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

## CALVIN FORRESTER TALLIS, continued:

## BY MR. HODSON:

Q
A
Q
Morning, Mr. Tallis.
Morning.
When we adjourned yesterday we were talking about the factors that went into your advice to Mr.

Milgaard about whether or not he should testify, and $I$ just want to cover a few more areas there.

As well, $I$ think when we went through your
interview, when we went through your interview with Mr. Milgaard and went through what he told you, I think as well you provided some commentary about how some of that information might be prejudicial to him if he were to testify, but I'm wondering if we can just try and capture that. Start off with first of all, and
you've already talked about this, but your assessment of how David Milgaard would handle questions not only from you but from the prosecutor, and apart from the substance of the answers -- and I think you've already told us that
on a number of them his answer would be "I don't know" in trying to explain why he did things -but apart from the substance, what was your assessment of how -- the manner in which you thought he would answer some tough questions, that -- how the jury might view that, and did you do a mock cross-examination of him to try and get a sense of how he might be perceived by the jury? Well I did not engage in a robust cross-examination of him, and my questioning was conducted with what $I$ will call civility, because I think that fairly describes it. But $I$ did realize, from the questions $I$ asked and indicated that would be asked of him, that he would come across as having difficulty in answering the questions, and of course answers like "I don't know" or "I don't remember", while perfectly truthful, can convey a different impression, and $I$ thought that when taxed in a robust cross-examination it could well portray that type of situation. Once again -- and I hesitate to use the term -- but from my experience at the time $I$ did have gut reactions to things -- and $I$ think probably most counsel would either use that word or different words to convey the same meaning --
but that, essentially, is the advantage that $I$ had at that stage, in trying to make the assessment with him. And of course, as I've already told you, I discussed the options that were available to him, and then the rest followed from that. I don't know whether that answers your question in sufficient detail or not, -Yes it does.
-- but I don't want to be too long-winded. No, and $I$ think it raises an interesting point, that you have a client who is innocent, telling you he is innocent, and you are proceeding on that basis, and that you have no doubt would tell the truth when he testified, $I$ think you've told us that; correct?

Yes.
You had no reason --
Well the best illustration of that is, you know, the purpose in stopping the lady, you know, what did he have in mind, and he would have said "well I must say that $I$ looked her over with a view to robbing her or snatching her purse", but I've gone through that with you.

So again, just back on the point, that someone who tells you he is innocent, and is presented to tell
the truth and you believe he will tell the truth, but that at the end of the day his evidence, $I$ think you are telling us, would end up hurting his own case and helping the Crown case by him telling the truth?

Yes. Yes. I always thought that, as a counsel, one had a duty to explain the options to a client, but more than explaining the options, as $I$ said yesterday, $I$ thought a person in that situation was entitled to my frank assessment of the situation. And that, of course, was based on my knowledge of the components of the case and, also, my knowledge of the type of questions that would be put to him, and that was largely based on my general experience as well as my experience in that particular setting.

If we can then move on as well, and $I$ just want to touch on each of these in this area, we've talked about them already, but you also told us that you felt there was a risk that, if David Milgaard testified, that he might, despite your efforts and his efforts, but that he might put his character in issue through inadvertently bringing his character into issue by answering a question with words like "well, I'm not the type of person who
would do that". I think you described, and I
think you told us that that was a risk, that if that were to happen it would open up an area where you felt damaging evidence would then be presented through your own witness, Mr. Milgaard, but possibly opening up an area for the Crown to call some other evidence; is that fair?

Yes. I think I've generally covered that earlier, but if you'd like me to go into it --

No, I think unless you would want to add anything to that --

A

Q

A
$Q$
No, I don't think $I$ can usefully add anything to what $I$ told you earlier in these proceedings. And in addition to what you knew $I$ think you told us, based on what you knew from your interview with Mr. Milgaard, that in and of itself caused you pause? I think, in other words, that you felt that, if character were an issue, it would be damaging; is that fair?

Yes. And $I$ thought that this can be opened up by answers to questions on cross-examination, and -Now we know in this Inquiry what Mr. Caldwell had in this area by way of information, and $I$ think I've shown some of it to you, and I think it's fair to say that he had information about David's
background that you didn't have. And would that be something, at the time, that you might have anticipated or thought about, knowing that Dr. McDonald had interviewed Mr. Milgaard, that Mr. Caldwell might well have his own damaging information that you are not aware of? Yes. And David had, $I$ think, been quite candid with me about his difficulties, and that includes any conflict with the law.

If we can then turn to the drug use, and you've talked about that a bit, and I think what you have told us, that it was a two-edged sword, on the one hand if you could use it to discredit Wilson, John, and Cadrain, that would be fine, but the risk was that the jury might, knowing that David was in the same group as these people, might, even though there was no evidence of alcohol and drug use on the morning of the murder, might somehow associate the drug use with him?

And I take it, if you called Mr. Milgaard to testify, that you would expect Mr. Caldwell to spend some time with his drug use, much as you did with the Crown witnesses?

A
I think that that's a fair assessment on your
part.
Q
And I take it there'd be a risk, then, with the jury drawing an adverse inference about the type of person Mr. Milgaard was, and $I$ think you made a comment earlier about trying to keep out some of this extraneous evidence, because the real issue was whether or not he had committed the crime as opposed to what type of person he was?

That's correct.
I now want to go through, and $I$ think you told us when we went through this that there would be -or when you gave advice to Mr. Milgaard, you told him that he would end up confirming some facts that were incriminating that had been led in the Crown's case; is that correct?

Yes.
And I just want to go through those. I think there's -- I've got nine points here. The first one would be the discussion about travelling from Regina to Saskatoon, the discussion in the car between Ron and David about breaking and entering and robbing, or break and enters and purse snatchings to finance the trip, and $I$ think you've told us you don't remember David telling you that?

A No. And $I$ would have taken the position that, I'm
sure, that this was off limits.
Okay. But putting aside, putting that aside for the moment, in fact $I$ think you were able to keep that out; is that --

That's right.
So assuming --
And that's why $I$ made the comment "off limits", because my argument would have been that since it has been ruled inadmissible as part of the Crown's case, I would have argued that it ought not to be a subject of cross-examination.
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
And $I$ think you may have told us that, if you called David, you would lead the evidence about what he thought about the robbing or the purse snatching when they approached the woman?

A Yes.

Is it possible that that evidence might have opened up discussions earlier in the trip about their intentions?

I think that it might well have.
So just on this point, the fact that -- and again,
I appreciate you don't recall David confirming or denying this, but if in fact he had -- in other words that there was no dispute that he and Ron Wilson discussed break and enters and purse snatchings, if Mr. Milgaard was called and if the evidence was otherwise admissible, I take it that he may end up confirming what Mr. Wilson had to say about the subject --

Well --
-- and making what was otherwise inadmissible admissible?

A
Well I'm not sure that, I can't say that he would have gone that far without the benefit of my notes now, but the mere asking of the question creates an atmosphere that is not helpful.

Okay. If we could now turn to the issue of the knife, $I$ think you've told us that Mr. Milgaard would confirm that he had a knife, although a different knife than the one identified by Wilson and John, --

A Yes.
Q
-- and that, also, he couldn't find the knife, in other words he couldn't produce the one that he had in the car?

No, he didn't know what had happened to it.
And so I guess in some respects, although he would say it was a different knife, he would confirm for the jury that he had a knife and perhaps lend some credibility to Wilson and John when they say they observed a knife?

A

Q people in his car stopped a woman for directions in an area in the vicinity -- and $I$ use that term and I'll come back to that -- in the vicinity of where Gail Miller's body was found. And $I$ think what you have told us is that he couldn't deny that it was in that area, and that it was generally on the west side between $20 t h$ and $22 n d$ Street, and he wouldn't be able to say it wasn't there; is that fair?

A
Yes. We couldn't, we just couldn't pinpoint the avenues.

And if Mr. Caldwell had taken out a map and, much as you did, and asked him to point out where they went, that he went through 20 th to $22 n d$ Street, up and down the avenues, would you have a concern that the jury might conclude that he was in the vicinity of Avenue $N$ and Avenue $O$ ?

Well that, of course, was part of my concern, and I knew that questions would be directed to that area.

And then, number 4, he would confirm that their vehicle got stuck after -- and, again, whether it was blocks or shortly after -- but after they met the lady for directions, he would confirm that part of Wilson and John's evidence, and that he -and that that location would be, again, in the vicinity of where Gail Miller's body was found? In other words he couldn't deny that it was there, he couldn't say it was, but again between 20 th and 22 nd Street and on one of the avenues; is that fair?

A Yes. "Vicinity", I used it in a very general sense.

Q Yeah. And that he would dispute, however, Mr. Wilson's evidence that he was gone for 10 or 15 minutes and he would say "for a short while", so
he would confirm that he left the car but he would dispute for how long; correct?

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
2

A
$Q$

A

Q
And then eight, that he would confirm the evidence of Wilson and John that he in fact did throw the compact out of the car and his answer would be I
don't know where it came from and $I$ don't know why I threw it out?

A

Q
strengthen the Crown's case by reason of some of the evidence being confirmatory of significant matters that had been advanced by the Crown. And just on that point, given that your tact with Wilson, John, Melnyk and Lapchuk and even Cadrain was to say that they were unsavoury characters, therefore, jury, view their evidence with some doubt, would the fact that your own client, if he testified and confirmed some of that, would that undermine, to some extent, your ability to say these people shouldn't be believed?

I think so.
We talked about the police statements, you brought that $u p$ yesterday, that the first statement David gave the police, it's 305273 , and $I$ think you referred yesterday to your concerns about some of the answers that he gave in that statement:
"Q Were you in Saskatoon this year?
A Maybe.
Q When would you have been in Saskatoon?
A I'm not sure."
And I think you told us that his evidence would be that he knew he was in Saskatoon and he knew when he was there; is that correct?

A
Yes, I already -- I mentioned that to you I think
earlier.
Q
And just generally on the statement, $I$ think you told us you had concerns that he would be cross-examined, $I$ think, in a robust manner about not only what he said to the police, but how he said it and also what he didn't tell the police; is that fair?

That's correct.
And is it fair to say, we went through the statement in detail, that you had concerns that his initial statement to the police of March 3rd, 1969 might end up being damaging evidence against him because of what he said, how he said it and what he didn't say?

A
Q That's correct.

Now, next $I$ want to turn to the, just the last point, and that would be if Mr. Milgaard testified what evidence he would add to the mix; in other words, what evidence would he give that was not presently before the jury that might be damaging, and the two points $I$ think that you brought up were, number one, that David Milgaard told you when he approached the woman that he had thoughts of robbing the woman or snatching her purse, or words to that effect, when he approached her.

Now, that evidence did not come out at trial; correct?

A
Q
That's correct.
And if Mr. Milgaard would have been called, I think you told us you would lead that because undoubtedly it would come out in Mr. Caldwell's cross-examination and you would want to take the sting out of it?

Yes.
And so again, and I think you've told us that that evidence would not be helpful to Mr. Milgaard's case?

No, and I thought that that would be explored or expanded upon in the context of what had been said about lack of money and so forth, but here again, I don't want to repeat what I've already told you. Sure. And the other point $I$ think you told us, and again there may be others that fall into this category of evidence that he would add to the mix, were the pants that he changed out of that morning that allegedly had the blood on them and the fact that he was not able to find them and the fact that he couldn't find his knife, for example, that that would be something that would be before the jury that Mr. Caldwell would be allowed to
cross-examine him and say, well, you know, why don't you have the pants, you know, do you have your other clothes, where are these pants and the knife, etcetera, and may be an inference that he had them and wasn't providing them; is that fair? Yes, that's a fair assessment, and I'm sure was a factor that $I$ considered.

And I suppose we then weigh, or you did, I think, told us you then weighed that, the risks with the benefits, and $I$ take it the benefits of having him testify would be that the jury would hear him get on the stand and say I did not kill Gail Miller? That's correct.

Which would be an important thing to have your client say?

Oh, yes. That's why these decisions are never easy and this one wasn't easy, and that is, wasn't easy for him, and yet $I$ felt that $I$ couldn't shirk my duty or abdicate my duty to discuss it with him and give him advice on the matter for his consideration.

Q And I think you told us earlier that based on these factors, you had sort of come to the conclusion, weighing everything that your advice was, that he should not testify, that he would
damage his case?
A
Yes, and he would strengthen the Crown case in some material respects, so $I$ guess we're talking about the same thing really.

And at that time, Mr. Tallis, I think you've told us you had been through a number of trials, jury trials before, and presumably would have had to face this same decision in those cases?

Yes. I can't tell you the number of times $I$ faced
it, but $I$ know that $I$ had had to face it quite a few times, both before and after this.

I understand at around this time, or actually maybe even a year or two prior, the Supreme Court heard a reference regarding the Steven Truscott case; is that correct?

A
Q

A
Yes.
And had you looked into that case at all and did that in any way influence your thinking with respect to this matter?

I had taken more than a passing interest in the Truscott case long before $I$ was ever briefed on this and $I$ recall that $I$ read the book by Madam LeBourdais I believe her name is, I may be mispronouncing it, but $I$ 'm not doing it disrespectfully, I read that book, and then I also
read the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada on the reference, and from reading that particular report and noticing that Mr. Truscott had been called to give evidence before the court, I appreciated what can happen with respect to a witness, and particularly a relatively youthful witness. I say that because without revisiting the actual case and going through the details, I recall that $I$ believe a majority of the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada disbelieved him on the basis of his testimony and pointed out a number of matters which, in my view, taken individually, didn't amount to that much, but when looked at globally or collectively led to the finding of disbelief.

Now, of course each case is different, but $I$ just mentioned that to you when you were going through this matter with me because I was very aware, with respect to matters of this kind, and $I$ have no doubt, on reflection, that $I$ couldn't help but notice that his lead counsel on that inquiry, or reference, was one of the giants of the Canadian criminal bar, Mr. Arthur Martin, who $I$ didn't know personally at that time, but later got to know.

Q

A

Q
A
Q
A
And this certainly wasn't a factor in any real sense of the word, but you do lose the last word to the jury if you call evidence, but that in no way really affects an assessment of this nature where you have a person that can, in good conscious, give evidence, but $I$ just mention that because that is a factor that $I$ knew some counsel placed great stock in it. I viewed it as sort of a very subsidiary consideration in this case. Okay. If we could call up 153470, please, and this is a document that we have not looked at yet and this is your summation at the preliminary hearing, your argument that you made at the conclusion of the evidence going in before Magistrate Cumming to have the case dismissed, and I just want to go through parts of it.
and I take it, Mr. Tallis, that the points you would have been making here at the preliminary hearing would be similar arguments that you would then also be making at trial?

Yes. I haven't viewed it in that context, but I'm sure you are quite correct. I think I glanced over this, but never really read it, if you know what $I$ mean.

Sure. We'll maybe just go through it, and number one --

A

Q

A
Q
You may well have had a written submission as well.

A Yeah, I must have had something written out.

Q
A
So here, number one that you raise is the time element:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { "I ask you to consider that in weighing } \\
& \text { that matter." }
\end{aligned}
$$

And then you go on about the time, 20 to 7, and I think essentially saying again, and you've alluded to this earlier, that this offence could not have been committed by Mr. Milgaard during the time frame that it was alleged to have -- or that it could have happened; is that fair?

Yes, $I$ think that's a fair reading of.
Number two, you say that you have Wilson's evidence that his car was never in the east-west alley or the one running north and south, and then Diewold's evidence that the car was in there for 10 minutes at the relevant time, and $I$ think what you are saying there is that that couldn't have been Ron Wilson's car because he was driving it and he testified it was never in there, and the Crown's case was that that car must have been, that the perpetrator of the crime must have been, or likely was in that car; is that correct?

A
Okay. If we can just --
Maybe even typed out.

A
$Q$ Yes.

And then again you go back to the time element about the girl obviously had been handled quite a lot, and then $I$ think again you've touched on that.

And then to the next page, you raised the secretor issue at the preliminary hearing as a basis to have the case dismissed, and you say:

```
"The seminal fluid that was tested by
Mr. Painter indicated that person in the
    initial test was group A, but a
    secretor, as distinct from a
    non-secretor. The Crown suggests the
    possibility that some of the accused's
blood is in the seminal fluid. This
possibility is put forward to diminish a
piece of evidence, a piece of scientific
evidence which initially would
completely eliminate David. The Crown
can't be heard to say there's a
probability it was his blood in the
seminal fluid. The doctor suggests it
could be from the onset of menstrual
flow, or from a vaginal irritation, or
possibly from the accused, if he is
```

```
bleeding himself internally, or
externally."
```

So at the preliminary hearing is it fair to say that you were trying to rely on the frozen semen and the secretor issue argument to say that David was eliminated as a suspect and that the case ought to be dismissed at the preliminary hearing? Yes.

On that basis?
Yes.
Next if we can go to 031255 -- there's nothing further on that document -- 031255. This is the affidavit that accompanied your address to the jury and it appears that it was January, the week of January 13, 1992 this was done. It's my understanding that the typed version of your address to the jury was typed up in January of 1992 from some shorthand notes and it was done for the purposes of the Supreme Court reference and your giving evidence there; is that correct? Yes, it was certainly prepared for the Supreme Court reference. I didn't take it as being prepared for the purpose of my evidence. Okay, sorry. That it was prepared for those proceedings?

A Yes. I must say, one of the court reporters phoned me to see if $I$ had a copy of my jury address, but of course $I$ explained that $I$ didn't have one, and secondly, even though $I$ know that $I$ had it drafted out, I tried, and I think I usually succeeded, in not reading a jury address, you have the points there and try to deal with it in a much more extemporaneous fashion looking directly at the jury rather than reading it with your head down on the lectern.

If we could go to 031265 . I just want to go through parts of this, Mr. Tallis, we've already referred to some parts, and the entire document is in as an exhibit. Just down at the bottom, this is page 7 of your address, you talk about the time element, and $I$ take it, Mr. Tallis, that that would have been -- if $I$ were to ask you what were some of your main arguments before the jury as to what you were putting forward to persuade them that David ought to be acquitted, would the time element be one of them?

A
Yes, it was, and, you know, that was focused on throughout the trial as well.

And then the next page, and I appreciate that there's some breaks in the transcript, but you
start off:
"First of all --"
And this is on the time element,
"-- you have the deceased located in one site and you have a key and comb located ... you have purse and contents. You have a sweater and boot. You have a cosmetic bag, or you could call them contents of a purse.

Now, I want to refer to that because if my learned friend is correct in the theory that he has propounded as to how these things got in these various places."

And just pause there. And we've already heard this in evidence, that various items belonging to Gail Miller were found in and around the alley, the sweater was buried, a boot was buried, the purse was in a garbage can and some other things were found in and around that. You say:
"You have, in my submission, a . . time element and of course you have this business of allegedly taking the boot, taking the sweater and burying them in a particular spot, a somewhat pointless
thing in my own opinion.
If the motive is . . . why
worry about a boot being buried where it was, why worry about a sweater being buried where it was, but these things, in my submission, involve a great deal of time, much more time than my learned friend suggested to you.

And there is nothing to
indicate here that this . . . was . . . or buried or anything like that to the site. There is no zigzag pattern of foot marks or anything like that leading up to the places, and this is something that we ask you to analyze very carefully ..."

So pause there. That would be a summary then of your, of that point. Can you elaborate on anything there, Mr. Tallis?

A
No. I think that indicates that it was certainly a focus on the time element, and lack of time $I$ guess $I$ should say in which to commit the homicide.

Q
And then here's where you deal with the cosmetic bag, or the compact.

A Yes.
Q And you say:
"Now, my learned friend in his very able way, said I anticipate counsel for the . . . will say something about the bag."

Let me just pause there. At that time Mr.
Caldwell would have known that you didn't cross-examine any of the witnesses about -Yes.
-- the cosmetic bag and may have sensed that you had a problem in how you approached that; is that fair?

I don't know what was going on in his mind, I just don't. I may have sensed something at that time, but --

Anyway, you say:
"Now, members of the jury, I think you would be surprised if $I$ did not. And in
that connection, $I$ am not going to
bother opening the exhibits, you can do
this. But $I$ do suggest to you that you
take this little cosmetic bag or
container and examine what is in there."
And this is Gail Miller's, one of the exhibits.
"You won't find just one lipstick or two lipsticks, the duplication which my learned friend suggested. You will find several. As I say, I am not going to open it all up and wave them in front of you. And then in addition to that you will find another little container, plastic with a sort of . . . on the back of it and there is a form of the cosmetic here in this area, and perhaps my friend was out of order in suggesting that you defer to the female member of your jury on matters of this kind. I gather throughout the course of the trial that some of the male participants here were as not as informed as they might have been on matters of this kind. But ... I invite you to consider that very carefully, and also consider the question of the purse, the contents of the purse, and then ask yourselves, when you examine that, bearing in mind the alleged dimensions of this other
so-called compact is it reasonable, is
it probable that there was in fact
another compact or cosmetic bag as is alleged in this particular case?" And so would that be a fair summary then of your approach to the evidence that David Milgaard threw a cosmetic bag or compact out of the car? Yes, and it essentially too was a response to the way Mr. Caldwell I think had gone about it. If we can go to the next page, and again here's where you talk about the condition of the body and the clothing and there are -- I think $I$ can just go down to the -- here at the start involves -no, go back to where you were, please, and you say:
"A most unique situation, and $I$ never recall ... in a situation where anything like this was found. But ... look at those photographs, consider the position of the clothes, the clothes themselves ... that it points unalterably to the fact that someone got the coat off the that girl ... got the coat off, got the dress down off the arms and after this ... then the stabbing must have taken place and the ... the stabbing in the back must have been, in my submission,
have taken place after the coat had been put back on, and this is why $I$ suggest to you it is such a unique situation." And then you talk about the slash marks, and then over to the next page, then carry on:
"Now you may say, well, these things were ... larger, and you may well say that to yourself and you may be saying that to me now, silently, but $I$ say this to you, because once again we must go back to the time element ... among other things, and $I$ ask you to bear them in mind because these are matters which you, as men and women of the world can consider and apply your common sense to. They are things that are there. And there are other factors which I suggest are important in connection with the time element."

Then you go on to talk about the boot being a distance from the body of significance. So again this would be back to the point that -- and you've touched on this a bit earlier, that whoever killed Gail Miller would have had to take her coat off, take her dress down, have her coat
back on, raped her presumably, somewhere in there put the coat back on and then stab her and then grab the sweater and the boot, bury it in the snow, put the purse in the garbage can, is that fair, and you are trying to say compare that with the time that David Milgaard would have been away from the vehicle?

That's correct, raising the impossibility of it having been committed as alleged or, at the very least, the improbability of it having been done in the manner alleged.

Then the next page, again you just make reference to the angle of the stab marks, that they are consistent with having been inflicted by a right-handed person, and evidence before the Court was David was left-handed; is that correct?

A
Q
Yes.
And again on the next page, this is again you are referring to some of Dr. Emson's evidence:
"I don't think he could, on the
evidence, it is unreasonable to suggest
that such a dreadful thing could happen
in such a short period of time."
Again, back to the time element.
Then down at the bottom of the
page you talk about the weather $I$ think and the condition of the body and the theory that the attack took place where the body was found and you say:
"... this may cause you a great deal of concern in deciding whether or not you can find beyond a reasonable doubt that this sexual attack started and was finished there."

And again, if it had not started and finished there, that would eliminate David Milgaard as a perpetrator based on the evidence against him; is that fair?

Yes.
And then the next page, once again you mention back to the time factor which is of the utmost importance, and then to the next page, you spend some time here:
"... let's deal with the conduct of David on the morning in question."

And then $I$ think this is based upon the evidence that was adduced from the Danchuks and the Rasmussens and the service station people; is that correct?

A Yes.

And you call them "average, everyday citizens," you don't say that disrespectfully, "who go about their daily work," and:
"... these are not the people who really looked for things therefore they don't see them. Now, just ask yourself, is that reasonable?"

I think you are referring to Mr. Caldwell's comments?

A
$Q$
And:
"I invite you to consider the
observations of Mr. Rasmussen ..."
The type of man, etcetera, and the Danchuks, and I think you end up comparing the Rasmussens and the Danchuks of the world to Wilson, John and Cadrain and Melnyk and Lapchuk and saying believe the Danchuks and Rasmussens over what these other people say; is that fair?

A
Yes. I think that was a fair assessment of the appeal to them.

Q
And the next page, $I$ don't think we need to go through it, but again you spend some time about the Danchuks and their observations. And then onto the next page you say, and this is with
respect to the Danchuks:
"Now, first of all $I$ invite you to consider this pretty carefully because I suggest when a stranger comes to your door, comes to your place at 7:30 in the morning, 8:00 in the morning with a group and you have never seen them before, you take a pretty careful look. And if they say they're from out of the city, you perhaps then scrutinize a little more carefully."

And then just at the bottom:
"Well I suggest to you that their appearance at the Danchuks leads to this conclusion, that there is no suggestion that David appears unusual; nothing unusual about his demeanour or about his speech, nothing -- and this is quite important -- nothing unusual about the other two. And Mrs. Danchuk, as I understand it, said that they were dressed like school kids."

What would be your, the reason for bringing up the fact that there was nothing observed unusual about Ron Wilson and Nichol John?

A

Q

A

Q
A

Q

A

Well the -- this was essentially the observations that the Danchuks had made. I think that that was a fair assessment of their testimony. And David, was acting no differently than the other two, essentially, and so they were collectively kids with nobody standing out like a sore thumb, if I may use that term.

Would you be trying to draw an inference that, if Nichol John had just witnessed a murder or if Ron Wilson had just been told that she had witnessed a murder and that she had been hysterical ten minutes earlier, that the Danchuks might have noticed something?

Well, yes. And, you know, their demeanour was described $I$ think by the Danchuks in the way in which they did and there was nothing untoward that they observed, even though Mr. Danchuk, I think, was somewhat curious as to what they were doing there that hour of the morning, --

And --
-- particularly when he found out that they were from out of town.

Now we'll go through the next page, and $I$ won't read through it.

You know, and $I$ mention that because $I$ think it
was one of the truck operators, tow truck operators or something, he had made a note of their number, number -- licence number. And all I'm saying, in effect, is that there was nothing that aroused the suspicion of Mr. and Mrs. Danchuk.

Q
And if we can go to the next page -- and $I$ won't read through it -- but there is a number of pages here, Mr. Tallis, where you talk about the Danchuks in particular, with -- and Mr. Rasmussen; would that have been an important part of your defence, then, to the jury, their observations?

Yes. I thought that their evidence was independent and untainted evidence and I thought they came across that way as witnesses.

And then again, go to the next page, again talks about Rasmussens and Danchuks. Then to the next page. You say:
"There is no suggestion in this particular instance that David was anything but polite and soft-spoken. I think Walter Danchuk was close to all
three of them, if $I$ recollect the evidence, and as $I$ recall he said he sort of wondered what they were doing.

That is that $I$ invite you to just ask yourselves, put yourselves in Walter's shoes and say, well, maybe $I$ ought to ask what these people are doing here. Nothing unusual, no scratch marks, no signs of blood, and of course he confirms no indication of the use of alcohol or anything like that." And then, of course, you go on to the garage people. Then the next page, similar argument about what was observed there. If we can skip ahead, I've covered your submissions on Wilson, John, and Cadrain. 031287, please. Again, I don't propose to read through it, but this is your submission here where you tell the jury that, based on $I$ think the evidence from Wilson, that the toque David was wearing was a different colour than the blue toque, therefore it wasn't his. We've covered the secretor issue that -addressed to the jury on that, so I think we've covered -- actually, go to 031305. You again go through what the evidence was from the police officers about David's cooperation with them.

So I take it, Mr. Tallis, that, even though you did not call David Milgaard as a
witness, that you attempted to or were able to get evidence out from other witnesses about his conduct that morning and his conduct with the police; is that fair?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Yes.
And that in your address to the jury you would highlight that, that even though David didn't testify, here is what others said about his conduct and his cooperation; is that correct? Yes.

If we could go to 006175 , this is the charge to the jury. And I think you've told us on a couple of occasions that you would have made submissions to the trial judge during the course of the trial, or near the end, about specific directions or instructions you might be seeking from him?

Yes. And the practice -- and I, it probably happened that, even before the charge was given, that we were asked to submit any authorities on areas where we wanted -- that we wanted included in the charge. I can't recall it specifically now but, having read over the charge, $I$ think that there were likely some aspects of it where that was done.

If we go to 006179. We have been through parts of
this, $I$ think with Mr. Caldwell, and there is a part here about the credibility of witnesses, and consider their:
"... age, education and apparent
intelligence or lack of it."
And then here, consider the:

> ".. matters of character, background,
> the type of life that a person has been
> leading. His record as a citizen are again matters that you will take into consideration."

And the next page:
"I will deal a little more extensively with the particular witnesses at a later point during my remarks but it must be obvious to you that the evidence of a so called upright reputable citizen is to be preferred of that of a person who has been leading a dissolute life, a life of crime, or has been acting in such a reprehensible manner that you may consider that his evidence is suspect." Again, that would bear on the point, $I$ think you had said earlier, about comparing the Danchuks and the Rasmussens of the world to the Melnyk,

Wilson, John and Cadrains?
Yes. This sort of falls under the rubric of an unsavoury witness or unsavoury character direction, and I'm sure that's one point that, one way or the other, I had asked for a submission on it before the charge was delivered, and I'm sure that $I$ had in my brief some case authorities on that, if not case authorities a text reference. If we can go to 006192 , please. And in years that followed the completion of the criminal proceedings there was some commentary about Avenue $N$ versus Avenue $O$ and this issue, Mr. Tallis, and here is what the judge says to the jury:
"There is of course some speculation as
to which route she took on her way in
all likelihood to catch a bus. If you
look at the sketch P. you will see that
she had probably three alternative
routes. I think Mr. Caldwell suggested
two. His theory was that she came down
Avenue "N". The house in question,
which was 130 Avenue "O", is situated at
the corner of 21 st Street and Avenue
"O". She could have come down Avenue
"O", she could have come down Avenue
"N", she could have skirted through this alleyway and out at the blind end - the "T" end; it wouldn't have saved her any time, it wouldn't have saved her any distance to go down the alley, as I see it. According to the evidence she could have picked up a bus on $20 t h$ at either "O" or "N". Now, if she was the girl who was walking along the street when the car with Wilson and the accused and John stopped to make an inquiry - if she was the girl if you accept the evidence of John and Wilson that it was on a street, then you would conclude I suggest that it was either Avenue "N" or Avenue "O" that she was walking on. But of course there is nothing conclusive to demonstrate that in fact she Gail Miller was the one who ..."
was:
"... walking down the street."
And, again, did you have any difficulty with that direction?

A
Well that, of course, was an area that was related in a sense to the time factor, but as far as
taking objection to it, there are some beneficial portions in it that $I$ don't think $I$ would have wanted to end up undoing at the time.

And what would that be?

Well, particularly the statement to the jury that there was:
"... nothing conclusive to demonstrate that in fact she Gail Miller was the one who ..."
was:
"... walking down the street."
And I think that's the most significant portion

Q It -- I'm sorry?
A -- significant portion of it.
Q It was suggested by some later in, reviewing this matter, and in particular counsel on behalf of David Milgaard, later counsel, that the evidence either was clear or should have been clear that she walked down Avenue $O$, and would have walked down Avenue O, therefore the Crown's case about where they got stuck and where she got stopped is all wrong because it couldn't have been on $N$ because she walked down Avenue O. And then - I'm over-simplifying it but $I$ think are you aware, Mr.

Tallis, of that contention later, that -- the significance of Avenue O versus Avenue N? Well, I'm just trying to reflect back. I don't think this was a situation where the judge would have changed his direction on it.

Yeah. And putting aside the judge's direction for a moment, --

Yeah.
-- and I think you've touched on some of this, did
you view there to be -- or what significance did you place on the fact that Gail Miller lived on Avenue O, that the bus stop that she I think arguably normally went to was on $20 t h$ and $O$, it was 40 below, and yet the Crown's theory seemed to place her on Avenue $N$, or perhaps in the alleyway, as opposed to Avenue 0 ?

A
Well I noticed, from my original or early memo, I grasped that the most likely route would be down Avenue O. But, of course, I don't have any subsequent memoranda or notes to refresh my memory on following -- on follow-up considerations.
$Q$
A
And --
But I do recall, as $I$ told you, checking, and even making my own sketch and whatnot, about whether or not there was a back door that one could go out
of. So $I$ certainly thought that $a--$ and this is to a large extent speculative -- that it would be down -- she could go down the alley, as has been mentioned, and to a large ex -- to -- and the question of whether or not she was -- would cut over to Avenue $N$ was possible, but it too was speculative.

Okay.
I knew that people did walk down the alley because, as I told you earlier, I had interviewed a lady who had been down the alley that morning, but it was not at the relevant time frame, so she wasn't of any assistance.

Go to 006197. This is where the judge deals with Nichol John, and we spent some time yesterday going through her evidence and how it was dealt with by the judge. He says here:
"I want to deal at this time specifically with the evidence of this girl Nichol John. You heard her in the witness box. You must have got some impression of the type of character she is, the kind of a person who would go on this particular kind of a trip in the first place, the kind of a girl who
would admittedly do the things that she did in and around Regina, the fact that she was a user of drugs - those are the kind of things $I$ referred to before which you will take into consideration in assessing a person's evidence. What kind of a person are they? Are they likely to be telling the truth? Are they likely to be lying? But $I$ want to deal with it specifically and for the purpose of trying to avoid making any errors I have had a large portion of her evidence typed out by the court reporter, because as you will recollect I gave permission to Mr . Caldwell to cross-examine her on a statement that she allegedly gave to the police and I told you at the conclusion of that evidence that anything that she did not adopt at the time she gave the evidence in the witness box in that statement was not evidence against the accused." Now again at this point, Mr. Tallis, as far as this direction and the credibility or lack of credibility of Nichol John, are you able to tell
us whether, from Mr. Milgaard's perspective, you were better off to have her credible or not credible in light of her evidence?

A

Q

Well of course, if she'd maintained her position at the preliminary hearing that she didn't remember anything or didn't see anything, that's one thing, but as it unfolded, of course, I've explained to you that she certainly created the impression here that at -- at trial, that she was holding back, and $I$ think the presiding trial judge felt that way. And, as I said yesterday, I think he assessed the words "I don't remember" as not an honest "I don't remember".

Yeah. So is it fair to say, and we talked a bit about this yesterday, that if the jury were to find that Nichol John was not credible in her evidence, that the likely or perhaps the only alternative would be that the "I don't remember" was not truthful and that the un-adopted statement was really what happened?

I think there is always that risk.
Now if we go to the next --
And, as we were talking yesterday, it probably -it may well have been -- could be used to enhance the credibility of Wilson in the eyes of some.

Now if we can go to the top of this page -actually, no, next page -- and $I$ won't read through this but $I$ just want to touch on the judge then -- if we can call out the top part, please -tells the jury, and he says:
"... there were certain things which were read to her which she did admit. She admitted that she gave a statement, she admitted that it was in writing, she admitted that she had the opportunity of reading it over, she admitted that it was in narrative form, she admitted that she signed every page of it. She told you the kind of a room she was in when she gave the statement. I'm only going to pick out those parts of her testimony where she admitted that she had made a statement to the detective sergeant and admitted that those were true, because as I say you must disregard anything that she did not accept as being the truth. This question was put to her:", and then for the next five or five or six pages the judge actually read out the questions and answers where she adopted the parts of her
statement and adopted the fact that she had told the police. Now $I$ suppose one view of that might be that she was confirming for the jury "here is the only evidence that you should listen to", I suppose another theory might be that, with reinforcing with the jury that "lookit, she remembered all of these things, that it might be unlikely to accept that she didn't remember the others"; do you remember having a view on that at all about this part of the charge?

A

Q
I don't specifically remember that now, but having read it over at your request I'm certain, I'm inclined to the view that it would have had the latter effect that you mentioned.

And so, in other words, that pointing out for the jury that a good part of the statement she remembered, she remembered the room, she remembered saying it, she remembered observing it, but that certain parts of the statement she couldn't, and that that might be somewhat suspicious; is that fair?

A
Yes. It goes back to our discussion yesterday about "selective memory". I mean that's not -that's a phrase $I$ was using to try and capture the impression that may have been left.

If we can go to 006205 . And here is where the judge talks about Melnyk and Lapchuk and that evidence, and if we can go to the next page, and then $I$ think this is Melnyk he's talking about:
"And in considering that witness's evidence you will recollect that he has had considerable trouble with the authorities, that he was convicted of theft in the spring of that year and given a suspended sentence, that he is presently charged with armed robbery in Regina, that he hopes he will be able to establish an alibi and have the charges withdrawn, that he himself uses and used drugs, although he hadn't done so for a time previous to this particular incident, and that his evidence first came to light as a result of a conversation he had with Wilson about two weeks ago. Of course Wilson knew that he was going to be giving evidence in this case, he knew the story that he expected to tell at the trial of the accused and presumably he was discussing the incident with Malnyk and Malnyk said
that he Malnyk then volunteered this information which he gave in the witness box, so it seems to me the obvious conclusion is that Wilson must have gone hot-tailing it off to the police and told them about it and that's how the police were able to trace these men down and of course once they got the lead it wouldn't be too difficult to find that Lapchuk also was involved in it."

And we talked a bit about this yesterday, about -- and $I$ think the judge brought out this evidence in questioning, and $I$ think you said that that tended to undermine the position you were trying to take, that Melnyk or Lapchuk had made a deal with the police or Crown or hoped to make a deal with the police or Crown; is that fair?

A

Q

Yes, and I think I covered that yesterday.
Yeah. Then the next page. And then here is where the judge, I think, sums up:
"You may ask yourselves what would be
the motive in these persons of dubious character inculpating the accused, which they endeavored to do. You have to
consider whether the fact that they are both now charged with crimes might have something to do with it. They might have been trying to ingratiate themselves with the police, they might not. They might be telling the truth in this particular instance, they might not be telling the truth. That's entirely for you to determine."

So, again, $I$ think you had mentioned that the character of these people, you asked the judge to bring out in the direction, and it appears that he did to some extent?

Yes, I recall that, and $I$ think that that was an aspect of the charge that was favourable.

Go to page 006209. At the bottom of the page, we touched on this yesterday as well, this is the hunting knife. Again he says:
"There is evidence that the accused had two knives, a hunting knife and a paring knife. We haven't heard much about the hunting knife if he did have two knives. It might occur to you to wonder why he didn't use the heavier knife if he did use a knife at all instead of the paring
knife. If the accused did commit the murder $I$ suggest to you that the evidence is such that you might conclude ...",
actually, let me pause there about the time. Just back on the hunting knife, based on that comment there, do you see any advantage to you in introducing the hunting knife that was found in the back alley near Gail Miller's body about a month after the murder?

A
No, I think I --
$Q$
A
$Q$
You --
-- explained that to you yesterday.
Now here is where the judge talks about time:
"If the accused did commit the murder I
suggest to you that the evidence is such
that you might conclude that it was somewhere between a quarter to seven and ten minutes past seven - if he did because the girl was ready to leave the house at between twenty-five to seven and a quarter to seven and they arrived at the motel at about seven ten."

And let me just pause there. I think, actually, the evidence of Mr. Rasmussen was that it could
have been as late as 7:30, and so this time window of 6:45 to 7:10, in fact $I$ think what he says is they arrived at the motel at about 7:10, so in other words it would be probably 7:05 given that they'd have to travel to the motel; is that fair?

A
Yes, depending on the, you know, depending on the speed they drove and whether they actually - - I don't think that they knew where the Trav-a-leer Motel was, they happened to see it and pulled in there.

Okay.
There was no suggestion that David knew where it was.
$Q$
Now in your address to the jury you talk about the time element on a number of occasions. If we look at what the judge says here, and let's talk about the two end posts, if $I$ can call it.

Yeah.

He says 6:45 is when she was ready to leave, so I suppose unless the perpetrator -- well, let's go back and take the Crown theory that it's David Milgaard. Unless David Milgaard is standing at her front doorstep, there would be a time frame between 6:45 and when she left and walked down the
street, so that if we try and narrow down, based on this direction to the jury, the time frame that the actual crime could be committed, that it's -you'd have to add some minutes to 6:45; is that fair?

Yes.
And if it is the woman that was encountered for directions, and the fact that they then drove, whether it's a half a block or a bit, got out, tried to push the car out, I think the evidence was for a couple of minutes, and then David left the car, you might add another two to five minutes? In other words what $I$ am trying to do is narrow the time frame --

Yes.
-- for when David Milgaard could have contact with her, so we might be 6:50, 6:55, is that fair, maybe even $7: 00$ that he would first have the opportunity -- and, again, if we assume she was the woman that was asked for directions, the first
time after that that David Milgaard could have contact with Gail Miller would be maybe, what, $6: 55,7: 00$, based on his --

In that neighbourhood, yes.
And then the time that they would have had to
leave to go to the Trav-a-leer might be, to get there at 7:10, might be 7:05, maybe even earlier? Yes, depending on factors that we can't be sure of in terms of the driving and how, you know, how fast they were driving, and the fact that they were not specifically going to the Trav-a-leer but ended up there because it was open.

Let me just pause here for a moment. Would -and, again, did you have any quarrel at the time, back in 1970 at the time of trial, with respect to this window that the judge put in the charge to the jury; in other words, would that be in accordance with what you thought the time window might be?

Yes, I thought the -- that, on balance, the direction was favourable.

Right. In fact, he could have gone 7:20 or 7:30 based on Rasmussen's evidence, could he not? Yes.

So, on that basis, $I$ want to focus on your time element argument. You then have -- and, again, I appreciate it depends on how many minutes you add on each side -- but it looks like the longest opportunity might be 6:55 to 7:05; is that fair? Yes, yes.

Q

A
$Q$
A

A

And, arguably, you might be able to shrink that window to nothing; is that fair?

Yes.
And that would be the impossibility argument -Yes.
-- if it's nil, and the improbability argument if it's maybe 10 minutes?

Yes.
Is that fair?
Yes.
And that's where we get back to the condition of the body, the removal of the coat, putting the coat back on, the stabbing, the rape, the burying of the boot, the sweater, etcetera. And I think that's the point that you were trying to make with the jury, was it, that, based on this time window, this could not have happened; is that fair?

Because I had the question of the charge in mind. One always likes to get as favourable a charge as you can, and --

And this --
Yes
A

Yes, $I$ was trying to make that point, not only with the jury but also with the judge.

And so --
-- in the conduct of a trial, you try to achieve
that.
And for your time element argument, I think you've already told us this, this charge would be considered favourable; is that fair?

I -- that is my assessment.
Then to go to 006 --
And I think, also, I -- in fairness, I should say that the manner and tone of the direction in this respect came across as favourable.

Now on, just on the time frame, would you have -you talked about making submissions to the judge. Do you recall or are you able to tell us, based on what you -- from observing this, whether you would have gone into the judge and argued about what time window ought to be put to the jury?

I can't say that, now, without -- you know, it just, it would be unfair to all concerned if $I$ were to try to reconstruct that at this stage, I just don't know.

If we can go to 006211, please. I want to just touch on this part of the charge. If we can go up one line higher, please, it says:
"The Crown has advanced one theory ...", and this is talking about the multiple stabbings, and the judge says:
"One would have thought ...", or pardon me, let me back up:
"... advanced one theory to you that she may have been stabbed and either
rendered unconscious or killed and afterwards raped. One would have thought that if that was so that whoever did the raping would be pretty well covered with blood; and if those were the circumstances and the accused had done it surely the Danchuks even though they weren't looking for blood would have seen blood if there had been a profusion of it, because how could a person be in contact with a woman like that, bleeding as she must have been bleeding, and not become himself fairly well covered with blood? And how was it that the coat was on her arms and yet her dress was pulled down? Of course there is always the possibility that she was threatened with a knife, raped and afterwards killed; there is always that possibility; whether you consider it or not is entirely up to you. But the fact
remains is that she was killed and the fact remains is that somebody had sexual relations with her and the fact remains that her body was in such a condition that there is evidence from which you might conclude in addition to the fact that she had sperm in her vagina, that she was raped at that particular spot and it wasn't something that may have happened back home with somebody with whom she consented to have intercourse." And then it goes on to describe it and the wounds, so it would seem to be from this that this would be a favourable direction with respect to your argument about the Danchuks not observing any blood?

A

Q Okay. If we can go down to the bottom of the -actually, go to the next page, the bottom, he says:
"Some of the evidence which was adduced

I suggest is not of very much assistance to us. The fact that the wallet was found near Cadrain's is not evidence really which you could link up with the accused. Whoever robbed her may have thrown it anywhere, and the fact that it was three doors away from Cadrain's doesn't, I suggest, implicate the accused to any degree at all. Anybody, any person might have dropped it in that particular locality."

And then it goes on to talk about it. I take it that would be a favourable direction to Mr.

Milgaard about the wallet?
A
Yes. I have to say that on balance, at the time I thought this was quite a favourable charge.

Q Then to page 006216 --

A

Q

A
$Q$ Right, I think he told the jury to disregard the toque and the wallet as in any way being evidence linking Mr. Milgaard to the crime.

Now, here's where he talks about the motel room and he says:
"In the first place you must consider whether the witness who gave evidence that a statement was made is telling the truth. If you come to the conclusion that he wasn't telling the truth or that you have a doubt as to whether he was telling the truth, then you must disregard that entirely."

So in other words, if the jury doubts Melnyk or Lapchuk, they must disregard it entirely.
"If you come to the conclusion, however, that one of the witnesses or all of the witnesses were telling the truth when they said that the accused said such and such a thing - if you come to the conclusion that they were telling the truth, you must go further and determine whether or not in fact the accused was telling the truth, because it could only be accepted as evidence against the accused if you concluded that he did make the statement and that in making the statement he was telling the truth.

Sometimes persons make statements which are completely untrue - for various reasons. Persons have been known to admit to things that they didn't do; persons have been known to boast about things that they didn't do. And so in order to consider that evidence you would have to find not only that the statement was made or the statements were made but that the person who made the statement was in fact telling the truth."

And I take it that would be a favourable direction with respect to the motel room evidence?

A
$Q$
A

BY MR. HODSON:
$Q$
Go back to 006217 , and just again, this was
talking about the charge to the jury and the motel room reenactment, he says:
"There is evidence, however, that the accused was under the influence of drugs when he was alleged to have made these statements in the motel. Now, being under the influence of drugs would he be more likely to create a bit of a sensation by admitting something that wasn't true? Would he be more likely under the influence of drugs to have his inhibitions removed and be more careless about guarding his tongue? Those are all matters that you will have to consider in determining whether or not if you do believe these witnesses that the accused did make those statements, whether the accused in fact was telling the truth when he made the statements." So in other words, the fact that Mr. Milgaard was on drugs at the time he allegedly made these statements could cut both ways, it might mean he's more truthful, it might mean he's more likely to lie; is that fair?

A That's correct.
And that would be -- did you consider that a favourable charge?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q

And here, after he's finished his charge, he asks for suggestions, the jury is out, and you make some suggestions here, I'll just go through a couple of them, and $I$ think you are talking about when Gail Miller left her house:
"... that the only thing left for her to put on were her shoes and with the utmost deference to your Lordship's recollection may $I$ suggest that the evidence in fact establishes that she did not have her shoes on; she was dressed in her uniform and her hair was combed back but on the contrary the evidence points to the fact that she did not have her coat on or gloves or anything like that."

And I take it this would be trying to add a few minutes to the 6:45, or reducing the window?

A Yes. I thought that was a reasonable suggestion based on the evidence.

006220 , the next page, you bring up a point here, in the charge to the jury the judge had talked about things that inculpated the accused and you say:
"I suggest that some areas of Your
Lordship's charge must be amplified and
I say it for this reason. When we come
to - to going into the facts of the case
Your Lordship started out with a
reference by saying - what are the facts
that in effect incriminate the accused?"
And then the word inculpate, and then there's a discussion, and I don't think we need to go through, but $I$ think what you said to the judge is lookit, $I$ think you should go and highlight those facts which exculpate the accused; is that correct?

A
Yes.
Q And then to page 006223 , and at the top, again this is you making reference about emphasizing the exculpatory and that:
"... one would expect to find blood in some substantial quantity."

I think on Mr. Milgaard.
"But I suggest, My Lord, that in
considering that aspect of the case,
Your Lordship should also have made
reference by way of exculpatory facts to
the conduct and demeanour of the accused
as seen by independent witnesses.
Rasmussen . ."
And then down at the bottom, and then:
"No, no immediately afterwards - his conduct at the hotel, his conduct at Danchuks."

Etcetera. So it would appear that you are asking him to go back and re-emphasize that as being exculpatory?

A

Q And then if we can go back to 006225 , and there is also a reference to the time element in there, so after this discussion -- go to 006225 , please. So the jury returns and the judge says:
"Members of the jury, I have been asked
to draw certain things to your attention
which I am very glad to do."
And then scroll down, it talks about:
"First of all $I$ dealt with evidence
which I referred to as being the type of evidence which you might consider as inculpating or incriminating the accused. You recollect $I$ went through the various things such as the evidence of these witnesses about some blood on his clothing, the evidence with respect to the statements that he is alleged to have made and so on. And then $I$ went on and brought out matters and drew them to your attention which were indicative of the fact that he didn't commit the crime, this is exculpatory matters, but I didn't refer to them as exculpatory, I didn't refer to them as matters which you could consider which were the opposite of incriminating, and you will recollect that after $I$ was through with a certain number of observations $I$ went on and $I$ said there was no scratches on his face, the type of characters who were giving this evidence was such that
you would have to scrutinize it very carefully, the fact that there was no profusion of blood on him and the fact that a person who would have sexual intercourse with a woman after she had been stabbed would likely have blood on him, the fact that Danchuks saw no blood - those are all intended to be by way of exculpatory, those things which you can consider which indicated the accused was not - and apparently $I$ didn't indicate it plainly enough to you to show that I was trying to place before those facts which you would consider in discounting any suggestion that these other matters were incriminating."

Scroll down:
"And that's what $I$ intended to do - I intended to try and give the picture as it was from the point of view of the Crown and then endeavour to draw to your attention those facts which would indicate or might indicate to you that the accused had nothing to do with this offence."

And scroll down, you say:
"I also referred to the time that the girl Adeline Nyczai saw the deceased in the house and I used the words that Nyczai had said that she was ready to go to work but she didn't have her shoes on. Now you will recollect this evidence better than $I$ did. I know that she said "ready to go to work" but she also said she did not have her shoes on, and I also believe this - and again it will be a matter of your recollection that she didn't have her coat on and she didn't have her gloves on and there's nothing to indicate that she in fact did leave the house immediately after Nyczai saw her. She might have left there ten minutes later, she might have gone back into the room and done something or other; the only evidence is that Nyczai did hear a door closing or footsteps or something like that but there is nothing to pin it down as to the fact when she in fact did leave the house."

So again, only the time factor there, that would
be a favourable direction because it would move

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
the 6:45 possibly later?

Yes.
Shrink that window we talked about earlier?
Yes.
And I take it minutes, would it be fair that minutes being reduced on that window were
important? I think we were dealing with --
Yes, I think minutes counted.
And then scroll down, please, you say:
"I also referred to the evidence of Wilson when he said that John was hysterical when he returned and $I$ also referred to John's evidence in which she had admitted that she had moved over towards Wilson when the accused got in the car. But you will also bear in mind this - that if she was hysterical as a result of something happening, if she was afraid of the accused you would have thought that she would have taken the first opportunity to leave the car and not get back in it again; in other words, she wouldn't have continued on with the other two on their little jaunt
up to Edmonton, she wouldn't have remained with them if she had been that upset or that hysterical or that concerned about it; if she was afraid of the accused and she had ample opportunity to get out of the car and stay out of the car at the various places they stopped around Saskatoon." And I take it that that would be a favourable part of the charge to Mr. Milgaard?

A

```
Yes, in my view it was.
```

Then to the next page --
And I should add that, as I said before, I was very conscious of the tone in which this was delivered and $I$ considered it to be a favourable type of tone under the circumstances.

And again just to go back, and this is the follow-up charge, if $I$ can call it that, after the judge heard your submissions on the earlier pages, and starts here:
"Some considerable time was taken by counsel and by me too in dealing with this matter of time and the question as to when the deceased left the house may be of very considerable importance to
you in determining whether or not the accused could have had the time to rape, murder and steal, or whether the time was such that it was too short for him to have been able to do all these things which as you will recollect one of the police officers said in connection with the coat - well, this would all take some time. So you bear in mind the time factor, $I$ suggest, Members of the Jury, very seriously in determining whether or not the accused could have done the things with which he is charged - could have done the thing with which he is charged.

Also there is no evidence of his actions that morning after arriving at the motel - I think the motel was the first place where he saw anybody who might have seen his condition other than the two occupants and other than the people who helped push the car - and we haven't got their evidence - and in the Danchuk house and in the Cadrain house that there was nothing about his manner
or speech or conduct which was anything other than normal. In other words, there was nothing from which you might conclude that he was upset about anything or had a guilty conscience or he had done something that was wrong.

I referred briefly to Cadrain's evidence. You will recollect that he went to the police after he returned to Saskatoon but that he was first questioned by the police in Regina and he admitted that at that time he had no recollection of anything unusual in the appearance of the accused, no
recollection of any blood on him, and $I$ think no recollection of a rip in the trousers at that time when he was being questioned, and he said that he was trying to tell everything that he remembered truthfully and that he had no recollection of those things.

Thank you."
So that's the end of his charge. So again, Mr. Tallis, would those parts would you have considered to be, both in substance and in tone,
favourable directions to the jury?
Yes, $I$ did, and one of the reasons, in addition to the obvious, that $I$ asked for the additional direction, or directions, is that $I$ was certainly of the view at that time that jurors tend to place significant weight on the observations or directions of a presiding trial judge, and this of course was a favourable approach in most respects and essentially were the last words that the jury heard; in other words, the last direction was from the judge, and this supplementary direction covered quite a number of points that in my view were helpful to David's cause.

Now, I'm trying to give you my
recollection going back to the time and $I$ think that it's quite reflective of the position $I$ felt I was in at that time. I suppose $I$ can sum it up by saying this, at the end of that supplementary set of directions, $I$ was pleased that $I$ had asked for those additional directions because I don't think -- and because $I$ know that the judge did not in any way denigrate or belittle the positions that $I$ had put forward when inviting him to address those aspects of the case. I hope I'm making myself clear on this, and I'm trying to
divorce it from any subsequent experience $I$ had as a trial judge.

Uh-huh. Just on the point, and you touched on this a bit earlier, but $I$ would like you to just elaborate about, we talked a fair bit when we were going through some of the key evidence about what, sort of your strategy and what questions you would ask witnesses, what questions you would not ask and the impressions of the jury, and $I$ think obviously that is one audience that you are playing to as defence counsel, if $I$ can use those words, in how you conduct the trial and the questions you ask and don't ask.

What about the trial judge, you talked a bit about the importance of the direction to the jury. Can you tell us what, again in this trial as defence counsel, what your objectives were as far as the trial judge and, in particular, with respect to the charge to the jury at the end of the evidence?

Well, as I've indicated to you, perhaps not as clearly as $I$ should have, I thought at that time that the trial judge played a pivotal role in any jury trial and, so there's no misunderstanding, I still feel the same way. element of persuasion focuses on the jury as the fact finders, but $I$ always think that when you are dealing with matters, whether of admissibility or with respect to the final instructions by the presiding judge, it is important to realize that there is an element of persuasion involved in that aspect of the case, and frankly that's what $I$ was trying to do here, not only with respect to the main charge, but when that charge was finished I did feel that it was in David's best interests for me to endeavour to persuade the presiding judge to amplify some of his directions and include one or two other items in it. I'm sorry, I'm afraid I'm being too long winded here.

No, that's fine. If we can then just go to the -the jury was out, $I$ think the transcript reflects they were out over night and maybe were in deliberations for 10 or 12 hours, does that -- I stand to be corrected on that, but -I know that they were out a long time and $I$ have a general recollection that they deliberated late into the evening and then returned the following morning for deliberations.

And again --

A

Q
2 I think what you said is correct, I'm not sure how many hours, but they were in at least, I think, 10 hours, maybe I'm overstating that, but more than a couple of hours. Do you recall, based upon your experience at the time, was that an unusual amount of time for the jury to be out or did you read anything into the fact that they were out that time frame?

I don't think I did. I thought that it was certainly a lengthy period of time and from that I'm sure $I$ concluded that they were giving the matter very conscientious and careful consideration.

If we can now go to the, 006851 , I think the verdict was handed down on January 31, 1970, and this is the Notice of Appeal dated February 10, 1970. Can you tell us how -- maybe just go to the next page on this document -- about what happened after the verdict and before this Notice of Appeal was filed and what happened?

A
Well, $I$ can't recall all the details, but of course I discussed the matter with David. We had not achieved the hoped-for result, but I'm not
sure whether it was that very day, I rather think it was, but if not, the following day $I$ discussed with him an appeal, $I$ recommended an appeal and got his instructions to prepare and serve and file a Notice of Appeal and that $I$ did.

I personally drafted up this
Notice of Appeal which you have shown me and at the time $I$ considered the section $9(2)$ point to be a significant one, and also the question of whether or not the verdict was unreasonable. I know that challenging a verdict as unreasonable has always been an uphill battle, but this is one of those cases where $I$ thought that it was a point of sufficient merit to pursue.

I recall, of course, the point about the blood group evidence with respect to Wilson. I suppose that was, in a sense, a subsidiary point, but $I$ wanted to make it abundantly clear on any appeal that our case never was that we were suggesting that Wilson had killed the girl or had anything to do with this crime, our position was that the evidence did not support a conviction of David, so that sort of gives you a bit of the background which I've distilled as best I can without all my file notes.
felt strongly enough about the appeal that $I$ spoke to my colleagues and $I$ think, I'm sure -- well, I know $I$ drafted the appeal and probably launched it before $I$ had the authorization from Legal Aid. The transcript was a very lengthy transcript and $I$ knew that that of course would be a significant disbursement based on, you know, prevailing costs, but my position, and $I$ had the full support of my partners, was that we would carry the appeal to the Court of Appeal whether or not any authorization came from Legal Aid.

Now, as it turned out, the Legal
Aid committee, as I recall it, and I don't remember the members who attended the meeting, but they asked me to attend, I think probably Mr. Heidgerken had phoned, and I did attend, I was asked to outline essentially the basis upon which the appeal was being taken, and the authorization then came for the limited funding that was permissible, but in particular that would cover the transcript. In other words, it could be ordered without any regard for what the cost of that would be.

And so if Legal Aid had not -- let me just back
up. Your earlier Legal Aid authorization then was only, in effect, until the end of trial; is that correct?

A
$Q$

I think there were. I seem to recall at least one case where they said no because they didn't feel there was sufficient merit to it.

And so just back to your decision then when you filed the appeal, if Legal Aid funding had not been provided, is it your evidence that you and the appeal? been provided, is it your evidence that you and 3

And was it a -- were there cases to your recollection where you might not get funding on
your firm then would have covered the costs of the transcript and other costs related to the appeal?

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

Yes.
If we can just go through the grounds quickly here, you talked about 9(2), and we've covered that, and $I$ take it that's the issue we talked about yesterday, --

Yes.
-- that it should have been done in the absence of the jury, and that's the point we discussed yesterday; is that correct?

That's correct.
Go to the next page. The blood type you talked about, Ron Wilson, and $I$ think you were saying that your position was you didn't want the jury to think that you were pointing the finger in any way at Ron Wilson --

Yes.
-- I think; is that correct?
Yes.
Number 3 is the, I believe the motel room reenactment witnesses, and you say they:
"... erred in admitting their evidence when it was of no real probative value and yet was highly prejudicial ...";
can you expand at all on that?

A

Q

Well on -- I think that that was drafted when $I$ was probably in a rather partisan frame of mind and, later, $I$ think $I$ realized that that was not a point that $I$ could really make any headway in an appeal.

And if we can scroll down, point number 4, this is the in regards:
"... to the nature and character of the evidence adduced on behalf of the prosecution, the verdict of the jury is unreasonable and cannot be supported on the evidence."

Can you tell us, what were the -- what parts of the case were you suggesting gave rise to this suggestion that the verdict was unreasonable? Well, this focuses particularly on the time factor, and we've discussed that.

Okay.
Unless you want me to elaborate?
No, I'm just -- just the subject. So the time element, again, --

Yes.
-- that the verdict is unreasonable because, based on the evidence, --

A Yes.
Q
-- I think your words were that the accused, it was impossible for him to have committed the offence, or highly improbable given the time frame?

A

Q
A
Q

A
$Q$
And so that would be the basis that the physical evidence actually excluded Mr. Milgaard --

A

Q

A
Q
"That the learned trial judge's error in
admitting cross-examination of the
witness, Nichol John by Crown counsel in
the presence of the jury, before any declaration was made as to her being adverse, was so prejudicial to the Appellant ...", etcetera. So that is what we talked about yesterday?

A

Q
Yes. That could have been rolled in with the first point, but $I$ guess $I$ decided to reiterate it.

Now we've heard some evidence that -- we're done with this document -- that at this time there was no requirement to file a factum with the Court of Appeal; is that correct? That's quite correct, the rules of procedure with respect to criminal appeals did not require the filing of a factum or written argument, and for many years the practice was not to do so. I think it probably -- well, I don't want to weary you with notions here -- but $I$ think it stemmed from the practice in England where it was strictly oral argument, and later on -- but this is much, much later, well into the $180 s$-- that there was a practice direction issued, as distinct from a Rule of Court, directing that written argument or a factum be filed in criminal appeals. Now even
before that direction, some counsel had started to file a written outline of their argument, and so forth, but in this era that we're talking about that was not done.

And we, in fact, have made efforts to check the Court of Appeal file and there is no record of anything being filed by either you or Mr. Kujawa; does that accord with your recollection?

Oh, I'm quite sure that's correct, because at that time that was the practice.

So the Court of Appeal would have the transcript; is that correct?

That's correct.
And would they have any of the physical exhibits; do you recall?

I can't recall now, but $I$ think the practice was that the exhibits were sent down if the court requested it.

Just to call up 066603, just go through some correspondence regarding the setting of the date, presumably you would have to wait for the transcripts of the trial to be typed up before the appeal could be heard; is that fair?

A
2 Yes.

And here's a letter September 17th, 1970, you
write to Mr. Kujawa, and at that time I think he was the individual with the Attorney General's office that argued appellate matters generally; is that correct?

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
I thought we had an excellent professional working relationship. He lived in Regina, and of course I lived here, so our contact was of a professional nature, but, to my way of thinking, it was excellent.

And as far as the date, there's just a couple of documents here, it looks like you write to him in September about a date. And then 066602 , this is an internal memo september 22 nd about a call from you, and $I$ don't want to get hung up on the details but it looks as though you are talking about a date in early part of November 1970. And
then 066594 is a letter October 7th to Mr. Kujawa confirming the date, it's November 6th, 1970 at 10:00 a.m., and you thank him for your assistance in picking a date which suits your convenience. And do you recall whether there was any effort by Mr. Kujawa to delay the hearing of the appeal? I think the evidence shows --

I do not recall any such thing. I think that the date was worked, you know, that we knew that the Chief Justice would fix the date, but he was always very accommodating in my experience and often -- I probably said to Mr. Kujawa that "would you be good enough to check with the Chief Justice, since you are in Regina, and let us have some suggested dates".

And, again, --
That was certainly the practice in those days, and --

From this correspondence it looks like in mid-September you asked for a date to be set, and then by agreement it looks like it may have been scheduled to fit your schedule, is that correct, on November 6th?

A
Obviously $I$ was available for that time, and it's nice to know well in advance when a case is being
heard, and certainly that was the practice in those days, the Chief Justice was certainly receptive to fixing dates and fixing them well in advance. Now, once fixed, you were expected to be ready to go on that particular date.

If we can go to 009340 , please. This is the Court of Appeal judgement of Chief Justice Culliton on behalf of the Court, it's dated January 5, 1971, but $I$ believe argument did in fact take place on November 6th, 1970. Can you tell -- and this was a five-judge panel of the Court, is that correct, Culliton -- or pardon me -- Chief Justice Culliton and Justices Woods, Brownridge, Maguire, and Hall? I think that was the whole Court at the time. The whole Court?

The full Court.
Yes. Was that unusual, to have the full Court sit on an appeal?

Well, $I$ think that in significant cases it was, and in this particular case of course the Section 9(2) point was involved. I can't speak for The Court at that time, but $I$ think that's probably a consideration that went into having the full Court sit.

Can you tell us, Mr. Tallis -- and I appreciate
we're going back 35 years, 36 years -- but can you give us your general recollection of the appeal, what was argued? We do not have the benefit of any factums or a transcript of that, we have their decision, but can you give us, to the best of your abilities, what you recall about the appeal itself, and perhaps your observations about where -- what the Court may have been interested in, things of that nature?

I can fairly say that the Section 9(2)
interpretation and application attracted a good deal of attention and comment during argument. As far as details of it, at this stage $I$ cannot go into it, but on that particular aspect of the case Mr. Kujawa -- first of all, at the conclusion of the appellant's argument, Mr. Kujawa was called upon. It was not a case where The Court said "we do not need to hear from you, Mr. Kujawa", so that was an indication that they treated the matter seriously.

And when dealing with the
Section 9(2) argument, Mr. Kujawa did not resile from the position that had been taken by Mr. Caldwell on the issue of a voir dire, in other words hearing the matter in the absence of the
jury. So, essentially, the Court agreed with the position, with in effect the joint position that we had taken at trial and the submission which I made with respect to the matter. And I recall in my brief, because $I$ had prepared a brief, drawing the analogy to the situation of where you have a voir dire with respect to the admissibility of a confession, and the fact that the burden was on the Crown to call all the material witnesses, because that was what had been going on, in my mind, at the trial.

So from that developed the, ultimately in the judgement, the seven steps I think you put to me yesterday, and the question arose as to whether or not -- and I'll use the term -- whether or not this was 'reversible error'. And in using that term $I$ am referring to the section of the Criminal Code that deals with that concept. And as far as the details of the argument on that, $I$ don't remember, but $I$ know that was a point that Mr. Kujawa took during his submission.

Now with respect to the unreasonable verdict aspect -- and here I don't want to be too long-winded and be repetitious -- I
recall that, and $I$ don't know which member, $I$ recall one Member of The Court was very interested in the time factor, so $I$ traced through this limited time frame, as well as referred to the serological aspect of it, in dealing with the unreasonable verdict aspect. Now I believe Mr. Kujawa took a contrary position but, in his usual way, he did not use any strident language on it, so we ...

And on the point with respect to
Wilson, $I$ really can't say exactly what was said in the discussion about taking of the blood type or grouping from him, but of course that was dealt with in the decision. So I really can't tell you much more than that without my notes.

And do you recall -- maybe, actually if we could go to page 009355, and this is just where the Court is reciting the facts and they spend a couple of pages where they actually repeat, verbatim, the evidence of Mr. Melnyk, do you recall -- and actually to the next page and the page after. Do you recall whether that was a significant issue that the Court of Appeal had raised or had concerns about?

A You know, I can't recall now. It's obvious to me,
reading it, that it was on their mind and it may well have been raised.

Q If we could then go to 066582. And this is a letter February 9th, 1971 to Mr. Heidgerken, and it appears that you are seeking Legal Aid approval to seek leave of the Supreme Court of Canada; is that correct?

Yes.
And, again, on the interpretation of Section 9(2), and then you say that:
"... it could probably be handled by an agent in Ottawa at much less expense."

No, I really don't, other than to tell you that, number 1, I had encouraged David to pursue it, and when Legal Aid was turned down I indicated to him that it was still open to appeal on this point probably in person, and $I$ think $I$ likely said "The Court would probably appoint somebody on a leave application". But then my recollection is somewhat frail in this area, as it may be in others, because in my discussions with David --
and this was by phone, $I$ don't think it was by letter -- he told me that he was getting advice and assistance from a Mr. King, $I$ think it was. And at that time $I$ understood this person to be a lawyer who had either been involved in cases in Alberta or British Columbia, and I didn't know the gentleman, and, you know, $I$ didn't think it appropriate that $I$ start asking David a lot of questions about it. Now, years later $I$ found out that he wasn't a lawyer, but --

Who was he?
Well I think $I$ was informed that David had met him in prison, but then there was some indication that at least somewhere along the line, whether it was when he got out of prison or whether it was before, that he was a criminologist who was helping lawyers draft up appeals, and that included Supreme Court materials. I know that David, I think, sent to me a draft of the points of appeal just in point form and asked, you know, what my view was of it, whether it was a fair way to put it, and I recall telling him that $I$, you know, $I$ was reluctant to interfere with what his counsel was now doing. And he said, well, that he just really would like my assessment, my opinion,
as to whether or not it covered the points. I think what he was really asking for was a second opinion on it, and $I$ recall telling him that $I$ thought that the draft that $I$ had received from him adequately raised the primary point, and that was the Section 9(2) issue.

Now I think there were other points included, but -- so that's, that's essentially what $I$ recalled, because it wasn't until years later that $I$ found out who Mr. King was. And I, I mean I'm not sure of all the details of his practice and whether or not he had an association with law firms, but I think that's what was intimated to me, as $I$ say, many years later.

Okay. If we could just, on this letter -- and, again, this is your February 9th, 1971 letter to the committee where you are seeking approval to take the $9(2)$ issue to the Supreme Court -- you say:
"I would also point out that $I$ think that Mr. Kujawa would co-operate in facilitating this matter if you feel it should be pursued."

Can you explain that comment?

A

I can't give you the genesis of that paragraph, but it tells me that $I$ probably asked Mr. Kujawa, after the judgement came down, what his position would be, and $I$ don't think $I$ would have said that to Mr. Heidgerken unless $I$ had had a signal, one way or another, that Mr. Kujawa would cooperate in facilitating this matter if it could be pursued. And --

And that was indicative of the relationship that $I$ had with him on a professional level.

Can you explain that?
Well, I never had any hesitation in raising matters of that nature with him, and that started with even picking the date for an appeal. And there were occasions where, $I$ can recall in particular one where $I$ was asked to undertake an appeal, I hadn't been trial counsel, and my research and uncovering of information indicated that at best the -- that there ought to have only been a conviction for a relatively minor offence. This is a different matter, not the Gail Miller matter; correct?

No, nothing whatsoever.
Carry on, yeah?
And so, as a result of that, he looked into it
with the information that $I$ had, $I$ had the appeal pending, but $I$ suggested that if what $I$ gave him was verified, my instructions were that we would agree to the appeal, and sentence being set aside, and that a conviction entered for a much less -- a much lesser offence, and in that particular case, involving a young person, that's what happened. Now I use that to describe the working relationship that $I$ had with him on a professional level, and that happened on other occasions too, but $I$ can't specifically recall. I think there was one other, now that $I$ mention it, that I specifically recall.

But in any event, the upshot was
that we appeared in front of The Court, made a joint submission, and indicated that if The Court approved this criminal litigation could be put to an end with the following relief, and the Court adopted that approach. But it meant that the appeal did not have to be argued in the usual way, and that was because he had followed up on my request to check out what $I$ believed to be the case, and $I$ don't want to belabour it but that was -- that's why I can say that there were various times $I$ received what $I$ would call significant
cooperation from him.
From Mr. Kujawa?
Yes.
And so this --
And, I must say, I always thought that The Court welcomed that type of thing.

So in this case, and again based on this comment, are you telling us that you -- I think you said that you believe you would have talked to Mr. Kujawa after the judgement of the Court of Appeal and got some sense that he might support the issue going to the Supreme Court?

From reading that paragraph, which I do not remember writing and $I$ do not remember the background to it, $I$ think that's a fair and reasonable inference.

If we could then go to 002351 . And, again, this is the memorandum of argument filed in support of Mr. Milgaard's application for leave, and I think Brian Crane filed that; were you involved at all in the preparation of this memorandum?

No. I think that the first time $I$ saw -- I have ever -- I don't think $I$ saw it before you directed my attention to the document.

And then 002359 of this, this is in the
application, it reads:
"It is submitted that subsection (2) of
s. 9 of the Canada Evidence Act is not
an exception to the general rule that a witness must be declared adverse before cross examination by the Crown is
permitted in front of the jury. The section only makes it clear that the trial judge may take into consideration the circumstances of a prior
inconsistent statement in determining whether a witness is adverse, which question the authorities prior to the amendment had left in doubt. All cross examination, it is submitted, prior to the finding adversity, must be held in the absence of the jury.

The Court of Appeal suggests that in this case there could have been no prejudice to the accused but in fact had counsel for the accused been permitted to cross examine Nichol John as to the circumstances in which the statement had been made the trial judge might well have determined that leave to
cross examine before the jury would not be given and that the witness would not be declared adverse. In any event such cross-examination was not permitted at any stage either in on the voir dire or in the presence of the jury prior to the finding that the witness was adverse. In these circumstances it is impossible to say that there has been no prejudice to the accused."

Now I appreciate these are another lawyer's submissions, but would that be consistent with the position that you put forward before Chief Justice Bence and before the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal on this issue?

A
Q
Very much so.
And then if we can go to 053142, this is the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, it says: "'Leave to appeal is refused. In making this decision we express no view as to whether before granting the leave to cross-examine provided for in s. 9(2) of the Canada Evidence Act, the Court is required to conduct a voir dire as to the circumstances in which the statement
in writing was obtained.'"
And I think we talked a bit yesterday, but the Court of Appeal decision in the Milgaard case ended up being followed in many other provinces, and indeed in Saskatchewan, for some time, and in fact still is the law today; is that fair, -Yes.
-- with maybe some modification later?
Yes. And $I$ think that in a later case, the Supreme Court may have approved of the procedure, but $I$, you know, $I$ 'm not briefing things like that now, but I'm sure that there are lawyers here that are quite familiar with those more recent authorities.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Was that 053142.
MR. HODSON: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay, thanks.
BY MR. HODSON:

I'm done with that document. If we can now move into a different area. You have testified that after you finished your involvement in this case, and in particular after you were appointed as a judge of the court in 1976, that you did not read any further materials on this matter, nor did you follow events in the media, and similarly, when
you testified at the Supreme Court of Canada, I think you told us you considered yourself to be bound by, with the exclusion of witness order, and therefore read nothing or very little in preparation of your testimony?

A
Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

A it.

Now, for the purpose of the Commission's work, I provided you with some documents and asked you to read some police reports and witness statements that the Commission has, they are from the police files in 1969 and from Mr. Caldwell's, in some cases from his files, and they appear to be at least documents and information that you did not have or did not have knowledge of, or may not have had knowledge of when you defended Mr. Milgaard in 1969 and 1970.

Now, some of the information in the documents are on what's been called the Gail Miller police file; in other words, their original police file, some are not. Some of the documents are found on Mr. Caldwell's file, some are not. I want to ask you some questions about the information in these documents and, in particular, whether, if you would have had this information, it would have assisted your defence or altered what you would have done at the time on behalf of Mr. Milgaard, I will ask you what you would have done with this type of information and how it may assisted your work, and before we get into it, I want to point out just a couple of caveats. The first is that $I$ appreciate
and point out that there is a vast amount of information that's before this Commission about what may have been in existence in 1969 and 1970 and the Commission has heard a lot of evidence to date about that, and $I$ don't think it's fair or appropriate to ask you to go back and digest all of this information that you didn't know about and then come back 36 years later and tell us everything you would have done differently with all of that knowledge, but what $I$ propose to do is provide you, and $I$ have provided you with key pieces of information, and I'll try and summarize them for you and ask for your general insights as to what you think you would have done with the general information, keeping in mind that you've not gone through this in detail.

The second caveat that $I$ want to point out before $I$ get into this area is that the issue of disclosure and what the police had, what the prosecutor had and what was and maybe should have been disclosed to you is a matter the Commissioner will deal with in due course based upon all of the evidence and after hearing all of the witnesses and $I$ do not want to put you, by my questions, in the position of providing opinions
on the conduct of the police and/or the prosecutor as to what they did or didn't do or should have done. However, $I$ would like to find out from you, when we go through this information, putting aside who had it or who could have given it to you, putting aside that issue, but whether the information we go through is the type of information that you contemplated receiving when you made the request back in June, July and August of 1969 when we went through the letter and, in particular, the Dallison case, whether this is the type of information that was in your mind at the time as being information that might assist you. So with that, and $I$ will go through some of these documents, and $I$ think, Mr. Tallis, $I$ can probably summarize some of them fairly quickly. We, as a Commission, have been through all of them to date and $I$ think you've had a chance to read them over at least once; is that fair?

A
Yes, I read them over some time ago when it was expected that $I$ might be called at an earlier date.
$Q$
And so if we could call up, the first one is 106175, and this is a police report of February

2nd, 1969 of Detective Sergeant Reid and this is two days after the murder, and this is just the one that mentions Mr. Campbell, the service station operator, and you alluded to this earlier, had actually phoned the police $I$ think on February 2nd to report his encounter with the vehicle and Mr. Wilson, Mr. Milgaard and Ms. John on the morning of January 31 at the Danchuks, and again we have -- and in this they actually have the license number of the car, down here, if we can scroll down, further, so he actually phoned in, gave the license number of the Wilson vehicle and sort of explained to -- advised that of the three young, he says fellows in the car, he only saw one of them.
"Reason that Mr. Campbell reported this to our department is that he wondered ... what were they doing in the alley." Now, again, is this, can you just tell us generally, and forget whether you get the actual report or you get the information, is this information, do you think it might have been -would you have used this in any way?

A
Well, $I$ think it would have been helpful.
Okay. In what respect?

A

Q

A
$Q$

Well, it could well lead you on a chain of inquiry. Standing in isolation it maybe doesn't look to be that significant in the way things unfolded, but taken together, I think that with other things it could have taken on additional significance.

And $I$ suppose one might say that if Mr. Campbell and/or the Danchuks were suspicious of this group, that they might have a keener eye of observation; is that --

Yes.
If we can go to 009245 , I'm going to go through some reports now, and maybe let's, we can just deal with this a bit generally. There are a number of police reports prepared by the saskatoon City Police that provide some detail of their dealings with Albert Cadrain, Nichol John, Ron Wilson and David Milgaard and in some cases, I think your words the other day were that some people provide statements through their mouth or words to that effect, and $I$ think what we see in some of these reports, the police would write down what the main players would have said to them. Generally speaking, would that, the information in reports about how the police
dealt with Wilson, John, Cadrain and Milgaard, be helpful to you?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

Yes, it would.
And can you elaborate on that a bit?
Well, as $I$ said to you the other day, whether a person chooses to write in statement form or write with his or her mouth is still something of importance because the information that is imparted is the significant point.

And now would it be fair to say that the information may be both helpful and may be damaging; is that --

That's right.
I just want to go through parts of this. This first one is a report of Sergeant Malanowich and this deals with Sharon Williams who was, I think you were aware, was the young lady that David Milgaard was going to see in Edmonton; correct? Yes.

And there's a lengthy statement. I think you've had an opportunity to review the statement of Sharon Williams?

Yes.
And then as well, and we've been through that a number of times, $I$ don't propose to go through it,
but again, Malanowich adds in this statement, attributes that Mr. Milgaard:
"... got violent and forced her and she admits it is at these times that she thought he was abnormal and a violent type of person."

Again, that type of information in the Sharon Williams' statement, if that had been provided to you, can you tell us, would that have been of assistance to you?

A

Well, it would assist in this way, it's the type of thing you want to know in advance because it tells you some aspects of the case that you may have to meet, and I use the term "may have to meet".

And back on the question of again the Dallison case, was this the type of information that you contemplated you might get?

Well, if $I$-- the answer is yes, and $I$ think that information that enables a person to defend a case covers both, anything that tends to show the person's innocence, but also anything that might be used against him or her.

If we can go to 106640 --
And you see in this one too that she was asked to
look, to see if there was any blood on any of his clothing or anything and she looked in his suitcase at the motel and so forth, but $I$ don't think there was anything of that nature observed. Okay. I see it's -- actually, we'll do one more document, 106640 , this is a March 22 nd, 1969 report of Lieutenant Short and it talks about: "On March 18/69 Det. Karst \& myself took Albert Cadrain to Regina and were in touch with the Regina City Police there and later proceeded to the Regina gaol and interviewed Ron Wilson again, however, nothing further was learned from him and we also found his home and talked to Mrs. Wilson where there was some discrepancies found in the clothing that these boys both Wilson \& Milgaard were wearing when they left Regina. Also female Nichol John was located in the hippie house in Regina and she was after considerable persuasion brought to the Regina gaol and interviewed by Karst and myself and was placed in a room with Cadrain and allowed to discuss this matter and it was learned from her after
this discussion that through
interrogation that she was of the opinion that Cadrain was telling the truth and that everything he said was exactly what had happened on this trip. She was of the opinion that Milgaard was of a dangerous character and that he had forced her to have intercourse etc. Several times and she was afraid of him. It is my opinion that Milgaard is a dangerous person and it is known that he had a record as a juvenile for several serious offences and although at this time we did not locate Milgaard it is my opinion that he should be located and probably followed and kept under close contact for some time in hopes of learning something further in regards to this person's activities while in S'toon with Nichol John and Wilson."

Again, would that be information, Mr. Tallis, that would be of use to you in your defence of Mr. Milgaard?

A Yes.
Q And in what way?

Well, several aspects; number 1, it's indicative of the case that the Crown may try to present with respect to his propensity for violence, if $I$ may summarize it that way, but more important, I think that it also is relevant when you consider the background or circumstances under which Nichol John and Wilson told the investigating officers various matters after having initially denied there was any involvement by anybody in the car.

MR. HODSON: This is probably an
appropriate spot to break, Mr. Commissioner. I'm wondering if we might come back at one o'clock with the idea that we may still try to get Mr. Tallis done today.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.
(Adjourned at 12:01 p.m.)
(Reconvened at 1:07 p.m.)
BY MR. HODSON:
Mr. Tallis, before lunch we were going through some police reports and statements, information that you did not have, and $I$ was asking you some questions about what you might have done with it. If you can call up 009254 . And again, this falls in the category of a police report that outlined their dealings with some of the key witnesses, and
this is Detective Karst, and I think I read earlier the one from Lieutenant Short about the trip with he and Mr. Karst, this is Mr. Karst's report, I'll just read parts of this. And again, so this is April 18th, '69, the report, and it talks -- actually, sorry, $I$ may have misspoke, this is a different occasion than what Lieutenant Short was talking about.

So this is Monday, April 14 th,
would be a month after Nichol's first statement and about five weeks before the May 24 th statement to Mr. Karst and Staff Sergeant Edmondson went to make inquiries about John and Wilson, if we can call out that paragraph, and this is Mr. Karst saying with the assistance of Ken Walters we located the Nichol John girl, interviewed and: "Further investigation of this girl when she was interviewed gave one the feeling that she was telling the truth and she emphatically stated she could not recall any time while they were in the City of Saskatoon during the morning of the murder at which time Wilson or Milgaard had left the vehicle in which they were driving long enough to commit this
offence. She denied that Milgaard had left their vehicle at any time to go to a bathroom or go for a cup of coffee which she could recall. This girl did however state that she felt Milgaard was capable of an offence of this nature and admitted having sexual relations with him at different times and that he was more of the animal nature than you would expect of a human."

And then next page, and this is again after talking to, Ron Wilson's mother was interviewed, and:
"She did however state, though that the both youths, Wilson and Milgaard had changed clothing at her residence on the night of Jan. 30 before leaving for Saskatoon, as they had spilled acid on them while working on the battery in the car in which they were trying to start."

And then here:
"Although there are many unanswered questions with regard to Milgaard's activities on that particular morning, if one is to believe the girl, Nichol

John, and it appears that she is very convincing with her story, then there is no way in which Milgaard can be connected with this crime."

Let me just pause there. I did cover two subjects. Let's talk about the latter one and Nichol John. Would information in this police report have been of assistance to you in defending Mr. Milgaard?

I think it would have.
And can you tell us how you might have used this type of information?

Well, for one thing, it might have led one on a chain of inquiry into certain areas and also have been relevant to the circumstances giving rise to the later incriminating statements.

So in the section $9(2)$ voir dire hearing we talked about yesterday, and $I$ suppose if Chief Justice Bence would have followed the procedure that the Court of Appeal later set out in that type of voir dire, is this something that you might have elicited before the Court?

A
Yes, and $I$ think it would have also been helpful with respect to those circumstances where -- let's put it this way, helpful in respect to probing the
role of Mr. Roberts.
Okay. And then the information from Ron Wilson's mother, and again we touched on this a bit earlier, $I$ think you may have had some inkling of that when she was called at the preliminary hearing; is that fair?

Yes.
And $I$ think you told us that this was not helpful evidence because it suggested, if it was true, that there would not have been acid on Mr. Milgaard's pants --

A
Yes.
-- on the morning at Cadrains' house?
That's right, and David said the only possibility was that he might have had some spots arising from battery acid.

If we can now scroll down a bit, and here we talk about on April 18th, it talks about Mr. Milgaard being interviewed and giving blood samples and it says:
"Milgaard was interviewed at length by various members of this department however seems to be no way to shake that youth's story. He denies emphatically having any blood on his clothing when
changing them and when confronted with the statement that Cadrain stated he did have blood on his trousers he stated that Cadrain was a lyer."

Would that information have been helpful to you? Well, this is the kind of information that you like to have because you never -- you never know what it will lead to, but certainly it is background information that one would want to have.

And then if we can scroll down a bit:
"With regards regards to the above information it now appears that further questioning of Cadrain is warranted with regards to the blood as both youths Milgaard and Wilson along with the girl, Nichol John deny that Milgaard had any blood on his clothing, while Cadrain emphatically states that he observed this blood. There is also the fact to take into consideration that when the Cadrain youth first attended at the Police Station some becomes ago to advise us of his information he denied that he knew anything of this murder in

Saskatoon until he returned home approx.
1 month later when his mother advised him of same. However this was found to be untrue when speaking to the Regina City Police we were advised by them that they had advised Cadrain of this murder and in fact questioned about same when they had him in custody at that point some 2 weeks prior to coming to Saskatoon. Also it should be noted that the dead girl's wallet and contents were found near the Cadrain residence which could be implicating for either Cadrain or Milgaard in that case as they were both known to be in the area."

And then a blood sample was taken, and the next page:
"Effort should be made in the near future to interrogate both or all 3 of the Cadrain youths along with the parents to ascertain whether their stories coincide when all are taken at separate times and apart from one another."

And then it goes on to talk about a statement of

Leonard Woytowich. Would that type of information have been of assistance to you, Mr. Tallis?

A
Yes, and $I$ particularly note the comments with respect to Cadrain knowing, or having been informed about certain aspects of this matter, and although he did indicate at trial that he, that he was trying to tell the truth when he first spoke to the police and denied any involvement, this type of thing would have opened up a much greater scope for cross-examination at the preliminary hearing without tipping your hand, so to speak, in certain areas.

If we can go to 009264 , this is a May 25, 1969 police report from Detective Karst and it details events starting on May 21 in Regina. This report details Detective Karst's dealings with Ron Wilson primarily on the dates May $21,22,23$ and $I$ believe 24 , so that would be the two days prior to Inspector Roberts, the day of and the day after, although I'm not sure that it covers the day after, so before we go through it, I take it generally speaking a police report dealing with how Ron Wilson was dealt with during that time frame that he was with Inspector Roberts, would
that be viewed -- .

A
Q
rise to at least a probing at the preliminary hearing to see what would be of value for use at trial, and often the -- well, I'm sorry, I'm thinking -- I'm getting ahead of myself.

You are talking about the Ron Wilson?
Yes.
We'll maybe scroll down so we have -- starting here at the top of the page, please, so:
"At 2:00 PM, May 21st, Ronald Wilson was interviewed ..."

And Mackie, Walters, Dike were present along with Detective Karst:
"This conversation also being taped and presently in my possession.

During this conversation with
Ronald Wilson, he admitted attending in
Saskatoon with Milgaard and Nickey on
the early morning of January 31 st and in contradiction to his original and other interviews, he admitted that Milgaard had left the car when they became stuck at approx. 6:45 that morning, while
looking for the Cadrain residence. All
Wilson would state at this time was that Milgaard appeared to be puffing and
running, slightly out of breath when he returned to the vehicle, and he admitted that he had since thought that this was the time that Milgaard was probably involved in a murder."

Would that information be of assistance to you, Mr. Tallis?

Yes. Well, my attention is particularly attracted to the fact that this oral statement was recorded and the tape recorded conversation would probably not only be in more detail than the actual report, but also indicate whether it was question and answer or narrative, and of course that would be very helpful depending on its contents for purposes of, at least of cross-examination at the preliminary hearing. What use could be made at trial would depend upon what was elicited during that phase.

And then the next page at the top:
"En route to Saskatoon, Wilson divulged to me that on that trip on Jan. 31st with Milgaard and Nickey the two boys had discussed B.\&E.'s, along with rolling someone and purse snatching as a source of money, as their financial
position at this time was not one with
which they could do any amount of
travelling, as they anticipated going to
Edmonton and Vancouver."
And then it goes on to talk about the elevator break-in, he says he does not recall a knife missing from the premises, and I think this is where the police first learned of the elevator break-in. Would this type of information have been helpful to you?

A

Q
A

Q
So scroll down here, so this is now on the trip back from Regina, so this would be May 21 , which would be two days before his statement of May 23rd, he says:
"He also stated at this that he could not recall a knife being in the car nor did he see Milgaard bring one from the elevator. On further questioning, he thought that possibly Milgaard could
have picked up a knife from the Champs Hotel where they had eaten earlier that day where Nickey had been employed, however, could shed no further light on that aspect."

Would that information be helpful to you?

A

Q Yes, essentially for the reasons that I've mentioned.

Scroll down.
"Wilson pointed out the area of Avenue $P$ and Avenue $M$ and $N$ around $22 n d$ St. West, as an area which is similar to the location where the girl was seen walking on the street that early morning when they approached her to ask directions, however, he was unsure of the exact block. Nor could he point to the exact location where the car had become stalled, where Milgaard had left the vehicle to go for help."

Again, would that information have been helpful?
Yes.
Next page. So then this is the next morning, May $22 n d$, the day before the polygraph, and they drive Mr. Wilson around the city or parts of the city.

And then:
"Wilson's account of what transpired
that morning was roughly as follows.
The three of them drove into the city
and drove around for a short while when
they met a girl in the area described
above, asked directions for Peace Hill.
The asking done by Milgaard who was on
the passengers side of the vehicle where
the pedestrian was. This girl stated
she didn't know and was unable to assist
them, however, Milgaard had asked
whether she would like a lift or ride to
where she was going, to which she
declined. Upon driving away, Milgaard
had made the remark to the effect, "The
stupid bitch". They drove a short
distance further and while making a
turn, the vehicle became stuck, as they
had no reverse gear. At this time
Milgaard left for help, returning
approx. lf minutes later puffing and
running, however, wilson states that he
mat this time."

They drove around the city, got the map, and then went to the Danchuks. Now, again, would this information be helpful, Mr. Tallis?

A
$Q$

Yes, for the same reasons that I've mentioned.

Go to the next page. We're now to Friday, May $23 r d$, which is the day of the polygraph.

Mr. Karst writes:
"... I attended at 608 Cavalier Hotel in the company with Inspector Wood, Lt.

Short, D/Sgt. Mackie, Cst. Chartier and Morrison and at 3:00 PM, I called at room \#610 of the Cavalier where Wilson picked out a knife which was out of a group of five, which Insp. Roberts had shown him as being similar to the one he states he had seen en route from Regina to Saskatoon on the morning of Jan. 31st, this being a reddish brown colored bone handled type paring knife.

Wilson was then brought to the Police Station and at 3:30 PM, a statement was taken from him with regards to the above described incident adding to the original that he had seen
this knife in the car during the trip,
which he previously denied. Also added in his statement was that when Milgaard returned to the car after being stuck, the first time, he stated something to the effect that, 'I fixed her', and when Wilson questioned him on this Milgaard declined to make any further comment. Also in this statement Wilson states he had seen blood on Milgaard's trouser when changing his clothes ...

This he had previously denied."
Next page, I'll just highlight some of the parts here, he talks about:
"Nickey seemed very nervous ...", Wilson -- and actually what Mr. Karst is doing is, I think, reciting parts of Mr. Wilson's May $23 r d$ statement which we have been through:
"... also recalls Nickey finding a ladies compact ...",
the statement goes on to talk about the incident in Calgary. Again, let me pause there. Would that information have been of assistance to you in the defence of Mr. Milgaard?

A Well this was particularly of significance in connection with probing of the role of Mr .

Roberts.
And in what regard, what -- can you --
Well I'm thinking of it in the context of the additions that had been made by -- or further details that had been given by Wilson, for example in the discussions, and --

And for --
And of course, if this was tape recorded, the whole manner of the taking of the statement and what was actually said would have been very significant from the standpoint of preparing for the preliminary hearing.

At the trial did you, and/or at the preliminary hearing, were you aware, apart from the written statements that Ron Wilson provided of May $23 r d$ and 24th, 1969, and apart from what you elicited from him or other witnesses; were you aware of the sequence of the interviews and what Mr. Wilson may have told the police officers on given dates or given times both before and after the polygraph session?

A
No, I don't believe I was. This was something that $I$ tried to elicit the details from Mr.

Roberts about what, you know, his actual participation or what he actually did and -- but
we've already been through that so I don't want to burden you again with it.
106676. And this is the May 29 th report of Sergeant Mackie who dealt primarily with Nichol John on May 22, 23, 24. There's parts of this:
"... May 22 nd, Nichole John was returned to Saskatoon ...",
and goes on to talk about her, was:
"... transported to $20 t h$ Street ...
where she was driven around the area and she stated that she recalled the brick wall on the east side of the ... Funeral ...",
home, recalled two garbage cans where the purse was found, this is where she says that the lid on the left-hand garbage can was tipped, she also recalled something of the church, and then driven around. And then, actually, just scroll down a bit further. Again, would that, the driving around, would that information be of assistance for the reasons you stated the other information? Yes.

And then at the bottom:
"At approx. 10:00 PM, I proceeded to the Cavalier Hotel where Supt. Wood, Lt.

Penkala and I interviewed Insp. Roberts of Calgary Police, in regards to this file, so that he would be able to interrogate Ronald Wilson and Nichole John for us on the 23rd."

Would that have been helpful information? This would have been very relevant to the information $I$ was trying to get from Inspector Roberts.

If we could now go to 106108 , please. I'm going to now move to matters not related directly to the David Milgaard witnesses, if $I$ can call them that. This is a January 31st, it should be 1969, police report, it's the day of the murder, and Constable Gabruch talked to the bus driver that morning for the bus that Gail Miller normally took, and: "... Husulak ...", the bus driver:
"... stated that around Ave. O and 20th St. he would ordinarily have a male passenger at Ave. O and 20 th St. who appeared to be a construction worker wearing red hat and approx. 20 years old, however this morning the gentleman was not around."

And if we can go to 106189. That information; would that be something, on its own, that might be of assistance to you?

A Well I think, in combination with other things, it certainly would be a matter of interest.

This is a report of February 3rd, Detective Sergeant Reid, so on the Monday at 6:50 he interviewed the bus driver:
"... regarding a construction worker wearing a red hat. Mr. Husoluk states the person got on the bus just the past trip and made a mistake as the person was wearing a red ski cap and not a red hat. This person according to the bus driver was checked out by Det.

McCorriston this date."
And then if we can go to
106212, and this is Detective McCorriston's report about the events of February 3rd as well, and they did, at 6:17 that morning they checked out Avenue $O$ and $20 t h$, one Tony Humen.
"Humen was identified by transit driver
John Husulak ... as the person he had
referred to as the person who usually
wears a red or orange hard hat and who
he believes had not caught this bus on
Jan. 31st. Humen at this time was wearing a red ski cap and stated he never wears a hard hat.", and then goes on to talk about the interview. Again, would that information be of assistance to you?

A
Yes, it would be. You know, coupled with other information it could well be helpful, and particularly, with background information like that, you could pursue certain avenues of questioning.

And the next page, 106213. This is the same report and the same morning, McCorriston writes:
"6:49 ... checked in 300 Blk. Ave. O. South, Larry Fisher, 334 Ave. O South. Works at Masonery Contractors ...

Wearing yellow hard hat. Stated last Friday he caught bus at 6:30 a.m. at Ave. O. and 20 th. Street. He states there waas no one else around at that time and he had no information to offer."

Now, we now know more about Larry Fisher than they might have known on the morning of February

A

Q
A
$Q$

A
Q
A

Q

A

3rd, '69, but would that information be of assistance to you at that time?

Well the address or place of residence, $I$ think, could well have triggered a chain of inquiry. Being the same address as the Cadrain -Yes.
-- house? And what about the fact of catching the bus that morning at -Well, as well.

Okay.
But I think the initial link would, in one's mind, would probably be the address.

If we can go to 106215. Sorry, 106215, the doc.
ID is 212. And this is a report of Detective McCorriston, and this is February 5, which would be five days after the murder, 6:55 a.m. in the 200 block Avenue $N$ South, and we know:
"... interviewed Mrs. Margaret Merriman of 226 Ave. N. South ..."

And her house, Mr. Tallis, would be right beside the east-west alley. The east-west alley behind the funeral home, if you go a bit further east, her house would be on the corner of Avenue $N$ and that same east-west alley; do you --
$Q$

A
Q

I can show you the map if you like, but it would be --

No, no, I accept what you say.
And it says:
"On the morning of Jan. $31 / 69$ she ordered a taxi to be at her home at 6:55 A.M. and watched out her front window for a few minutes while awaiting the arrival of the taxi, however she saw nor heard anything and was unable to offer any information."

And then, just in that
connection, 025148. And this is a March 27th report by Detective Sergeant Reid, and this is interviewing Mr. Arthur Merriman, Mrs. Merriman's husband. And he says:
"... on Jan. 31st, 1969, they left for work by Taxi, leaving at approx. 6:55 AM. It should be noted that this persons' residence they can look down the $T$ lane rear of Westwood Memorial and Mr. Merriman advises that his eyesight is not too good but they were looking out this window waiting for the taxi to arrive and nothing unusual was observed
pertaining to persons or vehicles, and Mr. Merriman is unable to offer any further additional information which may be of assistance to us in connection with this occurrence and at the time he was interviewed his wife was not at home."

Would that information from the Merrimans have been of assistance to you?

Well I would say, looking at what $I$ knew and what I was looking for, that this statement is of particular significance because of the time factor that we've already been going through.

And, as well, perhaps where they were -- where their house was located?

A
Oh yes, well, I'm making that assumption -Yes.
-- that --
If we could go to 024936 . I'm sorry, the doc. ID is 935, this is the second page. And this is a report of Detective Sergeant Mackie, and this is -- talks about Dennis Elliott, and this may have been in his statement and it may have been that you were aware of this, Mr. Tallis, but I'll just read you this part. Dennis Elliott was the fellow
who drove Gail Miller home the night before her murder, and he says:
"... he recalls that when he had taken Miller home he recalled a 1963 or 64 Pontiac with redist bottom, light colored top, with considerable damage to left rear fender or quarter panel.

There was a lone occupant in this vehicle who watched them and when he looked towards this vehicle the man in the vehicle looked away quickly. To his knowledge Gail was not aware of this vehicle. After he walked Miller to the house at 130 Ave. O. S. this vehicle was still present and the operator watching him when he returned to his vehicle, and he felt that he was about 10' away from this person on the street when he returned to get into his vehicle." And described the male person there. Do you recall if you would have been aware of this piece of information at the time of trial?

A
I don't recall if $I$ had a statement from Dennis Elliott or not.

Do you recall any mention of the fact that there
was a car in front of Gail Miller's house at 2:00 in the morning the night before the murder?

You know, I think that $I$ may well have, but the source $I$ can't tell you at this stage.

Okay. I think we saw some documents where Mr. Caldwell sent you Mr. Elliott's statement, and I

Well that's what $I$, that's why $I$ was asking, I may well have received the statement and that's where it would come from then.

009334 . This is a report of Officer Dimmitt's February 6th. It talks about one Simon Doell, former address, etcetera:
"He moved out previous to the murder.
He states that on occasions he had been riding on the Bus and when Miss Miller got on the bus she always as on the corner of Ave. N and 20 th St. directly across from the Funeral Home. He states that he missed her on the bus a couple of times and upon asking her how she was getting to work she stated that she was getting a ride to work ..."

And, again, this talks about her catching the bus at Avenue N --

A Yes.
Q
-- and $20 t h$ Street; would this information have been of any assistance to you?

Well, once again, it was background information that might well have been of assistance.

106234, this is a report of Detective Bennett February 6th, '69, and it says:
"Also interviewed was a Mary Gallucci ... who stated that she takes the bus at Ave. O and $20 t h$ Street every day. She stated that on Thursday morning, Jan. 31st, ...",
and $I$ think, from some other notes it, I think it has been suggested that the date should have read January 30th:
"... she recalls a girl get on the bus at the above with her. She describes thais girl as follow Younger girl, dark hair, wearing white dress and stockings, Dark coat ...",
goes on:
"She has seen her on the same bus before but does not think seen on Wed. There was also a young man get on the bus with ... who was a construction worker
wearing blue jeans and a hard hat, possibly yellow. This man comes from Ave. O South of 20 th Street. He has been getting on the bus at the same time since that day. She does not think that she could identify."

Again, would that information have been of assistance to you?

Yes, I believe so, for the reasons that $I$ have earlier mentioned.

Now 106547 , please. This is a report of Constable Wilton February 15th, 1969, and it refers to a phone call from a fellow named Sidney Sargent, and you have had a chance to read through this, Mr. Tallis. And this is a fellow who called the police and states that:
"... on the morning of the murder he left ...",
his office at 7:00 a.m., drove north on Avenue $N$ to 20 th where he had to come to a stop, said to be between 7:00 and 7:05.
"He observed a woman standing at the bus stop at the south curb wearing a blue or what appeared to be a blue coat similar to a nurse's cape. This woman also wore
white nylons, a white dress, and may have been wearing a hat. Before proceeding from the stop sign Sargent states he saw a young male person, age 18-20 years, staggering in a southerly direction on Ave. N towards 20th St. He described the person as approx. 6'2", skinny, blondish hair. He wore blue jeans and a kacki coat. The youth was staggering as though drunk however may have been walking in this manner if he had been wearing leather shoes. Sid Sargent did not pay any more attention to the 2 persons and then drove away. He delayed contacting the Police on this matter as he believed the information was of little importance."

Can you tell us whether this information would have been of assistance to you?

Well, I think that that could well have been very significant --

Q
Can you tell us how?
A I was just --
Q Oh, sure.
A Did he identify --

And I should -- sorry -- I should add that Mr. Sergeant, after this report, did not talk to anybody about this matter until he testified at the Inquiry, and he advised the Inquiry that he identified the woman as Gail Miller, whom he had known. And $I$ think he also described before the Inquiry that her -- that she was a, not right at the corner, a bit away, and as well that -something unusual about her clothing, and I can't recall exactly what he said, but something about how her clothing was arranged. So there's nothing in the report other than the identification of a nurse's cape or -- yes, of a nurse's cape, so there's nothing in the police report that says he identified the woman as Gail Miller, however when he testified here he did.

A
Yes, well you probably mentioned that to me, but this, to me, would be something quite significant. Can you explain how you might have used this or what you might have done with it?

Well a great deal would have depended upon what Mr. Sargent actually said, and with the additional information that you have been able to dig up, that, of course, would focus on the location of Miss Miller at least before she was killed.

And I take it that, if you were able to have someone observing her at the corner of Avenue $N$ and 20th Street between 7:00 and 7:05 a.m. alive and standing at the corner, that that might eliminate Mr. Milgaard as a suspect?

Yes. It supports the time element that we've talked so much about and, given the even narrower time frame, I think it strongly supports the impossibility, or at the very least improbability, of him doing anything to her or, indeed, having anything to do with her.

Okay. And if we put aside and take just what's in the police report at the time, and putting aside the fact of what he has told this Commission of Inquiry now, if it was simply that he had identified a woman wearing a blue, or what appeared to be a blue coat similar to a nurse's cape, etcetera, just with that description without the further identification of it being Gail Miller, would that information have been of assistance?

A
Yes. Well the clothes that are mentioned there would certainly indicate the nature of this girl's occupation and would, I think, spawn a potential link with the victim in this case.

Okay. I now want to move to some sexual assaults and indecent assaults, and this Commission has heard a fair bit of evidence and we've gone through all these statements and, in fact, heard from some of the victims, and what $I$ have done for you, Mr. Tallis, is $I$ have provided you with the statements of these victims and asked you to read them. And I've categorized them in three categories, and this is how I wish to go through them. The first set are the, what $I$ call the non-Fisher indecent assaults, and they are the assaults that -- or attempted assaults that occurred in and around January 1969 that were on the Gail Miller file, none of them identified Larry Fisher as the assailant, and in fact $I$ think when looking at the descriptions in those assaults -- and at that time $I$ think the evidence we heard that Larry Fisher wasn't known as the assailant of the other rapes at that time -- but certainly those rapes have never been visited upon Mr. Fisher, he has not been convicted of them, and I think in fact he denies them. So there is the non-Fisher assaults, if $I$ can call them that. The second grouping is the (V4)---- (V4)--- assault which occurred on the
same morning of the murder, again which Mr. Fisher has not been convicted of or charged with. (V4)---- (V4)--- has for some time, including at this Commission of Inquiry, testified that Larry Fisher was her assailant, Larry Fisher has denied that, and so again no charges there.

And the third group are the four assaults, sexual assaults, one indecent assault, that Larry Fisher confessed to and was convicted for, and those are the (V1)-, (V2)-----, (V3)------ assaults that occurred before Gail Miller's murder, and the (V5)-- (V5)--- assault that occurred after the murder. And there is a publication ban in effect for the names of the victims, Mr. Tallis, so we are free, in this room, to use the names, they will not appear on the record or outside this room. And so you have had a chance to go through those and look at them; have you?

Yes, you provided the material to me -Yeah.

A
-- and $I$ read it over. I'm sure I didn't read it over with the degree of care that you have read it over, but I'm generally familiar with those --
$Q$ Sure.
-- reports and statements.
So I want to deal first with what $I$ call the non-Fisher assaults, and the first one is the (V9)---- one of 106111. And, again, we have been through these a number of times so I'll just touch on the high points so that you know we're on the same page as to what we're talking about. This was an assault, and it's actually reported on January 31, '69 -- these are all, I think, on the Gail Miller murder file and it would appear that, after the murder, some of these women called the police in light of the Gail Miller murder. And: "... about $2-3$ weeks ago his wife had been indecently assaulted by a young man while she was walking in mid block on Ave Q between 22 nd and 21 st Sts., the time was approx. 7:30 to 7:45 a.m.

Description of youth is that he was wearing a blue parka with the hood up and he was approx. 5'5" tall.

Mr. (V9)---- said that they had not made any complaint to the police about this matter but thought this should be given to the police now as information in their investigation of
the murder which had since taken place." And again, if we can just go to 106249 , this is a bit more detail, and it's probably easier to go to this than the statement. And it talks about:
"... the 100 blk. Ave. Q. S., she was approached by a young man who grabbed her by her arms from behind and ran his hands over her body at which time she struggled and hit him in the face with an elbow and he then ran."

And so again perhaps, Mr. Tallis, I can just go through all four, then come back and ask you some general questions, or do you want to deal with them one by one?

No, I think you can, you know, go through them and then deal with them generally.

Okay. The next one is 024891 , are you able to get 024891 ? Actually, we'll bring up her statement, 006486 . This is the (V6)--- (V6)- statement, the statement is February 18, 1969, and it's an incident at the Hi-Low Mart, which is over in the Greystone area just off of 8th Street. A fellow came up -- and I'll just quickly go through this:
"... came up from behind me. He was so
sudden $I$ never heard him. His first
approach was to grab me by the private part."

I then said don't -- or he then said:
"... I don't want to hurt you. These were the only words he said."

And then to the next page. I think there was a bit of a struggle and then he ran off. Actually, there is a -- scroll down, please. I think there was a struggle, felt a bump:
"... I then screamed as loud as I could.
My assailant then got an arm around my throat. At this time the man in the car came running around the corner and stood. My assailant now took his arm away and sort of had a hold of my coat by the side."

Next page. And then $I$ think that he went off. Go to the next page, description here; eyes, large and dark; complexion a little dark or olive; black; 5 feet 2 inches to 5 feet 6 inches; middle 30 s, may have had a thin moustache. Next if we can go to 106191, and this is a report relating to (V11) (V11)--, complaint regarding a suspicious man following her, described as wearing a siwash sweater, about

30 years old, approximately five foot nine, and I think that is the -- right, that is the last of those.

So you've had a chance to look at those. Can you tell us whether those statements in and of themselves, put aside the other sexual assault information that we're going to come to with respect to Mr . Fisher, but these assaults, this information, would you have been able to use this in any way?

A
Well, I've thought about it in the light of what you asked me and trying to assess it as objectively as $I$ can, $I$ think that this is information that one would possibly set you on a chain of inquiry, but either standing alone or collectively but excluding the other items, I'm not sure that one could have been successful in having that evidence admitted to show that this crime was probably committed by a third person, albeit one who is not identified. I wouldn't rule it out, but $I$ don't want to elevate it to something that may not have been admissible on an application. Now, $I$ can go further than that -Sure.
-- but $I$ think it would be better to deal with it保

in the context of the others.
Sure, we'll maybe come back to that when we get to the other assaults.

I now want to deal with the
(V4)---- (V4)--- matter, 106110, and this is the January 31, '69 report. We've had -- we've been through this a number of times at the Commission and Ms. (V4)--- testified, but she said that at 7:07 a.m. on the morning of January 31, 1969: "... she was on her way to catch her bus on 22 nd $S t$. to the University she was assaulted by a male person. This person came out of a yard (after taking her back there) 201 Ave. H So., and walked towards her."

And I think it's seven blocks from where Mr. Gail Miller's body was found is where she identifies it.
"This male person then grabbed her and ran his hand up and down her legs. She screemed and this person then moved back. She had laid or thrown her books down and she picked them up and continued on North to 22 nd ST., She did look back and he was following her. She
quickened her pace and the next time she looked back he was gone."

And then her description is -- scroll down, please -- not young or old, possibly near 30 years of age, height five feet five inches or six inches, and etcetera, black or dark hair, not too long, wearing a three-quarter or one-half length suede coat, dark brown in colour. Coat could have had a fur collar.

And then if we can go to her statement, 006404 , this is her statement of the same date, she describes the incident again at 7:07 a.m., and I think her evidence before the Inquiry was that she had -- actually, maybe I'll just scroll down. She says $I$ was walking -- no, go back to where you were, please.
"I had just checked my time so know it was 7:07 a.m."
-- when the assault, or shortly before the assault, and you've had a chance to look at this and consider it, Mr. Tallis. Can you tell us whether this information would have been of assistance to you in the defence of Mr. Milgaard?

A
I think it would, particularly in the light of what $I$ now know about the other ones that you are
about to deal with, but this one may stand on a slight -- I would have argued, I think, that this one stands on a slightly different basis, and that is that it involved an assault on this bitterly cold morning at the time that she mentioned and I think it might well have been admitted as sort of a free-standing piece of testimony, if $I$ may use that term. I realize there could well be an argument over it, but reflecting on it, as you have asked me to, $I$ think that that is a tenable argument, and having regard to the circumstances, including the location and the weather conditions on the day in question, we get -- put it this way, I'm not attempting to be an expert in statistical causation or anything like that, but if you have a sexual predator at that time, and one would have no reason to doubt this lady's description, one could argue that the likelihood of having two sexual predators in the same area who conducted themselves in this way on a bitterly cold morning in January raises some very serious questions.

And is it evidence that you think you would have tried to put before the jury then for that purpose?

A
Yes, bearing in mind the additional items that $I$
know you are coming to.
Right.
Very much so.
And can you tell us how you might have argued to the jury that this might exclude Mr. Milgaard or raised a reasonable doubt about his guilt?

Well, there's no suggestion that he was the attacker, and the manner of this attack, the time of it and the general location $I$ think would be relevant considerations to raise.

Can you tell us how --
But I think that knowing what $I$ now know based on what you have shown to me, I would view this as part of the package that you showed it to me -that you showed to me.

Right. And you are referring to the rapes that Mr. Fisher was convicted of?

A

Q
A
Okay. Those are the ones I'm thinking of in particular.
$Q$
Can $I$ just ask you to comment on one point on the (V4)---- (V4)--- statement that we've heard some evidence and some different views on and how you
might have dealt with the time factor. If her timing is correct, at 7:07 a.m., and the window of opportunity $I$ think for the death of Gail Miller I think was 6:45, or perhaps 6:50 to 7:05 I think is where we got it, do you foresee, or how would you have dealt with that? In other words, if you are saying to the jury when Mr. Milgaard was in the vicinity he did not have enough time to have committed this thing, can you tell us how you might explain to the jury that this other perpetrator could have committed both?

A
Well, so much would depend on what Miss (V4)--said in testimony at the time and of course the accuracy of watches or whether they are out a little and so forth would enter into it, but as $I$ say, coupled with the others, $I$ think it would make a much more compelling case for its admission. I think the key would be getting the testimony admitted on behalf of the defence or, better still, persuading the Crown to call it once you became aware of it.

Would the statement of (V4)---- (V4)--- and the information in the police report, was that the type of information that you contemplated receiving when you made your request back in June,

July and August of 1969 for information from the Crown?

Yes, it would be, because that type of information could be very helpful in defending a case and pointing to the innocence of the person charged. If we can go to 039527 , we'll now go to the, I call them the Fisher assaults, they are the four that -- three sexual assaults and one indecent assault Mr. Fisher confessed to and pled guilty to. 039527. And this is a newspaper article of December 14 th, 1968 and the dates of the -- there were three assaults before Gail Miller's murder, I think the dates were October 21st, November 14th and November $28 t h \quad$ believe, or in that time frame. The first two were actual rapes, the one -- and those two rapes were on Avenue 0 , Avenue $F$, in that area, and 18 th Street. The one at the end of November, the (V3)------ one, was an indecent assault over by the university area, and this is a newspaper article talking about a warning to women not to talk to strangers and says:
"... after two instances of alleged rape and one assault were brought to their attention ... took place in the

Riversdale area and the assault took place in the university district.

They said the alleged assailant first talks to women and then takes them into alleys."

Do you have a recollection of being aware of this news article at the time?

A

Q
I have no recollection of having read it or having
it brought to my attention.
If you can take your mind back to again the time you were engaged by Mr . Milgaard and going through those proceedings, and in fact let's say the six months prior, do you have any recollection of being aware of these rapes having occurred?

No, I don't.
Would you as defence counsel in the bar -- would these matters be discussed -- or how prevalent would matters like these rapes be in the community? Are you able to shed any light on that?

A
Well, $I$ certainly don't recall any talk about them.

What about --
A And --
Q Oh, I'm sorry.

A
$Q$
A
Q
A

Q

A

Q
At the time you defended David Milgaard, did you have any knowledge of unsolved rapes or assaults in the two or three months prior to her death in Saskatoon?

A
And I recall, you know, after I was retained making inquires, general inquiries, and particularly of one person who, because of his background, seemed to know most everything that was going on over there, didn't, in any way --

Over where?
On the west side.
I see.
Didn't raise it with me at all, and that was my purpose in talking to him. Now, I have to say the (V6)- incident, $I$ don't recall any talk of it in our immediate community and that wasn't far from where I lived at the time.

Okay. We've heard some mention of it being described as a serial rapist on the loose in the city with heightened awareness of people. Do you have any recollection of that?

I don't recall that, and I'm quite sure that if that had come to my attention, I would remember it.

No, I didn't.

Q
Did you have any knowledge or information that the police, both the Saskatoon City Police and the RCMP who were assisting them, had, during the initial part of the investigation, suspected that the unknown rapist may have been the perpetrator of Gail Miller?

No. You've directed my attention in materials to comments in some of the reports and I certainly did not have any indication of that.

If you had been aware just generally that one of the initial theories of the police was that this unknown rapist may have been the murderer of Gail Miller, is that something as defence counsel you would have done something with?

Yes, I'm sure I would have asked Mr. Caldwell about it or, you know, somebody in his position. If we can call up 065399 , this is an RCMP report of March 20th, 1969, and just a bit of background. This report, although prepared in March of 1969 , the evidence we've heard is that it was not on the Saskatoon City Police files, nor was it on Mr. Caldwell's file, and in fact $I$ think post conviction it was located in 1993, and you've had a chance to read through these RCMP reports; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q
If we can just go to the page 065401, please, and I think the evidence we heard from, in particular, Corporal Rasmussen, as he then was, of the RCMP, who was involved, what he testified to was that the RCMP provided assistance to the city police for part of the investigation and these reports were reports to his superiors and basically reflected what they had learned from the Saskatoon City Police, or that had been part of the Saskatoon City Police investigation as opposed to being reports of an RCMP investigation, okay? Yes.

And with that, paragraph 10 , this report says, it talks about the two rapes and one attempted rape:
"In each case the attacker forced the girls down an alley at knife point where he forced them to undress before committing the offence. In the attempted rape, the attacker was scared off by the approach of car headlights. One of the victims claims that she can still identify her attacker while the other two are only able to give a brief description of him. In view of the
similar methods used in committing these offences, there is a good possibility that they were all committed by the same individual and this fact is not being overlooked during this investigation." Again, would that type of information be of assistance to you in your defence of Mr . Milgaard?

Yes. I wasn't aware of the contents of this report until you showed it to me.

And so I guess the -- actually, let me go to another report here and then I'll ask you some questions, 250597 , and next page, this is a May 7th, '69 report of Corporal Rasmussen. If you could go to 250603, the bottom:
"It is mentioned during the late fall of 1968 the local police department had reports of two rapes and one attempted rape. These investigations were conducted by the City Police with negative results. Persons involved were as follows."

And then those are the three rapes, (V1)-, (V2)----- and (V3)------.
"In these three instances the M.O. was Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv
similar in that the male approached his victim from the rear, covered their mouth with his hand and pointed a knife into their back, forcing them down the lane. The descriptions of the assailant given by all three were very similar and it appeared that the same person was involved. The assailant would force his victim to undress at knife point and always managed to stay in the shadows or behind them in order that his identity would not be detected. He would then have the victim lie on her coat at which time intercourse would take place. In the (V3)------ case, the assailant was scared away as a result of lights of a vehicle approaching down the lane."

And then scroll down, it then goes on to talk about they had some lab reports or some physical evidence with respect to the (V1)- rape and they actually did a check of the panties and agglutinogens of type $A$ were found on the blue panties and plaid jacket. In other words, I think from the test the perpetrator of the (V1)rape appeared to be an $A$ secretor.
scroll down:
"As a result of the foregoing, it is felt there is a strong possibility the three rapes and the murder are directly connected. In view of this, extensive interrogation was conducted with
(V2)----- with negative results."
And etcetera.
If that -- I'll just check, I don't think we need to go -- you've had a chance to read each of the statements from (V1)-, (V2)----- and (V3)------ ?

Yes, I did.
And we've been through them, and in particular how they describe the attacks.

A
Q
Yes.
You recall that, about being undressed and the back alleys referred to in these reports?

Yes. I think this RCMP report that you've read generally summarizes the similarities.

Can you tell us, Mr. Tallis, what you would have done if you would have been provided with this information?

A Well, after $I$ read this material over, $I$ felt that
this would form the evidentiary foundation for the admission of this type of evidence to demonstrate or at least support David's position that he didn't do it. First of all, $I$ do not think there would have been any dispute over the fact that David was not in the city at material times when these sexual assaults took place and, as I understood the law at that time, and $I$ think it still is the law, if "A" is charged with murder, it is open to him to demonstrate that it was, in fact, or was likely committed by another person. In this case, I'm sure $I$ would have felt that there was a very compelling basis on which to admit the testimony even if the defence had to call it. Naturally it would have been better if one could persuade the prosecution to call it, but if not, then one would seek to adduce it as part of the defence, and if there was an argument over its admissibility, that, I presume, would have been conducted in the absence of the jury, and in order to determine the issue it may well be; indeed, $I$ think it would have been prudent to call these ladies as witnesses, but at the end of the day $I$ think that a strong and persuasive argument could be made that this was
relevant and probative evidence with respect to the issue of whether or not the crime was committed by some other person, albeit unidentified.

I think the RCMP report summarizes the significant similarities that attracted the attention of experienced investigating officers and $I$ don't think that $I$ can really usefully add much more than by referring to that. I guess the more I reflect on it, the more $I$ feel that this is very compelling evidence, pointing to the conclusion that a third person, albeit unidentifiable by name, committed this crime that was in issue.

And is the information on these assaults, is that the type of information that you contemplated receiving when you made your requests of the Crown in the summer of 1969?

This is -- this evidence $I$ think is much more compelling in terms of admissibility than even some of the previous instances that you mentioned. Not that one would avoid including them in the materials submitted, the testimony submitted on a voir dire, and of course in my view this is the type of evidence, or testimony, that points to the
innocence, or potential innocence of an accused person and certainly is information that $I$ had in mind one would receive under the principles, for example, articulated in Dallison, in the Dallison case and other English cases that I thought were respectable authority at that time.

Would you have, and again I appreciate I'm asking you to look back with new information and speculate a bit, but would -- would the fact that the police, as you mentioned, seem to connect the rapes to the murder, at least at the initial part of the investigation, would you try and elicit that evidence from the officers?

Well, in terms of the admissibility, I would certainly try to.

Subject to admissibility?
Whether $I$ would be allowed to do that, but $I$ know that Corporal Rasmussen and, I think it's Staff Sergeant Edmondson, were very experienced RCMP investigators.

If we could go to 004102 , this is an April 15th, 1969 police report, and this relates to the Gail Miller murder investigation. Actually, if we can go to the top, it says:
"Regarding this file, on April 7th, I
called at 210 Ave. N. So., the home of Miss (V1)-'s aunt ..."

And (V1)--- (V1)- was the very first rape victim:
"To show her some pictures ... and was
transported to the Police station. At
the Police station Miss (V1)- was shown
a group of 19 photos - snapshots of various people picked at random.

Amongst these photos was included one of one David Milgaarde (this last photo was obtained from D/Sgt. R. Mackie). Miss (V1)- looked at these photos which were all placed on the desk at one time, and immediately picked out the photo of

David Milgaarde and one other male person whos identity at this time is not known to me. She stated that she had definitely seen both these persons around before somewhere however couldn't remember where or when. She could not identify any of these persons as the one who may have raped her."

And etcetera. Would this information, coupled with the other information, have been of assistance to you, Mr. Tallis?

A

Q Again, 105520, this is a February 27th, 1969 report by Identification Officer Penkala, and this is February 27 th, and this was on the Gail Miller file and it's talking about the items related to the murder and says:
"The similarity of our departments occurrence numbers 10173 and 10910 --" Both 68,
"-- complaints of rape, with this murder investigation, lists the following items which are reported missing, identifiable and could be of evidential value."

And those are the (V1)- and (V2)----- rapes. And then the next page, it goes on to list some information from those rapes.

And then as well 009298. This
is a letter from Mr. Penkala to the Crime Index. If we can go to the next page, actually go to 009299 , this is his report about the murder on February 5. And go to the next page. It says, 'Our Department has two unsolved cases dating back into October and November' -- call that out, please -- 'of 1968 which involve complaints of
rape. In both these cases the victim was attacked from behind while walking in the late evening, forced into a lane and, under threat with a knife, made to undress and submit to intercourse. The victims were always threatened and forbidden to see the attacker who, after the attack, carried away some of the victim's clothing. In these cases, the attacker allowed the victims to replace some of the clothing, usually the outer garment or coat.'

Would this information have been of assistance to you, Mr. Tallis, in the defence of Mr. Milgaard?

Yes, well, my earlier comments about the RCMP report apply with equal force to this.

And would you -- is this the type of information you contemplated receiving when you made your request to the Crown?

Yes, this is very material information.
I now want to turn to the (V5)-- (V5)--- matter, 261590. And this is February 21, 1970, three weeks after Mr. Milgaard has been convicted, and this is a rape that occurs around Avenue $V$ and $20 t h$ Street. And, again, you have had a chance to review this information, Mr. Tallis?

A Yes.

Q
Can you tell us -- and, again, I guess I have to ask you the question; presumably, if you would have known about the other rapes prior to the trial of Mr. Milgaard, there might have been a different result. If we go to -- let's take the situation where you do not know of the other rapes, the situation that existed, and that after Mr. Milgaard is convicted -- actually, let me rephrase that. After Mr. Milgaard was convicted on January 31, 1970, would you have still been alert to other information that might assist you in his appeal or in furthering his position? A Yes.

And can you tell us what you might have done if you had been made aware of this information about the (V5)-- (V5)--- rape in the month after the conviction?

A
Well if this particular rape and the others that hadn't been brought to my attention were brought to my attention, that would make an even more compelling argument for admission of this type of evidence on the appeal, and $I$ think that we are now talking about an application to admit fresh evidence on the appeal. But $I$ think that this
particular incident strengthens the argument that the evidence of these sexual assaults that we've been talking about, the three plus this one, we'll call them the four, is even more compelling when we consider admitting, an application to admit that evidence to show that the crime was or was likely to have been committed by a third person, albeit unidentified. It is particularly significant in this case that there could be no suggestion that David Milgaard was in Saskatoon at the time of the (V5)-- (V5)--- rape. So can you tell us what -- again, post-conviction, if you became aware of the (V5)-- (V5)--- rape, and let's say at that time you also became aware of the previous three, can you tell us what you would have done?

A

Q
A
Well $I$ would have launched an application to adduce fresh evidence on the hearing of the appeal --

Okay.
-- and endeavoured to get affidavits from the people involved, and if they were unwilling to swear affidavits, then of course $I$ would ask to have them called as witnesses either before a Commissioner appointed by the Court or before The

Court.
The usual practice through the years in Saskatchewan has been for the witnesses to be examined before the Court of Appeal as distinct from appointing someone to take their evidence on commission.

Now I should also say that I think, in this type of case, that given the information that you have provided to me $I$ would probably have approached Mr. Kujawa, if he was going to be handling the appeal, and asked to have him verify the information that $I$ have obtained -had obtained. I know it was veri -- would be verifiable, because he would have to go to the police to get confirmation of it, and invite him to consider whether or not he would agree to a new trial being ordered on the basis of that information.

And, based on your prior dealings with Mr. Kujawa, had you -- again, not specifically like this -but was that the type of thing you had done in the past with him?

A
$Q$
I had.
And can you tell us how you found him to deal with when you did that?

BY MR. HODSON:
Mr. Tallis, we'll just carry on with, I think where we finished up was the (V5)-- (V5)--matter. Just on the question of Larry Fisher, when did you first learn of a fellow by the name of Larry Fisher?

I think the, where it was first brought to my attention in a significant way, and maybe really in the first occasion, was when $I$ was in the Supreme Court hearing. It may have been mentioned in passing to me before that during the course of discussions with counsel for Mr. Milgaard before the hearing, but that's the time that $I$ recall my
attention particularly being drawn to it.
And that's in 1992; correct?
Yes. I think Mr. Brown asked the question of me, and I don't think anybody else did at the time. Okay. I'll just go through, and again just for the purposes of the record, and we've heard evidence on this, that after the (V5)-- (V5)--rape of February $21,1970 \mathrm{Mr}$. Fisher had moved to Winnipeg, and $I$ think the evidence before the Commission has been that he was not a suspect in any of the Saskatoon rapes, or there was three rapes and one indecent assault; that on August 2nd, 1970 he committed a rape in Winnipeg of (V7)--- (V7)---; and then on September 19th, 1970, he committed a rape on (V8)-- (V8)--- and he was caught at that time and arrested. And I've provided you with those two statements, you have had a chance to look at the particulars of the two Winnipeg rapes I believe?

Yes.
And then he was in custody, and then on October 21 st and 22 nd, 1970 he confessed to two of the rapes in Saskatoon, namely the (V3)------ and the (V5)--- rape.

A Yes.

Q

A
Q e Yes. December 30th, 1970 the Saskatoon City Police laid four charges here in Saskatoon against Mr. Fisher for the four, (V1)-, (V2)-----, (V3)------, (V5)---, the informations were sworn. At that time Mr. Fisher was in custody in Winnipeg and he was not brought back to Court on those charges. He then in May of 1971, through his legal counsel Mr. Greenberg in Winnipeg, pled guilty to the two charges in Winnipeg and received a sentence of $I$ believe 13 years, was sent to Prince Albert Penitentiary. Mr. Greenberg had had correspondence and communication with Mr. Kujawa in 1971, Mr. Greenberg has testified before this Commission that in effect he had a deal for pleading Mr. Fisher out in Saskatchewan with respect to the four charges, and in December of 1971 direct indictments were laid in Regina and Mr. Kujawa appeared, Mr. Greenberg appeared, and Mr. Fisher was brought down from Prince Albert to Regina, plead guilty, and got a concurrent sentence. Are you generally familiar with those facts from what -- the information that $I$ have provided to you?

A

Yes, I think that you set it out very succinctly to me, but accurately.

Now $I$ want to talk about what -- and $I$ take it, did you know any of that, did you know any of these goings-on with Mr. Fisher in 1970 or 1971? No.

Now the -- Mr. Fisher's confession for the two Saskatoon rapes was October $21 s t-22 n d, 1970$, and the appeal $I$ think you argued November 6th, 1970. And you may have already dealt with this when you answered about the other rapes, presumably if you -- I think you told us that if, before the appeal was argued, you learned of these unsolved rapes, you would have brought a fresh evidence application; fair, correct?

Yes.
If they became solved rapes before the appeal was argued, presumably the same application, but now with a perpetrator?

Yes.

Let's go to the scenario if you learned of this information, either about the rapes themselves and/or the fact that Mr. Fisher had confessed to two of the four of them, let's say you had learned about that after you argued the appeal in early

November 1970 but before judgement was rendered by The Court, which was January 5 of 1971; can you tell us what you would have done if you became aware of that information?

I've reflected on it in the light of your request, and I'm quite satisfied that the procedure I would have followed would have been to contact Mr. Kujawa and the Registrar of The Court to indicate that $I$ wished to make an application in the light of new information that had been brought to my attention. Since judgement had not been delivered it would have been open to me to ask for the delay of delivery of judgement. I did not know when the judgement would have been -- would have come down, or was going to come down, but since the matter had not been disposed of and no formal judgement roll issued it is, of course, open to counsel to apply for a rehearing. And on such a rehearing usually you, if a new matter of that nature comes to light, the opportunity to get a new hearing, I think, would be greater, that is a rehearing. In this case I'm sure, if it had
been brought to my attention in the way in which you have mentioned it, I would clearly have outlined to Mr. Kujawa the nature of the
application that $I$ was bringing, with details, and of course, quite apart from preparation of the relevant material in affidavit form or otherwise, I would have asked him, I think, to verify what $I$ don't think would be disputed facts as far as the nature of these assaults and the, by that time, the perpetrator of them, and invite him to consider his position and let me know while $I$ was getting things ready.

Based upon your dealings with Mr. Kujawa, are you able to tell us what you think he might have done in that scenario?

I know that he would have given it careful consideration, based on my previous professional dealings with him.

Can --
And what $I$ said to you earlier in that connection applies with equal force to this scenario.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Hodson, I missed something, I'm sorry; that you gave two dates, October 21-22, 1970, that was what?

MR. HODSON: That was the dates that Larry Fisher confessed to the (V3)------ and (V5)--assaults. He confessed on the 21st in Winnipeg and on the $22 n d$ to the statement that he provided
to Mr. Karst.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks.

BY MR. HODSON:
$Q$

Let's now go to the scenario where it's after January 5, 1971 , after the appeal has been dismissed by the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal, but the appeal to the Supreme Court, or the application for leave, is still alive, and again, you became aware of the, either the rapes themselves and/or the fact that Larry Fisher had confessed to two of them. Would the same apply, would you do the same thing there, but with respect to an application to the Supreme court? Yes. Assuming that $I$ was acting on it, I certainly would have, and if something like that had come to my attention $I$ would have passed it on to David and his advisors.

I know that $I$ was very conscious of a case that $I$ recall by the name of The Queen versus Horsburgh. I'm not sure of the exact year of it, but that was a case in which the supreme Court had ruled that the evidence of, in that case, recanting young people was properly admissible as fresh evidence. This recantation had arisen after the process through the courts,
and I think the same principle would probably be applied with respect to this type of evidence, in other words it was fresh evidence, and particularly the Winnipeg cases would, in my argument, add strength to that type of application.

So in a case where, let's use the example where Mr. Milgaard's appeals are exhausted, in other words after his application for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court; is that the horseman (ph) situation you are talking about?

No, no, no.
No? So --
It's a question of the admissibility of evidence on the appeal.

Q Oh, okay. In this case that would be an additional ground of appeal on which leave would be sought. If we go to the scenario -- and, again, I appreciate that you did not act for Mr. Milgaard at the Supreme Court -- but again, if you were acting for him at the time that all of his appeals had expired, let's go to 1971, and you had been made aware of either the rapes themselves and/or the fact that Mr. Fisher had either confessed to
them or been convicted of them; can you tell us what you would have done?

A

Q

A
$Q$
A speaking of when leave was denied? MR. HODSON: Yes. After that. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh yeah.

BY MR. HODSON:

And I appreciate that maybe I'm asking you to
speculate on a situation where you, in fact, were

A
Q
not even engaged, -Yeah. -- but were you aware or are you aware, Mr. Tallis, or let me tell you that what we have heard in this Inquiry, of allegations that have been made by David Milgaard and his mother and his lawyers, that Serge Kujawa, Mr. Caldwell, and others connected Larry Fisher as the killer of Gail Miller at a time, perhaps October 1970, and before Mr. Milgaard's legal avenues had been exhausted, and the allegation is that they connected Mr. Fisher as the killer and deliberately conspired to withhold this information from you and from others; do you have any knowledge or information to support or refute that allegation?

I simply have no knowledge of what that is based on.

No, and I appreciate that, and I'm just asking you. That allegation was made, and I'll go to some documents a bit later; is there anything, when you look back in your dealings with Mr. Kujawa or Mr. Caldwell or others, that would either support or refute the suggestion that they
knew Larry Fisher was the real killer of Gail Miller and deliberately conspired to withhold that information from you?

A

Q

A
Yes, I certainly would never have suspected anything like that, because $I$ knew each one of them to be a person of high personal and professional integrity.

I just want to ask you a couple questions about, we've heard some evidence about the practice and procedures back in 1970 and ' 71 regarding direct indictments, and we heard from Mr. Greenberg who was Larry Fisher's lawyer. But if we can go back to 1971, Mr. Fisher plead guilty in Manitoba, was sentenced, went to Prince Albert, and then made an
arrangement to plead guilty on the four Saskatchewan charges, and $I$ think the evidence of Mr. Greenberg was to the effect that either he requested it or somehow it came up to do it by direct indictment, and one of the reasons would be to avoid a preliminary hearing, committal, and a couple of Court appearances. Do you recall whether, at that time, arranging to have a direct indictment to plead out to an offence; was that something that happened from time to time, was that unusual, or can you comment on that?

A
I don't recall anything specific on that, but where you were bringing somebody in from another province to plead out on something, I don't think that would be unusual. Usually it would be done to facilitate matters, as you have outlined, but to sort of tell you whether or not there was any policy laid down on that, $I$ have no recollection of anything like that. Usually, things like that were handled as a matter of discussion between counsel acting for the accused person and counsel, like whoever was handling the prosecution file.

We have also -- and, again, the direct indictment that was filed in this case was in Regina, the offences took place in Saskatoon, and there has
been some evidence or some documents suggesting that Mr. Fisher -- that it may have been for convenience, and that Mr. Fisher, or that prisoners from Prince Albert may have been transported to the Regina Court as opposed to the Saskatoon Court on a more frequent basis. Do you have any knowledge of the practice, back in 1971, regarding prisoners from the penitentiary
appearing in Regina courts versus Saskatoon courts?

A
Not specifically, but $I$ can tell you that in those years -- and I think that's, it's, the practice still prevails -- criminal sentence -- criminal appeals, excluding say regulatory offences, are only heard in Regina.

When $I$ was a member of the bar, there was pressure to have appeals heard here in Saskatoon, and while $I$ was in practice here the local bar persuaded the, $I$ think the Court of Appeal and probably government officials, but particularly the Court of Appeal, that it was desirable to have The Court sit here. The result of those discussions ended up with The Court sitting here on civil appeals, as it still does, but criminal appeals were not heard here. Because
the feeling was that the prisoners were brought from Prince Albert to Regina, and $I$ don't know whether it was because of facilities, better facilities there for handling a number of prisoners that would come in on, often on sentence appeals but also on conviction appeals. So, in any event, $I$ can tell you, without any reservations, that civil appeals were heard here as a result of those discussions, but criminal appeals continued to be heard in Regina, and as far as $I$ know they still continue to be heard there to the exclusion of Saskatoon. I think I've made it clear to you --

Yes.
-- that there might be regulatory matters that come before The court here, but even the summary conviction appeals under the Criminal Code under points of law, and so forth, go before The court in Regina.

Q
It's my understanding that in those cases of either criminal conviction appeals, or criminal sentence appeals, that an accused in custody would generally be in attendance at the appeal?

A They are -- the Court, so far as $I$ know, has always taken the position that they are entitled
to be there in person. If they signify that they do not wish to attend then usually their -- that request is granted. But the usual practice has been, over a long period of years, for the accused to be there as of right, that is the accused or Appellant. I'm talking about the Court of Appeal on criminal matters, but $I$ can't speak with respect to other matters.

Okay. So as far as the suggestion, and $I$ think it is in one of the $R C M P$ reports that we have seen, that in 1971 , that there were regular transportation by air of prisoners from the Prince Albert Penitentiary to the Regina courts to deal with matters, versus Saskatoon; is that -- would you agree with that, is that -That, that, $I$ think that's an accurate statement. I recall the odd time when prisoners enjoyed having the ride down by plane from Prince Albert, would come in and then abandon their appeal at the last minute, smile somewhat graciously.

Q Okay. If we can go to 032805 and go to page 032819 , and here is the allegation that $I$ had referred to earlier, at least one of them. It says:
"It is alleged that Mr. .. Kujawa sought a direct indictment against Larry Fisher and prosecuted Fisher in Regina to avoid publicity and thereby continue the cover-up of the miscarriage of justice against Milgaard."

And if $I$ haven't, didn't fairly summarize that before, again, do you have anything in addition to what you have already said to add in response to that suggestion? Presumably, you are one of the people that he was seeking to avoid publicity of this matter from.

No, I can't add anything to what I've already told you.

If we can scroll down, there was also an
allegation made -- scroll down further right to the bottom of the page -- actually, go to the full page. That's good there, just that part. This is -- what I'm reading from is an August 15th report of the Alberta Justice based on allegations of criminal offences that were made on behalf of the Milgaard group against various officials, and one of them, it is alleged that Serge Kujawa, then the director of public prosecutions for Saskatchewan, K. Lysyk and R. Romanow connected
the Milgaard file with the Fisher file and knew that there was a miscarriage of justice, and I think this relates to an allegation that at the time Mr. Kujawa was working on the appeal that you had filed and you had argued against him that he also had the Fisher files at the same time and that he in fact had connected Larry Fisher as the culprit who committed the Gail Miller murder, but took steps to deliberately cover that up. Is there anything in your dealings with Mr. Kujawa during the appeal that suggested to you that he might have been aware of Larry Fisher as the killer of Gail Miller and that he took any steps to cover that up?

None whatsoever.
The good news is, Mr. Tallis, I'm on my last binder.

I now want to go to talk about, move into the 1980 s and your dealings with subsequent counsel for David Milgaard, and the first was Gary Young and we've talked a bit about him and $I$ think you've told us that he contacted you and that you made arrangements, or agreed to have your file from your former law firm made available for him to look at; is that correct?

A Yes. My attitude was that it should be made available to him. I didn't know what was there at the time when $I$ was talking to him, but $I$ had known him for many years and $I$ knew his colleagues and partners quite well and $I$ had no hesitation in, number one, talking to him, and number two, indicating that, to make available to him what there was.

And do you have a recollection of what you would have talked to him about? Did you talk about any of the details?

A
I don't think we went into anything much in the way of details because that wasn't the purpose of the discussion, although $I$ think he -- I think he raised with me what $I$ thought, whether there was any possibility of, or prospects of having the matter reopened one way or the other, and while this is just something very vague in my mind, it was a theme that sort of ran through, I think, some of my thinking. I thought that the history of these re-openings or references indicated that there was an uphill struggle for someone in that position, and I'm sure $I$ referred to likely cases such as Truscott, Latta, and there may have been another one, in particular $I$ think $I$ mentioned the

Horsburgh case because that dealt with the situation of where witnesses recanted and whether or not recantations might form the basis for a reopening. Now, this is just something very general and something that $I$ have a very vague recollection.

Now, if Mr. Young were to say, well, that $I$ don't think that $I$ did talk to him about that, $I$ certainly couldn't quarrel with it, but I'm trying to give you my best recollection, and my best recollection of course is just very vague.

Q
And at that time, Mr. Tallis, again I think this is the early 1980 s, are you able to tell us what -- and maybe it's not limited to the 1980 s, it might have even been in the '70s when you were done the case -- as far as an area that might be pursued to have the case reopened, did you have any thoughts as to what might be fertile ground for someone to pursue?

The fact that $I$ have the Horsburgh case in my mind would indicate $I$ certainly would never have ruled out witnesses recanting.

Okay. And can you think of anything else that might have been --

A

Q

A

Q

A

I can't think of anything else that we might have discussed, but it may well be that there were other things mentioned in passing. This was all by telephone and $I$ was living in Yellowknife at the time, so it's a good many years ago. If -- now, $I$ think we heard from Mr. Young that he acted for about four months and then Mr. Merchant acted?

Yes.
And you had some dealings with Tony Merchant as well did you?

Yes. Mr. Merchant somewhere along the way, and this was when $I$ was still in Yellowknife, phoned me, or either there was a message requesting me to phone him, so I did talk to him briefly on the phone, but $I$ can't recall the gist of that conversation other than the fact that apart from a few other things, he mentioned that he was involved, recently had been retained by $I$ think Mrs. Milgaard and probably David, I'm not sure just how he framed that, but anyway, I certainly became aware of it, and this would likely be in the -- likely be sometime in the fall, late summer of 1981 I believe. I could be wrong on my time frame, but --

Q And --
A
$Q$

A
Well, I hadn't really had time to reflect on it or, you know, read all the material that you've asked me to read, but $I$ know that I've always emphasized that, you know, the sanctity of solicitor/client privilege, and I don't recall whether Mr. Merchant had any waiver or authorization from David at that time, $I$ just don't recall, but $I$ know that $I$ emphasized to him that $I$ certainly was not in the practice of discussing a client's business or a former client's business in a public forum without some type of waiver. In other words, I took the position that any waiver, or any waiver was
something the client decided, not his former or present lawyer.

And $I$ think from the documents it would appear that $I$ don't believe David Milgaard had signed a waiver for you, I believe Mr. Merchant indicated that he was prepared to or he did, but I don't believe there was a waiver signed.

Well, I don't recall. He may have -- he may have had something of that nature, so I -- but I did discuss a few details in light of the contents of the Court of Appeal decision, but $I$ indicated to him that to go into it in greater detail, I would certainly have to take some time to reflect on it, and at that time $I$ still had hopes of getting access to what $I$ would call the complete file, or finding it, and in particular, finding my notes and trial brief.

Would -- and again, if you would have been provided with a waiver of privilege signed by David Milgaard, and Mr. Merchant would have asked you to do so, would you have gone through your file for Mr. Merchant and Mr. Milgaard and told them again much of what you've told this Commission of Inquiry?

A Oh, I would have done my very best to do so,
and -- but bearing it mind it would take a great deal of time to review everything, but unfortunately $I$ was never able to locate the file or any of my notes or anything like that and that still hampers me to this day.

But putting --
You have managed to dig up things that $I$ never had access to.

As far as the discussions between you and David Milgaard, and in particular what he told you about the events of January 30 and 31,1969 , would that have been information that, again assuming a waiver had been signed, that you could have and would have provided to Mr. Young, Mr. Merchant and indeed later Mr. Wolch and Mr. Asper?

Certainly $I$ would have talked to them about it, and if $I$ had had my file, then of course $I$ would have gone over it in great detail in terms of my notes. I'm sure that my handwritten notes had been typed into memoranda and you have one or two examples here that illustrate the way I generally did it.

Q
Now, let's -- and just as far as Mr. Merchant, I think there was some suggestion somewhere that, where he said or someone reported that you maybe
had not given him as much as he might have wanted, and is it your evidence that that would be because he did not have a waiver signed by David Milgaard? That may well be, but $I$ thought that he understood very clearly that $I$ was quite prepared to co-operate with him.

If we can then go ahead, 153486, I take it at a later point you were contacted by either Mr. Wolch and/or Mr. Asper; is that correct?

Yes.
And this is a letter, May 10th, 1989, from Mr. Wolch to you, and just sort of read the first part, and:
"For the last several years we have been representing David Milgaard in an attempt to have his case reopened. We have somewhat stumbled along attempting to find new evidence or issues to persuade the Department of Justice that David was in fact innocent of the murder of Gail Miller. Up until recently most of what we were able to obtain would amount for the most part to a rearguing of the case itself."

And from that opening paragraph, are you able to
tell us whether this would have been your first contact with Mr. Wolch or might there have been an earlier one?

A

Q

A

Q
relation to it, so we met privately, that is, there wasn't anybody else there, although I think there were other counsel around the building, and I believe he told me he was examining documents or something that had been brought over to the courthouse or -- anyway, I didn't get the details of that, it wasn't any of my business, but we had our discussion.

So how many in-person meetings then would you have had?

A
Well, $I$ think -- I'm quite sure there were at least two, but $I$ stand to be corrected if there were more than that, and of course I should add this, that $I$ recall that on the evening before $I$ was giving testimony in the Supreme Court of Canada, Mr. Wolch did speak to me by phone and came over to my room for a short period of time. And apart from that meeting at the hotel in Ottawa, can you tell us approximately how much time you would have spent with Mr. Wolch and Mr. Asper then in these previous two meetings? Were they lengthy, detailed meetings?

You know, I don't actually recall how long they were, but $I$ know the meeting on the Saturday that I had with Mr. Wolch was not a rushed meeting, if
you know what $I$ mean, and $I$ don't recall any rush on the other one, but --

And do you recall what areas you would have discussed?

I know that two areas that were of particular importance to Mr. Wolch involved I think areas that the Supreme Court were primarily interested in and that is, number one, what was the background to him not testifying, why did he not testify, and that of course involved whether or not certain advice had been given to him. The other significant matter that $I$ recall being raised was whether or not he ever admitted to me that he committed the crime, and so those areas were canvassed, plus some other details, because I know that we discussed them at some length, but $I$ can't really tell you how long at this time. And again, on the decision to testify, I mean, would it be fair to say that -- or try and compare what you've told us, this Commission, about what went into the decision to advise him not to testify, would you have given him that much information, less or can you tell us what -I think we essentially covered that area much in the way that $I$ have here, probably here you've
asked me more detail, but certainly we covered it, you know, to the extent it was covered in the Supreme Court of Canada.

Would you have advised Mr. Wolch of what David Milgaard had told you about the events of January 30 and 31?

I'm quite sure I did.
And the motel room reenactment?
I think that $I$ did, because $I$ had read over the Court of Appeal decision before he came and reflected on it, but $I$ can't say right at this stage all the details that we discussed. I wasn't, you know, recording the meeting or anything like that.

Now, this letter of May 10 th talks about the report of Dr. Ferris, indicating that Dr. Ferris' report indicates:
"... that David would appear to have been innocent of the crime. His conclusions were basically founded on the analysis of the semen found at the scene and David's blood grouping." Do you recall having any discussion with Mr. Wolch or Mr. Asper about this issue?

A I don't, and I don't recall seeing the report that
they refer to.
Do you have a recollection of discussing anything about the position you took at the preliminary hearing and trial about the secretor issue, if $I$ can call it that?

We may well have, but of course at that time I didn't have any of the materials, so I would certainly be relying on what they had read in the preliminary hearing and at trial if indeed we did get into any discussion of it.

Go to 153499, please, and this is October 18th, 1989, five or six months later, this is from Mr. Asper, and here he's looking for your files relating to this case if you still have them, it talks about a waiver, and if we go to the next page, please, and here's a waiver, October 16th, 1989. I take it that was received by you authorizing you to share whatever information you had?
I'm sure it was.

Then 153494 , this is a December 6th, 1989 letter from you to Mr. Asper, it refers to having spoken to Mr. Wolch about it previously, and you say:
"You will appreciate that --"
Go back to the full page, please.
"-- I do not have any of my old files. However I did ask a former colleague to check and see if the old file is in existence. Since there have been quite a number of changes since $I$ left practise, including a merger, I doubt that the file is still in existence. However, I will let you know as soon as I have some word about it."

So it looks like at this time you are of the view that your file is gone; is that fair?

A
A Yes. I know that $I$ set in m
Qearches on my own --
Q And then if we can go to --
A
-- quite a bit before that actually, but $I$ never really gave up hope of finding significant portions of it or even all of it until later. I was primarily interested in trying to find my notes and my trial brief which had all the relevant memoranda and so forth, but I turned everything upside down that $I$ had taken with me or stored out at the farm.

Q If we can go to 153506, and this is April 17th, 1990, a letter to both Asper and Wolch:
"I have pursued inquiries and searches
with respect to my old files pertaining to this matter. The only thing that has been located is a copy of the preliminary hearing broken down into segments. Although you probably have perused a copy of it $I$ am forwarding this material to you in case it is of any assistance.

Nothing else has been located
and $I$ hold out little prospect of any further portions of the file being in existence."

Again, it would appear at this point that you concluded the file was not to be located?

A
Q

A
No, no, we're talking about the actual preliminary
hearing, and $I$ think it was, when $I$ sent it to them, I think it had already been restored, so to speak.

If we can go to 153512, this is a letter August 15th, 1990, so again a few months later, from Mr.
Now, these segments of the preliminary hearing broken down into segments, would that have been your summary notes that we looked at or would it be actually --
$Q$

Wolch, I'll just go through parts of it, it says:
"I am really not aware as to how
informed you are as to the various
developments in the David Milgaard case.

I believe the news media in Saskatchewan
have been reporting much of what is
happening quite regularly, but suffice
it to say there have been a number of
starting developments since we were last
in communication. Since we last spoke
the key witnesses have recanted their
evidence and we also believe that we
know the identity of the true
perpetrator of the crime."
As far as following the news media, $I$ think
you've told us that you would not have been
reading what was in the paper about this case?
No, I didn't follow it, no.

And then he goes on to say:
"Ronald Dale Wilson was possibly the main Crown witness in the case. We were recently surprised to learn that he had in fact made two separate statements to the police; the first being in March of 1969, and the second in May of 1969 . We
enclose herein photocopies of these two statements. The statements are obviously substantially different."

Scroll down:
"As we review the transcripts from the preliminary hearing and the trial we note that but for three or four very general questions at the preliminary hearing, Wilson was never confronted specifically with his earlier statement. We wonder whether you were ever provided with a copy of the earlier statement or whether the trial tactic used with

Wilson did not include challenging him on his earlier statement. Mr. Caldwell has apparently told a member of the media that he discharged his duty of disclosure by providing the defence with three or four out of approximately one hundred witness statements. If you were not provided with a copy of Wilson's earlier statement then we would consider this to be a serious non-disclosure."

Do you have any recollection of getting this letter and responding?

A I'm sure I got the letter and I think that I probably phoned Mr. Wolch and told him that, you know, $I$ didn't have my file material or correspondence or anything, that $I$ simply didn't have any recollection of the statement that he was referring to.

Okay.

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

I could be wrong in that, but $I$ think that $I$ did indicate that to him, and certainly without my file and something like this just landing on my desk, $I$ wouldn't be able to say offhand.

Okay. I now want to turn to the section 690 proceedings which you testified at, and I think you initially were contacted, $I$ think you said in an earlier letter that you would have been aware that David Milgaard had applied to the Federal Minister of Justice for, to review his conviction; is that fair?

Yes.

If we can call up 333322. I should point out for counsel, I'm not sure, this may have been a document that we recently received from Federal Justice and I'm not sure if the documents are up on CaseVault yet. If they are not, they are in the process of being put up, so if counsel are
trying to find -- I'm not sure if that one falls in that category. No, that's the wrong document. 333322. This is an October 23rd, 1989 memorandum of Eugene Williams to the file:
"I telephoned Mr. Wolch following my conversation with His Lordship, Mr. ... Tallis to discuss a formal meeting to discuss Mr. Milgaard's trial. Mr. Wolch did not object to me talking to Judge Tallis, counsel to Milgaard at trial and upon appeal."

And if we can go to 157030, it refers to a telephone conversation to set up a meeting with Mr. Williams, and I take it at some point that you -- actually, let me just call up 15 -- go to page 3, 157032. Here's the waiver of solicitor/client privilege April 29th, '89 filed with that. And can you confirm, Mr. Tallis, that you would have then followed up and had a meeting with Mr. Williams?

Yes, I'm sure I did.
Do you have a recollection of meeting with him? Yes, he met with me in Regina. Then 157044 .

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Is that part of

030 ?
MR. HODSON: I'm sorry, the last -- yes, it was.

BY MR. HODSON:

This is February 23, 1990, and this is an undertaking conveyed verbally by Mr. Williams and, here, by Mr. MacFarlane. And it is basically an undertaking was provided:
"... to receive your responses to questions concerning your former client, David Edgar Milgaard, which you reserved for further consideration, on a confidential basis."

And he goes on to say it can only be used in certain circumstances. Do you recall how that undertaking came about?

A

Q Okay. And then scroll down:
"Mr. Williams has also undertaken that the information received will not be provided to the applicant, his counsel, or made public in any manner. Further, the Department of Justice will oppose
any application for the release of that information."

So that's something that came from Federal Justice?

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q
A
memorandum, $I$ think it's consistent with what you
have told us, and I --
Yes.
Can you tell us that --
that received thatridon'tapeifically
it. But the one that $I$ worked from is a later one that you have where he sent a memorandum to Mr. MacFarlane, and that was the one that was sent to me I think at the request of Mr. Wolch, he wrote to Mr. -- or contacted Mr. MacFarlane to make sure that $I$ had a copy prior to meeting with Mr. Wolch.

And I think 335386 , this is the --
Yes, that's the one that $I$ recall specifically, and $I$ know that $I$ had that and had made some scratch notes and whatnot on it when $I$ met -before $I$ met with Mr. Wolch.
$Q$
And so this memo would be accurate as far as what you would have told Mr. Williams?

Yes. It had to be fleshed out a little, but I certainly discussed it with Mr. Wolch, and actually $I$ think he politely asked me whether or not $I$ minded him looking at it, so I invited him to look over my shoulder as $I$ was sitting at my desk, and $I$ actually had some notes on it that $I$ would call "fleshing out". Because I had had - Mr. MacFarlane had asked me whether or not I received it, he knew apparently that Mr. Wolch was going to meet with me, and I told him that $I$ had received a copy of this interoffice memorandum and
that $I$ would -- was glad to have it available for my meeting with Mr. Wolch, and I indicated that since $I$ was likely to be giving evidence ultimately on this, that $I$ would have to flesh it out somewhat.

So just on the time frame, this is May 11th, 1990, - -

Yes.
-- I think your testimony at the supreme Court was in March of 1992?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
In re -- would it be closer to the time of your meeting with Mr. Williams or closer to the Supreme Court reference?

A
$Q$ Did - -

A
-- Mr. Wolch could certainly confirm that, I'm sure.
$Q$
Can $I$ just ask this; your meeting, when

Mr. MacFarlane sent this to you and you were reviewing it, was it to prepare yourself for the giving of evidence at the Supreme Court reference?

A
letter that $I$ had received, $I$ don't -- I can't locate it, but $I$ thought that there was a copy that came to -- of a letter that Mr. Wolch had written to Mr. MacFarlane asking that he make sure that he sent a copy of the memorandum, or whatever it was, to me so that $I$ would have it when $I$ was meeting with him, that is meeting with Mr. Wolch. But I -- I'm --

If we call up 157238, this may answer it, 157238. I think actually the doc. ID might be 157236. Go to page 238. This is a January 6th, 1992 letter from Mr. Wolch to Mr. Williams, this would be a couple of weeks before the Supreme Court reference is going to start, and if you can call that out please. And then received a copy of a letter to you of December 30 th, 1991 -- sorry, let me back up. 3 -- well, let's finish this letter and then we'll go back. It's referring in this letter: "I wish to avoid any misunderstandings."

And then you say:
"I might add that in your letter I do not quite understand your comment 'other notes that $I$ had made of our conversation were not transcribed or summarized elsewhere'. Does this mean you have other notes of your interview and that the notes that are being forwarded to His Lordship are simply an edited version of what His Lordship told you?

We would strongly suggest that
if Justice Tallis approves of the notes
of the interview that you immediately
forward same to us so we can determine
whether or not David Milgaard will
release privilege in a general sense.", and asks for a copy of the notes. If we can call up 335402. This is the December 30, 1991 letter from Mr. Williams to you:
"A copy of my summary that covered a
portion of our discussion accompanies
this letter. Other notes that $I$ had made of our conversation were not
transcribed or summarized elsewhere.
If after reviewing the summary,
there are clarifications that are
necessary, please advise."
So it would appear -- is this what you're -- does
this assist your memory, Mr. Tallis?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A

Q
Okay. That's probably an appropriate spot to break, and unfortunately $I$ 'm not done, but I'm very close, Mr. Tallis. And I think, Mr.

Commissioner, subject to discussions with
Mr. Pringle here, that we will resume with Mr. Tallis when we resume on February 20 th. We're off next week.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.
(Adjourned at 3:57 p.m.)
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| 24624:14, 24633:6, <br> 24633.9, 24634:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 24793: 3,24793: 10 \\ & 24804: 9,24804: 17 \end{aligned}$ | cross [21] - 24597:7, | D | 24619:5, 24620:20, |
| 24636:14, 24637:17, | 24804:18, 24805:3 | $24600: 2$ |  | 24627:16, 24628:11, |
| 24637:24, 24639:19, | 24805:19, 24809:1, <br> 24809•3, 24809•14 | $24605: 12,24608: 25$ |  | $24628: 20,24630: 16$ |
| 24642:4, 24642:7, | $24809 \cdot 20$ | 24610:4, 24611:7, | 24721:10, 24760:11 | 24631:3, 24632:20, |
| 24645:20, 24646:8, |  | 24612:1, 24623:9, | daily [1] - 24629:3 | 24633:17, 24633:25, |
| $24654 \text { :20, 24670:8, }$ | courtesy [1] - 24790:9 | $24641: 16,24679: 24,$ | Dale[1] - 24797:20 | 24634:7, 24638:18, |
| 24673:24, 24674:15, | $24790: 23,24791: 6$ | 24694:6, 24694:14, | Dallison [4] - 24700:11, | 24649:13, 24649:22, |
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| 24705:24, 24787:10, | 24696:19, 24705:6, | 24664:17, 24665:1, | 24601:23 | efforts [3] - 24599:21, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24800:7, 24800:8 | 24799:22, 24800:2 | 24665:23, 24666:10, | drugs [6] - 24641:3, | 4599:22, 24681:5 |
| discussed [14] | documents [13] | 24673:17, 24678 | 24645:15, 24659:2 | eight [1] - 24607:2 |
| 24598:4, 24604:9, | 24682:20, 24698:2, | 24681:17, 24688:19, | 24659:5, 24659:9, | either [21] - 24597:24, |
| 24673:24, 24674:2, | 24698:7, 24698:12, | 24691 :3, $24701: 10$ | 24659:19 | 24637:7, 24637:15, |
| 24677:10, 24678:18, | 24698:14, 24698:17, | 24701:11, 24702:22, | drunk [1] - 24735:10 | 24638:19, 24654:4, |
| 24679:13, 24717:23, | 24700:15, 24732:5, | 24711:17, 24712:11 | dubious [1] - $24646: 23$ | 24681:7, 24689:5, |
| 24750:17, 24785:2, | 24775:22, 24778:1, | 24716:7, 24718:17 | due [1] - 24699:22 | 24695:5, 24697:20, |
| 24792:4, 24792:16, | 24787:3, 24791:4, | 24719:9, 24724:18 | duplication [1] - | 24713:13, 24743:15, |
| 24793:12, 24803:16 | 24799:23 | 24729:20, 24742:8, | 24624:2 | 24764:24, 24769:22, |
| discussing [3] - | Doell [1] - 24732:12 | 24744:20, 24744:23, | during [17] - 24617:10, | 24772:9, 24773:24 |
| 24645:24, 24786:22, | Don [2] - 24593:9, | 24745:3, 24745:15, | 24634:14, 24635:15, | 24773:25, 24775:25, |
| 24794:2 | 24715:11 | 24753:17, 24755:4 | 24655:19, 24679:12, | 24777:3, 24779:21, |
| discussion [15] - | Donald [2]-24809:2, | 24755:17, 24755:18, | 24685:12, 24686:21, | 24785:14, 24789:8 |
| 24602:19, 24602:20, | 24809:19 | $24756: 2,24768: 21$ | 24708:22, 24714:24, | elaborate [4] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24644: 22,24661: 17 \\ & 24662: 22,24687: 12 \end{aligned}$ | done [36] - 24619:15, | $\text { 24777:18, } 247$ | 24717:17, 24721:25, | 24622:18, 24671:5, |
| 24706:1, 24777:20, | 24634:24, 24645:15, | 24781:15, 24781:16, | 24754:16, 24766:23, | elbow [1] - 24741:10 |
| 24783:14, 24786:4, | 24654:11, 24665:19, | 24795:21, 24796:4, | 24782:11, 24790:20 | element [18] - 24617:4, |
| 24790:21, 24791:8, | 24668:12, 24668:14, | 24796:17, 24798:4, | During [1] - 24716:15 | 24618:1, 24620:16, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24793: 23,24794: 10 \\ & 24806: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24669: 6,24677: 9 \\ & 24680: 10,24681: 4 \end{aligned}$ | 24801:20 | duty [4]-24599:7, | $24620: 21,24621: 3,$ |
| discussions [9]- | 24696:19, 24698:20, | 24627:19, 24793:16 |  | $24626: 11,24626: 19$ |
| $24604: 2,24615: 6$ $24688: 25,24723: 6$ | 24698:22, 24699:9, | $\begin{gathered} \text { draft [3] - 24689:17, } \\ \text { 24689:19, 24690:4 } \end{gathered}$ | $E$ | $24627: 24,24649: 16,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24766: 24,24778: 23, \\ & 24779: 9,24788: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24707: 14,24707: 22, \\ & 24720: 8,24736: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { drafted [4] - 24620:5, } \\ & \text { 24674:6, 24675:4, } \end{aligned}$ |  | $24662: 21,24672: 2$ |
| 24808:1 | 24738:5, 24752:14, | 24678:2 | 24682:25, 24716:18, | 24737:6 |
| dismissed [4] | 24756:23, 24763:15, | draw [3]-24631:8 | 24719:14, 24769:25, | elevate [1] - 24743:21 |
| $24615: 24,24618: 7$ | $24764: 16,24765: 21$ | $24662: 25,24664: 21$ | $24784: 14$ | elevator [3] - 24718:5, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24619:7, 24772:6 } \\ & \text { disposed [1] - 24770:16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24770:3, 24771:11, } \\ & \text { 24774:2, 24777:15, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { drawing [2] - 24602:3, } \\ & 24686: 5 \end{aligned}$ | easier [1] - 24741:3 | $24718: 8,24718: 24$ |
| dispute [5] - 24604:8, | 24784:17, 24787:25, | drawn [1] - 24767: | 24724:12, 24728:21, | $24759: 12$ |
| 24606:23, 24607:2, | 24807:24 | dreadful [1] - 24627:22 | $24728: 22,24728: 24$ | elicited [3] - 24710:22, |
| 24673:1, 24757:5 | door [3] - 24630:5, | dress [5] - 24625:22, | east-west [4] - | 24717:17, 24723:16 |
| disputed [1] - 24771 :5 <br> disregard [4] - | doors [1] - 24656: | $\begin{aligned} & 24626: 25,24654: 20, \\ & 24733: 19,24735: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24617:15, 24728:21, } \\ & \text { 24728:24 } \end{aligned}$ | eliminate [3] - |
| 24643:20, 24656:23, | doorstep [1] - 24649:24 | dressed [2] - 24630:22, | easy [3]-24612:17 | 24737:5 |
| $24657: 10,24657: 12$ | doubt [11]-24598:13, | $24660: 21$ | 24612:18 | eliminated [1] - 24619:6 |
| disrespectfully [2] - | 24609:8, 24614:20, | drew [1] - 24663:13 | eaten [1] - 24719:2 | Ellerman [1] - 24593:5 |
| 24613:25, 24629:2 <br> dissolute [1] - 2463 | 24628:7, 24657:8, <br> 24694:14, 24746:17 | drive [4] - 24607:12, 24607.15, 24607.22 | Eddie [1] - 24594:7 | Elliott [3] - 24730:22, |
| distance [3]-24626:21, | $\text { 24747:6, } 24766: 5,$ | $24719: 24$ | Edgar [1]-24801:11 edged [1] - 24601:12 | 24730:25, 24731:24 <br> Elliott's [1] - 24732:6 |
| 24637:5, 24720:18 | 24795:6, 24802:24 | driven [2] - 24724:10, | edited [1] - 24806:10 | elsewhere [1] - |
| distilled [1] - 24674:24 | doubts [1] - 24657:11 | 24724:17 | Edmondson [2] - | 24806:25 |
| distinct [3]-24618:12, | Douglas [1] - 24593:2 | driver [5] - 24725:15, | 24708:12, 24759:19 | elsewhere' [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24680: 23,24765: 5 \\ & \text { district }[1]-24750: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { down [69] - 24606:4, } \\ & \text { 24620:10, 24620:14, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24725: 18,24726: 8, \\ & 24726: 15,24726: 22 \end{aligned}$ | Edmonton [3] - <br> 24667:1, 24703:18 | 24806:6 |
| divorce [1] - 24671:1 | $24625: 11,24625: 22$ | driving [7] - 24607:20, | 24718:4 | 24662:16 |
| divulge [1] - 24715:17 | 24626:25, 24627:25, | 24617:20, 24651:4, | education [1] - 24635:4 | emphasized [2] - |
| divulged [1] - 24717:20 | $24636: 20,24636: 24,$ | $24651: 5,24708: 25$ | Edward [1] - 24592:7 | $24786: 16,24786: 20$ |
| doc [3] - 24728:13, | $24636: 25,24637: 5,$ | $24720: 15,24724: 19$ | effect [12] - 24610:25, | emphasizing [1] - |
| $24730: 19,24805: 16$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24637: 21,24638: 11, \\ & 24638: 20,24638: 21, \end{aligned}$ | dropped [1] - 24656:10 | $24632: 4,24644: 14$ | $24661: 24$ |
| doctor [1] - 24618:22 | $24638: 24,24639: 18$ | $24650: 8,24720: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24661: 15,24676: 2, \\ & 24686: 2.24702: 21 . \end{aligned}$ | emphatically [3] - <br> 24708.20, 24711.24 |
| Document [2]- 24593:4, 24593:5 | $24640: 3,24640: 9,$ | $24720: 5,24720: 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24686: 2,24702: 21, \\ & 24720: 16,24722: 5 \end{aligned}$ | 24712:19 |
| document [10] - | 24640:11, 24646:7, | 24721:1, 24731:1, | 24739:14, 24768:16, | employed [1] - 24719:3 |
| 24615:20, 24619:12, | 24649:25, 24650:1, | 24734:19, 24735:14 | 24777:3 | Emson's [1] - 24627:19 |
| $24620: 13,24673: 20$ | $24654: 20,24655: 22,$ | $\text { drug [4] - } 24601: 10,$ | Effort [1] - 24713:18 | En [1] - 24717:20 |
| 24680:11, 24693:24, |  | 24601:17, 24601:19, | effort [1] - 24683:5 | en [1] - 24721:16 |
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| enables [1] - 24704:20 | 24690:9, 24719:7, | 24648:25, 24650:10, | examine [8]-24612:1, | 24691:11, 24736:19, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| enclose [1] - 24798:1 | 24792:24 | 24651:18, 24655:5 | 24623:9, 24623:24, | $24748: 10$ |
| encounter [1] - 24701:6 <br> encountered [1] - | Esson [1] - 24593:10 establish [1] - 24645:13 | $\begin{aligned} & 24655: 18,24655: 25 \\ & 24656: 3,24656: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24624: 22,24641: 16, \\ & 24694: 22,24695: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { explained }[4]-24620: 3, \\ & 24642: 8,24648: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 24650:7 | establishes [1] - | 24657:4, 24657:22 | 24695:22 | 24701:1 |
| encouraged [1] - | 24660:19 | 24658:7, 24658:15 | examined [2] - 24610:4, | explaining [1] - |
| 24688:18 | etc [2] - 24706:8, | 24659:1, 24660:19, | 24765:4 | 24599:8 |
| end [20]-24599:2 | 24720:24 | 24660:23, $24661: 4$ | examining [1]-24791:4 | explanation [2] - |
| 24599:3, 24602:13, | Etcetera[1] - 24662:15 | $24663: 3,24663: 5$ | example [4]-24611:23, | $24607: 15,24607: 21$ |
| 24604:12, 24608:15, | etcetera [9]-24612:4, | 24663:8, 24663:10, | $24723: 5,24759: 4,$ | explored [1] - 24611:13 |
| 24610:12, 24616:16, 24629:15. 24634:15. | 24629:14, 24652:14, | 24663:25, 24665:8, 24665:20, 24666:11, | 24773:7 <br> examples [1] - | express [1] - 24695:20 <br> extemporaneous [1] - |
| $24637: 2,24637: 3,$ | 24737:18, 24745:6, | 24666:14, 24668:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { examples [1] - } \\ & 24788: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { extemporaneous [1] - } \\ & 24620: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| 24638:3, 24649:18, | 24756:9, 24760:23 | 24668:23, 24669:8, | excellent [2] - | extensive [1] - 24756:6 |
| 24669:23, 24670:18, | Eugene[1] - 24800:4 | $24671 \text { :6, } 24671: 20$ | 24682:14, 24682:18 | extensively [1] - |
| $24671: 19,24676: 2,$ | evening [3]-24672:23, | $\begin{aligned} & 24674: 16,24674: 22, \\ & 24676: 25,24677: 23 \end{aligned}$ | exception [1] - 24694:4 <br> exclude [1] - 24747 :5 | $24635: 13$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24692:18, 24749:18, } \\ & 24757: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $24762: 3,24791: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24676: 25,24677: 23, \\ & 24678: 10,24678: 13 \end{aligned}$ | exclude [1] - 24747:5 | extent [4] - 24609:10, |
| endeavored [1] - | 24692:14, 24695:3, | 24678:25, 24679:16, | excluding [2] - | 24793:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24646: 25 \\ & \text { endeavour [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24779: 7 \\ & \text { events [5] - 24696:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24680: 10,24683: 7 \\ & 24687: 20,24699: 4 \end{aligned}$ | 24743:16, 24778:14 exclusion [2] - 24697 | externally [1] - 24619:2 extraneous [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24664:21, 24672:12 } \\ & \text { endeavoured [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24714:16, 24726:19, } \\ & \text { 24788:11, 24793:5 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24699: 23,24711: 9, \\ & 24738: 3,24738: 17, \end{aligned}$ | 24779:12 | $24602: 6$ |
| 24764:21 | everyday [1] - 24629:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 24743: 18,24745: 13 \\ & 24746: 22,24747: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $24661: 20$ | eyes [2] - 24642:25, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ended [4] - 24608: } \\ & 24651: 7,24696: 4, \end{aligned}$ | evidence [151] - 24599:2, $24600: 4$ | 24752:20, 24753:3, | $\begin{gathered} \text { exculpatory [6] - } \\ 24661: 25,24662 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24742:18 } \\ & \text { eyesight [1] - } 24729: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| 24778:23 | 24600:7, 24601:17, | 24755:20, 24757:2, | 24662:17, 24663:16, |  |
| engage [1] - 24597:9 <br> engaged [2] - 24750 | $\begin{aligned} & 24602: 6,24603: 22 \\ & 24604: 1,24604: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 24758:19, 24758:25, | $24663: 17,24664: 9$ | $F$ |
| Englan | $24$ | 24763:25, 24764:2, |  | face [4] - 24613:8, |
| English [1] - 24759:5 | 24607:23, 24608:16, | 24764:6, 24764:18 | exhibit [1] - 24620: | 24613:10, 24663:24, |
| enhance [1] - 24642:24 | 24609:2, 24609:7, | $24765: 6,24767: 7$ | exhibits [4]-24623:21, | 94741: |
| enjoyed [1] - 24780:18 | 24609:22, 24610:12, | $24772: 22,2477$ | $24623: 25,24681: 14$ | faced [1] - 24613:9 |
| enter [1] - 24748:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24610:18, 24610:19, } \\ & \text { 24611:1, 24611:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $24773: 2,24773: 3$ | $24681: 17$ | facilitate [1] - 24777:16 |
| entered [1] - 24692:5 | $24611: 19,24614: 4$ | 24773:14, 24776:20, | existed [1] - 24763:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { facilitating [2] - } \\ & \text { 24690:23, } 24691: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| enters [2] - 24602:22, | $\begin{aligned} & 24615: 12,24615: 15 \\ & 24615: 23,24616: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $24789: 2,24789: 18$ | 24795:4, 24795:7, | facilities [2] - 24779:3, |
| 24604:9 | 24617:15, 24617:17, | 24797:12, 24804:3, | 24796:12 | 24779:4 |
| entirely [4] - 24647:8, | 24618:17, 24618:18, | 24805:3 | expanded [1] | 24603:17, 24604:5, |
| 24654:25, 24657:10, | 24619:20, 24619:23, | $24695: 23$ | 24611:14 | 24604:7, 24607:12, |
| $24657: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24621: 16,24625: 4 \\ & \text { 24627:15, 24627:19, } \end{aligned}$ | evidential [1] | $\text { expect [4] - } 24601: 22,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24607: 24,24609: 8, \\ & 24611: 21,24611: 22, \end{aligned}$ |
| $24779: 25$ | $24627: 21,24628: 12$ | 24761:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24662:1, 24709:10, } \\ & 24776: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $24624: 25,24625: 20,$ |
| equal [2] - 24762:15, | $24628: 21,24632: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { evidentiary [1] } \\ & 24757: 1 \end{aligned}$ | expected [3] - | $24630: 24,24637: 18$ |
| 24771:18 | 24633:16, 24633:22, | ex [1] - 24640:4 | $24645: 23,24684: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24638: 8,24639: 11, \\ & 24641 \cdot 2 \quad 24644: 1 . \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { equivalent [1] - 24682:7 } \\ & \text { era [1] - } 24681: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 24634:2, 24635:16, | exact [3]-24719:16, | $\begin{aligned} & 24700: 22 \\ & \text { expense [1] - 24688:12 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24641: 2,24644: 1, \\ & 24647: 1,24649: 2, \end{aligned}$ |
| erred [1] - 24677:23 | 24635:22, 24637:6, | $\text { 24719:17, } 24772$ | experience | 24650:8, $24651: 5$, |
| error [1] - 24679:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24637:12, 24638:18, } \\ & \text { 24640:16, 24640:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $24706: 5,24736: 10$ | $24597: 22,24599: 15$ | $24651: 17,24654: 25$ |
| error' [1] - 24686:17 | $24641 \text { :6, } 24641: 13$ | examination | $24671: 1,24673: 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24655: 2,24655: 3, \\ & 24655: 6,24656: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { errors [1] - } 24641: 12 \\ & \text { Esq[2]-24594:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $24641: 19,24641: 20,$ | 24597:7, 24597:10, | 24683:11 <br> experienced [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & 24655: 6,24656: 2, \\ & 24656: 6,24657: 20, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Esq [2] - 24594:5, } \\ & 24594: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 24641:22, 24642:3, | $24597: 20,24600: 21,$ | 24758:7, 24759:19 | 24658:11, 24659:16, |
| essentially [11] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24642:17, 24644:4, } \\ & \text { 24645:3, 24645:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $24608: 25,24611: 7$ | expert [1] - 24746:14 | $24659: 18,24660: 19$ |
| 24598:1, 24617:8, | 24645:17, 24645:21, | $24679: 24,24694: 6$ | expired [2] - 24773:23, | $\begin{aligned} & 24660: 23,24663: 15, \\ & 24664: 2.24664: 3 . \end{aligned}$ |
| 24625:6, 24631:1, | $24646: 13,24647: 19$ | 24694:15, 24695:4, | 24776:12 | $24664: 7,24665: 15$ |
| $24631 \text { :5, 24670:9, }$ | $24648: 3,24648: 16$ | 24714:11, 24717:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { explain [6] - 24597:2, } \\ & \text { 24599:7, 24690:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $24665: 23,24665: 24,$ |


| 24672:3, 24673:9, | 24711:6, 24738:3, | 24600:4, 24600:17, | 24645:17, 24650:18, | flow [1] - 24618:24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24681:5, $24684: 9$, | 24769:15, 24792:19, | 24612:18, 24642:11, | 24650:20, 24657:3, | fluid [3] - 24618:9, |
| 24686:8, 24688:15, | 24795:11, 24799:18 | 24670:16, 24675:2, | 24666:22, 24668:19, | 24618:15, 24618:22 |
| 24694:20, 24696:6, | fairly [5] - 24597:12, | 24709:5, 24731:17, | 24669:10, 24680:8, | focus [3]-24622:21, |
| 24712:20, 24713:7, | 24654:17, 24685:10, | 24742:9, 24756:4, | 24685:15, 24693:22, | 24651:20, 24736:24 |
| 24717:9, 24728:7, | 24700:17, 24781:7 | 24756:25, 24757:13 | 24698:25, 24700:24, | focused [1] - 24620:22 |
| 24731:25, 24737:14, | fairness [2] - 24616:20, | female [2]-24624:12, | 24703:15, 24708:10, | focuses [2]-24672:2, |
| 24738:4, 24738:15, | 24653:7 | 24705:19 | 24712:22, 24714:8, | 24678:17 |
| 24738:22, 24750:12, | fall [3]-24611:18, | fender [1] - 24731:7 |  | follow [6]-24639:21, |
| $24757: 5,24757: 11$ | falls [3] - 24636:2, | Ferris [1] - 24793:16 | $24740: 3,24741: 25,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24667: 18,24676: 12, \\ & 24696: 25.24733: 18 . \end{aligned}$ |
| 24759:9, 24769:23, | 24707:23, 24800:1 | fertile [1] - 24784:19 | 24749:15, 24750:4, | 24797:18 |
| 24772:10, 24773:25, | familiar [3] - 24696:13, | few [7] - 24596:12, | 24760:3, 24766:17 | follow-up [2] - |
| 24775:1, 24782:7, | 24739:24, 24768:23 | 24613:11, 24661:1, | 24766:19, 24766:21, | 24639:21, 24667:18 |
| 24784:21, 24785:17, | far [18] - 24604:18, | 24729:8, 24785:18, | 24782:21, 24789:12, | followed [8] - 24598:5, |
| 24789:20, 24790:12, | 24637:25, $24641: 23$, | 24787:10, 24796:25 | 24790:1, 24790:7, | 24636:10, 24692:21, |
| 24790:17, 24797:23, | 24671:18, 24682:19, | file [31] - 24674:4, | $24797: 24$ | 24696:4, 24706:16, |
| 24802:9, 24802:15 | 24685:13, 24686:19, | 24674:25, 24680:12, | First[3] - 24621:2, | 24710:19, 24770:7, |
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| 24710:18, 24781:20, | 24647:21, 24647:22, | lady's [1] - 24746:17 | 24635:9, 24635:19 | legislation [1] - |
| 24789:19, 24799:17, | 24647:24, 24647:25, | laid [4]-24744:22, | leads [1] - 24630:14 | 24676:9 |
| 24799:23, 24801:25, | 24648:1, 24648:6, | 24768:3, 24768:19, | learn [2]-24766:17, | legs [1] - 24744:20 |
| 24802:4, 24802:8, | 24648:8, 24654:22, | 24777:18 | 24797:22 | lend [1] - 24605:8 |
| 24806:13, 24807:16 | 24718:6, 24718:22, | Lana[1] - 24594:3 | learned [13]-24621:11, | length [3] - 24711:21, |
| justice [2] - 24781 :6, | 24719:1, 24721:13, | landing [1]-24799:10 | 24622:7, 24623:3, | 24745:7, 24792:16 |
| 24782:2 | $24721: 19,24721: 25$ | lane [4]-24729:21, | $24624: 3,24655: 17$ | lengthy [5]-24673:12, |
| Justices[1] - 24684:13 <br> juvenile [1]-24706:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 24753: 17,24755: 3, \\ & 24755: 9.24762 \cdot 4 \end{aligned}$ | 24755:5, 24755:17, | $24679: 23,24705: 13$ | 24675:6, 24703:20, |
|  | knives [2] - 24647:20, | $\begin{aligned} & 24762: 3 \\ & \text { language } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24705: 25,24718: 8 \\ & 24753: 9,24769: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24786:5, } 24791: 22 \\ & \text { Leonard[1] - } 24714 \end{aligned}$ |
| K | $24647: 22$ <br> knowing [4] - 24601 | Lapchuk[6] - 24609:5, | $24769: 21,24769: 24$ | less [3] - 24688:12, |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { knowing [4] - } 24601 \\ 24601: 15,24714: 5 \text {, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24629:17, 24645:2, } \\ & \text { 24646:10, 24646:15, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { learning [1] - 24706:18 } \\ & \text { least [14] - 24627:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24692: 5,24792: 23 \\ & \text { lesser }[1]-24692: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| kacki [1] - 24735:9 | 24747:12 | 24657:12 | 24673:4, 24676:20, | letter [26] - 24681:25, |
| Karen[3] - 24593:8, | knowledge [13] | large [4]-24640:2, | 24689:14, 24698:7, | 24683:1, 24688:4, |
| 24809:2, 24809:13 | 24599:12, 24599:13, | 24640:4, 24641:12, | 24700:19, 24716:1, | 24689:2, 24690:16, |
| Karst[12] - 24594:7, | 24697:11, 24698:8, | 24742:19 | 24717:15, 24736:25, | 24690:17, 24700:10, |
| 24705:8, 24705:22, | 24698:9, 24699:10, | largely [1] - 24599:14 | 24737:9, 24757:3, | 24761:19, 24789:11, |
| 24708:1, 24708:3, | 24731:12, 24751:22, | larger [1] - 24626:7 | 24759:11, 24780:24, | 24793:15, 24794:21, |
| 24708:12, 24708:14, | 24752:1, 24775:16, | Larry 18 ] - 24727:16, | 24791:12 | 24795:24, 24796:24, |
| 24714:15, 24716:12, | 24775:18, 24778:7, | 24727:24, 24738:15, | leather [1] - 24735:12 | 24798:25, 24799:1, |
| 24721:7, 24722:15, | 24809:6 | 24738:18, 24739:4, | leave [16] - 24648:20, | 24799:15, 24805:7, |
| 24772:1 | known [11] - 24623:8, | 24739:5, 24739:9, | 24649:20, 24651:1, | 24805:9, 24805:17, |
| Karst's [2] - 24708:3, | $24658: 3,24658: 5$ | 24766:16, 24766:18, | 24665:16, 24665:24, | 24805:21, 24805:23, |
| 24714:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24706:11, 24713:15, } \\ & \text { 24727:25, 24736:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $24771: 22,24772: 10,$ | 24666:22, 24688:6, | 24805:24, 24806:2, |
| keener [1] - 24702:9 | 24727:25, 24736:6, <br> 24738:18, 24760:17 | 24775:9, 24776:1, | 24688:22, 24693:19, | 24806:19, 24806:23, |
| 24603:3 | $24763: 4,24783: 4$ | 24776:13, 24776:23, | $24772: 8,24773: 9$ | level [2] - 24691:10 |
| keeping [1] - 24699:15 | Knox[1] - 24594:4 | 24782:12 | 24773:18, 24774:17, | 24692:10 |
| Ken[1] - 24708:15 | Krogan[1] - 24594:3 | last [13] - 24610:16, | 24774:21 | licence [1] - 24632:3 |
| Kendry[1] - 24593:4 | Kujawa[33] - 24594:5, | $24615: 11,24670: 9,$ | leaving [2] - 24709:17, | license [2] - 24701:10, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { kept }[1]-24706: 16 \\ & \text { kev }[6]-24621: 5 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24681: 7,24682: 1, \\ & 24682: 9,24683: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24670:10, 24727:18, } \\ & \text { 24743:2, 24760:10, } \end{aligned}$ | 24729:18 | $24701: 12$ |
| 24671:6, 24699: | 24683:6, 24683:12, | 24743:2, 24760:10, | $24613: 2$ | lid [1] - 24724:15 |
| $24707: 25,24748: 18$ | 24685:15, 24685:16, | 24789:14, 24797:9, | lectern [1] - 24620:10 | $24755: 13$ |
| 24797:11 | 24685:18, 24685:22, | 24797:10, 24801:2 | led [3]-24602:14, | Lieutenant[3] - |
| kids [2] - 24630:22, | 24686:21, 24687:7, | lastly [1] - 24608:4 | 24614:14, 24710:13 | 24705:7, 24708:2, |
| 24631:5 | 24690:22, 24691:2, | late [5] - 24649:1, | leer [3] - 24649:9, | 24708:7 |
| kill [1] - 24612:12 | $24691 \text { :6, } 24693 \text { :2, }$ | $24672: 22,24754: 16,$ | $24651: 1,24651: 6$ | life [3] - 24635:8, |
| killed [6] - 24626:24, | 24693:10, 24765:10, | $24762: 2,24785: 23$ | left [21]-24607:1, | 24635:19 |
| $24654: 5,24654: 23$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24765:19, 24768:14, } \\ & 24768: 20.24770: 8 . \end{aligned}$ | Latta[1] - 24783:24 | $24627: 16,24644: 25$ | lift [1] - 24720:13 |
| $\text { 24655:1, } 24674: 20,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24768: 20,24770: 8, \\ & 24770: 25,24771: 10, \end{aligned}$ | latter [2] - 24644:14, | $24649: 25,24650: 11$ $24660: 14,24660: 15$ | light [12] - 24642:3, |
| killer [4] - 24775:9, | $24774: 9,24775: 8$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24710:6 } \\ & \text { launched [2] - 24675:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24660: 14,24660: 15 \\ & 24665: 17,24667: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24645:18, 24719:4, } \\ & 24731: 5,24740: 12, \end{aligned}$ |
| 24775:13, 24776:1, | 24775:24, 24776:10, | 24764:17 | 24694:14, 24705:18, | $24743: 11,24745: 24$ |
| 24782:13 | $24781: 1,24781: 23,$ | $\text { law [7] - } 24601: 9$ | 24708:24, 24709:2, | $24750: 19,24770: 5,$ |
| kind [10] - 24614:20, | 24782:4, 24782:10 | 24690:13, 24696:6, | $\begin{aligned} & 24716: 21,24719: 19 \\ & 24750 \cdot 2124724 \cdot 16 \end{aligned}$ | $24770: 9,24770: 20$ |
| $24640: 23,24640: 24$ | I | $\begin{aligned} & 24757: 8,24757: 9, \\ & 24779: 18,24782: 24 \end{aligned}$ | 24729:17, 24731:7, |  |
| 24640:25, $24641: 4$, |  | lawyer [4] - 24689:5, | $24734: 18,24795: 5$ | likelihood [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24641: 7,24643: 14, \\ & 24710 \cdot 6 \end{aligned}$ |  | 24689:10, 24776:23, | left-hand [1] - 24724:16 | 24636:16, 24746:18 |
| 24712:6 | lack [4] - 24611:15, | 24787:2 | left-handed [1] - | likely [18] - 24617:24, |
| King[2] - 24689:3, | $24622: 21,24635: 5$ | lawyer's [1] - 24695:11 | 24627:16 | $24634: 23,24639: 18$ |
| 24690:10 |  | lawyers [3] - 24689:17, | legal [2]-24768:9, | 24641:8, 24641 :9, |
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| Merriman [4] - | 24747:5, 24748:1, | 24787:4, 24787:20, | 24720:22, 24729:8 | 24638:12, 24639:18, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24728:18, 24729:15, | 24748:10, 24763:5, | 24787:22, 24788:10, | miscarriage [2] - | 24670:8, 24682:8, |
| 24729:22, 24730:2 | 24763:12, 24763:15, | 24789:3, 24789:15, | 24781:5, 24782 :2 | 24751:4, 24789:21, |
| Merriman 's [1] - | 24766:2, 24766:5, | 24793:5, 24797:4 | mispronouncing [1] - | 24789:23 |
| 24729:15 | 24766:9, 24771:11, | 24799:16, 24800:10, | 24613:24 | Motel [1] - 24649:10 |
| Merrimans [1] - | 24779:15, 24782:12, | 24801:11, 24806:16 | Miss [6] - 24732:16, | motel [13] - 24608:4, |
| 24730:8 | 24784:3, 24784:16, | Milgaard 's [10] - | 24736:25, 24748:12, | 24648:23, 24649:3, |
| message [1]-24785:14 | 24784:17, 24784:19, | 24611:11, 24642:1 | 24760:2, 24760:6, | 24649:5, 24657:2, |
| met [10]-24606:12, | 24784:25, 24785:1 | 24693:19, 24709:23, | 24760:11 | 24658:14, 24658:24, |
| 24689:12, 24720:6, | 24789:1, $24790: 2$, | 24711:11, 24722:9, | missed [2] - 24732:20, | 24659:4, 24668:18, |
| 24786:3, 24790:19, | 24805:16, 24806:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 24773: 8,24775: 11 \\ & 21775 \cdot 11 \text { 2180n:8 } \end{aligned}$ | 24771:20 | 24677:21, 24705:3, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24790: 21,24791: 1, \\ & 24800: 23,24803: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $24592: 4,24594: 2$ | Milgaard | $\begin{aligned} & \text { missing [2]-24718:7, } \\ & \text { 24761:13 } \end{aligned}$ | mother [4]-24709 |
| 24803:12 | 24596:11, 24596:15, | 24760:10, 24760:15 | misspoke [1] - 24708:6 | 24711:3, 24713:2, |
| methods [1] - 24754:1 | 24596:22, 24599:20, | Miller [32]-24612:12, | mistake [1] - 24726:12 | 24775:7 |
| Meyer [3] - 24593:9, | $24600: 5,24600: 16$ | $24621: 17,24626: 24,$ | misunderstanding [1] - | motion [1] - 24795:12 |
| $24809: 2,24809: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24601: 4,24601: 21 \\ & 24602: 4,24602: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24637:18, 24638:8, } \\ & 24639: 11.24650: 22 . \end{aligned}$ | $24671: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { motive [2] - 24622:2, } \\ & 24646: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| 24740:15 | 24603:12, 24604:10, | $24660: 14,24691: 21$ | $-24805: 25$ | moustache [1] - |
| mid-september [1] - | 24604:22, 24610:17, | 24698:13, 24725:16, | mix [2] - 24610:18, | 24742:21 |
| 24683:20 | 24610:22, 24611:4, | $24731: 1,24731: 4$ | 24611:19 | mouth [3]-24702:20, |
| middle [1] - 24742:21 | 24615:3, 24617:10, | $24731: 13,24732: 16$ | $\text { Mo [1] - } 24754: 25$ | $24703: 7,24755: 3$ |
| might [97]-24596:17, | 24628:11, 24633:25, | 24736:5, 24736:15, $24736: 25,24737: 20$ | mock [1] - 24597:7 | move [7] - 24599:17, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24597:6, 24597:8, } \\ & 24599: 21,24599: 22, \end{aligned}$ | 24638:18, 24649:23, | $24738: 14,24740: 10,$ | modification [1] - <br> 24696 . 8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24615:1, } 24666: 1, \\ & 24696: 19,24725: 11 . \end{aligned}$ |
| $24601 \text { :2, } 24601 \text { :5, }$ | 24650:16, 24650:21, | $24740: 12,24748: 3$ | moment [3] - 24603: | $24738: 1,24782: 19$ |
| 24601:15, 24601:16, | 24656:14, 24656:25, | $24752: 6,24752: 13$ | 24639:7, 24651 :8 | moved [5] - 24666:15, |
| 24601:18, 24603:14, | 24659:18, 24662:3, <br> 24667:10, 24679:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 24759: 23,24761: 5, \\ & 24775: 10,24776: 2, \end{aligned}$ | Monday [2]-24708:9, | $24732: 14,24744: 21$ |
| 24604:1, 24604:4, | 24667:10, 24679:16, 24696.3, $24698 \cdot 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24775: 10,24776: 2, \\ & 24782: 8,24782: 13, \end{aligned}$ | 24726:7 | $24767: 8,24786: 2$ |
| 24606:5, 24607:17, | $24698: 21,24701: 7$ | $24789: 21$ | money [2] - 24611:15, | multiple [1] - 24653:24 |
| 24608:19, 24610:12, 24610:20, 24624:17, | 24702:18, 24703:1, | Miller's [8] - 24605:18, | 24717:25 | murder [36] - 24601:18, |
| 24631:12, 24634:16, | $24703: 18,24704: 2$ | 24606:16, 24623:25, | month [4]-24648:10, | $24648: 2,24648: 10$ |
| $24644: 2,24644: 5,$ | 24705:17, 24706:6, | $24648: 9,24732: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24708:10, 24713:2, } \\ & 24763: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $24648: 15,24668: 3$ |
| 24644:7, 24644:20, | $24706: 10,24706: 14$ $24706: 23,24708: 23$ | 24739:12, 24744:17, | months [5] - 24750:13, | $24701 \text { :2, 24708:23, }$ |
| 24647:2, 24647:3, | 24709:1, 24709:5, | mind [19] - 24598:20 | $24751: 23,24785: 7$ | 24712:25, 24713:6, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24647: 5,24647: 6, \\ & 24647: 7,24647: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $24709: 15,24710: 3$ | $24623: 14,24624: 22,$ | 24794:12, 24796:25 | 24715:19, 24717:5, <br> 24725:14, 24728•16, |
| 24648:3, 24648:17, | 24710:9, 24711:18, | 24626:13, 24652:21, | $\begin{gathered} \text { morning [36] - } 24596 \\ \text { 24601:18, } 24611: 20 \text {, } \end{gathered}$ | $24731: 2,24732: 2$ |
| 24650:12, 24650:17, | $24711: 21,24712: 16$ | 24666:17, 24668:9, | $24628: 20,24630: 6$ | 24732:14, 24734:17, |
| 24651:1, $24651: 2$, | 24716:17, 24716:20, | 24678:3, 24686:11, <br> 24688:1, 24699:15 | $24631: 19,24634: 3$ | 24739:1, 24739:12, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24651: 14,24651: 24, \\ & 24652: 1,24655: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $24716: 25,24717: 4$ | $24700: 12,24728: 11$ | 24640:11, 24668:17, | $\begin{aligned} & 24739: 13,24740: 10, \\ & 24740: 11,24740: 12, \end{aligned}$ |
| 24656:10, 24659:20, | 24717:22, 24718:23, | 24746:25, 24750:10, | $24708: 22,24709: 24,$ | 24741:1, 24749:12, |
| 24659:21, 24663:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24718:25, 24719:19, } \\ & 24720: 8.24720: 12 . \end{aligned}$ | $24759: 3,24783: 18$ | 24711:13, 24716:18, | $24756: 5,24757: 9$ |
| 24664:23, 24665:17, | $24720: 15,24720: 21$ | 24784:21, 24788:1 | 24716:22, 24719:14, | 24759:11, 24759:23, |
| $24665: 18,24668: 20$, $24669 \cdot 3,24676 \cdot 18$, | $24720: 25,24722: 2$ | minded [1] - $24803: 18$ minimal [1] - 24697:12 | $24719: 23,24720: 3$ | $24761: 7,24761: 11$ <br> $24761 \cdot 21,24782 \cdot 8$ |
| 24669:3, 24676:18, 24693:11, 24694:25, | $\text { 24722:6, } 24722: 23$ | Minister [2] - 24594:9, | $24721: 17,24725: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24761: 21,24782: 8, \\ & 24789: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| $24700: 13,24700: 22$ | 24725:12, 24737:5, | 24799:17 | $\begin{aligned} & 24725: 24,24726: 20 \\ & 24727: 14.24727: 25 \end{aligned}$ | murderer [1] - 24752:12 |
| 24701:22, 24702:7, | 24745:23, 24747:5, | $\text { minor [1] - } 24691: 20$ | $24728: 8,24729: 5$ | must [23] - 24598:21, |
| 24702:9, 24704:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 24748: 7,24750: 11, \\ & 24751 \cdot 21 \quad 24754 \cdot 8 \end{aligned}$ | minute [1] - 24780:20 | 24732:2, 24733:11, | $24616: 22,24616: 25,$ |
| 24704:22, 24707:12, | 24751:21, 24754:8, 24762:13, 24762:22 | minutes [16] - | $24734: 17,24739: 1$ | $24617: 22,24617: 23,$ |
| 24707:22, 24710:11, | $247635,24763 \cdot 9$ | 24606:25, 24617:18, | 24744:9, 24746:5, | 24620:1, 24625:23, |
| 24710:13, 24710:21, | 24763:10, 24764:10, | $24631: 12,24648: 19$ | $24746: 20,24790: 24$ | $24625: 25,24626: 10,$ |
| 24711:15, 24715:25, | $24766: 24,24773: 20$ | 24650:4, 24650:11, | Morning [3]-24596:4, | 24635:15, 24640:21, |
| $24726: 2,24727: 25,$ | $24775: 7,24776: 12$ | 24650:13, 24651:22, | 24596:7, $24596: 8$ | 24643:20, 24646:4, |
| 24733:5, 24736:19, <br> 24736:20, 24737:4, | $24781 \text { :6, } 24781 \text { :22, }$ | $24652: 7,24661: 2$, $24665 \cdot 18,24666: 6$, | Morrison [1] - 24721:11 | 24654:16, 24657:3, |
| $24746: 6,24747: 4,$ | 24782:1, 24782:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24665:18, } 24666: 6, \\ & 24666: 7,24666: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\text { most [10] - } 24597: 24 \text {, }$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24657: 9,24657: 12, \\ & 24657: 19,24661: 10, \end{aligned}$ |

Page 19


| 24795:1, 24795:3, | 24781:23, 24783:6, | 24725:20 | 24727:13, 24730:20, | $24696: 22,24698: 17$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24796:1 | 24783:17, 24783:25, | original [4]-24639:17, | 24740:7, 24742:6, | 24700:11, 24709:24, |
| olive [1] - 24742:20 | 24786:5, 24788:20, | 24698:13, 24716:19, | 24742:17, 24742:18, | 24730:12, 24747:22, |
| once [8] - 24626:10, | 24790:3, 24790:19, | 24721:24 | 24753:2, 24754:13, | 24753:3, 24756:15, |
| 24628:15, 24646:8, | 24790:20, 24792:2, | otherwise [3] | 24761:16, 24761:20, | 24763:19, 24764:1, |
| 24684:4, 24700:19, | 24792:8, 24798:19, | 24604:11, 24604:15 | 24761:22, 24780:22, | 24783:25, 24787:16, |
| 24715:24, 24733:4, | 24800:1, 24801:17, | 24771:3 | 24781:17, 24781:18, | 24788:10, 24792:5, |
| 24748:20 | 24803:1, 24803:3, | Ottawa[3] - 24688:12, | 24790:5, 24794:16, | 24807:6 |
| Once[1] - 24597:21 | 24803:9 | 24688:15, 24791:19 | 24794:25, 24800:16, | particularly [14] - |
| one [124]-24599:7, | One[4]-24652:22 | ought [6] - 24603:10 | 24802:18, 24805:1 | 24614:6, 24631:21, |
| $24601: 12,24602: 19,$ <br> 24604.24, 24605:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24654:1, } 24654: 6, \\ & 24753: 22 \end{aligned}$ | 24619:7, 24620:20, <br> $24633 \cdot 3,24653 \cdot 15$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { pages [5] - 24632:8, } \\ 24643: 23.24667: 19 . \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24638: 5,24678: 17, \\ & 24714: 4,24717: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| $24606: 19,24610: 22,$ | one's [1] - 24728:11 | $24691: 19$ | $24687: 19,24809: 4$ | $24722: 24,24727: 10$ |
| 24612:17, 24614:22, $24615: 8,24616: 11$ | one-half [1] - 24745:7 <br> ones [2] - 24745:25 | $\text { outer }[1]-24762: 10$ | Painter [1] - 24618:10 panel [2] - 24684:11 | $\begin{aligned} & 24745: 24,24751: 3, \\ & 24764: 8,24767: 1, \end{aligned}$ |
| 24617:3, 24617:16, | $24747: 21$ | outline [2] - 24675:18, $24681 \text { :2 }$ | $24731: 7$ | 24773:4, 24778:21 |
| 24620:1, 24620:4, | onset [1] - 24618:23 | outlined [3] - 24707:24, | panties [2] - 24755:21, | particulars [1] - |
| 24620:21, 24621:4, | open [7] - 24600:3, | 24770:25, 24777:16 | 24755:23 | 24767:18 |
| 24623:25, 24624:1, | 24624:5, $24651: 7$, | outside [1] - 24739:17 | pants [4]-24611:20, | partisan [1] - 24678:3 |
| 24632:1, 24636:4, | 24688:20, 24757:10, | over-simplifying [1] - | 24612:2, 24612:3, | partners [2]-24675:10, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24637: 19,24638: 8, \\ & 24639: 25, ~ 24642: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $24770: 12,24770: 17$ | $24638: 25$ | $24711: 11$ | 24783:5 |
| 24644:2, 24653:22, | $24604: 2,24714: 10$ | overlooked [1] - 24754:5 | paper [1] - 24797:17 paragraph [6] - | 24620:12, 24620:13, |
| 24653:23, 24654:3, | opening [3] - 24600:6, | overstating [1] - | 24691:1, 24693:13, | 24634:25, 24643:16, |
| 24657:14, 24662:1, | 24623:21, 24789:25 | 24673:5 | 24708:14, 24753:14, | 24643:25, 24644:19, |
| 24668:6, 24670:2, | openings [1] - | own [9]-24599:4, | 24756:1, 24789:25 | 24669:24, 24678:14, |
| 24671:10, 24672:13, | 24783:21 | 24600:5, $24601: 5$, | pardon [2] - 24654:2, | 24703:14, 24708:4, |
| 24674:9, 24674:12, | operate [2] - 24690:22, | 24608:15, 24609:8, | 24684:12 | 24719:25, 24722:12, |
| 24676:20, 24687:2, | 24789:6 | $24622: 1,24639: 24,$ | parents [1] - 24713:21 | 24722:16, 24724:5, |
| $24691: 5,24691: 16$ | operator [2] - 24701:4, | 24726:2, 24795:13 | paring [3] - 24647:20, | 24797:1 |
| $24701: 3,24701: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24731: 15 \\ & \text { operators [2] - 24632:1, } \end{aligned}$ | P | $\begin{array}{r} 24647: 25,24721: 19 \\ \text { parka [1] - } 24740: 19 \end{array}$ | passed [1] - 24772:16 |
| 24702:7, 24703:15, | 24632:2 |  | part [25] - 24602:1, | passenger [1] - |
| $24704: 25,24705: 5$ | opinion [7] - 24622:1, |  | $24603: 9,24606: 7,$ | 24725:21 |
| 24707:12, 24708:2, <br> 24708:18, 24709:25 | 24689:25, 24690:3, |  | $24606: 14,24632: 11$ | passengers [1] - |
| 24710:6, 24710:13, | $24706: 3,24706: 6,$ | pace [1] - 24745:1 | $24635: 2,24643: 4$ | $24720: 9$ |
| 24712:9, 24713:23, | opinions [1] - 24699:25 | Page [1] - 24595: | $24653: 21,24667: 10$ | 24766:23, 24785:3 |
| 24718:1, 24718:23, | opportunity [9] - | page [64]-24616:1, | 24679:9, 24682:25, | past [3] - 24648:19, |
| $24721: 15,24726: 21,$ | $24643: 10,24650: 19,$ | 24618:5, 24620:15, | $24730: 25,24742: 2$ | 24726:11, 24765:22 |
| 24727:21, 24732:12, 24739:8, 24740:3 | $24651: 24,24666: 22,$ | $24620: 24,24625: 8,$ | $24747: 14,24752: 4$ | Pat [1] - 24594 :6 |
| $24740: 4,24741: 14$ | 24667:6, 24703:21, | $24626: 5,24627: 12,$ | $24753: 7,24753: 10$ | pattern [1] - 24622:12 |
| $24741: 17,24743: 14,$ | 24748:3, 24770:20, | 24627:18, 24628:1, $24628 \cdot 15 \cdot 24628: 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24757:18, 24759:11, } \\ & 21781 \cdot 18 ~ 21780 \cdot 12 \end{aligned}$ | pause [9]-24600:17, |
| 24743:17, 24743:20, | oppose [1] - 24801:25 | $\begin{aligned} & 24628: 15,24628: 17, \\ & 24629: 22,24629: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $24789: 23,24800: 25$ | 24623:7, 24648:5, |
| 24745:7, 24746:1, | opposed [4]-24602:8, | 24631:23, 24632:7, | participants [1] - | 24648:24, 24651:8, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24746: 3,24746: 16, \\ & 24746: 17,24747: 23, \end{aligned}$ | 24639:16, 24753:11, | 24632:16, 24632:18, | 24624:15 | 24710:5, 24722 :21 |
| 24749:8, 24749:16, | 24778:5 | 24633:10, 24635:12, | participation [1] - | pay [2] - 24697:24, |
| $24749: 17,24749$ | opposite [1] - 24663:20 | 24643:1, $24643: 2$, | 24723:25 | 24735:13 |
| $24749: 24,24751: 3$ | options [3] - 24598:4, | 24643:13, 24645:3, | particular [35] | Peace [1] - $24720: 7$ |
| 24752:10, 24753:15, | 24599:7, 24599:8 oral [2] - 24680:20 | $24655: 23,24656: 17$ | $24621 \text { :25, 24625:2, }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { pedestrian [1] - } \\ & \text { 24720:10 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 24754:18, 24757:16, | $24717: 9$ | 24658:17, 24661:5, | $24632: 10,24632: 20$ | pending [1] - 24692:2 |
| 24757:17, 24758:22, | orange [1] - 24726:25 | 24661:23, 24667:12, | 24635:14, 24638:17, | Penitentiary $[2$ |
| $24760: 10,24760: 13,$ | order [5] - 24624:11, | 24673:20, 24677:13, | $24640: 24,24645: 16$ | 24768:13, 24780:13 |
| $24760: 15,24760: 21$ | 24658:7, 24697:3, | 24687:17, 24687:21, | 24647:7, 24655:8, | penitentiary |
| 24764:3, 24767:12, | 24755:11, 24757:21 | 24687:22, 24709:11, | 24656:11, 24671:18, | 24778:8 |
| 24774:15, 24776:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ordered [3]-24675:23, } \\ & 24729: 6.24765: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 24717:19, 24719:23, | $\begin{aligned} & 24675: 21,24684: 5 \\ & 24684: 20,24685: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Penkala }[3]-24725: 1, \\ & 24761 \cdot 4.24761: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| 24777:5, 24780:10, $24780: 24,24781: 10,$ | ordinarily [1] - | $24721: 5,24722: 12,$ | 24691:16, 24692:6, | people [18] - 24601:16, |
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|  | ```24718:23, 24751:8, 24762:6, 24786:4, 24795:3 seeing [1] - 24793:25 seek [2] - 24688:6, 24757:17 seeking [4] - 24634:16, 24688:5, 24690:18, 24781:11 seem [4] - 24655:13, 24676:7, 24676:20, 24759:10 segments [3] - 24796:5, 24796:16, 24796:17 selective [1] - 24644:23 semen [2]-24619:4, 24793:21 seminal [3] - 24618:9, 24618:15, 24618:22 senior [1] - 24682:7 sensation [1] - 24659:7 sense [8] - 24597:8, 24606:22, 24615:11, 24626:15, 24637:25, 24674:17, 24693:11, 24806:17 sensed [2]-24623:11, 24623:15 sent [10] - 24681:17, 24689:19, 24732:6, 24768:12, 24796:21, 24803:2, 24803:3, 24805:1, 24805:11, 24807:15 sentence [7] - 24645:10, 24692:4, 24768:11, 24768:23, 24778:13, 24779:5, 24779:22 sentenced [1] - 24776:25 separate [2] - 24713:23, 24797:23 september [1] - 24683:20 September [4] - 24681:25, 24682:21, 24682:22, 24767:14 sequence [1] - 24723:18 Serge [3]-24594:5, 24775:8, \(24781: 23\) Sergeant [9] - 24701:1, 24703:15, 24708:12, 24724:4, 24726:7, 24729:14, 24730:21, 24736:2, 24759:19 sergeant [1] - 24643:18 serial [1] - 24751:15 serious [3]-24706:13,``` | ```24746:21, 24798:23 seriously [2] - 24668:11, 24685:20 serological [1] - 24687:5 serve [1]-24674:4 Service [1] - 24594:6 service [2] - 24628:23, 24701:3 session [1] - 24723:21 set [9] - 24670:19, 24683:20, 24692:4, 24710:20, 24738:10, 24743:14, 24769:1, 24795:12, 24800:13 setting [2] - 24599:16, 24681:20 seven [7]-24648:18, 24648:19, 24648:21, 24648:22, 24648:23, 24686:13, 24744:16 several [4]-24624:4, 24706:12, 24707:1, 24789:14 Several [1] - 24706:9 sexual [12]-24628:8, 24655:2, 24664:4, 24709:7, 24738:1, 24739:8, 24743:7, 24746:16, 24746:19, 24749:8, 24757:7, 24764:2 shadows [1] - 24755:10 shake [1] - 24711:23 share [1] - 24794:18 Sharon [3] - 24703:16, 24703:22, 24704:7 shed [2] - 24719:4, 24750:19 shirk [1] - 24612:18 shoes [6] - 24633:3, 24660:16, 24660:20, 24665:6, 24665:10, 24735:12 Short [4] - 24705:7, 24708:2, 24708:8, 24721:10 short [7] - 24606:25, 24607:6, 24627:23, 24668:4, 24720:5, 24720:17, 24791:17 shorthand [2] - 24619:18, 24809:5 shortly [2] - 24606:12, 24745:19 shoulder [1] - 24803:19 show [6] - 24664:12, 24704:21, 24729:1, 24743:18, 24760:4, 24764:6``` |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 24630:4, 24630:13, | suppose [8] - 24612:8, | 24596:7, 24613:5, | 24610:17, 24617:21, | 24749:8, 24749:12, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24637:15, 24648:2, | 24644:2, 24644:5, | 24615:2, 24616:2, | 24696:20, 24697:1, | 24751:23, 24754:23, |
| 24648:16, 24656:1, | 24649:21, 24670:17, | 24620:12, 24620:16, | 24736:3, 24736:16, | 24754:25, 24755:6, |
| 24656:8, 24660:18, | 24674:17, 24702:7, | 24622:19, 24632:9, | 24739:4, 24744:8, | 24756:5, 24762:21, |
| 24661:9, 24662:4, | 24710:18 | 24633:24, 24636:12, | 24753:5, 24768:15, | 24764:3, 24764:15, |
| 24668:10, 24776:5, | Supreme [26] - | 24639:1, $24641: 23$, | 24799:13 | 24767:11, 24798:7, |
| 24806:12 | 24613:13, 24614:1, | 24669:24, 24684:25, | testify [9]-24596:11, | 24798:19 |
| suggested [10] | 24614:10, 24619:19, | 24700:16, 24706:21, | 24596:18, $24601: 22$, | three-quarter [1] - |
| 24622:8, 24624:3, | 24619:21, 24688:6, | 24707:14, 24707:19, | 24612:11, 24612:25, | 24745:7 |
| 24636:19, 24638:16, | 24689:18, 24690:19, | 24714:3, 24717:7, | 24634:8, 24792:10, | threw [2]-24608:2, |
| 24683:15, 24692:2, | 24693:12, 24695:18, | 24721:3, 24728:20, | 24792:18, 24792:22 | 24625:5 |
| 24711:9, 24733:14, | 24696:10, 24697:1, | 24730:24, 24734:15, | testifying [2] - 24615:4, | throat [1] - 24742:12 |
| 24776:12, 24782:11 | $24766: 22,24772: 7,$ | 24738:6, 24739:15, | $24792: 9$ | throughout [2] - |
| $24624: 11,24674: 20$ | 24773:10, 24773:21 | $24756: 22,24760: 25$ | $24592: 14$ | 24620:23, 24624:14 |
| $24678: 15,24778: 1$ | $24791: 15,24792: 7$ | 24762:12, 24762:25, | 24592:14 | throw [1] - 24607:24 |
| suggestion [12] - | 24793:3, 24804:9, | 24766:14, 24775:5, | 24614:11, 24631:3, | 24744:22 |
| 24630:15, 24632:19, | 24804:16, 24804:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 24782: 16,24784: 13 \\ & 24800: 7.24800: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 24643:16, 24655:19, | thumb [1] - $24631: 6$ |
| 24664:15, 24678:16, | Supt [1] - 24724:25 | 24800:18, 24802:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24697:5, 24746:7, } \\ & \text { 24748:13, 24748:19, } \end{aligned}$ | Thursday[1] - 24733:11 |
| 24747:7, 24764:10, | surely [1] - 24654:11 | 24802:13, 24806:13, | 24757:14, 24758:23, | tipped [1] - 24724:16 |
| 24775:25, 24780:9, | surprised [2] - | 24807:5, 24807:25, | 24758:25, 24791:15, | tipping [1] - 24714:12 |
| 24781:10, 24788:24 <br> suggestions [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24623:19, 24797:22 } \\ & \text { suspect }[4]-24619: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24808:3 } \\ & \text { tape [2] - 24717:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24804: 9 \\ & \text { text }[1]-24636: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { today [2] - 24696:6, } \\ & \text { 24707:14 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $24660: 11,24660: 12$ suggests [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & 24635: 22,24737: 5, \\ & 24767: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24723: 8 \\ & \text { taped [2] - 24715:9 } \end{aligned}$ | thais [1] - 24733:18 <br> theft [1]-24645:9 | Toews[1] - 24594:10 |
| 24618:13, 24618:22, | suspected [2] | $24716: 13$ | theme [1]-24783:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { together [2]-24697:8, } \\ & 24702: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| 24694:18 | 24752:4, 24776:15 | taxed [1]-24597:19 | themselves [7] - | token [1] - 24766:7 |
| suitcase [1] - 24705:3 | suspended [1] | Taxi[1] - 24729:18 | 24625:18, 24647:5, | tone [7]-24653:8, |
| suits [1] - 24683:4 | 24645:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { taxi }[3]-24729: 6, \\ & 24729 \cdot 924729 \cdot 24 \end{aligned}$ | $24743: 6,24746: 20$ | 24660:5, 24660 :8, |
| summarize <br> [4] - | suspicion [1]-24632:5 suspicious [4] - | Tdr[1] - 24594:4 | $24773: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24660: 9,24667: 14, \\ & 24667: 16,24669: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| 24699:12, 24700:16, | 24608:19, 24644:21, | Technician[1] - | theories [1]-24752:11 | tongue [1] - 24659:11 |
| $24707: 4,24781: 7$ <br> summarized [2] - | $24702: 8,24742: 24$ | 24593:11 <br> telephone [2] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { theory [8] - 24621:12, } \\ & 24628: 2,24636: 20, \end{aligned}$ | Tony[3]-24593:11, |
| $24806: 6,24806: 25$ | sweater [7] - 2462 | $24785: 4,24800: 13$ | 24639:14, 24644:5 | $24726: 21,24785: 10$ |
| summarizes [2] - | 24621:18, $24621: 24$, | telephoned [1] - | 24649:22, 24653:23, | 24636:15, 24686:21, |
| 24756:21, 24758:6 | 24622:4, 24627:3, | 24800:5 | 24654:3 | 24687:7, 24705:8 |
| summary [6] | 24652:14, 24742:25 | ten [4]-24631:11, | there'd [1] - 24602: | 24725:16, 24742:14, |
| 24622:17, 24625:3, | sword [1] - $24601: 12$ | 24648:19, 24648:23, | thereby [1] - $24781: 4$ | 24749:25, 24750:1, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24779: 16,24796: 18, \\ & 24806: 21.24807: 1 \end{aligned}$ | sworn [1] - 24768:6 | 24665:17 | therefore [5] - 24609:7, | 24757:7, 24777:25, |
| 24806:21, 24807:1 <br> summation [1] - | T | tenable [1]-24746:10 tend [3]-24608:22, | $\begin{aligned} & 24629: 5,24633: 18 \\ & 24638: 21,24697: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24782: 9,24782: 13, \\ & 24786: 24,24794: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| $24615: 21$ |  | $24608: 25,24670: 5$ | thin [1] - 24742:21 | $\text { top }[7]-24643: 1,$ |
| 24785:23 | ta | tends [1]-24704:21 | 24682:17, 24716:4, | 24716:8, 24717:19, |
| sums [1] - 24646:21 | tactic [1] - 24798:13 | term [9]-24597:22, | $24723: 3,24747: 21,$ | $24731: 6,24759: 24$ |
| Sunday[1] - 24790:24 <br> superiors [1] - 24753:8 | tailing [1] - 24646:5 talks [17] - 24632:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24605:12, 24605:16, } \\ & 24608: 21,24631: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $24783: 20$ <br> third [5] - 24605:14 | toque [4]-24633:17, |
| supplementary [2] - | 24645:2, 24648:14 | 24686:16, 24686:17, | 24739:7, 24743:19, | 24633:18, 24656:18, 24656:24 |
| 24670:11, 24670:18 | 24657:1, 24663:2, | 24704:14, 24746:8 | 24758:12, 24764:7 | touch [6]-24599:18, |
| Support [1] - 24593:6 | 24705:7, 24708:6, | terms [4]-24651:4, | thoughts [2] - | 24643:3, 24653:21, |
| support [7] - 24674:22, | $\begin{aligned} & 24711: 18,24722: 13, \\ & 24730: 22.24732: 12 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24758: 20,24759: 14 \\ & 24788 \cdot 18 \end{aligned}$ | $24610: 23,24784: 19$ <br> threat [1]-24762•3 | 24705:10, 24740:5, |
| $24693: 18,24757: 3,$ | $24732: 24,24741: 4$ | test [2] - 24618:11 | threatened [2] - | touched [6] - 24618:3, |
| 24775:16, 24775:25 | $24750: 4,24753: 15$ | $24755: 24$ | 24654:22, 24762:5 | $24626: 23,24639: 9$ |
| supported [1] - | 24793:15, 24794:15 | tested [1] - 24618:9 | three [20]-24632:23, | 24647:17, 24671:3, |
| 24678:12 | tall [1] - 24740:20 | testified [15] - | 24636:18, 24656:7, | 24711:3 |
| supports [2] - 24737:6, | Tallis[49]-24594:11, | 24598:14, 24599:21, | 24701:13, 24720:4, | tough [1] - 24597:5 |
| 24737:8 | 24595:3, 24596:5, | 24603:12, 24609:9, | 24738:8, 24745:7, | tow [1] - 24632:1 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { towards [4] - 24666:16, } \\ & \text { 24731:10, 24735:6, } \end{aligned}$ | 24613:7 | turned [3] - 24675:13, | U | 24752:12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24744:15 } \\ & \text { town [2] - 24631:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24650: 10,24723: 23, \\ & 24746: 23,24774: 7 \end{aligned}$ | twenty [1] - 24648:21 |  | 24678:20 |
| 24790:25 | triggered [1] - 24728:4 | 24648:21 | 24686:13, 24804:4 | 24649:21, 24691:5 |
| trace [1] - 24646:7 | trip [9]-24602:23, | two [47] - 24601:12, | un-adopted [1] - | unlikely [1] - 24644:8 |
| traced [1] - 24687:3 | 24604:2, 24640:24 | 24607:8, 24610:21 | 24642:19 | unreasonable [8] - |
| transcribed [2] - | 24706:5, 24708:3 | 24613:13, 24617:14, | unable [3] - 24720:11, | 24627:21, 24674:10, |
| 24806:5, 24806:25 | 24717:21, 24718:17, | 24624:1, 24630:20, | 24729:10, 24730:2 | 24674:11, 24678:12, |
| Transcript[2] - | 24721:25, 24726:12 | 24631:4, 24636:20, | unalterably [1] - | 24678:16, 24678:24, |
| 24592:12, 24596:1 | trouble [1]-24645:7 | $24645: 20,24647: 20$ | $24625: 19$ | $24686: 24,24687: 6$ |
| transcript [9] - | trouser [1] - 24722:10 | 24647:22, 24649:18, | unanswered [1] | unreasonable' [1] - |
| $24616: 20,24620: 25,$ | trousers [2]-24669:17, | 24650:12, 24666:25, | $24709: 22$ | 24679:12 |
| 24672:17, 24675:6, | 24712:3 | 24668:21, 24672:14, | unconscious [1] | unsavoury [3] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24675: 22,24677: 2, \\ & 24681: 11,24685: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { truck [2] - } 24632: 1 \\ & \text { true [5] - } 24643: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24701: 2,24710: 5, \\ & 24714: 19,24717: 22, \end{aligned}$ | $24654: 5$ | $24609: 6,24636: 3$ |
| transcription | $24659: 8,24711: 9$ | 24718:19, 24724:14, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { uncovering [1] - } \\ & 24691: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $24751: 22,24761: 23$ |
| 24809:5 | 24797:13, 24809:5 | 24746:18, 24749:15, | Under [1] - 24660:1 | 24769:13 |
| transcripts [2] - | Truscott[4]-24613:14, | 24749:16, 24749:23, | under [12] - 24636:2, | unsure [1] - 24719:16 |
| $24681: 22,24798: 5$ | 24613:21, 24614:3, | $\begin{aligned} & 24751: 23,24753: 15, \\ & 24753: 24,24754: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $24659: 2,24659: 5,$ | untainted [1] $24632 \cdot 14$ |
| transit [1] - 24726:22 <br> transpired [1] - 24720:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 24783: 24 \\ & \text { truth }[20]-24598: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $24761: 23,24767: 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24659: 9,24667: 16 \\ & 24679: 11,24706: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 24632:14 <br> untoward [1] |
| transportation [1] - | 24599:1, 24599:5, | 24767:18, 24767:22, | 24707:6, 24759:3, | 24631:16 |
| 24780:12 | $24641 \text { :8, } 24643: 22$ | 24768:10, 24769:7, | 24762:3, 24779:17 | untrue [2] - 24658:2, |
| transported [3] - | 24647:6, 24647:8, $24657: 6,24657: 7$ | 24772:11, 24783:6 | undermine [2] | 24713:4 |
| 24724:9, 24760:5 24778:5 | $24657: 9,24657: 15$ | $24788: 20,24791: 12$ | 24609:10, 24646:14 understood [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { unusual [12] - } \\ & 24630: 16,246 \end{aligned}$ |
| Trav[3] - 24649:9, | 24657:19, 24657:21, | 24791:21, 24792:5, | 24689:4, 24757:8, | 24630:19, 24630:24, |
| 24651:1, 24651 :6 | 24657:25, 24658:12, | 24797:23, 24798:1 | 24789:4 | 24633:5, 24669:13, |
| Trava-leer [3] - | 24659:17, 24706:4, | two-edged [1] - | undertake [1] - | 24673:7, 24684:17, |
| 24649:9, 24651:1, | 24708:19, 24714:8 | $24601: 12$ | 24691:16 | $24729: 25,24736: 9$ |
| 64651: | truthful [3] - 24597:18, 24642:19, 24659:21 | $\begin{gathered} \text { type [44]-24597:20, } \\ \text { 24599:13, 24599:25, } \end{gathered}$ | undertaken [1] - | 24777:11, 24777:15 <br> unwilling [1]-24764:22 |
| travelling [2] - | truthfully [1] - 24669:20 | $24602: 3,24602: 8$ | undertaking | up [70] - 24599:3, |
| $24602: 19,24718: 3$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { try }[14]-24596: 19, \\ 24597: 7,24620: 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24629: 14,24635: 8 \\ & 24640: 22,24663: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $24801 \text { :6, } 24801 \text { :8, }$ | $24600: 3,24600: 6,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { treated [1]-24685:19 } \\ & \text { trial [46] - 24611:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $24644: 24,24650: 1$ | $24663: 24,24667: 16$ | 24801:16, 24802:8 | $24604: 2,24604: 12$ |
| 24616:5, 24620:23, | 24652:25, 24653:18, | 24677:13, 24687:12, | undoubtedly [1] - | 24606:3, 24608:13, |
| 24624:15, 24634:14, | 24664:19, 24699:12, | $\begin{aligned} & 24693: 6,24698: 22, \\ & 24700: 7,24700: 12, \end{aligned}$ | 24611:6 | 24608:15, 24609:14, |
| 24642:9, 24642:10, | $\begin{aligned} & 24707: 2,24707: 13, \\ & 24759: 12.24759: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 24704:6, 24704:7, | undress [3] - 24753:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 24610: 12,24610: 21, \\ & 24615: 19.24619: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| $24645: 23,24651: 10,$ 24652:25. 24655:17. | 24792:19 | 24704:11, 24704:17, | $24755: 9,24762: 4$ | 24622:14, 24624:5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24652: 25,24655: 17 \\ & 24670: 7,24671: 2, \end{aligned}$ | trying [26] - 24597:2, | 24710:12, 24710:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { undressed [1] - } \\ & \text { 24756:18 } \end{aligned}$ | 24629:15, 24630:23, |
| 24671:12, 24671:14, | $24598: 2,24602: 5,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24714:1, 24714:10, } \\ & \text { 24715:20, 24718:9 } \end{aligned}$ | unfair [1] - 24653:17 | $24637: 7,24638: 3$ |
| 24671:17, 24671:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 24619: 4,24627: 5, \\ & 24631: 8,24639: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 24718:11, 24721:19, | unfolded [2] - 24642:7, | $\begin{aligned} & 24639: 21,24646: 21, \\ & 24651: 7,24653: 21, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24671: 23,24671: 24, \\ & 24676: 2,24676: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $24641: 11,24646: 15$ | $24748: 24,24749: 3$ | $24702: 4$ | $24654: 2,24654: 25,$ |
| 24679:23, 24681:22, | 24647:4, 24650:13, | 7754:6, 24755:22, | 24788:3, 24807:2 | 24655:18, 24656:4, |
| 24686:3, 24686:11, | $24652: 15,24652: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24757: 2,24758: 16, \\ & 24758: 25,24761: 1, \end{aligned}$ | unidentifiable [1] | $24661: 5,24667: 1$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24691: 17,24694: 9 \\ & 24694 \cdot 24 \quad 24697 \cdot 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24661:1, 24664:13, } \\ & \text { 24669:19, 24670:14, } \end{aligned}$ | 24762:16, 24763:22, | 24758:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24667:18, 24670:17, } \\ & \text { 24674:6, 24676:1, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 24697:15, 24714:7, | $24670: 25,24672: 9$ | $24765: 8,24765: 21$ | unidentified [2] | $24681: 19,24681: 22,$ |
| 24716:3, 24717:17, | 24709:20, 24714:8, | 4773:2, 24773:5, | uniform [1] - 24660: | 24682:23, 24689:17, |
| 24723:13, 24731:22, | 24725:8, 24743:12, | typed [6] - 24617 | unique [2] - 24625:14 | $24692: 21,24696: 4$ |
| $24763: 5,24765: 17$ | 24784:10, 24795:18, 24800•1 | 24619:16, 24619:17, | 24626:3 | $\begin{aligned} & 24700: 24,24707: 23, \\ & 24714: 10,24719: 1, \end{aligned}$ |
| 24787:17, 24794:4, <br> 24794:9, 24795:19 |  | 24641:13, $24681: 22$, | University [1] - | $24736: 23,24740: 20,$ |
| 24798:6, 24798:13, | 24604:21, 24610:16, | 24788:20 | 24744:11 | 24741:18, $24741: 23$, |
| 24800:8, 24800:10 | 24720:19, 24762:20, |  |  | 24741:24, 24744:20, |
| trials [2]-24613:6, | 24799:12 |  | unknown [2] - 24752:5, | 24744:23, 24752:17, |
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