# Commission of Inquiry <br> Into the Wrongful <br> Conviction of David Milgaard <br> before 

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE EDWARD P. MacCALLUM
and
Testimony before the Commission
sitting at the
Radisson Hotel at
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

On Thursday, October 6th, 2005
Volume 82
Inquiry Proceedings

## Commission Staff:

Mr. Douglas C. Hodson,
Commission Counsel
Ms. Candace D. Congram,
Executive Director
Ms. Sandra Boswell,
Document Manager
Ms. Kara Isabelle,
Document Assistant

## Support Staff:

| Ms. Irene Beitel, | Clerk to the Commission |
| :--- | :--- |
| Ms. Karen Hinz, CSR, and Official Q.B. Court Reporters |  |
| Mr. Don Meyer, RPR, CSR, |  |
| Mr. Hugh Esson, | Security Officer |
| Mr. Larry Prehodchenko, | Inland Audio Technician |

## Appearances:

Mr. Hersh Wolch, Q.C.,

Mr. James Lockyer, Esq.,

Ms. Lana Krogan,

Ms. Catherine Knox,

Mr. Garrett Wilson, Q.C.,

Mr. Rick Elson, Esq.,

Mr. Chris Boychuk, Esq.,

Mr. Bruce Gibson, Esq.,

Mr. Eamon O'Keefe, Esq.,

Mr. David Frayer, Q.C.,
for Minister of Justice
(Canada), The Hon. Irwin Cotler

Mr. Alexander Pringle, Q.C., for Justice Calvin Tallis
(Retired)

THOMAS DAVID ROBERTS CALDWELL, CONTINUED
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## Transcript of Proceedings

(Reconvened at 9:00 a.m.)
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Good morning. Before Mr. Hodson begins the business of the day, I just have a few remarks.

On the subject of section 9 of
the Canada Evidence Act, the work of the
Commission will soon turn to the trial of David Milgaard. The Supreme Court of Canada, in the Milgaard reference, declared that the trial was fair. That was also the position of the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal from whose decision leave to appeal was denied by the Supreme Court of Canada. Deference to those decisions will not prevent the Commission from examining the state of the law as it was in 1969 and 1970 when the preliminary and the trial took place.

Any lawyer, I think, who has
read the trial transcript, as I did for the first time about a year and a half ago, will see that the application of what has become known in the criminal law as the Milgaard rules might well have had a profound effect upon the jury's verdict of guilt. Indeed, the problem occurs not only to the legally trained. I invite you to
read an article, document ID 039137, which
appeared in The Saskatoon StarPhoenix on the 25 th of January, 1992. Let us do so together. Can we have it on the large screen?

A
Is the bottom edge --

MR. HODSON: We'll have to get the full page, please.
(Paused to read article)

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I see that the speed readers are finished. Does anyone require more time?

As I look over the lawyerly
faces before me, I recognize some who are true experts in the criminal law. One counsel has informed a witness that his experience in the practice of criminal law is 30 years. Others I know have practiced even longer.

There are some, though, myself
included, who cannot lay claim to any such degree of specialization. We might feel the need to improve our education about the sometimes vexing problems of the Canada Evidence Act and its application at trial. I do not wish to stifle initiative, but $I$ feel obliged, as the one responsible for expenditure of public funds, to
head off needless expense on research of the law by counsel present.

In view of what $I$ perceived
last year might be a problem in the application of section 9 of the Canada Evidence Act in the Milgaard trial, $I$ instructed members of Commission staff to conduct research on the subject. I do not mean to imply criticism today of counsel, judge or jury in that trial; it would be presumptuous at this stage to do so. Mr. John Agioritis, notwithstanding his other more pressing duties in the Commission, has managed to produce a scholarly treatment of the subject in draft form only. As time permits, the Commission will approve and release the finished product for, it is hoped, the sufficient instruction of counsel in preparation for a systemic phase inquiry with the help of an expert or experts in criminal law. In the meantime, our taxing officer has been instructed to cast a jaundiced eye over legal accounts which seek to fund research on this subject from Commission coffers. As we take a much needed two-week break from sittings, I ask you to ponder one further matter. Mr. Caldwell and Mr. Tallis,
as you know, were prosecutor and defence counsel respectively. Without setting any limits, at least at present, upon the scope of their examination as witnesses in this Inquiry, I want you to exercise restraint in putting questions to them which invite their opinions on section 9 of the Canada Evidence Act or the probable effect upon the trial of its application, or indeed upon the jury system itself which produced the result which so concerns us. As $I$ said, we will see to it that both legal research and impartial expert evidence is made available to you. As well, it might seem unfair to tax the very counsel whose arguments in 1970 resulted in the Milgaard rules with a critique of those arguments. For one thing, they are not impartial. In the case of Mr. Tallis, recently retired from the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal, a debate on evidentiary matters might as well appear unseemly if, for example, he were invited to disagree with the position taken by his own Court. In any case, both men, as barristers, must have laid open the wisdom, or lack thereof, of their work in the public domain. The record speaks for itself as to the arguments put and the
rulings made. Please understand that these men are not offered as experts for the purpose of giving opinion evidence, so I suggest, with respect, that trying to use them as such will not advance the work of the Commission.

Mr. Hodson, would you care to proceed.

MR. HODSON: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. I believe Ms. Knox had an issue she wished to raise.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.

MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, I do have one issue arising from today's reporting, and I should confess at the outset, the only reporting I've seen is the newspaper, I was delayed at my office yesterday, I've seen no other media, but in the newspaper report this morning, and again $I$ make this comment appreciating that it's difficult for a reporter to capture in a short story everything that goes on in the hearing room, but $I$ do have a concern about the stories reflecting the fullness of the evidence. Reference is made in the story this morning to the fact that yesterday -- or on Tuesday Mr. Caldwell received a police, from
police a lab report on evidence from the two rape cases, and I'm reading directly:
"Caldwell said he didn't think it was relevant and can't remember if he gave it to the defence lawyer along with other disclosure information."

And it's the last sentence that causes me concern and for that reason $I$ had it put up on Elmo so that my comments will be, or the reason for my comments will be visible. It states the lab report has a wavy line drawn through it and the word omit in the circle. Mr. Commissioner, there are two other features of that lab report that make it more than an exclusion by virtue of printing the word omit. If you look to where the blue circle is in the centre of the page, it refers to two people who, and not to the Gail Miller file, as all other reports that were provided to him indicated they were in relation to the Gail Miller murder, and at the top he made a specific note that this was a different file, indicating his mindset at the time that it was unconnected to this particular case, and as I indicate, there are two reasons for that, or perhaps three. One is the name as it appears.

I've examined it thoroughly, nowhere is there any indication of a file number that connects it to Miller, there's no name that connects it to Miller, there's nothing. It is headed in a way different from all other lab reports if one takes the time to pursue them and it does have the notation that it was, in his mind, a different file, and indeed it appears to be a different file.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you, Ms. Knox.

MR. WOLCH: Mr. Commissioner, if I may address you. I'm taken aback a bit by the last comments of My Friend. I don't know what she's asking the Commission to do. Obviously you'll --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Nothing I suppose.

MR. WOLCH: -- rule on what you hear here. Many reports that $I$ see in the press $I$ would like to argue about or say it didn't do this or didn't do that, the media is faced with days of evidence, they pick what they choose, they are free to do it, but $I$ don't see any purpose in making a speech here to yourself, it's out of your jurisdiction to tell the media what to take as important or not, and if My Friend has a
problem with the media, she's free to go to the reporters and tell them what she feels they should be covering or not and they will have the ultimate word, but $I$ don't know the purpose of addressing yourself and saying to the Commission I'm not happy with today's report when My Friend knows full well that it only puts the Commission in an awkward position.

Thank you, sir.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, it is a comment which does not cause me to make any remarks about it, let's leave it at that.

## THOMAS DAVID ROBERTS CALDWELL, continued:

BY MR. HODSON:

Q
A

Q

Good morning Mr. Caldwell.
Good morning, sir.
If we could call up 267924 .

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Is it 924?

MR. HODSON: 924, yes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.
BY MR. HODSON:
Yesterday we finished off going through many of your notes. I now want to turn to the January
time period and the trial time frame and just for the record identify a few documents. This would
be the indictment that you filed with the court on January 9th, 1970; is that correct?

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
$Q$

Yes, sir.
And that would at the time require you to list the witnesses that you intended to call?

It would.
If we could then go to 006896 -- or 895 , please.
Sorry, 896. And again we talked yesterday about
Mr. Rasmussen being the Trav-a-leer Motel individual, this just confirms that he was served with the subpoena; is that right? You recall yesterday there was some doubt as to whether he could be located. If we can just go to the next page, 006895 , just to confirm that Inspector Roberts was subpoenaed by you for the trial. Do you see that?

Yes, $I$ do, sir.
January 15th. And go to 006961 , and this is the actual subpoena that names Inspector Roberts, and I believe you told us yesterday, Mr. Caldwell, and please correct me if I'm wrong, that you did not believe you needed to call Inspector Roberts for your, for the Crown case, but that you would call him as a Crown witness if Mr. Tallis wished you to do so; right?


A

Q

A

Q

BY MR. HODSON:

And I simply put it up, there's another document I'll refer to a bit later about the jury process. Do you have a recollection regarding the jury selection, Mr. Caldwell, was there anything unusual about that process?

I wouldn't say unusual, I believe it went fairly expeditiously at the time.

Right. And I will turn up a document a bit later that identifies the number of challenges, etcetera, and $I$ believe that it did, in fact, go

A
That's my memory of it, sir.
And would that be, then, why you would subpoena him for the trial?

I can only assume that now, yes.
If we could then go to 006909 .
Mr. Commissioner, this is the
jury list that was on the file, $I$ would ask for an order that it not be published or that the names not be published for this document, or any information regarding the names of either jurors or anybody on the juror list.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, I order that.

And if we could call up 006905 , please. And I believe, at the time, there was 11 men and one woman on the jury; is that right?

That's my recollection, sir.
And did that -- was there anything unusual about that in 1970 as far as the make-up of a jury, or

No, not in my view.
We then find a list here, and $I$ think this is January, this is a to-do list by trial, and I'll just quickly go through some of these items. You will see again --

MS. KNOX: If we can identify for the witness, that is page 170 , and it's number 1 file.

A
Oh, thank you. I have that page, Mr. Hodson.
BY MR. HODSON:

Thank you. If we go down the page to Mary Marcoux, we saw this yesterday about 'and re Nichol John's statements', and would that be to talk to her about Nichol John's statement --

A
Q
A
Yeah.
The one we talked about where she said she wasn't
going to testify about nothing, that statement?

A
$Q$

A

2

A
$Q$
A
Q

A
$Q$ No doubt.

That would be the statement?
Yes, it would, sir. It wouldn't be about her.
The first part of the note is about her evidence, as it were, and the second would be about that statement.

And then we see a note number 4, if we could just call that out, 'Cal' and 'Roberts, continuity Gail Miller clothes', and then a checkmark. Do we take it from that, then, this is where Mr. Tallis told you you didn't need to call Roberts for continuity?

It must be, because $I$ checked that and the next three items and before the heading number 4 with 'Cal', I checked that, which means that I either phoned him or talked to him in person about all those --

Yeah.
-- and received his agreement.
And it says 'okay', 'Cal says okay with Kleiv only'. So I take it Mr. Tallis said Kleiv can prove the coat?

Yes.
And then, as well, it looks as though 'insanity et
al', and the answer 'no'; would you have raised that with him?

A
$Q$

A
Q
I would have, just so that I'd have some idea where we may be going in the case.

And then again, if you could scroll down to 7 please, 'interview Cadrain, John, Wilson per notes Monday p.m.'; would that be Monday night of the trial?

Yes, $I$ believe so.
And then number 8, 'Emson, sources blood in seminal fluid, sperm versus seminal fluid, pubic and head hair by Kleiv, would be significant difference between double and single edge'; would these just be notes to follow with Kleiv?

That's right.
And the next page, the top, 14 you've got a note 'reward offered, when, and claimed', and I presume that's referring to the reward that was offered by the Saskatoon Board of Police Commissioners?

And would that be important in preparing for your case?

A
Not -- no, I don't think so, but somewhere it would have come to light and $I$ would want to find out its present status, is how $I$ would describe
that, sir.
And at that time, $I$ mean, $I$ think we have seen evidence that it was at about a year later the reward was granted?

A
$Q$

A
Yeah.
Do you recall in the course of your preparations for trial, including completing the trial,
discussing the reward with any witnesses?
Not, not in any sense in or through the trial. As
I think I mentioned, I felt Mr. Cadrain should
have that reward, and $I$ think there is the -- a date or two written down, Mr. Hodson, as time goes on here.

Q
Yeah. And was that something you would have -did you reach that conclusion during -- before the trial was completed?

A
$Q$

A
I believe so. I think we saw a clipping earlier --
$Q$
I wouldn't -- I don't know, but it in no way bore on my dealings with Mr. Cadrain.

Okay. But is that something that you would have thought in your preparations? I mean, I think you identify that you would have been aware of the reward, is that fair?

Right.
the moment.
If you can just scroll down, please, to 22. And 22 looks like 'Karst to Regina', then there is another note, 'Cal', presumably that's his phone number?

Yes.
And it says 'reward'; would you have discussed the reward with Mr. Tallis?

I must have. The '22. Arrange Karst trip to Regina', and presumably that's Inspector Wood's phone number there, $I$ presume that's either Mr. Tallis' probably home number. It says 'reward, 3 Regina witnesses, advised Cal 8:45 Sunday' -Sorry, just on the reward.

I'm sorry.
Is it something Mr. Tallis asked you, "who got the reward?"

He may well have, but it clearly hadn't been made at that point, as I recall sir.

And even though it may not have been made, is it something that Mr. Tallis may have inquired about, for example, that he may wish to use at trial? The way the three headings are written $I$ assume it originated with me, because it's in my writing, it's the first of three items. I can't see
anything that, that indicates that he raised it with me, but that is conceivable.

And then a note, '3 Regina witnesses, advised Cal 8:45 Sunday, January $18^{\prime}$, and $I$ presume that would be Melnyk, Lapchuk and Ute Frank?

That's right.
And we'll see some more documents about that shortly.

Okay.
So would that be -- I guess that would be Sunday morning or Sunday evening?

That's right.
And, again, there's some correspondence I'll show you later.

A
$Q$
And then 'nil in opening address re', and is that you are telling him "lookit, I'm not going to include that"?

A
Oh yes, that's what that would be, because at that point none of us had any, you know, sound information on what that really was all about.

Q
A

2

And then what is this comment, 'same day $I$ heard'? Yeah, 'same day $I$ heard' refers to when $I$ advised Cal, Sunday, January 18th.

So if $I$ can summarize this, you would have heard on January 18th, you would have phoned Mr. Tallis on that day --

Yeah.
-- about the witnesses, and you would have told him that you are not going to put it in your opening address?

Yeah, that's right.
If we could then go to 007076 . And these notes, or presumably this note is for some -- this part that went to --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Could I just -MR. HODSON: Sure. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- ask your indulgence, please. Which three witnesses, three key witnesses?

Oh, no, the -- no, these would refer to the so-called reenactment witnesses, Mr. Commissioner. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh.

That's the three we're speaking of there.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And they would not be put in your opening address?

A

A

Q

A

Q完 bit, go to 007076 . This is a January 12th, 1970 letter, so this would be eight days prior to the trial, commencement of the trial -- pardon me, seven days, and that's number 4 in the top right-hand corner?

A
Q
If we could just go through parts of this. In this letter you are advising Mr. Tallis about a new sketch to tender into evidence, and $I$ believe

Right. And so let's just, just to skip back a

Yeah, I have that Mr. Hodson, thanks.
that was the photograph of part of a city map, as we've seen many times?

That's correct.
Go down to the next paragraph. You tell him that the indictment -- you've copied, given him a copy of the indictment, only one new witness in
addition to those that were called at the prelim, Mr. MacLeod of the toxicology. You go on to talk about that, and continuity, and next paragraph. No, scroll up:
"At the moment there is only one witness who was called at the preliminary inquiry whom $I$ do not intend to call at the trial, that being Maria Indyk. The evidence she gave at the preliminary inquiry was different to that which she had given in her statement to the police, in which she said that she saw one female and one male when she was waiting to get into the church, while at the preliminary inquiry she spoke of seeing two females. I would supply you with a copy of her statement but $I$ find that in some manner all but the first page of this statement have been
misplaced and $I$ have been unable to find the remainder of the statement either in my material, nor can the remainder of it be located at the police department. If any whom --"

I think that should read 'if and when'.
"If and when $I$ locate either the original
or a copy of her statement I will
forward a copy of the complete statement
to you. In the meantime, however, I have had Mrs. Indyk subpoenaed and she has been advised to stand by until further notice, so that she will be available should you wish her to be called and, no doubt, we can discuss this in the near future."

And just a couple points on that, Mr. Caldwell.
A

Q

A
Q

A

And would it be fair to conclude, from that, that you didn't think she had evidence of value -Umm.
-- or --
Yeah. It was, I guess, a combination of no first page of the statement. Whatever she had testified at the preliminary inquiry, $I$ don't think $I$ could essentially understand it, in a word.

I see. And so you weren't going to call it, but you told Mr. Tallis "I've subpoenaed her and, if you wish, $I$ will call her"?

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
And would there be an advantage, again if Mr. Tallis wanted that evidence before the jury, would there be an advantage to a defence to have the Crown call the witness?

A
$Q$
A
-- and suggest that 'it really happened in $A, B, C$ way', whatever that was, that's an advantage in a sense.

And second -- we touched on this yesterday with
respect to, I think, Mr. Roberts -- the second thing would be that in some cases, if it was the only evidence that was called by the defence, it might require Mr. Tallis --

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q
A
Q
A

Q
A fairly brief witness, to put him in a position
where he would have to address the jury first, I simply didn't feel there was any need to do that. Right. You could have, Mr. Caldwell?

Oh yeah, certainly could have, yeah.
And I don't mean to be critical in asking the question.

No, no.
I'm just trying to understand what prompted you to do what you did.

That's what $I$ think happened, sir.
You then go down, and you say:
"I have also had Mrs. Shirley Wilson of
Regina subpoenaed and I have also
advised her to stand by and await
further notice. I am not sure whether I
will call her as part of my case or not,
but perhaps we can also discuss this before the trial or once it gets under way on about January 19th."

And I think Mrs. Wilson was one that at the prelim, we saw evidence earlier from you and the documents that you did not intend to call her as a witness for the prelim, but you called her at Mr. Tallis' request; correct?

A Yes.

And I believe -- I don't believe Mrs. Wilson ended up testifying at the trial, but $I$ believe you had her available, is that correct?

I would have to look at the transcript.
That's fine.
Okay.
I think that's what the transcript reflects.
Okay, yes, very good.
Then we go on:
"As I advised you, my file indicates that among other materials $I$ did forward you the statements of Mr. and Mrs. Danchuk with my letter of September 19th, 1969."

So I take it there might have been an issue there where Mr. Tallis was requesting that?

Yeah, or may have misplaced it or something.
And then you say, scroll down:
"As you will further recall, and as I
advised you during the preliminary
inquiry, Mrs. Cadrain, the mother of
Albert Cadrain, appeared in my office one morning during the preliminary
inquiry with a paper bag containing a pair of trousers, apparently eaten by
acid, which $I$ believe to be the ones worn by Ron Wilson when the group left Regina and changed, by him, at Cadrain's house after the group of three persons reached Cadrain's house on the morning of January 31st. It is not my intention, at this time, to tender the trousers as an exhibit, however, they are in my office and available at any time should you wish them for any purpose at the trial."

Now that's fairly self explanatory, Mr. Caldwell, I take it that's what happened?

Yeah, that is, sir.
And we looked, yesterday, at that document or the note where you were worried that -- I shouldn't say 'worried', or maybe you were worried -- that you and your secretary may have to be witnesses for continuity of that?

A
$Q$

A $Q$ That's the same episode, sir.

So I take it that you had these pants, you did not -- and you believed them to be Mr. Wilson's? That's correct.

And you decided that they were not of probative value for the trial, you didn't see a need to put
them in?
That's the, what it boiled down to, really.
And you are telling Mr. Wilson "they are here, you can look at them, and you can do whatever you wish with them"?

Yeah, absolutely.
And if Mr. Tallis had asked you to put the pants in either through Ron Wilson or someone else, other witness, would you have done so?

Certainly.
Do you recall any discussion with him about the pants?

I don't, Mr. Hodson, at this point.
Okay. If we can then finish off the letter:
"I, at the moment, do not have any
further new witnesses whom $I$ intend to
call at the trial except as mentioned
above, however, should $I$ plan such action $I$ will notify you as soon as $I$ have discovered any such witness or witnesses and will advise you of what I expect them to say, if called. I trust that this will be satisfactory."

If we can then go to 009372 , and $I$ don't know what -- this is a handwritten note, I don't know
that you need to see the original on this, I'm not sure what folder this is from.

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q
A

Q
A
Q

A

Q

Okay.
But this is your handwriting?
Yes. Can $I$ just have a quick look here?
Sure. I think we -- it is in a different folder.
Ms. Knox, do you know where that is?
MS. KNOX: I believe I do.
Oh, thanks very much.
MS. KNOX: For the record, it is in folder
number 3 of the --
BY MR. HODSON:
So folder number 3, and it's got the number, well
it's got 95. And this is a two-page document; --
Right.
-- is that correct?
That's correct, and it's the same numbering
that --
So this is January 14th, 1970?
That's right, sir.
And it appears to be notes of yours either with a meeting or a call with Paynter; is that right?

That's right.
And this, let's just quickly go through it, I
think this deals with the secretor issue. And
would this be Mr. Paynter explaining things to you?

A

Q

So 'found one to contain spermatozoa and since it was a clear, pale yellowish liquid when thawed made no attempt to examine it for blood as such. At this time he did proceed to check it' -- if you could scroll right down to the bottom -- 'he did proceed to check it to see if he could find any blood group antigens in it. He found A antigens in the liquid which would indicate the fluid was probably from a group A person who would be a secretor. At a later date he examined the same
sample in which he had found seminal fluid, this time examining for the presence of blood, and got a positive presumptive test for blood in the sample. The presence of blood as such in the sample would account for the presence of antigens in the seminal fluid of a non-secretor and, since he found A antigens only, it indicates the blood would be from a group A person. Because of the presence of $A$ antigens it cannot be Gail Miller's blood which is type O.'

A
Yeah.
Now would that be your understanding then, at the time Mr. Caldwell, of what and how -- or let me back up -- of what it was that Mr. Paynter had done with the sample?

Yes, that would -- wanting to understand it in that interview with him.

And if $I$ can put it this way, and you tell me if you agree, but as far as the case against Mr. Milgaard was concerned, at the time you believed him to be a non-secretor and, therefore, that was not an explanation as to why the -- why his A antigens would be in the semen; correct?

A
$Q$
I believe that's correct, sir, yeah.
Yeah. And so we know in the frozen semen, if it
is to be the Crown's position or theory or evidence that the frozen semen came from the person who raped and murdered Gail Miller, that that would be step 1; step 2 would be to say 'look at the physical characteristics to see if we can link that frozen semen to Mr. Milgaard'; correct? That would be --

Yeah. And the fact that there are A antigens in that frozen semen, you then go look at Mr. Milgaard, and according to Mr. Paynter's tests -and there's some issue over that at the time and subsequent -- but you believed that that showed that Mr. Milgaard was type A and a non-secretor? Yes, which, again, $I$ felt was evidence in his favour.

Okay. Let me carry on.
Okay.
You then, or the police then, or Mr. Paynter then looked for another reason to explain why or how the semen of an A non-secretor might have A antigens in it and discovered that there was blood in the semen; correct?

A
Q Is that --

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
Q

I'm sorry, I believe that's correct, sir.
Right. And the fact that there was blood in the semen, the blood contains antigens, correct?

Evidently so, yes.
And that that might explain why $A$ antigens were found?

Yeah.
And I think the next step would be to say, okay, well it could have come from a A non-secretor --Uh-huh.
-- because the antigens in the semen are explained by blood; right?

Right.
And then the next step would be to try and establish some way that -- explanation, if $I$ could call it that, for there to be blood in the semen, and I think that's where Dr. Emson gave evidence about the ways in which blood from a young male might find its way into semen, a cut for example? Yeah, I think that's correct, sir.

Right. So is that a fair summary of what you would have understood and what you did at the time?

Yes.
Sorry, I can't promise that $I$ won't bring up
'secretor' again, Mr. Caldwell.

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$
A
Q
A

So this is in your folder 1, page 1, and it's a note at the top, it appears that it's a half-page note, $I$ think you are looking at?

That's right.
And it appears to be written on a piece of paper that related to 'supply witnesses with copies of the preliminary evidence', but the note states 'N. John's statement that she saw it and doesn't know why he didn't kill her heard by M. Marcoux, A. Cadrain, Mrs. Miller'?

That's correct.
And this is your handwriting?
Yes.
Would it have been made back in 1969-1970?
I would think so. The -- I think this is the piece of paper which $I$ resorted to to get the accurate wording written down before that escaped
me, and it very likely, I think, was in my binder at that time, sir, and $I$--

And you saw -- we saw another note, are you able to tell us that -- I think you told us you know you wrote it down right away?

Yeah, correct.

Are you able to tell us where you wrote it or which of these?

Well this looks like the likelier candidate for 'right away' to me now, Mr. Hodson.

All right. The fact that it's on a note that talks about copies of their preliminary evidence, does that make any --

That --
-- sense?
Yeah, that would be almost a form thing, typed out, and when $I$ wanted to get this written down $I$ ended up simply tearing it off above the typed line 7 there.

Okay. If we could then go to 007074 , please. And this is your January $15 t h$ letter, this is the Thursday, the trial started on the Monday?

A
$Q$
$Q$ Okay. I have that. Pardon me.

And document number 6 , if we call out the first two paragraphs, $I$ think this is where we get into

Maurice Cerato. You say:
"Further to my telephone call last night, as mentioned Nichol John's father called Detective Karst here, Monday night, January $12 t h$, and told him that a youth in Regina had approached him as to having evidently received a pair of pants with blood on them, from Milgaard, some time ago."

And you go on to describe that:
"... Karst advised me of this on Tuesday
...",
the 13th:
"... and I had him go to Regina
Wednesday, the 14 th, where he located
this youth, one Maurice Cerato ... and
obtained the pants in question from him
and took them to Cpl. McDonald at the
Crime Detection Laboratory.
Detective Karst took a
statement from Cerato concerning this
and $I$ enclose a photostatic copy and a
typed copy, since the photostat is
somewhat hard to read.

I had Detective Karst subpoena

Cerato and $I$ will have him up and interview him, $I$ hope, early next week, perhaps around January 20th. I

I have asked Cpl. Molchanko and S/Sgt. Payntor to examine the pants both as to rips or tears and for any traces of blood (the pants having been drycleaned and washed since) and I will let you know the results of their examinations as soon as they are known to me.

Depending on the results of the examinations and on my interview with Cerato, I may call him as a crown witness at the trial and probably at a later stage of the crown's case."

And then just on the note, if we can go to the left-hand side, can you tell us what that note says?

Yeah. It says 'told C', for Cal in this instance, 'on or about Thursday 22 nd $I$ didn't intend to call in view of Molchanko's report'.

Right, and $I$ don't think we need to go to Cerato's statement or Molchanko's report, --

A Okay, sir.

Q -- but basically that lab report indicated they couldn't find any identifiable blood on those pants; is that --

A
Q

A

Q
2
Right. And scroll down:
"As I advised you earlier, to save having to call one or two additional witnesses from Regina, $I$ propose to have Dr. Emson take a blood sample from Wilson when Wilson is up here for the trial and to have him personally group the blood and testify as to Wilson's blood group at the trial. You will recall that evidence was given in the Preliminary Inquiry that his blood group is B."

And $I$ think, if $I$ can pause there, I think the -your proof for Wilson's blood group, that was
done in Regina $I$ think by Sergeant Juno and then, an RCMP officer, and I believe Mr. Tallis ended up admitting Mr. Wilson's blood type to avoid Dr. Emson having to take the blood sample; does that sound correct?

A
$Q$

A

2

A
$Q$
Yes. I can't recall, but $I$ wouldn't be surprised, sir.

Next page. I think that's what the documents reflect?

Okay, well, I'm sure that's right.
And then:
"If Albert Cadrain's father is called as
a prospective juror $I$ will stand him aside."

And in fact his father, Mr. Cadrain was on the jurors list, just for the record.

Okay, thank you.
And then:
"I believe $I$ have given you copies of all the laboratory reports $I$ have received except one, and $I$ enclose a copy of that report which is one $I$ received in November of 1969. It covers an examination of samples taken from the parka or coat supposedly worn by Nichol

John, on the trip to Saskatoon ..." and the fibre. Now this letter says that you have given:
"... copies of all the laboratory
reports I have received ..."
You will recall, yesterday, I asked you about that lab report that was in the lab reports you received that referred to (V1)- and (V2)-----; do you recall that?

Oh yeah, yes, $I$ wouldn't be speaking in that sense in this. In other words, these would be lab reports that appeared to me to bear directly on the trial.

Q
A
I see.
Yeah, the way $I$ read that, Mr. Hodson.
So does this letter assist you in telling the Commission whether or not the (V1)-, (V2)----- lab report that you received from the police and marked different file, omit, whether or not you gave that to Mr. Tallis?

A

Q
Well, it does say I've given you copies of all the laboratory reports $I$ have received.

A Oh, yeah.

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q

A

And that was the point. Does that assist you, and if it doesn't that's fine.

I still can't say, sir, whether that went or not. I'm sorry, it may have gone, $I$ think $I$-- it's certainly attached to the lab reports which I used and it may not have gone based on the discussion about wrong -- wrong file or whatever.

And then you say:
"I have a good idea of the order in which $I$ hope to call the witnesses and will pass this onto you when we get together, hopefully on or before Saturday of this week, to go over some points concerning the trial and I trust that this will be satisfactory."

So it appears you contemplated meeting with Mr. Tallis and going over the order of witnesses?

And sent to Tallis, and $I$ think this is just a list of the statements that you had sent him and the dates? That's correct.

And we've seen these already, the Cadrain statements, the John statements -- just scroll down. Go back to the full page, please. And again the September $9 t h$ letter we touched on -full page, please -- and paragraph, or number 4, the January 9th, ' 70 letter which has the indictment and the big sketch; is that correct? That's right.

And then if we can go to 007072, and this is number 8 in the top right-hand corner?

I have that, sir.
And it goes statements to go to Cal, that would be January 17 th , so that would be a couple of days before the trial starts?

Evidently so.
And $I$ think this is pretty self-explanatory, 'have copy now, have original - get copied, made no --' No statement.

No statement?
Yeah.
And 'lost'?
Yeah. That appears to have an entry in each -one column for each one of those witnesses which $I$ would hope it would have.

Then if we can go to 007073 , which is document
number 7 in the top right-hand corner, and this appears to be -- have you got that?

A
$Q$

Q

A
Q

A

Q
A
Q

Q
And would you and Mr. Tallis have discussed Ms. John's evidence at trial and specifically how you might put her May 24 th statement to her if she --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Did you mean to say discussed her evidence at the preliminary?

MR. HODSON: I'm sorry?
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Did you mean to say would you and Mr. Tallis have discussed the evidence at the preliminary?

BY MR. HODSON:
Yes, the fact that at the preliminary Ms. John did not repeat the incriminating parts of her May 24 th statement at the preliminary hearing, so obviously you and Mr. Tallis would both know that there's an issue with Nichol John as to what she was going to say at trial; is that fair?

That's right.
And $I$ think you told us yesterday, and maybe I'll ask you again, on this date before the trial, what did you think Nichol John was going to say when she testified before the jury?

Well, $I$ don't know if $I$ could put it in terms of -- I guess I thought that she would give the post-polygraph statement which at that point I felt was accurate, to put it awkwardly.

And why did you think she was going to say it at the trial when she hadn't said it at the prelim?
that she may or should, you know, recite it at the trial in that form.

Q
A
Why did you think it was correct?
Based on the sequence of events of Mr. --
Inspector Roberts doing the polygraph on Wilson, John talking with Wilson after at some point, and then being before Inspector Roberts and remembering or -- pardon me, being shown the uniform, remembering seeing the offence take place.

Was it your belief at the time, and let's just talk a few days before the trial, that Nichol John's May $24 t h, 1969$ statement was truthful?

Is that the --
Yes, it is.
Yes, it was my belief that it was.
And you knew at that time that, number 1, she hadn't repeated the information, at least the incriminating information in that statement to you in three interviews?

Right.
And secondly, she had not repeated that before the preliminary hearing; correct?

A
That's correct, sir.
And third, $I$ think you told us yesterday that she
had said to three people in the witness waiting room around the time of the prelim that she had seen the murder and she wondered why Mr. Milgaard hadn't killed her because she saw the murder and that she wasn't going to say nothing in court, or words to that effect?

That's correct, and what $I$ took out of that is in fact she had seen the murder, that she didn't know why she herself wasn't killed as a witness, as it were, and that she was not going to say nothing. Now, that again to me reinforced that she knew the, if you will, the true story of what had happened there.

And at that time, and again we're talking, you know, right before the start of the trial, did you have any doubts, Mr. Caldwell, about Nichol John's May $24 t h$-- the version of events in the May 24 th statement?

No. I felt that that, brief as it was, was the accurate account of the matter.

And what was your thinking at the time as to why Nichol John would not repeat that to you in an interview or repeat that in evidence at the preliminary hearing?

A One thought could be that if she repeated it to me
it would possibly reinforce methods for me being sure that it got into the prelim or trial evidence would be one reason. In other words, the more often she repeated it in any setting, the more likely it was that she could be in a position of not avoiding giving it in evidence at the prelim or trial.

So, for example, we know at trial, which we'll get to in a moment, that you in fact put her May 24 th statement to her as an inconsistent statement? That's right.

And so the more time she said it, the more opportunity you had to put it to her at trial as being a previous inconsistency?

I may not have thought that, Mr. Hodson, but that would make sense as well.

And was there any reason, and I'll deal with this in more detail later, at the trial $I$ believe that your application under section 9(2) of the Canada Evidence Act was to put to Nichol John her May 24 th statement; correct?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Can $I$ just
interrupt for a second, please. I didn't get an answer, if he gave one, to the first part of your question, did you discuss with Mr. Tallis her
evidence at the preliminary, which she did not repeat.

MR. HODSON: Yeah, $I$ can come back to that, Mr. Commissioner, before I --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I don't think he answered, that's all.

A

A
That goes back to that simple $N$. John line, $M r$. Hodson, does it at the top?

MR. HODSON: Yes.
Okay. It shows that I discussed N. John, had to be her evidence -- pardon me, with Mr. Tallis, and I would assume that it would include the possibility or likelihood of having to use the section 9(2) procedure, but $I$ didn't detail, but that would make sense in that setting in my view. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay, thanks.

BY MR. HODSON:
And just back again at trial, you tendered the May 24 th, 1969 statement in an effort to -- as an inconsistent statement to, $I$ think, question the credibility of Nichol John's evidence that she didn't recall certain events; is that fair?

A Yes, I tried to follow the new 9(2) procedure and that would be --
$Q$ And -- I'm sorry?

A
Q

A

Q

A
Well, $I$ don't -- $I$ know that section exists and the difficulty with 9(1) had been that if a witness was, in effect, polite and nice to counsel, they could virtually say anything because it kind of depended on their demeanour and appearance. 9(2) I believe was enacted to get
around that hurdle. Now, I don't know that 9(1) -- I don't know how we could have done that. I suppose we could have called one of those civilians or two or three of them to say on day $X$ she said the following.

Let me back up. I'm simply looking for what you would have thought of at the time, I'm not asking for an analysis today of the sections, but if we go back at the time, and do you have any recollection of -- $I$ think you said earlier in fairness that you considered how you might get her utterance in the hearing room in his evidence; is that fair?

Yeah, that's right.
And as far as a specific recollection of the detailed analysis of law that you did at the time, are you able to recall that today?

No, sir.
And if we go through just some of the options you might have considered at the time then, did you look at, under 9(2), having the statement, or the statement she said, whether there might be an argument that it was reduced in writing because you wrote it down, for example?

A I don't think $I$ ever considered that.

Q

A

Would it be fair to conclude, Mr. Caldwell, that you and Mr. Perras, or whoever would have looked at this issue, and that if you felt that you could get her statement in the preliminary hearing room in as evidence, that you would have done so? Yeah, in a proper fashion, certainly.

And can we conclude from the fact that it was not raised with her at the trial, it would be one of two reasons, one, you didn't consider it, or two, you did and you concluded you couldn't; is that fair?

Yeah, one or the other, Mr. Hodson.
And are you able to tell us which one it was?
I don't think so. The one option that has just been mentioned $I$ would have thought would call for me to testify to get it in, that would be one way of doing it, and I thought that was out of the question.

Fair enough. And again we may come back to that when we get into the trial transcripts. So again, let's just go back to the note, and I think you said yes, it's likely you and Mr. Tallis would have talked about Nichol John and the possible 9(2); is that right? I'm sure that's right, sir.

And in fact we'll see in the transcript we know at trial when this issue came up and Chief Justice Bence asked for submissions from counsel about how this section ought to work and be applied, that you and Mr. Tallis had, I believe, a similar view on the law and how it should be applied and, in particular, whether the jury ought to be in or out of the room when Ms. John is cross-examined regarding the giving of the earlier statement; is that fair?

Yes, we did have a very similar view, both felt the jury should be out, Mr. Tallis and myself, and he made a submission, $I$ made a brief submission and the Chief Justice felt that it must be done the other way around because of his reading of the law.

And as it turned out, and we'll see a bit later, the Court of Appeal disagreed with Chief Justice Bence on that point; in fact, confirmed the position that you and Mr. Tallis took; is that correct?

A
Q
And is it something -- do you think this legal issue might be something you and Mr. Tallis discussed and agreed upon in advance of the trial?

A

Q

Q

A

Q
A

Q

A

Q
A
Q

A
Q

A

Q

I don't think we did. I think we simply got to that point and the judge asked us both our views and it happened that they were similar.

Right. And then go back to the statement, the second point is statement, 'boy who brought Gail Miller home that a.m.' That would be Dennis Elliott?

I assume so.
And you had already given that to him?
Yeah.
So would this just be a discussion about that? Maybe bring it to his attention that $I$ had given him that statement.

The across the street man, who I presume is who Mr. Elliott saw in the car?

Yeah, I assume so.
The night he dropped Gail Miller off?
Yes.
And statements, other Crown witnesses, and then
'Beauchamp situation explained.'
Okay.
Do you know what that --
I think, Mr. Hodson, it was what essentially we went over here yesterday.

With the wallet?

A Yeah, I believe so.
Q

A
Q

A
Q

A

A
$Q$
BY MR. HODSON:
And this is Sunday p.m., which I'm going to suggest is the Sunday, January $18 t h$, being the night before the trial; is that fair?

A
$Q$
That's right.
And then possible admissions of fact and dispensing with witnesses on account of, and then you've got Grant, Shaw, Mackie, Pyra, Flemming, Brand, Oleksyn, McDonald and Edmondson. So I take it you would have looked at whether you could get some admissions from Mr. Tallis on behalf of Mr. Milgaard to avoid calling evidence?

That's right.
And then if we can go to 007071 -- actually, sorry, if we can just go back, if we can go to 00690 -- 006915, that's document 161.

Just give me a minute, sir, to find that. MS. KNOX: RCMP page number 161.

Thank you. I have that, Mr. Hodson.

I believe so.
And Madelane was your secretary at the time?

And then 'other junk from Wilson's car,' and I think none of that was put in at trial; is that right?
The first $I$ heard of them was when one or more
Saskatoon police officers went down to, in effect, give Wilson and/or John a lift to Saskatoon to be sure they were there the night before the trial and not missing in some fashion. Now, I think this is all -- whoever that was, and I think it's recorded somewhere, advised me that one or more of Wilson or John had claimed that they knew someone who had seen the accused reenacting the murder, to put it very roughly, and that's how it came to my
attention, and then $I$-- I think we've seen $I$ phoned Mr. Tallis with what $I$ knew then about the matter and one of the police officers went back down to take -- pardon me, interview these witnesses within a day or two at my request. I got statements from them. When $I$ got the statements I'm sure they went from me to Mr. Tallis and $I$ had arranged I believe to have them show up here roughly the first weekend of the trial. This is the first $I$ knew about the so-called reenactment evidence of course.

And you had them show up the first weekend for what purpose?

Well, to interview them. I'm not firm on that date, it may have been after that.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: The day you first heard was --

Was this Sunday evening, Mr. Commissioner, the night before the trial started.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.

BY MR. HODSON:

And so would you have called Mr. Tallis that Sunday night do you think?

A I'm sure I did.

And so at that time you would have had -- it would
appear you have the three names and their addresses to allow you to get subpoenas; is that correct?

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q
A
Q
A
Q

A
$Q$

I had that, $I$ had written it in the middle of this page.

Now, we know from the statements, which I'll turn to in a moment, they were given on January 19th, which would be the Monday, the first day of the trial.

Okay.
And so then $I$ think you said you had officers go get statements and you advised Mr. Tallis and that you arranged to have them brought in for the weekend; is that right?

Yeah. I'm not -- the when is a little --
The subpoenas are returnable for Friday.
Okay.
That would be the first Friday of the trial.
So that's no doubt when it was, sir.
And then you would have brought them in to interview them $I$ take it after the police got the statement, you would have interviewed them? Yes, I did that.

And do you recall whether you advised Mr. Tallis or allowed him to interview the witnesses as well?

A
$Q$

A

Well, I certainly advised him. Without seeing some more notes $I$ can't recall whether he himself interviewed them. In other words --

Okay, I'll go to some documents that may assist you.

Okay.
And was this evidence, the information we've heard -- well, we've heard evidence from all of the so-called hotel reenactment witnesses, but was this information and this evidence significant at the time, Mr. Caldwell?

Well, $I$ was absolutely, you know, struck by it. I had never run into anything like that, and all the more so the night before the trial was to commence. It really -- I was taken aback by it, but I made a point of phoning Mr. Tallis with what I then knew and tried to follow it in an orderly manner.

Do you recall Mr. Tallis' reaction?
No, I don't.
Then go to 006904, and we'll maybe just skip around a bit here on dates because I'm not sure when these notes are from, this is 171 , and try and deal with the motel reenactment witnesses.

And this is a to-do and, I'm sorry, I don't know the date. Are you able to tell from where this document is in your file as to when the date may be?

A

It's stapled to I think one of the documents we went over yesterday which is 169 and 170 , but -And what are the dates on those?

Well, I'm looking for that. I don't at a glance see a date there, sir.

Okay.
Oh, I'm sorry, two-thirds of the way down, 169 -Maybe we could just call up --

Yeah.
MS. KNOX: 006906 .
BY MR. HODSON:
006906 .
Yeah, I see there, Mr. Hodson, advise Cal 8:45
Sunday, January 18th about the three Regina
witnesses, so --
So the to-do note 171 would have been after that $I$
take it?
I would assume so.
Thank you. If we can go back to 006904 --
No, I'm sorry, it had to be after because it's talking about Melnyk and Lapchuk.

Yes. So the earlier document was the note you told us where you phoned Mr. Tallis the Sunday night?

Sorry, which page did you want to answer?
No, just if you could listen.
Yeah.
The previous note was that you phoned Mr. Tallis on the Sunday night?

Right.
And advised him of this information you had? Yeah.

And this note would be after that; is that correct?

That's -- yes, it would be.
And so likely the first week of trial, does that sound logical?

A
It does.
And it says phone Pirogoff, and Pirogoff was a prosecutor in Regina; is that right?
That's right.
And did you know Mr. Pirogoff?
I knew him, yes.
And it says, 'Melnyk - trial, Regina, Wednesday 28
and Thursday 29. Lapchuk - plea, Monday 26 -
forgery and uttering'?

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q
be to check what dates they were in court; is that right?

A Yeah, to avoid them not showing up either in

One or the other. I think it would be the two fellows, Melnyk and Lapchuk.

And so I think you said one of the reasons would

Saskatoon or Regina because of the other engagement, as it were.
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q

A
Q
A

Do you recall whether you would have had a discussion with Mr. Pirogoff about the charges against Melnyk and Lapchuk and the evidence and the cases against them?

I'm sure I did not do that, simply the bare-bones dates and names of the charges.

There has been a suggestion, which $I$ will go to later on, Mr. Caldwell, in various documents, either specifically suggesting or implying that you arranged to have, with Mr. Pirogoff or another prosecutor, that Melnyk and Lapchuk be given favourable treatment in their charges in exchange for testifying at David Milgaard's trial. Did that happen?

Not in any way, shape or form, sir.
And specifically did you ask Mr. Pirogoff, another Crown solicitor, to ask the court that Melnyk and Lapchuk get better treatment than they otherwise would in exchange for them testifying at the David Milgaard trial?

Not at all.
And would that be appropriate, sir? That would be outrageous.

Q
If we can then go to 007071 , and again $I$ apologize for jumping around, but there are a number of documents around this date.

I have that, sir.
And I'll come back to Melnyk, Lapchuk and Frank in a moment, but this is the Monday of trial. Can you just read what's at the top? Is that -It says 'records ex file,' meaning from file, and, '* D. Elliott.'

Right. And so again to Mr. Tallis as requested, I presume that was from the Saturday meeting?

I presume.
And you gave him copies of the statements that were listed in your notes, and then if you can scroll down, you also enclose copies of Mr. Pratt's statement, of Aylesbury, whom you do not intend to call?

That's right.
Who was the elevator agent.
'Dennis Elliott, whom $I$ likewise do not intend to call."

Two statements, and:
"Mrs. Marie Indyk whom, as you will
recall, we left to be discussed as the
trial progresses, as to whether $I$ will
call her or make her available for yourself, if desired, or just what the situation will be."

And then you say:
"The statement from Adelaine Nyczai,
which you wanted has, as $I$ informed you, been lost and no statements were taken from these six witnesses."

And then $I$ think you say wrong on Hounjet, you have it there, and:
"The enclosed statement from Mrs. Indyk
is to the best of my knowledge only part
of the statement she gave and I have been unable to find the remaining pages . . ."

So I think that covers what we had discussed in the notes?

A
$Q$

A
Q Yeah, 163.
A

Q

A
I feel so, sir. Okay.

If we can go to 006914 , and this is document 62 -actually, sorry, 006913 .

Do you have a number in the corner, sir?

Okay, I have that.
Actually, no, sorry, I'll come back to that.

Q Just to carry on again with the Melnyk, Lapchuk, and Frank matter, if we could call up 267926. Do you have a corner number?

I do, but $I$ don't think you will need to see it. Okay.

This is just the indictment, and it looks like the name names of Melnyk and Lapchuk were added, is that right, if you can call that out please? Yes, they are added there in handwriting.

And I'll go through the documents if you wish, Mr. Caldwell, but I'm wondering if you are able to answer, in the absence of looking at specific documents, as to why Ute Frank was not called as a witness?

A
Yes, very definitely. I interviewed her very carefully at or about the time $I$ interviewed Melnyk and Lapchuk, and $I$ constructed a sort of $a$ guide sheet of about three-quarters of a page of what $I$ would want to ask her, and she absolutely stopped the interview and made it very clear she wasn't testifying no matter what happened, and I, I didn't feel $I$ could call her under those circumstance, to have her go that far in the trial and simply stop.

If you could call up 006298 . And again, $I$ don't
think you need to bring up the original, --

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
Q

A

A
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just mark it on the screen with your fingers?

BY MR. HODSON:
If you want your handwritten document, Mr.
Caldwell, your counsel can provide it, but $I$ don't think --

A
$Q$
I would. Thanks very much.
Maybe we could just go through this, just some of the details.

A Okay.
-- you may if you wish; would this be the guide sheet you talked about?

That -- that's it.
And these would be your notes of what you would ask her if you called her as a witness?

Yes.
And you concluded that she either would not or did
not have anything to say?
She, as we went through this process we got to roughly the, obviously the point that's shown there, and she wouldn't --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Could you just --
I'm sorry.
$Q$

,

Sure. Do you want me to do it, sir, just --

Well, I don't think we need to go through the whole document.

A
$Q$

A Okay.

Could you just identify where she stopped talking, I think?

Umm, well I got as far as the bottom:
"- T.H.C. started in room -

- needle, then mouth",
which was into the hotel room episode, and she simply was not going to (a) testify (b) continue being interviewed by me in describing this event, and I didn't feel, in law, that it was -- there was an obligation on me to call her in that factual situation.

Right. In the absence of looking at a specific document, which I will get to, I will go through all the documents, --

Sure.
-- are you able to recall whether or not you advised Mr. Tallis of this or allowed Mr. Tallis to interview her?

I do not recall either of those things, sir.
Now this document would indicate as well, $I$ think, Hoppy, Debbie Hall, Bob Harris, Gary Silljer, and I will refer to some of the other statements as
being people who were in the room at the time?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
Q

A
Q

A
$Q$ That's my understanding.

Do you have a recollection, Mr. Caldwell, that when you interviewed Lapchuk, Melnyk and Ms. Frank and got their statements, that the statements referred to other people being present when the so-called reenactment took place, and specifically Deborah Hall and Bob Harris?

I noticed this Ute Frank statement, about the fourth line from the bottom refers to.
"- shortly after Debbie left."
And:
" - D. ..."
being Debbie:
" ...didn't come back".
I'm sorry, what did you --
Okay, no, that's fine.
Yeah.
"- shortly after Debbie left.

- D. didn't come back".

Yeah.
My question was a general question, and we'll go through the statements, --

Okay.
-- but do you have a recollection of whether or
not either the police or you thought that, in addition to Ute Frank, Craig Melnyk and George Lapchuk, other people may have witnessed Mr. Milgaard's actions in the motel room?

A

Q
A

Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
Not at this point, I don't, Mr. Hodson. If -this may come up in other documents, I would be, try to be --

And I guess, just generally, if there was an
-- do you recall any efforts to try and locate Deborah Hall or anybody else who may have been in the room? .
incident -- let's just back up.

A
$Q$ police could locate Deborah Hall?

A
Q
A

Q

A

A

A

Q
BY MR. HODSON:
If we could just call up 007070 . Mr. Caldwell, at
the break we were trying to get a chronology of what happened with the motel reenactment witnesses. I have a letter by you wrote to Mr. Tallis on January 21 which would be, I believe, the Wednesday of the trial, and as well I have a page of notes that I'll refer that $I$ think may assist.

A Very good.

Q
And we'll call up the first two paragraph, it says:
"You will recall me advising you, on Sunday, January 18th, that $I$ had learned that day of an alleged incident in Regina, in which Milgaard was supposed to have stated in front of witnesses that he had stabbed or killed the nurse in Saskatoon.

I had Detective Karst go to Regina on January 19th to interview the people supposedly involved in this incident, and on January 20 th $I$ received three statements taken by Detective Karst, from these people, Craig Alfred Melnyk, George Nick Lapchuk and Ute Maria Frank, and I now enclose a copy of each of these statements for your file."

So from here, this would confirm the call on
Sunday, and that on the Wednesday you would have sent copies of the statements; is that correct? Yes.

Next paragraph:
"I intend to arrange, somehow, to
interview these witnesses in the very near future and depending on the results of these interviews, as $I$ mentioned to you earlier, $I$ may well attempt to lead evidence in the present trial from one or more of these three witnesses as to the admissions allegedly made by

Milgaard in their presence."
And then it just goes on to talk about the Hounjet statement, so that would be accurate, is that correct?

A
Q That's right.
'2. Same date they advised me and same date I advised T', Tallis, 'by telephone of what $I$ knew
of this and that depending on interview I might call them'?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Q

And would those two, would that have been Melnyk and Lapchuk?

A
$Q$
And I think you told us at some point, though, you
did meet and interview Ute Frank?

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q
A
$Q$
A

Q
Why would you put -- and I'm sorry, this is actually from the city police, --

A
$Q$
I did.
Go to 006912. Again, $I$ don't know that you need the paper copy --

Okay, sir.
-- for this, it's just a telex. This is January 20th, 770 , the second day of the trial, and to the RCMP Regina, 'urgently requested a record for Albert Cadrain of Regina in Milgaard case', and so I take it you were looking for his record for anything in Regina; is that right?

Umm, I think 'Albert Cadrain of Regina' would be for his record, if he had one, wherever it was,

Mr. Hodson. That's sort of a geographical
reference --
I see.
-- I think.
So you are looking if he had offences in Regina?
Well if he had offences anywhere, I would want to
know, I think $I$ wasn't limiting it to Regina by
the way that's --

Yeah.
-- but it says "of Regina"; do you know why that
would be?

A
Umm, no I don't, because he was indeed of Saskatoon.

Right.
Yeah.
If we call up 006911 , and this is the reply:
"Cadrain unable to associate subject
with FPS file here, RCMP CIS Regina";
what's 'FPS' mean?
Fingerprint search.
I see. And then, if we could, 006907 , and that's just a note.

Okay.
Number 168A is just a small note there. Do you
know what this is, it's got 'Tuesday Melnyk',
Lapchuk, Frank and phone numbers, 'Wilson
Wednesday', and 'Karst'; do you know what that
related to?

A

Q
Okay. Do you -- are you able to tell us what that
is?
A
Oh, thank you. It looks as if it is an
arrangement, a proposal that $I$ see Melnyk and
Lapchuk Tuesday, those are two phone numbers for
them, and Frank is underneath that with a phone number, and 'Wilson Wednesday', and then Karst's number, and 'Wilson Wednesday',
phone number is on there, so --

Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
$Q$

Do you know what that is, Mr. Caldwell?
No, in a word, I don't.
006910 , please. And this is a note of yours
January $23 r d, 1970$, is that correct, and that's
number 166?
Yes it is.
And we saw from your earlier note that that was the, that's a Friday, and that was the Friday that you had arranged to subpoena Melnyk and Lapchuk to come to Saskatoon?

Or -- I accept that, sir.
And it's got -- would these be notes of a meeting with them or after a meeting?

Yeah.
Do you know?
Umm, it -- it appears that way at -- you know, on the face of it.

And so would this be fair, Craig Melnyk, that he's got a trial for armed robbery?

Yeah.
And Lapchuk is entering a plea on the $26 t h$; is that an accurate reading?

A
Q

A

Q
A

Q
A
Q

A
$Q$
A
Q

A
$Q$

A

Q
A

Q

That's right.
And do you know what this note is here, something
'hearing day'?
'George', it almost looks like -- oh, 'mileage'. Oh.

I know what that is. Someone, I think, drove one or more of them up.

Okay.
One day mileage would be paid to that person.
Okay. And this is 'criminal records for above two and' --
'And Milgaard', it says.
'And Milgaard'?
Yeah.
Okay. If we could go to 006903, number 172 in the top right.

Okay.
It looks as though you've asked the police to get a criminal record for Melnyk, Lapchuk and Frank; is that correct?

Just give me a second, sir. That's how it looks.
And then 006901 .
Thanks.
174. This would appear to be the reply back from the RCMP, and it has Melnyk's record and Lapchuk's
record, and no record for Frank; is that correct? That's correct.

Could you then go to 155218 , please. And this is the statement of George Lapchuk, and we have been through this statement a number of times, this would have been the statement that Mr. Karst provided and gave to you; is that correct?

It would have, sir. Oh, thank you.
And $I$ just want to refer, again $I$ had asked earlier about, you will see here it says:
"David and ..."

I - or:
"David and 2 girls Ute Frank and Debbie

Hall were there."

And then it goes on to describe -- do you see that, Debbie Hall?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
I do.

And then if we can call up 009136 , this is Craig Melnyk's statement.

Would you -- maybe I'll get that, sir. Thanks. And it says here, again Mr. Melnyk identifies the girl on the chair:

```
"... Debbie Hall, I think she's in
Vancouver now."
```

Do you see that?

Just -- is that on the first page somewhere?
Yes, it is.
Okay. Yeah, I see that, Mr. Hodson.
And then as well 054372 , which is Ute Frank's statement.

Do we -- thank you, I have that here.
And this one is not very legible but I think you can see there, as well, that Ute Frank identifies Bob Harris, Gary Silljer, Melnyk, Lapchuk, and then:
"... Debbie Hall was ...",
I can't read that very well, I think --
Umm, "was", looks like, "also there" to me.
Yeah:
"... was also there"?
Yeah.
So I believe you had told us earlier in a note that Ute Frank, in your guide sheet, had told you -- or in your interview had told you that Debbie Hall had left at some point?

Oh, that, I assume that --
Right.
Yes.
So I think, would you agree, in looking at those three statements, Mr. Caldwell, that there is a
suggestion in the statements that Debbie Hall and possibly Bob Harris may have also observed Mr. Milgaard in the motel room?

A
Q

A
Q
A
Q
And if, if Deborah Hall had been available and had a different version of events, would you have called her?

A
I -- I, yeah, I suppose I would have. This, incidentally, $I$ have 277584 for that, $I$ don't know
$Q$ For what?

A
For this statement we're looking at, at the bottom left corner -- or right corner, I'm sorry.

It may be just a different version.
Yeah, $I$ think it is.
MS. KNOX: Just, Mr. Commissioner, for the record $I$ found, in other files, the original of the statement of Ute Frank, which is the number that Mr. Caldwell is referring to as opposed to the photocopy that we've been working with, and I
made a colour photocopy of the original, but it does exist in a different file with that file number.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.
BY MR. HODSON:
If we could call up 047622 , please. This is a transcript --

Hall.
-- of Deborah Hall testifying at the Supreme Court of Canada, we've heard Mrs. -- or Ms. Hall testify before this Commission, I simply just wish to identify what she told the Supreme Court of Canada, her version of what she saw in the motel room, and her take on that. If we could go to 047632 . And this is being examined by Mr. Wolch:
"Q Okay. And what was David doing when they made those comments?

A Well, he was in the process of jumping around on the bed, being a fool and playing with a pillow, kind of punching it up and things at the time he was asked."

Next page.
A
I think that was 'coked', sir, if I'm not wrong; is that not right, that word?

Q

A

Q
$\square$
$\square$ okay, at the time he was coked', thank you. then the next page she is asked:
"Q Tell us exactly what he said to the best of your memory.

A He responded to the question while he was -- and he was actually bouncing on the bed too and punching up this pillow. He said, "Yeah, sure. I stabbed her and fucked her brains out, that's a really good -- you know, it's a really good time for me."

Q He made a comment -- take your time. Don't worry about it. Just take your time.

A I think -- it was very -- it was a crude remark and it was sarcastically said.

Q And after the remark was made what, if anything, did you do?

A I couldn't understand why they even
asked him that. My thoughts were what an asshole. Like, it was kind of a silly, crude thing to say about something. He just kind of leaned back on the bed with this pillow behind his back and just sort of smirked about it and that was it." And then, again, if we could go to -- I'm not sure $I$ can find the reference. In any event, Ms. Hall testified before the Supreme Court, and certainly before the Inquiry, to the effect that she thought she viewed it as a joke, or words to that effect; do you recall --

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
Q
A
$Q$
I think $I$ was there for that, yes.
Yes.

Yeah.
And again, I'm sorry, $I$ can't put my reference on that transcript, but certainly the effect of her evidence before the Commission was that that's what she observed, but she didn't take it as seriously as others, or as a joke, --Uh-huh.
-- or as a crude remark.
Yeah.
Do you recall that being her take on the matters?

A
Q

I'm sure that's right, sir. If, in 1970, you had been aware and had had a statement from Deborah Hall that -- where she recounted what she observed in the hearing -- in the motel room as reflected in her evidence before the Supreme Court of Canada, would you have called that evidence before the Court?

Well there -- in this situation $I$ had two witnesses who were prepared to and did testify, Melnyk and Lapchuk, Ute Frank who declined at the, if you will, at the trial, there were other people, clearly, in the motel room. I wouldn't have felt it my duty to, you know, pursue them through thick and thin, to round them up, find what they had to say. There is a -- I think it wasn't with any big motives on my part, and I think there is a point at which you are not required to, you know, keep calling witnesses about one episode. If you had been aware of Ms. Hall's version of events in the motel room at the time, in January 1970, would you have called her as a witness at the trial?

At this point, sir, $I$ don't know.
COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: Just a moment now.年

Yeah.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Which one was it, sir, that -- who, in the interview, declined to go any further?

That was Ute Frank, Mr. Commissioner.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, all right, that's -- all right.

Yeah.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right. I thought you maybe said Hall there. All right, sorry. You had Melnyk and Lapchuk.

Yeah.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So again, and you didn't feel any obligation to call her, or to look for her; is that it?

Or her or the other two or three people in the room in view of what $I$ had, as it were.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
BY MR. HODSON:
Putting aside, Mr. Caldwell, and I appreciate your comment about efforts to locate, and we in fact heard evidence and saw in the statement that Ms. Hall was in Vancouver or Montreal or somewhere else at the time. Putting that aside for the moment, and I'm not suggesting that you ought to
have gone and found her in asking the next
question --
Okay.
Do you understand that?
Yes, sir.
If you had been aware at the time, if Deborah Hall had been with Craig Melnyk when Mr. Karst went to see him and said here's my take on events, here's what $I$ saw, and in fact what $I$ saw was a bit more specific than what the others saw --

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A

Q Yeah.
-- but I viewed it differently --
Yeah.
-- would you have called her?
In that scenario $I$ would have.
And why is that?
Well, because that's -- that proposed set of facts was a lot more clear and crisp, if you will, than what $I$ had from her about Hall at the time of the -- when this was all first revealed to me.

And the other fellow who was mentioned there, Bob Harris, and again $I$ think his evidence before the Commission was to the effect that he observed the event, and $I$ can't remember if he described it the same or identical as others, I think perhaps
slightly different, that his view was it was a joke?

A

Q

Okay.
And we've heard other evidence from some of the people there that $M r$. Harris was not there at the time and, if he was, he was in no condition to see anything. Putting aside those issues, if at the time you had been aware of or had Mr. Harris and had his version of events in the motel room, putting aside any obligation on your part to go find them, if you had it would you have called him as a witness?

Yes, I think I would.
Now if we can call up 006913, this is a letter, January 19th, 1970, and it talks about Mr. Roberts and his accounts, but down at the bottom there's a note here that says Bob Harris, 408 - 33rd Street East?

That would be with George Harris.
With George Harris, works with J. McKillop in Regina. Do you know what that note refers to? Only that $I$ must have written it on or after January 19th. No, this is -- I think this is, in effect, a copy of my file copy of that letter which is why $I$ would put that date on it and --

Is it fair to say that the note is unrelated to the letter, just might have been a piece of paper you put the note on?

I'm sure that's right.
And would you have had some information about where Bob Harris was at the time do you know? I wouldn't have written it unless someone told me that, in effect.

Do you have any recollection of contacting Bob Harris or trying to locate him at the time of trial?

I don't, Mr. Hodson. Mr. Hodson, I see now that this is originally, an original signature by Mr. Boyd, a letter to me, I think I -- so it would be on my file in the normal course of events. Right. So this is something you received, had on your file and you jotted this note down about Harris, and $I$ think you said it would be unrelated to the letter?

A That's correct.
Q If we could call up 007128 , please, and again, Mr. Commissioner, $I$ would ask for an order that this document not be published, nor any of the contents. It contains, it's number 194, and it contains the list of jurors and Mr. Caldwell's
notes.
Commissioner MacCALLUM: Very well, a publication ban then.

BY MR. HODSON:
And it appears --
I've found that document, sir. It's part of a larger one as you realize.

MS. KNOX: For the benefit of counsel, since I've located the original of that copy, it's in the prosecution file number 2.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.
A Thanks.

BY MR. HODSON:
And it's the second page of your trial notes I believe.

Yes, sir, that's right.
And would these be your notes regarding the selection of the jury?

That's right, sir.
And again $I$ don't want to go through any names, but just tell us, maybe we can, the headings at the top, it says call S.A.'s first. Can you tell us what that --

It says call stand asides first is what that stands for.

And $M$ and $H$ are for Mahar and Hudson who $I$ understand were two other jury trials going on at the time?

That's correct.
And so where we see that note, that would indicate that that juror was called for that --

That's how I believe --
Right?
A
Q
Yeah, that's right.
And then you have a column that says called or stand aside?

A
$Q$
A
By whom, and I believe Chief Justice Bence
suggested to me that $I$ use all my stand asides first, as it were, there is something in print about that, but it was normal to stand people aside if you wanted to, you know, not have them on the jury, so -- and then the column 'by' indicates it would be either me or the defence in this case.

And if we could just scroll down, the right-hand side would be the juror number?

That's right.
Scroll down, please. And it looks like the 12 th juror -- there's 26 names that $I$ counted, assume
for the moment my counting is correct, that those were the number of jurors that went through before the 12 were selected?

A
Q
A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

Would you give me that again, Mr. Hodson?
Well, go back to the full page.
Okay.
This would be the juror numbers that you select and I presume that the names that we go through until we get to number 12 are the jurors that were considered, the people that were considered?

Yeah, that's correct.
And assume that I'm correct in counting 26 names where I've circled there, you would have gone through 26 perspective jurors before you selected the 12; is that correct?

That's right.
That's a correct reading of your note?
It is.
And we're done with that document. I want to go now just to one issue, Mr. Caldwell, that was dealt with in Mr. Ron Wilson's evidence before the Commission. I'm wondering if we're able to call up some transcript and if we can go to -- is it by page number or date?

MS. ISABELLE: Page.

BY MR. HODSON:
Q
I think it's page number 5856, and this is -- this
is when $I$ was questioning Mr. Wilson, and this relates to the length of time, and just to give a quick background, $I$ don't propose to go through the statements and the documents of Mr. Wilson, we've been through them on more than one occasion, but it deals with this issue of Mr. Wilson's evidence, Mr. Caldwell, in his statement, what he told the police, what he said in his statement, what he said at the preliminary hearing, what he said at trial regarding the length of time that Mr. Milgaard was away from the vehicle on the morning of the murder. Do you understand that being an issue that has been discussed from time to time in this Inquiry?

A
Yes, sir.
And we went through with Mr. Wilson the apparent differences between the time frames, number 1, when he was away from the vehicle and got back, and secondly, when Mr. Milgaard got back after Wilson got back, and thirdly, the total time that Mr. Milgaard was away, and as $I$ say, we've been through that before, I don't propose to go through that. And $I$ was questioning Mr. Wilson, if you
can go to page 5858, and this is a reference that I am reading from Mr. Tallis' cross-examination at the trial when he's talking about the fact that Wilson, Mr. Wilson changed the length of blocks that he went from two and a half to four, and then if we can go to page 5859 and at the bottom and I ask him, right here:
"Q And you recall, Mr. Wilson, at the trial being challenged by Mr. Tallis about what you had said at the preliminary hearing being different than what you said at trial?

A Yes I do.

Q And $I$-- did you stick to your story at trial as opposed to what you said at the prelim?

A I believe I did.
Q And why is that?
A Because they wanted an extended time period so they got to.

Q And who are you referring to?
A Mr. Caldwell."
And then if you can go ahead to page 6002, and this is me asking the question of Mr. Wilson:
"Q Did the prosecutor Mr. Caldwell do
anything at all to cause you to lie at trial?

A Just suggesting to me about the length of time that we were separated.

Q And is that what you told us yesterday about the discussion you had with him?

A Yes."
I think that related to a discussion in a hotel room where words to the effect -- to stretch the time. Do you recall hearing that evidence, that suggestion, and $I$ just want to go through a few more before $I$ ask the question, but you are aware of Mr. Wilson saying in this Inquiry, and indeed on a number of previous occasions, alleging that you told him to stretch the time in his evidence about how long Mr. Milgaard is away from the vehicle. Do you recall hearing that?

Yes, I do.
And then if we can just go to 6639, and this is a reference of some questions about what Mr. Wilson says to the authors Rossmo and Boyd, and this is an interview $I$ think that was, or a transcript of an interview where -- and Wilson confirmed this I think at the hearing:
"Did you deal much with (inaudible)

Caldwell, the prosecutor." Wilson, "Yup." Boyd, "What was your impression of him?" Wilson, "Very difficult, demanding, he made sure he got what he wanted." Boyd, "In terms of?" Wilson, "In terms of especially at the trial when $I$ changed the time", it says "(inaudible)" or "from the", "preliminary". Boyd, "Oh, he wanted you to get more time?" Wilson, "Okay, put it in such a way ... 'are you sure?' and 'make sure you are sure it wasn't longer than you already said to begin with.'

Boyd, "You said it was longer?" Wilson, "Well, he insinuated he wanted to make sure $I$ said it was longer, that's what it seemed to me, so $I$ said it was longer at the trial. I think, because he was very definite on that point and they were going over the transcripts,"?

And then page 7473 -- I'm sorry, this is maybe Ms. Knox questioning, I'm not sure, I can't tell from the -- in any event, the question is:
"Q Okay. So when you say that Mr. Caldwell told you to stretch your time, and
you've used that language here, I'm going to suggest to you that what he said to you was are you sure about the time, he asked you, as prosecutors want to do when there's conflicts, to think about it and to be sure about how long you were away and how long he was away, and you simply said what was your original estimate, which was the 15 minutes.

A Yes."
And then it goes on in the transcript where Ms. Knox questions Mr. Wilson, and I don't propose to go through all of that, and he may have, in effect, $I$ think said that he didn't stretch the time, but in any event, regardless of what Mr. Wilson had said from time to time, Mr. Caldwell, you are aware that one suggestion or allegation that he has made and others have made about his evidence is that prior to his evidence at trial you told him to stretch the truth and indeed to lie at trial. You are aware of that allegation having been made?

A Yes, sir. Did you do so?

A No.

Q
Did you have -- would you have had a meeting with Mr. Wilson before the trial to discuss his evidence?

The evidence of Mr. Wilson, sir, I think was that I appeared in his hotel room with the preliminary hearing transcript the evening before he was to testify. I can't say that didn't happen, and if that did happen it wouldn't be unusual. Now, I -in no shape, way or form did $I$ try to influence the length of time he estimated Milgaard to be away from the vehicle and, for what it's worth, I think he later recanted it in the same testimony, if I'm not mistaken, sir, but it did not happen. If we could go to 007084 , please, and $I$ just want to identify it, this is -- it's about a 43 page document which I believe are your -- I'm not going to show him any of this.

MS. KNOX: Okay.
BY MR. HODSON:
Q
Just to read the first page, Mr. Caldwell. This is your, I think your handwritten and typed notes of your opening address; is that correct?

A That's right, sir.

And I actually have the transcript of what you
actually said in the opening address and I will refer to that.

A
$Q$

A
refer to that.

Okay.
But if we can just go through, if we can go to the second page, we'll see that some of this is typed, and actually if we can go to the last page, 007125 -- 7124, we'll see at the end, 'thank you, stopped here.' And then actually the next page we see 'not given in my opening,' and it looks like this relates to Shirley Wilson. It looks like you would have organized your opening address based on witnesses or evidence, S.W. being Shirley Wilson; is that --

Did I cause that?
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: No, I think it was me that time. What a relief.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You were giving me a heart attack before and now $I$ finished it off.

A

2
A
Q

A
$Q$

A
Q

BY MR. HODSON:
Are you both okay?
I think in my case we need a second opinion, sir. 210858 is the transcript from the trial, and if we can go to 210862 --

Okay, fine.
And this is the typed transcript, Mr. Caldwell, of the -- I think it's the official transcript of the trial that has your opening address, and $I$ will go through parts of this, but $I$ think if you are okay with following on the screen -- if you would like a paper copy, it doesn't have your notes on it. Are you fine following on the screen?

Yeah.
And if we can just go down to the bottom, and $I$ want to go through parts of the jury opening remarks, and we'll see here this is where it starts. Before we get into the document, can you tell us just generally, what was your practice at the time as to what it was you would say to the jury in your opening address?


A

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
Q

Well, $I$ would give them an outline of the evidence as $I$ believed it would be called in the trial. That would be based on what was said in the preliminary hearing and of course a couple of cautions by everyone that that might not be the evidence as it came out. If I could say, Mr. Hodson, this one that, is it 7084 , the reason it's in my handwriting is that from there on $I$ would dictate every evening the typed part which appears after it in sequence as the days went on, so $I$ had to hand write that, but the rest was typed by my secretary of the day.

Okay. I'm not sure if that follows, Mr. Caldwell.
Are these not your remarks that you would have read at the start of the trial before any evidence was heard?

Yes.
These --
Oh, I'm sorry, I've got -- yeah, I'm happy to go with this.

Yes. I'll show you a bit later your trial notes. Yeah, okay. Thank you, sir.

I believe these are your opening remarks that you prepared and read with some modifications at the trial?

A Yup.
Q

A

Q

A
BY MR. HODSON:
I can tell you, Mr. Caldwell, that although I haven't read them both, certainly they appear to be similar.

A
Q
Good, I'm relieved already.
If we go to 210862 , then, so again, what would be your objective or what was your practice, you told us just an outline of the case; is that --

A
Yeah, and $I$ think some brief excursions into the way they would have to apply the law at some stage, but mainly factual.

And I think what you tell the jury:
"... at this stage of the trial, to outline the evidence that the Crown expects --"

Next page,
"-- to call to prove its case; and I
don't think it hurts to emphasize again
that what $I$ am going to say now is only
an outline of what $I$ expect the evidence
will be and you of course as His
Lordship has said must be guided only by
the evidence that comes out here in
court."
So I think that's what you told us?

A
$Q$
Correct, yeah.
And would this be again, we talked the other day about Crown theory, and is that -- the Crown would have a case that you were trying to prove; is that fair?

That's right.
And you would sit down ahead of time, here's what we think happened?

Correct.
Here's the evidence we're going to call to establish what we think happened?

Right.
And $I$ think that that will then establish the guilt of the accused; is that right?

A
$Q$
loose ends, in other words, some things that you haven't quite figured out or can't be figured out that are possibly, well, the Crown says it's A or B, you decide, it doesn't matter which one it is as far as we're concerned, things of that nature? Yes.

Going into the trial you would have -- have a theory and a case that you were seeking to prove; is that fair?

Yes.
And the opening address to the jury would be your attempt to outline that for the jury, again subject to whatever rules and limitations existed for jury addresses at the time?

That's right, sir.
Now if we can go to page 210865, and it looks like you started off with, talk about the next three -I think actually you were calling Mary Marcoux and Ms. Nyczai, but then the next three Crown witnesses will be three of the major Crown witnesses at the trial, and then you go on to describe John, Cadrain and Wilson, and $I$ think you've told us that those -- maybe go to the next page, and -- full page, please -- and right there you talk about those people. So you would have
told the jury the Crown's major three witnesses are Wilson, John and Cadrain; is that fair?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$
going to say?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

That's right, that was emphasized.
And there would be a risk, sir, that if you -- not intentionally, but if you said to the jury here's what $I$ think the witness is going to say and the witness said something completely different, then that might be a problem; is that fair?

Yeah, that's not unheard of happening, and $I$ would
think you would want to mention it somewhere in the closing or words to that effect.

And I don't propose to go through this, it does talk about Wilson's state of events. If we can go to the next page, and he does talk about getting back to the car, "... when he left her she was now in a hysterical state," that's Nichol John, crying, and shortly after the accused returned to the car and got in the car, upon which Nichol John moved away from the accused Milgaard and toward Wilson.
"He will testify that Milgaard was breathing heavily at this time upon re-entering the car as if he had been running and that when he was in the car Milgaard stated to the two of them in the car words to the effect that he had
fixed her or words to that effect; and that Wilson replied "You what?" and that that was the end of that conversation, there was nothing further said."

And then scroll down, you tell the jury:
"Now Wilson will testify that two men came along and helped them get unstuck from the place where they were stuck; and I might say that the identity of these men has never been ascertained despite inquiries, and of course Wilson does not know who they were, being strangers in Saskatoon. Anyway I expect him to say that two men did come along and help them get free ..."

And I think that was based on what Wilson had told you previously?

A $Q$

Yes.
And the next page, again talking about Wilson, you tell the jury while they are,
"... at Cadrain's that he Wilson
observed blood on the front of
Milgaard's pants and of course when I
say blood naturally what he thought to
be or took to be blood; it's not a
question of analyzing or anything of this sort. He will testify that

Milgaard changed his entire outfit." So again, you would have told them about that piece of incriminating information coming from Mr. Wilson?

Yes.
And then to page 210871, again this is outlining Wilson's evidence, and you tell the jury:
"... while they were at the service station Milgaard did some cleaning out of the interior of the car and that when the car was fixed they went back to Cadrain's ..."

And would the cleaning out of the car, I think you told us the other day that that might be inferred to be items related to Gail Miller?

A

Q But the reason you would have called that evidence, Mr. Caldwell, would be to suggest that Mr. Milgaard had made efforts to clean the car?

A Yeah, that's right.

And something related to the -- you would be

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
Q
asking the jury to infer that that was related to cleaning out something from the car related to the murder of Gail Miller; is that fair?

Yup.

And if we scroll down, you talk about, here about Wilson saying that Milgaard was driving too fast for the road, and again $I$ think we talked yesterday that, or the day before that this would be part of the Crown's theory, that he was anxious to leave the city?

Yes.

And again, seeking to have the jury infer that he was trying to get away because he had committed the murder; is that fair?

Yes.

And then also talks about Nichol John would scream every once in a while for no apparent reason, and this is Wilson's evidence, and I take it you would be saying to the jury or asking the jury to infer from that that she was upset because either she had seen or she had known Mr. Milgaard had been involved in a murder? the compact, this is again you are saying what Central Booking Call tre 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv

Wilson is going to say about Wilson and John, Milgaard and Cadrain,
"... and upon the girl locating the compact she asked if anyone in the car knew whose it was or words to that effect, upon which the accused Milgaard grabbed it from her, threw it out of the car window without answering the question or commenting on it."

So I take it there, Mr. Caldwell, the theory was that that was, even though you never found the compact, you would be asking the jury to infer that that was Gail Miller's compact?

Right.
And that Mr. Milgaard was throwing it out of the vehicle because it was incriminating; is that fair?

Correct.
And then next you tell the jury that:
"Now Wilson will testify that while they
were in Calgary - Milgaard took him
aside or was alone with him and told him
about an incident that happened in
Saskatoon, Milgaard telling Wilson words
to the effect that he had hit a girl or
he had got a girl, or words to that effect - and that he thought she would be okay; and that he had put her purse in a trash can."

And I take from that, sir, that you were asking the jury to infer that Mr . Milgaard was describing to Ron Wilson in Calgary his encounter with Gail Miller on the previous morning?

That's right, sir.
And then down at the bottom you go to:
"The next Crown witness will be the girl
Nichol John, the other person who accompanied Milgaard and Wilson on this trip ..."

If we go to the next page you say:
"Now I expect her to describe being
invited by Milgaard and Wilson to
accompanied them on the trip; to
describe leaving Regina and the trip to
Saskatoon, during which she I expect
will testify saw two knives in the car
of different descriptions to one
another, one of them which was simply
loose in the car and one of them in
possession of the accused; one being a
bone handled hunting type knife and the other a type paring knife with a maroon handle."

And I should pause there, I didn't turn it up on the, your remarks about Mr. Wilson, but you told the jury as well about Mr. Wilson's -- that Mr. Wilson will testify about seeing a knife as well. I'm sure I did, sir.

And then carrying on, you say:
"I expect her to testify that they reached Saskatoon, stopped the girl, asked for directions, got stuck a couple of times and generally to give her version of the sequence of events on the way to Saskatoon and in Saskatoon and throughout the trip to Calgary, Banff and eventually back to Regina."

And then you go on to the next witness, Mr. Cadrain.

Okay.
So you have two paragraphs about Nichol John and no mention, other than the knife, of any of the incriminating evidence that you expected her -- or that was in her statement --

A Uh-huh.

Q

A
-- and that she might have said at trial. And I'm wondering, Mr. Caldwell, can you tell us why you wouldn't have told the jury about your expectation about what she would testify, namely that she had witnessed the murder?

Well I think, in view of my three interviews of her before the trial started and, in effect, their, you know, failure, if you want to look at it that way, $I$ would have been very reluctant to put in the evidence that she, in effect, didn't give, because she very well may not give it in the trial. It would be awkward if I said "she is going to say these five or seven things", if she didn't say it then $I$ would be, you know, $I$ would feel that that was regrettable that that was out there before the jury before it was in evidence. And so just let's probe this for a minute. Was your concern that you might inflame -- well, 'inflame' is perhaps the wrong word, well maybe it's the right word -- the jury at this time by saying you are going to have evidence of a witness who witnessed the murder when you weren't sure that she was going to say that? Well, yeah, that's -- I wasn't sure she was going to say it, I -- you know, I had the expectation
she would, but I couldn't tell that. Now if I put
it in there, it creates an awkward situation if and when she doesn't testify to it, and it could, you know, it could magnify into a really serious problem.

Well, what, and would that be a problem for you or a problem for the defence?

Well, for the whole case, I would think. It would be a problem for me because $I$ would, I'd have put it in a little incautiously; Mr. Tallis would have to look at that and see if he felt it was a, you know, a major difficulty; and $I$ would think the judge might eventually end up being very concerned about it. So it looks like I took the presumed safe way on this matter.

And, again, if you would have said something to the effect that "I expect that Nichol John, who has given a statement, will testify as follows", what -- and talked about the eyewitness of the murder, and the evidence came out during the trial exactly as it did, would that have been a problem? Well it -- that would not have been a problem. But $I$ had no way of, you know, relying or predicting that at this point, Mr. Hodson. It may well have not come out was my --

Q
A
$Q$

A
Q
A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

Let's go through the scenarios.
Okay.
You say nothing in your opening address about it, if at trial she testifies let's say exactly in accordance with her May $24 t h$ post-polygraph statement --

Uh-huh.
-- and says she witnessed the murder, etcetera, -Yeah.
-- in that scenario, from the Crown's perspective, there -- would there be any downside to the fact that you didn't mention it in your opening address?

I can't see any.
Yeah. And another scenario is that she did exactly as she did in trial and you get the statement before the jury on the issue of credibility; is that correct?

Umm, yes, that's --
And, in that situation, the fact that you have mentioned nothing in your opening; would that have any impact on the Crown's position?

Well I would think that $I$ was safer to do it this way in that second scenario as well.

Yeah.

A Maybe I'm --
Q Yeah. And the third way is -- oh, I'm sorry? COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Sorry, I just want to get point 2.

BY MR. HODSON:
The second one would be exactly what happened at trial, that in other words if you had made the statement in your opening address that "here's what she's gonna say", and at trial she doesn't adopt this statement, but the statement goes before the jury on the credibility issue?

A

Okay. What --
A
And it would have put, you know, defence counsel and the judge in an awkward or -- position as well, I would have thought.

And a third scenario would be where the opening address, you refer to the fact that Nichol John is going to testify about witnessing the murder, and that at trial she does not adopt her statement, and the judge does not allow the statement to go before the jury, or any of its contents, and in
that scenario $I$ take it, sir, you would have had a problem?

A
Yeah, and I'd have to address it and try not to say anything, you know, that would trigger a -the case having to be redone or anything like that.

Would it be fair to say at this time, at the time of your opening, that you were pretty sure that she wasn't going to repeat the May 24 th statement in her evidence?

A

Q

A
-- but more likely than not that she wasn't going to repeat her statement, or --

A
Q

A

A Yeah, okay.

Q
If we can go to the next page, we then talk about Albert Cadrain, and again you summarize here that Mr. Cadrain will talk about seeing blood when he changed clothes at Cadrain's house.

Uh-huh.
And then go to page 210876. And then you tell the jury about Cadrain's evidence. I'm skipping parts here, Mr. Caldwell, --

Yeah.
-- the transcript is in for what it is.
Okay.
I'm just simply going over certain parts of this with you.

A
That's fine, sir. It says:
"Now you will remember that this would be the first time Cadrain had been back to Saskatoon after leaving. And that upon arriving home and hearing of the murder of Gail Miller he went the next day to the Saskatoon Police - that would be the Sunday afternoon - to report what he knew of the incident after so to speak putting two and two together. Now I expect him to testify
that at one time in Calgary Milgaard who was alone with Cadrain told Cadrain words to the effect that he Milgaard was a member of the Maffia, that he had a gun in the back seat of the car and that Cadrain should go and kill those two off; however, Cadrain did not take this seriously."

Uh-huh.
So that would be your understanding of what Cadrain was going to say at the trial?

A

A

Yes. I believe Mr. Perras and I had gone through the two or three different considerations, things
that could develop if that happened, and made handwritten notes which $I$ believe are in his writing, I'm -- I had forgotten, Mr. Hodson, that I left that information out, and I'm -- not about the 9(2) but the --

Q
A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q
A
Q
A

Yes.
And I'm glad I did leave it out because I can't see any way that $I$ could go wrong with that.

Would it be fair to say, sir, that if Nichol John did not repeat the contents of her May 24 th statement, --

Uh-huh.
-- that you would want to get her statement before the jury in some form?

In a legal form.
Yes.
Yeah.
And why was that?
Well because (a) I believed it to be true, based on what we have been talking about here for the last two or three days, I believed that was the accurate version. She did -- was interviewed by Inspector Roberts who showed her the uniform, based on that she made -- in effect said that she'd seen the murder. As I recall, I believe

Inspector Roberts' view was that she was being truthful, but $I$ hope $I$ 'm not misstating that.

So $I$ had, in her case,
scientific, a policeman mind you, but a polygraph operator who had some way of measuring these things who, as $I$ recall, thought she was being truthful. But I hope I'm not --

Q

A
$Q$
Are you talking about Nichol John being polygraphed?

No, no, definitely that she wasn't.
Okay.
But during that sequence of events she ended up before Roberts and being shown the uniform, etcetera, is what $I$ was --

So, again, you wished to have that statement. And obviously you would agree, sir, that that statement was certainly, if seen by the jury for whatever purpose, was not favourable to Mr.

Milgaard; is that correct?
No, that's correct.
Because in that statement she said "I saw David grab the girl and stab her", or words to that effect?

A
$Q$
A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
2

Yeah, that's right. But you could only -- that, if it happened, had to be done based on legal -And I appreciate that, Mr. Caldwell.

Yeah, yeah.
And let me preface my remarks with, I mean, these issues that were raised by the court, dealt with by the Court, went to the Court of Appeal, and were dealt with by the Court of Appeal.

Yeah.
So I think we're on the same page, here, that the process that was applied was -- was reviewed by the courts.

Yeah.
And so I'm trying to question you a bit about what options you had and some of the reasons you did some of the things that the Crown did.

Certainly.
All right. So if we go back with the statement, and $I$ think you said if she did not repeat it in her evidence that you would want, in a legal way, to get that before the jury; is that fair?

Only if it could be done that way.
Yeah, in a legal way.
Right.
And you would agree, sir, that that -- number 1,
you are saying 'I believe that to be the truth'?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q
A
Q

A it's one of the things they could have concluded
simply on the way the trial went altogether. And so if we go back, again when you are confronted with the fact that she testifies, she does not adopt the statement, you then go into the section 9(2) process to try and get the statement, in a legal way, before the jury; correct? Umm, yeah, only in the -- under the 9(2) heading, of course.

Under the 9(2).
Yes.
And so let me suggest that there might be two scenarios. The first would be where you put the statement to her under section 9(2) as an inconsistent statement and she ends up, in the course of your examination, adopting the statement; that's one scenario?

Okay. All right.
That would be one?
Yeah, it could be.
So you would go through with the idea under 9(2),
in fact -- and $I$ don't want to get into debating the objectives -- but one of the objectives of

9(2) with a witness is to say "lookit, you said something before, you are saying something different now, I'm questioning your credibility", Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv
and in some cases the witness might say "okay, you are right, what $I$ said before is true --" Yeah.
"-- I now adopt it"; that's a possible outcome?
Yeah, that's been known to happen on some rare occasions, sir, but --

And in that situation you would have got your evidence in the sense of what you expected to be the truth, and that Ms. John would have, in that scenario, adopted the statement and testified saying "yes I saw this"; correct?

Yes, that's right.
And, in that scenario, Mr. Tallis would then be entitled to cross-examine her on her evidence?

In other words, the statement in the form of evidence; correct?

Absolutely, on anything he wished.
Right. And he could challenge the credibility of that evidence, and her recollection, and her eyewitness, etcetera?

I would certainly expect so.
And then the second scenario, sir, would be where you take the statements to cross -- or to question her under section $9(2)$ in a legal way, and she
does not adopt it, which is I think what happened at trial, in which case you would be asking the Court, in a legal way, to have the statement before the jury on the issue not -- on the issue of credibility?

Yeah.

Not on the truthfulness of the statement, but on Nichol John's credibility?

That -- that was how I understood it worked. Correct.

I think the judge stressed that when he dealt with it.

And in fact, to be a bit more specific, not just generally on Nichol John's credibility but the credibility of her statement "I don't recall the certain segment of events"?

That would be part of it.

And would it be fair to say that, and $I$ think this is borne out in your closing address, the argument would be "don't believe her when she says $I$ don't recall, she does recall"; correct?

I believe $I$ argued that.
And if the jury were to say 'okay, we don't believe Nichol John when she says "I don't recall", she must have recalled something'; that
would be a conclusion, right?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q

And your position was 'don't believe that, take this previous statement, use it in a legal way to conclude that she is lying when she says "I don't recall", and that the truth is really what's in
-- is that correct?
Yes. evidence; --

Yes.
-- is that correct?
Yes. (
the statement'?

A
Q
A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
2
A
$Q$
A
the statement'?
Uh-huh. That --
In a legal way?
Yeah.
And the net result of that, Mr. Caldwell, is that Ms. John's statement, the May 24 th statement, was not examined upon; was it? And --

That's the -- is that --
In other words Mr. Tallis -- well, and we'll hear from Mr. Tallis --

Yeah, yeah.
-- but certainly -- and maybe that's not a fair question for you, sir, other than to say that, at trial, would it be fair to say that there was not a cross-examination or a testing of Ms. John's May 24 th statement?

And this is the one $I$ was working on at the
time, --
Yes.
-- is it?
Yes.
If Mr. Tallis did not -- do you mean in the trial proper, sir.

Yes.
Okay. I assume that's correct, I --

And that will be a question that --
A
$Q$

And that -- and, again, $I$ think this is a question for Mr. Tallis, but that $I$ believe, at trial, that Nichol John was not cross-examined?

A Yeah.

And, in fact, I'm not sure how she could be when she wasn't repeating it in Court?

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q
A

Q
A
I
I would think that's right. You would still be open to cross-examine her on what she saw otherwise, of course.

Right. This is probably a good spot to break for lunch, Mr. Commissioner. (Adjourned at 11:54 a.m.) (Reconvened at 1:32 p.m.)

BY MR. HODSON:
Q
When we broke we were dealing with your opening remarks to the jury, 210858. If we could call
that up, please, and go to 210876 . And there is a paper copy if you wish to have it.

A

Q Oh, thanks.

And when we left off $I$ had talked to you, Mr. Caldwell, about Mr. Cadrain's evidence, and then $I$ asked -- no, I don't need, back to the full page, please -- I had asked you about Mr. Cadrain's evidence -- or, pardon me -- your remarks to the jury about Mr. Cadrain, and then $I$ asked you some questions about Nichol John and the section 9(2). So I just want to go back to the jury address, and then if we could go ahead to page 210879, just highlight some of the other remarks you made: "Now the next Crown witness will be a man named Henry George Diewald, the caretaker at St. Mary's Church. Now this is located on the northeast corner of 20 th Street and Avenue "O". It's just a block west of Westwood Funeral Chapel and it is located in the same position on its block as Westwood is on its block. Diewald will testify that he left the church rectory, which is north of the church, at around seven a.m. that morning to walk to the church and unlock
it ...",
and it goes on to talk about looking down the alley. And I take it, Mr. Caldwell, that this would have been your theory that -- or pardon me -- the Crown's theory that Mr. Diewold was looking down the $T$ of the alley between Avenue $N$ and Avenue $O$ and then, in fact, saw the vehicle in which Mr. Milgaard was in; is that correct? That, that appears to be so, sir.

And then if you can scroll down, please. You then tell the jury:
"... the next several Crown witnesses
are persons who had something to do with
Milgaard and his companions ..."
after the time of:
"... the murder and they are mainly
witnesses who had something to do with
the group as a result of various car
trouble ...",
and then you talk about -- scroll down, please:
"The first of these is a man by the name
of Rasmussen. Now he was working at the
time at the Trav-a-leer Motel ...", and if we can go to the next page --

A Okay.

Q
-- and just pick it up here, you again talk about the time, you say:
"Now, you may notice that if both the Crown witnesses Nyczai and Rasmussen are correct in their times that the deceased was at her residence at around a quarter to seven $a . m$. and the party of three including Milgaard were at the motel by seven thirty the same morning, three-quarters of an hour later, leaving a period of three-quarters of an hour in which the Crown suggests that the deceased left her home, walked on her way to catch the bus to the place where she was killed, that the murder took place, Milgaard and his party left the vicinity, drove out to the Trav-a-leer located on 22 nd Street and Circle Drive. However, this is the sequence of events as the Crown believes them to exist and it may be that when you've heard all the evidence you may come to the conclusion that the events did happen in this sequence and that perhaps one or both of Ms. Nyczai and/or Rasmussen are slightly

> out on their times or conversely of course you may decide that all the things did happen in this space of time."

So it appears in your opening address to the jury you are saying "here's the window, quarter to 7:00 to 7:30, is when the murder took place"?

Yes.
Q
And the one book end, if $I$ can call it that, on the front end would be Ms. Nyczai, who said "I last saw Gail Miller alive at about that time, 6:45, so she couldn't have been killed before then"?

Uh-huh.
$Q$

And Mr. Rasmussen, you say, saw Mr. Milgaard at 7:30 at the Trav-a-leer Motel, and so that was from that point on Mr. Milgaard was elsewhere and could not have committed the murder; is that fair? Yes.

And so whatever time it took to get from Avenue 0 to the Trav-a-leer Motel, that would really be the end time for your time frame; is that correct?

A The -- yes.

Next page. Then you go on to talk about the Danchuks, who will testify about seeing them that morning, and then the next page. And the only reference $I$ think you have about what the Danchuks observed, or there:
"I expect Danchuk to testify that he noticed a tear in the seat of the pants that the accused Milgaard was wearing at the time."

Would there be a reason, and $I$ don't think it's in here, that you wouldn't say in your opening remarks that they did not observe blood? Not that $I$ can think of, Mr. Hodson.

And then the next page is 27 , again you are talking about the Danchuks, telling the jury what you expect. Call out that portion, please. And you say that you:
"... expect her ...",
being Mrs. Danchuk:
"... to testify that she and the girl who lived next door left for work ...", and then:
"... recalls the accused as being wearing a toque on this occasion."

And would it be fair to say that that reference
to the toque is part of the Crown's theory that what was found by Mrs. Gerse may have, or was, Mr. Milgaard's toque with blood on it?

You could infer that, sir.
Then skip ahead to 210886. And, again, you are talking about the tow truck evidence, the service station evidence, and we've touched on this before, but you are telling the jury here about Mr. Milgaard cleaning items out of the car, putting them in the garbage can at the station: ".. and Davis did not check what these were ..."

Davis is the service station fellow. And I take it sir, this is what you told us yesterday, that would be part of the Crown theory, that this may have been when Mr. Milgaard was disposing of items from the vehicle that might be related to the Gail Miller murder?

Yes, sir.
Now next page, please. If we can call out about line 20 or line 15, you say:
"Now one of the pieces of evidence you will be hearing which certainly in the Crown's case goes unexplained is that the body had its arms in a black cloth
coat, which had some puncture marks through it which $I$ think you may decide would correspond with the puncture marks in the body itself; but that the uniform dress was rolled down and when it was stretched out and flattened out these puncture marks were not in the dress and this is simply something which is unexplained but that's one of the things that Kleiv and possibly Parker and some of the other witnesses will mention to you and that was the situation found indicating a stabbing through the coat and into the body at a time when the dress was actually rolled down and at a time when the deceased must have been out of the coat and the top of her uniform somehow taken down and the coat replaced. I just mention that because you will be hearing evidence of that." And I think that's what you told us the other day, that this was something that the Crown really couldn't explain?

A That's right, sir. Next page. Again, here you talk about Mr. Penkala
finding the knife blade, and then at the bottom:
"Now he will testify that on February the 4 th - you will remember that the occurrence was on the $31 s t$ of January but the search kept on and that as part of a continuing search of that area he located two frozen lumps of a yellow substance with hair frozen into them, that he retained these, and you will hear evidence later that one of these lumps contained human male spermatazoa, a constituent of human male seminal fluid. Now, Lieut. Penkala will
describe receiving those items from other officers ...",
and it goes on to talk about continuity. So you would have told the jury about the male seminal fluid found by the body?

That's right.
Next page. At the bottom you are talking about McCorriston's evidence about February 3rd finding, following a garbage truck and finding a purse in the back alley near where the murder took place, is that correct?

A Yes.

And you had already told the jury that Mr. Wilson was going to testify that he heard, in Calgary Mr. Milgaard said that he had stabbed a girl or jabbed a girl and grabbed her purse and put it in a garbage can?

All right, sir.
And would that be to tie McCorriston's evidence in?

A
Q
Would that be the Crown's theory, that McCorriston found a purse in the garbage, and Wilson said Mr. Milgaard had admitted to putting a purse in a garbage can after jabbing a girl?

That's right.
And then the next page, next page please, 893.
And here you talk about the wallet and you say:
"I expect Giles to say that he took Sgt. Mackie to the place where he found the wallet - which location by the way Sgt. Mackie says was immediately in front of 326 "O" South, which is a few houses north of Cadrain's house at 334 - and that when they got there the policeman Mackie himself found some of the papers . . ."

Now we've seen a couple of references in the notes to confusion, or something, between where Beauchamp says he found the wallet and where Mackie says Beauchamp found the wallet and where he saw the papers; do you know that?

I know that that seemed to exist.
And it seems to be that -- please correct me if I'm wrong -- that Mr. Beauchamp found the wallet in a spot that may not have corresponded where -with where Mr. Mackie thought he found it?

That could be the case, sir.
And, here, you tell the jury that:
"... by the way Sgt. Mackie says was immediately in front of 326 "O" South
. . ."
It wasn't Mackie who found the wallet, he found hospitalization cards, didn't he? I think that was the evidence.

I expect that was, Mr. Hodson.
And I'm wondering, do you recall any issue with whether or not the wallet may have been found across the street from Cadrain's, as opposed to two houses down?

A
It seems to me there was some mention of a skating hut and a wallet near or under it, but frankly at
this point, $I$ would have to be reminded of that. And as far as the Crown's theory was concerned, I believe that we will see in the closing address, certainly, that when Mr. Milgaard was at the Cadrain house and took the car out for what I think was termed 'an unexplained drive around the block', that this is when he would have disposed of Gail Miller's items, including the wallet?

That would be my understanding.
And would it be fair to say the fact that the wallet was found within a few houses of Cadrain's house was evidence that supported that theory?

I would say so.
Page 210895, again you talk about Helen Gerse and the toque right next door to Cadrain's, and go to the next page, talk about a toque sitting on top of the snow in front of her house, noticing there was blood, etcetera, and $I$ take it, sir, that the Crown's theory was that this was Mr. Milgaard's toque and that he disposed of it either when he drove around at Cadrain's house or when he was there?

A
$Q$
I take it that's so, Mr. Hodson.
210898, this is talking about Dr. Emson and his evidence and you say:
"He will testify that he found numerous spermatozoa in the vagina of the deceased. He will give his opinion that from what he saw he would estimate sexual intercourse took place within approximately twelve hours preceding the examination - and as you know these approximations are only that but I stress the words "before the examination" as opposed to before the death of the deceased, so you might bear that in mind in due course. He will testify that he found no signs by way of injuries to the genitalia of the deceased, the sexual organs, which would indicate sexual intercourse against her will during life but $I$ expect him to testify that in his opinion intercourse could have taken place while the deceased was unconscious or even after death from the absence of injuries to the genitalia."

If $I$ can pause there. Was that a piece of evidence that was somewhat unusual, Mr. Caldwell, the fact that there appeared to be no physical
signs of forced intercourse on Gail Miller?

A
$Q$

Did you ever consider or look at whether that may have been that there was not -- there was not sexual intercourse as part of the attack on her explanations, at least in your notes and his evidence, were that it could have been while she was unconscious?

That's one of them, yeah.
Or after she was dead?
That's right.
that morning?
I don't believe so, Mr. Hodson. At that point it appeared to be, if you will, all one attack by one person as far as the Crown assessed the case. But whether or not the Crown ever considered whether the spermatozoa found when Dr. Emson did the autopsy, whether that may have been from prior to the incident?

You mean the previous evening or something? Yes.

I think there was some attempt to determine whether she had had intercourse willingly within a reasonable time period before. I can't come up, with the short notice, with names, etcetera. I think someone tried to determine that.

There's some evidence of that.
Okay.
So would it be fair to say the Crown theory was that she was raped as part of the murder and that the fact that there was no physical signs of forced intercourse, that it must have been either that she didn't fight it or she was unconscious or she was deceased; is that fair?

A
Yeah, and that's based on what we learned, if you will, from Dr. Emson, among other things.

You go on to say that Dr. Emson:
"... will also explain that human blood as such - and I say that as opposed to constituent parts of human blood - that the human blood as such can get into seminal fluid and spermatozoa of the male person from his own body, that is for a variety of reasons including injuries to the genitalia, disease of the genitalia, and sometimes apparently without any apparent cause; and again this is speaking of blood as such as opposed to a constituent."

So if $I$ can pause there, it looks like you told the jury at the opening -- and $I$ don't know that you've identified the secretor issue yet, but you are telling them that $D r$. Emson is going to testify that in males human blood can get into their semen in a variety of ways? That is how I take that.

And would it be fair to say, sir, that you had to -- I shouldn't say had to, you desired to put before the jury an explanation as to why David Milgaard's blood might be in his semen, because you thought he was a non-secretor?

I think that's fair to say.
And if we can scroll down to the bottom, and then you talk here about, here's where we hear about Paynter, and:
"... that he found human seminal fluid in one of those two frozen lumps, which I told you about located by Lieut. Penkala, but no seminal fluid in the other lump; that he also found human seminal fluid on the panties taken from the deceased -"

And then go down here, it says:
"Now, he will testify that he found the accused Milgaard's blood to be type "A" and further that he examined this toque which Mrs. Gerse found and that it had human blood of an indeterminate group on it. Now I think that Staff Paynter will explain to you that depending on the sample they are given it is sometimes possible to say that a stain is human blood and it is sometimes possible to go on further and say it's type "A" or type "B" or whatever the case may be;"

And then you go on to talk about that, and then
down at the bottom:
"He will also testify that he received saliva samples given by the accused and tested them and found that no antigens of blood group "A" or "B" were to be found in the samples. Now, Lady and Gentlemen, I do want to pause here to explain briefly one of the more complicated aspects of the evidence which I think though will be clearly set out before you in evidence by Staff Sergeant Paynter. Now, when Staff

Paynter testifies $I$ expect him to explain to you some of the techniques involved in blood grouping ..."

Etcetera, and then here on line 4:
"... and $I$ expect him to testify that
there are people known as secretors and
that this class of people which is a
very large class - about eighty percent
I believe of the population - is that
they are persons who have their blood
antigens or blood grouping substances
secreted by their bodies into their
other bodily fluids - perspiration,
seminal fluid, saliva or tears - and when you have a sample of one of these items from a secretor that, all things being equal, you should be able to find out the blood group of that person from the examination of a sample if it's sufficient of one of these fluids. Now, I expect him to testify that when he initially checked the two frozen lumps I mentioned and found one to contain spermatozoa - and when this thing was melted by the way it was - clear pale yellowish fluid - he found it contained spermatozoa but he made no attempt to examine it for the actual presence of blood as such. And I stress that as I did with Dr. Emson's evidence because you will be hearing about blood as such as opposed to the constituents of blood, being these antigen which are parts of blood. However, that he did go ahead and check on this first occasion a sample to see if he could find any blood group antigens in it and he did find "A" antigens in the liquid."

And again he says:
"Now this would indicate at that stage and $I$ stress at that stage of the proceedings that the fluid was probably from a group "A" person who was a secretor - found "A" antigens that should be a secretor of group "A"." And if $I$ can pause there, and $I$ think at that time, as we've heard, Mr. Caldwell, you thought Mr. Milgaard was a non-secretor?

A
That's how $I$ recall it, sir, $I$ think that's correct.
$Q$ If he would have had evidence at the time, in 1970, the same evidence that $I$ think when Mr. Milgaard was checked in the early 1990 s it was determined that he was an $A$ secretor, if that test had been verified in 1970; in other words, if -- I think what Mr . Paynter said, when he tested he couldn't see the antigens in the saliva of Mr . Milgaard, it didn't mean he wasn't a secretor, he just didn't have them in that sample. If the testing had been done -- and might $I$ say properly might be too strong a word -- but if another test had been done that confirmed that Mr. Milgaard was an A secretor, presumably you would have put that
before the court?
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A
$Q$

A

Q
A
Q

If $I$ had it at that time, Mr. Hodson.
And that would have been -- would that have been helpful to the Crown's case against Mr. Milgaard? Only in the sense of making him part of a possible donor group as opposed to not part of it the way $I$ understood it at this time.

But let's just take a look at this.
Okay.
What you did at the time was saying, well, the frozen lump indicates it has A antigens and your first reaction was, or maybe -- or the lab people was it must be from a secretor. If you would have known at that time, as we know now, that Mr. Milgaard was a secretor, would that not have given you the ability to say lookit, this is consistent with him?

Yes, it would.
And in fact $I$ can't recall the percentages, I think that it may be 40 percent, or some percentage of people are A secretors?

Uh-huh.
Correct?
Yes.
And so if you would have had that evidence at the
time, would that not have been helpful to the Crown case?

A
$Q$

And certainly if the scientific evidence or opinion at the time had been that the frozen semen was from a group A secretor and that the antigens
in the semen could only be there from a secretor

A
$Q$
as opposed to be from blood -- do you follow? I hope so. Okay. So that in other words, there's A antigens in there, but the advice of either Emson or Paynter is that it must be from an A secretor, and you concluded conclusively that Mr. Milgaard was not an $A$ secretor, that might also be something that mind tend to eliminate him?

Oh, certainly, yeah.
Now, we talked about this a bit earlier, about the evidence that -- just when we talked about

Dr. Emson that you put forward about explaining how it is that, and $I$ think you've agreed with this, that you had to have some evidence to support -- let me back up. In order that Mr . Milgaard would not be eliminated as the donor of the semen, and at the time $I$ think you were under the mistaken assumption that he was a non-secretor, you had to have some evidence that would tend to show how his blood might get in his semen; correct?

I would believe that to be.
Because -- sorry, I didn't mean to cut you off.
I believe that to be so, Mr. Hodson.

Q

A but --
this is where you talk here about the later stage of the testing, he first says there's A antigens, and $I$ think then Mr. Penkala says, okay, but Mr. Milgaard is not a secretor --

Uh-huh.
-- how else could they get in there. Paynter goes back and tests and says okay, well, there's blood in here, or $I$ think what's blood, he said it could be leafy vegetables or something, or leather, but he says $I$ think there's blood in the semen, and if there's blood in the semen, blood has antigens and therefore the reason $I$ found A antigens in the semen might be from Mr. Milgaard's blood and so that it could be from a non-secretor.

Yeah.
And --
Go ahead, sir.
And then you went to try and get some evidence to explain how, to put before the jury to explain how it might be that Mr. Milgaard's blood could be in his semen because you thought you needed to get his antigens in the sample?

That -- I can't honestly confirm that totally,

Q

Q

$$
A
$$

Uh-huh.
And I may have overstated that, but he certainly said that was -- that was an explanation. He in the early '90s backed off of that a bit and I think he told this Inquiry that he was wrong, that it was really quite uncommon for there to be blood in the semen. Do you remember hearing that evidence?

I -- I don't remember, but I'm sure that he said it, sir. I was there when he testified in the Inquiry.

And did you on this issue of trying to sort out, for lack of a better word, how the frozen lumps of snow that Mr. Penkala found either were neutral to or didn't eliminate Mr. Milgaard, was that something that you left to the police and Dr.

Emson or is that something that you participated in trying to sort out?

A
No, I wanted it so-called sorted out for my own benefit and everyone else's. I would have to rely on the police and Dr. Emson to do that because I knew virtually nothing about those areas and $I$ of course didn't want to set up any false evidence of any description. I just had to essentially stand back from that and say please help me with this. Okay. That is all for the opening remarks. I do have just a couple of documents just to identify for the record, if we could call up 007127 , and you do not need to get the paper I don't think for this, Mr. Caldwell. And these are your trial notes and $I$ think there are 109 pages of your notes of trial. Actually, if you want to look at the originals just to confirm, that's quite fine.

If you would like me, $I$ will.
I think your counsel has them. I simply want you to confirm that these are your handwritten trial notes.

These are my --
I think you've got the wrong document. 195, please. Is it 195?

A Yeah, I do, I have 195, but the -- I just want to be careful, sir, about those RCMP numbers in the upper right-hand corner. I have evidently not numbered them as $I$ went through them, so if their math is correct, starting at the end, in my case here it starts at 104 in their numbering system and goes to 195, including that cover sheet that you are looking at there, sir.

Right. And those would be your notes you took during the trial?

A

And then we would also see notes for, your notes of Mr. Tallis' cross-examination; is that fair?

A No doubt, yeah.

And then actually if you can turn to the next
page, please, and this is 007132 , and actually go to the next page.

133?
Yeah. 133 is your notes for Ronald Wilson. The previous page, that I'll go back to, was actually, is on the back page of the previous page; is that right? You've got a photocopy. Perhaps if you get the original.

Thank you.
Let's put them up side by side, please, 007132 on the left, 133 on the right.

Yeah, the 132 is indeed on the back of $131, \mathrm{Mr}$. Hodson.

Okay. So I think you said your practice was to use a binder type --

Yeah.
-- with foolscap in. So are we correct that these questions on the left would have been notes you made for when you were examining Ron Wilson; is that fair?

It looks like it at a glance.
And on the left it says, 'W lied on two questions to R.' I'm assuming that's Wilson lied on two questions to Roberts. One, 'Was was he withholding any evidence? No.' And then, '(that

Nickey had seen it happen).' And two, 'Was he protecting anyone? No.' And you've got '(Nichol John).' Is that what your notes are? That's what they are.

Can you explain what that refers to? Well, it's across the page, as it were, from my notes for examining Wilson in chief. It may have been a reminder to me that that's the evidence as I understood it and make sure that $I$ don't miss that could be one reason.

Would we be correct in saying that this is what Roberts had told you, Inspector Roberts had told you about the two questions that Wilson had lied on in the lie detector?

A
Yeah, that would be where. I would have to get it from there, sir.

So from this, according to this note, was he withholding any evidence and was he protecting anyone, and Wilson answered no to both of those, and Roberts concluded he was lying or being -That's how $I$ read that.

And withholding any evidence, would this bracket be your inference or your conclusion about what he was withholding?

A
Well, it says that Nickey had seen it happen and $I$
assume $I$ may have gotten that from Mr. Roberts; in fact, I assume I did, and the same, sir, with the answer to number 2 there in brackets, but -And then to page 007127, it looks like -- I'm sorry, to 007135.

I have that, sir.
And these would be your notes to assist you in examining Nichol John in chief?

That's right.
And I see, maybe just call this part out, and would the check marks mean that you asked the question and you checked it off?

As I look at it now, I believe that's right. So if we go in order here, 'stuck in U-turn, stuck
again in alley behind funeral home, Ron and Milgaard out for help,' and then you've got 'on and stuck at Danchuk's, to motel for the map'? Yeah, meaning, I take it, moved on and got stuck at Danchuk's.

Right. And you have, 'vice versa in trial, motel first'?

A
$Q$
$Q$

Yes.
And I think at the prelim, I looked at that, and at the prelim Nichol John I think got them mixed up and said that she went to the Danchuks first
and then the motel. Is that what this --

A
$Q$
No doubt that's what it means.
And there's no notes here, Mr. Caldwell, about asking her whether she witnessed a murder, etcetera, and the transcript speaks for itself as to what you did ask her, and I think it was what happened next and then on she went, so $I$ don't think you ever asked her those questions, and I guess from these notes do we take it that you had not intended to ask her that or can you help us out?

Well, $I$ had intended to ask her the evidence concerning her allegedly seeing the murder taking place. Is that what you mean, sir?

Well, would you have simply asked her what happened next? I'm just wondering why there isn't a note in here that says ask her whether she saw David get out of the car and grab -- I know you can't lead her, but something to ask more specific questions about that?

Well, I'll just see if $I$ can find something that would help here.

Q
A
The -- about a third of the way down the page $I$ have, 'to S'toon, stopped girl.'

Q
A
Yeah, and 20s, presumably her age, 'stopped girl instructions,' which would be asking for instructions. 'Stuck in $u$-turn, stuck again in alley behind funeral home, $R$ and Milgaard out for help, on and stuck,' and then '(Danchuk's), to motel for map, to Cadrain's, $R$ \& D changed.' So I think what, the instant you are asking about is of course in that time frame.

Let me just be a bit more specific. In her statement when she goes through she talks about stopping the girl, getting stuck in the alley, Wilson and Milgaard out for help, and in her statement before she talks about going to the motel or to Danchuks, she talks about seeing David Milgaard grab a girl and stab her.

Well, that would come in, to me, clearly right before 'to Cadrain's.' Just give me a minute. Sure.
'On and stuck (Danchuks), to motel for map, to Cadrain's,' the part that was so significant would be right under the underlined 'in alley behind funeral home' that $I$ just, $I$ think, read to you, sir.

Yeah. And my question, Mr. Caldwell, is whether,
and again the transcript of your examination of Nichol John is before the Commission and it speaks for itself. In these notes my question is whether or not these notes can tell us anything as to what you were thinking going into the examination and whether you were even going to ask her those questions.

Oh, I don't think the notes indicate that as I may have done on other things. I certainly intended to ask her the questions and in my mind $I$ would know where it would be in that process, Mr.

Hodson, if that makes any sense at all.
Yeah. I'm just trying to find out if there was a reason you wouldn't have put in here sort of so that you could check it off, those points in her statement, in her May $24 t h$ statement.

A
Not that $I$ can see. I knew where it belonged and in this instance $I$ didn't do my usual routine of line by line and checking it when it was done, but it will be, I'm sure, easily ascertainable where it happened in the evidence of course. Okay.
and that's document 82, and I think these are Mr. Ullrich's notes. Maybe your counsel can give you a copy of that. I'm just wondering if you can take a look at that and tell me what those are?

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$
A
$Q$

A
$Q$
 , That's what they are, my red pencil note at the top, Ullrich notes of evidence at trial.

And it's my understanding that Elmer Ullrich attended the entire trial with you and sat at the prosecutor's table?

Not at the table, but in the audience. Oh, I see, I'm sorry.

Yeah.
And he took notes of the proceedings?
Yeah, absolute -- it says evidence at trial. I assume he took both cross and in chief, sir, which we could readily find out, but that was at my request.

Next if we can go to 007311 , please, and 1 understand that these would have been your notes, typed notes that you prepared to assist you in making the closing address to the jury?

That's right, sir.
And you had earlier mentioned when we were looking at, I think it's your opening remarks, that you would have dictated them every day after trial.

Was that maybe the closing remarks you were -That's what $I$ should have said.

And so I don't propose to go through these, we'll go through parts of the transcript, but $I$ take it you would prepare a draft and we see in some cases you amended and revised?

I expect that happened. I see some underlining and some additions in pen to what had been typed, so --

I just want to call up this first part in your notes. On page 1, Mr. Caldwell, if you take a look on the screen, or if you want to look at the document, and this is sort of the starting part where you talk about Gail Miller and it says:
"It must be inferred that she set off on foot for the bus line on 20 th Street, on either Avenues $P$. or $O .$, and the crown suggests, on the evidence, down Avenue O., proceeding southward on the west side of Avenue O."

Now, I think when we get to the actual transcript of what you said, I think you moved that a block over to $N$ and $O$ and $I I^{\prime}$ just wondering, is this $O$ and $P$ perhaps in error?

A
I think it's just a sheer error, sir.

Okay. If we could then go to 141905 , please -In the --

This -- no, this is just the transcript.
In ?
No, it's not in any of your files.
Okay, very good.
And this is your address to the jury, Mr.
Caldwell, that was prepared, I think, sometime after the fact by a court reporter?

Yeah, C.V. Reporting.
Right. And if you go to the next page, and I'll just go through parts of this with you, and again this is the start of your address to the jury, and, again, you will see the evidence is she left 6:35, 6:45 in the morning.
"It must be inferred that she set off on foot for the bus line on 20 th down either Avenues P --", and you say:
"-- excuse me, Avenues O or Avenue $N$, one or the other. She had to go south
from her residence, and the Crown suggests on the evidence that it was down Avenue $N$ proceeding southward ..."; is that --

That was my best understanding of it.
So Avenue $P$ looks like it was just a mistake? Completely.

And so the Crown theory then was that $I$ think you are saying that she either went down Avenue O or Avenue $N$, but that you suggest or the Crown suggests, on the evidence, that it was down Avenue N?

That's.
Is that --
That's right, sir.
And then you say:
"There is now, Milgaard, Wilson and
Nichol John, the Crown suggests, driving southward on that same avenue ...", which would be Avenue N :
"... overtook her somewhere in the block between 21 st and $20 t h$ Street, likely early in that block, I suggest to you the north end somewhere, and stopped and asked her directions."

Now when I asked this yesterday, Mr. Caldwell, but did you -- here the Crown theory is that she was stopped for directions in the 200 block of Avenue $N$, is that fair, that's the block between

20th and 21st Street?
That would be my understanding.
And then you go on, and I'll go through this with you, --

Okay.
-- but you talk about the car going down, getting stuck doing an U-turn, getting out to push, and then Mr. Milgaard and Mr. Wilson going out to look for help. Did it occur to you or what did you make of the fact that Gail Miller, I think on any viewing of the scene, would -- would be at 20 th Street by the time Mr. Wilson and Mr. Milgaard would have left the car, if $I$ can call it that? I -- I don't think that $I$ computed or calculated that. She was going south along the west side of that avenue that -- and they stopped, and the exchange about asking directions took place, and as I recall the car continued and U-turned at some point and got stuck, putting it very broadly. I -- I -- you can certainly, it would certainly be sensible to think that, all other things, you know, ignored, that she could have got to 20 th Street. That certainly was open to her, if this episode hadn't intervened, which I believe it did. Yeah. And, in fairness, $I$ think that may well
have been raised by -- before the jury, or could have been raised, is that --

A
$Q$
"Now, at this point ...",
and $I$ want to talk about this because $I$ think
we've identified that in -- that Wilson and John
had the vehicle stuck at different places; is
that fair?

A
Q
A
$Q$
A
Q

Q
Okay.
"... and that is something, lady and gentlemen, that you are going to have to sort out, whether you accept one version, accept the other, or possibly accept a combination of the two. But Wilson says they continued south to the intersection of $N$ and $20 t h$ and you remember he ... marked the residence there, as to where they had ... he later ... it to be that intersection and the name he did not know at the time but he
learned the name later. At that, he says they turned in the intersection and made what $I$ would call three-quarters of a U-turn, ending up facing eastward, as I understand it, and that it was at this point, with the car facing eastward, that he and Milgaard left the car, going in opposite directions looking for help, with Milgaard, as I understood the evidence, going back in the direction of the girl and Wilson going in another direction."

And:
"The Crown suggests this other direction was either east or west on $20 t h$ Street ..."

So, according to Wilson's version, he says Milgaard would have gone back towards the girl. And my earlier question, Mr. Caldwell; would she not have already been at 20 th Street, or the bus stop, or whatever?

Well that would -- I'm sorry -- that would certainly be arguable. I don't know that $I$ turned my attention to it in view of what $I$ thought were fairly well-established facts, but that's service
certainly arguable, Mr. Hodson.
Well if --
If she, for instance, had continued on to $20 t h$
Street and got on the bus, this whole thing
presumably wouldn't have occurred, among -- an
extreme example.
But did you ever look at that and say, 'okay, can
-- does Wilson and John's version of events make
sense'? In other words if both of their versions,
one Wilson says they are stuck at the intersection
of what $I$ think is $20 t h$, --
Right.
-- Nichol John says they actually come back a bit
further and get stuck going up the incline of the
alley, --
Uh-huh.
-- and we have seen the map on many occasions, but
if a look at that map and a look at where Gail
Miller would have been, if it was Gail Miller they
were talking to on that street, that by the time,
under either scenario, whether it's Wilson's or
Johns', by the time Mr. Milgaard leaves the car to
go look for help, under either scenario, I suspect
that we will hear others say that she had to be on
$20 t h$ Street?

A
minds of the police or the prosecutor as to possible explanations?

A
Well if -- to go back just one notch, sir, I didn't attach any, you know, grave significance to the difference in John and Wilson's estimates of how and where the car had ended up. I didn't think, essentially, anything turned on that for the usual reasons of two different people remembering one state of affairs. Now I can -- certainly, there is
a -- had she kept on at the same pace, she could have reached $20 t h$ Street and somehow or other left by bus or foot, there is no -- and that discounts even running as a possibility. I -- I don't know that I came up with any -- certainly nothing that made me think it couldn't happen this way, as it were, the -What if a police officer would have come in to you just prior to the trial and said, "lookit, I went at the north end of that block in the 200 block of Avenue $N$--"

A
Q

Well it would be a -- I don't know that, even if I
totally believed their honesty and time and measurements, etcetera, if $I$ could then say, "based on that, $I$ disbelieve the Crown witnesses that $I$ had".
I think there, as you know,
there was a very, I guess, scientific examination done by Mr. -- the gentleman who does crime scenes who originally was from Saskatoon, and there was a short film made about that $I$ believe, --

A

A
Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
I'm sure that's the case, Mr. Hodson.

And I'm trying to say, if it would have been, can we try and figure out what you might have done with it. And so let's just go back -Okay.
-- to the scenario where you are presented with something by the police or you come up with it on your own --

Okay.
-- and say "this just doesn't sit, fit quite right, because by the time Mr. Milgaard got out of the car, unless Gail Miller stopped and went back the other way", which I think you've said is a possibility, --

Uh-huh, yup.
-- "if she continued on to the bus stop then, by the time Mr. Milgaard got out, she'd be on $20 t h$ Street, and that if he went back the other way he wouldn't have -- wouldn't have seen her".

Yeah.
And I'm wondering if that's something, would you just say, "well that's something for the jury to deal with, let Mr. Tallis raise it if that's an issue", --

Okay.

Q

Number 1, I don't believe I considered it. Now, going on to the other possibilities, I would be re -- I would be, let's say, I think reluctant to substitute the hypothetical situation done by two or three policeman, however capable, or civilians which would indicate this thing couldn't happen. In one form or another of course, Mr. Hodson, it did happen, and clearly not the way we thought it did or $I$ thought it did at the time, but that was the evidence $I$ had to work with at that time. It would be very difficult, $I$ would think, if -- just to -- but what $I$ would do there I'm not sure. But would it be something, Mr. Caldwell, that you would say "fine, that's a point much like the coat"?

Uh-huh.
"It's unexplained, let the jury decide, and if the jury or if Mr. Tallis raises it, if the jury raises it, it may well be a factor that causes them not to believe the evidence of either Nichol John or Ron Wilson"; is that correct?

That would be a fair way of dealing with it. I don't recall if $I$ did that but that will be clear.

And that -- and maybe you've answered this when you talked about the police officers -- as a prosecutor, though -- and, again, just assume that this fact is brought to your attention either on your own or elsewhere that the timing of this thing, if you presume that Gail Miller continues to walk --

Uh-huh.
-- to $20 t h$ Street, that she's going to be there by the time that Mr. Milgaard goes to look out -- if we presume that that's brought to your attention, as a prosecutor, would you at the time have said "well, that's fine, that's -- those are the facts and that will be something for the jury to deal with"?

Well --
As opposed to "I'd better not run the charge"? Yeah. It wouldn't be the latter, and if that were put into evidence it would be legitimate to say "that is something the jury will be able to deal with because they have now heard another theory based on the evidence", as $I$ would put it.
Okay.

A
$Q$ Umm - -

No, that's fine.

A Yeah, thank you, sir.

Q
In we can just go on to finish up, here, this is again your comments on Wilson's evidence that he came back to the car and you talk about him, Milgaard, making the statement that he had fixed her. Then you go on to say:
"Now according to Nichol John the car got to what we, I submit, must presume to be this intersection, ...",

I think you are probably referring to a map: "... made a $U$-turn, became stuck, got unstuck again, went over to the garage in the opposite direction the girl was going, and $I$ would suggest this is somewhere along here facing north on the ... Of $N$, and then made a turn into an alley behind what she now knows to be the funeral home as $I$ understand her to say, that she recognizes the street, but at that time she didn't know it to be a funeral home -- now it is clear that this is the funeral home 1402-20th Street, Westward Funeral Chapel -- and became stuck on an incline going into the alley.
Now, whichever version of that
episode which you choose to accept, lady
and gentlemen -- and as I have said
already, you may accept something by way
of a compromise -- but assuming you
accept one or the other, I suggest that
it is absolutely inescapable that that
car was stuck in the very block from
which they had stopped the girl for
directions and stuck in a position which
would put her approaching the car at a
time when Milgaard left the car looking
for help."

And I guess that's the comment that $I$ was just referring to earlier.

A Okay.

That you put the car:
"... in a position which would put her approaching the car at a time when Milgaard left the car looking for help." Now there is a third thing, there, I could have said, which is "you may dis --", you know, "not accept either of these pieces of evidence", of course.

And would that be something that you would expect

Mr. Tallis to raise or would you?
A
Well, $I$ wouldn't, I wouldn't. He might well raise it, $I$ might raise it without it being a negative reflection on anyone, $I$ would think, if $I$ had done
that. Because you can obviously take one of the theories, another of the theories, and a third, being 'I simply don't accept any of that timing and' --

Right.
A
$Q$

Yeah.
And was it the Crown's position then, lookit, we don't know exactly where the vehicle was, --

A
$Q$

A
Q Yeah.
-- but by one or both it was in the vicinity?
That would be the best $I$ could put it, Mr. Hodson.

And that, in my view, was based on the evidence that went in at the trial.

And then if we can go to the next page, please. And then it says:
"... the Crown suggests that you may
well infer that this attack on the deceased, which the Crown says was made by the accused Milgaard and him alone, began as an attempted purse snatch."

And so, here, you are telling the jury that, lookit, our Crown theory is that he did this and he did this alone?

A That's right.
$Q$
And was that -- was there any reason for that, Mr. Caldwell?

Well, because there was no evidence that he had any assistance or -- in and with that happening. Were you concerned that if Mr. Wilson or Ms. John were part of the offence, i.e. part of the purse snatch, that Chief Justice Bence might have to caution the jury that, as accomplices, Wilson and John's evidence ought to be afforded less weight? That, that could be, and I'm -- I'm -- first of all, the evidence that $I$ or we had was that the accused, Mr. Milgaard, did that act on his own
and -- oh, yes, $I$ know there have been discussions earlier of possible accomplices. If, indeed, there was evidence to support it -- and I guess I stress that -- the Chief Justice may well have said, "but you take Wilson and John's evidence carefully because in my view they are, one or both are accomplices".

Now I didn't think Mr. Hodson, with deference, that there was any evidence of that, certainly at this juncture. I know, I realize there were discussions earlier that we've gone over before.

Sure.
Does that --
Yes, that's fine.
Okay.
And then you say:
"The Crown invites you to infer that
this attempt was met ...",
or sorry, so it began as an attempted purse snatch, so the Crown theory was that the purse snatching was the start of the crime?

A
Right.
And:
"The Crown invites you to infer that
this attempt was met with resistance on the part of the deceased, after which the accused produced the knife which Wilson said he had in his, the accused's, possession between Regina and Saskatoon, and commenced to menace the girl with the knife, and either leading her or chasing her westward in the alley behind the funeral home, turning the corner and going northward in the north-south of the $T-a l l e y$ where he finally attacked and killed her at the place where the body was found, where the snow was trampled and where her last desperate struggle took place, of course, bare-handed against the accused and his knife, and that point, you will recall ..."
and he goes on to $P-1$.

A

Q

A
That would be the Crown's theory and, of course, part of what $I$ am saying there would depend on inference by the jury.

Right.

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

Yeah.

Which, in a case of circumstantial evidence, is the --

Is the only way to do it if --

Okay.

And as -- there's certainly strict rules about applying that but many murders, of course, there is no eyewitness because the one and only witness is deceased, so that would be the way $I$ meant that, Mr. Hodson.

And then you carry on:
"Now from the finding of the spermatozoa in her vagina and on her panties, as well as on the frozen lump in the snow in the area where the body was found, which, of course, contained human spermatozoa the crown invites you to infer that what started out as a simple matter of a purse snatch turned into a wilful murder and a rape on the person of the deceased as she was either unconscious or dead at the time, and you will recall the evidence by Dr. Emson, testifying on that part of it."

So was that the Crown theory, that the rape took place while she was either unconscious or dead? Well, I've said here:
"-- turned into a wilful murder and a rape on the person of the deceased as she was either unconscious or dead --", so that was the Crown theory at that juncture. And if we can scroll down:
"Now the Crown's theory of the offence is that Milgaard then took the purse of the deceased, searching through it hurriedly as he went back towards the car behind the funeral home, heading south again or in this alley, or at the intersection here, if you prefer this may have taken place, and throwing out the items of obviously no value, the scissors, the comb ...", etcetera, and then scroll down, and:
"... deposited that purse in the trash can behind 1414-20th Street West. And at this point then returning to the car, whether the car is in the alley behind the funeral home or at the intersection, whichever you believe, with the wallet
and the cosmetic bag out of sight on his person, either in pockets or under his coat, to await a chance for a more leisurely search of this item at a safer distance from the scene of the murder."

A
Q

A

Q
A
Q
A
Q
A
Q

A

Yeah.
And if $I$ can pause there, the Crown theory would be that after the rape and murder he would have grabbed the purse, thrown out the items of no value, taken out the wallet and the compact, put the purse in the garbage can, and take the wallet and compact in his coat so he could check it later?

That would be the Crown theory.
Mr. Hodson, just as a matter of
interest, $I$ did mention both possible locales of the car being stuck just in that paragraph.

Oh, right, yes.
Yeah.
I'm sorry, and I may have --
No, no, you did mention that, but I --
Right.
Yeah.
So that you are saying in either case?
Whichever they choose, if either.
$\begin{array}{ll}\mathbf{Q} & \text { And -- } \\ \text { A } & \text { It's -- }\end{array}$
Yeah, and then you go on to talk about the throwing of the knife handle, and if you could scroll down to the bottom. You say:
"Now the Crown also suggests that the figure which Mr. Diewald, the caretaker at St. Mary's Church, saw pass in front of the vehicle's headlights twice at approximately 7:00 to 7:10 a.m. that morning, may well have been the accused passing in front of the car which was stalled -- according to Nichol John's evidence, just at the entrance to the alley, but which Diewald estimated to be stopped approximately at the intersection of the alleys. he said there was a vehicle there and he could see the headlights --",
etcetera. Now I note there, when you talk about Diewold, my read of that, and you say "it may well have been the accused passing", are you a little less --

A
Well as I, without quoting the evidence, as I recall this is he is on Avenue $O$, as $I$ understand
it, the vehicle is, as $I$ understand it, east of the north-south $T$ alley, and the headlights are facing Mr. Diewold, and $I$ think there was clear evidence that there was something like ice fog or mist very heavily that -- which is why I -But might $I$ suggest there might have been two, two concerns to the Crown theory with Mr. Diewold's evidence, one is that -- and I think he placed the vehicle right at the $T,--$

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
okay.
Right?
Yes.
Correct? And secondly he said, well you say 7:00
to 7:10, that if that was the vehicle Mr. Diewold
saw, then that might be getting -- and that was
Mr. Milgaard's vehicle -- that might be getting a
little tight for the time frame --
Yeah.
-- when Mr. Milgaard was seen by Mr. Rasmussen?
I would think it would be the former, the question
of location. And again, sir, $I$ was reluctant to urge on anyone the precision of estimates of time by people under these conditions, without being facetious.

No, and I appreciate that.
Yeah.
And my question is, though, and it may have just been the choice of words you used at the time, but in describing some of the other theories of the Crown you are saying "the Crown theory is that this happened"?

Yeah.
When we get to Mr. Diewold you say that "at
approximately 7:00 to 7:10 that morning the person he saw pass in front of the vehicle may well have been the accused"?

A
$Q$

A
Yeah.
As opposed to "the Crown theory is that he saw Mr. Milgaard pass in front of the vehicle". And I'm just wondering, maybe there is no significance in those words, but I'm wondering whether the Crown theory on Mr. Diewold might have been somewhat less than certainty that that's what he saw? Oh, well that's, yeah, I would ascribe to that, because $I$ didn't think there was any, you know,
precision in what he could have seen from there, with no reflection on him, simply because of the weather and physical conditions. And I think that may well have been -- Mr. Milgaard, of course, was the -- if you will, a better interpretation for him, Mr. Milgaard, than urging that it was, when the evidence didn't, you know, firmly put -- put that to be the case.

If we can go to the next page, please. Umm, no, actually, sorry, the -- back one previous. And then you go on to talk about, you say:
"Now when we look ... it doesn't look like ...",
you must be pointing to the map:
"... like such a distance; here is the scene, here is St. Mary's Church ...", and you are talking about the Trav-a-leer Motel: "... two blocks up this way and straight up 22 nd, brings you to the Travaleer Motel ..."

So I take it what you were showing is how the Milgaard vehicle got up, from the murder scene up two blocks to 22 nd Street and then up $22 n$ d to the Trav-a-leer?

A
In accordance with the evidence as $I$ understand it
to be.
Q
Yes. And then:
"Now the Crown suggests that was the next order of business, that is where Mr. Rasmussen said they were sometime shortly after 7:00 a.m. and obtained a map."

And I guess I'm just back to my question on Mr. Diewold. If it was 7:10 a.m. that he may have seen Mr. Milgaard pass in front of the vehicle, I'm not sure that that fits as well with Mr. Rasmussen, does it?

Umm, well presumably it should have been ten minutes later, is that the thought, or -No, I'm -- my suggestion, my question is in the Crown theory to the jury you have Mr. Diewold, who sees a vehicle in the alley where the body was found, 7:00 to 7:10 a.m., and Mr. Rasmussen who you say saw Mr. Milgaard shortly after 7:00?

And if -- and I appreciate your point on the precision of time -Okay, very good. -- but if they were both correct on the time, Mr. Milgaard can't be in both places?

A
Q
A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q
A
.
-- because that didn't -- the -- there is no evidence of that, in a word. Okay.

MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, if I could, I don't have the transcript in front of me, but somewhere $I$ recall seeing a notation that Mr. Rasmussen's evidence was that it could have been as late as 7:30 that he got to the motel. I recognize that the Crown here is saying 7:00 but I think the evidence perhaps put the time frame broader than he actually reflected in his closing address to the jury.

MR. HODSON: I think the evidence was 'could have been as late as 7:30' and we'll see, in Mr. Bence's charge to the jury, he said 7:10.

A
$Q$
A
Q

Q
BY MR. HODSON:
We'll look at it.
Yeah.
In his charge to the jury he says between 6:45 and 7:10 a.m.

Okay.
And there is evidence on Mr. Rasmussen, it's anywhere from shortly after 7:00, and 1 think when he was examined by Mr. Tallis it was as late as 7:30.

A Okay, well that's, I'm glad that point was raised, and perhaps in due course we can find it.

Q

A

Q
That's -- that's right.

And then the next page, you again talk about the toque, the blood-stained toque:
"... invites you to infer that on his way into Cadrain's he discarded ... the bloodstained toque right next door at 330 -- ... Mrs. Gerse's house and right next door to Cadrain's -- having used it to wipe the blood from ... his clothes."

So, again, that would be part of the Crown theory?

And I'll get to that later, and I'm not sure what the record shows on that point, but in his charge to the jury he addresses that.
a glass of water instead of going into the bathroom.

Okay.
-- in the instructions to the jury or the charge to the jury Chief Justice Bence, I think, corrected this point and indicated that $I$ think his view of the evidenced was that he went and got

A

Q
Scroll down. Go to the next page, 141916, and then you talk about changing the bloody clothes and saying:
"So during which trip he undoubtedly disposes of that bloody jacket and pants in some manner or another because, you will recall that there is no evidence of either of those items ever being seen again by anyone."

Now if we can scroll down, it looks here that you then turn to anticipating something about what Mr. Tallis might say and you say:
"And $I$ think he may suggest to you that Cadrain and Wilson were mistaken or lying, as the case may be, when they say they saw blood on Milgaard's clothing at the Cadrain house, on the basis that none of the witnesses who saw Milgaard after they left the vicinity of the murder and before they arrived at Cadrain's have testified that they saw blood, and $I$ would like to examine that proposition with you now if I might."

Then you go on to talk about Mr. Rasmussen only
having a short time to take a look at the Milgaards -- and then scroll down. I don't propose to go through all of this, but you are pointing out that one explanation as to why the Danchuks maybe didn't see blood is that they weren't looking specifically for it. Do you see that?

Where is that now, Mr. Hodson? If you could scroll down, it says:
"My learned friend asked Walter, "You had an opportunity to see the front?" Referring to Milgaard's clothing, and he replied, "Yes."

And maybe go on to the next page.
Yeah, there's a comment, I presume Mr. Danchuk, I never really looked that close, if I'm reading that correctly, carrying over from the last page. If we can just maybe go down to the bottom of page 13, this might better summarize it.

Okay.
"Now let me suggest, lady and gentlemen, that there is -- the simply statement, "I didn't see any blood" can mean very different things depending on the surrounding circumstances. It is one
thing to say, "I took a careful look at the clothing for blood and I didn't see blood." In that case there is very strong evidence that there was no blood. Now it is quite another thing, I suggest, to say, "I didn't see blood, but $I$ never really looked that close", or "I didn't see blood but I wasn't paying that much attention to the clothes." What $I$ am suggesting about the Danchuks' evidence is that while their evidence clearly is that they did not see any blood, you may well conclude that they did not direct their attention closely to the accused and his companions, and you may very well
conclude from the evidence of Cadrain
and Ron Wilson, that the blood was actually on Milgaard's clothing when he was at Danchuk's, and that the Danchuks simply did not notice it."

A Yeah, I see that.

Q So that would be your position or your explanation as to why the Danchuks didn't see any blood?

Yeah. Just asking them to, you know, consider all
those two or three different approaches.
MR. HODSON: Mr. Commissioner, I'm not sure, what $I$ might suggest is if we instead of taking a break, if we go to, and I'm not going to get done with Mr. Caldwell, but maybe go for another 10,15 minutes, until three o'clock, and call it a day, or do you want to have a break? COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I think I would like a break. I don't know about anybody else. MR. HODSON: That's fine. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: We'll come back at three.
(Adjourned at 2:48 p.m.)
(Reconvened at 3:02 p.m.)
BY MR. HODSON:
Q
I'll go back to 141919 of the address to the jury, just at the bottom there. So this is just carrying on with your address to the jury, Mr. Caldwell, and here you tell the jury:
"Now the Crown suggests there are other things which happened that day which logically point to the accused of the killer of the young woman. There is the fact that Cadrain said that Milgaard wanted to go to Edmonton right way when
he showed up at Cadrain's house, and that the accused, according to Cadrain, was anxious to have the car radio fixed at the second Texaco station by having the aerial put on ... this might indicate to you an anxiety to listen to the news broadcast."

So again, we've heard about this, but Mr.
Milgaard's behaviour that day in Saskatoon, the Crown was saying lookit, that suggests he was trying to get away from something; is that fair?

A
$Q$

You can certainly make those inferences.
And then scroll down:
"A further point of evidence which the Crown suggests points squarely at the accused and him only as the person who attacked and killed the girl was this episode with the cosmetic bag and compact case which occurred in Wilson's car not long after they left Saskatoon. Now the evidence is clear, they didn't belong to Nichol John, the only female in the party. Ron Wilson testified that they were not in his car when the party reached Saskatoon that same morning.

Now, upon the girl, Nichol John, holding up this compact and asking whose it was, there was no reply, but the accused who, if you remember, was driving the car at this stage, snatched the item and threw it out the car window without comment. Now I think, lady and gentlemen that this must be a classic example of actions speaking louder than words. For the accused, driving a car on an open highway -- that a person would have taken his attention off his driving long enough to reach and grab the item, throw it out the window right then, may indicate to you that he regarded it as pressing business to get rid of that cosmetic bag, and right now. No explanation, no nothing."

So I take it the cosmetic bag again was part of the Crown theory that linked Mr. Milgaard -- I think the Crown's position was that it was Nichol John's cosmetic bag even though it wasn't found, that was the inference?

A Yes, sir.

And you referenced the fact that it wasn't there
the morning of the murder when Mr. Wilson looked?

A
Q

A
Q

A

A
$Q$

A
Q
In fact, if we go onto this next paragraph, you say:
"Now you remember that Nichol John said purse in a garbage can which was not the one that was thrown out.

Okay. Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv
that the items she found in the glove compartment was a cosmetic bag containing a face powder compact, eye shadow and a tube of lipstick. Now I suggest that it is absolutely clear that this cosmetic bag must have belonged to Gail Miller and must have been taken from her purse by Milgaard, because, you will recall the evidence of Nichol John, it wasn't hers, she had not seen it before. The evidence of Wilson, who owned the car and should be in a position to know, said he knew nothing of the cosmetic bag and contents and it was not in his car when they left Regina. And the evidence of Albert Cadrain that he had never seen the items before. Now, these three and Milgaard, remember, were the only occupants of that car."

So again $I$ think the position of the Crown was that by inference it must have been hers based on those facts suggested there; is that correct?

A That's correct.

And then you anticipate what Mr. Tallis is going
to say:
"I expect my learned friend may suggest
to you that since the items found in the
car by Nichol John included some
duplication -- which they did -- with
the items found from the purse ..."

And then you go on to describe in a fair bit of detail, which $I$ will not do -- maybe go to the full page -- about the various items of make-up in the purse, and $I$ think the point that you are trying to make here to the jury is that inside Gail Miller's purse that was found in the garbage can there was lots of duplication; in other words, she carried more than one, I think, tube of lipstick, etcetera, and that that was your explanation that she could have had more than one cosmetic bag because she had more than one of other pieces of make-up. Is that a fair summary? A It is, sir.

Next page, and in fact you point out here:
"... bear in mind that there was no
duplication between the compact with its powder, the one in the car, and the
items found in the purse, so what $I$ am
suggesting is that it cannot be argued
that the fact that there is duplication between the stuff found in the car and the stuff found in the purse rules out the purse as the source of the items found in the car."

And again, you just ask the jury to keep that in mind.

A
That was another part of my, the Crown's theory, if you will.

And if we can go ahead to page 141925, please, you go on to talk about some credibility issues, you say:
"Now His Lordship will be telling you what effect Ron Wilson's ready admission of his criminal convictions and Cadrain's of his one conviction ... for vagrancy at Regina, at the end of the trip, should have when you are assessing their credibility. Suffice it for me to say that it is obviously perfectly
possible for persons with criminal
records to be honest and truthful
witnesses; as it is equally possible for persons without such records to be dishonest witnesses. And it would only
be if a person with such a record, if asked about his convictions denied them under oath and they were proven, that they would detract from his credibility."

You go on to say:
"Now in the case of the witnesses Wilson
and Cadrain $I$ have no hesitancy in
asking you to accept the evidence they gave on the stand. In the case of Nichol John, I submit there are compelling reasons to accept the first part of her evidence about leaving Regina and coming to Saskatoon, indeed, all the evidence up to and including the point where they stopped and spoke to the girl, and the last part of her evidence right after they left the vicinity after the body was found and including the evidence of going to a motel, to Danchuk's, to Cadrains's, the cosmetic case episode and so forth. But I want you to consider very carefully my contention that when she was examined as to the events from the time just after
they stopped the girl and asked for directions up until they arrived at the motel -- and this, of course, is the heart of the whole episode -- that Miss John, in my submission, was telling you less than the truth as she knew it to be for that full part of her evidence.

Now in assessing her
credibility as to this part of the episode you are entitled to take into account the answers she gave, after being declared adverse, to the questions concerning the statement she gave Sergeant Raymond Mackie on May 24 th, 1969. You will recall the kind of very unsatisfactory evidence she gave then, before being declared adverse, and certainly after being declared adverse being unable to remember some things at all. She had the accused get back in the car when at that ... he had never left it. That's her evidence. She didn't know how they got unstuck twice and so on, and the particularly incredible suggestion that she, last
week, here in this courtroom, could not remember whether the accused had called the girl "the stupid bitch" after he spoke to her. She could not remember whether she had seen Dave in the alley taking hold of the girl he spoke to; or could not remember whether she had seen him grab her purse; could not remember whether she had seen the girl grab for her purse again; could not remember whether she had seen the accused reach into his pocket and pull out the knife; or whether she had seen him stabbing with the knife; and whether she had seen him taking her around the corner of the alley.

Now I invite you -- in fact, she never even remembered telling Sergeant Mackie that she seemed to recall running down the street and the next thing she knew she was in her seat, back in the car. Now, one of the ... of the jury system is that you are entitled to come together and use your common sense and experience in the world to
decide things, and $I$ ask you to decide whether a person, if they had seen such events as she evidently once said, could ever forget them. It seems to me that they would be engraved on her mind. Now His Lordship has already told you the only use to which you can put the answers to those questions, and he will undoubtedly be repeating that you can only use the answers she gave me to those questions to assess her credibility, or truthfulness. That is the use I ask you to put those questions and answers to, and I suggest you will be driven to the conclusion that when she was giving her evidence here in chief, she was not telling the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth about this vital part of the whole incident, while she could recall in detail events happening both before and after that vital scene of the episode.

Now I suspect my learned friend will suggest --"

Let me just pause there. So that is your
summation on the Nichol John evidence that I've read, Mr. Caldwell, that that would be a fair -and that's the Crown position you put to the jury of Nichol John?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q
A

Q
A

Absolutely.
And I think it's clear from that that you are telling the jury don't believe Nichol John about she's saying she can't remember the vital parts of the episode?

That's -- yes, that's right.
And the inference is if that -- if you find that she's not telling the truth when she says I can't recall, that the version of events would be the version in her statement; is that fair, being the post-polygraph statement?

Yes. It was limited to credibility and I noticed that in the initial part of dealing with her, $I$ didn't go into the heart of that statement as it were.

Right.
And -- but it would be -- I'm urging him to take her performance on that $9(2)$ as evidence that they shouldn't, you know, rely on her for -Right. Let me put it this way -I'm sorry.

Q
-- what you are saying, Mr. Caldwell, is don't believe her, jury, when she says she can't remember; she can remember, it's engraved in her mind, the inference being then she must remember that which she had put in her statement; is that --

That's certainly how $I$ see it.
And then you talk about Ron Wilson:
"Now I suspect my learned friend will suggest that there are parts of the evidence of Ron Wilson that you should not believe and I want to make some observations about that and I am sure His Lordship will be telling you the proper use which you can make of the admissions by Wilson of his criminal record in assessing his credibility. But briefly, I suggest that the frank admission of all the convictions that my learned friend asked him about, indeed, supports his credibility rather than detracting from it since he told the truth when asked about the convictions, and $I$ want to go on and say that if it should be suggested that Wilson, for
some unknown reason, is out to get his
friend Milgaard, $I$ would certainly think
that he could have done a more
workmanlike job of that in his
testimony, if that were his intention.
Wilson, for instance, says that
Milgaard's remarks upon arriving at the car were "I fixed her", or something to that effect. It seems to me that surely if Wilson was out to get Milgaard and frame him, he could have quoted the accused as saying he stabbed or killed the girl, which certainly would have been more damning language on the part of Wilson as against the accused. Then there is the matter of the accused volunteering the information to Wilson in the bus depot in Calgary ... that he had a girl, or got a girl in Saskatoon, that he had put a purse in the trash can and he thought she would be all right.

Now again, it would seem to me that Wilson would have made this a lot worse if this were a matter of him ... trying to get the accused. But the really
fascinating thing about that statement came when His Lordship asked Wilson whether he ... followed this submission by Milgaard up by questioning him about
it. And do you remember what Wilson said here? He said to His Lordship, "I didn't believe him." Now it certainly seems to me that is not the testimony of a person ... on shifting the blame to an innocent party. If such were the case you would quite expect Wilson to say, "it's a thing he would do." But what was his reply? -- "I didn't believe him."

There are certainly no signs of hard feelings between Milgaard and Wilson; they left Regina together and even returned to Wilson's house for a few days after the trip and, evidently, still as friends. I submit to you that by his demeanour in the witness stand, Wilson showed no animosity towards the accused and $I$ feel that when you review his evidence against the other facts which are now proven to you
independently of his evidence, you may very well conclude that he gave a very fair and accurate account of what he knew ... this whole situation. I don't think the fact that he said ... whether he was testifying on the ... January '69, that it was two or two and a half blocks, and now he thinks that it was five blocks and four minutes ... six minutes. I don't think these kinds of things are going to be such as to influence you to decide that you cannot believe anything he said here." If I can pause there. It sounds, Mr. Caldwell, were you anticipating Mr. Tallis' argument that Mr. Wilson was lying and trying to frame Milgaard or can you explain what would have prompted these remarks?

A
It would be in the anticipation that Mr. Tallis might very well do that as being a promising attack on Wilson who, you know, had to be somehow discredited, $I$ would say, in the process. I suspect that $I$ saw that coming not through anything that happened with Mr. Tallis, but just through my knowledge of his abilities.

Then you go on to say, "Now Wilson stood up -scroll down, please.
"Now Wilson stood up to a very thorough and capable cross-examination by my learned friend. During this he readily admitted, as I said -- which would be evident anyway -- that at first he had withheld what he knew of this episode from the investigators during the earlier stages of the investigation, that being, you remember, when he was interviewed by Inspector Ruddell, in

Regina. He admitted he told Ruddell that nobody in the car had anything to do with the murder. He said that he did not give Inspector Ruddell everything he knew."

If $I$ can pause there. So it appears, Mr.
Caldwell, that you in fact raised with the jury Ron Wilson's first statement to Inspector Riddell where he denied everything?

I did that, sir, that's what that is.
Right. And can you explain why you would have put that before the jury?

Well, because $I$ felt that Wilson was untruthful
with Inspector Riddell and as the investigation went on became, by increments, more truthful. The second -- the first city police statement $I$ would have thought was untruthful, the post-polygraph statement $I$ thought was truthful, and I -- I'm just reviewing that because the statement he gave Inspector Riddell just absolutely couldn't be correct based on known facts $I$ would say. Do you recall, Mr. Caldwell, $I$ think when we were, when Ron Wilson was testifying, accusations made against you by Ron Wilson and others that you had not provided Inspector Riddell's statement to Mr. Tallis? Do you remember hearing about that? I believe I do.

And $I$ will call them up at a later point, but -and $I$ think we've seen evidence that you gave the statement to Mr. Tallis and it appears that you also raised the statements before the jury; is that --

Yeah, that's right. In one of those letters it's clearly set out that $I$ sent the Riddell statements.

And were you trying to, at this point, or was your effort to anticipate that Mr. Tallis may bring up the first statement and trying to say to the jury
here's the Crown theory, the first statement where he denied it he was covering up or he wasn't giving everything?

A

Yeah. By this stage, Mr. Hodson, it would be clear that Mr . Tallis would be going last because he didn't call evidence, so $I$ was trying to anticipate things he very well may say that would be good arguments and you don't get a chance, as it were, to come back and correct those after the defence addressed, all things being equal, so that's what $I$ was trying to do.

And you say again that Wilson:
"He said he did not give Inspector
Ruddell everything he knew. He said he continued this attitude when later interviewed by Detective Karst, in fact, he persisted in that attitude until May 22 nd or 3 rd when, according to the evidence, he had this long interview with the policeman at the Cavalier Hotel in Saskatoon."

I presume that's Roberts? That's right.
"He said he continued to deny that any of his party were in any way to blame
for the death till he came to Saskatoon, telling part of the true story for the first time ever on May $22 n d$, in Regina, as $I$ recall his evidence, and the rest of it in Saskatoon on the 23rd or 24 th and you will remember that was the time he was interviewed by the policeman in the Cavalier."

That's what $I$ was -- I didn't have -- that's the sequence $I$ was referring to, Mr. Hodson, but not that --

Right. So you were putting forward to the jury saying lookit, initially he gave a statement to Inspector Riddell of the RCMP where he denied that Mr. Milgaard was involved, and then after some lengthy interviews with the police he gave what you believed to be the truthful statement? That's correct.

You then say:
"Now my learned friend was kind enough to treat us to some very interesting evidence about the effects of various drugs these youths apparently had taken, L.S.D., and so on. But $I$ ask you to remember that the sworn and
uncontradicted evidence is that neither Wilson or Nichol John was under the effects of L.S.D., drugs, or anything of this sort, during that trip to Saskatoon, while they were in Saskatoon, and nor was Ron Wilson under the effects of any of these things when Milgaard made the admission of this in Calgary, nor was he under the affects of these things when he finally gave his first truthful account of the matter to the police around May 22 nd and $23 r d$, and that is sworn evidence."

And I think Mr. Tallis had in fact asked
Mr. Wilson about those questions?
Yes, I think so, sir, yes.
And then you go on to say:
"Now if Wilson were out to get Milgaard,
I must say $I$ would have expected him to say there was blood on the shirt, as well as the pants, in order to strengthen what Albert Cadrain said, but no, Wilson only testified to seeing the blood on the pants. In other evidence Wilson was asked when he noticed the rip
in the accused's pants and he said he was not sure if he saw them ripped at his place in Regina, before the trip, or for the first time at Cadrain's. He certainly had an opportunity at that time to say that they had not been ripped prior to reaching Saskatoon and thereby leaving you with the suggestion that they were ripped in Saskatoon, and thereby pointing at Milgaard as the person involved in the attack on Gail Miller."

And then down at the bottom -- and I take it, there, what you are saying, Mr. Caldwell, that, lookit, if Mr. Wilson was going to frame him he could have said a lot worse things; is that --

A
$Q$
And then he goes on, or you go on to talk about evidence from the Regina City Police Department. Pardon me. You say:
"Now my learned friend ...", being Mr. Tallis:
"... has also brought out some
interesting evidence about what the Regina City Police Department offers to prospective informants in drug cases and has gone into the business of Nichol John being kept in the cell the night before she gave the statement to Raymond Mackie. I suppose he may suggest that as a result of this unchivalrous treatment that the statement she gave on the 24 th may have been obtained by duress, or whatever he ... Now I think we should pause right here and say ...", and then you go on to talk about the work of the police investigation. So it appears you would have addressed this issue to the jury about Nichol John being in the police cells --

A Yeah. -- and her statement being under duress? That's right.

And you are trying to discount that as a possibility?

A
That's right. I'm sure there was evidence that she was in the cells, in effect, at her own request and for her own protection, if $I$ haven't got that transposed somehow. I'm sure that was a

Q But certainly by this remark, and it comes from you, --

A
Q

A
Q

A

Q
And then you go on to talk, to the bottom of the page, about Albert Cadrain's trip to Regina, and I don't propose to go through that, I think it tracks the evidence. And the next page. And then, again, you go back to Wilson, saying: "Now you recall, I think $I$ have already mentioned another ... thing and this is that Wilson said he deliberately held back a lot of what he knew about the murder when the policemen initially saw him and only telling the true story fully for the first time on May 22 nd or 23rd, and this is getting on towards
four months after the murder."
And so, again, you've brought up, again, the fact that Mr. Wilson had initially -- well, you say he held back a lot of information on his first statement; is that fair?

That's right.
If we can go to the next page. You go on, and I won't go through this in detail, but Dr. Emson's evidence about intercourse having taken place, and I think you say here that:
"... it would put it back somewhere in
the vicinity of 8:00 or 9:00 that
morning ..."
and I think that, sort of a very general -- I
think Dr. Emson's evidence was a range that included that time frame.

A
$Q$

A
Yeah.
And then goes on to say that:
"... coincides very closely ... with the
Crown's position that this event
happened between roughly 7:00 and 8:00
in the morning."
Then you go on -- I'm sorry?
Go ahead, but $I$ agree with what you said about the times there.

Q Yeah. And you say:
"Now you recall, from the absence of injuries to the vagina, Dr. Emson gave his opinion that intercourse against her will could have taken place after the deceased was either unconscious or dead, since, of course, either would cause, as he testified, relaxation of this part of the body.

Now you may ask yourselves how does the Crown suggest these three different locations of spermatozoa can be reconciled, that is, the vagina, on the panties and in the snow. The Crown suggests that when you look at that scene shown in photographs 2, 3, and 4, and see from it what $I$ submit must have been a desperate struggle put up for her life by the victim, that it is quite possible that the person who raped her achieved penetration, ejaculated into the body of the deceased; that some of the seminal fluid got on the panties, where it was later found ... at the laboratory; that other seminal fluid
drained from the body on to the snow where it froze into one of these lumps that was collected by Penkala. Now remember that Corporal Molchanko found human pubic hair in that same lump that had contained the spermatozoa, and that strengthens what $I$ have to say on that." So I take it, sir, that you are trying to explain to the jury how it is that semen was found in those three locations?

A
That's right.
And that's the Crown's theory about that?
That's correct, sir.
Next page. And you say:
"... it is clearly a possibility that
this is how, the explanation of how the
frozen lump of material came to be
there, and you don't need to have expert
evidence on ... you know it from your
common sense and your experience in the world ..."

Then you go on to tell the jury about:
"... the spermatozoa in the body was
blood stained and Staff Sergeant Paynter
found "A" antigens in the vial which
contained the lump and he tested, later, the same sample for the presence of human blood and got a reaction
indicating the presence of either blood or those two other extracts he mentioned, mainly leafy vegetables or leather, and that his evidence was finally to the effect that he could not say definitely if the person whose seminal fluid he examined was a secretor or was not a secretor.

The evidence of Dr. Emson, as I said, was that the spermatozoa in the body was blood stained and that there are a number of ways in which blood can get into the spermatozoa within the male person and all of this, $I$ submit, while it does not have the effect of identifying Milgaard alone as the source of that spermatozoa, certainly had the effect of not eliminating him either, and that is the effect $I$ ask you to give it. I am not saying it could only be him, I am saying that it certainly has the effect of not eliminating him, he is
one of the thousands."

A Yeah.
Q
And would that be the Crown's position, then, on the secretor issue which we've spent a fair bit of time on?

That's right, sir. And earlier this afternoon, I haven't got that final situation into my mind, but clearly it didn't identify him, didn't eliminate him, is where we end up based on the evidence.

Right. And $I$ think you said it doesn't eliminate: "... him, he is one of the thousands."

A
Q

A
Q Right.

And I think that may have been evidence from either --

Either Paynter or Emson, I think.
Paynter or Emson? And then again, just scroll down, you say:
"I ask you to remember now that he does not have to a secretor to get "A" antigens in to his spermatozoa if the antigens are found there as a result of whole blood being in his spermatozoa for the kinds of reasons that Dr. Emson mentioned."

And are you, here, anticipating an argument from
defence that the fact that he is a non-secretor eliminates him?

A
$Q$

I would have thought so, sir.
And if we can go to the next page, and $I$ think you say again to the jury:
"So I leave that phase of the matter by stressing again that while this part of the evidence does not, of itself, identify the accused, it most certainly does not eliminate him."

And if $I$ can pause there. If Paynter's test of Mr. Milgaard's saliva had been the same as the test that was conducted in the early '90s that identified him as an A secretor, would it be fair to say that the Crown's position at the trial of Mr. Milgaard would have been stronger --

That's --
-- on this point?
Yeah, that's the only way $I$ could see that.
And then scroll down. You go on:
"Now there is one puzzling aspect of
this case, and I suspect my learned friend will go into it, and that is the situation whereby the stabbing in the back must have taken place at a time
when the deceased had her coat on and the top of her dress down because, you remember, there were no holes in the dress. And the Crown has no eye witnesses as to how this took place, but from the facts that are proven before you, I think His Lordship will be telling you that you are entitled to infer how it took place. I am going to suggest the possible solution to you. That is, that when the accused led or forced the girl westward at the top of the "T" shaped alley behind the funeral home, or perhaps when he turned north at the trunk of the "T", he may have forced her at knife point and under threats of stabbing to remove her coat and sweater and pull the top of her uniform down, or more likely, I suggest he did this himself because the middle button has been yanked off and disappeared, the zipper of the dress was sprung, yanked this way while zipped, and the brassiere strap is broken. Now after all this was done it is suggested that the deceased
may have decided to make a run for her life, grabbed her coat around her, got her arms through and was running, only to be pursued and stabbed in the back, with the struggle to her death taking place in the trampled area where the body was found. The fact that the sweater was found inside out supports my theory, I suggest, because ... you believe ladies undress voluntarily, roll the sweater inside out, buried it in
that manner. I had told you already that ..." -did I misread that?

I just, $I$ think it says:
"... you believe ladies undress voluntarily, roll the sweater inside out . . ."

It may have been that what you meant is that it would not be unusual for, if the lady dressed voluntarily, that she'd roll the sweater inside out; is that possible?
Yeah. That doesn't make a whole lot of sense to me, but I'm sure $I$ said it anyway, sir.
"... buried it in that manner."

$$
\square
$$

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q
Yeah.
So that would have been your explanation about the coat and the uniform?

Yes.
I see it's 3:30, Mr. Commissioner. I'm not done, or close to done, this part of the closing address so I suspect it's appropriate to adjourn.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And we adjourn now until October the 24th, 1:00 p.m., Sheraton Cavalier, Top of the Inn. Thank you.

MR. HODSON: Thank you.
(Adjourned at 3:31 p.m.)
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