191:25 pressure [5] - 40240:23, 40313:22, 40317:10, 40317:14, 40348:21 pressures [2] - 40314:2, 40314:12 Presumably [1] - 40182:24 presumably [6] - 40200:23, 40206:6, 40254:25, 40280:3, 40371:19, 40371:23 presumption [1] - 40208:16 pretend [4] - 40258:22, 40321:25, 40322:14, 40436:24 pretty [2] - 40194:25, 40286:10 prevent [2] - 40334:5, 40334:6 prevention [1] - 40248:16 previous [5] - 40162:16, 40162:21, 40179:10, 40201:4, 40419:6 Previously [1] - 40419:3 previously [7] - 40162:14, 40344:13, 40374:5, 40418:4,</p>	<p>40418:24, 40419:9, 40435:5 primarily [1] - 40226:22 primary [1] - 40343:23 prime [1] - 40377:6 principle [7] - 40177:12, 40184:16, 40239:9, 40305:5, 40310:7, 40342:22, 40345:18 Principles [1] - 40360:11 principles [6] - 40292:12, 40305:2, 40310:12, 40335:2, 40336:11, 40360:11 priority [2] - 40346:13, 40346:18 priorizing [1] - 40346:9 prison [11] - 40315:15, 40324:17, 40324:18, 40324:20, 40325:2, 40325:4, 40325:6, 40325:8, 40325:13, 40326:4, 40371:25 prisoners [3] - 40324:25, 40325:5, 40325:7 prisons [2] - 40325:19, 40325:22 private [2] - 40171:10, 40440:21 privation [1] - 40315:15 privilege [3] - 40183:4, 40183:9, 40183:12 pro [1] - 40405:6 proactive [7] - 40327:8, 40328:15, 40328:20, 40333:11, 40407:23, 40408:2, 40419:18 probability [1] - 40287:10 probation [1] - 40325:5 problem [13] - 40208:20, 40241:10, 40242:8, 40245:8, 40248:8, 40257:15, 40264:21, 40269:6, 40318:15, 40347:23, 40395:16, 40406:12, 40437:19 problems [8] - 40169:6, 40242:16, 40242:24, 40244:13, 40244:17, 40264:2, 40264:23, 40265:1 procedural [2] - 40336:5, 40336:25 procedure [8] - 40223:10, 40274:23,</p>
---	--	---	--	---



<p>40337:7, 40344:2, 40346:9, 40361:21, 40363:5, 40364:5 Procedure [2] - 40361:19, 40394:4 procedures [10] - 40217:11, 40331:13, 40336:23, 40339:21, 40345:19, 40348:22, 40349:24, 40362:17, 40363:8, 40369:20 proceed [2] - 40318:10, 40334:19 proceeding [1] - 40318:20 Proceedings [4] - 40157:12, 40157:23, 40160:1, 40161:1 proceedings [4] - 40229:7, 40318:5, 40373:4, 40393:4 process [68] - 40163:10, 40164:1, 40167:24, 40168:15, 40175:18, 40179:20, 40209:13, 40217:11, 40220:7, 40236:6, 40236:18, 40237:17, 40238:9, 40249:21, 40257:24, 40272:6, 40273:17, 40275:8, 40275:18, 40285:7, 40285:13, 40289:8, 40292:12, 40293:7, 40294:10, 40304:19, 40304:25, 40308:4, 40315:10, 40316:17, 40325:7, 40328:23, 40332:1, 40332:13, 40334:4, 40335:3, 40335:7, 40337:21, 40338:4, 40340:17, 40340:18, 40343:1, 40343:20, 40345:6, 40347:5, 40347:19, 40348:4, 40348:7, 40348:15, 40349:4, 40349:7, 40349:13, 40349:18, 40349:22, 40350:2, 40351:11, 40351:22, 40362:1, 40364:25, 40369:6, 40373:2, 40374:23, 40376:5, 40419:10, 40419:23, 40437:14 processes [8] - 40179:15, 40218:1, 40326:2, 40336:23, 40338:20, 40340:1, 40340:2, 40340:5</p>	<p>processing [1] - 40347:15 proclaiming [1] - 40422:22 produce [6] - 40241:3, 40304:8, 40334:2, 40340:11, 40408:9, 40440:22 produced [1] - 40270:19 product [1] - 40274:18 production [2] - 40173:19, 40181:9 productive [1] - 40329:5 professional [1] - 40319:17 professionals [1] - 40328:7 Professor [1] - 40297:22 profile [1] - 40240:20 program [10] - 40168:24, 40168:25, 40169:7, 40170:5, 40170:19, 40172:7, 40172:10, 40172:19, 40173:20, 40174:1 programs [4] - 40168:23, 40169:2, 40169:13, 40170:13 progress [3] - 40296:6, 40309:22, 40347:20 progressed [1] - 40348:23 progresses [3] - 40222:10, 40222:13, 40387:6 prohibit [1] - 40308:19 promised [1] - 40434:16 prompted [6] - 40223:25, 40427:25, 40428:21, 40430:4, 40430:14, 40431:3 promptly [1] - 40304:3 pronounce [1] - 40316:13 proof [4] - 40274:10, 40277:2, 40286:22, 40391:19 propensity [2] - 40193:14, 40194:2 proper [4] - 40236:5, 40267:7, 40283:11, 40311:11 properly [6] - 40254:11, 40287:25, 40289:11, 40306:1, 40323:8, 40395:25</p>	<p>proportion [3] - 40282:17, 40283:12, 40284:2 proposed [2] - 40369:11, 40369:15 proposition [3] - 40415:18, 40435:4, 40439:2 proprietary [1] - 40212:4 propriety [2] - 40384:11, 40431:18 prosectors [3] - 40249:4, 40425:13, 40431:16 prosecutable [2] - 40187:25, 40199:22 prosecute [4] - 40251:21, 40319:19, 40319:23, 40360:25 prosecuted [13] - 40167:18, 40171:25, 40188:19, 40191:7, 40239:17, 40241:15, 40245:20, 40248:23, 40249:22, 40269:3, 40286:21, 40350:15, 40354:10 prosecuting [9] - 40171:16, 40244:21, 40245:9, 40248:25, 40315:20, 40319:18, 40377:2, 40395:23, 40426:12 Prosecution [4] - 40243:18, 40300:3, 40300:6, 40300:20 prosecution [32] - 40167:23, 40175:11, 40181:4, 40182:2, 40182:12, 40182:13, 40192:10, 40229:2, 40236:17, 40236:22, 40244:11, 40257:11, 40289:7, 40292:20, 40312:25, 40314:20, 40315:10, 40341:24, 40354:6, 40375:3, 40375:18, 40391:19, 40393:20, 40393:22, 40394:3, 40394:16, 40395:6, 40395:19, 40413:16, 40431:25, 40432:9, 40435:13 prosecution's [2] - 40182:8, 40241:21 prosecutions [2] - 40245:3, 40350:16 prosecutions' [1] - 40171:17</p>	<p>prosecutor [6] - 40254:13, 40254:22, 40315:5, 40427:10, 40438:16, 40438:22 prosecutor's [2] - 40181:21, 40181:22 Prosecutors [1] - 40361:11 prospect [2] - 40223:25, 40423:12 protect [1] - 40435:25 protracted [2] - 40209:15, 40273:9 prove [4] - 40198:6, 40199:21, 40207:3, 40250:12 provide [12] - 40178:6, 40178:16, 40217:3, 40224:8, 40228:19, 40272:18, 40293:6, 40294:6, 40294:8, 40331:7, 40364:20, 40365:10 provided [3] - 40225:7, 40345:10, 40383:9 provider [1] - 40302:17 provides [4] - 40224:11, 40264:1, 40310:23, 40341:16 providing [6] - 40181:6, 40194:6, 40232:15, 40301:5, 40409:14, 40445:11 Province [1] - 40447:4 province [1] - 40331:18 provincial [1] - 40376:18 provision [8] - 40175:5, 40181:12, 40184:7, 40184:21, 40236:20, 40275:5, 40364:24, 40431:20 provisional [17] - 40219:3, 40219:4, 40219:7, 40219:8, 40219:17, 40219:22, 40220:2, 40224:15, 40224:18, 40224:22, 40295:24, 40343:22, 40344:6, 40344:8, 40344:11, 40344:22, 40345:9 provisionally [1] - 40219:9 provoked [1] - 40428:1 psychiatric [2] - 40173:5, 40196:18 psychological [2] - 40173:5, 40173:9 pubic [1] - 40441:8</p>	<p>Public [1] - 40265:24 public [30] - 40171:2, 40171:16, 40180:17, 40180:25, 40181:1, 40181:17, 40182:22, 40185:12, 40240:23, 40244:18, 40245:3, 40257:4, 40305:25, 40306:10, 40306:12, 40306:15, 40306:22, 40308:12, 40313:11, 40314:2, 40317:3, 40317:10, 40317:14, 40323:4, 40323:12, 40324:22, 40338:16, 40359:24, 40367:8, 40418:19 public's [1] - 40173:21 publicity [2] - 40249:18, 40413:5 publicize [1] - 40339:19 publicizing [1] - 40171:1 publicly [5] - 40177:21, 40180:25, 40260:8, 40336:24, 40338:22 pulse [1] - 40248:24 punishment [1] - 40316:1 purely [1] - 40311:20 purported [1] - 40382:16 purportedly [1] - 40377:18 purpose [15] - 40170:4, 40174:18, 40175:4, 40185:7, 40190:8, 40292:4, 40292:16, 40300:1, 40315:8, 40321:20, 40384:13, 40385:3, 40386:2, 40386:24, 40426:13 purposes [5] - 40170:19, 40206:22, 40356:7, 40384:21, 40422:21 pursuant [1] - 40233:13 pursue [3] - 40357:5, 40391:11, 40430:25 pursued [2] - 40194:12, 40203:16 pursuing [2] - 40172:17, 40356:18 purview [1] - 40306:7 put [53] - 40161:15, 40177:14, 40188:7, 40197:21, 40204:1, 40216:10, 40222:11, 40223:14, 40223:20, 40224:4, 40224:10,</p>
---	--	--	--	---



40230:8, 40231:4, 40232:14, 40236:1, 40237:15, 40238:1, 40238:22, 40244:4, 40246:1, 40246:19, 40248:2, 40252:21, 40260:3, 40260:9, 40273:18, 40274:12, 40276:15, 40276:20, 40299:8, 40306:4, 40309:21, 40317:5, 40318:21, 40320:7, 40353:9, 40359:1, 40372:17, 40384:18, 40400:6, 40401:19, 40411:7, 40411:11, 40411:16, 40412:4, 40414:15, 40415:15, 40415:17, 40424:25, 40430:11, 40443:19, 40444:3, 40444:15 puts [2] - 40216:8, 40232:3 putting [19] - 40171:2, 40176:7, 40200:13, 40256:18, 40376:11, 40377:25, 40381:10, 40381:15, 40381:22, 40382:4, 40403:20, 40405:22, 40411:22, 40440:13, 40440:19, 40440:24, 40441:2, 40444:3, 40444:8	40258:12, 40263:17 quasi [3] - 40343:7, 40343:9, 40343:14 quasi-judicial [3] - 40343:7, 40343:9, 40343:14 que [1] - 40226:4 Queen's [4] - 40447:1, 40447:3, 40447:14, 40447:20 query [1] - 40402:3 quest [1] - 40241:6 questioned [3] - 40277:17, 40377:17, 40386:13 questioning [14] - 40207:1, 40241:19, 40242:20, 40377:14, 40378:6, 40381:8, 40382:16, 40420:8, 40427:5, 40427:12, 40427:22, 40428:1, 40428:13, 40438:2 questions [31] - 40177:13, 40203:5, 40234:17, 40255:16, 40265:17, 40285:24, 40288:16, 40292:24, 40296:16, 40297:12, 40297:17, 40308:17, 40321:18, 40342:23, 40350:24, 40367:24, 40368:25, 40397:20, 40406:22, 40407:24, 40409:14, 40415:10, 40416:18, 40423:25, 40425:25, 40436:18, 40439:13, 40443:13, 40443:14, 40443:19, 40444:17 quick [1] - 40228:6 quicker [2] - 40164:1, 40346:6 quickly [6] - 40163:20, 40165:24, 40206:7, 40334:19, 40358:15, 40440:11 quite [41] - 40161:10, 40167:15, 40170:11, 40172:15, 40175:19, 40190:15, 40198:19, 40204:2, 40205:25, 40213:9, 40216:7, 40231:2, 40231:6, 40232:11, 40233:23, 40234:19, 40236:14, 40239:3, 40243:18, 40247:6, 40255:25, 40256:14, 40257:7, 40261:12, 40263:7,	40266:10, 40268:17, 40269:2, 40282:2, 40282:20, 40284:17, 40321:20, 40341:22, 40347:22, 40380:17, 40410:2, 40410:17, 40416:23, 40426:14, 40428:25, 40442:5 quo [2] - 40259:7, 40321:9	R racing [2] - 40287:11, 40287:22 radically [1] - 40172:15 railway [1] - 40171:19 raise [8] - 40230:13, 40240:2, 40283:3, 40296:8, 40379:22, 40380:9, 40400:18, 40421:11 raised [18] - 40163:13, 40168:18, 40203:15, 40208:10, 40220:13, 40221:18, 40221:21, 40236:9, 40262:3, 40276:25, 40289:5, 40351:24, 40388:2, 40388:24, 40406:22, 40416:13, 40442:15, 40443:19 range [1] - 40298:11 rape [3] - 40389:17, 40390:6, 40392:5 raped [1] - 40207:14 rapes [5] - 40203:11, 40390:18, 40390:24, 40415:12, 40415:13 rapidly [2] - 40260:18, 40379:8 rapist [1] - 40414:5 rare [3] - 40212:17, 40240:6, 40422:15 rarely [6] - 40180:11, 40283:21, 40285:25, 40288:23, 40290:8, 40290:9 rarely-exercised [1] - 40180:11 rarer [1] - 40180:13 rash [1] - 40442:11 rate [5] - 40161:24, 40162:2, 40164:3, 40261:12, 40284:16 rather [13] - 40203:20, 40245:14, 40256:18, 40277:2, 40278:14, 40286:23, 40289:9,	40298:22, 40304:23, 40320:9, 40322:13, 40404:22, 40415:14 Rcmp [4] - 40159:9, 40375:12, 40385:13, 40390:15 re [16] - 40275:17, 40291:9, 40291:15, 40291:20, 40291:25, 40292:3, 40292:4, 40292:10, 40292:13, 40292:14, 40304:21, 40318:24, 40332:20, 40355:22, 40396:12, 40396:15 re-arguing [1] - 40275:17 re-examined [1] - 40304:21 re-interview [3] - 40291:20, 40291:25, 40292:4 re-interviewing [5] - 40291:9, 40292:3, 40292:10, 40292:13, 40292:14 re-invent [1] - 40332:20 re-opened [2] - 40396:12, 40396:15 reach [8] - 40200:23, 40224:18, 40322:24, 40323:12, 40323:23, 40324:11, 40325:24, 40426:15 reached [5] - 40200:24, 40266:19, 40344:8, 40344:22, 40417:13 reaching [2] - 40204:8, 40286:6 react [2] - 40271:22, 40419:16 reaction [3] - 40381:13, 40392:7, 40435:6 reactive [2] - 40327:9, 40407:22 read [5] - 40277:1, 40287:18, 40291:6, 40358:15, 40383:12 readily [1] - 40284:9 reading [5] - 40291:24, 40358:17, 40375:6, 40375:10, 40390:8 real [30] - 40189:20, 40199:18, 40201:21, 40203:23, 40204:4, 40204:6, 40204:11, 40212:25, 40213:11, 40213:16, 40213:22, 40245:24, 40279:12, 40287:2, 40287:7,	40287:13, 40287:17, 40287:19, 40287:25, 40327:14, 40354:9, 40406:2, 40417:8, 40420:1, 40420:6, 40420:11, 40420:15, 40429:6, 40430:1, 40442:22 realistic [1] - 40231:18 reality [3] - 40205:14, 40208:22, 40349:25 realize [1] - 40269:1 really [19] - 40172:9, 40172:11, 40180:24, 40193:6, 40193:23, 40202:9, 40214:21, 40217:10, 40246:17, 40330:17, 40337:9, 40368:10, 40369:14, 40370:11, 40377:19, 40378:19, 40396:5, 40413:21, 40441:15 reason [26] - 40195:7, 40201:2, 40206:10, 40222:25, 40230:13, 40241:11, 40242:7, 40244:24, 40253:19, 40254:8, 40263:10, 40270:4, 40270:13, 40288:11, 40295:17, 40313:5, 40318:21, 40323:15, 40323:24, 40347:17, 40356:2, 40382:14, 40395:12, 40411:3, 40421:24 reasonable [13] - 40181:6, 40201:19, 40213:22, 40233:3, 40234:3, 40234:10, 40235:4, 40391:12, 40423:12, 40425:10, 40426:3, 40428:3 reasonableness [2] - 40181:8, 40425:18 reasonably [5] - 40181:17, 40207:18, 40266:22, 40289:1, 40425:15 reasoning [6] - 40194:10, 40276:13, 40277:18, 40278:16, 40281:2, 40342:15 reasons [38] - 40177:12, 40177:25, 40178:4, 40192:20, 40242:14, 40253:9, 40253:21, 40259:21, 40262:23, 40263:12, 40263:14, 40263:18, 40269:9, 40278:5,
Q					
Qb [1] - 40158:9 Qc [2] - 40159:2, 40159:10 qualify [1] - 40163:6 qualifying [1] - 40419:5 quality [2] - 40366:23, 40367:12 quash [1] - 40189:21 quashed [21] - 40173:11, 40190:2, 40197:7, 40226:6, 40226:23, 40227:1, 40227:6, 40228:1, 40228:8, 40230:7, 40230:11, 40230:25, 40232:5, 40233:17, 40235:20, 40236:16, 40238:4, 40253:11, 40257:21, 40268:14, 40423:2 quashes [1] - 40233:10 quashing [4] - 40228:18, 40231:7,					



<p>40279:8, 40280:14, 40294:16, 40312:17, 40312:22, 40317:24, 40341:12, 40341:16, 40341:21, 40342:12, 40344:7, 40344:11, 40344:12, 40345:9, 40345:14, 40347:16, 40372:8, 40388:3, 40400:23, 40425:3, 40425:4, 40425:11, 40425:22, 40426:1 reassessment [1] - 40417:15 reassure [1] - 40439:14 recant [2] - 40214:14, 40407:3 recantation [5] - 40406:15, 40406:24, 40408:14, 40440:20, 40440:23 receipt [1] - 40349:9 receive [14] - 40166:23, 40170:9, 40198:9, 40204:5, 40204:15, 40214:4, 40327:2, 40349:12, 40366:11, 40404:7, 40408:23, 40409:8, 40421:23, 40434:18 received [12] - 40162:20, 40163:12, 40166:2, 40198:13, 40204:6, 40215:15, 40340:7, 40373:10, 40397:9, 40406:23, 40431:17, 40436:21 receives [1] - 40417:8 recent [2] - 40246:12, 40288:5 recently [1] - 40366:15 recently-created [1] - 40366:15 reception [1] - 40325:5 recognize [5] - 40259:15, 40274:19, 40275:6, 40322:12, 40434:6 recognized [3] - 40250:3, 40261:8, 40310:7 recognizes [3] - 40259:23, 40322:2, 40359:13 recollect [1] - 40257:16 recollection [5] - 40185:24, 40195:17, 40198:11, 40229:9, 40381:5 recollections [2] -</p>	<p>40382:10, 40409:15 recommendation [2] - 40265:19, 40265:21 recommendations [2] - 40368:24, 40369:13 recommended [2] - 40312:13, 40312:18 reconsider [1] - 40275:8 reconsidered [1] - 40435:9 Reconvened [4] - 40161:2, 40227:22, 40279:2, 40352:21 reconvicted [1] - 40231:20 record [23] - 40196:18, 40211:5, 40222:1, 40224:11, 40239:13, 40331:8, 40331:20, 40339:4, 40340:25, 40341:1, 40341:3, 40341:8, 40368:5, 40368:6, 40368:13, 40368:17, 40385:5, 40418:19, 40423:21, 40438:11, 40438:13, 40439:24, 40441:7 recorded [5] - 40195:20, 40222:10, 40222:14, 40239:20, 40362:13 recording [2] - 40257:23, 40340:23 records [7] - 40299:13, 40300:15, 40341:9, 40341:16, 40382:23, 40440:18, 40441:4 redress [1] - 40265:1 redressing [1] - 40319:2 reduced [2] - 40243:25, 40244:1 refer [27] - 40179:7, 40201:22, 40219:9, 40224:19, 40261:17, 40283:7, 40326:22, 40343:12, 40402:10, 40407:15, 40408:4, 40412:6, 40412:25, 40420:4, 40420:5, 40421:4, 40421:14, 40421:25, 40423:6, 40429:14, 40429:18, 40429:21, 40432:6, 40433:19, 40441:13, 40441:17, 40444:25 reference [37] - 40162:17, 40165:19, 40165:24, 40165:25,</p>	<p>40174:21, 40196:7, 40209:20, 40219:5, 40219:17, 40219:20, 40220:3, 40242:12, 40245:20, 40247:2, 40261:1, 40268:15, 40276:11, 40276:14, 40277:19, 40278:17, 40279:7, 40293:6, 40299:11, 40301:3, 40341:4, 40343:15, 40355:22, 40372:7, 40389:17, 40428:11, 40428:20, 40429:2, 40429:5, 40429:11, 40431:4, 40433:22 references [5] - 40244:23, 40253:10, 40388:2, 40389:21, 40390:11 referral [13] - 40162:21, 40164:3, 40164:4, 40199:10, 40273:23, 40288:20, 40295:23, 40295:25, 40344:5, 40360:17, 40396:6, 40403:1, 40420:13 referrals [5] - 40226:2, 40226:19, 40282:19, 40298:14, 40418:23 referred [21] - 40165:16, 40167:22, 40173:7, 40190:1, 40194:9, 40226:16, 40226:18, 40228:5, 40241:24, 40282:20, 40283:15, 40290:10, 40337:15, 40364:18, 40383:3, 40418:10, 40420:17, 40423:15, 40434:4, 40440:8, 40442:18 referring [12] - 40194:10, 40206:11, 40220:17, 40245:23, 40263:12, 40291:3, 40332:5, 40334:8, 40355:13, 40370:25, 40416:25, 40429:17 refers [2] - 40233:9, 40361:12 reform [1] - 40264:2 Reform [1] - 40366:16 reforming [2] - 40265:6, 40300:14 reforms [2] - 40369:5, 40369:15 refreshing [2] - 40319:15, 40319:24 refugee [1] - 40168:1</p>	<p>refuse [1] - 40183:12 refused [5] - 40163:4, 40194:20, 40236:20, 40283:10, 40284:15 regard [12] - 40188:5, 40201:4, 40213:25, 40262:2, 40286:20, 40309:11, 40324:14, 40329:16, 40343:20, 40361:10, 40386:25, 40425:16 regarded [1] - 40278:6 regarding [1] - 40274:25 regardless [3] - 40345:12, 40349:11, 40349:25 regime [2] - 40179:10, 40403:4 Regina [2] - 40375:15, 40375:18 regularity [1] - 40208:16 regulated [1] - 40258:24 regulating [1] - 40241:16 reinforced [1] - 40268:10 reiterated [1] - 40286:10 rejected [2] - 40193:21, 40225:21 relate [1] - 40168:8 related [13] - 40167:19, 40172:2, 40194:1, 40194:12, 40219:8, 40259:11, 40274:22, 40292:16, 40311:9, 40318:2, 40348:16, 40393:10, 40407:8 relating [7] - 40202:2, 40241:18, 40284:6, 40303:25, 40333:1, 40341:16, 40374:10 relation [21] - 40163:12, 40179:14, 40180:8, 40180:9, 40183:23, 40201:1, 40242:18, 40252:8, 40257:22, 40316:4, 40318:18, 40366:20, 40367:2, 40367:9, 40393:21, 40394:16, 40406:20, 40416:10, 40420:19, 40426:7, 40426:8 relationship [5] - 40192:3, 40306:5, 40310:21, 40311:19, 40311:24</p>	<p>relatively [6] - 40188:6, 40213:16, 40248:21, 40248:23, 40274:24, 40288:1 relatives [1] - 40423:1 release [1] - 40370:8 relevant [16] - 40168:19, 40178:7, 40207:19, 40207:23, 40216:23, 40243:2, 40245:2, 40251:1, 40256:23, 40257:25, 40273:22, 40288:22, 40342:16, 40388:10, 40393:24, 40394:1 reli [1] - 40277:16 reliability [12] - 40173:2, 40173:9, 40270:18, 40270:25, 40271:18, 40272:23, 40273:21, 40275:15, 40277:5, 40277:16, 40277:24, 40389:2 reliable [4] - 40272:7, 40272:15, 40378:21, 40444:23 Reliable [1] - 40272:14 relied [3] - 40194:9, 40243:4, 40395:24 religion [1] - 40406:24 rely [3] - 40184:13, 40211:5, 40403:10 relying [2] - 40270:23, 40441:3 remain [2] - 40163:9, 40163:22 remainder [2] - 40163:25, 40281:14 remained [1] - 40161:24 remaining [2] - 40163:8, 40164:7 remains [12] - 40176:25, 40182:9, 40188:1, 40196:25, 40222:8, 40284:14, 40355:10, 40365:18, 40395:16, 40412:21, 40426:7, 40426:14 remarkably [2] - 40161:25, 40162:4 remedied [1] - 40255:21 remedy [14] - 40163:2, 40217:3, 40227:17, 40230:5, 40230:23, 40237:8, 40237:15, 40238:3, 40239:1, 40239:25, 40254:19, 40258:11, 40295:7,</p>
---	--	--	---	---



<p>40437:24 remedying [1] - 40248:15 remember [15] - 40172:7, 40188:22, 40189:12, 40221:12, 40308:24, 40374:5, 40374:21, 40379:22, 40379:25, 40380:1, 40380:24, 40381:1, 40398:10, 40430:15, 40431:7 reminds [1] - 40263:7 remit [1] - 40367:8 remove [1] - 40421:10 removed [2] - 40203:23, 40312:14 rendered [1] - 40410:13 repairing [1] - 40313:2 repeat [2] - 40274:3, 40358:17 report [16] - 40176:5, 40176:6, 40179:3, 40185:3, 40245:1, 40247:4, 40283:7, 40284:5, 40312:7, 40312:11, 40361:15, 40362:12, 40366:9, 40366:11, 40397:8 reported [5] - 40191:25, 40196:4, 40196:19, 40360:13, 40362:7 Reporter[2] - 40447:14, 40447:20 Reporters[2] - 40158:9, 40447:3 reporters [1] - 40169:18 Reporters [1] - 40447:1 reporting [5] - 40244:25, 40311:18, 40359:20, 40360:7 reports [5] - 40184:23, 40298:6, 40342:8, 40390:14, 40418:16 repose [1] - 40437:3 represent [6] - 40282:2, 40296:21, 40296:22, 40309:14, 40326:8, 40368:4 representation [2] - 40307:3, 40432:21 representations [5] - 40271:17, 40293:9, 40293:14, 40344:10, 40428:21 representatives [3] - 40336:1, 40383:18, 40413:7 represented [9] -</p>	<p>40255:20, 40263:25, 40282:18, 40290:13, 40343:17, 40396:20, 40400:1, 40432:10 representing [3] - 40293:13, 40399:12, 40399:22 reputation [1] - 40261:2 request [3] - 40181:6, 40181:12, 40196:15 requested [1] - 40185:10 requests [1] - 40181:8 require [14] - 40163:21, 40181:9, 40183:24, 40184:8, 40186:6, 40210:6, 40210:11, 40223:17, 40291:15, 40331:5, 40331:6, 40340:14, 40374:14, 40404:16 required [6] - 40218:19, 40266:9, 40340:21, 40344:17, 40346:7, 40391:20 requirement [3] - 40351:4, 40351:10, 40366:8 requirements [3] - 40286:21, 40289:17, 40391:10 requires [4] - 40162:16, 40174:24, 40182:1, 40209:9 requiring [2] - 40185:5, 40223:13 residual [2] - 40179:3, 40179:5 resistant [1] - 40410:3 resolution [1] - 40345:23 resolved [4] - 40217:23, 40218:4, 40346:21, 40359:22 resolving [1] - 40382:19 resource [1] - 40185:20 resources [8] - 40185:8, 40186:3, 40311:6, 40324:6, 40335:19, 40346:2, 40346:5, 40346:8 respect [9] - 40183:13, 40311:20, 40311:21, 40328:19, 40331:11, 40356:18, 40360:12, 40424:23, 40425:24 respected [1] - 40318:7 respects [5] - 40211:23, 40214:6, 40325:15,</p>	<p>40325:18, 40329:3 respond [5] - 40219:23, 40224:22, 40281:21, 40327:4, 40416:17 responded [1] - 40220:1 respondent [1] - 40280:12 responding [1] - 40290:21 response [7] - 40171:6, 40180:5, 40200:21, 40219:7, 40220:1, 40261:21, 40436:9 responsibilities [3] - 40316:3, 40356:1, 40394:15 responsibility [11] - 40172:25, 40188:1, 40191:19, 40244:25, 40312:24, 40315:11, 40315:20, 40315:23, 40318:22, 40329:17, 40366:13 responsible [16] - 40171:15, 40198:21, 40200:19, 40233:25, 40235:22, 40240:25, 40245:5, 40315:10, 40315:13, 40316:9, 40316:18, 40347:4, 40380:16, 40390:19, 40393:5, 40437:10 responsive [1] - 40313:11 rest [2] - 40201:8, 40211:8 restatement [1] - 40268:6 rested [1] - 40237:24 restore [2] - 40246:7, 40303:22 restricted [1] - 40170:8 Restricting [1] - 40291:9 restrictive [1] - 40352:6 restructuring [1] - 40301:21 resubmission [1] - 40419:3 result [28] - 40164:3, 40165:25, 40168:14, 40169:12, 40171:22, 40172:19, 40197:9, 40234:1, 40254:8, 40254:11, 40255:7, 40255:13, 40267:21, 40268:4, 40269:18, 40270:5, 40270:12, 40270:19, 40273:16, 40288:20, 40408:19,</p>	<p>40420:13, 40425:2, 40425:4, 40427:1, 40428:21, 40433:16, 40442:19 resulted [7] - 40186:21, 40191:9, 40204:8, 40260:1, 40266:1, 40266:14, 40434:4 resulting [2] - 40240:23, 40255:1 results [3] - 40174:20, 40207:22, 40437:2 retained [2] - 40178:11, 40303:16 retaining [1] - 40303:14 retention [9] - 40300:8, 40300:15, 40300:17, 40301:1, 40301:23, 40302:5, 40302:13, 40302:19, 40303:8 retiral [7] - 40197:8, 40228:9, 40228:17, 40228:24, 40231:19, 40252:9, 40252:10 retried [2] - 40197:8, 40231:22 retrospectively [1] - 40268:19 return [1] - 40264:5 returned [2] - 40192:15, 40235:25 revealed [1] - 40263:3 reveals [1] - 40392:13 reversed [1] - 40232:25 reverted [1] - 40406:16 Review[15] - 40170:22, 40218:19, 40220:10, 40240:12, 40244:5, 40284:18, 40290:17, 40300:23, 40301:4, 40304:3, 40307:1, 40357:20, 40368:10, 40395:10, 40424:24 review [97] - 40163:15, 40163:19, 40163:21, 40165:18, 40170:10, 40179:7, 40182:1, 40182:16, 40200:16, 40206:1, 40207:15, 40216:19, 40217:13, 40217:15, 40217:19, 40218:24, 40219:8, 40219:13, 40220:8, 40220:11, 40220:24, 40221:4, 40221:9, 40221:10, 40221:24, 40222:2, 40223:14, 40223:15, 40223:25, 40224:2, 40224:3, 40224:9, 40224:13,</p>	<p>40225:15, 40225:18, 40228:6, 40239:4, 40246:4, 40250:24, 40251:23, 40256:17, 40287:15, 40294:3, 40294:9, 40296:11, 40301:14, 40302:14, 40304:19, 40304:21, 40304:25, 40312:14, 40314:20, 40317:15, 40326:23, 40329:22, 40329:25, 40334:19, 40334:22, 40335:2, 40335:7, 40336:2, 40340:3, 40340:14, 40347:19, 40347:21, 40348:3, 40348:12, 40348:13, 40348:18, 40349:22, 40350:17, 40351:17, 40358:10, 40363:13, 40374:23, 40374:25, 40375:22, 40376:4, 40376:5, 40376:12, 40376:15, 40379:14, 40380:9, 40395:18, 40398:20, 40399:7, 40409:22, 40412:18, 40415:19, 40419:10, 40429:6, 40429:10, 40430:4, 40440:7, 40441:13, 40441:14 reviewed [8] - 40245:15, 40251:24, 40256:7, 40307:20, 40334:14, 40346:21, 40349:20, 40397:10 reviewing [3] - 40318:22, 40351:11, 40394:24 reviews [5] - 40209:14, 40291:14, 40312:10, 40313:8, 40429:8 revisit [1] - 40368:17 Richard[1] - 40424:20 Rick[1] - 40159:7 rightful [1] - 40267:4 rightly [3] - 40213:9, 40239:18, 40286:19 Rights[4] - 40266:3, 40266:5, 40343:5, 40369:8 rights [1] - 40343:17 rings [1] - 40439:3 rise [15] - 40161:16, 40166:3, 40189:20, 40199:18, 40229:6, 40243:20, 40257:19, 40271:1, 40273:20, 40372:2, 40384:8,</p>
---	---	---	--	--



<p>40391:18, 40397:23, 40409:2, 40420:14 risk [7] - 40195:5, 40240:21, 40278:4, 40278:7, 40351:16, 40351:18, 40391:13 risks [1] - 40269:2 road [3] - 40211:20, 40408:22, 40434:24 robber [1] - 40188:15 robberies [1] - 40247:9 robbery [2] - 40188:11, 40190:12 Roberts [1] - 40378:10 robust [1] - 40322:1 rock [1] - 40171:21 role [12] - 40171:1, 40173:14, 40286:7, 40294:7, 40318:23, 40323:5, 40323:8, 40347:18, 40366:6, 40366:19, 40367:11, 40438:14 roles [1] - 40315:7 Ron [12] - 40272:2, 40277:5, 40371:1, 40377:16, 40384:2, 40384:4, 40385:12, 40386:9, 40389:5, 40406:16, 40440:20, 40444:5 Ronald [10] - 40273:3, 40277:15, 40277:21, 40278:5, 40278:9, 40372:10, 40387:16, 40387:20, 40388:12, 40394:15 Ronalds [1] - 40277:16 rotate [1] - 40290:14 Rough [10] - 40168:24, 40169:7, 40169:19, 40170:14, 40170:17, 40170:20, 40171:13, 40172:6, 40172:16, 40172:19 rough [1] - 40162:9 routine [2] - 40257:3, 40257:13 routinely [2] - 40291:25, 40295:15 Roy [26] - 40159:13, 40160:5, 40296:18, 40296:23, 40297:5, 40297:6, 40314:15, 40314:18, 40314:23, 40315:1, 40320:11, 40320:12, 40320:16, 40320:19, 40327:19, 40327:20, 40330:21, 40333:8, 40333:9,</p>	<p>40352:13, 40352:16, 40352:22, 40407:20, 40407:23, 40428:13, 40434:15 Roys [1] - 40420:8 Royal [12] - 40179:2, 40179:3, 40179:12, 40179:13, 40247:3, 40265:13, 40265:19, 40266:11, 40283:6, 40284:5, 40320:21, 40422:16 Rp [4] - 40158:10, 40447:2, 40447:18, 40447:19 rule [3] - 40301:13, 40308:18, 40309:2 rules [6] - 40286:20, 40305:2, 40331:5, 40339:23, 40346:24, 40351:22 run [4] - 40188:6, 40195:5, 40391:13, 40408:14 run-of-the-mill [1] - 40188:6 Runciman [3] - 40312:7, 40312:10, 40312:11 running [2] - 40188:25, 40400:6 rushing [1] - 40382:9 Ruth [1] - 40246:2</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Saskatoon [12] - 40157:17, 40159:7, 40373:6, 40375:6, 40375:12, 40375:19, 40376:14, 40378:8, 40390:18, 40390:22, 40424:21, 40433:2 satisfactorily [2] - 40192:23, 40209:5 satisfactorily-explained [1] - 40192:23 satisfied [7] - 40193:18, 40201:7, 40201:22, 40231:22, 40234:9, 40235:3, 40392:16 saw [2] - 40312:11, 40411:10 scale [1] - 40208:23 scarcity [1] - 40346:8 scenario [1] - 40315:3 scene [3] - 40188:13, 40206:7, 40444:8 scheduled [1] - 40301:15 schedules [1] - 40299:13 scheme [1] - 40235:9 Schiff [2] - 40290:23, 40291:6 school [1] - 40190:18 Science [2] - 40208:1, 40302:16 science [2] - 40184:23, 40304:10 Sciences [2] - 40302:18, 40302:22 scientific [10] - 40194:13, 40214:22, 40223:3, 40243:3, 40257:25, 40397:6, 40410:1, 40410:10, 40441:2, 40441:3 scientifically [1] - 40411:13 scope [2] - 40355:23, 40366:2 Scotland [4] - 40164:15, 40164:19, 40164:25, 40165:7 Scottish [1] - 40164:18 scratch [1] - 40333:4 screen [3] - 40340:17, 40353:10, 40373:15 screening [5] - 40340:17, 40340:18, 40373:11, 40374:12, 40374:23 screens [1] - 40340:13 seal [1] - 40327:22 search [2] - 40186:8,</p>	<p>40282:10 second [14] - 40231:10, 40289:4, 40315:3, 40353:22, 40353:24, 40359:11, 40360:15, 40386:16, 40386:21, 40396:10, 40397:2, 40397:12, 40398:13, 40406:15 secondly [4] - 40168:13, 40186:5, 40198:10, 40203:9 secret [1] - 40181:14 Secretary [27] - 40178:11, 40178:15, 40178:22, 40178:24, 40179:9, 40179:17, 40233:5, 40233:12, 40233:25, 40234:5, 40234:8, 40235:2, 40238:8, 40312:8, 40312:15, 40315:9, 40315:13, 40316:8, 40316:12, 40316:15, 40316:23, 40316:25, 40317:1, 40317:9, 40344:3, 40422:17, 40432:6 Secretary's [2] - 40312:24, 40317:15 secretor [1] - 40389:24 section [12] - 40162:15, 40174:15, 40174:18, 40183:3, 40184:6, 40185:7, 40233:19, 40233:23, 40234:6, 40284:5, 40342:10, 40361:19 Section [28] - 40174:8, 40174:10, 40178:8, 40178:21, 40180:23, 40181:5, 40181:11, 40182:21, 40183:18, 40185:23, 40186:22, 40196:16, 40232:20, 40232:21, 40235:17, 40353:11, 40353:14, 40353:20, 40354:24, 40355:6, 40356:10, 40356:14, 40357:1, 40357:12, 40359:3, 40369:21, 40428:9, 40429:1 sector [1] - 40306:12 Security [1] - 40158:11 security [5] - 40236:4, 40250:14, 40250:18, 40251:3, 40252:8 see [45] - 40164:11, 40164:20, 40173:14,</p>	<p>40199:4, 40207:12, 40207:15, 40211:14, 40213:15, 40220:15, 40224:14, 40244:24, 40250:9, 40265:3, 40278:20, 40282:15, 40291:14, 40292:20, 40300:4, 40301:19, 40304:12, 40318:21, 40330:8, 40332:11, 40338:3, 40341:7, 40343:9, 40357:23, 40360:4, 40365:8, 40366:6, 40373:13, 40373:22, 40373:25, 40376:16, 40387:18, 40388:7, 40388:21, 40393:11, 40394:2, 40408:17, 40412:8, 40413:1, 40426:23, 40436:7, 40438:13 seeing [3] - 40170:6, 40390:2, 40392:8 seek [6] - 40163:2, 40212:24, 40238:7, 40259:12, 40309:4, 40410:9 seekers [1] - 40167:18 seeks [1] - 40265:1 seem [8] - 40173:15, 40178:5, 40246:20, 40269:7, 40287:18, 40305:2, 40318:4, 40435:11 selected [1] - 40337:2 self [2] - 40185:2, 40224:10 self-contained [1] - 40185:2 self-monitor [1] - 40224:10 semen [2] - 40206:7, 40207:17 send [10] - 40223:3, 40271:10, 40280:14, 40329:11, 40329:16, 40329:20, 40333:17, 40333:20, 40404:21, 40407:18 sending [2] - 40398:25, 40422:5 sends [6] - 40230:22, 40334:16, 40334:20, 40337:17, 40337:18, 40349:13 senior [1] - 40318:7 sense [20] - 40222:9, 40227:13, 40229:1, 40232:1, 40237:24, 40239:18, 40245:1,</p>
--	---	-----------------	---	--	---



<p>40253:16, 40279:25, 40285:1, 40285:25, 40325:24, 40343:10, 40365:4, 40367:7, 40384:11, 40384:15, 40385:1, 40394:13, 40402:25 sensible [3] - 40311:17, 40347:23, 40435:11 sensitive [1] - 40263:18 sensitivities [1] - 40291:11 sensitivity [1] - 40263:11 sent [1] - 40349:9 sentence [15] - 40180:9, 40204:2, 40226:21, 40247:15, 40298:10, 40299:19, 40300:9, 40325:20, 40359:10, 40359:23, 40421:17, 40421:23, 40421:24, 40422:2 sentenced [1] - 40257:9 separate [7] - 40164:19, 40232:11, 40234:12, 40234:17, 40234:22, 40237:10, 40308:5 separately [1] - 40386:13 separating [1] - 40314:19 separation [6] - 40312:19, 40317:4, 40343:11, 40412:2, 40412:21 Serge [1] - 40159:6 serial [2] - 40414:5, 40415:12 series [2] - 40169:8, 40170:18 serious [19] - 40166:14, 40166:23, 40167:16, 40168:6, 40168:8, 40180:1, 40185:14, 40185:16, 40247:4, 40247:11, 40247:16, 40248:7, 40354:7, 40361:13, 40362:20, 40369:14, 40381:7, 40421:16 seriousness [1] - 40361:9 servants [1] - 40310:11 serve [3] - 40211:19, 40356:7, 40384:21 served [4] - 40190:8, 40421:17, 40421:22, 40422:2 Service [10] - 40159:7,</p>	<p>40208:2, 40243:18, 40300:3, 40300:6, 40300:20, 40302:16, 40375:13, 40378:8, 40424:21 service [7] - 40310:8, 40315:15, 40315:16, 40375:3, 40375:18, 40432:1, 40432:9 Services [2] - 40302:18, 40302:22 services [3] - 40181:5, 40236:4, 40376:24 serving [1] - 40184:9 set [16] - 40229:16, 40230:17, 40234:24, 40238:20, 40239:3, 40244:8, 40247:8, 40287:25, 40332:24, 40340:6, 40341:24, 40341:25, 40342:9, 40355:4, 40371:20, 40431:14 sets [4] - 40342:14, 40353:16, 40361:21, 40416:24 setting [1] - 40332:15 settle [1] - 40411:12 settled [1] - 40300:21 settling [1] - 40191:1 Seven [1] - 40228:12 seven [6] - 40195:18, 40228:2, 40228:7, 40228:10, 40281:1, 40281:2 severely [1] - 40192:6 sexual [7] - 40168:5, 40168:8, 40192:2, 40202:11, 40330:2, 40330:22, 40334:11 shadow [1] - 40374:21 shall [3] - 40174:12, 40233:5, 40354:18 Shawn [1] - 40191:6 shelf [1] - 40225:17 Sheraton [1] - 40157:16 shift [1] - 40172:5 shirt [3] - 40250:11, 40250:12, 40250:15 shoes [6] - 40188:16, 40189:1, 40189:2, 40189:9, 40189:11, 40189:17 shop [4] - 40188:11, 40188:19, 40188:21, 40188:25 short [3] - 40172:5, 40192:17, 40330:16 shortage [1] - 40258:7 shorter [5] - 40297:13,</p>	<p>40301:21, 40301:22, 40340:15, 40342:10 shorthand [1] - 40447:6 Shorty [1] - 40387:13 shot [1] - 40370:10 shout [1] - 40424:16 show [7] - 40199:11, 40199:14, 40216:3, 40233:24, 40250:14, 40321:13, 40322:18 showed [3] - 40440:18, 40441:4, 40441:7 showing [2] - 40204:25, 40377:21 shown [5] - 40251:16, 40262:15, 40383:5, 40389:22, 40445:1 shows [1] - 40233:2 sic [1] - 40274:21 side [1] - 40171:23 Sidney [2] - 40414:22, 40415:4 sig [1] - 40212:9 sight [1] - 40172:14 significance [13] - 40193:7, 40196:22, 40221:22, 40271:15, 40276:21, 40285:13, 40306:17, 40392:17, 40392:22, 40393:2, 40416:8, 40421:11, 40422:7 significant [38] - 40166:3, 40166:6, 40168:2, 40169:5, 40170:14, 40170:25, 40189:11, 40189:14, 40191:9, 40196:7, 40199:17, 40202:19, 40203:14, 40216:13, 40229:11, 40229:12, 40241:13, 40242:16, 40246:6, 40256:14, 40257:24, 40267:4, 40267:6, 40270:14, 40276:3, 40282:20, 40282:25, 40306:18, 40331:22, 40335:18, 40389:9, 40395:12, 40399:14, 40400:8, 40400:12, 40400:19, 40404:6, 40426:24 significantly [1] - 40194:5 silence [1] - 40265:23 similar [7] - 40165:7, 40165:9, 40203:10, 40203:11, 40336:19, 40405:13, 40434:25 simple [1] - 40289:18</p>	<p>Simply [1] - 40239:11 simply [41] - 40174:1, 40179:21, 40201:9, 40208:1, 40210:16, 40216:23, 40225:3, 40243:2, 40243:8, 40250:25, 40257:12, 40261:20, 40262:5, 40262:22, 40263:20, 40264:14, 40270:25, 40271:15, 40284:22, 40292:5, 40320:1, 40331:4, 40332:8, 40348:17, 40349:19, 40360:2, 40362:21, 40364:15, 40372:12, 40381:12, 40381:18, 40383:12, 40385:8, 40390:7, 40404:19, 40416:5, 40421:22, 40424:22, 40434:1, 40436:23, 40442:25 single [3] - 40283:24, 40404:2, 40404:23 sit [5] - 40177:8, 40201:5, 40282:3, 40324:8, 40446:10 site [7] - 40215:3, 40218:9, 40225:5, 40324:24, 40327:12, 40328:6, 40335:5 sitting [8] - 40157:15, 40191:4, 40225:17, 40288:8, 40308:14, 40404:1, 40418:2, 40439:8 situation [31] - 40167:11, 40183:17, 40190:3, 40201:14, 40231:3, 40246:18, 40269:22, 40270:10, 40278:15, 40281:5, 40284:7, 40285:2, 40285:6, 40301:14, 40302:8, 40302:12, 40321:19, 40354:12, 40358:13, 40358:20, 40363:9, 40363:21, 40364:2, 40364:13, 40374:2, 40376:11, 40388:25, 40393:22, 40409:10, 40432:2, 40432:23 situations [3] - 40205:4, 40225:11, 40285:8 six [5] - 40223:12, 40223:19, 40281:13, 40348:8 skeptical [1] - 40407:12</p>	<p>skewed [1] - 40319:6 skill [1] - 40447:7 slightly [3] - 40198:16, 40252:6, 40402:16 slip [1] - 40263:6 slow [1] - 40334:23 small [4] - 40248:21, 40248:23, 40288:3, 40331:21 smell [2] - 40170:2, 40170:7 snow [1] - 40207:18 snowbank [1] - 40441:6 social [2] - 40181:5, 40323:21 soil [2] - 40188:18 sole [1] - 40188:17 solicit [1] - 40322:24 solicitation [1] - 40369:3 soliciting [2] - 40328:16, 40328:21 solicitor/client [1] - 40183:12 solicitors [1] - 40326:10 solid [1] - 40382:11 someone [28] - 40176:18, 40187:5, 40187:9, 40187:23, 40187:25, 40188:21, 40191:15, 40193:13, 40199:1, 40199:2, 40205:16, 40206:10, 40206:23, 40207:3, 40231:2, 40234:21, 40247:21, 40249:7, 40253:24, 40254:12, 40289:10, 40316:6, 40316:22, 40356:9, 40421:6, 40428:22 sometime [1] - 40386:16 sometimes [5] - 40264:4, 40303:10, 40405:5, 40425:9, 40435:18 somewhat [5] - 40163:20, 40250:19, 40286:23, 40357:22, 40365:14 somewhere [7] - 40192:15, 40254:12, 40302:3, 40303:1, 40324:10, 40348:1, 40420:7 son [5] - 40368:21, 40371:13, 40371:24, 40372:8, 40372:18 soon [1] - 40304:4</p>
--	---	--	--	--



<p>sorry [17] - 40206:17, 40256:13, 40268:15, 40292:24, 40303:22, 40316:23, 40320:12, 40358:17, 40363:20, 40388:17, 40395:20, 40397:2, 40397:3, 40412:24, 40418:12, 40420:21, 40429:24</p> <p>Sorry [3] - 40162:23, 40247:19, 40328:19</p> <p>sort [58] - 40174:24, 40175:1, 40176:16, 40192:1, 40192:2, 40193:1, 40202:7, 40209:17, 40211:11, 40229:4, 40234:7, 40234:14, 40238:22, 40243:19, 40247:10, 40249:23, 40249:25, 40252:5, 40254:6, 40254:7, 40267:25, 40270:10, 40271:7, 40271:23, 40273:1, 40273:18, 40292:11, 40307:7, 40309:11, 40309:17, 40310:12, 40320:25, 40332:4, 40332:6, 40337:8, 40340:16, 40343:6, 40365:2, 40367:11, 40372:21, 40376:7, 40379:2, 40379:7, 40380:7, 40381:22, 40382:7, 40392:14, 40396:3, 40404:9, 40405:2, 40408:2, 40412:18, 40420:14, 40429:5, 40436:14, 40437:7, 40438:2</p> <p>sorted [1] - 40236:10</p> <p>sorting [1] - 40266:7</p> <p>sorts [9] - 40186:19, 40205:16, 40271:4, 40273:4, 40273:9, 40319:25, 40337:13, 40365:20, 40404:13</p> <p>sought [2] - 40309:20, 40381:22</p> <p>souls [1] - 40231:3</p> <p>sound [1] - 40189:5</p> <p>sounded [1] - 40258:18</p> <p>source [7] - 40181:21, 40182:9, 40250:3, 40334:18, 40430:8, 40430:11, 40434:7</p> <p>sources [1] - 40333:24</p> <p>south [1] - 40190:18</p> <p>space [3] - 40215:21, 40303:17, 40303:21</p>	<p>spark [1] - 40390:11</p> <p>sparked [1] - 40389:11</p> <p>spate [1] - 40247:9</p> <p>spattering [1] - 40194:14</p> <p>speaking [4] - 40164:12, 40214:7, 40253:22, 40407:10</p> <p>special [2] - 40348:10, 40446:3</p> <p>specific [8] - 40178:21, 40302:23, 40303:8, 40309:2, 40310:13, 40367:8, 40372:7, 40431:7</p> <p>specifically [8] - 40207:2, 40292:9, 40366:7, 40372:4, 40377:14, 40428:8, 40442:11, 40442:12</p> <p>specified [1] - 40174:13</p> <p>spectrum [3] - 40287:21, 40321:22, 40322:7</p> <p>speculating [1] - 40228:14</p> <p>spend [2] - 40220:7, 40334:17</p> <p>spending [2] - 40246:12, 40445:10</p> <p>spent [3] - 40217:21, 40248:5, 40319:16</p> <p>spite [1] - 40177:1</p> <p>splatter [1] - 40197:6</p> <p>split [1] - 40213:20</p> <p>spot [2] - 40226:11, 40278:21</p> <p>spots [1] - 40220:15</p> <p>spotted [1] - 40351:24</p> <p>spring [1] - 40235:6</p> <p>squad [5] - 40247:4, 40247:8, 40247:17, 40248:7, 40248:11</p> <p>staff [9] - 40209:22, 40281:25, 40311:6, 40325:4, 40337:1, 40340:9, 40341:6, 40350:5, 40350:20</p> <p>Staff [2] - 40158:1, 40158:7</p> <p>stage [18] - 40208:21, 40212:15, 40218:3, 40220:12, 40240:7, 40258:5, 40292:15, 40294:8, 40332:25, 40340:12, 40341:22, 40348:20, 40356:9, 40359:2, 40372:21, 40379:17, 40387:19,</p>	<p>40412:20</p> <p>stages [4] - 40221:20, 40346:25, 40386:11, 40387:4</p> <p>stains [1] - 40441:6</p> <p>stakeholder [1] - 40326:17</p> <p>stakeholders [3] - 40305:25, 40323:7, 40326:13</p> <p>stamp [1] - 40403:5</p> <p>stand [1] - 40316:19</p> <p>standard [4] - 40286:22, 40340:23, 40346:7, 40391:19</p> <p>standards [4] - 40239:4, 40268:23, 40268:24, 40269:5</p> <p>Standing [2] - 40369:7, 40369:8</p> <p>standing [2] - 40296:25, 40407:21</p> <p>stands [2] - 40234:15, 40369:19</p> <p>stark [3] - 40198:13, 40198:19, 40321:20</p> <p>start [10] - 40181:2, 40206:3, 40211:16, 40211:17, 40268:16, 40292:19, 40297:14, 40333:4, 40376:5, 40379:4</p> <p>started [9] - 40222:4, 40223:9, 40223:13, 40223:20, 40223:24, 40319:15, 40368:11, 40417:22, 40422:5</p> <p>starters [1] - 40385:8</p> <p>starting [3] - 40183:5, 40211:10, 40373:19</p> <p>starts [2] - 40346:20, 40375:1</p> <p>State [2] - 40233:5, 40233:12</p> <p>state [5] - 40177:12, 40230:8, 40230:9, 40376:2, 40385:5</p> <p>statement [36] - 40274:1, 40274:9, 40274:21, 40275:25, 40277:1, 40278:2, 40278:11, 40279:8, 40294:16, 40341:12, 40341:21, 40374:6, 40374:19, 40378:25, 40380:3, 40380:6, 40380:25, 40381:2, 40381:5, 40386:17, 40388:16, 40391:23, 40397:23, 40397:25,</p>	<p>40398:3, 40398:6, 40398:8, 40398:12, 40399:15, 40401:2, 40401:5, 40401:13, 40406:17, 40434:10, 40440:17, 40444:5</p> <p>statements [13] - 40377:7, 40378:13, 40378:21, 40384:2, 40384:4, 40385:11, 40385:18, 40386:10, 40386:21, 40387:18, 40393:13, 40393:25, 40439:25</p> <p>States [2] - 40177:19, 40405:13</p> <p>station [2] - 40250:25, 40251:1</p> <p>Statistics [1] - 40225:4</p> <p>stats [1] - 40297:18</p> <p>status [4] - 40231:12, 40259:7, 40306:9, 40321:9</p> <p>statute [8] - 40233:13, 40267:23, 40267:24, 40268:4, 40287:4, 40366:8, 40366:25, 40416:24</p> <p>statutory [13] - 40235:9, 40236:20, 40264:22, 40265:25, 40267:17, 40268:2, 40268:18, 40269:18, 40270:12, 40280:21, 40348:15, 40366:13, 40366:18</p> <p>stayed [1] - 40318:20</p> <p>Steele [4] - 40171:14, 40171:21, 40172:22, 40350:14</p> <p>Steele's [2] - 40173:2, 40173:10</p> <p>step [6] - 40203:23, 40207:12, 40218:12, 40380:12, 40439:12, 40439:15</p> <p>steps [11] - 40182:15, 40222:13, 40260:2, 40296:5, 40326:12, 40328:15, 40339:5, 40342:4, 40342:6, 40372:15, 40401:9</p> <p>sterling [1] - 40281:19</p> <p>stevelly [1] - 40159:4</p> <p>sticking/stuffing [1] - 40194:3</p> <p>still [16] - 40191:20, 40191:21, 40205:23, 40219:12, 40226:4, 40230:17, 40256:25, 40282:24, 40303:11,</p>	<p>40307:25, 40316:6, 40336:7, 40403:10, 40418:3, 40425:19, 40444:1</p> <p>stock [1] - 40223:23</p> <p>stole [1] - 40342:9</p> <p>stone [1] - 40340:6</p> <p>stop [3] - 40328:16, 40328:21, 40334:23</p> <p>stopped [1] - 40235:13</p> <p>Storage [1] - 40303:20</p> <p>storage [1] - 40303:17</p> <p>store [1] - 40304:17</p> <p>stories [1] - 40190:16</p> <p>story [5] - 40292:5, 40292:21, 40388:6, 40388:8, 40408:15</p> <p>straightforward [1] - 40334:9</p> <p>strand [1] - 40194:11</p> <p>stranded [1] - 40266:21</p> <p>strands [1] - 40193:25</p> <p>strange [4] - 40191:14, 40192:23, 40193:13, 40196:25</p> <p>strategic [5] - 40310:19, 40311:7, 40404:15, 40405:2, 40406:10</p> <p>strategies [1] - 40311:16</p> <p>strategy [1] - 40211:12</p> <p>streamlined [1] - 40163:25</p> <p>street [1] - 40414:7</p> <p>strength [2] - 40392:23, 40396:5</p> <p>strict [1] - 40299:22</p> <p>strike [1] - 40364:23</p> <p>strikes [1] - 40263:24</p> <p>strive [2] - 40259:6, 40321:8</p> <p>strong [2] - 40237:6, 40243:25</p> <p>strongly [2] - 40312:13, 40322:10</p> <p>structure [5] - 40300:15, 40336:19, 40341:20, 40367:17, 40376:8</p> <p>structured [3] - 40282:12, 40305:20, 40321:12</p> <p>structuring [2] - 40217:14, 40307:8</p> <p>stuck [3] - 40162:7, 40258:19, 40396:15</p> <p>student [1] - 40188:10</p> <p>stuff [2] - 40223:4, 40404:21</p>
---	---	---	--	--



stuffed ^[1] - 40193:4 stuffing ^[1] - 40193:14 stunningly ^[1] - 40166:2 subconsciously ^[1] - 40278:8 subject ^[4] - 40171:13, 40266:4, 40358:4, 40423:3 subjected ^[1] - 40177:13 subjective ^[1] - 40214:6 submission ^[1] - 40385:10 submissions ^[3] - 40344:25, 40345:16, 40418:4 submit ^[1] - 40404:6 submitted ^[1] - 40411:15 submitting ^[1] - 40330:16 subsequent ^[4] - 40198:16, 40256:16, 40304:21 subsequently ^[6] - 40216:13, 40232:24, 40294:9, 40296:9, 40396:10, 40418:10 subsidiary ^[1] - 40343:17 substance ^[3] - 40251:13, 40391:16, 40435:15 substantial ^[4] - 40201:2, 40218:25, 40243:16, 40281:24 substantially ^[1] - 40290:11 Substantially ^[1] - 40244:1 substitute ^[2] - 40416:22, 40417:10 substituting ^[2] - 40416:16, 40417:4 succeed ^[1] - 40279:13 success ^[1] - 40284:16 successfully ^[1] - 40319:23 sudden ^[1] - 40189:24 sufficient ^[5] - 40189:20, 40199:9, 40199:16, 40354:8, 40391:16 sufficiently ^[3] - 40199:17, 40230:25, 40231:18 suffocated ^[1] - 40248:3 suggest ^[21] - 40190:7,	40199:16, 40201:19, 40209:2, 40214:15, 40262:10, 40277:14, 40299:6, 40313:5, 40313:24, 40314:16, 40314:25, 40322:10, 40322:17, 40330:23, 40336:13, 40337:17, 40337:24, 40412:14, 40441:22, 40443:18 suggested ^[8] - 40200:18, 40236:24, 40251:4, 40330:2, 40388:20, 40398:22, 40400:25, 40433:5 suggesting ^[2] - 40235:15, 40358:19 suggestion ^[15] - 40175:16, 40180:6, 40181:14, 40192:1, 40198:24, 40199:6, 40202:25, 40251:15, 40293:21, 40314:9, 40388:4, 40388:5, 40392:24, 40400:14, 40409:3 suggestions ^[1] - 40309:10 suggests ^[3] - 40213:21, 40302:18, 40334:10 suitable ^[1] - 40209:19 sum ^[2] - 40164:21, 40423:4 summarized ^[1] - 40279:18 summary ^[7] - 40226:16, 40289:24, 40341:25, 40372:6, 40383:3, 40383:14, 40386:15 summer ^[1] - 40433:1 summing ^[5] - 40332:2, 40333:18, 40334:13, 40334:16, 40373:18 Supergrass ^[1] - 40247:20 supergrass ^[4] - 40247:12, 40247:17, 40247:19, 40247:21 supergrasses ^[1] - 40247:11 superimposition ^[1] - 40273:18 supervised ^[2] - 40209:22, 40347:7 supervision ^[2] - 40209:12, 40347:13 supplement ^[1] - 40294:19	supplementary ^[1] - 40180:15 supplemented ^[2] - 40336:7, 40343:3 support ^[6] - 40172:3, 40199:6, 40216:3, 40235:15, 40331:8, 40441:21 Support ^[1] - 40158:7 supported ^[4] - 40214:12, 40235:17, 40399:17, 40400:3 suppose ^[9] - 40176:21, 40177:3, 40178:3, 40185:13, 40211:10, 40309:4, 40365:22, 40434:9, 40436:11 supposed ^[4] - 40208:17, 40255:6, 40255:12, 40361:22 supposedly ^[3] - 40393:12, 40443:25, 40444:9 Supreme ^[5] - 40200:25, 40202:23, 40229:15, 40370:7 surely ^[4] - 40264:21, 40284:21, 40333:3, 40386:4 surname ^[1] - 40389:18 surprise ^[1] - 40217:9 surprised ^[1] - 40418:20 surround ^[2] - 40304:15, 40378:24 surviving ^[6] - 40420:25, 40421:4, 40421:18, 40422:12, 40423:1, 40423:7 survivors ^[1] - 40422:19 susceptibility ^[1] - 40273:14 susceptible ^[2] - 40314:7, 40314:11 suspect ^[32] - 40177:6, 40193:21, 40201:3, 40201:15, 40205:10, 40241:1, 40254:5, 40295:10, 40352:25, 40354:3, 40354:13, 40354:21, 40357:13, 40358:14, 40358:21, 40359:1, 40360:20, 40361:13, 40362:19, 40363:2, 40363:15, 40364:3, 40364:14, 40385:15, 40390:4, 40391:1, 40392:25, 40393:3, 40414:3,	40427:6, 40427:13, 40436:6 suspects ^[11] - 40241:6, 40241:19, 40242:20, 40247:25, 40248:1, 40257:23, 40292:11, 40362:25, 40391:8, 40391:17, 40391:21 suspicion ^[1] - 40208:11 suspicious ^[3] - 40208:18, 40406:22, 40413:18 sustainable ^[3] - 40442:21, 40445:2 swap ^[1] - 40189:1 switching ^[1] - 40416:13 symptomatic ^[1] - 40242:15 system ^[68] - 40177:19, 40235:7, 40235:11, 40238:2, 40238:18, 40242:17, 40243:12, 40245:7, 40245:25, 40246:8, 40246:21, 40249:5, 40254:12, 40255:6, 40255:12, 40258:17, 40258:25, 40259:14, 40259:15, 40259:23, 40260:11, 40260:14, 40260:19, 40260:25, 40261:5, 40261:8, 40262:14, 40264:3, 40264:4, 40264:10, 40264:21, 40286:8, 40289:16, 40300:19, 40302:2, 40302:25, 40303:24, 40315:25, 40321:16, 40321:22, 40322:2, 40322:6, 40322:11, 40324:2, 40327:1, 40360:1, 40364:21, 40365:10, 40366:5, 40366:10, 40367:19, 40369:24, 40369:25, 40370:4, 40403:9, 40403:22, 40416:14, 40419:15, 40421:2, 40421:12, 40422:25, 40425:14, 40425:15, 40425:17, 40437:8, 40437:10, 40437:21, 40437:24 system's ^[1] - 40235:12 systemic ^[16] - 40241:9, 40242:8, 40242:16, 40242:23, 40243:11,	40243:19, 40243:23, 40244:13, 40245:8, 40248:7, 40253:16, 40254:1, 40254:6, 40259:19, 40260:6, 40425:2 T Tshirt ^[3] - 40250:11, 40250:12, 40250:15 tackle ^[1] - 40369:14 tactic ^[1] - 40415:14 talks ^[5] - 40178:9, 40180:14, 40183:18, 40184:3, 40220:6 tangible ^[3] - 40420:24, 40421:1, 40422:24 tape ^[2] - 40250:21, 40251:2 task ^[1] - 40176:21 taxpayer ^[2] - 40330:24, 40331:4 Tdr ^[2] - 40159:5, 40438:16 technicalities ^[1] - 40285:15 Technician ^[1] - 40158:12 techniques ^[2] - 40205:25, 40272:22 teens ^[1] - 40194:17 telephone ^[2] - 40413:9, 40414:22 television ^[4] - 40168:23, 40168:25, 40170:5, 40173:19 temporary ^[1] - 40370:8 ten ^[3] - 40190:17, 40414:1, 40414:19 tend ^[8] - 40240:9, 40268:1, 40288:20, 40298:25, 40299:5, 40319:5, 40337:3, 40355:17 tended ^[3] - 40190:7, 40194:24, 40199:5 tending ^[1] - 40199:11 tends ^[4] - 40318:25, 40322:10, 40322:18, 40394:3 tension ^[3] - 40359:19, 40359:22, 40360:6 tenth ^[1] - 40365:21 term ^[8] - 40227:13, 40244:4, 40248:19, 40257:10, 40280:18, 40280:23, 40281:6, 40286:25
---	---	---	---	--



terms [70] - 40168:7, 40198:13, 40198:19, 40209:20, 40211:20, 40216:12, 40233:20, 40239:14, 40248:7, 40248:25, 40249:10, 40267:4, 40289:9, 40297:18, 40297:19, 40298:2, 40298:13, 40298:22, 40299:14, 40301:13, 40302:25, 40305:11, 40305:19, 40305:23, 40306:5, 40307:6, 40307:7, 40307:19, 40310:16, 40311:18, 40312:1, 40315:2, 40315:7, 40316:8, 40317:15, 40321:11, 40321:15, 40322:23, 40323:12, 40328:5, 40328:20, 40333:10, 40336:11, 40336:18, 40337:16, 40337:18, 40338:24, 40340:22, 40342:20, 40344:16, 40347:14, 40349:11, 40351:21, 40352:1, 40355:22, 40359:15, 40359:22, 40367:13, 40367:15, 40367:16, 40381:15, 40388:22, 40389:2, 40393:3, 40394:8, 40396:6, 40400:7, 40404:10, 40405:4, 40407:22 terrorism [3] - 40317:11, 40317:14, 40317:17 terrorist [4] - 40235:22, 40242:3, 40251:14, 40251:19 test [13] - 40199:9, 40201:6, 40201:22, 40203:18, 40204:20, 40205:5, 40213:16, 40213:23, 40237:22, 40245:21, 40273:11, 40273:23, 40442:22 tested [1] - 40189:9 testified [7] - 40365:11, 40368:8, 40369:7, 40380:24, 40381:1, 40385:13, 40398:5 Testimony [1] - 40157:14 testimony [1] - 40445:21 tests [1] - 40381:11 thanking [1] - 40445:19	theirs [1] - 40215:16 theme [2] - 40169:25, 40228:16 themes [1] - 40244:16 themselves [7] - 40175:12, 40215:16, 40215:19, 40273:15, 40289:6, 40396:2, 40430:5 theories [4] - 40378:1, 40383:15, 40390:17, 40393:16 theory [5] - 40185:15, 40393:14, 40428:18, 40428:20, 40428:24 thereabouts [1] - 40190:24 thereafter [2] - 40396:16, 40409:18 therefore [12] - 40221:23, 40237:2, 40254:5, 40272:15, 40303:10, 40316:19, 40321:25, 40324:17, 40389:8, 40394:4, 40426:12, 40426:16 they've [6] - 40219:16, 40262:7, 40325:17, 40329:11, 40333:5, 40421:22 thinking [10] - 40172:7, 40181:2, 40319:6, 40344:4, 40372:21, 40381:15, 40382:3, 40422:9, 40429:16, 40441:5 thinks [6] - 40216:13, 40249:11, 40279:12, 40365:5, 40412:5, 40412:10 third [13] - 40162:11, 40162:20, 40163:9, 40165:14, 40186:12, 40194:15, 40200:6, 40213:20, 40225:24, 40317:8, 40428:22, 40430:11, 40431:1 third/one [1] - 40213:20 thirds [4] - 40163:24, 40164:7, 40164:8, 40164:9 thorough [5] - 40251:11, 40260:17, 40261:25, 40262:10, 40297:11 thoroughly [2] - 40260:16, 40262:8 thoroughness [1] - 40252:2 thousand [1] - 40282:7	threatened [3] - 40188:25, 40259:24, 40260:20 threatening [1] - 40321:24 three [9] - 40185:25, 40193:25, 40223:16, 40281:1, 40282:14, 40353:23, 40357:24, 40358:11, 40386:12 threshold [5] - 40213:17, 40287:25, 40419:25, 40420:1, 40423:11 threw [1] - 40318:8 throughout [5] - 40161:25, 40247:25, 40326:4, 40328:22, 40437:20 ticking [1] - 40223:8 tiered [1] - 40336:18 tiers [1] - 40345:6 tightly [1] - 40233:23 timeliness [2] - 40345:20, 40345:22 timely [1] - 40347:15 title [1] - 40320:21 today [1] - 40446:11 today's [3] - 40268:23, 40269:4, 40289:15 Toews [1] - 40159:12 together [7] - 40266:22, 40279:20, 40342:12, 40344:7, 40377:25, 40388:7, 40396:4 tongue [1] - 40263:6 too-legalistic [1] - 40351:16 took [10] - 40168:22, 40179:17, 40255:19, 40301:18, 40317:24, 40335:21, 40413:11, 40414:19, 40422:19, 40430:23 top [4] - 40215:9, 40240:16, 40353:24, 40361:18 topics [2] - 40161:9, 40337:1 total [3] - 40185:20, 40248:22, 40298:23 totally [4] - 40428:3, 40434:19, 40442:10, 40444:14 touch [3] - 40174:3, 40265:11, 40340:9 touched [7] - 40183:10, 40222:19, 40265:14, 40284:19, 40289:23, 40292:24, 40294:17
--	---	--

<p>40276:23, 40278:13, 40319:4, 40322:23, 40334:18, 40347:25, 40369:14, 40381:7, 40403:12, 40404:22, 40411:7 Tuesday^[1] - 40157:21 tunnel^[1] - 40241:1 turn^[4] - 40192:6, 40259:25, 40262:12, 40326:15 turned^[2] - 40242:14, 40390:16 turning^[2] - 40172:3, 40192:5 turns^[1] - 40374:20 two^[39] - 40163:24, 40164:7, 40164:8, 40164:9, 40168:23, 40188:4, 40192:9, 40192:19, 40194:16, 40196:2, 40197:4, 40198:23, 40204:16, 40210:9, 40213:20, 40234:16, 40239:8, 40247:16, 40253:20, 40266:21, 40275:12, 40282:14, 40288:20, 40294:3, 40306:18, 40307:6, 40320:25, 40347:23, 40372:9, 40372:19, 40377:21, 40389:4, 40422:12, 40422:19, 40424:9, 40424:22, 40431:22, 40432:24 two-stranded^[1] - 40266:21 two-third/one-third^[1] - 40213:20 two-thirds^[4] - 40163:24, 40164:7, 40164:8, 40164:9 tying^[1] - 40237:9 type^[12] - 40188:6, 40191:24, 40198:7, 40198:9, 40205:3, 40270:8, 40300:11, 40307:18, 40315:2, 40319:10, 40358:13, 40378:5 types^[6] - 40165:22, 40185:21, 40260:14, 40289:5, 40290:1, 40302:14 typical^[2] - 40330:22, 40331:15</p>	<p>U</p> <p>Uk^[2] - 40302:2, 40405:14 ulterior^[1] - 40313:21 ultimately^[6] - 40237:8, 40273:21, 40311:2, 40376:22, 40410:13, 40438:5 umbrella^[1] - 40367:11 Umm^[12] - 40187:11, 40229:25, 40233:15, 40294:1, 40295:14, 40299:21, 40302:16, 40352:16, 40357:23, 40366:12, 40407:19, 40413:21 unable^[2] - 40195:1, 40263:11 unaware^[1] - 40430:9 uncertainty^[1] - 40230:18 unclear^[1] - 40250:19 uncommon^[2] - 40323:16, 40442:4 uncontrolled^[1] - 40408:25 uncovered^[3] - 40279:16, 40295:5, 40295:9 uncovering^[2] - 40169:5, 40173:17 under^[28] - 40167:25, 40174:10, 40178:21, 40179:9, 40185:23, 40186:8, 40186:21, 40196:15, 40207:7, 40209:11, 40236:20, 40272:11, 40274:23, 40286:20, 40313:17, 40353:19, 40354:23, 40356:14, 40356:25, 40360:10, 40360:15, 40381:5, 40381:11, 40381:15, 40381:23, 40382:4, 40394:4, 40396:22 Under^[2] - 40221:2, 40238:1 underlying^[4] - 40192:1, 40270:13, 40355:8, 40415:18 undermine^[2] - 40394:3, 40403:14 underpin^[1] - 40303:23 underpins^[2] - 40276:14, 40313:16 understood^[6] - 40206:17, 40240:3,</p>	<p>40271:16, 40305:12, 40357:8, 40436:14 undertake^[1] - 40244:25 undertaken^[2] - 40307:1, 40335:24 undertook^[1] - 40379:7 underway^[1] - 40209:14 undiscovered^[1] - 40415:23 Undoubtedly^[2] - 40350:3, 40426:5 undoubtedly^[3] - 40388:9, 40394:19, 40426:6 unease^[1] - 40385:1 unexplained^[1] - 40196:25 unfairly^[1] - 40196:10 unfounded^[2] - 40262:12, 40442:10 uniform^[1] - 40302:13 United^[18] - 40164:14, 40167:20, 40167:25, 40177:18, 40190:17, 40236:1, 40236:7, 40257:5, 40258:16, 40322:8, 40322:11, 40322:19, 40367:14, 40405:12, 40433:17, 40435:1, 40435:2, 40445:24 universal^[1] - 40327:2 university^[1] - 40188:10 unless^[4] - 40266:16, 40267:24, 40283:20, 40295:17 Unless^[1] - 40403:7 unlike^[1] - 40396:1 unlikely^[4] - 40189:23, 40214:18, 40229:22, 40395:5 unpleasant^[1] - 40191:2 unrealistic^[1] - 40186:3 unreasonable^[1] - 40427:23 unreliability^[2] - 40271:1, 40394:13 unreliable^[2] - 40270:6, 40278:7 unrepresented^[1] - 40371:14 unsafe^[8] - 40200:8, 40204:25, 40213:2, 40263:10, 40355:12, 40420:13, 40420:16,</p>	<p>40423:13 unsuccessful^[2] - 40294:12, 40419:6 unthinkable^[3] - 40248:11, 40318:13, 40318:19 untrue^[2] - 40372:12, 40401:5 unused^[2] - 40241:22, 40393:21 unusual^[2] - 40231:4, 40391:9 up^[69] - 40161:9, 40162:1, 40193:4, 40204:10, 40204:11, 40205:8, 40223:14, 40223:17, 40223:20, 40225:4, 40225:12, 40227:5, 40227:24, 40232:14, 40240:10, 40245:14, 40247:8, 40252:10, 40252:21, 40255:1, 40258:17, 40259:5, 40260:15, 40262:8, 40265:12, 40279:4, 40288:8, 40295:10, 40295:11, 40297:15, 40297:16, 40303:20, 40316:10, 40319:17, 40321:4, 40321:14, 40322:20, 40329:7, 40329:8, 40330:11, 40332:2, 40332:15, 40333:18, 40334:3, 40334:13, 40334:16, 40336:3, 40340:18, 40357:14, 40359:1, 40363:19, 40369:12, 40373:18, 40374:20, 40379:5, 40379:7, 40379:12, 40380:5, 40387:2, 40390:16, 40391:25, 40392:1, 40392:2, 40396:19, 40416:24, 40424:9, 40424:25, 40432:3, 40445:18 upheld^[2] - 40226:7, 40237:4 upright^[1] - 40437:4 urine^[1] - 40441:7 useful^[2] - 40177:4, 40384:21 usefully^[2] - 40365:6, 40366:4 uses^[1] - 40310:25 usual^[1] - 40250:8 utterly^[2] - 40204:24, 40370:16</p>	<p>V</p> <p>Vl^[3] - 40389:17, 40389:22 vacancies^[1] - 40282:12 valid^[6] - 40218:13, 40262:10, 40314:13, 40317:22, 40348:4, 40426:6 valley^[1] - 40171:23 valuable^[3] - 40262:12, 40264:17, 40415:14 value^[3] - 40261:6, 40402:23, 40409:15 variety^[1] - 40262:23 various^[9] - 40243:16, 40324:21, 40345:6, 40346:25, 40377:12, 40390:22, 40427:8, 40427:11, 40443:17 vault^[1] - 40439:8 venture^[1] - 40434:24 verdict^[16] - 40202:5, 40203:19, 40203:21, 40204:1, 40204:8, 40204:14, 40204:17, 40211:1, 40213:2, 40227:1, 40272:15, 40279:17, 40289:2, 40416:17, 40417:11, 40417:13 verdicts^[1] - 40264:6 version^[1] - 40357:23 versions^[1] - 40357:25 versus^[1] - 40313:2 vexatious^[1] - 40331:10 viable^[1] - 40360:19 Vic^[1] - 40159:11 victim^[3] - 40191:16, 40236:24, 40377:23 victims^[1] - 40389:19 video^[3] - 40195:20, 40250:11, 40252:8 view^[53] - 40177:8, 40179:18, 40189:18, 40205:6, 40208:15, 40219:3, 40219:4, 40219:7, 40219:17, 40219:22, 40220:2, 40224:15, 40224:18, 40224:23, 40231:11, 40235:21, 40237:6, 40237:17, 40245:14, 40246:15, 40259:22, 40260:4, 40267:3, 40270:24, 40274:18, 40275:9, 40278:15,</p>
---	---	---	---	--



40285:14, 40286:17, 40287:13, 40287:24, 40294:15, 40307:16, 40308:11, 40310:3, 40313:6, 40314:21, 40316:22, 40317:2, 40326:19, 40326:21, 40338:10, 40340:20, 40350:21, 40351:12, 40389:4, 40392:19, 40392:21, 40417:5, 40419:18, 40422:3, 40422:19, 40432:5 viewed [2] - 40381:24, 40406:21 views [3] - 40248:14, 40286:15, 40407:12 virtually [5] - 40239:21, 40239:22, 40248:2, 40248:11, 40315:16 vision [1] - 40241:1 viva [1] - 40445:16 voce [1] - 40445:16 vogue [1] - 40247:10 Volume [1] - 40157:22 volume [1] - 40337:7 voluntary [1] - 40365:9 vulnerability [5] - 40273:5, 40273:14, 40275:15, 40275:21, 40317:9 vulnerable [4] - 40273:19, 40277:12, 40380:7, 40405:24	weapon [1] - 40441:2 wearing [7] - 40188:16, 40250:11, 40250:15, 40309:20, 40356:14, 40356:17 web [7] - 40215:3, 40218:9, 40225:5, 40324:24, 40327:12, 40328:5, 40335:5 wedded [1] - 40410:2 weed [1] - 40213:6 week [1] - 40384:1 weekend [1] - 40445:11 weeks [1] - 40224:2 weigh [1] - 40213:4 weighing [1] - 40212:23 weight [3] - 40213:23, 40247:13, 40446:1 welcome [1] - 40201:21 well-meaning [3] - 40409:10, 40409:11, 40409:12 well-recognized [1] - 40310:7 West [3] - 40247:4, 40247:10, 40248:6 whatsoever [2] - 40392:17, 40408:6 wheel [1] - 40332:20 whereas [6] - 40189:22, 40260:13, 40282:12, 40290:6, 40306:22, 40331:5 Whereas [2] - 40402:16, 40404:19 whereby [1] - 40223:11 whilst [4] - 40233:19, 40268:17, 40286:16, 40335:23 white [1] - 40250:11 who'd [1] - 40179:19 whole [9] - 40215:1, 40239:22, 40286:9, 40287:20, 40289:21, 40313:18, 40437:8, 40437:9, 40444:3 wholesale [1] - 40248:10 wholly [5] - 40234:24, 40286:2, 40288:23, 40442:3, 40442:10 wide [3] - 40180:24, 40213:15, 40234:19 wider [4] - 40239:18, 40275:14, 40286:7, 40421:11 widest [1] - 40229:1 wife [2] - 40192:5, 40200:17 wild [4] - 40442:6,	40442:25, 40443:2, 40443:25 Wilde [1] - 40158:11 William [2] - 40160:3, 40161:6 Williams [1] - 40443:20 willingness [6] - 40235:11, 40322:18, 40334:22, 40408:22, 40409:17, 40438:6 Wilson [21] - 40273:4, 40278:9, 40371:1, 40372:10, 40377:17, 40384:2, 40384:5, 40385:12, 40386:9, 40387:16, 40387:20, 40388:12, 40389:5, 40394:15, 40406:16, 40406:23, 40414:22, 40415:4, 40440:20, 40443:23, 40444:5 Wilson's [4] - 40277:5, 40277:15, 40277:21, 40278:6 Wilson/nichol [1] - 40272:2 wish [9] - 40189:15, 40231:22, 40286:11, 40290:4, 40296:8, 40301:24, 40325:12, 40384:25, 40443:13 wished [1] - 40281:7 wishes [2] - 40311:5, 40368:14 wishing [1] - 40445:25 witness [33] - 40171:22, 40214:8, 40214:19, 40229:8, 40271:2, 40271:19, 40275:19, 40292:5, 40297:12, 40374:3, 40379:12, 40379:19, 40384:12, 40384:19, 40385:5, 40385:9, 40385:16, 40386:1, 40397:22, 40409:1, 40409:5, 40409:7, 40409:19, 40424:2, 40424:13, 40427:6, 40427:13, 40427:20, 40427:22, 40427:24, 40440:17, 40440:20, 40444:3 Witness [1] - 40358:17 witness' [6] - 40270:22, 40374:18, 40408:24, 40409:15, 40409:17, 40444:20 witnessed [4] - 40274:2, 40374:6, 40380:4, 40387:21	witnesses [53] - 40172:10, 40202:19, 40203:12, 40213:3, 40214:14, 40254:22, 40257:15, 40267:14, 40270:17, 40271:22, 40271:25, 40274:25, 40277:12, 40288:18, 40291:9, 40291:16, 40291:20, 40292:1, 40292:3, 40292:13, 40292:14, 40292:20, 40342:7, 40343:19, 40358:25, 40359:15, 40370:23, 40370:25, 40372:19, 40374:2, 40374:16, 40377:5, 40377:7, 40377:16, 40377:21, 40377:25, 40378:22, 40381:15, 40381:23, 40382:4, 40382:9, 40386:20, 40388:12, 40389:4, 40393:13, 40394:14, 40397:10, 40403:13, 40408:15, 40439:25, 40444:8, 40445:16, 40445:19 witnessing [1] - 40382:17 Wolch [11] - 40159:2, 40396:19, 40399:3, 40399:11, 40399:17, 40401:10, 40402:9, 40411:10, 40443:12, 40445:3, 40445:7 Wolch's [2] - 40412:14, 40414:23 woman [2] - 40171:18, 40207:13 won [1] - 40197:4 wonder [1] - 40319:20 wonderful [1] - 40176:19 wondering [4] - 40168:11, 40230:12, 40230:21, 40259:8 word [2] - 40243:25, 40335:15 words [18] - 40163:14, 40211:6, 40217:4, 40225:17, 40230:10, 40235:9, 40238:25, 40249:6, 40267:18, 40274:12, 40315:16, 40342:4, 40373:12, 40393:6, 40400:23, 40421:5, 40437:13, 40445:20 workable [1] - 40311:17	Worker [1] - 40220:11 workload [2] - 40297:20, 40298:23 works [3] - 40313:20, 40335:8, 40353:15 world [2] - 40259:17, 40339:17 World [4] - 40168:25, 40169:4, 40169:19, 40170:16 worry [1] - 40320:3 worse [1] - 40409:4 worst [1] - 40241:2 worthy [1] - 40354:22 wound [1] - 40396:19 write [3] - 40252:24, 40309:7, 40401:10 writes [1] - 40291:10 writing [1] - 40337:19 written [12] - 40310:6, 40327:14, 40335:6, 40335:11, 40337:3, 40338:4, 40338:23, 40339:2, 40342:19, 40346:24, 40398:18, 40402:7 wrongdoing [3] - 40208:10, 40253:13, 40254:21 Wrongful [1] - 40157:3 wrongful [29] - 40171:2, 40187:3, 40217:16, 40240:17, 40248:15, 40248:17, 40254:8, 40256:20, 40260:1, 40262:4, 40262:11, 40262:18, 40262:23, 40263:5, 40263:9, 40284:25, 40317:16, 40327:7, 40356:19, 40364:9, 40367:16, 40395:16, 40405:3, 40419:20, 40425:1, 40425:3, 40425:18, 40425:21, 40441:23 wrongfully [12] - 40176:18, 40198:3, 40234:18, 40234:21, 40258:9, 40262:7, 40316:10, 40322:25, 40325:11, 40326:9, 40334:10, 40423:20 Wrongly [2] - 40159:14, 40297:7 wrongly [8] - 40199:12, 40252:7, 40259:4, 40286:19, 40316:6, 40321:3, 40325:17, 40395:13 wrote [1] - 40240:11
W				
waiting [1] - 40225:18 waive [2] - 40183:4, 40183:12 waiver [1] - 40183:9 Wales [2] - 40165:4, 40326:5 walked [1] - 40433:2 walking [3] - 40171:18, 40171:23, 40188:21 wall [1] - 40202:24 Ward [2] - 40255:22, 40395:12 ward [1] - 40436:22 warrants [1] - 40186:9 waste [1] - 40190:14 watched [1] - 40172:8 watching [1] - 40172:7 Watson [1] - 40159:6 ways [2] - 40253:20, 40327:5 weakness [1] - 40403:22				



Y	Z
year ^[10] - 40167:17, 40219:13, 40235:7, 40244:7, 40248:22, 40282:21, 40298:13, 40329:24, 40365:22, 40410:24 years ^[40] - 40161:21, 40168:14, 40169:8, 40173:12, 40180:4, 40190:17, 40195:18, 40229:19, 40229:24, 40245:17, 40246:14, 40256:3, 40256:6, 40256:10, 40256:11, 40257:7, 40257:10, 40260:9, 40269:16, 40269:23, 40270:15, 40270:20, 40272:3, 40272:7, 40280:21, 40280:22, 40281:2, 40299:18, 40299:19, 40301:24, 40380:23, 40381:4, 40382:9, 40414:1, 40414:20, 40415:23, 40434:19, 40438:24 yesterday ^[28] - 40161:10, 40162:14, 40168:10, 40171:5, 40174:7, 40179:2, 40183:10, 40184:12, 40184:15, 40187:11, 40187:16, 40195:15, 40214:14, 40216:5, 40216:25, 40221:11, 40222:20, 40226:24, 40234:8, 40234:20, 40239:19, 40255:23, 40256:1, 40276:6, 40294:17, 40312:6, 40351:13, 40399:25 Yorkshire ^[1] - 40171:20 you' ^[1] - 40189:1 young ^[12] - 40171:18, 40188:9, 40190:19, 40192:3, 40194:16, 40268:12, 40269:12, 40269:22, 40270:16, 40273:5, 40273:15, 40380:6 yourself ^[2] - 40170:6, 40403:22	Zellick ^[5] - 40290:16, 40291:2, 40291:10, 40298:6 Zellick's ^[1] - 40297:22 Zimbabwe ^[3] - 40235:25, 40236:8, 40236:14

