

police officers, as the matter was developing, who entertained doubts that Mr. Milgaard was the, you know, the proper accused, if you will. Those -those were, you know, just points of view they had. There was certainly no division among the ranks as to the case, if you will, and I would expect the two things I have mentioned to have happened, didn't think that was out of the ordinary, in fact I guess it would be healthy. So --
Pardon me.
-- you say two or three things happened?
Yeah.
So there were some officers who, was it had doubts, or maybe even went further and thought maybe Mr. Milgaard was not the person who committed the crime?
A Well, I don't know how thinly I could slice that, but certainly had some doubts and, you know, I wouldn't think that would be unhealthy.
Q And do you remember who those officers were?
A Well I know that -- I believe that Gus Weir was one of them, and for some part of the case Deputy Chief Wood was one of them, and that, you know, that was discussed amongst themselves, etcetera.
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A | can call it that? |
| :--- |
| Well, really not much more than just the category. |
| I know he was involved, and he testified here, of |
| course. Umm -- |

Q I'm sorry, but let's just go back, I'm trying to
get your memory of events 1969-1970, --
Ah-huh.
Q
can call it that?

I know he was involved, and he testified here, of course. Umm --
I'm sorry, but let's just go back, I'm trying to
get your memory of events 1969-1970, --
A Uh-huh.
Q -- not what you subsequently heard police officers
say.
09:07 10
11

09:08 25
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 |  | Mr. Woods was the senior, next to the chief and deputy chief, he was the senior police officer at the time; correct? |
|  | 2 |  |  |
|  | 3 |  |  |
|  | 4 | A | That's right. |
| 09:08 | 5 | Q | Did that cause you a concern, as a prosecutor, |
|  | 6 |  | that the senior officer in charge of the criminal |
|  | 7 |  | investigations division had doubts about Mr. |
|  | 8 |  | Milgaard's guilt? |
|  | 9 | A | Not really, because I had to carry on with all |
| 09:09 1 | 10 |  | the, you know, features of the case and try to get |
|  | 11 |  | them all organized, keep them that way. I'd be |
|  | 12 |  | aware of his, his doubts. It wouldn't affect, you |
|  | 13 |  | know, my overall conduct I wouldn't suggest. |
|  | 14 | Q | And just, let's just talk generally in your |
| 09:09 1 | 15 |  | experience as a prosecutor and your dealing with |
|  | 16 |  | the police on investigations, not necessarily the |
|  | 17 |  | Gail Miller murder -- |
|  | 18 | A | Uh-huh. |
|  | 19 | Q | -- but other cases. Was it common to have |
| 09:09 2 | 20 |  | officers disagree on either points, small points, |
|  | 21 |  | big points, things of that nature? |
|  | 22 | A | It wasn't uncommon to have them disagree. Very often, by the time a case came to prelim or trial, someone had, you know, decided what seemed to be |
|  | 23 |  |  |
|  | 24 |  |  |
| 09:09 2 | 25 |  | the accurate version and gone ahead in that |
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MR. HODSON: '89, I'm sorry, 1989. Actually, the next page, please.
BY MR. HODSON:
Q And you will recall that I went through this part of the letter. If we could just call out part D and the part below it, please, and I'll just repeat that. It says:
"On September 26th, you advised me by telephone that Mr. Wolch had suggested that on the Provincial file there were either news clippings or police reports to the above effect, and asked me to check and see if this is so." And that was the Other Attacks on Nurses Or Other Women By Knife-Wielding Assailants, and you will recall we went through that yesterday, Mr.
Caldwell?
A Yes, sir.
Q And I was trying to get any assistance you may have as to how and where that originated, and why it was that Mr. Williams was asking you, and I suggested that it may have come from -- it may have come from Peter Carlyle-Gordge's review of the file. I have found some documents last night that may assist us.
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 |  | died young, not Mike McCord but someone in that |
|  | 2 |  | general league if you will. He came, interviewed |
|  | 3 |  | me, the feature was filmed, if you will, but I |
|  | 4 |  | think that's what happened to it maybe. |
| 09:15 | 5 | Q | And do you know when that would have been, Mr. |
|  | 6 |  | Caldwell, and just generally? |
|  | 7 | A | Yeah. |
|  | 8 | Q | Would it have been -- |
|  | 9 | A | Well, certainly post all the legal proceedings, |
| 09:15 1 | 10 |  | like after the Supreme Court I 'm sure. |
|  | 11 | Q | Okay. |
|  | 12 | A | Hmm. |
|  | 13 | Q | Let me just go back, and maybe we'll go through |
|  | 14 |  | these letters, and this might assist. |
| 09:15 | 15 | A | Okay. |
|  | 16 | Q | This is a letter December 28th, 1988 from |
|  | 17 |  | Mr. Asper to Sandra Bartlett, and the December |
|  | 18 |  | 28th, 1988 date is significant because that's the |
|  | 19 |  | same date, I believe, that Mr. Milgaard filed his |
| 09:15 | 20 |  | first application to the federal minister. And |
|  | 21 |  | we'll just go through this letter. |
|  | 22 | A | Okay. |
|  | 23 | Q | Mr. Asper attaches a copy of the application to |
|  | 24 |  | the minister, it was sent on December 28th, and |
| 09:15 2 | 25 |  | presume will be received the next day. And then: |
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```
Q -- in this case, but I think you also said that
        you never would have given a police report to
        defence counsel?
    A I believe that's what I said and I believe that's
        correct.
    Q And can we conclude from that that you would also
        not have given the police report at that time to
        either David Milgaard or J oyce Milgaard; if you
        wouldn't give it to his lawyer, I presume you
        wouldn't give it to them?
        Absolutely.
    Q We then go ahead in 1983 and we looked yesterday
        at documents where Peter Carlyle-Gordge looked at
        your file and in fact dictated a note about this
        very police report. Do you remember me showing
        you that?
        A Yes, sir.
        Q And I suppose, and again we'll hear from
        Mrs. Milgaard and Mr. Carlyle-Gordge on this
        issue, but is that a possible explanation as to
        how it may have --
        A It certainly could be because --
        Q -- got to her?
        A -- my understanding is that Mr. Carlyle-Gordge was
        working in concert or in assistance with the
22 A It certainly could be because --
-- got to her?
you also said that
2 you never would have given a police report to
A I believe that's what I said and I believe that's correct.
And can we conclude from that that you would also not have given the police report at that time to either David Milgaard or J oyce Milgaard; if you wouldn't give it to his lawyer, I presume you wouldn't give it to them?
A Absolutely.
Q We then go ahead in 1983 and we looked yesterday at documents where Peter Carlyle-Gordge looked at
your file and in fact dictated a note about this
very police report. Do you remember me showing
you that?
Q And
And I suppose, and again we'll hear from
Mrs. Milgaard and Mr. Carlyle-Gordge on this
working in concert or in assistance with the
```



24
09:26 25
realized the significance of the event."
I'm wondering if you can help us, Mr. Caldwell.
to J oyce Milgaard?
A No, I never had any face-to-face discussions with
Joyce Milgaard to my knowledge and I certainly did
not give her that report, if indeed it existed.

1970, I think you've told us that you would not
have disclosed the police report to Mr. Tallis; is
that fair?
To --
Mr. Tallis, the police report.

Q And I think you testified that your practice was
to disclose witness statements, but that police
reports were a different category?
A Yeah, that's right.
|-
A Go ahead, sir. police report to defence counsel, I think you told

All right.


## Milgaard forces.

Q And is that something you knew in 1983 or discovered later?
A I would suspect I discovered it later, sir.
Q Then if we can call up 004732.
I'm sorry, yeah, the way Mr. Carlyle-Gordge got
ahold of me and, yeah, at that time I wouldn't know that he was part of that camp, if you will.
Q And I think there's some documents later that I'II go through on that subject.
A Okay.
And then here's an article, May 16th, 1990, which is the next day, and it's a CP wire story out of Winnipeg and I suspect it may have picked up on some of Mr. Lett's report, but again it talks about the man being investigated for the murder and was interviewed by Saskatoon police only four days after the slaying, and if we can scroll down, "J oyce Milgaard, David's mother, said she learned of the police report from Saskatoon Crown prosecutor T.D.R. (Bobs) Caldwell. At the time, no one realized Asked Tuesday about latest developments,

## Page 17356

Caldwell flatly refused any comment whatsoever."
And do you have any reason to dispute that they would have called you for a comment?
A No, I imagine that that's correct.
Q And why would you not have commented?
A Well, because this -- I believe that at this time, this Winnipeg newspaper, or the person that wrote this article seemed to me to be part of the opposition team, if you will, and digging for things I simply -- I didn't believe the first part of that and I was not going to expand on it by, you know, by agreeing to it or otherwise.
Q Mr. Caldwell, with respect to the McCorriston report of seeing Larry Fisher at the bus stop on February 3, 1969, would you agree with the statement at the time no one realized the significance of the interview?
A Well, at the time McCorriston interviewed Fisher they certainly didn't, if that's what you are saying.
Q Yeah. Just at the time, being February 3rd, 1969, would you agree with the statement that no one realized the significance of the interview?
The McCorriston to Fisher interview?
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Q Yes.
A I'm sure that's correct.
Q Go to 004752. This is an article again by Dan Lett, Winnipeg Free Press, July 17th, 1990, and I want to go through parts of this. We've seen this article before, Mr. Caldwell.

## A Okay.

Q And again, July 17th, 1990, just to put it in perspective, let me tell you about a couple of events that we've already heard evidence about. The application, the first application by Mr. Milgaard was before the Federal Minister of Justice in, I think, June the 20th or June of 1990, or thereabouts. Ronald Wilson provided a statement to Paul Henderson of Centurion Ministries recanting some of his evidence at trial, and you recall we've heard evidence about that, about the recantation?
A Yes, sir, in the Inquiry.
Q And so this is an article that would be in the weeks after that. Mr. Lett writes:
"A statement given by a star witness in the David Milgaard case that could have discredited his entire testimony appears to have been withheld from defence
counsel during the 1969 trial, two lawyers close to the case have charged.

A statement given by Ron Wilson
to RCMP in Regina on March 3, 1969,
denies any knowledge of the brutal murder of nursing assistant Gail Miller in Saskatoon or any involvement Milgaard may have had with the crime."

> Now, I'll go through the article later, but --

```
A Very good.
Q -- would you have been aware of this allegation or
        charge against you at the time?
    A At which time, sir?
    Q At the time the article was --
    A Is it a Winnipeg article?
    Q I think it was carried elsewhere, but did you
        become aware at any point, Mr. Caldwell, in 1990,
        that there was an allegation made by David Asper
        that you withheld Ron Wilson's first statement
        from Mr. Tallis?
    A I can't say now, sir, I very well may have, and
        when there's an opportunity I would like to expand
        on which statement we're talking about here.
    Q Right. Well, maybe I will go through the article
        and then ask you the questions.
```



```
A Okay, that's fine, sir.
Q And so there the statement of March 3, 1969, and
    we have already heard evidence from you and
    others, Mr. Caldwell, and identified documents
    that indicate the March 3rd, }1969\mathrm{ statement was
    sent by you to Mr. Tallis --
A Yes.
Q -- prior to the preliminary hearing?
A I 'm sure that's right, sir.
    And we've also reviewed the transcript where
    Mr. Tallis cross-examined Ron Wilson with respect
    to the March 3rd, 1969 statement.
    I nspector Riddell; was it not?
    Yes, it is.
    So that all of that I --
    And you recall, I think, the other day, or maybe
        the last sitting when I went through your closing
        address to the jury, you also mentioned to the
        jury in your closing address the fact that
        Mr. Wilson had talked to Inspector Riddell in
        March of '69. Do you recall us going through
        No doubt I did, sir.
        *
```

$\square$ Bobs Caldwel1
by Mr. Hodson
Page 17360
actually, let's just go through this for your
benefit.
A Okay, very good, but just that far, sir, clearly
that's the statement to I nspector Riddell.
Q Yes, it is.
A Which is just to -- which of course I did, or we
or I did not accept as being truthful, and I know
we've also been through that, sir, but I can
expand if you wish.
Q No, we've been through that.
A That's fine.
Q And just what I want to get at, Mr. Caldwell, is
the issue --
A Yeah.
Q -- and to go through whether or not you gave that
statement to Mr. Tallis, the disclosure of the
statement.
A Well, yeah, it's right in my covering letter to
Mr. Tallis. There were two statements went to him
which would be the one to I nspector Riddell and
the one to Saskatoon city.
Q And I want to go through this newspaper article
because it talks about an allegation made against
you that you failed to disclose that.
Very good, sir.

|  | Bobs Caldwe 11 <br> by Mr. Hodson <br> Vol $86-$ Thursday, <br>  <br> Page 17361 |
| :---: | :---: |



Q And then I want to get your response to some questions, but let's go through the article, and it says:
"Wilson's first statement --"
That's the one to Riddell,
"-- stands in stark contrast with another dated May 23, 1969, in which he gave Saskatoon police officers several important pieces of testimony.

Wilson told police he saw
Milgaard with a paring knife before they arrived in Saskatoon ..."
Etcetera, and they go through the details of that statement.

Then if we can go up to the top
where I've circled there:
"However, in a statement taken last month by a Seattle private detective --"
That's Mr. Henderson,
"-- Wilson claimed he was pressured by police into testifying against his friend.

Wilson said he told the police he knew nothing, but they threatened to pin the murder on him unless he

A Very good.
And would you agree with Mr. Asper's comment that not providing Ron Wilson's first statement would be serious misconduct for the Crown?

## A I would.

Q And then they go on to talk about:
"Ken Watson, a B.C. lawyer representing Wilson, said he was shocked when he opened a package from the Justice Department containing, among other things, the two conflicting statements.

Watson said not only does the first statement lend credibility to his client's recent recant of his testimony it suggests a serious omission in information given to Tallis.
"I can see no reason (for the statement to be withheld)," Watson said.
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|  | 1 |  | your part in failing to provide the first |
|  | 2 |  | statement of Ron Wilson to Mr. Tallis. |
|  | 3 | A | Well, there was so much press coverage going on |
|  | 4 |  | from various sources, Mr. Hodson, that I |
| 09:38 | 5 |  | personally -- I personally couldn't, you know, |
|  | 6 |  | undertake to run around and try and rebut all of |
|  | 7 |  | it, or maybe even any of it. |
|  | 8 | Q | What is your reaction to this article as I read it |
|  | 9 |  | to you now? |
| 09:38 | 10 | A | Well, it's wrong. |
|  | 11 | Q | What is wrong with it? |
|  | 12 | A | Okay, I can go through that. In the first place, |
|  | 13 |  | Mr. Wilson's first statement, which was to |
|  | 14 |  | Inspector Riddell, was sent to Mr. Tallis, and |
| 09:39 | 15 |  | that's -- it's identified by date and so on in one |
|  | 16 |  | of my letters to Mr. Tallis, I 'm sure you are |
|  | 17 |  | aware of that, and that's the one that's covered |
|  | 18 |  | in that second paragraph. Could you possibly blow |
|  | 19 |  | this up a little, please? |
| 09:39 | 20 | Q | Sure. |
|  | 21 | A | Okay, that's fine. Okay. So a statement given by |
|  | 22 |  | Ron Wilson to RCMP in Regina March 3rd, 1969 is |
|  | 23 |  | the statement to I nspector Riddell and then |
|  | 24 |  | Wilson's first statement stands in stark contrast |
| 09:39 | 25 |  | with another dated May 23, the Saskatoon statement |








|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | A | No, sir, I do not. |
|  | 2 | Q | And again, we'll hear from Mr. Lett, but it appears that he may have talked to you -- |
|  | 3 |  |  |
|  | 4 | A | Yeah. |
| 09:54 | 5 | Q | -- about this issue -- |
|  | 6 | A | Yeah, he -- |
|  | 7 | Q | -- in connection with this article? |
|  | 8 | A | He may well have, and I assume I would have answered it the way it's quoted in the column, |
|  | 9 |  |  |
| 09:54 | 10 |  | and, Mr. Hodson, which of course was essentially what I believe we went through yesterday. |
|  | 11 |  |  |
|  | 12 | Q | Yes. |
|  | 13 | A | Yeah. And then I notice that, the top of the right column, the -- Mr. Williams mentions: |
|  | 14 |  |  |
| 09:54 | 15 |  | ""I'm grateful for his assistance," ... |
|  | 16 |  | "But I will not dignify any comments |
|  | 17 |  | about conflict of interest by commenting |
|  | 18 |  | on it further."" |
|  | 19 |  | That's referring to any alleged conflict of |
| 09:54 | 20 |  | interest by me being involved, I take it. Do you see that, sir? |
|  | 21 |  |  |
|  | 22 | Q | Yes. |
|  | 23 | A | Yeah. |
|  | 24 | Q | If I could just go down, and again this is August of 1990, it says: |
| 09:54 | 25 |  |  |
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testimony from two key Crown witnesses who now claim they were pressured and psychologically manipulated by Saskatoon Police in 1969."

09:54 25

```
A No, sir, I do not.
Q And again, we'll hear from Mr. Lett, but it
    appears that he may have talked to you --
A Yeah.
Q -- about this issue -
A Yeah, he --
Q -- in connection with this article?
A He may well have, and I assume I would have
    answered it the way it's quoted in the column,
    and, Mr. Hodson, which of course was essentially
        what I believe we went through yesterday.
Q Yes.
        Yeah. And then I notice that, the top of the
    ""I'm grateful for his assistance," ...
    "But I will not dignify any comments
    about conflict of interest by commenting
    n it further.""
        That's referring to any alleged conflict of
        interest by me being involved, I take it. Do you
        see that, sir?
    Q Yes.
        Yeah.
        of 1990, it says:
```
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"However, despite the fact the Justice Department is investigating a possible wrongful conviction, Williams said there is no reason to treat Caldwell as a witness and investigate his involvement in the case.

Williams said Caldwell has been ruled out as a witness because in Milgaard's application to the Justice Department, there was no specific allegation of prosecutorial misconduct. However, Williams agreed that he could have gotten much of the information himself by contacting the Saskatchewan Crown's office."
Did you have that understanding about --
A I --
Q Did Mr. Williams ever tell you any of that?
A I don't believe so. I'm pleased to see he felt that way.
Q But, well, were you aware at the time, Mr. Caldwell, that Mr. Milgaard's application -- and let me go back. When Mr. Milgaard applied to have his conviction set aside in 1988, and then the second application I think in August of '91, --
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```
Saskatchewan Justice, do you recall whether they would have been in touch with you in 1988 to 1992 telling you "Mr. Caldwell, here's what's been alleged that you did or didn't do while you were under our employ as a prosecutor"; do you recall them telling you that?
A I very much doubt it. I was among a group of 13 or 15, or whatever, people who were -- who had their positions abolished by one Order-in-Council by the Grant Devine Progressive Conservative provincial government, and that was May 14th of 1987, and I still had, you know, good relationships with various individuals in the department, but I was somewhat at arm's length after that for a time, sir.
Q When you say "arm's length" do you mean perhaps not on good terms?
A Well, certain people in the department I don't think were fond of me, and I wasn't very pleased with how I'd been treated, which resulted in a lawsuit by the way.
Q And so, as far as that being an avenue where you might have learned of allegations against you, are you telling us that you think that might be unlikely?
```

    Page 17383
    
## A Yeah, I think -- I don't think that would have happened at all. <br> Q And the last avenue, I think, where you might have learned about what was being alleged against you would be the media; is that fair, in -- <br> A Well, that you couldn't avoid in our case, and we even -- my wife and I took the pre -- the remedial step of going to Edmonton for a weekend to get away from the media uproar in Saskatoon, Mr. Hodson, only to find that it was just as bad in Edmonton, whereupon we returned. <br> Q And so, again, just the question about you. Is it fair to say, Mr. Caldwell, that you would have learned of allegations being made against you through the media? <br> A Yes. <br> Q Okay. <br> A It was inevitable, I think. And the one thing, Mr. Hodson, the bottom of the centre paragraph:

"However, Williams agreed he could have gotten much of the information himself by contacting the Saskatchewan Crown's office."
I'm sure that, if he did that, they would have
said "phone Caldwell". I was the one with kind

|  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Bobs Caldwell } \\ \text { by Mr. Hodson } \\ \text { Vol } 86 \text { - Thursday, October } 27 \text { th, } 2005 \end{array}$ <br> Page 17385 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 |  | of on -- you know, practical knowledge of the |
|  | 2 |  | things we went over yesterday. |
|  | 3 | Q | And when you left the employ of the Saskatchewan |
|  | 4 |  | Justice in 1987 what happened to the prosecution |
| 10:00 | 5 |  | file? |
|  | 6 | A | It would still be in the Saskatoon Crown |
|  | 7 |  | Prosecutor's office in Canterbury Towers. |
|  | 8 | Q | And did you take anything with you from that time? |
|  | 9 | A | No, I didn't, sir. |
| 10:00 | 10 | Q | If we could call up 077806. This is an article in |
|  | 11 |  | The StarPhoenix April 18, 1992, and I think this |
|  | 12 |  | is two days after -- two or four days after the |
|  | 13 |  | Supreme Court decision wherein Mr. Milgaard was |
|  | 14 |  | released from prison, and the headline Lawyers ask |
| 10:00 | 15 |  | why Milgaard wasn't freed in 1970. And my fear of |
|  | 16 |  | calling this up is that we might get a close-up of |
|  | 17 |  | Mr. Wolch's picture, but -- |
|  | 18 | A | Oh oh. |
|  | 19 |  | MR. WOLCH: Don't you dare. |
| 10:01 | 20 | A | I think that was in high school, sir, by the look |
|  | 21 |  | of it. |
|  | 22 |  | MR. HODSON: |
|  | 23 | Q | "David Milgaard is out of jail but his |
|  | 24 |  | lawyers still want to know why he wasn't |
| 10:01 | 25 |  | a free man 22 years ago. |
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|  | 1 |  | "Wolch said those who would ...", |
|  | 2 |  | let me just back up. In any event the article, I |
|  | 3 |  | don't need to go through the article, it talks |
|  | 4 |  | about, again, the information on Larry Fisher |
| 10:02 | 5 |  | back in 1970. And this quote here says: |
|  | 6 |  | "Wolch said those who would have been |
|  | 7 |  | aware of evidence about Fisher are; |
|  | 8 |  | Eddie Karst, the main investigator in |
|  | 9 |  | the Milgaard case who took confessions |
| 10:03 | 10 |  | from Fisher in Winnipeg; Bobs Caldwell, |
|  | 11 |  | prosecutor at Milgaard's original trial; |
|  | 12 |  | and Caldwell's superior, Kujawa." |
|  | 13 |  | And, again, what is your response to that |
|  | 14 |  | suggestion? |
| 10:03 | 15 | A | It's the same, sir, we -- I did not know about |
|  | 16 |  | those things at that time. |
|  | 17 | Q | If we could now go to 162465. And this is a |
|  | 18 |  | September 9th, '92 communication from David Asper |
|  | 19 |  | to J oyce Milgaard, and the next page talks about |
| 10:03 | 20 |  | a -- it's September 9th -- about a draft press |
|  | 21 |  | release that it appears is drafted by Mr. Asper, |
|  | 22 |  | and again we will be hearing more evidence about |
|  | 23 |  | this, but the next page is a draft news release. |
|  | 24 |  | And there is a couple of things I want to ask you |
| 10:04 | 25 |  | about here. And again, I have tried, and I'm |
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"We'd like an answer why David was not exonerated in 1970." Hersh Wolch said Thursday. "Let's find out and hold people accountable."

In October 1970, Larry Fisher confessed to several sexual assaults in Saskatoon which were similar to the attack on Gail Miller. Milgaard was convicted for her murder, but Wolch wants to know why Fisher wasn't suspected earlier in Miller's killing.

Crown prosecutors Bobs Caldwell and Serge Kujawa and chief investigator J oe Penkala all knew about Fisher, he said."
And, again, I just want you to respond to that. We touched on this already, but in this article of April 16, 1992, Mr. Wolch said you all knew about Fisher in October of 1970?

## A That's not correct, sir.

Q If we could then go to 077811. And this is an article April 22nd, 1992 headlined New evidence available on missing files, and Report clearing city police questioned. This is a StarPhoenix article. At the bottom, if you call that out:
"Wolch said those who would ...", let me just back up. In any event the article, I don't need to go through the article, it talks about, again, the information on Larry Fisher back in 1970. And this quote here says:
"Wolch said those who would have been aware of evidence about Fisher are; Eddie Karst, the main investigator in the Milgaard case who took confessions from Fisher in Winnipeg; Bobs Caldwell, prosecutor at Milgaard's original trial; and Caldwell's superior, Kujawa." And, again, what is your response to that suggestion? those things at that time.
If we could now go to 162465. And this is a September 9th, '92 communication from David Asper to J oyce Milgaard, and the next page talks about a -- it's September 9th -- about a draft press release that it appears is drafted by Mr. Asper, and again we will be hearing more evidence about this, but the next page is a draft news release. about here. And again, I have tried, and I'm

10:05 25
still seeking to find -- and it may be when other witnesses testify -- where and to what extent this found its way into the media, but I just want to ask you about some of the contents here, because these subjects are certainly covered in later media reports. And, again, this is September 1992. It talks about:
"... the fight for David's demand for justice carries on. Following the call by Mr. Wolch for a formal enquiry in Saskatchewan, an active letter writing campaign has been undertaken."
And then, down at the bottom, it talks about: "The core group of volunteers in the Winnipeg support group have continued the analysis of government files and in addition information has been provided to Mr. Wolch's office covering a wide spectrum including potentially implicating the current premier of Saskatchewan in his former capacity as Attorney General for Saskatchewan." And I think this is right around the time, Mr. Caldwell -- and we'll hear more evidence about this --
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\text { Page } 17389
$$

$$
\begin{array}{rcc}
1 & \text { A } & \text { Yeah, okay. } \\
2 & \text { Q } & \text {-- the Michael Breckenridge -- } \\
3 & \text { A } & \text { Oh. } \\
4 & \text { Q } & \text {-- matter, where certain allegations were brought } \\
5 & & \text { forward about, I think, misconduct on the part of } \\
6 & & \text { government officials. If we can go to the next } \\
7 & & \text { page, it goes on to say: } \\
8 & \text { "Some examples of information obtained } \\
9 & \text { as a result of further analysis of } \\
10 & \text { government files include: } \\
11 & \text { A second knife found at the scene of the } \\
12 & \text { murder which may have played an } \\
13 & \text { important role and which mysteriously } \\
14 & \text { went missing at the time of trial was, } \\
15 & \text { in fact, ordered released during the } \\
16 & \text { trial by Mr. T.D.R. Caldwell, the Crown } \\
17 & \text { Attorney prosecuting David Milgaard. } \\
18 & \text { This was a knife that had been seized } \\
19 & \text { from the scene of the crime, retained as } \\
20 & \text { an exhibit by police officers and } \\
21 & \text { entered as an exhibit by the Crown at } \\
22 & \text { the preliminary enquiry." } \\
23 & \text { Lalking about the bone-handled hunting knife that } \\
24 & \text { Ian Oliver had? }
\end{array}
$$
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> Q ongoing investigations. And as far as your dealings with Mr. Tallis about the knife -- and we touched on this before -- do you remember -Yeah. Q -- any dealings with Mr. Tallis about the knife? A I simply have the memory that he knew all about the situation, Mr. Hodson. Next, if we could call up 04830 -- I'm sorry, let me just pause there. You will see: "(Insert the Sidney Wilson/Eugene $\quad$ Williams information.) " And if we call up 048306, this is a memo September 16th, 1992, which I think is right around the time of the press conference relating to Michael -- I don't know that his name was used at the time -- but about the government official having the information about Mr. Kujawa and Mr. Romanow having the Fisher and Milgaard files together. And this is a memo, I believe, from Greg Roden, who would have been counsel, one of the counsel for the Milgaard family at the time, and it's Re: T.D.R. Caldwell, Mike Breckenridge, Sidney Wilson, T.D.R. Caldwell/knife evidence. If we could just call out that first paragraph, I
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| A | On the fence. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Q | On the fence, and that -- |
| A | I 'm not sure, sir -- go ahead? |
| Q | Yeah. My question is we've heard evidence from Mr. Oliver about the knife, we've heard evidence I think from you and Mr. Kleiv about the knife, -- |
| A | Yeah. |
| Q | -- are you aware of the knife ever mysteriously going missing at the time of trial? |
| A | No, it didn't. I 'm not -- the thing I was going to say, I 'm not sure that it was entered as an exhibit at the prelim, that may well have happened. |
| Q | I don't believe it was. I stand to be corrected, but again, -- |
| A | Yeah. I didn't -- |
| Q | -- were you aware of any, with respect to that hunting knife, any issue at the preliminary hearing or trial about it -- |
| A | About it going missing? I certainly wasn't, and there was -- it was very easy to, to follow where it had gone, from -- between Kleiv, I dentification Officer Ian Oliver, there was nothing missing in any sense about it, and I think it was eventually retrieved by the RCMP as one of these later |

A On the fence.
2 Q On the fence, and that --
3 A I'm not sure, sir -- go ahead?
4 Q Yeah. My question is we've heard evidence from
10:06 5
Mr. Oliver about the knife, we've heard evidence I
think from you and Mr. Kleiv about the knife, --
7 A Yeah.
8 Q -- are you aware of the knife ever mysteriously
going missing at the time of trial?
10:06 10
11
12
13
14
10:06 15
16

17
18
19
10:06 20
21
No, it didn't. I'm not -- the thing I was going
to say, I 'm not sure that it was entered as an exhibit at the prelim, that may well have happened.
Q I don't believe it was. I stand to be corrected, but again, --
A Yeah. I didn't --
Q -- were you aware of any, with respect to that hunting knife, any issue at the preliminary hearing or trial about it --
$10: 07$ 25
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | Q | Yeah. And I believe we'll be hearing from others on this, -- |
|  | 3 | A | Okay. |
|  | 4 | Q | -- I think it relates to what happened to the |
| 10:09 | 5 |  | file, I think the allegation was that Mr. Kujawa |
|  | 6 |  | and Mr. Romanow had the Milgaard and Fisher files |
|  | 7 |  | together in either 1971 or 1973 in a closed-door |
|  | 8 |  | meeting, I don't believe the allegation included |
|  | 9 |  | you in that meeting? |
| 10:09 | 10 | A | No. |
|  | 11 | Q | Do you ever remember being questioned about |
|  | 12 |  | whether you were in such a meeting? |
|  | 13 | A | No, I wasn't and didn't, and it was strictly, I 'm |
|  | 14 |  | pleased to say, a Regina venture, Mr. Hodson. |
| 10:10 | 15 | Q | And down at the bottom we talk about Sidney Wilson |
|  | 16 |  | evidence and the memo states, talks about the: |
|  | 17 |  | "... Sidney Wilson contacting Hersh |
|  | 18 |  | Wolch on Monday, February 26th, 1990." |
|  | 19 |  | It then goes on to say: |
| 10:10 | 20 |  | "He indicated that this person ...", |
|  | 21 |  | I'm sorry, Sidney Wilson: |
|  | 22 |  | "... indicated that this person was |
|  | 23 |  | Larry Fisher, and that he obtained this |
|  | 24 |  | information implicating Larry Fisher |
| 10:10 | 25 |  | from Linda Fisher, Larry Fisher's wife. |
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police had information relating Larry Fisher to the murder of Gail Miller, but chose not to disclose it."
So, again, to the extent that you were a member of the Crown Attorney's office at the time; is that correct?
A Yes. before, but the allegation that you suppressed the Larry Fisher evidence in October of 1970 and that you had information relating Larry Fisher to the murder of Gail Miller but chose not to disclose it; how do you respond that?

And then number 3, Evidence Relating to T.D.R. Caldwell and the Missing Knife, and again this is
"This is potentially very significant evidence. I would ask that you discuss this matter with Bob Bruce, who has intimate familiarity with the trial is clear that Mr. Caldwell did not advise the Court, at the time that the missing knife was the subject of
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testimony, that he had in fact instructed that the knife be released to Constable Ian Oliver. Since he gave those instructions, he must have known to whom the knife was released.
Accordingly, it appears that Mr.
Caldwell deliberately mislead the Court as to the whereabouts of the missing knife. Obviously a missing knife in a case where death was occasioned by stabbing, is an extremely important piece of evidence. At this point I would handle the issue simply by pointing out that Mr. Caldwell obviously had a duty to advise the Court that he knew where the knife was when the fact that it was missing was disclosed. He did not disclose to the Court that he instructed that the knife be released to Constable Oliver. He therefore mislead the Court. Further investigations are required to clarify the significance of this evidence."

And, again, were you aware, apart from what I have just read to you, of allegations being made
relating to this missing knife back in ' 92 and onward?
A Umm, --
I can tell you, it's the subject matter of the
RCMP investigation, -knife.
There were, I think there were up to seven complete and partial knives involved in this whole business. Which trial is he talking about, Mr. Hodson?
Q David Milgaard's trial.
A Okay. You were asking me if I was aware before?
Just aware, generally, of someone on behalf of David Milgaard saying you did something wrong --
A Yeah.
-- when it came to this hunting knife or a second knife? do anything wrong with it, just --
No, but just listen, Mr. Caldwell.
Okay.

RCMP --

| A | Okay, sir. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Q | Were you aware, at least generally, that someone was saying you did something wrong when it came to the hunting knife at the trial? |
| A | At the trial I was not. |
| Q | No, no. Were you aware in 1990, -- |
| A | Oh. |
| Q | -- at any time, -- |
| A | Oh, I'm sorry. |
| Q | -- that someone was saying, Mr. Caldwell, that you had done something wrong in your dealings with the hunting knife? |
| A | I expect I learned that, Mr. Hodson, in due course. |
| Q | And, again, I will go through some of the RCMP reports with you. |
| A | Okay. |
| Q | Let me ask you this: Did you deliberately mislead the Court as to the where, the Court at David Milgaard's trial, as to the whereabouts of the missing knife? |
| A | No. |
| Q | Did you mislead the Court with respect to the knife? |
| A | Of any description, no. |

A Okay, sir.
Were you aware, at least generally, that someone
was saying you did something wrong when it came to
the hunting knife at the trial?
At the trial I was not.
No, no. Were you aware in 1990, --
Oh.
Oh, I'm sorry.
-- that someone was saying, Mr. Caldwell, that you
had done something wrong in your dealings with the
hunting knife?
course.
And, again, I will go through some of the RCMP
reports with you.
Okay.
Let me ask you this: Did you deliberately mislead
the Court as to the where, the Court at David
Milgaard's trial, as to the whereabouts of the
missing knife?
A No.
knife?
f any description, no.
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| :---: | :---: |
|  | unusual for a Crown counsel. Did he |
|  | have that much interest in ensuring |
|  | Milgaard was never released? Did he |
|  | write letters on other convicted |
| 10:24 | persons? |
|  | -- It is believed that the head of the |
|  | National Parole Board was, at that time, |
|  | inviting input from prosecutors e.g., |
|  | conference in Banff in this regard. Did |
| 10:25 1 | Mr. Caldwell attend this conference, or |
|  | have access to this information? |
|  | k) What was the nature of Mr. Caldwell's |
|  | relationship with Saskatoon City Police |
|  | investigators in particular, those |
| 10:25 1 | involved with the Milgaard |
|  | investigation? |
|  | I) That the Saskatchewan Department of |
|  | the Attorney General (Head Office) had |
|  | both Mr. Milgaard's file and Mr. |
| 10:25 2 | Fisher's file in their possession in |
|  | October 1970 for appeal purposes. Did |
|  | Mr. Caldwell provide Head Office with |
|  | the material described? |
|  | m) The Milgaard file was full of |
| 10:25 2 | references to the Fisher rape and that |
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1 (TAKEN BY: INSP. M. SAWATSKY and SGT. M. DRESSLER) (BY REGINA R.C.M. POLICE).

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Today is the 21st of July, 1993 and we're in Saskatoon at the office of Mr. Halyk. Present in this conversation is myself, Inspector Sawatsky and Sergeant Max
Dressler, Mr. T.D.R. Caldwell and Mr. Halyk representing Mr. Caldwell.

Gentlemen, we're here today to,
to interview Mr. Caldwell concerning the allegations which have been made of, obstruction of justice. And how we would like to handle the interview today is we would like to first off talk about your rights and then ask you some questions, point out what the allegations are against you and then ask you some questions concerning your involvement in the, the Milgaard matter. Max has prepared a bit of a preamble there to introduce the, the allegations to you. So what I'll do, Max, is just to turn it over to you.

Before -- before I do that, I
would just like to say that we have sent you several letters, one of which was dated the 23rd of June, and in that letter we sent you some
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thereby obstructing justice contrary to the provisions of the criminal code. Do you understand that, Mr. Caldwell?

BOBS CALDWELL: Yes, I do. Yeah.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: You need not say anything, of course. Have you had a chance to consult with counsel, and of course you're not obliged to say anything.

BOBS CALDWELL: Yes, I have had thorough consultation with counsel and I'm -- understand that I do not need to say anything.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Do you wish to provide a statement to us today?

BOBS CALDWELL: Yes, I'm happy to do that.
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Okay. So for our purposes here today the statement then is given voluntarily under your own free will?

BOBS CALDWELL: It absolutely is, both legally and otherwise, as far as I'm concerned.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Thank you. Okay, do you want to -- do you want to discuss this, your reply to this letter first then?

BOBS CALDWELL: It would -- I think that would be helpful because I've made notes in the same sequence of questions are...

Bobs Caldwell - Tape of Interview
by RCMP

Page 17414
material which was photocopied from the prosecution file. This material was to assist you in reviewing and refreshing your memory, and then on the 11th of May we also sent you a letter and in that letter we asked you questions and I understand you have prepared a reply to those questions which we'll get into, but first, Max, if you would just go over the, your prepared documents there.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Certainly. We're investigating the circumstances surrounding the murder of Gail Miller which occurred on '69 January 31 at Saskatoon, Saskatchewan and of which David Milgaard was convicted on '70 J anuary 31. More specifically, our investigation has focused on certain allegations which include David Milgaard was wrongly convicted of the said offence and that Larry Earl Fisher was responsible for it.

You and others may have known of Milgaard's wrongful conviction and took steps to suppress that knowledge, including deliberately withholding evidence favourable to the defence from Milgaard's counsel, willfully failing to communicate this knowledge to others,
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INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Okay.
BOBS CALDWELL: ... they're in, and if anyone wants to pause at the end of any point and follow up one thing, that's fine too.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Okay, and I'm -- I'm referring then to the letter dated the 11th of May ' 93 , which was written to you by Mr. Halyk and we can just go into your response then to the points that are raised in this letter and we will follow along with you and interrupt you and question you in the area.

BOBS CALDWELL: Written by yourself to Mr. Halyk.

MR. HALYK: Yeah.
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Yeah, sorry, did I say that backwards?

BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah.
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Good, thank you.
BOBS CALDWELL: Okay.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: Perhaps it might be appropriate to do a technical check on our tape recorder. I'll be switching it off.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Okay, we're back in business.

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay, if you gentlemen
would like then, you've both got copies of the May 11th 1993 letter we just spoke of and the first question as I see it is paragraph 3(a). And I would simply give you what I've written by way of an answer to that, if I may, and that is this. It starts off by saying police reports in the Miller murder file. Now, the entire file of the Saskatoon Crown Prosecutors' Office on the Milgaard case was contained in one cardboard tote box approximately 16 by 20 by 12 inches. This included seven file folders made up by myself and the transcript of the preliminary inquiry. With respect to Gail Miller's death, our office had only the Regina vs. Milgaard file, which stayed intact in the Crown Prosecutors' Saskatoon office until, I understand, it was moved to Regina, as part of the Supreme Court of Canada hearing process. I searched this file at the request of Mr. Eugene Williams in 1989 and forwarded copies of the items set out in my letters to Mr. Williams of June 16th, 1989, which are -- this is the letter which I know you people have copies of all these items, but there's my copy.

With that letter went a copy of the letter to Mr. T.G. Street of the National
subsequent appeal to the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal.
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## Now, the Saskatoon Crown

 Prosecutors' file at the time of the preliminary hearing and the trial and the police reports therein did not, in my memory, and I'm quoting here, link the Miller murder to the sexual assaults being committed in the area. That's a quote from 3(a) on the first page of your letter. Since these sexual assaults were being committed by a person or persons evidently unknown at the time, no files on them would reach our office as no one was charged at the time. Eugene Williams -- oh, sorry bout that, okay. Eugene Williams requested that I search the file for other sex assaults or "knife" offences. Now, this is in page 4 of my letter to Eugene Williams of October 25th, 1989. And I did not, in the language again of 3(a), "have available all police facts and files" and I was not aware that the police saw similarities between "the rapes" and the murder of Gail Miller, and I emphasize if that was the case, if that was the case I didn't know about it and I have no reason to believe they did, but that's what I can say.Bobs caracreal - Tope of Intervien by RCMP
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Parole Board dated June 14th, 1972 and a letter to a Mrs. Nancy Flintoft-Meronek, National Parole Board, date is August 15th, 1977. And... I just paused there to say that I was working for the Federal Department of Justice in Saskatoon at that time when I had some of these Parole Board letters retyped because we were working from ancient carbon copies or photocopies of file copies which were becoming illegible, so if anyone's wondering, that's why we have nice crisp new ones, And of course they were not changed in that process.

Then on October 25th, 1989, I wrote Mr. Williams and sent it, and sent him a very comprehensive set of copies of items from the Crown file, and I know you have that letter as well. And then October 31st, 1989 I wrote Mr. Williams again, sent him the autopsy report, a Wilson statement and two Cadrain statements.

Now, at that time of course I was with Federal Justice and I went and searched the file at what is now called Provincial Department of Justice in Saskatoon, and at that time the file was in the same condition as when it was closed after the 1970 trial and the

Then on -- on March 2nd, 1992 I was asked by Inspector Quinn at the Saskatoon Police Department about my knowledge of the so-called script document, which is appendix B to my statement to Sergeant Pearson dated March 11th, 1992. Now, at that time I went down to the Saskatoon Police Department and, for the first time, I saw the Gail Miller murder file, which is a set of large binders which were some four or more feet in width from left to right, so to speak. I did not then or ever read through that file, which was obviously much larger than the Saskatoon Police Department file forwarded to our office for the Milgaard prosecution. So there's, in my view, an important distinction between the Milgaard prosecutors' file that came to us and the overall Gail Miller murder file which is a much different proposition.

Now, I have no memory now of any other offences, sexual or otherwise, which may have occurred in Saskatoon at or near the time of Gail Millers murder, And I was not aware that, again a quote here from 3(a) again, "police saw similarities between the rapes and the murder of Gail Miller." I was not aware of that if that

was the case, and of course I have no knowledge whether that was the case or not.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Just in further to that, did you ever at any time have two files, namely, the Milgaard file or the Fisher file from which you could draw comparison?

BOBS CALDWELL: None at all, and later on we'll get into that in greater depth, but I can say to you now that the only time our office ever got what I would call a file was as a result of someone being charged. Fisher was never charged in Saskatoon until the much later, you know, confessions arising out of his Winnipeg arrest, and we never had a Fisher file ever, whatsoever. All that I did was transmit a request from Ken MacKay to Deputy Chief Corey which I think I can expand on a little further down, but we never had a Larry Fisher file. Never had a reason to have a Larry Fisher file, even if he was charged with anything.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Okay, just -- just a question now, may be an appropriate time. You say you went down to Saskatoon Police Office and that's the first time you saw the police file?

BOBS CALDWELL: That's right.
have got comments all the way from, well, a certain individual put it together, to well the whole file was taken over, dumped on Mr. Caldwell's desk and he picked out aspects of that file that he wanted for his prosecution. Do you recall that ever happening, Where the file was brought over to you and you were -- went through it and picked out those aspects that you felt would, would help you with the prosecution?

BOBS CALDWELL: No. The way this worked and, and it's not an area of which I have a tremendous amount of detailed recollection, but we had in Saskatoon, starting in 1965, a Case Preparation officer at the Saskatoon Police Department and it was still one Elmer Ullrich, U-L-L-R-I-C-H, and is now retired, who took all cases and generally got them into good order, found missing witness statements, found lab reports, got after policemen to take statements, and he quite clearly did that operation on this file. And so I would get a file with the covering letter which we've all seen from the Deputy of that day, something called a brief summary, a much longer summary of pages which is also here, a collection of police reports, a
 thing and are vastly different in quantity and scope.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Right, because the police file would contain material that you didn't need for your prosecution?

BOBS CALDWELL: Absolutely, plus I would think a lot of it probably was collected after this trial was all over I would think, You know, in view of the subsequent allegations, etcetera, so I never did see that.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Okay, I have a question surrounding that, and in the investigation as we have gone so far, one of the questions that we have tried to clarify was how the file was put together to ultimately come over to your office; In other words, who put that together, and we

1 collection of civilian witness statements they used.

Now at that point I, of course, would be free to say please get me policeman $X$, get a report from him, or please go see civilian witness Y, get a statement, or have people come in and see me, any kind of follow-up I wanted the police would and did do, But I never received their entire collection, if you will, of raw material on any file, and certainly not on this one.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Okay, that's adequate, thank you.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: The letter to which you're referring to the Deputy Chief, or from the Deputy Chief to you apparently was dated the 8th of July, 1969?

BOBS CALDWELL: If you have it at hand, I wouldn't doubt that. I know I had it somewhere.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: I'm presenting a -- I have a copy here, Mr. Caldwell. I've identified it as appendix number 1 to my questions.

BOBS CALDWELL: That'd be the one, and there was only one. In other words, the file came over with this and we went from there.

Bobs Caldwell - Tape of Interview by RCMP
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look up and see if there's a statement, or simply the unfolding of the file when he learned of witnesses I didn't know about and I rounded them up or I indeed learned of witnesses that we initially didn't have. I know that things went to Mr. Tallis in a progressive way and the -just on that statement to Sergeant Pearson has in it copies of all my letters to Mr. Tallis which could, you know, roughly be called disclosure. Not to cut off your question, but that's the way that -- that is in there in a fairly comprehensive way I think. So it is true that things went to him in -- in instalments.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: If I understand correctly, Elmer Ullrich would have been responsible for preparing the case and bringing it to you?

BOBS CALDWELL: That's right.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: In the various documents that were appended to the file that was presented to you from the City Police, do you recall the numbers which were written in the top right-hand corner pages which alleged to be, we feel are page numbers. Now I'm presenting our file 93-211 to you and you'll notice that there are some page
numbers at the top.
BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: I can tell you what we've identified those, as being prepared by Detective Ray Mackie.

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: In -- in his attempt to draw documents from the file for presentation to the Prosecutors' Office.

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: Can you recall if Detective Mackie ever spoke to you regarding this at all or whether you were informed of this?

BOBS CALDWELL: The numbering thing? I don't recall the numbering routine at all and if I had to, you know, I would be of the opinion that the things I got were not numbered in that same way. In fact, somewhere earlier on in this 've been asked about numbers. I don't think that the material we got had that numbering on it, but you may -- you may know better than I do

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Yeah, I may help you out appendix B in your statement to Sergeant Pearson,

SGT. M. DRESSLER: You'll notice the numbers which appear on the face of the document along the left margin, and we have corresponded those numbers to numbers which appear to be the reddened numbers and I was just wondering if you have any knowledge of that.

BOBS CALDWELL: I don't -- again, I don't think that the material we got had that numbering thing in place on the documents we got and in a little later on I'll be telling you that if this is the alleged script thing, we didn't get it, But I know we'll cover that later.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Okay.
BOBS CALDWELL: Okay. Now, when I said that Ullrich prepared the file, of course, he -he's the one who pulled it together and did the mechanical business of getting everything in order of -- obviously he was not an investigator. That was the detectives with help from the uniformed people, etcetera.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Can I just interrupt you for one second?

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Sure, yeah.
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INSP. M. SAWATSKY: You say that you in 19 -- whenever you got, received word from Eugene Williams, I think you said you went and located the prosecution file...

BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah.
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: ... which was in the Saskatoon Justice Building...

BOBS CALDWELL: Well, provincial. It's a -- I was working for Federal Justice.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Okay.
BOBS CALDWELL: And it's important, that distinction. Unfortunately someone changed the name of the Department of the Attorney General to the Department of Justice, which now means they're easier to confuse, so I went back to Provincial Justice.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Gotcha.
BOBS CALDWELL: ... where I'd been the prosecutor during this episode to look at the file.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Okay, when you went back and went through that file, do you recall at any time seeing any correspondence relating to Larry Fisher?

BOBS CALDWELL: No. I know there was, now
because the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal only sits on criminal cases in Regina, that's the rule, so that 99 percent of the time a lawyer from what we called Head Office would do the actual appeal. In this case Serge Kujawa did it. That's done in Regina. I did not go to Regina or take any active part in the appeal, and for the time being, the -- the carton I've mentioned would simply be closed and put into closed file in wherever our office was physically located, we moved from the court house to Canterbury Towers in '81, And so by the time all this happened I'd been going to Canterbury to look at the file. But once it was closed there were two or three times I'd dealt with it. Do you want me to tell you about those?

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: I would, and I guess maybe I, I can help you by asking you a question then. He was convicted, David Milgaard was convicted in 1970 on the 31st of January.

BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah.
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: That would sort of end your involvement unless there was an appeal. Now, if there was an appeal, which there was, would you then take that file and send it down to
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I know there was because there's a letter from -from Deputy Chief Corey to, to I think Ken MacKay in Regina after Fisher's arrest, but I don't think that was ever part of our Milgaard file because there was no connection whatsoever with Fisher and the Milgaard matter, or the death of Gail Miller, either one, with the exception of the very brief interview by Sergeant Gerry McCorriston.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Right.
BOBS CALDWELL: Of, you know, one part of a paragraph saying that he was interviewed as a person who used to catch the bus at the same time.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Okay. After Milgaard was convicted, what would be the last involvement you would have had with the Milgaard file, prosecution file?

BOBS CALDWELL: The one at our office?
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Yes, the one at your office.

BOBS CALDWELL: Well, I -- the way things operated is that in most cases, including this one, any appeal to the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal was taken by, by our lawyers in Regina,
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Regina or would you prepare a brief or what would be your involvement in that appeal?

BOBS CALDWELL: None of that at all. Like, you've seen and have a copy of my report on completed cases and it of course would be in the Department's file in Regina. What my involvement in the appeal would be, I would undoubtedly be sent a copy of the notice of appeal, I would think by Regina, to say have you got anything to say about this. I expect that I talked to Kujawa by phone over it, over points of law or whatever, but frankly, I've no memory of doing that. However, I wouldn't quarrel with anyone who said I did. I did not go down to Regina, I did not do any kind of brief of law or answer any written correspondence from Kujawa saying what about this point or what about that point. And then he would -- would and did argue it in the Court of Appeal himself. So his name, of course, is on the reported case.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Okay. Would he -- I guess what I'm after is what would he require to do that? What would you send him? Would he be sent the file down?

BOBS CALDWELL: Well, ...

written here, I have no memory now of any other offences, sexual or otherwise, which may have occurred in Saskatoon at or near the time of Gail Miller's murder, I guess nothing else quite registered on me, to the extent that did, And I was not aware that, again using the language of the letter, that "police saw similarities between the rapes and the murder of Gail Miller." I guess I already told you people that.

Then I have knowledge of Larry Fisher being apprehended, that's the top of the second page of the letter. Okay. Now, on Larry Fisher, the Saskatoon Crown Prosecutors' office received 95 civilian witness statements of persons who were not called at the trial. I read through these statements twice, once on receipt of the file and again on receiving Mr. Tallis' letter of August 21st, 1969. I did not make any attempt to remember the names of any of these people, but Fisher did not give a statement to the Saskatoon Police Department and was, therefore, of course, not one of the people on this list. And I should add, nor was he one of the civilians who was called by the Crown as the other category, So he didn't make it on either
basis.
On or about March 16th of 1971
I was requested by phone by someone in the
Department of the Attorney General, Regina,
likely Ken MacKay, to have the Saskatoon Police
Department forward any outstanding charges they had against Larry Fisher for guilty pleas in Regina. I phoned Deputy Chief Corey and relayed this request as a result of which he wrote a letter dated March 17th, 1971 to the Department in Regina setting out my request and forwarding the requested information. I did not connect this Larry Fisher in any way with either the Dale -- David Milgaard file or the Gail Miller murder. And, just pausing there, I, until recently, was under the impression that Fisher had given a witness statement, but, by exhaustive research, I've now, I'm satisfied he didn't. So he wasn't called as a witness, he was not part of the 95 who weren't called 'cause he didn't give a statement. So all he was, was a fellow mentioned in passing, 'cause McCorriston happened to解 Now, on February 28th of


1990 -- and by the way, I know you have this but there's the, the McCorriston police report with the very brief thing about Fisher. On February 28th, 1990, while employed by the Canada Department of J ustice in the Saskatchewan Regional Office, Saskatoon, I received a telephone request from Eugene Williams to search the Provincial Crown Prosecution file for any mention of a person named Larry Fisher. On searching the file I found the investigation report of Detective McCorriston dated February 2nd, 1969, and this one you gentlemen have copies of I know, setting out the interview with Fisher on page 5, and I gave a copy of this document personally to Eugene Williams in Saskatoon on March 22nd of 1990. He and I went over to the Provincial Office. You've got that document. Okay.

Now, then to, to continue --
SGT. M. DRESSLER: Perhaps I can ask a couple of questions.

BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah, okay, sure, absolutely.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Couple of questions, Mr. Caldwell. In respect of Larry Fisher there is a
page 17437
note or a memorandum which I've taken from our file 93-211, page 40 and -- 39 and 40.

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: Reportedly written by Miss -- or Lieutenant Penkala on behalf of the Chief of Police, and I draw your attention to the last paragraph of page 2 and I'll read the text perhaps.

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: Our department has two unsolved cases dating back into October and November of 1968, which involved complaints of rape. In both these cases the victim was attacked from behind while walking in the late evening, forced into a lane and under threat with a knife made to undress and submit to intercourse. The victims were always threatened and forbidden to see the attacker who, after the attack, carried away some of the victim's clothing. In these cases the attacker allowed the victims to replace some of the clothing, usually the outer garment or coat.

Now as I see, this document is undated, however, it was taken from one of the files which were apparently in your, your

BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah, I can. Now, do you want me to continue on this, this scenario here, because I do get to Mr. Graham's statement.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Certainly, please.
BOBS CALDWELL: If that's all right, I'll do that then. Okay, now, in -- still on page 2 of, of the inspector's letter there's a second paragraph, the Saskatoon Star Phoenix does a story, etcetera. My comment on that is, when? I have no recollection of such a story at or near the time of the murder, and I expand on that by saying I have no recollection of a vast number of things at this point from that era, obviously.

Then I have, given the
publicity, in the same paragraph, Mr. Caldwell would have been well aware of other similar crimes. I have no recollection of being aware of other similar crimes," or, as mentioned above, of any other crimes at all at that time, period. I mean, I, I remember this case 'cause it was an outstanding and difficult and long-lasting thing, but I couldn't even tell you what other prosecutions I may have done or not at that time, so -- And then the next paragraph starts that a victim by name of Yang -- of (V4)---, etcetera.
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possession. Do you have any knowledge or recollection of that document?

BOBS CALDWELL: Let's just have a look at it. Well, number $1, I$ don't have any recollection of it ever being part of my materials, if you want to put it that way. Second, it looks to be, and I -- as if it may be a thing that was composed with a view to putting out a public announcement enlisting the aid of the public and giving some of the, you know, things that the police knew about these other offences. So, if it came off our file that's news to me, I wouldn't, you know, wouldn't, I simply can't comment on that, I have no recollection of it ever coming to my attention, and it looks very much to me as if it was constructed with a view, as I say, of putting out a press statement enlisting public help. I don't know if that's of any assistance to you, but is there anything else you want to inquire?

SGT. M. DRESSLER: No, that's, that's, thank you very much. Perhaps just in keeping with our discussion, can you recall providing a statement to Mr. W.G. Graham on the 19th of November, '91?

Now, I have no recollection of ever learning of this offence and then the quote is, "This offence committed by Fisher was not disclosed to the defence." My comment is, was this offence known to have been committed by Fisher at the time of the offence, i.e., did the victim know Fisher? Was this episode published? I have no recollection now of having heard of this episode at the time. But the way that reads, you see, implies -- I mean, to me the victim would have had to know Fisher personally when it says this offence committed by Fisher. I don't know whether the victim knew him personally and I have no recollection of the episode whatsoever.

And then, if you wish, that brings me to $B$ on page 2, that Mr. Caldwell failed to disclose at the original trial the identity of two witnesses, Mr. and Mrs. Merriman, who were in or had a view of the alley near the murder. My comment to that was who are Mr. and Mrs. Merriman? Are they part of the 95 witnesses that we mentioned earlier? Because one of the things I haven't had is the list of the 95 witnesses.

Now, if you would like, I -- I
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can tell you that I've, I have since come to the understanding that these were two people who had a view of the alley near the murder scene and are mentioned only in some policeman's investigation report. I -- I wouldn't have called them if they said I -- I looked down the road and didn't see anything, unless it were extremely critical timing involved or they were some way able to say that episode didn't happen. If you'd simply called people who said I lived near there and looked out the door and didn't see anything, the trial would still be going on, We just literally can't do that, and unless you're doing it for oblique motives, I didn't call them, There was no -- so I now understand it that there was no statement from them, period. So if you'd like to ask me about that, I'd be happy to answer that.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: There are -- there are the identities of two other individuals which were described in a police report as travelling down the alley the night of the 31st of January, '69 at approximately 10 PM . It may well be that these are the individuals to whom the allegation refers, although it is not clear. The name of one of the individuals was Barbara Best, the
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examination-in-chief, that would be leading and it would not be allowed because Rasmussen was my witness, so I couldn't lead him by saying was there blood on the accused, did he behave unusually.

Now, if the defence did not ask those questions, they could properly argue in summing up that there is no evidence by Mr. Rasmussen that the accused had blood on him or was behaving unusually. I mean, that would be quite proper, But the only way it could be raised is by the defence, in my opinion, and if neither of us raised it, there's no presumption it happened, all of which helps the accused.

Now, the next point is that evidence was held -- withheld from the defence. This is item D, the trial jury did not hear all the evidence. Now, my first question is what evidence because I don't know what this refers to, but if I can come back to that. The Supreme Court of Canada held on page 4 of the judgment, and I quote, "We have not been presented with any probative evidence that the police acted improperly in the investigation of the robbery, sexual assault and murder of Gail Miller, or in
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other was Linda Barron. Barbara Best does appear on one of the index -- in that index of 95
witnesses. Can you recall her at all?
BOBS CALDWELL: Not in the least. I -- not her name, nothing about her, and indeed not the names of the other 94 people, so. Is that okay for the Merrimans? Now, the next point here is that in C, Mr. Caldwell failed to offer in evidence that Rasmussen, the motel manager, says he did not see any blood on Milgaard, nor did he observe any unusual demeanour from him. Now, if Rasmussen did not mention blood on Milgaard or unusual behavior by Milgaard, the presumption would be that there was none of either. In other words, you don't assume that he'd behaved unusually or that he had blood on him, you assume that he -- that neither of those things happened and that both those things are in his favour. Those are assumed to be normal and that is in favour of the accused. If these two items were not led in chief, the presumption would be that both were regular, i.e., there was no blood, there was no unusual behavior. If I asked any blood, questioned any blood on him or questioned any unusual behavior by him in
their interviews with any of the witnesses. Nor has evidence been presented that there was inadequate disclosure in accordance with the practice prevailing at the time."

Just allow me a little editorial comment here. I can't answer this without specifics as to what evidence was allegedly withheld from the defence. Now, if you gentlemen can help me with that. That's a meaningless question unless -- unless someone says you did A, B, C or D.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: If I can, if I can maybe help to clarify that. I believe that came forward from Mrs. Milgaard's interview where she talked about other witnesses who didn't see anything and weren't called and I, and my own feelings are that you have adequately explained that when you talked about the Merrimans and those other people that you didn't call because they had no evidence to offer.

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay, because it's very -it's very, you know, it's very serious to say that someone withheld evidence from the defence. I'd be very happy to deal with specific allegations, but I can't answer that in the happy. terms of specifics.

BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah. we made an effort in our office to make
abstract, and if you feel it's been covered I'm

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: I'm satisfied it has with your answer to the Merrimans and, Max, do you agree? Do you have any problems with that?

SGT. M. DRESSLER: No, I agree, I agree completely. I just wanted to make a note that you've discussed, discussed disclosure in pages 4 to 10 of your statement with Sergeant Pearson in

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Can you offer a comment in respect of disclosure generally with regard to this case? Did you make a conscious effort to ensure "disclosure was made in proper fashion"?

BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah, I did. And if we, if you wish I can deal with this now. It may be coming up later, but the first thing I would say was that I quite honestly don't even remember if the term disclosure was in use in those days, but disclosure to the defence for a whole bunch of reasons. Number one, it's sort of the right thing and ethical to do; number 2, it in some percentage of cases leads to guilt pleas or


I have no record of giving them to Mr. Tallis, but it's very clear from his cross-examination at the preliminary hearing and maybe the trial that he had those previous statements by Wilson, some of which were false, some of which were partial, until Wilson eventually gave what I believe to be the true statement after seeing Sergeant Roberts. So there's a good deal of formal recording of what disclosure I made and there was more disclosure I made that, as far as I can see, never got reduced to writing, but it's clear from the transcript that it happened. And then, of course, the letter from Mr. Tallis to me asking me to reread the, all the civilian witness statements. I did that. And ...

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Can I just interrupt you, just gotta change a battery here.

MR. HALYK: Okay. Take a break. Smoke break.

BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: The time is 1422 hours, we're taking a short break.
(TURN TAPE OVER)
Testing, one, two, three, four. The time is 1430 and we're resuming our statement.
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guilty pleas to other offences or to us not having to call witnesses because things are admitted as facts and all kinds of things.

Now, in this case, first of all, you know, regardless of how it came out, it -- it's a very important case to the, our community. Second, it's very important to the accused. Third, I was dealing with Mr. Tallis who, I having prosecuted in Regina from 1958 till ' 62 and then here onwards, more than simply my opinion, was regarded as the leading defence counsel in the province of that day, and I feel I have personal knowledge of that. I had had a great deal to do with him over the years and he, in turn, had a very great, you know, responsibility in defending this case to be sure he got everything, So I made exhaustive disclosure which, as you mention, is largely set out in the letters that are appendices to Sergeant Pearson, my statement to Sergeant Pearson.

In addition to that, I've now concluded that I gave things to Mr. Tallis which never got recorded in so many words, the best example being the various statements by Wilson.

Page 17488
BOBS CALDWELL: Okay. I think I was going on about disclosure there.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: That's exactly right, yeah.

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay. The statement to Sergeant Pearson as we've noted has, I think, all my letters to Mr. Tallis. They, in turn, set out what statements were enclosed and I -- I know that more was given to him than got recorded, by mainly mentioning to the Wilson business, and anything, of course, that he wanted pursued was done. He, of course, as an example, sat in when we interviewed Inspector Roberts, the polygraph operator, and so, you know, there was no, no spirit of me holding out on him, or vice versa, whatsoever. I -- I can answer anything specific you want, but I certainly made every effort to make full disclosure for -- one of the many, many reasons is you wouldn't want an important case like this which ended up coming off properly to be reversed because you failed to ship some document to somebody. So unless you have anything more, that would be my reply. Is that okay on that? We can come back.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Yes.

$$
\text { Page } 17449
$$

BOBS CALDWELL: Now, one that I noted here, which totally baffles me, is E, evidence was withheld from the defence, A trial jury did not hear the evidence, I guess we've covered that, pardon me, that's D. Letter E, statements withheld by Caldwell prove that Milgaard was not in the vicinity. Now, I have no earthly idea what that's about, and I hope you can help me.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: I think that what they're talking about there is sort of a continuing from Rasmussen saying that -- and it's been, I think, Mr. Wolch has alleged all along that Milgaard was not there at the time because he was actually at the Trav-a-leer Motel and that that information about him being at Trav-a-leer Motel and Rasmussen being able to testify that was withheld.

BOBS CALDWELL: Well, we, we put in all we knew about their sequence of travel around that neighbourhood. As you may realize, that I had this particular map made by the City Police to show all those locations that they went to, the Trav-a-leer, the Belmont Texaco, etcetera, and in all the evidence we were aware of was put in for better or for worse. Now, in all cases like this
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INSP. M. SAWATSKY: And of course that again sort of excludes them from being there at the particular time, but the Crown's theory alleged they were.

BOBS CALDWELL: And it was also 40 below and foggy if I remember correctly, so --

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Uh hmm.
BOBS CALDWELL: There weren't too many potential witnesses hangin' around. (Chuckles). Anyway, I hope that is a suitable answer.

Now, the next one I have is non-disclosure of evidence that Rasmussen, Nichol John, Danchuk, and Sharon Williams did not see blood on Milgaard's clothing. If I may, I'll simply ask you to take my answer about the Rasmussen business being the identical thing. All these people were called as witnesses; I'm not sure about Sharon Williams, maybe not. Okay, but it was open, of course, to the defence to say isn't it true, Mr. X, that you didn't see blood on, on my client's clothing. I can't lead it. If the defence asks the, you know, if they get a positive answer saying yes, there was no blood, that's fine. If they don't, the presumption is there was none. So, I mean, what can I do? I
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there's never precise agreement on things happening down to the minute, and I know that some people have argued, as an example, there wasn't time for him to do the murder. I didn't write the script. Somebody did it and we put in all the evidence we had and it was open to the jury to decide that he was not in the vicinity, or the Crown got the wrong guy. They decided evidently that he was in the vicinity and did the murder. Now, unless -- I don't know what more I can say on that, unless you have specific questions for me.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: I have nothing further to add.

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay, because I know in, in criminal cases invariably you can't, you never come down to precision timings, you simply don't.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Yes, and I think also part of that is the, the several witnesses who say they had a view of the intersection of Avenue N, I believe, Max, and 20th Avenue...

BOBS CALDWELL: 20th Street.
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: ... never ever saw a vehicle stuck in there.

BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah, well ...
can't improve on what happened there.
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: And then again that -would that evidence in your opinion be in favour of the Crown or favour of the Defence?

BOBS CALDWELL: Well, the way it stands, if there's non-disclosure of evidence of -- well, it's very awkwardly worded. Let me put it this way, if no one says there was blood, the presumption is there was no blood, So that's what they ended up was apparently with evidence of no evidence about blood, which, in my opinion, is the same as there being no blood. Mr. Tallis could very properly say you heard witnesses A, B, and C , and you'll notice none of them mentioned blood on his clothing, and that clashes with D, E and F , So he couldn't have had it better than that. Then I have -- is, is that all for that?

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Yes.
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Yes.
BOBS CALDWELL: 'Kay, now, G, I failed to disclose Simon Doell's evidence re the bus used by Miller. And perhaps you gentlemen could... I have here who is Simon Doell? Perhaps you could help me because I have no memory of that at all.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Simon Doell is -- do
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you want to hand him the, that copy of the police report and let him read it? That may... we have a short excerpt from the police report here where Simon Doell is mentioned. I'm not aware that Simon Doell was of those 95 witnesses there of the statements that, that were not, were or were not called but, we have a (unintelligible) I think it's over her, Max, Sorry. That's it right there. And just refer to that document.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: I'm showing to you a police report dated February 6th, 1969, with the number 135 in the top right-hand corner and it refers to Mr. Doell, if you wish to review that.

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay.
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Particularly, Mr. Caldwell, these last, almost the last paragraph there in the centre portion of the text.

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay. Okay, this is a person saying that on occasions he'd been riding on the bus and when Miss Miller got on the bus she always ... something ... on the corner of Avenue N and 20th directly across from the funeral home. He missed her on the bus a couple of times and asked her how she was getting to work. She said she was getting a ride, she did
is on Avenue 0, and it's either 130 probably, let's say. Presumably came, what I would call, east on 21st headed, what I would call south on N to catch the bus at 20th, and the funeral home is at, at or about 1402 20th, and quite clearly the episode happened around this lane leading, which was leading to the $T$ alley that's been described so many times. There's no question at all, I mean, that's not a theory to me, that's what happened, I mean there's no evidence pointing away from that, and the business of asking this girl whether she knew where Peace Hill was, there is no Peace Hill in Saskatoon, there's an area called Pleasant Hill, and when she didn't know, that the remark the stupid bitch made by the accused. Sorry, I've digressed a little bit. I guess you could call it the Crown's theory, but I think it's more than a theory. By the time you have the evidence of Wilson and John and the police and where things were found, that the thing happened commencing on -- on, at or near this opening of the alley on N .

SGT. M. DRESSLER: I guess what I'm, what I'm getting at, is that, is there anything to suggest that she may have been accosted on Avenue
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not elaborate on this remark, and that's Morality Officer Dimmitt.

The City Police, you know, did an exhaustive job on this investigation to the extent of going and collaring people who were getting on similar buses the next one or two or three mornings, and if I knew about that Simon Doell, if that was his evidence, I wouldn't have called him, Just another guy getting on the bus who may or may not have been with her on any given morning. Like, I can't see that it helps or hurts anybody.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Could this have been connected to the Crown's theory that Gail Miller was walking on Avenue N when the attack took place, or when the sequence of events were initiated? Do you have any recollection of that?

BOBS CALDWELL: Well, the...
SGT. M. DRESSLER: Perhaps more properly, can you recall the -- the theory at the time?

BOBS CALDWELL: Well...
SGT. M. DRESSLER: Ah, what's yes...
BOBS CALDWELL: ... the Crown's theory, you -- mean, was that she had left her residence, which doesn't show up on this, but it, I believe,
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0 as she was proceeding to 20th, taken by vehicle around to the lane way? We're not disputing the fact that it occurred at the lane way?

BOBS CALDWELL: That was never suggested to me and I'm -- I -- I just, from all the facts I remember, there was no sug ... like, suggestion that the inquiry about Peace Hill took place anywhere but on the road where the car got stuck, all of which is Avenue N .

SGT. M. DRESSLER: I guess then in keeping with this Simon Doell entry on the police report...

BOBS CALDWELL: Uh hmmm.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: ...I guess it, could it be possible that -- that -- with Doell stating that she always got on the bus at Avenue N , that may have influenced the Crown's theory, or do you have any recollection of that?

BOBS CALDWELL: Well, no, it wouldn't influence me because I have no memory of ever reading the Doell thing, and because -- let's suppose he had insisted she always got on at Avenue 0, I wouldn't believe him, because the evidence was of the Wilson car coming down Avenue N , the inquiry being made somewhere along here,
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have any view they want, I mean, she, I suppose if she was a physical exercise fan could have gone three or four blocks down 20th to catch the bus. I, I wasn't writing the script and nor, I'm pleased to say, were Mr. Wolch or Mr. Asper. But in any event, aside from facetiousness, there was nothing ever to suggest Avenue 0 as the, as the locale of their encounter with this girl.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Thank you.
BOBS CALDWELL: 'Kay. Okay, now I think that gets us to page 3 of your letter, Inspector, and the item H I've got...

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Yes, I agree.
BOBS CALDWELL: All right. What I've
written down about that is, or noted, is the prosecution file was complete as recently as 1989 when I last searched it at the request of Eugene Williams. I did not destroy any material from the file at any time. I don't know what is meant by a "C" file. Our office in Saskatoon, from 1962 when I arrived here, till 1987 when I left that office, used only manilla-coloured, legal-sized filing folders. We did not have, nor did I personally use, yellow or any other coloured filing folders, And I don't know of any
"missing documents". Now would, can we expand on that, is...

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: I can tell you where that came from, where I believe that came from. When we had our meeting with Mr. Wolch he made reference to a C file which he could not give us any more detail as to where he felt it came from.

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay.
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: But we're speculating as, as a group there, that possibly it was notes that you may have made during prosecution on legal-sized yellow foolscap, which I know a lot of law firms use. Now, I don't know if you did.

BOBS CALDWELL: I didn't. I -- I used exclusively three-ring binder paper which you've got lots of examples in the exhibit. I never, ever used that, that yellow stuff that's so common.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Okay. And Mr. Wolch talks about a C file which he felt may have been a prosecution file.

BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah.
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Where he got this term investigation, and we've had, our members have
gone through every single document, have we come upon this file. So whether it's something from Mrs. Milgaard or, or what I don't know. But we, I think, have assumed, all of us, including Mr. Wolch, that it was likely the prosecution file.

BOBS CALDWELL: Well, it, it wasn't, and I said a minute ago I used foolscap, which is not three-ring binder size, it's closest to legal size, with a thing called a springback binder, and you've got my original notes, and lots of them in your file, which would illustrate that, and I know I don't need to show you pages of it, but...

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Well, would the notes then that are in the file constitute, to your knowledge, all of the notes that were made and then appended your file and held in that fashion?

BOBS CALDWELL: I didn't have any other
files. Everything I had went into the seven filing folders and into that carton. I didn't, you know, destroy anything, add anything, squirrel anything away. I had certain extra copies of typed documents that you've seen here today that were, that are in multiple copies, including in the Saskatoon Crown Prosecutors'
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file, so there's absolutely no -- nothing was destroyed, there were no $C$ files and no yellow anything as far as I'm concerned.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Okay, I guess just to, to sort of close that issue if we can.

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay.
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Do you recall or are you familiar with the term C file or yellow file?

BOBS CALDWELL: Absolutely...
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Does that mean anything to you?

BOBS CALDWELL: No, C file. My initial, I'd been known, of course, to end little notes with C for Caldwell. No C file though. No, I -it doesn't mean a thing to me. Absolutely not.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: That, that might be an explanation right there with something we can look at all right.

BOBS CALDWELL: Unfortunately I never did. I mean, I never created a filing folder with my initial or name on it in this because everything I did or dealt with, you fellows have.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Okay, that's something that if we can find more information on we could always come back to you and try and clarify it.
information that may be helpful to you. I'm holding a copy of those documents in my hand which I've attached as appendix 2 and which was referred to in Sergeant Pearson's statement as appendix B.

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: Through our inquiries we have determined that on the back of the document entitled summary was a handwritten drawing. We have identified that drawing as being completed by former Chief J oe Penkala.

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: ... and I was wondering if that has any way, in any way if that helps refresh your memory.

BOBS CALDWELL: About that document? Not in the least.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Thank you.
BOBS CALDWELL: No, not at all. I didn't know whose writing and drawing that was. It's obviously not mine, but, no, not at all. And what I said in the Sergeant Pearson statement I adopt on that. I'll expand if, if I could, but there's really not much more I could say.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: I see no need, thank
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INSP. M. SAWATSKY: But Mr. Wolch wasn't able to help us anymore than that, he sort of threw it out and we haven't been able to, to find anything more to support that.

BOBS CALDWELL: Well, I feel better now, (chuckles) 'cause I certainly can't help you. Then the next thing I have, if that was all on that, gentlemen, is this letter I prosecution was in possession of a document summarizing, etcetera. Now, here's -- my answer to that is this: Is this the alleged "script" document? If so, it's covered in my statement to Sergeant Pearson above. Now, I did not, to quote this, "deny ever seeing this document," I described finding it in my statement to Sergeant Pearson. I don't know what's meant by, and then another quote, "file markings indicating that it was received and filed at the Crown Counsel's office." Now you'll see, of course, in Sergeant, in Sergeant Pearson's statement what I said about finding it in Regina, which, unless you want to, I wont repeat all that.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: I just have some now.

BOBS CALDWELL: 'Kay, thanks. And then the next paragraph, let's see...

SGT. M. DRESSLER: I think we're onto J

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: J.
BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah, but tell me, I still don't understand, going back to I, yeah. It has file markings indicating it was received and filed at the Crown Counsel's office. Can you help me with that?

SGT. M. DRESSLER: I have no knowledge of those markings.

BOBS CALDWELL: But they're not in anything that, that either I have or the R.C.M.P. has.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: I 've located nothing in our files which suggests any markings...

BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: ... stating they were received by the Crown's office.

BOBS CALDWELL: So, so, you know, that to me is incorrect and...

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: That again is an allegation of Mr. Wolch and we again haven't been able to see that.


on that J right now or, okay. So in K, the question on my relationship with the investigators, I knew all the investigators who were called as Crown witnesses on the Milgaard prosecution. I commenced work in Saskatoon as agent of the Attorney General in February of 1962 and I had met all these investigators in the course of previous prosecutions. Those called at the trial were T.H. Kleiv, J.H. Parker, G.T. Reid, J. Penkala, L.R. Grant, G.R. McCorriston, R.E. Fleming, K.S. Mackie, E.A. Karst, R.W. Mackie and J. Oleksyn. I knew all those officers in their capacity as policemen and in mine, as agent of the Attorney General. Anything you want to ask me to amplify on that at all, you're welcome.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: The only thing that I have by way of clarification is that I was told, and there's no documentation to present that, but -- or present to refer to, that you were involved with their union or their association as lawyer.

BOBS CALDWELL: (Laughs).
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Now, could you just tell us about that?
know, eminent counsel as -- the one I recall was Mr. Tallis, succeeded by Mr. Halyk, did act for the association. So that's utter nonsense, of course.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Did your relationship or could your relationship with the police be construed as a conflict in terms of compromising your position as an agent for the Attorney General, To your knowledge?

BOBS CALDWELL: Well, that would have to arise out of me being their lawyer for their association wouldn't it? So, no -- no and no. If that's what that means, it didn't happen, so it couldn't have any bearing on anything. I mean, I'm amazed that anyone would think it was possible because I was a full-time provincial civil servant and certainly couldn't practice law in any shape or form.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Thank you.
BOBS CALDWELL: 'Kay. Now, letter L, I'll tell you my views on that, and that is that the Saskatchewan Department of the Attorney General must have had a file of its own (a sneeze) on the Milgaard prosecution, if for no greater reason than corresponding with the Saskatoon Crown
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Prosecutors about the case, and also appearing in the Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court of Canada on the original appeal where leave to appeal was refused shortly after the Court of Appeal case. That, of course, is not the recent Supreme Court hearing we're talking about. I do not know whether, what I call head office, in other words, Regina, obtained the Saskatoon Crown Prosecution file from our Saskatoon offices for "appeal purposes" and in the absence of some written record of that occurring, I doubt that it happened.

Head office would have my Report on Completed Cases dated February 12th, 1970, the trial transcript, the notice of appeal, and any correspondence which might have taken place between the Saskatoon office and the Regina Prosecutions Branch.

Now, as to whether I provided
Head Office with "Mr. Fisher's file," I have here see answers above, and that refers back to what I said about Fisher earlier in this interview. My office did not have a file on Mr. Fisher. He was not identified as the perpetrator of any Saskatoon offences until later he confessed to

|  |  |
| :---: | :--- |
|  |  |
| 1 | them in Manitoba, whereupon they were disposed of |
| 2 | by guilty pleas in Regina, and this is expanded |
| 3 | on in my statement to -- to Mr. Graham. I had no |
| 4 | "material" to provide head office. |
| 5 | Now, is there anything about |
| 6 | that -- that paragraph you want to pursue at this |
| 7 | point? Because it talks both about Milgaard's |
| 8 | file and Fisher's file. We never had a Fisher |
| 9 | file. |
| 10 | INSP. M. SAWATSKY: And I think you've |
| 11 | adequately answered did Mr. Caldwell provide head |
| 12 | office with the material described. |
| 13 | BOBS CALDWELL: Didn't have anything to |
| 14 | provide them. In fact, what did go didn't come |
| 15 | through our office, it went from the Deputy Chief |
| 16 | of Saskatoon direct to the Regina Department of |
| 17 | Justice head office. |
| 18 | INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Right. |
| 19 | BOBS CALDWELL: Didn't -- there's no point |
| 20 | in, or reason for it to come through our office, |
| 21 | and it didn't. And that is clear, of course, |
| 22 | from the letters that you have. |
| 23 | INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Yes. |
| 24 | BOBS CALDWELL: Is there anything else then |
| 25 | on that L one? |
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| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | you had by way of file material. Max, does that |
| 2 | satisfy you? |
| 3 | SGT. M. DRESSLER: Certainly. |
| 4 | BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah, because it's very |
| 5 | important to, to, you know -- again, remember |
| 6 | that we had a Queen against Milgaard file, That |
| 7 | was not the same as the Saskatoon Police/Gail |
| 8 | Miller murder file. Neither of those was the |
| 9 | same as Regina's Queen against Milgaard file, |
| 10 | which would basically have my report and any |
| 11 | appeal documents and stuff in it, And we had no |
| 12 | Fisher file, oh, of any description. So those |
| 13 | are all in little different compartments and |
| 14 | can't be kinda mentally pushed all in together, |
| 15 | 'cause they physically weren't that way. |
| 16 | SGT. M. DRESSLER: Perhaps while we're just |
| 17 | dealing with this, I may ask this question, which |
| 18 | might be appropriate. Did you at any time |
| 19 | discuss the case that you were proceeding against |
| 20 | Milgaard with Mr. Kujawa and, if so, the |
| 21 | circumstances? |
| 22 | BOBS CALDWELL: The Milgaard? |
| 23 | SGT. M. DRESSLER: Milgaard file itself. |
| 24 | BOBS CALDWELL: I'm sure I did. My -- for |
| 25 | instance, an example, I'm sure I must have phoned |
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error and we have about another hour of the interview, so we'll proceed with that.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.

## (TAPE RESUMES)

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Okay, we've still got, looks like a few minutes of tape, so maybe -- we may be able to finish off here, depending on the amount of conversation ...

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay, sure.
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: ... and then take a
break, but, if not I'll -- I'll alert when nearing the end.

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay. Well then I have, if you're through then with M. from my aspect of it, still this -- this M. still talks about were there other communications, telephone conversations, for instance, which may have included these references. Again, my Milgaard file was not full of references to -- to the Fisher rape or rapes or, I don't even see them as that, I see them as, at that point, unsolved sexual crimes which had not been attributed to Fisher. So there's a big jump being made of assumption there, and it's -- certainly Kujawa and I never talked about Fisher in any aspect
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| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Yeah, he came to my residence. |
| 2 | SGT. M. DRESSLER: And when would have that |
| 3 | occurred? |
| 4 | BOBS CALDWELL: Umm, well, I thought it |
| 5 | would be stickin' right out on the top of the ... |
| 6 | according to my, my notes, November 19th, 1991. |
| 7 | SGT. M. DRESSLER: Okay. |
| 8 | BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah, I got that from |
| 9 | somewhere. Oh, I'm sorry, it's -- it's the very |
| 10 | first thing in the statement. On November 19th, |
| 11 | 1991 I interviewed T.D.R. Caldwell at his home |
| 12 | 855 University Drive. That's Mr. Graham's sort |
| 13 | of opening thing and my statement takes up |
| 14 | another couple of full pages, And you have that. |
| 15 | SGT. M. DRESSLER: Okay. I wasn't given |
| 16 | access, or I didn't have access to the first |
| 17 | page, but that clarifies it. Those are all the |
| 18 | questions that I have about that. |
| 19 | BOBS CALDWELL: Okay. If you want that |
| 20 | you, you can have I today from me with no |
| 21 | problem, I'll photocopy it. |
| 22 | SGT. M. DRESSLER: Okay, thank you. |
| 23 | BOBS CALDWELL: But you do have my |
| 24 | statement to Graham? |
| 25 | SGT. M. DRESSLER: Yes I do. |
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whatever, because his existence hadn't been, he had not been identified, you know, aside entirely from the fact that we weren't paying attent ... any attention to anything but this prosecution at that point. So anyway, you can come back if you'd like.

Now the N., letter N. this that Saskatchewan Justice proceeded by direct indictment against Larry Fisher in the Saskatoon rapes, is this an unusual legal procedure? I gave my views on that to Mr. W.G. Bill Graham, who's Executive Director of the Saskatoon Police Commission. I think that should be Saskatchewan. In a statement I gave Mr. Graham November 19th, 1991, when he was investigating the alleged concealment of files concerning Larry Fisher, a copy of this statement is in the material sent with Inspector Sawatsky's letter to Mr. Halyk of June 23rd, 1993, and I adopt what I told Mr. Graham lock, stock and barrel, but I'm happy to expand on it if there is anything specific you'd like to go into. This is --

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Where was the statement given?

BOBS CALDWELL: At my house. To Graham?

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay, okay, that's good. So, now, do you want to expand on the question of the way the Fisher things were dealt with? As far as I'm concerned it's -- there's nothing whatever sinister about it.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Yeah, and I think when we wrote you that we were interested more in the, in the procedure, and actually I think that has been answered by another witness, and I think we now realize that you probably played no role in that. Do you recall if you would have played any role in, in that, and I ...

BOBS CALDWELL: In the Fisher thing.
MR. HALYK: Direct indictment.
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: In the direct indictment?

BOBS CALDWELL: Oh, none, none whatsoever. Because, you see, the only way our office would be involved is if Fisher had been charged. The Saskatoon Police didn't have -- they had a bunch of unsolved sexual offences with no accused for them. Now, our office would not get those nameless offences 'cause no one was charged. If it -- in another scenario, suppose they had arrested Fisher here and he confessed all this,

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
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| 1 | we would have one or more Fisher files. But |
| 2 | there was nothing, there was no point in -- our |
| 3 | office knew nothing about him because he was an |
| 4 | unknown one or more offenders at that time. So |
| 5 | ... |
| 6 | SGT. M. DRESSLER: When did you become |
| 7 | aware that Fisher had been charged by Saskatoon |
| 8 | City Police; can you recall? |
| 9 | BOBS CALDWELL: Well the only thing I would |
| 10 | ever know about it is -- is that letter from |
| 11 | Corey to -- it would be Ken MacKay phoning me |
| 12 | saying "please get the City Police to ship in |
| 13 | anything they have on Larry Fisher". But, of |
| 14 | course, in -- and that was, that was March of |
| 15 | '71, just let me look here a minute. MacKay |
| 16 | phoned me within a day or so of when Corey sent |
| 17 | the letter, because I have a letter from MacKay |
| 18 | to the Winnipeg lawyer for Fisher complaining |
| 19 | about lack of action, in which MacKay says "our |
| 20 | agent in Saskatoon is looking after this". |
| 21 | That's all within two or three days of each |
| 22 | other. So in -- what that means is he phoned me |
| 23 | and said "get Corey to send us all the Fisher |
| 24 | stuff". |
| 25 | SGT. M. DRESSLER: Uh hmm. |


|  |  |
| :---: | :--- |
|  |  |
| 1 | BOBS CALDWELL: I wouldn't think I would |
| 2 | know that because, I mean, they can't lay charges |
| 3 | until they know the identity of the accused. |
| 4 | They only learned the identity of the accused |
| 5 | because the -- he was, you know, what, |
| 6 | apprehended in Winnipeg and said "I want to clean |
| 7 | this stuff up". |
| 8 | SGT. M. DRESSLERVR: I might be able to help |
| 9 | you here. We're aware that City Police laid |
| 10 | charges against -- four rape counts against |
| 11 | Fisher in December of 1970. |
| 12 | BOBS CALDWELL: Uh hmm. |
| 13 | SGT. M. DRESSLER: And then it was |
| 14 | subsequent to that that he was returned to |
| 15 | Saskatchewan and he faced the direct indictment |
| 16 | later that, in 1971. Do you have any knowledge |
| 17 | of those 1970 charges? |
| 18 | BOBS CALDWELL: No, except what I learned |
| 19 | as a result of this whole process. Like, again, |
| 20 | you see, they would, we had -- we had no accused |
| 21 | physically, we had no court date, we had no file. |
| 22 | It was totally the opposite of the usual way of |
| 23 | operating because, because presumably the City |
| 24 | Police somehow learned that Fisher was the right |
| 25 | guy and laid charges. But had Fisher been |

we would have one or more Fisher files. But
aware that Fisher had been charged by Saskatoon
BOBS CALDWELL: Well the only thing I would ever know about it is -- is that letter from Corey to -- it would be Ken MacKay phoning me saying "please get the City Police to ship in anything they have on Larry Fisher". But, of course, in -- and that was, that was March of '71, just let me look here a minute. MacKay phoned me within a day or so of when Corey sent the letter, because I have a letter from MacKay to the Winnipeg lawyer for Fisher complaining agent in Saskatoon is looking after this". That's all within two or three days of each and said "get Corey to send us all the Fisher

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Uh hmm.
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BOBS CALDWELL: So, I mean, the -- the Fisher stuff never physically came through our office. I ended up with a carbon copy of the Corey letter to MacKay. And this, of course, is out of your documents. Like he'd send me that carbon copy and it would be presumably filed, or is it? Just a minute, I just want to make sure it is. No, I thought it was copied to us but it wasn't, so I didn't even get that.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Did you ever speak to Mr. Fisher's lawyer, Mr. Greenberg?

BOBS CALDWELL: Absolutely not. Because he would presumably understand that this was a Regina operation. Now in your file that says Fisher/Kujawa, there's a -- all that correspondence is in there in which, in which the Winnipeg lawyer was, in effect, nagging our Regina Head Office to get moving on this thing. He didn't know, there was no reason for him to deal with us, because he was already dealing with Regina and we didn't have anything to, to deal with. We didn't have a file.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Were you aware that Saskatoon City Police had laid charges prior to the direct indictment being sought?
physically in Saskatoon, arrested here, we'd have been involved in court dates, getting ready for the file, etcetera, etcetera. Not a bit of it in this instance, because we weren't asked to process or look after it. And the way it was done was unusual, but there's not a thing about it that's sinister in my estimation, and I think I explained all that to Graham.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Thank you.
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: I just see we're at the point now where, how you handled your files, and that sort of thing. And I think it would be an appropriate time to take another break and well turn the tape over.

BOBS CALDWELL: Very good.
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: The time is now 3:15.
(TAPE B)
SGT. M. DRESSLER: The statement resumes at 15:20.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Okay. Mr. Caldwell, we were at our second point and there, I see that we've duplicated ourselves, and what do prosecutors do with their files, that particular paragraph?

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay. What I can tell you

about that is that, at the time of the Milgaard trial, my office retained all files intact for five years and discarded run-of-the-mill files, such as .08's, etcetera, in the sixth, sixth year. We retained all files on murders, manslaughters, cause death by criminal negligence, sexual offenses with a view to, later on, dangerous sexual offender applications, and files, of course, on those applications themselves; inquests following unsolved murders and other important files permanently, and that practice was still going on when I left the office in 1987.

Now in the Milgaard file, I did not remove or destroy any correspondence or other material whatever. Prior to my leaving, there was no entry of files on microfiche taking place in our office in Saskatoon. I don't know what the present situation is. That's item N. and I would be happy to expand on that if there's anything.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Yeah. I guess the only question that arises in my mind, if your policy was to destroy files after five years, is there any particular thing or can you give a reason as
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I'm misreading this. I do not know whether this knife was tested in any way, that's the bone-handled knife that's referred to. The broken blade of the knife was found near the body and a matching handle found nearby, which items were initially one knife, and I -- we know that there's a photo somewhere of a physical match of those two. And that was the murder weapon. The bone-handled knife, I -- I suppose, in the course of snow melting if you scoured around you could find half a dozen unexplained knives in a city block, who knows. That one I have no knowledge of.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Okay, perhaps I can help you out, too, to refresh your memory. The bone-handled knife of which we speak was found by Kleiv and Oliver on the 28th of February '69 on a fence, a fence stringer ...

BOBS CALDWELL: Uh hmm.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: ... adjacent or near to the body, at 221 Avenue N. South. The knife was held until 1970, January 28th, by Kleiv when it was turned over to Constable Oliver, and I'll show you the file, quote, "... upon instructions from Mr. Caldwell agent for the Attorney

by RCMP
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to why you held onto this particular file?
BOBS CALDWELL: Because, what I told you is it was the exception. Like I destroyed run-of-the-mill files in the sixth year, but what I said was that we retained these other files permanently, In other words everything for five years, in the sixth year the .08's and ordinary stuff would go out, but -- but permanently retained murders, manslaughters, cause death by crim. neg., dangerous sexual offenders, inquests following unsolved murders, other important files permanently. So you could go back there now, I mean, I hope, and find important files of mine going back to 1962. So Milgaard wasn't retained as an exception, it was retained as part of the rule that we hung on to murders, among many other important things.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Okay, thank you, that's -- that's clear.

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay. Then, anything else on that? 'Kay.

Then item 0 , I have here I do not know whether this knife, which is the bone-handled hunting knife that's being discussed here, was found near the body -- or pardon me,
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General." I'm showing you a police report, file number E22 or page number E22, my Appendix 4, which appears to be a completed by Kleiv, I -- I think, with certain notations, and I'll read them. "... the knife found at 12:30 P.M., February 28th, 1969 at the scene was turned over to Constable Ian Oliver at 9:28, or 9:20 A.M. January 28th, 1970, upon instructions from Mr. Caldwell, agent for the Attorney General." Do you have any recollection of that knife at all?

BOBS CALDWELL: No, I don't, but I don't dispute that this is what happened. You know, this is in print at that time by one of the Police Officers in the Ident. Section and I wouldn't dispute that in the least but I certainly don't recall it.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Can you speculate as to your reason for returning it?

BOBS CALDWELL: Returning it?
SGT. M. DRESSLER: Ordering it returned
if -- if, in fact, the print is correct.
BOBS CALDWELL: Well, it simply says
"turned over to Ian Oliver on instructions from
Caldwell", I don't see anything about it being

| returned to any individual. Is that what you mean? <br> SGT. M. DRESSLER: Or just ... <br> BOBS CALDWELL: See, I don't see any mention there of ... <br> INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Turned, just turned <br> over to the police member. <br> SGT. M. DRESSLER: Yes, turned over to <br> Constable Oliver; do you have any knowledge of that at all? <br> BOBS CALDWELL: No. It could be in, in one of those exhibit charts you and I looked at this morning of mine, but I don't have any knowledge of it, but Oliver was presumably one of the Ident. Members, or a uniformed one, one or the other. Can't recall the thing now, but it, but I don't attach any importance to it, or significance. <br> SGT. M. DRESSLER: Okay, thank you. <br> BOBS CALDWELL: Unless you have some theory <br> that I don't know about. <br> SGT. M. DRESSLER: No, I'm not -- no, I'm not suggesting that. <br> BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah. I just don't have any present recollection of why, but it's | he's, he's one of the investigators assisting with this on the -- with Mr. Wolch's firm. <br> BOBS CALDWELL: As far as I'm concerned, it's some knife that showed up when the snow melted, and someone was careful enough to bring it in and not just to throw it away, Never got into the trial I'm sure, and was never seriously advanced. The only thing that I can think of is that someone might try and erect that into there being a second party to the offence, someone else helping. There was no sniff of evidence like that. And, as you know, in -- with respect to this statement by Nichol John, that would have even been helpful to the Crown if such a thing existed. In other words, there was never any indication that Milgaard had a second person assisting him, Nichol John or Wilson or anyone else. I couldn't see anyone who was a party to the offense, or potentially a party to the offense. That would be where, I suppose, the importance of another knife would come in. The only problem is there was no evidence to support it, so ... But I -- I -- I would certainly deny that it, that knife, had anything to do with inflicting any of the wounds whatever, I mean |
| :---: | :---: |
| obviously been hung onto by a policeman as opposed to A. thrown out or B. given back to the householder or something. <br> SGT. M. DRESSLER: There was some, a speculation on the part of Mr. Wolch, or I believe Mrs. Milgaard, that this may have had something to do with the murder. <br> BOBS CALDWELL: Uh hmm. <br> SGT. M. DRESSLER: To your knowledge, was that ever the case? <br> BOBS CALDWELL: No. <br> INSP. M. SAWATSKY: I, I think in, in the reviewing of the pathologist report, Mr. Bruce who is a worker or a helper with the Wolch firm, was of the opinion that that knife could have inflicted the fatal blow which, I guess in his opinion, was maybe deeper than the others and therefore this is longer. Do you recall any discussions along those lines or, or -- <br> BOBS CALDWELL: No. Well Dr. Emson testified at some length, I think, about the knife, characteristics of the cuts, and so on. And I don't, I don't know who Mr. -- what did you say his name was? <br> INSP. M. SAWATSKY: His name is Bob Bruce, | that's just out of left field. <br> And Dr. Emson very, very <br> carefully examined the wounds. He purchased a, a knife that was similar to the broken knife, and he in fact made test cuts in another cadaver to assess what kind of, you know, cuts this knife would make. He did that, absolutely, I'm not the slightest bit facetious about that, 'cause he thought that might well be asked him, and he came to court prepared to, not only prepared to testify on that, but he had the knife that he used for that purpose in his possession. That didn't happen to be raised, of course, we -- we didn't raise it, and there's no reason to. But if there'd been a serious attack on -- attempt to involve another knife, another person, different kinds of cuts, he had -- he was ready for that and, and had evidence to that effect. <br> INSP. M. SAWATSKY: That evidence then, I assume, really wasn't disputed by the defence? <br> BOBS CALDWELL: No, or otherwise we would have been into that area, you see. <br> INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Thank you. I -- I <br> think that clears that area. <br> SGT. M. DRESSLER: Uh hmm. |

suggest to you this appears to be a meaningless editorial comment. Now I would be happy to
explain to you what I know about the motel room thing if you want to deal with it now.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Perhaps we can. You discuss it on pages 7 and 17 of the statement provided to Peter Carlyle-Gordge, and then on page 10 of Sergeant Pearson's statement. Now as I understand it, two witnesses were called at trial, namely Mr. Melnyk and Mr. Lapchuk, Ute Frank was identified and interviewed; to your knowledge did that occur?

BOBS CALDWELL: Apparently so, yeah. Now I was just gonna see if I can find my handwritten or typed summary. Do you have it at hand and, the, it's just entitled Lapchuk/Melnyk or something like that.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: I don't have access to that right now, no. But what I do have is a handwritten note which -- it originates from our file 93-207, page 1, my Appendix 3, which -- that may be of some assistance.

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay. I'm just looking for the -- it might just be an idea if I could take a minute to find this, it won't take long, do you
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INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Yes.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: Yes.
BOBS CALDWELL: Okay. So I wasn't there and I'm only going by, you know, press reports etcetera, but if your assessment of that essentially is the same as mine, you know, we're just one recant short in this question. In other words, as I understand it, Wilson ended up going back and adopting his trial evidence, and for what it's worth, once Wilson and Nichol John started telling the truth at the time they saw Inspector Roberts I was not of the view, certainly in Wilson's case, that he was holding anything back. Nichol John, I think, told a lot more of the truth and failed, of course, finally to tell the truth about seeing the killing go on, which is another topic we may or may not want to (unintelligible). But, in any event, that's all that thing means, we're one recantation short in this statement. So if you're happy with that Wilson thing I'll leave it at that then.

The other thing there though,
the motel room incident is not sincere, I simply
one, but I understand that Wilson recanted was suppo Dav' and trial evidence. This is what I understand about Wilson.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: I think you're correct there, and we, at this particular time, have answered that question --

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay.
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: -- because we located that transcript and it was misfiled, not in order. It was, you know, the $A, B, C, D$, and all of a sudden this last transcript was not $D$. or $E$. or whatever, it should have been after the other one, it was way back at the end, and just recently we've located that and I think we have answered that.

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay, if that's all for 0,解

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Uh hmm.
BOBS CALDWELL: Okay then. Letter P, I was
want to shut the machine down for a minute?
SGT. M. DRESSLER: Sure. The time is
15:34, we'll take a short break.
BOBS CALDWELL: Okay, thanks.
MR. HALYK: ... give him the hard questions... he's getting too relaxed ...

BOBS CALDWELL: ... listen, we still have to go and do this thing. You guys haven't forgotten that, eh?

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: No, no we haven't.
BOBS CALDWELL: O.K., that's good.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: The statement resumes at 15:42.

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay, I think we were talking about the motel room reenactment thing.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: That's right.
BOBS CALDWELL: The motel room incident is not sincere. I can't comment on this, an editorial. But I did make notes at the time, of which I have a photocopy here and I think you have the original of this, that Sunday, J anuary 18th, Saskatoon Police learned for the first time of an alleged admission by Milgaard in Regina to killing a nurse in Saskatoon. Now the same date that they advised me of this, I advised Mr.
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Tallis, in other words I obviously phoned him that Sunday night at home, or wherever he was, as to what I knew of it up 'til that point, and that depending on the interviews, I might call these witnesses. The same date I arranged for the investigator to go to Regina, Monday, January 19th, and interview these people. This was done Monday, January 19th and on Tuesday, J anuary 20th, I received three statements from these persons and Wednesday, January 21st, I delivered carbon copies of all three statements to Mr. Tallis, advised him that I would interview the witnesses as soon as possible, and may call evidence from one or more at the trial. And I had two of them to Saskatoon, Friday, January 23rd and interviewed them, and advised Mr. Tallis Saturday, J anuary 24th that I would plan on calling these two late in the Crown's case. This doesn't give the date, but it was the year of the trial, which was '70, I hope. So, and the way that police learned about it is that they went down to Regina to bring back Wilson and or Nichol John, and -- and whoever the police officers who were escorting these two were, I think it was Wilson who told one or more of them, may have
T.H.C. in the room by needle and then by mouth, and I didn't make any more notes. But what I know that means is that she then stated I, basically "I don't know anything, I was too far on, gone to be any use", so I didn't call her and ethically, in my view, there's absolutely nothing wrong with that. Because you don't simply call a witness to say "I, yeah I was there, but I can't tell you anything about the important part, i.e. the reenactment".

Now, I understand that subsequently, at the Supreme Court hearing, she basically testified that she -- about the reenactment in very graphic terms, and I believe she said that she did -- she didn't do any of this because she was terrified of Milgaard. And that was a, that was a characteristic of many of these witnesses, including Wilson, including Nichol John, were very much afraid of Milgaard, because they were aware of his, you know, very, very sudden temper, violent actions, and so on. So I can certainly relate to, to why Ute Frank wouldn't, wouldn't come clean with me and/or testify.

been one or two policemen and we could figure out
who if we worked on it, in fact you probably know who it is, but I don't. But in any event, that's how that thing cooked up, so I ascertained that I could call the witnesses as far as the law is concerned, because I had just now learned of this information. And I, when I interviewed the two male witnesses, I specifically told them that I didn't want them leaning either way in this, that -- don't care if they like Milgaard or hate him, they've got to tell the truth, and I don't want them leaning for him, leaning against him, tell the truth. And I thought they were, one of them was better than the other, but I thought they were quite good witnesses. And I've since examined -- produced by you, Sergeant, this, this is a photocopy of, of what are my own notes of interviewing Ute Frank, and in the file which you gentlemen have is the original of this, if you will. But these are my handwritten notes. So this, there's no date on this, but it indicates to me that I interviewed her undoubtedly around the time I interviewed the two boys, got a whole lot of kind of background-type things from her, and as soon as they -- we get her to the stage of
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The other witness Debra Hall, there are two or three other names mentioned here, Bob Harris and Garry Silzer, but Debra Hall, in my understanding now, was simply not around Saskatchewan at the time of the trial. I think subsequently it's been ascertained that she was in Eastern Canada or something. Now I'm happy to expand on any of that that you, you gentlemen may have questions about.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Do you know if Mr. Tallis interviewed Ute Frank?

BOBS CALDWELL: Somewhere I thought it had come to my attention that he did, but -- and, quite frankly, I thought it had come from your investigation or your file. So I have to leave it at that. I, obviously I haven't talked to Mr. Tallis, but my impression is that he did. And it may, indeed, be from some notes I have of my own somewhere.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Was there any deliberate attempt, at any time, to conceal any of the evidence from any of these individuals, to your knowledge.

BOBS CALDWELL: The evidence?
SGT. M. DRESSLER: Any of the evidence that
page 1750
you learned as a result of your inquiries over the re-enactment?

BOBS CALDWELL: From?
SGT. M. DRESSLER: In other words, is there anything that you learned that you did not disclose, or --

BOBS CALDWELL: Oh, yeah. Not at all. We had, I think we had witness statements from Lapchuk and Melnyk. Ute Frank, all we've got is my notes. So there's nothing that I held back whatsoever. In fact I was very startled by this happening the night before the trial started, I was, you know, very much surprised. But the fact of the matter is that in law, if that's the first I've heard about it, I can still go ahead and call it. But what that made me do, of course, was be exceptionally diligent to get it to Mr. Tallis right away, and keep him as informed as I was, so I didn't hold a thing back, in fact went to the opposite extreme. And I didn't call her because she didn't have damaging evidence, I called her 'cause -- I didn't call her because she flatly said "I 've got nothing to tell you from this point on" and you simply don't call people like that.

Page 17503
door, and his mother said "where have you been, you should've, you should hear what happened the day you left". And when she described the murder the, sort of, lights came on in Albert's brain and he made his way down to the police station. So there's a, a long period where the police were working diligently, but virtually had nothing to work with.

Now, the first round of statements given by these people to Inspector Riddell in Regina, my memory tells me it was all three, Milgaard, Hall -- or pardon me -- Wilson and J ohn, were false, period. And my memory is, and, and I'll have to leave it at that, that they were simply all false, and as the rest of the investigation went on, you could very clearly tell that they were false. For instance, saying they hadn't been in Saskatoon or had just driven through, or I don't even remember the details. But there's a lot of other supporting evidence against which you could judge them and very quickly figure out they were not correct.

Then, initially, Wilson was not truthful with the Saskatoon Police, but when the time came when Inspector Roberts was called in
-
by RCMP
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SGT. M. DRESSLER: Okay.
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: I just have one ...
BOBS CALDWELL: Sure.
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: ... just one question about the statements. If one were to ascribe to the theory or -- or -- and I guess not the theory, to the allegation that Saskatoon Police coerced the witnesses into saying what they wanted them to say through a series of statements, of course you were presented with all the statements from these people, from -- from Wilson and from Nichol John; could you tell me, for this interview, why the statements, or the third statements or the fourth statements from these people, the last, the final statements, why you believed them over the statements where they said "no, nothing happened"?

BOBS CALDWELL: Oh yeah, absolutely,
well -- and, and forgive me if I'm not in exact details on this, but to begin with it was 30 days before the Saskatoon Police got a very substantial lead on, on the guilty party. And that happened when Albert Cadrain finished this trip all around Alberta, went to jail seven days in Regina for vagrancy, came home, walked in the
and -- and interviewed Wilson and John at the Cavalier Motor Hotel, it's my belief that what Wilson finally came around to then was, was a truthful statement, and I never changed my mind about that. In other words, Wilson was afraid and young and a drug user and all those bad things, but I think when he was through with Roberts he told the truth as he perceived it.

Now I think to a large extent Nichol John also did, except for the fact that my belief is that she saw the killing take place -and we can expand on that later -- but -- because of the statement she made to Mrs. Miller, to Mary Marcoux and to Albert Cadrain after -- or during the prelim., which I have described and I'll describe again, but, she never did come through and say that. But largely then, from then on, I thought she told the truth with that rather important exception.

Milgaard, of course, never did give truthful statements, and the statement he gave to the Saskatoon Police, the warned statement, which I know you have, and it has sketches in the back of it and so on, simply was not, it couldn't be true, measured against what,
what the Crown knew and the police knew as the thing went on chronologically. Like a lot of things were, you know, proven by witnesses with no axe to grind, no -- no motive, no this, no that, and as you looked at their statements you could very readily tell that the early ones were just simply untrue.

I can't, if you want I'd look at them and give you details, but that's why I, why I knew the earlier ones were untrue and then, as we got further and further along, the -- the true ones started coming out because they virtually had no choice other than to be truthful when all this surrounding body of information was there. So that's how I would explain that.

Of course Milgaard, I never did put in his statement because it never was true, whether there was one or more of them, and I was under no obligation to do that, obviously. Does that answer your ...

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Yes, it does, and I think that the thrust of my question being that, as a prosecutor, you would not -- you -- I guess you have a duty or an obligation to put it in what you believe are truthful statements or
witnesses in this case, is that I became satisfied, with the exception of Nichol John's failure to recite that she saw the killing, I was satisfied that she also and Wilson totally had come around to what they conceived to be the truthful statements. But they were belated proceedings and only because of Inspector Roberts' assistance with the polygraph.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: One other aspect that I wanted to cover is that, for the record and for the purpose of this statement, I want it known that we met you this morning, and that this morning when we did meet you, we provided you with the remainder of the prosecution file which has been housed in Sask. Justice, and that file was entrusted to us. And the reason we brought it with us this morning was to allow you to review documents, your notes from the trial, exhibit list and things like this, to help prepare you for this interview this morning -- or this afternoon.

BOBS CALDWELL: Yes. Well that was very helpful, and I did go through that probably 10 inches high of material this morning, and that's the first time I've seen it intact, if you will,
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truthful witnesses, and at some point in time you must have decided that the first statements were not truthful but that the last statements were?

BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah.
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: And I guess you're, you're -- what I want you to answer to me, and then I think you did adequately, is the fact that you believed the third statements for various reasons?

BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah, because you could measure them against a whole body of known facts, now not -- you weren't simply going on do I believe this person or not, you measure their statement against all kinds of surrounding evidence by the neighbours and the people who helped them tow and push cars, and the service station guys, and all kinds of things that weren't subject to -- to argument, they were simply, you know, known facts. And, of course, you're not obligated ever, as a prosecutor, to call witnesses whom you don't believe. You certainly are obligated to let the defence know they exist, and "here's what the guy said, I don't believe it but you use it". But that's what happened with respect to the very important
since -- since I closed the file in, in Justice.
When I saw it in Regina with
Sergeant Pearson, it had been dismembered and some of it was in Ottawa and so on, so that was very helpful, and some of the things I've said here are based on refreshing my memory from that collection of material, so I appreciate you mentioning that.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: I just want to take a moment and go over my notes here and see if I have any other questions, and Max, if you just want to do the same.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: I have a number that are still remaining which may touch on the various areas that we've already alluded to. It's been alleged that Mr. Tallis' performance at trial and at prelim. was somewhat less than adequate. Do you have any comments on that?

BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah, that's outrageous and totally incorrect, and it offends me beyond words. I -- I started prosecuting in Regina in 1958. I think I'll send my eminent counsel to get me some coffee here, we don't really need him (chuckles). In any event, I did prosecute in Regina from '58 'til the beginning of '62, and of
course by the time of this I'd been steadily prosecuting in Saskatoon 'til '70, 1970 I guess. And he was, not just in my estimation, but he was recognized as the leading defence counsel in the province and I had, I had assisted him with prosecutions, because he had his own ... thank you ... he had his own agency of the Attorney General at Humboldt, Saskatchewan, in other words, he had a judicial centre that he worked at. I had done serious criminal cases with him defending, and he had done a lot of very heavy-duty defence work, and he took this case on, which, you know, I can imagine some eminent counsel saying "I'm just too busy". Interviewed everybody, had a long prelim that was spread out over several days, adjourn, come back, do some more, had a two-week trial in -- you know -- did, as far as I'm concerned, his usual extremely thorough, careful job. You can see that in the things that he simply requested from me. Look over those 95 things again and there was a good degree of co-operation between us. And he followed the instructions, I believe, of the Milgaards themselves in not calling a defence, got signed documentation to that effect, and
on why the decision was made not to call the accused, but if I were defending him I think that would weigh heavily with me.

Now is there any specific thing that you'd like to go into, any specific things that he was supposed to have done, not --

SGT. M. DRESSLER: No, not at all.
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: It was a very general comment made to me by Mrs. Milgaard, and when I asked her to clarify and give me some details, she was unable to do it. But what she did, and I, I told this to Mr. Tallis because I feel that both of you gentlemen have a right to know that that accusation was made of you, and Mrs. Milgaard said that she had been told by someone -- and she didn't name that person -that a comment was made by either yourself or by Mr. Tallis, and I think it was more leaning towards yourself, --

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay.
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: -- that "Mr. Tallis and I have worked to put people away before together, worked together before to put people away". Now I think you have a right to know that was made and to answer to that if you wish.

they, I believe, made the choice knowing how his
practice would be. And there would be those very competent lawyers who would not have called a defence in this case for fear that this particular accused would have blown up in, ten minutes into cross-examination. I have no knowledge of what Mr. Tallis, you know, views are, or the Milgaard family, decided, but, I mean, he did a, an extremely good job on this case. You can do an extremely good job on a jury trial and have it go the other way than you hoped, and this happened to be one where, despite his efforts, the accused was convicted, and obviously in my opinion properly convicted. But after being fairly prosecuted and extremely well defended, the most outrageous aspect of this whole thing to me is the badmouthing of Mr . Tallis done by the Milgaard troops in the meantime, which is something, of course, he's not in a position to get up and to publicly answer, and I take great delight in answering on behalf of the Bar that that's just a totally false accusation. I'd certainly deal with any individual things that anyone claims were not done properly. And again, we have no knowledge
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BOBS CALDWELL: Well, if we ever did that, we were both working on one accused. (Chuckles). We were not, we were not in the defence, defence verses prosecutor thing. Like Mr. Tallis and I, in fact, worked on different aspects of a, of a guy who was a dangerous sexual offender named Leslie Klassen. Now I, my dates thing doesn't bring back whether that was before or after this, but he started prosecuting Mr. Klassen for what we thought was a murder, and he got appointed to the Bench, and another gentleman, Del Perras, took over. Mr. Perras left to go to Regina to be our boss, and another one of my colleagues, Bill Pinckley, took that file over, and eventually there was a conviction for manslaughter. In the parallel thing, I was doing the dangerous sexual offender, and Klassen was found to be a dangerous sexual offender. So that would be an example of where Mr. Tallis and I worked together on one, locking one person up.

That may well be the, the thing that I'm being quoted for, and if, if I am, I'm pleased to acknowledge that, because there was nothing wrong with any of that, obviously.

But in this case he was
defending, I was prosecuting, we had a good professional business-like and arm's-length relationship where nobody was trying to pull anything over on anybody. I didn't operate that way either, and I wouldn't dream of jeopardizing a case like this by taking some shortcut or sticking something under a table, I wouldn't do that in this case or any other case. I didn't do that in this case, and I would not do it to Mr. Tallis or anyone else. I mean, I didn't operate that way, he didn't operate that way. So he did his job and I did mine, which doesn't mean we have to be up fist-fighting in court over it at all to do, both of us to do our jobs properly. So the only (chuckles) the only -- the quotation you've given me, I think, comes out of the famed Leslie Klassen case, and if that's where it came from I'm delighted to endorse it. But it certainly doesn't apply in any way to Tallis and I cooking this case up, because that's simply beyond the pale.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Are you familiar with a man by the name of Sidney Wilson?

BOBS CALDWELL: No, and I've tried to
ascertain whether he exists in relation to being

Page 17515

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Who was the primary investigator in the file?

BOBS CALDWELL: Well there's -- that's a little hard to answer. I think initially you'll find that it was assigned, it may have been to George Reid and one other person, would it be Ray Mackie or Keith Mackie or someone -- maybe Ray Mackie, and there was sort of a formal assignment. And as I recall, the first two fellas who got the file actually worked for 30 days, and the first day they had off was the day that Albert Cadrain walked into the Police Station, and we may get into that in a minute, I realize. But they would be the nominal, the ones nominally charged with it, but then, you know, many of the other detectives, of course, would take a very significant part in it, McCorriston for one, Ed Karst I think.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Did you ever deal with these investigators while the investigation was ongoing? And I'm, in terms of a chronology, Milgaard was identified on or about March 2nd of 1969, once Cadrain came to the ...

BOBS CALDWELL: Uh hmm.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: ... attention of police.
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the one who pointed at Larry Fisher, presumably. As far as I know he doesn't exist, by the way, but maybe I'm skipping ahead.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: I think that pretty well ends it. But just to sort of recap here on, on, on the note that, the reason that brought us here, is at anytime have you destroyed any documents that were in your possession regarding this file?

BOBS CALDWELL: No, I haven't. And, just without cutting that off, I want to be sure that you fellas have made sure to examine this second list. I think we have largely covered it, but the one that's attached to the other letter. No, I haven't destroyed any documents with respect to the file of any description. It was often the case to, say, throw out the original subpoenas after such and such a time but I, I simply didn't, and in keeping with the policy I explained to you earlier, like the file like this and any other murder was absolutely kept at our office intact, as far as I'm concerned, indefinitely. And once I left, of course, I have no idea what happened after '87, but while I was there they were kept.

BOBS CALDWELL: That was in Saskatoon ... SGT. M. DRESSLER: That's correct? BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: Did you provide legal advice, or did you participate at all in the investigation in terms of direction, or giving advice in that regard?

BOBS CALDWELL: Well, frankly, I don't remember, and I could well have done that without any notes being made on, you know, in my file that so and so showed up or I told him this or that. It -- one would assume that, that if I was, I don't even know if I was sort of seized with the file at that point. At some stage of the game it became my file, and -- but, I wouldn't be surprised if police came over saying what do you think of this or ...

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Uh hmm.
BOBS CALDWELL: ... what should we do. But odd as it may sound I don't recall that, but you certainly wouldn't surprise me if someone said "yeah, here's some proof that he did".

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Are you aware of any police members, at any time, being guilty of improper conduct in terms of their dealing with

Page 17517
witnesses, I'm suggesting coercing witnesses or abusing or threatening them in any way?

BOBS CALDWELL: Not -- absolutely not. I don't know if, in your investigation, you've met people like Karst and Charlie Short and John Oleksyn and Ray Mackie. Really what -- these were kind of, you know, professional policemen in Saskatoon. I'm just looking at my list of witnesses here. If you knew these people, if I may say personally, the way I certainly did, you'd have to -- you'd have an awful tough time selling me that that had happened, 'cause I knew a lot of them very well through other cases. And the attempts that have been made to, to suggest that people like Charlie Short was rude to Wilson or locked him up over night or something are absolutely ridiculous. Like that isn't the way the Police Department operated, these are senior, mature men, it isn't the way I operated, and neither the Police Department nor myself would condone that if we knew it was going on. And the police were very much appreciative of, you know, the way our office worked here, and were very ... they wouldn't do anything to jeopardize their relationship with us and I simply don't know of


1
2
3
4
chance to nail him. This is three Regina young people coming through the city trying to pick up a fourth person, Cadrain, and -- and being in and out of the city in a few hours. So, you know, it -- it isn't -- no one could possibly erect that into the Saskatoon City Police finally getting a chance to nail a guy who's been annoying to them because they didn't have a clue who he was until 30 days later when Cadrain came back.

Now, secondly, I was obviously in the same position, I didn't know, you know, this accused from Adam. And there was no, there's no -- there's no one to exert pressure on anyone. You can put all the pressure you wanted on me if I didn't have a case to go to court or we didn't know who the accused was. And there's certainly a very proper sentiment in the community that whoever did this should be brought to justice, but that doesn't mean you go out and grab the nearest candidate and jam everything around so it'll fit him. And I know that, earlier on, that the other side attempted to float the idea that the whole city's in a panic and they just had to have a victim and they chose
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any of that, and there've been Herculean efforts made to try to invent some of that. It simply hasn't come off.

And the Supreme Court, of course, held that there was no prob ... probative evidence of any of that happening. I also don't know of any.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: I see our tape is in need of changing, we'll switch sides at -- time is $16: 10$.

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay.
(TURN TAPE OVER).
UNKNOWN: ... sitting down and...
SGT. M. DRESSLER: Testing 1, 2, 3, 4. Statement resumes at 16:13. Mr. Caldwell, were you aware if the police, and in fact yourself perhaps, were under pressure from any source or sources in order to identify and prosecute anyone for this offence? Was there any pressure to your knowledge?

BOBS CALDWELL: Well, no there wasn't. । mean, first of all no one in Saskatoon knew David Milgaard existed, that's for openers. This isn't some local guy whose been a pain in the rear end to the police for years and they've finally got a
poor David. Well, we didn't know who poor David was until Cadrain came back, and I think it was some months later that he was eventually arrested after an awful lot more investigation, if I'm not mistaken. I think he was arrested actually in B.C. And there was no, I mean, no one put pressure on me to do anything in this case except a proper prosecution. I mean, I suppose I could have said it, if things were a little different, "I don't think this thing can go on, we don't have the evidence". I, at some stage of the game, obviously decided it should go on and we did have the evidence. So no one was in a position to pressure me and nobody was in a position to pressure the police. For one thing, they had to, in a, in a manner of speaking, answer to me, like they had to come to me with evidence, say "what else do you think we need" or "what do you think of this witness", and they, you know, respected my directions, if you will, or decisions on things. So it wasn't a case of, of pressure at all, but -- there's no use the mayor phoning the Police Department saying "accuse some, get somebody arrested for this murder o we can lose it and get on with other
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business", you know. So --
SGT. M. DRESSLER: Are -- were you aware of any split within the police ranks as to whether Milgaard was responsible for the offence?

BOBS CALDWELL: Well I think there were different theories. I, it's, again, it's not a split. I mean there's a fair number of policemen around, and there were ones who I would suggest were possibly skeptical about him being the right accused at one stage of the game, and as things went on and on and on I assume they were converted, others who very early on presumably felt he was the right one, and in my opinion they proved to be correct. But the fact that different policemen had different views on how good the case is or maybe this is the right guy can't be characterized as a split in the Police Department.

## I mean if you have one sore

 head policeman who's mad because he missed a promotion and still doesn't think this guy is guilty, that doesn't matter to me.SGT. M. DRESSLER: Uh hmm.
BOBS CALDWELL: That's not a split in the Police Department. And so no, no split,
behind garbage trucks and going through the contents of garbage cans to find Gail Miller's purse, I thought they did a sensational job, and I was very anxious to -- that that be properly publicized. So he, I just opened up a file with the, my dealings with him so I could find it, and he, he wrote me February 22nd saying "thanks for your help last weekend", so presumably the week before February 22nd of ' 83 he was in Saskatoon and up in my office talking with me. And then he wrote me again saying he'd be back on Friday morning, and I got another phone memo saying, call me if March 11th is not convenient, so I guess he was back here on March 11th. I haven't dug into my old office diaries but that would, I could confirm you that those dates, but he was apparently here twice.

And I allowed him to read parts of the file and then to interview me about the case, all on the understanding, strictly, that he was writing a book on Western Canadian murders. Now I also know that at least on one of those occasions I agreed to him tape-recording our conversation, which he said would just help him with writing the article, and
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certainly differences of opinion among
investigators as -- as to whether this was the right guy at an early stage.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: I'd like to have you reflect on an interview you provided to Mr. Peter Carlyle-Gordge; can you remember that interview?

BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah, I sure do.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: When did it occur?
BOBS CALDWELL: Well this is an odd situation. I had seen Mr. Carlyle-Gordge, his bylines, in both Maclean's magazine and the Globe and Mail, so I knew that he was a journalist. And he got in touch with me, it appears in 1983; advised me that he was doing a book on Western Canadian murders, and that he had been put onto the Milgaard case as a very interesting case, clearly it was, by Mr. Wolch in my memory. So I, of course at that time, was of the view that this case was irrevocably finished -- and I'll know better than that another time -- but I thought it was all over and done with so, in any event, I was happy to talk to him. And my objective in this exercise was to -- to -- to give credit to the Police Department, who I thought did a terrific job starting absolutely nowhere, walking
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I didn't think that was sinister. So we have, you've given Mr. Halyk and myself a transcript, which I have in front of me, and I've also supplied you gentlemen with a tape recording of a C.B.C. Sunday Morning interview in which I heard my own voice coming out of the speaker, and unquestionably it was the tape made by Carlyle-Gordge either, either appended to one end of this typed interview or conceivably done on the second occasion without my knowledge, but I'm willing to assume it was the former. But I was not too delighted to hear this because, of course, I never agreed to him doing anything with that tape other than using it to help him write his article. So that's my sort of jumping-off point.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: The tape begins almost in mid-sentence, as it were, and then ends unexpectedly. Can you recall the types of conversation or -- or what led up to this tape being used?

BOBS CALDWELL: Well, I think that -- I haven't played the cassette which I gave you gentlemen to take with you, I have a duplicate of it at home. I think it, it will be found to
either be on the front end or the back end of the typed part, probably the front because the back end ends up with me asking him about his project and how it's coming. Sounds like a natural ending. But it would just be in the -- this would take place as a result of him saying "well, you know, tell me the things you think are fascinating about the case". And I did that, there were three or four things I thought were very interesting, like it ending one year to the day after the killing and things like that. So -- so then what's happening is that we're just chatting, and quite clearly I hadn't checked on -- I hadn't got the whole case in detail back into my mind, obviously, although I did write some salient things from it before I talked to him which I have in my file, just dates of trials and how many witnesses and things. So, this is just a chat with him in which, when I read it now, I see that I -- I really hadn't made any attempt to, you know, to redigest the whole file, obviously. But I'd certainly answer anything you want to know about the contents of it.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: No, I don't think we need to address that. There's one point. Do you
say "I knew someday something like this would happen".

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Had you become involved in the investigation or in the, in the prosecution, when that visit occurred?

BOBS CALDWELL: Well, I can't -- I don't know the date of the visit at this point, and I, I can't answer that yes or no, I can't recall, but maybe you could -- if you could give me some more information?

SGT. M. DRESSLER: We have no record as to the date.

BOBS CALDWELL: Well it, that, that is in a police report. Do you mean the date they went to Langenburg?

SGT. M. DRESSLER: We do not have the police report.

BOBS CALDWELL: That is -- that exists. I don't have it either, but that police report exists with -- because at the time when -- I simply, you know, I can see it in my mind's eye. I don't think I physically have a copy of it.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Would that have been on the prosecution file, or do you think that was on the police report or, or a note given to you, or

recall, during the police investigation,
Detective Karst and Lieutenant Short, or
Lieutenant Short, rather, travelling to
Langenburg and Yorkton district --
BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: -- to speak to the Milgaard family?

BOBS CALDWELL: And I recall what happened too.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Can you briefly outline the circumstances as to -- to when it occurred and what your knowledge is of it?

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay. What I remember of it, and I don't remember the exact purpose of them going, but what I remember is that when some of the details of the murder were recited to Mr. Milgaard Senior, him saying words to the effect of "I knew someday something like this would happen". Now Short and/or Karst recorded that, put it in the police reports, and the next thing, of course during the great publicity run up to the hearing he, of course, denied saying that. He said "oh, I really didn't mean that", but I remember that, today, from then. It was such a striking thing for the father of this fellow to
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something like that?
BOBS CALDWELL: Well, it got to me, and therefore I would assume was -- got to me because it was on the prosecution file.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: We haven't been able to find that.

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay, well, I can assure you it exists.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Okay.
BOBS CALDWELL: And I would think of checking with the City Police, whoever you've been dealing with there. I think they've got everything cross-indexed by investigators.

INSP. M. SAWATSKY: We have their entire file, we'll look again for it.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: We'll look into that.
BOBS CALDWELL: Okay. It exists for sure.
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Okay.
BOBS CALDWELL: And, but, is that all you wanted to ask me about? That stuck out so vividly in my mind to have the father say "I knew someday something like this would happen", you know.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: I guess what were trying to do is, is find a date as near as possible,
whether it was pre or post-charge. Do you have any knowledge to that?

BOBS CALDWELL: No.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: In that regard?
BOBS CALDWELL: No, I don't. I think, when was the charge, was it not more like June or --

SGT. M. DRESSLER: The charge was laid May 27th.

BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah, okay, so it was actually sworn some little time after the murder, and so that trip may well have been before or after the thing was sworn.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: A point in respect of the polygraph examination which was conducted on Ron Wilson. I have here, it appears to be handwritten notes by your hand, from our file 93-204, it looks as though dated the September 3rd, 1969, where it discusses Inspector Roberts. Could you please examine this --

BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah, sure.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: -- and offer some comments?

BOBS CALDWELL: 'Kay. Okay. This looks, at a glance, as if I phoned him, there are a couple of phone numbers here, and I'll just
subpoenaed to court. This is Roberts talking about their practice. Chief's orders. Chart doesn't have questions. So it doesn't have questions written on it, I guess its just a graph of lines that Roberts, at least, can understand. Clothes from blank ask Wood, this would be, this would be Superintendent Wood, and back to same guy. I don't know what that means. Something to do with, it may be something to do with things Wilson said in his examination. Are you -- oh, this must be questions that he used on Wilson; are you holding back anything re Gail Miller? Did you ever intentionally hurt anyone? Have you lied to any questions on this test? I have a note here, yes. This must be Roberts explaining to me his technique, is what I would gather. Wilson questions re the Gail Miller murder; are you deliberately holding back any info re that? Have you lied to any question on this test? Could refer to Did you ever hurt anyone or to the question whether he was holding back. Wilson didn't see it, Wilson didn't do it. Do you know for sure who did it, yes. I presume this is what he asked Wilson, what Wilson answered, and I presume he concluded that Wilson neither saw it
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show -- tell you what I can about it.
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Are you able to find it?

BOBS CALDWELL: Yeah, no, this is fine. Thanks. Okay. This is Inspector Roberts, Calgary City Police, their number, his home number, the Detectives' number, 3rd of September, '69 it looks like. There's a chart that remains in R., that being Roberts' possession, re the interviews. Did on Wilson, not on John. Now I, I presume that means the chart but I can't tell that at a glance. Interpretation of the chart. He could read the chart and could look at it. Will call back at 1:30 our time. Now I don't know who, who the 'he' is, if that's -- that's sort of, he could -- oh, I'm sorry, he could send the chart and he could look at it. So maybe, maybe, maybe someone else, such as Tallis, had a, had a -- lined up some polygraph operator and wanted him to look at Wilson's if it worked. But when it says he, he could send the chart, he could look at it, I don't know who the 'he' is, the second he. He's gonna call back re Wilson lying on two questions. Wilson lied on two questions. Now don't let out charts unless
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nor did it from that. Wilson told Roberts that in Calgary Dave told him "I took her purse, I poked her with knife a few times". So that's things that Roberts told me. So that looks like one phone call to me.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Were you satisfied that a polygraph examination had been conducted on Wilson?

BOBS CALDWELL: Well I assume it was, I -the polygraph thing, my memory is that, that I wasn't a party to arranging that, my memory is that it was arranged and done by the police and I was told about it either, you know, once it was underway or when, in fact, it was even over. Because, you see, I didn't get into this business of, of becoming a half investigator, like I never did like that thing with the prosecutor going along with policemen, looking at scenes, getting in the way and stuff like that, so I kinda tried to keep my distance. I know they arranged all that, I know it came off, I believe he tested both Wilson and John. And it was at that time that in my, you know, understanding of everything, that we ended up with the truthful version of everything, with the one exception
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that John in fact saw the killing but she never would say in court. Does that answer you?

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Yes, it does. Yes, it does.

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay, 'Kay.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: Now this be -- this may be somewhat of a duplication now. It has been alleged that all references to Larry Fisher being arrested in Winnipeg in 1970 were kept secret from investigators and from victims. The apparent reason, of course, so as not to arouse suspicion that Fisher may have murdered Gail Miller. Do you have any knowledge of this?

BOBS CALDWELL: From investigators and from victims?

SGT. M. DRESSLER: From the victims.
BOBS CALDWELL: No, I don't, but -- but the way the -- and I'm not, you know, critical of the Police Department -- but the way it operated there was no, there was absolutely no formal mechanism in place to advise victims of the outcome of cases unless a particular, I suppose, prosecutor phoned and said "hey, that guy was convicted", or unless a very conscientious investigator phoned to say he was convicted. But
of joint 'cause 'I missed a trip to Winnipeg'.
You know, that simply happens. And the next day the similar thing happened, I suppose the guy would have found out about it and all the victims would have been advised, but... Does that, does that answer you?

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Yes, it does.
BOBS CALDWELL: Okay.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: Now I have here a police report, page B176 dated August 26th, '69, and I wonder if you could just review it ...

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: ... and to refresh your memory and see if you have any knowledge of that event.

BOBS CALDWELL: Okay. I guess that's Ullrich, by the look of it, because it's been yellow-lined and it photocopies so badly, but that is Ullrich?

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Yes.
BOBS CALDWELL: Okay.
MR. HALYK: While he's looking at that, we'll be getting a copy of this state...
transcript, will we?
INSP. M. SAWATSKY: Yes. Just like we did

there was no, there was no sort of community services unit to, to go after people and say "here's how your case came out". So they could not be -- it wouldn't surprise me in the least if none of the victims were notified, and I would attribute nothing sinister whatever to that, 'cause it was simply a hit and miss operation.

Now as far as to investigators,
I think there's been one or two investigators here expressing great amazement that Karst went to Winnipeg to, to interview, was it Wilson -- or pardon me, Fisher. Karst himself didn't remember going there, which I can understand, I mean, you know, he was a busy -- he was one of the very well-regarded investigators. He and a guy named Tom Vanin used to do many of the murder investigations 'cause they were very, very good. Karst is a very fatherly figure, and Karst didn't remember going, I don't know how he would -- how he would then, you know, phone up all the investigators who should know and say "hey, I went to Winnipeg". I attach nothing sinister to Karst not remembering he went to Winnipeg, and nothing sinister to whoever some other investigator may have been who had his nose out
for the other witness.
MR. HALYK: And, by the way, I could indicate to my knowledge Mr. Caldwell has not read that interview and it hasn't been provided to him ...

BOBS CALDWELL: We deliberately...
MR. HALYK: ... intentionally, so --
BOBS CALDWELL: ... deliberately didn't do that and, Mr. Halyk, and I agreed on that, and I'm -- you know, would rather be that way, so -so.

Okay, now this episode I remember, and I've read it in police reports say in the last year or so now. I couldn't have told you by memory that it was Ray Mackie and Ullrich and myself who were there, but it obviously was, and Ullrich was a meticulously careful policeman, like, he was just utterly reliable and careful. And in fact I recited this episode about the bathtub in one of my letters to the Parole Board. Were you aware of that? And I couldn't remember, in recent years when I looked at the, looked at that letter, where I'd got that information, and I somehow or other found out that that's where it came from. But Cadrain told us that, and I mean



Cadrain saying that Milgaard had done this. I
2 was just gonna take one second to find where, where I incorporated that in -- yeah, the letter to Mr. Street, June 14th, '72 and the Parole -or the National Parole Board, last paragraph on page 3 and into page 4 deals with that episode. Want to just glance at that? Very bottom of that page.

See, recently when I was rounding this material up and getting it into order, I 'd -- I couldn't recall that the, the details of that, but that police report by Ullrich is how it happened. And no special -unless, I don't know why we were interviewing Cadrain unless it was just part of the whole business of getting ready for the, for the prelim. or his part in it.

SGT. M. DRESSLER: Now, I understand that you were called to the Supreme Court in 1992 to testify, however, you did not testify?

BOBS CALDWELL: That's right, yeah.
SGT. M. DRESSLER: Do you have any idea as to why you were not -- why you did not testify?

BOBS CALDWELL: Well the thing that preceded that was me giving Sergeant Pearson my
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anyone who wants to call anyone can do it regardless. But the bottom proverbial line was that I wasn't called. Now quite frankly, at the time, I was kind of relieved. Since then I'm -I have nagging afterthoughts that that was a very important chunk of evidence. And under the rules they were using in that court, which were hearsay, rumours, beer-parlour second-hand gossip, it obviously could have gone in, okay, there was no question of that. And it would be my view that it would be a damning piece of evidence against Milgaard. And -- but no one ever told me, like in so many words, "you weren't called because of A. or B. or C", but I certainly wasn't.

And I might say, just while were on that, that this morning we were looking at my N.B. for Trial handwritten sheets, and there was a duplication of two pages, and my original handwritten note of this was -- was -do you remember was on one of those. And the reason there'd be two pages, I've been thinking since, is that once I wrote that out on that blank sheet with the number I would then have wanted to preserve it separately, that's why
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Eugene Williams and when it was you did certain things and I was trying to find a document, or I had asked you the question about when, when it was that Eugene Williams asked you to look through

A Uh-huh.
Q -- and your evidence was that you thought that that was the first thing you had done, or near the start, and I think that was around October of '89.
A Yes.
And I note your answer here, Mr. Caldwell, you
"On February twenty-eighth, nineteen-ninety, while employed by the Canada Department of Justice in the Saskatchewan Regional Office, Saskatoon, I received a telephone request from Eugene Williams to search the Provincial of a person named Larry Fisher On searching the file I found the investigation report of Detective and this one you gentlemen have copies
of I know ...",
and then you say:
"... and I gave a copy of this document
personally to Eugene Williams in
Saskatoon on March twenty-second of
nineteen ninety. He and I went over to
the Provincial Office. You've got that document. Okay. Now, then to, to continue."
And I'm wondering, Mr. Caldwell, if you are able to -- does that assist your recollection or your reconstruction of events as to what might have happened?
A Yes. This was much earlier, or nearer the event, and I would think, Mr. Hodson, that the one I'm looking at here would be correct in terms of differences from what I said yesterday.
Q If we could go to 022178. And you were asked, here, about the suggestion that you may have failed to disclose relevant evidence to the defence from witnesses or people who, for lack of better words, saw nothing, but were perhaps looking at where they should have seen something, if you follow?
A
Yes.
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```
Q And I think the allegation is that, given what the Crown theory was as to what happened in the back alley that morning, if someone was looking in the area where the Wilson vehicle was supposed to be and these events were supposed to take place, that a witness who saw nothing might well be important; do you follow?
A Yes, I do, sir. And you say -- and let me just back up. They put to you specifically, I think, two people, Mr. and Mrs. Merriman and Marie Indyk. We've already dealt with Marie Indyk.
A Yes.
But on the Merrimans, if I could call up 002102, and this is a police report of Officer McCorriston and this is a police report that was in your file, in the prosecution file, and I think it was in the prosecution file perhaps for other reasons -- or pardon me, that -- you will recall, when we went through the Ullrich witness summary, that he would identify a police report page number when he had a specific piece of evidence, so I think this report was in for some other reason, at least on the face McCorriston, on February 5 at 6:55 a.m.:
```

"... interviewed Mrs. Margaret Merriman of 226 Avenue $N$ South who works at the Cafeteria at the Star Phoenix. In the morning of Jan. 31/69 she ordered a taxi to be at her home at 6:55 A.M. and watched out her front window for a few minutes while awaiting the arrival of the taxi, however she saw nor heard anything and was unable to offer any information."
And, again, if we could just -- so if we look at that address, 226 Avenue N North, if we could call up I think it's map B?
A It's, I think that said 'South', Mr. Hodson, if I 'm right, but --
Q Umm, the?
A The address.
Q I thought it was, if we could maybe go back, I thought it was 'North'.
A Okay.
Q Oh, I'm sorry, you are right, Avenue N South. Okay. If we can go back to map B. Anyway, we heard her evidence at this Inquiry -- and I'm sorry, is there -- maybe it's map -- map C? No. Map A? I'm running out of maps. Yes, there is
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 03:08 | 1 |  | do you have any recollection of looking at this |
|  | 2 |  | document at the time and considering its |
|  | 3 |  | significance? |
|  | 4 | A | I do not, Mr. Hodson. |
|  | 5 | Q | And again, looking at it now and in light of what |
|  | 6 |  | Mrs. Merriman has said, would you agree that there |
|  | 7 |  | might be some significance to what she didn't see |
|  | 8 |  | the morning of the murder? |
|  | 9 | A | Yes, I would agree that when it's put to me in |
| 03:09 | 10 |  | this fashion with the map, with the police report, |
|  | 11 |  | there could have been, could and might have been |
|  | 12 |  | some significance of what she did or didn't see. |
|  | 13 | Q | And if, at the time in 1969, you would have |
|  | 14 |  | recognized the significance, what, if anything, |
| 03:09 | 15 |  | would you have done with it? |
|  | 16 | A | Well I assume -- I -- number 1, I had -- did this |
|  | 17 |  | go to Mr. Tallis or do we know that? |
|  | 18 | Q | This is a police report -- let me just clarify. |
|  | 19 | A | Okay. |
| 03:09 | 20 | Q | You testified no police reports went to Mr. |
|  | 21 |  | Tallis, she did not provide a witness statement. |
|  | 22 | A | Okay. |
|  | 23 | Q | The only information, at least that we have been |
|  | 24 |  | able to find on the files, are the two police |
| 03:09 | 25 |  | reports that identify discussions with her, and I |
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morning of the murder. And again, based on that -- and I'm not sure, let's just go back to, if I could call up the police report 002102. Now that was on your file. I should add that, Mr. Caldwell, there was a second police report of Officer Reid, I think of March 27th or thereabouts, where he interviewed Mr. Merriman and had similar information --
Okay.
-- except that Mr. Merriman said that he had trouble seeing, and in fact I think Mr. Merriman was blind or close to blind at the time, but he indicated that he and his wife were looking out the window for a taxi and saw nothing, or words to that effect.
A All right.
Q That police report does not appear to be part, or that report is not part of Ullrich's brief, and it appears that it was not on your file and may not have been given to you.
A Okay, sir.
Q So this report, though, I think has your -- you see that handwriting at the top?
A Yeah, that's definitely my initials and numbering. Q Okay. So is this -- can you tell us, at the time,
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stand to be corrected, but I think the only record on the prosecutor's file about the Merrimans is this entry right here in the police report.
A Okay. And you are asking what, sir?
The question of whether -- if you would have realized the significance of this piece of information -- I think you've told us that that might be important -- if you had appreciated that at the time what would you have done with it?
A I should have -- I should have passed -- (a), called her presumably as a witness, or (b), passed the information along to Mr. Tallis in one form or another, probably a letter in absence of there being a statement, sir.
Q Now, when we went back, and I don't want to cover this ground in too much detail again, remember Mr. Tallis asked you to go through the witness statements and review them and identify in accordance with the Dallison case any witness statement that had evidence that might tend to exculpate the accused, or words to that effect?
A I recall that.
Q And I think you read through the witness statements; right?
I undoubtedly did.
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | Q | Did you read through the police reports as well to see if you could pick out anything in the |
|  | 2 |  |  |
|  | 3 |  | investigation reports? |
|  | 4 | A | Under the heading of that request, Mr. Hodson, I |
| 03:08 | 5 |  | don't think I would have because he asked me to |
|  | 6 |  | look at witness statements and I did do that. I |
|  | 7 |  | think that's clear. |
|  | 8 | Q | And then if we can go back to the transcript of |
|  | 9 |  | the interview, 022178, and again just your comment |
| 03:09 | 10 |  | here where you say: |
|  | 11 |  | "I, I wouldn't have called them if they |
|  | 12 |  | said I, I looked down the road and |
|  | 13 |  | didn't see anything, unless it were |
|  | 14 |  | extremely critical timing involved or |
| 03:09 | 15 |  | they were some way able to say that |
|  | 16 |  | episode didn't happen." |
|  | 17 |  | So we've dealt with the Merrimans and I think, |
|  | 18 |  | sir, correct me if I'm wrong, that in light of |
|  | 19 |  | what Mrs. Merriman said, that she may have been |
| 03:09 | 20 |  | looking at the exact spot where the Wilson |
|  | 21 |  | vehicle was according to Nichol John? |
|  | 22 | A | Yes. |
|  | 23 | Q | That that might have been significant? |
|  | 24 | A | It may well have, sir. |
| 03:09 | 25 | Q | There was also a reference in the police reports, |
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03:10 25

1

7 Q They canvassed homes, did a door-to-door search to

19 Q Is that fair, like --
03:10 $20 \quad A \quad I$ assume that's right, sir.
21 Q And the fact that we have a bunch of people who were talked to by the police that didn't see anything.
A Yeah.
although I can't say that these were all on your
file, that in the days following the Gail Miller
murder the police interviewed many, many people in
and around that area and, in particular, people
who were at the bus stops, including Larry Fisher?
Yes.
get anybody in the area to say what did you see
that was suspicious that morning, and I think in
summary, for the most part, it was a number of
people saying at around that time I didn't see
anything unusual.
A Yeah.
Q And my question, just take a step back as a
prosecutor, how would you have -- how would -- it
appears you didn't give any of that information to
Mr. Tallis.
A Okay.

22
23
24
Q
And back at that time was that something you might
expect Mr. Tallis to do or is that something you felt that you, was in your court to deal with?
A You mean to do in the sense of him going and interviewing people?
Well, for example, when Mr. Tallis says do you have any witness information or statements that might help the accused, let me put it that way --
A Okay.
-- the fact that people in that area didn't see the Wilson vehicle and didn't see anything in that alley might be considered helpful, would you agree with that?
A Yes, that's right.
And yet when I read your comment here, you seem to be saying, well, lookit, I would never call a witness to say I didn't see anything, so therefore they are not important to you; correct?
A Yes.
But they might be important to Mr. Tallis?
Yes, I understand that, sir.
And I'm trying to understand how it was that this provided to Mr. Tallis, was it because of the

Well, the only way one could, I suppose, disclose
it to Mr. Tallis would be to dictate a memorandum embodying all the results of all those door-to-door checks by various policemen and send him a letter, you know, along with addresses, names and all that sort of thing. That would be something I don't ever recall doing, you know, in my time, but that's the only way I can envision doing it based on what you are asking me, sir.
Q Right. And I guess, let's just try and go back, and I think we can take it as a given that -- I mean, we've gone through everything you did provide to Mr. Tallis?
A I think that's right.
Q And I think we can say that this type of information was not in there.
A I'm sure that's right.
Q And I'm just trying to probe to find out the reason -- the reason or reasons that it may not have been, and again, at that time, in 1969, based upon your understanding of your responsibility as a prosecutor, is this the type of information -you tell us, what -- where is the line, what type of information did you think you had a duty to disclose to Mr. Tallis when he made the request?
Well, the things which I did do, which was go
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 |  | hands -- let me put it this way. If there had |
|  | 2 |  | been a statement taken by Margaret Merriman on May |
|  | 3 |  | 25th, '69 after the police had gathered the |
|  | 4 |  | information from Wilson and John that put the |
| 03:15 | 5 |  | Wilson vehicle near that back alley and |
|  | 6 |  | Mrs. Merriman had stated in that statement that I |
|  | 7 |  | was looking out at the entrance to the T alley |
|  | 8 |  | behind the funeral home where the police tell me |
|  | 9 |  | Nichol John's vehicle -- or where Nichol John says |
| 03:15 | 10 |  | their vehicle was between 6:45 and 6:55 a.m. and I |
|  | 11 |  | didn't see anything, in that scenario do you think |
|  | 12 |  | you would have given -- |
|  | 13 | A | I think I would have, because in that scenario, |
|  | 14 |  | Mr. Hodson, you had some of what, let's say, we |
| 03:15 | 15 |  | thought were correct facts about vehicles and |
|  | 16 |  | people that hadn't existed earlier. I would hope |
|  | 17 |  | that against that background I would either look |
|  | 18 |  | myself or be told to look at the Merriman |
|  | 19 |  | statement and at that point I would think it would |
| 03:16 | 20 |  | be meaningful and I would ship it off to |
|  | 21 |  | Mr. Tallis because it was sort of a frame of |
|  | 22 |  | reference for it then, if you will. |
|  | 23 | Q | And sol guess I'm trying to understand then, what |
|  | 24 |  | we know from Mrs. Merriman now is that's what she |
| 03:16 | 25 |  | saw at that time and I think she also said that |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 |  | struggle I think from my point of view, but if |
|  | 2 |  | that had carefully come into focus, I think I |
|  | 3 |  | should have sent off the information somehow. |
|  | 4 | Q | And just 022181, I just want to -- you mention in |
| 03:17 | 5 |  | the interview with the RCMP that you have no |
|  | 6 |  | record of sending Mr. Tallis Ron Wilson's first |
|  | 7 |  | statement. |
|  | 8 | A | Yeah. I think that's wrong, sir, because -- |
|  | 9 | Q | Right. |
| 03:18 | 10 | A | Yeah. |
|  | 11 | Q | At least -- |
|  | 12 | A | I'm sorry? |
|  | 13 | Q | There's a record, the letter, there is a letter |
|  | 14 |  | where you have sent that and I just -- |
| 03:18 | 15 | A | Yeah. |
|  | 16 | Q | Is that a mistake? |
|  | 17 | A | Yes, that is. At some point I hadn't got the two |
|  | 18 |  | or more Wilson statements sorted out in my mind, |
|  | 19 |  | so this is incorrect. |
| 03:18 | 20 | Q | And then 022187, talking about Simon Doell, and he |
|  | 21 |  | is the fellow who I think in a police report said |
|  | 22 |  | that he saw Gail Miller take the bus at Avenue N. |
|  | 23 | A | That's correct. |
|  | 24 | Q | And you were asked the question on the previous |
| 03:18 | 25 |  | page -- maybe just go back to the previous page -- |
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could it be possible that with Doell stating that she always got on the bus at Avenue N , that may have influenced the Crown's theory, or do you have any recollection of that, and I think what the allegation relating to Simon Doell is is this, that the Crown theory was Avenue N , that's where Gail Miller was.

## A That's correct.

Q And that Simon Doell corroborated that by saying that Gail Miller was on, caught the Avenue $N$ bus, that there was other evidence from other witnesses that put her at Avenue O and that you didn't disclose the Simon Doell evidence to the defence so they could challenge his Avenue N statement. I think that's, if I can summarize that, and I just want to go through what your response is. You say, well, no it wouldn't influence me because I have no memory of ever reading the Doell thing and because let's suppose he had insisted she always got on at Avenue O I wouldn't believe him, because the evidence was of the Wilson car coming down Avenue N. So let me pause there. Now, Simon Doell didn't say Avenue N , but a number of other people did say -- pardon me, Simon Doell didn't say Avenue 0 , but a number of other witnesses did.

```
A But I think, Mr. Hodson, he did say N; did he not?
Q He did, Simon Doell said N.
A Okay.
    Gail Miller's roommates for the most part said 0,
    but the question I have here is you say if you
    would have had people saying, insisted she always
    got on the bus at Avenue O, you wouldn't believe
    them because the evidence was of the Wilson car
    coming down Avenue N. I'm just wondering if --
    why you wouldn't believe them instead of saying,
    well, if they are right, maybe Wilson is wrong.
A As to where the car was, sir?
Q Yes.Well, no, for example, you are saying
    because Wilson puts the car on Avenue N --
    Yes.
    -- therefore, anybody who says she caught the bus
    on O, you wouldn't believe them because you say
        she was on N
        That's in a nutshell.
        Right. And my question is what's the flip side,
        why don't you say, well, maybe I should believe
        the people who say she walks down Avenue O and
        John are wrong.
        Well, Mr. Hodson, I think there were, I think
```Page 17564

03:22 25
maybe even yesterday we went through three or four factors which led me to, if you will, accept the Avenue \(\mathbf{N}\) version, whether it was right or not. I don't recall there being a, you know, a very substantial competing Avenue \(\mathbf{O}\) theory and maybe you could help me with that.
Q There was, I mean, we called in this Inquiry right at the very outset Gail Miller's roommates who said, I think for the most part that, that Avenue O is where she would normally take the bus, and I don't think anybody said positively that that had to be where she took the bus, but that's what they believed, and I'm just trying to understand, Mr. Caldwell, a couple of questions; one, why you would say that if anybody said O it didn't fit your theory, therefore, you wouldn't believe them?
A I think that is an unfortunate choice of terminologies. I think that -- I think that, without going through the reasons why I believed it was an Avenue \(\mathbf{N}\) based enterprise, and I don't doubt what her roommates said, I had forgotten that, as to what route she usually took -- I just -- I wouldn't change that, Mr. Hodson, unless I felt there was evidence, if you will, to support that, to put it at the other corner.
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