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## Transcript of Proceedings

(Reconvened at 9:00 a.m.)
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Good morning.
ALL COUNSEL: Good morning.

## EDDIE ALEXANDER KARST, continued:

```
BY MR. HODSON:
```

Q
A
Q

A
Q
.
Good morning, Mr. Karst.
Good morning, sir.
If we could call up the, your Supreme Court of
Canada evidence, it's doc ID 121433, and if you go
to page 121500, please. I'm sorry, page 568,
121568, please. And, Mr. Karst, this is where you
were examined, or testified at the Supreme Court
of Canada, you recall that, in the reference case?
I remember being there.
And this is some questions asked to you by Mr.
Wolch and talking again about the Miller file and
your visit to Winnipeg in October of 1970 , and he
asks at line 9:
"Q This is October 22 of 1970. It hadn't
exactly been filed away for a long time.
A Oh, no, but it was solved as far as I
am concerned.
Q So your mind was closed about it?
A Certainly. I wouldn't bring up a past

> file that has already been completed in the courts."

And I take it you accept that answer as being accurate and truthful; is that fair?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A


I do.
And I'm just wondering, I think yesterday, this -it says you wouldn't bring up a past file, but I want to clarify, yesterday $I$ think you said, and please correct me if $I$ 'm wrong, that if something came up in the course of the interview that caused you to think there would be a connection, that you would do something about it?

Yes, if there was some extenuating circumstances, I would certainly want to look at it.

But do I take it from this answer to Mr. Wolch's question that because the file was completed in the courts, would it be not something you would bring up on your own; is that what you are saying? That's correct, that's fair.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And that's the Milgaard file we're talking about is it?

MR. HODSON: The Miller investigation file, yes.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right.
BY MR. HODSON:

Q

A

Q And if we could go to page 040148 of doc ID 040146 , and you are asked here about again your trip to Winnipeg, Mr. Homeniuk asks:
"KEN HOMENIUK: Inspector Nordstrum was in charge of Morality $I$ believe? ED KARST: He was in charge of Morality. And he wouldn't give, I'm sure, he didn't delegate me the order, it either come from my boss, which was likely Hughy Frazer at the time or --" It says Keith, but I think that should, "-- Chief Kettles which one it was I don't know, but $I$ know that Nordstrum didn't have the authority to say we're going to Winnipeg. It would have to come from the chief or deputy chief."

Mr. Karst?
No.
No?
Excuse me, I say in there it likely come from Hughy Frazer. Well, that was certainly wrong because he was not in that section. I guess I should have said Superintendent Wood, but for some reason or other I had Frazer mentioned several times, but $I$ don't know why.

Okay. Putting aside Frazer, let's just go back, is your answer correct that Nordstrom didn't have the authority that either the head of detectives or Wood or Kettles would have to give; is that -That's my understanding.

Okay. So just so that Inspector Nordstrom on his own couldn't be one who would make a decision for you to go to Winnipeg with him?

I don't believe so.
Page 040151 , please, and down at the bottom, Mr . Homeniuk asks:
"KEN HOMENIUK: Okay. I think you have answered the next question as to why Morality wouldn't have went. Your discussions with Gus Weir, did he ever, did he ever bring this up about Fisher.

Your answer:
"ED KARST: No, no. It never came to light until, $I$ can't remember who was here before that showed me, but $I$ think it was another mounted policemen investigating this sometime ago, I can't remember ..."

And then question:
"KEN HOMENIUK: ... Rick Pearson ...?"

Answer:
"ED KARST: ... Ya right. And when he showed me the statement that's the first time I really realized. And that's the only time $I$ ever talked to Gus about it, I think he called me or $I$ called him.

And I said, I don't know how the hell I
went, it was your file, had no idea."

And I'm wondering, Mr. Karst, it appears that at this time you are talking about a recollection of a conversation with Gus Weir. Do you know what that's referring to?

A
I may have at that time.
Q Do you recall that?

A
No, I don't.

And then to page 040161 , please, and at the bottom
you are asked again by Mr. Homeniuk about coming back from Winnipeg in October of 1970:
"KEN HOMENIUK: Okay. So as far as coming back then and discussing it with anybody else in Morality, do you recall it."

And your answer is:
"ED KARST: I wouldn't have, no, because it was, it wasn't my file and $I$ just didn't. And I've heard since say that well that the guys didn't know, that those cases were solved."

If I can pause there. You will recall yesterday, Mr. Karst, I read you a couple of media reports where some officers were saying they didn't know the cases were solved. Do you recall --

A
I recall that.
And then carrying on:
"Well, if they read their files they had to know because that would be the routine thing, you take your file back, it goes to CR --"

Which is central records,
"-- its printed up and put on the files.
Well it had to go on their files unless
it was somebody's file if he didn't read
it, $I$ don't know, he didn't do to a
thorough job if he didn't read his file
to see that his only suspect was caught."

And again, is that an accurate answer?
Generally, but $I$ probably didn't think that out too well because $I$ said if they read their files. Well, I guess I really don't know whether somebody put it on their file. I assumed that, but I'm not in a position to say that it went on their file.

And I think you said yesterday you think your practice would have been to prepare an
investigation report and you are telling us you don't know whether or not you did that, you think you would have?

I don't put it on there.
You think you would have dictated it?
I don't dictate it. I wrote them out -I'm sorry.
-- and handed them in probably to Inspector Nordstrom.
$Q$
A
And whether somebody put them on that file, I don't know.

2
A
$Q$

Okay.
I assume that -- I know that's the system that goes there, but whether it exactly went on at that time I'm not in a position to say.

And then if you can go to 040165 and here's what you say in response to -- I think the significance of -- I think just previous Mr. Homeniuk is asking -- let me maybe just scroll up to put it in context, a little further, and it says:
"KEN HOMENIUK: Pretty insignificant really this Fisher, I mean just these, along with another rest of the interviews you were doing at that time . . ."

And you say:
"ED KARST: ... there was nothing exceptional or it would stick in my mind ..."

Question:
"KEN HOMENIUK: ... Nothing stood out, ya.

Answer:
"ED KARST: Like I said, in court you
know over that period of twenty years,
I'm sure $I$ took thousands of statements,

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A 2 2
not just the hundreds, but thousands. Well how the hell do you now pick one out of the, you know. Unless it was really something outstanding like, you know, $I$ remember taking statements from Milgaard. But $I$ don't remember that Fisher, and if they wouldn't have showed me my signature on the bottom, I would have denied it."

And is that an accurate, truthful statement? That would be.

And it appears here that we're talking about, where you say you saw your signature on the bottom, and you recall when $I$ showed you those statements before it was just typewritten? I recall that. Do you think there was a handwritten -- or do you know what you are referring to there?

Obviously it was the statements taken because I state that in this statement.

And if we could -- okay, I'll come back. I have another reference to that in your discovery I'll show you in a moment. Actually, if we could go to page 146533 , please, of doc ID 146450 , and question 370 , this is at your discovery, you were
asked:
"Q Which documents, specifically, are you referring to, then, that tell you that you are in Winnipeg?

A I'm sure when $I$ was in Ottawa they showed me a statement that $I$ took in handwritten form, in my handwriting with my signature and, therefore, I know that $I$ was there."

And it would appear from those two answers, Mr. Karst, that at least at that time you were recalling a handwritten signature?

That's what it appears to be.
And then if you could go back to page 146461 , please, and again this is from your discovery transcript you were asked:
"Q And would you agree with me that in all likelihood, you would have had occasion to review the full file --"

This is the Gail Miller file,
"-- after your initial review of it, just to acquaint yourself with all the facts and evidence?

A I can't remember that I specifically did, but $I$ 'm sure that $I$ would have.

It would be normal procedure to keep
up to date with the file."
I'm just wondering if that is accurate, Mr.
Karst?

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q

I agree with that.
That's fine, I'm done with that document. Now, Mr. Karst, just some final questions here, and we've gone over a fair bit of detail about your role in the investigation and $I$ take it, sir, that you would agree that you played a role in the decision to pursue David Milgaard as a suspect in the murder of Gail Miller?

I did.
And did you play a role in the decision to charge David Milgaard with the murder of Gail Miller?

I don't know whether $I$ would say $I$ played a role in it. I certainly had a significant part in it in my views.

And did you have a belief at that time about David Milgaard's responsibility for the murder of Gail Miller?

I did.
And what was that?
I considered him to be guilty.
And on what basis did you have that belief?

A
$Q$

A

Q



On the evidence that was obtained from all the people we spoke to and just that $I$ guess. Were there any parts or significant parts of the evidence that stood out in your mind which caused you to reach that conclusion?

I suppose that a significant part of it was the blood that was mentioned on his clothing, statements he made, the throwing out of the compact or alleged throwing out of the compact out of the vehicle and then of course Mr. Roberts' portion of the investigation.

And one of the mandates of this Commission of Inquiry is to inquire into the conduct of the investigation into the death of Gail Miller and, as you know, Larry Fisher has been convicted of the rape and murder of Gail Miller and the Government of Saskatchewan has exonerated David Milgaard and declared him to be factually innocent of this crime. If you look back at your role in the investigation into the death of Gail Miller, is there anything that you believe you could have or should have done differently?

Personally, I don't know.
If you look back at the original police
investigation in its entirety, and not just your
role but the entire investigation, and based upon your observations or personal knowledge of the investigation, what do you think could have or should have been done differently?

I think, looking back, probably we should have had an independent, $I$ don't know what you would call them, a reader that -- excuse me -- that would not have been involved in the investigation itself, only read the information that comes in. Maybe he would have been -- I don't know, but he may have been in a better position to make an independent decision without speaking to or, you know, being influenced by the officers, and $I$ don't know whether that would have helped, but --

And are there any specific parts of the investigation that you think an independent reader would have assisted on, is there anything in specific you can --

A

Q
A
$Q$

I don't think anything specifically, $I$ just think it's a good idea to have somebody independent review the file that doesn't go out and do actual investigating, that's the way my opinion --

## And?

That's only my opinion.
And did you see, and again $I$ appreciate you are
just giving your opinion, but did you see -- were there some problems inherent, then, with the investigating officers being the readers or the analysts; is that --

No, I don't think so.
No?
But I, what $I$ am trying to get at is $I$ think whoever was -- and in charge of the files, or we know who that was -- were obviously influenced by officers' opinions conversing with them. However if you hadn't, what $I$ am getting at, if you had an independent reader he may not have been influenced to that extent.

So are you talking about someone who could take a step back and perhaps be a devil's advocate?

Exactly what $I$ am saying.
And perhaps challenge some of the officers?
I think so.
And you think that would have been of assistance? It wouldn't have done any harm.

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Karst, for answering my questions. I believe $I$ can -- you will be cross-examined first by Mr. Lockyer; next by Mr. Wolch; and then after that $I$ think Mr. O'Keefe or Mr. Beresh next Monday has questions; and

Mr. Pringle. Well, we'll see what happens after the first two, and counsel will introduce themselves to you.

A
Yes, sir.

## BY MR. LOCKYER:

Yes, sir, Mr. Karst. As I'm sure you realize, I'm here on behalf of Mrs. Milgaard.

A
$Q$
And it would be reasonable to say do you think, sir, that the days of May 21 st to May 24 th of 1969
were really three or four sort of seminal days for
the future of David Milgaard and, indeed, Joyce
Milgaard as well?

I don't know what you mean by the word 'seminal'?

Well very -- they had an impact on their lives
that was to last many, many, many years, including
right up to today?
I agree with that.
Uh-huh. Because up until then the investigation had focused, really for about 11 weeks, on David Milgaard as a potential suspect?

A
$Q$
Right, $I$ would agree with you.
And had seemingly come up short, you didn't have any evidence or any sufficient evidence upon which to base a charge for murder?

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q
A
Q

A
$Q$

A
Q

I think we had a suspicion but whether it was, you know, it certainly wasn't conclusive.

Well the only evidence you had, for what it was worth, really was that he was in the area at the time, based on what he had told you, and Cadrain saying he had seen blood on his trousers; that was about it, wasn't it?

I would have to go over it all to agree with that but --

That's hardly reasonable and probable grounds for charging someone?

Yes.
It's not, is it, when you think about it?
I didn't get the last comment.
I say that's not reasonable and probable grounds to charge someone?

I agree with you.
Yes. So, really, everything had come up short at least until, if we had put ourselves in your shoes, on -- and, indeed, the investigators' shoes -- as of May $16 t h ?$

As far as laying a charge, yes.
And indeed, up to that point, you had statements from David himself, Mr. Wilson and Ms. John which largely matched each other as to their -- as to
what happened and what they did on their journey from Regina to out west, including their stop in Saskatoon?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
not?
I, I fail to follow you there, and --
The stories, you said in the context of that David
had said -- David and Mr. Wilson and Ms. John had
really all said the same thing about their trip,
including their stop in Saskatoon, in that context
you said in your examination-in-chief 'I didn't
place much significance on the matching stories',
and I'm wondering why you didn't place much
significance on the matching stories?
Probably, at that stage of the investigation, $I$
suppose that $I$ was, as in any other investigation,
proceeding to investigate every aspect of it, and
if they, if their stories were similar, I still
had to investigate.

Okay. That's not -- I understand that, that's not
quite the same as saying 'I didn't place much significance on it', would it be better to say you
placed a fair bit of significance on it but you still thought it required further work?

I think, if I'd have placed a lot of significance on their stories being similar, I would have thought $I$ didn't need much more investigation. Well it's a good point.

In my opinion.
But you didn't think that, clearly?
Obviously not.
And nor did the others investigating the case?
I can't -- I don't know about that.
Well, no, I thought you were basically following orders?

A
$Q$
I was.
And you were given orders to 'look, Milgaard is obviously a pointless suspect, he clearly didn't do it because of all the interviews we've done, so lay off and let's get someone who's realistic'; you didn't get instructions like that, did you?

No, I didn't.
No, you got instructions to keep going?
To keep investigating, yes.
To keep investigating David Milgaard?

A
$Q$

Or anything else that might come up.
But, in particular, David Milgaard?
That was my portion of the file.
It wasn't just yours, it was others' portion, other people's portion of the file as well; wasn't it?

Some of them, yes.
I mean in the period of March-April-May the primary focus of the investigation was David Milgaard?

But I also recall reading some statements and information that Penkala, and probably others, were of the opinion that there was a connection between the rapes and the murder and they were also looking at that aspect.

And there was being a lot invested in the investigation of David Milgaard, there were -people were going to, I have got three cities, there may be more, Edmonton, people were going to Winnipeg, people were going to Regina, there was

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

quite a lot of investment in the investigation of David?

In the context of investigating someone about a murder or questioning them about a murder, if they leave out the fact that they know all about it and saw it, then you would think that what their -their response to you is a lie, really, wouldn't

A
Q
you?

It's pretty remarkable that they are all telling you the same things and leaving out the same things if they haven't sort of sorted it out between themselves beforehand; don't you think?

It may have been remarkable, --
Right.

A
$Q$
-- but I didn't see it that way.
And surely you would have thought that way?
I beg pardon?
You would have thought to yourself that $I$ can't trust these statements because they may well have got together beforehand and said, you know, we're not going to tell the police, David, that you killed this lady and we're going to give them a story that leaves out a whole section of our trip in Saskatoon, our whole breakdown, for example; right?

I can't ever recall, and $I$ don't remember things back that way, that -- that too clearly, but I don't recall having a theory in my mind that they had got together prior to us interviewing them. Well if you think about it logically now, sir, it's really the only -- if we assume for a moment that the three of them all commonly gave the same false story to you and other officers in March of 1969, that the only really logical explanation for that is that they had sort of talked about it beforehand between themselves as to what they were and weren't going to tell the police?

Knowing what $I$ know now $I$ could have well come to that conclusion at that time.

Q
$\square$ 5 A bit coincidental, otherwise, that the three of them all happened to say the same thing and all happened to leave out the same things?

Well, originally.
Right, okay. So when you -- certainly there was nothing in the statements that the three of them gave, the series of statements that the three of them gave, because each of them gave more than one, they were all questioned two or three times before May 15 th; right?

I believe so, several times.
Yes. And it all, as you -- as it's put in, I think it's, I'm not sure if it's your report or someone else's, they all, as it was put with respect to David Milgaard in an April 18th report, they all stuck to the same story; right?

I think those words were mentioned.
Yes. And there is nothing that you knew, at least, as of May $15 t h$ to suggest, other than your own surmise, there was no evidence that they had got together and concocted their stories beforehand?

I concur with that.
Right. But when, on May 21 through 24 , you suddenly find out that, indeed, Wilson and John
had not told the truth in their previous
statements, right, when you find that out then
surely it must have dawned on you that they must have contrived, together, their earlier statements for them to match the false statements, which you now knew were false as of May 24 th; right? I'm a little behind you there. Well May 24 th you find out Wilson and John -- this is your view of it at the time -- have been lying in a series of statements that they had given in March and April?

Yes, they had left certain things out.
Right. Okay. Well can we call it lying? If you like.

If you agree we can call it that, sir.
If you like, sir.
Otherwise, $I$ keep saying long sentences, and I'm trying to avoid it; all right?

Okay.
So you know as of May 24 th -- this is your
belief -- that they have been lying in March and April, you know as of May 24 th the lies that they have told are the same as each other and the same as the lies that you now believe David Milgaard told in his statement to the police as well;
right?
A
I'd have to look at that file over again, I can't -- $I$ can't remember all the things, and probably you are right to some of them --

And it's --
-- but $I$ don't know about them all.
And there were some things, for example David had in his statement about stopping the old lady and asking for directions, the other two didn't? Yes.

So there were some things in one statement that weren't in the other but, in essence, the three of them gave matching statements? I think you used that term yourself.

I believe you are right.
And I appreciate they are not word for word, you would never expect that under any circumstances, but they were matching -- that's a generic term --
'matching statements'?
And you are talking about originally?
Yes.
Yes.
For a two-month, for an 11 -week period, insofar as they were questioned several times between them in that 11 -week period; right?

Q

All denials, yes.
Okay. So we now, on May 24 at the very latest -really even before May 24 , in the preceding days, but let's go to you on May 24th -- but on May 24 th you now know that John and Wilson lied to you and others, other police officers, in their preceding 11-week period; correct?

Inconsistencies, yes.
A little more than that, sir.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Lockyer, you clearly put words in his mouth, you instructed him to describe leaving things out as a lie and it's going to just -- I understand what you are getting at, you don't want to use long sentences, but it's going to make it very difficult to read the transcript later and find out what this witness actually meant.

So he wants to tell you that what he saw was, between the original statements and the ones of May 24 th, was the fact that the first ones left things out which were included on May $24 t h$.

MR. LOCKYER: Okay. I'll do it that way.
BY MR. LOCKYER:
So as of May 24 th, sir, you know that John and

Wilson have left out highly material facts in all their previous statements; right?

A

Q

A
I agree.
And that they have both left out the same highly material facts, namely seeing or knowing about a murder committed by David Milgaard?

That part is correct.
All right. And, insofar as they had spoken to the police in March and April and May before the 21st, had said the same things, in essence, to the police?

I agree with that.
And the same things, in essence, as David had said when he had spoke to the police too?

Generally.
Yes. So did you say to Wilson and John, in your case in particular $W i l s o n$, did you say to him
'explain to me how you came to say what you did in
March and April up til now, how did it come about that you said the same as John and the same as David, had you got a story together, how did it come about?'; did you ask him that?

I probably did but $I$ can't remember now.
That's such an obvious question, isn't it, sir?
It probably is.

But you don't have any record of any answer to it?
No I don't.
Because the only -- if you think, if you use your imagination as best you can, sir, your imagination can only lead you to one con -- two conclusions; either by pure fluke they all happened to give, in essence, the same story, which was an incomplete story, to say the least, in their March-April interviews; or the three of them had sorted out, between themselves, the story they were going to tell the police; it was really one or the other, wasn't it?

It's a possibility.
And the first likelihood doesn't seem very likely, does it, that they had all coincidentally happened to all say the same things and leave out the same things; doesn't seem likely, does it?

Yeah, no, it doesn't.
No. So that means that somewhere, if we're thinking of it logically, somewhere along the road you should have been saying to yourself on May 24 th that David, Nichol, and Wilson must have at some point got together and decided what they were going to tell the police, so why wouldn't you ask them? That's highly material evidence against

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

David if you visualize the three of them in a discussion, one of them being the murderer, as to the story they are going to give the police, but there's nothing about that in any of the materials, is there sir?

Not that $I$ am aware of.
No. Why not?
I can't recall.
I'm going to suggest you never asked the questions of Wilson?

That $I$ didn't know.
But I suggest you would have known that because you were present and saw how you had manipulated Wilson into giving the statements that he gave May 23rd, May 24 th, and indeed May $21 s t$, May $22 n d ?$ Are you asking me if $I$ manipulated him? I'm suggesting to you that's what you did? Right. Indeed, pretty well everything you've got up to this point is exculpatory, not inculpatory, if you look at what David told the police, what

Ron Wilson told the police, and what Nichol John told the police; right?

If we exclude Cadrain's story.
Yes, no, I'm talking -- I'm saying since Cadrain's story --

Okay.
-- all that's come along, really when you look at it, is exculpatory?

That looks that way.
Right. And the May $16 t h$ meeting that we've heard about, and you say you weren't at, generated, as you saw, a theory put forward by, as we understand it, Mackie, that would make David the murderer and describe the circumstances as to how the murder had come about; am I right?

That's what it looked like.
All right. And the essence of the theory, sir, was that they stopped a nurse, Gail Miller obviously, and they stopped her, to use the words of a document, 'on the pretence of asking her for directions but, in fact, to steal her purse'; remember that?

A

2
I remember it.
That David gets out of the car to get her purse, to steal it, right, and then loses control of his
sexual urges; correct?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
Well wasn't -- $I$ think it was on the car journey, someone correct me if I'm wrong -- I know it was
early on that $W i l s o n$ starts telling you that there was an in -- that the lady was stopped and asked for directions; remember? That was very early on in his dealings with you?

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

I think that was early on, $I$ don't know what -Right. Which -- and it's now a young lady, it's not an old woman any more --

Right.
-- or an old lady as described by David, it's become a young woman. So already, right at the outset, you, who don't even know this theory you say or you weren't at the meeting anyway, are already -- right at the beginning Wilson is starting to feed it to you; is that right? On our trip home from Regina, yes, -Right. -- I recall that's where he -Right, he starts feeding bits of it to you; correct?

I suppose after --
And you are saying, sir -- are you saying that at this time, whether or not you were at the meeting on May 16 th, did you know the Mackie theory at this point?

I didn't know that theory but $I$ think $I$ probably
generally concurred with it. I don't -- I know I wasn't there, but $I$ agree with mostly what $I$ read in there.

Well, do you all sit in separate offices, or were you sort of sitting and talking about this case for hours and hours and hours?

I'm sure we discussed it many times.
I'm sure you did, for many hours, right?
I don't know whether I'd put a time frame on it, but many times.

And surely, sir, if Mackie had a theory that he had worked out and actually committed to paper as to how Gail Miller had met her death at the hands of David Milgaard, it's almost inconceivable, isn't it, that five days after he -- at least five days after he has put it to paper, if we assume that he put it to paper on May 16 th at the very latest, and certainly in that five days following that meeting you would have found out from Mackie that theory that he was presenting that he had committed to paper, right; you would have surely known it?

I'm sure he related information to me.
Right. And it's your position, sir, that as Wilson, over the next few days, gave you the
theory in dribs and drabs over the next few days, it's your position that you never provided him with the theory for him to adopt as opposed to him independently coming up with it; is that right?

A
Q

A
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A
$Q$

A
$Q$
$Q$

A
$Q$

What you are saying is that $I$ told him?
Yes. You are saying that Wilson independently volunteered a story to you that happened to match the theory as opposed to you giving him the theory and having him adopt it, that's your position? I gave him no theory.

You didn't?
No, sir.
Okay. So he independently, coincidentally, adopted the theory that had been presented by Mackie to the May $16 t h$ meeting; right? Well, I don't agree with that. Well he adopted the theory of the stopping, the stopping of the nurse on the pretence for directions to steal --

Yes, there were portions of it.
-- stealing her purse, he adopted that; he adopted the theory of David being the one who went and got the purse, went towards the woman; correct?

Yes.
He adopted the theory of Nichol running away from

```
the car; correct?
```
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Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
Right. So, coincidentally, --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I'm sorry,
Mr. Lockyer, I'm just having trouble remembering where he said that. Could you point it out,
where Wilson said he saw the purse thrown in the garbage?

MR. LOCKYER: Not immediately, not -- no, I can't.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Somebody will make a note of it then. Mr. Fox, do you know?

MR. FOX: I think just generally, when you are cross-examining the witness and saying to them 'Wilson said this in a statement' and 'Wilson said that' and so on, again normal procedure would be to produce the statement, bring it up on the doc. screen, point out what you are referring to, let the witness look at it, and then ask him to comment on it.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: That's the trouble I'm having, Mr. Lockyer, I can't remember. I can't verify in my own mind that Wilson actually said the things that you have been attributing to him.

MR. LOCKYER: Well the witness has adopted it so --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Pardon me?
MR. LOCKYER: The witness has adopted that that's what he was told.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: He is agreeing
with what you said.
MR. LOCKYER: Yes, yes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But Mr. Fox's
point is it's probably unfair to ask him to remember all those things. How do I know he is not just agreeing with it because he can't remember?

MR. LOCKYER: I'm sorry, there are just some things that are in my mind that $I$ just feel I didn't need to refer to as $I$ went along, I --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, you do as far as I'm concerned, because my memory is obviously not as good as yours, Mr. Lockyer.

MR. LOCKYER: Yes. Umm, anyway I can't, I'm sorry $I$ can't give you the passage offhand, maybe Commission Counsel can?

MR. HODSON: I can maybe clarify this. In Ron Wilson's statement of May 23rd, 065362 , he said in Calgary David hold him he grabbed her purse and she fought and he said he jabbed her with a knife a few times and said he put her purse in a trash can. And $I$ think right -- is that the second page, if you look at the end of the first paragraph, I think that's the reference.

Q
Q

A
$Q$


COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: May the 23rd?
MR. HODSON: May the $23 r d$, and the statement of Ron Wilson is that he was told by Mr. Milgaard --

MR. LOCKYER: Right.
MR. HODSON: -- that he put the purse in. I don't believe, and I stand to be corrected, that he ever said he saw David Milgaard put the purse in the garbage can.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Uh-huh.
MR. HODSON: In a statement anyway.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, that's --
BY MR. LOCKYER:
So it's your position, sir, that quite
independently of you providing Mr. Wilson with Mackie's theory, that he came up with it; is that right?

That's correct.
Right. I see. And would I be right, sir, if I put it this way; that the purpose of the whole exercise in May, from May 21 to May 24 th, was to verify everything that you already had suspicions of?

Either verify or discount, one or the other.
Uh-huh. If we can go to 014227 , please, and
particularly 014353. You were asked in the Supreme Court of Canada, sir, by Saskatchewan Crown a question at line 4:
"Q Was your only purpose in getting these two individuals to Saskatoon to find out once and for all what they knew?

A To verify everything that we had suspicions of."

Do you remember saying that, sir?
A
I don't remember it, but it's there, and I obviously said it.

Your words, you didn't qualify, to verify or refute everything we had suspicions of, you saw it in terms of to verify everything we had suspicions of?

A
That's what I said.
Yes. And in fact Mr. Neufeld didn't seem to like that focus because his next question was to find out what they knew, and you said yes; right? Yes.

Uh-huh, thank you. Now, really by, then by May the 24 th, sir, once again we have matching stories from Wilson and John, but of course now they are stories that match with an entirely new slant to them; right?

An entirely new which?
An entirely new slant to them; namely, that David Milgaard was the person who killed Gail Miller? Yes.

Right. So they've gone from matching stories that were completely innocent stories to matching stories that are highly incriminating; correct?

I agree.
And you found their stories, their new stories, unlike their old stories, their new stories very credible; am I right, sir?

Very credible?
Yes. Believable?
Believable.
Credible, same thing $I$ think. You found them very believable; is that right?

That's correct.
Okay. And $I$ want to see, $I$ want to quickly go through why you found them so believable, sir, and make a few suggestions to you as to why you found them so believable. First of all, if you put what Wilson said beside what John said, essentially they were saying the same thing from different perspectives; am I right?

I don't follow that.

A
$Q$

Q

A

Well, they were saying the same thing except at one point Wilson is away from the car so he's not describing the same events as John is when he's away from the car. You see my point?

Yes, I do.
But if you take that into account, they are different perspectives is what $I$ mean by that, essentially they are giving the same story; right?

I agree.
They jibe in other words with each other?
Yes.
And that made it quite convincing to you; is that fair?

I would agree.
As well, sir, they gave stories that certainly, as far as you are concerned, had not been fed to them by anyone; right?

Had not been which?
Fed to them by anyone, by the police, in other words, in particular.

Repeat that, please?
They hadn't been fed their stories by the police? You are saying they hadn't been fed by the police? Yeah, I'm putting that to you.

I agree with that.

A

And that's a reason to believe their stories, that independently of each other -Oh, yes, yeah. -- they have come up with the same story as of May 24th; right?

Generally the same.
The only challenge to that independence would be when they were both together with Roberts, if you remember that was brought out by Commission Counsel, but by that time, by the time that Roberts has them together they both largely committed themselves to their new stories anyway, so I'm not sure we have to be too worried about the contamination of that meeting. Do you follow me? I follow you.

Right. And so we have really two uncontaminated, matching stories from these two people which helps make it convincing; am I right?

I believe that's true.
Right. And in fact, sir, I think in your May 25 th
report, and $I$ can take you to the page if you like, but maybe you can just remember this, you've concluded your report on May $25 t h$ by pointing out that Nichol John's statement that would have been
taken that day coincides with Wilson's statement. Do you remember writing that?

A
$Q$

A
Q

Yes. And if we go through Nichol's statement particularly, could $I$ have 065356 , please, this is Nichol John's statement of May 24 th, sir. I appreciate you didn't take it, but you saw it, so you had a chance to assess it, and as we go through, let's look at some of the things that
really you would have to have been a part of, you would have to have been there to be able to say these things. All right?

All right.
First of all, start there, we've got the knife, that there was a knife used, that's the first thing, a true fact; correct?

Just a minute. Is this my statement here?
No, this is Nichol John's statement, okay, which you read and said coincided --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Where was this knife, Mr. Lockyer, where was it at this time?

MR. LOCKYER: She's describing the knife that David had and I'm just going to say -COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Whereabouts? MR. LOCKYER: It's the knife that she says he stole from the elevator that he has on his person.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, okay, yeah. I think the preface to your questioning though was that Nichol John said things which could only have been known by someone who was at the murder, so it's clear he doesn't --

MR. LOCKYER: No, no, but she turns the
knife into the weapon that David used to commit
the murder and presumably you would have to be there to know a knife was used to commit the murder. Do you see the point?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Fox?
MR. FOX: The only comment $I$ make, $I$ thought Mr. Karst's evidence was that he hadn't taken the statement. He was generally aware of the statement and likely the contents of it, he's not aware that he had particularly read the statement as such. This particular statement of Nichol John $I$ think was taken by Mr. Mackie, so again $I$ think if he's going to be asked questions about this document, because it isn't his document it is important that it be pointed out what section of the statement is being referred to and did he in fact read that and have knowledge of it before you make the assumption that he has read the statement, because I don't think that's what his evidence was.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, I think he agreed that he was familiar with it.

MR. FOX: He certainly said he was familiar, generally familiar with the information contained in it.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just be careful

Q

A
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$Q$
that he understands the context and that he has seen it before.

BY MR. LOCKYER:
Yeah, I had introduced this by saying you didn't take it, and he has agreed that -- you've agreed, sir, particularly in the case of Nichol John, she has given a series of facts to the police in her statement that really require her to be at the scene of the killing to be able to say them? I think that would be a reasonable assessment. Yes. And the first one $I$ was going to bring to your attention is where she says, and maybe I'll just quote it for the sake of simplicity:
"This knife --"
And this is the knife that she says David stole from the grain elevator; right?

I don't know.
"This knife was a kitchen knife used to peal potatoes and things like that. It had a maroon handle."

MR. FOX: Again, the statement --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I don't think you have to stand up, Mr. Fox, I already put that difficulty to him. There's nothing to connect this with what she purports to have seen at the
murder.
MR. FOX: Well, he said that she says the knife was stolen from the grain elevator which would seem to corroborate Wilson. In fact, that's not what she says, she says I don't -- I think the statement says $I$ don't know if the knife came from the elevator or not, so again, if you are going to put the statement to him, it has to be at least accurate.

MR. LOCKYER: Where the knife came from, sir, doesn't bother me at all. I don't care two hoots where the knife came from.

MR. FOX: It does because he's suggesting the statements are the same and Ron Wilson said a knife came from the grain elevator. Mr. Lockyer stands up and says she says the knife came from the grain elevator. That's exactly what she did not say, so it is significant.

BY MR. LOCKYER:
Q
I'm sorry, Mr. Fox doesn't understand what I'm doing. It has nothing to do with whether her statement was similar to Mr. Wilson's or not, that's nothing to do with what I'm asking at the moment, so I'm not trying to make any points in that regard. Let me just read what's there, sir.
"This knife was a kitchen knife used to peal potatoes and things like that. It had a maroon handle. This knife was the same as one of a group of knives that $I$ was shown by Mr. Roberts."

You understand --

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q
A
Q

I have difficulty remembering what knife that's referring to.

It's a knife that she said David Milgaard had with him that morning.

Okay.
All right.
All right.
Don't worry about where it came from, we'll just leave that out. All right?

All right.
And like Mr. Wilson, you remember he as well picked out the same knife from a group of five knives. Do you remember that?

I don't know whether he picked out the same knife, but $I$ was present when he picked out a knife.

I think we know it was the same one.
Okay.
And if we presume, sir, as indeed $I$ think $I$ can
tell you, that the knife that she's referring to
as the one she picked out of a group of knives was in fact the knife found by Gail, or under Gail Miller's body, then either she's just had a very lucky pick or, a one in five I guess you could say, or she did indeed see the knife that David used when she says he stabbed Gail Miller; right? Do you follow?

Are you talking about Nichol John?
Yes.
I wasn't aware that she picked out a knife.
Yeah, but as a matter -- I'm just talking as a matter of common sense here, sir, she has a fact here in her statement which is a reason to believe her statement because she has said and picked out the very knife that seems to have been used to stab Gail Miller as the knife David had with him, and that was a reason to believe what she said to the police; wasn't it?

I suppose so.
Yes. Just common sense it seems to me. You then move on to the next paragraph, sir --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I don't mean to be nitpicky, but she was shown an entire knife, I guess the police used an entire knife which they got as an example. The knife which was found and
which was suspected to have been the murder weapon was broken, was it not, Mr. Lockyer, just to make that clear?

MR. LOCKYER: So it was an identical knife, I'm sorry, I think you are right.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes. You are saying the same knife.

BY MR. LOCKYER:
$Q$
Yes, identical to look at, so $I$ think the point remains.

The next paragraph, sir:
"On the way to --"
What Nichol John says:
"On the way to Saskatoon Dave spoke of wanting to snatch a purse. I didn't like the idea of the $B$ \& $E$ or the snatching of the purse bit."

In fact, there's good -- from the scene, sir, we know that Gail Miller's purse was taken from her and dumped some distance from her body; correct? That's true.

So it doesn't take a genius to realize then that her killer took her purse and then dumped it; correct?

A
I believe you are correct.

A

So that's a good reason to believe what Nichol John is saying because once again she's giving a story which matches the known facts to the police of the crime; right?

That part of it, yes.
Which she wouldn't have known that Gail Miller's purse was taken unless she was at the scene? That's what we felt $I$ guess.

Right. Item 3 is the next -- sorry, two paragraphs down, after we got to Saskatoon:
"After we got to Saskatoon we drove around for about 10 or 15 minutes. Then we talked to this girl. This was in the area where Sgt. Mackie drove me around." Well, the area where Sergeant Mackie drove her around, sir, and where she identified the murder, or the attack as having taken place, was in fact where it had taken place; right?

I don't know that.
Well, I'm telling you that as a fact. If you are telling me that.

I would imagine, I can't believe by May $24 t h$ you didn't have some idea of that, that she had picked out the area where Gail Miller was killed? I may have, but like $I$ say, I wasn't there.

Q
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Q

A
Q

A
Q
完

A

It seems pretty likely you would have known that. So that's a pretty good reason to believe what she said to the police isn't it?

I would think so.
She can pick out where the murder happened?
I would agree.
And if you think about Wilson, did you know, sir, I know he didn't do it with you, but did you know that later on when he came to testify at the preliminary hearing and at the trial, he purported to remember that the area where they broke down the first time, there was a funeral home nearby. I wasn't aware of what he said at the -But if you had known that -- I mean, you probably did know that back in 1969 at some point; right? I've lost you a little bit there.

I say you probably knew at some point back in 1969?

I knew what?
That Wilson had said there was a funeral home near where they broke down?

I suspect that, yes, agreed.
And that of course would be another reason to believe Wilson?

Correct.

Much as it was a reason to believe Nichol John that she was over to identify where the killing had happened?

Agreed.
Right. And then if you carry on down to here, you actually have Nichol John telling you -- not you, but telling you generically, police is what I mean by that, all right?

It appears that way.
"We started to drive away and only went about half a block when we got stuck. We ended up stuck at the entrance to the alley behind the funeral home."

Well, that's bang on where Gail Miller's body was found; right?

Very close.
Okay. Every reason then to believe what Nichol John has told the police; am I right?

I would agree.
Uh-huh. And then over the page we have here, we have another reference to the taking of the purse:
"The next thing $I$ recall is seeing Dave in the alley on the right side of the car. He had a hold of the same girl we spoke to a minute before. I saw him
grab her purse. I saw her grab for her purse again. Dave reached into one of his pockets and pulled out the knife. I don't know which pocket he got the knife from. The knife was in his right hand." Now, there we've got a whole series of facts, some of which we've seen before, the grabbing of the purse is entirely consistent with what the police knew of the murder scene; correct? That's true.

Every reason then -- another reason then to believe what she's saying?

I concur.

David reached into his pocket and pulled out a knife, so we know -- and then she says in the next sentence, or the next paragraph that she saw him stabbing her with it. You see that?

Because Gail Miller was indeed stabbed numerous
times; am I right?
That's correct.
Right. And then what's particularly interesting
of that part is the knife was in his right hand and we know that David Milgaard is left-handed; right?

A
Q

A
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I don't know whether it was because of the right hand or not, but the fact that she seen him stab $I$ think was reason.

But with the right hand?
It would give me reason anyway.

But with the right hand would be something that would have a familiar ring to the police given that the pathologist had said that the assailant was most likely right-handed? It would just be another reason to give credibility to what she's saying don't you think?

I'm not sure about that.
All right. Then we have, if we go to here:
"The next $I$ recall is him taking her around the corner of the alley. I think

I ran after that. I think $I$ ran in the direction Ron had gone. I recall running down the street. I don't recall seeing anyone. The next thing I knew I was sitting in the car again."

And you know, and the you again is generic, you and all the investigators in this case know that a lady saw a woman running down the street, right, around the time of the murder; correct? It may be. I don't recall. I'm sorry, her name isn't in my head. Can someone -- Marie Indyk? Okay, there is such a lady.

A
I believe that, $I$ know the name, but are we referring to the one that says a barefoot person, is that the one?
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A

Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q

## 

 Then, and this, perhaps the best reason of all to believe what she's saying:"I seem to recall seeing Dave putting a purse into a garbage can. I don't
remember which time it was or where I was when $I$ saw this."

Now, that, without any question whatsoever, places her at the scene and makes David the killer; doesn't it?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

I don't know whether $I$ put a lot of emphasis on the statement. "I seem to recall," I mean, she's thinking that she seen it.

But there was a purse in the garbage?
Yes, there was.

She seems to recall something you know is true?
Depends on the interpretation.
That surely - -

She doesn't remember which time or where. I can't
place much faith in that statement, but --

Let's say it helps --
Yes.
-- you believe that she was at the scene because what she seems to recall turns out to be bang on; correct?

That's right.
Okay. And then she says:
"I recall there were two garbage cans.
The one on the left had the lid tipped.
I don't recall which one he put it in."

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$
A
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A
$Q$

Would you have known, sir, at the time, that there were two garbage cans?

I didn't, no, sir.
You remember you didn't or do you think you might have known back then?

It is not in my mind that $I$ remember.
All right. But if indeed there were two garbage cans, that would be a reason to give her --

That's true.
-- special credibility?
Yes, if there were two.
And that's sort of -- those are the items $I$ wanted to take you through, sir. Oh, no, sorry, there's one more, if we go to page 065359, please:
"On May 23 Mr. Roberts showed me a coat.
This coat as $I$ recall is identical to
the one worn by the girl we spoke to and Dave attacked."

That coat of course that was shown to her was Gail Miller's coat, sir, so once again that's reason to believe what she's saying because by recognizing that coat she is placing herself at the scene of the murder; right?

That appears to say that.
Right. So by my count, and $I$ don't know that the
count matters, but by my count it's a series of 10
items, give or take two so we don't argue about
it --
Okay.
-- where she has described things that really
place her at the scene of the crime according to
the knowledge that the police had of the scene of
the crime?
Some of it.
Well, all the ones I've taken you through without
exception, all those items I've taken you through
place her, or she is describing the scene of the
crime in the way the scene of the crime is known
to have been to the police?
Allegedly.
I'm not sure what you mean by allegedly. Who is
the alleged here, the police, the police version
of the crime scene or her version?
I'm not convinced that $I$ know in my mind whether
this story she says, that he used the right hand
to stab, whether it was actually that way or not.
I don't know whether he stabbed her with the right
hand or left hand, or whoever was responsible.
Okay. I agree the pathologist was not definitive
on the fact that the killer must have done it with
his right hand and I think I made that clear in the questioning.

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$
stabbing, but the kinds of things that Wilson told you was he told you, for example, and we've just seen it, that he was told by David what he had done with the purse, that he had thrown it in the garbage; right?

Yes.

And indeed the purse was found in the garbage?
That's true.
So that surely gives huge credibility to what Mr. Wilson is telling you?

I thought so.
Right. There's the funeral home which he comes up with at the preliminary hearing?

Yes.

Correct. Huge credibility, he's placing the murder where it happened; correct?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
Correct.

He picks out the right knife when he's shown -- a one in five chance when he's shown a bunch of knives; right?

A similar knife, yes.
And he describes the -- he describes them being near a laneway which is consistent with, when they broke down, which is consistent with where Gail Miller was murdered; right?

A

Q
Q

Consistent, yes.
And he describes her as wearing a dark coat; do you remember that?

I don't remember it, but --
It came out yesterday, I'm sorry, I can't take you to it, but hopefully we can all remember that.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, no, no, if you are expecting him to agree with it -- he just said he can't remember it.

MR. LOCKYER: It's the first page of the statement, what he said, he would accept it from me.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just give us the statement then, please.

MR. LOCKYER: I think it's the first page of the statement that was put up before.

MR. HODSON: Wilson?
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Wilson, yes.
MR. HODSON: 065361 .
BY MR. LOCKYER:
I think it's in here. Yeah, there it is. He told
you after he had spoken to a young lady in a dark coat; right? Do you see that?

Not just yet, but I'm trying.
Third line.


A
Q
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$Q$

Q

Okay.
And that adds some credibility to him being at the scene because indeed Gail Miller was wearing a dark coat; right?

Okay.
You agree with me?
Yeah.
So when you put the statements of John and Wilson together and look at them, not just from the point of view of how they jibe with each other, but also from their different perspectives, you remember I added that little rider, but also describe things that means they really have to have been at the scene to say what they were saying, then there was every reason to believe what they were saying to you and that's why you believed them; isn't that right?

That's true.
Now, you've been here, sir, for the last eight months, I'm not sure you've missed a day actually. A couple.

All right, a couple. I've missed a lot more than you, I'm sorry, but it's not for want of being here, and you must have thought, you must have been thinking very hard over those eight months

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
$Q$

about this, about all of this; have you not?

About?
About this whole case?
I would think so.
And particularly thinking hard as to how it is that Nichol John and Ronald Wilson said what they said in those days from May 21st to May 24 th; is that fair?

Are you referring to what I'm thinking during these last few months?

Yes, yes. In the last eight months you must have thought about that?

Certainly, now that $I$ know they were lying.
And I want to take you through -- I've got five possible explanations, sir, I want to take you through, which would explain, each one of them would provide a different explanation as to how John and Wilson could have said what they said by the time the day of May 24 th is over. All right? Good.

And the first possibility, and then I'm going to ask you which ones you reject out of hand, if any, and which ones you accept as feasible, all right, and the first one, sir, is the simple one, that they did indeed tell the truth and they did see

David Milgaard murder Gail Miller.
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A
$Q$
Right. So we can reject that one out of hand; do you agree?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I'm sorry, here again the witness keeps -- you ask him if he rejects it out of hand, he says I reject it, so could you either explain to him what you mean by
out of hand -- it makes no sense at all or what? BY MR. LOCKYER:
$Q$
A
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Yes. You reject it completely?
At this time?
Yes.
Yes.
Yes, yes, I'm talking now, please understand, I'm talking today, I'm not talking back in 1969.

Okay.
I've done that, we've been talking about 1969 and I've moved to 2005 . All right?

All right.
So think of all these questions in 2005 terms, please. The third possible scenario, sir, to explain what they said in those days, May 21 to May 24 , is that Nichol John, Ronald Wilson and presumably David Milgaard all watched Larry Fisher murder Gail Miller, they all saw it happen. Do you reject that completely as a feasible theory, sir?

I reject it as a feasible theory, yes.
I mean it's just stupid; isn't it?
Yes.
Yes, it is.
Doesn't seem reasonable.


Q

The fourth possibility, sir -- I'm going to ask you, when $I$ have given you my five, if you can think of a sixth, but these are really the only ones I can think of -- the fourth possibility, sir, is that Nichol John and Ron Wilson, separately really, because apart from that little meeting with Roberts they were giving their stories separately and independently, at least between May 21 and May 24 , had concocted stories in their own minds which they then gave to the police which coincidentally happened to match; do you think that's a viable theory, sir?

I don't think so.
Nor do I.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: No, and which stories, please, at what time?

MR. LOCKYER: I'm talking --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Are you speaking about after May 24 th?

MR. LOCKYER: As of May 24 th.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: As of May 24 th ?
BY MR. LOCKYER:
Midnight May 24 th, if $I$ can do it that way, as of midnight May $24 t h ?$

But you are asking me what my opinion was now?

Q You are -- absolutely.

A
$Q$

A

Q
BY MR. LOCKYER:
I mean it doesn't really make any sense if you think about it, sir, how could they have come up with facts where the one jived with the other, how could they come up with all these facts that were true but could really only be known to someone who was at the scene of the crime, it's just not a feasible explanation that Nichol John said 'right, this is going to be my story', Ronald Wilson said 'and this is going to be my story', and lo and behold they give stories that match each other and they give stories which match the scene of the crime; doesn't make any sense, does it?

To some extent, yes.
Really to a considerable extent, would you agree, sir?

A
$Q$
A
Q

All right, $I$ agree.
Yes, all right. The fifth alternative, sir -- and it's really the last one $I$ have got, I don't have
any more after this -- is that they have to have been in those days, May 21 to May 24 , they have to have been provided with the information that they then regurgitated during those days by people in the know as to what had happened at the scene of the crime. Now leave aside whether you accept that or reject that as a theory, that is a viable theory; would you agree, sir, in the abstract? Probably a viable theory, but it wasn't a theory. Just in the abstract, please. In the abstract, that's a viable theory, do you agree?

Yeah, oh yeah.
Gives a perfectly good explanation for it?
Yeah.
If we take the police as being the ones in the know, they tell Ronald Wilson about the purse being found in the garbage, they take Nichol John to the scene of the crime and say 'this is where it happened and take note of the funeral home', they explain how Gail Miller suffered multiple stab wounds, they show them the knife and say 'this is the knife that was found under her body'; if all of that happened, and in the meantime they are saying 'and you better give that back to us because if you don't you are in big trouble', if
we imagine that, in the abstract that's a viable, reasonable explanation -- in the abstract -- for how they could have come up with the stories that the police are left with as of midnight May 24 th; do you agree? In the abstract.

Even at this stage of this Inquiry $I$ can't even assume, now, that that was done.

Move yourself out of it, sir, it's -- you are looking at someone else's investigation in another city, a homicide you've never had anything to do with, and you were presented with the scenario that we have. Let's say it's the Utah police force we're looking at. All right. It would be perfectly reasonable to say, in the factual situation that we have, that one could explain how things happened as the way they did at midnight on May 24 th that the members of the Utah police force had fed the information, in the way $I$ have described it, and cajoled the witnesses into saying what they said; agreed?

You could assume anything, yes, sir.
And that there's no giant leaps of credulity when you come up with that explanation, is there, sir?

I didn't understand that word that you used. Well you don't have to -- it's not like

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
visualizing that somehow, independently, Nichol John and Ronald Wilson came up with these stories that not only matched each other but also matched the scene of the crime. I mean the reason you reject that is, as a matter of common sense, it just seems so implausible as to be unacceptable. But in the other case, what $I$ have described to you, the Utah police, those kind of things can happen in normal life; can't they?

I suppose they can.
Yes. All right. Now of those five theories then, sir, and they are all abstract -- well, actually the first four weren't but the fifth is presently just an abstract theory -- the only really viable theory that doesn't fly in the face of common sense is the last theory of those five theories; do you agree?

No.
Well, okay, I guess we just have to go back through what we said so far and I don't want to do that all over again. Let me ask you this. Do you have a sixth theory, sir? You have had eight months to think about it, and so have I.

I have had longer than eight months.
Well, there you go. Do you have a sixth theory,
sir? I've given five.
They just lied, period.
But that's --

That's the only theory $I$ have now.
But we rejected that one as being implausible.
I haven't. Well that's the only --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Who lied, Wilson and John did?

A I beg your pardon?
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Who lied, Wilson and John?

I can think of about five witnesses; Wilson, John, Cadrain, Melnyk, Lapchuk, and whoever else we talked to, they were all --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
BY MR. LOCKYER:
All right, sir. But that, sir, takes us back to theory number 4. What you are saying, then, is that -- I'm only focused on John and Wilson here, don't care about the others, all right? Uh-huh.

Just focused on John and Wilson as of midnight May 24th. If your theory is that they came up with
the stories they did just because they were liars -- which $I$ wouldn't dispute for a minute
that they were liars -- but the question is how did they come to tell the lies they did, that's the issue, not whether they lied but how did they come up with these lies, that's the issue. You understand?

A
Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q
Well, that's the point, and that's what my
theories are designed to address. You don't have a theory as to how they did that, do you? You can't think of a reasonable explanation for how

A
$Q$

A
they could have done that, can you?
That's --
You can't think of a plausible theory?
They just lied.
Right. And I'm suggesting to you, sir, the only plausible explanation is that the police fed it to them and they adopted it out of sheer fear, and that's the only plausible explanation?

Certainly not by me nor by anybody that $I$ know.
Because they were two really very vulnerable people, sir, between May the 21 st and May the 24th; don't you think?

I don't know.
Well they were, they were both young, in their
late teens; correct?
That's correct.
They had both been taken out of their home towns; correct?

Correct.
To a town they didn't know very well?
That's probably true.
Right. I think, I don't know if they had only
been here once but they certainly hadn't been here
very much, that's clear; right?
That's true.

Q

A
$Q$
$Q$

A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

They were both kept in the cells for at least one night; correct?

I believe so.
And, in the case of Nichol John, it may well have been two or three nights?

That's probably true.
Yes. And in the case of Nichol John in particular, we don't have any reason to think that she had suffered that experience before, being in cells?

Are you asking me?
Yeah. She didn't have a record.
I find it highly unlikely that they would keep her there and wouldn't feed her.

I'm sorry, we're at crossed purposes, you didn't understand my question.

Okay.
I said I, at least in the case of Nichol John, as far as we know it was the first time she had ever been kept in cells overnight or been kept in police cells?

I don't know that.
All right. They were being questioned yet again about a very serious case indeed?

I agree with that. A horrible case; right?

A
Q
A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$
Q

Beg pardon?
A horrible case?
Yes.
Yes. It was -- must have been clear to them by now that the police weren't buying their original stories, all right, how many times --

I don't know that.
-- do you ask the same person the same thing?
I don't know that, sir.
Do you think that that's a reasonable assumption that that's probably how they felt, even on your story?
I just can't comment on how they felt.
All right. And they were surrounded by a large number of male police officers; correct?

I would agree with that.
All of whom were significantly older than them?
I would agree with that.
Probably the youngest officer they were dealing with was in his forties and many of them in their fifties and sixties?

Well, that could be, yes.
Yes. And certainly some of you -- and please don't think I'm being rude because I'm not -- but
just to take you, you are a big man, and I imagine you were a fairly big man back then?

A
Q I would believe so.

Okay. And probably some of the other officers around were big men as well? 'Burly' would be a better description.

Agreed.
Yes.
Agreed.
So they really were, were they not, sir, ripe for persuasion by police officers who were determined to solve an awful crime and had come up to a dead end before May 21 st?

Just repeat that, please?
I said they were ripe for persuasion by police officers who were determined to make an arrest for an awful crime, had decided that David Milgaard was the culprit but had come up against a solid wall in terms of proving what they believed, and the only way through the wall was through Nichol John and Ronald Wilson; do you agree with that? MR. FOX: I wonder which one of those three questions --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: It's a pretty big question, yeah.

A

Well you've read the document, that's all I'm just saying, relying on that document, sir?

Well, you can.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well now show him
the document and show him exactly what you mean please.

MR. LOCKYER: Well, it's the document you saw yesterday.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I know which document you are referring to, sir.

MR. LOCKYER: The document is at 006799 .
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And now please point it out to him where the officers had decided that Milgaard was guilty.

BY MR. LOCKYER:

Q
A
I was meant to be --

What date is it?
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: That would be the report.

MR. HODSON: I have got 050609 .
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What is it now?

MR. LOCKYER: I'm sorry, yes, I'm sorry, I read the wrong number.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: 050609.
MR. HODSON: Is that --
MR. LOCKYER: No, it's what I call the smoking gun, but $I ' m$ not sure $I$ dare call it that again.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: No.

MR. LOCKYER: That has been criticised. I had it right? Apparently I had it right. Is that it? Okay. Oh, I'm looking at the map, I'm not looking at the screen. For some reason I'm look at the map over there.

BY MR. LOCKYER:
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q
Yeah, this document, thank you. This document. So you've had a chance to read this now?

I have.
Right. And that's the document I'm talking about; you understood that's the document I'm talking about?

Right.
And don't you think that document, sir, makes it very clear that certainly its authors had decided that David Milgaard was the culprit?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Whereabouts? I asked you to show him exactly.

BY MR. LOCKYER:
Well, I don't want to really read five pages, it's just -- just taking the fifth page alone, sir, it describes a theory. Go to page 803, please, that page, sir. Look at the summary of it. I mean do you really -- do you need to read it again, sir, or are you familiar with it?

A

Q

A

Q
A

Q

A

A

Q

A
Q
A

Q

No, I think I remember it.
Yeah, I think you probably are. That summary, sir, makes it pretty clear that its author, at the very least, thinks that David Milgaard is the culprit; right? And that's Mackie?

The author may think that.
And that's Mackie?
Yeah.
Yes, who was as involved in this investigation as anyone; right?

Correct.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Let's look at the rest of it, please.

On second reading there, it doesn't look like he had his mind made up, suggestions, obtained, brought to the -- so the stories can be obtained, so I don't know whether he was -- I don't know what was in his mind.

BY MR. LOCKYER:
Well he says 'where the true story can be obtained'?

Yeah.
As if the story up to date has not been true?
I --
That's how $I$ would read it, sir, anyway.

A

Q

A

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just before we move to a new subject, do you think this might be an appropriate time for a break, will you be much longer?

MR. LOCKYER: Sure. Could you give me two minutes just to finish this May 21 to 24 and then I'm done with that section?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, you may.
BY MR. LOCKYER:
And Commission Counsel didn't ask you when you became aware of it, sir, I wanted to ask you when?

When I became aware of it?
Roughly? I --
You know, $I$ can't remember.
But it was many years ago?
I think so, but $I$ don't remember.

And the -- all right, that's a good time, Mr. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right.
(Adjourned at 10:34 a.m.)
(Reconvened at 10:51 a.m.)
BY MR. LOCKYER:
There's just one more area that $I$ want to ask you about in connection with the May 21 to May 24 , sir. Do you think that there's kind of an absence of written material about what happened over those four days? I mean let's take, let's take your report, for example. Really what -- your involvement, aside from the statement and the supplementary statement that you had Mr. Wilson sign, apart from those two documents everything else that you did in those days is all contained within the six pages of your May 25 th report; is that right?

See, I don't know, there may be more there that isn't there, that $I$ don't know.

I'm sorry, I don't understand, 'there may be more there'; where?

You are saying that everything that $I$ knew was contained in them six pages?

No, not everything you knew. Everything you

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
recorded, I said, was contained within those six pages, of what you did in those days; right?

I don't know.
Well there is no other reports that we have of yours telling us things that you did in that period --

Well I don't --
-- from May 20 , really from May 20 th to May $25 t h ;$ is what your report covers?

That's all we see, yes.
Right. I mean you would have had your notes, presumably?

I would have.
But as I understand it your notes wouldn't even be as detailed as your report; correct?

They would have been more concise.
Yes. So in -- do you think, sir, that given the enormity of what was going on in these days, namely creating a case that resulted in an arrest and a conviction for first degree murder -- and that was the intention from the outset was to see if you could create a case against him; right?

No.
But --
You are saying it was my intention from the outset
to create a charge against David?
'Create' is not a good word, it has connotations to it. Your intention at the outset was to see if, at the end of dealing with Wilson and John again, to see if you could build a case so that you could charge David Milgaard; right?

No, I don't think $I$ could say that.
You can't? Well you were certainly -- the endeavour was to see if, to use not the words you gave in the Supreme Court of Canada but the words you gave today, to see if you could either incriminate him or clear him? That's true.

All right. Let's do it that way.
Okay.
Umm, so do you think -- do you not think, sir, that, given the significance of this time frame and the intention which you had in your mind when you went into it, that your notes are, to say the least, sparse for four very important days in the lives of so many people?

A
Q
We don't have much of a record of it, do we, of what happened in those four days?

A
I don't know whether everything that $I$ did or
inquired about is in there but $I$ think, generally, the outlining is there.

The outlining?
Right.
I mean I will say this to you, sir, that your report of May 25 th is significantly more detailed than Mackie's report for the same period, but I'm still going to put to you that your report, as you say, is at best an outline of that?

I could have -- knowing what $I$ know now, I wish there could have been more detail, but at that time I suppose it looked like it was sufficient. And when did you come to -- did you draft -- just going by practice, $I$ wouldn't expect you to remember this for a moment --

Uh-huh.
-- but by practice, sir, would you have sat down on May 25 th and drafted that report from beginning to end?

Did I?
No, would you have, 'did' if you like but I'm doing it in terms of 'would' rather than 'did'. I mean if you did a report that covered a series of days, were you doing the report day by day and then putting it all together and then submitting
it, or would you have sat down on May 25 th and done the report?

A

2
A
Q
A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
$Q$
t, or would you have sat down on May $25 t h$ and

I think, if there was opportunities to leave a day-by-day report, I did that. If there was no -if you were involved in too many other things, and that was too busy, you probably left a report at the end of several days.

But if you did it by --
If that's --
Sorry?
If that's the question you asked. I don't remember.

Well, it sort of was. It didn't quite answer it, though, because $I$ want to ask you this. If you do it day-by-day report then, sir, do you file daily reports presumably?

Ask that again, slower.
If you do reports day by day, --
Yes.
-- so if you did a report May 21, May 22, May 23, May 24 , would we not most likely have four different reports, one for May 25 --

If I did that, yes, there should be.
Well, okay. So given that all we have in your case is a report dated May 25 th that covers May

20th to May 25th, can we reasonably safely assume that you started writing that report maybe the night of May $24 t h$ but really on May 25 th? That's a reasonable assumption.

Right. And so it was really a bit of a memory exercise you would have been engaged in on May $25 t h$ with the assistance of your notes, which, as best $I$ can understand, are at best cryptic references to what you were reporting on? I would agree with that. So it would have been quite a memory exercise that you were engaged in on May 25th as you -- I think you hand-wrote your reports, is that -I did.

Yes. As you were hand-writing your May 25 th report it was a bit of a memory exercise as to what had happened in the previous five days? Yeah, in addition to what you said, using my notes as a guide.

Right, using cryptic notes, all right.
I want to move into the Fisher
side of the case, sir, and $I$ want to see if I'm right in some assumptions that $I$ think $I$ have gleaned from your evidence-in-chief, but I'm not entirely sure, meaning your evidence-in-chief here
in the last three days. First of all am I right that you most certainly knew, as of January of 1969, that someone had been committing some serious rapes in Saskatoon in the preceding months?

I think $I$ would have known at that time, yes.
All right. When you testified in the Supreme Court of Canada, sir, you didn't qualify it. And I'll take you to it, 121433 going to 121499 of the transcript -- sorry, doesn't seem to have worked MR. HODSON: Bottom, the very bottom? MR. LOCKYER: The very bottom?

BY MR. LOCKYER:
Yes, thank you, right. Can you read your answer at the bottom there? I won't read it all to you, just the last phrase is what $I$ am interested in, or the last sentence. Just a moment.
"They had the rape cases which $I$ was not a part of, although I am certainly aware that there were rapes happening." I would agree with that.

All right. And did you know, sir, am $I$ right in my understanding that you knew, back in 1969, that there was a suggested linkage between those rapes
and Gail Miller's murder?
Did $I$ know there was a linkage?
Yes?
I don't believe so.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: No, he asked you if you knew there was a suggested linkage, somebody was --

Somebody may have, but $I$ can't recall that at this time.

BY MR. LOCKYER:

All right.
In fact $I$--
Sorry?
-- I think $I$ read a report in the last few days
here --
If we go back --
-- that somebody had connected something.
If we go back a page to 498 you will see:
"Q Obviously ...",
looking at line 11 here:
"Q Obviously, you are looking for the victims of Fisher to identify the killer of Gail Miller.

A There may have been some work along that line -- not by myself, but by
other officers.
Q But, clearly, you would have been aware of it from the newspaper reports and being seriously involved and keeping abreast of the reports.

A Oh, certainly."
Remember being asked that?
I agree with that.
All right. And if we then look two pages on at 121500, sir, you have read to you, starting here at line 10:
"Q Do you recall a report from a Mr.
Penkala. February 27 is the actual date of the report, in which he says at the bottom of the page:
'The similarity of our departments' occurrences --'

Numbered so and so and so and so. '-- complaints of rape with this murder investigation lists the following items which are reported missing identafile and could be of evidential value.'

Then he lists a whole number of items that could correlate the two cases.

A I recall reading it."

Do you remember saying that at the Supreme Court of Canada, sir?

A
$Q$

A
"On March 28 one Richard McKee known to this dept., ... was interviewed with regards to this file, this being as he fitted the description of the composite photo described in one of the rape cases however his alibi appeared to stand up and he was also taken to the Red Cross where a sample of his blood was taken and found to be of "O" type, which would eliminate him in this murder file."

And that was filed, that investigation report, on -- in the Gail Miller file, so that -- you see it at the top, 'Gail Miller murder'; do you see that?

I do.
Right. So clearly, sir, you knew of the tie suggested as being possible between the rapes and Gail Miller's murder, right, back in 1969? It would appear that way, that I had some --

Q Yes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What's the document ID please?

MR. LOCKYER: Sorry, 106664.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: 106664.
BY MR. LOCKYER:
And that is right in the midst of the
investigation of David Milgaard that you wrote that report; correct?

That's correct.
April 18th, you've already got all the original statements $I$ think for April 18th, isn't that a day that David Milgaard was re-interviewed as I recall, and a good month and a bit before the fateful days May 21 to May 24 ; right?

Correct.
Okay. And had you -- you were asked by Commission Counsel yesterday whether you had always remembered McCorriston's report and I thought I would just take you to 121433. And this is the conversation that the -- the one-sided conversation, if $I$ can call it that, that you had with CBC's Gillian Findlay, all right. And at 121582 --

MR. HODSON: Wrong numbers. 121582?

MR. LOCKYER: Oh, that didn't work. Sorry. I better leave that because it doesn't -- I have got the wrong numbers down.

MR. HODSON: I'm sorry, do you want the Findlay one?

MR. LOCKYER: Yeah, but $I$ don't know what page it will be in the middle of that report, clearly I've got everything -- what is the number of the report? That might help me.

MR. HODSON: It was 153652.
MR. LOCKYER: No, I'll leave the question, it's -- I'm not going to be able to find the reference without a bit of work.

BY MR. LOCKYER:
Umm, do you remember, sir -- let me just ask you this, I can't take you to it -- but do you remember whether you might have said to Gillian Findlay that McCorriston's report was something that you had remembered?

I could well have told her that.
You may well have told her that?
I may well have told her that.
And could that well have been true, sir, when you spoke to her?

I don't know. As I said yesterday or the other
day, I was pretty upset with her and I don't think I -- I didn't think out my answers very clear. Because Commission Counsel suggested to you inferentially that perhaps you hadn't remembered it for all that time, but perhaps you had seen it more recently before you met with her?

I may have said that.
No, no, sorry, listen to me.
Okay.
Commission Counsel, when he was questioning you yesterday and came to this part of your interview with her, suggested to you that maybe you hadn't remembered the report for all those years, but maybe you had seen it more recently. Do you remember he suggested that to you?

He may have. I can't remember that.
And you said, you sort of adopted that that may well be what happened.

All right.
And that raised a question in my mind as well, that by the time you spoke to Gillian Findlay you had been retired for some time; had you not?

What year was my interview with her?
MR. HODSON: October of '90.
MR. LOCKYER: October of '90, yes. I was

A

A
$Q$
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A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
going to say 1990 .

I was retired for months or a year.
BY MR. LOCKYER:

Anything else that you remembered would have been a memory that you had retained from being a police officer as opposed to going back into the file and seeing it again?

I would say that's right.
Okay. And then post David's conviction, sir, in

January of 1970 , it's a month later that you become involved and play a role in the investigation of the rape of (V5)-- (V5)---; is that right?

No, I didn't become involved in that.

Well, remember the, you were shown the February $22 n d, 1970$ report of your involvement with Mackie in the (V5)-- (V5)--- rape investigation?

I don't remember becoming involved in that. I
think -- $I$ would have to see that report.
Sorry, can someone give me the number?
I think $I$ said $I$ was with Mackie.
Yes, you were, the report says you were.
But $I$ don't think $I$ was involved. At least $I$ don't recall being involved. MR. HODSON: It's 105211 .

BY MR. LOCKYER:

And that's the report, sir, where it says on this date Detective Karst and myself contacted Mr. Wood who had been working at the hotel, and you'll see that, when you read the rest of the report, that it's in the context of (V5)-- (V5)---, and it's a matter of days after her rape and you'll remember this is the report where you went and spoke to Albert Cadrain about it. Do you remember

A
A
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
that now from yesterday?
I remember it coming up yesterday or the day before.

And one would think, if you were with Mackie and you went to speak to Albert Cadrain, given your relationship with him, it's likely you were the one who did the talking, not Mackie; is that fair?

No, he's the senior officer. It could be either way. I'm not saying $I$ wouldn't have talked to him, certainly $I$ knew him.

And you have no idea, I think you told us, why you went and interviewed Albert Cadrain?

None whatsoever.
Because coincidentally you were interviewing the chap who lived in the same house that Fisher had lived in.

Coincidentally.
Coincidentally how that came about?
Coincidentally, yes.
But for some reason, the way this reads, you or Mackie or both of you had reason to think that Albert Cadrain might be able to help in (V5)--(V5)---' rape; is that right?

My recollection, certainly not me. Maybe Mackie. I don't know.

And it's interesting the way it reads is he was interviewed in regards to his information, this is Cadrain, he might be able to supply concerning this suspect, but if you read the previous sections of the report, there's no reference to a suspect in the report. Do you see that?

I see that, but that's not my report.
So it's an anonymous suspect is being, someone is speaking to Albert Cadrain about a suspect whose name we don't know; is that right?

It would appear that way.
Could it have been Larry Fisher, sir? I suppose it could have been.

I have no idea.
And is it fair to assume, sir, given the way that this report is written, it's not written with Mackie, he's not describing what he did with you sort of tagging along, but he's describing it, is the way $I$ read it, as if the two of you are working together. You see that?

I see that.
Right. Do you think, sir, that it's a reasonable assumption to make that in those circumstances you
likely would have known the essence of what had happened to (V5)-- (V5)---?

Not necessarily.
Well, the question presupposed, not necessarily, the question was do you think it likely you would have?

I may have.
Yes, all right. And do you think, sir, that if you had, alarm bells might have gone off in your mind a month after, less than a month after David Milgaard's trial had come to an end, that here was a woman who had been raped who worked at the same hospital that Gail Miller had worked at; who rode the same bus that Gail Miller rode; who was followed by her assailant off the bus, you could conceivably think that Gail Miller was followed by her assailant as she walked to the bus, so there's a similarity not identical there; that the man she described as wearing orange construction boots, not far off yellow, similar colours, within blocks of where Gail Miller had been murdered; she had been forced to remove some of her clothes; had been raped; had been attacked from behind and violently raped, violence used in an alleyway; do you think if you had read that, sir, it might have all suddenly rung some starting bells in your mind?

A

Q

A
$Q$
A

Q

A

A

If I had studied these rape files --
No, no, this one only, don't plural it.
This one? Is there any mention made of a knife here?

She didn't say she saw a knife.
Yeah, there's no -- there's no murder. I can see similarities, but $I$ can also see dissimilarities.

No, no, I'm not asking you whether you see similarities or dissimilarities, I'm just asking you, do you think if you read this and realized these facts, that she worked at the same place, rode the same bus, orange construction boots, so on and so forth, do you think it might have gone in your mind, my God, this rings a big bell, three weeks after David Milgaard's conviction? If $I$ had read all that and studied it you are asking me?

Yes.
It may have.
All right. It would have, wouldn't it? Don't you
think it would have and don't you think it would have done --

I answered that.
Sorry, my fault, but let me finish the question. okay.

And don't you think it would have if Mackie had read the report as well, that the two of you were so intricately involved in the Gail Miller murder investigation and the apprehension of David Milgaard for it, that it would have been almost impossible for it not to have rung bells if you had read the (V5)-- (V5)--- complaint?

Obviously it didn't.
Obviously not. And do you think, sir, that it's because of your involvement as exemplified in this report in (V5)-- (V5)---' rape complaint, do you think that may explain why you were one of those sent to Winnipeg on October the $22 n$, later the same year, to take a statement from Larry Fisher? I don't know why $I$ was sent.

Do you think that's a reasonable explanation for why you were sent?

A

A
It could well be.
Yeah. And you've acknowledged that in going there you would have had, I think we ended up with you agreeing you would have had all four of the rape and attempted rape files?

I don't think $I$ agreed that we had all four. I said Nordstrom may have had them, because I don't know what he had.

Q
A
Q

A
Q
A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q

A

It was common sense he would have had them?
May have had them.
I'm just trying to think about how police officers work, sir. I can't conceive of you going to take a statement from someone on a serious case without having some idea of what the case was all about beforehand; in other words, reading the file.

Well, I'm sure --
Maybe I'm wrong.
-- we had the two files.
And I'm sure you would have read them before you interviewed him?

I would think $I$ would look at them.
Right. And given we found out that you also questioned him about the other two and he denied them, (V1)- and (V2)----- -

I didn't say I don't think I talked --
Remember the letter that we saw yesterday where there was a letter sent saying that he had admitted two and denied the other two when interviewed?

I think I remember that.
And you acknowledge that --
I'm not aware that $I$ questioned him about the other two.

A

Okay. Well, I don't think there's any suggestion there was any other trip by other Saskatoon police officers down to Winnipeg to question him, so I sort of assumed it was you.

I don't recall doing that and $I$ said yesterday if I would have, I would have thought I would have had a statement form outlining that with a negative response, but $I$ don't see anything like that, and if it was there, it's not there. If you look at it now, sir, do you think it's not -- unless the Saskatoon Police Service was wanting in its investigative abilities -That's possible.

I suppose it is -- that it just seems so likely that you would have taken all four files with you that had been linked in the way that they have as a series of interconnected rapes; right? Forget Gail Miller now, just as a series of interconnected rapes, it's inconceivable you would only have gone to talk to him about two and not the other two?

I can't agree with that.
You can't?
No. If my superiors were in touch with Winnipeg, which obviously they were, and they say we have a
suspect here that's willing to $I$ believe question I suppose on various things and he's prepared to give you a statement on two of them, I suspect that's why we went and took two statements.

And the only information, sir, that we have, at least now about -- tell me, is this the only serial rapist that you are aware of in Saskatoon in your career as a police officer? I asked Penkala that, he couldn't think of any others. I'm wondering if you can.

As we know -- $I$ don't know if we knew of a serial rapist then, but $I$ can't recall anything like that.

So it would be fair to say that at least as far as you know, this was the only serial rapist that operated in Saskatoon in your career?

As we know it now.
Well, as it was known then, because the rapes back in 1969, sir, and '70, to take (V5)-- (V5)---, were linked by the police to each other. Leave out Gail Miller. It was always assumed that whoever was committing these rapes was almost certainly going to be the same person, wasn't it? I mean, look at the letter that was written that $I$ related to you that resulted in them charging

Larry Fisher with all four of them.

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
Q

A
$Q$
A

Q

A
$Q$
A
Q
No, no, the rapes. What are you talking about?
When you went to Winnipeg with Nordstrom to see
Fisher, you knew that you were going on an
expedition to do with a very serious big case, a

A
$Q$

A

Q
one and only --
Not in comparison to the murder file that $I$ had been working on.

By comparison to the murder file, still, sir, a very serious, big case?

Oh, certainly, rape is serious.
Yes, yes. I mean, next to murder, it would be really about the most serious thing one could visualize, wouldn't it --

I think you are right.
-- multiple rapes being committed by the same person on strangers?

Yes.
Hard to think of anything worse?
Right.
Hard to think of anything more dangerous?
Uh-huh.
If only because, forgetting Gail Miller, I'm sure
you are aware that serial rapists often end up at
some point killing their victims?
Yes, I'm aware of that.
So a very dangerous individual that you were on
your way to see in $W$ innipeg and you knew that; right, as you went there? You must have known that.

A

Q
A

Q

A

Q
A

Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q
A
$Q$

When $I$ went to see Fisher?
Yeah.
I don't think $I$ was aware of that.
You don't think so?
I don't think we had anything, any knowledge of Fisher other than the Winnipeg police telling us. Right.

If my memory serves me correct, that's the first
time $I$ heard that.
What the Winnipeg police were telling you that you could then convert into what you already knew in Saskatoon would have made you realize that this was a very, very serious case that you were on?

Rape is considered serious.
Yes. He's been charged with two rapes in
Winnipeg, you know that?
I think I did.
And there's two more at least he's confessing to
in Saskatoon which are linked to two others at
least?
Correct.
Right?
Absolutely.
Right, okay. And yet you've just forgotten the interviews?

Q

A I forgot -- yes, I have.
Just forgotten, just gone out of your mind completely?

I beg your pardon?
Went out of your mind completely?
Absolutely.
Right. And even though, sir, you acknowledge that you did speak to this other officer, Gus Weir, about what you had done in Winnipeg some years later, is that right, which means the memory is retained for several years?

MR. FOX: With respect, again, what the witness said was that if Gus Weir said that, he wasn't disputing it. He's not said he had any recollection of speaking to Gus Weir subsequent. I'm sorry, I should go to the --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
MR. FOX: I apologize for popping a mint in my mouth just before $I$ got up. What the witness said is he had no recollection of speaking with Gus Weir or Gus Weir raising the subject with him. What was put to him was Gus Weir's statement that he recalled some conversation with Mr. Karst. All Mr. Karst said, if Gus Weir said that happened, I'm not in a position to say it
didn't happen. He didn't acknowledge the conversation or say that he had a recollection of that conversation occurring.

BY MR. LOCKYER:
Maybe we can look at what you did say, 146450 , please, this is what you said at the discovery proceedings, Mr. Karst, going to 146556 . Starting here, sir:
"Q Now you do recall discussing the whole Fisher interview with Gus Weir, you've already told us that?

A No, not the whole Fisher interview, it was just, $I$ remember him talking to me about it and $I$ think it was even on the telephone, but you say it was a social function, it might have been. I know it was touched upon, I remember that.

Q And when was that?
A I don't know.
Q He says seven or eight years.
A That could well be.
Q How could you have this discussion with Gus Weir if you didn't even remember going?

A I guess maybe Gus asked me. I don't know. I mean $I$ just don't know. Maybe it came up and he said, you know, "How come you went to Winnipeg?" I don't know what -- ask him, he'll know."

Do you remember being asked those questions and giving those answers, sir?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

2

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A

Q
A

Where was this at?

At the discovery proceedings in --
Probably. It was recorded.
Which was the most recent time you testified?
COMMISSION MacCALLUM: When was that?
BY MR. LOCKYER:
I'll give you a date. It was on April 30th of
1996, sir. Do you accept --
I accept what's there.
-- the answers that you gave there, sir?
They are very --
Sorry?
I would say they are very vague to say the least.
Well, you don't --
I didn't remember going, I didn't --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, Ms. Knox?

MS. KNOX: Yes, just a point in terms of
the math. If this was done, if this conversation that the witness is talking about having with Gus Weir was seven or eight years earlier, that would have been 1988 , 1989 when the review was happening, not back in the early ' 70 , which is a conversation that $I$ think Gus Weir was supposedly talking about.

MR. LOCKYER: Seven or eight years is in the context of when he was in Winnipeg.

MS. KNOX: I took it to be in the context of when he was giving his evidence, but it could be 1988, 1989 .

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, thanks for the reminder, but go ahead with your questions. BY MR. LOCKYER:

Thank you. So is it conceivable, sir, from what you said here, that you remembered the winnipeg encounter for several years and then forgot it? I guess logically that's how memory works, you do remember things for a fair period of time and then you forget them; right?

A That's very possible.

I mean, if we -- as I recall -- could we turn to the next page, because your counsel says, the next page, he, meaning Mr. Karst, doesn't remember now
who has determined that he didn't --
"He probably remembered the day after he went, and maybe three days after, or maybe he did five. Is he able to answer that, Mr. Rodin, in fairness?"

So you see what your counsel is saying you would have remembered it for a while certainly, and $I$ have no doubt you would have if we had asked you October 23, 1970, but it would seem that you may have acknowledged here that you remembered it for several years. Is that fair, sir?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
I know $I$ just don't remember it now and that's -Right. And something else you said, sir, that was interesting. Would $I$ be right in saying that when you went to see Mr. Fisher on October 22 nd, your mind was closed regarding who had murdered Gail Miller?

I would suspect that's right.
Yes. That's the way you put it at the discovery, sir.

I concur with that.
Same document, 146625, and:
"Q At that point --"
And that point in time is October 22 , all right:
"Q And at that point in time --"

Starting at 787,
"-- there was no room in your mind for any doubt about the guilt of David Milgaard, both during the course of your continued investigation of the Miller matter and when you investigated Fisher to the extent that you did; is that fair?

A When $I$ went to see Fisher I was closed altogether, as far as Miller was concerned.

Q Yes, but your mind was still closed too, your mind didn't open up at any point when you talked to Fisher?

A Not with regards to Miller, no."
Do you remember being asked those questions and giving those answers?

A
$Q$
I don't remember, but it's there.
And it's interesting the way you are answering those questions is actually as if you are remembering the trip, don't you think, the way you answered those questions?

A $Q$ You could interpret it that way $I$ suppose.
"When I went to see Fisher --"
An event apparently you don't remember,
"-- I was closed altogether as far as Miller was concerned." And I'm not sure how you would know that if you can't even remember going, and then,
"But your mind was still closed too, your mind didn't open up at any point when you talked to Fisher?"

And your response, you seem to be remembering your conversation with him in that you could answer:
"Not with regards to Miller, no."
You see that, sir?
Yes. I can analyse that a little different. Well, feel free.

Had I have asked him where my mind would have been
open to the Miller file, $I$ would have probably asked those questions, but $I$ don't see anything in my report saying that.

If we can go to 15 -- you don't have a report, so I'm not sure what you mean by that. You didn't do a report, or if you did, we don't have it. That's true. I'm sure I did, but it's not available.

Okay. 153652 , this is the October 12 th conversation, which I've now found, with the CBC
reporter, sir. Perhaps it's because the number was upside down $I$ got lost. Could we go to -- and this is something that Commission Counsel asked you about yesterday, 153659. Remember, this is the conversation, sir, we don't have the questions, we have the answers?

A
$Q$ That's correct.

And one of the answers that you gave, you said, it's right here, and there was sort of a query as to what was meant by it:
"I certainly expect that back in 1971 when Fisher was transferred from Winnipeg that it should have been checked out. But it never --"
-- was. And I'm going to suggest to you, sir, that first of all the "it" would be Fisher's possible involvement in the Miller murder. Do you agree, that's what the "it" would mean there? We can go back a bit, can we move -This is the interview in Winnipeg with the press? Yes, this is the $C B C$ reporter. I don't place too much on any of my answers there. She's asking you about -- well, I'm going to question you about it anyway, sorry. Fine.

Q

A
$Q$

You are not going to put me off that easily, Mr. Karst.

I'm not trying to.
You are being questioned, sir, about Fisher and why isn't it that anyone followed up on Fisher for Gail Miller's murder and that's gone on for some time and then you have this answer:
"I certainly expect that back there '71 when Fisher was transferred from Winnipeg that it should have been checked out. But it never came to my attention."

And that's when -- because this is, remember, before you knew that you had taken the statements from Fisher; right?

Okay.
So you are talking in the context as if you had nothing to do with Fisher in 1970, '71. You follow?

I don't know what -- I can't recall what this would even refer to, being transferred from Winnipeg, $I$ don't know what that means.

I'm going to get to that.
Okay.
Right now $I$ 'm just trying to pinpoint when you are

A
Q

A
talking to this reporter. This is at a point in time when you say you have no memory of the fact you had anything to do with Fisher in 1970 .

All right.
And I'm going to suggest to you, sir, that the question would have been, because remember the reporter at this point doesn't know that you've been involved in 1970 either.

I don't know if she knows that or not.
No one knew. Well, no one knew -- well, no one on
David Milgaard's side of things or in the media knew, they found out in December, we saw that yesterday, several months later, and I'm going to suggest to you, sir, then, her question logically, because of her ignorance of October, 1970, would have been, well, we know that Fisher was transferred from Winnipeg to Regina in 1971 for his guilty plea, at which point you could then say I certainly expect that back in 1971 when Fisher was transferred from Winnipeg to Regina. You see the sense of that?

Q
So that's the context. I can't think of any other logical context. It makes complete sense, it seems to me, that that's the context in which you are saying what you are saying, and really then what you are saying is, and this is before it's brought to your attention, that you were the one who questioned Fisher in October, 1970, you are saying whoever had these dealings with Fisher in 1970, '71 should have done something about it, that's what you are saying there isn't it?

I can't really answer that because there's too much out of this thing missing.

And it turned out it was you who was the one who should have checked things out. In effect, your comment was on your own conduct without you realizing it at the time you made it. Do you follow?

No.
You are saying whoever dealt with Fisher, in essence, should have checked him out for the Gail Miller murder, but it never came to my attention, when in fact we now know it sure did come to your attention in spades in October of 1970 when you are the one who went and interviewed him alone. Right?

A

Q

A
Q
Yes. And your claims, sir, to not remember the October 22 nd, 1970 meeting comes despite what we've heard of your memory about your meeting with Cadrain which you've said you have such a good memory of, your meeting with David Milgaard that you say you have such a good memory of, your meetings with Ronald Wilson and the events of May 21 to 24 --

MR. FOX: Again -COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes. MR. FOX: -- I think it's objectionable to say your meetings with Albert Cadrain that you have such a good memory of, your meeting with David Milgaard that you -- -

MR. LOCKYER: Meeting, singular I said.
MR. FOX: Meeting that you had with David Milgaard that you had such a good memory of.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, I think he said what you say he had such a good memory of.

Did you say that, sir?

MR. LOCKYER: He said it in
examination-in-chief, the meeting he had with Cadrain in early March, was it March 3rd, he said he had a very good memory of it. The meeting with David Milgaard in March, he said he had a very good memory of it in his
examination-in-chief, I made a note as he said it. The meeting with Wilson, he said the same thing. The five-year-old Cadrain, he said the same thing. He had a very distinct memory of Malanowich describing his interview with Sharon Williams he said in his examination-in-chief.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You mean here in the Inquiry?

MR. LOCKYER: Right here, yes. I made a note of it each time he said it.

MR. FOX: The description that he had a very good memory of it is different from acknowledging that $I$ have a memory of it.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.

MR. FOX: For example, the recollection of speaking to the young person at the Cadrain household, he remembers speaking, he said $I$ remember speaking to a young person. He didn't
know the age, didn't know who it was, I'm not even sure if he knew the gender. A recollection of it isn't saying $I$ have a very good memory of it. That's my objection to it, that's all. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Fox, in effect, is saying that you are putting words in the witness' mouth. If you are not, please refer us to the page number of the transcript -MR. LOCKYER: I can't. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- where this came up. Okay, if you can't, that's fine. The objection then is --

BY MR. LOCKYER:
$Q$
Then I'll go through them one by one. You have an excellent memory of your first meeting with Cadrain; is that right, sir?

A

Yes. Do you remember saying in your examination-in-chief you had a very good memory of your first meeting with David Milgaard?

I probably said it if you have a record of it.

Q

A
$Q$

A

Do you remember saying in you're
examination-in-chief you had a very good memory of your meetings with Wilson?

I probably said that.
Do you remember saying in your examination-in-chief you had a very good memory of the five-year-old Cadrain corroborating his brother's claim of blood on the jeans or blood on the trousers?

I have a memory of that.
Do you remember saying you had a very good memory of it, sir?

I don't recall saying a 'very good memory', but if I said it, that's fine.

Might you have said it?
I might have said it.
Yes, okay. Do you remember saying you had a very good memory, sir, of Malanowich describing his interview of Sharon Williams?

It might have said it.
All right. And yet you don't remember anything about October 22nd, 1970?

If that's the date you are referring to being in Winnipeg, you are correct.

Yeah. What about the 1980 Linda Fisher interview,
sir, did you know about that?

A
$Q$

A

Q
A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
. What I said in the past $I$ can vaguely remember so whatever $I$ said there was because it's like it was.

Q

A
$Q$

Have you not gone through your transcripts of what you said in the past in preparation for -Oh, many, many times. Okay. Well, let's look at your discovery proceedings, the most recent evidence in 1996. 146450 going to 146483 , starting here:
"Q When did you first become aware that Lillian Fisher attended at the Saskatoon Police Station in August of 1980?

A When was $I$ aware of it?
Q When did you become aware of it, yes?
A Probably shortly after she came in. I don't know but I would expect I would be informed.

Q Do you recall who informed you?
A No, I don't.
Q I show you document 263, which is an investigation report, Saskatoon Police Department, it's a report of Inspector Wagner. I wonder if you'd look at it and tell me whether you've seen that report before?"
"A Yes, I've seen this before.
Q I take it when Lillian Fisher came in, or shortly thereafter, that's what you
would have seen in terms of that
particular --
A I didn't hear you.
Q I said that's the document you would have seen when you learned that Lillian Fisher came in, in August of 1980?

A I would think so.
Q And who was assigned to follow up on the information given by Lillian Fisher?

A I don't know.
Q Were you assigned?
A I'm sure somebody was. I know I wasn't.

Q You weren't?
A No.
Q I take it you would have seen this document within a short period of time after she attended, it wasn't a year or two years or --

A No, but it could have been weeks if $I$ was on annual leave or something. But I'm sure it was relatively close.

Q Did you make any inquiries as to who, in fact, followed up on this information?

A I know somebody did but $I$ can't
remember who.

Q And what information did the follow-up reveal, do you know?

A No, I don't."

Remember giving those questions -- being asked those questions and giving those answers, sir?

A
Q

A
$Q$
A

Q Yes, yes.

So you did read the report around the time, within weeks at the most if you were on vacation, at the time --

It would appear that's what I thought.
-- of Linda Fisher coming in; is that right, sir?
It would appear that's what $I$ thought. Obviously I hadn't read it very close because I see it the other day where it was signed Parker and I don't know that, here, when $I^{\prime} m$ giving this evidence. And you said another very interesting thing, sir, at the examination for discovery in this regard. If we could -- first of all, can we move to 146488, just for the sake of completeness. Perhaps we could go back to the previous page, I'm sorry:
"Q I take it you will agree with me that when Linda Fisher came in and Larry Fisher's name was mentioned you were
aware that McCorriston had interviewed Fisher shortly after the murder; is that correct?

A When Linda Fisher came in?
Q Yes.
A I wasn't there so I don't know.
Q Well back to document 263, perhaps we should clarify that. When Linda Fisher came in, you know that she gave information concerning Larry Fisher and the Miller murder; is that correct?

A You're talking about 1980?
Q When she came in in 1980?
A I would be aware of it sometime after that, sure.

Q And my question to you is, when Linda Fisher came in, when you learned that she gave information about Larry Fisher, I take it that you remembered

McCorriston's reference to Larry Fisher in the course of his investigation, is that correct, the reference that $I$ just directed your mind to

A I'm missing your question, then.
Q Well would you have said, 'Gee, Larry

A
Q

A
$Q$

Fisher, that fellow was interviewed by McCorriston."

A I would think so, yes."
Do you remember being asked those questions and giving those answers? Parker'.
I don't remember, but it's there.
How do you explain, Mr. Karst, that in 1980 you became aware that this lady had come in and said that she believed her husband had committed the crime, and by this time David Milgaard had been in jail for more than 11 years, and you did absolutely nothing about it? How do you explain that?

It wasn't assigned to me in the first place.
Just wasn't your responsibility?
No, certainly not.
You didn't --
Had she have come to me with that, and I'd have probably had somebody assign it to me, I would have interviewed -- investigated, but this is not up to me to go over somebody else, Inspector Wagner's head.

Well as a human --

Q

But as a human being, sir, did you worry about it? 'Holy smokes, she's came in to say she thinks her husband committed the crime, this is a chap who I know from the McCorriston report was questioned to some degree in the early days', maybe in 1980 you still remembered your Winnipeg interview in 1971 -- or 1970, rather, maybe not, who knows? Uh-huh. I know.

As a human being, sir, wouldn't you say to yourself, forget you are a police officer, forget everything, 'my God, someone had better follow up on this and inquire about it and follow up on it to see, if only with the people whose responsibility it was to follow up on it'; you didn't think of doing that?

I'm sure I wouldn't go over Inspector Wagner's head, I know that.

I'm not asking you to do that, sir.
Well if $I$ wanted to go investigate it $I$ would have to be going over his head.

I'm not asking you to investigate it. I'm just saying to you, sir, did it come to your mind as a human being to say 'I want to know what's coming of this, I want to know what's happening. Someone else said that the man who $I$ was involved and
played a big role in investigating and putting in jail for 11 years as of 1980 , that here's someone else coming in and saying he didn't do it'?

You can perceive that that way now.
But you didn't -- it just didn't phase you, it doesn't seem it phased you as a human being, you didn't react to it as a human being at all, you just carried on doing your job?

That's your opinion.
No, that's a question.
A question?
It's a question; what did you think?
I don't know whether it phased on me because this was his, another person's inquiry, and it -- I may have asked questions, I can't remember, I may have asked him or somebody or, you know, 'did you check that'. I can't remember that.

Well you didn't say -- and don't you think, sir, that it was a sufficiently startling event that you would remember how you reacted to it?

Oh, I don't remember how $I$ reacted to it.
No, no, you missed the first part of the question, sir.

Okay.
Don't you think it was a sufficiently startling
event that maybe this man had been in jail for 11 years for something he hadn't done that you would remember what you felt and what you did as a consequence of learning about Linda Fisher's trip and reading the statement; don't you think? That's probably not the first piece of information that came in and $I$ can't answer that because it wasn't assigned to me.

Don't you think you would remember; that's the question?

Obviously, I don't.
Well, maybe you don't because it didn't bother you at all, you didn't give it another thought and just carried on with your life?

That's a possibility.
Uh-huh. And did you think, sir, or do you think you might have thought at the time that maybe, somehow, this information should be communicated to David Milgaard --

I don't suppose --
-- or his counsel if he had one?
I don't suppose I thought of that.
I'm sorry?
I don't suppose $I$ thought of it and, if $I$ did, it wasn't my authority to do that.

A
Q
A
Q

A

Q

You gave a really cold answer to that question at discovery, sir.

Did I? Okay.
146628, you were asked the same question, it was a very cold answer.

Okay.
Look at this:
"Q You certainly didn't advise David Milgaard or any lawyer representing David Milgaard that Linda Fisher had come forward in August of 1980 with information implicating Larry Fisher?

A No, I didn't.
Q Why not?
A In 1980, I seen no point. That file was closed."

But you did. You had someone -- you had read a statement of someone who had come in and said --

I didn't, I --
-- 'I think my husband committed this crime', and
gave reasons as to why she believed that, and it was someone whose name was familiar to you from the investigation?

A

Uh-huh. So you realize if you had said to
yourself -- forget being a police officer -- as a human being, if you had said to yourself 'oh dear, maybe the wrong man's in jail and has been for 11
years for a crime he didn't commit, maybe something should be done about this and $I$ should make sure, as a human being, something is done about it in one form or another'; if you had done something, sir, you might have saved David Milgaard spending the next 12 years in jail? Do you see the point?

I see the point.
Yeah. And how would you explain, sir, given you are saying it wasn't your responsibility, how would you explain the fact that, whoever's responsibility it was, he or she did absolutely nothing --

I can't --
-- with Linda Fisher's information?
I cannot explain that, sir. I don't know what their reasons were.

And it's reprehensible, isn't it, that no one did anything; --

I would agree with that.
-- don't you think? Yes. And wasn't it, sir, just that same mindset that you displayed in your answer here in 1996:
"That file was closed."

End of story.

Oh, I felt that way prior to any new information coming in that was valid.

And you felt that way after new information came in as well, just take Linda Fisher's statement?

No. As I said, I didn't follow that up, so I don't know.

But that's new information?
It is.
And yet you still reacted the same way:
"That file was closed."?
In my mind, it was, unless something credible come in.

In a sense you are saying 'the cell door is closed, the key is thrown away, that's the end of it'. Right? In reality that's what -In a sense, you can interpret it that way, the courts convicted him and $I$ had no further dealings with it.

If you knew about the statement, or given that you knew about and read the statement that Linda Fisher gave, sir, is it reasonable to suppose that other members of the old Milgaard team also knew that she had come in and read the statement?

You know, $I$ can't answer that.
The Mackies of the world, he was still in -- he
was still working in 1980; right?
A
$Q$ Well you got it, I mean presumably someone had to come to you to show it to you, all right, so presumably they came to you knowing that you -they came to you because they knew what your involvement was in the case; that's logical, anyway, isn't it?

Sir, I don't know how $I$ became aware of it, --Uh-huh?
-- and I don't know how the other people did, so I can't answer that.

And in essence, sir, isn't it right, isn't it true that the Saskatoon Police Service buried Linda Fisher's report, period?

I have no idea, sir.
Uh-huh. Let's look at (V4)---- (V4)--- for a moment because I'm not -- I don't understand, at the moment at least, your position in that regard. You said, sir, in your evidence-in-chief yesterday, and I tried to write it down verbatim, and $I$ can't reference it so this is what $I$ wrote down, quote:
"I can't attach any significance to the (V4)--- event."

Do you remember saying words like that?

A
$Q$

A

Q
A
Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
Q

A

Yesterday?
Well, it was the day before yesterday, actually.
Can we -- what was that in context --
What, you want me to say it again?
No, I just wondered what was that in --
Oh, (V4)---- (V4)--- is the lady who was assaulted shortly after 7:00 a.m. a --

Okay.
-- few blocks from where Gail Miller was murdered, I'm sorry.

All right.
And you said in your examination-in-chief, and I think I quote:
"I can't attach any significance to the
(V4)--- event."
Do you remember saying that?
I probably said that.
"I can't see two assaults being committed
by the same murderer.";
do you remember saying that? Sorry:
"I can't see two assaults being
committed by the same person.";
do you remember saying that?
I think so, yes.

You said:
"The time element is too close for the same person to have committed both assaults.";
do you remember saying that?
I said that.
Now you said all that in the present tense, 'I
can't', 'I can't', 'I can't', not 'I couldn't', 'I
couldn't', 'I couldn't', and $I$ want to ask you is
it your opinion today, sir, that Larry Fisher was not the person who assaulted (V4)---- (V4)---; is that your belief?

I can't answer that --
Well what's your belief?
-- because I don't know what my belief is in that.
I don't think $I$ have made up my mind about it.
Really?
Yes.
So despite what you heard here -- did you see
(V4)---- (V4)--- give her evidence?
I think I did.
Kind of hard to forget.
I have --
Remember, Mr. Beresh cross-examined her and put to her in any number of different ways that she had
misidentified Larry Fisher as her assailant, do
you remember that?
A
No.
You don't?
I don't.
Okay. Maybe you did miss it, because it would be hard to forget, --

Okay.
-- at least in my view. You know (V4)---- (V4)---
identified Larry Fisher as her assailant, sir,
right?
I'm aware of that.
All right. And you know that (V4)---- (V4)--- was
sexually assaulted on the same morning as Gail
Miller's murder, right, you know that?
Was she sexually assaulted or assaulted?
She was sexually assaulted, remember, the man who assaulted her put his hand on her thigh --

Okay.
-- as part of her description of the assault.
Okay.
Q
All right?
A All right.
Q
A

Q

$$
A
$$

$Q$
A
Q
A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
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BY MR. LOCKYER:
My heart is always in my mouth, Mr. Karst, as to whether the right document is going to appear. It has. That's the interview of her; all right? By?


Q

$$
A
$$

A
$Q$

A

See that? If you look here, just the sexual issue, right?

Okay.
"Her storey is that she was on the way to catch her bus on 22 nd St., to the University, she was asaulted by a male person. This male came out of a yard (after taking her back there) of 201

Ave. H. So., and walked towards her.
This male person then grabbed her and ran his hand up and down her legs."

Yes.
That's the sexual aspect of the assault.
I think, at that time, that was considered an assault. I don't think it was a sexual assault.

I would certainly hope so, as much as it would be now, too.

Okay.
Umm, and an assault with sexual connotations, so I
guess --
That's -- I could agree with.
All right.
Yes.
That's a sexual assault, believe me.
Okay.

Q
A
Q
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It is now, it was then, sir. Okay.

Or indecent assault $I$ guess it would have been. All right.

And then she basically threw her books at him and he disappeared. Umm, I'm wondering sir, and maybe it helps us, it might help us to get an
understanding of your thinking as a police officer, $I$ mean the options here are really -- and we've talked about options before this morning, you and I -- the options here are twofold; either it was Larry Fisher who committed the murder of Gail Miller and the attack on (V4)---- (V4)---; or
you had two completely different individuals
roaming the streets of Saskatoon at 7:00 in the morning within seven blocks of each other, both with similar intentions in mind, the desire to sexually assault women who carried out their acts within minutes of each other within blocks of each other. I mean the latter seems so inherently unlikely, doesn't it, in minus 35 degrees Centigrade?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: 41.1.
MR. LOCKYER: Well, even better or even
worse, I'm not quite sure which way you look at
it.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: There was some -I interjected on purpose, not to be funny. There was some difference in those estimates so we took the trouble of getting a record from Environment Canada which is in the documents.

MR. LOCKYER: Okay. Centigrade?
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Either way.
MR. LOCKYER: They are not the same, minus 41 Centigrade or --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: They cross at minus 40 , the scales cross.

MR. LOCKYER: So they do, that's quite right.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But I think it's, Celsius is the record which was given.

BY MR. LOCKYER:

Q

A

Q

A

Q

Right. I mean the latter option, I mean just thinking of it as a matter of common sense let alone as a police officer, just seems so unlikely as to be not acceptable; doesn't it?

You are talking about two different people? Yeah?

I find the other --

You do?

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
-- thing you have posed as just as ridiculous, but

I don't understand. A man carries out a rape/murder, that doesn't necessarily mean that his sexual desires to attack strangers has suddenly come to a halt?

I didn't say that, but --
Well I'm not sure why it's inherently unlikely, then, it seems quite likely to me?

It's quite unlikely that, in my opinion, that you commit a rape and a murder and then go seven blocks away and you are in the middle of, as somebody has said, where there is people walking down Avenue $H, ~ a ~ b u s y ~ s t r e e t, ~ I ~ f i n d ~ t h a t ~ r a t h e r ~$ difficult to understand too. Both of them are rather --

Well there's nothing about people, it's just her, --

Okay.
-- she didn't talk about others.
I thought I heard, here, some evidence by somebody saying it's a very busy area, or busses and cars, but maybe I'm mistaken.

Okay. Well there's nothing in this report about it.

A Not in --
Q
There may have been cars, I think that may be right, but no pedestrians.

Okay.
I mean pedestrians must have been pretty few and far between that morning --

I would think so.
-- at minus 41 degrees?
I think that's right.
All right, okay, I hear you. I hear your position. Umm, something $I$ want to ask you, really I'm going to move off the case itself and move into what might be best called sort of systemic issues, which --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, which is a
good time to adjourn?
MR. LOCKYER: Oh, all right.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: It's 12:00.
MR. LOCKYER: I'm sorry, I had no idea what time it was.
(Adjourned at 12:00 noon)
(Reconvened at 1:30 p.m.)
BY MR. LOCKYER:
Q
Sir, one of the things that gave you, and again
you in the terms of you and the others, the
police, in other words, as a whole, some cause for, to pause in terms of whether or not you thought David was the one who had killed Gail Miller, was what David told you when you interviewed him on March the 3 rd ; is that right? I would agree with that.

And it was a document -- well, it became a document, what he's told you, it became a document that really, that really was something that certainly on its face would help establish that David had not killed Gail Miller; fair? I mean, he told you he didn't and he gave you a whole statement as to what he had done that day; right?

And perhaps even more importantly than that was the fact that what he had told you, and I think we went through this at the beginning, jibed a great deal with what Mr. Wilson and Nichol John told you

A
$Q$

A
Q
as well in the case of Wilson on the same day and in the case of Nichol John a few days later; correct?

The defence, whether or not they wanted to, I don't know, maybe Mr. Tallis will tell us when he comes, but if we assume for a moment that Mr. Tallis had thought that the statement that David gave you would help David in the eyes of the
jury, the law would have prohibited him from leading it. Do you understand what I'm saying? No.

Well, if Mr. Tallis had wanted to put David's statement in in front of the jury, he wouldn't have been allowed to by the trial judge. All right.

To simplify what $I$ just said.
Okay.
And the question $I$ wanted to ask you, sir, was this: Do you think that that's perhaps a bit unfortunate, that it may have been very helpful for the jury in 1969 , 1970 I suppose, if they had had a chance to hear what David had told you on March 3rd?

It's a possibility.
Yes. I mean, they would have heard David right from the beginning when first confronted with the accusation that he was involved in Gail Miller's murder, they would have heard his reaction to that accusation and his description of what he did on the day that Gail Miller died; right?

A That's true.

And that would surely have helped them come to their decision don't you think?

A
$Q$

I would think it might help.
Yes. And perhaps even more helpful if the jury had had a chance to hear not only what David had told you on March 3rd, but what Ronald Wilson had told Riddell on March 3rd and what Nichol John had said on March 12 th, if I'm right -- 11, 12 , one or the other -- and been able to see how the three of them said much the same thing in those early days. Don't you think that would have helped the jury as well? It may have.

And might have really helped them in an understanding that perhaps the statements of Wilson and John that they gave in May, and in particular the evidence that they gave to the jury which, in essence, in the case of Wilson matched what he had said in May and in the case of Nichol John was $I$ don't remember most of what I'm supposed to have said in May, would have been helpful to a jury to hear all those original statements in assessing whether they should believe what they said in May don't you think? It may have.

Yeah. So tell me, sir, as a police officer who has been in the game or was in the game for many,
many years, and $I$ appreciate you haven't had a lot of time to think about this and this perhaps isn't the ideal circumstances to think about it, in the middle of a cross-examination before a commission of inquiry, but do you think it might be worth considering whether a defence counsel, if he wishes, should be allowed, as of right, to lead his client's statement when he's first interviewed by the police so the jury can hear it?

I don't know that.
But you think in this case it would have been good?

It may have been.
Uh-huh. Now, I want to ask you a question to sort of, to end this, not unlike the last questions asked by Commission Counsel, but perhaps a little more direct, $I$ want to ask you this: Do you, sir, yourself accept any responsibility for what happened to David Milgaard and Joyce Milgaard?

I do.
And the Miller family?
Yes.
You do? And $I$ imagine you don't feel very good about it; is that fair, sir?

A
Certainly $I$ don't.

Q
A
Q

No, I don't think you would, I'm not trying to be facetious. All right?

All right.
Have you ever wanted to apologize to them, sir?
No. I certainly feel sorry for David Milgaard or anyone else that has been wrongly incarcerated or for Mrs. Milgaard having been put through this;
however, $I$ did nothing wrong in my opinion and $I$ don't feel $I$ have anything to apologize for.

Okay. You sort of apologized and then retracted it.

I feel sorry for them.
MR. LOCKYER: All right. Thank you, that's all.

## BY MR. WOLCH:

Mr. Karst, I'm Hersh Wolch and I'm David Milgaard's lawyer.

And I don't expect to be overly long with you. I can tell you I've been busily editing what $I$ was going to ask you, between Commission Counsel and Mr. Lockyer, so hopefully I'll try not to be repetitious if $I$ can avoid it.

Thank you.
I want to pick up on a suggestion you made to

Commission Counsel and to the Commission this morning, and it's one that $I$ find interesting, and that is the suggestion that maybe there should be somebody independent to look into the reports or the file or whatever it might be. Could you elaborate on that a little bit for me?

I don't think $I$ can elaborate much more than what I said there. It seems to me to have an independent investigator look at all these reports without actually being involved in the field, not speaking to people personally, it was just a thought that went through my mind, it might have been useful. Maybe it wouldn't have been. And don't take what I'm going to say as being critical because I think I'm, what you're being is realistic, but $I$ would have thought that one should be able to look at the police as independent in what they are doing, and is it a fact that you are recognizing that police can become -- I don't mean this critically -- biased or develop some sort of tunnel vision or not see the broader picture, not through any ill intent, but just through a fact of life?

I think that could happen.
So that when you are an officer faced with a case
that you are trying to solve, particularly a brutal case like this, you are pretty desperate to want to solve it, and you may be, by human nature, inclined to jump on a lead and really form a strong opinion and perhaps lose some of the independence or whatever one might call it? Those are possibilities.

So that when they are investigating this particular case and the theory of the rapist who was on the loose in Saskatoon seems to be going nowhere and then Cadrain comes in with the blood idea, that human nature and such, you really jump on that and you hope and pray it's right that it will lead you to the killer?

I would think something would have led us to him, yes.

So it's -- you see, what I'm trying to lead up to is that in the system we try to look at the police as being independent, that is, they are fair, they look at all sides, and then we have the added step of the prosecutor who is deemed to be independent and, you know, etcetera, etcetera, but in truth, in the real world when you are trying to solve a crime, there's a tendency to get a little carried away perhaps or focus so much that you might not
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look at the other side?

A
$Q$

A

That could happen.
And is that what you are getting at, maybe somebody should look at it who hasn't been involved, hasn't been under the gun, so to speak, to solve the crimes, somebody should look at it and say, hey, wait a minute, what about this and what about that?

I suppose essentially that's what $I$ was trying to say.

That's what your idea is, because I would like to touch a little bit on this concept that $I$ think has been called tunnel vision, but I think you know what tunnel vision basically is don't you? I have a vague idea.

And I'm going to suggest to you, and perhaps cite some examples, that that is something of what occurred here in the sense that once you focused on David Milgaard, there was a tendency to jump on anything that incriminated, and anything that pointed the other way to sort of slough it aside, that's the general theme. I'm going to try and get more specific obviously, but would you accept the general preface before $I$ go into it?

I don't think so. I think if we could have
envisualized things that were anti to his guilt, we would have looked at those too.

Q

And $I$ haven't got it in front of me, but $I$ believe
that the notes of his statement from your first
interview with David encompasses about 20 pages of
notes, so it was a long interview your first time
in Winnipeg?
A
$Q$
Lots of notes and David drew diagrams to be helpful?

A
$Q$
Well, I guess what I'm talking about, Mr. Karst, is when David was questioned, he was questioned several times, but when he was questioned, first of all, he answered the questions?

Correct.
And in your experience many people choose not to answer questions?

That's correct.
And he didn't ask for his counsel, he didn't stop the questioning; correct?

You are referring to who?
David.
That's correct.

Fairly long.

That's correct.
And in the course of talking to you he mentioned
things that were actually unflattering to him, many people might not volunteer, such as he talked about a criminal record?

A

Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
$Q$ , See, the point I'm getting at is that it seems to me that you would look at sexual immorality in David's case as being something significant and
yet, if $I$ hear you correctly, when you have a rapist going out on the street you tend to say 'well he doesn't kill', as if in one hand minor -when you are looking at David, minor sexual -consensual sex between kids is significant that he may have committed a rape/murder whereas the rapist on the street is not killing so maybe he didn't kill Gail Miller. You see the difference in approach when you are focusing on one person? Possibility.

And so what $I$ am saying is basically David sat for a long questioning, answered many, many, many questions, drew diagrams, talked about himself, and yet what you seemed to take out of it is that he wasn't nervous, he didn't ask for a lawyer as those kind of kids are doing, and he didn't specifically deny the offence. Now isn't that sort of a negative look at the bigger picture?

I suppose you could analyse it that way.
I mean not being nervous is consistent with innocence; isn't it?

A
$Q$
Maybe sometimes.
Well you -- well we know now, of course, that David is innocent and had nothing to hide? Right.
$Q$

Right?
Right.
So we know, now, that he was behaving like a normal innocent person, he wasn't nervous, he didn't need a lawyer, those are typical responses by an innocent person; aren't they?

Sometimes innocent people are nervous too. Oh, of course, but to say that he wasn't nervous and therefore that's somewhat suspicious is really stretching it a bit; isn't it?

It could be construed that way.
And in fairness, also, you now appreciate that what he was remembering was really a non-event? That's correct.

And if $I$ can briefly touch on a matter Mr. Lockyer raised with you, and there was some difficulty with whether the kids' stories were all the same and whether there was a lie or omission, and I might suggest to you that, umm, you would have had to conclude that they were, and I'll use the word
'lying', because all three were saying that there was no opportunity for David to commit an offence, were they not?

Originally, yes.
I mean. So $I$ guess it's not a matter of omission,

A
it's a matter of specifically, specifically taking the position that there was no opportunity for the crime. Excuse me.
-- looking at the negatives all the time. For example, there's much been made about David in a hurry to leave town, you recall that?

I recall that.
And then the significance of that is obvious, but did you ever stop and say to yourself 'well who stops to help somebody who is stuck after you've committed a murder/rape, volunteer to help the Danchuks', did you ever look at it that way?

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q
A
Q
$Q$
都 but I don't blame you for not following that. And did it come to your attention or cross your mind that, if these kids are in the area where the crime is being committed, then with the landmarks they went looking for they would just go to

Cadrain's as opposed to going to the Trav-a-leer and away from where they were; did that cross your mind?

A

A
$Q$

Right.
Q
Umm, and then you had Cadrain. Now regarding Cadrain, there were clearly problems with him, were there not? And $I$ will be more specific. His questioning in Regina, now I appreciate you say he

A
raised it with you but we did see your report where you were concerned about it, he took the position that he learned about the whole thing in Saskatoon from his parents or mother, you recall that, he got back and found out about it?

I think what he, $I$ can't remember the exact words, but he learned about the whole story when he got back.

Yeah. But did anybody go to Regina to find out what he was questioned about, why he was questioned, what he said?

I didn't. I don't know if other officers did. Well wouldn't that be something that perhaps should have been done?

I expect so.
And do you know why they questioned him in Regina?
Why they questioned Cadrain?
Yeah?
I think he was arrested or held on a vagrant charge.

Okay, but are you aware of the licence plate being taken down of Wilson's car and people being in Reg -- police being interested in it?

I believe $I$ understand that the car was searched when they returned.

Q

A
$Q$

Yeah. And did you question him about that, like, 'why didn't you tell me about this before'? I mean you don't forget something like that; would you not agree?

As $I$ say, $I$ can't really remember, okay.
But $I$ don't mean you, $I$ don't mean you, but as an officer you would expect anyone to remember, within a, at least for a month that a person said 'let's get a gun and kill people', it doesn't drift out of your mind; right?

I could believe that.
And if you are coming into the police station the first time and you are going to tell them you may suspect somebody in a killing, the first thing you would say -- or the second thing after blood I suppose -- would be 'he also told me he wanted to get a gun and kill people, the witnesses'? I would think it would be important.

Yeah. So did you or anyone ever go to him and say 'look, look fella, $I$ mean this is not making a lot of sense to me here, you are adding things that are so important you couldn't have forgotten them, either you are holding back or you are lying to us'; was there any of that critical looking at him?

All $I$ can say in answer to that is that $I$ know he was interrogated several times and what all questions were asked $I$ can't remember.

But do you remember him also coming up with more
fanciful tales about virgins in bathtubs and all
that sort of stuff?
A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
I remember that but $I$ don't remember when it came up.

But didn't it cause you serious concern about him? When $I$ heard about this it was, $I$ think, after the trial.

Okay. Now if $I$ understand correctly, and this may be a test of your memory, but you indicate that you took some solace in the fact that a
five-year-old indicated that he had seen blood also?

Yes, it -- I placed some faith in that story. Well, isn't that something that would find its way into some report somewhere?

It should have, and I suspect it's in my notebook, but --

Well even if it's in your notebook that's pretty significant, but whether it's a five-year-old or not, that somebody in the house confirms blood? And it may have been on the file at one time, I don't know.

Okay, it's -- you know there is no sign of it?
I know that now.
There is no sign of that at all. And, now,
thinking about that, so you would have gone to a
house to find out if anybody else saw blood; is
that what it was?
I'm sure we questioned them.
And how would you know the five-year-old was there?

Probably the parents told us, or somebody.
And how would you identify to the five-year-old a month earlier, like, how would the five-year-old know what you are talking about?

He was probably --
And --
-- questioned by other members of the family did he see something.

Well keep in mind this is a month or so later. Right.

Okay. It's kids coming to the house and leaving; would you expect a five-year-old to remember kids coming to the house a month earlier and leaving?

I suppose that's what impressed me, that child remembering that long back.

But at the same time you knew that the Danchuks didn't see blood, you knew that nobody else appeared to see blood anywhere on David?

I recall that.

Q
A

Q

A
$Q$
A
Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

But you took solace in a five-year-old?
I don't know whether $I$ would put that it way, but
it made some impression on me.
So you tried to found out what anybody else in the house saw?

Correct.
Well how could you miss the Fishers?
I didn't realize there was anybody downstairs.
No, but $I$ mean if you are raising the question, I presume it would be 'who else would have been in the house that day?'

And $I$ wouldn't be surprised if that question was asked.

And I presume the answer would be 'just us and the Fishers downstairs'?

And I don't recall the Fishers' name ever coming up, it's not in any report of the people that were there.

No, I appreciate that, but what $I$ am saying is that you, if you had actually gone so far as to determine a five-year-old was in the house, it's hard to imagine you wouldn't have found out there were people living downstairs. But returning then to Wilson, you were aware that he had changed his stories?

A Yes.
Q
And that he had done it by increments, little bits at a time?

Yeah, I would say that.
And, really, nothing he said could ever be verified, could it, by somebody independent?

Not by somebody independent.
Didn't that cause you concern?
Apparently not.
He couldn't identify the location; could he?
No.
Now keeping in mind that this is an area where he says he was stuck and walked out for 15 minutes and he couldn't tell you where that was; is that right?

That he couldn't tell us, that's correct.
He had no trouble with Danchuks, he had no trouble with Trav-a-leer, but this crucial incident he couldn't identify the location; wouldn't that cause you a great deal of concern?

I know they weren't familiar with the city, it was
a, I think a half-dark, very frosty morning, you
know, $I$ think you would have -- if you didn't
notice it you would have trouble identifying places.

Q

Okay. But did it cross your mind as a grave concern is the fact that nobody saw any of this, like no independent person saw Wilson walking around looking, a car stuck, umm, nobody saw anything?

I wouldn't be surprised at that, because on a morning of what we understand to be 41 below, I am doubtful whether there was too many people around. Well your files show there were many around. The Merrimans are waiting for a taxi right at the spot?

Oh, I'm not saying there was no people, but there was certainly -- I'm only assuming that, on a morning like that, there wouldn't be much traffic or pedestrians.

Well, but you would think somebody, if a man is walking for 15 minutes in the area looking around and a car was stuck you would think somebody would see something?

And maybe somebody did see him.
Okay. But you couldn't find anybody?
We couldn't find anybody.
Okay. Now, if you turn to John, she had changed her story; right?

That's correct.

And that the story she changed to had many problems in it as Mr. Lockyer took you through? What $I$ am getting at is, firstly, she says that she was reminded because she saw the bloodstained dress; do you remember that?

I recall that.
That's a bit hard to understand, isn't it, given the story she tells? She never would have seen a bloodstained dress.

Well, originally, no.
Yeah. No, she never did, even at the end she never saw a bloodstained dress.

I can't recall what $I$ read here about what Mr.
Roberts had said she had said, but she --
She said she saw a stabbing through a coat.
Okay.
Okay? So how a bloodstained dress would remind her of anything is difficult to fathom. Even her story about a stabbing through a coat and not a dress doesn't match the facts.

Never been able to understand it.
Well we understand it now; don't we?
I don't know whether $I$ do, as to --
Well that's how Fisher operates. He did -- all
the crimes, he takes the clothing off, lies them
$Q$
A
$Q$
on them, covers their faces, we know how it works. That explains what happened.

I mean if you are watching a murder and you see somebody put a purse in a garbage, either you see it or you don't, you don't see to remember maybe it happened; wouldn't you expect that?

I would expect that.
And that was what you were alluding to this
morning that it sounded kind of funny. And then of course you have her behaviour, which appears to be, to the Danchuks and everybody else, quite normal, not quite consistent with somebody who has just seen a horrific murder; correct?

I don't know whether the Danchuks -- excuse me -I don't know whether Danchuks made any comment about her being normal or not, $I$ can't recall. Okay. And as Commission Counsel asked you, it does seem kind of improbable that people, or at least David, or anyone would embark on a robbery which either was planned to be a rape or escalated with the getaway car stuck; wouldn't that sound kind of strange?

Not the smartest thing to do.
Well it's about the dumbest thing to do; isn't it? Probably.

I mean can you imagine the picture of you've got a rape/murder and you are waiting for a car to come by for two strangers to push you out of where you are stuck? It's kind of ridiculous, isn't it? I would guess that.

One, the one factor that maybe gave you some comfort was the idea of the compact; correct?

I suppose it coincided with the fact that there
was something missing, or could be missing, at the time.

Right. But no compact was found in any ditch? That's correct.

And was any effort made to see if Gail Miller's compact was still in her purse?

I believe some investigators checked that, yes.
Yeah. And whether any members of the Miller family could identify a compact that matched any description that may have been given?

I know some people checked on it, but what the results were, I can't remember.

So would it be fair to say that, when you look back at it now, you see all these flaws or problems in what these kids were saying, Wilson, John?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
Yeah. But is it fair to say you weren't seeing them then?

A
2
Apparently not.
And might that be what is called tunnel vision, that you were focused so much you weren't seeing
the problems, you were only focusing on what might implicate?

A
I thought, at the time, we were looking at everything we thought plausible.

But you see now that you weren't?
I suppose you can assume --
Sorry, I didn't mean to cut you off?
Yes.
What $I$ am getting at is it finds its way into police files that David is criticized because he says he can't find Cadrain's but he's good enough
to find drug houses; do you recall that general criticism of him?

I don't know if it was a criticism, it was just a fact that --

A fact, I mean it's like looking at him under a microscope almost, but at the same time $I$ can go through a whole file and $I$ can't see one point where it said 'why would somebody rob somebody when their getaway car is stuck?' I can't see that anywhere that anybody put that forward. You see what $I$ am getting at?

A
I see what you mean.
So what $I$ am saying is it would appear that, collectively, the police were going down one
path -- and tunnel vision, we know it exists -going down one path and not looking critically or looking at those things which exculpate the person who you are focused on?

I don't know whether $I$ completely agree with that. I thought we looked at, at the time, all the aspects there were --

Well I think an extension of that would be (V4)---- (V4)---. I mean she couldn't fit in any theory that linked David Milgaard; right?

I don't remember who --
The lady 800 yards away.
Okay.
Okay. There is no theory that can implicate David Milgaard in that?

Not that $I$ am aware of.
Okay.
Okay.
So it's just discarded and left out is what happens. Are you aware that the jury never heard a word about it?

A
Q
I'm not aware of what the jury heard.
Now do you know where her -- the assault on (V4)---- (V4)--- occurred?

A
I was never at the scene but $I$ know the address

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A

Q

A
that was given.
But, being familiar with Saskatoon, you can picture it in your mind?

I can picture in my mind where she was.
Yeah. And if you went from there down the railway tracks you would get to Cadrains'; wouldn't you? I'm not that familiar at this time -Okay.
-- but you may be right.
Okay. But I -- Mr. Lockyer covered it with you so I'm not going to, but $I$ take it that, or am $I$ right that you are saying that you wouldn't expect a person who has committed a horrible rape/murder to still wish to attack?

Not within minutes in the same area, it, it just doesn't sound reasonable to me.

But there's nothing reasonable about rape/murder?
You are right.
Okay. So you can't put yourself in your mindset as to what you would do, but I'm going to suggest to you that Larry Fisher is what they call a punishment rapist and hates women, and when he has committed the act he's still on a high, coming down, and would still attack.

Q

Okay. But you also do agree with the idea that to have two people committing sexual assaults in 41-below Celsius weather at around 7:00 in the morning is beyond coincidence that it be two different people?

I find that easier to believe than one person done it.

Do you know of anybody else who has ever committed a sexual crime in Saskatoon at 40 below at 7:00 in the morning?

I don't.
In all your history as a policeman?
No, I don't recall that.
So the only two happened within minutes of each other on the same morning by two different people?

It sounds pretty farfetched, doesn't it?
Yes, it does.
Okay. Now we mentioned earlier that the three kids basically were consistent in their original statements and subsequent questioning for a time in not giving any opportunity for David to have committed a crime?

That's true.
And Mr. Lockyer asked you and took you through the portion of the time after May $16 t h$, as to your
view as to what exactly happened, and if $I$ heard you correctly you say that the kids lied; that is John and Wilson?

A
Q
A
Q

BY MR. WOLCH:
What I am getting at is that when they were speaking to you in May, Wilson incrementally and John after speaking with Mackie and being with Roberts in particular, whatever it is, those are lies?

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
A
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: About what?
MR. WOLCH: They lied -- well in --
COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: But what, they
lied on May the 24 th or they lied in their first version, that's what $I$ want you to get down.

MR. WOLCH: Oh, I'm sorry, I'm sorry. All right, thank you, Mr. Commissioner.
les?
That's correct.
I mean not every word is a lie --
Yeah.
-- but the part that's important is a lie? Most of it.

Right, okay. And then are you aware of evidence that has been given that the two of them said to each other 'let's give them what they want'; are you aware of that, have you heard that?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Wilson and John he means?

BY MR. WOLCH:
Yeah, Wilson and John saying 'okay, let's just give them what they want'?

Yeah, I think $I$ have seen that somewhere.
Okay. Now you will agree with me that, when people lie, they usually have a reason; right? Sometimes.

I mean if we were to ask Larry Fisher, 'did you rape and kill', he might say 'no', and we say
'well he doesn't want to admit he did it', that's a reason?

A
$Q$

A
Q
Okay. To what do you attribute the reason is that these kids lied on this occasion, like, why?

I don't know.
You can't think of a reason that they would lie?
Okay. Now Wilson, when he came forward and said
that, you would agree with me was putting himself
in jeopardy? Cadrain, in terms of them later on saying that they were manipulated or coerced or whatever, nothing nice about the police, you know what $I$ am talking about?

I know that, yes.
Okay. Now Wilson, when he came forward and said that, you would agree with me was putting himself in jeopardy?
$\qquad$

Originally you are talking about?
No, no, I'm talking about, yeah, in May. Like -When they were implicating Mr. Milgaard? Absolutely.

Yes. I don't know why.
Can you give a reason why they might have?
I cannot.
Do you agree that the only imaginable reason is that they felt pressured and manipulated -- and were manipulated?

No, I can't agree with that.
I'm not saying you should agree with it, but is there any -- that is a feasible reason?

That's a feasible reason.
Can you think of any other feasible reason?
No.
And your question about $W$ ilson in particular, and
$\qquad$

Said which, sir?
Well when Wilson came forward and said 'look, I lied because $I$ was manipulated', or 'coerced' or whatever words he used, he is putting himself in jeopardy?

In what respect?
Well he committed perjury at the trial?
I guess he could have been. I don't know the legal part of that but --

Okay. But you do agree with me that you can't think of any other explanation as to why they would lie that is feasible other than coercion and/or manipulation?

Yeah.
And it's fair to say that when you first talked, or at least not you personally, but when Wilson and John were first interviewed they knew nothing about the murder?

That's correct.
And that's nothing surprising, is it, if you are living in another city? I mean kids don't pay attention, necessarily, as to crimes in other cities, or get any details, that's not surprising? True.

Correct?

A
Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
$Q$
2
Okay. Well, I'll try not to leave it there for a second, I'll try to rephrase that. I'm not saying you yourself were responsible, but I'm asking you
Okay. But would that be the only possibility, other than the police, where they could have gotten the information they used to describe the crime?

You are posing a possibility, $I$ know that $I$ don't agree with it. I had nothing to do with it and I don't know of anybody else that did, so $I$ just have to leave that there. Meyer CompuCourt Reporting
as the man who was there, and, I mean, you are the chief officer, in fact, you were the only one that went to Ottawa for the Supreme Court, as the man who was there, can you see any other source of information to these kids to what they put in the statement other than police?

I just can't answer that.
So you can't see any other source?
I don't know.
Mr. Karst, I've covered basically the first half in the sense that there really are two aspects to this case, we have Milgaard and we have Fisher. I want to get into the Fisher end of it now. Now, there's no doubt about it that when you were doing the Miller investigation you knew about the rapist who was terrorizing a good part of Saskatoon; correct?

I would put it this way, $I$ probably knew of rapes that were occurring.

But in the newspapers they were looking for a rapist?

They probably were.
And when the investigation of Miller turned up, there was certainly involvement with (V1)- and (V2)----- to try to link the crimes, it was a
logical conclusion?

A
Q
A
Q
A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

I understand some did that.
It was a correct conclusion; right?
Probably was.
And --
Excuse me. (Pours water) Thank you.
And in fact you had some involvement with the (V5)--- rape, Mr. Lockyer showed it to you this morning?

Yeah, that's right.
In fact, you had questioned Cadrain about that or talked to Cadrain?

I don't think $I$ did, but $I$ read the report.
You saw Cadrain's name in there?
Yes, I did.
And I'm a little unclear about you and Nordstrom as a combination going to Winnipeg. Nordstrom was very senior I take it?

Very much so.
So that means to me at least that the police took this very seriously?

I don't know what conclusion $I$ could draw to that.
Well, isn't it an obvious conclusion, you know,
that the big guns don't go out every day?
Well, I suppose the information was just as good
when $I$ went to Winnipeg to see Mr. Milgaard, but they didn't send a senior officer. I don't know what conclusion to draw from that.

Well, I'm just saying the obvious one is that the police took it very seriously, that they sent out a high-ranking officer?

I could construe it that way $I$ guess.

And you say you are not clear as to why you were chosen?

I certainly am not.
But your being chosen is unusual?
I would have thought so.
But you don't recall obviously questioning anybody as to why me?

No, I didn't question the chief's orders.
Through your counsel, a number of witnesses who testified here have commented upon you being a good investigator and, more importantly, a good questioner or interrogator or whatever word has been used, we've heard that quite a few times? I have.

Do you agree with that assessment?
I'm not going to agree or disagree. I don't know. I'll leave that to other people to decide. What would make you a good interrogator, why would
you be better than someone else? What's your talent?

A

Q

BY MR. WOLCH:
Q

I don't recall it, but I'm not saying it didn't happen.

Q Okay. I thought somebody gave that as an explanation as to why you went to Winnipeg, because you were good at taking statements. In
any event, this was a very serious matter that you went there for?

Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: To Winnipeg?
BY MR. WOLCH:

To Winnipeg. I'm sorry, Mr. Commissioner. And I
take it you were going there on four matters,
there was four matters to clean up, or was there more?

From what $I$ have understood, there was two, but
there could have been four. We're talking about
interviewing Fisher?
Yeah.

A
Yes.

Well, you know that Fisher in the end pled guilty to (V1)- and (V2)-----?
$A$
$Q$

A
I understand that.
So it's hard to imagine you wouldn't be there to
question him about those is it?
As $I$ said before, $I$ can't recall questioning him
and $I$ thought if $I$ would have, $I$ would have had
statement forms saying I refuse to answer the
questions or whatever.
Well, to the best of your knowledge, you and
Nordstrom were the only two that went; is that

A
Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
A
Q

A
correct?
To the best of my knowledge.
And you are basing that on having read reports and looked at the file?

You like to know you have the right guy and you want to know what the facts are?
Yes.
And (V5)--- was a file you had some peripheral involvement in?

I don't recall it, but $I$ see my name connected with it.

Would it be fair to say that whatever files you were going there to question him on you would have studied?

I don't know whether $I$ would have studied them. Like I said earlier, we had information that Mr . Fisher wanted to plead guilty to two of our files.

Not much use of me studying the file if $I$ know ahead of time he's going to plead guilty. Well, surely you would want to know details?

I think $I$ had sufficient details there for the charge.

Well, sometimes you can get false confessions? That's true.

I guess they would have sent me back for another
statement.
No, but I'm thinking if you flew there or whatever you did, you would at least be reading reports and say I'm going to know what $I$ want to talk to the guy about?

I'm quite sure $I$ would have familiarized myself. That's what I'm getting at. It's hard to imagine you wouldn't.

Essential facts.
Our question is which files did you look at, whether it was two or four, and what you are saying is you know you would have looked at -Two.
-- (V5)--- and (V3)------, but not necessarily (V1)- and (V2)-----?

Yes.
Now, (V1)- and (V2)----- are the two that are most familiar with Miller; are they not?

I don't know that.
Well, they both find their way into the Miller file.

A
Q Okay.

Okay? We know that, those are the two files. (V5)--- was after, for example, and (V3)------ was an indecent assault. (V1)- and (V2)----- are the
ones who we have blood types and things like that, so is it coincidence that Larry Fisher was avoiding the two that he was guilty of that most are connected to the Miller file? You see the connection between those two in particular? Not at this time $I$ cannot. I probably didn't then either.

But I take it to determine whether, you know, what you may have looked at at that time, we have to rely in part on reports and what we can glean from them, and $I^{\prime} m$ going to suggest to you that those rapes, that is, (V1)-, (V2)----- in particular, were well known, not just to the police, but to the general public. They were publicized, they were advertised, there was a deep concern to the general public. Would you agree with that? I understand there was information for the public. If the public heard about it, it would be hard to imagine that a detective with your training and experience wouldn't be well versed into it? I'm sure $I$ was aware of them, but as far as well versed into them, they were not in my division and I don't think $I$ would study them.

I wonder if we could look at 261053, and before I do, Mr. Commissioner, I'm at your direction as to
when you would like a break. Whatever you want. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: When did we start, 1:30? Another 15 minutes.

MR. WOLCH: We only go to 3:30, that's why I'm asking, so whatever you -- it doesn't matter. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, we can -- do you need a break?

MR. WOLCH: No, I don't need a break. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Does anybody else need a break?

MR. WOLCH: There's no point in breaking at three o'clock or something.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Can you go to
3:30?
A
Yes, I'm fine, Mr. Commissioner.
MR. WOLCH: Whatever.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Let's do it that way.

BY MR. WOLCH:
Okay, now, $I$ think this was shown to you before, if we can just -- this is a letter from, to Regina from Saskatoon, and if we can turn the page. Now, it goes through the various charges and details the charges and what the facts are and it deals with (V1)-, (V2)----- and, you know, it says
(V2)----- was unable to identify Fisher from photos, and Ms. (V1)- viewed police photos, including that of Fisher, and was unable to identify him as the assailant. You see that?

I see that.
Now, if we can turn the page, it says here:
"During October 22, 1970, Members of our Force interviewed Fisher while he was confined to cells at the Fort Garry, Manitoba, Police Station. Fisher admitted being responsible for the rape of (V5)-- (V5)----- (V5)--- .. and also the attempted rape of (V3)-- (V3) (V3)------ ... Fisher was questioned about the offences committed on October 21 and November 13, 1968, and denied any knowledge of same."

You see that?
Yes.
Well, that would seem to suggest that you and Nordstrom would have questioned Fisher about (V1)and (V2)-----, which makes total sense.

A
It wouldn't surprise me. As I said -- but I think there should have been statements. Of course, there's no files.

Oh, I agree there should be something, but we haven't got it, so we have to try and create and work with what we have, but what I'm saying is that right here it would appear that you and Nordstrom would have questioned Fisher about the two that he denied, (V2)----- and (V1)-.

It appears that it was brought up, unless somebody else questioned him about them.

Well, it says during October 22, 1970 .
Obviously the Winnipeg department had questioned him because we've already had responses that he was wanting to pled guilty to two. Maybe they questioned him on these other ones, I don't know. I appreciate that, but what I'm saying is this seems to clearly indicate that you and Nordstrom would have questioned him about (V1)- and (V2) ----- ?

It doesn't clearly indicate that to me.
Well, Fisher -- it says here:
"Members of our Force interviewed Fisher while he was confined to the cells. He admitted being responsible for the rapes of (V5)--- and (V3)------."

Obviously that's the members of the force isn't it? I mean, it follows that what the author is

A
$Q$
saying, that he admitted to the members of the force these rapes, otherwise it wouldn't make any sense. Do you see that?

That's what it appears.
And when it goes on and says he was questioned about the others and denied it, it would be to the same people, as it's a paragraph talking about the interviews of October $22 n d$.

Possible.
It's also logical, isn't it, it's hard to imagine you would go there and not question him at all about certain offences which he ends up pleading guilty to months later?

As I said, I wouldn't be surprised if I did question him.

Now, the -- there was some indication that you were the better questioner versus Nordstrom; is that correct?

I've never seen Nordstrom question anybody, so I don't know.

So then you must have questioned him then?
I presume I did.
Okay. Now, there's no record of your questioning him anywhere to your knowledge?

Not that I'm aware of.

Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Now, might you -- sorry, can you leave that document up, I'm not finished with it. Would you agree with me that normally when you, Ed Karst, question somebody, you are pretty thorough?

I would like to think so.
I mean, David Milgaard talking about nothing took 20 pages?

Oh, I think we were talking about lots.
No, but talking about not crime, he's talking about what he did on a particular day.

Yeah, okay.
Here we've got two rapes, you've got a chance to break two major cases, hard to imagine you saying, you know, "Larry, did you do it? No? Okay, thanks." Right?

I don't know what the circumstances were there because $I$ can't remember, but $I$ assume that the Fort Garry police had questioned him and it was as a result of that that we went and took confessions and probably didn't do any more thorough investigations.

Well, you are asking a man whether he committed two terrible rapes in Saskatoon and terrorized the women of Saskatoon.

We already knew he did that.

Q Not (V2)----- and (V1)-.
A
Q

A
$Q$

Q
I don't know.
I mean, surely you are not going to say this man, who is very -- I mean, he's beyond being the prime suspect in those cases, you are not going to have him say to you I didn't do it and you are going to walk away, you are going to ask him where he was living, where he was working, was he working, who was he living with, you are going to ask him a whole bunch of questions. Doesn't that make sense?

I don't recall that, sir, so $I$ can't answer it. But does it make sense to you?

I could ask him lots of questions. Yes, it makes sense.

We're talking here about two very, very serious crimes and you, as a dedicated officer, aren't just going to, oh, well, $I$ can walk away from here, but let's look at the next paragraph:
"Police investigation revealed that Fisher lived within a block of the locations where these rapes occurred, the description of the culprit is very similar and the modus operandi is the same in all four cases. Fisher claims that he had never heard of these offences being committed, which is hard to believe as they happened within a three week period in the same area and received wide publicity."

You see that?
I see that.
Now, I just put it out as interest, the deputy chief thinks Fisher should have known about those rapes being committed in the area, so you would think the police, all police would know about it;
right?

A
Q

A
$Q$
A
Q
A
$Q$
A
$Q$
A
Q
and one has to assume you were prepared to question him, that you didn't just go all the way to Winnipeg with no information, you and Nordstrom, so you are there prepared to question him, you know that these crimes are committed close to Fisher's residence, the two he admits. It's right in his statements, you know he's living close to his crimes; right?

A
That's his version.
Yeah. Even Fisher should know. And so what you are looking at is Fisher lived within a block of where the rapes are committed; right?

I -- okay, go ahead.
You see that?
I see it.
So you would want to know where Fisher lived?
I believe $I$ seen on the statements we took from him, I think there's addresses on there.

But where did he live for (V1)- and (V2)-----?
I don't know.
But you must have found out?
I can't answer that. I don't know.
But you are there questioning him about offences

Apparently.

A
2

You would want to know where he lived for (V1)and (V2)----- wouldn't you? "Larry, where were you living on October 21st; Larry, were you living on November 13th?"

All $I$ can say is that, as $I$ repeated before, obviously $I$ went there with the intent of taking two admissions which the Winnipeg police had. Beyond that, I can't comment.

Were you not going there with the intent of getting four admissions?

I don't know because $I$ can't remember that.
Logically you were; weren't you?
Depending on what Inspector Nordstrom had instructions or whatever.

Well, police investigation revealed where Fisher lived when all these rapes occurred; right? That's possible.

And the way to find out where Fisher lived was to ask him?

I agree.
And the people who talked to him were you and Nordstrom; right? Correct. Okay. And I'm going to suggest to you that assuming you asked him to account for where he

A
$Q$
lived, he would have told you the Cadrain house?
I can't answer that either because $I$ don't know what he would have told me.

Reasonable chance, isn't there?
It's which?
There's a reasonable chance he would have given you the address?

He may have.
And if he had given you Cadrain's address, that would have put up a red flag for you?

It may have.
I want to now turn to Linda Fisher, $I$ think her name is, $I$ think she was called Lillian, but I think it's Linda. She came into the police station, $I$ think Mr. Lockyer took you through it, and made a statement to the police which I believe you indicated you saw, and with that premise, did you note that she had the wrong address? Did you see that?
No, sir.
Okay.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: May I see it,
please?

BY MR. WOLCH:
Q

A
$Q$

BY MR. WOLCH:
Yeah. Okay, she says something about Larry and then his mother, Marcy, still resides there.
"We were living at 329 Avenue O South ("O"?) when that nurse was found murdered."

I think, though, that the address being wrong is not really a problem because she goes on to say: "David Milgaard was convicted of that murder and was to have come to our house that morning."

You see that?
A
Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
I don't remember when $I$ read it and, as $I$ said, that report was never assigned to me although I believe I had looked at it.

Okay, well, $I$ won't go through all that,
$Q$
A
$Q$
A
Q

A
$Q$
$\square$

Mr. Lockyer did and we have it on the record, but what I'm getting at is whenever you read it, and we can check with what you told Mr. Lockyer, would
it not have come as a shock to you to learn that this guy Fisher was living in the Cadrain basement and you as one of, if not the key investigator didn't know that?

I can't recall that.
No, but logically would you not agree that's how you probably would have reacted?

I would have probably wanted to look into it. Yeah.
"I divorced Larry two years ago while he was serving time for rape. He has been involved in several cases of rape."

You see that? -

Yes, sir.
Now, as the man who questioned Fisher, the man who got him confessing to two of the rapes and you know he pled guilty to four, he's the Saskatoon rapist, you are looking at this, doesn't -- when she's talking about Larry Fisher and rape, wouldn't that ring a bell?

I never connected the rape, no.
So you are saying that you could look at this and
you see Cadrain and all the background of that, you see the woman talking about Larry Fisher having committed rapes and you know you are the man who went and talked to him and nothing goes off in your head about this?

I don't know if it did or not.
So if it did, you chose to do nothing?
Well, as $I$ said earlier today, that if it was assigned to somebody, not my business.

It's not your business? That's your best answer, it's not your business?

I'll put it a little more emphatically, that Inspector Wagner assigned it to somebody else. But you are the man who knows, you know Fisher, you are the man who went to Winnipeg?

As $I$ said, $I$ didn't recall that. Well, you are a major investigator in the Milgaard case, why wouldn't you just go and look up Fisher, who is he, when did he plead guilty, what is this all about?

I just answered that, sir.
It's not your business, is that what it is? And this is 1980 ish, it's not that long after, you've gone to Winnipeg to talk to probably the most vicious rapist in Saskatoon history and he's pled
guilty to four of them and here you are reading a statement, God all mighty, he lived in the basement where Milgaard visited, and you say it's somebody else's file?

Besides that, $I$ never knew -- that's what $I$ said, yes. I never knew that he pled guilty to four files, $I$ wasn't aware of it. Had I have, I don't know if it would have made any difference.

You know he admitted it?
Yes, two of them.

And when you charged and cautioned him, you said you will be charged, you didn't say you may be charged?

Yes.

You said you will be charged?
That's true.

Right?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
That's true.

And you say even out of curiosity you never went back and said to anybody, "what happened with
those two rapes that Fisher denied to me?"
Not that $I$ ever recalled.

Likely you would have?
I may have, but $I$ don't recall that.
Likely you went and talked to them about it, he
denied them, you would have likely said to somebody, "Whatever happened to those things?" Right?

A
$Q$
Apparently I didn't.
If we can just scroll down, it says:
"Something has been bothering --"
You see here she says:
"The day of the murder or the day after I found my paring knife missing. Larry and $I$ were not getting along well and $I$ said to him "You probably killed that nurse." He went very pale but at that time $I$ didn't think any more of it. It has been bothering me ever since, especially when Larry started raping women."

And then she goes on to describe the paring knife.
"Larry was never questioned about this case. I have a feeling that Milgaard was innocent of that crime. I don't know Milgaard. I have never seen him." You see all that there?

I do.
Now this is not a woman who has been fed details,
given information, or has any reason, particularly, other than with appears to be her conscience, to come forward, and she specifically says about confronting Larry with 'you probably killed that nurse' and him re -- and his reaction, and her paring knife missing; those are all facts that must have struck you, confounded you?

Apparently it didn't.
One of the key bits of information that was troubling to you as an investigator was that some articles were found around the Cadrain home; correct?

You have his wife saying her knife went missing, he behaved somewhat inappropriate when she confronted him with the killing, he lives in the

Cadrain basement, you've questioned him in Winnipeg about rapes, that rapist was suspected of being the rapist who killed Gail Miller, and you are saying nothing registered with you?

It didn't really come to me because it went to somebody else.

No matter how you get something, if it's important, shouldn't you deal with it?

Well, if you are instructed by a senior officer to do other work, I don't think you would -- if you -- put it this way; if $I$ was instructed, if my name would have been on it, I'm sure I would have looked into it. What happened with somebody else's name $I$ don't know.

But the other officer wouldn't have your personal knowledge, you know the Cadrain house, you know the address, you know everything, you know Fisher, it's all personal to you; isn't that right? That's true.

Mr. Commissioner, I note we're going to 3:30, I would prefer to have a very brief break to get my throat back and I'll finish easily this afternoon --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Sure.
MR. WOLCH: -- with plenty of time to
spare.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Would ten minutes be all right?

MR. WOLCH: Sure.
(Adjourned at 2:48 p.m.)
(Reconvened at 2:59 p.m.)

BY MR. WOLCH:
Mr. Karst, $I$ only have a few more questions for you. I want to refer to a document, $I$ wonder if you could pull up the document I'm thinking about? Thank you.

MR. HODSON: That's amazing.
MR. WOLCH: I wondered if you would notice that.

BY MR. WOLCH:
$Q$
This is your testimony in the supreme Court, and I'll try to get through it, this part fairly quickly because there's only really one main question $I$ want to ask you. Umm, it starts off where I'm asking you a few questions about basically the Gus Weir situation and the investigators who say they didn't know anything, etcetera, etcetera, but I'm not focusing on that, I'm just trying to get you into the frame. If we can go, scroll down then, and $I$ asked you what --
"Q They indicate that for years they continued to try to solve those very crimes."

If you can turn the page:
"A I can't understand it.

Q You were interviewed and gave a fairly lengthy interview ...",
and I'm just going to speed read if $I$ could: "... to a lady named Gillian Findlay from The Fifth Estate television show, were you not?

A Yes, I was."

And I then go on to quote you, and we've gone through this before, that's why I went through it pretty fast:
" I certainly expect that back in
1971 when Fisher was transferred from Winnipeg that it should have been checked out."

Those would have been your words in the Gillian Findlay interview. And reading, going down fairly quickly, those are your words out of Findlay:
"Q. 'I certainly expect that back in
1971 when Fisher was transferred from

Winnipeg that it should have been checked out. But it never came to my attention. I'm in the section at that time and $I$ don't recall that at all. But maybe it never got to me. Because if it had of, I'd have looked at it. I can only speak for myself. I know there's some shoddy work done places. There's probably some done by some of them there. But where are you going to go that you don't find that? I don't know. As sure as I am that everything went right, $I$ would still check that out. If I was still there I would still do it. I can't speak for somebody else."

Then it goes on. Once again $I$ point out this is quoting yourself to Findlay:
"'It's very possible that there had been rapes in Saskatoon prior to the Miller case. I don't know. That's handled by morality section. Rape isn't handled by detectives and we were a different squad. It's a funny way to work but most are set up like that - you have a
morality squad. Why hadn't Joe sent somebody up there to investigate Fisher?

I don't know.'
A. I don't.
Q. But you did. You went yourself.
A. Not about the Milgaard file.
Q. No, but you are being asked about checking Fisher out in 1971, transferred
to Winnipeg. You said to Gillian
Findlay: 'I don't know anything about
it.'"
And this is the answer that $I$ am concerned about:
"I may have told her that. I wouldn't
tell her everything."
A Right.
Q Do you see that?
A I see it.

And then, unfortunately, the Chief Justice put us on a different train of thought. So I want to now, 13 or so years later, carry on with that thought. You say:
"I wouldn't tell her everything."
Now that suggests to me that you were mis -deliberately misleading her. I'm going to give you a chance to answer that. You see, you said
to her:
"I don't know anything about it."
Now your next answer isn't 'I didn't remember it' or 'I couldn't remember it', your answer is:
"I wouldn't tell her everything."
Do you see that?
I see it.
And I take it at that point in time you are saying under oath that you did remember but you misled her, you wouldn't tell her, in other words you were being untruthful to her?

That doesn't imply that to me. I think earlier in this hearing $I$ said $I$ was some upset with her and I wouldn't be telling her everything.

Okay. But if she is asking you about Fisher and you say:
"I don't know anything about it."?
A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
be, that that is the truth?

Now there is two reasons for saying 'I know nothing', one is you really know nothing, -Right.
-- and the other one is you are not telling the truth, or and you do know and you don't want to tell her?

The possibility $I$ just put to you was that $I$ wasn't telling her very much of anything in the --

Well, but hang on, you know or you believed that there may not be any files anywhere? Dan Lett
told you that, as far as he knew, the Winnipeg files weren't in existence?

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A

And the other possibility is that $I$ wasn't telling her.

Not telling her what?
Probably anything.

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q
A

2

A
Q

A

No, no, but what -- you could only -- when she asked you about Fisher you could only say 'yes I know', 'no I don't', and you could say 'yes, I know but $I{ }^{\prime} m$ not telling you'?

I wasn't telling her $I$ wasn't telling her. I'm just --

But you might not be telling her because you couldn't remember or you were deliberately withholding?

I don't think it's either one of them. Well, it could have been the last one, maybe I was deliberately withholding it from her. So maybe you were deliberately withholding that you remember going and talking to Fisher?

No, that's not true.
Then what were you withholding?
I can't tell you at this time if $I$ was withholding anything.

But you -- okay -- but you say here:
"I wouldn't tell her everything."
Right?
I believe I said that.
Well you did say it under oath in the Supreme Court?

Okay.

And I'm going to suggest to you that the only meaning to take from that is that you remembered Fisher but you weren't going to tell her?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
Okay. Those are all my questions, Mr. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Does anybody have questions which can be finished in 20 minutes?

MR. HODSON: I think -- yeah. My
understanding is that Mr. O'Keefe and/or
Mr. Beresh is here next week, and I'm not sure,

Mr. O'Keefe, if you wish to address whether he wishes to do it today and can get done, or on Monday. But $I$ don't think, other than Mr. Fox, I don't believe any other counsel wish to question; would that be fair?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Will you be more than 20, Mr. Fox?

MR. FOX: I will.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
MR. O'KEEFE: I think I'm likely to be a little bit more than 20 as well, sir, and 1 think Mr. Beresh probably will have some questions, as well, he would like to ask.

MR. HODSON: I might, if I could about

Mr. Beresh on Monday, there is a concern about getting done on Monday; Mr. Fox, do you think you will be done with him, that we have three hours Monday, and as long as we are certain that we will finish Mr. Karst on Monday, I think the concern is losing the 20 minutes today, and if we're assured we will be done Monday with Mr. Karst is essential. Secondly, the rest of the police witnesses next week will be fine in the three days we have, assuming we get Mr. Karst done in one day.

MR. FOX: Yeah. I'm assuming if Mr. Beresh is something in the order of a half hour, or something like that, that $I$ will still finish comfortably on Monday.

MR. O'KEEFE: I can't imagine that he would be longer than 45 minutes, sir.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right.

MR. FOX: So I, yeah, I would leave it at that.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah. Clearly you would like to go last, Mr. Fox?

MR. FOX: I would, yes.
COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: So we adjourn, then, and $I$ guess we go to the Radisson at 1:00 on August the 29th, eh. So we're adjourned to that time.

Oh. Mr. Hodson, I'm sorry, without consulting our rules with respect to contacting a witness in the course of cross-examination it might be prudent to say to Mr. Karst that he should not discuss the case with others except for yourself.

MR. HODSON: In fact, I don't think I'm allowed, $I$ think the rules preclude even me from talking to him. I have no intention to.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right. As
long as he understands it. Thank you.
(Adjourned at 3:10 p.m.)
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