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Transcript of Proceedings
(Reconvened at 9:00 a.m.)
THOMAS DAVID ROBERTS CALDWELL, continued:
BY MR. HODSON:
Q
If $I$ could call up 105605 , please. Yesterday when we adjourned, Mr. Caldwell, I was taking you through this document and there's a few entries that $I$ want to go to, but before I do, I just want to maybe restate what $I$ had covered a bit yesterday.

This was a document that Mr.
Ullrich prepared, we've called it the Ullrich police summary, which $I$ think the evidence is that it was a summary of the case, if $I$ can call it that, that the police put together and delivered to you sometime in July of 1969. I think yesterday you told us that you then took that case and you developed your own Crown theory, if $I$ can call it that, or Crown summary of the case that you ultimately took to trial, and when $I$ was going through this document with the purpose of asking you, Mr. Caldwell, at the time you received the police case, if $I$ can call it that, and $I$ think you testified yesterday that you would have viewed it with a critical eye in the sense of looking at
it, trying to figure the case out. Is that a fair summary of what you said yesterday?

I think so, sir.
And $I$ was going through this and asking you some questions trying to find out what, back in July of 1969, August of 1969 , either you remember considering or whether you think you would have considered; in other words, not what you ended up calling it at trial, but what, when you first got the case, sort of your reaction and your issues and your concerns. Do you understand that that's where $I$ wish to go? If we could go to page 607, please, and $I$ think we left off about that, the service station, and if we could call out this part of the police summary, and it talks about: "The four --"

And that would be Milgaard, Wilson, John and Cadrain,
"-- then started for Calgary, Milgaard driving. A short distance out of Saskatoon John found a compact case in the car. When she asked whose it was, Milgaard took it and threw it out the window. This articles has not been recovered."

Do you remember, Mr. Caldwell, this part of the case, the compact?

I believe so, sir.
And can you tell us what significance, if any, did you place on that piece of evidence at the time? Well, I would assume that if that compact was identified in due course as having been the property of Gail Miller and been thrown away by, in this instance, Mr. Milgaard, it would be some evidence that he had been at or about Gail Miller at the time of the offence, or shortly thereafter. Now, it says here this article has not been recovered and $I$ think we heard evidence already that the police sent a dog out in the ditches to try and find it, although it was three months after the fact, it wasn't located, and $I$ take it that's something you would have known at the time, that the compact had not been recovered?

I would assume so, sir.
And you would have known as well that Gail
Miller's purse had been recovered I think by Detective McCorriston?

A
Q
A
A
$Q$
I would have known

And the contents of that purse?
Yes, I believe that's so, sir.

Q
Do you recall, and there's a few notes that $I$ will go through a bit later that will touch on this, but do you have any recollection of, or do you think you would have gone back and said okay, if that's Gail Miller's compact in the car, let's check what's in her purse when her purse was found, and I understand, Mr. Caldwell, that in her purse there were items, similar items of a compact or cosmetic bag or whatever the distinction may be. Do you follow my questioning? In other words, if there was a compact bag in her purse, that that might suggest that maybe this wasn't her compact?

It could, but life since then $I$ think has taught me that there may well be two or three or four compacts legitimately carried by ladies at one time.

And again I'll take you to some notes, but do you think, sir, that's something you would have considered at the time as on issue, if $I$ could call it, that lookit, can we explain, if the Crown or the police theory is that this is likely Gail Miller's compact, let's rationalize that with what we found in her purse?

A
I wouldn't see it as an issue I don't think, Mr.

Hodson.
But would it be fair to say that this was part of the Crown theory, that the suggestion or the inference that this may have been or was Gail Miller's compact?

Oh, certainly, yup.
And the next paragraph talks about driving, and we saw some reference to this with the tow truck drivers, etcetera, the fact that Mr. Milgaard drove at speeds up to 100 miles an hour on side roads, what significance did you place on that in the case?

It could be an indication of guilt in the sense of a desire to quickly depart Saskatoon where he knew an offence had occurred, would be one way of looking at it.

And $I$ think we saw reference to that earlier. So the behaviour of Mr. Milgaard after the time of the offence was a matter that was considered by both the police and the Crown and -I would hope so, Mr. Hodson. I can't see that you would not look at that.

And then scroll down, it talks about the police saying:
"At Calgary Milgaard told Wilson that
while in Saskatoon he had hit a girl, grabbed her purse. When she fought he had jabbed her a few times with a knife.

He had put her purse in a trash can and that he thought she would be alright." Now, the significance of that $I$ take it is pretty obvious, Mr. Caldwell?

I would think so, sir.
And this would be an admission by the accused to one of his travelling companions that he had stolen a purse and jabbed a woman with a knife? Yeah, hit a girl, grabbed her purse, she fought, he jabbed her a few times, had put her purse in a trash can, all would be certainly incriminating admissions, $I$ would think, by anyone.

Right. And then if we can scroll down, the police summary states:
"Wilson told John and she replied she already knew. This does not seem to be the complete truth as police feel sure Wilson knew something, if not all, the story while still in Saskatoon."

And again $I$ touched on this yesterday, and $I$ think this is the third reference in the police summary that talks about, at least from the
police perspective, doubting Wilson's -- even with Wilson's May $23 r d$ and May $24 t h$ statements, still doubting whether he's giving the complete story. Do you agree?

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A

That's quite possible, sir.
And do you have a recollection, Mr. Caldwell, of what if anything you did to address that?

Well, not that specific instance, if you would, or phrase. I think Mr. Wilson clearly gave varying evidence $I$ would think even in the proceedings, you know, standing alone.

Did you have, and let's just jump ahead a bit to the preliminary hearing and the trial, and

Mr. Wilson's evidence, do you recall whether you had concerns about his credibility?

Only in a general sense that $I$ would have for the, her -- pardon me, him, Nichol John, as other occupants of the car, as friends of the accused at that point, those would be things that, you know, I would be aware of, but it wouldn't prevent me from proceeding with their evidence.

So the fact that they were friends of the accused, would that tend to suggest that they might be more favourable to him?

Well, you just want to be alert to that fact, sir.

Q
"In Calgary Milgaard approached Cadrain about obtaining a gun and getting rid of Wilson and John. Det. Karst had this information."

What significance, if any, did you place on this piece of information?

It seems to be a free-standing item. I believe it got into evidence at the trial.

I believe that's correct, yes.
And it could be interpreted, if you will, as his knowledge that these two were, that being Wilson and John, were witnesses to a crime, if he can get a gun and get rid of them, that would presumably lessen the likelihood of him being convicted somewhere along the road.

Do you recall at the time whether this statement was viewed as perhaps indicative of guilt on the part of Mr. Milgaard or whether you or others, being the police, thought that this was a serious threat on the part of Mr. Milgaard?

I didn't take it as not being serious, but $I$ don't think it was, you know, on overwhelming factor. Did you have any concerns about the credibility of Mr. Cadrain's information on this point?

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q I suppose.

Scroll down, there's a reference here about marijuana, drug use, did that -- where, if at all, did that fit into your assessment of the case, Mr. Caldwell, the fact that there was some evidence
that, on this trip and perhaps even the morning of the murder, that Mr. Milgaard and the others, his travelling companions, may have been on drugs or had consumed drugs?

A

And then we talk here about Sharon Williams and I know there's a lengthy statement from Sharon Williams in your materials. Do you have a recollection of reviewing that and putting any significance on -- now, she was the lady, the young lady in Edmonton that Mr. Milgaard went to see shortly after the trip to Saskatoon and she gave a statement and we've heard evidence here about her relationship with Mr. Milgaard.

A
Well, from my knowledge now I gather that was a very common thing among young people of every description and the fact that that was allegedly happening, $I$ wouldn't place a lot of weight in that, Mr. Hodson, in terms of guilt or anything. You wouldn't have?

Would not, no.
So the fact that they may or may not have been on drugs, as far as your assessment of the case, didn't play a significant role; is that --

I wouldn't think so for those reasons.

I undoubtedly read the statement and considered

Q

A
it, sir.
Do you have any recollection of what importance if any it played in your assessment of the case? At this point $I$ don't, Mr. Hodson.

Okay. And then here it says:
"Early in March Cadrain returned to
Saskatoon at which time he officially learned of Miller's death. After some thought he came to the police with his story."

And it says officially learned and there's some evidence in his statements and elsewhere that Mr. Cadrain may have been first informed of the murder while he was in Regina, being questioned by the Regina police. Do you have a recollection if that played any part in your consideration of Mr. Cadrain's evidence, how he learned of the murder in his dealings with the Regina police?

I don't think so. I'm of the view that he did learn from the Regina police and then he came to Saskatoon, as we know, talked to Saskatoon City Police. The fact that he presumably did learn of it from Regina and then -- it doesn't detract in my assessment of his evidence that the term officially $I$ think is --

Do you recall there, yeah, do you recall there being anything significant or unusual about the manner in which Mr. Cadrain learned of the murder and/or any of his dealings with the Regina City Police?

No, no I don't.
So that is the completion of the three-page police summary, and that would be the summary that Mr . Ullrich prepared outlining the police theory, if $I$ can call it that; is that fair?

That's fine, sir, yeah.
Then, if $I$ can call up the next page, which is 105608. And this is the Ullrich witness summary, I think is what we've called it, and I think you told us that this is what Mr. Ullrich would put together based upon the court brief file; is that right?

A
That's my -- that's my understanding.
And I think, what you told us yesterday, he would
identify who the key people were and the evidence
they had to provide; is that a fair --
That's fair.

And that, in providing this summary, he would refer to -- and we see here with Adeline Nyczai -statement numbers. And $I$ think we've heard
evidence that the statements were all numbered 1 to 95; is that right?

A
$Q$

I would think you could call it that very, very honestly, sir.
$Q$
And so we'll just go through some of the key ones. And I think the first one, Adeline Nyczai, was the -- a roommate of Gail Miller's, and I think she they may provide?
ended up being called to testify, and her evidence was, $I$ think, to place what time Ms. Miller left the house; is that correct? And $I$ think that was the basis of her evidence, usually left work about 7:00 a.m. and observed her 6:35-6:45?

I would assume that's what she said, sir.
And I take it, as part of your case to the jury, you would be trying to identify the likely time that Gail Miller was murdered?

I would think so.
And you talked yesterday about, and I'm not sure if this was your word, but about the elasticity of time estimates, that some people may have
different versions, but would it be fair to say that you are trying to pinpoint when she was last seen alive to indicate that the murder could not have taken place before that, obviously?

Yeah. I'd be working with the times they gave to the police in these statements and seeing how, if at all, they fit together or clashed or whatever. And we touched on this yesterday, but obviously if the evidence indicated a time frame for the murder and that conflicted with the time frame where the accused, Mr. Milgaard, was somewhere else, that would obviously be a problem for the prosecution;
is that right?
A

Q
A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Q out.

Do you recall whether you ever phoned Don, I think it says Robinson, $I$ think it was Robertson, but do you recall phoning the probation officer for
Well, just knowing as much as we could about her, and that happened to be something that they found


Nichol John?

A

Q

I don't recall that, it's not beyond the realm, and the police may well have, Mr. Hodson, spoken to him it seems to me.

Yeah. Do you have a recollection, yourself, of calling?

No. No.
And is that something you think you likely would have done?

I wouldn't think so, because that would be an investigator job, and $I$ may have asked them to do it.

I see. And then we talk about statements 81 and 94. Maybe, just for the record, we'll show that this -- if we could call up 006645 . We'll see the statements are 81 and 94 , and here is the second statement, and there is the 94 number that $I$ think the police put on; is that right?

Yes sir.
And Mr. Commissioner, I don't propose to go through all of these numbers to show that they match, but $I$ can say that in the Ullrich witness summary the witness statement numbers correspond with the witness statements that were numbered by the police.

A

I would assume that to be the case, Mr. Hodson. Yeah.

Unless you --
Yeah, sure.
-- point out something else.
Yeah. If we could just go back to the previous document. So from here, again if we call out Nichol John, and I think you told us yesterday that certainly $I$ think the first go-round, when you first received this, that certainly the statements referenced in the witness summary were provided to you; is that correct? Maybe not all at once but they were provided to you?

The two that are quoted or numbered there I'm sure were provided to me.

Yeah. And $I$ think -- and please correct me if I'm wrong -- but $I$ thought the evidence was yesterday, or perhaps $I$ read it in a document somewhere, that when this witness summary was provided, that these statements referred to in the witness summary were provided, and $I$ think you said at a later date you asked for the rest of them and ended up getting all of them; is that correct?

In -- yeah, subject again to some error, that's what I believe happened.


Q
A
$Q$

That would be the reference, $I$ think, in the witness summary to this. And would you have read the police reports at the time, and when you received them, Mr. Caldwell, in preparation for

I see it.
The ref --
I see it.
the preliminary hearing and trial?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

A
位

I would.
You would have read them at least once; is that --
I would be sure I had read them once at least.
And if we could go, this just deals with Nichol John and this is Mr. Karst's April 18th report, if we can go to the next page, please. And you will recall, Mr. Caldwell, that initially both Nichol John and Ron Wilson gave statements to the police in early March 1969 saying basically that they were with Mr. Milgaard that morning, he wasn't out of their sight for more than maybe a minute or two, and that he did not commit the murder as far as they were concerned?

Now, Mr. Hodson, were those the statements to Inspector Riddell?

Yes, they were.
Okay. That I do recall.
Yeah. So you would have known at the time that, when they were first questioned, Mr. Wilson and Ms. John both gave an account of that morning, January 31 , and both said words to the effect that Mr. Milgaard did not or could not have committed the murder? I would have --

$Q$
A
Q

Is that a fair --
That's right.
And so here's a police report of April 18th, and just so that we have the time frame here, Nichol John's first statement was March 11th, 1969 to Mr. Riddell, she gave a second statement on May 24th, 1969 to Ray Mackie, and so those were the two statements. The second statement is where she provided a number of incriminating statements, including stating that she had witnessed the murder, okay, so that's the second statement; do you understand that?

Okay. Was that the one that was in the time frame of the polygraph test?

Yes, it was.
Okay.
It was the day after, yes.
All right.
So that's the second statement. So here's Mr. Karst's report of April 18th, right in the middle of those two, if $I$ can call it that. And $I$ take it you would have read this report?

I'm sure $I$ would.
If we can just go back to the front page of that for a moment, page 1, and that's your handwriting
at the top, 'Karst 1'?

## 1

A
Q

A

Q
A

Q

A

That's right, sir.
And can you describe what, what does that mean when you put Karst, and 1 I think is a page number?

That's what that means, if -- page 1 of whatever followed, 2, 3, 4, etcetera.

Okay. If you can go to the next page, please. That's an example there, Mr. Hodson.

Yeah. And so there is a reference here, this is Mr. Karst, after having interviewed Nichol John he says:
"Although there are many unanswered questions with regards to Milgaard's activities on that particular morning, if one is to believe the girl, NicholJohn, and it appears that she is very convincing with her story, then there is no way in which Milgaard can be connected with this crime."

And I take it, sir, you would have read that at the time?

I -- I'm sure I did.

Well, can you tell us, what significance would that statement have played in your assessment of
not only the case, but of Nichol John's evidence?

A
Well that was Detective Karst's, if you will, summary as of that time of his views, of course, which appears to me to be favourable to Mr. Milgaard. And $I$ think it, it's clear that as time went on, and particularly after the second statement, $I$ for one didn't -- didn't, if you will, believe the -- what's suggested here, that he couldn't be connected with the crime.

So that, after Nichol John gave her second statement, your view was that he was connected to the crime?

Oh, yes, that's right.
All right.
But not necessarily just based on that, Mr. Hodson, I don't know what happened in the interim. I appreciate that. But just to go back to as the prosecutor when you are assessing the case, if I can call it that, let's say it's July-August of '69, during the prelim, after the prelim, would this, the fact that the police at one point in the investigation had said (a) if Nichol John, who I think you would agree was probably the key witness?

A
She -- yeah.

And that she had originally said that Mr. Milgaard was not involved, and that she was very convincing with her story according to Mr. Karst, and that if she was believed, then Mr. Milgaard could not have done it; and would that have played any role in your assessment?

Well I certainly, you know, valued what Mr. Karst said at that stage of the proceedings, but $I$ don't think that that state of affairs lasted very long, for the reasons we just started talking about.

Okay, yeah, and we'll go through a bit later.
That's correct.
And a month later she gave a statement indicating that she witnessed the murder, correct, I think May 24 th?

Yeah, I'm sure that's so.
And let's just talk about when you first looked at the case and looked at that; did you, did you take her second statement as being the truth then?

I -- the post --
Post-polygraph?
Yeah, $I$ did, sir.
Okay. And then, I'll get into this a bit later, but we know that at the preliminary hearing Nichol John did not repeat the incriminating information

from her post-polygraph statement?

A
$Q$
recited what was in her second statement. Now I, again, stand to be corrected --

Q
A

Q
A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Uh-huh.
-- but at that point she hadn't -- she hadn't come around in that fashion at the end of the prelim, as $I$ recall it.

And we'll go through that.
Yeah, that's --
I'm just trying to get a sense, Mr. Caldwell, where this type of police information, where it would play a role in your thinking, if anywhere? Well once the -- her second statement was in, and assuming that $I$ knew the circumstances surrounding it, the first one would be, in my view, simply no longer this -- the case as suggested here by Detective Karst that it was then, I wouldn't believe that it was the case now, if you want to put it awkwardly.

So at that time, then, you would have formed the belief that her original statement to Inspector Riddell was not true?

That's right.
And why was that?
Well $I$ don't recall a lot of the details in it at this moment, but it seemed to me that it included
things that could be proven wrong by, if you will, third-party witnesses. I don't know what they were, but $I$ got the distinct feeling that her -that statement was broadly wrong.

Okay. If we could go back, and just go back to the witness summary, 105608 . And again, this is just summarizing Nichol's evidence, and it talks about the elevator break-in and that Mr. Milgaard returned to the call -- returned to the car with a flashlight, and $I$ touched on this a bit yesterday, but what -- the elevator break-in, what significance did that have, Mr. Caldwell?

I wouldn't think, on the murder charge if you will, much if any. It's an offence but it's largely, $I$ would have thought, disconnected with what occurred later.

Go to the next page. And then it, the first paragraph, summarizes that she can identify -- or that:
"... enroute to Saskatoon ... that Milgaard was in possession of a knife - can describe the knife."

And also:
"- can identify the knife found at scene of the murder as same kind of knife."

And I take it that that would be pretty important evidence, Mr. Caldwell?

I would think so.
And then next:
"- Also enroute to Saskatoon Milgaard spoke of wanting to snatch a purse from someone."

So this is Nichol John saying, according to this summary, that Mr. Milgaard in the car said he wanted to snatch a purse from someone.

I see that there.
And what significance, if any, did that have in your case?

That -- as -- I guess only in the sense that the evidence that we had to work with was that he ended up snatching a purse from someone in the sense of the Gail Miller attack and --

And would this go to motive then?
Well it's something he said which I don't think would have been too significant of its own accord, but if you view it in that light it could, I suppose.

Then it talks here about: "Drove around in city for 10-15 minutes. (can state area of scene of murder as
being area they drove around in. Was taken around this area by D/Sgt. Mackie since and can say area appears to be the same)".

So I take it that this, this evidence, would be placing the Milgaard vehicle in the area of the murder at or about the time of the murder; is that --

That's how $I$ would take it.
And if we can scroll down, please. And then this is summarizing what Ms. John has said about getting stuck:
"- Wilson continued about $1 / 2$ block
where he attempted to make a U-turn at a alley and became stuck in the alley
entrance. There being a funeral home at
the alley entrance (this probably would
be Westwood Funeral Chapel ...)".
And so I take it, again, this would put,
according to Ms. John, would put the vehicle in
the back alley or near the back alley where Gail
Miller's body was found?
A
Umm, that's correct:
"U-turn at a alley and became stuck in
the alley entrance",
which I would take it to be the alley and what I thought and believed was Avenue $N$.

2
A

Q

A
$Q$

Yes.
And, and clearly that was the location of the only
funeral home, Mr. Hodson, that's involved, as I hear it. So that's how I --

So this would put the vehicle at the location
where I think, in accordance with the Crown
theory, is where the car got stuck?
That would be my understanding.
Yeah. And then if we can go down, and this is a note the police put in, or -- I'm sorry, it says: "- Wilson and Milgaard attempted to push the car free, but were unable to. Note - this area still seems uncertain. Both Wilson and John who originally claimed to know nothing of the murder but maintain they were stuck and two men came to assist in pushing them free. The police have been unable to locate these two men. Police believe the first lack of knowledge and now the uncertainty surrounding the facts at the alley entrance may mean Wilson and John either are not telling the entire truth
or are more involved in offence than they wish to say."

And I touched on this a bit yesterday, Mr.
Caldwell, but it would certainly appear from that
that the police have some doubts about what Wilson and John are saying about the -- about getting stuck and getting unstuck; do you see that?

A

Q

A

Yeah, $I$ just -- let me read it off this -Sure.
-- if you will. (Witness reading) The fact that the police were unable to locate these other two men who are named, or not named but mentioned here, would have, to my way of thinking, have no significance. I can understand how that would happen legitimately. The -- I can understand, also, how lack of knowledge and then uncertainty could be read as meaning that Wilson and John were either untruthful or more involved, in other words, that could be the case. There's nothing in that set of facts that drove me, if you will, to doubt what they did say, Mr. Hodson. Okay.

But, certainly, that's a legitimate position. Right, and the --

A
$Q$

A

Q
A

Q

A
Q

A

And it was that of the police, as I read it, as opposed to anyone else.

Yes. And did you share that view?
Well had I -- had we gone through it at that time and place, I wouldn't have been concerned about the inability to locate the two men -Yes.
-- and I would -- the credibility of Wilson and John could only be determined by the process of calling them as witnesses, $I$ would think, at that stage, either prelim and the trial.

So in this case, if there is some uncertainty -let me just back up. I think what the police are saying is -- and please correct me if I'm wrong -is that 'lookit, the fact that Wilson and John first denied any knowledge about this and now they do have some knowledge but they are uncertain about what happened at the alley entrance either means they are not telling the entire truth, which could mean they are, maybe they are not involved but they are not telling everything'?

Uh-huh.
'Or are more involved in the offence and are not saying because they are more involved'.

It could mean those, either of those, Mr. Hodson.

And $I$ think what you said, in that situation, your -- as prosecutor would you then just say 'fine, that's for the jury to decide'?

A

Q
A

Q
A
Q

A

Q Well, to the extent that it -- at that point I accepted the so-called second statements of Wilson and John --

I see.
-- as correct. Now whether or not, Mr. Hodson, they ended up being, let's say, believed by the judge at the prelim or the jury at the Queen's Bench trial, there would be no reason for me not to proceed with them if $I$ had faith, if you will, in them myself, --

Okay.
-- which I think I did.
And I appreciate that, Mr. Caldwell, but if there is a situation, we're saying 'fine, Wilson and John have both given second statements', if $I$ can call it that, --

Uh-huh.
-- you believe they are truthful, and the first statements are not truthful, and if you still had the same, 'concerns' might be too strong a word, but if in your mind you are thinking the same way the police are thinking, that, you know, it's odd
they haven't -- that it's uncertainty at the alley entrance, in other words 'maybe we're not getting everything'; would that cause you to change anything you do as far as the case or putting them on the stand?

I don't think so. I had a certain view of their evidence that, at that point, as I understood it would be. The only thing that's left after that is either me let's say not calling them, and there was no, no justification for that; (b) the Court assessing what it thought of them if $I$ did, if and when $I$ did call them, and of course that's not a question of -- that can sometimes be unpredictable depending on how they testify.

Right. And so is it, when you called Wilson and John at the prelim and at the trial then, were there some areas where you still had, in your mind, saying 'okay, there's some things that are a bit unclear here that $I$ can't put my finger on but nothing significant enough to prevent me from calling them', is that --

- he had hold of the girl he had spoken to moments earlier
- he grabbed at her purse
- he pulled the knife from one of his pockets
- he held the knife in his right hand
- he was stabbing at the girl with the knife
- they went around a corner in the alley".

Now the fact that it says here that he held the knife in his right hand; were you aware at the time, Mr. Caldwell, of preparing and presenting the case, that Mr. Milgaard was left-handed?

I found some questions over that in the material I have been looking at recently. I wouldn't be surprised if he was. I don't think I knew, Mr. Hodson.

Q
And would that be a factor? Let's just go back to that time and assume for the moment that you would have been aware, from the police or otherwise, that he was left-handed?

A Okay, uh-huh.

Would that be, would that be something that would cause you to question a bit further Ms. John's
observation that he has a knife in his right hand?

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
Q
And, again, $I$ take it that this would be a significant piece of evidence, then, for the Crown?

And then just a couple points here:
"- John does not recall Wilson returning to the car."
"- Not sure if Milgaard said anything."
And then talks about driving, again, to the
Danchuk's. If we can just scroll down:
"- Nichol John ...",
and, again, this is a summary of what's in her statement, $I$ don't think we need to go to her statement, but in that statement she said she:
"Observed no blood on Milgaard's clothes or hands."

Did that cause you to -- cause any pause in your mind, Mr. Caldwell, or any --

This is still Nichol John, is it?
Yes, yes.
No, that wouldn't. It -- the fact that she did not see it, if she's being truthful she didn't see it, and one could conclude from that that there was none there. Other witnesses might have said "I saw both", and the Court could conclude from that that they believed that or disbelieved it, but that wouldn't necessarily reflect on John in my view.

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q


I see. The fact that Wilson and Cadrain saw blood and were with Mr. Milgaard for at least, you know, probably the same amount of time in the same area as Nichol John was; is that fair?

I would think so.
And -- and the fact that Nichol John had witnessed him stabbing a girl, would you consider that she might be more likely to look for blood on his clothes?

Well I -- the reaction that's up a little there, Mr. Hodson, the evidence $I$ think was that:
"- she moved toward Wilson who was in driver's seat, to get away from Milgaard."

I think there was evidence that, --
Yes.
-- rightly or wrongly, she was frightened of him at that point, therefore $I$ personally wouldn't have expected her to be "eh just a minute, let me check your clothing for blood", even visually. Okay. And then, if you can scroll down, it talks again about:

> "John while looking for a map in the glove compartment of the car found a cosmetic case:
- can describe the cosmetic case and
contents
- asked whose it was
- nobody knew whose it was"
"- Milgaard grabbed the case and threw
it out of the car ..."
What was that -- and $I$ think you told us the fact
of the cosmetic case in the car was significant;
is that fair?
A
I thought it was one more thing that could be
evidence.
$Q$
A
What about her evidence that Mr. Milgaard grabbed
it and threw it out the window?
Well that would be significant evidence, it -- I
would think you could argue that, in the light of
what had happened so far, if you will, if those
other things had come to light, this would be one
other way of getting rid of evidence somewhat
parallel to the purse thing, Mr. Hodson.
Q Okay. If you can go down to the bottom:
"- can describe clothing worn by
Milgaard at time of murder. Wearing a
tooke. Never saw clothes after he
changed ...".
Do you remember, and $I$ think we've -- we touched
on it in Mr. Ullrich's police summary, the toque that was found next door to the Cadrain's, and I believe the evidence at trial was that the -- a blue toque was found, Mrs. Gerse said there was blood on it, they tested it and $I$ think said it was blood but they couldn't determine the type of blood --Uh-huh.
-- and I don't believe there was any evidence led at trial that directly connected that as being Mr. Milgaard's toque?

A

Q
A

Q
I wouldn't think so, and I think there's some further -- realize that we're not basically interested in what's come out here, but I think there was evidence about the toque in the inquiry, if I'm not mistaken.

Yes, we heard from Mrs. Gerse?
Yes, and I don't think, if you ask me, it was connected with anybody.

And that may well have been, I think, the judge's direction to the jury, that at the time of, at this time when the police give you the case and you are looking at it, would it be fair to say that what the police found was that there was a toque next door to Cadrain's?

A Yes.
Q
A
$Q$

A

Q
A

Okay. So at the time, let's just go back to the toque, at the time you knew that Mr. Milgaard was at the Cadrain house that morning?
Not at the time of the -- I didn't learn that until much, much later.

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
都

It would be some evidence. I don't know if there
was any attempt, or successful or otherwise, to
type it, Mr. Hodson, but if that were the case, it
was any attempt, or successful or otherwise, to
type it, Mr. Hodson, but if that were the case, it would be a piece of evidence.
this toque was Mr. Milgaard's, the fact that it was found next to the Cadrains and had blood on it would be a significant piece of evidence?

Would be piece ofevidence.

Gail Miller's, if it could be established that

And $I$ think in fairness, and we'll see this in a couple of occasions later, I think at this time I think the police point out that Nichol John says he was wearing a toque and Mrs. Danchuk $I$ think in her statements, or her evidence may have said he was wearing a toque, but not a blue one, I think a striped one or something of that nature, so I guess my only point here is that at this time the fact of pursuing whether or not you could establish or call evidence that would link the toque found by Mrs. Gerse to David Milgaard was something that you would look at pursuing; is that fair?

Well, yeah, yeah.
Next page. I now turn to Ron Wilson and I take it, sir, I'm not asking you to rank witnesses in terms of importance, but Mr. Wilson would have been a key witness for the Crown?

Yes, he would.
And again we see reference to statements 78 and 93. If we could call up -- and those are, the first statement being the March -- yeah, the March $3 r d$ statement to Riddell and 93 are the two statements of May 23 and May 24. If we could call up 006709 , and $I$ take it, Mr. Caldwell, you would
have, when you got the file or in your preparations, you would have read what the key witnesses had to say to the police?

A

Q

A
Q
A
$Q$

A
Well, that, Mr. Hodson, was not an unheard of situation in criminal cases in general. I think quite frequently people tended to tell untruths and eventually change that to what in some cases was the truth.
$Q$
A
Q
So had you encountered this before with witnesses?
Oh, I think so. Yes, undoubtedly.
And what about -- did you ever take a look at this with a view of saying, okay, well, when Wilson is on the stand, defence counsel may in fact cross-examine him on this point?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q

A

Well, I would have -- that would certainly be open to defence counsel.

And is that something that you would consider and say how does the witness explain that or how do I deal with that in front of the jury?

Well, I would have taken the position that $I$, in effect, believed Wilson's second statement, call him with the expectation that he would give that evidence, and what became of him in cross-examination was, remained to be determined.

I mean, he could have collapsed, he could have hung in very well.

And are you telling us that that's something that Mr. Wilson would have to deal with, the fact that he gave an earlier inconsistency?

Well, in the final analysis it would be $I$ would say.

Would you look at the first statement with a view to saying in assessing -- let me back up. You obviously would have looked at the two statements; correct?

Yes, right.
Or the two sets of statements. And you decided or your view was the second one was truthful?

That's correct.

A

Q
A
Q

Did you ever look at it saying, with the view of saying, well, maybe the first one is truthful and the second one is not?

And can you tell us just generally, did you in your mind come to some rationale as to why Mr. Wilson would have initially denied witnessing or hearing anything and then later incriminating Mr. Milgaard?

Well, there was an element of fear on his part, of Mr. Milgaard as there was with some other witnesses, that could be one factor. He possibly was afraid he might be charged at the end of the evidence based on what he said. I don't know. There would be factors. I don't know what -And again, and let's just go back to Nichol John and the same situation, did you in your mind try and rationalize why she would first deny seeing or hearing anything and then later giving an incriminating statement?

A
$Q$
A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$
A

Well, I knew that had happened. I don't know if we mentioned this, but $I$-- during one of my interviews of Nichol John she ran out of my office in the court house based -- and $I$ was certain that she was fearful of Mr. Milgaard.

Okay.
From what she told me and her actions.
Okay. Was that something in your mind, Mr.
Caldwell, at the time, that explained in part to
you why her statements might have differed from the first to the second?

Well, it would as a reluctance to come out with what I believed was a true account.

So again if we could just go back to Mr. Wilson.
So this is his first statement, if we could go to page 006712 , and did you know of Inspector Riddell at the time of the RCMP?

I knew of him. I don't feel I ever met him for some reason.

And he would have been a senior officer with the RCMP; is that fair?

Yeah, he was an inspector, and $I$ think he was in charge of what's called CIB in Regina. Ah --

Go ahead if you want to --
Yeah, I think --

Q -- if you are going to get your water.

A

Q

So my understanding, sir, is that he would have been at Regina subdivision, the sort of head office of the RCMP, as a CIB officer.

And so here's Mr. Wilson's first statement, we've been through this many times, I'll just go to the, these two points. In his first statement he says:
"I never knew of Dave to have a knife.
I am convinced that Dave Milgaard never
left our company during the morning we were in Saskatoon."

And then at the bottom:
"All during this trip there was never any mention about the murder of a girl
in Saskatoon. In fact, I didn't even
know about this murder until the police
told me today."
And then if we can call up 009231, and you'll see at the top this is your page 5 of statement number 78, that's your handwriting?

That's right.
And 78, the one before, was the March 3rd statement $I$ just read to you about Mr. Wilson, and these are Mr. Riddell's notes that he took, we believe, at or about the time of taking the
statement. If we can scroll down to number 5, Inspector Riddell says:
"During the interview with Wilson, he appeared straightforward with nothing to hide. He was not sure of the exact times --"

Etcetera, and again, Mr. Caldwell, is this something -- presumably you would have read it at the time back when you were preparing the case? Well, I assume $I$ read that summary as well as the Wilson statement.

And again can you tell us, the fact that Inspector Riddell would have given his assessment after interviewing Wilson that he appeared straightforward with nothing to hide, did that play any part in your assessment of the case or of Mr. Wilson's evidence?

Well, I concluded that in my view the statements certainly given by Wilson, if not John, and if not Milgaard, were -- couldn't be reconciled with what were the known facts, so I, in that sense, Mr. Hodson, $I$ wouldn't place, what did you ask me, much strength in it or -- I wouldn't -- because I don't think it was true is what I'm saying.

And so is it fair to say that in light of what you
subsequently learned, your view was that
Mr. Wilson was not straightforward with nothing to hide?

A

A

Q

At that point he certainly -- that's correct, he certainly wasn't.

If we can go back to 105608 , and again this is just a summary of Mr. Wilson's evidence, and we'll go through this, this is what the police summarize, and they talk about:
"- having acid on his clothing and changed clothes at his home late Jan. $30 t h . ~ o r ~ e a r l y ~ J a n . ~ 31 s t . ~$

- Milgaard did not change clothes."

Do you remember there being an issue, Mr.
Caldwell, about whether or not Mr. Wilson and Mr.
Milgaard changed clothes in Regina the night before the murder or --

I don't know that it was an issue. It seems to me that we went into that and $I$ think eventually some pants were tested as to whether or not they had acid damage. There were various pairs of pants appeared as you know, sir, as time went on. Was there some suggestion that if Mr. Milgaard had changed his pants the night before the murder because of acid on them, that there would be no
need to change his pants the next morning at Cadrains' house unless there was blood on them?

A

Q I suppose one could argue that.

And that in fact if Mr. Milgaard had not changed his pants in Regina, then the morning of the murder one of the reasons he changed his pants is because they had acid on them rather than blood, I think those were the two competing theories, if $I$ can call it that. Do you recall that?

Well, not in so many words, but $I$ can understand that that would be arguable, if you want.

Okay. And we'll see this when we went into Shirley Wilson's evidence, I think Mrs. Wilson -Mr. Tallis asked her to come to the prelim and you called her; is that right?

I believe that's right.
We'll touch on that a bit later.
All right.
If we can scroll down, and again we see the evidence about the elevator and $I$ note that the flashlight was recovered. Would that -- again, anything change with your assessment of the elevator incident now that the flashlight was turned over that was taken from there?

Where did it surface, do we know that?

## 


$Q$

A

Q

A
Q

A
Q

A
Q

I believe the evidence indicates that Ron Wilson had the flashlight and gave it to Detective Mackie and the elevator agent identified it as being one taken from the elevator.

Well, I suppose that would, in a small way, corroborate that it had happened, but $I$ wouldn't put much weight on it. I don't know, is that what you are asking, sir?

Yes.
Okay.
And then:
"- enroute to Saskatoon observed
Milgaard in possession of a knife which he can identify, exhibits $H$ and $N$, as being same kind."

H and N are the handle and the blade?

Okay.
Again, the same view as you held with Miss John, the fact that Mr. Wilson could identify the knife was significant?

I wouldn't think so.
And then scroll down:
"- enroute to Saskatoon they discussed breaking and entering, rolling someone or purse snatching for money."

Did you have thoughts at the time, Mr. Caldwell, as to whether Mr. Wilson may have been involved with Mr. Milgaard in the snatching of purses or breaking and entering?

A
summarize Wilson as spoke to a girl for directions, became stuck making a U-turn:
"- location believed to be 200 blk. Ave. N south."

And I think at this stage the statements of
Mr. Wilson reflect that they became stuck in the vicinity of where, $I$ think the words were of where he was driven around.

A
Q Where he which, sir?

I think Mr. Wilson's statement at the time to the police was not specific as to exactly here's where
we got stuck, but in this vicinity, and at trial
he ended up testifying, $I$ think he put the $S$ mark on the map as to saying here's where we got stuck.

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A Oh, okay.

And I'm wondering at this time what you made of Mr. Wilson's statements or evidence that lookit, this is where $I$ think we got stuck.

Well, what -- that one sentence "became stuck making a U-turn, location believed to be 200 blk.

Ave. N south," on the face of it, sir, matches what my view of the evidence was as I then knew it. In other words, I felt it happened there essentially.

Okay. Now, at the trial, and $I$ will take you to this a bit later, $I$ believe in your opening address to the jury and as well probably in your closing address, identified that some -discrepancies may be too strong a word -- but the fact that $W i l s o n$ and John were saying they got stuck not in exactly the same spot. Do you remember that?

I may well have.
And again, is that something that it is what it is?

I don't think one could improve on that by
pressing, leading your own witness and trying to change it. I felt, Mr. Hodson, that both those were, if you will, legitimate views of what had happened on the part of each of them, as to the getting stuck in the location that is.

Okay. And then if we can scroll down, it says: "- on returning to the car, John was was in the car and hysterical --"

And again keep in mind this is a summary of what Mr. Wilson said, "John told of seeing Milgaard take a girl into the lane and stab her with a knife."

And so here Ron Wilson, and this is in his statement as well, he's saying that when he got back to the car Nichol John was hysterical and Nichol John told him at that time that she saw Milgaard take a girl into the lane and stab her with a knife, and do you recall a bit earlier when $I$ went through the police note where the police said that they think Wilson knew more than he was saying and they think he knew at the time about the murder?

A
Uh-huh.
It would appear here that $W i l s o n$ is saying oh,
yes, I knew -- I knew about the murder right then because Nichol -- or $I$ knew then that Nichol John claimed to have seen David Milgaard stab a girl; correct?

A
Yes, the -- told --
"- John told of seeing Milgaard taking a girl into the lane and stab her with a knife.

- Milgaard returned to the car, kind of running and breathing heavily."

And saying "I got her" or "I fixed her" could be taken as Wilson reciting what John told him there, which would be all or part of a murder $I$ would assume.

Q Right. So a part of the body of evidence at the time you received the case from the police, and the summary states this and this is reflected in the statements --

A
Uh-huh.
-- we have Nichol John saying that, and $I$ just referred to this on the previous page, that when Wilson got back to the car she can't recall saying anything to Mr. Wilson; right? That was in her statement?

A Ah -- uh-huh.

And she does say in Calgary, I believe she says in Calgary Ron Wilson told her -- just hang on a minute. Let me go ahead to Mr. Wilson. And then Mr. Wilson says two things in his statement; one, he says that in Calgary the next day or after the day of the murder he told Nichol John about David Milgaard admitting that he stabbed a girl. Do you remember that part of the evidence?

I do, yeah.
So Mr. Wilson said to Mr. Roberts and in his statement, when $I$ got to Calgary David told me that he grabbed a girl, jabbed her with a knife, put a purse in a garbage can.

Uh-huh.
Wilson then says and I told Nichol John that and Nichol told me she already knew.

A
Yeah.
And the fact that here we have Ron Wilson saying that, at or about the time of the murder Nichol John told him that she had just witnessed a murder, or witnessed a stabbing, did you ever look at that and say, okay, how could, or why would Ron Wilson tell Nichol in Calgary that David had stabbed a girl when the day before, according to Ron Wilson, Nichol had already told him? In other
words, the way that Mr. Wilson knew was from Nichol John. Do you follow --

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A sort. It may be -- those may be both true memories by each of them and the difference
clearly is who knew what when as $I$ would see it, so I'm not sure that I --

Well let's just take -- forget Nichol John for a moment, let's just take Ron Wilson's statement on its own.

Uh-huh.
In one breath he says I knew about the murder that morning -- $I$ knew about the stabbing, let's talk about a stabbing.

Uh-huh.
I knew about the stabbing right when it happened, when $I$ got back to the car Nichol John told me, she told me she saw David grab a girl and stab her. The next breath he says in Calgary David Milgaard told me that he stabbed a girl or jabbed a girl --

Uh-huh.
-- and took her purse. I then went and I told Nickey and Nickey told me she already knew, and I'm not sure if anybody asked Mr. Wilson, well, why did you go tell her when you knew, Mr. Wilson, that she must have known because she told you that.

A
I wouldn't think I asked him that, Mr. Hodson, or got an answer to it. You know, in the best of all
worlds it should be one or the other and $I$ think this was a fairly unusual factual situation that --
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$
A

## ,

And so that -- I'm sorry?
No, that they were going through.
I'm wondering, though, if that would have caused you to look at Mr. Wilson's statement and say, okay, this doesn't make sense, how can he be, on the one hand, saying he was told by Nichol and the next day telling her.

Was this post polygraph?
Yes, it was.
Okay. Well, the -- Wilson, as we know, was the only person who was tested by Inspector Roberts as I recall and at the end of that Inspector Roberts I think came to an opinion as to what Wilson had said that was and was not truthful. Now, what -Wilson, as $I$ recall, then gave a so-called, the second statement as $I$ recall. That's the state of affairs that $I$ believe to be correct and $I$ don't think $I$ went to him and said what you've just explained, if $A, B, C, h o w ~ c o m e ~ y o u ~ h a d ~ t o ~ d o ~$ that.

And is that something that you would expect then to unfold at trial?
,

A

A

Q

A
$Q$

Well, I would -- I think that's all that would be left because $I$ think it had been explored with Wilson, there would be -- we had the assistance of a polygraph operator saying this is what $I$ believe he believes to be true, that was, you know, given to me in the form of a statement, and $I$ don't know where $I$ could go from there. Rather than having at that point faith that that was the true account, $I$ would simply call him at the trial would be my response.

And if we can scroll down:
"In approx. 15 minutes Milgaard returned to the car, kind of running and breathing heavily."

And again, if we can pause there, this would be the police summary of Mr. Wilson's information at the time, that Mr. Milgaard was away from the car for approximately 15 minutes?

Well, only to the extent of calling what evidence we had about it, which is what $I$ think we're looking at here.

And was that -- was that an important piece of
Do you recall dealing with that issue, about how long Mr. Milgaard was away from the car?

evidence, the time that he was away?

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
$Q$

A

Well, arguably 15 minutes would, you know, couldn't give time for the things that we believed to happen did happen. I don't know how much further you could go in trying to nail down 15 minutes.

But let me just -- for example, that if it was two minutes, if the evidence that you had was that Mr . Milgaard was away from the car for two minutes, would it be fair to say, well, that -- and that's believable --

Yeah.
-- that that would not be enough time to commit the offence?

I would think that's so.
And so the time within -- or the evidence before the jury as far as the time that Mr. Milgaard was away from the car would be an important part of the case?

I would think so, sir.
And then if we can just scroll down, again Milgaard said "I got her" or "I fixed her". I take that as an admission, would be viewed as an admission?

I would assume so.

And then here we talk about Marie Indyk again:
"There is evidence from Marie Indyk of a girl who comes running and stopping within 3-4 feet of her, then going north on Ave. O."

And it goes on to describe him as a ghost because she could not hear him walk and then talks about the evidence of Milgaard obtaining a map at the Trav-a-leer and not wearing shoes, and again $I$ think we touched on this yesterday, about Ms. Indyk. Do you have anything to add about that, Mr. Caldwell?

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A appeared to be blood on his trousers, what were
you --
Sorry, the question was according to Wilson, Wilson also says he saw blood on Milgaard's trousers. My question was, again $I$ take it that would be -- would that be corroboration then of

Mr. Cadrain's --
Well, I would think so.
And then as well Wilson describes that:
"- Milgaard took the compact and threw
it out the window."
Again, would that be the same value as Nichol
John's evidence about the compact?
Yeah, I would think so.
And then we have:
"- enroute to Calgary John screamed
several times for no apparent reason."
What significance if any did that have in the Crown theory?

A

Q
I don't know that $I$ assigned -- A, called the evidence, or $B$, assigned any value to it, but it could certainly be evidence that she was terrified by something that had happened shortly before.

And then we've got the Calgary incident where
Milgaard told him that he hit a girl, grabbed her purse, she fought, he jabbed her a few times with
the knife, put her purse in a trash can, that he thought she would be all right, and:
"- Wilson told John and she already knew."

So we just touched on that, that's -- again, I take it that Mr. Wilson's evidence about what Mr. Milgaard told him in Calgary would be a significant piece of evidence to the Crown? I would certainly think so.

Then if we can scroll down, and here's another police note, it says:
"Wilson at first told police he knew nothing of this offence however has since told the story as set out in the brief. There still remains areas, especially at time of actual offence, which seem in doubt as far as Wilson is concerned."

Are you able to tell us what that meant or what meaning you put on that?

A
Well, one meaning could be that the length of time Milgaard was away from the car would fit into that definition if you ask me, which seem in doubt as far as Wilson is concerned. I can't -- that would be the obvious one that would spring out to me,

A
sir.
So when you have the note from the police saying 'there is still areas that seem in doubt', as the prosecutor, what would you do to try and nail down, if $I$ can call it that, with Mr. Wilson any uncertainty that he might have?

Well, again, if -- this being post-polygraph and post-statement too, I would think that $I$ wouldn't be thinking in terms of approaching Mr. Wilson and quizzing him about that.

Why not?
Because $I$ felt, at that time, I had -- he was telling the truth as he perceived it.

Okay. But the police are putting in this note that -- a couple things; (1) they are not sure that Wilson is telling the police everything; -Well that --
-- (2) that he may know more about the morning of the murder than he is letting on; (3) that he may be covering because he played a part in it; and (4) there still remains areas, especially at the time of the actual offence, which seemed in doubt as far as Wilson is concerned. And I think what the police note here is saying Wilson's -- there is some things that $W i l s o n$ is doubting. Is that a
fair read of that?

A
$Q$

What would be your practice, sir, at the time, about interviewing Crown witnesses before the prelim?

A Well in the case of the three, Wilson -- pardon me -- John and Cadrain, who I believe the file effect.
shows that, in any event, I'm sure I had a police officer there with me during the interview, $I$ think there are notes to that effect, and I'm sure that would have happened simply to pre -- you know, to prevent, again, accusations later on "that's not what $I$ told you, I denied it", etcetera. So that $I$ did invariably.

Now I also spoke to witnesses to
the general effect that "when you are testifying, if you are not sure of something say so, if you don't know something say so, if you are sure of something $I$ suggest you stick with it unless it clearly has to be changed for other -- for factual reasons". So I'm sure $I$ gave that admonition to all of them, certainly for the trial, if not -and $I$ suspect for the prelim.

And again just generally, when -- let's take Ron Wilson, for example, and $I$ take it you don't recall what you specifically asked him or talked to him about, --

That's right.
-- is that fair, in preparation?
No, that's right.
What, based on your practice, what would you -what would you go through with him other -- and
you've talked to us about what you would tell him about his evidence or your --

A
$Q$
A

Q
A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A

Q I see.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Which statement are you referring to?

BY MR. HODSON:

Q

A

Q
A
Q
A
Q
A
$Q$

A
Q
A
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A
Q
A
$Q$

I was going to ask him that. Now which statement would you have referred Mr. Wilson to?

Well I think the first, not the Riddell
statement, --
Right.
-- but the first of the --
The police?
-- yeah, the first of the two police statements.
The post-polygraph statements?
That's -- that's right.
And so do you think you would have shown him the Riddell statement at all?

I don't think so.
And why not?
Because $I$ didn't think it was anywhere near correct.

Okay. So you would take his post-polygraph statement or statements, there was two of them, there was the follow-up one; do you think you would have shown him that one as well?

Umm, --
He -- and let me just help you out.
Yeah.
He gave a statement on May $23 r d$, after the polygraph, and then the next morning he added a
paragraph or two, $I$ think, to his May 23rd statement.

A
Q
A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
$Q$
A

Q

A

Q
2
Now we've heard some evidence or seen references to Mr. Wilson suggesting that, in different ways and in different times, that you told him or encouraged him to stretch the time that Mr. Milgaard was away from the vehicle. We've heard that allegation or that evidence before; is that fair?

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
And so the three, the comments about the three, I think you said if you are unsure, and you are sure, or if you don't know; those are the three? Yes. If you are sure, $I$ guess beginning with "if you are not sure of something say so, then if you don't know something", was an important category, "say so", and in the third place "if you are sure of something you should by and large stick with that".

That's right.
Did you encourage or tell Mr. Wilson to stretch the time that Mr. Milgaard was away from the vehicle?

No, absolutely not.
Are you -- do you have a recollection of talking to -- with him about the time that he was away from the vehicle, Mr. Milgaard?

I don't, Mr. Hodson, at this point. I'm satisfied

I talked to him --
What would have been your practice at the time as far as dealing with a witness on that type of subject if an issue came up about the time? Well you would simply say "lookit, whatever you remember is what you are -- I want you to say in this thing". That may or may not be what's in the statement, all things being equal it would be, but I wouldn't encourage anybody to alter that in that manner.

And when you interview a witness for trial would you then also have an interview or would you use the preliminary hearing transcripts?

I would think so.
And $I$ believe there's reference on the file where you in fact obtained copies, and did you in fact provide the transcript to witnesses to read?

Yes, it -- all the prelim witnesses received that evidence for them to read to themselves.

What would be your practice, at the time, about dealing with a witness where the witness may have given inconsistent information, let's say between a statement and the preliminary hearing evidence? How would you, again for trial, how -- what would be your practice in dealing with that witness?

A
Well, in that sort of special category, you would -- I would assume $I$ would have his original statement, and then $I$ would have the prelim evidence that he gave, and go through it and say "look, how come in $A$ you did -- you said this, and in $B$ you said this", and attempt to come to what he felt was truthful, and then attempt to have that, you know, examined in chief at the trial. Okay. If we can just go down. And then again, I won't go through all of these witnesses, Mr. Pratt is the elevator agent, here we have Mrs. Indyk that the police have put in and refers to statements and page numbers, and if we can just go to the next page. And just for the record, Mr. Caldwell, Ms. Indyk, I don't believe, was called at the trial, $I$ believe she testified at the prelim.

A
$Q$ Okay. I was hoping -- I think this is the -- this is --

This is the lady near the church, and what it says is:
"Observed a female approaching. (police believe this could have been John)", then it goes on, described her:
"- she appeared to be frightened.

- she turned and walked north on Ave.
O.",
and then:
"Observed a male walking north on Ave. O
also."
- describes male's walk as that of a ghost as she could hear no steps, whereas the girl's steps were crisp and sharp in the cold snow.

Could this have been Milgaard with no shoes?"

And, again, I take it the police are raising that as a question, saying maybe that's who she encountered, and then that she may be able to identify the coat, and:
"May be able to identify female as John."

And $I$ believe the police, in fact, got Nichol John's coat to try and --

A

Well, no, but I'm sure that happened if you say so.

And we'll touch on Mrs. Indyk again, it's dealt with in your notes. We go to Mr. Diewold, and
here was the fellow, he was the church caretaker and he testified at trial, and $I$ note here that there is no statement taken from this witness but reference is made to pages in two police reports, and I think those police reports -- we don't need to go to them -- but the police reports is where the police record the information that Mr. Diewold provided.

All right.
And I take it there were occasions, Mr. Caldwell, where the witness information was captured by the police in an investigation report rather than in a witness statement?

I, that would be a good example, I would -frankly wasn't aware of that but $I$ understand that.

And, again, Mr. Diewold said they opened the church at approximately 7:00 a.m., and you know where this church, this church is really facing the east-west alley between Avenue $N$ and $O$; correct?

I'm not -- it's -- I believe that's right, and it's $I$ believe on Avenue O, if I'm not mistaken. Yeah.

It's on Avenue $O$, and $I$ think where Mr. Diewold
was looking down the alley would be, if Nichol John said their vehicle was stuck behind the funeral home in the entrance to that alley, --Uh-huh.
-- that's where Mr. Diewold would be looking? Should be right in his line of sight, assuming he could see through the fog etcetera, but -Right. And so what he says, he:
"Observed an auto in the north lane, 1400 blk. 20th. St. west in vicinity of Westwood Funeral Chapel."

I maybe got my directions wrong. In any event, I'm sorry:
"- auto was facing west in east-west lane".

So that would be a car entering the lane from
Avenue N facing Avenue O ; --
A

Q
As I read that, it would.
-- is that correct? And that:
"- headlights were on

- was still there approx. 7:10 a.m.
- someone passed infront of the auto." And $I$ take it that would be an important piece of evidence, again, on the basis of that's the location where the body was found; correct?

A
$Q$

A

Q
A
Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q 2

It's, yeah, it's immediately, to my way of thinking, south of where the body was -Yes.
-- X number of yards --
Yes.
-- in the north-south lane.
And, secondly, he is looking down the lane where another witness, Nichol John, said their vehicle is stuck; is that --

As $I$ understand it.
And, thirdly, the time that he sees it is
important; is that fair?
Well I would assume so.
Yeah. That, again, the time that he was looking down there would be important whether it fit or didn't fit with other known facts?

Yeah, I would think.
And then, as well, he talks about:
"-- A lady came in the church."
And you will see the police:
"Note - this is general area Wilson and John claim they became stuck."
"- The car would be approx. one block east of the location Diewold would be observing it from."

And I think that's what you told us; is that right?

A
$Q$
That's my understanding.
Okay. This is probably a good spot to break.
(Adjourned at 10:29 a.m.)
(Reconvened at 10:50 a.m.)
BY MR. HODSON:
Just go back to 105614 , is the page number, we'll just finish have up this police summary. Again, I don't propose to go through them, Mr. Caldwell. This is the information on the Danchuks, and $I$ think you told us yesterday that -- and please correct me if I'm wrong -- that you called them as witnesses, and basically to say that they saw Mr. Milgaard after the time of the murder and didn't notice anything unusual, or didn't notice any blood; is that fair?

I think that was their evidence, sir.
Next page, please. And Campbell, McQuhae, and we'll see a few others, the tow truck drivers, and I think the police evidence there was a couple things; that they suggested that Mr. Milgaard may have been in a hurry, and secondly, the fact about cleaning out the car; do you remember that?

A

```
I -- yes.
```

And, again, would it -- would the cleaning out of the car, was that significant to the Crown's theory?

A

Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
A
Q

A
$Q$
-- or to a criminal offence; is that fair?
I think that's right.
If we go down to the bottom we see Albert Henry Cadrain, and $I$ think you would agree that, in addition to Mr. Wilson and Ms. John, that Cadrain was a key witness at the trial?

Right, that's correct.
And, again, we see a summary of what Cadrain has to say, that:
"- Milgaard stated that they had to
leave town right away.

- Milgaard seemed excited."

Again, you've talked about that, that would fit
in with the theory that he was trying to get away from something; is that fair?

A

Q

Well I would simply -- this is what Cadrain says he saw, I presume Nichol John's statement covered that same time frame, and I can't -- I can't think why they were -- what's wrong with it, in a word, except for the modesty factor I guess.

If we could scroll down, please. Again, Cadrain talks here, on the trip to Calgary:
"- Milgaard faked car trouble infront of
a transport truck on the highway, talked
to driver and gave packages from trunk
of car to driver."

What did you make of that?
I didn't, Mr. Hodson, I'm not -- I assume that went into evidence?

I believe it did.
But if it did I, I couldn't put any, any significance on it.

If you could scroll down. It also says, and this
is under Cadrain and I'm assuming this is
Cadrain's version of events, that:
"Wilson and John seemed frightened of Milgaard."

Was that your, do you recall, was that your assessment of these witnesses?

That's right.
And what about Cadrain; did you ever determine whether he was afraid of Mr. Milgaard?

Well, I don't think in the same sense. I'm sure he was, you know, cautious of him, but he joined this trip, of course, after the crew had arrived in Saskatoon, and went on from there.

What caused you to think that Mr. Wilson and Ms. John were afraid of Mr. Milgaard?

Well their actions at times when $I$ interviewed them, the -- in the case of Nichol John, the way she performed in the examination-in-chief in the
trial, among other things.
And --
I'm sure they made it clear that they, you know, were afraid of him.

And that was your assessment at the time?
It was, yeah.
If we can go to the next page, please. And here we have Mr. Davis and just, here's the reference to wanting to clean out the car, and again $I$ think you've touched on that. If we can then go to page -- I don't propose to go through this, if we can go to page 60 -- or pardon me -- 620. And it looks down here, with Officer Kleiv, that Mr. Ullrich has put together the exhibits on the next page. So the police would gather up the physical evidence and assign an exhibit letter to it, and say 'here's what we think you need'; is that correct?

That's basically -- that's right.
And can we just talk briefly about, we see this mentioned down at the bottom on $a$ number of these police officers who were called as witnesses, the issue of continuity, which $I$ think we're probably all familiar with, but if you could just briefly tell us, back in 1969, what you needed to do with
police officers as far as continuity so we can get it on the record?

A
Well we, we manufactured a, what amounts to a two-page chart that had a hinge down it made of tape, which I'm sure is on the -- in -- on the material, which started on the left edge with Item, Where Found, Who Found By, the Date, and everyone who handled it, Mr. Hodson, thereon was recited.

Let me just -- maybe $I$ can just put it to you this way. Did you as prosecutor, if you were putting in a piece of physical evidence, have to call every person who had possession or control of that physical evidence from the time it was recovered until it was presented in Court to establish continuity?

A
That, that was the point of departure, but you
could -- quite often counsel would agree to omit a
number of those things --
Right.
-- when they were satisfied.
So, and I don't wish to go through this because I
don't think there's any issues about
continuity, --

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
-- but I take it a fair bit of your time as
prosecutor would be to ensure that you called all
of the police and other witnesses to establish,
for example, the wallet, --
Yeah.
-- person who found it, and gave it to Mackie, who
gave it to Kleiv, who gave it back to Mackie?
Uh-huh.
That was part of your job, as prosecutor, to prove
that?
That's right.
Right. If we can go to page -- next page, please.
We see here with Dr. Emson, who was the
pathologist; prior to the David Milgaard
prosecution had you worked with Dr. Emson before?
I must have, umm, because $I$ came here in 1962 and
he -- he was around, certainly, at the time of
this.
Okay. And if we can go to 105624 , please. And $I$
note in these summaries that the police officers,
essentially their evidence, and we'll see that at
the preliminary hearing and trial, essentially the
evidence of the police officers was the handling
of physical evidence; is that fair?
You mean the identification officers?

No, and for example Mr. Karst and Mr. Mackie, I think their evidence was primarily related to physical exhibits; is that fair?

I assume so.

Okay.
Along with whatever testimony they had to give other than that.

Okay. But, normally, would a police investigator have much evidence, direct evidence?

Well --
Let me rephrase it this way. I mean, you wouldn't call a police officer to say "tell me what Shorty Cadrain told you, tell me what Nichol John told you, tell me what Wilson told you", you would put that in through other people?

Through those three witnesses initially.
Yes.
And then, by and large, you couldn't do that other thing, Mr. Hodson.

Right.
In other words, you would call the three witnesses, and $I$ don't know of any way in which you could then say "tell me what Cadrain, etcetera, told to policemen".

Right. No, and I'm not suggesting you could, I'm
just trying to establish that a number of police officers were called at the preliminary hearing and trial, but primarily to deal with the handing of physical exhibits?

A

A
$Q$

A

Q
A

Q
I would think so.
Yeah. And then, if we can go to Detective Karst, there is reference here to a statement that he took from Mr. Milgaard; do you remember reading Mr. Milgaard's statement that he gave to the police?

Umm, I undoubtedly did.
And do you recall whether you had made any impressions about that statement as far as your assessment of the case against him?

Well, I don't recall the details now, I don't -at that time $I$ didn't believe it represented an accurate account of what had happened.

And why was that?
Well I'd have to see it, sir, versus the evidence that $I$ knew about then.

Well I think, and if $I$ can summarize it, it's a lengthy statement, but he indicated he was in Saskatoon and, $I$ think, did -- although he wasn't specifically asked in the first statement, he was, in a later statement he denied being involved, but
just recounted his activities that morning, acknowledged he was driving around in back alleys.

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
A

Q

A
$Q$
A
2
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Uh-huh.

Again, do you have a recollection of what effect, if any, Mr. Milgaard's statements had in your assessment of the case against him?

Well I wouldn't think $I$ could use them against him, put that way, because they were not admissions and they -- one or both of them trailed off at the end, it seems to me, into sketches and --

Yes.
-- things like that?
Okay.
And so, unless $I$ wanted to put them into the Crown's case as admissions if -- which then would have to be proven in the usual fashion.

Yeah. And $I$ think we can correctly state that neither statement contained any admission of responsibility --

Oh, I would be -- yeah.
-- for the offence?
I'm sure that's right.
And let's assume, well, they are a denial statement. says:
"The following are not listed as witnesses. If required, please advise." And then it goes on to list a number of people. Can you tell us what would the -- would Mr. Ullrich initially indicate who he thought would need to be witnesses, and 'here are some other people you might want to call', or explain that?

A
Yeah.
And my question is in, not as to whether you would put it in as evidence, but in assessing the Crown's case and factoring everything into the mix, what, if any, significance did you place on Mr. Milgaard's statements to the police?

Well I -- I -- I would have to have a case, you know, without them, if $I$ may put it that way, so I wouldn't think that they'd -- they would have much effect on my views.

And so, the fact that he denied involvement and went through explaining his version of the morning, would it be fair to say that you believed Mr. Wilson and Ms. John's version of events? I would think so.

If we go to page 627, and here's a category, it I think that's how it worked, exactly.

And the decision to call a witness would be your decision; is that fair?

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q
BY MR. HODSON:
Yeah, he testified at the preliminary inquiry but not at the trial.

A
Yeah, what -- I could add to his list, subtract
from it, add people from this list or from the
police force at large as time went on.
Okay. And we have Simon Doell, we see here, who
talks about Gail Miller getting on the bus at
Avenue N. Was that an important part or a part
of, again, the Crown's theory?
I don't know at this point, Mr. Hodson, was he
called? That's something I don't know.
I believe so. I stand to be corrected. Mr.
Doell, I don't think, was -- I don't think
testified at trial? I can check that.
Umm, --
But --
All right.
MS. KNOX: He did testify at the
preliminary inquiry but $I$ don't think he
testified --
MR. ELSON: Not at the trial.
BY MR. HODSON:
That, if you would like to check it, I can go back
to it.
Yeah. No, I'm just wondering if -- do you have a recollection, today, of any role his evidence played?

I don't, sir.
And then, down at the bottom, Celine Cadrain. It says:
"- was present at residence Jan. 31 st.
when Milgaard and other came to her residence.

- can corroborate evidence of her brother Albert, who is listed as a witness."

And if we look at Celine Cadrain's statement, she talks about the events that morning, but in her statement she says that she did not see blood on Mr. Milgaard's clothing. And I think, in fairness, I think she may have seen Mr. Milgaard after he had changed clothes, or there was a suggestion that that may have been the case. Uh-huh.

Do you recall where or how Celine Cadrain's statement fit in, if at all, to the Crown's theory?

A
Well, number 1, was she called?

Q
A
$Q$

A

Q
A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
$Q$

No.
Okay. Well then $I$ would have read the statement and presumably didn't think she should be called. I don't know, at this point, why that was. Again, the fact that she did not -- that she observed Mr. Milgaard at Cadrain's house yet didn't see blood, do you recall that being a significant fact?

I don't at the moment, but $I$ get -- apparently there is a suggestion that there may have been at -- two different times that we're talking about here?

I believe that that suggestion has been made, yes. Well $I$ can't tell you, sir, more than that -Okay.
-- unless we pursue it in more detail. I'm happy to do that.

If we can go to 006301 . And this is a document, you can't see it very well, just call out at the top Statements Taken on the Gail Miller Case, and then it lists the name of the statements, the number which corresponds with the police number on the statement, address, and a brief summary. Uh-huh.

Would this be an index of the statements that the
city police gave you?
A
Q

A
Q

A

Q

A Oh, I see, okay.
-- what that means is that, initially, you would have got only those witness statements listed in the summary?

I can't say that offhand, Mr. Hodson. I assume I may have got them all, but they would be differentiated by the method you just mentioned of X's.

Call up 009431, I'll just identify a couple of documents here. This "Re: List of exhibits \& continuity," is this something the police would have prepared to let you know who had what and when, the continuity?

Yeah, I've noted, "Re exhibits Kleiv has handled only." In other words, this evidently refers only to ones that he handled. I don't know when that typing document was compiled. I assume it came to us in that form.

Q

A
$Q$

A
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A
$Q$

A

Q
A
$Q$完

Okay. If we could call up 006674 , and $I$ think this is the exhibit board you talked about. Okay.

And that's a document $I$ think you used at trial to -- I'll just call out the top part -- to talk about the description of the item, location and who had it, and we see over here continuity?

That's right, and as you know, there's a second page.

Yeah, there's a number of pages.
Yeah, that's what it was.
I don't think we need to go through them. This is
a document from your file that's --
Yeah, it's one that was not an exhibit, I
discovered it was for our own use.
Yes.
And fortunately it survived.
Yeah. We're done with that document. So I've gone through, Mr. Caldwell, what the police gave you initially, and that was the police summary, the witness summary and I think you've said that you would have received the witness statements referred to in the witness summary, ultimately you received them all?

Uh-huh.

Q
A
$Q$

A
Q

A
Q

A

Correct?
That would be my memory.
And secondly, you would have received the police reports that were referenced in the witness summary; correct?

Yes.
And so you would have read through all that presumably to -- fairly early on, would that be -I would think essentially when they arrived. And then if we can just maybe go back and summarize what at this time, going into the preliminary hearing, would be the key evidence, and let me just go through and outline this, I think we've covered all this. Number 1, Albert Cadrain seeing blood on Mr. Milgaard and as well as evidence that Mr. Milgaard was in a hurry, that he threw the compact out the window and that he asked Cadrain to get a gun to kill --

Mr. Hodson, is this something $I$ wrote or are you just --

No. Well, I just went through this -- I just want to go through, Mr. Caldwell, and again at this time, this is what Mr. Cadrain's version of events was.

All right.
$Q$

A
Q

A
Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
Q

I just went through the summary for these people. So Mr. Cadrain, you would agree, had evidence that was incriminating against Mr. Milgaard; is that fair?

Uh-huh, right.
And Nichol John was, had given a statement saying she had witnessed the murder; correct?

That's correct.
And Mr. Wilson had given evidence, or given a statement, pardon me, that Milgaard had admitted to him that he stabbed a girl?

Yes.
And that Wilson had heard Nichol John tell him when he got back in the car that Mr. Milgaard had stabbed a girl?

Yes.
And you had Mr. Milgaard who had given a couple of statements denying any involvement?

Yes.
If we can just talk about the physical evidence at
the time. Would it be correct to say that --
well, let's put aside the frozen lumps of snow and the blood issue for a moment --

All right.
-- putting that aside, I believe the record
suggests that there was no other physical evidence that linked David Milgaard to Gail Miller; is that fair?

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
2

Well, I assume that's correct, sir.
In other words, there was nothing -- and let's put aside the frozen lumps of snow for the moment. Uh-huh.

There was nothing at the murder scene or on Gail Miller's body that could be directly linked to David Milgaard by way of physical evidence. The knife, we've heard about the knife and the identification of the knife, but, for example, fibres or hairs or things of that nature. I assume that's correct.

And secondly, that in the Wilson vehicle and on Mr. Milgaard, when he was questioned, there was nothing sort of related to him, nothing on his clothing or in the vehicle that he was in that linked either the vehicle or him or his clothing to the Gail Miller murder scene; is that correct? That's Mr. Wilson you are talking about or -No, Mr. Milgaard. Mr. Milgaard. I assume that's right. Okay. So as far as the physical evidence -- and then the frozen lumps of snow, and we'll get into
that in a bit of detail, but the -- what was found
at the scene -- maybe you can just tell us what your understanding was of how the frozen lumps of snow that Mr. Penkala found were either evidence for or against or neutral with respect to Mr. Milgaard.

Well, Mr. Hodson, without actually reading all that, I --

Okay. We'll go through it. Maybe we'll just -what we've already heard is that the frozen lumps were identified as being human semen, human spermatozoa, and that it was identified to be from a person who was blood type $A$ and a secretor. Do you remember that?

I take that as --
And at the time the blood tests done on Mr. Milgaard showed that he was blood type $A$ and the test as to whether or not he secreted antigens into his bodily fluids when Mr. Paynter conducted that, he did not find any antigens and $I$ think his evidence before this Inquiry was that that didn't mean that Mr. Milgaard was a non-secretor, what it meant was that he didn't find any antigens in his bodily fluids. Some, at least in the documents at the time, termed that to be a non-secretor.

A Yeah. I believe that what he said at that time was that Mr. Milgaard was a non-secretor. I think all that more detailed evidence came along later. Yes.

And $I$ made a point of putting that into evidence with the knowledge that it pointed away from Mr. Milgaard.

Okay. And so -- and $I$ think we have seen evidence that much later on when Mr. Milgaard was tested, that in fact he is an A secretor, but that wasn't established at the time; is that fair?

A
$Q$
And that as well $I$ think, and we'll get into this, is that there was evidence called at the preliminary hearing and trial seeking to explain how an antigen from blood could find its way into semen if the donor was a non-secretor, and $I$ think if $I$ can summarize it, if Mr. Milgaard's blood got
into his semen, that that would explain why
antigens were found in a frozen lump of snow; is that a fair summary?

I take that to be right.
And if he had been known at the time to be an $A$ secretor, then the reasons his antigens might be in his semen is because he's a secretor; is that
fair?


A
$Q$

A

2

I assume so.
So apart from the blood issue then, I think that the physical evidence, and again $I$ think we talked about the knife being -- Mr. Wilson and Ms. John testified about the knife being seen in Mr.

Milgaard's possession, but no other physical
evidence; is that fair?
Ah, yeah, in the --
Physical evidence in the sense of maybe forensical. I'm not sure if that was used at the time. I'm talking fibres, blood, things of that nature.

I think you are right.
And then if we can go look at the evidence that was supportive, I guess, of the Crown theory that Mr. Milgaard had committed the crime, and to look at the other side of the coin for a moment, the fact that, and $I$ don't think you had any evidence, that you had a witness that could corroborate the story of Wilson and John, that they were in behind the funeral home; is that correct?

I think you are right, sir.
So in other words, that you had Wilson and John, their version was that they were there?

A Yeah.
Q
And yet Mr. Milgaard's statement saying they weren't there, but you didn't have any third party who could say $I$ saw their vehicle or $I$ saw them in the area; is that fair?

I think that's correct.
And then as far as the blood sighting we have, and we touched on this yesterday, the Danchuks, who said afterwards they saw Mr. Milgaard and noticed no blood and nothing unusual, that would be something that might be a factor in saying, well, that might suggest he didn't commit the crime; is that fair?

Yeah, it could be.
And Mr. Rasmussen at the Trav-a-leer Motel also observed Mr. Milgaard and saw no blood on him; correct?

A
$Q$ Same -- same reasoning there I assume.

Now let's talk about the time element to commit this offence given -- let me just sort of walk through and $I$ want to know sort of how you dealt with this and what you thought at the time. I think it was known that Gail Miller likely left her house at about 6:45 a.m., plus or minus five minutes?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

And the time frame $I$ think Rasmussen was shortly after seven and $I$ think his evidence at trial was as late as 7:30 a.m., so that would be an important time frame?

I would agree.
And then the Danchuks who said they saw the

Milgaards at about 7:40, so that would be after
the Trav-a-leer?
A
Q

A
I would agree.
And so did you consider, in assessing this case, whether it was, whether there was an issue as to whether or not, if Mr. Milgaard was the perpetrator, that he in fact could have done all these things to Gail Miller in that time frame? Implicitly I must have concluded that it was not out of the question I assume.

And you say that because otherwise you wouldn't have proceeded?

Well, there could be a decision, if $I$ viewed the time business that way, I could have been -- had, in effect, had to make that decision. I didn't do that obviously.

And was that an issue, and $I$ think we'll see that in the submissions to the jury, was that an issue that was raised by defence counsel?

I can't tell you in terms of cross-examination and so on.

Submissions to the jury?
I would assume it was.
And --
I haven't read Mr. Tallis' closing recently, sir.

Q

I believe there is reference made to the timing, so again $I{ }^{\prime} m$ just wondering from your -- would it be fair to say you were mindful of that, that the time frame was important, and would you go so far as to say may have been typed or --

Oh, yeah, I would, and subject, without repeating it to my, what I said yesterday, that $I$ found time and again that these times are not usually, you know, precisely measurable.

And then we talked yesterday about the coat and the stab marks, and $I$ don't want to go over that, but again $I$ think you said it was unusual and that the fact that if Nichol John saw David Milgaard stabbing the girl and those were the stab marks that went through the coat and in fact caused the death, that her uniform would have to be off before that could happen?

That would be my understanding.
And I think in fairness, Mr. Caldwell, and we'll see this in your jury, opening remarks to the jury, $I$ think your position to the jury was that the Crown could not explain that?

I think that's right.
So that was out there as something that was, couldn't be explained, and did you consider that
that might be something that was favourable to the accused; in other words, that might cast some doubt on whether or not what Ms. John said was true?

A
It could very well have done that.
We talked about the right hand, left hand, the
fact that Mr. Milgaard was left-handed and that
two things, I think Nichol John said she saw him
jabbing the girl with the knife in his right hand
and I think Dr. Emson's evidence was that the
wounds in Gail Miller's body were consistent with
an assailant who was right-handed?
Uh-huh.
You recall that?
I do.
And again, would that be something that you might
put on the other side of the ledger saying, well,
that might suggest that Mr. Milgaard may not have
done it?
Yes, yes.
What about -- I talked about timing. Did you ever
consider or think about -- the version of events
from Wilson and John were that they stopped Gail
Miller and $I$ think the Crown theory was walking
down Avenue $N$ ?
be what would have to happen. The jury might well have, who knows, disbelieved them based on that.

Okay. But again from your perspective, did you ever go back to Wilson and John or to the police and say lookit, how could -- how could Gail -Gail Miller would be at the bus stop by the time Mr. Milgaard left the vehicle on $20 t h$ Street, a busy street, this doesn't fit. Do you recall anything of that nature?

I don't. I don't recall me going back and putting that to the investigators.

Would you -- and again your practices at the time -- when you sat down and reviewed this case, do you think you would have got into those types of details, sort of challenging matters trying to get everything explained?

Well, $I$ guess internally in reading the thing myself I would consider all those things. I'm not sure if $I$ went beyond that to, in effect, bounce them off someone else, one of the investigators or whoever.

Q Did you -- and also, did you ever consider, and again at the time you were sort of reviewing the case and perhaps assessing Nichol John, that if she in fact saw Mr. Milgaard stab a girl, that she
then ended $u p$ going on a trip with him for the next three days, did you find that to be unusual?

A Well, unusual in the overall sense, but the evidence as it was in the case was that she got back in the car, $I$ think this was Wilson's evidence, that John was over as far as she could on the seat, in effect to get away from him, and if there wasn't evidence $I$ certainly -- I think there may be some evidence to the effect that she was not prepared to try to get away from him on, you know, in that setting, because of fear of him. Okay.

And I hope -- that would be, you know, make sense to me.

Because one theory $I$ think we've heard or read somewhere is that if she had witnessed him stabbing a girl, that she might not want to spend the next two or three days with him?

Well, that may be, but there has to be a sensible opportunity for her to escape intact herself as a person in that scenario who has just seen an attempted murder or murder.

And what about at the Cadrain house, did you ever consider that?

A
I -- that would be one in a sort of sequence of
events when she was still along. I don't recall ever considering that, Mr. Hodson.

What about as well, and $I$ don't think we need to bring up the statement, but Nichol John on her May 24th, 1969 statement, and this is after she is interviewed by Inspector Roberts, not polygraphed, but interviewed --

No.
-- she gave the statement to Raymond Mackie the next day and in it she uses words to the effect that, 'I didn't remember that $I$ had witnessed a murder until yesterday,' being when she was with Mr. Roberts.

Uh-huh.
And I'm wondering, did that ever cause you concern as to how someone could not remember a murder?

A Well, I think it's a phenomenon that very unpleasant sights can trigger a layman, if you will, to block the memory because it is so unpleasant, and I'm probably misstating it, there's something called hysterical amnesia, Mr. Hodson, that could have happened here, and what happened to her on the -- was this on the day of the polygraph or thereabouts? Well, she didn't have the polygraph.

Yeah. I don't think we need them up on the screen
unless there's something in particular, but I think, does he want to look at his file?

MR. KNOX: I'm just wondering if you are talking about the notes from file number 1 ?
Perhaps if --
I think that would be helpful, Mr. Hodson.

MR. HODSON: Yes.
A Thank you.

BY MR. HODSON:
And find page 30 in the top right-hand corner.
Did you find it?
A
$Q$

A
$Q$
Not readily, sir.
These numberings, by the way, were done by the RCMP I believe.

Yes, I think so. I have that, sir, that page.
And it says at the top, 'Thursday, August 7,' and I think that's 1969. Is that correct?

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
$Q$
And if we can go through, number 1, 'summary, P. 2 --?' do you know what that refers to?

A
Summary, page 2 , question mark, I've noted 'ask R.M.,' which would be Ray Mackie, 'Monday, August l1th.' I hope something else shows up about that.

That's fine, $I$ don't know if anything turns on it.
And again point 2, and you've got a check mark, are check marks when something has been done?

Not necessarily. I see they run out halfway down
the page, but $I$ would think it would mean that with these, Mr . Hodson.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Sorry?
I would think, Mr. Commissioner, that that would mean that it had been done with respect to these three or four or five check marks.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, okay.
BY MR. HODSON:
And, 'ask R.M. Monday August 11,' would that be Ray Mackie?

A

Q
It would.
And is it fair to conclude that you would have asked Mr. Mackie about some of these questions re: the facts?

Yes.
So number 2 is, 'outline page 3, anyone (mother etc) describe Miller's compact as John can,' and then it looks like different coloured ink?

A Yeah.
It may in fact be the answer from Mr. Mackie,
'sister better'.

A
$Q$

A

Q
A
Q
$Q$

A

Q

A

All those are my writing and I assume that answer came from him.

So can we take it from that you are trying to find somebody who can tell you or tell the Court what was in Gail Miller's compact?

Describe it. Her sister would be better for that than whatever else we had.

Okay, right.
Is that --
Yeah. Then it says, 'Peggy Miller, Gail's letters

- did she find? Significance of this .......
would Milgaard be having intercourse with Gail.'
I assuming $S I$ is sexual intercourse?
Yes.
'With Gail in Swift Current. If this is true, did
PM,' who I think is Peggy Miller, 'think this up.'
Yeah.
And you will recall that Peggy Miller gave a statement to the police that Gail Miller knew David Milgaard from Swift Current. Do you remember that?

I -- yeah.
And it's got a note here, 'asked Ray Mackie' and then this ink, 'R. thinks so'?

That indicates -- $I$ put that question to him and
he felt that was so.
So on August the 7th, 1969, it appears from these notes that you have asked Mr. Mackie about Peggy Miller's statement about Gail knowing David Milgaard and Mr. Mackie says that he thinks she may have made this, think this up?

Yeah. The left hand, Mr. Hodson, it was evidently Monday, August 11 th and the list was made on the other date.

Yes.
Do you see those checks?
Yeah.
And that's what $I$ would say that means.
Do I take it from this, though, that on August 11th, then, at this point you had satisfied yourself that Peggy Miller's statement that Gail Miller knew David Milgaard from Swift Current was not likely correct?

A
And that was based on Ray Mackie telling you that? Yeah, because he was the one with the knowledge. If we could scroll down, please, and then it's got, 'Need Fogel to give body temp and estimate time of death.' Fogel was the coroner; is that right?
And then number 6, it says M, which I'm assuming is Milgaard, 'Milgaard's statement to Karst - how many useful admissions in it to use versus Milgaard if he testifies - such (a) as he didn't know what he did with clothes; - (b) denied there was blood on clothes; (c) in alleys trying to find St. Mary's cathedral and Cadrains. Get declared
And then number 6, it says $M$, which I'm assuming anything happened on that. There's no check mark.
voluntary and then don't tender and save for cross-examination'?

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q
A

Q

Yeah. There wasn't a procedure, and there's a reported case, $I$ think Mr. Halyk was involved, in which the Crown could have statements proven voluntary and hold them in case the accused testified, and $I$ think that's what that refers to, there may be a citation show up later.

So would this be a note of yours saying, to consider doing it, you've got a question mark that maybe you will get, prove that Mr. Milgaard's statements were voluntary and use it in cross-examination if he were to testify? That would be it. It says, 'get declared voluntary, then don't tender, save for cross-examination,' the bottom.

And down at the bottom, number 7, I'm assuming that's 'seminal fluid on panties indicates sexual intercourse took place at time of killing,' and then, '- lack of signs on her,' and I'm assuming that's private parts?

That is.
Correct?
Yeah.
'Ask Emson if this mitigates against sexual
intercourse then, or was it post death and therefore post,' and then 'resistance?', and then in a different coloured pen it says 'could be from previous sexual intercourse.' Can you tell us what that refers to?

Somebody must have -- that question was put to someone and they came back and told me that one of the explanations could be previous sexual
intercourse. I don't see it there, but $I$ would have assumed that would be Dr. Emson, Mr. Hodson. And so would this be a note where -- it says
'questions re facts,' at the top, trying to sort out how it was that Gail Miller didn't have injury on her private parts?

Well, that was a question, yeah.
And then the writing at the bottom, can you tell from your file, is this something you wrote in later, did someone give you that information or do you know?

Yeah, somebody did. I can't -- there's no date or anything on it, but someone definitely did. Next page, please, 7049. So we see now F1 was the previous page, $F 2$, and we go to number 8 -Just a minute, sir. Oh, yeah. Okay.

And, 'whole significance of seminal fluid probably
being ex secretor group A'?
That would be my shorthand for from a secretor of group A, the ex part.

Ex being from?
Ex being from A.
Okay, from a secretor group A. 'See page 290 Paynter, Emson and Paynter re'.

Yeah.
And if you can call up 009 -- and you'll see here this 290 -- I'll call you to the police report, 009374 is the doc ID, and go to 009384 , and you'll see up at the top there's 289. If you go to the next page, please, you'll see 290?

I see that.
And then it looks as though this is Paynter's remarks about a secretor; is that correct? That's right.

So you would have made a reference to, I take it, the police file then from your question re: facts?

Well, yeah. This -- Paynter's report would be part of the police file in that sense and he explains what the -- what you can read into that if you will. If we can go back to the handwritten note, please,


007049 , number 9. M, who I presume is Mil --

A
$Q$ Yeah.

Milgaard's statements. Number 1, "Karst Winnipeg - March 3.' 2, 'Barrett - Saskatoon April 18th,' and then a question mark, 'are there more?' and then it looks like again different coloured pen, 'no more statements, more conversations.' Can you tell us what that means? Somebody advised me and $I$ wrote that, 'No more statements, more conversations'. It doesn't identify who, but $I$ would assume it would have been either Karst or Barrett, but I can't be positive of that.

And if we can go down to number 10 , you write, 'Has Wilson been eliminated as rapist?'

Uh-huh.
'(Blood and saliva taken for test (P. 374)'; do you know what that refers to?

Well at that stage $I$ apparently wanted to know if he had been eliminated scientifically, because it goes on to talk about blood and saliva taken for a test, and that would be one of the things I would think $I$ would want to be reassured of.

So is this a note where you are wanting to follow up to make sure that Wilson was eliminated as the
rapist?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$
A

Hodson, it might be later.
Okay. Number 12, 'He told someone he got rid of' --

A

A

BY MR. HODSON:
'Told someone he got rid of clothes because battery acid on them, who', and then it says
'Cadrain's or Karst's first statement', 'Albert Cadrain or Karst's first statement.'

Now do you know what that refers
to?
A
Q
Oh, that --
And let me just maybe, let me just go through the note and I'll come back.

A
$Q$

A
Sure, that's fine.
I think this is referring to Mr. Milgaard. 'He told someone he got rid of clothes because battery acid on them, who?', and then you've got 'Cadrain or Karst, get this declared admissible and hold in case he testifies'. Now --

That had would be the same situation $I$ just mentioned a moment ago.

And then it says, Call Mrs. Wilson in rebuttal
about acid, clothes changed in Regina pre leaving for Saskatoon.'

So do I take it, from that, what
you are saying is Mr. Milgaard told someone he got rid of his clothes at Cadrain's because the battery acid was on them, and you say 'who', and $I$ think that comes from Cadrain's first statement. Uh-huh.

You then say get this declaration that Mr. Milgaard made admissible and hold in case he testifies?

A
Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$ Uh-huh.

And then, if he does, call Mrs. Wilson in rebuttal to say that he had changed his clothes in Regina --

I see.
-- for the acid; is that --
That would make sense in that it would rebut the statement that he still had acid, just, damaged clothing in Saskatoon, as $I$ read it.

Yeah. And if you will recall earlier I had mentioned that there was some theory that, or an issue about whether Mr. Milgaard had changed his clothes in Regina before he left or not.

A Uh-huh.

Q

A
Q

A
Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

Because, if he did, then he wouldn't need to change them the next morning because of the acid? I can assume that's right, sir.

And then 13, it says, 'Why M', who I presume is Milgaard --

Yeah.
-- 'walking without shoes? They ever show up?' And it says 'not known' and 'no'.

Yeah, that's what I --
So would you follow up, when you have these comments here, would you follow up with Mackie, or other police officers, and ask these questions? I, yeah, I would. The, going back to the page 1, that, 'Ask R.M.', is Ray Mackie, 'Monday, August 11th', and $I$ evidently asked him questions 1, 2 , 3, 4, and I don't see -- but that's what $I$ would do is follow it up with some police officer, depending on who you would expect to have the evidence.

And then, if we can go down to the 14 , 'Do we have Nichol John's coat?', and an answer, 'Yes, P. 393'. We don't need to call it up, -Okay. -- that's the report that deals with it. And then 15, 'What known re:

Milgaard assaulting another girl in Regina (Karst at page 392)', and then it says, 'This was Nichol John in park previous summer and at Champs Hotel or Wascana previous afternoon or evening'; is that right?

Yeah. I think, above it, it says, 'That a.m. in previous afternoon'. Oh, 'That a.m.', I think it's 'or', Mr. Hodson.

Okay. It says, 'Nichol John in park previous summer' and, 'Previous afternoon or evening Champs Hotel or Wascana'?

A
$Q$
A
Q
A

Q

A
$Q$
-- document 009264 , and this is the May 25 th police report of Mackie, your note said page 392. If we can go to 391, which is 009268 at the bottom, and this is Mackie's report -- or pardon me, Mr. Karst' report, it says:
"Inquiries have been made in Regina in regards to Milgaards whereabouts,
however, no one had any information to offer with regards to his present employment or residence, in fact, it was revealed to me by the Wilson youth that Milgaard assaulted another girl in Regina and that he was being sought by various members of the Criminal Element in that Centre, and if the Police didn't get to Milgaard before they do, they didn't need to worry about him."

And then you will see, up at the top, 392; correct?

A That's right.
And so if we can just go back to 007049 .
Is that the --
And just down at the bottom you will see that -that's the page 3 -- $I$ take it that your note was referring to that police report that $I$ just read to you?

I assume, yeah, it would have to be.
And why would you be trying to get information about whether Mr. Milgaard had assaulted another girl?

A
Well just, $I$ would think, under the general heading of trying to assess his, oh, not
temperament but propensity to strike out at people on short or little or no notice.

So would this note be, can we infer that you would have been reading a police report and made a note, what is known about what is referred to in that report?

A
Umm, yeah. It's off the screen now but that would be it, I think.

Yes.
Yeah.
And then, and this is in a different colour pen, it looks as though -- and please tell me if I'm correct --

A
Q

A
$Q$
And then the next page. Then at the top, this is F3, '16. What did polygraph tests produce?' And then it says, 'Only helped with Wilson - not used on John.'

Can you tell us what that
relates to?

A
Yeah. That's, that's the, there was only one
polygraph episode in the case, and that was the one of Inspector Roberts. Now, 'What did polygraph test produce?', I talked to someone, maybe even him, and the answer was, 'Only helped Wilson - not used on John'. I think, clearly, it was only used on Wilson, was what we meant in that note.

Had you ever been involved with polygraph before this case?

No, sir.
Did you have an understanding, at the time, as to what or how it worked or what it did?

It was extremely limited, and so-called lie detector, but $I$ hope it was more than that. And what was your understanding of what, what the polygraph accomplished?

A
$Q$
I would assume or understand that it would tell
the operator if certain questions were being answered truthfully by the subject.

And as far as Ron Wilson and his polygraph and the statement that he gave after his meeting with Inspector Roberts, what did you understand what statements that Mr. Wilson had made, what did you understand was tested by Inspector Roberts?

A
I would have to look back at it, but --

Q Just generally?
A
Yeah. I would assume that he was, he was testing or dealing with the first statement, which could -- didn't seem to add up with the known evidence, and as a result of Mr. -- of the test, he -- it ended up with Mr. Wilson giving, if you will, a new or a second statement, did it not, is my memory.

Did you understand, as far as the incriminating statement where Mr. Wilson said that Mr. Milgaard had admitted jabbing a girl with a knife in Saskatoon, you recall Mr. Wilson's incriminating statement; correct?

A
Yes. Now if it -- is it the post-polygraph, so-called?

Q
Yes.
A
$Q$

A
Yes, I do.
And what did -- did you understand that that statement was tested?

Umm, no, I thought that was the -- wasn't that the statement that he gave after the test?
$Q$
A
$Q$
Yes. Well, let me rephrase it this way.
Okay.
When Inspector Roberts -- let me back up. Did in -- did you understand Inspector Roberts to say
"what Mr. Wilson told me is not true" or -- and/or
"what Mr. Wilson has told me now is true"?
Well, it would be the latter, $I$ would think. He made -- like we've heard that it's characteristic to ask questions that people are bound to tell untruths to and then go on to the other evidence, I think we heard.

Let me ask it this way. Did you understand that Mr. Wilson's incriminating statement, the statement that incriminated Mr. Milgaard, did you understand at the time that that statement had been verified by way of the polygraph examination?
Either that or it had -- it had actually been --
come out of the polygraph examination.
Right.
I can't at the moment, without looking back --
Okay. We'll maybe go -- I think there's some
notes here later about some questions.
Okay.
And then at the bottom here it says, I'm not sure
what the letter C is, 'Why does Milgaard tell Barb
Berard who tells M John that he is going to be
picked up for murder', and I think that's Barbara
Wispinski, and there is a reference in Nichol
John's March lith statement to Riddell where she
says that Barb Berard told her that she heard from David Milgaard that he thought he was going to be picked up for murder.

A

Q

A
$Q$
A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$
And if we can then go to 007052 , which is the next page, and this has got L1 at the top, which is that -- and Questions re Law; is that how you put your notes?

A
Well, this once I did, and --
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And then it says Questions re Law. Would this be around the time, August of '69, when you were doing the facts?

A
Q
A
Q
A
Q
A

Q
BY MR. HODSON:
I see. Have you got the document?

A

Q

A

Q Yes. Yeah, that's the one I have, Mr. -And so can you tell us, would this have been around the time that you -- within a -- within days or weeks of when you did your questions on the facts?

I assume so.
And it says, number 1, 'Get in evidence via John that Wilson told her that Milgaard told him of killing? Exception to hearsay?'

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q

A Yeah.
Q
A
Can you tell me what that refers to?
Well that's the conversation that's been mentioned earlier on the way to Saskatoon. I evidently spoke to Karst, who related that he -- Wilson told him that, and that it was -- had likely been, or would likely be in Nichol John's statement as well.

Okay. And if we could then go to 007040 , please. And this is a letter of July 1, '69, from the RCMP to Superintendent Wood, and this references the elevator break-in, and Mr. Weafer says they have been instructed to lay a charge for break enter and theft:
"... against Milgaard and have done so.
The charge will be held here pending the outcome of your proceedings against the individual."

And then 2:
"You may wish to advise your prosecutor of the additional Information laid ...", in co-operation, etcetera. And this was on your prosecutor's file, so $I$ take it that you would have been aware that Mr. Milgaard, that a charge had been laid for -- for the break-in at the
elevator?
A
And then if you can go to 009226, and this is on your file as well, and $I$ think it's referred to by -- I'm not sure if that's the police report number or not, but this is the RCMP investigation report that they prepared relating to the elevator break-in, and it appears that this was -- if $I$ can go to the next page -- received by the Saskatoon Police on June 11th, '69, and then it appears sent on to you on your file sometime shortly after that; is that --

Well, I'm not sure about that last statement, sir.
Did --
A
Are you saying it was on my file --
Yes.
-- as it were?
Yeah. This, the letter from Weafer to Wood is on your file --Uh-huh.
-- as is this RCMP report, and it looks like the RCMP report went to the city police, and that the city police would have given you this, perhaps as part of the court brief. In fact, I can go back and probably identify that for you. Are you
doubting that that was on your file?
A
I -- I -- I'm sure, if you can show me, not a question of, you know, that it was on my file. There have been, there have been discoveries in this case that various RCMP things did not come to the city police, as $I$ understand it, but went cross-country and up to $F$ Division or
headquarters, or whatever the terminology was. I just caution on that, Mr. Hodson, because I understand that's happened.

Well it appears that this information would have been given to you --

Okay.
-- in June or July of 1969 on your file?
Okay.
And $I$ take it you are saying you can't tell me whether it was or it wasn't?

And I guess my question is -- or let me back up.
We have heard a fair bit of evidence in this
Inquiry that the RCMP were involved in assisting the Saskatoon City Police in the investigation of the Gail Miller murder; you are aware of that?

A Uh-huh, right.

And Riddell and Edmondson are names that have come up?

A

Q

A
Q
And if it may assist you, Mr. Caldwell, two things; $I$ think we've heard evidence from the Saskatoon City Police that they didn't get them; and secondly $I$ can tell you that, based on the file that we've been provided as being your file, there is no -- the RCMP reports are not on that. Well, Mr. Hodson, I think I learned all of that, if you will, relatively recently --

Yeah.
-- during the Inquiry, and it's what $I$ understand to be the situation, so that's why I don't wish to
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A
Q
A
A
$Q$


And I guess my question concerns as to why you would get an RCMP report regarding the elevator break-in but not $R C M P$ reports relating to the Gail

Miller murder investigation; are you able to answer that?

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

No, I don't think so, and $I$ would have expected that any -- anything that mattered would have come to me through the city police even if the RCMP -

No.
-- and I'm just wondering if you have a recollection of whether you would have asked any RCMP officer at the time for any reports? is no reference that the police, the Saskatoon City Police, had them or sent them to you --
were investigating it.
I see. So that if there was a report you would expect to get it from the city police?

Yes, if it went anywhere, and as opposed to what $I$ call cross-country.

I see.
Yeah.
And $I$ think, in fact, this report that's on your file appears to have been sent to the city police?

I, yeah, oh yeah. That's got the police
department received date stamp on it.
Yeah. This is probably a good spot to break.
(Adjourned at 11:59 a.m.)
(Reconvened at 1:30 p.m.)
BY MR. HODSON:
If we can go to 007045 . I now wish to turn, Mr. Caldwell, to the preliminary hearing which we know began on August 18th, 1969 and your dealings with Mr. Tallis, defence counsel, and I think this is a document from your files, it's dated August 11th, '69, tentative witness order, and again just so that we can identify for other counsel, $I$ take it this "S" is a summary, is the Ullrich summary, I think that corresponds with the page numbers?

A I would assume that, sir.

And then $I$ see here when we get to John, Wilson and Cadrain, you've got a note here, 'put ahead of John and Wilson in prelim.' Do you know what that -- was there any reasoning there about putting Cadrain ahead of those two or can you explain what that note is, or do you know?

Well, it -- their -- John and Wilson's evidence both went $u p$ to the time Cadrain joined the group and followed it afterward. I can -- I can't see any advantage in that for anyone. I notice it ends, sir, with a question mark after prelim, so the evidence will show, but $I$ may have decided to leave him where $I$ would think he would belong after John and Wilson.

Okay. And if we can go to page 007047 , this would be the third page, and again $I$ think it lists all of the witnesses that you in fact did call, and down at the bottom, please -- actually, just scroll up for a moment, please. It looks like here we talk Peggy Miller, compact, question mark. Were you still trying to decide whether you were going to call her?

A
I must have been. Now, $I$ don't know whether $I$ did or not.

I believe you did.

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q
A
Q

A

Q

A

Okay.
The compact. Scroll down to the bottom. And then
there are some names. It says Aline Cadrain. I
think that is Celine Cadrain?
I would assume so.
And then you've got question mark and then no. Do
you know what that -- and Fogel, Mrs. Miller,
you've got no. Would this be possible witnesses
and you decided against calling them?
That's what $I$ take it from that, sir.
Do you recall what went into your decision not to call Celine Cadrain?

No. Is this a sister?
Yes.
The sister we were speaking about yesterday?
Yes. Celine was home on the morning of January
31, 1969 and $I$ think her statement indicated that
she was in bed when Mr. Milgaard and his friends
arrived, that she was up later.
I take it $I$ would have decided that she had no, if
you will, useful evidence.
And then if we can go to 006942 , and this looks to be a more formal list of witnesses; is that correct?

Yes. That looks like an Ullrich product to me.

And then again it's got, I see subpoenaed, page in summary. If we can go to the next page, please, it's got here by Dr. Ian McDonald, excused by Mr. Caldwell?

That's what it says.
And I take it that you didn't call Mr. McDonald?
No. If this is still prelim, I certainly didn't. Yes.

And not at the trial either, as you know, or at least -- and that at the end, sir, it says letter which $I$ assume means $I$ wrote him to not attend or words to that effect.

Go to 007043 , please, and these are notes I think all from your correspondence file, and this is August 15th, '69?

Right.
MS. KNOX: I wonder, Mr. Commissioner, if he could be directed to the RCMP number that's at the top because that will allow him to find it in his own file and he has indicated a preference for working with the coloured photocopy, but he can only identify it in his file by the RCMP number.

BY MR. HODSON:
Sure, that's fine. If you could -- and again, if
you wish to see the originals of these, Mr. Caldwell, you may -- $I$ can't tell in advance whether you do or you don't, so --

A
$Q$
A
Q Okay.

So if you look at number 35 --
I have that 35 here now in paper form.

Right. And if you look at the top, it says
'Superintendent Corey: Re Wilson,' and 'appeared Magistrate Court Edmonton this a.m. before magistrate John Coughlan, charged conspiracy to commit fraud, 408(1)(d), sentenced three months, Fort Saskatchewan jail. Second charge, Public Health Act, possession LSD, sentenced one month concurrent.' And we heard some evidence before, Mr. Caldwell, that at the time of the prelim Mr. Wilson was in jail in, I think, Fort Saskatchewan; is that correct?

That's my memory. I assume this would be in support of getting him back, just knowing where he was.

And I'll show you an affidavit in a moment that was used to get him back. So does that sound correct, that Mr. Wilson was incarcerated at the time?

A It does to me.

Next if we could call up 009426 , and I'm not sure, this is not in the correspondence 1 file, I'm not sure what folder this -- I'm not sure if you need to see the original of this, Mr. Caldwell, or not. Perhaps Ms. Knox can look for it and we can go through this. If you want to refer to the original just let me know, but $I$ think it's fairly straightforward.

Very good.
MR. HODSON: Ms. Knox, did you want me to wait until you find --

MS. KNOX: You go ahead. If he needs it, I'll get it.

That would be fine by me, sir.
BY MR. HODSON:
And this is August the 12 th, ' 69 , so this would be about six days before the start of the prelim, and presumably Joe $P$ is Joe Penkala? That's correct.

And then if we can just go through, and I'll maybe just read this and ask you some questions. Okay.
'Scene: Knife blade and frozen blood in snow, two frozen lumps of yellowish stuff. Joe collects two lumps later and sends lab,' and then is that --
what does that refer to, check?

A
Q
A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A

Q
A
$Q$

A
Q

Well, $I$ think it's evidence.
'Evidence if sperm and whether --'
'Whether could establish a blood group.'
Okay. And then it says lab, appears to say lab reported, '1. Was sperm. 2. Group A type'?

Yes. Yeah, that's what $I$ see it as.
Would these be notes of a meeting or a discussion with Mr. Penkala?

I assume so if -- could you give me the top of it again briefly?

Sure.
Yeah, it starts with Joe $P$ and the date, so $I$ assume it would be a meeting with him on those topics.

I think your counsel maybe has the original there. Okay, thank you.

So if we can scroll down, and this would be shortly before the prelim, so $I$ take it it would make sense that you were checking out the evidence or reviewing the evidence?

Yeah, that's correct.
And then you put a star, 'you can determine blood group from sperm if he's a secretor. If a secretor, you secrete blood antigens into all body
fluids. If not, you don't.' And then question mark. 'Got blood sample from Milgaard, it's type A. Must also establish he's a secretor. Took saliva test, they proved he was not a secretor. Asked lab to retest. Paynter got exhibits back,' it looks like a question mark. 'Examined further and has now found there was actual blood in the sperm.'

A
Those two things, Mr. Hodson, neither the first or this were question marks, if you --

I'm sorry.
A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
And are you able to explain what this note would refer to other than what it states?

A
Well, it was under that general heading of figuring out a sperm secretor's blood, and $I$ apparently got that far and thought that either

Dr. Emson or an urologist would be the logical people to explain that in evidence.

If we can just go back to the previous pages. Is
it fair to summarize this, at least according to this note, that based on the two lumps that Mr. Penkala found, the lab said yes, it had sperm, and it was of group A type?

Uh-huh.
And then scroll down, you can determine blood group from sperm if he's a secretor; in other words --

A That's --
Q
If the sperm has $A$ antigens in, then you know it's from an $A$ secretor, and 'if you are a secretor, you secrete blood antigens into the fluids. If not, you don't.' And it says you got a sample from Milgaard, type $A$, 'must also establish he's a secretor. Took saliva tests, proved he wasn't a secretor,' and then you go back and said retest, and when you retested Paynter said there was actual blood in the semen, and $I$ think then the next page, and please correct me if I'm wrong, but the analysis here is that the reason that an $A$ antigen might be in the frozen semen from a non-secretor would be if the donor had blood in
the semen?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q

That's how $I$ read it, sir.
So if you can't establish that Mr. Milgaard is a secretor and you have to try and find a way to establish, or as to explain why A antigens would be in the semen; is that correct?

That's how I read it.
And then when Paynter came back and said, well, there's blood in the semen, that would explain how antigens got in there; correct?

That's my memory of it.
That's fair.
Yeah.
And then so here the note is, well, how do you explain that the blood would be in the semen, the donor's blood; correct, and that's where you end off. If we can go to the next page. Okay.

Next page, please, at the top, 'now - explain conditions under which blood could get in sperm. Emson or urologist.' Was it fair to say at this point, after talking to Mr. Penkala, you've recognized that one issue at trial, or at the prelim, will be to explain conditions under which blood could get into the sperm?

Yes, it would.
And then it goes on to say, 'also her pubic hairs were frozen in the seminal fluid lumps.' And then it looks, it goes on to another note, and again this is August 12 th, Corey, who I'm assuming is Deputy Chief Corey, 'Ronald Wilson in Edmonton and charged with conspiracy to commit fraud, plead guilty, sentenced August 15th, '69. Asked Corey to get details from Edmonton on Friday re sentence so we can get order for witness.' Is that -That's all correct.

And then if we can go to 007042 , and this is document number 36 in the top right-hand corner? I have that.

And it refers to Mr. Tallis' June 10 th letter, and maybe we'll just go back because $I$ don't think we looked at that today and I'll just quickly call that up, 007063 . So this is June 10 th and you remember when we went through this yesterday, this was the day after I think Mr. Tallis first appeared in Court, the evidence we went through yesterday is that you were not in Court until July 3rd, and then July 8 th was the engagement letter from the city police, and so it was around early July you became involved as prosecutor, and this
was the letter that Mr. Tallis wrote and we went through it, this is where he asks for copies of any witness statements and related reports on the matter.

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q
A

2

W

Yes.

If we can then go ahead to 007042 , this appears to
be your reply, and $I$ take it at sometime between
June 10 th and August 15 th you would have received
the police file, the Ullrich summary and the
Ullrich --
I would have in one way or another, either all at once or in installments as the case may be.

Now, this refers in the letter and as well to a telephone conversation. Do you know, either by recollection or by practice, would you and

Mr. Tallis have talked on the telephone a fair bit during the course of this file?

I would think so. Any time it appeared useful, one or other would phone the other one.

And would you always make a note of that?
I hope so, because it often involved, say, undertakings on my part, names of witnesses, numbers, so $I$ would do my best to record that. Okay. And so here we see copies of statements, and this is August 15 th, so this is the
preliminary hearing, so at this stage Albert Cadrain's March 2 statement, and there's a note that I'll show you in a moment that talks about his second statement.

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
Q

A
Q


And again, the March 3rd statement that Mr. Wilson gave that you said this was the statement where he denied knowing anything about the murder and claimed that Mr. Milgaard could not have done it,
statements for the three key witnesses?
That's the way $I$ read it, sir.
why would you send that to Mr. Tallis?
A
Well, because that would be, among other things, a piece of evidence pointing away from Mr. Milgaard's guilt. It would fall under the heading of things Mr. Tallis had requested in that respect, and second, if it was a different set of assertions that he made in the other statement, Mr. Tallis should have that so he would be aware of that, could pursue it, possibly cross-examine on it.

And then it goes on, if we can scroll down: "I also enclose a copy of the autopsy report on Miss Gail Miller, prepared by Dr. Emson."

And again $I$ think that Mr. Tallis in his June 10th letter had asked for related reports. Would the autopsy report be something then that he would have asked for do you know?

A
If he simply said related reports, I certainly
would have sent the autopsy report as, you know, as soon as $I$ got it. Related reports I suppose could mean lab reports.

And I'll get to that in a moment. Okay.

And it says:
"The above are the only statements from the two witnesses, Wilson and John, which $I$ have at present."

And then $I$ think that was the case, correct, there was no other statements?

A
Q

A
$Q$

Right, Diewold, McQuhae, Shawchuk, Gerse, Hounjet, Pyra, Brand and Edmondson, and I believe these are people on your witness list where you may not have had statements or --

A That may well be. I would need to look at it a
little further, but --
Okay. I'm not sure if much turns on that, but at this point do you know if you would have had all the statements or just some of the statements?

A

And there will be a document, Mr. Commissioner, that $I$ think identifies the dates that the hearing actually sat, if that's relevant. And so here is your letter and the follow-up to your August 15th
letter:
"I now enclose a copy of the second statement by Albert H. Cadrain, dated March 5, 1969."

So I take it that's when that statement was sent?
Yeah. Well, dated -- I'm sending it on August $20 t h$.

Yes, but that's the second statement of Cadrain that was not sent in the August --

That's my understanding.
And then it says:
"As well as copies of the Crime
Detection Laboratory Reports concerning
the examination of the exhibits in this case, for your use."

And what Crime Detection Laboratory Reports would you have sent?

Well, I would have sent all the ones I had received and for some reason or other I didn't recite them in this letter. I'm sorry, that could become clear.

Q
Sure. If we can call up 009374 and that is, Ms. Knox, $I$ think is in the exhibits folder. Perhaps your counsel has the original, you can show that to Mr. Caldwell. In your files there's
a list of Milgaard lab reports stapled together starting at 009374.

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

A Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv
Q Yes.
I would assume they were since in this -- or this thing they are stapled together in certain order. Some have more than one report from one witness. On the face of it $I$ assume that's what $I$ sent. If we can go to 009390 , please, which is part of the stapled group of reports, this is a lab report, it's got Paynter at the top, and it relates to -- no, sorry, I've got -- no, 009391. Is that one of these as well?

No, I'm sorry, 009386 , and if you could find that in your collection there.

Okay.
It's got 349 in the top right corner. Do you see that?

I have one with 383 in the top right corner. I think $I$ need to keep going.

You go 386 in the bottom right.
Is this, Mr. Hodson, it looks like it, but $I$ don't spot that number offhand.

I have that now, Mr. Hodson.
Yeah. Now, would those be the lab reports that you would have sent to Mr. Tallis?

A
Q

Okay, thanks.
Now, you have in front of you the original lab report and is that part of the group of lab reports stapled together under the title Milgaard lab reports?

Yes, it is.
Now, let's just go through this. It's got Paynter at the top and $I$ think you had told us earlier that's where you've identified the police witness where a report related to; is that --

That's right.
And it's got different file. Is that your handwriting?

That is.
And we see here that this is (V2) (V2)- (V2)-----
and (V1)--- (V1)- alleged rape?
That's correct.
And then a question mark and omit and a line
through it. Is that your --
Yeah. I'm not convinced those are both mine, the question mark and the omit as well, sir.

And up here, different file, and can you tell me, do you have a recollection first of all of dealing with this lab report at the time?

I'm sure I did, Mr. Hodson, and $I$ can't say now I
have a recollection of it, but $I$ would be happy to expand once you get to --

Sure. It relates to the (V2) (V2)- (V2)----- and (V1)--- (V1)- and at that time, in 1969, would you have been familiar with the rape files or the rape matters relating to (V2) (V2)- (V2)----- and (V1)--- (V1)-?

Well, only if a charge had been laid against someone and that file had come to our office would be one way $I$ would be --

Okay.
Are those two episodes --
These are two -- just for your -- the (V1)- and (V2)----- rapes occurred in late October and November of 1968, there was no charge laid until December of 1970 .

A
Q

At the time would the names, or did the names (V2)----- and (V1)- mean anything to you?

A No, they didn't.

And are you able to tell us -- it looks from this,
sir, and please, you told us you have no recollection, but it appears you put a note, different file, omit and put a line through it. Can you explain what, based on your practice, what you think that might have meant?

Yeah. I think in this case $I$ concluded that this report had nothing to do with and no part in or on the David Milgaard prosecution file and I would have expected, Mr. Hodson, that if it meant something, some investigator would have phoned or showed up saying hey, what did you do about that (V2)----- and (V1)-.

Q
Yeah. Are you able to tell us, Mr. Caldwell, whether this report, this page would have been in the lab reports that you sent to Mr . Tallis on August 20th, 1969?

A
$Q$
That $I$ can't tell you. I would hope possibly he could -- we don't have a letter setting that out, eh?

Well, we do, we have -- the letter $I$ just brought up was 007038 that says you are enclosing copies of the Crime Detection Laboratory Reports concerning the examination of the exhibits in this case.

A
Now, the -- I can't tell from what I have before
me that $I$ sent it to Mr. Tallis. It may well be that in view of my view on it being a different file, episode completely, that $I$ may not have sent it to him for that reason and --

Okay. At that time would you have known on August 20th, would you have done -- can you give us an indication as to when you might have put this -- I mean, obviously this Paynter writing up here, can you tell us what Paynter number 3 would be? Well, that's the third page of evidence that $I$ had organized behind his name. Pardon me, Paynter, page 1, if you will, on that one, Mr. Hodson, 384. Sure, if we can call up 009384. So here, this would be Paynter 1?

Yeah.
Would this be page 1 of the Paynter reports?
Yeah. The way I had them organized, if I was going to examine him in chief, $I$ would, all things being equal, go through this sequence, page 1, 2, etcetera.

Let's go through it, let's go to the next page, and we'll see $P .2$, $I$ presume that's Paynter 2? That's right.

And the next page is the one we were talking about, (V1)-, (V2)-----, Paynter 3?

A Yes.
Q And then the next page --
A Four.
Q
A
$Q$

A
Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
and 'put in' and then 'yes', so same type of note as to what Paynter evidence you are putting in?

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q
A
Q
-

And the letter of August 20 th then, as far as the Crime Detection Laboratory reports concerning the examination of exhibits in this case, $I$ think you
told us -- please correct me if I'm wrong -- that you are not sure whether or not the (V1)-, (V2)----- lab report would have been sent to Mr. Tallis?

A
$Q$
I -- that's my position, $I$ can't tell from that, and $I$ don't know independent of that.

Okay. If we could then go to 007037. This is a letter August 21st, 1969, the following day, from Mr. Tallis, and we'll go through that. It says:
"You have been kind enough to make available to me certain statements of prosecution witnesses and various reports which may be relevant to this particular prosecution. In the event that $I$ do want further witness statements, $I$ will first make a request of you before raising it in Court. However, in the light of our conversation on the afternoon of Wednesday, August 20 th, $I$ would certainly want you to make it a point to check to see whether or not there are any witnesses that you do not propose to call who may be able to give evidence of assistance to the defence. If the City

Police Department have not turned over all of their material to you in this connection $I$ would be obliged if you would look into this matter prior to the completion of the preliminary hearing.

I might mention that $I$ have
always thought that the procedure in the case of this kind is correctly
summarized by Lord Denning in the case of Dallison vs Caffery ...

I shall be pleased to hear from you in this connection."

Now it's dated August 20 th, which is the same date of the letter where you sent over the lab reports; are you able to tell us what that may have related to, Mr. Caldwell?

A
I can't, but $I$ would assume it would be under the general heading of Lab Reports and Witnesses, unless I made a note of it in the file, sir, which I'm not aware of that at the moment. But it prompted Mr. Tallis to say:
"... I would certainly want you to make
it a point to check to see ...", etcetera:
"... whether ... there are any witnesses
that you do not propose to call who may be able to give evidence of assistance to the defence."

I think that triggered that second look of mine, or first look, through all the witness statements.

Q
Does this assist your recollection, Mr.
Caldwell, --
Yeah.
-- as to whether or not this letter may have prompted you to get all of the witness statements from the city police?

A
Q
A
Yeah.

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q
Okay.
I think there should be a note of that somewhere. If we could then go to 007035 , and this is a note, if you look for 42 in the top right-hand corner of your file.

I have that, sir.
And it's a note of August 22 nd, '69, so again this is after the prelim started, and it's got, 'Lab witnesses - phone Corporal Stewart', and then talks about Kirby and McDonald, Paynter and

Molchanko. It looks as though on August 22 nd you are making some notes about when these lab witnesses are going to be called?

That's how it looks.
And we've got Paynter here, and it says paint --
' P and M not required to September 2 nd', so do I take it, from that, that that's when Paynter would likely have been called at the preliminary hearing?

Well on the, based on that, $I$ would have assumed that to be the case. We could check that via -Yeah.
-- the transcript.
I can check it by the --
Okay. That would be good, sir.
Does that assist you at all in determining whether or not you would have made notes on Paynter's lab reports prior to August 20 th, being the date that you sent them to Mr. Tallis?

Umm, I'm not sure $I$ follow you on that, sir.
Okay. I had asked you earlier, August 20 th you sent a letter to Mr. Tallis that said 'I'm enclosing the crime detection lab reports', --

A
Right.
-- and it related to exhibits in this case, and we
looked at a collection of lab reports that were stapled on your file --

A

Q in the evening of 20 -- August 22 nd, '69, same
start with -- and then taxi driver, and I'm not sure what -- I think there was a taxi driver who surfaced as one of the possibly helpful witnesses. Yeah, MacRae Fraser.

Yeah, okay.
I think there is a letter to that.
Okay.
So that would be, again, related to Mr. Tallis, that information about the taxi driver?

It would.
Okay.
And then 'phone lab, get order for Wilson', it was a matter of getting him there for Court. I'm not just sure what -- evidently $I$ did phone the lab, maybe it's on that issue up above about witnesses, Mr. Hodson.

Okay. If we can then go to 007036, please.
Yeah.
And this is tentative witnesses, again same date, tentative witnesses next week. So this looks as though John and Cadrain are going to be the following week and then after that, --

A
Q Oh yeah.
-- presumably into September, I see we have Paynter down here; is that correct?

A
$Q$
A
Q
A
Q

A
$Q$

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

Umm, yes. This was the business of only having limited times available, it looks --

I see.
-- to me.
007030 .
Yeah, I have that here, Mr. Hodson.
And this is just a draft of your affidavit, I don't need to go through it, --

Okay.
-- but I think this is the affidavit that you
swore to enable you to get an order to transport
Mr. Wilson to the preliminary hearing; is that right?

Yes.
If we could then go to 007029 , and that has the number 47 in the top right-hand corner.

Okay, I have that as well.
And this is August 25, '69, and these are notes of yours, Mr. Caldwell?

Yeah, they are.
And can you tell us what -- and I'll go through them in detail --

Sure.
-- but are they just reminder notes, or notes of meetings, or are you able to tell?

A Yeah, I can read them through, sir.

Q

Yeah. And would Mr. Wilson have been in custody at that time when you interviewed him?

A
$Q$

Q
A
Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

- on the interviews with you?

A affidavit. retained in custody?
sentence, --
Yes.
-- sir, not just a --

I don't.
tell what that reference is?
changed to 'Thursday'.
here on the screen; what is that?
'ED'.

That's, that's right.

No, I don't, but if we could look at this

Well he was certainly in custody when he was brought in and presumably he would have been

Oh yeah, I think so, because he was under a

So if we assume, and $I$ think the assumption is
correct, that Mr. Wilson would have been in jail
cells when he was brought into Saskatoon for the prelim, do you have a recollection of meeting him in -- at the police station in the jail cells?

And then this note here, $I$ think you said, can you

The John one, it said 'Wednesday', that was

No, I'm just talking about what I've got circled

It appears that these were the officers that went

Q
A
Yes, it is, but $I$ can't quite decipher the heading, unless we went to Edmonton, which $I$ don't think we did. But maybe that will come later, sir.

Okay. And then, does this assist you, did you interview Wilson, John, Cadrain, with Karst, Karst, and Mackie; does that sound correct? That's right.

And do you have any recollections of any of those interviews?

Oh, no, not beyond the fact that they were done with those three police officers, one -- each individually, of course.

And if we can go down to 'meeting Tuesday a.m. 9:45 advised Penkala, Karst, Short, Oleksyn'; am I right that a meeting would have been held on the Tuesday the 26 th of August?

Yeah, it looks that way.
And then at the bottom it says, 'A.H. Cadrain', in fact if we can just, umm, umm -- hang on a second here. Actually, if we can just -- yeah, 'A.H. Cadrain, Ed Schellenberg in Calgary when $M$ giving drugs', I presume 'M' is 'Milgaard'?

A
Is that correct?
'And having S.I.', sexual intercourse, 'with young girls'?

That's the note.
'Going to school at E.D. Feehan, goes to Sion'?
And then does that -- 'lives across from E.D. Feehan'?

Yeah, it should read 'lives across from E.D. Feehan, goes to Sion', it ended up.

And then scroll down, 'A.H. Cadrain at Jackfish Lake, Armand Blanchette, phone, to show Friday a.m. unless he hears from Wednesday'?
'Us Wednesday'. No, that was Mr. Cadrain, I believe that was on a farm, and that's the thing I mentioned before, $I$ believe, about him hitchhiking to Saskatoon.

If we could call up 007028 , and that's got number 48 in the corner.

I have that, sir.
And in the top right-hand corner it says,
'Interview with Cadrain'; is that your
handwriting?
A That's -- is.
Q
And this is a police report prepared by Detective Ullrich, and I'll just go through parts of it, it says:
"On August 25/'69 I ...",
met -- this being Ullrich:
"... with Det/Sgt. ... Mackie and Mr.
Caldwell, the prosecutor interviewed the witness Albert Henry Cadrain in Mr.

Caldwell's office."
A
I think, Mr. Hodson, $I$ think it's:
"... I with ..."
those fellows. Other than that it's --
Yes, I'm sorry, what did $I$ say?
'I met', I think you said.
Oh:
"... I with Det/Sgt. ... Mackie ..."?
A Yes.
Q
So is this -- this appears to be Mr. Ullrich's report?

A
$Q$

A
In this instance, he was, and he may have been in others.
$Q$
So would this be your interview of Mr. Cadrain prior to him giving evidence at the preliminary hearing; is that correct?

A That's how I take it, yup.

And it looks as though some information was provided, and I'll go through that, it says:
"Mr. Cadrain repeated the story he had formerly given to the police with some additional information."

A
Q

A
$Q$

That --
And then I take it that that would be, 'the story he had formerly given the police' would be his statements, is that fair?

Yes, I would say so.
And then the additional information is:
"He stated that the first -- he first met Milgaard in Calgary in the spring of 1968 at which time Milgaard on more than one occasion had given teen age females drugs, had placed them into a bath tub containing water and had sexual intercourse with them. The water was to dispose of any blood which might appear as a result of the act. Cadrain claimed that he observed this act on more than one occasion, that some of the females were virgins and blood appeared.

Milgaard on one occasion invited him to come in stating, "Your next." Cadrain
states that Ed Schellenberg who lives with his mother near E.D. Feehan Collegiate was present in Calgary at the time and could corroborate his story."

And then scroll down. It says here:
"Mr. Caldwell wants Schellenberg
interviewed and a statement obtained for him."
'Obtained for him'. Do you have a recollection of this?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
I do, in this instance, of that.
And tell us what you remember and why you asked to get a statement?

Well this, this was a new piece of information, and it would come under the heading of what $I$ would call very, $I$ guess, abhorrent sexual behaviour, which $I$ would want to have that reduced to a statement in case we got into some issue about insanity, or what have you, later on. So would the reason you would ask the police to follow up with Mr. Schellenberg and to get a statement would be to use in the, possibly use in the prosecution?

A
Well, it could be, but just to find out what that was all about and have it on the file if it did
amount to anything.
And were there any concerns about the credibility of this story from Mr. Cadrain; would that be a reason you might want to check with

Mr. Schellenberg?
Well, not in this case, I didn't -- I felt I had no qualms with credibility, Mr. Cadrain's
credibility. It would be more to see if that, that account of the thing was correct, if so it could be reduced to writing and kept for the moment.

And so you would have Mr. Cadrain's version of events, and did you then ask the police to go out and ask to get Mr. Schellenberg's?

Apparently $I$ did, and $I$ think very, very recently it's been discovered that that was pursued, Mr. Hodson. I think you maybe are aware of that.

I will maybe call up 045348. Do you have a recollection, at the time, of hearing back from the police?

No, no, I'm -- I didn't.
We'll maybe just call this up.
Okay.
This is a statement that Edward Schellenberg gave to the RCMP December 14th, 1993, and if you can go
to page 045351, and this is a question and answer of Mr. Schellenberg. He is asked:
"Q Are you aware of an incident in Calgary involving Albert Cadrain and David Milgaard?

A An incident. There are a couple of things I remember Albert telling me about David. One of those things that Albert told me involved David having sex with a girl in a bath tub. I seem to recall Albert saying something about blood in the bath tub. I don't remember them saying anything but $I$ drew that it had something to do with a virgin."

And then if you can go to page 045354 . And then I think it's talking about:
"Q Where were you living when the police came to talk to you."

Actually, if we can just go back up. In any event, actually, we can go back down:
"Q Where were you living when the police came to talk to you.

A Devon, Alberta. There were two Saskatoon City Policemen. They were
plain clothesmen. I do not recall their names.

Q When, roughly, would that have been?
A That would have been in 1969. It was after David was arrested. I know I was there for the summer months. Sometime between June, July and August of 1969 .

Q Did the police tell you why they had come to see you?

A Said they wanted to some information about David Milgaard and I believe I told them about those two incidents. The bath tub incident and the milk truck incident."

And then it goes on to talk about some other things. Now $I$ wasn't been able to find any police report about the police follow-up with Mr. Schellenberg, Mr. Caldwell, and I may have missed it but $I$ don't think there's any police report on the follow-up nor any statement.

No.
Do you have any recollection of hearing information such as I've read from the 1993 interview of Mr. Schellenberg?


Q

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q
A

Q
$Q$

No. The first $I$ saw or heard of this, Mr. Hodson, would be within the last week or two I think in com -- looking at some Commission materials. All right.

I didn't get anything back.
So, to your recollection, did you hear anything back from the police?

Not at all, no.
If we could go to 007 -- or let me just pause
there. If all that Mr. Schellenberg said is 'I didn't witness anything, I just know that Mr. Cadrain told me', would that be of any value to you?

I wouldn't think so in any form.
Pardon me?
I wouldn't think so in any form.
If we can go to 007027 , and this is page 49 in the top right.

I have it.
And, again, your notes, and just down at the bottom it says 'read Sharon -- S. Williams statement', I take it that is the Sharon Williams statement?

I take it that, sir.
Do you have a recollection of her statement and
whether that played any role in your assessment of the Crown's case?

Umm, I know she gave a statement, I can't recall any particulars at this point, and $I$ don't think it, in any sense, entered into evidence in the Crown's case.

This talks about Emson and it says, 'Knife wounds caused by double or single-edged? Bleeding', what is that?

It says, 'from vaginal area'.
'From vaginal area? Low'?
That's, 'How get blood in sperm'.
'No injuries to private parts', and, 'Indicating sexual intercourse post-death and post-resistance?' Can you tell us what that related to?

A
Well those were evidently questions I wanted to ask Dr. Emson with what he could say about what sort of knife caused the wounds, whether there was the bleeding mentioned, how one got blood in sperm in general terms, and whether the lack of injuries to the private parts could indicate sexual intercourse post-death and post-resistance is the way $I$ put it.

And was that an issue, Mr. Caldwell, that you were
trying to sort out for the purposes of trial to, 'explain' may be the wrong word, but $I$ believe Dr. Emson's evidence was that there was no injury to Gail Miller's genitalia; is that correct?

A

Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
A

Q

A

Q

A
Q
And you will see, just so that we keep this in sequence, this is -- next, to page 007024 , and this says, 'now Tuesday-Wednesday', I'm not sure
whether that follows your earlier statements?
A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Yes, yeah. It's, 'Now Tuesday-Wednesday, read
letter and case, reply to letter pointing out re
taxi driver, will look up any rumour, etcetera'.
I crossed out C. That would be in reference to
Mr. Tallis' request for me to reread the matters
looking for possible evidence helpful to the defence, and the case would be the Dallison vs

Caffery that he mentioned in that letter.
Right.
Then -- do you wish me to go on with it, sir?
No, that's fine.

A
Q

A
Q
A

Q
A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv

A Umm, $I$ can't tell just from the -- I can't remember what techniques were involved, but it could be audio tapes, it could be ones that the machine printed out as part of the test, $I$ suppose.

Were you aware at the time, Mr. Caldwell, that Mr. Chartier, Officer Chartier, had been recording

Inspector Roberts' interview of Nichol John?
I found that out somewhere along the way.
And when you say 'somewhere' are you talking during the course of the prosecution?

A
Q

A
I would think so.
And can you tell us what you remember hearing or learning?

Well $I$ either read or learned that Detective Chartier and Morrison were in the Sheraton

Cavalier, had bored a hole through the wall
between two rooms and were, I assume, audio
recording whatever Mr. -- or Inspector Roberts was
doing with respect to -- I don't know if both of
-- it would essentially be Wilson, I suppose, but
I don't know that.
Q
And where did you learn that from?
I think it's somewhere in print in the police reports.

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv

A
-- was it not? Now did -- is the evidence that Nichol came in later and said something to him or gave him a statement?

The evidence that $I$ think we've heard, Mr.
Caldwell, is that Inspector Roberts interviewed Ron Wilson and Nichol John on the same day, Ron Wilson first, --

Yeah.
-- conducted the polygraph, sent him away; Nichol John came in, did not have the polygraph, but during the course of questioning admitted to Inspector Roberts that she had witnessed the murder; and then $I$ think Mr. Wilson came back and Mr. Roberts, according to his evidence before the Supreme Court, spent some time with both of them. Okay.

And I believe Officer Chartier's evidence before the Inquiry is that he thinks he set up the tape for the day, although $I$ don't know that he was specific on --

Uh-huh.
-- exactly what he may have recorded?
Okay.
And, I guess, were you aware that Nichol John's -that the interview by Inspector Roberts of Nichol

John may have been captured on audio tape?
A
$Q$

A
Q
-- one of the elements of that was to establish proof that Ms. John gave the statement, the earlier statement; correct?

A I don't think $I$ was. It could have been, but $I$ don't think it -- $I$ thought there was a written statement that I'm aware of.

Well Ms. John gave a written statement the next day.

Yeah, right.
What about with Ron Wilson, is that something that you would have -- would that have been of value to you as a prosecutor, to have the recording of the police interview of Wilson and John when they first gave certain parts of the incriminating evidence?

Well only to the extent that it would, if you will, supplement what Inspector Roberts said, and I wouldn't -- I wouldn't know that that was something I needed to have because I had no, you know, no reason to mistrust him, for instance. When you, at the trial when you engaged in the section 9(2) procedure, which we'll get into, --Uh-huh.

Umm, that's one of the things that you had to do.

And would the fact that you might have a tape recording of what she said to Inspector Roberts be of assistance in that exercise?

It could have been. I didn't feel that what $I$ did have to work with there was, you know, insufficient in that respect, and $I$ think that was simply the policeman's evidence; was it not?

Well I -- we will get into that.
A
Q

A
Q
A
$Q$

A
Well I knew a very limited amount about the three or four different kinds of amnesia from the Hartridge murder trial, and obviously, here, evidently $I$ wanted to ask Dr. McDonald about

Nichol John and hysterical amnesia. I think the 'off/on' would refer to the episode in which, having been shown the clothing of Gail Miller, she now recalled something which she didn't moments before, is the -- is my reading of that, sir.

Now this is -- Nichol John testified on September the 4th, '69 at the preliminary hearing, and I'm not sure, but it appears that these notes may have been prior to that. And so does this, would this note relate to the issue of her remembering the murder when she met with Inspector Roberts, is that what you think that refers to?

Well, yeah, but not that Dr. McDonald was in any way a witness or involved in that, but whether that would be a sensible explanation of why one minute she couldn't remember and having been -shortly thereafter shown the clothes, she purported to remember and described the murder to some extent.

Okay. Number 4, it says, 'Ullrich et al,' and then it's got Karst underneath. It has, 're pro defence evidence'; is that right?

A Yeah, that's correct.
Q

A
Can you tell us what that means?
I don't know, it's 'Ullrich et al re --' or 'pro
defence evidence'.
I'm assuming that's what it says.
Yeah, it's I guess whether they have any knowledge of the, of evidence falling under Mr. Tallis' request letter to me; in other words, that would have to be -- that could be characterized as pro defence evidence.

And so did you go to Ullrich and other police officers and ask?

Yeah. I see a check mark there, which means I did, and then underneath it in fine red pen, that's also my writing, and $I$ put Karst there which makes me think $I$ asked him as well.

Q And then scroll down, number 5, 'interview Emson,' I believe that's --

A
Yeah, that's right, 're different knives making wounds'.

What's that refer to?
Well, to -- I suppose the likelihood that the broken knife found at or about the scene could be responsible for the wounds and that would be the jumping off part. I think there may have been other knives that -- yeah, it says here different knives making wounds. There were one or two other knives in a sense involved there, sir, as you
know.

Q

A

Q
A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q
A

Q

A

And then it's, 'read S. Williams statement,' which we've touched on, that's Sharon Williams?

Yeah, Sharon Williams.
And then, 'Nichol John coat to lab?'
Yeah. It doesn't look as if I pursued that, at
least not by the check mark that isn't there.
And then number 8, 'results, interviews with
Schellenberg, interviews with girlfriend of
Mrs. Danchuk'?
Yes.
Firstly with Schellenberg, what does that note tell you, if anything?

Well, $I$ would be looking to find the results of the interviews with Mr. Schellenberg, which the
way I'm reading this $I$ don't think ever happened in the sense that he was in Calgary at some point.

I'm not quite sure if -- how that played out.
I see.
I clearly didn't end up with much in the way of results out of that.

And then do you know what this reference is to the girlfriend of Mrs. Danchuk?

No, I don't. Someone must have mentioned that --
I don't know if it could be under the heading of
things Mr. Schellenberg reported Mr. Cadrain of saying, for instance, that's the only suggestion $I$ can make, and $I$ don't see it off the top.

And then if we can go to, 'write Weafer,' and he was the Craik, or the Aylesbury RCMP officer?

That's right.
And what is this, we can't see it very well.
Maybe you can read it from your original.
That says Elmer Dennis Elliott. He's one of the people $I$ think who could have been a suspect. Okay.

And then Karst, it says Spence and Elliott. I would think those were indications of me speaking to those two officers about these two fellows in their capacity of possible suspects, but only possible in that sense.

Okay.
Under the Mr. Tallis letter heading, sir.
Okay. If we can now go to --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Sorry, your last
remark, sir?
Pardon me, the Mr. Tallis letter heading, Mr. Commissioner. In other words, his request to me to look for things that might be useful to the defence.

BY MR. HODSON:
If we could next call up 007022. This has I think number 54 in the top right-hand corner and this is September 3rd, 1969; is that correct?

That's right.
And you've got that document in front of it?
I do.
And Inspector Roberts, it looks like that's his phone number, Calgary city police; is that right? That's right, and his home number.

Would this be a phone call with him?
Yes, it must be. Now, I'm not sure if D-E-T
number -- it sounds like detachment, but for the moment $I$ don't know what that is.

Fair enough.
Okay.
If you can just go through and tell us what this note refers to?

A
It says, 'there's a chart that remains in R's --' for Robert's, '-- possession re the interviews. Did on Wilson; not on John.' Meaning he did and didn't do those respectively. 'Interpretation of chart: He could send chart and he could look at it.' And he says, 'will call back at 1:30 our
time.' Now, then there's an asterisk saying, 'Re Wilson lying on two questions'.

Can we just pause there. Does this relate to a second call with Mr. Roberts then?

The way I'm reading it, I think it's still the first, sir.

Okay, carry on.
Okay. 'Wilson lied on two questions. Don't let out --' okay, it must have been the second because by this time he said don't -- they don't, in effect, let out charts unless subpoenaed to Court. Chief's orders. 'Chart doesn't have questions.' So that would trigger me that in fact it was a call back to me. '3. Clothes from,' and it says, 'ask Wood and back to some guy.' I would assume those were the clothes that were given to Mr. Roberts for the use, the use -- in $I$ think interviewing John if I'm not mistaken. If $I$ may, $I$ believe, Mr. Caldwell, and correct me if I'm wrong, there was an issue that certainly Inspector Roberts had Gail Miller's coat when he was interviewing Nichol John.

A
$Q$ Okay.

And there was an issue about continuity and as to whether or not you had to call Mr. Roberts for
that purpose only.
Okay.
Do you remember that?
I don't, but I'm not surprised.
Okay. If you could then carry on and tell us what these notes refer to?

Yeah. 'Clothes from,' blank, 'ask Wood' means to ask Superintendent Wood, 'and back to some guy,' that must have been what Roberts told me $I$ should ask Wood where the clothes went after the use they made of them. Now, (a), these are, I gather, his questions. '(a), are you holding back anything re G.M.?' is Gail Miller. '(b), did you ever intentionally hurt anyone?' and I noted a yes in the next line. It says, '(c), have you lied to any question on this test?' The way that's written, $I$ can't tell whether it applies to the (b) or (c), Mr. Hodson.

If you can go to the next page, 007023 , I think it's got page 2.

A
Q
A
I have that.
And if you could go through that, please.
This would still be Mr. -- or Inspector Roberts. I've written Wilson questions, "1 re the --' oh yeah, G.M.M. would be shorthand for Gail Miller
murder, 'are you deliberately holding back any information about that.' '2, have you lied to any question on this test?' and then in brackets, ' (could refer to - did you ever hurt anyone - or to the question whether he was holding back.' Then he went on to advise me, 'Wilson didn't see it, Wilson didn't do it.' I assume those are Wilson's answers to Mr. -- to the inspector. Then the question, 'You know for sure who did it?' and the answer 'yes' underlined. Then the next thing Mr. Roberts, Inspector Roberts told me, 'W --' for Wilson, '-- told Roberts that in Calgary Dave told him: I took her purse, $I$ poked her with knife a few times,' is how $I$ read that.

Based on this note, Mr. Caldwell, are you able to tell us what it was that you understood, what statements of Wilson were determined to be true or which statements were determined to be deceptive or untruthful based on your discussions with Mr. --

I could
Yes.
A
And I guess I'll -- well, the two things under the number 2 , six or eight lines down, 'W didn't see it, $W$ didn't do it,' and then he evidently, 'You
know for sure who did it?' and he answered yes to that. would -- I suppose it could have been on it or off it.

And again, what was your -- let me just go back.
When you were done your call with Inspector Roberts, what did you understand -- let me rephrase it this way. We've heard some evidence, particularly Inspector Roberts' evidence at the Supreme Court, that what may have been tested is Mr. Wilson's denial of any knowledge that was determined to be deceptive, and then he gave incriminating evidence, or as well we've heard that when Mr. Wilson gave incriminating evidence, that his statement giving incriminating evidence was tested and found to be true. Do you understand the difference between the two?

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$
A

Q

A
Well, it was, in a sense, the first impartial, if you will, scientific person to assess Wilson as to the topic of credibility, and $I$ certainly felt that was much better than nothing, and $I$ had no any effect did that have on the way you viewed Ron Wilson's evidence?
reason to, you know, to doubt Mr. Roberts' work.
I never dealt with this topic before and he clearly was in the business at that time. If we can go to 007021 , please, and this is a note, number 55 in the top right-hand corner, and again Emson, can you tell us what this refers to? Yes. It's -- I must have -- oh, Emson, and then I've written, '1. Stabs - one or more knives?' - single or double-edged? - left hand - right hand, can he tell? - significance of no injuries to genitalia.' And then there's a date, evidently September 4th, 1969. I take it from that, sir, that $I$ phoned him and those check marks mean $I$ covered all those things with him. The next thing, he said, 'Friday at five is O.K. Next week: Any time but Thursday morning.' I don't know if that means for me to come up and interview him or --

What is this, these bottom notes?
'E: Bleeding from vagina,' and that would refer again to Dr. Emson, I assume, to ask him that question, and the next one is 'show him pics,' which I assume would be -Let's go back to the top here, one or more knives. Okay.

Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
A

2

A
$Q$

A

What -- do you recall, Mr. Caldwell, being concerned about whether or not one or more knives was used in the attack on Gail Miller?

Yes.

And why was that?
Well, at the time of the original investigation, if you will, my memory is the one and only knife was the broken one which could, in effect, be matched handle and blade.

Yes.
Was taken to be and assumed to be the murder weapon. Now, I know other ones appeared in due course. I understand there's quite a bit of evidence early in the Inquiry, and I happened not to be here for that, about those knives.

I think, and if $I$ may, we've heard that Officer Oliver located a knife $I$ think on March 2nd, 1969 in the vicinity of the body, a bone-handled hunting knife?

Yeah. It was, I believe, the one that was over a fence on the lower stringer of the fence, if I'm not mistaken.

Yes.
And I -- there was some discussion of what was done with that at some --

And I'll deal with that --
A Yeah, okay.
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q
A

Q

A

Q

A

Q
A
$Q$
And then left hand, right hand, can you tell, is that asking Dr. Emson --

A
Yeah, it is.
And would that be based on the fact that Mr.
Milgaard was left-handed?

Well, yeah, it was understood that Mr. Milgaard was left-handed and if he could -- I still don't see how being one handed would eliminate the wounds being made by a person using his, if you will, off hand, but --

It appears that you had raised this with Emson? Oh, yeah, I had.

Would this have come from discussions with Mr. Tallis do you know? I can't see anything to point that way. And then, 'significance of no injuries to genitalia?'

Yeah, that's the -- the situation evidently was that there were none, as $I$ recall his evidence, and I'm asking what the significance of that is in terms of, you know, would that be an invariable finding in most cases or not.

MR. HODSON: This is probably an appropriate spot to break. (Adjourned at 2:47 p.m.) (Reconvened at 3:06 p.m.)

BY MR. HODSON:
Mr. Caldwell, $I$ would now like to turn to Nichol
John and the preliminary hearing, and before we get to her evidence at the preliminary hearing, do
you recall learning about a statement Nichol John made to some other witnesses in the hearing room, or in a waiting room?

A
Q
This -- my note says:
"Mrs. Miller, Mary Marcoux and Albert
Cadrain all heard Nichol John say 'I
don't know why he didn't kill me too - I
was right there \& saw it all, but I'm
not going to say nothing'."

Now, there was, $I$ believe, a witness waiting room involved in this and $I$ believe possibly Peggy Miller was also present, but that isn't revealed in this note. I went by this room and one or other of those three told me this indicating that all three of them heard it and $I$ wrote it down as promptly as possible on whatever $I$ had available. I had thought, Mr. Hodson, that it was in that NB for trial list, which $I$ kept in a spring back
binder on foolscap, and that may surface somewhere else, but either this was my original note and I transferred it to that other one or vice versa.

Okay. Do you have a recollection of the event though?

Yes, I do. It was pretty striking.
And why was it pretty striking?
Well, because this was an admission, if you will, by Nichol John that she saw it all, she was right there, she didn't know why he didn't kill me too, and I'm not going to say nothing, which could only be in the context of Gail Miller as far as $I$ could see.

And you said this was in a waiting room, and was this at or associated with the preliminary hearing?

And would there be any reason for her to be in a witness waiting room after she testified?

A
I wouldn't think so. She may have been hanging
around the scene.
We'll go to some documents later where this 'see in person' page, item 5, and I think, Mr.

Caldwell, in your notes you have a document as part of your preparation where it has NB for trial, which is important.

Uh-huh.
Correct?
Yes.
And then as well you have a list of 'see in person' items?

Okay, I didn't realize that, but --
We'll go to that a bit later, but just so that we note that that -- and $I$ think your evidence is either this is the original note or a note that you transcribed?

A
Q

A
Yes, that's right, one or the --
Do you have a recollection of, when you heard this
information, of writing it down somewhere?
I wrote it as soon as $I$ could while the wording was fresh in my mind, presumably right there in that same area.

Q Okay. If we could then go to 030692. Now, this is Nichol John's transcript from her preliminary hearing evidence, and $I$ believe it was September
the 4th that she testified. The date is not stated on there, but $I$ believe it's Thursday, September the 4 th. Prior to her testifying at the preliminary hearing, Mr. Caldwell, and $I$ think we saw an earlier note that said you would have interviewed her with Mr. Karst I believe?

Yeah, I believe that was the person.
Prior to her giving evidence at the preliminary hearing, $I$ take it you would have interviewed her; is that fair?

Oh, yes, yeah.
And I think you said -- do you have a recollection of that?

One part of it I do. Somewhere I recorded that I interviewed her some three times. Now, I believe that was in my report on the preliminary hearing. Yes.

The one $I$ recollect was the one that $I$ mentioned that took place in my office in which she essentially ran out of the building in tears, that one I remember.

Q And who else was present at that meeting?
A
I would think it was Ullrich and it may have -and one other policeman. I'm not sure that that's recorded anywhere. There would have been one or
more policemen then.
Do you recall why she ran out of your office?
Well, the basic -- I think it was in escape or whether it was out of fear of having to go through and testify about this whole episode, because I was trying to interview her about it.

Do you have a recollection of, and let's talk prior to the preliminary hearing, do you have a recollection in the course of your interview with Nichol John of her ever telling you that she witnessed the murder?

A
Q
No.
And is it possible she did and you don't recall
or --
No. If she had said that, I don't think I would have forgotten that.

And so from that, would it be fair to say then as before you put her on the stand at the preliminary hearing, had you in previous interviews asked her -- let me just back up. I think you said your practice would be to go through the statement that the witness had given; correct?

A
That would be correct.
So you went through the statement with Nichol John and she had not repeated to you that she witnessed
the murder; is that what you are telling us?

A
$Q$

A
Q

And what about some of the other incriminating information in her statement, do you remember if -- do you have a recollection of what she would have said about that?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Well, $I$ think it was -- wasn't that a sequence of three or four or five things?

Yes. Let me just, maybe just help you out a bit here.

Okay.
We know at the trial and at the prelim she did not repeat, and I think, and $I$ stand to be corrected, there was about seven items that were
incriminating to Mr. Milgaard in this statement and at the preliminary hearing and trial she did not repeat those.

That's -- I think I'm thinking about the same sequence you are, sir.

Right. So whether it's seven or not, one of those, in fact, was the witnessing of the stabbing, okay.

Yes.
And so of those incriminating statements that she did not repeat at trial, in the course of any of your interviews with her do you know if she repeated those to you?

I don't feel that she did.
And did that cause you some concern?
Well, it did because $I$ felt that the crux of the matter, the episode we've just been talking about
now, was, A, was truthful.
Q
A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q
And I think your note says as well, it says:
"I don't know why he didn't kill me too

- I was right there and saw it all, but I'm not going to say nothing."

A

Q
Yes.
And that $I$ expected her to testify to it. I could certainly understand why she would be unhappy about doing so.

Did -- what did you attribute to the fact that she wasn't able to repeat the incriminating pieces of information in her statement to you when you interviewed her?

Well, I -- I -- under the overall heading of being afraid of David Milgaard was the jumping off point.

What -- tell us, what significance if any did you place on the comment she made in the hearing, the witness hearing room you just told us about?

Well, $I$ thought that was very significant. If in fact that's what she had seen, it was very, you know, compelling evidence of the attack in one way or another.

That's right.
And again, did you have concerns then, Mr.

Caldwell, that she might not repeat what's in her statement at trial or at the prelim?

A
Now, maybe my counsel may assist me here, I'm sure this episode $I$ believe took place at the prelim if I'm not mistaken.

Q
A

Q
A
Now, I would be concerned that, from her overall demeanour, that she might not say at the prelim or trial what $I$, you know, understood to be the correct, the truth on her part on what she did know, which we'll say those five or six or seven items.
$Q$
Right.
A

Q
A
$Q$
A
Q
And I seem to have -- can you tell me the page of that and I'll get it out?

Sure. If we can call up -- do you want the notes? Either one.

003847 . It will come up on the screen. Okay.

Maybe we can just call out the top part.
MS. KNOX: For Mr. Caldwell's assistance, I don't believe we've ever located the original in
his green ink that this was apparently made in, unless I'm missing it somewhere. I don't believe we've been able to locate his original copy of that and there's only the photocopies found elsewhere in the files.

MR. HODSON: That's correct. So that's -- I guess I'm glad to know that, if you want to put it that way, but --

BY MR. HODSON:
Sorry, did you want to see this note?
No, I have it here, sir, on the screen.
Okay. My question -- I'm sorry, I think you had asked to see this did you?

Yeah, I did. I didn't have it on my screen. Okay. And let me just ask you again, did it occur to you during this time period that Nichol John would not, first of all, tell, repeat the incriminating information to you in interviews and she didn't repeat it at the preliminary hearing or the trial?

A
Q

A Well, by this time, Mr. Hodson, I, for what it's worth, $I$ was satisfied that she had seen that, and
the route in which we got to that was, as you recall, post polygraph by Mr. Wilson. In other words, $I$ know she wasn't tested, but after that and after being shown the uniform by Mr. Roberts I believe is when she made the most incriminating statement, which $I$ took to be true.

Did you go back to Mr. Mackie who took the statement and say, look, what's going on here, she's not -- she's not repeating what she told you, can you explain that?

A

And tell us what you recall or what causes you to say that she was upset with Mr. Mackie?

A

Q
And that's something you knew at the time back then?

A
$Q$
I found it out about then.
Okay. What about Inspector Roberts, did you ever go back and say lookit, she's -- what she told you
in the interview about witnessing a murder she's now not repeating to me and didn't repeat at the preliminary hearing, can you assist us in why that might be?

A any way that --
And yet, when it came time to testify at the prelim, she wouldn't or didn't tell you that? Well I -- that was unfortunate, but $I$ couldn't see

Q Yeah, now --

A
Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
-- to cope with it, Mr. Hodson.
Well was it a case of, and again whether it's by
your recollection or what you are able to tell us
likely occurred, was it a case of Nichol John
saying, 'Lookit, $I$ don't remember that', or was it
a case of saying, 'I don't -- I'm not prepared to
talk to you'?
I don't know. The 'I don't remember', I don't
recall that being said. I got a very strong
impression that she was not willing to talk to me
in that sense.
So --
I mean, she spoke with me, but $I$ got the feeling
that she was not going to, you know, willingly
tell what $I$ believed, then, to be an accurate
story.
And then when you called her -- if we could go to
the preliminary hearing transcript 030692 -- when
you called her to testify at the preliminary
hearing, what was your expectation as to what she
was going to say about the key parts in her
statement, the incriminating parts in her
statement?
Well I am not, I'm not sure what my expectations
were, but $I$ simply had to -- I couldn't not call her as a witness, and $I$ had to do that, and $I$ think, again, there's some mention that three interviews hadn't produced her --

Sure, and I'll get to that.
Okay.
But when you called her as a witness were you putting her on thinking that, once she is under oath in the courtroom, she might repeat from her statement?

A

Q
Yeah, I would say that.
And so there was something --
Did you say 'repeat her' --
I'm sorry, --
Yeah.
-- that she would testify at the prelim consistent
with what she put in her May 24 th statement?
Well I would -- that's what you would expect with, you know, with all witnesses off the top, as it were.

If we could then go to 030704 , this is the transcript, and just quickly go through a couple of the questions. You can see here, this is you asking her questions, and then:
"Q And what happened there?

A Dave got out of the car to see what was wrong, ... we were stuck ...".
"Q ... can you relate the alley to any particular buildings ...

A Yes, behind the funeral home." And then to the next page, actually go to 706, actually, sorry, 705. And then down at the bottom she said:
"Q And you said both he and Ron got out?
A Yes.

Q Was there any discussion as to what they were going to do ...

A Yes, they were going to get help."
Next page:
"Q And you were stuck still?
A Yes.
Q Was Dave still sitting to your right and Ron to your left?

A Yes.
Q When they got out, did you get out?
A No.
Q What happened after they got out?
A Ron went in one direction and Dave went in another.

Q What happened then?

A I don't recall."
A
Q
-- and I've read the transcript, and if we can actually go to the next page. And a couple of questions here:
"Q I see. Did Dave say anything when he got back in the car?

A I can't recall.
Q Okay, and did you notice anything about him, particularly his condition when he got back in the car?

A He was cold. That's all."
And can't estimate how long he was gone, and at
this point in the preliminary hearing you did not challenge her with her previous statements, --

A
Q
A

2

A

Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

Umm - -
-- this isn't in the transcript?
No, I was -- she was, pardon me, my witness to begin with and $I$, as you know, could not, in effect, cross-examine her. I was -- ordinarily you would go with the rules relating to examination-in-chief.

Was there a legal or tactical or other reason that
you did not utilize section 9(2) of the Evidence Act at the preliminary hearing?

Well $I$ know $I$ didn't do it and at this point, sir, I'm not sure why. I suspect that $I$ was not ready to cope with it at that point.

I see. And did you think you needed this evidence from her in order to secure the committal?

I -- I'm not sure. I felt that it was evidence that she knew of, $I$ may well have got a committal for trial in the absence of that evidence, but it

And prior -- sorry?
No, that's all.
And, prior to this, you had provided her May 24 th statement to Mr. Tallis?

A Yes.
Q
Do you recall having any discussion with Mr.
Tallis about the fact that Nichol John was not
repeating --
No, --
$Q$
A
Q
Would it be a fair assumption that you likely would have talked to him about it?

A
$Q$

A
Q
A

Q
A
Q
It could have happened but $I$ don't think there's any notes anywhere to indicate on that.

Right. But he would know, I presume, that she had given a sworn statement saying that she had witnessed the murder; correct?

Yeah, I think she -- Mr. Tallis had so-called -Yeah.
-- both or all three of her statements, --
Yeah.
-- in my understanding.
And then, when you put her on the stand at the preliminary hearing, she says, 'I don't recall
what happened after they got out of the car', and I'm wondering; would that not be something that you and defence counsel would discuss after the fact, 'What about this witness and' --

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q

Oh, you mean at the end of the prelim or something?

Yeah, or at some point?
It could well have been. I don't recall it happening, however.

If we could then go to 048305. And this is a document that the Commission has received, I'm not sure from where, $I$ believe it may have been from the Milgaards, but it's a page of a memorandum September 9th, 1969, and it I believe is Mr. Tallis' memorandum to file.

I see.
Now we don't have Mr. Tallis' file, but we do have
this page, there -- and it's not clear, it
looks -- if we just go down to the bottom for a
moment. It appears to end mid-sentence so it appears that there is more to this memo. But in any event, if we can go back up to the top, and this is September 8th, '69. It says:
"On this date $I$ met with Mr. Caldwell for approximately one hour to review this file and discuss the questions of additional witnesses that are to be called. I made notes of this in my brief book and these notes appear in the

Luboff brief case where you pencilled on my name in white letters. Pull out those notes."

If $I$ can pause there, and $I$ think you told us this yesterday, that it was your practice to, with defence counsel on occasion to go through and un -- go through your file and show them parts of your file?

Umm, yeah, I -- I -- I don't -- I think this looks as if it could be directed to Mr. Disbury, the way -- it doesn't say so but --

Okay. Well, and again, I'm not asking you to -No.
-- to -- that question, Mr. Caldwell.
Yeah, okay.
My question is about your dealings with defence counsel.

A
$Q$
And yesterday I thought you told us that on occasion, with police investigation reports, you might share them and let defence counsel look at them but not give them copies?

A
That is right.
And here, whether this is to Mr. Disbury or to the file or to himself, it appears that Mr. Tallis is
saying that he met with you for an hour to review the file and discuss the question of additional witnesses?

A
Q

Well it's, it says:
"... review the file ...",
"... discuss the question of additional
witnesses that are to be called."
I gather the main subject matter were these whatever additional witnesses were that $I$ proposed to call. Umm, off -- you know, I can't say what those are based on this.

Q Sure. We'll just carry on, and the memorandum says:
"The following points will have to be
carefully briefed in preparation for
this trial:

1. The admissibility of evidence with respect to commission of other offences by the accused both before and after the alleged murder."

And do you know what that -- what that would be?

And I appreciate this isn't your document, --

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
the assault was offhand.
Okay. I had showed you a note earlier today about where you made a note -Yeah.
-- of a police report about a suggestion that Mr. Milgaard had assaulted a girl in Regina, and your note indicated Nichol John.

Oh, all right, that --
Yeah.
I remember that episode from --
And was that something, do you remember whether that was going to be a part of your case at all? I -- it's hard to understand how it would be, except possibly under the heading of reasons why John was, you know, afraid of him.

Okay. And if we can go down, paragraph 2 talks about:
"The admissibility in evidence of objects found but which cannot be identified or specifically linked to the particular crime - in this connection I am thinking of such items as the toque and so forth. When dealing with items of this nature it seems to me that the main grouping of the evidence or its
admissibility will centre around relevance.
3. In this particular case it will be important to have complete production of statements of Crown witnesses and in this connection $I$ may want to have production of the lie detector material."

And then it goes on about:
"The admissibility of so-called self serving evidence will be very important ...",
but $I$ don't know what else is said. If we can then go to 007014,
and this is page 60 in the top right-hand corner, do you have that note?

A
That's it? Yes, sir.
And it appears that there's three pages here, are there, 60,59 , and 58 in the top right; is that correct?

A
Q
And so this is September 8th, '69, this is the same date as Mr. Tallis' memo indicates that he met with you, correct?

A I -- yes.

And would these be your notes? And just actually scroll down for a moment. Actually, go back, go back to the full page.

A
Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
A
Q
And if we could just go through, $I$ think number 1, and on this date there were still two days left in the prelim, 'Witnesses to recall Wednesday 12 noon

Kliev, Reid, Penkala McCorriston, Oleksyn'. Do you know what the 'E' refers to; the exhibits?

Not offhand, but I hope I'll --
Okay. If we can go down to number 2, 'Remaining Crown witnesses', and you have got 'MacLeod', who I think was the RCMP lab person, and you have got a note here that says 'Tallis not requiring'? That would be what he told me, and he would have undoubtedly been excused as a result.

And then, 'Fleming, Mackie, Mackie, Shawchuk, Gerse, Karst, Edmondson, Pratt, and Emson'; do you know what these 'E' and 'C' would refer to? Not offhand, but $I$ hope something will come up. Okay. I'm not sure if anything turns on it. Paragraph 3, it says, 'Cal wants Mrs. Wilson, Roberts', and then beside 'Mrs. Wilson' it says 'asked D/C', which I assume is deputy chief, 'to subpoena'?

A That's right.
Q And then, here, 'I to phone'?
A Yeah, I was to phone Roberts.
Q
So can you tell us what -- what does this note tell us?

A
Oh, well he's, that's the third heading that he wants to -- Mrs. Wilson, presumably, to attend,
and I've arranged to subpoena her, presumably Mr.
Roberts to attend, and I -- I was to phone him.
That may -- we -- may be the phone call we've already seen, I'm not sure.

Well if $I$ can assist you, Mr. Caldwell, -Yeah.
-- I will be showing you notes that suggest that you did subpoena Shirley Wilson --

Okay.
-- to attend at the preliminary hearing, and in fact arranged to have Inspector Roberts fly in, he didn't testify at the preliminary hearing but the documents suggest that you and Mr. Tallis interviewed him.

And I have a letter here that I'll show you that appends them as a follow-up.

That's good.
Your counsel has advised me that the 'E' may refer to 'advised Elmer'; is that --

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q
A

Q

A
Q

Umm, that could, that could well be the case, in that he'd be the way, the person $I$ would deal with in getting witnesses.

And if we can just call up 007026 , this may assist you. You see here, 'advised Elmer'; does that help you out at all?

That could -- appears to mean that $I$ told Elmer, we'll say, Wilson could be on Wednesday or Thursday.

No, no, I am just -- Mr. Caldwell, I think I had asked you the question earlier as to what the initial 'E' meant on your earlier note?

Okay. I can't come up with anything better, for the moment, than that.

Okay.
What my counsel suggested.
If we could go back to 007014 . If we can go down
to the bottom, and so do we take it from that that
Mr. Tallis had asked you to have Mrs. Wilson and
Mr. Roberts brought in?
Yeah, that's how I read it.
And if we can go to the next page, please. And this is, 'G.W. Pratt, elevator agent, Aylesbury', and then a note, 'Looked like the one but no identification mark on it, if busy at elevator
can't come, told him I'd call him Tuesday'; do you know what this relates to?

A
Q
A
Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
 Yeah. The left hand, left hand is the Source, evidently the second column Witness, Does It Show This, so Ullrich -- then the witness 'Dennis Elliott' and, 'It does not show that', in other words there's nothing indicating, in his evidence, that it would tend to show the prisoner innocent. The next one is 'Karst' who evidently was -- you know -- is 'L. Spence, Elliott', and then I have, 'As above'.

Okay, before we go through the rest, -Okay.

Q
A
$Q$

A

Q
A
Q

A

Q

A
Q
A
$Q$

A
Q
No, I don't, sir.
Would it be your practice then, if you were meeting with Mr. Tallis, to go through the file and identify some possible witnesses which tend to show prisoner innocent?
And do you have a recollection of that or are you show prisoner innocent?

Well that's what he was wanting me to do and I was, you know, trying to do that.

And $I$ guess my question is are you able to tell us whether these would be notes showing this is what you went and showed Mr. Tallis, these statements -- and I'll go through them with you -Okay.
-- or whether these are your own notes that you went -- from when you went through the file; are you able to tell us?

Umm, maybe we could go through them and -Sure.
-- it will become apparent.
So here we've got Elliott and Spence, we've heard about those people.

Uh-huh.
There is a follow-up letter which $I$ will go to when we're done this --

Okay.
-- that identifies some of those statements. We then have ' Nicholas Canton, statement number 23, suspects Spence'. 'Orlee Lehne, number 25 , says falling out with Spence, number $25^{\prime}$.
this is the Orlee Lehne statement, you will see
the number 25 --

A
$Q$路 - that' see here:

> "She advised me she had a falling out with her boy friend Les Spence of Purdue ..."

So do you see that? Orlee Lehne is saying, giving a statement January 31 that Gail Miller had advised her she had had a falling out with her boyfriend, Les Spence. If we can go back to the note.

Oh, umm --
And just go back to the note. So you've got a note here, 'Orlee Lehne, number 25 , says falling out with Les Spence'?

Yeah, that's a nutshell of --
So my question is, is that something you think you would have shown Mr. Tallis at the meeting, or -Well it -- if I can -- can we have that back and I'll read the last one you showed me?

You want the statement back?
Yeah, the police report thing that was on a moment ago.

Okay. If we can go back to 006369 .

A Okay.

Q
A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Yeah. I can't tell from this materials, sir.
They are certainly the one, and it may well be that Mr. Tallis and I discussed them, based on
what I've just heard here.
Was it your practice, at the time, to go through the file and identify these things and show them to defence counsel?

A

Q

A

Q
A
Q
A

Q
And they would be notes of your review of
statements and police reports; is that fair?
A
Q
Yeah.
And you can't tell us whether or not you shared it
with Mr. Tallis or not?
Not at this time.
That's fine. And if we can just scroll down, you
will see, 'Leonard Balzer, number 30', and it says
-- maybe you can just read that?
A
Oh, that is, 'Cab fare with knives going to kill
girlfriend.' Somebody he was giving a taxi ride
to -- evidently with -- that person had knives and was going to kill girlfriend. You know, that --
$Q$
A

Q

A

Q Yes.
-- could be something that could fit into that category.

You had mentioned earlier, when we had talked about a note where you were going to read Mr. Tallis' letter and check on rumours, and you had said that there may have been some rumours that Mr. Tallis wanted you to check?

It could be he could have put some of these to me and asked me to see if we had statements covering them or something of that sort.

And then the next one says, 'See page 117, Morris Tkachuk'. And if we can call up 183170, and you will see it says 117, we'll go to 117 of the police report, and you'll see if we go to the next page, please, page 117, call out the bottom. And this is McCorriston's report, I think of February 3rd or 5 th:
"7:52 A.M. Checked at the rear of a new apartment block construction at the south west corner ..."
"George Weinmeyer ... He is a painter and arrived work at approximately 7:40
A.M. ... He stated a drywall employee had been there from approximately 6:00 A.M. that date."

And:
"His name was not known however further investigation revealed this person to be Morris Tkachuk ... He states he arrived at work at approximately 5:50 A.M. Jan.

31st."
And this is at the apartment block that is just at the end of the $T$ alley.

A

Q

Okay.
"... stated he had been working on the second floor ... and could not have seen toward the ..."
alley.
And then if we could call up,
just to add to that if we could call up 006373 , which is a statement from a George Weinmeyer.

And what George Weinmeyer says:
"On Friday January 31 I arrived for work
at 7:40 a.m.",
and then scroll down to the bottom, it says:
"Anyway Jack Hicks and $I$ were discussing
a drywall applicator whose first name is

Morris I believe.
He works for Mechanical Drywall
. . ."
And then the next page. It says:
"I believe that this person said he arrived at 6 AM and came in a taxi. He then said on Monday Feb. 3rd that his dad had brought him to work." And then down at the bottom:
"The only thing really is the fact that I don't think he was at work at 6 AM. I feel I would have heard him in the building although he could have been there."

So that's the information on Morris Tkachuk. And I'm just wondering whether that, would that be something you would share with Mr. Tallis, or are you able to tell us?

A
$Q$ Could you tell us why you would have made a note then? Go back to 007016 .

A And is that where --

Q
Can you tell us what -- why you would have made that note?

Oh, okay.
And, again, this document talks about, it looks like, other suspects?

Yeah, 'See page 117 re Morris Tkachuk', presumably
that would be followed by looking at the thing we just did, and it wouldn't amaze me if $I$ didn't think that could in any way be -- you know, provide evidence leading away from the suspect, to put it awkwardly.

And, again, and I'm wondering what would cause you to put this on the note as --

Umm - -
-- compared to others that don't get on the note?
Well he's -- he's -- he's on there in one sense -Yeah.
-- and various other --
Let me just back up.
Okay.
I'm not suggesting, Mr. Caldwell, that you should have disclosed this --

No, no.
-- to Mr. Tallis.
Okay.
$Q$
A

I'm simply asking for you to tell us how it is that you made this note and why you would have put this information on there?

On my page? Well it, again, it would be -- I suppose he could fit into that category that we have been looking for, people that might have evidence pointing away from the guilt of the accused.

Yes, and why would you be making notes of that? Well it would be at Mr. Tallis' request.

And then what would you do with this information?
Well I would, I assume that I passed it to him either in print or in the meeting we've been spoken, --

Okay.
-- or otherwise.
Okay. If we go back to page 117, if we could call up 183170 and go to the next page, we see 117 at the top. And $I$ read before, this information of McCorriston's about Morris Tkachuk, now I want to call back up the full page.

Okay.
And we see as well on that same page, at the top,
a reference to:
" $6: 49$ A.M. checked in 300 Blk. Ave. O. South, Larry Fisher 334 Avenue O South.

Works at Masonery Contractors ...", and we've read through that before.

Uh-huh.
Again, at the time, Mr. Caldwell, would that information there, the entry that Mr. McCorriston made about Larry Fisher; would that be of any significance to you at that time?

A
No, it -- he was simply one of a series of people who -- who Detective McCorriston interviewed at these various times, got essentially name and address of them. This is what $I$ believe $I$ found on the request of Mr. Williams later when $I$ was asked to search the file -Okay.

A

Q
-- for the name Larry Fisher. At this point I didn't know the name of Larry Fisher in any shape or form and the address, equally, did not mean anything to me.

But when you talk about Mr. Williams, was this in 1989 or '90?

Yeah, the one we've spoke of earlier, I think.
And, I'll touch on that a bit later, --

A Yeah.
Q
-- but Mr. Williams phoned you and asked you to what?

A
It's possible, yeah.
If we can go back to 007016, just go back, and I
don't propose to call these up. I think Murray
Harris, number 32 -- these two statements, Murray
Harris and Lloyd Miller, are two statements that
talk about a fellow with a knife at a party Gail
Miller was at and another individual who was at a
party. I can give you the doc IDs, statement 32,
Mr. Harris' is 006383 , and the Lloyd Miller
statement is 006389 . And the last one, Raymond
LaPlante, is 006432 , statement 47, and again, I
don't think me need to go through them, but those statements, Mr. Caldwell, have in them information about, $I$ think in a couple of cases, parties where Gail Miller was at and a fellow pulled a knife, things of that nature.

Okay.
And so is it fair to say that that might have been
information that you took out of the statements
as -- again we can go to the top heading --
Yeah, it could be.
Go back to the full page, please.
It could be that.
Would those all be possible witnesses with
evidence which tends to show prisoner innocent?
I -- yeah, I believe by that definition they would.

Would there be any other reason for you to make these notes other than to provide, or as part of your request from Mr. Tallis to review the file? No, I can't think of any, and I certainly feel I would have conveyed all this to him, be it of whatever strength or weakness, Mr. Hodson. .
the original, but you certainly may.
A
$Q$

And again this talks about his letter of August 21, '69 and your letter, you say:
"I have obtained all the statements obtained from civilian witnesses in relation to this investigation, totalling ninety-five."

And so I think we had identified earlier that
that was the number of civilian statements?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
Q
A
Q
A
Q

A
Q
$Q$

Yeah, and $I$ read them as it says here.
And just for the record, Mr. Caldwell, there was -- there ended up being 98 statements.

Okay.
Actually 99 statements, 98 , being three additional
ones from Melnyk, Lapchuk and Ute Frank came
later.
Okay.
And there's two statements from MacRae Fraser, one is 31 and one is 31 A , so just so that we're all on the same page.

Okay. Those three, as we all know --
-- relate?
Yeah, and also went to Mr. Tallis.
And we'll deal with those later.
Okay, that's fine.
So it says here that you would have gone through and read all 95 civilian witness statements? That's what I did. "... and have read these statements over to see whether any of these witnesses would, in my opinion, "... be able to give evidence of assistance to the defence ..." as suggested in your
letter."

You say:
"I have also noted the statement in
Dallison vs. Caffrey."

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q
A didn't see anything, you know, objectionable about it.
$Q$
Yes.
And then you quote it, stating:
"The duty of a prosecuting counsel or
solicitor, as $I$ have always understood
it, is this: If he knows of a credible witness who can speak to material facts which tend to show the prisoner to be innocent, he must either call that witness himself or make his statement available to the defence."

Yeah.
And, Mr. Caldwell, at the time would this quote from Dallison vs. Caffrey that you set out, was that what you understood your duty to be at the time?

I think Mr. Tallis --
He did.
-- sent it to me and I'm in effect adopting it. I

And the quote from Dallison vs. Caffrey, was that
basically your understanding of your obligation at the time?

Yeah, it would be.
And then you go on to say:
"The only material that could possibly
fall into this category, as far as $I$ am concern, arose early in the
investigation."
And you go on to talk about Les Spence, the Nicholas Canton information, Orlee Lehne comment, and talked about the fallings out, and then scroll down, you talk about one Dennis Elliott had taken Gail Miller out on the evening of January $30 t h$ and was to have taken her out the next evening. He saw a man unknown to be parked in a vehicle across the street.
"Both Dennis Elliott and Leslie Spence were eliminated as suspects in the murder to the satisfaction of the investigators ..."

So I take it you would have informed Mr. Tallis that here's what the police had on spence and Elliott as suspects and they were eliminated and as well that Elliott saw a man unknown to him parked in a vehicle across the street when he
took Gail Miller home?
I put that in the letter.
Yeah. And then the next page, you say:
"You will understand that in my opinion, none of the above constitutes evidence "... which tends to show the prisoner innocent ...". However, you may have a different opinion on this and, therefore, $I$ have supplied the above information as possibly coming closest to evidence in that category which $I$ have been able to find on the file. I have also spoken to some of the investigators who are most familiar with the file and they suggested the names of Elliott and Spence."

And again, would that have happened?
Yes, yeah.
And then you say:
"You will recall asking me earlier about
a taxi driver who was supposed to have driven Gail Miller and a man to work on the morning of January 31 st, and $I$ some time ago supplied you with copies of the two statements by MacRae Fraser to read.

I now enclose copies of these statements for your file, and, as you will recall from reading the statements, it appears that Fraser is of the opinion that this incident took place either on January $30 t h$ or $29 t h$ and not January 31 st." It suggests here, Mr. Caldwell, that prior to this you had let Mr . Tallis read the statements before you gave him copies?

I would take it that way.
And then it says you also asked for and I now enclose copies of the statements from the Danchuks, scroll down, copies of the statements taken from the accused. You say:
"As I mentioned to you, I may or may not attempt to have either or both of these statements ruled voluntary, either for the purposes of putting them in as confessions or holding them for cross-examination purposes, at the trial."

And $I$ think we saw a note about that a little earlier; correct?

A Yeah, correct.
Q And it says:
"The above material is forwarded to you in addition to the various copies of statements and reports which $I$ sent to you earlier in this connection. I wish to emphasize, however, that if you have any specific inquiries to make of me concerning specific persons whom you may learn of who supposedly can shed any light on the case $I$ will be pleased to track these down for you, to the best of my abilities, in the file or through the investigators. If you have any such requests to make $I$ will be pleased to hear from you in due course."

And again, can you elaborate on that, Mr. Caldwell?

A
Just -- just in the same spirit, if he -- give him everything that appears to fall under that heading. If he comes up in future with a suggestion of other persons, in effect, who would fall into that category, I'm volunteering to do my best to track them down in the sense that through the police department is the sort of jumping off point for that. Does that --

Yes. And then it says:
"As requested by yourself, I have added the names of Inspector Roberts of the Calgary Police Department, and,

Mrs. Shirley Wilson of Regina, to the list of Crown witnesses as required by the Legal Aid Plan, and $I$ hope that both of these persons will be in Saskatoon Wednesday."

And then:
"The various Police Officers who were to check their notes for further information will be attending at my office at 12:00 noon on September 10th, at which time we will be able to interview them and you should be able to recall any of them you wish on the afternoon of that date."

I take it from this that Mr. Tallis had asked you to have the police check notes for further information?

That's right, and at that meeting the plan would be that if he felt there was any need to or want to recall any of them, it could be done evidently on that afternoon.

And were you making these officers available to be
interviewed by Mr. Tallis?
A
Q
Yeah, that's what it says I take it.
Do you know if that happened?
I don't, but $I$ would expect, Mr. Hodson, that it did happen, because it would matter to him and I don't know why it wouldn't have happened.

MR. HODSON: Okay. This might be an
appropriate spot to break for the day,
Mr. Commissioner. I think we're moving on to a different area. I appreciate it's four o'clock, but $I$ think it has been a long day.

```
(Adjourned at 4:00 p.m.)
```
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