

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 Wednesday, September 20th, 2006

Volume 186

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. Hugh Esson, Security Officer
Mr. Tony Fitzgerald, 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. Garrett Wilson, Q.C., **for** Mr. Serge Kujawa
Mr. Pat Loran, 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., **for** Minister of Justice
 (Canada), The Hon. Vic Toews
Mr. Marshall Hopkins, Esq., **for** Justice Calvin Tallis
 (Retired)
Mr. Kenneth R. McLeod, Esq., **for** Eugene Williams



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

INDEX OF PROCEEDINGS

DESCRIPTION:

PAGE:

EUGENE WILLIAMS, CONTINUED

- BY MR. HODSON

38831



Transcript of Proceedings

(Reconvened at 9:05 a.m.)

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Good morning.

ALL COUNSEL: Good morning.

EUGENE WILLIAMS, continued:

BY MR. HODSON:

09:05 10 Q Good morning, Mr. Williams. Call up 124983 and go
11 to 125022, and this is your examination of Mr.
12 Wilson and we were partway through when we broke
13 yesterday, and this part of the transcript, you
14 are showing him the June 4th statement and asking
15 him to read it and confirm its contents:

16 "...and if you do not confirm them I
17 would ask you to write in any changes
18 you wish to make to it."

19 And again, were you concerned, were you aware
20 that he had some changes to his recantation
21 statement or can you explain how that came about?

09:06 22 A I had no reason to believe that he had any
23 changes, I simply wanted him to confirm it, and
24 sometimes after you've made a statement you may
25 have additional thoughts or realize that perhaps
something wasn't stated as clearly as it might
have been, so this was an opportunity for him to I
guess finalize his thoughts about the statement



1 before I started questioning him about it.

2 Q Okay. And in response, he indicated that there's
3 one addition he would like to make -- go down to
4 the bottom -- and next page -- and we have seen
09:07 5 the statement with the notation, but you say:

6 "So, for the record, the notation is
7 then on page 4 of the third full
8 paragraph, the paragraph which starts,
9 "This was not the truth," and you have
09:07 10 written in, "He had gotten a bone
11 handled hunting knife out of the
12 elevator he broke into?"

13 And in his June 4th, 1990 statement, I think what
14 he had said is that his evidence about David
09:07 15 Milgaard having a knife was not the truth and Mr.
16 Wilson now is saying that although it wasn't a
17 maroon-handled paring knife, he was saying that
18 David Milgaard had a bone-handled hunting knife;
19 is that correct?"

09:07 20 A Yes, that's correct.

21 Q What was the significance of I guess two things;
22 number one, the fact that in his statement to Mr.
23 Henderson he said I think in essence that David
24 Milgaard did not have a knife on the trip to
09:07 25 Saskatoon, so that fact, and secondly, the



1 significance of this information, namely, that Mr.
2 Wilson was now saying David Milgaard had a
3 bone-handled hunting knife?

09:08 4 A Firstly, with respect to no knife on the trip, in
5 his earlier statement of June 4th he resiled from
6 his trial testimony, that he has now amended that.
7 The significance of the bone-handled knife is that
8 such, a knife of that description was found in the
9 alley, or one of the alleys close to where the
09:08 10 body was discovered. However, from my vantage
11 point, it wasn't that significant because the
12 murder weapon was established to have been a type
13 of paring knife with a maroon handle.

14 Q So just on the latter point then, the fact that --
09:09 15 were you aware that there had been a bone-handled
16 hunting knife found in the alley?

17 A In one of the alleys, yes.

18 Q Yeah. So did this information, did you view this
19 information as being possibly incriminating to Mr.
09:09 20 Milgaard?

21 A No.

22 Q Okay. So back to the first point, what about the
23 fact that Mr. Wilson was now changing, or appeared
24 to be changing what he had said on June 4th about
09:09 25 the knife, did you put any stock in that? What



1 significance if any did that have?

2 A Well, it simply reinforced the fact that he had
3 given some thought to what he had said earlier and
4 perhaps another thought had arisen and sometimes
09:09 5 that happens.

6 Q And would you agree that if Mr. Wilson was simply
7 trying to help David Milgaard and give whatever
8 was needed to help David Milgaard, that
9 volunteering this piece of information would not
09:10 10 necessarily be helpful in the sense of he did have
11 a knife?

12 A That argument could be made. I viewed it more or
13 less as neutral.

14 Q Go to 025, please. Here you are questioning Mr.
09:10 15 Wilson about his meeting with Mr. Henderson, and I
16 don't propose go through all of it, but I think
17 you tried to have him run through what happened
18 that day, what he looked at, what Mr. Henderson
19 gave him and the nature of the discussions; is
09:11 20 that correct?

21 A That's correct.

22 Q And why was that important?

23 A Well, at the time I wanted to know whether his
24 memory had been refreshed and, if so, by what
09:11 25 sources. When you have a six or a seven or eight



1 page statement which appears to be in narrative
2 form, it signals that -- and it's not in his
3 handwriting -- it signals that there may have been
4 a longer or larger discussion that preceded it and
09:11 5 that the statement was a summary or a synthesis of
6 what had happened. By contrast, I had seen a
7 number of police statements which took a question
8 and answer format and that would indicate, or it's
9 often used as an indication that from the
09:11 10 beginning to the end at least of that portion of
11 the interview, that that's all there was.

12 Q So here, Mr. Wilson says that the document, being
13 his statement, was given at four or five o'clock
14 in the afternoon, and then if we can go to, I
09:12 15 think there's a later point that indicates they
16 started at nine a.m.; is that correct?

17 A Yes. I seem to recall about seven or eight hours
18 of discussion culminated in the signing of the
19 statement.

09:12 20 Q And then here you ask him, you say:

21 "Q When did you start?

22 A In-depth, I don't think we started
23 in-depth until after dinner."

24 And you ask:

09:12 25 "Q What information did you obtain?"



1 And I take it that was to find out what Mr.
2 Henderson had provided to Mr. Wilson to refresh
3 his memory?

4 A Yes.

09:12 5 Q And were you concerned about that?

6 A I wouldn't call it concern. If you take a look at
7 Mr. Wilson's statement, it has specific denials of
8 four or five points. This is 15, almost 20 years
9 after the event, after he testified, and the
09:13 10 specificity of the denials prompted me to want to
11 question just whether or not -- how it came about,
12 and to the extent that he received additional
13 information which better informed his recall, I
14 was certainly interested to find out what that was
09:13 15 and, if so, that would help me make, or help my
16 boss make some kind of an assessment or weight to
17 be given to that statement.

18 Q And then here you ask him:

19 "Q What information did you obtain?

09:13 20 A I got to see I believe a statement
21 from Shorty.

22 Q Albert Cadrain?"

23 And:

24 "A I don't know which statement..."

09:14 25 Is it likely or do you recall whether that would



1 have been the June 20th, 1990 statement of Albert
2 Cadrain, the mental hell and torture statement we
3 referred to yesterday

4 A Probably not, and I say that because the statement
09:14 5 was obtained on June 4th.

6 Q No, I'm sorry, at -- oh, I'm sorry, okay, so this
7 is back --

8 A I'm interviewing him in July.

9 Q Right, okay.

09:14 10 A His first statement -- or his statement to
11 Henderson was in June and I believe Albert
12 Cadrain's statement --

13 Q June 20th, correct.

14 A -- was later, yes.

09:14 15 Q And then as well:

16 "...I believe that one was typed."

17 So that would have been likely one of his, either
18 his March 2nd or March 5th, 1969 statements; is
19 that your assumption?

09:14 20 A Possibly, yes.

21 Q And then a typewritten statement from his brother,
22 not Albert, and you indicate Kenneth, and I'm
23 wondering if that -- and he says yes. I'm
24 wondering if that might have been Dennis Cadrain's
09:15 25 statement which was obtained in late May?



1 A It's possible.

2 Q And then a discussion about the transcripts and
3 you ask him:

4 "Q From the Preliminary trial?"

09:15 5 "Q Did you read them?"

6 A Yes, I did."

7 "Q You read it all?"

8 A Yes."

9 And this is where the comment about begin at nine
09:15 10 o'clock. What was your sense as to whether or
11 not Mr. Wilson had read the entire transcript of
12 his evidence?

13 A At the time I didn't zero in on that. What I
14 surmised was that he probably reviewed the
09:15 15 transcript and possibly read certain portions in
16 greater detail, but the important fact was that he
17 had at his disposal both the preliminary inquiry
18 and the trial transcripts for him to review.

19 Q And again, did you see anything inappropriate
09:16 20 about Mr. Henderson providing Mr. Wilson with
21 those transcripts to review?

22 A No.

23 Q Go to the next page, and it talks about an
24 in-depth discussion around one o'clock, was it a
09:16 25 question and answer, started out that way:



1 "Q And how did it end up?

2 A I just kind of said, "Enough is enough
3 and I'll tell you the truth."

4 Q Did you obtain any information about the
09:16 5 investigation that Mr. Henderson was
6 conducting?

7 A Just the basic background that I even
8 heard from my sister who had seen him
9 on T.V."

09:16 10 What was the purpose of that, asking about that?

11 A Simply to identify any other additional sources of
12 information that might have informed his comments
13 on the statement.

14 Q Were you concerned that that might have influenced
09:16 15 his statement?

16 A It may have triggered some form of recall, yes, it
17 might have. I wouldn't call it concern, I just
18 needed to identify the potential sources.

19 Q We've heard some evidence that, at least in some
09:17 20 of the interviews Mr. Henderson conducted, and I
21 can't recall his evidence with respect to Ron
22 Wilson, but that he, one of the approaches he used
23 with witnesses was we know Larry Fisher committed
24 the crime, we now have -- we now know who
09:17 25 committed the murder, it was Larry Fisher, things



1 of that nature, and would you have been familiar
2 with that technique? I think he used it with
3 Dennis Cadrain on one of the interviews. Were you
4 aware of that?

09:17 5 A I was not.

6 Q Would that have caused you concern if that
7 information had been provided to Mr. Wilson as
8 part of the interview of June 4th, 1990?

9 A It certainly would have been a bit disturbing
09:17 10 because the presentation in that way might cause
11 an interviewee to doubt the accuracy of what they
12 had given before and to tailor their recollection
13 to accord with their new understanding of the
14 facts. It could have an influence.

09:18 15 Q If we can go to 028, 456, 457, you ask him whether
16 or not Mr. Henderson provided the contents of
17 medical or scientific reports or professional
18 opinions. What was that in relation to?

19 A I wanted to know whether, for example, he had seen
09:18 20 any of the Ferris report, the extent. If so, what
21 impact. A follow-up would be what impact it might
22 have had on his evidence.

23 Q And then to, down at the bottom you ask him about
24 were you aware:

09:18 25 "...that David Milgaard was due for a



1 parole hearing in the next three or four
2 days?"

3 And this was after the June 4th statement. What
4 was the purpose of that line of questioning?

09:19 5 A Well, Mr. Wilson's statement was first presented
6 to a Parole Board hearing I believe on June 6th
7 before we received it and I was curious to know
8 whether that was the initial purpose of it. I
9 wanted to know whether the goal or the objective
09:19 10 in interviewing Wilson was firstly for the purpose
11 of presenting that evidence to the Parole Board or
12 whether it was for presenting it to the minister
13 in relation to the 690 application because it
14 first appeared, as I recall, at the Parole Board
09:19 15 hearing.

16 Q Go to 125030. You question him about the March
17 3rd, '69 statement to Inspector Riddell. It
18 appears you had him read it, you say:

19 "Q That four-page document generally
09:20 20 describes some of the events that
21 happened on your trip to Saskatoon on
22 January 31st, 1969?

23 A Yes.

24 Q I think you will agree with me that it
09:20 25 does not and it did not contain all of



1 the details that happened on that day?

2 A No, it didn't.

3 Q Things were left out?

4 A A couple, yes."

09:20 5 What was the significance of that evidence?

6 A The Riddell statement was the first, or one of the
7 first encounters that Mr. Wilson had with the
8 police, and that statement was bereft of any

9 references to any encounters with a woman in an

09:20 10 alley or a woman on the street in Saskatoon, as I
11 recall. It was a bland statement and had nothing

12 incriminating, and it contrasted with the later

13 statements that were taken in May significantly,

14 but I wanted to find out from Mr. Wilson whether

09:21 15 it was a complete statement and, initially, he

16 acknowledged that he had left some things out.

17 Q And were you -- we had shown you yesterday the

18 newspaper article where Mr. Wilson was quoted as

19 saying, basically, that that first statement was

09:21 20 -- I can't recall the exact words -- I think the

21 truth, and words to that effect; was that one of

22 your purposes in questioning him?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Go to 039, please. And again, I won't go through

09:21 25 all of it, but you question him about, in some



1 detail, about his session with Inspector Roberts,
2 is that right, and how long it took and what
3 happened; is that correct?

4 A Yes.

09:22 5 Q And what was your general assessment of how Mr.
6 Wilson described the polygraph session to you
7 compared to the impression you got when you read
8 it on the June 4th, 1990 statement?

9 A Well his demeanour was fairly relaxed and he was
09:22 10 calm and he didn't, he didn't display a great deal
11 of emotion such as anger or frustration, or some
12 of the things that I would expect to find from
13 someone who had been badly treated. And when you
14 recall things that were unpleasant, sometimes it's
09:22 15 reflected in the retelling, I didn't observe that.

16 Q And so what -- what did you make of that, then, if
17 anything?

18 A I just pursued it a bit more.

19 Q Go to the next page. Again, this relates to the
09:23 20 timing, about how long he was under the polygraph:

21 "Q So maybe as long as six hours might be a
22 bit of an exaggeration?

23 A A little bit, yes."

24 And you say:

09:23 25 "Q I suggest to you ...",



1 or then, pardon me, then his statement goes on to
2 say:

3 "... 'Finally I began to implicate
4 Milgaard in the murder telling the
09:23 5 police the things they wanted to
6 hear.'?"

7 And, to put this in a bit of context, I think in
8 Mr. Wilson's June 4th, 1990 statement he
9 described his treatment at the polygraph, and
09:23 10 then said:

11 "... 'Finally I began to implicate
12 Milgaard in the murder telling the
13 police the things they wanted to
14 hear.'?"

09:23 15 If you want me to bring up Mr. Wilson's statement
16 I can at any time, Mr. Williams, but I think
17 that's what you are asking him. You then say:

18 "Q I suggest to you that you had implicated
19 Mr. Milgaard in the murder before you
09:23 20 got on the polygraph?

21 A That's what I have been told.

22 Q By whom?

23 A I believe it was in the transcripts.

24 Q That's what you have been told or is
09:24 25 that what you answered in response to



1 questions that were asked by counsel for
2 Mr. Milgaard at both the Preliminary
3 Inquiry and at the trial?

4 A That's what the transcripts say, yes."

09:24 5 And can you just explain the significance of that
6 line of questioning?

7 A The message contained in the statement was that
8 the incriminating statements that were obtained in
9 1969 had been obtained as a result of persistent
09:24 10 questioning, perhaps the impression was left it
11 was inappropriate questioning, which turned a
12 neutral March statement into an incriminating May
13 statement, and that that result was the result of
14 inappropriate police behaviour, and it focused on
09:24 15 the polygraph. The significance of that, to me,
16 was that the polygraph was, I believe, on May
17 24th, but the --

18 Q May 23rd, sorry.

19 A -- I'm sorry, May 23rd -- but before Mr. Wilson
09:25 20 met Mr. Roberts, the polygraph operator, he had
21 begun to provide incriminating evidence about Mr.
22 Milgaard. So the narrative that had been
23 presented in the June 4th, 1990 statement by --
24 Mr. Wilson's June 4th, 1990 statement didn't fit
09:25 25 in with the facts that were observed from an



1 outside source.

2 Q And would that, would that be the trial
3 transcripts, then?

4 A That would be the trial transcripts, and that
09:25 5 would be the earlier statement that he had made to
6 the police officers from Saskatoon.

7 Q And maybe just to assist you here, Mr. Williams,
8 let's call up the Wilson statement, it's 000248,
9 and go to page 250. At the top, and this is page
09:26 10 3 of the statement, he says:

11 "I kept answering no, I didn't kill Gail
12 Miller and didn't think David Milgaard
13 had. I recall that I was questioned on
14 the polygraph twice for maybe as long as
09:26 15 six hours. It was like a sweat session.
16 My mind was exhausted and I was mentally
17 scrambled. I remember it now being like
18 brainwashing. Finally I began to
19 implicate Milgaard in the murder,
09:26 20 telling police the things they wanted to
21 hear."

22 And would that be the part of the statement,
23 then, that you were probing with Mr. Wilson?

24 A Yes.

09:26 25 Q And what did you conclude then, based on this



1 questioning of Mr. Wilson, about the credibility
2 of, at least in your view, of this comment that it
3 was after the brainwashing and the polygraph that
4 he finally began to implicate Milgaard in the
09:26 5 murder?

6 A Well I needed to know whether, I mean 20 years
7 after the event he could have gotten the order,
8 could have gotten the order of things wrong, so I
9 needed to find out whether, by presenting a
09:27 10 different suggestion to him, whether that would
11 jog his recall, and I suggested to him that
12 perhaps he had started to implicate Mr. Milgaard
13 not after six hours of a sweat session, but had
14 begun that well before his contact with the
09:27 15 polygraph operator.

16 Q And, if that had been the true state of affairs,
17 what significance would that have in assessing the
18 credibility of Mr. Wilson's recantation?

19 A Well, it certainly would have corrected the
09:27 20 impression left in that paragraph of the
21 statement.

22 Q If we can go to 125042. And again, you follow up,
23 and I think what you did -- actually, sorry, let
24 me just back up. I think what you did is -- no,
09:28 25 the previous page -- I think you read to him from



1 the transcript, the cross-examination by Tallis:

2 "... 'I take it that the first time you
3 ever implicated or suggested that David
4 implicated -- that David was implicated
09:28 5 in the Gail Miller murder was on May
6 23rd, 1969?' Your answer 'No.'

7 Question 'To the police?' Answer 'No,
8 it was the day before.' Question 'The
9 day before?' Answer 'In Regina.'"

10 Ken Walters and Ed Karst. And that was what I
11 think you referred to earlier, his evidence in
12 questioning by Mr. Milgaard's lawyer, that Mr.
13 Wilson at the trial said, or at the prelim, or
14 both, that, no, he implicated David Milgaard
09:28 15 before May 23rd; is that correct?

16 A That's correct.

17 Q And then the next page. He says -- he wants to
18 elaborate on it a bit and he says:

19 "A ... When they were coming down to get
09:29 20 me, I'm scared, and to keep on
21 mentioning David, and I believe I said,
22 'Well, it's possible that David did do
23 it.' and that's the only way I can see
24 that he was implicated the day before."

09:29 25 And, again, what's -- what was the significance



1 of that answer in assessing the credibility of
2 the recantation?

3 A Well, this was a prior inconsistent statement that
4 was taken under oath at the prelim or at trial at
09:29 5 a time when the events, you know, were much
6 fresher or were -- would be expected to be much
7 fresher in the mind of the witness.

8 Q If we can go to 125046. You state here, at
9 question 602, you -- after going through a bunch
09:29 10 of the transcript you say:

11 "Q Those answers indicate that you had
12 implicated Milgaard in the murder before
13 you got to Saskatoon?

14 A Yes, it does.

09:30 15 Q Those answers were correct, were they
16 not?

17 A Yes."

18 And what was the significance of that information
19 from Mr. Wilson?

09:30 20 A Well it, it contradicts what he said on June 4th,
21 and puts the June 4th statement, or at least that
22 portion of it, in a completely different light.

23 Q Go to page 125049. Here, again, back to the
24 questions about, here, the March 3rd, '69
09:30 25 statement. Was it your sense that Mr. Wilson was



1 going back to the March 3rd statement, saying
2 "that's, that's the truth, and that's everything"?

3 A There was a fair bit of reliance on the March 3rd
4 statement, yes.

09:30 5 Q And here he says:

6 "A Just a few things are deleted from there
7 from the other one.

8 Q A few things?

9 A Getting stuck and the knife and the
09:30 10 break and entry."

11 Did you view those as being significant omissions
12 from the March 3rd, '69 statement?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Why was that?

09:31 15 A The getting stuck, or -- was the event that was
16 the focal point of the trial. Getting stuck in
17 Saskatoon, and that's what I interpreted the
18 "getting stuck" to be, was one of the significant
19 -- that was the trigger for the separation of
09:31 20 David Milgaard and Wilson and Nichol and it was,
21 it was during that period of time I think, based
22 on the Crown's theory advanced for the murder,
23 that David Milgaard may have had the opportunity
24 to commit the crime, and so that omission from the
09:31 25 March 3rd statement was a significant one.



1 Q And did you view that as being incriminating,
2 then, or suspicious?

3 A No, it just simply indicated that total reliance
4 could not be placed on the March 3rd, 1969
09:32 5 statement as the definitive or the complete truth
6 that recorded the events of those -- of that time.

7 Q Would you agree that if Mr. Wilson was simply
8 trying to help David Milgaard in 1990, and sort of
9 recanting whatever it was that needed to be
09:32 10 recanted, that getting stuck might be something
11 that he would say didn't happen given that that
12 was the opportunity?

13 A Yes, if that were his objective, yes.

14 Q Now, in fairness, I think on later dates he, from
09:32 15 time to time, did say they didn't get stuck, but
16 did that give some credibility to the recantation
17 in the sense that there were incriminating,
18 arguably incriminating things that he did not
19 recant, namely the knife and getting stuck?

09:33 20 A Well, it certainly bolstered it a bit, yes.

21 Q Now were there also some things that he recanted
22 that you knew from other sources were true?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And was that one of the problems in trying to put
09:33 25 weight on the recantation?



1 A Well, it certainly made the task of assessing it a
2 bit more problematic, yes.

3 Q I'm going to ask you about here, and just to put
4 this in context, at the trial Mr. Wilson testified
09:33 5 that -- and in his statement -- that the day after
6 the murder in Calgary, while Mr. Wilson was I
7 think phoning Heather Beaton from the bus depot,
8 and that's when Mr. Wilson said David Milgaard
9 allegedly admitted to grabbing a woman, stabbing
09:34 10 her, and putting her purse in the garbage can. So
11 the name Heather Beaton is in the statement, and I
12 believe his testimony was to the same effect, and
13 you ask him here about:

14 "Q Didn't you also tell the police about a
09:34 15 conversation that you had with David at
16 the Calgary bus depot?

17 A Yes, which was also bullshit.

18 Q It was also bullshit. How did the
19 police know about Heather Beaton?

09:34 20 A That I don't know. I was surprised
21 that you knew her name.

22 Q The only person who knew about Heather
23 Beaton is Ronald Dale Wilson, right, and
24 Shorty Cadrain and possibly David
09:34 25 Milgaard and Nichol John?



1 A Um-hum.

2 Q So if the police were going to plant a
3 story how would they get that
4 information about Heather Beaton unless
09:34 5 you told them?

6 A Because I was in there trying to phone
7 Heather Beaton."

8 Can you explain what you were probing there and
9 what was the significance of this information?

09:34 10 A Details, such as names that would be known only to
11 the interviewee, informed the assessment of the
12 claim that the story was planted by the police.

13 Usually when you concoct a
14 story, or when you devise one, you need to put in
09:35 15 certain details and you need to have some
16 appreciation of what the person planting the story
17 knows about your life or -- and it was just one of
18 those details that stuck out because Heather
19 Beaton didn't factor into any of the conversations
09:35 20 or any of the information that I had seen from
21 other -- from any of the other witnesses.

22 Q Okay. If we can go to 054. And here you are
23 saying:

24 "Q You are suggesting that the police
09:36 25 planted that story?



1 A Yes.

2 Q How would they know about Heather Beaton
3 to put the story in that context?

4 A Because it all fit in that way, that's
09:36 5 why. Sure I told them about probably
6 Heather Beaton and everything else and
7 needed a place to put it someplace.
8 That was a good place to put it.

9 Q Why would they go to all the trouble of
09:36 10 getting Heather Beaton involved in this?

11 A I'm the one that mentioned Heather
12 Beaton, not them.

13 Q Doesn't it stand to reason, Mr. Wilson,
14 that if the police didn't know about
09:36 15 Heather Beaton they couldn't have
16 planted Heather Beaton into the context
17 of what follows?

18 A This whole thing is a piece of shit.
19 That's what I'm trying to get across
09:36 20 to you.

21 Q Just answer my question. If the police
22 didn't know about Heather Beaton how
23 would -- they couldn't have put it in
24 that context, could they?

09:36 25 A They gave me the pieces and let me put



1 it together the way I wanted to."

2 And, again, what was your reaction to that

3 answer, piece of information?

4 A It didn't have the ring of truth.

09:37 5 Q Let me just go back, and I want to -- if we go
6 back to Mr. Wilson's June 4th statement, 000248,
7 and go to page 252, and I think this is where this
8 line of questioning comes from. And this is Mr.
9 Wilson saying:

09:37 10 "- that when we were alone together in
11 Calgary, Milgaard told me he'd 'hit a
12 girl' or 'got a girl' in Saskatoon and
13 put her purse in a trash can.

14 This testimony was planted in
09:37 15 my mind by police. At no time did
16 Milgaard confess anything like this to
17 me."

18 Go back to the trip. Would it be fair to say
19 that you were testing that statement; whether it
09:37 20 was credible that that piece of information was
21 planted in Ron Wilson's mind by the police?

22 A Yes.

23 Q And is it fair to say that in light of the fact
24 that his statement included Heather Beaton, a fact
09:38 25 that was only known to him and not the police,



1 that caused you to doubt the credibility of his
2 assertion that that was planted in his mind by the
3 police?

09:38 4 A It certainly caused me to question how, and the
5 context in which, that alleged plant occurred.
6 Yes, it caused me to doubt that it was planted in
7 his mind by the police.

09:38 8 Q Now let me just go through a scenario that might
9 explain how the Heather Beaton got into -- into
10 Mr. Wilson's fabricated story about what happened
11 in Calgary, that if -- if the police asked Mr.
12 Wilson, again in 1969, about "did David ever make
13 any admission to you after the trip when you were
14 in Calgary, can you think anywhere in Calgary, did
09:39 15 he ever say anything where he admitted being
16 involved in the murder", and if Mr. Wilson, for
17 whatever reason, chose to lie and say "yes, he
18 did, he did make an admission to me", the police
19 presumably would say "well where was it, what did
09:39 20 he say, tell me what happened", and Mr. Wilson
21 could have, in that scenario, said "okay", if he
22 was fabricating that, which he says he was, then
23 puts it in the context of a real -- of a true
24 event, namely they were at the bus depot, they
09:39 25 were phoning Heather Beaton, and he puts the



1 admission into a known fact. Do you follow?

2 A Yes, that -- that's possible. What --

3 Q Oh, sorry, go ahead?

4 A That's possible. Umm, what occurred to me was
09:39 5 this. If that had, in fact, taken place I would
6 have expected a more detailed narrative in the
7 statement that set out precisely how this story
8 came to be.

9 Q From -- you are talking in June of '90?

09:40 10 A In June of '90 from Mr. Wilson.

11 Q Yeah. And so if Mr. Wilson had said in June of
12 '90 just that, that, for example, "for whatever
13 reason I decided to implicate David Milgaard and
14 give information that I knew not to be true,
09:40 15 either because I thought he was guilty, I was
16 afraid of my own predicament, the police were
17 pressuring me", whatever his reason, that he chose
18 to give false and implicating information to the
19 police and "here's how it came about, and I
09:40 20 decided to give them this confession which didn't
21 happen and I decided to place it in Calgary, and
22 here's how it came about"; would that have been
23 more credible to you than the statement where he
24 says "this testimony was planted in my mind by
09:41 25 police"?



1 A Yes.

2 Q And is it fair to say that, based on your
3 examination of Mr. Wilson and the other facts,
4 that you found it difficult to conclude that that
09:41 5 statement could have been planted in his mind by
6 police?

7 A The -- the image that -- or not the image, but the
8 narrative that Mr. Wilson set out as the context
9 in which this planting or manipulation took place
09:41 10 just wasn't supported by objective facts that we
11 had discerned, and I'm referring to the time with
12 the police. In total, certainly Mr. Wilson was in
13 the police, or was questioned perhaps six hours or
14 more, but it -- what I was able to learn was it
09:42 15 wasn't continuous, it was on separate days, with
16 different officers, in circumstances that did not
17 signal that there was coercion or manipulation.

18 Certainly, how a story is
19 planted is one of the indicia that I would look at
09:42 20 to determine whether or not the conclusory
21 statement that he was manipulated, and the police
22 planted it in his mind, whether or not that was
23 supported by the evidence.

24 Q If we can go to 125072. And, in fact, is it fair
09:43 25 to say, Mr. Williams -- just back on this Heather



1 Beaton story -- that if Mr. Wilson had said,
2 again, "I lied, I made this up and I told the
3 police, I fit it into this incident in Calgary
4 because they asked me whether, in Calgary, he had
09:43 5 made an admission and I told them this, but that
6 I, Ron Wilson, made it up for whatever reason";
7 how would you test the credibility of that?

8 A I would have probed a bit more. I'm not certain
9 which questions I would ask at this moment, but it
09:43 10 --

11 Q Yeah.

12 A -- would be a line of questioning I would follow
13 up.

14 Q Okay. And we touched on this back in June, and I
09:43 15 think you told us that in questioning the
16 credibility of a recantation, that you would probe
17 not only the substantive portion of the
18 recantation to test its truthfulness compared to
19 known facts, you would also test the truthfulness
09:44 20 of the reasons put forward for the recantation and
21 the truthfulness of that; correct?

22 A Well, certainly the motives inform, yes.

23 Q If we can go to 072, you ask him here about the
24 police:

09:44 25 "Q Did ...",



1 they:

2 "... offer to withdraw any charges in
3 return for your testimony?

4 A No.

09:44 5 Q Did they offer you any deal whatsoever?

6 A No."

7 And then the next page:

8 "Q They didn't threaten you?

9 A No.

09:44 10 Q Similarly at the trial were you
11 threatened?

12 A I was never threatened."

13 I think there is a few other references. What
14 was your sense, from Mr. Wilson, about his
09:44 15 interaction with the police back in 1969 and his
16 description of what the police did to him in the
17 questioning?

18 A Okay. By his responses to my questions denying
19 either threat, promise, coercion, I was trying to
09:45 20 find, you know, a lever that the police would have
21 on him to coerce him or to manipulate him. And
22 ordinarily a promise or a threat is used to
23 persuade someone to testify in the manner that you
24 wish them to testify, and if they weren't holding
09:45 25 out something for him, for example if he had had



1 outstanding charges and he might get some benefit
2 by way of, you know, "I'll talk to the Crown and
3 we'll see if we can make these go away", or "talk
4 to the --", you know, the stories about maybe get
09:45 5 a lighter sentence, then -- I was looking to see
6 whether there were any inducements for him,
7 offered by the police, to persuade him to
8 implicate Mr. Milgaard, or whether the police had
9 threatened him in some fashion to persuade him to
09:46 10 implicate Mr. Milgaard, and he didn't identify
11 any.

12 Q Okay. If we can go to 079, just a line of
13 questioning here, it appears you probed:

14 "Q Were you afraid of Eddy Karst?

09:46 15 A No.

16 Q Were you afraid of Charlie Short?

17 A No."

18 "Q You got along with Eddy Karst ...",

19 "Q Those were the two fellows with whom you
09:46 20 dealt with?

21 A Yes.

22 Q You got along with Eddy Karst and
23 Charlie Short?

24 A Seemed to, yes.

25 Q They didn't intimidate or threaten or



1 challenge you?

2 A No.

3 Q Certainly by the time you went to
4 Saskatoon they didn't tell you that they
09:46 5 were still looking at you as the prime
6 suspect in the murder of Gail Miller; is
7 that fair to say?

8 A I would say that, yes."

9 What was the significance of that, this
09:46 10 information?

11 A Again, that was just trying to find out if there
12 was any inducements or threats, and trying to
13 isolate the potential sources of them.

14 Q Go to 125083, please. You have a line of
09:47 15 questioning here, I think you dealt with not only
16 his interaction with the police at the time he
17 gave this statement, but also what happened at
18 trial. You said:

19 "Q ... the police weren't leaning on you in
09:47 20 any way; they had no hold on you?

21 A They had no hold on me, no.

22 Q You weren't in custody at that time?

23 A No.

24 Q You had an opportunity at trial to tell
09:47 25 the truth as you knew it then?



1 A I had opportunities, yes.

2 Q Didn't you in fact tell the truth as you
3 then knew it?

4 A No, I didn't.

09:47 5 Q Why not?

6 A I was scared.

7 Q Of what?

8 A Who is going to believe me now?"

9 And then you go on. What was the significance of
09:47 10 this line of questioning?

11 A Well Mr. Wilson had, at some point in time Mr.
12 Wilson had been in custody and had had contacts
13 with the police while in custody. By the time the
14 trial had -- by the time of the trial he was out
09:47 15 of custody, and to the extent that he may have
16 been frightened, intimidated merely by virtue of
17 the fact of his custody, this change in
18 circumstances might have provided him with an
19 opportunity to come clean if, in fact, he had lied
09:48 20 previously, and that was essentially what I was
21 trying to probe at that point in time.

22 Q And was the question there "if, if in fact the
23 police had manipulated and coerced you into lying
24 in your May 23rd and 24th statement, what happened
09:48 25 at the prelim and trial that caused you to lie



1 again there"; is that the general --

2 A That's the thrust of the question, yes.

3 Q And did you learn anything in this interview with
4 Mr. Wilson to explain, at least to your
09:48 5 satisfaction, about what prompted him to lie at
6 the preliminary hearing and trial?

7 A I don't recall specifically what his response to
8 the succeeding questions were, but I did come away
9 with a feeling that his explanation did not -- or
09:49 10 wasn't a satisfactory one.

11 Q 125110. You ask Mr. Wilson:

12 "Q Other than what is contained in that
13 statement and the comments you had in
14 relation to another exhibit, and I
09:50 15 believe it's Exhibit "7", is there
16 anything else that you recall about that
17 trial testimony having reviewed your
18 evidence recently, both at trial and at
19 the Preliminary Inquiry, with which you
09:50 20 now take issue and say is not correct?

21 A The only thing I can see is not right
22 he didn't have a decent defence
23 lawyer.

24 Q And why do you say that?

09:50 25 A Because he should have used my



1 original statement first and then I
2 might have broken down and told the
3 truth.

4 Q Anything else?

09:50 5 A I just wish I hadn't been such a pill
6 head back then. It might have
7 helped."

8 What was the significance of this information
9 from Mr. Wilson?

09:50 10 A Here is a witness critiquing the performance of
11 counsel in terms of his forensic account -- not
12 forensic accounting, but forensic examination
13 skills at trial. I just found it -- I found it a
14 surprising comment coming from Mr. Wilson, because
09:51 15 generally, unless they are professional witnesses,
16 witnesses are just happy to get off the stand and
17 usually don't analyse the performance of the
18 questioner, and what he was, what Mr. Wilson was
19 saying here is that Mr. Tallis had perhaps been
09:51 20 not as good as he should have been because it
21 appears as if he lacked certain information;
22 namely, the March statement, and had he that
23 information he would have been able to crack my
24 story. I felt that that was information that Mr.
09:52 25 Wilson obtained from another source and I was



1 just --

2 Q Did it affect your assessment of his credibility?

3 A That alone, no, but certainly at the end of the --

4 at the end of the interview after I had had an

09:52 5 opportunity to either review my notes and reflect

6 on it, there did not appear, based on Mr. Wilson's

7 responses to my question, there did not appear to

8 be the factual foundation to support the thesis

9 contained in the June 4th, 1990 statement that he

09:52 10 had been coerced and manipulated by police because

11 the facts that I would expect to see in those

12 coercion situations did not exist and they came

13 from the description that Mr. Wilson provided to

14 me and, consequently, I seriously questioned the

09:53 15 veracity of the conclusions contained in the June

16 4th, 1990 statement.

17 Q Did you have concerns about how the statement came

18 about?

19 A Yes. If -- I would put myself in the role of a

09:53 20 Crown counsel trying to introduce a statement at

21 trial and if I tendered a six or an eight page

22 statement that was the result of eight hours of

23 interview between the person giving the statement

24 and the police, there would be an awful lot of

09:54 25 explaining to do, and I didn't get an explanation



1 that seemed to satisfy me that --

2 **Q** Did you consider -- what about the possibility,
3 and I think we heard some evidence about this
4 subject from Dr. Rossmo and Professor Boyd, that
09:54 5 Mr. Wilson, having realized or acknowledged 20
6 years later that he had lied at trial, was looking
7 for someone else to blame, and initially blamed
8 the police and it now appears here to blame
9 Mr. Tallis, as opposed to, I think in their words,
09:54 10 taking his own responsibility for that and
11 suggested that it might not be an uncommon
12 occurrence where a witness recants and is trying
13 to justify perhaps in his own mind his earlier
14 behaviour. Is that something that you considered
09:54 15 or you can comment on now?

16 **A** I didn't consider it at the time. It's certainly
17 a possible explanation. I would leave that to
18 those, the psychiatrists and psychologists who --

19 **Q** Of which I am not one.

09:55 20 **A** -- better understand human behaviour.

21 **Q** But again, just as far as looking at -- is it
22 correct to say, though, that in looking at the
23 recantation, what's put forward as the motive is
24 important to you in testing it?

09:55 25 **A** It's certainly a factor, yes, in the



1 circumstances.

2 Q If we can go to 125111. Here the transcript shows
3 that Mr. Watson questioned Mr. Williams and it
4 appears that you took no objection to that?

09:55 5 A I did not. He was entitled to question his client
6 to the extent that -- to the extent that I had
7 raised certain issues that ought to be addressed
8 to make the record clear, this was his
9 opportunity.

09:56 10 Q Go to 220989, please. So that's the conclusion of
11 the Wilson transcript, and I think you've
12 commented on the conclusions you reached with
13 respect to that and I'll show you a document
14 later. Just generally, though, after you had
09:56 15 interviewed Ron Wilson then, tell us what
16 conclusions, if any, you reached at that time
17 about whether or not his recantation provided a
18 reasonable basis to conclude that a miscarriage of
19 justice had occurred?

09:57 20 A I didn't assess the answers I had received from
21 Mr. Wilson in the context of whether or not it
22 alone signaled that, or informed the issue as to
23 whether or not there was a basis to conclude that
24 a miscarriage of justice likely occurred.

09:57 25 Following the interview I focused on a further



1 review of the information that had been presented
2 at trial and compared it with the notes that I had
3 taken to assess whether or not the foundation for
4 the thesis contained in the June 4th, 1990
09:58 5 statement could be supported, and the thesis as I
6 understood it was that the police had brow-beaten,
7 or perhaps just by persistent questioning, warn
8 down this relatively youthful witness to the point
9 whereby he provided a statement that he felt was
09:58 10 what they wanted to hear and would implicate David
11 Milgaard, and so having asked him about the
12 circumstances and received his answers, I didn't
13 feel that those circumstances had been borne out
14 by the facts as he related to support the
09:58 15 conclusion that he had been coerced or
16 manipulated.

17 Q And what about the substance then of his
18 recantation, I mean, the fact that he said I lied
19 at trial when I said David Milgaard admitted
09:59 20 killing her to me?

21 A Well, I would merely point out in my report the
22 areas in which, or the factual discrepancies so
23 that the minister could assess it and give it the
24 weight it --

09:59 25 Q But as far as your assessment of -- would you



1 agree that if a witness' recantation after
2 investigation and probing was determined to have
3 merit, to be credible, particularly of a witness
4 that gave the evidence that Ron Wilson did, that
09:59 5 that would be significant evidence that likely on
6 its own would give rise to a miscarriage of
7 justice; would you not agree?

8 A It could provide the minister with a basis to give
9 a remedy, yes.

10:00 10 Q And so I appreciate your comments on the motives
11 and the statement. Is it fair to say that the
12 substantive merits of what Mr. Wilson was saying,
13 what were your conclusions about that, as to
14 whether it provided a basis to grant a remedy?

10:00 15 A The conclusions that were contained in Mr.
16 Wilson's statements weren't supported by the facts
17 as they related them.

18 Q So in other words, the ground put forward is Ron
19 Wilson said the police manipulated, caused him to
10:00 20 lie and therefore -- and his evidence is false;
21 therefore, there's a miscarriage of justice.
22 After your review, I think you are telling us your
23 conclusions were that there's no merit to that
24 allegation; is that fair?

10:00 25 A That's fair.



1 Q Can you tell us, did -- what you learned in your
2 review of that allegation, namely, the
3 recantation, the circumstances and your follow-up,
4 can you tell us, did that influence your thinking
10:01 5 when you assessed other grounds and tried to reach
6 conclusions about the merits of that?

7 A Well, we're talking July, 1990. By then, I think
8 that was the fourth or fifth ground that had been
9 advanced.

10:01 10 Q Let me be a bit more specific. Are you able to
11 tell us whether, when you looked at the Larry
12 Fisher information, for example, in trying to
13 assess where that fit in, do you think you were
14 influenced in any way by what you had learned in
10:01 15 going down the path on the Wilson recantation?

16 A I can't say for sure. I can tell you that having
17 looked at earlier grounds and having been
18 confronted with widely-covered news stories
19 indicating that a certain bit of evidence
10:02 20 represented this, and on closer examination I
21 formed a different view. Certainly you would look
22 at the information that is then presented with a
23 great deal of scrutiny, because if the assertion
24 has not been borne out by the fact and someone is
10:03 25 making another assertion, you look at it a bit



1 more closely, and that, I think, is human nature,
2 but I guess my experience in dealing with matters
3 relating to criminal law has indicated that
4 sometimes it's just one little nugget in a file
10:03 5 that could have that ring of truth, so you run it
6 down.

7 Q Can you comment on whether -- I mean, obviously
8 the Ron Wilson recantation was put forward on
9 behalf of Mr. Milgaard to say that there was a
10:03 10 miscarriage of justice, the verdict wasn't safe,
11 his evidence wasn't safe. After reviewing the
12 Wilson recantation as you've described in your
13 examination, did it -- can you comment on whether
14 or not your view on the safety of the verdict, if
10:04 15 I can put it that way, was neutral, you were more
16 confident in the safety of the verdict or less
17 confident, and I apologize if I'm not using the
18 right language, but I want to try and get a sense
19 of whether this maybe had a counter-productive
10:04 20 effect on your assessment of the safety of the
21 verdict?

22 A It didn't have a, quote, "counter-productive"
23 effect. I guess the question I was looking at,
24 and the question that's firmly the focus I guess
10:04 25 of our inquiries, is whether, whether one



1 particular ground that's advanced or the
2 cumulation signals that there's a foundation to
3 conclude that maybe this is something that should
4 go back to the courts, and whether it's Wilson
10:05 5 alone or Wilson in combination with Deborah Hall,
6 the information we had about Mr. Cadrain, the
7 Ferris, none of that seemed to really have an
8 impact on the foundation facts that were advanced
9 at trial for the conviction of David Milgaard.

10:05 10 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Are we talking
11 about -- was your question, Mr. Hodson, did you
12 view the recantation to have a counter-productive
13 effect?

14 BY MR. HODSON:

10:05 15 Q Yeah, and let me be a bit more specific. The
16 recantation, everything related to the Ron Wilson
17 recantation in June of 1990, the circumstances and
18 everything that happened, once you were done your
19 review of that, I'm trying to find out whether
10:05 20 what you learned in investigating that ground and
21 the conclusions you reached may have had a
22 counter-productive effect, and the premise was
23 that this was put forward as being a ground of the
24 miscarriage of justice and I'm trying to probe
10:06 25 whether it may have had a counter-productive



1 effect in either giving you comfort that the
2 verdict was safer or how did it affect the other
3 grounds?

4 A It didn't affect the other grounds. You know, 20
10:06 5 years ago I was a different person. Between the
6 trial and my interview, Mr. Ron Wilson had had a
7 number of events in his life and, you know, that
8 could have affected his recall. Applicants will
9 reach out for whatever support they think will
10:06 10 assist their case, so to the extent that someone's
11 recall is bad, that's one thing.

12 The one area that perhaps was
13 a bit of concern was the extent to which this
14 witness had been, let's say, influenced by
10:07 15 information about our process, about my
16 participation in that process and that that
17 information affected our ability to get the job
18 done quickly, or more expeditiously, and I felt
19 that that was counter-productive.

10:07 20 Q And that would be the efforts to have you removed
21 and those matters that we talked about?

22 A Well, yeah, because I had been on the case then
23 for, what, at least 18 months and in order to -- I
24 forget whether there were a thousand exchanges or
10:07 25 not, but in order to get someone up to speed to



1 question Mr. Wilson would have taken some time for
2 preparation, etcetera, etcetera, and on the one
3 hand you had Mr. Wolch and Mr. Watson saying,
4 yeah, Wilson will talk to anybody but Williams.
10:08 5 Well, to get somebody up to speed would mean there
6 would be some time interval and --

7 Q Did the process that we, that you went through to
8 get the interview of Mr. Wilson have a
9 counter-productive effect on your assessment of
10:08 10 his, or have any effect on how you assessed his
11 credibility?

12 A No.

13 Q Let me just go back and try and ask it, this
14 question a different way. Before Ron Wilson's
10:08 15 evidence even became an issue in the application,
16 I think you told us that it was what it was at
17 trial, and would you agree that it was fairly
18 incriminating evidence?

19 A Yes.

10:09 20 Q And that in the absence of anything being brought
21 forward about that, I suspect you could look back
22 at the transcript and say, okay, well, if David
23 Milgaard is innocent, then obviously Ron Wilson
24 lied at trial, something went wrong, correct, and
10:09 25 without even probing that you would have to reach



1 that conclusion; correct?

2 A Yes.

3 Q You would have to find a way to explain Ron
4 Wilson's evidence in light of the assertion that
10:09 5 David Milgaard is innocent; correct?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And so if that had never been probed, if Mr.
8 Wilson was not available, there's no other
9 information, you simply had the trial record,
10:09 10 presumably you would have to find a way to, or not
11 find a way, but have to consider some explanation
12 for Mr. Wilson's evidence in light of the -- I
13 mean, if Deborah Hall is correct and Dr. Ferris is
14 correct that David Milgaard is innocent, then how
10:09 15 is it that Ron Wilson said what he said at trial;
16 is that --

17 A My analysis wouldn't go that way, and I'll tell
18 you why. The objective isn't to retry the case in
19 my mind, the objective is simply to review what
10:10 20 has transpired to see whether or not, whether
21 substantially or procedurally, there were defects
22 sufficient to call into question the validity of
23 the result or whether or not there were defects
24 sufficient that it merited a return to the courts
10:10 25 for the courts to deal with it.



1 Q No, and --

2 A So that if, for example, the scientific evidence
3 in fact shed a completely different light on it,
4 and one of the first things that I explored was
10:11 5 DNA, now if the DNA had been performed, or I had
6 performed it and come up with a result that tended
7 to, that showed that David Milgaard was not the
8 donor of that sperm, then regardless of the Wilson
9 evidence, regardless of the Hall, then that would
10:11 10 have been a basis to send it back, so you look at
11 the nature of the defect and its impact in making
12 the assessment or in making a recommendation as to
13 what the minister should do with this.

14 Q No, I appreciate that point, and I had understood
10:11 15 your evidence earlier to be that you still had to
16 figure out, or look at how the grounds fit into
17 the context of what happened at trial?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And so -- and what I'm getting at, though, is
10:12 20 let's take the Deborah Hall and the Dr. Ferris
21 information, that I thought you had said that you
22 had to put that in context to see what difference
23 that may have made and sort of what the other
24 facts were, and I think you said that you would
10:12 25 not pursue the Ron Wilson evidence unless its



1 raised as a ground, but you would be aware of it?

2 A Yes.

3 Q And what I'm trying to get at is whether as a
4 result of having, probing the recantation, whether
10:12 5 you ended up concluding that Mr. Wilson's evidence
6 at trial was safer, for lack of a better word,
7 than if you had not looked at it. In other words,
8 that once you've gone down the path and questioned
9 him, do you then say, okay, I've now satisfied
10:12 10 myself that there wasn't anything wrong with Mr.
11 Wilson's evidence at trial, if you had not gone
12 down that path I suppose it's up in the air, and
13 that's what I'm trying to get at.

14 A Okay, I think I better appreciate the thrust of
10:13 15 your question. I would simply answer it this way.
16 If Wilson's evidence about the recant had a
17 stronger factual foundation, it would have
18 prompted a consideration as to whether or not this
19 is fresh evidence, new evidence sufficient that it
10:13 20 should go back to the Court of Appeal for hearing
21 and determination and that would be -- that would
22 be the thought process that -- that was one of the
23 factors that I would be looking at.

24 Certainly to the extent that
10:13 25 the recant didn't seem to have that ring of truth



1 to it, to the extent that it didn't seem to really
2 challenge the veracity of what had happened at
3 trial, it didn't take away from the body of
4 evidence that supported the conviction.

10:14 5 Q Go back to this article, this would be July 25,
6 which I think is the day after your interview of
7 Mr. Wilson if I'm not mistaken. I think it was
8 July 24th. And you are familiar with this
9 article?

10:14 10 A Oh, yes.

11 Q And I think here it says:

12 "The federal Justice
13 Department is inflicting untold
14 psychological damage to David Milgaard
10:14 15 by delaying his application for a new
16 trial, Milgaard's lawyer charged
17 yesterday."

18 And down at the bottom:

19 "Asper said the department
10:14 20 investigators seem to be taking their
21 time while his client rots in jail.

22 "This is supposed to be
23 the final repository of justice in the
24 country," Asper said of appeals to the
10:14 25 justice minister. "From our



1 perspective, it looks a lot more like
2 the three stooges."

3 Eugene Williams, the
4 department's chief investigator on the
10:15 5 Milgaard case, said the application will
6 be delayed while senior management
7 review his report."

8 Can you comment on what -- what was your reaction
9 to this article?

10:15 10 A Disappointment, perhaps a bit of anger. It gave
11 me the impression that here's someone who has one
12 hand tied behind your back so he can punch you in
13 the nose, and what I meant simply by that is this:
14 We received the -- the complaint was that we were
10:15 15 slow and we were delaying things. Within the
16 framework of the then existing 690 process,
17 without the ability to compel the attendance of
18 witnesses and the production of materials, we
19 relied on persuasion to obtain co-operation.
10:16 20 We've just discussed the circumstances surrounding
21 the interview of Mr. Wilson and it should be fresh
22 in everybody's mind that although we were in
23 Nakusp in June, Mr. Wilson declined to be
24 interviewed. In fact, the very representatives of
10:16 25 the firm that are accusing us of delay and causing



1 the client to rot in jail were the same ones who
2 were demanding or requesting that someone else
3 come in to do the interview and that of course
4 would necessitate delay, so on the one hand there
10:17 5 was a complaint about delay, but on the other
6 hand, there were actions which were forestalling
7 the completion of the report.

8 Admittedly, and to the reader
9 who is not fully apprised of the facts, when you
10:17 10 go back to the first paragraph of the article,
11 you'll see that in December, 1988, that is the
12 first date that is mentioned, and now this article
13 is July of 1990, a significant amount of time has
14 elapsed. What the reader doesn't know is that
10:17 15 first in December, 1988 the application was not
16 complete, trial transcripts weren't received until
17 I believe May. At the initial application two
18 grounds were advanced, but additional grounds had
19 been advanced between December of 1988, as late as
10:18 20 June of 1990. One month later, before those
21 grounds are fully investigated, there's a
22 complaint.

23 I can understand where someone
24 believes that the initial grounds advanced were
10:18 25 sufficient to merit a remedy why there might be



1 some limitations. However, because of the
2 continued, shall we say, correspondence between
3 the department and representatives of the
4 Milgaards, either with me personally or with
5 Sergeant Pearson who was conducting the
6 investigation of the Larry Fisher matter with me,
7 there was sufficient exchange to dispel the notion
8 that we were tardy in pursuing or in following up
9 on this application and, consequently, the
10 headlines in my view were unfair, but the
11 juxtaposition of the dates of December of '88 and
12 the fact that it was then July of 1990 and the
13 omission to include, that there had been a number
14 of grounds that had been examined, certainly
15 framed us in a very unenviable position. The
16 reference to three stooges, well, comedy is not my
17 first line.

18 Q If we can just go back to the full page, please.
19 It appears as well, Mr. Williams, that you did
20 comment:

21 "Williams said that if the
22 evidence uncovered so far in Milgaard's
23 application were compelling enough, the
24 application could be fast-tracked to the
25 minister's attention."



1 They talk about the Donald Marshall case where it
2 only took six weeks, and go over to the next
3 column:

4 "However, in that case
10:20 5 investigators had conclusive physical
6 evidence..."

7 Talking about the *Marshall* case,

8 "...pointing to the real killer. So
9 far, Williams said, none of the evidence
10:20 10 presented in the Milgaard application
11 has warranted a fast-track response from
12 the department.

13 "That is a conclusion you
14 could safely reach," Williams said."

10:20 15 And then as well Mr. Corbett, the department's
16 general counsel, talked about a deadline and then
17 went on to say:

18 "...the process was awaiting Williams to
19 complete a face-to-face interview with
10:20 20 Ron Wilson -- the Crown witness who
21 claims he was pressured by Saskatoon
22 police..."

23 So it would appear here that -- would you have
24 talked to Mr. Lett about this? It appears Mr.
10:21 25 Corbett did as well.



1 A Yes.

2 Q And was that a departure from what -- I mean I
3 think, earlier, you told us that you -- you could
4 not and would not comment. Was there a change
10:21 5 here that --

6 A Well I generally would not comment on the
7 specifics of a case, but if that's generally that
8 procedure, saying okay, look, are you telling me
9 that if you've got conclusive evidence, without
10:21 10 referring to this case, generally if -- if there
11 is conclusive evidence, it signals that somebody
12 is factually innocent or there is a significant
13 basis to conclude that a miscarriage of justice
14 likely occurred, we would move on it.

10:21 15 Q If we can go to 039507. This is an August 1, 1990
16 *Globe and Mail* article by David Roberts, and it
17 deals with a couple subjects. John Patterson in
18 that interview, which I will be going to next,
19 you'll recall Mr. Patterson's involvement in this?

10:22 20 A Yes.

21 Q And he was someone who had served time in jail
22 with Larry Fisher and made some statements, around
23 this time, about what Mr. Fisher may have said to
24 him; is that correct?

10:22 25 A Yes.



1 Q And I just want to go through parts of this. I
2 don't think we have been through this article
3 before. It says:

4 "Mr. Milgaard's Winnipeg
10:22 5 lawyer, David Asper, also has disclosed
6 to the media a series of circumstantial
7 facts that he feels link a convicted
8 rapist to the Miller slaying.

9 The latest development
10:22 10 occurred Monday when a Regina man told
11 CBC television that a former prison
12 inmate - the same man that Mr. Asper and
13 Mr. Milgaard point to as the likely
14 killer - gave him a tacit confession
10:22 15 about 13 years ago.

16 William Corbett, senior
17 counsel for the Justice department's
18 criminal prosecutions branch, said
19 yesterday that the department wants to
10:23 20 discuss the Regina man's allegation. Mr
21 Asper said Justice department officials
22 may travel to Regina by the end of the
23 week.

24 Mr. Corbett noted that, as
10:23 25 Mr. Milgaard's supporters provide the



1 department with new evidence on almost a
2 monthly basis, the review of the case
3 has slowed. He had hoped to brief
4 Ms. Campbell on the matter by the end of
10:23 5 August, he said, adding that there is no
6 clear-cut evidence to suggest that Mr.
7 Milgaard was intentionally dealt a
8 judicial travesty in 1970."

9 And then a quote:

10:23 10 "Seventeen per cent of
11 people still believe Elvis Presley is
12 alive,' Mr. Corbett said in an oblique
13 reference to those who believe in Mr.
14 Milgaard's innocence."

10:23 15 Would you have discussed this quote with Mr.
16 Corbett around the time this appeared in the
17 newspaper?

18 A Before the quote appeared in the newspaper, Mr.
19 Corbett spoke with me, because -- to debrief me on
10:23 20 his conversation with that reporter, and if you
21 would go back?

22 Q Sure, go back to the full page.

23 A Thanks. I would draw your attention --

24 Q You can actually just touch the screen, Mr.
10:24 25 Williams, and they can bring it up.



1 A Okay. I'm trying to find the -- the part of the
2 report which basically says that --

3 Q That?

4 A No. If we could go back to the full screen, I
10:24 5 just need a moment's indulgence, please?

6 Q Sure.

7 A Yes.

8 Q Sorry, on the left?

9 A It's this portion here.

10:25 10 Q Yeah.

11 A "Mr. Corbett noted that, as Mr.
12 Milgaard's supporters provide the
13 department with new evidence on almost a
14 monthly basis, the review of the case
15 has slowed. He had hoped to brief
16 Ms. Campbell on the matter by the end of
17 August, he said, adding that there is no
18 clear-cut evidence to suggest that Mr.
19 Milgaard was intentionally dealt a
20 judicial travesty in 1970."

21 Now I draw your attention to that because, in
22 saying that, the reporter indicated or recited a
23 number of facts that had been publicly reported,
24 and recited a number of conclusions which folks
10:26 25 had drawn on those facts. For example, the



1 allegation that Deborah Hall's evidence pointed
2 to the fact that, you know, two other witnesses
3 had lied, that Ferris' report had exonerated
4 David Milgaard, and other things. And in a
10:26 5 conversation with Mr. Corbett at that time, he
6 indicated to that reporter that you can't believe
7 everything you read in the newspaper, because
8 certain journals report that Elvis is still
9 alive, and it is in that context that the:

10:26 10 "Seventeen per cent of
11 people still believe Elvis Presley is
12 alive,' ..."

13 was made. And that was shortly after the
14 conversation when there was a debriefing. That
10:27 15 is not, however, the context in which the quote
16 appears, because the reporter's take on it is
17 that that was an oblique reference to those who
18 believe in Milgaard's innocence. It was not. It
19 was an oblique reference to those who believe in
10:27 20 the accuracy of the facts recited in certain
21 journals as being 100 percent correct.

22 Q And did this comment, we have seen this comment
23 come up later, did this comment about Elvis
24 Presley come up in the media after this point?

10:27 25 A I believe it did.



1 Q And this reference that either Mr. Corbett or the
2 federal Justice Department held this view?

3 A Correct.

4 Q Do you know if any steps were taken to correct
10:27 5 this, at least from the Federal Justice's
6 perspective?

7 A I don't recall. It's possible. But there's one
8 thing you have to remember. Over the course of,
9 there's several newspaper articles, I've spent
10:28 10 countless hours discussing our process and
11 procedures with various members of the press, but
12 most of the time the results of those
13 conversations never find their way into the story,
14 or what you might find is one or two lines as part
10:28 15 of a quote, and that's -- that's the business of
16 news reporting. And sometimes you are content, if
17 it's just a one-day story, and hopefully it's a --
18 as I heard one folks say, "might use that
19 newspaper to wrap food or fish and it will be
10:28 20 forgotten", but that quote has never been
21 forgotten.

22 Q And can you comment on the effect it may have had
23 on the work that you were doing?

24 A Well, certainly to the extent that the, let's say
10:29 25 the scope of complaint had now proceeded beyond me



1 to one level higher, certainly it added some
2 impetus to the completion of the work as quickly
3 and as thoroughly as we could.

4 Q I see it's 10:30, probably an appropriate spot to
5 break.

6 (Adjourned at 10:30 a.m.)

7 (Reconvened at 10:51 a.m.)

8 BY MR. HODSON:

9 Q Go to 061821. Actually if we could just go back
10 to the article, 039507, and you'll see here:

11 "The latest development

12 occurred Monday when a Regina man told
13 CBC television that a former prison
14 inmate ... gave him a tacit confession
15 about 13 years ago."

16 And over on the right-hand side, here:

17 "Mr. Asper said, the

18 ex-convict in Regina, who refused to be
19 identified, said he served time at
20 Prince Albert Penitentiary with the
21 rapist in 1977."

22 And of course "the rapist" is Larry Fisher;
23 correct?

24 A Yes.

25 Q "He said the Regina man, a



1 convicted armed robber, has had a clean
2 record since his release in 1978 and is
3 eager to give Justice Department
4 investigators his story of the rapist's
10:52 5 confession.

6 The man told Mr. Asper that
7 he and the rapist were playing hockey
8 one night in prison and got into a
9 stick-swinging duel. The rapist
10:52 10 threatened to stab him and dump him in a
11 snowbank.

12 'I did it before and got away
13 with it. I can do it again,' the Regina
14 man said the rapist told him.

10:52 15 The Regina man told Mr. Asper
16 that his recollection of the admission
17 is vivid. He is coming forward 13 years
18 later because a recent television
19 documentary about the Milgaard case
10:52 20 reminded him of the hockey game and
21 rapist's comments.

22 'My motive is that an
23 innocent guy is in jail,' Mr. Asper said
24 he was told."

25 Now is this when you would have first learned



1 about this information, in this news article?

2 A I believe so, yes.

3 Q And what was your reaction to this type of
4 information that there was -- I mean obviously, at
10:52 5 this time, Mr. Fisher is on your radar screen?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And what was your reaction to this?

8 A Well, on the one hand, well here we go again,
9 there's another avenue that we have to run down,
10:53 10 because this -- this is -- this is clearly another
11 bit of information that supports the contention
12 that Larry Fisher is the killer and we have to
13 look at it, run that down.

14 Q If we can then go to 012681. And I take it if
10:53 15 what was reported in that article was correct,
16 that this fellow was saying Larry Fisher had
17 confessed to him, would that be a piece of
18 information that would assist you in your work in
19 trying to link Larry Fisher to Gail Miller's
10:53 20 murder?

21 A Well we'd need to know what he confessed to, what
22 offence, yes.

23 Q If it was a confession to the Gail Miller murder
24 and if it was a credible confession?

10:53 25 A Well, that would certainly get our attention and



1 that would certainly affect the results, yes.

2 Q And so here's a memo August 2, 1990 from you to
3 Mr. Corbett commenting about attaching a:

4 "... recent transcript of the CBC
10:53 5 stories concerning the new informant who
6 allegedly received a confession from
7 Larry Fisher. Also enclosed is a copy
8 of the CP Wire story quoting me as
9 saying I would be meeting with the
10:54 10 informant later this week, that quote is
11 incorrect. I have not spoken to any
12 reporters to indicate a time or place of
13 a meeting."

14 And then go on to talk about that meeting.

10:54 15 "Since I did not confirm the timing of
16 any meeting the only person who could
17 confirm that meeting would be the
18 informant or someone to whom the
19 informant had advised of that meeting."

10:54 20 Can you explain what was happening there? What
21 was the issue about the public disclosure of your
22 meeting with the informant?

23 A That comment relates to a portion of the story
24 which indicated that Justice Department officials
10:54 25 would be meeting with the informant who had been



1 identified in the story. Umm, the impression is
2 that that information came from me, and it would
3 be -- it would not be appropriate for me to advise
4 the press the timing of those types of meetings,
10:55 5 particularly with an informant who wished to
6 remain anonymous.

7 Q If we can go to the next page, here's the
8 attachment, and it's a wire story:

9 "The federal Justice
10:55 10 Department will interview a man who says
11 a fellow prison inmate confessed to a
12 murder similar to the one for which
13 David Milgaard is serving a life
14 sentence, CBC-TV reported Tuesday.

10:55 15 The man's statement is a
16 major breakthrough in Milgaard's fight
17 to have his conviction overturned, said
18 David Asper, lawyer for Milgaard.

19 'People, generally speaking,
10:55 20 don't admit to crimes unless they've
21 committed those crimes', Asper said.

22 'So that gives it a
23 circumstantial degree, at least, of
24 trustworthiness.' "

10:55 25 And then goes on to talk about:



1 "The disguised man said the
2 other inmate went on to complain that
3 he'd received ...",
4 or it goes on to talk about what was reported on
5 the CBC. Do you recall how you became aware of
6 who this person was and how did you arrange the
7 interview with him?

8 A I believe that, I believe that it came via either
9 Mr. Asper or Mr. Wolch, --

10 Q And --

11 A -- that information.

12 Q And his name was kept confidential for a while but
13 it was John Patterson, correct, he testified at
14 the Supreme Court reference?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Yeah. So they would have given you the name; is
17 that correct?

18 A Or -- yes, I believe that to be the case.

19 Q Now also attached, if we can go to the next page,
20 is the CBC transcripts. What was the
21 significance -- or why did you go and get these
22 transcripts?

23 A To get as much information as we could about the
24 story. To the extent that there were quotes, and
25 the quotes were attributed to Mr. Patterson, it



1 would be useful for me, in terms of any interview,
2 to have precisely what he said.

3 Q Is my understanding correct that, that the
4 information, that there wasn't a statement of
10:57 5 Mr. Patterson given to you but, rather, it was
6 "here's what he said to the media", and that's the
7 information being provided to you, and that you
8 followed up and then interviewed him, or am I
9 missing something?

10:57 10 A My understanding was that Mr. Patterson had
11 contacted Mr. Asper, that Mr. Asper had recorded
12 what he had learned from Mr. Patterson, and it was
13 that record -- or it appears as if either that, or
14 Mr. Patterson had contacted the media, and they
10:57 15 had quoted Mr. Patterson in the -- in the various
16 stories.

17 So the way the story appears,
18 it looked as if the quotes were those of Mr. -- of
19 Mr. Patterson to the media, so I wanted to collect
10:57 20 as many of those as I possibly could.

21 Q Okay. And, again, so here, if we can go to the
22 next page, and this is from the CBC interview:

23 "We were playing hockey ...",
24 etcetera. And then, down here, he said:

10:58 25 "And he said, I've done it before, he



1 said. I've got no problem doing it
2 again. I said yeah right Fisher. When
3 did this happen? I said you're not
4 doing time for murder or manslaughter,
10:58 5 so when did this happen. And he said,
6 wouldn't you like to know he said."

7 So that would have been at least one of the
8 quotes that caught your attention; is that fair?

9 A Yes.

10:58 10 Q And that:

11 "The former inmate realized the
12 importance of the incidents after he saw
13 Fisher on a 24 Hours documentary about
14 Milgaard."

10:58 15 And then to the next page. Here's where, this is
16 July 31 where they report:

17 "The federal Justice department will
18 interview a man who has new information
19 relating to the David Milgaard case."

10:58 20 And is that the comment where you said you didn't
21 tell anybody that?

22 A That's correct.

23 Q Who would you have talked -- obviously
24 Mr. Patterson you would have talked; had you
10:59 25 arranged the interview by this time?



1 A I don't believe I had.

2 Q And then to the next page. Again, I think this is
3 the part that was quoted in the CP story:

4 "David Milgaard's lawyer says this is
10:59 5 the strongest piece of information yet
6 which may prove his client's innocence."

7 And down to the bottom:

8 "Late this afternoon it was confirmed
9 that the former inmate will give sworn
10:59 10 testimony to the Justice department
11 later this week."

12 And I think your evidence is that that would have
13 come from someone other than you; is that
14 correct?

10:59 15 A Yes.

16 Q If we can go to 016762. And this is the interview
17 of J.P. held before a court reporter August 4th,
18 1990. If we can go to the next page. I think, at
19 this time, Mr. Patterson wanted to keep his name
11:00 20 confidential, is that correct, that's why we're
21 seeing the initials J.P.?

22 A Yes.

23 Q And he was represented by Reg Watson in this
24 interview, is that correct, --

11:00 25 A Yes.



1 Q -- as counsel? And it was under oath; is that
2 correct?

3 A I believe it was.

4 Q Actually, let me just check, it doesn't say -- oh
11:00 5 I'm sorry, yes, the next page he was sworn. Go to
6 page 767. It appears, here, you are questioning
7 him about his previous incarceration:

8 "Q Did you come into contact with Larry
9 Fisher there

11:00 10 A Yes, sir."

11 Next page. Here that he got along well with Mr.
12 Fisher. If we can go to the next page. And you
13 show him copies of the transcript of the CBC
14 Winnipeg news item and the comments attributed to
11:01 15 someone as 'unidentified' and he says:

16 "A It's not 'shake', it should be the word
17 'shank'."

18 And that would be the earlier document, earlier
19 transcript I think I showed you, is that correct;
11:01 20 that's what you showed him?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And then if you could scroll down:

23 "Q ... I'm giving you a pen, sir, I'd just
24 ask you to make that correction. You
11:01 25 are referring to page 2?"



1 And then he says:

2 "A At that time, Larry said to me, he said
3 I'll shank you, it should read, and I'll
4 initial your copy."

5 And:

6 "A And I'll continue reading here."

7 He says:

8 "It's not quite the wording as should be
9 read - as the transcript of it.

11:02 10 Q Well, make whatever corrections are
11 necessary, sir

12 A It should read as I said you and whose
13 army."

14 And then he goes on to repeat this, and that's
15 the comment I said before:

16 "... 'I've done it before and I've got
17 no problem doing it again. And I said
18 yeah right, Fisher.' I asked him 'When
19 did this happen? I said you're not
11:02 20 doing time for murder or manslaughter,
21 so when did this happen. And he said,
22 wouldn't you like to know ...' That's
23 correct there. But there's parts that
24 have been omitted from this, the
11:02 25 continuation of the interview, which is



1 very pertinent to this, which is not -
2 like they reported it here, that on page
3 3 here, there's a whole part of it that
4 is missing, that stopped me and really
11:02 5 made me look at this whole incident.

6 After here where like - yeah, see here
7 they put 'The former inmate realized the
8 importance of the incidents after he saw
9 Fisher on a 24 Hours documentary ...'

11:02 10 You know, prior to this part here where
11 they said this, they left out part of my
12 interview where I had had a conversation
13 with Larry Fisher. Being that I was on
14 short time in the spring of 1978, short
11:03 15 time meaning short term left in my
16 incarceration, I no longer fitted into
17 any of the shop programs or anything; I
18 took over as a dormitory and the
19 administration office cleaner."

20 And then it goes on to talk about the timing of
21 the hockey incident.

22 "In April of '78 Larry had gone up for a
23 transfer hearing. That was, he had
24 applied approximately ten months earlier
11:03 25 to be transferred to the new regional



1 psychiatric centre which was opening in
2 Saskatoon, RPC we called it. And they
3 asked for a number of inmates who wished
4 to go into treatment program, to apply.
11:03 5 And Larry had applied. He came back to
6 the dorm after his transfer meeting, and
7 in the presence of myself, another
8 former inmate who is now up on rape and
9 murder charges in Toronto, which is
11:03 10 David Edward Faulds."

11 Then go on to the next page, just scroll down:

12 "And I said to him, I said well, why did
13 they turn you down Larry, and he said
14 they said because I've only got a short
11:03 15 period of time left on my incarceration
16 and they said that they felt I needed a
17 long term treatment program, so,
18 therefore, it would do me no good to
19 transfer now. And at that time he said.
11:04 20 - ... I'll show them fucking bastards.
21 He said I'll get out and I'll do it
22 again. He said I sat here for seven
23 years with no treatment, none at all."

24 And then the next page. Sorry, just down at the
11:04 25 bottom, previous page, and then he goes on to



1 talk about:

2 "... in 1980, approximately two and a
3 half to three months after Larry Fisher
4 was released ... he indeed did what he
11:04 5 said he was going to do."

6 Next page:

7 "... he has gone out and did exactly
8 what he said he was going to do, in
9 front of myself and other witnesses.
11:04 10 And I left it at that, okay. Never
11 thought about it again."

12 And down at the bottom -- sorry, then he talks
13 about the David Milgaard documentary on Larry
14 Fisher, that:

11:04 15 "They just simply said that the person
16 that's now being questioned in the
17 Saskatchewan Penitentiary lived in the
18 basement of that house."

19 And on to the next page, if we can go to page
11:05 20 775.

21 Let me just pause there, Mr.
22 Williams, and get you to comment on that. And
23 I'll go through other parts of this, but what did
24 you -- what did you learn from Mr. Patterson when
11:05 25 you interviewed him?



1 A Well I, I basically wanted to confirm or probe
2 some of the comments attributed to him, and to
3 find out the circumstances of -- in which those
4 comments were obtained. I wanted to find out in
11:05 5 more detail what he had heard or overheard from
6 Larry Fisher, and to do that I wanted to get a --
7 to put those comments into a kind of a context to
8 find out the circumstances in which he came into
9 contact with Mr. Fisher, and initially you can see
11:05 10 that my -- my initial questions are fairly short
11 and his answers are quite lengthy, so that gave
12 him an opportunity to fully describe the
13 circumstances, and that would then be the
14 foundation for later questioning.

11:06 15 Q Okay. And it appears that Mr. Patterson explained
16 about another conversation he had with Mr. Fisher
17 in the late '70s then, before he got released, and
18 that Fisher was upset that he couldn't get
19 treatment and that he was going to go out and do
11:06 20 it again; --

21 A Yes.

22 Q -- is that correct?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And if we can go ahead to 016775. I think, is it
11:06 25 fair to say that you confirmed with him the



1 conversation that was in the CBC interview about
2 the conversation during the hockey game, that
3 "I've done it before", that was something that he
4 confirmed; is that correct?

11:07 5 A Yes.

6 Q Then if we can go to 016781.

7 A Well I had confirmed, at that spot, that they had
8 been involved in a fight and that there was one
9 conversation, --

11:07 10 Q Okay.

11 A -- and he did, in fact, confirm it.

12 Q And if we can go to 781. And then you go:

13 "Q To that portion of the transcript ...

14 'When they showed his face, and who they
11:07 15 were talking to, the connection was made
16 there and that's when I got angry, very
17 angry.'"

18 And just to put that in context, I think he was
19 talking about when he saw the television show
11:07 20 that talked about Larry Fisher as being the
21 person identified as the killer of Gail Miller,
22 is that right, and his previous record?

23 A Yes.

24 Q That's what he was referring to? And he said he
11:07 25 got angry when he saw that television show. You



1 said:

2 "Q Why?"

3 And he said:

4 "A Well, they missed a part - some words in
11:08 5 there also, where I said I was shocked
6 at first, stunned and then I got angry.
7 Angry that - that the person I knew in
8 the penitentiary, Larry Fisher, what he
9 had stated to me he was capable of doing
11:08 10 and had done before; what he said he
11 would do upon his release because he had
12 not received psychiatric treatment, and
13 the relationship as to the crimes that
14 they showed that he was convicted for,
11:08 15 within a block of that - of his
16 residence, and the fact that Gail
17 Miller's body was found in the exact
18 same way that he said he was going to
19 kill me, is when I got angry that they
11:08 20 hadn't even questioned this man.

21 Q Would your response have been the same
22 if you knew, firstly, that the victim's
23 of Fisher's sexual assaults were not
24 found within a block of his residence?

11:08 25 A Yes, I would have."



1 And what was the purpose of that question?

2 A As I sit here right now, I'm not sure.

3 Q And, if I may assist, was that in reference to the
4 news story that had talked about the rapes being
5 within a block of either Fisher's residence --

11:09

6 A It may well have been, yes.

7 Q And then the next page you ask, here:

8 "Q The threat to shank and throw you in the
9 snowbank?

11:09

10 A Okay.

11 Q Right, you made that connection?

12 A Not at that time.

13 Q Not at that time. But you made it after
14 you heard a number of things from the
15 CBC?

11:09

16 A Yeah.

17 Q I'm suggesting to you that some of the
18 things that you heard from the CBC
19 aren't factually correct?

11:09

20 A I could say even if it wasn't
21 factually correct by the CBC, and, of
22 course, the media has things to twist
23 around, the fact that I know Larry
24 Fisher and the incidents that I've had
25 with him, the two incidents that I

11:09



1 named in particular."

2 And do you recall what -- were there concerns
3 about whether Mr. Patterson had received
4 incorrect information in the news stories?

11:09 5 A Based on those earlier comments, yes. As I'm
6 sitting here now, I haven't reviewed it recently,
7 but I can't specify which factual assertions in
8 the news stories I took issue with.

9 Q Okay. If we can go to 016788, we'll go through
11:10 10 parts of this and see if that will assist you.
11 You ask him here:

12 "Q Okay. Let me ask you this. How did
13 this interview take place?

14 A I contacted CBC."

11:10 15 "A Winnipeg. I contacted Regina here first
16 and they just referred me to Winnipeg.

17 Q And to whom did you speak?

18 A Cecil Rosner."

19 "Q After the initial contact with Mr.
11:10 20 Rosner, what then happened?

21 A After I spoke with Mr. Rosner, he
22 phoned me back a number of occasions
23 afterwards and we've gone over
24 basically the same question that
11:10 25 you've given me."



1 And then 143:

2 "Q Have you made contact with any other
3 individuals related to David Milgaard?

4 A David Asper, Milgaard's lawyer,
11:11 5 contacted me.

6 Q Did you initiate that contact?

7 A No, sir.

8 Q Did you question him as to how he came
9 to know of your whereabouts?

11:11 10 A Yes, sir.

11 Q Did you get a response?

12 A Yes, sir. It was from the CBC.

13 Q Did you speak with Mr. Asper about your
14 observations in 1977/78?

11:11 15 A Yes, sir.

16 Q What did you tell him?

17 A Exactly the same thing that I have
18 told CBC. He had asked me also at
19 that time if I had had any previous
11:11 20 connections with David Milgaard. Did
21 I know David Milgaard, and if so, in
22 what fact did I know David Milgaard.
23 And I stated to him, as I stated to
24 you, I have only seen David Milgaard
11:11 25 from a distance twice."



1 And then to the next page -- what was the purpose
2 in asking about whether he had contacted anybody
3 associated with David Milgaard?

4 A I wanted to find out if there was a friendship.
11:12 5 If there was, that might have informed or
6 influenced what he was about to tell me.

7 Q And then here you ask:

8 "Q Okay. The Globe and Mail article,
9 Wednesday, August 1, 1990, I draw your
10 attention to the sixth column of that
11 article and to the last two lines of the
12 fifth column."

13 And that's the article we just referred to
14 earlier; correct?

11:12 15 A Yes.

16 Q And Mr. Patterson quotes from it, he says:

17 "A Well, that doesn't read right either.
18 See, it says "Mr. Asper said the
19 ex-convict in Regina who refused to be
11:12 20 identified, said he served time in
21 Prince Albert Penitentiary with the
22 rapist in 1977." He first made contact
23 in '76 to 1978. "He said the Regina
24 man, a convicted armed robber, has had a
11:12 25 clean record since his release in 1978



1 and is eager to give Justice Department
2 investigators his story of the rapist's
3 confession."

4 And Mr. Patterson says:

11:12 5 "No, that's not correct at all. And not
6 at any time with CBC, or talking with
7 Mr. Asper, did I use the word
8 'confession'. That is incorrect.

9 Q Did Mr. Fisher confess anything to
11:13 10 you --

11 A As to actually killing Gail Miller or
12 killing somebody?

13 Q Firstly, as to killing anybody?

14 A Right there, it's like I stated
11:13 15 before.

16 Q You interpreted it to mean that he
17 killed someone?

18 A He stated it right to me that he had,
19 and he no problem doing it again. He
11:13 20 says, I'll shank you and I'll stuff
21 you in a snowbank and the guards will
22 find you in the spring.

23 Q And you interpreted that to mean that he
24 will kill you and put you in a snowbank?

11:13 25 A That's the only way to interpret it



1 when a guy tells you that.

2 Q All right. From what you have just told
3 me, I gather that you did not say to Mr.
4 Asper that Fisher confessed to killing
11:13 5 Gail Miller?

6 A No, sir.

7 Q And I gather from what you have just
8 told me, that Fisher did not confess to
9 you that he killed someone, but he
11:13 10 threatened that he would kill you?

11 A Well, I guess the way you're wording
12 it and saying in particular, I would
13 have to say that he said to me he has
14 killed somebody; he's admitted that he
11:13 15 has killed somebody and he'd have no
16 problem doing it again, and that I'm
17 his next victim."

18 Again, what was the significance of this
19 information?

11:14 20 A Well, it clarified the statements contained in *The*
21 *Globe and Mail*. It's one thing to say that an
22 accused confessed to a killing, it's another
23 thing -- and that's pretty powerful, you know,
24 here you have a confession. On further -- when I
11:14 25 drew the article to the attention of Mr.



1 Patterson, he read it and he corrected the use of
2 the word confession and for me that was important.
3 He maintained that in his discussion with Mr.
4 Fisher, he perceived Fisher to have said look, I
11:15 5 killed someone, but he didn't go so far as to say
6 that Fisher confessed to the killing of Gail
7 Miller. You know, one could draw an inference,
8 but confession was not his word, and the news
9 articles reported it as if it had been his word.

11:15 10 Q If you can go to 016794, you ask here:

11 "Q Okay. And I'm going to quote and ask
12 you..."

13 And I think this is from the news article,

14 "...whether Mr. Fisher said these words
11:15 15 to you "I did it before and got away
16 with it. I can do it again." Did
17 Fisher say those words to you?

18 A No.

19 Q Did you say those words to Mr. Asper?

11:15 20 A No.

21 Q You're certain of that?

22 A Yes, sir."

23 What was the purpose of asking those questions?

24 A Well, that was what was widely reported. This is
11:15 25 *The Globe and Mail* and I don't know, I don't have



1 the article in front of me, but I believe that
2 those portions were up in quotes in the article
3 and that signaled to me, and it signals to most
4 folks who are reading, that when you put words
11:16 5 within quotes it's verbatim.

6 Q So that's 039507, the quotes:

7 "I did it before and got away with it.

8 I can do it again," the Regina man said
9 the rapist told him."

11:16 10 So that's what you were probing?

11 A Yes.

12 Q If we can go back to the transcript. Now, what he
13 goes on to say, though, in the rest of that
14 answer, he says:

11:16 15 "When I spoke with Mr. Asper, I told him
16 that in 1980 I said that when he was
17 released from the penitentiary and he
18 had raped and stabbed that woman and cut
19 her throat, I said to him at that time,
11:17 20 I said, in his mind I guess he did get
21 away with it again, because he left her
22 for dead. As far as she was concerned,
23 she was dead. He had cut her throat and
24 left her there. And I said that relates
11:17 25 back to when he told me that he's done



1 it before; he'd do it to me; he had no
2 problem doing it."

3 And so it appears that Mr. Patterson does say Mr.
4 Fisher did tell him that he has done it before;
11:17 5 is that fair, that he had killed before?

6 A That was Mr. Patterson's take on it, yes.

7 Q Yeah. So that although the exact words "I did it
8 before and got away with it, I can do it again"
9 weren't spoken, according to Mr. Patterson, what
11:17 10 he did confirm, though, is that Mr. Fisher appears
11 to have told him that he had done it before, i.e.,
12 killed somebody; is that correct? That's your
13 understanding of what --

14 A Yes.

11:17 15 Q And so what was the concern here, that it was --
16 it was extended to Gail Miller?

17 A Yes. I mean, the article conveys an impression
18 that Larry Fisher confessed to Mr. Patterson and
19 the context was set out in that very narrow
11:18 20 fashion.

21 Q And after your interview of Mr. Patterson, what
22 conclusions did you draw as to whether or not his
23 evidence or information as far as his discussions
24 with Mr. Fisher, whether they would assist you in
11:18 25 trying to find a link between Mr. Fisher and Gail



1 Miller?

2 A It -- the type of link that I was looking for was
3 not established on the basis of that interview.
4 It was certainly -- it was disturbing.

11:19 5 Q And what about the -- and just for the record,
6 Mr. Commissioner, I won't go to them, but at the
7 end of the transcript Mr. Williams marked as
8 exhibits *The Globe and Mail* article and the CBC
9 reports, so those are there. Maybe if we can go
11:19 10 to 012669, CBC, this is your August 22nd, 1990
11 memo to file relating to this interview; is that
12 correct?

13 A It is.

14 Q And would it accurately set out your thoughts and
11:19 15 conclusions about this interview at the time?

16 A Yes.

17 Q If we can go to the last page, you say:

18 "Although it appears that Mr.

19 Fisher angrily threatened to kill

11:19 20 Mr. P., in 1977, the circumstances which
21 precipitated the threat, coupled with
22 the promise to re-offend and the fact of
23 re-offending is not sufficient, without
24 more, to link Larry Fisher to Gail
11:20 25 Miller's death.



1 Mr. P. did not and does
2 not interpret Mr. Fisher's angry threat
3 to be a confession. Neither do I."

4 Would that be an accurate reflection of what you
11:20 5 concluded at the time?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And can you comment on -- did the fact that this
8 matter was reported in the media first in any way
9 influence your approach to it or affect your
11:20 10 assessment of it?

11 A No. It was consistent with much of what we had
12 gotten since March of that year. Essentially the
13 application was being made in a public forum at or
14 about the time that we got it, but, I mean, it was
11:20 15 just another attempt to embarrass us into an hasty
16 decision.

17 Q If we can go to 155223, this is your August 5,
18 1990 memo that talks about an interview of Craig
19 Melnyk on August 1; is that correct?

11:21 20 A Yes.

21 Q What would have been your purpose at this time of
22 interviewing Mr. Melnyk?

23 A Well, I had spoken with Deborah Hall and I had
24 spoken also with George Lapchuk. I just thought
11:21 25 it would be prudent to firm up this aspect of the



1 application and Craig Melnyk and George Lapchuk
2 were the two motel room, if I can refer to them,
3 they were the two witnesses at the Milgaard trial
4 who testified, and if I can summarize their
11:22 5 testimony, the so-called re-enactment at the
6 hotel, and their information came to the attention
7 of the police as a result of information provided
8 by I think Mr. Wilson.

9 My sense in reading the
11:22 10 transcript was that their information was an
11 important, an important part of the Crown's case,
12 and at the time I thought it desirable to see
13 whether or not there had been any changes to their
14 testimony.

11:22 15 Q What did you make of the fact that it was Ron
16 Wilson who brought Melnyk and Lapchuk to the
17 attention of the police around the time of the
18 trial commencement?

19 A Well, that was just another indicia that perhaps
11:22 20 signaled that maybe he had not been coerced by the
21 police, but may have had some information that he
22 thought would shed light on the killing, so --

23 Q I take it from the memo that Mr. Melnyk confirmed
24 the veracity of his trial evidence?

11:23 25 A Certain portions of it. I arrived at Mr. Melnyk's



1 door unannounced, I tried several times to make
2 contact with him and without success, and I
3 obtained his address and just went to the door.
4 As it turned out, he was on his way -- he was
11:23 5 about to leave on a holiday and so we had a brief
6 conversation and in that context I didn't give
7 him -- while I had the entire transcript, I drew
8 his attention to what I thought were the salient
9 portions of that testimony, asked him to review it
11:24 10 and questioned him briefly about it.

11 Q And then here it, you then say:

12 "In response to my questions concerning
13 conversations between Mr. Melnyk and
14 Mr. Wilson about what Wilson saw, Melnyk
11:24 15 said that Wilson told him that when
16 Milgaard came back to the car in
17 Saskatoon, he (Milgaard) had a wallet
18 and blood on his hands; or blood on the
19 wallet in his hands; Wilson made some
11:24 20 additional remarks about a wallet which
21 Mr. Melnyk did not recall."

22 What was the significance, if any, of this
23 information?

24 A Well, it was pretty significant in the sense that
11:24 25 it went a little further than what Wilson had told



1 the police, but it tended to confirm one aspect of
2 Wilson's testimony at trial in that he, Wilson,
3 separated from Milgaard. I didn't know quite what
4 to make about the additional details, but I have
11:25 5 produced it there.

6 Q And then as well you showed him Deborah Hall's
7 affidavit, presumably the 1986 affidavit, that
8 stated Mr. Melnyk lied at trial?

9 A Yes.

11:25 10 Q What was his reaction to that?

11 A He disagreed with her and basically said that, you
12 know, he had no axe to grind with Milgaard. I
13 took that to mean that he didn't dislike Mr.
14 Milgaard, but simply stated what he had seen.

11:25 15 Q And as well that:

16 "Mr. Melnyk also noted that there was no
17 tradeoff for his testimony at trial. I
18 interpreted that to mean that he did not
19 receive any consideration for appearing
11:25 20 as a witness..."

21 Where did this issue come from?

22 A One of the things -- it may well be that -- Craig
23 Melnyk had had some brushes with the law, I wasn't
24 certain at the time, I'm not certain now just the
11:26 25 nature of them, but it was conceivable that he may



1 have been under charge or perhaps a serving
2 prisoner and there may have been an inducement for
3 him to provide a statement incriminating Mr.
4 Milgaard.

11:26 5 Q Then the next page. Did you find anything in your
6 investigation to suggest that Mr. Melnyk and Mr.
7 Lapchuk were either paid money or given other
8 favourable consideration for testifying at the
9 Milgaard trial?

11:26 10 A No, I did not.

11 Q Did you ever make a comment to that effect to Mr.
12 Wolch or Mr. Asper?

13 A I did not. I think in the context of -- there was
14 a conversation I recall around the time of the,
11:27 15 around the time of the Supreme Court reference
16 about a reward that was offered in connection
17 with, I think it was either police or -- there was
18 a \$2,000 reward, and I did make an effort to find
19 out who the recipient of it was and I did find out
11:27 20 that it had gone to Albert Cadrain, but I don't
21 recall saying Lapchuk and Melnyk were paid.

22 Q There is a newspaper article which I'll show you
23 later where Mr. Wolch is quoted as saying -- in
24 fact, it's in his April 25th, 1991 letter to the
11:27 25 minister, where he says that, to Minister Kim



1 Campbell, that one of your officials implied that
2 these witnesses were paid, referring to Melnyk and
3 Lapchuk. Now, I'll show you those documents later
4 and I'll ask you later in the context of that, but
11:28 5 do you have any recollection of ever saying
6 anything of that nature or implying that, that
7 Melnyk and Lapchuk were paid for their evidence?

8 A That was not my information at the time, and
9 certainly, based on my conversation with Mr.
11:28 10 Melnyk, he denied it, as did Mr. Lapchuk.

11 Q Here it says:

12 "In closing, Mr. Melnyk noted:

13 "Whether Milgaard did it I
14 don't know, but what I saw, I saw.
11:28 15 There's no way that I imagined that."

16 Later he noted: "I can't
17 believe that all the witnesses who
18 testified, got together to convict
19 Milgaard. I came out here to get away
11:28 20 from the adverse publicity I received in
21 Regina."

22 And anything else to add to that? What was Mr.
23 Melnyk referring to there; do you know?

24 A My only sense was that in the circles in which he
11:29 25 was then a part of, the fact that he testified in



1 the trial was not well received and he wanted to
2 get away from that milieu. He also I think may
3 have been referring to perhaps published reports
4 that signaled that witnesses had gotten together
11:29 5 to perhaps concoct a story to frame David
6 Milgaard.

7 Q 155215, a memo of August 6th, 1990 -- sorry, page
8 215 of that -- August 6th, 1990, of your interview
9 with George Lapchuk, and I take it on the same
11:29 10 trip you went to see Mr. Lapchuk; is that correct?

11 A That's correct. I saw Mr. Lapchuk first.

12 Q You saw him first. And you say:

13 "After I explained the purpose of my
14 visit, Mr. Lapchuk told me that he had
11:30 15 mistaken me when he first spoke with me
16 for a representative of a Seattle based
17 religious organization. Apparently a
18 representative of that organization had
19 called him urging him to recant his
11:30 20 testimony in the name of the Lord. The
21 representative had noted that "Dale
22 Wilson has recanted, why don't you?"

23 Was that in reference to Paul Henderson do you
24 think?

11:30 25 A I believe it was, or some organization of which



1 Mr. Henderson was a member.

2 Q And what's your recollection then of your meeting
3 with Mr. Lapchuk, did he initially try not to talk
4 to you?

11:30 5 A Mr. Lapchuk wasn't anxious to speak with me, but
6 he was persuaded. He finally relented. George
7 Lapchuk was a bit of a tough guy. We had -- I
8 forget how I made contact with him, but I did,
9 probably with the assistance of Sergeant Tidsbury,
11:31 10 and there had been some telephone conversations
11 and he agreed to meet me.

12 Q And I take it that Mr. Lapchuk confirmed his trial
13 evidence according to that note; is that correct?

14 A Yes.

11:31 15 Q And disputed Deborah Hall's affidavit?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Go to the next page, it says here:

18 "Mr. Lapchuk noted that he spoke with
19 Ron Wilson after the trial. Wilson told
11:31 20 him (Lapchuk) that he saw blood on the
21 clothes of David Milgaard when they were
22 in Saskatoon."

23 What was the significance of that information?

24 A I believe that more or less -- well, it was some
11:31 25 confirmatory information about Wilson's testimony



1 at trial which I believe was later recanted.

2 Q And then it says:

3 "Recently Ron Wilson met George Lapchuk.

4 Mr. Wilson attempted to offer an

11:32 5 explanation for his recent actions.

6 According to Mr. Lapchuk, he (Lapchuk)

7 did not want to hear any explanations

8 from Wilson. (From his longterm

9 acquaintance with Wilson, Lapchuk gave

11:32 10 me some insights into Wilson's

11 character. I am left with the

12 impression that Ron Wilson had gotten

13 more than religion for changing his

14 story.)"

11:32 15 Can you elaborate on that comment, as to what Mr.

16 Lapchuk said or what you took from his comments?

17 A The impression I received from speaking with Mr.

18 Lapchuk was that Mr. Wilson had received some

19 consideration for the recant.

11:32 20 Q And in fact here it was suggested that there was a

21 financial incentive for Mr. Wilson to recant his

22 earlier testimony. Is that what Mr. Lapchuk said?

23 A Mr. Lapchuk had said that, but it was in the

24 context of events that had occurred in 1980. I

11:32 25 believe at the time a reward had been offered or a



1 financial inducement had been offered to Mr.
2 Wilson to change his testimony at that time and he
3 had refused it.

4 Q And that he what?

11:33 5 A Mr. Wilson I think at that time had refused to
6 change his testimony in 1980, but that -- I think
7 Lapchuk may have speculated that perhaps an offer
8 was renewed to Mr. Wilson and he accepted it.

9 Q But was it anything more than speculation on Mr.
11:33 10 Lapchuk's part?

11 A Mr. Lapchuk, I heard from Mr. Lapchuk that he had
12 that conversation with Mr. Wilson. His --
13 Lapchuk's take on the conversation was that Wilson
14 was trying to explain something, but I think it
11:33 15 was primarily speculation.

16 Q Okay. And then you say:

17 "Despite his checkered past, Mr. Lapchuk
18 left me with the impression that he told
19 the truth at trial and is strong in his
11:34 20 recollection of the events today. He
21 noted that the expression on Milgaard's
22 face was so frightening that it remains
23 vivid in his memory to this day. Much
24 the same comment was echoed by Mr.
11:34 25 Melnyk when I spoke with him."



1 Again, what was the significance of that
2 information?

3 A That information addressed the suggestion by
4 Deborah Hall that what she observed in the motel
11:34 5 room was just a big joke and that everybody was
6 joking. Both Mr. Melnyk and Mr. Lapchuk were
7 frightened and having heard some anecdotes from
8 Mr. Lapchuk about some of his adventures, it would
9 take quite an event to frighten him.

11:34 10 Q And so what conclusions did you reach then about
11 Mr. Melnyk and Mr. Lapchuk about, as far as their
12 recollection of the motel room incident being a
13 serious matter?

14 A Well, they remained steadfast in their account
11:35 15 which had been the subject of their trial
16 testimony and cross-examination and nothing from
17 our interviews or our discussions altered the
18 accuracy of what they testified at trial.

19 Q And can you -- what was your sense of the
11:35 20 significance of that evidence at trial?

21 A The case against David Milgaard was a
22 circumstantial one and that circumstance, coupled
23 with others, was used as an important part of the
24 web that contributed to his contribution -- I'm
11:35 25 sorry, contributed to his conviction. As a



1 result, if either -- if Melnyk or Lapchuk resiled
2 from that, it would certainly give us cause to
3 question or consider that there may be a basis to
4 believe that a miscarriage of justice may have
11:36 5 occurred.

6 Q Go to 113521.

7 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Excuse me, sir,
8 are you telling me then that you don't take the
9 motel declarations as a confession, but rather
11:36 10 simply as circumstantial evidence?

11 A Yes.

12 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

13 BY MR. HODSON:

14 Q 113521. This is an August 9th, 1990 letter to
11:36 15 Mr. Watson and it refers to a request to pose
16 additional questions to Mr. Wilson and to
17 ascertain whether Mr. Wilson will undergo a
18 polygraph test. Can you tell us what, to the best
19 of your recollection, what were the questions or
11:37 20 the areas of questions, and also why were you now
21 seeking a polygraph?

22 A As a result of information received from Mr.
23 Lapchuk, and possibly Mr. Melnyk, I had a few
24 supplementary questions of Mr. Wilson because I
11:37 25 learned after speaking with Mr. Wilson of his



1 conversations with Lapchuk and I wanted to explore
2 that.

3 Secondly, we had received such
4 contradictory information from Mr. Wilson in terms
11:37 5 of the June 4th, 1990 statement when compared to
6 his remarks at trial and when compared to some of
7 the answers he gave to my questions, so we weren't
8 quite certain what to make of it in terms of what
9 was the truth and that prompted the request for a
11:38 10 polygraph.

11 Q And so, sorry, back on the questions, were they to
12 follow up on some of what Mr. Melnyk and Mr.
13 Lapchuk told you?

14 A Yes.

11:38 15 Q And the record suggests that you did not get an
16 opportunity to question Mr. Wilson again; is that
17 correct?

18 A That's correct.

19 Q And why not?

11:38 20 A He declined to be questioned and, in relation to
21 the, in relation to the polygraph, I learned from
22 Mr. Watson that Mr. Wilson wanted, as a condition
23 for the polygraph, he wanted to have the notes or
24 the charts of his earlier polygraph session with
11:39 25 Mr. Art Roberts and those could not be provided to



1 him and without that he declined to be
2 polygraphed. They couldn't be provided to him
3 because they could not be found.

4 Q And 003413, this is the letter I think from
11:39 5 Mr. Watson of that date saying that if Mr. Wilson
6 is to undergo a polygraph, the questions and his
7 charts must be made available?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And I think by that time you had already checked
11:39 10 with Inspector Roberts and the Calgary and
11 Saskatoon police and the records could not be
12 located?

13 A That's correct.

14 Q Did that cause you a concern? You mentioned
11:39 15 earlier that when you interviewed Mr. Wilson about
16 his June 4th, 1990 recant, and we haven't got to
17 the tape yet, but certainly records or notes
18 relating to Mr. Henderson's interview with Mr.
19 Wilson, and I think you would agree that that was
11:40 20 an area that you were concerned with, finding out
21 what happened; correct?

22 A Yes.

23 Q What about with Inspector Roberts and his
24 interview of Nichol John and Ron Wilson back in
11:40 25 1969 and the fact that he spent an afternoon and



1 evening with these two witnesses without a note or
2 any record, including the polygraph?

3 A I was -- I was concerned that -- I would have
4 preferred to have had them but they could not be
11:40 5 found.

6 Q No, but as far --

7 A But --

8 Q Okay. Oh, I'm sorry, carry on?

9 A But as far as the notes, from an assessment
11:40 10 standpoint there had been at least an opportunity
11 to question the police officers, I'm not certain I
12 got their notes. There were some reports, I'd
13 call them occurrence reports, describing the
14 circumstances of the questioning and the narrative
11:41 15 of the police investigative steps in relation to
16 the securing of the questions -- or the statements
17 from Nichol and from Ron Wilson.

18 Q Okay.

19 A But --

11:41 20 Q But I believe, Mr. Williams -- and correct me if
21 I'm wrong -- that there has not been, at least not
22 that I am aware of, a written record of what
23 transpired in the room with Inspector Roberts and
24 Nichol John and Ron Wilson by way of notes,
11:41 25 polygraph charts, police report, or statements,



1 the statements were taken after?

2 A That's correct.

3 Q And, other than Inspector Roberts' evidence at the
4 Supreme Court, there would be no other source of
11:41 5 information, source of written information, to
6 find out what happened; is that -- do you agree
7 with that?

8 A Yes, I do.

9 Q And I'm just trying to compare your concern with
11:41 10 the fact that when Mr. Henderson met for a day
11 with Ron Wilson and arrived with a, ended up with
12 a six-page written statement at the end of six or
13 eight hours, would there be any difference in
14 approaching that if you compare that to Inspector
11:42 15 Roberts, who spent a similar amount of time that
16 produced two statements but, again, no record of
17 what happened?

18 A Admittedly, on the face of it, they appear to be
19 similar. I note a couple of differences, however.

11:42 20 First, Inspector Roberts
21 didn't take the statements from Mr. Wilson or Ms.
22 John. Certainly, the effect of his examination
23 contributed, I suspect, in some measure to the
24 account that they provided to the police officers.

11:42 25 But I think, more importantly,



1 the polygraph charts, the notes, were done in
2 1969, and some 20 years later they were -- could
3 not be located. The significance of the
4 polygraph, I guess, is probably -- or might have
5 11:43 been a live issue at trial, but there was an
6 opportunity to test that process and the procedure
7 for examining the witnesses by Mr. Roberts at
8 trial, and there was an opportunity to fully
9 canvass that issue there. It -- I'm not certain,
10 11:43 as I speak now, how that was dealt with, but there
11 was an opportunity to test it.

12 In terms of the disappearance
13 of the charts and the reports, 20 years had
14 elapsed, and I was aware of certain document
15 11:43 destruction procedures by some of the police
16 forces, so I didn't take anything sinister in
17 response to the fact that old records may not now
18 be in existence.

19 By contrast, Mr. Wilson was
20 11:44 examined on June 4th, and a request for -- which
21 was a recent event -- and our request for the
22 notes -- and notes had to have been taken over a
23 six or seven-hour period, I later learned that the
24 interview was taped -- those weren't forthcoming.
25 11:44 So that was a significant difference.



1 Q Do you recall being made aware, we've heard some
2 evidence before this Commission that Inspector
3 Roberts' interview of Nichol John and/or Ron
4 Wilson may have been tape recorded and/or listened
11:44 5 in on by officers in an adjacent room, were you --
6 does that --

7 A That doesn't ring a bell. It may have happened
8 but I'm not --

9 Q And so is it fair to say, then, that the
11:45 10 circumstances -- I think what you are telling us,
11 please correct me if I'm wrong, that the
12 circumstances under which the records of the
13 interviews, the Roberts interview of Wilson and
14 John and the Henderson interview of Wilson, that
11:45 15 because one was 20 years earlier and there was
16 other circumstances you did not -- you did not
17 have concerns that the Roberts interview notes and
18 charts weren't available, you saw some innocent
19 explanation for that; is that fair?

11:45 20 A Yes.

21 Q But on the Henderson interview of Wilson, because
22 it was only a month earlier, you had concerns that
23 -- in other words there shouldn't be a reason that
24 the notes and tape aren't available?

11:45 25 A Well, it would have been nice to have had them.



1 Q Well, let's go to that question. So putting aside
2 who and how the notes, and where they went, would
3 you agree that, in looking at the credibility of
4 the Wilson recantation in June of 1990, it would
11:46 5 have been helpful to have the tape of that
6 interview and any of Mr. Henderson's notes?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Would you agree that, in determining the
9 credibility of Ron Wilson's and Nichol John's
11:46 10 statements that came out of their session with
11 Inspector Roberts, that it would have been helpful
12 to have either Inspector Roberts' notes or a tape
13 of that session and/or the polygraph charts?

14 A Yes.

11:46 15 Q And so would you agree that, in looking at both,
16 there is no distinction, really, between the two,
17 it would be helpful to have that background
18 information?

19 A Correct.

11:46 20 Q If we can go to 157100.

21 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Umm, I -- I
22 thought the question was going to be, sir -- if
23 you'll forgive me, Mr. Hodson --

24 MR. HODSON: Sure.

11:47 25 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- in the result



1 you saw an innocent explanation for the lack of
2 the Roberts' notes. Did you see, by contrast, no
3 innocent explanation for the lack of notes for
4 Henderson, or tape?

11:47 5 A If I understand your question, Commissioner, I
6 felt that there was no reason why it couldn't be
7 produced --

8 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

9 A -- it -- by virtue of let's say the lack of -- or
11:47 10 the interval between the taking of the statement
11 and our request for it.

12 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes. But, in
13 either case, the notes would have helped you?

14 A Oh, indeed.

11:47 15 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Both cases, I
16 mean?

17 A Yes.

18 BY MR. HODSON:

19 Q This is an August 14th, 1990 letter from Mr. Asper
11:47 20 to Minister Kim Campbell with a copy to you and
21 Mr. Corbett. And this is a letter that raises,
22 with the minister, concern about your, or the
23 department's use of Mr. Caldwell. And it says:

24 "It has come to our attention
11:48 25 that your officials have been to some



1 degree using the services of Mr. T.D.R.
2 Caldwell, who is employed with the
3 Department of Justice in Saskatoon,
4 Saskatchewan. This is shocking since it
11:48 5 was Mr. Caldwell who conducted the
6 prosecution against David Milgaard in
7 1969. Apparently your officials have
8 told the media that unless Mr. Milgaard
9 specifically alleges prosecutorial
11:48 10 misconduct, in their view there is
11 nothing improper with the inclusion of
12 the original prosecutor in the present
13 investigation."

14 Can you comment on that? Did -- do you recall
11:48 15 whether you or others in your department told the
16 media what's attributed to you there?

17 A The way it is characterized does not reflect my
18 recollection of any discussions I may have had
19 with the media. I did not, in the absence of any
11:49 20 suggestion of prosecutorial misconduct, I did not
21 think it improper to question Mr. Caldwell and to
22 obtain his assistance in terms of making contact
23 with the police investigators and in terms of
24 getting access to his files so that we could
11:49 25 assess the claims that had been made.



1 "... the inclusion of the original
2 prosecutor in the present
3 investigation."

4 misstates the role that Mr. Caldwell played. He
11:50 5 played no greater role, by providing his file
6 material to me or taking time to discuss the
7 theory of the case to me, than he would have with
8 some of the folks, whether it's
9 Mr. Carlyle-Gordge or others who were interested
11:50 10 in the case, and who had access to his file
11 material. It was perhaps a good thing for me
12 that, at the time, he was a member of the federal
13 prosecution service, as it's now called, so
14 contacting him was not a problem. But my
11:50 15 understanding, and it was confirmed when I
16 visited, was that the file material was within
17 the -- was still with the ministry of the, I call
18 it the ministry of the Attorney General, I guess
19 it's Sask. Justice, and he facilitated because of
11:50 20 his knowledge of the officials there. I think it
21 was Fred Dehm who was the Crown prosecutor, he
22 made the introductions and allowed me to have
23 more rapid access to it, so if -- if that
24 activity qualifies as:

11:51 25 "... inclusion of the original



1 prosecutor in the present

2 investigation.",

3 so be it. It was essential, at least initially,

4 for me to understand the Crown's theory of the

11:51 5 case, and what better person to obtain that from

6 but having a conversation with the prosecutor.

7 Q Prior to this letter was it your understanding

8 that -- or what was your understanding as to

9 whether any of the grounds put forward on behalf

11:51 10 of David Milgaard included any allegation of

11 prosecutorial misconduct?

12 A That -- that might have -- there wasn't any ground

13 raised specifically like that. There had been

14 some notations in certain articles about the fact

11:52 15 that -- or the suggestion that, for example, Mr.

16 Wilson's March 1969 statement had not found its

17 way into Mr. Tallis' hands, or the Ute Frank

18 statement hadn't, and --

19 Q Let me pause there. On that news article, do you

11:52 20 recall ever being advised by, directly by counsel

21 for David Milgaard that that was a ground of the

22 application, that Mr. Caldwell failed to disclose

23 the March the 3rd, '69 statements to Mr. Tallis?

24 A I don't recall that having ever been advanced.

11:52 25 Q And so that would have been something you read in



1 the paper?

2 A The contention, I think the inference that was
3 drawn from some of the articles, for example in
4 relation to Wilson, that's the latest example, was
11:53 5 that obviously Caldwell didn't have -- not
6 Caldwell -- but Mr. Justice Tallis did not have
7 the March 3rd, 1969 statement of Wilson because
8 had he, had he that document, he would have,
9 quote, in Wilson's terms, "destroyed him". The
11:53 10 inference is that the Crown didn't disclose.

11 Q So --

12 A Similarly with Ute Frank, some of the headlines
13 signaled that, you know, the Justice Department
14 had been sitting on this statement for 20 years,
11:53 15 and it would have signaled that two witnesses
16 lied. So the impression was, although it wasn't
17 stated, the impression in the press, which was not
18 corrected by those in the Milgaard camp, was that
19 there was a failure of disclosure.

11:54 20 Q But what I am -- I'm sorry.

21 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: No, go ahead?

22 BY MR. HODSON:

23 Q But I guess my question is, though, did you view
24 that to be a ground in the application in light of
11:54 25 the fact -- I think what you are telling us is you



1 read it in the paper but it wasn't directly
2 provided to you in a communication on behalf of
3 David Milgaard that said "one of the grounds of
4 our miscarriage of justice is Mr. Caldwell failed
11:54 5 to disclose the Ron Wilson statement"?

6 A By the time that we received this particular piece
7 of correspondence I had spoken with Justice
8 Tallis, one of the areas of our conversation
9 related to the relationship between the Crown and
11:54 10 the defence, and with respect to disclosure. As a
11 result of that conversation I had no concerns
12 about disclosure being fully made in accordance
13 with the best traditions of criminal law practice.

14 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, sir, what
11:54 15 I'd like to know is did the fact that allegations
16 like this appeared in the press cause you to
17 investigate them as grounds for the application,
18 irrespective of the fact that they were not
19 included in the formal application?

11:55 20 A I asked, I made inquiries about them, sir, and I
21 found no in -- no evidence that there was a --
22 that there were problems with disclosure.

23 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well did you feel
24 obliged to investigate them because they were in
11:55 25 the press, even though not in the application?



1 A I'm not saying I felt obliged, but I did look at
2 them, yes.

3 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right. Thank
4 you.

11:55 5 BY MR. HODSON:

6 Q Is it fair to characterize that allegation as
7 being related somewhat to the Ron Wilson
8 recantation? I suppose, let me --

9 A It -- it -- it factors into the Ron Wilson
11:55 10 recantation, it also was raised in relation to the
11 Ute Frank statement.

12 Q Let me re-characterize that. I suppose, if Mr.
13 Caldwell had not disclosed statements of key
14 witnesses that tended to tell a different story
11:56 15 than what the witnesses said at trial, quite apart
16 from Ron Wilson's recantation, that might be
17 something that would give rise to a miscarriage of
18 justice; is that fair?

19 A Yes.

11:56 20 Q And so would you agree, then, that that is
21 arguably a different issue than Mr. Wilson's
22 recantation?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And so at this point I'm still not sure, I think
11:56 25 you said you investigated it, but was -- can we



1 conclude, from that, that you were looking into an
2 allegation that you read in the paper about
3 non-disclosure, or had you dismissed the article
4 when you read it, based on what Mr. Tallis told
11:56 5 you?

6 A I had dismissed it by then, because by then I had
7 taken a look at the Crown file and I'd seen the
8 correspondence and the exchanges between Mr.
9 Caldwell and Mr. Tallis.

11:56 10 Q And then, the next paragraph down, it says:

11 "Moreover, it is of great concern that
12 evidence advanced by Mr. Milgaard is
13 being subjected to strict scrutiny by
14 your officials, while those involved in
11:57 15 the original investigation and
16 prosecution have not, as far as we can
17 tell, even been questioned, let alone
18 under oath. We wonder why the
19 investigation is not as balanced as it
11:57 20 ought to be."

21 I'm wondering what, your comment about that
22 statement, was that your view of what you were
23 doing or what you were supposed to be doing?

24 A No. Umm, you know, I spoke with Mr. Justice
11:57 25 Tallis, it wasn't under oath. I did speak with



1 Larry Fisher, it was under oath. Whether -- the
2 preferred course --

3 Q Sorry, I'm -- I wasn't concerned about oath or not
4 oath, --

11:57 5 A Okay.

6 Q -- I'm more concerned about --

7 A Strict scrutiny for some and not for others?

8 Q And why the investigation is not as balanced, in
9 other words, why are you not investigating Mr.

11:57 10 Caldwell and others involved in the investigation?

11 A Mr. Caldwell, if I can take the last question
12 first, there had not been any specific complaint
13 about Mr. Caldwell, first; and secondly, nothing
14 that I had discovered in looking at the other
11:58 15 grounds signaled a need to examine Mr. Caldwell's
16 activity or the activity of the -- well, there was
17 some suggestion, and we did follow up with respect
18 to the police officers and whether or not they had
19 acted improperly in relation to the witnesses,
11:58 20 that was examined.

21 Q Okay.

22 A We made probes of the -- of the points that had
23 been raised in the application, and I'll tell you
24 why.

11:58 25 The information from Deborah



1 Hall came by way of an affidavit under oath. I
2 thought it appropriate, in those circumstances, to
3 question her under oath.

4 To the extent that there was
11:59 5 trial testimony that had been tested under oath, I
6 felt reasonably comfortable that that stood, and
7 to the -- unless there was some other compelling
8 reason that signaled a departure from that
9 information, and where circumstances permitted, I
11:59 10 would take it under oath, but if I couldn't I
11 accepted or took what I could.

12 My feeling was, and my
13 objective was, to get at the facts, and to get at
14 them in as strong a form that I could. While Mr.
11:59 15 Asper might take a different view, my objective
16 was to be impartial, and to pose the questions of
17 all of the folks that I met to test their
18 veracity.

19 Q I see it's 12:00, Mr. Commissioner. Just a
12:00 20 reminder that we're back at 1:00.

21 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

22 *(Adjourned at 12:00 p.m.)*

23 *(Reconvened at 1:03 p.m.)*

24 BY MR. HODSON:

01:03 25 Q Good afternoon. If we could call up 157100.



1 A Mr. Hodson, before you ask your next question, I
2 would like to add to the answer to the last
3 question?

4 Q Certainly.

01:03 5 A It refers to the document that's on the screen and
6 the addition is simply this: The complaints that
7 are contained in the letter concerning the use of,
8 or the inclusion of Mr. Caldwell and concerns
9 about balance reflects, in my view, a
01:03 10 misapprehension of the 690 process. The
11 application is to the minister and the minister
12 and the minister's representatives will speak to
13 both the Crown and the defence in an endeavour to
14 get all of the facts that are required to make an
01:04 15 informed decision, and to the extent that you
16 speak to the Crown prosecutor in order to
17 facilitate the retrieval of file materials or to
18 question that individual about the Crown's theory
19 and where reliance was placed in relation to the
01:04 20 trial proceedings, that's entirely consistent with
21 the role of the minister's staff in conducting an
22 impartial investigation. That's the portion I
23 wish to add.

24 Q Thank you. If we can just go down to this next
01:04 25 subject matter in the letter, and it's referring



1 to:

2 "...the investigation into the
3 individual who is likely the true
4 perpetrator..."

01:04 5 And I think that's referring to Larry Fisher,

6 "...we are quite dismayed that
7 apparently little or no progress has
8 been made."

9 Now, since the July -- let me back up. Would you
01:05 10 have informed Mr. Asper and Mr. Wolch about the
11 polygraph session of Mr. Fisher and your
12 interview with him?

13 A Either myself, or perhaps Mr. Pearson, would have
14 indicated to Mr. Wolch and Mr. Asper of our desire
01:05 15 to interview and to speak with Mr. Fisher.

16 Q Do you recall whether you would have informed
17 them, though, that the interview was done and
18 here's what he said or would that be something at
19 the October 1 meeting?

01:05 20 A At the time of this letter I suspect that we would
21 have said -- we would have interviewed him or at
22 least identified the fact that we had interviewed
23 him, but probably just basically said didn't get a
24 confession.

01:05 25 Q And what about the polygraph, do you recall



1 whether that was a subject you would have raised
2 with Mr. Wolch or Mr. Asper?

3 A I'm afraid I don't recall. I wouldn't be
4 surprised if it had been raised, but --

01:06 5 Q If it had?

6 A If it had been.

7 Q Yeah.

8 A But I have no specific recall of discussing it
9 with them.

01:06 10 Q Is it something you think would have been
11 disclosed to them at the October 1, 1990 meeting?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And do you have a recollection of disclosing that
14 to them, the fact that a polygraph was attempted
01:06 15 of Mr. Fisher?

16 A I have no specific recall of that, of making such
17 a disclosure, but it's the type of information
18 that we would likely have made known.

19 Q Okay. In this letter, and again this is August
01:06 20 14th, 1990, Mr. Asper writes that July 5:

21 "...we raised concerns that your
22 officials were not completely familiar
23 with the nature and substance of the
24 record of this new suspect. We
01:06 25 requested details regarding the



1 suspect's seven other serious sexual
2 assaults, and have not yet received
3 same."

4 Are you able to tell us whether, as of August
01:07 5 14th, 1990, you take issue with this suggestion
6 that the details or the occurrence reports and
7 witness statements had not been provided by that
8 date?

9 A I, quite frankly, don't take issue with it. My
01:07 10 recollection now is I'm not sure what we had
11 gotten by that date. It may well be that we
12 hadn't received much, if anything.

13 Q I think, sorry, if I may, I showed you yesterday,
14 I think you would have had the (V5)-- (V5)---
01:07 15 file --

16 A Yes.

17 Q -- from mid July?

18 A He speaks of seven other serious sexual assaults.

19 Q I think those would be the two Winnipeg, (V10)
01:07 20 (V10)- and the four Saskatoon.

21 A Yes. We --

22 Q And so -- I'm sorry, go ahead.

23 A I believe that Sergeant Pearson had been able to
24 recover or obtain the (V10) (V10)- file because
01:08 25 that was an RCMP investigation. I, at this



1 moment, don't know or don't recall what progress
2 we had made in terms of getting Winnipeg's.

3 Q The letter goes on to talk about an investigator
4 that Mr. Asper has located, a former City of
01:08 5 Winnipeg police officer, and in fact I think he's
6 referring to Lorne Huff, the fellow who
7 interviewed Mr. Fisher in 1971. Were you familiar
8 with who Mr. Huff was?

9 A I became familiar with Mr. Huff afterwards.

01:08 10 Q And then what Mr. Asper seems to be saying here is
11 that:

12 "...it would appear that the RCMP have
13 withdrawn their involvement, and your
14 officials have become directly involved
01:08 15 without having given us the opportunity
16 to conduct an investigation."

17 And this is a letter to Minister Campbell, and
18 then:

19 "It should be noted that this has been
01:08 20 our investigation, and not that
21 conducted by your Department, which has
22 resulted in all of the new evidence now
23 before your officials."

24 We talked about this back in June, about when you
01:09 25 started to investigate Larry Fisher and you



1 engaged Sergeant Pearson to do that, and what do
2 you have to say about Mr. Asper's contention here
3 that they were not given an opportunity to
4 conduct an investigation by having the RCMP
01:09 5 withdrawn?

6 A Well, that was news to me because my information
7 was that Sergeant Pearson was still conducting an
8 investigation. It's a bit of advocacy in the next
9 paragraph in which he indicates that it is the
01:09 10 Milgaard investigation which has resulted in all
11 of the new evidence before us. Certainly the
12 efforts of Mrs. Milgaard and Mr. Asper identified
13 a number of new areas for investigation, but we
14 weren't -- but we also did some checking and were
01:10 15 able to, shall we say, clarify the information
16 that had been provided to us.

17 Q I recall I think your evidence back in June to the
18 effect that when Larry Fisher became a suspect,
19 you had the RCMP conduct that investigation and
01:10 20 that you were conducting it as opposed to -- or
21 maybe it was Sergeant Pearson who talked about the
22 concerns of having a parallel investigation being
23 conducted. Do you recall that issue about --

24 A Yes.

01:10 25 Q And I thought your evidence was to the effect that



1 you were desirous of having Mr. Pearson do the
2 investigation without a parallel investigation; is
3 that right?

4 A Well, when you say a parallel investigation --

01:10 5 Q By David Milgaard's counsel or people on his
6 behalf.

7 A Yes.

8 Q And so here, I just want your comment here, this
9 letter, I think Mr. Asper is saying that:

01:11 10 "In order for our investigation of the
11 new suspect to be complete, we will
12 require the co-operation of your
13 officials, both in providing our
14 investigator with all details of the
01:11 15 investigation into the suspect to date,
16 as well as providing us with access to
17 him. This kind of co-operation does not
18 appear to be forthcoming, and we are
19 most disturbed once again by what
01:11 20 appears to be an effort to preserve the
21 status quo rather than uncover the
22 truth."

23 What was your understanding as far as whether
24 they were, and Mr. Asper, whether it be Mr. Huff
01:11 25 or whoever, were doing their own investigation



1 and your co-operation, or your alleged
2 non-co-operation with their investigation?

3 A Well, it was news to me. I was aware that Mr.
4 Asper, Mr. Wolch and the Milgaards had been taking
01:11 5 investigative steps. Certainly the discovery or
6 the presentation of Mr. Wilson, obtaining
7 statements from Wilson, Cadrain and others
8 signaled, you know, an active role. I wasn't
9 aware, apart from I think at an earlier stage
01:12 10 there was an offer to have Mrs. Milgaard, Joyce
11 Milgaard attend at the Sask Pen and interview Mr.
12 Fisher, but apart from that, I wasn't aware of any
13 specific retainer of a private investigator or
14 someone other than Centurion Ministries as
01:12 15 conducting an active investigation and, quite
16 frankly, I wasn't happy at the prospect of
17 learning that, because in my view it was a matter
18 for the police and Mr. Pearson was already on the
19 file.

01:12 20 Q And so do I take it from that that you were not --
21 I think, number one, you are saying you weren't
22 aware that they were doing their own investigation
23 and waiting for your co-operation; is that fair?

24 A That's correct.

01:13 25 Q And secondly, had you known that, you would have



1 been inclined not to be in favour of them doing
2 their own investigation for the reasons you
3 stated?

4 A They may. I couldn't prevent them, but certainly
01:13 5 I would not commit the RCMP to disclose the
6 results of whatever investigation it was
7 conducting to the Milgaards.

8 Q And why not?

9 A Firstly, it's -- on two bases; one, in relation to
01:13 10 the historical information, it was being done at
11 the behest of -- for the Minister of Justice.
12 Secondly, if the RCMP is saying now, then, we're
13 -- perhaps had re-opened the case and were
14 conducting a criminal investigation, as an officer
01:13 15 of the court, as a prosecutor, putting that hat
16 on, I could not and would not compel an
17 investigative force to disclose to a third party
18 that is not of a certain, shall we say,
19 classification, it's not another police or
01:14 20 official agency, the fruits of an ongoing
21 investigation. It's just not done and it's not my
22 place to do so.

23 Q Can we go to 113354, this is an August 15th, 1990
24 memo to file indicating that you spoke with Mr.
01:14 25 Pearson on August 13th, 1990 and it talks about a:



1 "...timetable in relation to his
2 participation, and identified the
3 matters which remained to be completed."

4 And that:

01:14 5 "Mr. Pearson indicated that he would
6 complete his report by August 25..."

7 Scroll down. It talks about interviewing
8 Mrs. Cadrain, Mike Robinson, follow-up on the
9 polygraph issue. Is it a correct read of this
01:14 10 that by this time, Mr. Williams, you were in the
11 process of concluding your investigation and you
12 were asking Mr. Pearson, or Sergeant Pearson to
13 complete his remaining tasks by August 25, 1990?

14 A I asked him to give me an estimate as to when he
01:15 15 would finish and he provided me with that date,
16 but we were, true, we were winding it down or
17 running down the leads that were still
18 outstanding.

19 Q If we can go to 004374, and just before we have
01:15 20 any answers, Mr. Williams, just a couple of
21 comments, and it may be that Mr. Frayer and your
22 counsel wish to speak to this.

23 This is an August 28th, 1990
24 memorandum from Mr. Williams to Mr. MacFarlane
01:15 25 that contains, for the most part, a summary of the



1 investigative steps that he took, his assessment
2 of some of the information and his conclusions on
3 various matters. It is a memorandum -- as opposed
4 to being a memorandum from him to the file with
01:16 5 his summary of his work and conclusions, it is a
6 memo to Mr. MacFarlane.

7 I can state, Mr. Commissioner,
8 that it is not my intent to question about advice
9 Mr. Williams may have provided to Mr. MacFarlane
01:16 10 or anything of that nature, but I do believe the
11 document, at least for the most part, reflects a
12 summary of his investigative fact-finding work
13 and, in fact, deals with much of what Mr. Williams
14 has already testified to.

01:16 15 It's my understanding that
16 Mr. McLeod, on behalf of Mr. Williams, has no
17 objection; in fact, believes this to be an
18 appropriate document to question Mr. Williams.
19 Mr. Frayer, I'm not sure, maybe you can express
01:16 20 where you are at as far as my ability to question
21 the witness with respect to this document, and of
22 course the question here is this advice.

23 MR. FRAYER: Thank you, Mr. Hodson.
24 Mr. Commissioner, Mr. Hodson and I had a
01:17 25 preliminary discussion with respect to this



1 particular document and the way he has
2 characterized it is the way that I agree with it.
3 It's an investigative narrative with
4 investigation done to date, much of which we've
01:17 5 heard through this witness to this point, and
6 further investigative steps to be taken.

7 It may very well be that
8 contained somewhere in this memorandum there may
9 be portions of it that could be considered to be
01:17 10 advice. I am comforted by what Mr. Hodson says
11 with respect to the manner in which he intends to
12 use this document and I'm satisfied that he can
13 proceed on that basis.

14 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you, Mr.
15 Frayer.

16 MR. FRAYER: Thank you.

17 BY MR. HODSON:

18 Q Thank you. And the first paragraph, Mr. Williams,
19 I take it this is a document that you would have
01:17 20 prepared around August 28th, 1990?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And it's a 20 page document, fairly lengthy, and
23 deals with the work you had conducted to date in a
24 fairly detailed way; is that correct?

01:18 25 A It's a summary of the steps we had taken and what



1 the issues were and what we had found.

2 Q And your first paragraph states that, it says:

3 "This memorandum is for information
4 only. It outlines the issues raised in
01:18 5 this application, describes the
6 investigative or other steps taken in
7 addressing those issues; summarizes the
8 findings to date, and identifies the
9 remaining issues to be resolved, and the
01:18 10 means by which the resolution of those
11 issues can be achieved."

12 And is it correct or accurate to say that first
13 paragraph is an accurate summary of where you
14 were at as far as your fact-finding or
01:18 15 investigation aspect of your work?

16 A Yes. It's a written -- a fairly detailed status
17 report.

18 Q And would it be fair to say that this would draw
19 from other files or other memos you had prepared
01:18 20 that we've already gone through and much of what
21 we've already commented or discussed in your
22 evidence is summarized in this memo?

23 A Yes.

24 Q If we can just scroll down, and it appears here at
01:19 25 the outset that you are identifying at least your



1 understanding of the grounds that had been put
2 forward to that date; is that a fair way to state
3 it?

4 A Yes, it is.

01:19 5 Q And so you've characterized the Larry Fisher
6 information, the basis of the information --
7 and go to the next -- sorry, just the bottom, you
8 say:

9 "Further, counsel have drawn attention
01:19 10 to the police conduct during the
11 investigation by alleging that a key
12 Crown witness, Ronald Dale Wilson, was
13 manipulated and coerced by the police to
14 implicate David Milgaard in the death of
01:19 15 Gail Miller. The statement of Albert
16 Cadrain was also submitted to support
17 the contention that the police harassed
18 these teenaged witnesses."

19 And so on the Cadrain statement, it was not that
01:20 20 he recanted, but rather the police manipulation;
21 is that correct?

22 A That's how I saw it at the time, yes.

23 Q If we can scroll down, I don't propose to go
24 through this in detail, Mr. Williams. Would you
01:20 25 agree that this would reflect your thinking at the



1 time as far as your, number one, the information
2 that you had gathered and, number two, the
3 conclusions that you drew as to whether or not
4 that information provided a reasonable basis -- or
01:20 5 might provide a reasonable basis to conclude that
6 a miscarriage of justice had occurred?

7 A I agree with most of the characterization. It
8 does indeed set out my understanding of the
9 issues, the summary of the facts and there are a
01:20 10 number of factors discussed which bear on the
11 amount of weight, if you want to call it that,
12 that might be attributed to some of the statements
13 that were provided to us and -- but it is not a,
14 shall we say, it's not a document that I think
01:21 15 sets out a recommendation with respect to the
16 final question that would have to be determined.

17 Q Fair enough, but if I were to ask you on August
18 28th, 1990 tell me what you've learned in your
19 investigation and the conclusions you've drawn
01:21 20 with respect to the grounds put forward in the
21 application, would this be a good summary of what
22 you thought at the time?

23 A Yes, although some of the conclusions on the
24 various points aren't stated in that document.

01:21 25 Q Okay. Now if we can go to the next page, I won't



1 go through this, this is the Deborah Hall stuff,
2 the forensic report. Go to page 004378, and here
3 the heading is *Was Larry Fisher the assailant of*
4 *Gail Miller?* And I think you've told us that was
01:22 5 the, sort of the initial characterization of this
6 ground; is that correct, that Larry Fisher is the
7 killer, therefore, David Milgaard is not and
8 therefore there's a miscarriage of justice?

9 A Yes.

01:22 10 Q And then it goes on to set out, and I take it this
11 came from primarily the Linda Fisher information,
12 that was the initial bit of information that you
13 pursued on this ground?

14 A Yes. Subsequently, if we're still on the topic of
01:22 15 Larry Fisher --

16 Q Yes.

17 A -- subsequently, as a result of information
18 obtained from the applicants, there was another
19 facet, shall we say, of the Larry Fisher insofar
01:23 20 as it related to the application of David
21 Milgaard, in that it was examined in relation to
22 whether or not the evidence surrounding Mr.
23 Fisher's convictions for sexual assault in
24 Saskatoon, what impact that might have had on the
01:23 25 jury had it been presented at trial.



1 Q And so that would be a related but a different
2 ground than Larry Fisher is the killer?

3 A Yes.

4 Q And so if we can scroll down here, you comment:

01:23 5 "Additionally I examined his prison
6 records and the available occurrence
7 reports relating to his convictions to
8 determine whether the circumstances of
9 the crimes for which he entered pleas of
01:23 10 guilty, bore any similarities to the
11 circumstances surrounding Ms. Miller's
12 death. They were not similar."

13 And do you recall what files or what information
14 you would have had and, secondly, elaborate on
01:24 15 your conclusion that the -- his other offences,
16 to the extent that you had information, were not
17 similar to the Gail Miller death?

18 A The files that, or the most complete file I think
19 we had was, came from Winnipeg and there was one
01:24 20 from Saskatoon, I think it was (V5)-- (V5)---.
21 Apart from that, I believe we had a brief summary
22 of the incidents giving rise to the other three
23 sexual assaults for which pleas of guilty had been
24 entered into Regina. Admittedly, there was a
01:24 25 summary or a synopsis of the events which set out,



1 I would call it the bare bones of the case, the
2 type of information that one would read in on a
3 plea of guilty, but it would set out the date,
4 time and place, some of the circumstances of the
01:25 5 activity that gave rise to the offence.

6 Q Sorry, if I can just -- if you pause there. Do
7 you know if that -- was that the March 17, 1971
8 letter from Deputy Chief Corey to Ken MacKay? I
9 think that was the letter that was used by Mr.
01:25 10 Kujawa when he spoke to Mr. Fisher's guilty pleas.

11 A I believe that was it.

12 Q Okay.

13 A And there were some details. One of the things we
14 looked at was, in terms of the other offences, was
01:25 15 the extent, the time, location, whether or not
16 there was anything in particular about the
17 offences which perhaps gave an identifier that,
18 you know, that was Larry Fisher as the assailant
19 of Gail Miller, the use of a weapon, the degree of
01:26 20 violence, whether or not there was an escalating
21 pattern of violence, things like that. There were
22 some similarities in the sense that some of the
23 offences involved the use of a knife, but that is
24 not an unusual event in relation to a sexual
01:26 25 assault, and in terms of, in examination of what



1 was then available, my conclusion was it wasn't
2 similar, or there wasn't sufficient similarities
3 that pointed to Larry Fisher as Gail Miller's
4 assailant.

01:26 5 Q Were you satisfied at that time that you had
6 sufficient details about each of these incidents
7 to make that assessment of similarity?

8 A I had all that I could find and on that basis I
9 drew a conclusion. We were seeking or we had
01:27 10 sought fuller descriptions in the files, we had
11 sought the files but they weren't available.

12 Q Did you give any thought to interviewing, either
13 you or Sergeant Pearson, interviewing the victims
14 with respect to those assaults where you did not
01:27 15 have, for example, a witness statement or an
16 occurrence report?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And what did you conclude?

19 A We did not conduct the interviews and I suspect
01:27 20 that we didn't conduct them because that's --
21 certainly not at that time, because we were of the
22 view that at the initial look, there weren't
23 sufficient similarities based on what we had
24 discovered.

01:27 25 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just -- could I



1 ask you for -- we saw that March 17th letter to
2 MacKay; did we not?

3 MR. HODSON: Yeah. Do you want to have it
4 called up? I'm wondering if we -- I don't have a
01:28 5 doc. ID.

6 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just make a note
7 of it, ladies, we can get it up afterwards and
8 then --

9 MR. HODSON: Yeah. It's the March 17th,
01:28 10 1971 letter from Corey to MacKay.

11 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I would like to
12 show it to this witness and ask him if it's the
13 sort of thing that would be presented to a court
14 who was being asked to accept similar fact
01:28 15 evidence, just on the basis of that, the details
16 contained in that letter.

17 A Okay.

18 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: That's what I
19 wanted to ask him.

01:28 20 MR. HODSON: We'll just maybe wait a
21 moment. I think someone here will --

22 BY MR. HODSON:

23 Q And just, I'll just go through this briefly, Mr.
24 Williams, and assist you. It's a March 17th
01:29 25 letter, if we can go to the last page, it's from



1 the deputy chief of police, Mr. Corey, to Ken
2 MacKay, and if we can go to page 1, and the
3 evidence we've heard is that after Mr. Fisher
4 confessed to two of the Saskatoon assaults in
01:29 5 Winnipeg, he was attempting to negotiate a plea in
6 Saskatchewan and I believe this was a letter
7 requested by Mr. MacKay in the Regina A.G.'s
8 office to get information about the offences, and
9 so it outlines the four Saskatoon offences -- and
01:29 10 if we can go to the next page -- it talks about,
11 for example, charge number one, this is the (V1)-
12 one, was walking down the lane,

13 "...grabbed from behind and, at knife
14 point, forced down a lane ... forced to
01:30 15 remove most of her clothing and was then
16 raped. (V1)- described her assailant as
17 a male in his early twenties, dark
18 hair... The knife appeared similar to a
19 paring knife."

01:30 20 Ms. (V1)- looked at photos, was unable to
21 identify him. And then similarly with the
22 (V2)----- rape, it goes on to describe some of
23 the facts there.

24 Is this a document, are you
01:30 25 able to tell whether this is familiar, whether it



1 might have been something you had in August of
2 1990 when you were making that assessment?

3 A Yes.

4 Q Do you have a recollection of having this document
01:30 5 at some point?

6 A Yes, or seeing it, yes.

7 Q Now, Mr. Commissioner, did you have a question for
8 him on this document?

9 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, on the basis
01:30 10 of this and whatever other information you had, I
11 gather he made the assessment, which is I suppose
12 somewhat similar to that which would be made by a
13 trial judge, in deciding whether evidence of
14 similar acts was admissible. And that's all I
01:31 15 wanted to get out of him, is the basis for
16 arriving at the conclusion that he did, that
17 there was not enough similarity?

18 MR. HODSON: Okay.

19 A Admittedly a paring knife or a jackknife was used
01:31 20 in all -- at least in the first three, but one of
21 the things you would note would be the time of
22 day, the location, whether there was any
23 particular identifying aspect of it, the level of
24 violence, whether or not robbery was, you know, a
01:31 25 factor.



1 BY MR. HODSON:

2 Q If we can go back to the August memo, please. So
3 here, when you say they are not similar, are you
4 able to comment on whether you were looking at it
01:32 5 then as a prosecutor would in determining whether
6 this information could be admissible in a
7 prosecution against Larry Fisher?

8 A Yes.

9 Q What about the -- from a defendant's perspective,
01:32 10 from Mr. Milgaard's perspective, as that this is
11 evidence that is similar, that shows a similarity
12 such that it would be relevant and admissible at
13 his trial to point to a third-party perpetrator?

14 A I was alive to that issue, and in a trial context
01:32 15 certainly that would be a, that would be a
16 consideration for the defence to raise reasonable
17 doubt.

18 Q And so I -- what I am trying to understand.

19 Though, when you are looking at the similarities
01:32 20 what was it for, the purpose? Was it the
21 prosecution standard, or the defence standard, or
22 what was it that you were --

23 A Well I was looking, I guess initially, from the
24 prosecution standpoint, whether or not there was
01:33 25 anything about what had happened, that one could



1 look at that fact pattern and look at Gail Miller
2 and say "that is Larry Fisher's work in the
3 killing of Gail Miller", is there something we --
4 it happened that it was dark, most of them
01:33 5 happened at night, they happened in different
6 parts of the city, is there something about the
7 victim, is there something about the circumstances
8 which is so, so, so common in comparison with that
9 of Ms. Miller.

01:33 10 Q Now so you have said here that, based on the
11 information that you had in August of 1990 and
12 your review of the information of the seven
13 assaults, if I can call it that, that's the four
14 Saskatoon, the two Winnipeg, and (V10) (V10)-;
01:33 15 correct?

16 A Yes.

17 Q And I think you said you had limited information
18 on -- let me back up. You did not have witness
19 statements from (V1)-, (V2)-----, and (V3)-----,
01:34 20 but you did from (V5)---; is that correct?

21 A I believe so, yes.

22 Q And you would have had witness statements from
23 (V8)--- and (V7)--- in Winnipeg?

24 A Yes.

01:34 25 Q And (V10) (V10)- in North Battleford?



1 A Yes.

2 Q So, on the basis of that, you concluded that there
3 were not sufficient similarities to the
4 circumstances surrounding Gail Miller's death as
01:34 5 the Fisher assaults; is that fair?

6 A Yes.

7 Q In 1991, on the second application, I believe you
8 would have been provided with additional
9 information, namely statements from the three that
01:34 10 you did not have in 1990; correct?

11 A Correct.

12 Q Namely (V1)-, (V2)----- and (V3)-----?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Was there anything in those three statements that
01:34 15 you reviewed that caused you to change your view
16 about similarities between the Fisher assaults and
17 Gail Miller's death?

18 A Well there were certainly additional details that
19 informed the assessment. I did not, for reasons
01:35 20 -- I did not make an assessment in terms of
21 similar fact or similar act in any, shall we say,
22 detailed way because I was aware, initially at
23 least, that -- or from fairly early on following
24 the receipt of that information that I would not
01:35 25 likely be the person making the assessment of that



1 second 690 application.

2 Q Okay.

3 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just one more
4 thing, please. Umm, as an evaluator of
01:35 5 similar-fact evidence, is it your opinion that an
6 interview of the victims would have given you any
7 more useful information than that which was
8 contained in the March 17th letter, together with
9 what other information you had, namely the
01:36 10 (V5)--- file?

11 A I think an interview of the victims would have
12 been useful and would have been desirable if I had
13 reached what I would call a threshold question or
14 if I'd had a level of satisfaction of the
01:36 15 similarities. And here's what I mean by that.

16 Ms. Miller was -- Ms. Miller
17 was robbed and she was stabbed early in the
18 morning and with a level of violence that had not,
19 had not been approached in any of the cases before
01:37 20 her death, and it wasn't until 11 years later with
21 respect to (V10) (V10)-, and I had information
22 which informed the level of violence with respect
23 to (V10) (V10)- that prompted me to dismiss that
24 as a similar act incident in comparison to the
01:37 25 other assaults. The time of day, the locations,



1 were the initial factors that prompted me to
2 discount some of the similarities. There didn't
3 appear to be any, quote, "identifying element",
4 other than the use of a knife, which is fairly
01:37 5 common.

6 In hindsight, it would have
7 been better, the evaluation would have been better
8 informed had we in fact interviewed the victims,
9 because it would have provided perhaps a better
01:38 10 factual foundation for making the assessment. I
11 did not do so and the assessment suffers as a
12 result.

13 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well it strikes
14 me, sir, that the similarities, we know that all
01:38 15 the sexual assaults with which you were concerned
16 were the work of Larry Fisher?

17 A Yes.

18 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: That wasn't the
19 question.

01:38 20 A No.

21 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: The question was
22 were they so similar --

23 A To Gail Miller.

24 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- to the
01:38 25 circumstances of the -- Gail Miller's death that



1 one could say "Fisher had a hand in this death"?

2 A Yes.

3 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You couldn't
4 interview Gail Miller, obviously, --

01:38 5 A She's --

6 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- to get the
7 level of violence from her own mouth, so I just
8 fail to see at the moment, sir, what good it
9 would have done to interview the sexual assault
01:39 10 victims as a means of identifying Fisher as
11 Miller's murderer when you already had the
12 details, in writing, of what had happened to
13 them. I don't -- I don't quite understand the
14 urge to run around and quiz people all over again
01:39 15 about things like this.

16 A Well that, I take your point, sir, Mr.
17 Commissioner.

18 BY MR. HODSON:

19 Q Are you able to comment, Mr. Williams, about --
01:39 20 you later did learn more information about the
21 sexual assaults than you had in August of 1990; is
22 that correct?

23 A That's correct.

24 Q And do you recall whether there was anything there
01:39 25 that -- I appreciate that you did not formally,



1 weren't asked to formally do an assessment, but
2 did you, did you consider it at all? Are you able
3 to comment on whether the information you didn't
4 have in August of 1990 might have affected the
01:39 5 conclusion you reached in 1990?

6 A Certainly, it was stronger. I think, on balance,
7 I probably would, would have come to the same
8 conclusion as I had in August of 1990.

9 Q And what was it, are you able to point to one, one
01:40 10 factor that was most significant, that stood out
11 in making this assessment? We have had a number
12 of people testify about their views in looking at
13 the Fisher assaults and the Gail Miller murder,
14 similarities and differences, and was there
01:40 15 something that stood out in your mind that swayed
16 you to the side of saying "lookit, I don't think
17 there's sufficient similarity"?

18 A I was thinking, sir, after Gail Miller died in
19 1969 I would have expected what I would call an
01:40 20 increasing level of violence in relation to the
21 subsequent sexual assaults and I would have
22 expected, I guess, more of an element of theft or
23 robbery as part of it. Most of the other offences
24 took place in the evening, albeit that it was
01:41 25 dark, and by contrast Ms. Miller's death was early



1 in the morning. Now we know that there was
2 another, there was another example that had been
3 brought to our attention that had occurred the
4 same morning that Gail Miller died. I didn't
01:41 5 think that was sufficiently similar in terms of
6 the manner of the approach and the nature of the
7 sexual contact.

8 Q I think that was the (V4)---- (V4)--- incident and
9 I think that came out in August of '91, if I'm not
01:41 10 mistaken, right around the time of the second
11 application; is that the assault you are referring
12 to?

13 A Yes.

14 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: As to the time of
01:42 15 day, sir, all the offences, including Miller's,
16 were apparently done under cover of darkness?

17 A They were. I --

18 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So does it make a
19 difference as between morning and evening?

01:42 20 A Not when you take darkness as the common-place
21 factor, no, it doesn't.

22 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

23 BY MR. HODSON:

24 Q When you are looking at this question in August of
01:42 25 1990 about whether the -- Fisher's assaults are



1 similar to the Gail Miller murder, is it fair to
2 say that you would attempt to do so without --
3 you'd go down that path and conduct that exercise
4 without considering the evidence against David
01:42 5 Milgaard, in other words the evidence against him;
6 is that --

7 A That's correct. As I recall, one of the things
8 that happened following the receipt of the second
9 application and the fuller description of the
01:43 10 materials, I believe we, if not the Department of
11 Justice the RCMP, had sent the information out to
12 one of their analysts for evaluation.

13 Q And I take it, when you look at the Fisher
14 assaults and the similarity, that you're trying to
01:43 15 do so keeping David Milgaard out of the picture;
16 correct?

17 A Correct.

18 Q I'm wondering if it's -- if you're able to --
19 well, let me put it this way: Is it difficult to
01:43 20 do that when you have been looking at the evidence
21 that existed against David Milgaard? And let me
22 ask the question this way. If you would have
23 looked at this information in 1990, and there had
24 been no David Milgaard conviction, charge, or
01:44 25 anything, he was completely out of the picture, it



1 was an unsolved crime, and you looked at the Larry
2 Fisher rapes and the similarities and asked
3 yourself "are those similar to the Gail Miller
4 murder", compared to asking yourself that same
01:44 5 question with the knowledge that, number one,
6 David had been convicted of the crime; and two, 20
7 years later you had investigated a number of
8 grounds put forward to suggest that the evidence
9 against him was faulty, for lack of a better word,
01:44 10 and your assessment of that had been that it
11 wasn't as faulty as it had been suggested, and
12 sort of comparing those two I'm wondering whether
13 you -- whether you might look at it differently?

14 A I think I probably would look at it differently.

01:44 15 Q In what way?

16 A Well to the extent that, in the first scenario,
17 there's -- you are still a whodunit and certainly
18 there were suspicions about Mr. Fisher's
19 involvement.

01:45 20 In the second scenario, you
21 have a number of allegations that have been placed
22 in support of Mr. Milgaard's position, and upon
23 investigation they're found to be not quite as
24 stated, so it -- you do look with a bit more
01:45 25 skepticism about a set of circumstances that are



1 pointing towards another individual, and
2 particularly when you have a significant body of
3 evidence that was tried before -- tested before a
4 jury that resulted in Mr. Milgaard's conviction.

01:45 5 Q Okay. Let me ask one further question, that I
6 think the other scenario was let's pretend there
7 was no David Milgaard, no conviction, and I think
8 what you are saying is that you would look -- you
9 might look at the Fisher information differently
01:46 10 if there had been no conviction and no David
11 Milgaard; correct?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Similarly, if in 1990 you looked at this and you
14 knew with certainty that David Milgaard was
01:46 15 innocent, might you look at it a bit differently?
16 And I'm not suggesting you did, sir, but if you
17 had that view at the time, that you were certain
18 that Mr. Milgaard was innocent, do you think you
19 might have looked at the similarity of the Larry
01:46 20 Fisher rapes compared to the Gail Miller murder
21 differently than if you felt that there was a
22 conviction there and that he was, based on what
23 the Court ruled, the person who had committed the
24 crime?

01:46 25 A I guess my answer is this. If there was a



1 separate head of evidence or a separate bit of
2 evidence that signaled that Mr. Milgaard was
3 innocent, I would probably still maintain that
4 whatever similarities existed between Mr. Fisher's
01:47 5 rapes and the killing of Gail Miller would not be
6 such that I would even consider charges against
7 Mr. Fisher, I would still hold the same opinion
8 that it -- there wasn't enough to link Fisher to
9 that murder.

01:47 10 Q No, I appreciate that. But is it fair to say that
11 you might have viewed them as being more similar
12 than you did before; are you able to comment on
13 that?

14 A I -- my comment is that the similarities wouldn't
01:47 15 change, no.

16 Q Just go to the next page here. You talk about --
17 you state here:

18 "The evidence of Linda Fisher, and the
19 other circumstantial evidence does not
01:47 20 link Larry Earl Fisher to the murder of
21 Gail Miller."

22 And I take it that would have been your
23 conclusion, at the time, based on all the
24 information you had gathered and reviewed?

01:48 25 A Yes.



1 Q You then go on to talk about the July 30th report:
2 "... the event as a 'chilling
3 confession' by Larry Fisher.",
4 and then go on to describe that. If we can
01:48 5 scroll down, here you say:

6 "Although the inmate was reminded of his
7 fight with Fisher after the C.B.C.
8 story, the former inmate noted that
9 Fisher did not confess that he murdered
01:48 10 anyone.

11 When confronted with a Globe
12 & Mail story dated August 1, 1990, the
13 former inmate denied telling David Asper
14 the words attributed to him by Mr.
01:48 15 Asper. The story line read:

16 "WRONG PERSON JAILED IN 1969 RAPE CASE,
17 EX-CONVICT SAYS".

18 Go back to the story. Just on that, was that a
19 factor, the John Patterson incident? And when I
01:49 20 say "incident", the fact of how it was reported
21 and what you learned later, how did that affect
22 your conclusion about this Larry Fisher being the
23 perpetrator or the link?

24 A Again, it built up some, some evidence that Mr.
01:49 25 Fisher was not a very nice man, but there wasn't,



1 either alone or in combination with the other
2 information that we had gathered, I wasn't
3 satisfied of the link, sir.

4 Q So, at this time, it would appear that --

01:49 5 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Excuse me.

6 MR. HODSON: Oh, sorry?

7 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh I see, yes, I
8 gotcha. Go ahead, Mr. Hodson?

9 BY MR. HODSON:

01:49 10 Q Just on this issue of Larry Fisher I think, then,
11 if we could just jump ahead to 004392.

12 A Yes.

13 Q You talk here about, this is just towards the end,
14 I think this is under summary, you indicate that:

01:50 15 "The evidence of Linda Fisher ... does
16 not link Larry Fisher to the murder ..."

17 "Nor is the fact that Larry
18 Fisher is a convicted rapist, a link to
19 the murder of Gail Miller. The
01:50 20 circumstances of Ms. Miller's death do
21 not bear a similarity to the offences
22 for which Mr. Fisher was convicted."

23 Do I take it, from that, that as of August 28th,
24 1990, then, that based on your investigation you
01:50 25 did not find any evidence that would link Larry



1 Fisher to the murder of Gail Miller?

2 A Yes.

3 Q And, in particular, the evidence of Linda Fisher,
4 the John Patterson statements, your interview of
01:50 5 Larry Fisher, and his other offences?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And I take it, then, that as far as the -- if we
8 go back to what was put forward by counsel for
9 David Milgaard as a ground, namely that Larry
01:51 10 Fisher is the perpetrator and therefore that there
11 is a reasonable basis to conclude that a
12 miscarriage of justice had occurred -- and we'll
13 deal with the defence issue in a moment -- but as
14 far as that ground, is it fair to say that you
01:51 15 concluded that there was no evidence that
16 established that as a ground, as least based on
17 your investigation?

18 A Certainly not to my satisfaction, correct.

19 Q And was it a case that "he might be the
01:51 20 perpetrator but we just don't have evidence", or
21 what's --

22 A Yes.

23 Q Yes?

24 A Yes. You know, it's -- you did not ignore the
01:51 25 fact that it was possible that he may have done



1 it, however, needed something to link it.

2 For example, if Linda Fisher's
3 knife was similar in appearance to the murder
4 weapon, that might have been a stronger link, that
01:52 5 might -- that would have been a very good link,
6 but it wasn't. If -- admittedly there were some
7 of Mrs., there were some of Gail Miller's clothing
8 or identification that was found near the Cadrain
9 residence, and I was aware of that, but it was --
01:52 10 it worked both for and against.

11 Q How did the --

12 A One of the things that had occurred to me was
13 this. If I'm -- if I've committed a serious crime
14 am I going to drop the evidence, incriminating
01:52 15 evidence, on my doorstep?

16 Q In looking at this question, and I think you said
17 that although he may be -- there may be some
18 suspicion, there wasn't enough there to provide a
19 basis to say that there had been a miscarriage of
01:53 20 justice in David Milgaard's conviction; is that
21 fair?

22 A Yes.

23 Q And I think you told us back in June he didn't
24 have to prove, David Milgaard didn't have to prove
01:53 25 that Larry Fisher committed the crime, correct?



1 A Correct.

2 Q And I think you said the threshold was something
3 to the effect that 'some reasonable basis', some
4 evidence to suggest that Mr. Fisher may be the
01:53 5 perpetrator, is that -- or was it higher than
6 that?

7 A I think the word formulation I used was a
8 reasonable basis to conclude that a miscarriage of
9 justice may have occurred and, in the context of
01:53 10 the Larry Fisher information, taking a look at it
11 as to whether or not there was, call it,
12 sufficient fresh evidence that might be brought to
13 a Court of Appeal that might have affected the
14 verdict or the outcome.

01:54 15 Q And when you say "may have affected" would you,
16 would your analysis or your examination of the
17 existing case against David Milgaard be a factor
18 in how you weigh whether or not the Larry Fisher
19 information sort of meets the threshold?

01:54 20 A It certainly would be a factor, yes.

21 Q Yeah. In other words if, if a couple of the
22 bricks in the case against David Milgaard had
23 crumbled, might the Larry Fisher information, even
24 though you couldn't link him to the murder, but
01:54 25 might it become more significant? In other words,



1 what I am getting at is can you divorce the two,
2 Larry Fisher's culpability and David Mil -- the
3 case against David Milgaard?

4 A They are -- they are related. I -- 'they are
01:54 5 related' perhaps isn't quite the meaning I want to
6 convey. What I want to signal is simply this. If
7 there are a couple of major elements that are --
8 have crumbled from the case against David
9 Milgaard, it certainly lessens your comfort level
01:55 10 and might certainly signal that, although
11 individually some of the information linking Mr.
12 Fisher isn't that strong, that coupled, however,
13 with shall we say deficiencies that have been --
14 that may have been discovered in relation to the
01:55 15 evidence led at trial, that might have prompted a
16 favourable result.

17 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I wonder if we
18 could break and then sort of equalize the hours.
19 Thank you.

01:55 20 MR. HODSON: Certainly.

21 *(Adjourned at 1:55 p.m.)*

22 *(Reconvened at 2:14 p.m.)*

23 BY MR. HODSON:

24 Q Just go back to 004379, and we talked about your
02:14 25 conclusions about the suggestion that Larry Fisher



1 was the perpetrator. You had mentioned earlier in
2 your evidence on a couple of occasions that a
3 related ground put forward on behalf of David
4 Milgaard that related to the Larry Fisher rapes
02:14 5 was the suggestion that, the fact that David
6 Milgaard's counsel was not aware of these offences
7 and Mr. Fisher might provide a reasonable basis to
8 conclude that a miscarriage of justice may have
9 occurred, and I think we identified in sort of two
02:15 10 different scenarios, and I'll just go through
11 that, number one, at the time of trial, of David
12 Milgaard's trial, the (V1)-, (V2)-----, (V3)-----
13 offences had occurred. Mr. Fisher was not a
14 suspect nor, I don't think, even on the radar
02:15 15 screen at the time, so at the time of Mr.
16 Milgaard's trial there was a question of whether
17 or not the fact that Mr. Milgaard's counsel was
18 not aware of these three offences somehow might
19 give rise to a miscarriage of justice. And,
02:15 20 secondly, before Mr. Milgaard's criminal
21 proceedings were concluded before the Supreme
22 Court, I think in 1971, that Larry Fisher had
23 committed another assault after Mr. Milgaard's
24 conviction in Saskatoon and two in Winnipeg, and
02:15 25 before Mr. Milgaard's criminal proceedings were



1 concluded, he had, I think, essentially confessed
2 to all six of those, so in other words, he was
3 known to be the person who committed those
4 offences, and so I think the suggestion was, and
02:16 5 I'm not sure that it was put to you that
6 specifically, Mr. Williams, on the first
7 application, but I think that you generally
8 understood that that was one of the grounds.

9 Can you comment on, after you
02:16 10 had investigated Mr. Fisher and concluded that
11 there wasn't a link between he and Gail Miller,
12 what if any conclusions did you make regarding
13 this miscarriage of justice based upon the fact
14 that Mr. Milgaard did not have an opportunity to
02:16 15 raise these offences in his proceedings?

16 A I think one of the observations you would make is
17 recognize that the absence of the opportunity to
18 put that evidence before a jury, you know, might
19 have, or could have had some impact on the result
02:17 20 of the deliberations. In the context of the 690
21 process, it's one of those situations in which it
22 would be examined, but it would be examined in the
23 context viewed in the strength of the case that
24 remained to support a conviction of David
02:17 25 Milgaard, so it's one of those factors that is



1 presented and could have had an impact or an
2 effect had the minister chosen to give it more
3 weight than it was given.

02:17 4 Q And are you telling us that that necessarily
5 involves a review of the strength of the case
6 against David Milgaard?

7 A It does.

02:18 8 Q By way of example, if Mr. Fisher were to apply --
9 not apply today, but if Mr. Fisher were to suggest
10 that his case was a miscarriage of justice because
11 person X was a better suspect than him, would the
12 DNA evidence have to be addressed before you would
13 look at a better suspect?

02:18 14 A Yes. The case against -- certainly that's a
15 stronger compelling bit of evidence that would
16 have to be dealt with.

02:18 17 Q And so no matter how good a suspect Mr. X might be
18 in the Fisher scenario, unless and until the DNA
19 evidence is addressed, it might be a tough sell;
20 is that a fair way to put it?

21 A Yes, unless there's equally compelling evidence of
22 guilt for Mr. X, yes.

02:19 23 Q If we can go to the next page, again, I don't
24 propose to go through this in detail, we've
25 covered most of it, but this would be your review



1 of what you did with Mr. Wilson. If we can go to
2 004383, and I think you talked about this before,
3 *The recent allegations vs. the historical and*
4 *evidentiary record*, and I think you told us that
5 when you compared Ron Wilson's recantation
6 compared with the record and other known facts,
7 you began to doubt the credibility of his
8 recantation; is that correct?

02:19 9 A Certainly some of the factual underpinnings that
10 had been inserted were not established.

11 Q If we can go to 004387, here you comment again, we
12 touched on this about that part of his
13 recantation:

14 "That the police planted the story that
02:19 15 Milgaard confessed to getting a girl or
16 "hit a girl" in Saskatoon and put her
17 purse in a trash can."

18 You say:

19 "This portion of Mr. Wilson's statement
02:20 20 contains facts in the narrative that
21 only Mr. Wilson could know."

22 And you go on to say:

23 "How would the police know that detail
24 to put the conversation into the context
02:20 25 of the Milgaard admission. There is no



1 indication on the police file that they
2 were aware of Ms. Beaton's existence or
3 identity before it was revealed by Mr.
4 Wilson. When interviewed Mr. Wilson's
02:20 5 comment was "the confession in the
6 Calgary bus depot did not happen." He
7 acknowledged that he, accompanied by
8 Milgaard, had tried unsuccessfully to
9 telephone Heather Beaton from the
02:20 10 Calgary bus depot."

11 And again, we touched on this, but was that a
12 significant issue for you when you looked at
13 assessing Mr. Wilson's credibility, this Heather
14 Beaton story and the fact that it was planted, or
02:20 15 suggested that it was planted?

16 A Yes. I mean, the Heather Beaton fact alone, you
17 know, may not amount to much, but taken with all
18 of the circumstances that Mr. Wilson had set out
19 or described in his June 4th, 1990 memo to support
02:21 20 the allegation that he had been, you know, the
21 story had been planted, it was just another
22 factor, but it was, for me, one of the tips of the
23 iceberg that signaled that it was not a plant.

24 Q And again, so that if Mr. Wilson had simply said I
02:21 25 lied about that, an admission, for whatever reason



1 I was scared, police pressured me and I had to
2 give them an admission and I decided to say this
3 is when it took place because the Beaton
4 conversation did happen and I just chose that to
02:21 5 be when I gave the fabrication, and is that
6 something that you might have more readily
7 accepted?

8 A That's possible, yes.

9 Q As opposed to the fact that the police planted
02:22 10 that in my mind, that that was the concern?

11 A Yes. Sometimes it's not just the allegation, but
12 how the allegation comes up, whether it's a
13 narrative or whether it's a pinpoint form, you
14 know, some basis.

02:22 15 Q Did you consider, after your interview with Mr.
16 Wilson, that maybe he just got a little carried
17 away in his recantation and that even though you
18 may have concluded that the planting of the story
19 by the police may have been a bit, I think,
02:22 20 farfetched according to your -- I don't mean to
21 put words in your mouth, but that you had trouble
22 with it, that maybe there was a grain of truth to
23 some of it?

24 A You know, I considered it and it's for that reason
02:22 25 that we probed it with Mr. Wilson, but I had to



1 keep in mind that I did not get similar complaints
2 either from Mr. Cadrain, certainly in terms of the
3 police putting things in his mind, nor from Nichol
4 Demyen or Nichol John, and those were also factors
02:23 5 that entered the equation.

6 Q Go to 004391, and just the comment here about Mr.
7 Caldwell, and I think you are stating here that:
8 "Mr. Caldwell did not participate in any
9 of the witness interviews, nor did he
02:23 10 participate in any dissemination of the
11 material obtained from them, which had
12 not been publicly disclosed by other
13 sources."

14 And I take it that would be accurate is it?

02:23 15 A Yes.

16 Q Go down to the bottom -- sorry, there, you say:
17 "Although a number of news reports have
18 featured various aspects of the Milgaard
19 case, most notably, the identification
02:24 20 of Larry Earl Fisher and the recanting
21 of the testimony of Ronald Dale Wilson,
22 the following observations can be made:"

23 And these would be your observations; correct?

24 A Yes.

02:24 25 Q "Deborah Hall has no new evidence to



1 offer. Her description of events
2 mirrored that of the Crown witnesses.
3 She however believed that Milgaard's
4 actions were in gest. The fact that
02:24 5 Milgaard had consumed drugs was before
6 the jury."

7 I take it then that you did not think that there
8 was not much that Deborah Hall had to say that
9 would provide a reasonable basis to conclude that
02:24 10 a miscarriage of justice may have occurred?

11 A There wasn't anything in Deborah Hall's statement
12 which had not already been presented to the jury
13 in terms of the narrative, and her conclusion that
14 Lapchuk and Melnyk had lied when examined more
02:25 15 closely revealed that her description of what took
16 place mirrored theirs; however, her perception of
17 the actions was that it was a joke, and I think
18 that suggestion was put to the jury and
19 consequently it wasn't new or fresh from that
02:25 20 vantage point.

21 Q If you go on:

22 "The conclusion in Dr. Ferris report
23 ignores the obvious contamination of the
24 forensic sample."

02:25 25 And a few other comments. And I take it your



1 conclusion there was that Dr. Ferris' report did
2 not provide a reasonable basis to conclude that a
3 miscarriage of justice had occurred?

02:25 4 A That's correct. Dr. Ferris himself, when asked to
5 consider the issue of contamination, stated that
6 it did not exonerate David Milgaard.

7 Q Next page, I read you already the Larry Fisher
8 conclusion, we dealt with that, you say:

9 "The public recantation of the trial
02:26 10 testimony of Dale Wilson has been
11 carefully scrutinized. It was first
12 disclosed to the National Parole Board
13 at a parole hearing for Mr. Milgaard on
14 June 8, 1990."

02:26 15 What was the significance, if any, of that fact?

16 A It was just part of the narrative, it just
17 signaled to me that it was presented to the Parole
18 Board I suspect in the hope or the expectation
19 that David Milgaard would have a favourable review
02:26 20 by the National Parole Board and would be
21 released, failing which the objective was to
22 submit it to the minister hopefully for his
23 release as well, that's all.

24 Q You then say:

02:26 25 "Mr. Wilson's charges of police



1 manipulation and coercion are not
2 supported by his own description of the
3 police behaviour and attitude towards
4 him, when he described their questioning
02:26 5 and their investigative procedures."

6 And then you go on to talk about interviews with
7 policemen and you say:

8 "His present recall conveniently recites
9 a conclusion, i.e., I was manipulated,
02:27 10 but does not identify any action other
11 than police questions, in a friendly,
12 courteous, albeit persistent manner to
13 support the charge. Similarly the
14 charge of police coercion is not
02:27 15 supported by Wilson's description of the
16 tactics used by the police."

17 What if any conclusions did you draw about where
18 this allegation of police coercion and
19 manipulation came from?

02:27 20 A At the time I didn't draw any -- it may have been
21 a suggestion put to him by his interviewer, but
22 that wasn't the issue for this report, that was my
23 assessment.

24 Q You say:

02:27 25 "The same conclusions can be drawn with



1 respect to Albert Cadrain. The number
2 of police contacts with Cadrain was made
3 because the accounts given by Wilson and
4 Nichol John did not correspond with
02:28 5 those provided by Albert Cadrain.
6 Nichol John and Ronald Wilson had
7 withheld information from the police
8 over a two month period."

9 What were you referring to in that latter
02:28 10 comment, about information withheld from the
11 police?

12 A I was referring to what Mr. Wilson described as
13 things that had been omitted from his March
14 statement concerning, for example, getting stuck,
02:28 15 and some of the other things that he talked about.

16 Q You then go on to talk about Nichol John and you
17 say:

18 "Ms. John continues to have nightmares
19 of a scene in which a man is sitting
02:28 20 astride a woman, in that alley. Her
21 sketch of the scene in her nightmare
22 corresponds to the scene of Gail
23 Miller's murder."

24 Can you tell us, what was the significance of
02:28 25 Nichol John and what she had to say by August,



1 1990, where does that fit in in your assessment?

2 A Well, nothing that she told me detracted from her

3 trial testimony and I think that's basically it.

4 She has, however, left me with the strong

02:29 5 impression that she had seen something but was not

6 able to recall it.

7 Q And again, not looking to get into any advice or

8 discussions with Mr. MacFarlane, but just getting

9 a sense of the status of matters at the time, it

02:29 10 says:

11 "Based on the information gathered to

12 date, it does not appear that further

13 investigation beyond the interview of

14 Mrs. Cadrain which is being pursued by

02:29 15 the R.C.M.P., is required to determine

16 whether there was a probable miscarriage

17 of justice in this case."

18 Is it fair to say that other than maybe a few

19 loose ends, at this time your investigation was

02:29 20 essentially completed?

21 A Yes, we were thinking of wrapping it up. I think

22 Sergeant Pearson had a few things that I may have

23 omitted to mention there, but I seem to recall

24 that his estimate was that he would be finished

02:30 25 and would provide a report towards the end of



1 August, possibly the 25th or shortly thereafter.

2 Q Go to 004745 --

02:30

3 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: If that's a
4 different subject, I would just like to ask the
5 witness something.

6 MR. HODSON: Sure.

7 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I think, as I
8 recall Sergeant Pearson's evidence, he really
9 hadn't given up on questioning Wilson?

02:30

10 A I'm sorry, questioning Wilson?

11 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: He had not really
12 given up on questioning Wilson, he wanted to go
13 further with him, but he left the impression,
14 with me at least, that you were not of the same
15 mind.

02:30

16 A You mentioned Wilson. You didn't mean Fisher?

17 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Fisher, I'm sorry,
18 yeah. Sorry.

02:31

19 A Okay. That -- we may have had that difference of
20 opinion, sir.

21 MR. HODSON: If it might assist,
22 Mr. Commissioner, I do intend to cover, it's
23 coming up in early September, there's a
24 discussion I think between Mr. Pearson and Mr.
25 Williams on that. I can go to that right now if

02:31



1 you want .

2 COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: No, you don't have
3 to, just in your own time is fine.

4 BY MR. HODSON:

02:31 5 **Q** This article is August 29th, 1990, about
6 *Ex-prosecutor helping probe Milgaard case*, and I
7 think it's a follow-up to the letter that was
8 written to Kim Campbell on that subject; is that
9 correct?

02:31 10 **A** Yes.

11 **Q** And can you tell us any particular concerns or
12 reaction with this article in the newspaper?

13 **A** It's another, I guess, chapter in an attempt to
14 keep the story alive. It recites the claim of
02:32 15 conflict and suggests that yet there's something
16 else that's wrong with this process or the
17 application.

18 **Q** And here the suggestion was:

19 "Williams said Caldwell has been ruled
02:32 20 out as a witness because in Milgaard's
21 application to the Justice Department,
22 there was no specific allegation of
23 prosecutorial misconduct."

24 And is that an accurate statement?

02:32 25 **A** At that time, yes.



1 Q And were there later allegations of, or did you
2 view the August 14th letter to Kim Campbell as
3 changing that; in other words, putting his conduct
4 in issue?

02:32 5 A No, I didn't. If I used the qualifier at the
6 time, that was wrong, I didn't see Mr. Caldwell as
7 a potential witness other than to assist me in
8 understanding the case. As far as I was aware,
9 there was no sustainable allegation of
02:33 10 prosecutorial misconduct.

11 Q If we can go to 151588, this is an August 30th,
12 1990 memo to file. It appears you had another
13 conversation with Art Roberts:

14 "...to obtain additional details
02:33 15 concerning the format he used when he
16 performed polygraph tests on..."

17 John and Wilson,

18 "...and to determine whether there were
19 any police officers present during the
02:33 20 pre-test and testing sessions..."

21 Do you recall what prompted you to make those
22 inquiries?

23 A I may have been prompted to do so as a result of
24 suggestions coming from some of my colleagues or
02:33 25 perhaps my superiors. Umm, in the second



1 paragraph where it says Mr. Wilson --

2 Q Yeah, I think that should be Roberts.

3 A It should be Mr. Roberts.

4 Q Right. So just for the record, the second

02:34 5 paragraph, it should read Mr. Roberts,

6 "...said that he would clearly explain
7 to the potential subject that the latter
8 was not under any obligation to take the
9 test."

02:34 10 And if we can scroll down, it says:

11 "Mr. Roberts noted that he would usually
12 conduct the pre-test and the testing
13 sessions alone with the subject. He
14 noted that it was generally best to have
02:34 15 no one else in the room, to distract the
16 subject. As best he can recall, he
17 never had any police officers in the
18 hotel room (in which the Wilson test was
19 performed) with him during the pre-test
02:34 20 and the testing session.

21 You've got that underlined. What was the
22 significance of that information?

23 A The significance of that was, I guess it bore on
24 the issue of police coercion and possible
02:34 25 manipulation as set out in one of Mr. Wilson's



1 statements, June 4th.

2 Q Okay. You then,

3 "...related to Mr. Roberts Mr. Wilson's
4 statement concerning the presentation
02:35 5 and selection of the knife as the one he
6 had observed on David Milgaard."

7 And I think this related to Mr. Wilson's account
8 that he was shown knives and suggested which
9 knife to select; is that right?

02:35 10 A It relates to that, yes.

11 Q And:

12 "Mr. Roberts disagreed firmly with Mr.
13 Wilson's characterization. He noted
14 that Mr. Wilson's description reminded
02:35 15 him of a "peak of tension test" that he
16 probably had perform.

17 He said that the test was one
18 used to determine whether an individual
19 was truthful in identifying objects. A
02:35 20 pre-test session would be performed; the
21 subject would be questioned to determine
22 the right questions to comfortably
23 elicit a yes or no answer..."

24 And then:

02:35 25 "Typically, the suspected weapon would



1 be placed in the middle of a row of
2 weapons, and the subject would be asked,
3 in turn, for example, "Did you see this
4 knife in X's possession in the car on
02:35 5 the trip between Regina and Saskatoon?"
6 The subject would know the order of the
7 questions. By the time the third
8 question was asked, the tension in the
9 subject would peak and then would
02:36 10 subside. The subject's responses to the
11 questions would be monitored on the
12 polygraph machine."

13 And I think we also heard some evidence from Mr.
14 Sawatsky on that. Again, can you tell us the
02:36 15 significance of that information?

16 A It provides, shall we say, some clarification
17 possibly of, in relation to Mr. Wilson's statement
18 that he was shown the knife. It just adds to the
19 context.

02:36 20 Q Did you have any concerns, based on your
21 discussions with Mr. Roberts, or your interviews
22 of anybody else, as to whether or not Mr. Roberts
23 may have improperly influenced either Wilson or
24 John in their statements or evidence?

02:36 25 A No, sir.



1 Q Go to 015878, and this is a September 5, 1990
2 report to you, and attached, if we can go to
3 002369, is Mr. Pearson's report of August 28th,
4 1990, and I think you told us back in June that
02:37 5 Sergeant Pearson would regularly report, or
6 monthly report and you would eventually get copies
7 of this; is that correct?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And then if we can go to page 002376, here is his
02:37 10 *Investigator's Comments* regarding Mr. Fisher, he
11 says:

12 "At the time of this report Larry Fisher
13 has not been eliminated as a suspect..."

14 So that's August 28th, 1990,

02:37 15 "...even though he has agreed to answer
16 all questions that we have for him. The
17 investigators are at a disadvantage when
18 dealing with Mr. Fisher, as we have no
19 information on his movements at the time
02:38 20 of Gail Miller's murder. Being unable
21 to challenge Fisher's honesty, a valid
22 polygraph is absolutely essential if he
23 is to be cleared as a suspect."

24 And then I think that would have been -- do you
02:38 25 recall getting that report from Sergeant Pearson?



1 A Yes, I do.

2 Q And then if we can go to, the doc. ID is 056743,
3 and go to 056790. And this is September 6th,
4 1990, and this is Sergeant Pearson's note, and the
02:38 5 Commissioner had referred to this a few moments
6 ago in relation to Sergeant Pearson's evidence,
7 but his note indicates:

8 "While at a psychological
9 profiling seminar being hosted by the
02:38 10 Prince Albert City Police, I received a
11 telephone call from Mr. Williams at my
12 hotel room in P.A. at the Marlborough
13 Inn. Mr. Williams stated he had
14 received my last report and seemed
02:39 15 somewhat concerned that I still
16 considered Fisher to be a suspect and
17 was asking why, in view of the denials
18 Fisher made during his interview with
19 us. I explained to Mr. Williams that,
02:39 20 in my mind, Fisher remains a suspect as
21 he has not yet provided answers to
22 questions which would properly explain
23 his activities as stated by his ex-wife
24 Linda Fisher. I still believe a
02:39 25 properly conducted polygraph examination



1 is essential, as we know very little of
2 Fisher's activities on the date of Miss
3 Miller's murder and a polygraph is only
4 one method to determine the truthfulness
02:39 5 of his answers. I explained to Mr.
6 Williams that I am not prepared to take
7 at face value the answers provided by
8 Fisher to date. It was also explained
9 that Fisher's reluctance to cooperate
02:39 10 causes me some concern."

11 Now that's his note of the call. Do you agree
12 with that or do you have a recollection of what
13 was discussed and what prompted the call?

14 A What prompted the call, I guess, was my reading of
02:40 15 his earlier memo. He basically said he didn't
16 eliminate Fisher as a suspect, and we talked about
17 that. But, you know, at that point perhaps we
18 were going at slightly different purposes.

19 Q What, explain that, what purposes?

02:40 20 A Like what I now understand is that in addition to
21 assisting us for the purposes of a 690, he had
22 separate instructions from his headquarters to
23 reinvestigate the case, and to the extent that he
24 was involved in that and hadn't yet eliminated
02:40 25 Fisher as a suspect that was a valid purpose for



1 him to pursue. I certainly was interested in that
2 outcome to the extent that his investigations, if
3 he turned up something that would link Mr. Fisher
4 to the Gail Miller homicide, I would certainly be
02:40 5 interested, and we had that exchange, and we left
6 it at that.

7 Q So, just so that I'm clear, what were your
8 purposes, then, in having Sergeant Pearson
9 investigate Larry Fisher and how did those differ
02:41 10 from his purposes?

11 A Well it's one thing to be investigating certain
12 aspects of the Milgaard application, it's another
13 to be launching a reinvestigation of a homicide
14 investigation, and what I now learn is that maybe
02:41 15 he had a wider mandate from his superiors than the
16 mandate that I had asked him to perform.

17 Q And so your mandate, and we covered this earlier,
18 your mandate to him was what?

19 A Well, essentially, to investigate the allegations
02:41 20 surrounding -- or brought up by Linda Fisher and
21 brought up by the Milgaards. But certainly, once
22 we had tracked it down, I didn't realize at the
23 time that he was, you know, still wedded to the
24 idea of the polygraph, because my hopes by then
02:42 25 for a successful polygraph were rapidly



1 disappearing.

2 Q And so your purposes in having Sergeant Pearson
3 investigate Larry Fisher would have been limited,
4 then, to what you needed to check for the purposes
02:42 5 of your 690 review; is that correct?

6 A I think that's a synopsis of it, yes.

7 Q And that would be something lesser than a complete
8 investigation as to whether or not Larry Fisher
9 killed Gail Miller?

02:42 10 A Because that could take quite some time, yes.

11 Q And so --

12 A I mean, there's some overlap, but I thought that
13 it may have been a misunderstanding between us.
14 But I thought that, by then, the polygraphing or
02:42 15 the re-polygraphing of Mr. Fisher was probably not
16 going to happen and --

17 Q For example, back in February of 1990 when you
18 received the Larry Fisher information, I take it
19 that you could have gone to your counterparts in
02:43 20 Saskatchewan and asked them to have the
21 appropriate police agency launch an investigation,
22 a murder investigation, and in other words "go
23 investigate whether Larry Fisher is the
24 perpetrator of the murder and, when you're done,
02:43 25 report back"?



1 A Yes.

2 Q And in which case you likely would have had to put
3 your 690 review on hold pending that
4 investigation?

02:43 5 A Possibly. But the other thing is they may not
6 have, based on the evidence that had been
7 provided, they might have said "look, this isn't
8 enough to launch an investigation".

9 Q Okay. So in the circumstances, though, I think
02:43 10 you've told us you chose to get the RCMP to
11 provide assistance to you?

12 A Yes.

13 Q But I think you said back in June, and are saying
14 again today, what you had asked Sergeant Pearson
02:43 15 to do was something quite different than a -- than
16 the Saskatoon police would do if they were
17 re-opening the investigation into the death of
18 Gail Miller to determine if Larry Fisher was the
19 perpetrator?

02:44 20 A It would be a cut down version, yes.

21 Q Okay. And so here you said, in September of 1990,
22 did you become aware from Sergeant Pearson that he
23 had broader instructions from his superiors than
24 what you had, or what's --

02:44 25 A No, I didn't become aware of that until I was



1 reviewing some documents for the purposes of this,
2 this Inquiry.

3 Q Okay. And do you recall what it was that caused
4 you to think that Sergeant Pearson was going
02:44 5 beyond what you had asked him to do?

6 A Well, it wasn't so much then that I thought he was
7 going beyond what I had asked him to do, it was
8 just that I guess the last document had a
9 paragraph in which he said 'absolutely essential
02:45 10 to do the polygraph before he could eliminate
11 him'. Well, I was getting a fair bit of pressure
12 to wrap things up, and it was uncertain when we
13 could get that polygraph conducted for Fisher. We
14 knew that, or at least I knew that he was
02:45 15 scheduled for some surgery to deal with a medical
16 condition, and it may be some time if we -- after
17 that for rehabilitation or to get better, and it
18 was uncertain when we could get to that. And on
19 the other hand, I had the Milgaards asking for a
02:45 20 quick decision, and my own bosses saying "give us
21 what you've got and let's wrap it".

22 Q And so is what you are telling us that it was your
23 understanding that, if Sergeant Pearson had been
24 conducting a typical murder investigation as a
02:46 25 police officer -- I'm not sure if any is 'typical'



1 -- but if he was investigating, trying to
2 determine whether or not Larry Fisher killed Gail
3 Miller for the purposes of laying criminal
4 charges, was it your understanding, in September
02:46 5 of 1990, that Sergeant Pearson was not done, was
6 not satisfied that that investigation, if that
7 were the purpose, --

8 A Yup.

9 Q -- had been concluded?

02:46 10 A It -- for -- as far as he was concerned there was
11 still some things he had to run down, and I didn't
12 tell him to stop.

13 Q Pardon me?

14 A I didn't dissuade him from doing that, but I just
02:46 15 completed my report as at that time.

16 Q Now given that he, and I think his evidence was
17 that he was only involved because Federal Justice
18 asked him to, are you saying that he was free to
19 do whatever other police work beyond your mandate,
02:46 20 that you weren't stopping him from that?

21 A That's correct.

22 Q Did you have any understanding, though, that that
23 was -- or, I guess, why would he do that given
24 that his instructions were coming from you?

02:47 25 A Well, you'd have to ask him, I -- you know, we had



1 the conversation and we had -- he expressed his
2 views and I said "okay".

3 Q And so what about the other area -- and I think
4 Sergeant Pearson, when we were dealing with this
02:47 5 note about following up with Mr. Fisher -- and I,
6 I could be wrong on this -- but I think his
7 evidence was to the effect that, since he was
8 getting instructions from you at this point, he,
9 although he had a few follow-ups he did not pursue
02:47 10 matters much further, would you agree with that,
11 at least as far as his work for you?

12 A I believe that's correct.

13 Q And do you recall a discussion with him as well
14 about interviewing the Fisher sexual assault
02:47 15 victims, was that around this time, or was that at
16 a prior date? I believe Sergeant Pearson
17 testified that he had a desire to interview them.

18 A I think that happened with respect to the second
19 application, --

02:48 20 Q Okay.

21 A -- and we had talked about it, and based on some
22 information that I had at the time, namely that
23 perhaps the second application would be decided or
24 would be referred to a Court, I asked him to hold
02:48 25 up on commencing those, or some of those at



1 least -- I think there was exceptions but -- until
2 such time as a decision had been taken as to who
3 would be conducting the review of the second
4 application, and whether anything that I would do
02:48 5 or I would cause him to do might unduly interfere
6 with how that second application was processed.

7 Q Okay. If we can just go back to 002376. And was
8 this the language, then, that concerned you in the
9 August 29th, 1990 report, that at this time:

02:49 10 "... Larry Fisher has not been
11 eliminated as a suspect ...",

12 and that it's:

13 "... absolutely essential if he is to be
14 cleared as a suspect.";

02:49 15 was it that language that caused you concern?

16 A Yes, I think that's the paragraph that I was
17 referring to. You know, he may well be -- it's
18 one thing to clear someone as a suspect, it's
19 another thing to find evidence to link them to the
02:49 20 offence.

21 Q And so is your concern, here, that you thought
22 Sergeant Pearson might be doing a murder
23 investigation as opposed to inquiring into the
24 grounds that you asked him to review?

02:50 25 A It seemed -- well, they are connected, but it was



1 a bit wider.

2 Q And after your discussion with him, then, did you
3 come away from that with a view that you had
4 effectively stopped him from pursuing that, at
02:50 5 least for your purposes?

6 A Umm, no. We had an understanding.

7 Q And what was that?

8 A Well I understood that if he wanted to check it
9 out and clear as a suspect, fine, let me know if
02:50 10 there was anything that linked them.

11 Q But as far as -- let's be clear on this. In early
12 September 1990 is it fair to say that, as far as
13 Larry Fisher was concerned, you, Federal Justice,
14 did not have any further instructions for Sergeant
02:50 15 Pearson, he was done his work for you as far as
16 Larry Fisher was concerned?

17 A By and large, yes.

18 Q Well was there anything left that you had asked
19 him to do that he hadn't done?

02:51 20 A Not specifically. He may have had -- there may
21 have been some follow-up tasks that were in his
22 job jar that he wanted to finish up.

23 Q Okay. 004394. And this is a September 10th, 1990
24 letter, I think you mentioned this yesterday, this
02:51 25 is a letter from both Mr. Wolch and Mr. Asper. It



1 says:

2 "We are writing to you
3 pursuant to your request that we
4 summarize our final position with
02:51 5 respect to the application by David
6 Milgaard under Section 690 ..."

7 I did not locate any written communication from
8 you to them asking for this, and it's not
9 referred to in the letter, do you think this may
02:51 10 have been a phone call?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And, do you recall, what was the nature of that
13 call?

14 A The response may be a bit of confabulation because
02:52 15 I'm -- we had a number of calls. But, typically,
16 the calls with the request for "give me your final
17 submissions" would signal to Mr. Wolch and Mr.
18 Asper that we had completed our investigations
19 and, before concluding our report, "please
02:52 20 summarize your position so that that position is
21 presented to the minister."

22 Q And so I think you've told us that, by the end of
23 August 1990, you had basically finished your
24 investigation; is that correct?

02:52 25 A Yes.



1 Q Before you answer this question I want to make
2 sure that, Mr. Frayer, that I am not stretching
3 here, and indeed Mr. McLeod.

4 But are you able to comment on
02:52 5 whether or not -- you mentioned in one of your
6 earlier answers that you were getting some
7 pressure to get this done, and to the extent that
8 you're not getting into advice given or received,
9 are you able to tell us about what factors were in
02:53 10 play that might have prompted you to get the --
11 your investigation concluded sooner rather than
12 later?

13 And, Mr. Frayer, do you have
14 any --

02:53 15 MR. FRAYER: I have no problems with that.

16 A Well you've drawn my attention to a couple of news
17 articles with some fairly damning headlines about
18 the impact that the delay in getting a decision
19 had had on Mr. Milgaard. There were public
02:53 20 complaints about the pace with which we were
21 proceeding, by Mr. Milgaard's counsel, and
22 certainly there were communications with --
23 between counsel and my superiors and letters to
24 the minister asking us to make haste in terms of
02:54 25 completing what work we had to do so that a



1 decision could be forthcoming. To ensure that
2 whatever decision was taken fully reflected the
3 position of counsel, having regard to the fact
4 that the grounds that were initially identified in
02:54 5 the December '88 application had been expanded and
6 to ensure that we had a full appreciation of those
7 grounds, I had asked Mr. Wolch and Mr. Asper, I
8 forget which, to summarize their final position,
9 and this letter is their response to that request.

02:54 10 BY MR. HODSON:

11 Q If we can go through, so this would have been what
12 you had asked them to provide, signaling to them
13 that "we're done our investigation, nearing
14 completion, give us a letter confirming the list
02:55 15 of grounds"; is that a fair way to put it?

16 A Yeah. I -- you know, we had had things come in in
17 instalments and I wanted to make sure that, in
18 completing the report, we certainly zeroed in on
19 the grounds that they identified as being
02:55 20 significant and ensured that their concerns were
21 brought to the attention of the minister, not in
22 my words, but in theirs.

23 Q And again, *Companions*, it talks about Ron Wilson's
24 evidence:

02:55 25 "... totally recants the incriminating



1 evidence that he gave against David
2 Milgaard.",

3 and it also appears:

4 "... that the evidence of Albert Cadrain
02:55 5 is highly suspect ..."

6 Under *Unsavoury Witnesses*:

7 "Secondly, the evidence of
8 Messrs. Melnyk and Lapchuk has been
9 rebutted by that of Deborah Hall, who
02:56 10 did not testify at the trial and was
11 never interviewed by the police, as well
12 as Ute Frank, who was in fact
13 interviewed and gave a statement which
14 could have been useful to Milgaard, not
02:56 15 the Crown. Neither of these ladies had
16 anything to gain at the time that they
17 made their respective statements ...
18 while Messrs. Melnyk and Lapchuk were
19 not only of unsavoury character, but
02:56 20 given that they were pending at the time
21 of the trial on serious charges, had
22 everything to gain."

23 So, again, that would be -- anything different
24 there, in 1. and 2., that you had not already
02:56 25 received in earlier communications?



1 A No, sir.

2 Q Next page:

3 "Thirdly, we have presented
4 your department with the two reports of
5 Dr. Ferris and Dr. Markesteyn, which
6 either totally exonerates Mr. Milgaard,
7 or entirely discredits the forensic
8 evidence tendered at the trial."

9 Again, nothing new there, would you agree?

02:56 10 A That's correct.

11 Q "Added to this evidence, we
12 have provided you with the identity of
13 the person who is very likely the true
14 killer. At the very least, the
02:56 15 undisputed fact that a serial rapist was
16 operating in Saskatoon at the time of
17 the Gail Miller murder, and that this
18 rapist had attacked at least two women
19 who resided in the neighbourhood where
02:57 20 Gail Miller was murdered, would have
21 been very relevant at the trial. We
22 have communicated with Mr. Justice
23 Tallis, and he advises that he was never
24 made aware of the fact that these rapes
02:57 25 were occurring in such short proximity



1 before the Gail Miller murder. The jury
2 was never given the opportunity to
3 consider that Milgaard might not be
4 guilty because another person who had
02:57 5 committed two rapes and an indecent
6 assault was on the loose in Saskatoon
7 and that this person might be
8 responsible."

9 And I take it that's, I think we touched on that,
02:57 10 you were aware of that being a ground put forward
11 as it's stated there?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And then:

14 "Our submission goes further,
02:57 15 however, in that we say that even if one
16 accepts the untruthful evidence tendered
17 at the trial, the theory of the Crown is
18 simply not plausible."

19 And then it goes on to talk about various things
02:57 20 that would suggest that the evidence at trial, it
21 was impossible for David Milgaard to have
22 committed the offence, and is that something that
23 had been communicated to you earlier?

24 A Not in that format. We had had discussions,
02:58 25 verbal discussions, in which this -- you know, the



1 time, what I called the timing factor in the
2 alibi, had been discussed. This capsulizes the
3 submission.

4 Q So the 'timing' was that, based on what the jury
02:58 5 heard, it wasn't possible for David Milgaard to
6 have committed the crime; correct? That was the
7 ground put forward. And I think you said earlier
8 that your answer to that was, well, the jury
9 thought otherwise, that unless there was something
02:58 10 different, there was nothing to provide a basis on
11 which a miscarriage of justice may have occurred?

12 A Yes. Barring new evidence, this was simply
13 re-arguing a point that was fully litigated at
14 trial.

02:58 15 Q And here:

16 "Furthermore, not only did he have an
17 alibi with the Manager of the hotel,
18 ...",

19 that was Rasmussen; now he testified at the
02:58 20 trial?

21 A He did.

22 Q And what did you make of this alibi ground?

23 A The Crown's evidence established a total absence
24 of a car having been stuck in the vicinity of -- I
02:59 25 mean certainly that was, again, an issue that was



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

dealt with at trial.

Q Okay. I see it's 3:00, Mr. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.

(Adjourned at 2:59 p.m.)



1 OFFICIAL QUEEN'S BENCH COURT REPORTERS' CERTIFICATES:

2 We, Karen Hinz, CSR, and Donald G. Meyer, RPR, CSR, CRR,
3 CBC, Official Queen's Bench Court Reporters for the
4 Province of Saskatchewan, hereby certify that the
5 foregoing pages contain a true and correct transcription
6 of our shorthand notes taken herein to the best of our
7 knowledge, skill, and ability.

8
9
10
11
12 _____, CSR

13 Karen Hinz, CSR

14 Official Queen's Bench Court Reporter

15
16
17
18 _____, RPR, CSR, CRR, CBC

19 Donald G. Meyer, RPR, CSR, CRR, CBC

20 Official Queen's Bench Court Reporter



| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| \$ | <p>003413 [1] - 38930:4 004374 [1] - 38955:19 004378 [1] - 38961:2 004379 [1] - 38985:24 004383 [1] - 38989:2 004387 [1] - 38989:11 004391 [1] - 38992:6 004392 [1] - 38981:11 004394 [1] - 39014:23 004745 [1] - 38998:2 012669 [1] - 38916:10 012681 [1] - 38892:14 015878 [1] - 39004:1 016762 [1] - 38898:16 016775 [1] - 38904:24 016781 [1] - 38905:6 016788 [1] - 38908:9 016794 [1] - 38913:10 025 [1] - 38834:14 028 [1] - 38840:15 039 [1] - 38842:24 039507 [3] - 38884:15, 38890:10, 38914:6 054 [1] - 38853:22 056743 [1] - 39005:2 056790 [1] - 39005:3 061821 [1] - 38890:9 072 [1] - 38859:23 079 [1] - 38861:12</p> | <p>13 [3] - 38885:15, 38890:15, 38891:17 13th [1] - 38954:25 143 [1] - 38909:1 14th [4] - 38936:19, 38948:20, 38949:5, 39000:2 15 [1] - 38836:8 151588 [1] - 39000:11 155215 [1] - 38923:7 155223 [1] - 38917:17 157100 [2] - 38935:20, 38945:25 15th [1] - 38954:23 17 [1] - 38963:7 17th [4] - 38965:1, 38965:9, 38965:24, 38971:8 18 [1] - 38874:23 186 [1] - 38827:22 1969 [14] - 38837:18, 38841:22, 38845:9, 38848:6, 38851:4, 38856:12, 38860:15, 38930:25, 38933:2, 38937:7, 38939:16, 38940:7, 38974:19, 38980:16 1970 [2] - 38886:8, 38887:20 1971 [4] - 38950:7, 38963:7, 38965:10, 38986:22 1977 [3] - 38890:21, 38910:22, 38916:20 1977/78 [1] - 38909:14 1978 [4] - 38891:2, 38901:14, 38910:23, 38910:25 1980 [4] - 38903:2, 38914:16, 38925:24, 38926:6 1986 [1] - 38920:7 1988 [3] - 38881:11, 38881:15, 38881:19 1990 [66] - 38832:13, 38837:1, 38840:8, 38843:8, 38844:8, 38845:23, 38845:24, 38851:8, 38866:9, 38866:16, 38869:4, 38871:7, 38873:17, 38881:13, 38881:20, 38882:12, 38884:15, 38893:2, 38898:18, 38910:9, 38916:10, 38917:18, 38923:7, 38923:8, 38928:14, 38929:5, 38930:16, 38935:4, 38936:19,</p> | <p>38948:11, 38948:20, 38949:5, 38954:23, 38954:25, 38955:13, 38955:23, 38957:20, 38960:18, 38967:2, 38969:11, 38970:10, 38973:21, 38974:4, 38974:5, 38974:8, 38975:25, 38976:23, 38978:13, 38980:12, 38981:24, 38990:19, 38994:14, 38997:1, 38999:5, 39000:12, 39004:1, 39004:4, 39004:14, 39005:4, 39008:17, 39009:21, 39011:5, 39013:9, 39014:12, 39014:23, 39015:23 1991 [2] - 38921:24, 38970:7 1:00 [1] - 38945:20 1:03 [1] - 38945:23 1:55 [1] - 38985:21</p> | <p>39013:9 2:14 [1] - 38985:22 2:59 [1] - 39022:4 2nd [1] - 38837:18</p> |
| \$2,000 [1] - 38921:18 | | | | 3 |
| ' | | | | |
| <p>'69 [4] - 38841:17, 38849:24, 38850:12, 38939:23 '70s [1] - 38904:17 '76 [1] - 38910:23 '78 [1] - 38901:22 '88 [2] - 38882:11, 39017:5 '90 [3] - 38857:9, 38857:10, 38857:12 '91 [1] - 38975:9 'absolutely [1] - 39010:9 'chilling [1] - 38980:2 'confession' [1] - 38911:8 'finally [2] - 38844:3, 38844:11 'got [1] - 38855:12 'hit [1] - 38855:11 'i've [1] - 38900:16 'in [1] - 38848:9 'my [1] - 38891:22 'no [2] - 38848:6, 38848:7 'people [1] - 38894:19 'seventeen [2] - 38886:10, 38888:10 'shake' [1] - 38899:16 'shank' [1] - 38899:17 'so [1] - 38894:22 'some [1] - 38984:3 'the [2] - 38848:8, 38901:7 'they [1] - 38985:4 'timing' [1] - 39021:4 'to [1] - 38848:7 'typical' [1] - 39010:25 'unidentified' [1] - 38899:15 'well [1] - 38848:22 'when [2] - 38900:18, 38905:14</p> | 1 | | 2 | |
| | <p>1 [8] - 38884:15, 38910:9, 38917:19, 38947:19, 38948:11, 38966:2, 38980:12, 39018:24 100 [1] - 38888:21 10:30 [2] - 38890:4, 38890:6 10:51 [1] - 38890:7 10th [1] - 39014:23 11 [1] - 38971:20 113354 [1] - 38954:23 113521 [2] - 38928:6, 38928:14 124983 [1] - 38831:7 125022 [1] - 38831:8 125030 [1] - 38841:16 125042 [1] - 38847:22 125046 [1] - 38849:8 125049 [1] - 38849:23 125072 [1] - 38858:24 125083 [1] - 38862:14 125110 [1] - 38864:11 125111 [1] - 38868:2 12:00 [2] - 38945:19, 38945:22</p> | | <p>2 [3] - 38893:2, 38899:25, 39018:24 20 [10] - 38836:8, 38847:6, 38867:5, 38874:4, 38933:2, 38933:13, 38934:15, 38940:14, 38957:22, 38977:6 2006 [1] - 38827:21 20th [3] - 38827:21, 38837:1, 38837:13 215 [1] - 38923:8 220989 [1] - 38868:10 22nd [1] - 38916:10 23rd [5] - 38845:18, 38845:19, 38848:6, 38848:15, 38863:24 24 [2] - 38897:13, 38901:9 24th [3] - 38845:17, 38863:24, 38879:8 25 [3] - 38879:5, 38955:6, 38955:13 250 [1] - 38846:9 252 [1] - 38855:7 25th [2] - 38921:24, 38998:1 28th [6] - 38955:23, 38957:20, 38960:18, 38981:23, 39004:3, 39004:14 29th [2] - 38999:5,</p> | <p>4 [1] - 38832:7 456 [1] - 38840:15 457 [1] - 38840:15 4th [23] - 38831:11, 38832:13, 38833:5, 38833:24, 38837:5, 38840:8, 38841:3, 38843:8, 38844:8, 38845:23, 38845:24, 38849:20, 38849:21, 38855:6, 38866:9, 38866:16, 38869:4, 38898:17, 38929:5, 38930:16, 38933:20, 38990:19, 39002:1</p> |
| 0 | | | | 4 |
| <p>000248 [2] - 38846:8, 38855:6 002369 [1] - 39004:3 002376 [2] - 39004:9, 39013:7</p> | | | | 5 |
| | | | | 6 |
| | | | | <p>602 [1] - 38849:9 690 [9] - 38841:13, 38880:16, 38946:10, 38971:1, 38987:20, 39006:21, 39008:5, 39009:3, 39015:6 6th [4] - 38841:6, 38923:7, 38923:8, 39005:3</p> |



| | | | | |
|----------|--|---|---|---|
| 7 | 38865:12 accounts [1] - 38996:3 accuracy [3] - 38840:11, 38888:20, 38927:18 accurate [5] - 38917:4, 38958:12, 38958:13, 38992:14, 38999:24 accurately [1] - 38916:14 accused [1] - 38912:22 accusing [1] - 38880:25 achieved [1] - 38958:11 acknowledged [3] - 38842:16, 38867:5, 38990:7 acquaintance [1] - 38925:9 act [2] - 38970:21, 38971:24 acted [1] - 38944:19 action [1] - 38995:10 actions [4] - 38881:6, 38925:5, 38993:4, 38993:17 active [2] - 38953:8, 38953:15 activities [2] - 39005:23, 39006:2 activity [4] - 38938:24, 38944:16, 38963:5 acts [1] - 38967:14 add [3] - 38922:22, 38946:2, 38946:23 Added [1] - 39019:11 added [1] - 38890:1 adding [2] - 38886:5, 38887:17 addition [3] - 38832:3, 38946:6, 39006:20 additional [10] - 38831:22, 38836:12, 38839:11, 38881:18, 38919:20, 38920:4, 38928:16, 38970:8, 38970:18, 39000:14 Additionally [1] - 38962:5 address [1] - 38919:3 addressed [4] - 38868:7, 38927:3, 38988:12, 38988:19 addressing [1] - 38958:7 adds [1] - 39003:18 adjacent [1] - 38934:5 Adjourned [4] - 38890:6, 38945:22, 38985:21, 39022:4 administration [1] - | 38901:19 admissible [3] - 38967:14, 38968:6, 38968:12 admission [8] - 38856:13, 38856:18, 38857:1, 38859:5, 38891:16, 38989:25, 38990:25, 38991:2 admit [1] - 38894:20 admitted [4] - 38852:9, 38856:15, 38869:19, 38912:14 admittedly [1] - 38983:6 Admittedly [4] - 38881:8, 38932:18, 38962:24, 38967:19 advanced [9] - 38850:22, 38871:9, 38873:1, 38873:8, 38881:18, 38881:19, 38881:24, 38939:24, 38943:12 adventures [1] - 38927:8 adverse [1] - 38922:20 advice [5] - 38956:8, 38956:22, 38957:10, 38997:7, 39016:8 advise [1] - 38894:3 advised [2] - 38893:19, 38939:20 advices [1] - 39019:23 advocacy [1] - 38951:8 affairs [1] - 38847:16 affect [6] - 38866:2, 38874:2, 38874:4, 38893:1, 38917:9, 38980:21 affected [5] - 38874:8, 38874:17, 38974:4, 38984:13, 38984:15 affidavit [4] - 38920:7, 38924:15, 38945:1 afraid [4] - 38857:16, 38861:14, 38861:16, 38948:3 afternoon [4] - 38835:14, 38898:8, 38930:25, 38945:25 afterwards [3] - 38908:23, 38950:9, 38965:7 agency [2] - 38954:20, 39008:21 ago [4] - 38874:5, 38885:15, 38890:15, 39005:6 agree [18] - 38834:6, | 38841:24, 38851:7, 38870:1, 38870:7, 38875:17, 38930:19, 38932:6, 38935:3, 38935:8, 38935:15, 38942:20, 38957:2, 38959:25, 38960:7, 39006:11, 39012:10, 39019:9 agreed [2] - 38924:11, 39004:15 ahead [6] - 38857:3, 38904:24, 38940:21, 38949:22, 38981:8, 38981:11 air [1] - 38878:12 albeit [2] - 38974:24, 38995:12 Albert [12] - 38836:22, 38837:1, 38837:11, 38837:22, 38890:20, 38910:21, 38921:20, 38959:15, 38996:1, 38996:5, 39005:10, 39018:4 alibi [3] - 39021:2, 39021:17, 39021:22 alive [5] - 38886:12, 38888:9, 38888:12, 38968:14, 38999:14 allegation [13] - 38870:24, 38871:2, 38885:20, 38888:1, 38939:10, 38942:6, 38943:2, 38990:20, 38991:11, 38991:12, 38995:18, 38999:22, 39000:9 allegations [5] - 38941:15, 38977:21, 38989:3, 39000:1, 39007:19 alleged [2] - 38856:5, 38953:1 allegedly [2] - 38852:9, 38893:6 alleges [1] - 38937:9 alleging [1] - 38959:11 alley [4] - 38833:9, 38833:16, 38842:10, 38996:20 alleys [2] - 38833:9, 38833:17 allowed [1] - 38938:22 almost [3] - 38836:8, 38886:1, 38887:13 alone [8] - 38855:10, 38866:3, 38868:22, 38873:5, 38943:17, 38981:1, 38990:16, | 39001:13 altered [1] - 38927:17 amended [1] - 38833:6 amount [4] - 38881:13, 38932:15, 38960:11, 38990:17 analyse [1] - 38865:17 analysis [2] - 38876:17, 38984:16 analysts [1] - 38976:12 anecdotes [1] - 38927:7 anger [2] - 38843:11, 38880:10 angrily [1] - 38916:19 angry [6] - 38905:16, 38905:17, 38905:25, 38906:6, 38906:19, 38917:2 Angry [1] - 38906:7 anonymous [1] - 38894:6 Answer [2] - 38848:7, 38848:9 answer [14] - 38835:8, 38838:25, 38848:6, 38849:1, 38854:21, 38855:3, 38878:15, 38914:14, 38946:2, 38978:25, 39002:23, 39004:15, 39016:1, 39021:8 answered [1] - 38844:25 answering [1] - 38846:11 answers [11] - 38849:11, 38849:15, 38868:20, 38869:12, 38904:11, 38929:7, 38955:20, 39005:21, 39006:5, 39006:7, 39016:6 anxious [1] - 38924:5 apart [3] - 38942:15, 38953:9, 38953:12 Apart [1] - 38962:21 apologize [1] - 38872:17 Appeal [2] - 38878:20, 38984:13 appeals [1] - 38879:24 appear [9] - 38866:6, 38866:7, 38883:23, 38932:18, 38950:12, 38952:18, 38972:3, 38981:4, 38997:12 appearance [1] - 38983:3 Appearances [1] - 38829:1 |
| 8 | 8 [1] - 38994:14 | | | |
| 9 | 9:05 [1] - 38831:2 9th [1] - 38928:14 | | | |
| A | Ag.'s [1] - 38966:7 ability [4] - 38874:17, 38880:17, 38956:20, 39023:7 able [16] - 38858:14, 38865:23, 38871:10, 38949:4, 38949:23, 38951:15, 38966:25, 38968:4, 38973:19, 38974:2, 38974:9, 38976:18, 38979:12, 38997:6, 39016:4, 39016:9 absence [4] - 38875:20, 38937:19, 38987:17, 39021:23 absolutely [2] - 39004:22, 39013:13 accept [1] - 38965:14 accepted [3] - 38926:8, 38945:11, 38991:7 accepts [1] - 39020:16 access [4] - 38937:24, 38938:10, 38938:23, 38952:16 accompanied [1] - 38990:7 accord [1] - 38840:13 accordance [1] - 38941:12 According [1] - 38925:6 according [3] - 38915:9, 38924:13, 38991:20 account [4] - 38865:11, 38927:14, 38932:24, 39002:7 accounting [1] - | | | |



| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| <p>appeared [6] - 38833:23, 38841:14, 38886:16, 38886:18, 38941:16, 38966:18 appearing [1] - 38920:19 Applicants[1] - 38874:8 applicants [1] - 38961:18 application [36] - 38841:13, 38875:15, 38879:15, 38880:5, 38881:15, 38881:17, 38882:9, 38882:23, 38882:24, 38883:10, 38917:13, 38918:1, 38939:22, 38940:24, 38941:17, 38941:19, 38941:25, 38944:23, 38946:11, 38958:5, 38960:21, 38961:20, 38970:7, 38971:1, 38975:11, 38976:9, 38987:7, 38999:17, 38999:21, 39007:12, 39012:19, 39012:23, 39013:4, 39013:6, 39015:5, 39017:5 applied [2] - 38901:24, 38902:5 apply [3] - 38902:4, 38988:8, 38988:9 appreciate [5] - 38870:10, 38877:14, 38878:14, 38973:25, 38979:10 appreciation [2] - 38853:16, 39017:6 apprised [1] - 38881:9 approach [2] - 38917:9, 38975:6 approached [1] - 38971:19 approaches [1] - 38839:22 approaching [1] - 38932:14 appropriate [5] - 38890:4, 38894:3, 38945:2, 38956:18, 39008:21 April[2] - 38901:22, 38921:24 area [3] - 38874:12, 38930:20, 39012:3 areas [4] - 38869:22, 38928:20, 38941:8, 38951:13 arguably [2] - 38851:18, 38942:21</p> | <p>arguing [1] - 39021:13 argument [1] - 38834:12 arisen [1] - 38834:4 armed [2] - 38891:1, 38910:24 army [1] - 38900:13 arrange [1] - 38895:6 arranged [1] - 38897:25 arrived [2] - 38918:25, 38932:11 arriving [1] - 38967:16 Art[2] - 38929:25, 39000:13 article [25] - 38842:18, 38879:5, 38879:9, 38880:9, 38881:10, 38881:12, 38884:16, 38885:2, 38890:10, 38892:1, 38892:15, 38910:8, 38910:11, 38910:13, 38912:25, 38913:13, 38914:1, 38914:2, 38915:17, 38916:8, 38921:22, 38939:19, 38943:3, 38999:5, 38999:12 articles [5] - 38889:9, 38913:9, 38939:14, 38940:3, 39016:17 ascertain [1] - 38928:17 aside [1] - 38935:1 aspect [4] - 38917:25, 38920:1, 38958:15, 38967:23 aspects [2] - 38992:18, 39007:12 Asper[39] - 38879:19, 38879:24, 38885:5, 38885:12, 38885:21, 38890:17, 38891:6, 38891:15, 38891:23, 38894:18, 38894:21, 38895:9, 38896:11, 38909:4, 38909:13, 38910:18, 38911:7, 38912:4, 38913:19, 38914:15, 38921:12, 38936:19, 38945:15, 38947:10, 38947:14, 38948:2, 38948:20, 38950:4, 38950:10, 38951:12, 38952:9, 38952:24, 38953:4, 38980:13, 38980:15, 39014:25, 39015:18, 39017:7 Asper's [1] - 38951:2 assailant [4] - 38961:3, 38963:18, 38964:4,</p> | <p>38966:16 assault [7] - 38961:23, 38963:25, 38973:9, 38975:11, 38986:23, 39012:14, 39020:6 assaults [16] - 38906:23, 38949:2, 38949:18, 38962:23, 38964:14, 38966:4, 38969:13, 38970:5, 38970:16, 38971:25, 38972:15, 38973:21, 38974:13, 38974:21, 38975:25, 38976:14 assertion [4] - 38856:2, 38871:23, 38871:25, 38876:4 assertions [1] - 38908:7 assess [5] - 38868:20, 38869:3, 38869:23, 38871:13, 38937:25 assessed [2] - 38871:5, 38875:10 assessing [4] - 38847:17, 38849:1, 38852:1, 38990:13 assessment [24] - 38836:16, 38843:5, 38853:11, 38866:2, 38869:25, 38872:20, 38875:9, 38877:12, 38917:10, 38931:9, 38956:1, 38964:7, 38967:2, 38967:11, 38970:19, 38970:20, 38970:25, 38972:10, 38972:11, 38974:1, 38974:11, 38977:10, 38995:23, 38997:1 assist [9] - 38846:7, 38874:10, 38892:18, 38907:3, 38908:10, 38915:24, 38965:24, 38998:21, 39000:7 assistance [3] - 38924:9, 38937:22, 39009:11 Assistant[1] - 38828:5 assisting [1] - 39006:21 associated [1] - 38910:3 assumption [1] - 38837:19 astride [1] - 38996:20 attached [2] - 38895:19, 39004:2 attaching [1] - 38893:3 attachment [1] - 38894:8</p> | <p>attacked [1] - 39019:18 attempt [3] - 38917:15, 38976:2, 38999:13 attempted [2] - 38925:4, 38948:14 attempting [1] - 38966:5 attend [1] - 38953:11 attendance [1] - 38880:17 attention [15] - 38882:25, 38886:23, 38887:21, 38892:25, 38897:8, 38910:10, 38912:25, 38918:6, 38918:17, 38919:8, 38936:24, 38959:9, 38975:3, 39016:16, 39017:21 attitude [1] - 38995:3 Attorney[1] - 38938:18 attributed [6] - 38895:25, 38899:14, 38904:2, 38937:16, 38960:12, 38980:14 Audio [1] - 38828:13 August[41] - 38884:15, 38886:5, 38887:17, 38893:2, 38898:17, 38910:9, 38916:10, 38917:17, 38917:19, 38923:7, 38923:8, 38928:14, 38936:19, 38948:19, 38949:4, 38954:23, 38954:25, 38955:6, 38955:13, 38955:23, 38957:20, 38960:17, 38967:1, 38968:2, 38969:11, 38973:21, 38974:4, 38974:8, 38975:9, 38975:24, 38980:12, 38981:23, 38996:25, 38998:1, 38999:5, 39000:2, 39000:11, 39004:3, 39004:14, 39013:9, 39015:23 available [7] - 38876:8, 38930:7, 38934:18, 38934:24, 38962:6, 38964:1, 38964:11 avenue [1] - 38892:9 awaiting [1] - 38883:18 aware [23] - 38831:16, 38833:15, 38840:4, 38840:24, 38878:1, 38895:5, 38931:22, 38933:14, 38934:1, 38953:3, 38953:9, 38953:12, 38953:22,</p> | <p>38970:22, 38983:9, 38986:6, 38986:18, 38990:2, 39000:8, 39009:22, 39009:25, 39019:24, 39020:10 awful [1] - 38866:24 axe [1] - 38920:12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">B</p> <hr/> <p>background [2] - 38839:7, 38935:17 bad [1] - 38874:11 badly [1] - 38843:13 balance [2] - 38946:9, 38974:6 balanced [2] - 38943:19, 38944:8 bare [1] - 38963:1 Barring [1] - 39021:12 based [18] - 38846:25, 38850:21, 38858:2, 38866:6, 38922:9, 38923:16, 38943:4, 38964:23, 38969:10, 38978:22, 38979:23, 38981:24, 38982:16, 38987:13, 39003:20, 39009:6, 39012:21, 39021:4 Based [2] - 38908:5, 38997:11 basement [1] - 38903:18 bases [1] - 38954:9 basic [1] - 38839:7 basis [27] - 38868:18, 38868:23, 38870:8, 38870:14, 38877:10, 38884:13, 38886:2, 38887:14, 38916:3, 38928:13, 38957:13, 38959:6, 38960:4, 38960:5, 38964:8, 38965:15, 38967:9, 38967:15, 38970:2, 38982:11, 38983:19, 38984:8, 38986:7, 38991:14, 38993:9, 38994:2, 39021:10 basis' [1] - 38984:3 bastards [1] - 38902:20 Battleford [1] - 38969:25 bear [2] - 38960:10, 38981:21 beaten [1] - 38869:6 Beaton[22] - 38852:7, 38852:11, 38852:19,</p> |
|--|---|---|---|---|



| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <p>38852:23, 38853:4, 38853:7, 38853:19, 38854:2, 38854:6, 38854:10, 38854:12, 38854:15, 38854:16, 38854:22, 38855:24, 38856:9, 38856:25, 38859:1, 38990:9, 38990:14, 38990:16, 38991:3 Beaton's [1] - 38990:2 became [4] - 38875:15, 38895:5, 38950:9, 38951:18 become [4] - 38950:14, 38984:25, 39009:22, 39009:25 began [5] - 38844:3, 38844:11, 38846:18, 38847:4, 38989:7 begin [1] - 38838:9 beginning [1] - 38835:10 begun [2] - 38845:21, 38847:14 behalf [6] - 38872:9, 38939:9, 38941:2, 38952:6, 38956:16, 38986:3 behaviour [4] - 38845:14, 38867:14, 38867:20, 38995:3 behest [1] - 38954:11 behind [2] - 38880:12, 38966:13 Beitel [1] - 38828:9 believes [2] - 38881:24, 38956:17 bell [1] - 38934:7 Bench [4] - 39023:1, 39023:3, 39023:14, 39023:20 benefit [1] - 38861:1 beraft [1] - 38842:8 best [5] - 38928:18, 38941:13, 39001:14, 39001:16, 39023:6 better [12] - 38836:13, 38867:20, 38878:6, 38878:14, 38939:5, 38972:7, 38972:9, 38977:9, 38988:11, 38988:13, 39010:17 between [17] - 38866:23, 38881:19, 38882:2, 38915:25, 38919:13, 38935:16, 38936:10, 38941:9, 38943:8, 38970:16, 38975:19, 38979:4,</p> | <p>38987:11, 38998:24, 39003:5, 39008:13, 39016:23 Between [1] - 38874:5 beyond [5] - 38889:25, 38997:13, 39010:5, 39010:7, 39011:19 big [1] - 38927:5 bit [28] - 38840:9, 38843:18, 38843:22, 38843:23, 38844:7, 38848:18, 38850:3, 38851:20, 38852:2, 38859:8, 38871:10, 38871:19, 38871:25, 38873:15, 38874:13, 38880:10, 38892:11, 38924:7, 38951:8, 38961:12, 38977:24, 38978:15, 38979:1, 38988:15, 38991:19, 39010:11, 39014:1, 39015:14 blame [2] - 38867:7, 38867:8 blamed [1] - 38867:7 bland [1] - 38842:11 block [3] - 38906:15, 38906:24, 38907:5 blood [3] - 38919:18, 38924:20 Board [6] - 38841:6, 38841:11, 38841:14, 38994:12, 38994:18, 38994:20 Bobs [1] - 38829:5 body [4] - 38833:10, 38879:3, 38906:17, 38978:2 bolstered [1] - 38851:20 bone [5] - 38832:10, 38832:18, 38833:3, 38833:7, 38833:15 bone-handled [4] - 38832:18, 38833:3, 38833:7, 38833:15 bones [1] - 38963:1 bore [2] - 38962:10, 39001:23 borne [2] - 38869:13, 38871:24 boss [1] - 38836:16 bosses [1] - 39010:20 Boswell [1] - 38828:4 bottom [8] - 38832:4, 38840:23, 38879:18, 38898:7, 38902:25, 38903:12, 38959:7, 38992:16</p> | <p>Boychuk [1] - 38829:8 Boyd [1] - 38867:4 brainwashing [2] - 38846:18, 38847:3 branch [1] - 38885:18 break [3] - 38850:10, 38890:5, 38985:18 breakthrough [1] - 38894:16 bricks [1] - 38984:22 brief [4] - 38886:3, 38887:15, 38919:5, 38962:21 briefly [2] - 38919:10, 38965:23 bring [2] - 38844:15, 38886:25 broader [1] - 39009:23 broke [2] - 38831:9, 38832:12 broken [1] - 38865:2 brother [1] - 38837:21 brought [7] - 38875:20, 38918:16, 38975:3, 38984:12, 39007:20, 39007:21, 39017:21 brow [1] - 38869:6 brow-beaten [1] - 38869:6 Bruce [1] - 38829:9 brushes [1] - 38920:23 built [1] - 38980:24 bullshit [2] - 38852:17, 38852:18 bunch [1] - 38849:9 bus [5] - 38852:7, 38852:16, 38856:24, 38990:6, 38990:10 business [1] - 38889:15</p> | <p>38943:9, 38944:10, 38944:11, 38944:13, 38946:8, 38992:7, 38992:8, 38999:19, 39000:6 Caldwells [1] - 38944:15 Calgary [12] - 38852:6, 38852:16, 38855:11, 38856:11, 38856:14, 38857:21, 38859:3, 38859:4, 38930:10, 38990:6, 38990:10 calm [1] - 38843:10 Calvin [1] - 38829:12 camp [1] - 38940:18 Campbell [7] - 38886:4, 38887:16, 38922:1, 38936:20, 38950:17, 38999:8, 39000:2 Canada [1] - 38829:11 Candace [1] - 38828:3 canvass [1] - 38933:9 capable [1] - 38906:9 capsulizes [1] - 39021:2 car [3] - 38919:16, 39003:4, 39021:24 carefully [1] - 38994:11 Carlyle [1] - 38938:9 Carlyle-gordge [1] - 38938:9 carried [1] - 38991:16 carry [1] - 38931:8 case [37] - 38874:10, 38874:22, 38876:18, 38880:5, 38883:1, 38883:4, 38883:7, 38884:7, 38884:10, 38886:2, 38887:14, 38891:19, 38895:18, 38897:19, 38918:11, 38927:21, 38936:13, 38938:7, 38938:10, 38939:5, 38954:13, 38963:1, 38982:19, 38984:17, 38984:22, 38985:3, 38985:8, 38987:23, 38988:5, 38988:10, 38988:14, 38992:19, 38997:17, 38999:6, 39000:8, 39006:23, 39009:2 Case [1] - 38980:16 cases [2] - 38936:15, 38971:19 Catherine [1] - 38829:5 caught [1] - 38897:8 caused [9] - 38840:6, 38856:1, 38856:4,</p> | <p>38856:6, 38863:25, 38870:19, 38970:15, 39010:3, 39013:15 causes [1] - 39006:10 causing [1] - 38880:25 Cavalier [1] - 38827:16 Cbc [23] - 38828:11, 38885:11, 38890:13, 38893:4, 38894:14, 38895:5, 38895:20, 38896:22, 38899:13, 38905:1, 38907:15, 38907:18, 38907:21, 38908:14, 38909:12, 38909:18, 38911:6, 38916:8, 38916:10, 38980:7, 39023:3, 39023:18, 39023:19 Cbctv [1] - 38894:14 Cecil [1] - 38908:18 cent [2] - 38886:10, 38888:10 centre [1] - 38902:1 Centurion [1] - 38953:14 Certain [1] - 38918:25 certain [19] - 38838:15, 38853:15, 38859:8, 38865:21, 38868:7, 38871:19, 38888:8, 38888:20, 38913:21, 38920:24, 38929:8, 38931:11, 38933:9, 38933:14, 38939:14, 38954:18, 38978:17, 39007:11 certainly [36] - 38836:14, 38840:9, 38847:19, 38851:20, 38852:1, 38856:4, 38858:12, 38859:22, 38866:3, 38867:16, 38867:25, 38882:14, 38889:24, 38890:1, 38892:25, 38893:1, 38916:4, 38922:9, 38928:2, 38930:17, 38954:4, 38964:21, 38968:15, 38970:18, 38977:17, 38984:20, 38985:9, 38985:10, 38988:14, 38992:2, 39007:1, 39007:4, 39007:21, 39016:22, 39017:18, 39021:25 Certainly [12] - 38858:18, 38862:3, 38871:21, 38878:24, 38932:22, 38946:4, 38951:11, 38953:5,</p> |
| <p>C</p> | | | | |
| <p>Cadrain [17] - 38836:22, 38837:2, 38840:3, 38852:24, 38873:6, 38921:20, 38953:7, 38955:8, 38959:16, 38959:19, 38983:8, 38992:2, 38996:1, 38996:2, 38996:5, 38997:14, 39018:4 Cadrain's [2] - 38837:12, 38837:24 Caldwell [20] - 38829:5, 38936:23, 38937:2, 38937:5, 38937:21, 38938:4, 38939:22, 38940:5, 38940:6, 38941:4, 38942:13,</p> | | | | |



| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>38974:6, 38982:18, 38985:20, 38989:9 certainty [1] - 38978:14 Certificates [1] - 39023:1 certify [1] - 39023:4 challenge [3] - 38862:1, 38879:2, 39004:21 change [6] - 38863:17, 38884:4, 38926:2, 38926:6, 38970:15, 38979:15 changes [4] - 38831:14, 38831:17, 38831:20, 38918:13 changing [4] - 38833:23, 38833:24, 38925:13, 39000:3 chapter [1] - 38999:13 character [2] - 38925:11, 39018:19 characterization [3] - 38960:7, 38961:5, 39002:13 characterize [2] - 38942:6, 38942:12 characterized [3] - 38937:17, 38957:2, 38959:5 charge [5] - 38921:1, 38966:11, 38976:24, 38995:13, 38995:14 charged [1] - 38879:16 charges [7] - 38860:2, 38861:1, 38902:9, 38979:6, 38994:25, 39011:4, 39018:21 Charlie [2] - 38861:16, 38861:23 charts [7] - 38929:24, 38930:7, 38931:25, 38933:1, 38933:13, 38934:18, 38935:13 check [3] - 38899:4, 39008:4, 39014:8 checked [1] - 38930:9 checkered [1] - 38926:17 checking [1] - 38951:14 chief [2] - 38880:4, 38966:1 Chief [1] - 38963:8 chose [4] - 38856:17, 38857:17, 38991:4, 39009:10 chosen [1] - 38988:2 Chris [1] - 38829:8 circles [1] - 38922:24 circumstance [1] - 38927:22</p> | <p>circumstances [28] - 38858:16, 38863:18, 38868:1, 38869:12, 38869:13, 38871:3, 38873:17, 38880:20, 38904:3, 38904:8, 38904:13, 38916:20, 38931:14, 38934:10, 38934:12, 38934:16, 38945:2, 38945:9, 38962:8, 38962:11, 38963:4, 38969:7, 38970:4, 38972:25, 38977:25, 38981:20, 38990:18, 39009:9 circumstantial [5] - 38885:6, 38894:23, 38927:22, 38928:10, 38979:19 city [1] - 38969:6 City [2] - 38950:4, 39005:10 claim [2] - 38853:12, 38999:14 claims [2] - 38883:21, 38937:25 clarification [1] - 39003:16 clarified [1] - 38912:20 clarify [1] - 38951:15 classification [1] - 38954:19 clean [3] - 38863:19, 38891:1, 38910:25 cleaner [1] - 38901:19 clear [7] - 38868:8, 38886:6, 38887:18, 39007:7, 39013:18, 39014:9, 39014:11 clear-cut [2] - 38886:6, 38887:18 cleared [2] - 39004:23, 39013:14 clearly [3] - 38831:23, 38892:10, 39001:6 Clerk [1] - 38828:9 client [3] - 38868:5, 38879:21, 38881:1 client's [1] - 38898:6 close [1] - 38833:9 closely [2] - 38872:1, 38993:15 closer [1] - 38871:20 closing [1] - 38922:12 clothes [1] - 38924:21 clothing [2] - 38966:15, 38983:7 co [6] - 38880:19, 38952:12, 38952:17, 38953:1, 38953:2,</p> | <p>38953:23 co-operation [5] - 38880:19, 38952:12, 38952:17, 38953:1, 38953:23 coerce [1] - 38860:21 coerced [5] - 38863:23, 38866:10, 38869:15, 38918:20, 38959:13 coercion [7] - 38858:17, 38860:19, 38866:12, 38995:1, 38995:14, 38995:18, 39001:24 colleagues [1] - 39000:24 collect [1] - 38896:19 column [3] - 38883:3, 38910:10, 38910:12 combination [2] - 38873:5, 38981:1 comedy [1] - 38882:16 comfort [2] - 38874:1, 38985:9 comfortable [1] - 38945:6 comfortably [1] - 39002:22 comforted [1] - 38957:10 coming [6] - 38848:19, 38865:14, 38891:17, 38998:23, 39000:24, 39011:24 commencement [1] - 38918:18 commencing [1] - 39012:25 comment [37] - 38838:9, 38847:2, 38865:14, 38867:15, 38872:7, 38872:13, 38880:8, 38882:20, 38884:4, 38884:6, 38888:22, 38888:23, 38889:22, 38893:23, 38897:20, 38900:15, 38903:22, 38917:7, 38921:11, 38925:15, 38926:24, 38937:14, 38943:21, 38952:8, 38962:4, 38968:4, 38973:19, 38974:3, 38979:12, 38979:14, 38987:9, 38989:11, 38990:5, 38992:6, 38996:10, 39016:4 commented [2] - 38868:12, 38958:21 commenting [1] -</p> | <p>38893:3 Comments [1] - 39004:10 comments [12] - 38839:12, 38864:13, 38870:10, 38891:21, 38899:14, 38904:2, 38904:4, 38904:7, 38908:5, 38925:16, 38955:21, 38993:25 Commission [6] - 38827:2, 38827:14, 38828:1, 38828:2, 38828:9, 38934:2 Commissioner [49] - 38831:3, 38873:10, 38916:6, 38928:7, 38928:12, 38935:21, 38935:25, 38936:5, 38936:8, 38936:12, 38936:15, 38940:21, 38941:14, 38941:23, 38942:3, 38945:19, 38945:21, 38956:7, 38956:24, 38957:14, 38964:25, 38965:6, 38965:11, 38965:18, 38967:7, 38967:9, 38971:3, 38972:13, 38972:18, 38972:21, 38972:24, 38973:3, 38973:6, 38973:17, 38975:14, 38975:18, 38975:22, 38981:5, 38981:7, 38985:17, 38998:3, 38998:7, 38998:11, 38998:17, 38998:22, 38999:2, 39005:5, 39022:2, 39022:3 commit [2] - 38850:24, 38954:5 committed [11] - 38839:23, 38839:25, 38894:21, 38978:23, 38983:13, 38983:25, 38986:23, 38987:3, 39020:5, 39020:22, 39021:6 common [3] - 38969:8, 38972:5, 38975:20 common-place [1] - 38975:20 communicated [2] - 39019:22, 39020:23 communication [2] - 38941:2, 39015:7 communications [2] - 39016:22, 39018:25 Companions [1] -</p> | <p>39017:23 compare [2] - 38932:9, 38932:14 compared [9] - 38843:7, 38859:18, 38869:2, 38929:5, 38929:6, 38977:4, 38978:20, 38989:5, 38989:6 comparing [1] - 38977:12 comparison [2] - 38969:8, 38971:24 compel [2] - 38880:17, 38954:16 compelling [4] - 38882:23, 38945:7, 38988:15, 38988:21 complain [1] - 38895:2 complaint [5] - 38880:14, 38881:5, 38881:22, 38889:25, 38944:12 complaints [3] - 38946:6, 38992:1, 39016:20 complete [9] - 38842:15, 38851:5, 38881:16, 38883:19, 38952:11, 38955:6, 38955:13, 38962:18, 39008:7 completed [4] - 38955:3, 38997:20, 39011:15, 39015:18 completely [4] - 38849:22, 38877:3, 38948:22, 38976:25 completing [2] - 39016:25, 39017:18 completion [3] - 38881:7, 38890:2, 39017:14 conceivable [1] - 38920:25 concern [13] - 38836:6, 38839:17, 38840:6, 38874:13, 38915:15, 38930:14, 38932:9, 38936:22, 38943:11, 38991:10, 39006:10, 39013:15, 39013:21 concerned [14] - 38831:16, 38836:5, 38839:14, 38914:22, 38930:20, 38931:3, 38944:3, 38944:6, 38972:15, 39005:15, 39011:10, 39013:8, 39014:13, 39014:16</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|



| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| <p>concerning [6] - 38893:5, 38919:12, 38946:7, 38996:14, 39000:15, 39002:4</p> <p>concerns [11] - 38866:17, 38908:2, 38934:17, 38934:22, 38941:11, 38946:8, 38948:21, 38951:22, 38999:11, 39003:20, 39017:20</p> <p>conclude [14] - 38846:25, 38858:4, 38868:18, 38868:23, 38873:3, 38884:13, 38943:1, 38960:5, 38964:18, 38982:11, 38984:8, 38986:8, 38993:9, 38994:2</p> <p>concluded [9] - 38917:5, 38970:2, 38982:15, 38986:21, 38987:1, 38987:10, 38991:18, 39011:9, 39016:11</p> <p>concluding [3] - 38878:5, 38955:11, 39015:19</p> <p>conclusion [17] - 38868:10, 38869:15, 38876:1, 38883:13, 38962:15, 38964:1, 38964:9, 38967:16, 38974:5, 38974:8, 38979:23, 38980:22, 38993:13, 38993:22, 38994:1, 38994:8, 38995:9</p> <p>conclusions [21] - 38866:15, 38868:12, 38868:16, 38870:13, 38870:15, 38870:23, 38871:6, 38873:21, 38887:24, 38915:22, 38916:15, 38927:10, 38956:2, 38956:5, 38960:3, 38960:19, 38960:23, 38985:25, 38987:12, 38995:17, 38995:25</p> <p>conclusive [3] - 38883:5, 38884:9, 38884:11</p> <p>conclusory [1] - 38858:20</p> <p>concoct [2] - 38853:13, 38923:5</p> <p>condition [2] - 38929:22, 39010:16</p> <p>conduct [9] - 38950:16,</p> | <p>38951:4, 38951:19, 38959:10, 38964:19, 38964:20, 38976:3, 39000:3, 39001:12</p> <p>conducted [7] - 38839:20, 38937:5, 38950:21, 38951:23, 38957:23, 39005:25, 39010:13</p> <p>conducting [10] - 38839:6, 38882:5, 38946:21, 38951:7, 38951:20, 38953:15, 38954:7, 38954:14, 39010:24, 39013:3</p> <p>confabulation [1] - 39015:14</p> <p>confess [4] - 38855:16, 38911:9, 38912:8, 38980:9</p> <p>confessed [10] - 38892:17, 38892:21, 38894:11, 38912:4, 38912:22, 38913:6, 38915:18, 38966:4, 38987:1, 38989:15</p> <p>confession [15] - 38857:20, 38885:14, 38890:14, 38891:5, 38892:23, 38892:24, 38893:6, 38911:3, 38912:24, 38913:2, 38913:8, 38917:3, 38928:9, 38947:24, 38990:5</p> <p>confession' [1] - 38980:3</p> <p>confident [2] - 38872:16, 38872:17</p> <p>confidential [2] - 38895:12, 38898:20</p> <p>confirm [9] - 38831:12, 38831:13, 38831:20, 38893:15, 38893:17, 38904:1, 38905:11, 38915:10, 38920:1</p> <p>confirmatory [1] - 38924:25</p> <p>confirmed [7] - 38898:8, 38904:25, 38905:4, 38905:7, 38918:23, 38924:12, 38938:15</p> <p>confirming [1] - 39017:14</p> <p>conflict [1] - 38999:15</p> <p>confronted [2] - 38871:18, 38980:11</p> <p>Congram [1] - 38828:3</p> <p>connected [1] -</p> | <p>39013:25</p> <p>connection [3] - 38905:15, 38907:11, 38921:16</p> <p>connections [1] - 38909:20</p> <p>consequently [3] - 38866:14, 38882:9, 38993:19</p> <p>consider [9] - 38867:2, 38867:16, 38876:11, 38928:3, 38974:2, 38979:6, 38991:15, 38994:5, 39020:3</p> <p>consideration [5] - 38878:18, 38920:19, 38921:8, 38925:19, 38968:16</p> <p>considered [4] - 38867:14, 38957:9, 38991:24, 39005:16</p> <p>considering [1] - 38976:4</p> <p>consistent [2] - 38917:11, 38946:20</p> <p>consumed [1] - 38993:5</p> <p>contact [11] - 38847:14, 38899:8, 38904:9, 38908:19, 38909:2, 38909:6, 38910:22, 38919:2, 38924:8, 38937:22, 38975:7</p> <p>contacted [6] - 38896:11, 38896:14, 38908:14, 38908:15, 38909:5, 38910:2</p> <p>contacting [1] - 38938:14</p> <p>contacts [2] - 38863:12, 38996:2</p> <p>contain [2] - 38841:25, 39023:5</p> <p>contained [11] - 38845:7, 38864:12, 38866:9, 38866:15, 38869:4, 38870:15, 38912:20, 38946:7, 38957:8, 38965:16, 38971:8</p> <p>contains [2] - 38955:25, 38989:20</p> <p>contamination [2] - 38993:23, 38994:5</p> <p>content [1] - 38889:16</p> <p>contention [4] - 38892:11, 38940:2, 38951:2, 38959:17</p> <p>contents [2] - 38831:12, 38840:16</p> | <p>context [26] - 38844:7, 38852:4, 38854:3, 38854:16, 38854:24, 38856:5, 38856:23, 38858:8, 38868:21, 38877:17, 38877:22, 38888:9, 38888:15, 38904:7, 38905:18, 38915:19, 38919:6, 38921:13, 38922:4, 38925:24, 38968:14, 38984:9, 38987:20, 38987:23, 38989:24, 39003:19</p> <p>continuation [1] - 38900:25</p> <p>continue [1] - 38900:6</p> <p>Continued [1] - 38830:3</p> <p>continued [2] - 38831:5, 38882:2</p> <p>continues [1] - 38996:18</p> <p>continuous [1] - 38858:15</p> <p>contradictory [1] - 38929:4</p> <p>contradicts [1] - 38849:20</p> <p>contrast [4] - 38835:6, 38933:19, 38936:2, 38974:25</p> <p>contrasted [1] - 38842:12</p> <p>contributed [3] - 38927:24, 38927:25, 38932:23</p> <p>contribution [1] - 38927:24</p> <p>conveniently [1] - 38995:8</p> <p>conversation [21] - 38852:15, 38886:20, 38888:5, 38888:14, 38901:12, 38904:16, 38905:1, 38905:2, 38905:9, 38919:6, 38921:14, 38922:9, 38926:12, 38926:13, 38939:6, 38941:8, 38941:11, 38989:24, 38991:4, 39000:13, 39012:1</p> <p>conversations [5] - 38853:19, 38889:13, 38919:13, 38924:10, 38929:1</p> <p>convey [1] - 38985:6</p> <p>conveys [1] - 38915:17</p> <p>convict [4] - 38890:18, 38910:19, 38922:18,</p> | <p>38980:17</p> <p>convicted [7] - 38885:7, 38891:1, 38906:14, 38910:24, 38977:6, 38981:18, 38981:22</p> <p>conviction [12] - 38873:9, 38879:4, 38894:17, 38927:25, 38976:24, 38978:4, 38978:7, 38978:10, 38978:22, 38983:20, 38986:24, 38987:24</p> <p>Conviction [1] - 38827:4</p> <p>convictions [2] - 38961:23, 38962:7</p> <p>cooperate [1] - 39006:9</p> <p>copies [2] - 38899:13, 39004:6</p> <p>copy [3] - 38893:7, 38900:4, 38936:20</p> <p>Corbett [12] - 38883:15, 38883:25, 38885:16, 38885:24, 38886:12, 38886:16, 38886:19, 38887:11, 38888:5, 38889:1, 38893:3, 38936:21</p> <p>Corey [3] - 38963:8, 38965:10, 38966:1</p> <p>Correct [5] - 38889:3, 38935:19, 38970:11, 38976:17, 38984:1</p> <p>correct [80] - 38832:19, 38832:20, 38834:20, 38834:21, 38835:16, 38837:13, 38843:3, 38848:15, 38848:16, 38849:15, 38859:21, 38864:20, 38867:22, 38875:24, 38876:1, 38876:5, 38876:13, 38876:14, 38884:24, 38888:21, 38889:4, 38890:23, 38892:15, 38895:13, 38895:17, 38896:3, 38897:22, 38898:14, 38898:20, 38898:24, 38899:2, 38899:19, 38900:23, 38904:22, 38905:4, 38907:19, 38907:21, 38910:14, 38911:5, 38915:12, 38916:12, 38917:19, 38923:10, 38923:11, 38924:13, 38929:17, 38929:18, 38930:13, 38930:21, 38931:20, 38932:2, 38934:11, 38953:24,</p> |
|--|--|---|--|---|



| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| <p>38955:9, 38957:24, 38958:12, 38959:21, 38961:6, 38969:15, 38969:20, 38970:10, 38973:22, 38973:23, 38976:7, 38976:16, 38978:11, 38982:18, 38983:25, 38989:8, 38992:23, 38994:4, 38999:9, 39004:7, 39008:5, 39011:21, 39012:12, 39015:24, 39019:10, 39021:6, 39023:5</p> <p>corrected [3] - 38847:19, 38913:1, 38940:18</p> <p>correction [1] - 38899:24</p> <p>corrections [1] - 38900:10</p> <p>correspond [1] - 38996:4</p> <p>correspondence [3] - 38882:2, 38941:7, 38943:8</p> <p>corresponds [1] - 38996:22</p> <p>Counsel[2] - 38828:2, 38831:4</p> <p>counsel [16] - 38845:1, 38865:11, 38866:20, 38883:16, 38885:17, 38899:1, 38939:20, 38952:5, 38955:22, 38959:9, 38982:8, 38986:6, 38986:17, 39016:21, 39016:23, 39017:3</p> <p>counter [7] - 38872:19, 38872:22, 38873:12, 38873:22, 38873:25, 38874:19, 38875:9</p> <p>counter-productive [7] - 38872:19, 38872:22, 38873:12, 38873:22, 38873:25, 38874:19, 38875:9</p> <p>counterparts [1] - 39008:19</p> <p>countless [1] - 38889:10</p> <p>country [1] - 38879:24</p> <p>couple [8] - 38842:4, 38884:17, 38932:19, 38955:20, 38984:21, 38985:7, 38986:2, 39016:16</p> <p>coupled [3] - 38916:21, 38927:22, 38985:12</p> | <p>course [6] - 38881:3, 38889:8, 38890:22, 38907:22, 38944:2, 38956:22</p> <p>Court[13] - 38828:10, 38878:20, 38895:14, 38921:15, 38932:4, 38978:23, 38984:13, 38986:22, 39012:24, 39023:1, 39023:3, 39023:14, 39023:20</p> <p>court [3] - 38898:17, 38954:15, 38965:13</p> <p>courteous [1] - 38995:12</p> <p>courts [3] - 38873:4, 38876:24, 38876:25</p> <p>cover [2] - 38975:16, 38998:22</p> <p>covered [3] - 38871:18, 38988:25, 39007:17</p> <p>Cp[2] - 38893:8, 38898:3</p> <p>crack [1] - 38865:23</p> <p>Craig[3] - 38917:18, 38918:1, 38920:22</p> <p>credibility [13] - 38847:1, 38847:18, 38849:1, 38851:16, 38856:1, 38859:7, 38859:16, 38866:2, 38875:11, 38935:3, 38935:9, 38989:7, 38990:13</p> <p>credible [4] - 38855:20, 38857:23, 38870:3, 38892:24</p> <p>crime [8] - 38839:24, 38850:24, 38977:1, 38977:6, 38978:24, 38983:13, 38983:25, 39021:6</p> <p>crimes [3] - 38894:20, 38906:13, 38962:9</p> <p>crimes' [1] - 38894:21</p> <p>criminal [7] - 38872:3, 38885:18, 38941:13, 38954:14, 38986:20, 38986:25, 39011:3</p> <p>critiquing [1] - 38865:10</p> <p>cross [2] - 38848:1, 38927:16</p> <p>cross-examination [2] - 38848:1, 38927:16</p> <p>Crown[13] - 38861:2, 38866:20, 38883:20, 38938:21, 38940:10, 38941:9, 38943:7, 38946:13, 38946:16,</p> | <p>38959:12, 38993:2, 39018:15, 39020:17</p> <p>Crown's [5] - 38850:22, 38918:11, 38939:4, 38946:18, 39021:23</p> <p>Crr[4] - 38828:11, 39023:2, 39023:18, 39023:19</p> <p>crumbled [2] - 38984:23, 38985:8</p> <p>Csr[8] - 38828:10, 38828:11, 39023:2, 39023:12, 39023:13, 39023:18, 39023:19</p> <p>culminated [1] - 38835:18</p> <p>culpability [1] - 38985:2</p> <p>cumulation [1] - 38873:2</p> <p>curious [1] - 38841:7</p> <p>custody [5] - 38862:22, 38863:12, 38863:13, 38863:15, 38863:17</p> <p>cut [5] - 38886:6, 38887:18, 38914:18, 38914:23, 39009:20</p> | <p>38852:8, 38852:15, 38852:24, 38856:12, 38857:13, 38869:10, 38869:19, 38873:9, 38875:22, 38876:5, 38876:14, 38877:7, 38879:14, 38884:16, 38885:5, 38888:4, 38894:13, 38894:18, 38897:19, 38898:4, 38902:10, 38903:13, 38909:3, 38909:4, 38909:20, 38909:21, 38909:22, 38909:24, 38910:3, 38923:5, 38924:21, 38927:21, 38937:6, 38939:10, 38939:21, 38941:3, 38952:5, 38959:14, 38961:7, 38961:20, 38976:4, 38976:15, 38976:21, 38976:24, 38977:6, 38978:7, 38978:10, 38978:14, 38980:13, 38982:9, 38983:20, 38983:24, 38984:17, 38984:22, 38985:2, 38985:3, 38985:8, 38986:3, 38986:5, 38986:11, 38987:24, 38988:6, 38994:6, 38994:19, 39002:6, 39015:5, 39018:1, 39020:21, 39021:5</p> <p>days [2] - 38841:2, 38858:15</p> <p>dead [2] - 38914:22, 38914:23</p> <p>deadline [1] - 38883:16</p> <p>deal [6] - 38843:10, 38860:5, 38871:23, 38876:25, 38982:13, 39010:15</p> <p>dealing [3] - 38872:2, 39004:18, 39012:4</p> <p>deals [3] - 38884:17, 38956:13, 38957:23</p> <p>dealt [8] - 38861:20, 38862:15, 38886:7, 38887:19, 38933:10, 38988:16, 38994:8, 39022:1</p> <p>death [12] - 38916:25, 38959:14, 38962:12, 38962:17, 38970:4, 38970:17, 38971:20, 38972:25, 38973:1, 38974:25, 38981:20, 39009:17</p> | <p>Deborah[14] - 38873:5, 38876:13, 38877:20, 38888:1, 38917:23, 38920:6, 38924:15, 38927:4, 38944:25, 38961:1, 38992:25, 38993:8, 38993:11, 39018:9</p> <p>debrief [1] - 38886:19</p> <p>debriefing [1] - 38888:14</p> <p>December [5] - 38881:11, 38881:15, 38881:19, 38882:11, 39017:5</p> <p>decent [1] - 38864:22</p> <p>decided [5] - 38857:13, 38857:20, 38857:21, 38991:2, 39012:23</p> <p>deciding [1] - 38967:13</p> <p>decision [7] - 38917:16, 38946:15, 39010:20, 39013:2, 39016:18, 39017:1, 39017:2</p> <p>declarations [1] - 38928:9</p> <p>declined [3] - 38880:23, 38929:20, 38930:1</p> <p>defect [1] - 38877:11</p> <p>defects [2] - 38876:21, 38876:23</p> <p>defence [6] - 38864:22, 38941:10, 38946:13, 38968:16, 38968:21, 38982:13</p> <p>defendant's [1] - 38968:9</p> <p>deficiencies [1] - 38985:13</p> <p>definitive [1] - 38851:5</p> <p>degree [3] - 38894:23, 38937:1, 38963:19</p> <p>Dehm[1] - 38938:21</p> <p>delay [4] - 38880:25, 38881:4, 38881:5, 39016:18</p> <p>delayed [1] - 38880:6</p> <p>delaying [2] - 38879:15, 38880:15</p> <p>deleted [1] - 38850:6</p> <p>deliberations [1] - 38987:20</p> <p>demanding [1] - 38881:2</p> <p>demeanour [1] - 38843:9</p> <p>Demyen[1] - 38992:4</p> <p>denials [3] - 38836:7, 38836:10, 39005:17</p> <p>denied [2] - 38922:10,</p> |
| <p>D</p> | | | | |
| <p>Dale[5] - 38852:23, 38923:21, 38959:12, 38992:21, 38994:10</p> <p>damage [1] - 38879:14</p> <p>damning [1] - 39016:17</p> <p>dark [3] - 38966:17, 38969:4, 38974:25</p> <p>darkness [2] - 38975:16, 38975:20</p> <p>date [15] - 38881:12, 38930:5, 38949:8, 38949:11, 38952:15, 38955:15, 38957:4, 38957:23, 38958:8, 38959:2, 38963:3, 38997:12, 39006:2, 39006:8, 39012:16</p> <p>dated [1] - 38980:12</p> <p>dates [2] - 38851:14, 38882:11</p> <p>David[88] - 38827:4, 38829:2, 38829:10, 38832:14, 38832:18, 38832:23, 38833:2, 38834:7, 38834:8, 38840:25, 38846:12, 38848:3, 38848:4, 38848:14, 38848:21, 38848:22, 38850:20, 38850:23, 38851:8,</p> | | | | |



| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| <p>38980:13 Dennis [2] - 38837:24, 38840:3 denying [1] - 38860:18 Department [11] - 38879:13, 38889:2, 38891:3, 38893:24, 38894:10, 38911:1, 38937:3, 38940:13, 38950:21, 38976:10, 38999:21 department [11] - 38879:19, 38882:3, 38883:12, 38885:19, 38885:21, 38886:1, 38887:13, 38897:17, 38898:10, 38937:15, 39019:4 department's [4] - 38880:4, 38883:15, 38885:17, 38936:23 departure [2] - 38884:2, 38945:8 depot [5] - 38852:7, 38852:16, 38856:24, 38990:6, 38990:10 depth [3] - 38835:22, 38835:23, 38838:24 deputy [1] - 38966:1 Deputy [1] - 38963:8 describe [3] - 38904:12, 38966:22, 38980:4 described [7] - 38843:6, 38844:9, 38872:12, 38966:16, 38990:19, 38995:4, 38996:12 describes [2] - 38841:20, 38958:5 describing [1] - 38931:13 Description [1] - 38830:2 description [9] - 38833:8, 38860:16, 38866:13, 38976:9, 38993:1, 38993:15, 38995:2, 38995:15, 39002:14 descriptions [1] - 38964:10 desirable [2] - 38918:12, 38971:12 desire [2] - 38947:14, 39012:17 desirous [1] - 38952:1 Despite [1] - 38926:17 destroyed [1] - 38940:9 destruction [1] - 38933:15</p> | <p>detail [6] - 38838:16, 38843:1, 38904:5, 38959:24, 38988:24, 38989:23 detailed [4] - 38857:6, 38957:24, 38958:16, 38970:22 details [13] - 38842:1, 38853:15, 38853:18, 38920:4, 38948:25, 38949:6, 38952:14, 38963:13, 38964:6, 38965:15, 38970:18, 38973:12, 39000:14 Details [1] - 38853:10 determination [1] - 38878:21 determine [9] - 38858:20, 38962:8, 38997:15, 39000:18, 39002:18, 39002:21, 39006:4, 39009:18, 39011:2 determined [2] - 38870:2, 38960:16 determining [2] - 38935:8, 38968:5 detracted [1] - 38997:2 development [2] - 38885:9, 38890:11 devise [1] - 38853:14 died [2] - 38974:18, 38975:4 differ [1] - 39007:9 difference [5] - 38877:22, 38932:13, 38933:25, 38975:19, 38998:19 differences [2] - 38932:19, 38974:14 different [18] - 38847:10, 38849:22, 38858:16, 38871:21, 38874:5, 38875:14, 38877:3, 38942:14, 38942:21, 38945:15, 38962:1, 38969:5, 38986:10, 38998:4, 39006:18, 39009:15, 39018:23, 39021:10 differently [5] - 38977:13, 38977:14, 38978:9, 38978:15, 38978:21 difficult [2] - 38858:4, 38976:19 dinner [1] - 38835:23 directly [3] - 38939:20, 38941:1, 38950:14 Director [1] - 38828:3</p> | <p>disadvantage [1] - 39004:17 disagreed [2] - 38920:11, 39002:12 disappearance [1] - 38933:12 disappearing [1] - 39008:1 Disappointment [1] - 38880:10 discerned [1] - 38858:11 disclose [5] - 38939:22, 38940:10, 38941:5, 38954:5, 38954:17 disclosed [5] - 38885:5, 38942:13, 38948:11, 38992:12, 38994:12 disclosing [1] - 38948:13 disclosure [7] - 38893:21, 38940:19, 38941:10, 38941:12, 38941:22, 38943:3, 38948:17 discourt [1] - 38972:2 discovered [4] - 38833:10, 38944:14, 38964:24, 38985:14 discovery [1] - 38953:5 discredits [1] - 39019:7 discrepancies [1] - 38869:22 discuss [2] - 38885:20, 38938:6 discussed [6] - 38880:20, 38886:15, 38958:21, 38960:10, 39006:13, 39021:2 discussing [2] - 38889:10, 38948:8 discussion [9] - 38835:4, 38835:18, 38838:2, 38838:24, 38913:3, 38956:25, 38998:24, 39012:13, 39014:2 discussions [8] - 38834:19, 38915:23, 38927:17, 38937:18, 38997:8, 39003:21, 39020:24, 39020:25 disguised [1] - 38895:1 dislike [1] - 38920:13 dismayed [1] - 38947:6 dismiss [1] - 38971:23 dismissed [2] - 38943:3, 38943:6 dispel [1] - 38882:7 display [1] - 38843:10</p> | <p>disposal [1] - 38838:17 disputed [1] - 38924:15 dissemination [1] - 38992:10 dissuade [1] - 39011:14 distance [1] - 38909:25 distinction [1] - 38935:16 distract [1] - 39001:15 disturbed [1] - 38952:19 disturbing [2] - 38840:9, 38916:4 divorce [1] - 38985:1 Dna [4] - 38877:5, 38988:12, 38988:18 doc [2] - 38965:5, 39005:2 Document [2] - 38828:4, 38828:5 document [20] - 38835:12, 38841:19, 38868:13, 38899:18, 38933:14, 38940:8, 38946:5, 38956:11, 38956:18, 38956:21, 38957:1, 38957:12, 38957:19, 38957:22, 38960:14, 38960:24, 38966:24, 38967:4, 38967:8, 39010:8 documentary [4] - 38891:19, 38897:13, 38901:9, 38903:13 documents [2] - 38922:3, 39010:1 Don [1] - 38828:11 Donald [3] - 38883:1, 39023:2, 39023:19 done [23] - 38873:18, 38874:18, 38896:25, 38900:16, 38905:3, 38906:10, 38914:25, 38915:4, 38915:11, 38933:1, 38947:17, 38954:10, 38954:21, 38957:4, 38973:9, 38975:16, 38982:25, 39008:24, 39011:5, 39014:15, 39014:19, 39016:7, 39017:13 donor [1] - 38877:8 door [2] - 38919:1, 38919:3 doorstep [1] - 38983:15 dorm [1] - 38902:6 dormitory [1] - 38901:18 doubt [5] - 38840:11, 38856:1, 38856:6,</p> | <p>38968:17, 38989:7 Douglas [1] - 38828:2 down [36] - 38832:3, 38840:23, 38848:19, 38865:2, 38869:8, 38871:15, 38872:6, 38878:8, 38878:12, 38879:18, 38892:9, 38892:13, 38896:24, 38898:7, 38899:22, 38902:11, 38902:13, 38902:24, 38903:12, 38943:10, 38946:24, 38955:7, 38955:16, 38955:17, 38958:24, 38959:23, 38962:4, 38966:12, 38966:14, 38976:3, 38980:5, 38992:16, 39001:10, 39007:22, 39009:20, 39011:11 Dr [8] - 38867:4, 38876:13, 38877:20, 38993:22, 38994:1, 38994:4, 39019:5 draw [8] - 38886:23, 38887:21, 38910:9, 38913:7, 38915:22, 38958:18, 38995:17, 38995:20 drawn [6] - 38887:25, 38940:3, 38959:9, 38960:19, 38995:25, 39016:16 drew [4] - 38912:25, 38919:7, 38960:3, 38964:9 drop [1] - 38983:14 drugs [1] - 38993:5 due [1] - 38840:25 duel [1] - 38891:9 dump [1] - 38891:10 during [6] - 38850:21, 38905:2, 38959:10, 39000:19, 39001:19, 39005:18</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">E</p> <hr/> <p>eager [2] - 38891:3, 38911:1 Earl [2] - 38979:20, 38992:20 early [6] - 38966:17, 38970:23, 38971:17, 38974:25, 38998:23, 39014:11 echoed [1] - 38926:24 Ed [1] - 38848:10</p> |
|--|--|--|--|---|



| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| <p>Eddie [1] - 38829:8 Eddy [3] - 38861:14, 38861:18, 38861:22 Edward [2] - 38827:7, 38902:10 effect [17] - 38842:21, 38852:12, 38872:20, 38872:23, 38873:13, 38873:22, 38874:1, 38875:9, 38875:10, 38889:22, 38921:11, 38932:22, 38951:18, 38951:25, 38984:3, 38988:2, 39012:7 effectively [1] - 39014:4 effort [2] - 38921:18, 38952:20 efforts [2] - 38874:20, 38951:12 eight [5] - 38834:25, 38835:17, 38866:21, 38866:22, 38932:13 either [21] - 38837:17, 38857:15, 38860:19, 38866:5, 38874:1, 38882:4, 38889:1, 38895:8, 38896:13, 38907:5, 38910:17, 38921:7, 38921:17, 38928:1, 38935:12, 38936:13, 38964:12, 38981:1, 38992:2, 39003:23, 39019:6 Either [1] - 38947:13 elaborate [3] - 38848:18, 38925:15, 38962:14 elapsed [2] - 38881:14, 38933:14 element [2] - 38972:3, 38974:22 elements [1] - 38985:7 elevator [1] - 38832:12 elicit [1] - 39002:23 eliminate [2] - 39006:16, 39010:10 eliminated [3] - 39004:13, 39006:24, 39013:11 Elvis [4] - 38886:11, 38888:8, 38888:11, 38888:23 embarrass [1] - 38917:15 emotion [1] - 38843:11 employed [1] - 38937:2 enactment [1] - 38918:5 enclosed [1] - 38893:7 encounters [2] -</p> | <p>38842:7, 38842:9 end [12] - 38835:10, 38839:1, 38866:3, 38866:4, 38885:22, 38886:4, 38887:16, 38916:7, 38932:12, 38981:13, 38997:25, 39015:22 endeavour [1] - 38946:13 ended [2] - 38878:5, 38932:11 ends [1] - 38997:19 engaged [1] - 38951:1 ensure [2] - 39017:1, 39017:6 ensured [1] - 39017:20 entered [3] - 38962:9, 38962:24, 38992:5 entire [2] - 38838:11, 38919:7 entirely [2] - 38946:20, 39019:7 entitled [1] - 38868:5 entry [1] - 38850:10 equalize [1] - 38985:18 equally [1] - 38988:21 equation [1] - 38992:5 escalating [1] - 38963:20 Esq [5] - 38829:7, 38829:8, 38829:9, 38829:12, 38829:14 essence [1] - 38832:23 essential [5] - 38939:3, 39004:22, 39006:1, 39010:9, 39013:13 essentially [4] - 38863:20, 38987:1, 38997:20, 39007:19 Essentially [1] - 38917:12 Esson [1] - 38828:12 established [5] - 38833:12, 38916:3, 38982:16, 38989:10, 39021:23 estimate [2] - 38955:14, 38997:24 etcetera [3] - 38875:2, 38896:24 Eugene [4] - 38829:14, 38830:3, 38831:5, 38880:3 evaluation [2] - 38972:7, 38976:12 evaluator [1] - 38971:4 evening [3] - 38931:1, 38974:24, 38975:19 event [8] - 38836:9,</p> | <p>38847:7, 38850:15, 38856:24, 38927:9, 38933:21, 38963:24, 38980:2 events [8] - 38841:20, 38849:5, 38851:6, 38874:7, 38925:24, 38926:20, 38962:25, 38993:1 eventually [1] - 39004:6 evidence [108] - 38832:14, 38838:12, 38839:19, 38839:21, 38840:22, 38841:11, 38842:5, 38845:21, 38848:11, 38858:23, 38864:18, 38867:3, 38870:4, 38870:5, 38870:20, 38871:19, 38872:11, 38875:15, 38875:18, 38876:4, 38876:12, 38877:2, 38877:9, 38877:15, 38877:25, 38878:5, 38878:11, 38878:16, 38878:19, 38879:4, 38882:22, 38883:6, 38883:9, 38884:9, 38884:11, 38886:1, 38886:6, 38887:13, 38887:18, 38888:1, 38898:12, 38915:23, 38918:24, 38922:7, 38924:13, 38927:20, 38928:10, 38932:3, 38934:2, 38941:21, 38943:12, 38950:22, 38951:11, 38951:17, 38951:25, 38958:22, 38961:22, 38965:15, 38966:3, 38967:13, 38968:11, 38971:5, 38976:4, 38976:5, 38976:20, 38977:8, 38978:3, 38979:1, 38979:2, 38979:18, 38979:19, 38980:24, 38981:15, 38981:25, 38982:3, 38982:15, 38982:20, 38983:14, 38983:15, 38984:4, 38984:12, 38985:15, 38986:2, 38987:18, 38988:12, 38988:15, 38988:19, 38988:21, 38992:25, 38998:8, 39003:13, 39003:24, 39005:6, 39009:6, 39011:16, 39012:7, 39013:19, 39017:24, 39018:1, 39018:4,</p> | <p>39018:7, 39019:8, 39019:11, 39020:16, 39020:20, 39021:12, 39021:23 evidentiary [1] - 38989:4 ex [3] - 38890:18, 38910:19, 39005:23 Ex [2] - 38980:17, 38999:6 ex-convict [2] - 38890:18, 38910:19 Ex-convict [1] - 38980:17 Ex-prosecutor [1] - 38999:6 ex-wife [1] - 39005:23 exact [3] - 38842:20, 38906:17, 38915:7 exactly [1] - 38903:7 Exactly [1] - 38909:17 exaggeration [1] - 38843:22 examination [11] - 38831:8, 38848:1, 38858:3, 38865:12, 38871:20, 38872:13, 38927:16, 38932:22, 38963:25, 38984:16, 39005:25 examine [1] - 38944:15 examined [8] - 38882:14, 38933:20, 38944:20, 38961:21, 38962:5, 38987:22, 38993:14 examining [1] - 38933:7 example [17] - 38840:19, 38857:12, 38860:25, 38871:12, 38877:2, 38887:25, 38939:15, 38940:3, 38940:4, 38964:15, 38966:11, 38975:2, 38983:2, 38988:8, 38996:14, 39003:3, 39008:17 exceptions [1] - 39013:1 exchange [2] - 38882:7, 39007:5 exchanges [2] - 38874:24, 38943:8 Excuse [2] - 38928:7, 38981:5 Executive [1] - 38828:3 exercise [1] - 38976:3 exhausted [1] - 38846:16 exhibit [1] - 38864:14</p> | <p>Exhibit [1] - 38864:15 exhibits [1] - 38916:8 exist [1] - 38866:12 existed [2] - 38976:21, 38979:4 existence [2] - 38933:18, 38990:2 existing [2] - 38880:16, 38984:17 exonerate [1] - 38994:6 exonerated [1] - 38888:3 exonerates [1] - 39019:6 expanded [1] - 39017:5 expect [2] - 38843:12, 38866:11 expectation [1] - 38994:18 expected [4] - 38849:6, 38857:6, 38974:19, 38974:22 expeditiously [1] - 38874:18 experience [1] - 38872:2 explain [11] - 38831:18, 38845:5, 38853:8, 38856:9, 38864:4, 38876:3, 38893:20, 38926:14, 39001:6, 39005:22, 39006:19 explained [5] - 38904:15, 38923:13, 39005:19, 39006:5, 39006:8 explaining [1] - 38866:25 explanation [8] - 38864:9, 38866:25, 38867:17, 38876:11, 38925:5, 38934:19, 38936:1, 38936:3 explanations [1] - 38925:7 explore [1] - 38929:1 explored [1] - 38877:4 express [1] - 38956:19 expressed [1] - 39012:1 expression [1] - 38926:21 extended [1] - 38915:16 extent [19] - 38836:12, 38840:20, 38863:15, 38868:6, 38874:10, 38874:13, 38878:24, 38879:1, 38889:24, 38895:24, 38945:4, 38946:15, 38962:16, 38963:15, 38977:16,</p> |
|---|--|---|--|--|



| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| 38961:23, 38963:10, 38969:2, 38975:25, 38977:18, 38979:4, 38983:2, 38985:2, 39004:21, 39006:2, 39006:9 fit [6] - 38845:24, 38854:4, 38859:3, 38871:13, 38877:16, 38997:1 fitted [1] - 38901:16 Fitzgerald [1] - 38828:13 five [2] - 38835:13, 38836:8 focal [1] - 38850:16 focus [1] - 38872:24 focused [2] - 38845:14, 38868:25 folks [5] - 38887:24, 38889:18, 38914:4, 38938:8, 38945:17 follow [11] - 38840:21, 38847:22, 38857:1, 38859:12, 38871:3, 38929:12, 38944:17, 38955:8, 38999:7, 39012:9, 39014:21 follow-up [5] - 38840:21, 38871:3, 38955:8, 38999:7, 39014:21 follow-ups [1] - 39012:9 followed [1] - 38896:8 Following [1] - 38868:25 following [5] - 38882:8, 38970:23, 38976:8, 38992:22, 39012:5 follows [1] - 38854:17 food [1] - 38889:19 force [1] - 38954:17 forced [2] - 38966:14 forces [1] - 38933:16 foregoing [1] - 39023:5 forensic [6] - 38865:11, 38865:12, 38961:2, 38993:24, 39019:7 forestalling [1] - 38881:6 forget [3] - 38874:24, 38924:8, 39017:8 forgive [1] - 38935:23 forgotten [2] - 38889:20, 38889:21 form [4] - 38835:2, 38839:16, 38945:14, 38991:13 formal [1] - 38941:19 | formally [2] - 38973:25, 38974:1 format [3] - 38835:8, 39000:15, 39020:24 formed [1] - 38871:21 former [9] - 38885:11, 38890:13, 38897:11, 38898:9, 38901:7, 38902:8, 38950:4, 38980:8, 38980:13 formulation [1] - 38984:7 forthcoming [3] - 38933:24, 38952:18, 39017:1 forum [1] - 38917:13 forward [15] - 38859:20, 38867:23, 38870:18, 38872:8, 38873:23, 38875:21, 38891:17, 38939:9, 38959:2, 38960:20, 38977:8, 38982:8, 38986:3, 39020:10, 39021:7 foundation [7] - 38866:8, 38869:3, 38873:2, 38873:8, 38878:17, 38904:14, 38972:10 four [7] - 38835:13, 38836:8, 38841:1, 38841:19, 38949:20, 38966:9, 38969:13 four-page [1] - 38841:19 fourth [1] - 38871:8 frame [1] - 38923:5 framed [1] - 38882:15 framework [1] - 38880:16 Frank [4] - 38939:17, 38940:12, 38942:11, 39018:12 frankly [2] - 38949:9, 38953:16 Frayen [9] - 38829:10, 38955:21, 38956:19, 38956:23, 38957:15, 38957:16, 39016:2, 39016:13, 39016:15 Fred [1] - 38938:21 free [1] - 39011:18 fresh [4] - 38878:19, 38880:21, 38984:12, 38993:19 fresher [2] - 38849:6, 38849:7 friendly [1] - 38995:11 friendship [1] - 38910:4 frighten [1] - 38927:9 | frightened [2] - 38863:16, 38927:7 frightening [1] - 38926:22 front [2] - 38903:9, 38914:1 fruits [1] - 38954:20 frustration [1] - 38843:11 fucking [1] - 38902:20 full [5] - 38832:7, 38882:18, 38886:22, 38887:4, 39017:6 fuller [2] - 38964:10, 38976:9 fully [7] - 38881:9, 38881:21, 38904:12, 38933:8, 38941:12, 39017:2, 39021:13 Furthermore [1] - 39021:16 | general [3] - 38843:5, 38864:1, 38883:16 General [1] - 38938:18 generally [9] - 38841:19, 38865:15, 38868:14, 38884:6, 38884:7, 38884:10, 38894:19, 38987:7, 39001:14 George [5] - 38917:24, 38918:1, 38923:9, 38924:6, 38925:3 gest [1] - 38993:4 Gibson [1] - 38829:9 girl [2] - 38989:15, 38989:16 girl' [2] - 38855:12 given [21] - 38834:3, 38835:13, 38836:17, 38840:12, 38851:11, 38895:16, 38896:5, 38908:25, 38921:7, 38950:15, 38951:3, 38971:6, 38988:3, 38996:3, 38998:9, 38998:12, 39011:16, 39011:23, 39016:8, 39018:20, 39020:2 Globe [6] - 38884:16, 38910:8, 38912:21, 38913:25, 38916:8, 38980:11 goal [1] - 38841:9 gordge [1] - 38938:9 gotcha [1] - 38981:8 Government [1] - 38829:4 grabbed [1] - 38966:13 grabbing [1] - 38852:9 grain [1] - 38991:22 grant [1] - 38870:14 great [3] - 38843:10, 38871:23, 38943:11 greater [2] - 38838:16, 38938:5 grind [1] - 38920:12 ground [19] - 38870:18, 38871:8, 38873:1, 38873:20, 38873:23, 38878:1, 38939:12, 38939:21, 38940:24, 38961:6, 38961:13, 38962:2, 38982:9, 38982:14, 38982:16, 38986:3, 39020:10, 39021:7, 39021:22 grounds [23] - 38871:5, 38871:17, 38874:3, 38874:4, 38877:16, 38881:18, 38881:21, | 38881:24, 38882:14, 38939:9, 38941:3, 38941:17, 38944:15, 38959:1, 38960:20, 38977:8, 38987:8, 39013:24, 39017:4, 39017:7, 39017:15, 39017:19 guards [1] - 38911:21 guess [18] - 38831:25, 38832:21, 38872:2, 38872:23, 38872:24, 38912:11, 38914:20, 38933:4, 38938:18, 38940:23, 38968:23, 38974:22, 38978:25, 38999:13, 39001:23, 39006:14, 39010:8, 39011:23 guilt [1] - 38988:22 guilty [6] - 38857:15, 38962:10, 38962:23, 38963:3, 38963:10, 39020:4 guy [3] - 38891:23, 38912:1, 38924:7 |
| G | | H | | |
| | | | hair [1] - 38966:18 half [1] - 38903:3 Hall [11] - 38873:5, 38876:13, 38877:9, 38877:20, 38917:23, 38927:4, 38945:1, 38961:1, 38992:25, 38993:8, 39018:9 Hall's [4] - 38888:1, 38920:6, 38924:15, 38993:11 hand [8] - 38875:3, 38880:12, 38881:4, 38881:6, 38890:16, 38892:8, 38973:1, 39010:19 handle [1] - 38833:13 handled [6] - 38832:11, 38832:17, 38832:18, 38833:3, 38833:7, 38833:15 hands [3] - 38919:18, 38919:19, 38939:17 handwriting [1] - 38835:3 happy [2] - 38865:16, 38953:16 harassed [1] - 38959:17 haste [1] - 39016:24 hasty [1] - 38917:15 | |



| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| <p>hat [1] - 38954:15</p> <p>head [2] - 38865:6, 38979:1</p> <p>heading [1] - 38961:3</p> <p>headlines [3] - 38882:10, 38940:12, 39016:17</p> <p>headquarters [1] - 39006:22</p> <p>hear [5] - 38844:6, 38844:14, 38846:21, 38869:10, 38925:7</p> <p>heard [14] - 38839:8, 38839:19, 38867:3, 38889:18, 38904:5, 38907:14, 38907:18, 38926:11, 38927:7, 38934:1, 38957:5, 38966:3, 39003:13, 39021:5</p> <p>hearing [7] - 38841:1, 38841:6, 38841:15, 38864:6, 38878:20, 38901:23, 38994:13</p> <p>Heather [21] - 38852:7, 38852:11, 38852:19, 38852:22, 38853:4, 38853:7, 38853:18, 38854:2, 38854:6, 38854:10, 38854:11, 38854:15, 38854:16, 38854:22, 38855:24, 38856:9, 38856:25, 38858:25, 38990:9, 38990:13, 38990:16</p> <p>held [2] - 38889:2, 38898:17</p> <p>hell [1] - 38837:2</p> <p>help [5] - 38834:7, 38834:8, 38836:15, 38851:8</p> <p>helped [2] - 38865:7, 38936:13</p> <p>helpful [4] - 38834:10, 38935:5, 38935:11, 38935:17</p> <p>helping [1] - 38999:6</p> <p>Henderson [15] - 38832:23, 38834:15, 38834:18, 38836:2, 38837:11, 38838:20, 38839:5, 38839:20, 38840:16, 38923:23, 38924:1, 38932:10, 38934:14, 38934:21, 38936:4</p> <p>Henderson's [2] - 38930:18, 38935:6</p> <p>hereby [1] - 39023:4</p> <p>herein [1] - 39023:6</p> | <p>Hersh [1] - 38829:2</p> <p>higher [2] - 38890:1, 38984:5</p> <p>highly [1] - 39018:5</p> <p>him' [1] - 39010:11</p> <p>himself [1] - 38994:4</p> <p>hindsight [1] - 38972:6</p> <p>Hinz [3] - 38828:10, 39023:2, 39023:13</p> <p>historical [2] - 38954:10, 38989:3</p> <p>hit [1] - 38989:16</p> <p>hockey [5] - 38891:7, 38891:20, 38896:23, 38901:21, 38905:2</p> <p>Hodson [35] - 38828:2, 38830:4, 38831:6, 38873:11, 38873:14, 38890:8, 38928:13, 38935:23, 38935:24, 38936:18, 38940:22, 38942:5, 38945:24, 38946:1, 38956:23, 38956:24, 38957:10, 38957:17, 38965:3, 38965:9, 38965:20, 38965:22, 38967:18, 38968:1, 38973:18, 38975:23, 38981:6, 38981:8, 38981:9, 38985:20, 38985:23, 38998:6, 38998:21, 38999:4, 39017:10</p> <p>hold [5] - 38862:20, 38862:21, 38979:7, 39009:3, 39012:24</p> <p>holding [1] - 38860:24</p> <p>holiday [1] - 38919:5</p> <p>homicide [2] - 39007:4, 39007:13</p> <p>Hon [1] - 38829:11</p> <p>honesty [1] - 39004:21</p> <p>Honourable [1] - 38827:6</p> <p>hope [1] - 38994:18</p> <p>hoped [2] - 38886:3, 38887:15</p> <p>hopefully [2] - 38889:17, 38994:22</p> <p>hopes [1] - 39007:24</p> <p>Hopkins [1] - 38829:12</p> <p>hosted [1] - 39005:9</p> <p>Hotel [1] - 38827:16</p> <p>hotel [4] - 38918:6, 39001:18, 39005:12, 39021:17</p> <p>hour [1] - 38933:23</p> <p>Hours [2] - 38897:13, 38901:9</p> <p>hours [9] - 38835:17,</p> | <p>38843:21, 38846:15, 38847:13, 38858:13, 38866:22, 38889:10, 38932:13, 38985:18</p> <p>house [1] - 38903:18</p> <p>Huff [4] - 38950:6, 38950:8, 38950:9, 38952:24</p> <p>Hugh [1] - 38828:12</p> <p>hum [1] - 38853:1</p> <p>human [2] - 38867:20, 38872:1</p> <p>hunting [4] - 38832:11, 38832:18, 38833:3, 38833:16</p> | <p>38844:18, 38848:3, 38848:4, 38848:14, 38848:24, 38849:12</p> <p>implicating [1] - 38857:18</p> <p>implied [1] - 38922:1</p> <p>implying [1] - 38922:6</p> <p>importance [2] - 38897:12, 38901:8</p> <p>important [7] - 38834:22, 38838:16, 38867:24, 38913:2, 38918:11, 38927:23</p> <p>importantly [1] - 38932:25</p> <p>impossible [1] - 39020:21</p> <p>impression [13] - 38843:7, 38845:10, 38847:20, 38880:11, 38894:1, 38915:17, 38925:12, 38925:17, 38926:18, 38940:16, 38940:17, 38997:5, 38998:13</p> <p>improper [2] - 38937:11, 38937:21</p> <p>improperly [2] - 38944:19, 39003:23</p> <p>In-depth [1] - 38835:22</p> <p>in-depth [2] - 38835:23, 38838:24</p> <p>inappropriate [3] - 38838:19, 38845:11, 38845:14</p> <p>incarceration [3] - 38899:7, 38901:16, 38902:15</p> <p>incentive [1] - 38925:21</p> <p>incident [8] - 38859:3, 38901:5, 38901:21, 38927:12, 38971:24, 38975:8, 38980:19, 38980:20</p> <p>incidents [6] - 38897:12, 38901:8, 38907:24, 38907:25, 38962:22, 38964:6</p> <p>inclined [1] - 38954:1</p> <p>include [1] - 38882:13</p> <p>included [3] - 38855:24, 38939:10, 38941:19</p> <p>including [2] - 38931:2, 38975:15</p> <p>inclusion [4] - 38937:11, 38938:1, 38938:25, 38946:8</p> <p>inconsistent [1] - 38849:3</p> | <p>incorrect [3] - 38893:11, 38908:4, 38911:8</p> <p>increasing [1] - 38974:20</p> <p>incriminating [12] - 38833:19, 38842:12, 38845:8, 38845:12, 38845:21, 38851:1, 38851:17, 38851:18, 38875:18, 38921:3, 38983:14, 39017:25</p> <p>indecent [1] - 39020:5</p> <p>indeed [4] - 38903:4, 38936:14, 38960:8, 39016:3</p> <p>Index [1] - 38830:1</p> <p>indicate [5] - 38835:8, 38837:22, 38849:11, 38893:12, 38981:14</p> <p>indicated [8] - 38832:2, 38851:3, 38872:3, 38887:22, 38888:6, 38893:24, 38947:14, 38955:5</p> <p>indicates [3] - 38835:15, 38951:9, 39005:7</p> <p>indicating [2] - 38871:19, 38954:24</p> <p>indication [2] - 38835:9, 38990:1</p> <p>indicia [2] - 38858:19, 38918:19</p> <p>individual [4] - 38946:18, 38947:3, 38978:1, 39002:18</p> <p>individually [1] - 38985:11</p> <p>individuals [1] - 38909:3</p> <p>inducement [2] - 38921:2, 38926:1</p> <p>inducements [2] - 38861:6, 38862:12</p> <p>indulgence [1] - 38887:5</p> <p>inference [3] - 38913:7, 38940:2, 38940:10</p> <p>inflicting [1] - 38879:13</p> <p>influence [3] - 38840:14, 38871:4, 38917:9</p> <p>influenced [5] - 38839:14, 38871:14, 38874:14, 38910:6, 39003:23</p> <p>inform [1] - 38859:22</p> <p>informant [7] - 38893:5, 38893:10, 38893:18,</p> |
| I | | | | |
| <p>iceberg [1] - 38990:23</p> <p>Id [2] - 38965:5, 39005:2</p> <p>idea [1] - 39007:24</p> <p>identification [2] - 38983:8, 38992:19</p> <p>identified [10] - 38890:19, 38894:1, 38905:21, 38910:20, 38947:22, 38951:12, 38955:2, 38986:9, 39017:4, 39017:19</p> <p>identifier [1] - 38963:17</p> <p>identifies [1] - 38958:8</p> <p>identity [5] - 38839:11, 38839:18, 38861:10, 38966:21, 38995:10</p> <p>identifying [5] - 38958:25, 38967:23, 38972:3, 38973:10, 39002:19</p> <p>identity [2] - 38990:3, 39019:12</p> <p>ignore [1] - 38982:24</p> <p>ignores [1] - 38993:23</p> <p>image [2] - 38858:7</p> <p>imagined [1] - 38922:15</p> <p>impact [8] - 38840:21, 38873:8, 38877:11, 38961:24, 38987:19, 38988:1, 39016:18</p> <p>impartial [2] - 38945:16, 38946:22</p> <p>impetus [1] - 38890:2</p> <p>implicate [10] - 38844:3, 38844:11, 38846:19, 38847:4, 38847:12, 38857:13, 38861:8, 38861:10, 38869:10, 38959:14</p> <p>implicated [7] -</p> | | | | |



| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| <p>38893:19, 38893:22, 38893:25, 38894:5</p> <p>information [108] - 38833:1, 38833:18, 38833:19, 38834:9, 38835:25, 38836:13, 38836:19, 38839:4, 38839:12, 38840:7, 38849:18, 38853:4, 38853:9, 38853:20, 38855:3, 38855:20, 38857:14, 38857:18, 38862:10, 38865:8, 38865:21, 38865:23, 38865:24, 38869:1, 38871:12, 38871:22, 38873:6, 38874:15, 38874:17, 38876:9, 38877:21, 38892:1, 38892:4, 38892:11, 38892:18, 38894:2, 38895:11, 38895:23, 38896:4, 38896:7, 38897:18, 38898:5, 38908:4, 38912:19, 38915:23, 38918:6, 38918:7, 38918:10, 38918:21, 38919:23, 38922:8, 38924:23, 38924:25, 38927:2, 38927:3, 38928:22, 38929:4, 38932:5, 38935:18, 38944:25, 38945:9, 38948:17, 38951:6, 38951:15, 38954:10, 38956:2, 38958:3, 38959:6, 38960:1, 38960:4, 38961:11, 38961:12, 38961:17, 38962:13, 38962:16, 38963:2, 38966:8, 38967:10, 38968:6, 38969:11, 38969:12, 38969:17, 38970:9, 38970:24, 38971:7, 38971:9, 38971:21, 38973:20, 38974:3, 38976:11, 38976:23, 38978:9, 38979:24, 38981:2, 38984:10, 38984:19, 38984:23, 38985:11, 38996:7, 38996:10, 38997:11, 39001:22, 39003:15, 39004:19, 39008:18, 39012:22</p> <p>informed [11] - 38836:13, 38839:12, 38853:11, 38868:22, 38910:5, 38946:15, 38947:10, 38947:16,</p> | <p>38970:19, 38971:22, 38972:8</p> <p>initial [10] - 38841:8, 38881:17, 38881:24, 38900:4, 38904:10, 38908:19, 38961:5, 38961:12, 38964:22, 38972:1</p> <p>initials [1] - 38898:21</p> <p>initiate [1] - 38909:6</p> <p>Inland [1] - 38828:13</p> <p>inmate [11] - 38885:12, 38890:14, 38894:11, 38895:2, 38897:11, 38898:9, 38901:7, 38902:8, 38980:6, 38980:8, 38980:13</p> <p>inmates [1] - 38902:3</p> <p>Inn [1] - 39005:13</p> <p>innocence [3] - 38886:14, 38888:18, 38898:6</p> <p>innocent [11] - 38875:23, 38876:5, 38876:14, 38884:12, 38891:23, 38934:18, 38936:1, 38936:3, 38978:15, 38978:18, 38979:3</p> <p>inquiries [3] - 38872:25, 38941:20, 39000:22</p> <p>inquiring [1] - 39013:23</p> <p>Inquiry [5] - 38827:2, 38827:23, 38845:3, 38864:19, 39010:2</p> <p>inquiry [1] - 38838:17</p> <p>inserted [1] - 38989:10</p> <p>insights [1] - 38925:10</p> <p>insofar [1] - 38961:19</p> <p>Inspector [11] - 38841:17, 38843:1, 38930:10, 38930:23, 38931:23, 38932:3, 38932:14, 38932:20, 38934:2, 38935:11, 38935:12</p> <p>instalments [1] - 39017:17</p> <p>instructions [5] - 39006:22, 39009:23, 39011:24, 39012:8, 39014:14</p> <p>intend [1] - 38998:22</p> <p>intends [1] - 38957:11</p> <p>intent [1] - 38956:8</p> <p>intentionally [2] - 38886:7, 38887:19</p> <p>interaction [2] - 38860:15, 38862:16</p> | <p>interested [4] - 38836:14, 38938:9, 39007:1, 39007:5</p> <p>interfere [1] - 39013:5</p> <p>interpret [2] - 38911:25, 38917:2</p> <p>interpreted [4] - 38850:17, 38911:16, 38911:23, 38920:18</p> <p>interval [2] - 38875:6, 38936:10</p> <p>interview [53] - 38835:11, 38840:8, 38864:3, 38866:4, 38866:23, 38868:25, 38874:6, 38875:8, 38879:6, 38880:21, 38881:3, 38883:19, 38884:18, 38894:10, 38895:7, 38896:1, 38896:22, 38897:18, 38897:25, 38898:16, 38898:24, 38900:25, 38901:12, 38905:1, 38908:13, 38915:21, 38916:3, 38916:11, 38916:15, 38917:18, 38923:8, 38930:18, 38930:24, 38933:24, 38934:3, 38934:13, 38934:14, 38934:17, 38934:21, 38935:6, 38947:12, 38947:15, 38947:17, 38953:11, 38971:6, 38971:11, 38973:4, 38973:9, 38982:4, 38991:15, 38997:13, 39005:18, 39012:17</p> <p>interviewed [12] - 38868:15, 38880:24, 38896:8, 38903:25, 38930:15, 38947:21, 38947:22, 38950:7, 38972:8, 38990:4, 39018:11, 39018:13</p> <p>interviewee [2] - 38840:11, 38853:11</p> <p>interviewer [1] - 38995:21</p> <p>interviewing [7] - 38837:8, 38841:10, 38917:22, 38955:7, 38964:12, 38964:13, 39012:14</p> <p>interviews [8] - 38839:20, 38840:3, 38927:17, 38934:13, 38964:19, 38992:9, 38995:6, 39003:21</p> | <p>intimidate [1] - 38861:25</p> <p>intimidated [1] - 38863:16</p> <p>introduce [1] - 38866:20</p> <p>introductions [1] - 38938:22</p> <p>investigate [7] - 38941:17, 38941:24, 38950:25, 39007:9, 39007:19, 39008:3, 39008:23</p> <p>investigated [4] - 38881:21, 38942:25, 38977:7, 38987:10</p> <p>investigating [4] - 38873:20, 38944:9, 39007:11, 39011:1</p> <p>investigation [58] - 38839:5, 38870:2, 38882:6, 38921:6, 38937:13, 38938:3, 38939:2, 38943:15, 38943:19, 38944:8, 38944:10, 38946:22, 38947:2, 38949:25, 38950:16, 38950:20, 38951:4, 38951:8, 38951:10, 38951:13, 38951:19, 38951:22, 38952:2, 38952:4, 38952:10, 38952:15, 38952:25, 38953:2, 38953:15, 38953:22, 38954:2, 38954:6, 38954:14, 38954:21, 38955:11, 38957:4, 38958:15, 38959:11, 38960:19, 38977:23, 38981:24, 38982:17, 38997:13, 38997:19, 39007:14, 39008:8, 39008:21, 39008:22, 39009:4, 39009:8, 39009:17, 39010:24, 39011:6, 39013:23, 39015:24, 39016:11, 39017:13</p> <p>investigations [2] - 39007:2, 39015:18</p> <p>investigative [9] - 38931:15, 38953:5, 38954:17, 38956:1, 38956:12, 38957:3, 38957:6, 38958:6, 38995:5</p> <p>investigator [4] - 38880:4, 38950:3, 38952:14, 38953:13</p> | <p>Investigator's [1] - 39004:10</p> <p>investigators [6] - 38879:20, 38883:5, 38891:4, 38911:2, 38937:23, 39004:17</p> <p>involved [9] - 38854:10, 38856:16, 38905:8, 38943:14, 38944:10, 38950:14, 38963:23, 39006:24, 39011:17</p> <p>involvement [3] - 38884:19, 38950:13, 38977:19</p> <p>involves [1] - 38988:5</p> <p>Irene [1] - 38828:9</p> <p>irrespective [1] - 38941:18</p> <p>Isabelle [1] - 38828:5</p> <p>isolate [1] - 38862:13</p> <p>issue [22] - 38864:20, 38868:22, 38875:15, 38893:21, 38908:8, 38920:21, 38933:5, 38933:9, 38942:21, 38949:5, 38949:9, 38951:23, 38955:9, 38968:14, 38981:10, 38982:13, 38990:12, 38994:5, 38995:22, 39000:4, 39001:24, 39021:25</p> <p>issues [7] - 38868:7, 38958:1, 38958:4, 38958:7, 38958:9, 38958:11, 38960:9</p> <p>item [1] - 38899:14</p> |
| J | | | | |
| <p>jackknife [1] - 38967:19</p> <p>jail [4] - 38879:21, 38881:1, 38884:21, 38891:23</p> <p>Jailed [1] - 38980:16</p> <p>January [1] - 38841:22</p> <p>jar [1] - 39014:22</p> <p>Joanne [1] - 38829:3</p> <p>job [2] - 38874:17, 39014:22</p> <p>jog [1] - 38847:11</p> <p>John [18] - 38852:25, 38884:17, 38895:13, 38930:24, 38931:24, 38932:22, 38934:3, 38934:14, 38980:19, 38982:4, 38992:4, 38996:4, 38996:6, 38996:16, 38996:18,</p> | | | | |



| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| 38996:25, 39000:17, 39003:24 Johrls [1] - 38935:9 joke [2] - 38927:5, 38993:17 joking [1] - 38927:6 journals [2] - 38888:8, 38888:21 Joyce [2] - 38829:3, 38953:10 Jp [2] - 38898:17, 38898:21 judge [1] - 38967:13 judicial [2] - 38886:8, 38887:20 July [11] - 38837:8, 38871:7, 38879:5, 38879:8, 38881:13, 38882:12, 38897:16, 38947:9, 38948:20, 38949:17, 38980:1 jump [1] - 38981:11 June [40] - 38831:11, 38832:13, 38833:5, 38833:24, 38837:1, 38837:5, 38837:11, 38837:13, 38840:8, 38841:3, 38841:6, 38843:8, 38844:8, 38845:23, 38845:24, 38849:20, 38849:21, 38855:6, 38857:9, 38857:10, 38857:11, 38859:14, 38866:9, 38866:15, 38869:4, 38873:17, 38880:23, 38881:20, 38929:5, 38930:16, 38933:20, 38935:4, 38950:24, 38951:17, 38983:23, 38990:19, 38994:14, 39002:1, 39004:4, 39009:13 jury [9] - 38961:25, 38978:4, 38987:18, 38993:6, 38993:12, 38993:18, 39020:1, 39021:4, 39021:8 justice [25] - 38868:19, 38868:24, 38870:7, 38870:21, 38872:10, 38873:24, 38879:23, 38879:25, 38884:13, 38928:4, 38941:4, 38942:18, 38960:6, 38961:8, 38982:12, 38983:20, 38984:9, 38986:8, 38986:19, 38987:13, 38988:10, 38993:10, 38994:3, | 38997:17, 39021:11 Justice [25] - 38827:6, 38829:10, 38829:12, 38879:12, 38885:17, 38885:21, 38889:2, 38891:3, 38893:24, 38894:9, 38897:17, 38898:10, 38911:1, 38937:3, 38938:19, 38940:6, 38940:13, 38941:7, 38943:24, 38954:11, 38976:11, 38999:21, 39011:17, 39014:13, 39019:22 Justicés [1] - 38889:5 justify [1] - 38867:13 juxtaposition [1] - 38882:11 | 39000:2 kind [4] - 38836:16, 38839:2, 38904:7, 38952:17 knife [26] - 38832:11, 38832:15, 38832:17, 38832:18, 38832:24, 38833:3, 38833:4, 38833:7, 38833:8, 38833:13, 38833:16, 38833:25, 38834:11, 38850:9, 38851:19, 38963:23, 38966:13, 38966:18, 38966:19, 38967:19, 38972:4, 38983:3, 39002:5, 39002:9, 39003:4, 39003:18 knives [1] - 39002:8 knowledge [3] - 38938:20, 38977:5, 39023:7 known [8] - 38853:10, 38855:25, 38857:1, 38859:19, 38948:18, 38953:25, 38987:3, 38989:6 knows [1] - 38853:17 Knox [1] - 38829:5 Krogan [1] - 38829:4 Krogan-stevely [1] - 38829:4 Kujawa [2] - 38829:6, 38963:10 | 38925:3, 38925:6, 38925:9, 38925:16, 38925:18, 38925:22, 38925:23, 38926:7, 38926:11, 38926:17, 38927:6, 38927:8, 38927:11, 38928:1, 38928:23, 38929:1, 38929:13, 38993:14, 39018:8, 39018:18 Lapchuks [2] - 38926:10, 38926:13 large [1] - 39014:17 larger [1] - 38835:4 Larry [71] - 38839:23, 38839:25, 38871:11, 38882:6, 38884:22, 38890:22, 38892:12, 38892:16, 38892:19, 38893:7, 38899:8, 38900:2, 38901:13, 38901:22, 38902:5, 38902:13, 38903:3, 38903:13, 38904:6, 38905:20, 38906:8, 38907:23, 38915:18, 38916:24, 38944:1, 38947:5, 38950:25, 38951:18, 38959:5, 38961:3, 38961:6, 38961:15, 38961:19, 38962:2, 38963:18, 38964:3, 38968:7, 38969:2, 38972:16, 38977:1, 38978:19, 38979:20, 38980:3, 38980:22, 38981:10, 38981:16, 38981:17, 38981:25, 38982:5, 38982:9, 38983:25, 38984:10, 38984:18, 38984:23, 38985:2, 38985:25, 38986:4, 38986:22, 38992:20, 38994:7, 39004:12, 39007:9, 39008:3, 39008:8, 39008:18, 39008:23, 39009:18, 39011:2, 39013:10, 39014:13, 39014:16 last [7] - 38910:11, 38916:17, 38944:11, 38946:2, 38965:25, 39005:14, 39010:8 late [3] - 38837:25, 38881:19, 38904:17 Late [1] - 38898:8 latest [3] - 38885:9, 38890:11, 38940:4 latter [3] - 38833:14, | 38996:9, 39001:7 launch [2] - 39008:21, 39009:8 launching [1] - 39007:13 law [3] - 38872:3, 38920:23, 38941:13 lawyer [7] - 38848:12, 38864:23, 38879:16, 38885:5, 38894:18, 38898:4, 38909:4 laying [1] - 39011:3 leads [1] - 38955:17 leaning [1] - 38862:19 learn [5] - 38858:14, 38864:3, 38903:24, 38973:20, 39007:14 learned [10] - 38871:1, 38871:14, 38873:20, 38891:25, 38896:12, 38928:25, 38929:21, 38933:23, 38960:18, 38980:21 learning [1] - 38953:17 least [25] - 38835:10, 38839:19, 38847:2, 38849:21, 38864:4, 38874:23, 38889:5, 38894:23, 38897:7, 38931:10, 38931:21, 38939:3, 38947:22, 38956:11, 38958:25, 38967:20, 38970:23, 38982:16, 38998:14, 39010:14, 39012:11, 39013:1, 39014:5, 39019:14, 39019:18 leave [2] - 38867:17, 38919:5 led [1] - 38985:15 left [17] - 38842:3, 38842:16, 38845:10, 38847:20, 38887:8, 38901:11, 38901:15, 38902:15, 38903:10, 38914:21, 38914:24, 38925:11, 38926:18, 38997:4, 38998:13, 39007:5, 39014:18 lengthy [2] - 38904:11, 38957:22 less [3] - 38834:13, 38872:16, 38924:24 lessens [1] - 38985:9 lesser [1] - 39008:7 Let [1] - 38883:24 letter [28] - 38921:24, 38928:14, 38930:4, 38936:19, 38936:21, 38939:7, 38946:7, |
| K | | | | |
| | | L | | |
| | | | | |



| | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|---|---|--|
| <p>38946:25, 38947:20, 38948:19, 38950:3, 38950:17, 38952:9, 38963:8, 38963:9, 38965:1, 38965:10, 38965:16, 38965:25, 38966:6, 38971:8, 38999:7, 39000:2, 39014:24, 39014:25, 39015:9, 39017:9, 39017:14</p> <p>letters [1] - 39016:23</p> <p>level [8] - 38890:1, 38967:23, 38971:14, 38971:18, 38971:22, 38973:7, 38974:20, 38985:9</p> <p>lever [1] - 38860:20</p> <p>lie [4] - 38856:17, 38863:25, 38864:5, 38870:20</p> <p>lied [10] - 38859:2, 38863:19, 38867:6, 38869:18, 38875:24, 38888:3, 38920:8, 38940:16, 38990:25, 38993:14</p> <p>life [3] - 38853:17, 38874:7, 38894:13</p> <p>light [7] - 38849:22, 38855:23, 38876:4, 38876:12, 38877:3, 38918:22, 38940:24</p> <p>lighter [1] - 38861:5</p> <p>likely [11] - 38836:25, 38837:17, 38868:24, 38870:5, 38884:14, 38885:13, 38947:3, 38948:18, 38970:25, 39009:2, 39019:13</p> <p>limitations [1] - 38882:1</p> <p>limited [2] - 38969:17, 39008:3</p> <p>Linda [7] - 38961:11, 38979:18, 38981:15, 38982:3, 38983:2, 39005:24, 39007:20</p> <p>line [9] - 38841:4, 38845:6, 38855:8, 38859:12, 38861:12, 38862:14, 38863:10, 38882:17, 38980:15</p> <p>lines [2] - 38889:14, 38910:11</p> <p>link [19] - 38885:7, 38892:19, 38915:25, 38916:2, 38916:24, 38979:8, 38979:20, 38980:23, 38981:3,</p> | <p>38981:16, 38981:18, 38981:25, 38983:1, 38983:4, 38983:5, 38984:24, 38987:11, 39007:3, 39013:19</p> <p>linked [1] - 39014:10</p> <p>linking [1] - 38985:11</p> <p>list [1] - 39017:14</p> <p>listened [1] - 38934:4</p> <p>litigated [1] - 39021:13</p> <p>live [1] - 38933:5</p> <p>lived [1] - 38903:17</p> <p>locate [1] - 39015:7</p> <p>located [3] - 38930:12, 38933:3, 38950:4</p> <p>location [2] - 38963:15, 38967:22</p> <p>locations [1] - 38971:25</p> <p>longterm [1] - 38925:8</p> <p>look [26] - 38836:6, 38858:19, 38871:21, 38871:25, 38875:21, 38877:10, 38877:16, 38884:8, 38892:13, 38901:5, 38913:4, 38942:1, 38943:7, 38964:22, 38969:1, 38976:13, 38977:13, 38977:14, 38977:24, 38978:8, 38978:9, 38978:15, 38984:10, 38988:13, 39009:7</p> <p>looked [12] - 38834:18, 38871:11, 38871:17, 38878:7, 38896:18, 38963:14, 38966:20, 38976:23, 38977:1, 38978:13, 38978:19, 38990:12</p> <p>looking [20] - 38861:5, 38862:5, 38867:6, 38867:21, 38867:22, 38872:23, 38878:23, 38916:2, 38935:3, 38935:15, 38943:1, 38944:14, 38968:4, 38968:19, 38968:23, 38974:12, 38975:24, 38976:20, 38983:16, 38997:7</p> <p>lookit [1] - 38974:16</p> <p>looks [1] - 38880:1</p> <p>loose [2] - 38997:19, 39020:6</p> <p>Loran [1] - 38829:7</p> <p>Lord [1] - 38923:20</p> <p>Lorne [1] - 38950:6</p> <p>lying [1] - 38863:23</p> | <p>M</p> | <p>Maccallum [40] - 38827:7, 38831:3, 38873:10, 38928:7, 38928:12, 38935:21, 38935:25, 38936:8, 38936:12, 38936:15, 38940:21, 38941:14, 38941:23, 38942:3, 38945:21, 38957:14, 38964:25, 38965:6, 38965:11, 38965:18, 38967:9, 38971:3, 38972:13, 38972:18, 38972:21, 38972:24, 38973:3, 38973:6, 38975:14, 38975:18, 38975:22, 38981:5, 38981:7, 38985:17, 38998:3, 38998:7, 38998:11, 38998:17, 38999:2, 39022:3</p> <p>Macfarlane [4] - 38955:24, 38956:6, 38956:9, 38997:8</p> <p>machine [1] - 39003:12</p> <p>Mackay [5] - 38963:8, 38965:2, 38965:10, 38966:2, 38966:7</p> <p>Mail [6] - 38884:16, 38910:8, 38912:21, 38913:25, 38916:8, 38980:12</p> <p>maintain [1] - 38979:3</p> <p>maintained [1] - 38913:3</p> <p>major [2] - 38894:16, 38985:7</p> <p>male [1] - 38966:17</p> <p>man [15] - 38885:10, 38885:12, 38890:12, 38890:25, 38891:6, 38891:14, 38891:15, 38894:10, 38895:1, 38897:18, 38906:20, 38910:24, 38914:8, 38980:25, 38996:19</p> <p>man's [2] - 38885:20, 38894:15</p> <p>management [1] - 38880:6</p> <p>Manager [2] - 38828:4, 39021:17</p> <p>mandate [5] - 39007:15, 39007:16, 39007:17, 39007:18, 39011:19</p> <p>manipulate [1] - 38860:21</p> | <p>manipulated [7] - 38858:21, 38863:23, 38866:10, 38869:16, 38870:19, 38959:13, 38995:9</p> <p>manipulation [6] - 38858:9, 38858:17, 38959:20, 38995:1, 38995:19, 39001:25</p> <p>manner [4] - 38860:23, 38957:11, 38975:6, 38995:12</p> <p>manslaughter [2] - 38897:4, 38900:20</p> <p>March [21] - 38837:18, 38841:16, 38845:12, 38849:24, 38850:1, 38850:3, 38850:12, 38850:25, 38851:4, 38865:22, 38917:12, 38939:16, 38939:23, 38940:7, 38963:7, 38965:1, 38965:9, 38965:24, 38971:8, 38996:13</p> <p>marked [1] - 38916:7</p> <p>Markesteyn [1] - 39019:5</p> <p>Marlborough [1] - 39005:12</p> <p>maroon [2] - 38832:17, 38833:13</p> <p>maroon-handled [1] - 38832:17</p> <p>Marshall [3] - 38829:12, 38883:1, 38883:7</p> <p>material [4] - 38938:6, 38938:11, 38938:16, 38992:11</p> <p>materials [3] - 38880:18, 38946:17, 38976:10</p> <p>matter [8] - 38882:6, 38886:4, 38887:16, 38917:8, 38927:13, 38946:25, 38953:17, 38988:17</p> <p>matters [6] - 38872:2, 38874:21, 38955:3, 38956:3, 38997:9, 39012:10</p> <p>Mclean [1] - 38829:3</p> <p>Mcleod [3] - 38829:14, 38956:16, 39016:3</p> <p>mean [20] - 38847:6, 38869:18, 38872:7, 38875:5, 38876:13, 38884:2, 38892:4, 38911:16, 38911:23, 38915:17, 38917:14,</p> | <p>38920:13, 38920:18, 38936:16, 38971:15, 38990:16, 38991:20, 38998:16, 39008:12, 39021:25</p> <p>meaning [2] - 38901:15, 38985:5</p> <p>means [2] - 38958:10, 38973:10</p> <p>meant [1] - 38880:13</p> <p>measure [1] - 38932:23</p> <p>media [10] - 38885:6, 38888:24, 38896:6, 38896:14, 38896:19, 38907:22, 38917:8, 38937:8, 38937:16, 38937:19</p> <p>medical [2] - 38840:17, 39010:15</p> <p>meet [1] - 38924:11</p> <p>meeting [13] - 38834:15, 38893:9, 38893:13, 38893:14, 38893:16, 38893:17, 38893:19, 38893:22, 38893:25, 38902:6, 38924:2, 38947:19, 38948:11</p> <p>meetings [1] - 38894:4</p> <p>meets [1] - 38984:19</p> <p>Melnyk [27] - 38917:19, 38917:22, 38918:1, 38918:16, 38918:23, 38919:13, 38919:14, 38919:21, 38920:8, 38920:16, 38920:23, 38921:6, 38921:21, 38922:2, 38922:7, 38922:10, 38922:12, 38922:23, 38926:25, 38927:6, 38927:11, 38928:1, 38928:23, 38929:12, 38993:14, 39018:8, 39018:18</p> <p>Melnyk's [1] - 38918:25</p> <p>member [2] - 38924:1, 38938:12</p> <p>members [1] - 38889:11</p> <p>memo [12] - 38893:2, 38916:11, 38917:18, 38918:23, 38923:7, 38954:24, 38956:6, 38958:22, 38968:2, 38990:19, 39000:12, 39006:15</p> <p>memorandum [5] - 38955:24, 38956:3, 38956:4, 38957:8, 38958:3</p> |
|--|---|-----------------|---|---|--|



| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| <p>memory [3] - 38834:24, 38836:3, 38926:23</p> <p>memos [1] - 38958:19</p> <p>mental [1] - 38837:2</p> <p>mentally [1] - 38846:16</p> <p>mention [1] - 38997:23</p> <p>mentioned [7] - 38854:11, 38881:12, 38930:14, 38986:1, 38998:16, 39014:24, 39016:5</p> <p>mentioning [1] - 38848:21</p> <p>merely [2] - 38863:16, 38869:21</p> <p>merit [3] - 38870:3, 38870:23, 38881:25</p> <p>merited [1] - 38876:24</p> <p>merits [2] - 38870:12, 38871:6</p> <p>message [1] - 38845:7</p> <p>Messrs [2] - 39018:8, 39018:18</p> <p>met [4] - 38845:20, 38925:3, 38932:10, 38945:17</p> <p>method [1] - 39006:4</p> <p>Meyer [3] - 38828:11, 39023:2, 39023:19</p> <p>mid [1] - 38949:17</p> <p>middle [1] - 39003:1</p> <p>might [55] - 38831:23, 38837:24, 38839:12, 38839:14, 38839:17, 38840:10, 38840:21, 38843:21, 38851:10, 38856:8, 38861:1, 38863:18, 38865:2, 38865:6, 38867:11, 38881:25, 38889:14, 38889:18, 38910:5, 38933:4, 38939:12, 38942:16, 38945:15, 38960:5, 38960:12, 38961:24, 38967:1, 38974:4, 38977:13, 38978:9, 38978:15, 38978:19, 38979:11, 38982:19, 38983:4, 38983:5, 38984:12, 38984:13, 38984:23, 38984:25, 38985:10, 38985:15, 38986:7, 38986:18, 38987:18, 38988:17, 38988:19, 38991:6, 38998:21, 39009:7, 39013:5, 39013:22, 39016:10, 39020:3, 39020:7</p> <p>Mike [1] - 38955:8</p> | <p>Mil [1] - 38985:2</p> <p>Milgaard [124] - 38827:4, 38829:2, 38829:3, 38832:15, 38832:18, 38832:24, 38833:2, 38833:20, 38834:7, 38834:8, 38840:25, 38844:4, 38844:12, 38844:19, 38845:2, 38845:22, 38846:12, 38846:19, 38847:4, 38847:12, 38848:14, 38849:12, 38850:20, 38850:23, 38851:8, 38852:8, 38852:25, 38855:11, 38855:16, 38857:13, 38861:8, 38861:10, 38869:11, 38869:19, 38872:9, 38873:9, 38875:23, 38876:5, 38876:14, 38877:7, 38879:14, 38880:5, 38883:10, 38885:13, 38886:7, 38887:19, 38888:4, 38891:19, 38894:13, 38894:18, 38897:14, 38897:19, 38903:13, 38909:3, 38909:20, 38909:21, 38909:22, 38909:24, 38910:3, 38918:3, 38919:16, 38919:17, 38920:3, 38920:12, 38920:14, 38921:4, 38921:9, 38922:13, 38922:19, 38923:6, 38924:21, 38927:21, 38937:6, 38937:8, 38939:10, 38939:21, 38940:18, 38941:3, 38943:12, 38951:10, 38951:12, 38953:10, 38953:11, 38959:14, 38961:7, 38961:21, 38976:5, 38976:15, 38976:21, 38976:24, 38978:7, 38978:11, 38978:14, 38978:18, 38979:2, 38982:9, 38983:24, 38984:17, 38984:22, 38985:3, 38985:9, 38986:4, 38987:14, 38987:25, 38988:6, 38989:15, 38989:25, 38990:8, 38992:18, 38993:5, 38994:6, 38994:13, 38994:19, 38999:6, 39002:6, 39007:12, 39015:6, 39016:19,</p> | <p>39018:2, 39018:14, 39019:6, 39020:3, 39020:21, 39021:5</p> <p>Milgaard's [27] - 38848:12, 38879:16, 38882:22, 38885:4, 38885:25, 38886:14, 38887:12, 38888:18, 38894:16, 38898:4, 38909:4, 38926:21, 38952:5, 38968:10, 38977:22, 38978:4, 38983:20, 38986:6, 38986:12, 38986:16, 38986:17, 38986:20, 38986:23, 38986:25, 38993:3, 38999:20, 39016:21</p> <p>Milgaards [5] - 38882:4, 38953:4, 38954:7, 39007:21, 39010:19</p> <p>milieu [1] - 38923:2</p> <p>Miller [40] - 38846:12, 38848:5, 38862:6, 38885:8, 38892:23, 38905:21, 38911:11, 38912:5, 38913:7, 38915:16, 38916:1, 38959:15, 38961:4, 38962:17, 38963:19, 38969:1, 38969:3, 38969:9, 38971:16, 38972:23, 38973:4, 38974:13, 38974:18, 38975:4, 38976:1, 38977:3, 38978:20, 38979:5, 38979:21, 38981:19, 38982:1, 38987:11, 39007:4, 39008:9, 39009:18, 39011:3, 39019:17, 39019:20, 39020:1</p> <p>Miller's [16] - 38892:19, 38906:17, 38916:25, 38962:11, 38964:3, 38970:4, 38970:17, 38972:25, 38973:11, 38974:25, 38975:15, 38981:20, 38983:7, 38996:23, 39004:20, 39006:3</p> <p>mind [19] - 38846:16, 38849:7, 38855:15, 38855:21, 38856:2, 38856:7, 38857:24, 38858:5, 38858:22, 38867:13, 38876:19, 38880:22, 38914:20, 38974:15, 38991:10,</p> | <p>38992:1, 38992:3, 38998:15, 39005:20</p> <p>Minister [5] - 38829:10, 38921:25, 38936:20, 38950:17, 38954:11</p> <p>minister [14] - 38841:12, 38869:23, 38870:8, 38877:13, 38879:25, 38921:25, 38936:22, 38946:11, 38988:2, 38994:22, 39015:21, 39016:24, 39017:21</p> <p>minister's [3] - 38882:25, 38946:12, 38946:21</p> <p>Ministries [1] - 38953:14</p> <p>ministry [2] - 38938:17, 38938:18</p> <p>mirrored [2] - 38993:2, 38993:16</p> <p>misapprehension [1] - 38946:10</p> <p>miscarriage [23] - 38868:18, 38868:24, 38870:6, 38870:21, 38872:10, 38873:24, 38884:13, 38928:4, 38941:4, 38942:17, 38960:6, 38961:8, 38982:12, 38983:19, 38984:8, 38986:8, 38986:19, 38987:13, 38988:10, 38993:10, 38994:3, 38997:16, 39021:11</p> <p>misconduct [5] - 38937:10, 38937:20, 38939:11, 38999:23, 39000:10</p> <p>Miss [1] - 39006:2</p> <p>missed [1] - 38906:4</p> <p>missing [2] - 38896:9, 38901:4</p> <p>misstates [1] - 38938:4</p> <p>mistaken [3] - 38879:7, 38923:15, 38975:10</p> <p>misunderstanding [1] - 39008:13</p> <p>moment [5] - 38859:9, 38950:1, 38965:21, 38973:8, 38982:13</p> <p>moment's [1] - 38887:5</p> <p>moments [1] - 39005:5</p> <p>Monday [2] - 38885:10, 38890:12</p> <p>money [1] - 38921:7</p> <p>monitored [1] - 39003:11</p> | <p>month [3] - 38881:20, 38934:22, 38996:8</p> <p>monthly [3] - 38886:2, 38887:14, 39004:6</p> <p>months [3] - 38874:23, 38901:24, 38903:3</p> <p>Moreover [1] - 38943:11</p> <p>morning [7] - 38831:3, 38831:4, 38831:7, 38971:18, 38975:1, 38975:4, 38975:19</p> <p>most [12] - 38889:12, 38914:3, 38952:19, 38955:25, 38956:11, 38960:7, 38962:18, 38966:15, 38969:4, 38974:10, 38988:25, 38992:19</p> <p>Most [1] - 38974:23</p> <p>motel [4] - 38918:2, 38927:4, 38927:12, 38928:9</p> <p>motive [2] - 38867:23, 38891:22</p> <p>motives [2] - 38859:22, 38870:10</p> <p>mouth [2] - 38973:7, 38991:21</p> <p>move [1] - 38884:14</p> <p>movements [1] - 39004:19</p> <p>murder [39] - 38833:12, 38839:25, 38844:4, 38844:12, 38844:19, 38846:19, 38847:5, 38848:5, 38849:12, 38850:22, 38852:6, 38856:16, 38862:6, 38892:20, 38892:23, 38894:12, 38897:4, 38900:20, 38902:9, 38974:13, 38976:1, 38977:4, 38978:20, 38979:9, 38979:20, 38981:16, 38981:19, 38982:1, 38983:3, 38984:24, 38996:23, 39004:20, 39006:3, 39008:22, 39008:24, 39010:24, 39013:22, 39019:17, 39020:1</p> <p>murdered [2] - 38980:9, 39019:20</p> <p>murderer [1] - 38973:11</p> <p>must [1] - 38930:7</p> |
|---|--|--|---|--|



| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;">N</p> <p>Nakusp [1] - 38880:23 name [6] - 38852:11, 38852:21, 38895:12, 38895:16, 38898:19, 38923:20 named [1] - 38908:1 Namely [1] - 38970:12 namely [9] - 38833:1, 38851:19, 38856:24, 38865:22, 38871:2, 38970:9, 38971:9, 38982:9, 39012:22 names [1] - 38853:10 narrative [10] - 38835:1, 38845:22, 38857:6, 38858:8, 38931:14, 38957:3, 38989:20, 38991:13, 38993:13, 38994:16 narrow [1] - 38915:19 National [2] - 38994:12, 38994:20 nature [10] - 38834:19, 38840:1, 38872:1, 38877:11, 38920:25, 38922:6, 38948:23, 38956:10, 38975:6, 39015:12 near [1] - 38983:8 nearing [1] - 39017:13 necessarily [2] - 38834:10, 38988:4 necessary [1] - 38900:11 necessitate [1] - 38881:4 need [5] - 38853:14, 38853:15, 38887:5, 38892:21, 38944:15 needed [9] - 38834:8, 38839:18, 38847:6, 38847:9, 38851:9, 38854:7, 38902:16, 38983:1, 39008:4 negotiate [1] - 38966:5 neighbourhood [1] - 39019:19 neutral [3] - 38834:13, 38845:12, 38872:15 Never [1] - 38903:10 never [8] - 38860:12, 38876:7, 38889:13, 38889:20, 39001:17, 39018:11, 39019:23, 39020:2 new [17] - 38840:13, 38878:19, 38879:15,</p> | <p>38886:1, 38887:13, 38893:5, 38897:18, 38901:25, 38948:24, 38950:22, 38951:11, 38951:13, 38952:11, 38992:25, 38993:19, 39019:9, 39021:12 news [14] - 38871:18, 38889:16, 38892:1, 38899:14, 38907:4, 38908:4, 38908:8, 38913:8, 38913:13, 38939:19, 38951:6, 38953:3, 38992:17, 39016:16 newspaper [8] - 38842:18, 38886:17, 38886:18, 38888:7, 38889:9, 38889:19, 38921:22, 38999:12 next [33] - 38832:4, 38838:23, 38841:1, 38843:19, 38848:17, 38860:7, 38883:2, 38884:18, 38894:7, 38895:19, 38896:22, 38897:15, 38898:2, 38898:18, 38899:5, 38899:12, 38902:11, 38902:24, 38903:19, 38907:7, 38910:1, 38912:17, 38921:5, 38924:17, 38943:10, 38946:1, 38946:24, 38951:8, 38959:7, 38960:25, 38966:10, 38979:16, 38988:23 Next [4] - 38889:11, 38903:6, 38994:7, 39019:2 nice [2] - 38934:25, 38980:25 Nichol [13] - 38850:20, 38852:25, 38930:24, 38931:17, 38931:24, 38934:3, 38935:9, 38992:3, 38992:4, 38996:4, 38996:6, 38996:16, 38996:25 night [2] - 38891:8, 38969:5 nightmare [1] - 38996:21 nightmares [1] - 38996:18 nine [2] - 38835:16, 38838:9 non [2] - 38943:3, 38953:2 non-co-operation [1] -</p> | <p>38953:2 non-disclosure [1] - 38943:3 none [3] - 38873:7, 38883:9, 38902:23 North [1] - 38969:25 nose [1] - 38880:13 notably [1] - 38992:19 notation [2] - 38832:5, 38832:6 notations [1] - 38939:14 note [9] - 38924:13, 38931:1, 38932:19, 38965:6, 38967:21, 39005:4, 39005:7, 39006:11, 39012:5 noted [13] - 38885:24, 38887:11, 38920:16, 38922:12, 38922:16, 38923:21, 38924:18, 38926:21, 38950:19, 38980:8, 39001:11, 39001:14, 39002:13 notes [19] - 38866:5, 38869:2, 38929:23, 38930:17, 38931:9, 38931:12, 38931:24, 38933:1, 38933:22, 38934:17, 38934:24, 38935:2, 38935:6, 38935:12, 38936:2, 38936:3, 38936:13, 39023:6 nothing [7] - 38842:11, 38927:16, 38937:11, 38944:13, 38997:2, 39019:9, 39021:10 notion [1] - 38882:7 nugget [1] - 38872:4 number [23] - 38832:22, 38835:7, 38874:7, 38882:13, 38887:23, 38887:24, 38902:3, 38907:14, 38908:22, 38951:13, 38953:21, 38960:1, 38960:2, 38960:10, 38966:11, 38974:11, 38977:5, 38977:7, 38977:21, 38986:11, 38992:17, 38996:1, 39015:15</p> | <p>38943:25, 38944:1, 38944:3, 38944:4, 38945:1, 38945:3, 38945:5, 38945:10 objection [2] - 38868:4, 38956:17 objective [8] - 38841:9, 38851:13, 38858:10, 38876:18, 38876:19, 38945:13, 38945:15, 38994:21 objects [1] - 39002:19 obligation [1] - 39001:8 obliged [2] - 38941:24, 38942:1 oblique [3] - 38886:12, 38888:17, 38888:19 observations [4] - 38909:14, 38987:16, 38992:22, 38992:23 observe [1] - 38843:15 observed [3] - 38845:25, 38927:4, 39002:6 obtain [8] - 38835:25, 38836:19, 38839:4, 38880:19, 38937:22, 38939:5, 38949:24, 39000:14 obtained [9] - 38837:5, 38837:25, 38845:8, 38845:9, 38865:25, 38904:4, 38919:3, 38961:18, 38992:11 obtaining [1] - 38953:6 obvious [1] - 38993:23 obviously [6] - 38872:7, 38875:23, 38892:4, 38897:23, 38940:5, 38973:4 occasions [2] - 38908:22, 38986:2 occurred [19] - 38856:5, 38857:4, 38868:19, 38868:24, 38884:14, 38885:10, 38890:12, 38925:24, 38928:5, 38960:6, 38975:3, 38982:12, 38983:12, 38984:9, 38986:9, 38986:13, 38993:10, 38994:3, 39021:11 occurrence [5] - 38867:12, 38931:13, 38949:6, 38962:6, 38964:16 occurring [1] - 39019:25 October [2] - 38947:19,</p> | <p>38948:11 offence [4] - 38892:22, 38963:5, 39013:20, 39020:22 offences [15] - 38962:15, 38963:14, 38963:17, 38963:23, 38966:8, 38966:9, 38974:23, 38975:15, 38981:21, 38982:5, 38986:6, 38986:13, 38986:18, 38987:4, 38987:15 offend [1] - 38916:22 offending [1] - 38916:23 offer [6] - 38860:2, 38860:5, 38925:4, 38926:7, 38953:10, 38993:1 offered [4] - 38861:7, 38921:16, 38925:25, 38926:1 office [2] - 38901:19, 38966:8 Officer [1] - 38828:12 officer [3] - 38950:5, 38954:14, 39010:25 officers [8] - 38846:6, 38858:16, 38931:11, 38932:24, 38934:5, 38944:18, 39000:19, 39001:17 official [1] - 38954:20 Official [5] - 38828:10, 39023:1, 39023:3, 39023:14, 39023:20 officials [11] - 38885:21, 38893:24, 38922:1, 38936:25, 38937:7, 38938:20, 38943:14, 38948:22, 38950:14, 38950:23, 38952:13 often [1] - 38835:9 old [1] - 38933:17 omission [2] - 38850:24, 38882:13 omissions [1] - 38850:11 omitted [3] - 38900:24, 38996:13, 38997:23 once [4] - 38873:18, 38878:8, 38952:19, 39007:21 One [4] - 38881:20, 38920:22, 38963:13, 38983:12 one [80] - 38832:3, 38832:22, 38833:9,</p> |
| | | <p>O</p> | | |
| | | <p>o'clock [3] - 38835:13, 38838:10, 38838:24 oath [1] - 38849:4, 38899:1, 38943:18,</p> | | |



| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| <p>38833:17, 38837:16, 38837:17, 38838:24, 38839:22, 38840:3, 38842:6, 38842:21, 38850:7, 38850:18, 38850:25, 38851:24, 38853:14, 38853:17, 38854:11, 38858:19, 38864:10, 38867:19, 38872:4, 38872:25, 38874:11, 38874:12, 38875:2, 38877:4, 38878:22, 38880:11, 38881:4, 38889:7, 38889:14, 38889:17, 38889:18, 38890:1, 38891:8, 38892:8, 38894:12, 38897:7, 38905:8, 38912:21, 38913:7, 38920:1, 38922:1, 38927:22, 38934:15, 38941:3, 38941:8, 38953:21, 38954:9, 38960:1, 38962:19, 38963:2, 38966:11, 38966:12, 38967:20, 38968:25, 38971:3, 38973:1, 38974:9, 38976:7, 38976:12, 38977:5, 38978:5, 38986:11, 38987:8, 38987:16, 38987:21, 38987:25, 38990:22, 39001:15, 39001:25, 39002:5, 39002:17, 39006:4, 39007:11, 39013:18, 39016:5, 39020:15 one-day [1] - 38889:17 ones [1] - 38881:1 ongoing [1] - 38954:20 opened [1] - 38954:13 opening [2] - 38902:1, 39009:17 operating [1] - 39019:16 operation [6] - 38880:19, 38952:12, 38952:17, 38953:1, 38953:2, 38953:23 operator [2] - 38845:20, 38847:15 opinion [3] - 38971:5, 38979:7, 38998:20 opinions [1] - 38840:18 opportunities [1] - 38863:1 opportunity [18] - 38831:24, 38850:23, 38851:12, 38862:24,</p> | <p>38863:19, 38866:5, 38868:9, 38904:12, 38929:16, 38931:10, 38933:6, 38933:8, 38933:11, 38950:15, 38951:3, 38987:14, 38987:17, 39020:2 opposed [5] - 38867:9, 38951:20, 38956:3, 38991:9, 39013:23 order [7] - 38847:7, 38847:8, 38874:23, 38874:25, 38946:16, 38952:10, 39003:6 ordinarily [1] - 38860:22 organization [3] - 38923:17, 38923:18, 38923:25 original [5] - 38865:1, 38937:12, 38938:1, 38938:25, 38943:15 otherwise [1] - 39021:9 ought [2] - 38868:7, 38943:20 outcome [2] - 38984:14, 39007:2 outlines [2] - 38958:4, 38966:9 outset [1] - 38958:25 outside [1] - 38846:1 outstanding [2] - 38861:1, 38955:18 overheard [1] - 38904:5 overlap [1] - 39008:12 overturned [1] - 38894:17 own [11] - 38857:16, 38867:10, 38867:13, 38870:6, 38952:25, 38953:22, 38954:2, 38973:7, 38995:2, 38999:3, 39010:20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">P</p> <p>pace [1] - 39016:20 page [52] - 38832:4, 38832:7, 38835:1, 38838:23, 38841:19, 38843:19, 38846:9, 38847:25, 38848:17, 38849:23, 38855:7, 38860:7, 38866:21, 38882:18, 38886:22, 38894:7, 38895:19, 38896:22, 38897:15, 38898:2, 38898:18, 38899:5, 38899:6,</p> | <p>38899:11, 38899:12, 38899:25, 38901:2, 38902:11, 38902:24, 38902:25, 38903:6, 38903:19, 38907:7, 38910:1, 38916:17, 38921:5, 38923:7, 38924:17, 38932:12, 38957:22, 38960:25, 38961:2, 38965:25, 38966:2, 38966:10, 38979:16, 38988:23, 38994:7, 39004:9, 39019:2 Page [1] - 38830:2 pages [1] - 39023:5 paid [4] - 38921:7, 38921:21, 38922:2, 38922:7 paper [3] - 38940:1, 38941:1, 38943:2 paragraph [13] - 38832:8, 38847:20, 38881:10, 38943:10, 38951:9, 38957:18, 38958:2, 38958:13, 39001:1, 39001:5, 39010:9, 39013:16 parallel [3] - 38951:22, 38952:2, 38952:4 pardon [1] - 38844:1 Pardon [1] - 39011:13 paring [4] - 38832:17, 38833:13, 38966:19, 38967:19 parole [2] - 38841:1, 38994:13 Parole [6] - 38841:6, 38841:11, 38841:14, 38994:12, 38994:17, 38994:20 part [19] - 38831:10, 38840:8, 38846:22, 38887:1, 38889:14, 38898:3, 38901:3, 38901:10, 38901:11, 38906:4, 38918:11, 38922:25, 38926:10, 38927:23, 38955:25, 38956:11, 38974:23, 38989:12, 38994:16 participate [2] - 38992:8, 38992:10 participation [2] - 38874:16, 38955:2 particular [9] - 38873:1, 38908:1, 38912:12, 38941:6, 38957:1, 38963:16, 38967:23, 38982:3, 38999:11</p> | <p>particularly [3] - 38870:3, 38894:5, 38978:2 parts [5] - 38885:1, 38900:23, 38903:23, 38908:10, 38969:6 partway [1] - 38831:9 party [2] - 38954:17, 38968:13 past [1] - 38926:17 Pat [1] - 38829:7 path [4] - 38871:15, 38878:8, 38878:12, 38976:3 pattern [2] - 38963:21, 38969:1 Patterson [23] - 38884:17, 38895:13, 38895:25, 38896:5, 38896:10, 38896:12, 38896:14, 38896:15, 38896:19, 38897:24, 38898:19, 38903:24, 38904:15, 38908:3, 38910:16, 38911:4, 38913:1, 38915:3, 38915:9, 38915:18, 38915:21, 38980:19, 38982:4 Patterson's [2] - 38884:19, 38915:6 Paul [1] - 38923:23 pause [3] - 38903:21, 38939:19, 38963:6 peak [2] - 39002:15, 39003:9 Pearson [28] - 38882:5, 38947:13, 38949:23, 38951:1, 38951:7, 38951:21, 38952:1, 38953:18, 38954:25, 38955:5, 38955:12, 38964:13, 38997:22, 38998:24, 39004:5, 39004:25, 39007:8, 39008:2, 39009:14, 39009:22, 39010:4, 39010:23, 39011:5, 39012:4, 39012:16, 39013:22, 39014:15 Pearson's [4] - 38998:8, 39004:3, 39005:4, 39005:6 pen [1] - 38899:23 Pen [1] - 38953:11 pending [2] - 39009:3, 39018:20 Penitentiary [3] - 38890:20, 38903:17, 38910:21</p> | <p>penitentiary [2] - 38906:8, 38914:17 people [5] - 38886:11, 38888:11, 38952:5, 38973:14, 38974:12 per [2] - 38886:10, 38888:10 perceived [1] - 38913:4 percent [1] - 38888:21 perception [1] - 38993:16 perform [2] - 39002:16, 39007:16 performance [2] - 38865:10, 38865:17 performed [5] - 38877:5, 38877:6, 39000:16, 39001:19, 39002:20 perhaps [24] - 38831:22, 38834:4, 38845:10, 38847:12, 38858:13, 38865:19, 38867:13, 38869:7, 38874:12, 38880:10, 38918:19, 38921:1, 38923:3, 38923:5, 38926:7, 38938:11, 38947:13, 38954:13, 38963:17, 38972:9, 38985:5, 39000:25, 39006:17, 39012:23 period [4] - 38850:21, 38902:15, 38933:23, 38996:8 permitted [1] - 38945:9 perpetrator [9] - 38947:4, 38968:13, 38980:23, 38982:10, 38982:20, 38984:5, 38986:1, 39008:24, 39009:19 persistent [3] - 38845:9, 38869:7, 38995:12 Person [1] - 38980:16 person [17] - 38852:22, 38853:16, 38866:23, 38874:5, 38893:16, 38895:6, 38903:15, 38905:21, 38906:7, 38939:5, 38970:25, 38978:23, 38987:3, 38988:11, 39019:13, 39020:4, 39020:7 personally [1] - 38882:4 perspective [4] - 38880:1, 38889:6, 38968:9, 38968:10</p> |
|---|---|--|--|--|



| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>persuade [3] - 38860:23, 38861:7, 38861:9</p> <p>persuaded [1] - 38924:6</p> <p>persuasion [1] - 38880:19</p> <p>pertinent [1] - 38901:1</p> <p>phone [2] - 38853:6, 39015:10</p> <p>phoned [1] - 38908:22</p> <p>phoning [2] - 38852:7, 38856:25</p> <p>photos [1] - 38966:20</p> <p>physical [1] - 38883:5</p> <p>picture [2] - 38976:15, 38976:25</p> <p>piece [7] - 38834:9, 38854:18, 38855:3, 38855:20, 38892:17, 38898:5, 38941:6</p> <p>pieces [1] - 38854:25</p> <p>pill [1] - 38865:5</p> <p>pinpoint [1] - 38991:13</p> <p>place [13] - 38854:7, 38854:8, 38857:5, 38857:21, 38858:9, 38893:12, 38908:13, 38954:22, 38963:4, 38974:24, 38975:20, 38991:3, 38993:16</p> <p>placed [4] - 38851:4, 38946:19, 38977:21, 39003:1</p> <p>plant [3] - 38853:2, 38856:5, 38990:23</p> <p>planted [16] - 38853:12, 38853:25, 38854:16, 38855:14, 38855:21, 38856:2, 38856:6, 38857:24, 38858:5, 38858:19, 38858:22, 38989:14, 38990:14, 38990:15, 38990:21, 38991:9</p> <p>planting [3] - 38853:16, 38858:9, 38991:18</p> <p>plausible [1] - 39020:18</p> <p>play [1] - 39016:10</p> <p>played [2] - 38938:4, 38938:5</p> <p>playing [2] - 38891:7, 38896:23</p> <p>plea [2] - 38963:3, 38966:5</p> <p>pleas [3] - 38962:9, 38962:23, 38963:10</p> <p>Pm [5] - 38945:22, 38945:23, 38985:21, 38985:22, 39022:4</p> | <p>point [23] - 38833:11, 38833:14, 38833:22, 38835:15, 38850:16, 38863:11, 38863:21, 38869:8, 38869:21, 38877:14, 38885:13, 38888:24, 38942:24, 38957:5, 38966:14, 38967:5, 38968:13, 38973:16, 38974:9, 38993:20, 39006:17, 39012:8, 39021:13</p> <p>pointed [2] - 38888:1, 38964:3</p> <p>pointing [2] - 38883:8, 38978:1</p> <p>points [3] - 38836:8, 38944:22, 38960:24</p> <p>Police [2] - 38829:7, 39005:10</p> <p>police [91] - 38835:7, 38842:8, 38844:5, 38844:13, 38845:14, 38846:6, 38846:20, 38848:7, 38852:14, 38852:19, 38853:2, 38853:12, 38853:24, 38854:14, 38854:21, 38855:15, 38855:21, 38855:25, 38856:3, 38856:7, 38856:11, 38856:18, 38857:16, 38857:19, 38857:25, 38858:6, 38858:12, 38858:13, 38858:21, 38859:3, 38859:24, 38860:15, 38860:16, 38860:20, 38861:7, 38861:8, 38862:16, 38862:19, 38863:13, 38863:23, 38866:10, 38866:24, 38867:8, 38869:6, 38870:19, 38883:22, 38918:7, 38918:17, 38918:21, 38920:1, 38921:17, 38930:11, 38931:11, 38931:15, 38931:25, 38932:24, 38933:15, 38937:23, 38944:18, 38950:5, 38953:18, 38954:19, 38959:10, 38959:13, 38959:17, 38959:20, 38966:1, 38989:14, 38989:23, 38990:1, 38991:1, 38991:9, 38991:19, 38992:3, 38994:25, 38995:3, 38995:11, 38995:14, 38995:16,</p> | <p>38995:18, 38996:2, 38996:7, 38996:11, 39000:19, 39001:17, 39001:24, 39008:21, 39009:16, 39010:25, 39011:19, 39018:11</p> <p>policemen [1] - 38995:7</p> <p>polygraph [35] - 38843:6, 38843:20, 38844:9, 38844:20, 38845:15, 38845:16, 38845:20, 38846:14, 38847:3, 38847:15, 38928:18, 38928:21, 38929:10, 38929:21, 38929:23, 38929:24, 38930:6, 38931:2, 38931:25, 38933:1, 38933:4, 38935:13, 38947:11, 38947:25, 38948:14, 38955:9, 39000:16, 39003:12, 39004:22, 39005:25, 39006:3, 39007:24, 39007:25, 39010:10, 39010:13</p> <p>polygraphed [1] - 38930:2</p> <p>polygraphing [2] - 39008:14, 39008:15</p> <p>portion [8] - 38835:10, 38849:22, 38859:17, 38887:9, 38893:23, 38905:13, 38946:22, 38989:19</p> <p>portions [5] - 38838:15, 38914:2, 38918:25, 38919:9, 38957:9</p> <p>pose [2] - 38928:15, 38945:16</p> <p>position [7] - 38882:15, 38977:22, 39015:4, 39015:20, 39017:3, 39017:8</p> <p>possession [1] - 39003:4</p> <p>possibility [1] - 38867:2</p> <p>possible [10] - 38838:1, 38848:22, 38857:2, 38857:4, 38867:17, 38889:7, 38982:25, 38991:8, 39001:24, 39021:5</p> <p>possibly [7] - 38833:19, 38838:15, 38852:24, 38896:20, 38928:23, 38998:1, 39003:17</p> <p>Possibly [2] - 38837:20, 39009:5</p> <p>potential [4] -</p> | <p>38839:18, 38862:13, 39000:7, 39001:7</p> <p>powerful [1] - 38912:23</p> <p>practice [1] - 38941:13</p> <p>pre [4] - 39000:20, 39001:12, 39001:19, 39002:20</p> <p>pre-test [4] - 39000:20, 39001:12, 39001:19, 39002:20</p> <p>preceded [1] - 38835:4</p> <p>precipitated [1] - 38916:21</p> <p>precisely [2] - 38857:7, 38896:2</p> <p>predicament [1] - 38857:16</p> <p>preferred [2] - 38931:4, 38944:2</p> <p>prelim [3] - 38848:13, 38849:4, 38863:25</p> <p>Preliminary [3] - 38838:4, 38845:2, 38864:19</p> <p>preliminary [3] - 38838:17, 38864:6, 38956:25</p> <p>premise [1] - 38873:22</p> <p>preparation [1] - 38875:2</p> <p>prepared [3] - 38957:20, 38958:19, 39006:6</p> <p>presence [1] - 38902:7</p> <p>present [5] - 38937:12, 38938:2, 38939:1, 38995:8, 39000:19</p> <p>presentation [3] - 38840:10, 38953:6, 39002:4</p> <p>presented [12] - 38841:5, 38845:23, 38869:1, 38871:22, 38883:10, 38961:25, 38965:13, 38988:1, 38993:12, 38994:17, 39015:21, 39019:3</p> <p>presenting [3] - 38841:11, 38841:12, 38847:9</p> <p>preserve [1] - 38952:20</p> <p>Presley [3] - 38886:11, 38888:11, 38888:24</p> <p>press [5] - 38889:11, 38894:4, 38940:17, 38941:16, 38941:25</p> <p>pressure [2] - 39010:11, 39016:7</p> <p>pressured [2] - 38883:21, 38991:1</p> | <p>pressuring [1] - 38857:17</p> <p>presumably [3] - 38856:19, 38876:10, 38920:7</p> <p>pretend [1] - 38978:6</p> <p>pretty [2] - 38912:23, 38919:24</p> <p>prevent [1] - 38954:4</p> <p>previous [5] - 38847:25, 38899:7, 38902:25, 38905:22, 38909:19</p> <p>previously [1] - 38863:20</p> <p>primarily [2] - 38926:15, 38961:11</p> <p>prime [1] - 38862:5</p> <p>Prince [3] - 38890:20, 38910:21, 39005:10</p> <p>prison [5] - 38885:11, 38890:13, 38891:8, 38894:11, 38962:5</p> <p>prisoner [1] - 38921:2</p> <p>private [1] - 38953:13</p> <p>probable [1] - 38997:16</p> <p>probe [5] - 38859:16, 38863:21, 38873:24, 38904:1, 38999:6</p> <p>probed [4] - 38859:8, 38861:13, 38876:7, 38991:25</p> <p>probes [1] - 38944:22</p> <p>probing [6] - 38846:23, 38853:8, 38870:2, 38875:25, 38878:4, 38914:10</p> <p>problem [6] - 38897:1, 38900:17, 38911:19, 38912:16, 38915:2, 38938:14</p> <p>problematic [1] - 38852:2</p> <p>problems [3] - 38851:24, 38941:22, 39016:15</p> <p>procedurally [1] - 38876:21</p> <p>procedure [2] - 38884:8, 38933:6</p> <p>procedures [3] - 38889:11, 38933:15, 38995:5</p> <p>proceed [1] - 38957:13</p> <p>proceeded [1] - 38889:25</p> <p>proceeding [1] - 39016:21</p> <p>proceedings [4] - 38946:20, 38986:21,</p> |
|---|--|--|--|--|



| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| <p>38986:25, 38987:15 Proceedings [4] - 38827:12, 38827:23, 38830:1, 38831:1 process [12] - 38874:15, 38874:16, 38875:7, 38878:22, 38880:16, 38883:18, 38889:10, 38933:6, 38946:10, 38955:11, 38987:21, 38999:16 processed [1] - 39013:6 produced [3] - 38920:5, 38932:16, 38936:7 production [1] - 38880:18 productive [7] - 38872:19, 38872:22, 38873:12, 38873:22, 38873:25, 38874:19, 38875:9 professional [2] - 38840:17, 38865:15 Professor [1] - 38867:4 profiling [1] - 39005:9 program [2] - 38902:4, 38902:17 programs [1] - 38901:17 progress [2] - 38947:7, 38950:1 promise [3] - 38860:19, 38860:22, 38916:22 promised [1] - 39006:14 prompted [11] - 38836:10, 38864:5, 38878:18, 38929:9, 38971:23, 38972:1, 38985:15, 39000:21, 39000:23, 39006:13, 39016:10 properly [2] - 39005:22, 39005:25 propose [3] - 38834:16, 38959:23, 38988:24 prosecution [6] - 38937:6, 38938:13, 38943:16, 38968:7, 38968:21, 38968:24 prosecutions [1] - 38885:18 prosecutor [9] - 38937:12, 38938:2, 38938:21, 38939:1, 38939:6, 38946:16, 38954:15, 38968:5, 38999:6 prosecutorial [5] -</p> | <p>38937:9, 38937:20, 38939:11, 38999:23, 39000:10 prospect [1] - 38953:16 prove [3] - 38898:6, 38983:24 provide [14] - 38845:21, 38870:8, 38885:25, 38887:12, 38921:3, 38960:5, 38983:18, 38986:7, 38993:9, 38994:2, 38997:25, 39009:11, 39017:12, 39021:10 provided [27] - 38836:2, 38840:7, 38840:16, 38863:18, 38866:13, 38868:17, 38869:9, 38870:14, 38896:7, 38918:7, 38929:25, 38930:2, 38932:24, 38941:2, 38949:7, 38951:16, 38955:15, 38956:9, 38960:4, 38960:13, 38970:8, 38972:9, 38996:5, 39005:21, 39006:7, 39009:7, 39019:12 provides [1] - 39003:16 providing [4] - 38838:20, 38938:5, 38952:13, 38952:16 Province [1] - 39023:4 proximity [1] - 39019:25 prudent [1] - 38917:25 psychiatric [2] - 38902:1, 38906:12 psychiatrists [1] - 38867:18 psychological [2] - 38879:14, 39005:8 psychologists [1] - 38867:18 public [4] - 38893:21, 38917:13, 38994:9, 39016:19 publicity [1] - 38922:20 publicly [2] - 38887:23, 38992:12 published [1] - 38923:3 punch [1] - 38880:12 purpose [12] - 38839:10, 38841:4, 38841:8, 38841:10, 38907:1, 38910:1, 38913:23, 38917:21, 38923:13, 38968:20, 39006:25, 39011:7 purposes [11] -</p> | <p>38842:22, 39006:18, 39006:19, 39006:21, 39007:8, 39007:10, 39008:2, 39008:4, 39010:1, 39011:3, 39014:5 purse [3] - 38852:10, 38855:13, 38989:17 pursuant [1] - 39015:3 pursue [3] - 38877:25, 39007:1, 39012:9 pursued [3] - 38843:18, 38961:13, 38997:14 pursuing [2] - 38882:8, 39014:4 put [43] - 38833:25, 38844:7, 38851:24, 38852:3, 38853:14, 38854:3, 38854:7, 38854:8, 38854:23, 38854:25, 38855:13, 38859:20, 38866:19, 38867:23, 38870:18, 38872:8, 38872:15, 38873:23, 38877:22, 38901:7, 38904:7, 38905:18, 38911:24, 38914:4, 38939:9, 38959:1, 38960:20, 38976:19, 38977:8, 38982:8, 38986:3, 38987:5, 38987:18, 38988:20, 38989:16, 38989:24, 38991:21, 38993:18, 38995:21, 39009:2, 39017:15, 39020:10, 39021:7 puts [3] - 38849:21, 38856:23, 38856:25 putting [5] - 38852:10, 38935:1, 38954:15, 38992:3, 39000:3</p> | <p>39002:21 questioner [1] - 38865:18 questioning [24] - 38832:1, 38834:14, 38841:4, 38842:22, 38845:6, 38845:10, 38845:11, 38847:1, 38848:12, 38855:8, 38859:12, 38859:15, 38860:17, 38861:13, 38862:15, 38863:10, 38869:7, 38899:6, 38904:14, 38931:14, 38995:4, 38998:9, 38998:10, 38998:12 questions [23] - 38845:1, 38849:24, 38859:9, 38860:18, 38864:8, 38904:10, 38913:23, 38919:12, 38928:16, 38928:19, 38928:20, 38928:24, 38929:7, 38929:11, 38930:6, 38931:16, 38945:16, 38995:11, 39002:22, 39003:7, 39003:11, 39004:16, 39005:22 quick [1] - 39010:20 quickly [2] - 38874:18, 38890:2 quite [14] - 38900:8, 38904:11, 38920:3, 38927:9, 38929:8, 38942:15, 38947:6, 38949:9, 38953:15, 38973:13, 38977:23, 38985:5, 39008:10, 39009:15 quiz [1] - 38973:14 quo [1] - 38952:21 quote [11] - 38872:22, 38886:9, 38886:15, 38886:18, 38888:15, 38889:15, 38889:20, 38893:10, 38913:11, 38940:9, 38972:3 quoted [4] - 38842:18, 38896:15, 38898:3, 38921:23 quotes [8] - 38895:24, 38895:25, 38896:18, 38897:8, 38910:16, 38914:2, 38914:5, 38914:6 quoting [1] - 38893:8</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">R</p> <p>radar [2] - 38892:5, 38986:14 raise [2] - 38968:16, 38987:15 raised [9] - 38868:7, 38878:1, 38939:13, 38942:10, 38944:23, 38948:1, 38948:4, 38948:21, 38958:4 raises [1] - 38936:21 Rape [1] - 38980:16 rape [2] - 38902:8, 38966:22 raped [2] - 38914:18, 38966:16 rapes [7] - 38907:4, 38977:2, 38978:20, 38979:5, 38986:4, 39019:24, 39020:5 rapid [1] - 38938:23 rapidly [1] - 39007:25 rapist [11] - 38885:8, 38890:21, 38890:22, 38891:7, 38891:9, 38891:14, 38910:22, 38914:9, 38981:18, 39019:15, 39019:18 rapist's [3] - 38891:4, 38891:21, 38911:2 Rasmussen [1] - 39021:19 rather [5] - 38896:5, 38928:9, 38952:21, 38959:20, 39016:11 Rcmp [10] - 38829:9, 38949:25, 38950:12, 38951:4, 38951:19, 38954:5, 38954:12, 38976:11, 38997:15, 39009:10 re [8] - 38916:22, 38916:23, 38918:5, 38942:12, 38954:13, 39008:15, 39009:17, 39021:13 re-arguing [1] - 39021:13 re-characterize [1] - 38942:12 re-enactment [1] - 38918:5 re-offend [1] - 38916:22 re-offending [1] - 38916:23 re-opened [1] - 38954:13 re-opening [1] -</p> |
| Q | | | | |
| <p>Qb [1] - 38828:10 Qc [3] - 38829:2, 38829:6, 38829:10 qualifier [1] - 39000:5 qualifies [1] - 38938:24 Queen's [4] - 39023:1, 39023:3, 39023:14, 39023:20 questioned [11] - 38846:13, 38858:13, 38866:14, 38868:3, 38878:8, 38903:16, 38906:20, 38919:10, 38929:20, 38943:17,</p> | | | | |



| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| <p>39009:17 re-polygraphing [1] - 39008:15 reach [5] - 38871:5, 38874:9, 38875:25, 38883:14, 38927:10 reached [5] - 38868:12, 38868:16, 38873:21, 38971:13, 38974:5 reaction [6] - 38855:2, 38880:8, 38892:3, 38892:7, 38920:10, 38999:12 read [23] - 38831:12, 38838:5, 38838:7, 38838:11, 38838:15, 38841:18, 38843:7, 38847:25, 38888:7, 38900:3, 38900:9, 38900:12, 38910:17, 38913:1, 38939:25, 38941:1, 38943:2, 38943:4, 38955:9, 38963:2, 38980:15, 38994:7, 39001:5 reader [2] - 38881:8, 38881:14 readily [1] - 38991:6 reading [4] - 38900:6, 38914:4, 38918:9, 39006:14 real [2] - 38856:23, 38883:8 realize [2] - 38831:22, 39007:22 realized [3] - 38867:5, 38897:11, 38901:7 really [6] - 38873:7, 38879:1, 38901:4, 38935:16, 38998:8, 38998:11 reason [11] - 38831:19, 38854:13, 38856:17, 38857:13, 38857:17, 38859:6, 38934:23, 38936:6, 38945:8, 38990:25, 38991:24 reasonable [10] - 38868:18, 38960:4, 38960:5, 38968:16, 38982:11, 38984:3, 38984:8, 38986:7, 38993:9, 38994:2 reasonably [1] - 38945:6 reasons [3] - 38859:20, 38954:2, 38970:19 rebutted [1] - 39018:9 recant [7] - 38851:19, 38878:16, 38878:25,</p> | <p>38923:19, 38925:19, 38925:21, 38930:16 recantation [30] - 38831:17, 38847:18, 38849:2, 38851:16, 38851:25, 38859:16, 38859:18, 38859:20, 38867:23, 38868:17, 38869:18, 38870:1, 38871:3, 38871:15, 38872:8, 38872:12, 38873:12, 38873:16, 38873:17, 38878:4, 38935:4, 38942:8, 38942:10, 38942:16, 38942:22, 38989:5, 38989:8, 38989:13, 38991:17, 38994:9 recanted [5] - 38851:10, 38851:21, 38923:22, 38925:1, 38959:20 recanting [2] - 38851:9, 38992:20 recants [2] - 38867:12, 39017:25 receipt [2] - 38970:24, 38976:8 receive [1] - 38920:19 received [24] - 38836:12, 38841:7, 38868:20, 38869:12, 38880:14, 38881:16, 38893:6, 38895:3, 38906:12, 38908:3, 38922:20, 38923:1, 38925:17, 38925:18, 38928:22, 38929:3, 38941:6, 38949:2, 38949:12, 39005:10, 39005:14, 39008:18, 39016:8, 39018:25 recent [5] - 38891:18, 38893:4, 38925:5, 38933:21, 38989:3 recently [2] - 38864:18, 38908:6 Recently [1] - 38925:3 recipient [1] - 38921:19 recited [3] - 38887:22, 38887:24, 38888:20 recites [2] - 38995:8, 38999:14 recognize [1] - 38987:17 recollection [12] - 38840:12, 38891:16, 38922:5, 38924:2, 38926:20, 38927:12, 38928:19, 38937:18,</p> | <p>38948:13, 38949:10, 38967:4, 39006:12 recommendation [2] - 38877:12, 38960:15 Reconvened [4] - 38831:2, 38890:7, 38945:23, 38985:22 record [16] - 38832:6, 38868:8, 38876:9, 38891:2, 38896:13, 38905:22, 38910:25, 38916:5, 38929:15, 38931:2, 38931:22, 38932:16, 38948:24, 38989:4, 38989:6, 39001:4 recorded [3] - 38851:6, 38896:11, 38934:4 records [5] - 38930:11, 38930:17, 38933:17, 38934:12, 38962:6 recover [1] - 38949:24 refer [1] - 38918:2 reference [9] - 38882:16, 38886:13, 38888:17, 38888:19, 38889:1, 38895:14, 38907:3, 38921:15, 38923:23 references [2] - 38842:9, 38860:13 referred [7] - 38837:3, 38848:11, 38908:16, 38910:13, 39005:5, 39012:24, 39015:9 referring [14] - 38858:11, 38884:10, 38899:25, 38905:24, 38922:2, 38922:23, 38923:3, 38946:25, 38947:5, 38950:6, 38975:11, 38966:9, 38996:12, 39013:17 refers [2] - 38928:15, 38946:5 reflect [3] - 38866:5, 38937:17, 38959:25 reflected [2] - 38843:15, 39017:2 reflection [1] - 38917:4 reflects [2] - 38946:9, 38956:11 refresh [1] - 38836:2 refreshed [1] - 38834:24 refused [4] - 38890:18, 38910:19, 38926:3, 38926:5 Reg [1] - 38898:23 regard [1] - 39017:3</p> | <p>regarding [3] - 38948:25, 38987:12, 39004:10 regardless [2] - 38877:8, 38877:9 Regina [17] - 38848:9, 38885:10, 38885:20, 38885:22, 38890:12, 38890:18, 38890:25, 38891:13, 38891:15, 38908:15, 38910:19, 38910:23, 38914:8, 38922:21, 38962:24, 38966:7, 39003:5 regional [1] - 38901:25 regularly [1] - 39004:5 rehabilitation [1] - 39010:17 reinforced [1] - 38834:2 reinvestigate [1] - 39006:23 reinvestigation [1] - 39007:13 related [13] - 38869:14, 38870:17, 38873:16, 38909:3, 38941:9, 38942:7, 38961:20, 38962:1, 38985:4, 38986:3, 38986:4, 39002:3, 39002:7 related' [1] - 38985:5 relates [4] - 38843:19, 38893:23, 38914:24, 39002:10 relating [5] - 38872:3, 38897:19, 38916:11, 38930:18, 38962:7 relation [18] - 38840:18, 38841:13, 38864:14, 38929:20, 38929:21, 38931:15, 38940:4, 38942:10, 38944:19, 38946:19, 38954:9, 38955:1, 38961:21, 38963:24, 38974:20, 38985:14, 39003:17, 39005:6 relationship [2] - 38906:13, 38941:9 relatively [1] - 38869:8 relaxed [1] - 38843:9 release [4] - 38891:2, 38906:11, 38910:25, 38994:23 released [4] - 38903:4, 38904:17, 38914:17, 38994:21 relented [1] - 38924:6 relevant [2] - 38968:12, 39019:21</p> | <p>reliance [3] - 38850:3, 38851:3, 38946:19 relied [1] - 38880:19 religion [1] - 38925:13 religious [1] - 38923:17 reluctance [1] - 39006:9 remain [1] - 38894:6 remained [3] - 38927:14, 38955:3, 38987:24 remaining [2] - 38955:13, 38958:9 remains [2] - 38926:22, 39005:20 remarks [2] - 38919:20, 38929:6 remedy [3] - 38870:9, 38870:14, 38881:25 remember [2] - 38846:17, 38889:8 reminded [3] - 38891:20, 38980:6, 39002:14 reminder [1] - 38945:20 remove [1] - 38966:15 removed [1] - 38874:20 renewed [1] - 38926:8 repeat [1] - 38900:14 report [30] - 38840:20, 38869:21, 38880:7, 38881:7, 38887:2, 38888:3, 38888:8, 38897:16, 38931:25, 38955:6, 38958:17, 38961:2, 38964:16, 38980:1, 38993:22, 38994:1, 38995:22, 38997:25, 39004:2, 39004:3, 39004:5, 39004:6, 39004:12, 39004:25, 39005:14, 39008:25, 39011:15, 39013:9, 39015:19, 39017:18 reported [9] - 38887:23, 38892:15, 38894:14, 38895:4, 38901:2, 38913:9, 38913:24, 38917:8, 38980:20 Reporter [2] - 39023:14, 39023:20 reporter [4] - 38886:20, 38887:22, 38888:6, 38898:17 reporter's [1] - 38888:16 Reporters [2] - 38828:10, 39023:3 reporters [1] - 38893:12</p> |
|--|--|--|--|---|



| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| <p>Reporters^[1] - 39023:1 reporting^[1] - 38889:16 reports^[10] - 38840:17, 38916:9, 38923:3, 38931:12, 38931:13, 38933:13, 38949:6, 38962:7, 38992:17, 39019:4 repository^[1] - 38879:23 representative^[3] - 38923:16, 38923:18, 38923:21 representatives^[3] - 38880:24, 38882:3, 38946:12 represented^[2] - 38871:20, 38898:23 request^[8] - 38928:15, 38929:9, 38933:20, 38933:21, 38936:11, 39015:3, 39015:16, 39017:9 requested^[2] - 38948:25, 38966:7 requesting^[1] - 38881:2 require^[1] - 38952:12 required^[2] - 38946:14, 38997:15 resided^[1] - 39019:19 residence^[4] - 38906:16, 38906:24, 38907:5, 38983:9 resiled^[2] - 38833:5, 38928:1 resolution^[1] - 38958:10 resolved^[1] - 38958:9 respect^[16] - 38833:4, 38839:21, 38868:13, 38941:10, 38944:17, 38956:21, 38956:25, 38957:11, 38960:15, 38960:20, 38964:14, 38971:21, 38971:22, 38996:1, 39012:18, 39015:5 respective^[1] - 39018:17 response^[10] - 38832:2, 38844:25, 38864:7, 38883:11, 38906:21, 38909:11, 38919:12, 38933:17, 39015:14, 39017:9 responses^[3] - 38860:18, 38866:7, 39003:10 responsibility^[1] -</p> | <p>38867:10 responsible^[1] - 39020:8 rest^[1] - 38914:13 result^[17] - 38845:9, 38845:13, 38866:22, 38876:23, 38877:6, 38878:4, 38918:7, 38928:1, 38928:22, 38935:25, 38941:11, 38961:17, 38972:12, 38985:16, 38987:19, 39000:23 resulted^[3] - 38950:22, 38951:10, 38978:4 results^[3] - 38889:12, 38893:1, 38954:6 retainer^[1] - 38953:13 retelling^[1] - 38843:15 Retired^[1] - 38829:13 retrieval^[1] - 38946:17 retry^[1] - 38876:18 return^[2] - 38860:3, 38876:24 revealed^[2] - 38990:3, 38993:15 review^[20] - 38838:18, 38838:21, 38866:5, 38869:1, 38870:22, 38871:2, 38873:19, 38876:19, 38880:7, 38886:2, 38887:14, 38919:9, 38969:12, 38988:5, 38988:25, 38994:19, 39008:5, 39009:3, 39013:3, 39013:24 reviewed^[5] - 38838:14, 38864:17, 38908:6, 38970:15, 38979:24 reviewing^[2] - 38872:11, 39010:1 reward^[3] - 38921:16, 38921:18, 38925:25 Riddell^[2] - 38841:17, 38842:6 right-hand^[1] - 38890:16 ring^[4] - 38855:4, 38872:5, 38878:25, 38934:7 rise^[5] - 38870:6, 38942:17, 38962:22, 38963:5, 38986:19 robbed^[1] - 38971:17 robber^[2] - 38891:1, 38910:24 robbery^[2] - 38967:24, 38974:23</p> | <p>Roberts^[22] - 38843:1, 38845:20, 38884:16, 38929:25, 38930:10, 38930:23, 38931:23, 38932:15, 38932:20, 38933:7, 38934:13, 38934:17, 38935:11, 39000:13, 39001:2, 39001:3, 39001:5, 39001:11, 39002:3, 39002:12, 39003:21, 39003:22 Roberts^[4] - 38932:3, 38934:3, 38935:12, 38936:2 Robinson^[1] - 38955:8 role^[5] - 38866:19, 38938:4, 38938:5, 38946:21, 38953:8 Ron^[31] - 38839:21, 38855:21, 38859:6, 38868:15, 38870:4, 38870:18, 38872:8, 38873:16, 38874:6, 38875:14, 38875:23, 38876:3, 38876:15, 38877:25, 38883:20, 38918:15, 38924:19, 38925:3, 38925:12, 38930:24, 38931:17, 38931:24, 38932:11, 38934:3, 38935:9, 38941:5, 38942:7, 38942:9, 38942:16, 38989:5, 39017:23 Ronald^[4] - 38852:23, 38959:12, 38992:21, 38996:6 room^[8] - 38918:2, 38927:5, 38927:12, 38931:23, 38934:5, 39001:15, 39001:18, 39005:12 Rosner^[3] - 38908:18, 38908:20, 38908:21 Rossmo^[1] - 38867:4 rot^[1] - 38881:1 rots^[1] - 38879:21 row^[1] - 39003:1 Rpc^[1] - 38902:2 Rpr^[4] - 38828:11, 39023:2, 39023:18, 39023:19 ruled^[2] - 38978:23, 38999:19 run^[6] - 38834:17, 38872:5, 38892:9, 38892:13, 38973:14, 39011:11 running^[1] - 38955:17</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">S</p> <p>safe^[2] - 38872:10, 38872:11 safely^[1] - 38883:14 safer^[2] - 38874:2, 38878:6 safety^[3] - 38872:14, 38872:16, 38872:20 salient^[1] - 38919:8 sample^[1] - 38993:24 Sandra^[1] - 38828:4 Sask^[2] - 38938:19, 38953:11 Saskatchewan^[7] - 38827:17, 38829:4, 38903:17, 38937:4, 38966:6, 39008:20, 39023:4 Saskatoon^[28] - 38827:17, 38829:7, 38832:25, 38841:21, 38842:10, 38846:6, 38849:13, 38850:17, 38855:12, 38862:4, 38883:21, 38902:2, 38919:17, 38924:22, 38930:11, 38937:3, 38949:20, 38961:24, 38962:20, 38966:4, 38966:9, 38969:14, 38986:24, 38989:16, 39003:5, 39009:16, 39019:16, 39020:6 sat^[1] - 38902:22 satisfaction^[3] - 38864:5, 38971:14, 38982:18 satisfactory^[1] - 38864:10 satisfied^[5] - 38878:9, 38957:12, 38964:5, 38981:3, 39011:6 satisfy^[1] - 38867:1 saw^[14] - 38897:12, 38901:8, 38905:19, 38905:25, 38919:14, 38922:14, 38923:11, 38923:12, 38924:20, 38934:18, 38936:1, 38959:22, 38965:1 Sawatsky^[1] - 39003:14 scared^[3] - 38848:20, 38863:6, 38991:1 scenario^[6] - 38856:8, 38856:21, 38977:16, 38977:20, 38978:6, 38988:18</p> | <p>scenarios^[1] - 38986:10 scene^[3] - 38996:19, 38996:21, 38996:22 scheduled^[1] - 39010:15 scientific^[2] - 38840:17, 38877:2 scope^[1] - 38889:25 scrambled^[1] - 38846:17 screen^[5] - 38886:24, 38887:4, 38892:5, 38946:5, 38986:15 scroll^[7] - 38899:22, 38902:11, 38958:24, 38959:23, 38962:4, 38980:5, 39001:10 Scroll^[1] - 38955:7 scrutinized^[1] - 38994:11 scrutiny^[3] - 38871:23, 38943:13, 38944:7 Seattle^[1] - 38923:16 second^[11] - 38970:7, 38971:1, 38975:10, 38976:8, 38977:20, 39000:25, 39001:4, 39012:18, 39012:23, 39013:3, 39013:6 secondly^[5] - 38832:25, 38944:13, 38953:25, 38962:14, 38986:20 Secondly^[3] - 38929:3, 38954:12, 39018:7 Section^[1] - 39015:6 securing^[1] - 38931:16 Security^[1] - 38828:12 see^[24] - 38836:20, 38838:19, 38848:23, 38861:3, 38861:5, 38864:21, 38866:11, 38876:20, 38877:22, 38881:11, 38890:4, 38890:10, 38901:6, 38904:9, 38908:10, 38918:12, 38923:10, 38936:2, 38945:19, 38973:8, 38981:7, 39000:6, 39003:3, 39022:2 See^[1] - 38910:18 seeing^[2] - 38898:21, 38967:6 seeking^[2] - 38928:21, 38964:9 seem^[5] - 38835:17, 38878:25, 38879:1, 38879:20, 38997:23</p> |
|--|--|---|--|---|



| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p>select [1] - 39002:9 selection [1] - 39002:5 sell [1] - 38988:19 seminar [1] - 39005:9 send [1] - 38877:10 senior [2] - 38880:6, 38885:16 sense [12] - 38834:10, 38838:10, 38849:25, 38851:17, 38860:14, 38872:18, 38918:9, 38919:24, 38922:24, 38927:19, 38963:22, 38997:9 sent [1] - 38976:11 sentence [2] - 38861:5, 38894:14 separate [4] - 38858:15, 38979:1, 39006:22 separated [1] - 38920:3 separation [1] - 38850:19 September [8] - 38827:21, 38998:23, 39004:1, 39005:3, 39009:21, 39011:4, 39014:12, 39014:23 Serge [1] - 38829:6 Sergeant [25] - 38882:5, 38924:9, 38949:23, 38951:1, 38951:7, 38951:21, 38955:12, 38964:13, 38997:22, 38998:8, 39004:5, 39004:25, 39005:4, 39005:6, 39007:8, 39008:2, 39009:14, 39009:22, 39010:4, 39010:23, 39011:5, 39012:4, 39012:16, 39013:22, 39014:14 serial [1] - 39019:15 series [1] - 38885:6 serious [5] - 38927:13, 38949:1, 38949:18, 38983:13, 39018:21 seriously [1] - 38866:14 served [3] - 38884:21, 38890:19, 38910:20 service [1] - 38938:13 Service [1] - 38829:7 services [1] - 38937:1 serving [2] - 38894:13, 38921:1 session [10] - 38843:1, 38843:6, 38846:15, 38847:13, 38929:24, 38935:10, 38935:13, 38947:11, 39001:20, 39002:20</p> | <p>sessions [2] - 39000:20, 39001:13 set [11] - 38857:7, 38858:8, 38915:19, 38916:14, 38960:8, 38961:10, 38962:25, 38963:3, 38977:25, 38990:18, 39001:25 sets [1] - 38960:15 seven [7] - 38834:25, 38835:17, 38902:22, 38933:23, 38949:1, 38949:18, 38969:12 seven-hour [1] - 38933:23 several [2] - 38889:9, 38919:1 sexual [12] - 38906:23, 38949:1, 38949:18, 38961:23, 38962:23, 38963:24, 38972:15, 38973:9, 38973:21, 38974:21, 38975:7, 39012:14 shall [8] - 38882:2, 38951:15, 38954:18, 38960:14, 38961:19, 38970:21, 38985:13, 39003:16 shank [3] - 38900:3, 38907:8, 38911:20 shed [2] - 38877:3, 38918:22 Sheraton [1] - 38827:16 shit [1] - 38854:18 shocked [1] - 38906:5 shocking [1] - 38937:4 shop [1] - 38901:17 Short [2] - 38861:16, 38861:23 short [6] - 38901:14, 38901:15, 38902:14, 38904:10, 39019:25 shorthand [1] - 39023:6 shortly [2] - 38888:13, 38998:1 Shorty [2] - 38836:21, 38852:24 show [8] - 38868:13, 38899:13, 38902:20, 38905:19, 38905:25, 38921:22, 38922:3, 38965:12 showed [7] - 38877:7, 38899:19, 38899:20, 38905:14, 38906:14, 38920:6, 38949:13 showing [1] - 38831:11 shown [3] - 38842:17, 39002:8, 39003:18</p> | <p>shows [2] - 38868:2, 38968:11 side [2] - 38890:16, 38974:16 signal [4] - 38858:17, 38985:6, 38985:10, 39015:17 signaled [12] - 38868:22, 38914:3, 38918:20, 38923:4, 38940:13, 38940:15, 38944:15, 38945:8, 38953:8, 38979:2, 38990:23, 38994:17 signaling [1] - 39017:12 signals [5] - 38835:2, 38835:3, 38873:2, 38884:11, 38914:3 significance [26] - 38832:21, 38833:1, 38833:7, 38834:1, 38842:5, 38845:5, 38845:15, 38847:17, 38848:25, 38849:18, 38853:9, 38862:9, 38863:9, 38865:8, 38895:21, 38912:18, 38919:22, 38924:23, 38927:1, 38927:20, 38933:3, 38994:15, 38996:24, 39001:22, 39001:23, 39003:15 significant [14] - 38833:11, 38850:11, 38850:18, 38850:25, 38870:5, 38881:13, 38884:12, 38919:24, 38933:25, 38974:10, 38978:2, 38984:25, 38990:12, 39017:20 significantly [1] - 38842:13 signing [1] - 38835:18 similar [23] - 38894:12, 38932:15, 38932:19, 38962:12, 38962:17, 38964:2, 38965:14, 38966:18, 38967:12, 38967:14, 38968:3, 38968:11, 38970:21, 38971:5, 38971:24, 38972:22, 38975:5, 38976:1, 38977:3, 38979:11, 38983:3, 38992:1 similar-fact [1] - 38971:5 similarities [14] - 38962:10, 38963:22,</p> | <p>38964:2, 38964:23, 38968:19, 38970:3, 38970:16, 38971:15, 38972:2, 38972:14, 38974:14, 38977:2, 38979:4, 38979:14 similarity [7] - 38964:7, 38967:17, 38968:11, 38974:17, 38976:14, 38978:19, 38981:21 Similarly [4] - 38860:10, 38940:12, 38978:13, 38995:13 similarly [1] - 38966:21 Simply [1] - 38839:11 simply [17] - 38831:20, 38834:2, 38834:6, 38851:3, 38851:7, 38876:9, 38876:19, 38878:15, 38880:13, 38903:15, 38920:14, 38928:10, 38946:6, 38985:6, 38990:24, 39020:18, 39021:12 sinister [1] - 38933:16 sister [1] - 38839:8 sit [1] - 38907:2 sitting [4] - 38827:15, 38908:6, 38940:14, 38996:19 situations [2] - 38866:12, 38987:21 six [11] - 38834:25, 38843:21, 38846:15, 38847:13, 38858:13, 38866:21, 38883:2, 38932:12, 38933:23, 38987:2 six-page [1] - 38932:12 sixth [1] - 38910:10 skepticism [1] - 38977:25 sketch [1] - 38996:21 skill [1] - 39023:7 skills [1] - 38865:13 slaying [1] - 38885:8 slightly [1] - 39006:18 slow [1] - 38880:15 slowed [2] - 38886:3, 38887:15 snowbank [4] - 38891:11, 38907:9, 38911:21, 38911:24 so-called [1] - 38918:5 someone [18] - 38843:13, 38860:23, 38867:7, 38871:24, 38874:25, 38880:11, 38881:2, 38881:23, 38884:21, 38893:18,</p> | <p>38898:13, 38899:15, 38911:17, 38912:9, 38913:5, 38953:14, 38965:21, 39013:18 someplace [1] - 38854:7 sometimes [5] - 38831:21, 38834:4, 38843:14, 38872:4, 38889:16 Sometimes [1] - 38991:11 somewhat [3] - 38942:7, 38967:12, 39005:15 somewhere [1] - 38957:8 sooner [1] - 39016:11 sorry [20] - 38837:6, 38845:18, 38845:19, 38847:23, 38857:3, 38899:5, 38903:12, 38923:7, 38927:25, 38929:11, 38931:8, 38940:20, 38949:13, 38949:22, 38959:7, 38981:6, 38992:16, 38998:10, 38998:17 Sorry [5] - 38887:8, 38902:24, 38944:3, 38963:6, 38998:18 sort [8] - 38851:8, 38877:23, 38961:5, 38965:13, 38977:12, 38984:19, 38985:18, 38986:9 sought [2] - 38964:10, 38964:11 source [4] - 38846:1, 38865:25, 38932:4, 38932:5 sources [6] - 38834:25, 38839:11, 38839:18, 38851:22, 38862:13, 38992:13 speaking [3] - 38894:19, 38925:17, 38928:25 speaks [1] - 38949:18 specific [8] - 38836:7, 38871:10, 38873:15, 38944:12, 38948:8, 38948:16, 38953:13, 38999:22 specifically [5] - 38864:7, 38937:9, 38939:13, 38987:6, 39014:20 specificity [1] - 38836:10</p> |
|---|---|---|--|--|



| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <p>specifics [1] - 38884:7 specify [1] - 38908:7 speculated [1] - 38926:7 speculation [2] - 38926:9, 38926:15 speed [2] - 38874:25, 38875:5 spent [3] - 38889:9, 38930:25, 38932:15 sperm [1] - 38877:8 spoken [5] - 38893:11, 38915:9, 38917:23, 38917:24, 38941:7 spot [2] - 38890:4, 38905:7 spring [2] - 38901:14, 38911:22 stab [1] - 38891:10 stabbed [2] - 38914:18, 38971:17 stabbing [1] - 38852:9 Staff [2] - 38828:1, 38828:8 staff [1] - 38946:21 stage [1] - 38953:9 stand [2] - 38854:13, 38865:16 standard [2] - 38968:21 standpoint [2] - 38931:10, 38968:24 start [1] - 38835:21 started [6] - 38832:1, 38835:16, 38835:22, 38838:25, 38847:12, 38950:25 starts [1] - 38832:8 state [5] - 38847:16, 38849:8, 38956:7, 38959:2, 38979:17 statement [102] - 38831:11, 38831:18, 38831:21, 38831:25, 38832:5, 38832:13, 38832:22, 38833:5, 38835:1, 38835:5, 38835:13, 38835:19, 38836:7, 38836:17, 38836:20, 38836:24, 38837:1, 38837:2, 38837:4, 38837:10, 38837:12, 38837:21, 38837:25, 38839:13, 38839:15, 38841:3, 38841:5, 38841:17, 38842:6, 38842:8, 38842:11, 38842:15, 38842:19, 38843:8, 38844:1, 38844:8, 38844:15, 38845:7,</p> | <p>38845:12, 38845:13, 38845:23, 38845:24, 38846:5, 38846:8, 38846:10, 38846:22, 38847:21, 38849:3, 38849:21, 38849:25, 38850:1, 38850:4, 38850:12, 38850:25, 38851:5, 38852:5, 38852:11, 38855:6, 38855:19, 38855:24, 38857:7, 38857:23, 38858:5, 38858:21, 38862:17, 38863:24, 38864:13, 38865:1, 38865:22, 38866:9, 38866:16, 38866:17, 38866:20, 38866:22, 38866:23, 38869:5, 38869:9, 38870:11, 38894:15, 38896:4, 38921:3, 38929:5, 38932:12, 38936:10, 38939:16, 38939:18, 38940:7, 38940:14, 38941:5, 38942:11, 38943:22, 38959:15, 38959:19, 38964:15, 38989:19, 38993:11, 38996:14, 38999:24, 39002:4, 39003:17, 39018:13 statements [26] - 38835:7, 38837:18, 38842:13, 38845:8, 38870:16, 38884:22, 38912:20, 38931:16, 38931:25, 38932:1, 38932:16, 38932:21, 38935:10, 38939:23, 38942:13, 38949:7, 38953:7, 38960:12, 38969:19, 38969:22, 38970:9, 38970:14, 38982:4, 39002:1, 39003:24, 39018:17 states [1] - 38958:2 stating [1] - 38992:7 status [3] - 38952:21, 38958:16, 38997:9 steadfast [1] - 38927:14 steps [7] - 38889:4, 38931:15, 38953:5, 38956:1, 38957:6, 38957:25, 38958:6 stevelly [1] - 38829:4 stick [1] - 38891:9 stick-swinging [1] - 38891:9 still [17] - 38862:5,</p> | <p>38877:15, 38886:11, 38888:8, 38888:11, 38938:17, 38942:24, 38951:7, 38955:17, 38961:14, 38977:17, 38979:3, 38979:7, 39005:15, 39005:24, 39007:23, 39011:11 stock [1] - 38833:25 stood [3] - 38945:6, 38974:10, 38974:15 stooges [2] - 38880:2, 38882:16 stop [1] - 39011:12 stopped [2] - 38901:4, 39014:4 stopping [1] - 39011:20 stories [6] - 38861:4, 38871:18, 38893:5, 38896:16, 38908:4, 38908:8 story [35] - 38853:3, 38853:12, 38853:14, 38853:16, 38853:25, 38854:3, 38856:10, 38857:7, 38858:18, 38859:1, 38865:24, 38889:13, 38889:17, 38891:4, 38893:8, 38893:23, 38894:1, 38894:8, 38895:24, 38896:17, 38898:3, 38907:4, 38911:2, 38923:5, 38925:14, 38942:14, 38980:8, 38980:12, 38980:15, 38980:18, 38989:14, 38990:14, 38990:21, 38991:18, 38999:14 street [1] - 38842:10 strength [2] - 38987:23, 38988:5 stretching [1] - 39016:2 strict [1] - 38943:13 Strict [1] - 38944:7 strikes [1] - 38972:13 strong [4] - 38926:19, 38945:14, 38985:12, 38997:4 stronger [4] - 38878:17, 38974:6, 38983:4, 38988:15 strongest [1] - 38898:5 stuck [10] - 38850:9, 38850:15, 38850:16, 38850:18, 38851:10, 38851:15, 38851:19, 38853:18, 38996:14, 39021:24 stuff [2] - 38911:20,</p> | <p>38961:1 stunned [1] - 38906:6 subject [13] - 38867:4, 38927:15, 38946:25, 38948:1, 38998:4, 38999:8, 39001:7, 39001:13, 39001:16, 39002:21, 39003:2, 39003:6, 39003:9 subject's [1] - 39003:10 subjected [1] - 38943:13 subjects [1] - 38884:17 submission [2] - 39020:14, 39021:3 submissions [1] - 39015:17 submit [1] - 38994:22 submitted [1] - 38959:16 subsequent [1] - 38974:21 Subsequently [1] - 38961:14 subsequently [1] - 38961:17 subside [1] - 39003:10 substance [2] - 38869:17, 38948:23 substantially [1] - 38876:21 substantive [2] - 38859:17, 38870:12 succeeding [1] - 38864:8 success [1] - 38919:2 successful [1] - 39007:25 suffers [1] - 38972:11 sufficient [12] - 38876:22, 38876:24, 38878:19, 38881:25, 38882:7, 38916:23, 38964:2, 38964:6, 38964:23, 38970:3, 38974:17, 38984:12 sufficiently [1] - 38975:5 suggest [9] - 38843:25, 38844:18, 38886:6, 38887:18, 38921:6, 38977:8, 38984:4, 38988:9, 39020:20 suggested [7] - 38847:11, 38848:3, 38867:11, 38925:20, 38977:11, 38990:15, 39002:8 suggesting [3] - 38853:24, 38907:17,</p> | <p>38978:16 suggestion [12] - 38847:10, 38927:3, 38937:20, 38939:15, 38944:17, 38949:5, 38985:25, 38986:5, 38987:4, 38993:18, 38995:21, 38999:18 suggestions [1] - 39000:24 suggests [2] - 38929:15, 38999:15 summarize [4] - 38918:4, 39015:4, 39015:20, 39017:8 summarized [1] - 38958:22 summarizes [1] - 38958:7 summary [11] - 38835:5, 38955:25, 38956:5, 38956:12, 38957:25, 38958:13, 38960:9, 38960:21, 38962:21, 38962:25, 38981:14 superiors [4] - 39000:25, 39007:15, 39009:23, 39016:23 supplementary [1] - 38928:24 support [8] - 38866:8, 38869:14, 38874:9, 38959:16, 38977:22, 38987:24, 38990:19, 38995:13 Support [1] - 38828:8 supported [7] - 38858:10, 38858:23, 38869:5, 38870:16, 38879:4, 38995:2, 38995:15 supporters [2] - 38885:25, 38887:12 supports [1] - 38892:11 suppose [4] - 38878:12, 38942:8, 38942:12, 38967:11 supposed [2] - 38879:22, 38943:23 Supreme [4] - 38895:14, 38921:15, 38932:4, 38986:21 surgery [1] - 39010:15 surmised [1] - 38838:14 surprised [2] - 38852:20, 38948:4 surprising [1] - 38865:14</p> |
|---|---|---|---|---|



| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| <p>surrounding [5] - 38880:20, 38961:22, 38962:11, 38970:4, 39007:20</p> <p>suspect [25] - 38862:6, 38875:21, 38932:23, 38947:20, 38948:24, 38951:18, 38952:11, 38952:15, 38964:19, 38986:14, 38988:11, 38988:13, 38988:17, 38994:18, 39004:13, 39004:23, 39005:16, 39005:20, 39006:16, 39006:25, 39013:11, 39013:14, 39013:18, 39014:9, 39018:5</p> <p>suspect's [1] - 38949:1</p> <p>suspected [1] - 39002:25</p> <p>suspicion [1] - 38983:18</p> <p>suspicious [1] - 38977:18</p> <p>suspicious [1] - 38851:2</p> <p>sustainable [1] - 39000:9</p> <p>swayed [1] - 38974:15</p> <p>sweat [2] - 38846:15, 38847:13</p> <p>swinging [1] - 38891:9</p> <p>sworn [2] - 38898:9, 38899:5</p> <p>synopsis [2] - 38962:25, 39008:6</p> <p>synthesis [1] - 38835:5</p> | <p>taped [1] - 38933:24</p> <p>tardy [1] - 38882:8</p> <p>task [1] - 38852:1</p> <p>tasks [2] - 38955:13, 39014:21</p> <p>Tdr[2] - 38829:5, 38937:1</p> <p>Technician[1] - 38828:13</p> <p>technique [1] - 38840:2</p> <p>teenaged [1] - 38959:18</p> <p>telephone [3] - 38924:10, 38990:9, 39005:11</p> <p>television [5] - 38885:11, 38890:13, 38891:18, 38905:19, 38905:25</p> <p>ten [1] - 38901:24</p> <p>tended [3] - 38877:6, 38920:1, 38942:14</p> <p>tendered [3] - 38866:21, 39019:8, 39020:16</p> <p>tension [2] - 39002:15, 39003:8</p> <p>term [2] - 38901:15, 38902:17</p> <p>terms [16] - 38865:11, 38896:1, 38929:4, 38929:8, 38933:12, 38937:22, 38937:23, 38940:9, 38950:2, 38963:14, 38963:25, 38970:20, 38975:5, 38992:2, 38993:13, 39016:24</p> <p>test [15] - 38859:7, 38859:18, 38859:19, 38928:18, 38933:6, 38933:11, 38945:17, 39000:20, 39001:9, 39001:12, 39001:18, 39001:19, 39002:15, 39002:17, 39002:20</p> <p>tested [2] - 38945:5, 38978:3</p> <p>testified [10] - 38836:9, 38852:4, 38895:13, 38918:4, 38922:18, 38922:25, 38927:18, 38956:14, 39012:17, 39021:19</p> <p>testify [4] - 38860:23, 38860:24, 38974:12, 39018:10</p> <p>testifying [1] - 38921:8</p> <p>Testimony[1] - 38827:14</p> <p>testimony [22] -</p> | <p>38833:6, 38852:12, 38855:14, 38857:24, 38860:3, 38864:17, 38898:10, 38918:5, 38918:14, 38919:9, 38920:2, 38920:17, 38923:20, 38924:25, 38925:22, 38926:2, 38926:6, 38927:16, 38945:5, 38992:21, 38994:10, 38997:3</p> <p>testing [5] - 38855:19, 38867:24, 39000:20, 39001:12, 39001:20</p> <p>tests [1] - 39000:16</p> <p>theft [1] - 38974:22</p> <p>theirs [2] - 38993:16, 39017:22</p> <p>theory [5] - 38850:22, 38938:7, 38939:4, 38946:18, 39020:17</p> <p>thereafter [1] - 38998:1</p> <p>therefore [6] - 38870:20, 38870:21, 38902:18, 38961:7, 38961:8, 38982:10</p> <p>thesis [3] - 38866:8, 38869:4, 38869:5</p> <p>they've [1] - 38894:20</p> <p>thinking [4] - 38871:4, 38959:25, 38974:18, 38997:21</p> <p>third [4] - 38832:7, 38954:17, 38968:13, 39003:7</p> <p>third-party [1] - 38968:13</p> <p>Thirdly[1] - 39019:3</p> <p>thoroughly [1] - 38890:3</p> <p>thoughts [3] - 38831:22, 38831:25, 38916:14</p> <p>thousand [1] - 38874:24</p> <p>threat [5] - 38860:19, 38860:22, 38907:8, 38916:21, 38917:2</p> <p>threaten [2] - 38860:8, 38861:25</p> <p>threatened [6] - 38860:11, 38860:12, 38861:9, 38891:10, 38912:10, 38916:19</p> <p>threats [1] - 38862:12</p> <p>three [9] - 38841:1, 38880:2, 38882:16, 38903:3, 38962:22, 38967:20, 38970:9, 38970:14, 38986:18</p> | <p>threshold [3] - 38971:13, 38984:2, 38984:19</p> <p>throat [2] - 38914:19, 38914:23</p> <p>throw [1] - 38907:8</p> <p>thrust [2] - 38864:2, 38878:14</p> <p>Tidsbury[1] - 38924:9</p> <p>tied [1] - 38880:12</p> <p>timetable [1] - 38955:1</p> <p>timing [5] - 38843:20, 38893:15, 38894:4, 38901:20, 39021:1</p> <p>tips [1] - 38990:22</p> <p>today [3] - 38926:20, 38988:9, 39009:14</p> <p>Toews[1] - 38829:11</p> <p>together [5] - 38855:1, 38855:10, 38922:18, 38923:4, 38971:8</p> <p>Tony[1] - 38828:13</p> <p>took [14] - 38835:7, 38843:2, 38858:9, 38868:4, 38883:2, 38901:18, 38908:8, 38920:13, 38925:16, 38945:11, 38956:1, 38974:24, 38991:3, 38993:15</p> <p>top [1] - 38846:9</p> <p>topic [1] - 38961:14</p> <p>Toronto[1] - 38902:9</p> <p>torture [1] - 38837:2</p> <p>total [3] - 38851:3, 38858:12, 39021:23</p> <p>totally [2] - 39017:25, 39019:6</p> <p>touch [1] - 38886:24</p> <p>touched [4] - 38859:14, 38989:12, 38990:11, 39020:9</p> <p>tough [2] - 38924:7, 38988:19</p> <p>towards [4] - 38978:1, 38981:13, 38995:3, 38997:25</p> <p>track [1] - 38883:11</p> <p>tracked [2] - 38882:24, 39007:22</p> <p>tradeoff [1] - 38920:17</p> <p>traditions [1] - 38941:13</p> <p>Transcript[2] - 38827:12, 38831:1</p> <p>transcript [17] - 38831:10, 38838:11, 38838:15, 38848:1, 38849:10, 38868:2, 38868:11, 38875:22,</p> | <p>38893:4, 38899:13, 38899:19, 38900:9, 38905:13, 38914:12, 38916:7, 38918:10, 38919:7</p> <p>transcription [1] - 39023:5</p> <p>transcripts [10] - 38838:2, 38838:18, 38838:21, 38844:23, 38845:4, 38846:3, 38846:4, 38881:16, 38895:20, 38895:22</p> <p>transfer [3] - 38901:23, 38902:6, 38902:19</p> <p>transferred [1] - 38901:25</p> <p>transpired [2] - 38876:20, 38931:23</p> <p>trash [2] - 38855:13, 38989:17</p> <p>travel [1] - 38885:22</p> <p>travesty [2] - 38886:8, 38887:20</p> <p>treated [1] - 38843:13</p> <p>treatment [6] - 38844:9, 38902:4, 38902:17, 38902:23, 38904:19, 38906:12</p> <p>trial [76] - 38833:6, 38838:4, 38838:18, 38845:3, 38846:2, 38846:4, 38848:13, 38849:4, 38850:16, 38852:4, 38860:10, 38862:18, 38862:24, 38863:14, 38863:25, 38864:6, 38864:17, 38864:18, 38865:13, 38866:21, 38867:6, 38869:2, 38869:19, 38873:9, 38874:6, 38875:17, 38875:24, 38876:9, 38876:15, 38877:17, 38878:6, 38878:11, 38879:3, 38879:16, 38881:16, 38918:3, 38918:18, 38918:24, 38920:2, 38920:8, 38920:17, 38921:9, 38923:1, 38924:12, 38924:19, 38925:1, 38926:19, 38927:15, 38927:18, 38927:20, 38929:6, 38933:5, 38933:8, 38942:15, 38945:5, 38946:20, 38961:25, 38967:13, 38968:13, 38968:14, 38985:15,</p> |
| T | | | | |
| <p>tacit [2] - 38885:14, 38890:14</p> <p>tactics [1] - 38995:16</p> <p>tailor [1] - 38840:12</p> <p>talks [7] - 38838:23, 38903:12, 38917:18, 38954:25, 38955:7, 38966:10, 39017:23</p> <p>Tallis[11] - 38829:12, 38848:1, 38865:19, 38867:9, 38939:23, 38940:6, 38941:8, 38943:4, 38943:9, 38943:25, 39019:23</p> <p>Tallis [1] - 38939:17</p> <p>tape [6] - 38930:17, 38934:4, 38934:24, 38935:5, 38935:12, 38936:4</p> | | | | |



| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| <p>38986:11, 38986:12, 38986:16, 38994:9, 38997:3, 39018:10, 39018:21, 39019:8, 39019:21, 39020:17, 39020:20, 39021:14, 39021:20, 39022:1 tried [5] - 38834:17, 38871:5, 38919:1, 38978:3, 38990:8 trigger [1] - 38850:19 triggered [1] - 38839:16 trip [7] - 38832:24, 38833:4, 38841:21, 38855:18, 38856:13, 38923:10, 39003:5 trouble [2] - 38854:9, 38991:21 true [8] - 38847:16, 38851:22, 38856:23, 38857:14, 38947:3, 38955:16, 39019:13, 39023:5 trustworthiness [1] - 38894:24 truth [16] - 38832:9, 38832:15, 38839:3, 38842:21, 38850:2, 38851:5, 38855:4, 38862:25, 38863:2, 38865:3, 38872:5, 38878:25, 38926:19, 38929:9, 38952:22, 38991:22 truthful [1] - 39002:19 truthfulness [4] - 38859:18, 38859:19, 38859:21, 39006:4 try [3] - 38872:18, 38875:13, 38924:3 trying [24] - 38834:7, 38851:8, 38851:24, 38853:6, 38854:19, 38860:19, 38862:11, 38862:12, 38863:21, 38866:20, 38867:12, 38871:12, 38873:19, 38873:24, 38878:3, 38878:13, 38887:1, 38892:19, 38915:25, 38926:14, 38932:9, 38968:18, 38976:14, 39011:1 Tuesday[1] - 38894:14 turn [2] - 38902:13, 39003:3 turned [3] - 38845:11, 38919:4, 39007:3 tv [1] - 38894:14 Tv[1] - 38839:9</p> | <p>twenties [1] - 38966:17 twice [2] - 38846:14, 38909:25 twist [1] - 38907:22 two [28] - 38832:21, 38861:19, 38881:17, 38888:2, 38889:14, 38903:2, 38907:25, 38910:11, 38918:2, 38918:3, 38931:1, 38932:16, 38935:16, 38940:15, 38949:19, 38954:9, 38960:2, 38966:4, 38969:12, 38977:6, 38977:12, 38985:1, 38986:9, 38986:24, 38996:8, 39019:4, 39019:18, 39020:5 type [5] - 38833:12, 38892:3, 38916:2, 38948:17, 38963:2 typed [1] - 38837:16 types [1] - 38894:4 typewritten [1] - 38837:21 typical [1] - 39010:24 Typically[1] - 39002:25 typically [1] - 39015:15</p> | <p>38930:6 underlined [1] - 39001:21 underpinnings [1] - 38989:9 understood [4] - 38869:6, 38877:14, 38987:8, 39014:8 undisputed [1] - 39019:15 unduly [1] - 39013:5 unenviable [1] - 38882:15 unfair [1] - 38882:10 unless [9] - 38853:4, 38865:15, 38877:25, 38894:20, 38937:8, 38945:7, 38988:18, 38988:21, 39021:9 unpleasant [1] - 38843:14 Unsavory [1] - 39018:6 unsavory [1] - 39018:19 unsolved [1] - 38977:1 unsuccessfully [1] - 38990:8 untold [1] - 38879:13 untruthful [1] - 39020:16 unusual [1] - 38963:24 up [49] - 38831:7, 38839:1, 38840:21, 38844:15, 38846:8, 38847:22, 38847:24, 38859:2, 38859:6, 38859:13, 38871:3, 38874:25, 38875:5, 38877:6, 38878:5, 38878:12, 38882:8, 38886:25, 38888:23, 38888:24, 38896:8, 38901:22, 38902:8, 38914:2, 38917:25, 38929:12, 38932:11, 38944:17, 38945:25, 38947:9, 38955:8, 38965:4, 38965:7, 38969:18, 38980:24, 38991:12, 38997:21, 38998:9, 38998:12, 38998:23, 38999:7, 39007:3, 39007:20, 39007:21, 39010:12, 39012:5, 39012:25, 39014:21, 39014:22 ups [1] - 39012:9 upset [1] - 38904:18 urge [1] - 38973:14</p> | <p>urging [1] - 38923:19 useful [4] - 38896:1, 38971:7, 38971:12, 39018:14 Ute [4] - 38939:17, 38940:12, 38942:11, 39018:12</p> | <p>view [21] - 38833:18, 38847:2, 38850:11, 38851:1, 38871:21, 38872:14, 38873:12, 38882:10, 38889:2, 38937:10, 38940:23, 38943:22, 38945:15, 38946:9, 38953:17, 38964:22, 38970:15, 38978:17, 39000:2, 39005:17, 39014:3 viewed [3] - 38834:12, 38979:11, 38987:23 views [2] - 38974:12, 39012:2 violence [7] - 38963:20, 38963:21, 38967:24, 38971:18, 38971:22, 38973:7, 38974:20 virtue [2] - 38863:16, 38936:9 visit [1] - 38923:14 visited [1] - 38938:16 vivid [2] - 38891:17, 38926:23 Volume [1] - 38827:22 volunteering [1] - 38834:9 vs [1] - 38989:3</p> |
| | U | | V | W |
| | <p>Um-hum [1] - 38853:1 Umm [7] - 38857:4, 38894:1, 38935:21, 38943:24, 38971:4, 39000:25, 39014:6 unable [2] - 38966:20, 39004:20 unannounced [1] - 38919:1 uncertain [2] - 39010:12, 39010:18 uncommon [1] - 38867:11 uncover [1] - 38952:21 uncovered [1] - 38882:22 under [16] - 38843:20, 38849:4, 38899:1, 38921:1, 38934:12, 38943:18, 38943:25, 38944:1, 38945:1, 38945:3, 38945:5, 38945:10, 38975:16, 38981:14, 39001:8, 39015:6 Under [1] - 39018:6 undergo [2] - 38928:17,</p> | | <p>V1 [6] - 38966:11, 38966:16, 38966:20, 38969:19, 38970:12, 38986:12 V10 [12] - 38949:19, 38949:20, 38949:24, 38969:14, 38969:25, 38971:21, 38971:23 V2 [4] - 38966:22, 38969:19, 38970:12, 38986:12 V3 [3] - 38969:19, 38970:12, 38986:12 V4 [2] - 38975:8 V5 [6] - 38949:14, 38962:20, 38969:20, 38971:10 V7 [1] - 38969:23 V8 [1] - 38969:23 valid [2] - 39004:21, 39006:25 validity [1] - 38876:22 value [1] - 39006:7 vantage [2] - 38833:10, 38993:20 various [6] - 38889:11, 38896:15, 38956:3, 38960:24, 38992:18, 39020:19 veracity [4] - 38866:15, 38879:2, 38918:24, 38945:18 verbal [1] - 39020:25 verbatim [1] - 38914:5 verdict [6] - 38872:10, 38872:14, 38872:16, 38872:21, 38874:2, 38984:14 version [1] - 39009:20 via [1] - 38895:8 Vic [1] - 38829:11 vicinity [1] - 39021:24 victim [2] - 38912:17, 38969:7 victim's [1] - 38906:22 victims [6] - 38964:13, 38971:6, 38971:11, 38972:8, 38973:10, 39012:15</p> | <p>wait [1] - 38965:20 waiting [1] - 38953:23 walking [1] - 38966:12 wallet [3] - 38919:17, 38919:19, 38919:20 Walters [1] - 38848:10 wants [2] - 38848:17, 38885:19 warn [1] - 38869:7 warranted [1] - 38883:11 Watson [6] - 38868:3, 38875:3, 38898:23, 38928:15, 38929:22, 38930:5 weapon [4] - 38833:12, 38963:19, 38983:4, 39002:25 weapons [1] - 39003:2 web [1] - 38927:24 wedded [1] - 39007:23 Wednesday [2] - 38827:21, 38910:9 week [3] - 38885:23, 38893:10, 38898:11 weeks [1] - 38883:2 weigh [1] - 38984:18</p> |



| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| <p>weight [5] - 38836:16, 38851:25, 38869:24, 38960:11, 38988:3 whatsoever [1] - 38860:5 whereabouts [1] - 38909:9 whereby [1] - 38869:9 whodunit [1] - 38977:17 whole [3] - 38854:18, 38901:3, 38901:5 widely [2] - 38871:18, 38913:24 widely-covered [1] - 38871:18 wider [2] - 39007:15, 39014:1 wife [1] - 39005:23 William [1] - 38885:16 Williams [37] - 38829:14, 38830:3, 38831:5, 38831:7, 38844:16, 38846:7, 38858:25, 38868:3, 38875:4, 38880:3, 38882:19, 38882:21, 38883:9, 38883:14, 38883:18, 38886:25, 38903:22, 38916:7, 38931:20, 38955:10, 38955:20, 38955:24, 38956:9, 38956:13, 38956:16, 38956:18, 38957:18, 38959:24, 38965:24, 38973:19, 38987:6, 38998:25, 38999:19, 39005:11, 39005:13, 39005:19, 39006:6 Wilson [151] - 38829:6, 38831:9, 38832:16, 38833:2, 38833:23, 38834:6, 38834:15, 38835:12, 38836:2, 38838:11, 38838:20, 38839:22, 38840:7, 38841:10, 38842:7, 38842:14, 38842:18, 38843:6, 38845:19, 38846:8, 38846:23, 38847:1, 38848:13, 38849:19, 38849:25, 38850:20, 38851:7, 38852:4, 38852:6, 38852:8, 38852:23, 38854:13, 38855:9, 38856:12, 38856:16, 38856:20, 38857:10, 38857:11, 38858:3,</p> | <p>38858:8, 38858:12, 38859:1, 38859:6, 38860:14, 38863:11, 38863:12, 38864:4, 38864:11, 38865:9, 38865:14, 38865:18, 38865:25, 38866:13, 38867:5, 38868:11, 38868:15, 38868:21, 38870:4, 38870:12, 38870:19, 38871:15, 38872:8, 38872:12, 38873:4, 38873:5, 38873:16, 38874:6, 38875:1, 38875:4, 38875:8, 38875:23, 38876:8, 38876:15, 38877:8, 38877:25, 38879:7, 38880:21, 38880:23, 38883:20, 38918:8, 38918:16, 38919:14, 38919:15, 38919:19, 38919:25, 38920:2, 38923:22, 38924:19, 38925:3, 38925:4, 38925:8, 38925:9, 38925:12, 38925:18, 38925:21, 38926:2, 38926:5, 38926:8, 38926:12, 38926:13, 38928:16, 38928:17, 38928:24, 38928:25, 38929:4, 38929:16, 38929:22, 38930:5, 38930:15, 38930:19, 38930:24, 38931:17, 38931:24, 38932:11, 38932:21, 38933:19, 38934:4, 38934:13, 38934:14, 38934:21, 38935:4, 38940:4, 38940:7, 38941:5, 38942:7, 38942:9, 38953:6, 38953:7, 38959:12, 38989:1, 38989:21, 38990:4, 38990:18, 38990:24, 38991:16, 38991:25, 38992:21, 38994:10, 38996:3, 38996:6, 38996:12, 38998:9, 38998:10, 38998:12, 38998:16, 39000:17, 39001:1, 39001:18, 39003:23 Wilson's [38] - 38836:7, 38841:5, 38844:8, 38844:15, 38845:24, 38847:18, 38855:6, 38855:21, 38856:10, 38866:6, 38870:16,</p> | <p>38875:14, 38876:4, 38876:12, 38878:5, 38878:11, 38878:16, 38920:2, 38924:25, 38925:10, 38935:9, 38939:16, 38940:9, 38942:16, 38942:21, 38989:5, 38989:19, 38990:4, 38990:13, 38994:25, 38995:15, 39001:25, 39002:3, 39002:7, 39002:13, 39002:14, 39003:17, 39017:23 winding [1] - 38955:16 Winnipeg [11] - 38885:4, 38899:14, 38908:15, 38908:16, 38949:19, 38950:5, 38962:19, 38966:5, 38969:14, 38969:23, 38986:24 Winnipeg's [1] - 38950:2 Wire [1] - 38893:8 wire [1] - 38894:8 wish [5] - 38831:15, 38860:24, 38865:5, 38946:23, 38955:22 wished [2] - 38894:5, 38902:3 withdraw [1] - 38860:2 withdrawn [2] - 38950:13, 38951:5 withheld [2] - 38996:7, 38996:10 witness [20] - 38849:7, 38865:10, 38867:12, 38869:8, 38870:3, 38874:14, 38883:20, 38920:20, 38949:7, 38956:21, 38957:5, 38959:12, 38964:15, 38965:12, 38969:18, 38969:22, 38992:9, 38998:5, 38999:20, 39000:7 witness' [1] - 38870:1 Witnesses [1] - 39018:6 witnesses [19] - 38839:23, 38853:21, 38865:15, 38865:16, 38880:18, 38888:2, 38903:9, 38918:3, 38922:2, 38922:17, 38923:4, 38931:1, 38933:7, 38940:15, 38942:14, 38942:15, 38944:19, 38959:18, 38993:2</p> | <p>Wolch [12] - 38829:2, 38875:3, 38895:9, 38921:12, 38921:23, 38947:10, 38947:14, 38948:2, 38953:4, 39014:25, 39015:17, 39017:7 woman [5] - 38842:9, 38842:10, 38852:9, 38914:18, 38996:20 women [1] - 39019:18 wonder [2] - 38943:18, 38985:17 wondering [6] - 38837:23, 38837:24, 38943:21, 38965:4, 38976:18, 38977:12 word [8] - 38878:6, 38899:16, 38911:7, 38913:2, 38913:8, 38913:9, 38977:9, 38984:7 wording [2] - 38900:8, 38912:11 words [22] - 38842:20, 38842:21, 38867:9, 38870:18, 38878:7, 38906:4, 38913:14, 38913:17, 38913:19, 38914:4, 38915:7, 38934:23, 38944:9, 38976:5, 38980:14, 38984:21, 38984:25, 38987:2, 38991:21, 39000:3, 39008:22, 39017:22 wrap [3] - 38889:19, 39010:12, 39010:21 wrapping [1] - 38997:21 write [1] - 38831:14 writes [1] - 38948:20 writing [2] - 38973:12, 39015:2 written [7] - 38832:10, 38931:22, 38932:5, 38932:12, 38958:16, 38999:8, 39015:7 Wrongful [1] - 38827:3</p> | <p>38847:6, 38867:6, 38874:5, 38885:15, 38890:15, 38891:17, 38902:23, 38933:2, 38933:13, 38934:15, 38940:14, 38971:20, 38977:7 yesterday [7] - 38831:10, 38837:3, 38842:17, 38879:17, 38885:19, 38949:13, 39014:24 yourself [2] - 38977:3, 38977:4 youthful [1] - 38869:8 Yup [1] - 39011:8</p> |
| Z | | | | |
| <p>zero [1] - 38838:13 zeroed [1] - 39017:18</p> | | | | |
| X | | | | |
| <p>X's [1] - 39003:4</p> | | | | |
| Y | | | | |
| <p>year [1] - 38917:12 years [14] - 38836:8,</p> | | | | |

