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## Transcript of Proceedings

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

## THOMAS DAVID ROBERTS CALDWELL, continued:

Q
A
Q
Yesterday when we adjourned we were dealing with a September 9th letter, September 9th, '69. If I could call up 007011 , and just to cover a couple of points that we touched on yesterday, you will recall, Mr. Caldwell, that based upon your notes and Mr. Tallis' memorandum it appears that you met with him on September the 8th, 1969; do you recall us looking at those documents yesterday?

A
Q

A
$Q$
Q

Morning, Mr. Caldwell.
Morning, sir.

Yes I do.
And it appears from those notes that there may have been, and $I$ think you said likely was, some discussion about the file and witness information, and that Mr. Tallis had asked for some information; is that correct? I would think that happened, sir. And I think $I$ asked you, and you agreed, that your

```
BY MR. HODSON:
```

```
BY MR. HODSON:
``` quote in your letter from the Dallison vs Caffery
case, \(I\) think you said that that was what you believed to be your obligation at the time as far as providing either information or statements to defence counsel; is that correct?

A
\(Q\) That's right.

If we could just go back to, or go to the next page, I just want to -- actually, and if you want to look at the original or -- I think your counsel has a copy of that.

Oh, thank you.
It's got 62 in the top right-hand corner. So I think, just in the bottom there, your letter says:
"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. . . .", which was the next day, and \(I\) think that was the day, the day before the prelim was finishing: "... at which time we will be able to interview them and you should be able to recall any of them you wish in the afternoon of that date."

We touched on this briefly. I think you said yesterday that the officers were coming to your
office, and that you and Mr. Tallis would
interview them, is that fair, or that he would have an opportunity to interview them?

A

Q

I've got a note that \(I\) will show you in a moment --

A
\(Q\)
Okay fine.
-- that appears -- that has some information from officers that may assist, -Okay.
-- but maybe we'll deal with that then. And so then Mr. Tallis would come to your office, you would have the officers available, and then if he chose you would then recall these witnesses?

A Yeah. The situation there appeared to be these would be ones which he would indicate to me that he wanted called, and \(I\) would call them, and it would still be the Crown's case in the prelim, as I read this, was --

Yes.
-- was about to finish.
And are you able to tell us who the police officers were, by memory, or who you think they would have been?

Not from the letter, \(I\) can't, sir.
And so at this point, we're September 9th, 1969, and there's some further communication and further letters with disclosure later on in the file and I'll go through those, Mr. Caldwell, but I want to pause at this point and just talk a bit about the police theory. We've heard evidence that at the time, certainly in February of 1969 and perhaps later, that the Saskatoon City Police and the RCMP, who were investigating the murder, had a theory that the person who had raped two woman -women and attempted to rape a third in October and November of 1968 , that that person, if we'll call them the rapist of those three previous assaults, that that rapist was also the same person who
killed Gail Miller. Now I believe I asked you on Monday whether you were aware of that as being a theory and \(I\) think you told us you were not; is that correct?

A
I think that's correct, sir.
So if we just pause here, though, where would you, as prosecutor -- I mean we know that, based on the police evidence, that the police had that theory, and you are -- I think you have told us you didn't know about it. Are you able to tell us again, looking back, how -- how would it be that you wouldn't know about it? And maybe that's not a question for you, but for the police, but \(I\) wouldn't mind your thoughts on that?

Well \(I\) would be, if you will, very much concentrating and involved with trying to get the -- this preliminary hearing on and through in the best form I could. I think I'd be, to a large extent I'd be ignoring other crimes, if you will, that went on in the city, including newspaper accounts of them. I wouldn't -- I have no recollection of seeing newspaper accounts and, as you know, there were one or two searches of the file at various peoples' requests which didn't produce any -- cause -- I should say carried out
by myself. So other crimes in general, I'd be pretty well looking at this case, and I -- it -- I would expect that, if there was someone thinking that such and such a witness or episode bore on the David Milgaard prosecution, they would be coming to me and saying, "Eh, did you get this report", or, "I want to advise you of so and so". I don't believe that happened, sir.

Okay. If we could take a look at that, and I think -- correct me if I'm wrong -- but I think that when you got the package of information from the police \(I\) think what you are saying -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- is that there wasn't something there that flagged this and said, "Oh, by the way, we had this other theory but it didn't prove to work"?

A
Yeah, I think it certainly didn't get before me, and in a form -- \(I\) don't think in any form. Okay.

Certainly not in a form in which \(I\) would start out following whatever leads those may have been.

Right. And if we just take a look at the ways in which you, as prosecutor, might become aware of this, the first would be that it might be in the file materials that the police give you?

A
Q
A

Q

A

Q
A
Q

A
Q

A
\(Q\)

A
Well it -- I would only be -- that would only happen if someone came to me saying, "Did you
        information, \(I\) suppose, would be to be generally
        aware of it or to be in discussions with police
        officers and just be familiar with that part of
        the investigation?
        Well it -- \(I\) would only be -- that would only
        happen if someone came to me saying, "Did you
notice item \(X\) or \(Y^{\prime \prime}\), you know. I wouldn't be trying to broaden my view of the murder prosecution.

And a third way, sir, would be -- and if we take a look at what, the letter we just went through, is that you going back to the police, and we saw this with Dennis Elliott and Les Spence?

Yeah.
They were suspects who were eliminated, and it appears that you either went through the file, or went back to the police and said, "Lookit, Mr. Tallis wants to know about these rumours or about these theories", and someone checked out, or you checked out, --

Yeah.
-- other suspects?
Yeah. That, \(I\) think, is inescapable from --
Is that --
And I would have done that for any (a) suspect, or (b) other theory that he put to me.

Right. And that would be -- involve you looking at the file and doing your own independent review, saying, 'Okay, what other suspects might be here, what might have been eliminated', right, so there would be that?

A

I would have to do that, I think.
Yeah. And, secondly, it also appears, from at least some of the documents we've gone through so far, and said, "Tell me, police", we've saw the notes of Karst and Ullrich, saying, "Who were some other suspects"; correct?

Yeah. Because all, beyond looking at my file, the next thing \(I\) would do or have to do is talk to policemen --

And --
-- and say, "What do you think of Mr. X or Y?"
And do you think, Mr. Caldwell, and I -- do you have any recollection of the specifics of what you would have talked to the police about, and those, things of that nature?

Not the specifics, no.
Based upon the documents that we looked at, and your practices at the time, do you think you would have gone back to the police and said, "Lookit, tell me who are some other suspects or who were suspects, do you have any information that might tend to show that the accused is innocent", things of that nature?

I understood, sir, that it appeared that \(I\) had done that.

Q It --

A
\(Q\)

A
Q
A
Q

A
\(Q\)

From what you said.
It appears from the notes, well certainly the notes we went through yesterday, --

Yeah.
-- and \(I\) can call them up if you like?
Yeah.
In fact maybe what \(I\) could do is just call up page
007014 . And this was the notes, I think you've told us, the three-page notes of your meeting with Mr. Tallis. And if we could go to -- you seem to remember at the bottom, here are the statements that Mr. Tallis wanted, and go to the third page. And this is titled Possible witnesses with evidence which "tends to show prisoner innocent"? Yeah.

And we went through this yesterday and \(I\) believe, and \(I\) went through, actually, some of the files, and \(I\) believe your evidence, sir, was that this would be -- be notes you made of either the review of the file or the meeting with the police, or the meeting with Mr. Tallis, but that it would reflect a review of police files and information; is that
\(\qquad\)
requests that we know about here.
Okay. And so I think you said, with Source, that you may have actually asked officers?

Yeah. What that would mean, Mr. Hodson, is in the case of Dennis Elliott \(I\) would have, in effect, asked Ullrich, third column Does It Show This, is 'no'.

Oh, I see.
In the case of Spence and Elliott, I asked Karst, and once again Elliott \(I\) have 'as above', which I think refers to L. Spence, in other words it's the same result.

Right.
And both those were -- the file did not show any of that class of evidence based on me speaking with the people we just mentioned here.

Right. And \(I\) take it, \(I\) mean there's nothing in this note that talks about the rapist theory, if \(I\) can call it that, or the unknown, if -- let me put it this way, the unknown suspect, being the person who committed the three previous assaults?

A
Q

A
\(Q\)
Q

A
\(Q\)
A
\(Q\)
A
\(Q\)
'

In the case of Spence and Eliiott, I asked Karst,

Yeah, I'm sure.
There's nothing in the document?
I'm sure you are right, sir.
And so, again, do we take it from that, Mr.

Caldwell, that that was something that you would have not known about then?

A
Q
A
\(Q\)
A

Q

A
\(Q\)

A
A reah, I said, 'You may have a different opinion and therefore \(I\) 'm supplying it', and \(I\) pointed out that:
"... as possibly coming closest to
evidence in that category ... which I
haven't been able to find on the file." And then, Mr. Hodson, it goes on. As you can see:
"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."

So, in other words, \(I\) both read the file and talked to the people who should have knowledge of those people, persons.

Okay. And just back again, \(I\) think \(I\) was talking about the ways in which you, as prosecutor, might find out this information. I think, number one, we identified by it being in the police file that you got that you would read it; correct?

Oh yes.
And so let me just make sure we're on the same page.

Okay.
I was talking about trying to probe a bit, Mr. Caldwell, to see what may have happened back then as to the information that the police had. We know the police had theories and information about an unknown rapist as a suspect, about how it might have either got to your attention, and just to
look at that process?

A
\(Q\)

A

Q

A
\(Q\)
A
Q

A
\(Q\)

A

Okay.
So I think, number 1, we said it could be in the police brief that you got, it could be in that file?

That would be one.
And I'll go through that in a moment. Secondly, it could be in verbal communication that police officers gave to you in discussions, or you were generally aware of it?

That could be.
And I think you've told us you weren't?
Yeah.
Third, it would be where you go back to the police and say it appears from the documents that you did that, tell me who were suspects, tell me who has been eliminated, things of that nature?

That appears to be what \(I\) did.
And the fourth way, might I suggest, we've also seen some indication that Mr . Tallis made some specific requests of you to follow up to get me information on, we saw the cab driver, get some information on the cab driver and some other matters?

Q

A

Q

A
Q

Q

If the police would have told you at that time, Mr. Caldwell, that initially the police were of the view that the person who committed the rapes,
doesn't appear that that information was the subject at least of written discussion between you and the police?

No, that's correct, sir.
the three previous -- when \(I\) call them rapes, there was the two rapes and an attempted rape -prior to the Gail Miller murder that the police said we have a theory that the person who committed those -- or number 1, that the same person committed those three offences -Okay.
-- and secondly, we believe that person may also have committed the murder and that that was pursued as part of the investigation, okay. All right.

And that that was a theory at the time and that the police, once they developed a case against David Milgaard, eliminated that theory or eliminated the unknown suspect, the unknown rape suspect as a suspect in the murder, and would that be information, if the police had told you that and said yes, this is what we pursued and here's all the information and we concluded that it was not the same person and we eliminated the unknown rapist as a suspect, is that the type of information that you think, Mr. Caldwell, if you had it at the time, that you would have given to Mr. Tallis?

I would think so because, Mr. Hodson, that's quite
a comprehensive package that you've described; in other words, that's not just someone saying what about good old so and so, that would be a process where they did a careful investigation, presumably came to a conclusion, \(I\) would assume they would, you know, bring that to me and make me aware of it, and in that case \(I\) wouldn't have -- I would have given it to Mr. Tallis had I, in effect, had it or known of that in that form. I wonder if that's --

Yes. And would that be, and again if we get back, we don't need to bring it up, but the test, if I can call it, that you said you were trying to follow, the Dallison vs Caffrey, is that a credible witness who can speak to material facts which tend to show the prisoner to be innocent, now, it may not have been a witness, but I suppose the police could be a witness, saying yeah, this is --

It does, a police officer could be a witness and it would be a credible witness tending to show the innocence of Milgaard that we're speaking of.

Right. And that would be the -- and again, when we get back to -- I guess if we can make it simple, when we're looking at, as a prosecutor, at
a file to try and identify material facts which tend to show the prisoner to be innocent, am I correct that there's sort of two different ways to do that, and one is here's information that tends to show that Mr. Milgaard did not commit the crime?

A
\(Q\)

A

2

A
\(Q\)
Yes.
And two, here's information to suggest that someone else committed the crime?

Yeah.
Because if someone else committed the crime, Mr . Milgaard didn't; is that fair?

That makes sense.
And so those would be the two prongs of what you would look at when you are -Yeah.
-- trying to address the duty that you saw at the time to provide information or witness statements to defence counsel?

That sounds correct to me, sir.
And the fourth \(I\) think that we talked about, and that would be that Mr. Tallis had asked you for the information, and in asking you this question, Mr. Caldwell, I'm not suggesting that Mr. Tallis should have asked you, okay, but if he had, if

Mr. Tallis had in the course of these discussions said, 'lookit, \(I\) understand there were some rapes at the time or \(I\) understand from talking to officer \(X\) that that was investigated, would you go get me information on these rapes,' would you have complied with that request?

Absolutely, because of various reasons, including my respect for Mr. Tallis' ability and integrity and his knowledge of things in the community which I may not know about, \(I\) would have unquestionably pursued that.

If we can now just turn, I just want to go through some documents that were in your, I believe in your prosecution file and just ask you some questions about them.

All right.
First if we could go to document 009298 , and this is number 25A, 25B and C. I'm not sure, Ms. Knox, whether he needs to see the original on this. It's the typed version and I'm just referring to one paragraph, and so maybe just -- have you got that? Maybe just look at the screen. If you want the paper copy, let me know.

A
Thank you.
This is a letter of February 5, 1969 from Mr.

Penkala to the Crime Index section, and if we can go to the next page, and it starts off, "Re murder of Gail Miller," provides a description, and the next page, it ends up with a conclusion, and \(I\) believe, Mr . Caldwell, this is on your prosecution file and \(I\) believe you have acknowledged, or \(I\) will ask you to acknowledge that this document, that you did have it back in 1969, 1970? If that's the indication, I'm sure I did, sir. Okay. And if we can go to this last paragraph, it describes the offence and it says: "Our department has two unsolved cases, dating back into October and November of 1968, which involve complaints of rape. In both these cases, the victim was attacked from behind while walking in the late evening, forced into a lane and, under threat with a knife, made to undress and submit to intercourse. The victims were always threatened and forbidden to see the attacker who, after the attack, carried away some of the victim's clothing. In these cases, the attacker allowed the victim to replace some of the clothing, usually the outer
garment or coat."
And so this refers to the two rape cases?

A
Q

A

2

A
\(Q\)

A

Q
And are you able to tell us, and \(I\) believe just for the record I think -- and we'll see this a bit later in the police -- in the Ullrich summary that he sent to you, the three-page police summary, the 21 page witness summary, the witness statements, the police reports, there was also a package of correspondence that was sent, various police have read it, sir. (
correspondence.

A
\(Q\)

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q
A

Okay.
And that's where this information was obtained \(I\) believe, Mr. Caldwell.

Okay, sir.
And \(I\) guess you would have read that. Are you able to tell us whether that would have, or did it cause you to \(I\) guess think about or consider whether those two unsolved cases might have something to do with the Gail Miller murder? Well, I'm taking it for granted that \(I\) read it. At this point \(I\) can't remember what if any action it prompted me to --

Yeah, and it would appear from this, just by the description of the rapes, about undressing, submitting to intercourse and then replacing some of the clothing, and we know, we talked yesterday about the unusual state that Gail Miller's dress was found in with the -- which I think you said it appeared that she undressed and then put her coat back on before she was stabbed?

Yeah, or someone did that.
Someone did that to her, I'm sorry, yes.
But I think those are parallel things, Mr. Hodson, those two or three things you've just mentioned.

It is in 1968, which is of course shortly before this, before the Milgaard matter, so I assume I read it. I can't -- \(I\) can't see any indication that it prompted me to take any action, unless you have other --

No, I have just put this to you, and perhaps with the benefit of hindsight, Mr. Caldwell, does this -- you've talked about the parallels between --
-- those two or three things.
Those two rapes and the Gail Miller murder. That's apparent in looking at the document now? Yes, it is, and the benefit of hindsight, I certainly would have, if \(I\) had it to do all over, which hopefully \(I\) won't, I might have pursued those things, but it didn't --

At the time, sir, and \(I\) think you've told us you don't think this connected, if \(I\) can call it that, if it had connected, what would you have done?

Well, \(I\) would have said did you ever solve those two cases that are mentioned in there. I think they are mentioned as unsolved cases. Presumably they remained unsolved for some period, including this period of time. I suppose you would say what's the evidence, what can you tell me about
the evidence you do have, identity, similarities, differences to this case. You would be more used to working with those in terms of similar acts evidence and trying to call that on a current case which was -- of course \(I\) didn't attempt to do in this, in the Milgaard prosecution.

And back at the time when you are probing the police for information, would it be sort of a request such as lookit, can you people look at the files and tell whether there's anything that -Yeah, very likely phone some investigator or Ullrich and say what can you tell me about this more than is in here.

And would you -- what effect if any would sort of the evidence you had against Mr. Milgaard play into that; in other words, would the fact that you had what you thought at the time was an eye witness --

Yeah.
-- to the crime and an admission from another witness, where, if any, would that play into your thought process?

A
Well, in that state of affairs, the case against Mr. Milgaard would be much stronger than either of these because we did have Nichol John as an eye
witness, Wilson as a quasi eye witness if you will, and --

I'm sorry, let me just maybe rephrase the question, \(I\) 'm not sure \(I\) put it well. When you are talking to the police and trying to identify exculpatory information or information that may tend to show the prisoner innocent, I'm wondering what influence if any the facts and the case you have against Mr. Milgaard would play? I'm not asking you to judge other suspects or anything of that, but what \(I{ }^{\prime} m\) trying to get at is if you felt that you had such a strong case against Mr. Milgaard based on the evidence, would that cause you to do anything different when you go to the police and sort of to what lengths you go to try and probe and get information that may tend to show him innocent? Do you understand what I'm trying to get at?

A
I think so. I don't know, Mr. Hodson, quite how to answer that. I didn't think I had a strong case against Mr. Milgaard. I don't know what effect that would have on my request to police to, you know, pursue these two other unidentified accused offences; in other words, I would have thought it would be the same thing. Strong or
weak case against him \(I\) wouldn't think would affect how \(I\) approach that last paragraph, if \(I\) did.

To what extent, Mr. Caldwell, would you be relying on the police to bring to your attention this type of information about other theories and other suspects that may have been eliminated?

Well, completely, other than the other narrow field of Mr. Tallis which we've spoken of, I was not an investigator and \(I\) had to resist temptations to run around on the fringes of these things, so \(I\) had -- there's no one \(I\) could rely on but the police, they are the ones \(I\) would inquire of and get whatever answer I got.

So just a couple of other documents. We've seen the February 5th letter from Mr. Penkala. Next if we could call up 009330, and this is a February \(3 r d\), it says '68, but it's '69-- no, sorry, I've called up the wrong page. 002104.

Now, is that one of these -- I guess it's not one of the RCMP numbered things we've been looking at?

Q No. Okay.

And do you want -- did you want a copy of the -- I can go take a look at this. It's not in your
correspondence folder.

A
\(Q\)

A
Q

A
Q

A
Q Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv
and received a statement from him. And then if
you can just go to the left --

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
It -- if I had to establish continuity, it would be necessary for that. I'm not so sure, Mr.

Hodson, that this wasn't some of the follow-up of Mr. Tallis' requests project.

I see.

A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)

A

Q

A

Q

Yes. And then if we just scroll down to the bottom of that page, right to the bottom, we see in this report right under the keys, it says at fair?

Yes, and they went out and talked to this gentleman.

8:30 p.m., (V2) (V2)- (V2)-----, 412 Avenue D south, who would have been a rape victim, was brought to the morality office where Morality Sergeant Oleksyn and myself showed her a group of photos which included two colour photographs which included the Canton brothers. Due to no identification being made of either of these men, Morality Sergeant Lindgren and Phillips were instructed to take this girl to the identification department where a composite photo was made up by her. Can we assume, Mr. Caldwell, that you would have read that part of the report at some point?

I would think so.
And are you able to tell whether that paragraph and the name (V2) (V2)- (V2)----- would have meant anything to you at the time?

A
Evidently it didn't. I can't see any marginal notes saying pursue this or ask something. We know that Ms. (V2)----- was the second of the rape victims in November of 1968. Were you aware of that at the time?

I don't believe so, and this thing, you know, I would simply take as one more thing that officer Mackie did on that date, one more paragraph of things that he looked after in one form or

A
another.
And maybe you are not able to answer this, but if this police report had not dealt with -- we can scroll up at the top --

Okay.
-- if this police report had not included this paragraph about the keys, if it had not, do you know whether this was a report that you would have even received?

Well, since it -- the label is 'R. Mackie - keys' in the upper right-hand corner, and then the marginal note is 'keys from McC to Mackie \& return,' or words to that effect, it is limited, in my estimation, to evidence about these keys, because that's all either boxed or highlighted or has notes about it, so it's quite possible \(I\) only wanted it for that, but \(I\) would be surprised if \(I\) hadn't read the whole thing.

Right. But just getting back, and when we talked about the witness summary yesterday, it appears, and certainly the only police reports that you received were those reports that were specifically mentioned in the witness summary, and this report, page 93, I believe is simply mentioned in connection with the key s?

A I'm assuming you are right, sir.
Q
Right. And so my question is if this, for example, had these keys been in a completely different police report, a separate report on the keys and that, do you think you would have received the report from Mr. Ullrich? Do you follow?

Well, if it were dealing with the keys, by the look of this \(I\) would have obtained a reporting even if it was one or two sentences about the key issue, if there is one.

Yeah. Let me just try it -- and maybe this isn't a fair question for you, Mr. Caldwell. If Mr. Mackie had prepared two reports on February 4th, one that he put the keys in, this information about the keys, and one report with the rest of the information -- right?

A
Yeah.
-- I'm wondering, what was your understanding of what you would get from Ullrich as far as the -Well, I wouldn't think, if Ullrich knew that \(I\) was interested in, let's say, the keys as a topic, if they were the only thing in that report, I'm sure I would have got the report. Secondly, if he knew that and the investigator talked about other
aspects of the case which he appears to be doing here and the key business was incorporated in that, I'm sure he would get me the whole report, so either way, Mr. Hodson, I would get it the way I see this now.

I see.
But I would have of course, you know, used what part of it, if any, had anything to do with the case. I don't know whether the keys ended up being contentious.

Right. But are you aware, sir, from a later review of -- not a review, but a look at what consists of the entire Gail Miller investigation file, as to whether or not you received all of the police investigation reports?

Well, on the Gail Miller investigation file, \(I\) clearly did not, and \(I\) think that \(I\) mentioned -but when \(I\) saw that file, it was with Inspector Quinn at the police station, I believe \(I\) went down to give a statement about the so-called missing statements, and that file was five to six feet, plus or minus, wide horizontally, so I clearly didn't get that.

Okay. And based upon the police records that we have seen, there are certainly -- and based upon
your evidence, sir, that the only police investigation reports you received were those identified by page number in the Ullrich witness summary, based on that it would appear that there are police investigation reports that you did not get?

Absolutely.
And again my question is as to who -- which reports that you received, was it your understanding that the reports that you received were those that Mr. Ullrich identified in his witness --

That's my understanding based on what we have done in recent days, and if that proves incorrect, Mr. Hodson, I would be happy to -MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, if \(I\) can, just for the correctness of the record, I think we should acknowledge that there were some reports that came after the preliminary inquiry were done, the ones that are dated August, September, there are reports on his file that aren't connected or don't match with the brief, but they are post the submission of that brief before the preliminary inquiry.

MR. HODSON: I believe that's correct,
although I think they are handwritten in page numbers after, yeah, so we will -- as I said earlier, we will have a document that identifies what's on there, but \(I\) think generally, up until the date that you received the Ullrich witness summary, and \(I\) appreciate the comment that there were a couple of police reports, I looked at one yesterday, August 26 th, relating to Mr .

Schellenberg and Albert Cadrain, do you remember that police report?

A
\(Q\)
Yeah, I do.
That actually arose out of your interview in preparation for the prelim.

Okay.
So that was a police report after you got the Ullrich summary that's on your file?

Yeah, I expect there were, Mr. Hodson, and I clearly don't recall them, but I'm happy to look at any one you want to direct to me.

If we could then call up 183170, please, and we looked at this yesterday, this is

Mr. McCorriston's February 5, '69 report. If we can go to the next page, please, and \(I\) think \(I\) asked you this question yesterday, we were looking at the bottom part -- we don't need to call it
out -- but we were looking at the bottom part on Mr. Tkachuk and Mr. Weinmeyer, I went through that yesterday on this page?

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
\(Q\)
And so would this be the report or the information you relied upon to understand what Mr. Diewold's story was?

A
\(Q\)

A

Q
A
\(Q\)

A
Q

A

Q
A
\(Q\)

If he didn't give a report, this would be all I had, Mr. Hodson.

I see. So then if we go on the second page, I don't see any notes of yours on that page; is that correct?

Is that 117?
Yes. It might be a note there.
No notes of mine, and I'm pleased to say that I didn't do any of the highlighting, including the Larry Fisher highlighting which is on here now. Yeah. I think, just for the record, \(I\) think in 1990 or '91 when the police reviewed the files, they may have highlighted all the names for a record and we'll be hearing evidence about that. Okay.

And then the next page, these would be your notes, purse found, and \(I\) think this is a report where Officer McCorriston found the purse; is that correct?

That's right. That's not my writing, but that's --

Oh, okay, sorry. The 'purse found' is not yours? The red 'purse found' in brackets is not mine. 'N thinks it's --' something.

Squeeze-out?

A
\(Q\)
    Yeah, is mine in red pencil. It appears the title
    'purse' in the blue is mine, in the left column,
    that's my printing or writing.
    So, sorry, if you could just -- 'purse', is that
        yours?
    Yes.
    Where I've circled, the top purse, and 'N thinks
        it's squeeze-out', that's your writing?
    That is as well.
    And the rest of it is not your writing?
    And, I'm sorry, the 'no compact' is my writing as
    well in the blue, sir.
    So what I've circled, the 'purse, no compact, N
        thinks it's squeeze-out' --
        Those are mine.
        And does \(N\) refer to Nichol?
        Just let me read it. It could be that means \(N\)
        commenting on what type of cosmetic or -- whatever
        that item -- would you like me to read it?
        No, that's fine.
        Okay.
        I'm not sure much turns on that.
        Okay.
        Would this page, then, be used by you in your
        prosecution to assist you with dealing with the
purse and the compact?

A
\(Q\)

A

A

Fisher, or what was going on, but it just didn't happen.
\(Q\)

And then, if we can go to the next page, we see
R.M., which I presume is Mackie, number 2 --

A

Q

A
\(Q\)
A
Q
And just at the top, if we can go to the top of the page, --

A
Yes.
-- I think that arrow was added after the fact?

A
\(Q\)
\(Q\)

A

Q

A
\(Q\)
A
Q
A
Q

A
Q
BY MR. HODSON:
Maybe we can just put the coloured photocopy on the Elmo and I'll walk you through it, what is yours.

Sure.
And so on that page the 'R.M. - 2' at the top would be your writing?

That's correct.
And the 347,641 , and 85 ; is that your writing?
None, none of those.
The red underlining; is that yours?
None of them on that page, sir, are.
None on the page, and \(I\) think we see that all the names are underlined. And is that blue arrow -That's a -- didn't exist when \(I\) had the file. If we can go back to the -- I'm sorry, and the "wallet" and the writing at the bottom is not yours; is that correct?

A

Q
I certainly hope so. It was not my handiwork, and nor was any of the red underlining, sir.

And perhaps, maybe we can put that, is that the original or is that a copy?

MS. KNOX: It's a coloured photocopy.

That's correct.
And if we could go back to the first page, please,
get the first page on there. And I think you said
the writing at the top, 'R. Mackie - 1', that is
your writing?
A
Q

A
\(Q\)
A

Q
And the red underlining of all the names; is that yours?

None of that is, and nor is that initial, whatever it is, B or --

Well the \(B\) is not yours, and the bottom left-hand I think is Ms. Knox's handwriting on the photocopy to identify which --

A

Q

And I think she wrote that on the copy after it was copied. And what about this; would any of that be your handwriting on there?

A

Q

A
\(Q\)

No. It's red underlined, again, and it's not mine.

Okay. I think we can go back, I think we're fine, you can return that copy to Mr. Caldwell if he needs it, if we could just put our version of the document back on the screen.

Oh, thank you.
Would it be fair to say, Mr. Caldwell, I think the reference in the Ullrich witness summary to these pages refers to the wallet?

I wouldn't be surprised because it appears to be, first of all, something that was involved in the investigation because of where it was found initially, umm, and it's very -- just that one three-line paragraph about it.

MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, if I may, I've retrieved the original from the file that he had, and that arrow is attached to a sticky tag note, I can have it displayed on Elmo as well.

MR. HODSON: Sure.
BY MR. HODSON:
Did they have sticky notes in 1969, Mr. Caldwell?
I don't think so, sir.
Okay. So that note, and \(I\) think when it got copied, that's where the note came on?

A I -- oh, now I see. This is interesting because the note shows on your -- the screen, but of course not on the --

Yeah, I think that the note was copied, okay. Okay.

So that was after. If we can just go back, again, is there anything in that original that changes anything you've said?

A
Not unless, sir, you wanted me to look at one part of the note.

No. If we could just call up, back from the Ullrich witness summary, page 105623 , and \(I\) don't think we need to get the original. And we'll see at the bottom, this is what Mr. Ullrich prepared, Detective Sergeant Mackie. If you can call that out please, and you will see there pages 346-347, and you will see:
"April 4th ... received wallet and contents from Beauchamp, turned it over to Penkala."

And then, as well, April 4 found the two hospitalization cards. So if we see 346-347, let's go back to 009251, and this is 346-347, and if we go to the second page we see, here's the information about the wallet which was seized on

April 4th, turned over to Penkala:
"... along with 2 hospitalization cards
for processing by their dept."
Can we take it from that, Mr. Caldwell, that
that's the connection between those, that police report and the Ullrich witness summary?

A

Q
That's what \(I\) believe, and it narrows it down to the one item, but -- that I'd be examining on the way \(I\) see it now, sir.

And then if we could go back to the first page, please, and \(I\) take it you would have read, I think you've told us you would have read all the police reports; is that correct?

Yeah, I would have.
And then we see a reference here to, on March 31, Carl Joseph Crook, 412 Avenue J South, date of birth:
"... was interviewed with regards to
this murder. Crook was unable to offer any assistance and denied being
responsible. Crook did not know his blood grouping but believed that on the morning of this offence he was at home. When interviewed in regard to his associations and knowledge of (V2)-----
and (V1)-, rape occurrences, Crook was acquainted with the (V1)- family and denied being responsible for either of these offences also. He was unable to supply with his blood grouping and as he was a prisoner he was not taken to RedCross for this to be done." Again, would that have had any significance to you at the time, sir, the mentioning of the rapes and the names (V2)----- and (V1)-?

A Umm, no, it wouldn't.

If we can then go to the next page. Again, this is the same report of Mr. Mackie, and it says:
"Also on April 4 I received from

Mr. (V2)----- one photo, one jacket
photographing which had been the property of his son. This jacket was described Mr. (V2) ----- by as being an identical jacket being worn by the person who attacked her except that the collar was different. After receiving a photo of this jacket it was circularised through the dept. for anyone to be on the look out for it."

And, again, would that have had any significance
to you at the time when you read it, Mr.

Caldwell?
A
No, sir.
If we could call up 009386, that's document ID -yeah, thank you. And I asked you about this yesterday, I just want to identify it for the record. This is another document that was on your prosecution file, and we went through this yesterday when we talked about the lab reports that you may have sent to Mr. Tallis, and again I think what you told us, that would be your writing "omit", and I believe you told us you thought this was from a different file?

Yeah, that's also my writing as well, yeah.
Okay. And, based on these notes, was this a case where you thought it was inadvertently given to you?

A
Yeah, it's -- it came to me and un -- and of course read it, the top note is "different file" encircled, then the note "omit" I now realize and I'm sure is my handwriting because of -- the colours and the question mark would be mine, and also the squiggly line was mine.

Q It _-

A And so it, in my view, came from a different file,
shouldn't have been there at all.
And did you, at any time, draw a connection between the names in that report and the names from the two or three pages that \(I\) just read to you in your police reports?

No, I didn't, sir.
If we could then go to call up document 006486.
And this is a handwritten statement of (V6)---(V6)-. Do you want the -- actually, Ms. Knox, if you -- if you've got the statement folder there we can maybe go through these. I want the (V6)---(V6)-, (V)-- (V) (V)----, (V9) (V9)---- and (V4)---- (V4)---, it's 38, 39, 40 are the statement numbers. MS. KNOX: (Inaudible)

BY MR. HODSON:
Perhaps, while she's getting those, \(I\) can just go through the first one. This is a statement of (V6)--- (V6)- and I believe the records suggest, Mr. Caldwell, that these would have been sent to you by the Saskatoon City Police after Mr. Tallis requested that you go through all of the witness statements; do you remember telling us about that yesterday?

A
Oh, yes, and I'll -- I'm sure you are correct on
that.
And so that you ended up getting all of the witness statements from the city police?

As \(I\) understood it.
And was that -- and I think you told us -- correct me if I'm wrong -- that was prompted by a request from Mr. Tallis to get them and read them?

I think that was the sequence of events, sir. I have the original here now.

And this is a statement of February 18th, 1969 and it talks about -- if we can just call out this paragraph, we have seen this document before, I'll just touch on briefly what it is. This woman says:
"On Wednesday on January 15 th or 22 nd about two weeks before the Miller murder, I was on my way to the Hi Low Mart or confectionary at approximately 6:00 p.m."

And then it talks about "near Lindsay Place", which is in Greystone, right off of 8th Street. Okay.

And then the next page she goes on to describe an attempted assault or an assault. And then, if we can go to the fourth page, she describes her
assailant there in the statement as:
"5 feet 2 inches to 5 feet 6 inches,

Stalky build but not fat
age - middle thirty's may have had a
thin line moustache".

Now I take it, from what you have told us, you
would have read this at the time?

A
Yes, if it came in as a result of the Tallis request through the police, \(I\) would have read it when it got to me.

And it doesn't, it doesn't appear that it was given to Mr. Tallis. Would there be any reason at the time, Mr. Caldwell, that you would provide this statement to Mr. Tallis?

Do you wish to read through it?
A
\(Q\)

A
I would like to do that, sir.

Yeah, go ahead and read through it.
(Witness reading) I get -- in this instance it's another person eventually helped this lady out, and she also got a, if you will, good look at the assailant in this instance, which was unusual I guess.

So I guess my question is, is would you view this or did you view this statement at the time as a
credible witness who can speak to material facts which tend to show Mr. Milgaard to be innocent?

A
\(Q\)

A

Q
A
Q
A

Q

A

Q
A
Q
A
\(Q\)
    I wouldn't have thought so, sir.

And why not?
Because there was -- is -- as it happens, I think you mentioned Lindsay drive or crescent --

Yes.
-- is in --
Yes.
-- which is in Greystone, which is the other end of the city, for one thing. This fellow was never identified, although he was viewed by this witness. I just didn't know how you could erect that into anything.

Yeah. And are you answering that today, Mr. Caldwell, based on the memory at the time or based on what you think you would have done and thought at the time?

What I would have done and thought, sir. I don't -- I have no memory of this statement.

Okay.
I --
I appreciate that.
Okay.
Next if we could go to 006400 , and that's
statement 38, and your counsel will provide you with the original.

A
Q
                            Yeah, if I received it I -- it must have been on
            there. That didn't -- was not put on there by
            myself.

Q
And it appears to say \(I-n-d\) for, I'm assuming,
"indecent assault only, not connected"?

And maybe I'll just highlight just a couple points --

A

Q
That's how I read it. I'm sorry.
What, again -- and \(I\) take it you have no memory of
dealing this with this statement at the time?
Well \(I\) can read it if you like, sir, but \(I\) don't have.

Okay. And I think just a general question. What, as a prosecutor, if you saw that note on a statement, presumably that was written by the police, would that be a fair --

Yeah, it had to be, because it was pre-arrival to me.

Yes?
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What's the name of the complainant?

MR. HODSON: Sorry, (V)-- (V) (V)----. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

Maybe I'll read it, Mr. Hodson, if you --
BY MR. HODSON:
Yes, please do.
(Witness reading) I expect \(I\) read it at the time, umm --

Okay.
-- so that we know dates, places and
circumstances. In this statement (V)-- (V)---says:
"On February 3, 1969 ..." which is three days after the murder:
"... at about 7:25 p.m. I was at
Hewgills Drug Store and left there
walking west on the north side of \(20 t h\)
Street ... When in the 1900 blk 20th
Street ..., I heard a noise and looked around and saw a man near the trees in the St. Pauls nurses residence. He climbed over the fence and I started running."

And then it describes being chased, and then on the next page, and describes him, he was: "... about 5'9" tall wearing a light coloured siwash, black pants ...", etcetera. And \(I\) believe it describes, \(I\) believe this fellow chased her, \(I\) don't think he ever caught her. So, again, would this statement be one that you -- would she be a credible witness who can speak to material facts which tend to show Mr. Milgaard to be innocent?

A
I wouldn't have thought so, and she regrettably couldn't identify the individual even in the sense
            of by name, even though she got a
            better-than-usual look at him.
\(Q\)
-- which is a day that the evidence you had suggested that Mr. Milgaard was out of the province --

A Yeah.
Q
A

A

2
Okay. If we could call up 006402 , please. This is statement 39 and the statement of (V9) (V9) ---- .
```

                                    MS. KNOX: (Inaudible)
    ```

BY MR. HODSON:
Actually, if we can just put the original statement up just for a moment, I think you can take a look at. I think you indicated -- and this is actually the original statement, Mr.

Commissioner, in handwriting, and then this red pen, 'indecent assault' or:
                            "Ind assault only
not connected",
    that's the red pen that you said was on there
        when you received the document?

A

A

Right. The next page you're referring to? Yeah, the last, the second page there. So I can't see how \(I\) could have used that, or shouldn't say 'I', but what use it would be in that heading, Mr. Hodson.

Okay. If we could just go back, and I think this is where you were -- she described the person as,
And also, at the end, indicates his:
"He never spoke to me. I don't feel I can recognize ..."
\(Q\)
2 \(\square\) Certified Professional Court Reporters serving P.A., Regin
Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go \(-x_{2}+2\)
sorry, the second page?
A
Q

And:
"While in the 100-Blk Ave Q-So ...", so that would be a couple of blocks from where Gail Miller was murdered?

A
\(Q\)
That's how I read it.
Yeah. And she was employed as a nurse still in uniform and wearing a coat and boots, and that would be similar, \(I\) take it, to Gail Miller?

Yeah, I would assume so.
Yeah. It says:
"While in the 100-Blk Ave Q-So about the centre of the block \(I\) was walking in the middle of the street a young man walking toward me, when we met \(I\) stepped to the side, he came to me, but pinned my arms from behind as we met, he ran his hand over my body, he did not try to remove any of my clothing. I scuffled with him for a moment and hit him in the face with my elbow and he let me go."

And then it goes on to describe where she saw this person.

Yeah.
So again at the time, Mr. Caldwell, you believe you would have concluded that this was not a credible witness who could speak to material facts which tend to show Mr. Milgaard to be innocent?

I wouldn't have thought so, sir.
And again, what about a question \(I\) had asked you earlier with the (V)---- statement, would it be relevant or tend to show Mr. Milgaard to be innocent if the person who committed this assault on (V9) (V9)---- was the same person who may have killed Gail Miller, and at the time, January 15th, that Mr. Milgaard had not been in the city? Do
you follow?
If -- if --
Let me just rephrase that.
Okay.
If -- I think you said you didn't see how this would be connected, or words to that effect. What about the scenario where Mr. Tallis might say "here is an assault committed two weeks earlier in the area with a nurse, or an attempted assault" -actually, \(I\) think it is an assault, I'm sorry -Yeah.
-- "within two weeks of the, before the murder, with a nurse, and this is the guy who killed Gail Miller, and it couldn't be David Milgaard because he wasn't there on January 15th"; what about that line of defence? Did you consider that and whether that might be important in considering whether this statement should be disclosed at that time?

A

Q

A
\(Q\)

A
I -- is it -- it is one I disclosed, is it?
No, I don't believe so.
Oh, okay, I'm sorry. I could see -- I can think,
now, that that would be a consideration.
Okay.
I don't think \(I\) recognized it in that manner at
that time.
Okay. Next, if we could go to the (V4)----(V4)--- statement, which is 006404 .

MS. KNOX: (Inaudible)
BY MR. HODSON:

Sure. We'll put the original of that (V9) (V9)---- statement, and if you could please just read the (V4)---- (V4)--- statement.

Okay. (Witness reading)
So, again, the (V9)---- one. Sorry, Mr. Caldwell, if \(I\) could just draw your attention back to the (V9)---- statement on the screen.

A

Q
A

Q
"Ind assault only
no connection",
have?

A
It would have an influence because it was evidently, both those were read by some investigator before they got to me and, in effect,
eliminated, and \(I, ~ y o u ~ k n o w, ~ o f t ~ t o ~ b e g i n ~ w i t h, ~\) would give some weight to that point of view.

And would you read no connection to mean no connection to the Gail Miller murder?

Oh, that's what it would be.
If you can carry on reading the (V4)---- (V4)---
statement, if we can bring that up on the screen, 006404 ?

A
\(Q\)
And do you have a recollection back from 1969
about an incident the morning of the murder, very close to the time of the murder, about seven blocks away? Do you remember this?

Presumably that's this one?
Yes.
Yeah.
They are talking about -- do you remember the (V4)---- (V4)---?

No, I do not.
Do you remember anything about an assault that happened the morning of the Gail Miller murder?

A
I don't, sir.
And again we see this note, indecent assault, not connected, that's in red pen on there; is that right?

A

That's right. I would assume, but don't know, that it's the same author of the other red pen though.

We've actually heard from Miss (V4)--- and we've heard a fair bit of evidence or seen documents with respect to this assault. Again -- and would what she describes, I don't think I need to go through it, but what she describes is at 7:07 a.m., which is, you would agree, would be very close --

Oh, absolutely.
-- to the time that, or to the range of time that Gail Miller was murdered?

Yes.
And seven blocks away, being accosted or assaulted by a male person, who she describes, and again, is this statement, Mr. Caldwell, something at the time you thought was a credible witness who can speak to material facts which tend to show the prisoner to be innocent?

Well, clearly \(I\) didn't take it that way at the time, Mr. Hodson.

Okay. What -- just before \(I\) pause there, again, the police note, 'indecent assault not connected.' Would that have had some influence on your
decision?
A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)
-- and the police -- I know for a fact in the police summary and the witness summary there's no mention of the (V4)--- assault and the police investigation report of Detective Bennett that was made on that date that talks about Miss (V4)--was not included --

A
Q
-- in the package of investigation reports that you received.

A
So that --

Q

A

Q
A
Q
A
\(Q\)
A
\(Q\)
A
\(Q\)

A
Umm, some -- I can't say at this point, Mr.
Hodson. I think there would be similar reasons to
the last one or two that we just discussed.
And again, \(I\) think you maybe answered this, but
the police comment, 'indecent assault not I appreciate you don't have a recollection, but whether you can help us with, at the time, what might have caused you to conclude that you ought not to send it to Mr. Tallis.

Q
No, I think that's all.
Okay.
And again, I'm just wondering if you can tell us,
thepolice
connected,' would that have influenced your decision?

A

Q

A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)

It would have. Those things reflected somebody presumably in a position of knowledge having reviewed these approximate three things before coming to that conclusion as I mentioned. I certainly think it would have affected my, you know, coming to that decision.

Right. We have seen in the documents, and \(I\) suspect we will hear, and have heard evidence and we'll hear more evidence about a debate as to whether or not the same person theoretically could have committed both offences. What the record now shows, the evidence of Miss (V4)---, is that she has identified Mr. Fisher as the person who -Okay.
-- assaulted her. Mr. Fisher denied that and of course we know that Mr. Fisher committed the murder of Gail Miller, and so again without getting into the debate of whether or not -whether or not Mr. Fisher was the assailant of Miss (V4)---, he was never convicted of that.

I was going to ask you that. There was -No. And again, with that in mind, we've heard some suggestion, Mr. Caldwell, and I'm going to
put this to you, that the (V4)--- assault, if \(I\) can call it that, the Miss (V4)--- assault was significant in that it would suggest, if one presumes that only one person is out committing offences of this nature on a morning, a 40 below morning of January 31 , that with this second assault of Miss (V4)---, if you could exclude, Mr. Milgaard could be excluded at that time as the person who committed that assault --

Yeah.
-- and you presume that the same person at the time committed both the (V4)--- assault and the Gail Miller murder, that that would then exclude Mr. Milgaard. Do you follow that?

I guess so, yeah.

And I'm just wondering if you can comment or respond to that, that has been a suggestion made from time to time, and \(I\) expect you will hear others after me put that to you --Uh-huh.
-- probably better than \(I\) just did.
It's difficult, A, to go back to what \(I\) was thinking at the time of this prosecution, of course whenever that was, 1969. I clearly gave some weight to that endorsement on these two or
three statements, indecent assault not connected. It's possible, Mr. Hodson, \(I\) may have simply said at that point this has nothing to do -- I guess you had to look at not connected to me could be read as with the accused Milgaard.

Yes.
In other words, when you -- you tend to think in those terms, do we have other counts of this, that and the other, was not connected with him in that sense clearly.

If the facts were, Mr . Caldwell, at the time that the police said yeah, this is connected, we actually think this was Mr. Milgaard --

Yeah.
-- would that change things?
I would think \(I\) would get ahold of the person who made the notes and say, now tell me more about that or what have you done to follow that up.

And then at the time did you give any thought to, back in 1969, would you have given any thought to providing it to Mr. Tallis and letting him decide?

A
The way this looks, \(I\) don't think so, sir. I think -- I think that \(I\) put some, you know, credibility or what have you in that endorsement.

I was not able to find in any of your file any
notes, \(I\) don't believe, that refer to this, and there's certainly no notes on this, and \(I\) take it, sir, you have no recollection of what you would have thought about or what would have factored into your decision at the time?

No, I don't, and the more so, sir, if there are no notes that have surfaced on it, you know, on my file so-called, that you are saying they have not surfaced?

I have not seen any. I stand to be corrected, but I don't believe there's any on there.

Can you tell me when you got, and I think the record reflects that these statements would not have been provided to you until after the first wave of police information, if \(I\) can call it that, after Mr. Tallis asked you to review them -Yeah.

When you sat down and read through the statements, do you have a recollection, did you read them once, twice, or what guided your thinking when you went through them?

A
I would be surprised if \(I\) read them more than once, saw the -- I read the statement, I assume
paid attention to the red note in the corner saying that it was not, they were not connected. I think that would be everything that went, you know, through my mind at that time.

And would the fact that these statements may not have been provided to you in the first, as part of the Ullrich witness summary, as part of what the police gave you, would that have any effect on your thinking of their significance?

I don't think so. The fact that they weren't in that first batch wouldn't exclude me from looking at them this time.

This is probably an appropriate time to break, Mr. Commissioner. Maybe we'll just quickly put that on, if people want to take a look at the original, and again the red handwriting that's on that statement, \(I\) think that's believed to be the police; is that right, Mr. Caldwell?

Yeah, it must be.
MR. HODSON: Okay, thank you.
(Adjourned at 10:26 a.m.)
(Reconvened at 10:48 a.m.)
BY MR. HODSON:

Q
Mr. Caldwell, I had just gone through before the break those statements of the three assaults,
(V6)-, (V)----, (V9)----, those three, and (V4)---, and \(I\) think you said at the time you don't recall dealing with them and you said here's what \(I\) think \(I\) would have thought at the time. If you had been aware, sir, of the rapist/murderer theory, that being that the person who committed the (V1)-, (V2)----- and (V3)------ assaults had been viewed as a suspect in the murder, okay, and let's just make sure we're clear here, those are different assaults than the one \(I\) just showed you, okay. So we've got (V1)-, (V2)-----, (V3)--------being the October, November incidents. If you had been aware, either from the police or otherwise, that there was a theory the police were investigating early on in the Gail Miller investigation, and for some time period, that the murderer of Gail Miller was the same person who committed these earlier rapes, if you had been aware of that as a theory, I think you told us you would have disclosed that information? Yes.

If you had been aware of that theory, do you think that would have changed what you would have done with respect to the (V)----, (V9)----, (V6)- and (V4) --- ?

A
\(Q\)
A
Q

A
Q
A
\(Q\)
A

Q

A materials arrived at me from the police
department.
And did you understand that to be a note made by the police during the course of their investigation or did you understand that to be a note directed to you?

Well, the red ink, the fact that it wasn't in whatever the ink was in which the original statement was taken, \(I\) took those to be, \(A\), recent, and B, directed to me, is the way \(I\) would look at it now.

Okay. If we can just go back to 007011 , and just to tie this up, September 9, '69 is this letter, and I think the 10 th and the 11 th of September you finished up the preliminary hearing.

And so in this letter, clearly on this date, before the preliminary hearing is finished, you would have received, it says here I obtained all the statements from civilian witnesses totalling 95 and have read them, and so certainly before the preliminary hearing you would agree, Mr. Caldwell, you got all of the civilian witness statements that existed at that time in connection with the Gail Miller murder investigation?

A That's correct.

Q
A

2
 And if we can go to 007008 , and this is an example -- this is a police report dated September 5, '69 by Ident Officer Kleiv and it relates to some work done on September 5 relating to the exhibits, and I'm not sure if anything turns on the exhibits, \(I\) think these are the contents of

Mr. Wilson's car that the Regina police had taken to the lab, and \(I\) don't believe any of that ended up being in evidence, but this police report ended
up on your file and \(I\) think Ms. Knox had raised the point earlier that in addition to the Ullrich witness summary that had some of the investigation reports, that you would then get some investigation reports that were generated after? Yes, I would expect that. This one appears to be a later --

Right, September 5 .
Yeah. So that's well into the -- if not after the prelim, certainly well into it.

Right. So again, to the extent that after Mr.
Milgaard was charged and after the police file, or parts of it were turned over to you, there would
be occasions where further police investigation work was done and generated a report and you would get a copy of the report?

Yeah, that would be my understanding.
Now let's go to 007005 , and -MS. KNOX: Page 69.

BY MR. HODSON:

And this is dated September 10th, 1969 and the heading is looked up in notes and it's got McCorriston, Oleksyn and Kleiv, and if \(I\) can just go back, I don't think \(I\) need to bring it up, but this is September 10th. Your letter of September 9th to Mr. Tallis, I'll just read you on the bottom of page 2, you write: "The various police officers who were to check their notes for further information will be attending at my office at 12 noon on September 10 th at which time we will be able to interview them and you should be able to recall any of them you wish in the afternoon of that date."

A
Q

A
Q

A
\(Q\)

A

Q

A
Q

A

So McCorriston appears to be present; is that fair?

Oh, yeah.
And McCorriston would have had his notebook there to go through?

I would assume so.
And so number 1, 'knife shown Cadrain March 5, little hunting knife.' Do you know what that -other than what it states?

No more than that.
And then it says, 'interview with Cadrain March 5, with Edmondson.'

Yeah, that's Stan Edmondson who testified here.
And do we take it from that that Mr. Tallis would have asked these officers to check their notes to see who Cadrain interviewed on March 5?

That -- I would assume that to be the case. It could have been me, but --

And then McCorriston, 'March 4 - discussed comb with Hein - don't know if showed to --'

H would be Hein I'm assuming.
Okay. So it appears there must have been some issue over a comb, and \(I\) think there was a comb found?

Uh-huh.

Q
        I -- in this case \(I\) wouldn't oppose it in any
        respect.
        You wouldn't what?
        I would not oppose that and I can't imagine they
        Caldwell, to allow Mr. Tallis to actually view the
        notebooks of the officers?
        A
        And then, 'February 1 - keys and comb to
        Fontaine.' Vicky Fontaine, to help you out, was
        the friend of Gail Miller who she worked with who
        actually identified the body on the date of the
        murder.
    Okay. All right, sir.
        So would it be fair to say that Mr. Tallis may
        have had a question about that?
        May well have had.
        Would you be checking these things up in their
        notes for your own purposes?
        Well, the way \(I\) read this, Mr. Tallis and myself
        would have been there, these officers would have
        been there, and \(I\) would ask them and they would,
        if necessary, show you the page in the notes, but
        I don't even know that that was -- I suspect they
        would have the note and read it and \(I\) made -- this
        is kind of my file copy, if you will.
        Would it have been your practice at the time, Mr.
        respect
would either.
And so that if Mr. McCorriston or Mr. Tallis wanted to look through McCorriston's notebook -Yeah, there was a routine of -- they were not testifying here, but often they would fold it open to the appropriate page or section. I would certainly not have, you know, objected to that. And then number 2 would be Oleksyn, and number 1, 'has nil - talked to accused June 6, pre Tallis interviewing him.'
    Yeah, that's -- he has nothing to add, as it were,
    under the --
    And number 3, Kleiv, 1, and it's got a star,
        'received small hunting knife from Oliver.' Is
        that what that is?
        That's -- yeah, 'received small hunting knife from
        Oliver,' that's right, sir.
        And then 'K' which is Kleiv, 'there when \(O^{\prime}\)
        Oliver, 'found it, but Kleiv didn't see where it
        was. February 28, 12:30 p.m., Kleiv still has
        knife, single edged'?
        A
        Yeah, all that \(I\) found out from Mr. Kleiv, as
        presumably did Mr. Tallis.
        So do we take it from this note that on September
        10th, 1969, information about the hunting knife
found by Mr. Oliver was provided to Mr. Tallis?
Yeah, it was.
And then the bottom -- do you know if the knife, if Kleiv would have had the knife there?

It says Kleiv still has it. From that I would infer that he didn't have it with him at that time, but at the station.

And if Mr. Tallis had said can I take a look at it, would you have arranged to have Mr. Kleiv do that?

A
\(Q\)

A
It may have been something to do with blood types, some scientific concern, because it's Cadrain as opposed to anyone else.

Would it --

I'm sorry, it may have been to try and eliminate him from some hair and fibre --

Would this have been, do you think, a request by Mr. Tallis to get some information about Cadrain's hair sample?

A
It could have been that, or me. I can't see any reason why \(I\) would be pursuing, but it could be
me, Mr. Hodson.
Next page, it looks like Mr. Penkala was at this meeting as well?

Yes.

Is that fair?
That's correct.
It says Penkala, number 1, 'no other exhibits or samples.' Would that have been a request made of him?

A
\(Q\)

A
Well, yeah, it says got no samples from autopsy, and if there had been some previous reference to someone wanting that, that \(I\) would take it as his answer to that, that he didn't, \(A\), get, or \(B\), have any.

Q And did you think there was a request from somebody then that --

A
Yeah, it would -- the way they answer is would -I presume there was a question.

And then three, it says, 'got one lump into one vial, took to Emson, and Emson estimated it was
sperm. Then to fridge, then to Kleiv. Area found.' Is that -- do you know what that relates to?

A

Q

A
Q

A
Q
A

Q


A
\(Q\)

I assume it's the, something to do with frozen snow and/or seminal samples, the way it reads.

And would this be you and Mr. Tallis then, or one or both of you going through Mr. Penkala's notes about these subjects?

No, he would have been there the way I --
No, I appreciate that. But if \(I\) get the picture right, you have a room there with McCorriston, Oleksyn, Kleiv, Penkala and Reid, you and Mr. Tallis going through --

That's my -- that's how \(I\) read it as well, sir.
And so your notes would have been discussions or questions that were asked of these officers? Yeah, that's correct.

And then down to Reid, number 5 --
Yeah, that's, 'may have taken sample paring knife around. Check this and let us know after prelim,' Mr. Hodson.

I've been advised that my abbreviation may have been in error, if we can go back up.

Which one is that?
E-S-T, and I think established, I said estimated.

I'm sorry, Mr. Lockyer has corrected me, 'and Emson established it was sperm.' Is that correct? That's -- yeah, it would be established. Sorry about that. Thank you, Mr. Lockyer. If we can go down to number 5, Officer Reid, number 1, 'may have taken sample paring knife around. Check this and let us know after prelim.'

Okay.
And can you tell us what that --
Someone must have thought that there was a sample paring knife. I would take that to be a knife similar to the one that was found broken, but this one being intact, taken around to show to witnesses of some sort. Then it says, 'check this and let us know after prelim.'

We did hear evidence from Mr. Penkala that the police, after the blade was found under the body and before the handle was found, --

Uh-huh.
-- they went out and purchased --
Yeah.
-- what they believed to be a replica, and that that knife was used, in fact \(I\) think the photograph is of, may will be of that knife. Yeah, and that --

Q
A
Q

A

Q

A
Q
A

Q
A
Q
A

Q

A

Q
A
Q

A

Q
If we could then go to 267794. I don't believe the record shows that -- and the record will speak for itself on the prelim -- I don't believe any of the officers were recalled at the prelim, do you -- it looks like September 11th:
"During the a.m. of this date, the above-mentioned was committed for trial on the charge of non-capital murder ...",
so that would be the morning after your meeting with Mr. Tallis?

A
Q

Yes.
MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, if I may, the index for the witnesses at the preliminary inquiry indicate that either on, I believe on

At the end of the prelim \(I\) would assume he would have.

September \(10 t h\), the last day, there was actually a recall of Gerald McCorriston, Thor Kleiv, and Joe Penkala.

MR. HODSON: Do you have a doc. ID for that document?

MS. KNOX: It is contained in the preliminary inquiry transcript, the cover document page for volume 3 is 008357 , and the page in the index that shows those individuals being recalled -- and \(I\) can indicate their evidence was very brief -- is 008360 .

MR. HODSON: Maybe, if we could just call that up, 008360.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.
MR. HODSON: Thank you, Ms. Knox.
BY MR. HODSON:
So it does appear that McCorriston, Kleiv, and Penkala were called for further cross-examination?

A

Umm, and that, that was examination evidently for the first time, sir.

Right. And then --
I'm sorry, and cross-examination.
Okay. I will check on the lunch hour --

A

Q

A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)

A
Q

A

Q
And \(I\) think there might even be another document, but August \(18 t h, 20,22,27,28\), September 4 th and 5th and September 10 th and 11 th, and Ms. Knox has that original file cover, so nine days. reference for the Commissioner and other counsel for the days. I think this was your inside file cover and this tells us the days that the prelim sat?

Yes, that's correct.

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
\(Q\)

BY MR. HODSON:
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A
Page 90 in that file.
Okay. Mr. Hodson, \(I\) found those, they are stapled into one document as \(I\) have them now.

Yes. And if you want to just take a quick look through, \(I\) don't have any questions on them, -Okay.
-- I just want to identify them for the record. Okay, just -- that's what they are, sir.

Yeah. And in fact, and without going through them, I've gone through them and all -- it appears, Mr. Caldwell, that they would be notes primarily of Mr. Tallis' cross-examination. Obviously, you wouldn't be making notes while you were examining; is that fair?

That's right.
And then if you want to go to just 007001 .
Is this another number?
It's 73 in the top right.
Okay.
And this just talks about Wednesday, September 10th, and we'll see the reference there to recalled McCorriston, Kleiv, and Penkala, and then finished up with Shirley Wilson and Emson.

Can you give me that corner number again, please?
73. You can look at the document on the screen,

Mr. Caldwell, \(I\) just think it might be easier.
A
Oh, okay, that's --
Wednesday, September 10 th, it just indicates that
those witnesses were recalled, and I think that's what Ms. Knox identified from the prelim index; correct?

A
Q

BY MR. HODSON:
September 11th, 10:00 a.m.
Because of the size of the 10 I suspect.
Yeah. So September 11 th, and then it looks like there was argument, and there's actually a typed transcript that Mr. Tallis urged the magistrate not to commit for trial; do you recall that? Yes.

We're done with those notes. If we could next go
to 006975 , please, this is your note of September 16th?

MS. KNOX: Page 95 in the corner.
A Yes, that's right.

BY MR. HODSON:
And then if you want to get 94 and 93, being right after. So this is your letter to Mr. Meldrum, who's the Deputy Attorney General?

A

Q

A
\(Q\)
A
Q
A
Q
Was it a requirement, Mr. Caldwell, for you to report to the Deputy Attorney General about the case?

A
Yes, this is a standard form we used on cases at that point, and completed cases included prelims, which theoretically had not been completed, but the --

And what was, what were you to put in these reports, and what was the purpose of the report?

A Well, as you can see, dates, where, the court it
was in, the judge, the charge, defence counsel, the committal, and then interviewing, the figures as to time spent, (a) 4, (b) 9.

And I'll go through the report with you.
Okay.
Just talking generally, --
Okay.
-- why, what was the reason for this report?
Well \(I\) would assume that the deputy wanted some way of measuring what \(I\) was doing here, at the time, from day-to-day.

So that, if we look at this, we've got the dates of the prelim up there?

Right.
We've got the number of days, we've got the list of witnesses, \(I\) take it, that you would have prepared from your file?

Right.
And if we can go to the next page, and then once the witnesses are done we'll maybe go through this, you would have prepared a commentary or a summary of what happened?

A
Umm, yes, that's right.
And:
"... major crown witnesses were Ronald

Dale Wilson and Nichol John, the two youths who accompanied Milgaard from Regina to saskatoon on the morning of the murder and then accompanied him on the trip to Alberta and finally back to Regina; as well as Albert H. Cadrain . . ."

And I think you've told us that already, that Wilson, John, and Cadrain were the major crown or the key Crown witnesses?

A Yeah.

You the describe:
"The evidence of Wilson and Cadrain was good evidence. However, the John girl would not describe in her evidence Milgaard actually stabbing the deceased (which, according to the second of her two statements, she had seen happening at the time of the murder). I had interviewed her three times prior to her giving evidence and despite this she still did not come forth with the evidence of actually seeing the stabbing take place. It may be, however, that at the time of the trial she will reveal
more about what she saw."

Now can we take it from that, Mr. Caldwell, that, before the prelim, you would have interviewed her three times?

A

Q

A

A
Yeah, \(I\) think \(I\) mentioned that, and \(I\) can --
You mentioned --

Yeah.

Can you tell us again then?

Yeah. Well my memory is only that, is that on one of these interviews, the occasion in which she ran out of my office in the courthouse out the back entrance onto the parking lot and \(I\) think out to the front street, we had a view of that street
from our office and \(I\) believe her father was there in a truck or something conveying her around, I think was the first kind of major interview \(I\) had with her, and \(I\) did find out, one way or another, that she was upset with Detective Sergeant Mackie for reasons known to her. Umm, she clearly did not want to go ahead with testifying in the case, whatever stage it was at.

And what was -- what caused you to think that she had an issue with Mr. Mackie?

A

Q
A
Q

A

Q
A
Q
And you would have known, at the time, that it was Mr. Mackie that took her incriminating statement of May 24 th?

A Yeah, I would have.

Q

A

Q

A
\(Q\)
 Okay. If we can then just go down: "Milgaard is in custody at the present time and I will oppose any application to have him released on bail."

I don't believe, at least \(I\) haven't seen any

A
Q

Q

A
\(Q\)
record of bail being applied for, do you recall?

I don't recall that happening.
And then you go on to conclude:
"This is a very lengthy and complicated case and there will be many things to be done by way of preparation for the trial between now and the trial date. However, if the Crown witnesses give their evidence at the trial in the manner similar to that at the Preliminary Inquiry it should represent a good case against the accused. No defence evidence was called at the Preliminary Inquiry."
"This is a very lengthy and complicated
case and there will be many things to be
done by way of preparation for the trial
between now and the trial date.
However, if the Crown witnesses give
their evidence at the trial in the
manner similar to that at the
Preliminary Inquiry it should represent
a good case against the accused. No
defence evidence was called at the
Preliminary Inquiry. "

Yeah.
And \(I\) take it that was your view at the time, Mr . Caldwell?

Yes.
And we know, at the prelim, you did not have
Nichol John's evidence of her -- incriminating evidence with respect to witnessing the murder; is that right?

That's right.
And so, even in the absence of Nichol John's
evidence on those points, on the incriminating parts of the May \(24 t h\) statement, even in the absence of that you felt that you had a good case against the accused?

A

Umm, yes. I think it would be implicit in that \(I\) expected her to give the, what \(I\) regarded as the true account of the matter in the trial, but of course we couldn't know at that time if that was going to happen. I thought it was a -- there were other very strong portions to the case.

Yeah. But my question, and \(I\) think is based on this paragraph, even in the absence -Sure.

I think you say that, even if the witnesses testify in a manner similar to at the prelim, it should represent a good case against the accused? Right.

So even if Nichol John testifies at the trial the same way --

Yeah.
-- she does at the prelim, you felt you had a good case against the accused?

Oh, I did, sir, yeah.
And we will be dealing with this a bit later, this is before you had any knowledge of the evidence of

Craig Melnyk and George Lapchuk, the motel reenactment evidence?

A
Q If we can go to the next page, please. Down at the bottom we see a question mark, after you identify the witnesses, question mark, Mrs. Cadrain, Mrs. Wilson, Pratt, Hnatiuk, Keith Mackie, Milgaard's two statements, I think is that
'witnesses on voir dire'?
A
Q

A

Q And can you tell us what, and we know you didn't call her, --

A
Q

A

Q

A
\(Q\)
A
\(Q\)
know, admissible evidence or --
Do you have a recollection of hearing anything about pants she may have found at her house and turned over to Mr. Mackie?

A

Q That could be. There were two or three sets of pants in the case, that, that may well be. Yeah. There is the pants that Maurice Serrato brought forward, we'll talk about a bit later, -Yeah.
-- but there's some reference in some of the documents that Mrs. Cadrain may have found the
pants that had been eaten with acid.

A
Q

A

Q

A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)

A
Q
A
\(Q\)

Yeah.
I don't know whose pants, they might have been Wilson's pants, \(I\) don't know.

Not -- I had the notion, and don't, you know -that those were Wilson's, but \(I\) may be totally wrong in that.

Are you able to help us out as to why that might have been, why you might have called Mrs. Cadrain?

Not without more, sir.
Okay. And Mrs. Wilson \(I\) think we've talked about,
and I believe we saw her evidence at the prelim, she was not called at trial, and \(I\) think that
related to the changing of the clothes, is that
right, the night before the trip?
I assume so. Whatever she said at the prelim I didn't, I didn't, I'm sorry, feel it necessary to call her at the trial.

And then Pratt we know is the fellow, the elevator
agent, where the break-in occurred; were you
thinking of calling him?
It looks like that.
And you decided not to?
Yeah, I believe so.
And do you know why?

A
\(\square\)
2
A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q

No, I don't offhand, but \(I\) assume \(I\) did not call
him, sir, so --
No, you did not.
Yeah, okay.
And then down, 'Milgaard's two statements', I presume \(M\) is Milgaard?

Yeah.
And 'witnesses on voir dire'; is that a note that you might have to call witnesses to prove his statements?

Yeah. If I tried to prove any of his statements I
would have to have the appropriate witnesses lined
up in the event of a voir dire.
If we could then go to 006974 , and that's got
number 96 in the top right-hand corner?
I have that letter, sir.
And this is a letter of September 24 th, 1969 from
Deputy Chief Forbes to you and it says:
"Enclosed are duplicate copies of an account submitted by the Calgary City

Police Department for expenses incurred
by Inspector A.R. Roberts, who was
requested to come to Saskatoon for
interviews with T.D.R. Caldwell and C.F.
Tallis, the Crown Prosecutor and Defence

Counsel, respectively, at the
Preliminary Hearing of the Milgaard case."

And then it just goes on to ask you to submit the bill to the Attorney General's Department. And then the next page, which is \(006973 A\), and this is the account, and it looks here that, although I think they maybe misspelled your name, --

A
Q

A
Q
A
Q

I --
-- a salary of two days, it looks as though Mr. Roberts would have been with you people and/or travelling for two days?

It --
Does that sound right?
Yeah, it sounds right to me.
And then if we could go to 006818. This is a letter of October 2, 1969 to Mr. Boyd, this is your letter sending off the invoice, and it talks about:

> "During the Preliminary Inquiry Mr. C.F. Tallis, Q.C., who was appointed under the Legal Aid Plan to defend Milgaard, became aware of the participation of Inspector Roberts in questioning the
> Crown witnesses, Wilson and John, and
formally requested me to have Inspector Roberts subpoenaed and brought to Saskatoon as a potential defence witness at the Preliminary Inquiry. As you know, Section 6(a) of the Plan requires the Crown Prosecutor to place such defence witnesses, as requested by defence counsel, on the crown witness sheet and have them summoned to attend and pay them as if they were crown witnesses.

Inspector Roberts attended at Saskatoon and was interviewed by myself and Mr. Tallis, jointly, concerning his part in questioning the witnesses and, as well, \(I\) interviewed him at some length for my own purposes in connection with the Preliminary Inquiry."

Now would that be an accurate account of what happened?

Yes, it would.
So it appears, from this letter, that Mr. Tallis was considering calling Inspector Roberts as a defence witness at the preliminary hearing?

A
I would assume that. The billing, as you see, had
to be done through, through our department -Right.
-- for administrative reasons.
But what the letter says is that, although you would subpoena him and pay for him, you were doing that because the Legal Aid plan required you do that, --

Yeah.
-- but that, really, he would be a defence witness?

That's -- I'm sorry, it came from Mr. Tallis, so on the face of it you would expect it would be. If \(I\) can just -- thanks.

Would there be a distinction, Mr. Caldwell, between Mr. Tallis saying "lookit, I would like you as the Crown to call Mr. Roberts as a Crown witness" versus "I would like to call him as a defence witness"?

I think the Crown would be stuck with the bill in either case, so I --

Let's forget the bills for a moment.
Okay, very good.
Q
A
I want to know if you can tell us -Okay.
-- whether or not, first of all, would there be a
distinction or would it matter whether or not Mr.
Roberts was called as a Crown witness at the prelim or as a defence witness?

A
Q
A
Q

A
\(Q\)

A

Q

A
Q
Or, second, he could call him as a defence witness?

A Right.

And I'm trying to understand whether there was some reason that Inspector Roberts was treated differently that Shirley Wilson?

Well only -- one reason would be that he produced a bill, in effect, that had to be paid, and we have seen the correspondence on that.

Shirley Wilson, I would have re
-- the way the legal plan evidently worked, I would have been the one who had to subpoena her, and I did that. I don't know, sir, if I'm answering --

No, I'm -- I will keep trying.
Okay.
I'm trying to understand, Mr. Caldwell, whether or
not -- you talk in your letter of Mr. Tallis wanting Roberts, twice, as a potential defence witness --

Yeah.
-- and place such defence witnesses. And let's back up. At the preliminary hearing, --Uh-huh.
-- Mr. Tallis had the right to call defence witnesses at the preliminary hearing?

Yes, right.
To call his own witnesses?

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
Q

A
Q

A
\(Q\)
A

Absolutely.
And was it contemplated then, when you brought Inspector Roberts in, that if Mr. Tallis wanted him to testify at the preliminary hearing, that he would have called him as a defence witness?

He could have, or he could have asked me to, and I could have called him and simply let him be cross-examined, if that was the route, which was a bit unusual \(I\) guess.

Right. And now that's what \(I\) am trying to find out.

Yeah.
This letter suggests that unlike Shirley Wilson, in the case of Shirley Wilson you said "I'll call her", --

Uh-huh.
-- and \(I\) think your exam was brief and he cross-examined?

Okay.
With Roberts, from this letter, it appears that if
Mr. Tallis wanted him to testify, that you would have to call him as a witness?

Yeah.
Or were you prepared to call him?
I would have, I think. The way that reads may not
give that impression.
I see. So that if Mr. Tallis said "I would like Inspector Roberts' evidence to be heard at the preliminary hearing" you would have called him as a Crown witness?

I would have, yeah.
And possibly simply called him and then let Mr. Tallis cross-examine?

That would be one possibility, sir.
I take it that, since Inspector Roberts wasn't on your witness list, that you didn't think you needed his evidence at the prelim to secure a committal?

I think that's right.
Do you have a recollection of your interview with Mr. Roberts or your meetings with Mr. Tallis and Mr. Roberts?

A
Umm, well, I'm sure that meeting that has been mentioned, \(I\) think on a Saturday morning in my office, occurred. I think, I think there's some documents about that, are there not, sir?

If \(I\) may assist, \(I\) think there may have been later, a later discussion towards the trial, -Okay.
-- I'm talking about at the preliminary hearing.

A

And I take it that, there is a reference in earlier notes about the lie detector, I take it Mr. Tallis would have been aware that Mr. Roberts had performed the lie detector test on Mr. Wilson?

A
Q
I don't offhand, and it says 'at the preliminary hearing' here, so he presumably would have been here.

And so, when you brought Inspector Roberts in, you would have allowed Mr. Tallis to ask him whatever questions he wished?

Oh, certainly, yeah. Yeah, I see this paragraph, the way it reads 'from my' -- 'for my own purposes in connection with the preliminary inquiry', so we jointly interviewed him and then \(I\) interviewed him separately, which is -- wouldn't surprise me.

And that he was questioned concerning his part in questioning the witnesses, and that would be Nichol John and Ron Wilson?

I, yeah, I would assume, must be.
Do you recall whether Mr. Tallis had raised a concern with you about the manner in which Mr. Roberts had interviewed these witnesses?

I don't, sir, recall that.

I would assume he would know that.
And in fact there's documents we've seen, and
we'll see others, that confirm that. I think the note we saw yesterday about requesting the lie detector tapes; do you remember that?

A
Q

A
Q
A
Q

A
\(Q\)

A
I'll look at it, sir. It appears that John and Wilson have been inverted in that bracket called 'attack and trip', could you -- is that what you are --
\(Q\)
A
Yeah, let's go to the third page, 919.
Yeah, okay.

And there's some notes at the bottom where we see 'E to SB 19 of after Mrs. Cadrain'; do you know what that refers to?

A

Q
A
Q
A

2
A
Q

A
Yeah, I mean called to stand by after Paynter's name and the three more lab witnesses, for instance.

Yeah. So at this point in December you are still thinking Mrs. Cadrain may be a witness?

A
\(Q\)
I would assume so.
And then 'changes in order, Wilson, John, Cadrain, before Marcoux'?

A
Q

A
I see that.
Anything to add to that? Do you know why --
Is Marcoux the young lady who --

Q
A
\(Q\)

A

Q

A
Q

A
\(Q\)

A
-- found the body, yes.
Found the body. Well, in one -- in one sense, or in fact the episode had happened before she found the body, so that would just look chronological to me.

And then what about number 2, 'Diewold before Rasmussen.' Diewold is the fellow at St. Mary's church who saw the car, 7:10 I think, thereabouts, and Rasmussen is the fellow at the motel. I'm assuming again \(I\) would try to get it in chronological order, sir, as \(I\) then understood it. Does that -- I mean, that's what I'm assuming.

Yeah, if you can explain that, that's fine. Yeah, that's what \(I\) take from that.

And then next, 006971 , \(I\) don't think there's a need for you to get your original, \(I\) just want to --

Okay.
Again, and we see a number of these, \(I\) don't propose to go through them other than it looks as though December 8th, '69 you would have had subpoenas issued, these are the police officers, and there's similar ones for the rest of the witnesses. Does that sound right?

Yeah, it does.

Q

A
\(Q\)

A
Q

A
\(Q\)

A

Q
A
\(Q\)

A

And then 006963 , and this has got 108 in the top right, December 9th, '69.

I see that on the screen.
And it appears to be your letter to Chief Kettles with the witness subpoenas to be served. I take it the police would look after serving these for you?

Yes.
And then scroll down to the bottom, please, we've got Robert Rasmussen in Calgary, and if \(I\) can assist here, Mr. Rasmussen, again, he was the fellow who worked at the motel, the Trav-a-leer Motel.

Okay.
And I think he had moved to Calgary by the time of the trial, there's some documents trying to locate him.

Okay.
Do you remember that?
It looks like that.
And then as well we have Inspector A.R. Roberts, Calgary police department, peace officer, January 19th, and there is, in fact, a subpoena that you get issued for Mr. Roberts.

Okay.

And so, I mean, he wasn't called at trial, but I take it, sir, that based on that, would it be fair to say that you took steps to have him available --

A

Q

A

Q
A
Q
A
Q
Again, Mr. Commissioner, these notes, the numbers 119, the RCMP numbered these pages when they got the file and numbered them from back to front \(I\) think in most cases. When \(I\) look at the file, it appeared that these were some loose notes that were in the file that would suggest December, January sometime -- December, '69, January, '70 and trial prep notes; is that --

A
That sounds --
And if we can go through them, I see we have
number 2 here, \(I\) couldn't find anything that was number 1, and I'm not sure anything --

A

Q

A
Q

A
Q

A
Q

And would it be fair to say -- well, let's go through the first one and then I'll ask you, it says, 'Why \(T\)--' and \(I\) think that's Tallis, '-dwelling on no foot marks and no blood spots away from body: only near body. Idea she not dragged or walked there. Uniform absorbed much blood.

Wound causing death may be late in proceedings.'
And again, would this just be notes to yourself on
the file of things to --

A

Q

A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)

And do you know what -- and then you've got a line through it. Does that mean you would have satisfied yourself --

I think that's what it means, or given up, one or the other.

And do you know what this item, why you would be worried or concerned about Tallis dwelling on no boot marks away from body, only near body?

Something -- not offhand. Something to do with the order things happened in or -- at the scene I presume.

Okay. And if we could scroll down to number 3, and it says David, who \(I\) presume is David Milgaard, 'David good boy department, cut own hair sample, co-op, nice to Danchuk's. Appearances are deceiving.' And then can you tell us -I'll try and help you with that, 'if a person being interviewed looks nervous - doesn't prove he did it. - if he prof, calm and polite, doesn't eliminate him.' These were references \(I\) guess that Mr. Tallis had cross-examined along these lines indicating some good behaviour by Mr. Milgaard.

Okay. And then you've got a note here, 'not interested in his manners at all these other
times, proves nil so his actions --' or proves -what's that word?

A
\(Q\)

A
Q

A
\(Q\)
A
\(Q\)

A
Q
A

Q

A
Q
A

And then five, 'sweater inside out - girls don't take off sweaters this way'.

Yeah. That's just another note to me. That number 4 could have something to do with cross-examining Mr. Danchuk by Mr. Tallis saying wouldn't you have expected \(A, B\) and \(C\) to be the case, but there were no scratch marks on his face, that's all \(I\) can --

All right. So do you think these might have been notes that you took based on Mr. Tallis' cross-examination?

A
\(Q\)

A

Q

A
\(Q\)
And then the next page, 006952 , it has 120 in the top right, 'N.B. for summation,' I take it that means important for summation?

A That's right.

And that would be the summation to the jury?

A Yes, sir.
Q
And you say, 'honest witnesses honestly mistaken,' and then you have 're Danchuk's car.' You've got Danchuk's car being a '64 Chev, Campbell saying it's a '63 Ford. 'Trial, Mrs. Gerse, holes in toque. Grant, one lump and source of it.' Can you tell us what --

Yeah, those would be things \(I\) would be planning on covering in a closing and one of the things that does happen is that honest witnesses can be and are honestly mistaken and this is simply a difference in the description of Danchuk's car between two people. I think clearly the same car as it turned down.

And if you can scroll down, \(I\) think you've done the same for Wilson's car, Wilson says it's a '58 Pontiac, McQuhae, Anderson, Danchuk, Davis describe it as a Pontiac, Chev, Pontiac and various --

And then you say, 'no car went east west because no --'

A
Marks.

A
Q

A
Q
A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A

Yeah.
And that would be the east-west alley, would be the one that runs from Avenue \(N\) to Avenue \(O\) ? That's right.

Or -- correct?
No, that's my understanding, yeah.
Yeah. And the body was found on the north-south alley that intersected?

That's right.
So no car went east-west because no marks?
Yeah.
And you have, 'Diewold saw a car in there. Ident
van had been there in a.m., apparently left no
marks. See photo.' And then, 'Parker walked
east-west in afternoon. Photo 4.' Can you tell
us what that --
Well, that -- there's some suggestion that no car had gone east and west in that same alley and in following that up, it appears as if Mr. Diewold did and testified that he saw a car in there, the way I'm reading this. The identification van had been there in the morning, but apparently left no marks. Apparently that shows up, Mr. Hodson, in the photo that includes that van, if that's how I'm reading it, and then Detective Parker walked
east-west in the afternoon and evidently that's encompassed in photo 4.

Okay. So can \(I\) read from this that if Mr. Tallis makes the argument that there was no car in the east-west alley because there were no marks, that these were some of the things that you would respond with?

That could well be.
Then the next page, which has 121 in the right-hand corner, 006951 , and I think S.I. we've established is sexual intercourse?

A
Q
'Improbability of sexual intercourse in that weather.' Number 1, 'anyone who would do that wouldn't worry re freezing.' Number 2, 'sperm in snow and body, unlikelihood of ejaculation taking place except as part of this episode.' Can you tell us what that --

A
Well, there was a suggestion that it was unlikely that sexual intercourse would take place in that weather. This is my note, anyone who would do that wouldn't worry about freezing, and two, there was sperm in the snow and in the body, in the snow and the body, and then \(I\) had an unlikelihood of ejaculation taking place except as part of this
episode. In other words, it would appear to be all one episode.
\(Q\)

A

Q

A

Q

A
-- did that would be the author, if you will, of the sperm is what I'm trying to say.
Yes.
there; is that fair?
Except as part of this episode. In other words, whoever --

And then it follows, and I presume that's McCorriston, 'purse contents as proving it wasn't Gail Miller's compact - etc. B.S. - note duplications within purse contents themselves.'

Can you --
Yeah, it appears that, 'purse contents as proving it wasn't Gail Miller's compact - etc.,' I think would evidently -- 'note duplications within purse contents themselves.' In other words, the way the purse and contents were found, itself included duplications of some items that it couldn't be said you would never have a duplication, which would work against it not being her purse, to put it awkwardly, sir.

So what you are saying is that the argument that the compact, or thrown away -- or the fact that Gail Miller's purse contained a compact, etc., didn't mean that she didn't have two because her purse had duplications?

A

Q

A
That would be how -- my view.
Now, I looked for an officer with the initials B.S., but I didn't find one. Am I --

I think we had some of them testifying here earlier, but \(I\) believe they are retired. I think that's their traditional heading, sir.

Q
A
\(Q\)

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q
A
Q

A
girl. Two and three are part of the same --
Q

A

And because \(I\) see a reference here to trial and to Lapchuk and Melnyk --

A Yeah, yeah, there's two -- he evidently gave two
estimates of time, one in the prelim, one in the trial, that's why that's that way, and I'm questioning is that a big deal, in a word. And then \(I\) think number 3 is, 'why not see blood on sweater and shirt too,' and I think

Mr. Wilson's evidence was that he saw it on the pants, but not the shirt?

That would be how \(I\) would read that, sir, but \(I\) take it of David Milgaard is what they are talking about, okay.

And then Lap and Mel, which I'm assuming is Lapchuk and Melnyk credibility department?

A
\(Q\) That's right.
'One says bed and one floor, words different,' and again would that be --

Yeah, that would be things I understood they had said about, of course, about the hotel room reenactment. I didn't appear to attach any weight to that. 'One says bed and one floor, words different.' Just from my own -If we can just go back maybe to the first page, 006953 . In your file are these notes together, Mr. Caldwell, the ones we've just gone through, or are they loose notes?

A If you give me a second I'll --

I'm looking for 119, 120 and 121.
A
\(Q\)

A

Q

A

Q
I'm wondering if, if you take a look at this first page, whether these, looking at it now that we've saw the page about Melnyk and Lapchuk and the reference to Wilson's evidence at trial, are these possibly notes through the trial that might have been -- for example, 'why Tallis dwelling on no boot marks,' is that something maybe that happened at trial that you made notes of?

A

Q
A

Q
It looks to me as if it's pretrial, but is there any evidence --

No, I'm trying to --
Yeah. I mean, was that covered in the preliminary hearing possibly?

It may have been. Let's just go down to number 3. I think you had said that there's quotes and I
think you had said these were matters that you were putting together in the, based on what points

Mr. Tallis was making.
A
Yeah. It could be -- for the moment it could be trial time, sir, but --

Okay. This is probably a good spot to break for lunch.

A Thank you, sir.
(Adjourned at 11:56 a.m.)
(Reconvened at 1:32 p.m.)
BY MR. HODSON:
Mr. Caldwell, this morning we had gone over the prelim and you advised and we saw some documents that suggested that three officers were recalled at the prelim, being officers Kleiv, Penkala and McCorriston, to give brief evidence, and I've checked the transcripts, \(I\) just want to call up 008258 , and go to the next page, please, and you recall when we went through the notes about your meeting with Mr. Tallis and the mention about the hunting knife. It looks as though at the bottom Mr. Kleiv was called and Mr. Tallis cross-examined him, it says you are going to check a number of items at my request during the course of your cross-examination. And then the question, if you go to the next page -- sorry, go back to the earlier page, he says:
"Q First of all, you mention having in your possession, a small hunting knife?

A Yes, sir.
Q As I understand it, you received that small hunting knife from Constable Ian Oliver on February 28, 1969?

A Yes, sir.
Q And then \(I\) believe that both of you
initialled it at that time?
A Yes, we did."
So again it appears that that evidence on the second hunting knife was put in at the prelim at Mr. Tallis' request?

That's how I read it, sir, as well.
If we can go back to 006949 and there's 123 in the top right-hand corner?

A
Q
I see that on the screen.
And I was going through before lunch some notes that you had taken and the one page we had referred to looked like it would have been after or during the trial because it referred to Melnyk and Lapchuk and to Wilson's trial evidence, and I'm not sure whether this is with that, maybe we'll just go through and see if you can help us out in figuring out when you would have prepared ,
this. These are your notes?

A
\(Q\)
items. Is it fair to say they would have been notes either in preparation for trial or during the trial of points to cover?

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q

A

I would think that.
And then if we can scroll down further, please, right here, it says, 'N.J. locked up. Long haul for police.' Would that be Nichol John locked up, is that what that note is?

I take it to be that.
And \(I\) know at the prelim, and \(I\) believe at the trial, there was some examination or cross-examination of Nichol John about her stay in the police cells. Do you remember --

I know that was raised, yeah.
And is that what this is referring to?
I would assume so.
Next if we could go to 006960 , please, this is document 112 in the top right-hand corner.

Okay, I have that, sir.
And this is your letter, January 6, 1970, to
Mr. Kettles, again some subpoenas, and then a note here that says, I'm assuming that is 'explained to deputy chief, January 6, that I'll phone these two'?

That is correct.

And would that be referring to them, at the bottom, Inspector Roberts -- scroll down -- I presume Insp R. is Inspector Roberts?

I do as well.
And, 'try to avoid January 21, important'? Yes.
'R: Give him one or two days' notice'?
That's right.
Inspector Brown. So do I take it from this that
you had talked to Inspector Roberts about --
I would say so. I don't offhand know who
Inspector Brown is, but perhaps you do.
I don't know.
Okay. That may become clear later.
And if we can go to 006947 , and again this is just a note from -- I think MMS was your secretary at the time?

Is this 125?
Yes.
I'll just look at this.
Sure. I'll call this out, please.
MMS was --
I'm sorry, I'm just getting it enlarged.
Oh, I'm sorry.
So we'll go through. This is a memo to you that

Detective Ullrich phoned about Mr. Rasmussen, and again, do you know what that would mean?

That would be correct, I obviously asked Ullrich to ask Rasmussen about something. At the moment I'm not sure what it would be because we only have the answer here.

And do you know what these -- I presume that may be just information about serving subpoenas; is that --

Yeah. Yeah, the Danchuk one is where he is apt to be found. Mrs. Danchuk, the second one, same places mentioned in Ullrich brief, and I guess W.D. is Walter Danchuk.

Go to 006946, this is a subpoena for a fellow by the name of Maurice Cerato who had given the police a statement that -- actually, maybe we could -- why don't we just have you read that note on the top there.

Okay. The M.C. would be Maurice Cerato, 'told Mr. John of getting from \(M\) on Monday --'

That would be --
Pardon me?
I'm sorry, from the \(M\), would that be Milgaard? For the moment \(I\) assume that. Okay.

A 'On Monday, January 12 th and John told Karst by phone that p.m. Karst advised me Tuesday, 13th \(K\) and \(S\) down Wednesday, \(14 t h\) - got pants and to lab today.' I think that refers to Nichol's father advising the police about these pants and they evidently picked them up, took them to the lab, and \(I\) evidently phoned Mr. Tallis that same day by the look of that to advise him of that. And there's a statement in the documents of \(a\) Maurice Cerato indicating that he had bought a pair of jeans from Mr. Milgaard --

Yeah.

Q
A
Q

A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)

A
2
I think for 15 cents --

Yeah.
-- that had the legs cut off, and that he thought there was blood on them, and do you recall that?

Yeah. Roughly speaking \(I\) do, yeah.
And that they had been washed and then \(I\) think the police picked them up and took them to the lab and I don't think anything came out of the lab.

I think the lab more or less said they couldn't do anything with them, if that's the --

I believe that's what the report says.
Yeah.
And you did not in fact call Mr. Cerato?
is involved with,' and then \(I\) think some notes, some follow-up, and then \(I\) take it you did follow up to have Rasmussen served?

A

This is a January \(12 t h, 1970\) letter from you to the administrative officer at the Attorney General, and again referencing your October 2 nd letter for Roberts, and then if you could scroll down to the third paragraph -- just go back, the second paragraph says the police received another invoice and it's not paid, and then scroll down, it says:
"Inspector Roberts was extremely helpful and co-operative in attending at Saskatoon in this respect last year, and has been subpoenaed again as witness for the trial herein, which will commence on or about January 19th, and it may be
necessary to have him attend at
Saskatoon for that purpose."
So I take it from that that, A, January 12 th, he hadn't been paid for the last --

A
\(Q\)

A

Q

A
Q

Q
A sir, \(I\) just want to know generally what, what would you be putting in these notes, and when
would you prepare them, and what was the purpose of them?

A

Q

A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)

A

Q

Well it presumably is pretrial, and they are things that haven't been settled to my mind in terms of whether or not we call people, whether we pursue them, that kind of thing.

So these would be, and again \(I\) think in your filing folder they are around documents in early January 1970 , so does that sound about right?

Umm - -
In the time period leading up to the trial?
It does.
And so we will see, you've got a number, next I am
going to be going to N.B. For Trial and then
you've got some -- a document of -- let me back
up. The headings of your notes that \(I\) have got are Figure out Law, etc., --

Yeah.
-- you have a set of notes called N.B. For Trial, you have a heading of documents called see in Person, you have one called Write, being W-R-I-T-E ?

Uh-huh.
One called Phone with a list of things to do, and I will go through all of those with you.

A Oh --
Q
A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q
A
\(Q\)

A

Q
A
\(Q\) -etc.

Okay. pants'?

Right.

But does that sound --
It sounds, yeah.
-- how you organized items to do, is that a fair

Apparently so, yeah.
So if we go through the first one, Figure out Law,

Number '1. Put in', I'm assuming 'W' is 'Wilson's
'Pros and cons' and then 'no'?
And I wrote 'no'.
Is that --
I assume, presumably thought they had no
evidentiary value once we'd found what we could about them.

And is that, are we correct in assuming that you
had the pants; is that right?
From that I assume --
That the police had the pants?
Someone had 'em.
And is it possible that those came from
Mrs. Cadrain?

A

Q
A
Q

A

Q

A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)

Umm, it could be, sir.
Okay.
At this point, you know, \(I\) can't --
And then number '2. Should we prove Wilson's and/or Cadrain's blood types, if so via Brand or Emson', and answer 'yes, Wilson's via Emson'? That's right. And it was just a 'yes', I evidently thought that should happen, and the simple way would be to have Dr. Emson do it as he would be a witness anyway.

Would that be to eliminate -- let's go back to the question. Would you raise that question to, whether you should prove Wilson and/or Cadrain's blood type, the only relevance of their blood type would be to either exclude or connect them with the sample found on Gail Miller; is that correct, sir?

That would be my thought, and \(I\) think they turned out to be three different ones if Milgaard was included, but --

Cadrain and Wilson were not \(A\) blood types, \(I\) can tell you that, sir.

Okay.
And the question here though, it appears that you addressed your mind to the fact that whether or
not you should prove that Wilson and Cadrain could not be the donors of the semen found on Gail Miller?

A

Q

A

A
BY MR. HODSON:
And I apologize, Mr. Caldwell. If we could just
go back on the blood types.
Okay.
Would you agree with the following; that as part
of your deliberations as to what you should prove
or establish at trial, you considered calling evidence to establish the blood type of Mr . Cadrain and Mr. Wilson; and secondly, that the COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- chastised by the reporters, would you be careful. Okay. Thank you.
\(Q\)

Yes, I assume it refers to the semen, I assume that's what \(I\) was doing.

I'll just refer that to --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I'm sorry, Mr.
Caldwell, we just seem to be falling into the habit of talking over --

Oh, I beg your pardon.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So before I get to
--
MR. HODSON: Maybe we'll just go back to --
okay Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv
only purpose in doing so would be to exclude one or both of them as the donor of the semen found near Gail Miller's body?

A
Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
It would be a 'yes' to both those, sir.
And, thirdly, you made the decision to call only evidence with respect, at least according to this note, evidence with respect to Mr. Wilson's blood type?

Evidently so.
And would that be to show to the jury that Mr. Wilson is not the one who raped Gail Miller? Well that he, if the types were right, that he, in effect, couldn't have been the person who was the originator of the semen, is how \(I\) would put it, I guess.

Okay. Three refers to some keys, I don't think anything turns on that. Go down to 4, 'RH/HL', which I'm assuming is 'right hand/left hand evidence'?

That's right. And there is -- there was a policeman named Constable Has who I believe observed the accused on one, at one point. I think that's what that is, as opposed do -- and then 'R. Mackie phone' and 'Dimmitt'.

I think that's actually 'plane', I think

Mr. Mackie was on the plane with Mr. Milgaard. Oh, I'm -- beg your pardon, right. Yeah, that's right, because he made some observations on the plane back from B.C.

So this was a note about establishing what hand Mr. Milgaard was?

That's the topic, yeah.
And then number 5, 'Emson's questions'?
'From page'.
'To autopsy report and interview Emson'?
Yeah. That means that \(I\) was going to transfer Dr.
Emson's questions from my guide page, it looks like, to the actual autopsy report, and then go and interview him.

And then 'prove or leave out items left for ident, identification'?

A

Q
A

Q Okay. Number 7 is, and I'm assuming \(M\) is Milgaard, 'read Milgaard's statement to Karst re useful admissions'?

A
Yeah.
\(Q\)

A
Q
A
Q
A
\(Q\)
A
Q

A
\(Q\)

A
Q

A
We11 I would expect I found that out at -- when
the Crown's case was closed and Mr. Tallis was
called on at -- for defence evidence or not.
And that's when you would have learned, do you think?

A
Q

A

Q
A
Q

A
Q

A
Q

A
Q

A

Q
A

That's, yeah, I -- I expect so.
And then number '8. Read Mrs. Wilson's evidence re what exactly happened with clothes'.

Yeah.
And I take it that is the preliminary transcript?
That's what \(I\) take it as well.
Number '9. Did purse have G.M. ident right in it?'

Yeah.
And I presume that's Gail Miller. Answer 'yes, McCorriston'?

I'm quoting McCorriston that that was the case.
And then number '10. Go over Beauchamp's wallet episode with Ray Mackie, show page 76 and 77 , get clear where Giles Beauchamp really found it, at 326 O, not near school, and Remenda', Remenda's, I'm assuming?

Yeah.
'214 Avenue M South, page 118, or 224 N South (report)? and 326'?
'Third or fourth house north', it says, yeah, 'page 189'.

Are you able to explain what this refers to? Well, \(I\) believe earlier in the -- I may -- in the Inquiry we had both those people claiming they
found the wallet, did we not?
That's right, yes.
Yes, so that's what it would be, at -- there was an inconsistency there which \(I\) hoped to get
figured out before the trial.
In fairness I think, Mr. Caldwell, at the time, in 1969, Mr. Remenda had not provided a statement and nor did any report, \(I\) don't believe, refer to him as being the person who found the wallet.

Oh, okay.
It reported him being there.
Yeah.
And I might assist you a bit further, whether -was there some concern about Mr. Beauchamp's evidence as to where he found the wallet? I think so, Mr. Hodson. I'd have to look at some --

Yeah, you are not, without -- this note doesn't jog anything in your mind about the wallet?

Well just that it was the topic, that it says 'wallet episode, get clear where G.B. really found it'.

And that was you were going to go over with Ray Mackie?

A I assume so, yeah.

And then next page.
Okay. That 'figure out Molchanko report October 31, envelope said "from front right"' -- pardon me -- '"from right front"', end of quote, 'who wrote this, Kleiv or Tweed?' And then it appears I talked to Kleiv who says he thinks it was him who wrote it. The 'find out', I think, should be up a line. And then it says 'Joe, it was Kleiv', that refers to Joe Penkala telling me that he was satisfied it was Kleiv.

Okay. And then number 12 , I'm not sure again, this is just reference to the code, I don't know if anything turns on that. This would just be notes trying to follow up on some questions you had about --

Yeah.
Molchanko was an RCMP fibre expert, --
Yeah.
-- or fibre, in the fibre section?
From the lab in some form or other.
If we could call up 006929 , and that's page 144, Mr. Caldwell, in your original documents.

Yeah, I have that here.
It goes backwards from 144 all the way back down to 131 in the RCMP numbering, and it appears to be

14 pages of notes called N.B. For Trial, and then N.B.-1, N.B.-2, etcetera, in the top right corner; is that right?

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
Certainly through the prelim and up to trial but, Mr. Hodson, I would hope that, by the trial, that that would have all been resolved, but --

I see. So this would be a set of notes, a running
set of notes of important items that you had to either deal with or follow up on for trial?

That's right, and I'd be happy to --

Sure, and we'll go through them. So, first, maybe we'll just call out, number 1 , 'eliminate Hnatiuks', and you've got '(2)' of them, and the answer is 'no', and they were, I think, Matthew Hnatiuk and his mother who lived right by where the body was found. I take it that would be whether you could eliminate them as witnesses?

A
\(Q\)

A
Yes, and \(I\) evidently decided to keep them.
And then number '2', I believe that's 'Mary Marcoux re trampling in snow not being done by those looking at body'?

Yeah. There was some question that -- as to whether the trampling in the snow around the body had been caused by the people looking at it. That may have come up at the prelim.

And then number 3 --
Mrs. Indyk.
-- yeah, 'Mrs. Indyk says second person female, not male, with long shiny black hair and beige scarf, did she give a second statement re this person'.

A Yes.
'Answer, Elmer, no, and both were native women'? No, I think that's 'mature'. Oh, I'm sorry, 'mature', 'both were mature women'. And then, I'm sorry, this last?

Oh, 'pic on TV was a teenager', the photograph on television appeared to her to be a teenager.

And was this relating to her evidence of seeing someone the morning of the murder?

That's -- would be my assumption, sir, because I think that was what her evidence was limited to.

And so then \(I\) think we had earlier saw some reference, at least in the police summary prepared by Mr. Ullrich, that she, at least according to that summary, had saw a female and a male?

I assume that from the way this reads.
Yeah, so here she is saying no, it was two
females, and they were both mature women?
That's right.
Is that right?
That's right.
And then there is a note here, 'advise Cal' with a checkmark, could you tell us what that --

A
The 'advise Cal' means that \(I\) intended to do that, and the checkmark means \(I\) did it.

So you would tell him the information you had from

Mrs. Indyk?
A
\(Q\)

And I think we saw an earlier note where you were -- your note about honest people see -- make honest mistakes about the type of car?

Yeah, that's, \(I\) think it's the same topic. You will notice that in small writing 'Campbell says '63 Ford red and white', lower down 'McQuhae says Pontiac', so \(I\) think it's that same question.

And then under 'Danchuk' it says 'blood "I didn't see any"'?

A

Q
What number are we at, sir?
If you look on the screen, I've -- number 5.

A Oh, okay.
Q You will see that part.
A Yeah, I see that.
Q

A

A Yeah.
'Nil new, nothing new, no statement to add'? Yeah.

Is that, I take it the police would have followed up on that for you?

A
\(Q\)

A

Q

A

Q
A
\(Q\)

A
Q

It appears that way. I asked Elmer December 31st, it appears. Is Nick Kohout Danchuk's landlord? I assume he is.

I'm sorry, sir, I don't know.
Okay. And then 'Elmer says Karst getting statement from him, Karst said nothing new, no statement, nothing to add'.

Okay. And then if we can scroll down, let's deal with this bottom part going up to the Danchuks, 'Sandra Danchuk's statement may have worn toque, prelim did wear toque?'

Okay.
Can you explain that?
Yeah, there would evidently be a difference in what she said and \(I\) would be trying to find out if she could, you know, what shall \(I\) say, improve on that or decide one or the other or say she didn't know.

And then again number 7, just statements, and \(I\) think we've touched on this, statements from these eight individuals, you didn't have statements; is that correct?

Uh-huh, that's right.
Next page. 8 I don't think we need to go through, --

A
Q

A
A
-- covered with snow, as \(I\) recall. I don't think it was ever -- the Crown didn't have any
the body in terms of feet, but across the fence and on the bottom stringer.

Yes, that's the hunting knife --
Yeah, --
-- that Mr. Oliver found.
indication that it was used in any way, and \(I\) don't think anyone else suggested to me that, that it may have been. That's about what \(I\) can say. And you didn't sort of put in knives indefinitely, essentially because they showed up at some time, I don't seem to -- want to be seen to be facetious but --

Well, yeah, \(I\) think we have seen in the documents I think probably at least five knives were found --

A
        Yeah.
            -- but certainly the prelim transcript he
questioned Mr. Kleiv on that?

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q
A
\(Q\)

A
Q

A

Yeah.
Do you recall anything about Mr. Tallis wanting to get the knife in as evidence?

Umm, not, not offhand I don't.
And if Mr. Tallis wanted to get the knife to put into one of your -- to put to one of your witnesses in examination, would he be able to do that?

Absolutely, yeah.
Would you have the knife available for him at the trial for that purpose?

It would be, I would assume, at the station, but it would certainly still exist and be findable.

So if you weren't going to put it in as evidence, would you have told him that that was your intent? Umm, \(I\) don't think \(I\) ever intended to, and \(I\) don't think he would expect \(I\) was going to.

Right.
I don't know if that's --
Yeah.
Yeah.
So, as far as you were concerned, are you
satisfied that Mr. Tallis would have known --
Yeah.

Q
A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)

A
Q

A

Q

A

2
A
\(Q\)
-- that it wasn't your intent to put the knife in?
I think so. And the small peculiarity of this was
that he knew Ian Oliver and recognized him right at the prelim and greeted him, so he would know about the situation, \(I\) would say.

Go on to number 12 , 'caution Davis re
over-defensiveness', and then 'Elmer, where, at Pike Lake or Clarence and 8th'?

Yeah.
And Mr. Davis was the mechanic who worked on the vehicle the second time --

Yeah.
-- after it broke down at Cadrains'; can you tell us what this is about?

Evidently \(I\) thought he was being very, very defensive in his evidence at the prelim and this is -- I just thought, eh, there is no need for that based on anything he did.

Defensive in what sense?
Well apologetic for possibly how he treated the party of three or how the car repair went or something.

I see.
I could if you wish, later, Mr. Hodson --
No, that's fine.

A
Q

A
\(Q\)
A
\(Q\)

A

Q

A
\(Q\)

A
remember"'. That's about all, sir, I can suggest. Right. And then '16. Law re evidence re short of money, \(B\) \& E, etcetera, as admissible', and then 'admissibility and relevancy' and then note 'leave it out'; is that your note, 'leave it out'? Yeah, that's my note as well. Okay.

We discussed it somehow and came to some conclusion we should do that.

And when you say 'we', who would that be?
I would hope it was someone else plus me, possibly Mr. Perras, Detective Ullrich, someone.

And so would you consider putting in evidence that either Mr. Milgaard or the group were short of money, the break and enter, would that be the discussion or the break and enter in Aylesbury? Umm, the break and enter in Aylesbury, I assume. 'Short of money, \(B\) \& E', there was only one \(B\) \& \(E\) that \(I\) recall, and etcetera, 'as admissible', and then I have 'admissibility and relevancy' written there. I know it was discussed with other persons and I guess I -Right. -- concluded to leave it out.

In fact \(I\) recall, and we'll maybe see this a bit
later or in Mr. Tallis' evidence, --

A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)

A
Q

A
\(Q\)
A
Q
A
\(Q\)

A
Q
And he was not called at the trial for that purpose; is that right?

A
agreement with Mr. Tallis, that he didn't think anything turned on it. But it doesn't say that in so many words there, but he'd be the one who could give me the okay not to prove continuity, if you will.

So at this point your note says you've got to call him for continuity, we saw earlier that at the prelim Mr. Tallis asked that he be brought in to be interviewed, --

A
\(Q\)
A
Q

A
\(Q\)
A
\(Q\)
A
Oh sure. I didn't feel Mr. Roberts had anything to hide in terms of the Crown or the investigation, if you will.

But that as far as -- now obviously, at trial, Mr. Tallis could have called him as a witness?

A
Q
A

Q

A

Q

A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)

A

Uh-huh.
As a defence witness?
Yeah.
And that would have certain implications with respect to addresses to the jury?

I think that's one thing, it would force him to go first if he -- that in itself, alone, if he might not wish to do so for other reasons.

And secondly, if it was his own witness, absent some ruling from the court he couldn't cross-examine that witness?

That's right. I certainly would have called him, and I didn't feel that Mr. Roberts, that anything came out about him or his investigation that was, you know, harmful to the Crown.

And would it be correct to say that, in the absence of Mr. Tallis' admission or agreement on continuity, that you might have to call Mr. Roberts?

Yeah, it is. There is a, conceivably -- you can check maybe at the break -- there may be a note about this in that chart of mine, the double-page one --

Okay.
-- which would explain who decided what, sir.

Q
A
\(Q\)

A

Q
A

Q

A
\(Q\)
A

Q
A
Q

A

Q
A
                                    MS. KNOX: (Inaudible)

BY MR. HODSON:

Q

A

Q

A
Q
A

Q

A

Q

A
Q
A
\(Q\)

A
Q
2 why that would be, but it was.

And then just, we'll deal with this while we're at it.

Okay.
'Kleiv - suitcase with black coat, brassiere and nurses uniform to Mackie', those are some continuity. 'Ray \(M\) agrees with above dates and

times, check if Ray checked individual items'.

A
\(Q\)

A

Yeah.
'Ray did not check contents after return from Roberts'.

Yeah.
And then there's a check with an arrow, if we could just scroll up a bit on that, please. Looks like there's an arrow up there to Roberts and the continuity?

Yeah, but a bracket of sorts, and I -- that's got my handiwork, sir.

Okay. If we could go to the next page, 006931 , which has 141 on the top right-hand corner?

Okay, I have that.
And that's N.B.-4.
Okay.
And '17 - Wilson's blood sample results: Who took sample? Continuity?' And then some notes, 'Elmer who took and continuity, results, blood type B, phone Walters re mitts', and then over here 'phone Ken Walters re mitts'; do you see that?

Yes.
Do you know what that relates to?
Yeah. I'll -- 'Wilson's blood sample results', and I -- it's still me, although \(I\) switched to a
ballpoint, 'who took sample? Continuity?' Then I evidently talked to Elmer Ullrich, asked him who took it and what was the continuity, and then \(I\) have 'Kleiv says no one in Saskatoon' right below that, as you can see on December 31st, and that's speaking to Ullrich, on the right column 'Regina police may have taken one, phone Ken Walters re mitts'. I, oddly enough, knew Ken Walters from my Regina career, but -- and \(I\) have here in the left margin 'phone Ken Walters re mitts'.
\(Q\)

A
Q

A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)
A
Q
2 A
Is there --
Yeah, I'm sorry, sir. That's just --
And just again on the mitts, there was some
evidence that efforts were made by police to find
mitts that Ron Wilson's sister or brother had to
see if they matched the toque that Mr. Milgaard
may have had?
Uh-huh.
Do you remember anything about that?
Roughly speaking I do.
And is that likely what that note refers to?
I assume so, sir.
And so following up on a piece of evidence or a
question that you needed answered; is that fair?

And then it says, 18, 'W' which I'm assuming is Wilson, 'says he left clothes he took off at Cadrains: were they recovered'?

A
\(Q\)

A

Q
And, 'rip in Milgaard's pants.' Does that mean that Wilson would have missed that in his evidence-in-chief?

A
Q
That's how \(I\) read that, sir, in the prelim.
And so this would be a note to deal with that at
trial then?
A
Yeah, to --
And 20 is, 'find Workman and Huculok case'?
Yeah.
That's a legal issue you were looking at?
That's right.
Do you know offhand what --
A
Not just off the top \(I\) don't, but it would be very readily findable.

21, 'Roberts: How many questions did he feel
Wilson lied on?'

A
Q

A
Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
rest of it is all correct.
I'm sorry, when Wilson, and I believe, sir, is this the point that \(I\) had asked you the other day about Wilson's statements saying, number 1 , that he had been told by John right at the time of the murder that she had witnessed it, and yet the next day Wilson told John, and I think I had asked you that it was somewhat -- asked you the question, why would Wilson tell Nichol John something she already knew. Remember when I asked you those questions?

A
Q

A
It looks that way. I don't know that \(I\) ever got a total answer to it.

And you've got N.B., which \(I\) presume is important, and it's got that circled; is that right?

A That's right.
Q 25, 'put in W's pants.' I presume that's Wilson's?

Yes.
26, 'get RCMP handwritten statements, Wilson and any others (John) etc.'?

A
\(Q\)

A

That would be to be sure that we had original handwritten statements versus, you know, photocopies or typed ones, because you need the originals if you wanted to cross-examine or whatever.

And for the record, those handwritten statements, at least Ron Wilson's -- is that Nichol John's? Ron Wilson's handwritten statement is on the prosecutor's file.

MS. KNOX: I think somebody has suggested that Nichol's handwritten statement was made an exhibit because of the adverse witness rule.

BY MR. HODSON:
That's correct, her handwritten statement was tendered at the trial and it was a trial exhibit. So you would have had the Wilson and John original handwritten statements?

Yes, \(I\) would.
Next page, 140 at the top, call out the top part, 27, I don't know that we need to get -- 'Cadrain mean by old-time clothes he wore in Regina?' I think that was in his evidence?

Yeah. That was old-timer, and I think
Mr. Cadrain, almost in a sense farming or country-type clothing as opposed to dress I
assume.
And again, this is just some information on blood typing, \(I\) don't know that we need to go through that.

Okay.
This would be figuring out who and when things happened; is that right?

Yes.
And then what is FP's, what is that, and photos? Fingerprints and photos?
'Fingerprints and photos taken in Saskatoon. Can't remember who present.' Who was it now -This is about Cadrain; is that right?

I assume so.
So --
I see that red note in the upper box may refer to
this, 'Cadrain blood sample never tested,' etcetera, so \(I\) assume that is about Cadrain, sir, that we're speaking of.

And can we take it from this that Mr. Cadrain was fingerprinted and photographed?

Yes, I take that, and then you notice the next line, 'Joe, he was on' the date is blank, 'voluntary on his part, co-operated, Kleiv - K photographed and fingerprinted Cadrain, March 2.'

So that was the other ident member saying to me that he had done that.

And you are saying here who was it and why was this done. Were you asking, number 1, was Mr. Cadrain photographed and fingerprinted, if so why?

Yeah, I suppose so. He wasn't charged or, as far as \(I\) can tell, suspected of offences or anything of that sort, and in this, in this state of events, in other words, you wouldn't ordinarily just photograph him or fingerprint him for -We saw, and \(I\) didn't call it up, but when Mr. Penkala was recalled at the preliminary hearing to be examined by Mr. Tallis, he had questions about Albert Cadrain giving a hair sample, and do you recall if these matters were matters raised by Mr. Tallis about what the police had done with Mr. Cadrain as far as hair, fingerprint and blood?

Scroll down to 29 , 'Cadrain re - what he remembers not effected by drugs'?

A
Yeah.
What he remembers as --

A

Q

A
\(Q\)

A
Q
A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)

Yeah, 'not effected by drugs'.
What does that refer to?
Well, someone -- I'm taking it from that there was some evidence that Mr. Cadrain was on drugs to some extent and I'm -- was going to try and establish or find out whether what he remembered had been affected by the drugs. This very likely came out in the prelim \(I\) would think.

And then number 30 , ' C' who \(I\) presume is Cadrain, 'Short and Karst took him to Regina to see Nickey and they all got together in a room there. Last spring.'

That's what that says.
Why would you make a note about that?
I'm not sure right off the -- it may become evident later on or -Would that be a matter that came out of the prelim perhaps?

It may well have.
31, 'Cadrain - what re hard feelings between Cadrain and Milgaard over a girl'?

Yeah. Someone had suggested there were hard feelings. In that respect \(I\) wanted to ask him about that.

And then next is Constable Mildner, number 115, re

M - suitcase - Humboldt.' I'm assuming M is Milgaard?

A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)
A
Q

-- a police report, \(I\) can tell you generally a police report of Mr. Mildner where David Milgaard told him while in the police cells that his pants,

I believe that his pants that he wore were in a suitcase at the bus depot in Humboldt and his mother was going to bring them, or someone was going to bring them.

Yeah.
Does that sound familiar? I will bring up that report a bit later.

Very good.
So would that be what that relates to?
I believe so.
33 -- did you ever get --
I think there's, in effect, something in print,
Mr. Hodson, which --

Did you ever get the pants that --

A
\(Q\)

A

Q

A
Q

A
Q

A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)
    -- I don't --
-- that Mr. Milgaard was wearing?
COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: Just a minute. I'm sorry.

BY MR. HODSON:
Did you ever get the pants that Mr. Milgaard was
wearing the morning he attended at Cadrain's
before he changed?
I can't say at this --
I don't believe there's any record of having the physical pants.

No, I don't believe so.
And then 33, 'go and interview Mrs. Cadrain re pants, etc., room layout,' and does this suggest that you were going to go and interview her?

Not necessarily me. I would think I would ask some officer to do that.

Do you have a recollection of being at the Cadrain
house as part of the trial preparation?
I'm sure I've never been there, sir. Then
included.
Next page, please --
Okay.
-- and then this is 139, N.B. 6, number 34, 'John
says Milgaard's toque matched mitts, and all three belonged to Ron's brother. Get the mitts.'

A
\(Q\)
A
Q
A
\(Q\)

A
Q
A

Q

A
\(Q\)

A

Q
Would you get -- and would you get the background and psych files to be used in the event that Mr . Milgaard testified? on, that there might be a defence of insanity and/or drunkenness raised, that that would be available for the Crown to make what it wanted of that.

A

Q

And then number 36 , it says, 'why Beauchamp instead of Remenda re wallet'?

I think that's that same question.
And \(I\) wouldn't mind just exploring that a bit
because --

A
\(Q\)

A

Q

A

Q
A
Q

A
Q

Okay.
-- because Mr. Beauchamp testified at the prelim and at the trial and at Mr. Fisher's trial that he found a wallet. Mr. Remenda, as you know, testified before this Commission I think for the first time in any proceeding indicating that he found the wallet, not Mr. Beauchamp.

Okay.
And I'm wondering if back in 1970 was there an issue there about which of these two boys had found the wallet?

Well, apparently Beauchamp was evidently the better claimant from the way you've put this question. I don't -- I didn't realize that

Remenda first said that in the Inquiry, sir.
Let me just clarify this.
Okay.
There's a statement that Mr. Beauchamp was eight years of age at the time, said he found a wallet, then went and showed it to Mr. Remenda at Mr.

Remenda's house?
Uh-huh.
And then called Mr. Mackie who went to Remenda's house and Mackie's reporting that he then took

Beauchamp back to where the wallet was found and then Beauchamp testified.

A

Q

Okay.
Mr. Remenda's story, version of events to this
Commission was that he found the wallet, Remenda, Beauchamp was there, they went to Beauchamp's house, Beauchamp's mother phoned Mackie, Mackie came down and instead of taking Remenda to show him where the wallet was found, took Beauchamp, so that's what we've heard so far. I'm wondering whether you can tell us whether back then there was the same confusion over who found the wallet? Well, evidently there were two possible claimants. I don't know that anything turned on it, sir, but I clearly didn't get the answer to that, at least in that sense.

37, 'prove Wilson's blood type B,' we talked about that earlier?

Yes.
And that would be to eliminate him as a donor of the semen found near Gail Miller's body; is that correct?

That's right.
38, 'Wilson - who took blood and saliva, some continuity,' and again this would just be a tie-in
to number 37 , how you are going to prove it; is that right?

A

Q

A

Q

A
\(Q\)

A

Q

A
Q

A
A Yeah, or at the very least advised Mr. Tallis that it was there.

Q
A Yeah. And so the next page, please, this now talks about, 'Paynter re breakdowns within group, A1 - A2 - etc. Paynter couldn't determine the blood group of the blood found in the seminal fluid.' And then maybe I'll just read this and I'll come back. Just scroll down, please, and just pause there. It's got, 'if blood of a group A person, would give same,' then crossed out, and '(liquid) checked seminal fluid for antigens found them - but couldn't say if they were from blood or secreting into seminal fluid. Get this straightened out!!!! (With Paynter).' Are you able to tell us what that relates to?

Well, it's the -- it's that same question I think we were into a little earlier about how much he could tell from blood found in seminal fluid -no, blood group, as it were. Check -- it's that same question, Mr. Hodson.

Maybe I can just try and assist you. We covered this before and \(I\) think it's set out in the trial transcript in your examination of Mr. Paynter. Yeah.

If we can go back to the full page, and \(I\) think,
and please correct me if I'm wrong, but the first point is Paynter couldn't determine the blood group of the blood found in the seminal fluid. So if we pause there, the frozen semen had A antigens in it the first time he tested. We've -- I believe the evidence is that when he tested it again he said that there was blood also, found blood in the frozen semen. He went further to say that the antigens in the semen \(I\) think could have been from the blood and that might explain --

A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)

A Uh-huh.
-- that it may not have been from a person who was a secretor. In other words, if you find antigens in semen, it could be because the donor is a secretor or it could be because the donor's blood is in the semen, and \(I\) think that's the position the Crown took at trial. Does that sound right? That does.

And I think that, and we saw a document earlier where you asked Dr. Emson to advise how a donor's blood could get into bodily fluids, in particular semen.

Uh-huh.
That sounds right?
That does.

Q

A
\(Q\)

A

Q

A
\(Q\)

A
Q
A

And then here it looks like, 'checked seminal fluid for antigens - found them - but couldn't say if they were from blood or secreting into seminal fluid.' Do you see that?

I do.
And so is that -- again, and you say then get this straightened out with Paynter. Would this be along the lines we looked at before where you were following up with Paynter and Emson to sort out this issue?

Yes, and I think the checked seminal fluid, etcetera, were things that Paynter must have told me by the look of that.

And just to sort of finish off on that area, I think we maybe touched on this before, but at trial you had to lead evidence to explain -- let me back up. At the time of trial the evidence of Mr. Paynter was that in the frozen semen there were A antigens?

Uh-huh.
And that one explanation would be that it would be from an A secretor; correct?

Uh-huh.
Yes?


Q

And you knew that Mr. Milgaard was blood type A and that the tests conducted as to whether or not he was a secretor did not disclose antigens. We've heard Mr. Paynter say that that doesn't necessarily mean he's a non-secretor, it just means that they didn't find antigens in the saliva when they tested. We have seen in the transcript and reference elsewhere that some people took that to mean that he was a non-secretor at the time. Yeah, yeah, I didn't, Mr. Hodson, I made a point of calling that evidence because, as \(I\) then understood it, it would eliminate him as the source of the fluids, whatever they were. Right. But at the time of trial, Mr. Caldwell, I don't believe it was your position that the frozen lumps of snow eliminated Mr. Milgaard as a suspect.

You know, I -- \(I\) can't recall that, sir.
Let me just, and we'll maybe come back to this when we get to the closing address to the jury, I think where it was left is that it might be neutral, it doesn't eliminate him, but it doesn't necessarily implicate him \(I\) think was your position.

Okay.

But the point -- on this point, we touched on it earlier, were you not trying to find an explanation for the fact that if Mr. Milgaard was a non-secretor, which \(I\) think you thought at the time; is that fair?

That's right.
If he was a non-secretor, then his antigens
wouldn't be in his semen; correct?
That's my understanding.
Right. And secondly, you had a sample of frozen semen near the body, which I think you suggested was from the person who raped and killed Gail Miller?

A
Q

A
\(Q\)

A

Q
I'm sure I did.
Yeah. And in that sample there were A antigens; correct?

Yeah, I believe that's correct, sir.
And so if Mr. Milgaard was a non-secretor, in order to connect that sample to him, you had to find some explanation as to how his antigens could
otherwise get into the semen?
I would think that's correct.
And in fact there was evidence called from Dr. Emson and Paynter to say that, well, the reason antigens could be in there is because
there's actually blood in there, not just the antigens, but blood?

A
\(Q\)

A
Q

A
Q
A
Q

A
Q

A

BY MR. HODSON:
Q
If we can just go back, call up 006932, and I had, before the break, I had talked about this

Constable Mildner 're M suitcase - Humboldt,' and
I indicated there was a police report on your
(Adjourned at 2:37 p.m.)
(Reconvened at 3:00 p.m.)
file. If we can call up 032345, and it will come up on the screen, the police report. This is a police report, that's your handwriting, Mildner? That's right, sir.

And this is a September 1, 1969 ---- report.

Report. And I'll just go through parts of it, just the first paragraph, this is Mildner's report.
"While being assigned guard to David Edgar Milgaard on separate occasions in particular that of Sept. 1, Milgaard now lays awake at 12 midnight and he discusses his preliminary hearing." If we can go down to this paragraph here, it says:
"The conversation turned to the clothing and in particular to pants that he had been wearing during these events. "I made 2 boo-boos in my statement to the dicks upstairs. One was that \(I\) had told them that \(I\) had changed my pants in S'toon which wasn't right - I changed them in Regina. I can bring the woman up from Regina who saw me changing
them." Milgaard referred that he had a grey pair of pants that he did change in Regina when he stole the battery and spilled some acid on them and that he presumed that his defence lawyer Tallis will bring the woman from Regina to testify to that effect. The conversation then turned to his suitcase "Cal Tallis will bring my pants, my mother asked me what the key was doing with my belongings in Langenburg, I told her just yesterday or the day before that this key belonged to a locker in the Bus Depot in Humboldt where my suitcase was both the pants including the striped pair of pants \(I\) changed in S'toon are." He further stated that he threw the older suitcase, did not when or where, and that the suitcase in Humboldt was a new one that he purchased since the murder. He further stated that he figures that Cal Tallis is bringing the suitcase and that it will probably be in his mother's possession and be submitted evidence by his defence
            attorney."

And then it goes on to talk about Humboldt. So again, would that be the note in your note, Mr. Caldwell, referring to this information from Mr. Mildner?

A

Q
Yeah. Can you remind me where that, what number it is or page?

Yeah, it's number 32, page 140.
MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, for the witness reference, it's not in his file number 1, so he won't find it.

MR. HODSON: No, no, I think he's looking for his hand note, it's page 140 .

MS. KNOX: Oh, sorry.
Oh, yeah, that's right. Yeah, that would be that item 32 , sir, on page 140. That's what it would be .

BY MR. HODSON:
Now, do you recall whether you or the police made any efforts to try and obtain the pants from this locker?

A
Q No, I don't.

And do you recall any discussions with Mr. Tallis about these pants or do you know whether he had the pants?

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)
 Q

No, sir, to all those things.
If we could go to page 006935 and this is page 137
of your N.B. for trial.
Thank you.
Again we'll just go through some of these, 137 in the top right.

Yes, that's right.
And again we've got the suitcase from Kleiv to
Roberts, and that was Gail Miller's uniform, amongst other items, that were given to Roberts when he interviewed Nichol John?

All right, \(I\) take that as correct.
And then Mackie and the keys, 48, 'Karst says toque April 5 afternoon to Joe, April.' Again, that would be a continuity item \(I\) presume?

Yeah. It's actually April 5, obtained to Joe, April, and then there's a blank there.

Okay.
He apparently obtained it April 5th and gave it to Joe, we don't know when.

If we can go down to 52, 'Detective Ken Walters:
what did he see on jacket?' Again, we've seen
some evidence and heard evidence that the jacket
David Milgaard was wearing on the morning of Gail Miller's murder, that Shirley Wilson, Ron Wilson's
mother had it, and her evidence was that she showed it to Ken Walters and then threw it away at his direction or something to that effect.

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q

It would seem that that's the issue that that may relate to; would you agree?

A
\(Q\) Uh-huh.

Is that what this is referring to?
It must be, Mr. Hodson.

Do you have any recollection of what you learned from that?

No.
And then, 'Paynter: Emson: Re freeze and thaw sperm - re effect on antigens pretrial.' I promise \(I\) won't ask you any more detailed questions about secretors, today anyway, but we saw a letter I think during Mr. Penkala's evidence about the theory Dr. Emson had that maybe freezing and thawing semen would get rid of the antigens or something of that effect?

Uh-huh, that's --
Do you remember anything about that?
No, sir, in a word.

I would think so.
And 54, 'get right/left-handed evidence lined up. Has Ray Mackie --'

Well, that would be something in the range of dangerous sexual offenders which \(I\) was involved with a couple of those. There were very clear prerequisites when you tried to launch those things and what \(I\) knew of Mr. Milgaard at that point led me to wonder if he could be, if that
could happen, and it clearly couldn't.
And then 58, I think this is just dictate from in-chief guides for these witnesses I presume? Yes.

59 talks again about Mackie taking Gail Miller's clothes to Roberts?

That's right.
And the next page, and again this is N.B. for trial 10, this is now dated December 2nd, 1969; correct?

A
Q

A
\(Q\)
That's right.
Can we infer from that that the previous N.B. pages would have been prior to that, those notes prior to that date?

I would say so, sir, but --
And then we have 61, 'get in evidence via John that Wilson told her that Milgaard told him of killing somehow?' And then a note -- sorry, 'exception to hearsay,' and then you have 'no way to do this. Leave it out because if it goes in they --' the status of the Wilson and John -- I think this
was seen a little earlier as well, no way to do this, either \(I\) concluded that or in consultation with someone that it was not -- it couldn't be done, in a word.

Q

A
Q
Now we'll pause there, and we touched on this a bit yesterday.

A
\(Q\)

A
Q

A
Q
A
Q
Uh-huh.
First of all, you could get in evidence, you could
have Ron Wilson say "here's what the accused told me"; that would be admissible?

Yeah, that's one civilian to another, as it were. Right, and so that would be evidence against Mr. Milgaard?

Yeah.
So you could call that?
Yes.
And it says 'get in evidence through Nichol John that Wilson told her that', so in other words \(I\) take it the evidence through Nichol John that she was told by Wilson about Milgaard's admission
would have been obviously hearsay?
That's my view.
And as an exception to the hearsay, and you say 'no way to do it', so you conclude you can't get that evidence in?

That's what I concluded.
And then let's go to this remark about 'leave it out because if it goes in they are accomplices', and were you concerned that the fact that John and Wilson knew about the murder, that somehow they would be accomplices, or can you explain that?

Oh, I'm sorry, let me just pause here. Is this note here possibly for 62?

Yeah, it is I think, Mr. Hodson.
Okay.
So it says 'admissible as motive or such?', and then I've written 'leave it out as if it goes in \(W\) and \(J\) may be regarded as accomplices' I think.

I see.
There is a case called Castellani, B.C. Court of Appeal, that would apparently bear on that.
\(Q\)
A

Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
\(Q\)
A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)
A
Q
snatching shortly before the encounter with
Ms. Miller; is that --

A
Q
A
Q
A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q
Q

A
\(Q\)

Oh, possible.
That's part of your case at the time?
Yeah, it could be, \(I\) could --
And so the issue there, is it admissible as such? Uh-huh.

And then you go on to say 'leave it out as if it goes in Wilson and John may be regarded as accomplices'?

Yeah.
And so \(I\) take it the one benefit of putting it in is that it would show motive that would support your theory; correct?

Yes.
And in fact we'll see in your address to the jury, both your opening and closing, that was part of a theory, that this started out as a purse snatching.

Okay. I had forgotten that, but I'm sure you are right, sir.

And I'll take you to that, if I'm mistaken, we'll see when we go through your address.

No.
And so the advantage of calling that would be that
you could get in evidence that would support your theory of the motive; correct?

A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)
A

Q

A
\(Q\)

A
Yeah. I can't tell without looking at it, sir, but it's a B.C. Court of Appeal case which appears Wilson and John's evidence might be given lesser weight?
-- now, but was the basis of that that there would be a caution to the jury that, as accomplices,
to bear on that.
I see. But just generally was it your, just back at the time, was the issue that you were concerned about that, if you put in evidence of the purse snatching amongst Wilson, John and Milgaard being part of the discussion, you were worried that Wilson and John might be regarded as accomplices and that might impact on their evidence?

I would think so.
Okay. And then 'read history via Dr. MacDonald', is that -- can you tell us what that is?

That's, I wanted to read David Milgaard's psychiatric history through him.

And why would that be important, sir?
Well, in instances when there was a possibility of drunkenness or insanity defences, if -- the more you could legitimately know about the psychiatric history of the accused or intervenee, \(I\) think it was deemed the better off you were, and \(I\) believe I did end up reading that so \(I\) think that's indicated later somewhere.

Right. What about just generally, Mr. Caldwell, as a prosecutor, and in looking at the evidence and looking at the case and looking at the crime; did you normally try and get this type of
information?
A
Well in cases that, capital cases I -- you'd certainly try to, because there'd always be the, not danger, but likely -- or possibility that these kind of defences could be raised, and if \(I\) was familiar with the chart, if you will, it was deemed to be helpful.

Okay. '64. M', who I'm assuming is Milgaard, 'statement to Karst - how much useful admissions in it? To use if Milgaard testifies - such as (a) denied blood on clothes (b) didn't know what he did with clothes (c) in alley trying to find St. Mary's Church and Cadrain's, get declaration voluntary then don't tender and hold for cross-examination'. And \(I\) think we saw a similar note earlier.

Yes, that's that same question.
Yes. And then '65. Mrs. Wilson - read her evidence re what exactly happened with clothes', 'write Weafer' and 'Ullrich new exhibit charts', I think we've seen similar notes before. Okay.

Next page, which is 134.
No. I think, Mr. Hodson, as you know, this is the one and only Commission document that \(I\) have
because it didn't photocopy correctly.
Q
A

Q

A

Q

A

And we'll go to '69. Wilson', which I'm assuming is Ron, --

A
Uh-huh.

Q -- let's just go through that, 'admits A. Make sure', and then you've got 'leave out'?
'Purse snatching'. I had 'get in' and then substituted 'leave out'.

Okay, so 'make sure to get in conversation re purse snatching but would this make him an accomplice and is it therefore better left out, yes, leave out'?

A
\(Q\)
A

Q

A
Yeah, that's right, 'battery theft, etcetera'. Note to me saying that that -- there was no need to mention that, I -- that could come under the heading of -- I'm just -- there was a question about that and \(I\) apparently thought it was better left out.

There is a danger, in some of these cases, of calling relatively insignificant other offences which end up dis -- you know, concerning the judge that it, that shouldn't have
been called in this or a case \(X\), whatever it may be.
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)

Okay. And then we go to, can you tell us what this is, 're' --

Yes, 'see', umm --
Is that 're ridicule etcetera by Tallis'?
Yeah. I'm not sure if it's -- it shouldn't be Tallis, with my knowledge of him, because I -- he certainly didn't ridicule.

Sorry, let's just go back.
Okay.
This is Wilson, and then 'see ridicule etcetera by T'; do you know what that --

Unless we come up with another one of the main characters.

That's fine.
Yeah, okay, not for the moment \(I\) don't.
And 'C2 what clothes he leave at Cadrain's, pants only'?

Uh-huh.
And then down here, 'how important is it we get his pants into evidence and would \(I\) have to testify and Madeline and Mrs. Cadrain?' Oh, okay.
'And/or if witness ID's as positively his does
this eliminate need for continuity'. So do I take it from that -- and Madeline was your secretary at the time?

A
Q

A

Oh, here, that would be there was some evidence that he was annoyed at David Milgaard over the fact that Wilson's transmission had, in effect, blown out, and \(I\) was gonna try and ensure that he
    didn't let that affect his overall evidence in the
    trial, is the way \(I\) would see that.
\(Q\)

A
Q

A
Q
A
Q
A
\(Q\)
A
\(Q\)

A
Q
A
examination-in-chief he said red plastic'. Now the initial 'Wilson' and the colon in there indicates that I asked Wilson about that and he said 'same knife' to me.

So let me just clarify that. The part here before W with the colon is you would have pointed out that in the transcript, or at page 460 , Wilson had said brown bone-handled knife but in chief had said red plastic, you then talked to him and he said 'same knife'?

A
'J. The stupid bitch, rip in Milgaard's pants', and I think we saw a note earlier that that may not have come out in chief of Wilson at the prelim?

Yeah.
Next page, and again these are Wilson continued, if \(I\) can call out 'J. Did he swear under oath re
these four pages etcetera in statement to Karst'?

A
Q
A
Q

A
\(Q\)

A

Q

A
-
Well only, \(I\) guess, the general concern that you'd be disappointed that people of that age would be into and using drugs, that did happen, and \(I\) would -- I would try to assess how much, if any, it affected their evidence when the episode was going on, and at the prelim, and at the trial if subsequent dealings?
necessary.

Q
                            -- in 1969, 1970, --

Do you recall whether you had any concerns -let's talk about Albert Cadrain -- as to whether you were aware of his drug use and whether that drug use affected his, either his credibility, or his recollection of events?

Well there was some other evidence from other witnesses, \(I\) think, that Cadrain had been under drugs, as \(I\) recall, in --

You are talking at the time in '69?
That's --
I want to know back --
Yeah.
-- in 1969, 1970, --
Okay.
-- Mr. Caldwell, --
Yeah.
-- whether you had concerns about Mr. Cadrain's credibility or his recollection based on drug use, from wherever --

No.
-- you got the information?
No I didn't, I --
What about Mr. Wilson?
No, not from that reason. Mr. Wilson seemed to,
as we know, change his view of things from time to time, but not based on that, I wouldn't be concerned.

And you are talking changed his view back at the time?

Well, as time went on in the trial, it seems to me.

And did that concern you at all?
It -- well, maybe I'm confusing it with part of the Inquiry, Mr. Hodson, where -- and I know that in the Supreme Court he changed --

I -- yes.
-- several times.
No, I appreciate that, Mr. Caldwell, and I appreciate sometimes it's difficult to tell me or tell us a recollection back then given what you have heard subsequent and seen subsequent, --

Yeah.
-- but I'm -- if you can, back at the time you prosecuted the case, do you know if you would have had concerns --

Yeah.
-- about Mr. Wilson's credibility?
Well item \(K\) says, and this means \(I\) would have put this to Wilson, 'not under influence of alcohol,
drugs or LSD when -- while in Saskatoon', I'm not telling him that but it's something \(I\) would raise with him. I assume \(I\) came out of that with an answer saying that he was not, and that may be in the transcript somewhere.

But, again, are you able to tell us whether, at the time you prosecuted Mr. Milgaard, whether you would have had concerns about the reliability or credibility of Wilson, John, Cadrain, because of any drug use on their part?

A

Okay. And what about Mr. Cadrain, do you recall whether you had any concerns about his mental stability or credibility, not related to drugs but just his credibility and mental stability?

He -- he -- I assessed him as being an honest young man and seemed quite determined to have his account in this thing heard by a Court. There was no time in which I felt that \(I\) would be improper to call him, and of course \(I\) called him at both the prelim and the trial and each one of those would involve -- pardon me -- personal interviews with me ahead of time so \(I\)-- I didn't have any, you know, hesitation in calling him based on those
kind of factors.
Q
A
Q

A
Q
A
Q

A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)
A
Q
 -
-- Mr. Caldwell, though, is at the time you prosecuted Mr. Milgaard, whether you observed anything or were aware that Mr. Cadrain may have
No. I think that those things were -- postdated, well, the trial date, as \(I\) recall. They were concerns raised later, he ended up in University
Hospital at some point.
Yes, and what \(I\) want to know, --
Hospital at some point.
Yes, and what \(I\) want to know, --
Yeah.
recollection, at the time you prosecuted Mr.
Milgaard, of being aware of any condition that Mr. Cadrain may have had? Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv
been suffering from any mental condition?

A
Q
A
Q

A
Q

Absolutely not.
Any recollection of visions being mentioned?
No.

That he may have been seeing visions related to the murder?

No.
Okay. If we can then go on to -- again just back
to what -- Mr. Wilson, 'Milgaard's toque was Wilson's sister's which he thinks was white, green and brown, find matching mitts, call sister to ID toque.' Again, do you know what that would relate to?

A 'Find matching mitts which would match the toque, call sister to identify', I don't know whether that challenge went any further than that.

Now we know that the other toque we have seen was the one that Mrs. Gerse found that was a solid blue; correct?

That's my understanding.
And so would you be pursuing, with Mr. Wilson, to try and establish what colour of toque Mr.

Milgaard had or was wearing that morning?
Umm, there was --
Let me back up.

A
Q

A
Q

A

Q


A

Q

Okay.
Would this have been -- this may have been
evidence that Mr. -- I think it's referring to the prelim evidence that Mr. Wilson had given, --

Oh.
-- or someone had, about -- I believe the evidence
was that Mr. Milgaard had borrowed a toque from
Ron Wilson --
Uh-huh.
-- and that there was matching mitts, and \(I\) think, according to this, if that was the toque he was wearing on the morning of the murder, it would have been white, green, and brown as opposed to blue?

Umm, I just saw that page 481 note, Mr. Hodson, for the first time at the start of that.

Yeah.
So it would be prelim evidence to that effect.
So would you be checking this then?
Yes, to see what could be discovered that would be helpful.

So we scroll down, and \(I\)-- the last one, 'M. Did
Milgaard say he "hit a girl" that "she fought",
"he jabbed her a few times with a knife"'; would these be your notes for your interview of Mr.

Wilson, then, is this what you would go over with him?

A
Q

A

Q
A

Q

A
Q

A
\(Q\)
A

Q

A

2

A
A
-- so presumed evidence out. I wonder if that could be page 6 of John's statement possibly?
attempt to sort those three sets of --

Right.

Q Right. It says that 'Milgaard brought flashlight and knife from elevator, Pratt agree'?

Yeah.
And I think we see Mr. Pratt's statement that he says "no, only the flashlight was taken", correct?

Yes, I believe so.
I believe so. And then \(I\) believe Nichol John's evidence at the prelim was she saw, I think she identified a bone handled knife and a maroon handled knife, is that -- I think that's what the document suggests?

A
Q

A
Yes, and it says 'also saw a maroon handled knife', I guess she mentioned that, that's how I look at that.

So when you say here 'brown and tannish bone handle, what's this all about', you are trying to find out what knife this is?

A
Q
A
I think the 6 may well refer to page 6 of her statement --

Q Okay.

A
Q
A
\(Q\)
A
Q
A

Q

A
\(Q\)

A
Q

A
\(Q\)

A
    -- is all \(I\) can -- I don't know.
    And then \(B\) she says 'stuck twice'?
    Yeah.
    'Then to Danchuks'?
    Yeah.
    'Then to motel for a map'?
    Yeah.
    And I think, if we pause there, \(I\) think we know, \(I\)
    think from the evidence, that the motel was before
        the Danchuks.
        Okay.
        I think, and \(I\) think Ms. John corrected that at
        trial.
        Okay.
        And \(I\) believe that's, based on the times, that
        that's what the record reflects. Would this be
        just a note to check that with her?
        Yes, it would, because apparently what she was
        saying, if you will, didn't match the evidence,
        'stuck twice, then to Danchuks, then to motel',
        which presumably is not the same as the --
        Would it possibly -- would possibly these be notes
        based on their prelim evidence that you would be
        going through --
        Yeah.

Q
                                    -- saying "these are things I've got to check with
    them"?
    Quite possibly, sir.
    And then 'C', is that 'first says'?
    I think so.
    'First says bone handled knife was just in car,
        doesn't know who had it'?
    Yeah.
    'Page 41, but goes on to say Dave had it page 42'?
    Yeah.
    Okay.
    Those, I presume, are prelim evidence pages.
    Okay. And then again 'D. Milgaard wearing
    toque'; 'E. No mention \(B\) \& E, dope, battery
    theft'?
    Yeah.
    So, again, would that be a reminder that you are
    not going to bring it up with her?
    I would think so, yes.
    And then the next page, 'Cadrain', and again do
    these look to be notes or points to go over with
    Mr. Cadrain to prepare him for trial?
    They would to me, yes.
    And so, if we go to the top, we recalled the
    mention before of 'old timer clothes', 'A. Date of

Milgaard et al. appearing in Saskatoon, check credit union withdrawal, get straight, he' --

A
\(Q\)
A
Q

A
\(Q\)
A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)

A
Q
A
\(Q\)
A
Q
A


Well as a -- I must have felt Cadrain was rather heavy on the 'I guess this' and 'I think that' as opposed to things \(I\) thought that he should or did
know with certainty.
So would these be notes that you would use in your interview with Mr. Cadrain, then, --

I --
-- before the trial?
I would think so.
'B2. No hard feelings over girl between him and Milgaard'?

Someone had suggested that there were, and I put that to Cadrain, and \(I\) assume got a negative reply from him.

And then B2 -- pardon me -- C. Car across the street facing south, fouled up at page 596 and 7, go over directions with Cadrain'?

A
\(Q\)
A
Q

A
Q
Yeah.
That --
I'm sorry, sir, go ahead?
And I think that, at the prelim, he may have got the direction of the car wrong?

That's what I would assume.
Did you have concerns about Mr. Cadrain's, his
evidence and the reliability of it, based on his
--
A
No, no, Mr. Cadrain was -- as my understanding of the evidence he, of course, was not in on whatever
happened to Miss Miller on any reading of the evidence, he -- they picked him up at his house and took him on this jaunt to Alberta, etcetera, and he -- he -- I had no concerns about him unique to him, if you will. I thought he was an honest young fellow and seemed determined to, you know, give an accurate account of what he knew about the entire trip I thought.

If you could scroll down, 'B2. Nothing re theft at B.A. Lunch'. I'm not sure if we have seen that before; do you know what that relates to?

A
-- leads me to think \(I\) thought it was somewhere else and wanted to pursue it with him.

And then 'E. Got home when'?
A

Q
'Sunday, Saturday, page 620, statement, March 2nd statement to Karst'. And, again, were you trying to figure out when Mr. Cadrain got home from Regina?

Yeah, just to nail that down.
And then 'F. If not sure say so, not a la page 654'.

Yeah.
'Point out to Cadrain'?
Yeah.
I take it there was something in the transcript
that you wished to raise with him?
Yeah, but this page 654 would be an example of
that, \(I\) was hoping, if he didn't know or
something, he'd say so, if he was not sure he'd
say so, not do it the way he did on page 654 and
57, however that was, and we could look at it eventually if you wish.

And, again, would you have said to Mr. Cadrain
your standard phrase, \(I\) think you told us
yesterday, you say to all witnesses?
I would think so.
And then 'G. Admit any sexual relations with Nichol John'?

A
Yeah.

Q

A
Q

A
\(Q\)

A

Q

A
A
Yeah. I assume that someone had alleged that he had been sexually intimate with Nichol John, it may have been her, and I -- if that was the case, I wanted him to admit it, and the second is I

And then the next page, please, this is the last
one, N.B.-14, 'Cadrain, admit sexual intimacy with Nichol John' and then '"bad language"'? in the office already. wanted him to admitit, and
I take it that was something you would have raised with him?

Yes.
'Not on drugs or LSD when Milgaard made statement re killing off Nichol John and Ron Wilson or affecting his memory'?

Yeah. That refers to Cadrain himself, of course, that he was not -- he, Cadrain, was not on drugs or \(L\) SD when the statement was made re killing off Nichol John and Ron Wilson, nor were they affecting his memory. So that's somewhere, Mr. -where I specifically addressed that.

And then lastly on here, 'brief re accomplices, no mention \(B\) \& E, dope, etcetera'; would you have done a brief regarding the law on accomplices or had Mr. Perras do that?

I hope so. There may well have been one on hand
Nichol John
wanted him to admit any bad language he used.
I'm sorry, that you would what?
The second is simply, the ditto mark is "admit", and it refers to bad language. I think Cadrain must have been bending over backward not to use any, you know, swear words, in effect.

Yes.
And I'm telling him, eh, admit bad language if you used it.

And then again we see the note 'nothing re \(B\) \& \(E\), dope, etcetera'; would you have told Mr. Cadrain not to mention that?

I expect so.
Then next if we can go to 006920 , and that's page 147 -- no, sorry, I've got the -- if we can go to, sorry, 006926.

A

And, again, it looks like you've got a list of witnesses or people to see in person?

A
Yeah, \(I\) have that page, Mr. Hodson, and it's in my copy, if you will. It's stapled with some other documents but I'm happy to look at the one you -If you could look at page 147. Would this be a
set of notes for people you need to see in person?

A
Q had been a question over the room layout in what \(I\) assume is Cadrain's house. As to what clothes were left and as to what was wrong with Shorty's story, which indicates that somebody must have been representing to me that there were things wrong with it. I can't tell from this who that was.

And then we have what looks like a note written in
here, it says important, N.B., 'Mrs. Miller and Mary Marcoux and Albert Cadrain all heard Nichol to talk about that?

In this instance \(I\) hope \(I\) would have, but \(I\) don't see evidence that \(I\) did there, sir. Oh, the check marks I think indicate that \(I\) had covered those three topics with her. From this I can't tell whether it was by phone or in person.
Satacta

John say \(I\) 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

A
\(Q\)

A
Q

A
No, I think likely this went in, when you mentioned the dates, would be transferred from one of my other recordings of it, if you will.

And lastly, 'Giles Beauchamp found wallet across street from St. Mary's, not same side, page 72,' which is the transcript?

A

Q And 'important, 76'.
A

Q

A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\)

A
A
statement - stand by,' I think would refer to the
arrangement to have her stand by and await being notified, and the third is McLeod. I think that's a crime lab person.

And then Weafer is the fellow in Craik?
Yeah.
I take it you would have talked about that?
Yeah.
Or written to him. 3, 'Cal - Emson, Wilson
blood,' and then second, 'bloody pants'. Do you
know what that would refer to?
A

Q
A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
'Re \(N\) John saying she saw it,' refers to about Nichol John presumably said, or suggested the snow was trampled.

Let me suggest it might be -- is it possible that your first note is to talk to Mary Marcoux about

So here, Mary Marcoux, phone her, '- snow not trampled by onlookers,' and then you have another note --
the snow not being trampled and, secondly, about whether in the hearing room Mary Marcoux heard Nichol John saying she saw the murder? Do you recall, \(I\) think your note indicated Mary Marcoux was in the hearing room.

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
Q
A
2

She did, and that could very well be the explanation, in fact more likely \(I\) guess.

Did you consider calling that evidence of the people in the waiting room at the trial, about what Nichol John had said?

I believe we considered it, but couldn't find, if you will, a proper heading of evidence to get it in on.

Scroll down, Davis, we talked about Roberts, continuity, just that he had them. I take it you would have talked to Roberts?

Yes.
Then we get to number 4, Karst, 'take May 23 statement, Wilson after first part polygraph, or after whole thing'?

Yeah.
And then, 'K: After the whole thing.'
Yeah. I asked him. He told me that.
So that would be the May \(23 r d\) statement, Wilson's statement, you would have asked him whether he
took it after the first part of the polygraph or after the whole thing, being the whole session?

When it was ended, whenever that was.
And the \(K\) indicates you would have talked to Karst and got that information?

That's correct, and that was his reply, after the whole thing.

Why at that time would you be concerned about when the Wilson statement was taken, whether it was in the middle of the interview with Roberts or after? Just at a glance here, I can't say that, but some question must have arisen about it.

Is it possible Mr. Tallis had asked about that?
It's possible, but \(I\) would have thought there would be a note to that effect, but \(I\) believe that was consistent with what Mr. Karst's evidence was.

And then there's the toque and then is that -Hankie and girdle.
'Hankie - girdle to Penkala, April 7 - where hankie and girdle from?' And just in fairness, there is, when the toque was found, I think there were two other items, and it says \(K\), who \(I\) assume is Karst, 'from lane behind Gerse's house'?

That's how \(I\) read that.
Scroll down, \(I\) think Emson we've touched on,

Bagwell and the pants, \(I\) don't think anything turned on that. It appears at the bottom, 'mitts, Wilson's brother, what he sees on jacket. Wilson said it looks like there were burns/holes in it didn't look re blood.' Would that be Mrs. Wilson or do you know what that -- actually, sorry, this is Ken Walters.

Oh, okay.
Do you recall the earlier note where you were going to call Ken Walters about what Mr. Wilson -or what he may have seen on the jacket?

I'm sorry, \(I\) just saw his name there as well and this would be him, indeed.

Q W might be Walters, I'm sorry.
A
Yeah. I think, Mr. Hodson, the actual letter six I didn't notice, but it actually says his name there, as you can see.

Right. If you look at the screen, Mr. Caldwell, I've got six, Ken Walters, and then am I correct at the bottom, you'll see on the screen where it says what he sees on jacket, 'Walters said it looked like there were burns/holes in it, didn't look re blood.' Is that correct?

A
Yeah. Oh, it didn't look re blood means he didn't turn his attention to looking for blood or lack of
blood the way \(I\) read this.
Okay. So let me try that again. 'Walters said it looks like there were burns/holes in it'?

A
Q
A

Q

A
Q

A
\(Q\)

A
\(Q\) I think so, and it says it was \(B\) who found; is that right?

A
It says, 'it was B who found it: R.M.,' which means Ray Mackie told me that.

Okay. If we can scroll down, go to the next page,
please, go to Paynter, and I take it these other items we're skipping over are just notes of people that you had called with what's noted in the, on the document; is that fair?

A

Q

A
Q
A

Q

A
Q

A
\(Q\)

A

That's right.
And then it says, this is Paynter, 'report May 5, why when found Wilson's blood B not --' what's that word?
'Not proceed with examination of his --'
Saliva sample?
Yeah.
The answer was, because he was \(B\) and seminal fluid suspected of being from a group A secretor, eliminated him from being in class.'

Yeah, that's what he told me.
And, 'get whole secretor/non-secretor story straight'?

Yeah.
Then Bagwell deals with the clothing and Molchanko the fibre. Next page. Continuing on with Paynter, I think that's the stuff from Wilson's car, and then here's a note that says 'what \(T\)--' which must be, I'm assuming is Tallis, '-- getting at re A1, A2 etc? Re his testing technique?'

That I assume the same as you do, Mr. Tallis must
have raised that possibly in the prelim.
Am I correct that based on something Mr. Tallis did at the prelim, you were wondering whether he had something or some issue with respect to blood types and you are asking Paynter what is this about?

That's right, and his reply there is 'doesn't mean much' and then the next line, 'nothing to this, nil to this'.

And then, 'explain whole secreting, etc., bit'? Yeah.
'Freeze/thaw effect on antigens,' and then it says, 'Paynter has tried this - re A non-secretor - and freeze and thaw has no effect.'

That's right, the question, and then from Paynter has on as the answer he gave me and \(I\) wrote out.

Right. So he would have done a test to see whether freezing and thawing changed the sample of an A non-secretor?

A That's right.

2
And I think if I'm correct, Dr. Emson had said maybe if you freeze and thaw, somehow it will show antigens in the semen for the non-secretor; does that sound right?

A It does.

And then if we could just scroll down, 'Paynter re - can have seminal fluid without spermatozoa - but not sperm without seminal fluid.' So I take it that was an issue you had raised with him?

That's right.
Next page -- I think that's it for the notes. I think, Mr. Commissioner, this might be a good spot
to break, we're getting into the actual trial part.
(Adjourned at 3:53 p.m.)
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