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## Transcript of Proceedings

(Reconvened at 9:02 a.m.)
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Good morning.
ALL COUNSEL: Morning.

## THOMAS DAVID ROBERTS CALDWELL, continued:

```
BY MR. WOLCH:
```

Q
A
Q


Morning, Mr. Caldwell.
Morning, sir.
Just for the record's sake, after we broke yesterday you were given a number of questions, and I understand you spent some time here doing your best to refresh yourself; and also for the record, this morning you met with myself and your counsel just to clarify a little bit so we could expedite going through this?

That's right, sir.
Okay?
Yes, that's correct.
And I think $I$ told you this morning that $I$ would like to get through this portion as quickly as possible.

You have my best wishes, sir, I'll try to help. But, for the record, the questions you were given; can you recite them, -Yes.
$Q$

A
, yes sir.
of:

1. Ron Wilson March 3rd
2. Nichol John March 11th
3. David Milgaard March 3rd and April 18 th

Refer to Mr. Lockyer's question to you yesterday in transcript pages we are giving you today."

Which I got yesterday.
"Review each statement by itself to refresh your memory on what it says, or of what it says, rather. Then compare all three statements to each other to find similarities between them and differences between them. Then look to each statement to see anything shown to be false by known fact.",
sir.
Okay. And maybe, I'm not sure we can do this for the record, perhaps you can; do you have in front of you the numbers of the statements you looked
at?
Yeah. Do you wish to start with which?
Just the ones you looked at, --
Okay.
-- and if the staff can help by just quickly pulling them up so we know what we're lookin' at, just quickly pull them up?

Okay. Well there is a John statement -Sorry?

MS. KNOX: Tell him it's the Bates number you need on the bottom of the page, he put his own numbers on.

BY MR. WOLCH:
Oh, I'm sorry, thank you very much. Just that number?
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Well then a Wilson statement says 042086 .
Okay, pause.
Okay.
Okay. You see it on the screen now; that's the statement?

Yeah, I'm sure it is, sir. It is, yeah.
Yeah, that's the one. We've all seen that many times, that's the March the 3rd statement, okay?

Then there are two David Milgaard's statements, the 006586 , and $I$ believe, Mr. Wolch, that -- the typed version, if you will, of that is -- pardon me, there is a second one April 18th, and that's 0 -- pardon me -- 30 --

The one on the screen now is March the 3rd, '69?
Okay.
Okay. And the next one is?
Is April 18th, '69, and that's 305267 , and those are $I$ believe --

See that one now on the screen? That's the April
18th --
Yes, sir.
-- copy of the statement --
That's it, sir.
-- of David Milgaard?
That's right.
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Okay. So those are the documents you had to look at?

I -- that's right.
Okay. And what did you understand your first task to be?
"To review each statement by itself to refresh your memory." I had read through them yesterday. Yes?
"Compare the three statements to each other to find similarities between them and differences between them."

Let's pause there.
Okay.
Did you find -- obviously you found similarities, --

Yeah.
-- I'm more concerned about differences.
Okay.
Did you find differences?
Mr. Wolch, if -- very few, and inconsequential, would be how $I$ would answer you. I didn't try to catalogue them, there were differences, and I'd -I'd say they were that way.

But they would be a type you would expect to find?
Yeah, in any two witness statements from one
person, if you will.
Q Yeah. So nothing stood out?

A
Q
good that may be.
Okay. Because there was some reference somewhere along the way from you that perhaps they denied being in Saskatoon --

Yeah.
-- or something like that?
That's right, sir, I'm sure I said that and it isn't here.

Okay.
It --

Okay. So when you read it over, --
Yeah, that --
-- known facts, there's nothing to contradict?
No, sir, that's right.
So --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay. So your answer is there's nothing false by reference to the known facts?

I think that's correct, sir, I -- as I look through the whole matter as best I can. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

BY MR. WOLCH:
$Q$
And when you were -- this is perhaps a tough question -- but when you were, back in '69, reading statements of witnesses like these people
were you cognizant of the fact that, while they appeared to be a narrative, many of these statements omitted the questions that were being asked along the way?

A

Q

A
$Q$
A

Q

A
$Q$


Yeah. Truthfully, Mr. Wolch, I didn't notice that, and $I--I^{\prime} m--I$ wouldn't doubt that that was the case.

That is you wouldn't expect a 16-year-old normally to sit down and give a complete story, what you would expect is the officers would be saying "and what happened next", "where did you go next", and that is how the statement is created?

That's right. And, all things being equal, the questions would be -- for instance in Mr. Milgaard's it's question/answer.

Right.
All things being equal, one would expect the questions there, when you mention it I'm sure that wasn't always the case.

Because it might be unfair, at the end of the day, might you agree, to accuse somebody of leaving something out if they weren't asked about it?

Yeah, that's so, sir.
I mean you wouldn't expect, for example, these kids to say "oh yeah, we, then we went to Edmonton
and we did some marijuana there" --
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Yeah.
-- when (a) they know they are being questioned about Saskatoon, --

Uh-huh.
-- and (b) nobody has asked them about doing marijuana in Edmonton?

I've --
Do you follow me?
Yeah, I do, and I've seen examples of just that, where someone indignantly said "nobody asked me", not with respect to this, but I've certainly seen it, sir.

You see, we've got through a that very quickly. Oh good. It's not the break time by any chance, is it, sir.

Oh, okay.
Thank you, sir.
Now what I'd like to turn to, though, is what occurred to Gail Miller and how you perceived it back in '69, and I'd like to explore that with you.

All right, sir.
And we know somewhat what your position was, given we have your closing address to the jury and we
have your draft copy leading up to it, and unfortunately we have your letters to the parole board where you gave your theory, we have that to look at, but I'd like to go over this a bit --
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Q pointed out.

And we know that she never got to the bus stop; right?

That is my understanding, that's correct, sir.
So -- and $I$ could ask you this but maybe I'll lead
you a bit -- would it be -- would you ascribe to
the theory that she walked down Avenue $O$ and was
likely accosted by Fisher where $I$ have the $X$ by
the alleyway; would that be a likely --
Umm, it could be, Mr. Wolch. I think I should
just mention that, because of one thing and another, $I$ was not in the Inquiry when Fisher gave his evidence during May.

No, but --
No, just so that you know that.
I know, --
Yeah.
-- but I'm not going to say what Fisher says, -Okay.
-- I mean just --
No, no.
But, just looking at it logically, we know quarter to 7:00, --

Yeah.
-- we know she doesn't get to the bus stop prior to 7:00, something occurred on that to stop her from getting from $A$ to $B$ ?

Yeah.

Q
A presumed -- thought she'd gone to 21 st Street,
along here, and gone south on Avenue $N$, and that the meeting with the Wilson vehicle and occupants occurred somewhere going down this avenue. The request for directions, etcetera, I felt happened as their car went south on $N$, and as $I$ felt she walked south on $N$ on what $I$ believe is the west sidewalk, Mr. Wolch --

Okay. And then -- and then what did the car do? My memory of it is that the car kept going south on $N$, got to $20 t h$ Street --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just a minute, you said the west sidewalk, do you mean the east sidewalk?

No, I actually meant -- I meant west, sir. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay. He's driving --

A
Yeah.
BY MR. WOLCH:

I'll try to help you on that.
Okay.
That would make it impossible for David to be calling out the window, $I$ think, and being the nearest person to her?

A
Okay. Is --
I'm not going to hold you up, but the car is
coming down that street, she's walking down that street; now where does the U-turn take place, or whatever, take place?

A
Okay. Just the direction thing, there is a little map in the upper right corner, and I said west, Mr. Commissioner, because it would be the sidewalk on the right of the vehicle, if you will, as it went south.

So she would be on this sidewalk here?
That was my understanding, Mr. Wolch, yeah.
That's --
Okay, that's what $I$ was trying to say.
Okay.
And then the car, $I$ felt, went to $20 t h$ Street.
Okay. Try to follow a bit on the map so we can see.

A
Q

A

Q
A
$Q$ Okay, now where is it stuck, I won't -- I'll let you tell us?

A
I felt that there was evidence of almost a snow
boulevard on $20 t h$, and it initially got stuck there, if my memory is correct.
$Q$

A

Q
A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Well I can envision a situation, sir, where it could be stuck, if you will, in the north half of 20th, for one thing. In other words there's -that would be the westbound half, or -- and actually halt traffic?
attempt this $U-t u r n$ and head back toward the alley
is --
$Q$
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Uh-huh.
-- would you not expect that for all this to take place, going down the street, turning around, coming back, she would be long gone?

A

Q
But they got unstuck by them pushing the car out?
I assume that that was the time, sir.
But with busses going by --
Yeah.
-- and cars going by, nobody --
Yeah.
-- in the entire city would see this impediment to
traffic?
Mr. Wolch, I don't think anyone was located who
claimed to have seen it, I think that much is --
Well, that's for sure, that's in fact the point
I'm making.
Yeah, well, I agree with that, sir.
Yeah.
No one was found to --
And also, given that it was 40 below and Gail
Miller was not all that warmly clothed, --
Uh-huh.
-- would you not expect that for all this to take
place, going down the street, turning around,
coming back, she would be long gone?
I would have thought so, sir.
But why wouldn't that cause you to think that this
is impossible?
A
Well, Mr. Wolch, I clearly would have no knowledge, $I$ would simply have theories on what might happen. That theory, sir, that you've put forth in my opinion is quite possible. In other words, suppose she had run in any direction, she would be gone by the time the latter parts of this occurred.

But it makes the combined stories of Wilson and John impossible. I mean -- and $I$ haven't even thrown in the fact that it's a bizarre reason why she would be going down the wrong street given the bus stop and the fact that the knife through the dress, or through the coat and not through the dress --

Uh-huh.
-- when you throw that in, $I$ have a very difficult time understanding how this could have been advanced by yourself even.

Well, sir, the evidence, if you will, that $I$ had was roughly along those lines, I couldn't hopefully invent any, and $I$ had to work with what appeared to be, you know, witnesses of various types, including civilians, who had nothing to do with it, etcetera.
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Mr. Caldwell, I'm not for a moment suggesting that you had an improper purpose or you were trying to convict an innocent person, nothing at all -No, sir.
-- but what I'm trying to understand is how the prosecutor's focus and mentality would adopt a scenario that really makes no sense, that's what I'm trying to --

Okay.
-- identify, how you wouldn't see then, the obvious, that it's just impossible.

Well, frankly, sir, I didn't see it that way and $I$ find it, you know, it's a very legitimate stance to take, it didn't seem to me to be that way, and there was also, for better, for worse, three or four witnesses or pieces of evidence which did identify it with $N$ instead of $O$ as you may recall. Well, we'll deal with that --

No, that's fine, sir, $I$ just wanted to mention that.

You may have some trouble with that.
Okay.
We'll deal with that.
Very good.
Now, it's fair to say, though, that even you
couldn't really decide what street it was on until
very, very late in the day?
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In terms of the investigation you mean, sir?
Well, I'm going to suggest to you that you were almost finished the jury trial and you hadn't in your own mind decided if it was or N .

Mr. Wolch, that's not how $I$ recall it, but you may be correct.

Well, let's look at 007311 .
Okay.
This is not your closing address, but this would be a draft that you were kind enough to provide -Okay, sir.
-- which is very similar to your eventual closing,
so $I$ presume this was done sometime during the
jury trial itself?
I assume it was, sir.
And $I$ don't want to go through all of it, but you say it's the Crown's theory, and if we can start highlighting that part there.

Do you want me to read it, sir?
No, not yet.
Okay.
It says:
"It must be inferred that she set off on
foot ... on either Avenues P. or O., and the Crown suggests, on the evidence, down Avenue o."

You see that?

A

Q
A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$
A
Q

A Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv
is wrong, O was a very good possibility and $N$ is what $I$ should have been talking about is the way $I$ read it.

Okay, but you do have O here and you talk about o again and again.

That's right, sir, but $I$ can suggest that when $I$ got the Avenue $P$ in there, which should never have been in there, that moved it up one block in my mind. What $I$ should have been talking about was 0 and $N$, sir, is my conclusion from this. I haven't seen this for a while.

Oh, no, I appreciate that, but I guess the point that I'm trying to make, and $I$ don't know if you accept it or not, is that you were having trouble yourself in trying to determine what the Crown's theory should be as to what street it occurred on.

A

Q
But you realize now Avenue $O$ is the logical street for her to walk down?

A
Yeah, all things --
You are satisfied with that?

A Yeah.
And $I$ want to focus a little bit on your, on how you perceived things happened and at this time if I could turn to 067384 at 85 actually, and what I'm referring to is your -- this is your letter to the parole board. I'm not going into it for the other purposes --

Okay, sir.
-- other than how you describe the incident.
Okay, sir.
It would have been very fresh in your mind at that time, and starting about here, highlight that portion there, they drove along Avenue $N$ around 7:00 a.m., asked directions of Gail Miller, and I'm going to read this quickly.

Okay, fine.
And they asked for Peace Hill, didn't know, replied stupid bitch. At the end of the block, stuck, Milgaard heading back towards the sidewalk on which Miller had been walking, confronted, grabbed purse, pulled knife, took her down alley. Now, you've got this portion here which is really what I'm looking at.

A Okay, sir.

Nichol John observed this part of the episode and
ran away, eventually getting back into the car.
When Wilson returned to the car she was hysterical, and you've got her running away coming back to the car.

A

Yeah. I'm just wondering, that would not have been in trial evidence.

A

Q
A

Q
I can't say, sir. Maybe it wasn't.
Might that have come from the script?
Not by me, sir, it didn't, because I did not read that thing. This could be the trial evidence, it could also be wrong.

Now, I appreciate that when we look at your closing address and your position you took back then, there are some difficulties with remembering and getting everything together, and I can understand that.

A Okay, sir.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just a second. MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, I don't mean to needlessly interrupt, and $I$ won't, but having had the opportunity to review Nichol John's May
$23 r d$ statement last night, not in great detail,
it seems to me that that was said in her
statement but not in her evidence in trial, but that may be --

MR. WOLCH: You might be right, but $I$ guess my point is that was not admissible evidence. No.

MS. KNOX: No, but it was in her statement. BY MR. WOLCH:

I'm sorry, I'm sure you are right, but that was not admissible evidence that you were putting to the parole board is what I'm getting at.

No, sir. I'm sure what my counsel said is no doubt what happened.

I accept that.
Okay, very good.
What $I$ would like to do is bring to your attention
that, and $I$ don't know if you are aware of this, and $I$ would be interested in knowing, that there was prepared a film of your -- that deals with your closing address. Are you aware of that?

No. I was not asked to take part in it either, Mr. Wolch, but I didn't know that.

Well, I don't think anybody plays your part, but your voice is there.

A Very good.
Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A A

TRANSCRIPT OF NARRATION OF VIDEOTAPE REENACTMENT

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { "A single portrayal of the evidence } \\
& \text { given at the trial of David Milgaard in } \\
& \text { January of } 1970 \text { is virtually impossible } \\
& \text { because of the many conflicting versions } \\
& \text { put by the witnesses Nichol John and Ron } \\
& \text { Wilson. This videotape attempts to } \\
& \text { provide the viewer with a sense of the } \\
& \text { area in which the crime occurred and to } \\
& \text { portray the alleged encounter with Gail } \\
& \text { Miller." }
\end{aligned}
$$

MR. WOLCH: Can we stop for a minute? I thought it was going to work. Try it again. "It's unclear as to whether this alleged encounter occurred on Avenue O or Avenue $N$ between 21 st and $20 t h$ Streets in Saskatoon."

## VIDEOTAPE STOPPED

MR. WOLCH: That's not the beginning.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You can take a few minutes to set that up.

MR. WOLCH: Could we set that up if you don't mind?
(Adjourned at 9:30 a.m.)
(Reconvened at 9:45 a.m.)
MR. WOLCH: Mr. Commissioner, for the record, $I$ probably should have said that the tape in question is one that we prepared for the Supreme Court. It was filed in the Supreme Court for the reference itself and the tape, I believe I provided it a number of months ago, quite a few months ago with the intention of having it played here. Unfortunately it wasn't -- is the word digitalized, and so it makes the playing of it a little more difficult, and so we're going to try and do it at this point in time. Where it's at
now is about a minute into it, the first minute is really blurry. $\quad$ don't know if it will go from here, but maybe we can give it a try and see how it works out. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right.

## VIDEOTAPE CONTINUED

"... though her evidence was
considerably different at the trial.

In his closing address to the
jury, the Crown Attorney said the following:
"Now, I'd like first to outline the Crown's theory of the offence. The evidence is that the girl, Miss Miller, was standing at her residence home, 130 O South between, as I get it, 6:35 and 6:45 the morning of the murder. It must be inferred that she set off on foot for the bus line on 20 th down either Avenue $P$ - excuse me, Avenue O or Avenue $N$, one or the other. She had to go south from her residence, and the Crown suggests on the evidence that it was down Avenue $N$ proceeding southward on the west side of that avenue, proceeding towards 20 th

Street where the bus line is."
Although the Crown committed
itself to the theory that Milgaard's encounter with Gail Miller occurred on Avenue $N$, this passage from the jury address shows that the Crown also had to allow for the possibility of an attack on Avenue 0 .

Let us begin with an examination of the Avenue $O$ theory.

Gail Miller lived at 130 Avenue
O South which was slightly over one block in a straight line from a bus stop located on the southwest corner of

Avenue $O$ and 20 th Street. There was also a bus stop located at the corner of Avenue N and 20 th Street. If Gail Miller were to take the bus to work along 20th Street, common sense suggests that she would take the most direct route to the bus stop, straight along Avenue O to 20 th Street.

As we see in this portrayal,
Gail Miller would leave her home from the front door and would have the option
of crossing over to the west side of the street, either at 21 st or when she reached $20 t h$ Street. Here we see her crossing over to the west side of the sidewalk at 21 st Street and then proceeding south.

At this point, according to the Crown theory, she would be stopped by the Wilson vehicle and Milgaard would ask her for directions.
"Hi. Do you know how to get to the Peace Hill area?"
"No, I'm sorry."
"Stupid bitch."
Ms. Miller would then continue in a
southward direction towards $20 t h$ Street and, according to Wilson and John, they also proceeded in a southward direction, arriving at an intersection on a street with a center boulevard. Although 20th Street has never had a center boulevard or any sort of median, the Crown nevertheless insisted that the street on which the U-turn was made was 20 th

Street. Here we see the point at which
the car has reached the intersection and begun its $U$-turn as well as the location of Gail Miller, given her forward progress, after the encounter with the vehicle.

The evidence at trial disclosed that once the $U$-turn was three-quarters completed, the car became stuck and Milgaard and Wilson got out of the car and spent a considerable period of time trying to get it unstuck. By the time the decision was made for Milgaard and Wilson to get out of the car and try to push it, Gail Miller would have already arrived at the bus stop on Avenue $O$ and 20th. The evidence that Milgaard left on foot to get help toward where the girl had been walking in this version removes the possibility of an encounter with Gail Miller on foot. The alleged encounter with Gail Miller on Avenue O is simply not possible.

Moreover, David Milgaard was
looking for St. Mary's Church as a landmark to guide him to Cadrain's home.

Albert Cadrain lived one block south of St. Mary's Church and, if this alleged encounter had occurred on Avenue 0 , then the Wilson vehicle would have been stuck not more than 50 feet from this rather imposing landmark, a landmark which, at approximately 9:00 a.m. on the morning of January 31st, 1969, in fact did guide Milgaard to the Cadrain home. The Avenue $N$ theory evolved as a result of the statement given by Mr. Henry Diewold who was the caretaker of St. Mary's Church. Diewold testified that he walked from the rectory of the church to the church itself at approximately 7:00 a.m. and as he walked he had a clear view into the east-west portion of the $T$-shaped alley. He said that he saw lights of a car positioned at approximately the stem of the $T$ in the alley which would be approximately at the point where the police vehicle is positioned in this photograph. As he returned from the church to the rectory at about 7:10 a.m. he saw the lights
again and saw a figure pass back and forth in front of the lights.

The evidence of Marie Indyk suggests that either she or Mr. Diewold is mistaken about the time. In order to connect this car with the murder and with Wilson, John and Milgaard, the Crown had to explain how it would have been in the alley facing in a westerly direction. The way that this was done was to place Gail Miller walking in a southward direction on Avenue $N$ headed towards the bus stop at $20 t h$ Street. Here we see a portrayal of the route that Gail Miller would take to come directly out of her front door, head south on Avenue 0 to 21 st, then east on 21 st to Avenue $N$, then south on Avenue $N$ toward 20th. With temperatures hovering about minus 40 Fahrenheit, it is difficult to conceive of why anyone would take the longest route possible to a bus stop. In any event, as Gail Miller proceeds south on Avenue $N$, we see and hear the alleged encounter with
her.
"Hi. Can you tell me how to get to Pleasant Hill or downtown?"
"No, I'm sorry."
"Can we give you a ride
somewhere?"
"No, thank you."
"Stupid bitch."
Her response to the trio is inconsistent with someone who had lived in the area for several months, although at the trial Nichol John testified that after the encounter the vehicle went to the intersection, made a U-turn, got stuck, then got unstuck, then completed the U-turn and pulled over toward the curb before entering the alley behind the funeral home. In her statement of May 24th, 1969 she told the police that after the alleged encounter the vehicle turned directly into the alley where it became stuck. She described a period of time spent trying to get the vehicle unstuck with Milgaard and Wilson in the vehicle. She then described both of the
boys getting out of the car, trying to push and then ultimately going to seek help.

As we see in this portrayal of
that statement, Gail Miller is long past the car and the entrance to the alley before either Wilson or Milgaard leave the vehicle. The Crown's theory of how this crime occurred did not account for the forward progress of Gail Miller because in this, the most damaging scenario for Milgaard, Gail Miller is at 20th Street and, according to Nichol John's trial evidence, a considerably longer period of time was spent at the intersection and at the curb before actually heading into the alley. An encounter with Gail Miller by Milgaard after leaving the vehicle to seek help was simply not possible.

In spite of this, Nichol John then stated that she saw Milgaard encounter the woman that they had asked for directions, grab for her purse, struggle and then draw with his right
hand a knife and begin several stabbing motions at this woman. He then
supposedly dragged or moved this victim into the east-west portion of the alley, ultimately disappearing, as we see, to the right into the north-south portion of the stem of the $T$ toward where the body of Gail Miller was ultimately found.

Nichol John's recollection is fuzzy after this point. She claims that she then ran from the car, came back to the car and saw Milgaard at the $T$ portion of the alley depositing a purse in a garbage can. Somehow both he and Wilson were then back in the car and inexplicably it became unstuck and they drove away enroute to the motel, the Danchuks and then Cadrains.

Aside from the fact that Gail
Miller's forward progress would have precluded an encounter with Milgaard and assuming that the car was stuck in this area, there are several other factors which defeat this theory.

First, Gail Miller was stabbed through her coat and not her dress. This means that Nichol John would also have needed to see David Milgaard remove Gail Miller's coat, take her dress down around her waist, replace the coat and then stab her.

Also, the police identification officers testified that there was no sign of a struggle beginning at one point and leading to where the body was found and, in particular, there was no blood in the snow.

In addition, identification
officers testified that there were no signs of a car having been stuck anywhere in the east-west portion of the alley.

The Avenue $N$ theory, according to the most damming version, Nichol John's May 24 th, 1969 statement, simply does not work, and works even less so on the basis of Nichol John's evidence at the trial.

The stunning aspect of this
case is that the Crown had substantial
information in its possession not apparently disclosed to the defence which conclusively establishes the fiction of the Avenue $N$ theory.

1. Adeline Nyczai provided a statement or January 31 st, 1969 stating that she saw Gail Miller alive between 6:35 a.m. and 6:45 a.m. dressed for work but without her coat on. She stated that Gail Miller usually left for work before 7:00 a.m. This witness testified at the trial.
2. Ann Friesen, another of

Gail Miller's roommates whose statement apparently was not disclosed, said on January 31st, 1969 that Gail Miller left every morning between 6:40 a.m. and 6:45 a.m., walked straight south on Avenue O to 20 th Street and left by the front door.
3. Betty Hundt, another roommate, provided a statement on January 31st, 1969 stating that Gail Miller left every morning at 6:45 a.m.,
going out the front door, and Miss Hundt believed that Gail Miller walked south on Avenue $O$ to $20 t h$ Street.
4. According to a witness by the name of Mary Gallucci on the day before the murder, a pretty nurse travelled south on Avenue $O$ to the bus stop at 20th. This is consistent with the statements of Nyczai, Friesen and Hundt. Mrs. Gallucci also observed a construction worker wearing a yellow hard hat would come from south of 20 th Street to the bus stop on Avenue O at approximately 6:45 a.m.
5. At 226 Avenue $N$ South Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Merriman were waiting for a taxi that they had ordered for 6:55 a.m. looking out their front window directly at the spot where Nichol John claimed that the car became stuck. They saw nothing.
6. Through the disclosure process, the reference case contained statements of many people who were out on the streets in the vicinity of the
crime. No one saw a vehicle stuck and, if Wilson and John are to be believed that the car became stuck at the intersection of Avenue $N$ and 20th, a considerable amount of traffic, including city busses, would have had to circumvent the car. The notion that neither Milgaard nor Wilson was able to find any assistance to get the car unstuck is simply untenable.
7. George Jones, a student who lived on the southeast corner of Avenue N and $20 t h$ Street, left his home a few minutes after 7:00 a.m. and walked north along Avenue $N$ to 22 nd Street past the funeral home and the back lane. He saw nothing.
8. Another witness interviewed by police who lived at the southwest corner of Avenue N and 20 th Street drove his truck north on Avenue $N$ from $20 t h$ to 22 nd Street past the funeral home and the alley at approximately 7:00 a.m. He saw nothing.

Several independent witnesses
failed to corroborate the Avenue $N$ theory. In fact, they contradicted it. The conclusion is that it, like the Avenue O theory, must fail.

Consequently, there is no credible evidence placing Milgaard at or near the scene of the crime when Gail

Miller was killed."

VIDEOTAPE ENDS

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Has that been marked for the record?

MR. WOLCH: Please, sir, might it? I think it has a document number I think.

MR. HODSON: It will have a doc ID. Is there one on that --

MR. WOLCH: No, that's mine, not the one I gave you.

MR. HODSON: I will get and advise you of a doc ID for the tape.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.
BY MR. WOLCH:
$Q$ Mr. Caldwell, I'm going to have a -- sorry, I'll wait for Mr. Hodson.

```
                                    Mr. Caldwell, I'm going to have
```

a few questions only about the tape, but before $I$
ask you a few questions, do you have any reaction to seeing that given the mindset you had back in '69?

A

Q
A

Q

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

Q

A

Q
A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q
A

But everything in this film was available at the time of trial.

Were all those -- there's names of witnesses there that $I$ didn't recognize, but that may not be -But they come from police reports.

Okay.
I'm not saying that you had all that
information --
No.
-- but I'm saying between yourself and the police everything there was available.

Okay. If that's the case, I don't doubt what you are telling me, sir. Clearly some of it didn't get to the Crown.

But when you act it out, do you see the impossibility of Gail Miller going ahead, you see 20th Street, which is a busy -- you can see how active that street is generally?

Uh-huh.
It's not a hidden-away street?
I realize it is an active street. There was
evidence at some stage $I$ think of Nichol John indicating they ran into what she called $I$ think a snow boulevard. Clearly there was no, you know, civic boulevard there. I did -- I think I said
one of the things that could have happened is she could have kept going south and been totally out of the picture when any of this was about to happen.
$Q$

A
Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q

A
0
$Q$

But they are all could-haves?
Yeah.
You see there's people around, there's the Merrimans, there's busses going by, there's people going by, nobody sees a single thing -- Diewold and Indyk see other things -- but nobody sees anything to corroborate any theory you have. Well, sir, that's certainly how this looks, yeah. And then you have the added feature of Wilson at 40 below for 15 minutes. Where's he going? The 40 below aspect, I'm amazed that much of any of this happened, including, you know, the killing itself, but that seemed to be a fact at the time. Oh, no, but there was much speculation and more logic in the idea that it happened inside a car, the car that Diewold was looking at.

Yeah.
But, I mean, you accept that Wilson may have walked for 15 minutes --

Uh-huh.
-- I mean, he would have been further away than

Miss (V4)---, but how -- I'm trying to understand how you could accept in 40 below he's going for 15 minutes. Where is he going?

A

All right. But given -- oh, I'm sorry.
MS. KNOX: Just one, and this is purely a
technical point in terms of distance. Wilson said that he, at one point he was away from the car for 15 minutes, he would have only been walking in one direction for 7 1/2 --

MR. WOLCH: Oh, okay.
MS. KNOX: -- because he would have had to
do it twice --
MR. WOLCH: Okay.
MS. KNOX: -- so he couldn't have gone a
distance of 15 minutes and come back.
MR. WOLCH: So he couldn't have got to Ms. (V4)--- and back.

MS. KNOX: I --
BY MR. WOLCH:

Q
A

Q
A
$Q$

A
Q

A
$Q$

No, I get your point.
Yeah. Actually, Mr. Wolch, I had just thought of that myself and --

Okay, it wasn't a trick.
But it was $71 / 2$ each way according to Wilson, yeah.

Each way, but $71 / 2$ minutes at 40 below, you are going to go pretty far?

Yeah, $I$ follow you, sir.
I mean Gail Miller can get from her house to the bus and back two or three times in that amount of time?

Yes.
But, in any event, would it be fair to say that, at the time of the prosecution, you were so
focused on David being the killer that you never
took a step back, like this video did, and say
"okay, let's look at it all and test it, let's
test the frailties, let's test the
improbabilities", that; you never went to the
scene, you told us that?
I did not.
But you never really tested it, you relied, 'the police believe he did it so $I$ believe he did it', and we go in one direction?

Well, Mr. Wolch, in a sense I did not take a step back and look at it because in -- at the time when the case was being developed, if you will, there were, in my view, no other possible suspects known to me -- and I appreciate that $I$ wouldn't know of all of them -- but there was no other likely scenario that $I$ was aware of, and that of course would tend to fo -- you know, keep me focused on Mr. Milgaard.

Okay. And that's assuming you didn't know about the other attacker in the area, like --

Yeah, and --
Although it was on your file, but you didn't know about that?

Yeah, the -- that's an -- I don't mean to be -that's a very awkward topic, as to who found out what when, as $I$ believe $I$ didn't clearly or in -you know, know about the other attacker matter. I'm sure we could go through that again, but -No. will, not in my prosecution file, that $I$ think $I$ would have remembered that name to start with. Well we'll -- you mean the singer, you mean, is that the idea?
It was in your police reports, though, I'll -- I can't find it now, but we didn't just make it up. Yeah. But I think, Mr. Wolch, that it was, if you

No, I didn't think you would wish to, but --
No. But would it be fair to say that, when you
see the video, it causes you considerable
discomfort as to the case you put in?
Well, it, it advances another tenable explanation of how the murder occurred.

No, it, with respect it doesn't, it just says
"this is how it didn't happen"?
Or yeah, pardon me, $I$ meant how it did not occur.
Yeah, but $I$ mean --
Yeah.
-- all that was there for you, I mean all the statements were taken from police reports, -Yeah.
-- files, $I$ know of nothing in that video that wasn't available to you back in '69?

I did -- never saw a person named George Jones in a witness statement for one thing, was that --
$Q$ Okay. And we could turn to a different topic with you. Mr. Pringle asked you a number of questions about Mr. Tallis and you clearly, you clearly had minute, $I$ should have known that", or "how did that get by me", or anything like that at all? Not that $I$ can pick out at the moment, sir.

nothing but praise to say for Mr. Tallis, there is no doubt about that, and $I$ was taken by your comment several times about how hard a worker Mr. Tallis is.

Yeah, I knew him to be that, sir.
An extremely hard worker?

Yeah.

The preliminary hearing in this case, if my memory serves me right -- and I'm sure if I'm wrong somebody will correct me -- was August the 18th; is that when it started?

I don't have that but I'm sure --

Sorry, I'm --
-- it's easily findable.

Okay. I'm pretty sure it was August 18th or thereabouts. I'm sorry, I should have known the date, --

No, that's fine, sir.
-- but $I$ just do it by memory.
MS. KNOX: I can give you a document that will assist you.

MR. WOLCH: Oh, thank you.

MS. KNOX: That's the start date and that's

BY MR. WOLCH:

Q
A

Yeah. It started on Monday, August the 18th, -Very good.
-- and then it went, it says here, Thursday the 21st, Wednesday the 27 th, Thursday the $28 t h$, looks like maybe Tuesday the 4 th possibly -- Thursday the 4 th, Friday the 5th, Wednesday the 10 th, and Thursday the l1th, so it's into September.

That was, Mr. Wolch, was that all prelim dates or were there a couple of opening/adjournments in there?

Well, there would be gaps, but those appear to be the dates when the preliminary went on.

When the actual evidence was running, is that -Well, that's right, that's --

Okay. I just want -- as you know, there were two or three early appearances where, essentially, the thing got adjourned, but --

No, I'm talking about the preliminary hearing.
Okay, that's -- I am too, sir, but --
As $I$ see it, Monday the 18 th was the first day?
Okay. I'll --
Okay?
That's, I'm sure, right.
And the reason $I$ ask you about that is if we can pull up 0015 I think it's 06, but I could be
wrong, I have the document with me but I'm having a hard time reading it. Oh, that's right.

A
Q

A
Q

A
Q
A
Q
A
$Q$

A
Q

A Okay.

Now here's your letter to Mr. Tallis, and what you are giving him are -- is really the most important part of your case, Cadrain's statement, the two Wilson statements, and the John statements; you see that?

Yeah, I do.
And that's dated August the 15 th, if we can get
the whole --
Okay, I see that as well.
You see?
Yeah.
Now would that have gone by mail?
I assume so. The -- it -- our office was in the
courthouse and the lawyers had a, pickup drawers
in land titles, which at that point was in the
courthouse.
Okay. Well August 15 th would have been the Friday, I take it, --

Yeah.
-- the Friday preceding the Monday when the preliminary started?

Uh-huh, yeah.

So we don't know if Mr. Tallis can tell us, or we -- when he got it, but the absolute earliest would have been the Friday and more likely the Monday? Yeah. It could be, sir, depending on which method --

Well, if you mailed it, for sure he didn't get it until Monday?

Absolutely, which makes me wonder if $I$ mailed it. I think we may have used another method, I don't know.

Okay. Whatever it is, we're now talking about either the day of the preliminary hearing, or the weekend before, he is getting the most important statements of the case?

It looks that way, sir.
Now you made comment about how Mr. Tallis burns the midnight oil and works hard, and I don't doubt that to be correct, but at that point he didn't have very much to work with?

A
Yeah. If that's the -- I have no reason to doubt the dates, timing, etcetera, sir. I don't -- I don't know if this is the first material $I$ sent him, is one thing.

But you appreciate how important a preliminary hearing is, $I$ think Mr. Pringle took you through
that?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
Q

A

Yes, absolutely.
It's a chance to ask questions that you might not want to risk at a trial?

Yeah, I --
You know, you might want to attack the police a little bit at a preliminary --

Yeah.
-- as to how they took statements, but you might
not want to do it in front of a jury?
No, I agree with that, sir. Yeah.
So you can really experiment and try things at a preliminary, but it's pretty hard to do if you don't have the statements?

I agree with that principle exactly, sir.
Now we know disclosure is crucial on defending people, but $I$ understand the word that always goes before disclosure is the word "timely"?

That $I$ would -- I understand that as well.
So August 15 th, and maybe the day of the
beginning, is pretty late to be giving out the most important statements in the whole case?

I agree, sir. The first sentence in my letter:
"Further to your letter of June 10 ... and our telephone conversation, enclosed
. . .",
etcetera. Evidently, we had spoken about this at or shortly after June 10 th, by the way this reads.

Well --

But Mr. Tallis might have more knowledge on that than $I$ do, sir.

It just seems to me that August 15 th is a rather late response --

Yeah.
-- to the June 10 th request when $I$ take it you had those statements for some period of time?

Well that, Mr. Wolch, is something I don't know, frankly. There were difficulties with summer holidays, both in terms of investigators and in terms of our office, $I$-- Mr. Tallis may know this better than $I$, but $I$ would assume there was some difficulty in assembling the material:
"I also enclose ... the Autopsy Report . . " ",
and some of this may have been waiting on others, is all $I$ can suggest.

No, but $I$ mean $I$ appreciate -- I'm not trying to say anything about Mr. Tallis, --

A I -- yeah.

Q -- but when you say he was such a hard worker and prepared, --

A
Q
A

Q
A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
A

Q
I think you've had about six days of preliminary by then, and you are responding to him by this time, and $I$ don't know when he would have got this letter, whether the preliminary was still on or not on or whatever, and you talk about Les Spence who we heard about, and Dennis Elliott who we
heard about, and then you say they were both eliminated as suspects. So, in your mind, that's not going to help him a great deal; is it?

A

Q
A
Q
A
$Q$

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
2

No, but $I$ think it's something he should know, sir.

No, but they were eliminated?
Yes, that's correct.
Yeah.
In other words it -- if he had the -- that could save him chasing around trying to find things about them out $I$ would assume.

But if you look, earlier in this letter you say that you have gone through the 95 statements, -That's right.
-- so you would have read the (V4)---- (V4)--statement?

Assuming it was one of them, sir, I would have read it.

Yeah. Now I'm still astounded as to how you could read (V4)---- (V4---'s statement that she was attacked on the same day, at roughly the same time, in roughly the same area, --

Uh-huh.
-- and not say "this is something that falls within Mr. Tallis' request"?

A Yeah. At this point $I$ don't know that, sir, in other words I'm sure $I$ read it but $I$ don't know what the -- what followed that.

No, but what $I$ am getting at is you read it carefully enough that you are able to give them Dennis Elliott, that you know isn't going to help him, --

Yeah.
-- Leslie Spence that you know isn't going to help him, and yet you have the (V4)--- statement, which many will say should have been led regardless of whether it helps him or not as part of the story, --

Uh-huh.
-- and somehow, at this time, it doesn't go to him? I --

Doesn't --

You can't explain it; can you?
No, sir. The second, or the paragraph that says:
"The only material that could possibly
fall into this category ...",
I mention Spence and -- let's see here.
And Elliott?
Yes, and those were things that -- I ended up saying they were eliminated as suspects, I did
give them to Mr. Tallis on the footing that he might have, $I$ suppose, a different view of that than $I$ did, so that $I$ said they'd been eliminated but I recited what $I$ thought they could say -No.
-- in that, yes. Just --
You know, I won't belabour it, but you see -Yeah.
-- the (V4)--- missing, --
Okay.
-- you know, I'm not even focusing on any other statements of victims of Fisher, --

Okay.
-- I'm just focusing on (V4)---, who is so closely related that you wouldn't have spotted it is quite remarkable?

Well, evidently $I$ didn't, sir.
And if you turn to the next page, to 001510 , the next page in this letter, --

Oh, I see that now.
-- you see you give some more information about some man --

A McCrea Fraser.

Yeah, a cab driver I think. But I'm more concerned with the next paragraph:
"You also asked for, and $I$ now enclose, copies of the statements by Sandra Danchuk and Walter Joseph Danchuk, both of whom were Crown witnesses at the preliminary inquiry."

A
I assume that $I$ did not have their statements, Mr. Wolch, that's all $I$ can read into that, at the prelim, because this says I:
"You also asked for, and $I$ now enclose, copies of the statements by ...", Danchuk, the two Danchuks:
"... both of whom were Crown witnesses at the preliminary inquiry."

The only thing $I$ can, you know, sense $I$ can make of that, they must have been called, I must have been working without their actual statements. Does that make much sense to you, -Well --
-- that you would have these witnesses called and you wouldn't have the statements they gave to the police?

A
I might have had a police report saying "this is what they say", sir, that's -- just let me read a little further on. Yeah, no, that's the way that looks to me.

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q

It just strikes me as a bit strange that "here, Mr. Tallis, here are the statements of the witnesses who have already testified"?

Yeah, yeah. That's unusual, Mr. Wolch, in this scenario. I can't say it didn't happen though. Well, it did happen, it's here?

No, I mean it appears to have happened in this scenario. If it were a number of witnesses of course I'd be, you know, concerned about that, but that's -- that's the only way that makes sense to me and I believe that's true.

Well the one, the more troubling paragraph, is the one that follows:
"I also enclose copies of the two statements taken from the accused, ...", Uh-huh.
"... one in Winnipeg, March 3rd, 1969, and the other in Saskatoon April 18th ... As I mentioned to you, I may or may not attempt to have either or both of these statements ruled voluntary, either for the purpose of putting them in as confessions or holding them for cross-examination purposes, at the trial herein."

A
Q

A
Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
statement of a person charged with murder?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q
A
$Q$

A
A
Okay. Now $I$ won't say, Mr. Wolch, that he wasn't given them, $I$ don't know that, in other words that the accused was not given them, or was, at that time.
That's right, that appears that way to me.
Now, as $I$ understand the law back in '69, the Code mandated that the accused must be given copies of his statement, that was actually in the Code?

Well, they wouldn't be given to David, they would be given to his lawyer $I$ would think?

No, but I -- literally speaking, they could have given them to him, $I$ don't know whether that happened.

Okay, well, assume it didn't happen.
Okay. This is my attempt to pass them on to Mr . Tallis.

Okay. But I'm just wondering, why so late in the day, I mean how is Mr. Tallis to prepare properly for a preliminary hearing when he doesn't even know what his client told the police?

I don't know why it was at this late juncture, I simply don't know that at this point, sir.

Well you were asked a lot of questions about, from Mr. Pringle in particular, about a lawyer preparing for Court --

A
Q

A
Q
A Yeah. No, it's -- that would be a must, and I don't know why this thing developed in the
sequence it did, but it clearly did.
Maybe we're going to learn something.
MS. KNOX: No. Mr. Commissioner, again I'm -- I don't mean to be difficult, but the presumption in Mr. Wolch's questions is, by the date of this letter, Mr. Tallis didn't have or hadn't seen the statements in order to prepare. I draw your attention to a -- one sentence in the letter that indicates that he is now sending him copies of statements he has already seen, or he has already had, referring to the McRae Fraser statement. The language of it -- I didn't mark it as I was looking -- but when he talks about the McCrea:

> "I now enclose copies of these statements for your file ..."
and:
"... you will recall from reading the statement ..."

So, clearly, Mr. Tallis had read statements that he is now being given copies of in advance, if the language of this letter is right, so -BY MR. WOLCH:

Q
Well, that may be true, but $I$ don't think it's that clear. That's not -- I mean, on a plain
reading we can interpret it, and $I$ may agree that it's possible you discussed with Mr. Tallis what Mr. Milgaard said, --

A
Q
A
Q

A

Q
A Yeah.
-- I don't know, --
Do you --
-- but $I$ would think, as counsel, he would want a copy before the preliminary starts?

Mr. Wolch, is it -- could I just -- I didn't notice this either. Could I deal with that McRae Fraser paragraph because it may throw some light on the rest of it?

Okay. Well --
This is paragraph 2 on page 510:
"You will recall asking me earlier about
a taxi driver who was supposed to have driven Gail Miller and a man to work on the morning of January 31st, and I some time ago supplied you with copies of the two statements by MacRae Fraser to read.

I now enclose copies of these statements for your file, and, as you will recall
from reading the statements, it appears
that Fraser is of the opinion that this
incident took place either on January
$30 t h$ or $29 t h$ and not January 31 st."

Q
A

Q

A

Q
A
Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
A Well, if $I$ can read that last one, maybe $I$ can help, sir:
statement"?
Well, if $I$ can read that last one, maybe $I$ can
help, sir:
"I also enclose copies of the two statements taken from the accused, one in Winnipeg, March 3rd, 1969, and the other in Saskatoon April 18th, 1969."

It says:
"As I mentioned to you, I may or may not attempt to have either or both of these statements ruled voluntary, either for the purposes of putting them in as confessions or holding them for cross-examination purposes, at the trial herein."

Now that can only mean, Mr. Wolch, that I showed the -- them to Mr. Tallis, I think probably in the same way as the other one we were speaking of, now I'm sending them to him. Simply -- and it may all have been done earlier, but that appears to be how it was in this instance. Mr. Caldwell, I've had trouble yesterday with how you interpret what you write, ...

Very good.
-- and I'm having a lot of trouble with this one. Very good. I'm not saying you didn't read them to Mr. Tallis, --

Okay, that's fine.
-- I'm just saying this paragraph doesn't say that, and no reading of the previous paragraph can make you believe that. It would have been just as easy for you to say "I showed you these statements before", in fact one might conclude that the McCrea paragraph contradicts that you would have shown him the statement, because you would have said so?

The way, Mr. Wolch, $I$ read this is that it appears to deal with three, if you will, sets of statements. In all these it appears that Mr . Tallis had seen them previously. The one says: "... as you will recall from reading the statements ...",

Fraser's, this and that.
Is that the statement -- yeah, go ahead?
The next paragraph says:
"... statements by ... Danchuk and ...
Danchuk, both of whom were Crown
witnesses at the ...",
prelim; and then third deals with the statements of the accused which, on that, the way -- that appears to be one whole sequence and $I$ can't read it the way you are suggesting, sir.

Well, moments ago you said you may not even have had the Danchuk statements?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q
A
$Q$
A
Q

A

Q
A
Q
But you may not have had them until then, like the Danchuks', I don't know?

A Well I -- I don't know that, sir, without looking at some documents.

Q

Well why -- why -- can -- how can you say "I would have shown the Milgaard statements to Tallis" on the plain reading of the letter "but the Danchuk statements $I$ wouldn't have shown because $I$ didn't have them"?

MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, what the witness said is that he might not have had them. In order for us to be able to determine whether he had them we need to pull up the Danchuk statements, show him the dates on them, and then he can determine, based on the record, whether they were part of the 95 that he got in August. He is saying "might", he is speculating, and then it's being put back to him that it is factual.

This is the relationship
between counsel that was ongoing for many months between June about a file. Nobody, and certainly Mr. Caldwell, could not have anticipated that, 35 years later, he would be sitting here with a letter he wrote to a man that he was having oral communication as well as written communication with and it was being dissected in a way that would suggest this was the only time they talked about or had any connection about this stuff. MR. WOLCH: Mr. Commissioner --

MS. KNOX: This letter just does not capture everything that went on between the parties. Mr. Tallis --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Ms. Knox, please, you'll have a right to examine your own client after Mr. Wolch is finished, and I would appreciate it if you wouldn't put argument before me, and it's come up before with other counsel. The man has been asked to explain why he is sending the statements of the accused to his own lawyer at the very last minute, and he has offered his explanation which Mr. Wolch finds wanting, and he is just trying to canvass that issue so let him go ahead.

MR. WOLCH: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: I just pause to point out the obvious, that we will have an explanation, perhaps, from the witness who is best qualified to give it.

BY MR. WOLCH:

But $I$ mean, Mr. Commissioner, just for the sake of the record, $I$ think My Friend is sort of missing the point. I'm trying to get an interpreting of his own words, I'm not concerned with anything more than what you are saying here, and, if $I$ may,
my difficulty, Mr. Caldwell, is that I can't seem to get you to agree that there's nothing in this paragraph that suggests that you had gone over those statements before, or anything that conveys that?

Okay.
I'm not saying you didn't, --
Yeah, okay.
-- I'm just saying there's nothing in there that says that on plain reading?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, yeah, but Mr. Wolch, $I$ think his explanation was it's inherent in the words "as I mentioned to you", which demonstrates that they must have discussed the statements before, that's all he can say to you, $I$ think that's what he is saying. Mr. Wolch, $I$ was -- I was simply going to say the same thing, the language "as I mentioned to you" simply has to mean that we discussed the statements previously.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah, that's fine Mr. Caldwell, you've already said that.

A I thank you, sir.

BY MR. WOLCH:
2 That's fine. And $I$ guess the point is $I$ think you

A
$Q$

A

Q
A
Q
A
Q

A
Q

A
2
can agree with me, and we can talk about standards back then, --

Uh-huh.
-- that this is far from timely disclosure? I
mean --
Yeah, it certainly would have been better if everything could have been advanced, if you will. Well the statement of an accused -Yeah.
-- is really where defence counsel starts with, --Uh-huh.
-- as "what did my client say about the incident to the police" --

Yeah.
-- is, I mean, law school first day. I mean it's the most basic of all; you agree with that general principle?

Yeah, that's correct, sir.
I mean that's where you start from.
Mr. Commissioner, I note the
time, I'm not sure if $I$-- if we're close or not. I'm going to move to a different topic, I'm happy to continue or take the morning break, whatever you prefer?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, we had one
unofficial break, but $I$ suppose we could take another one.

MR. WOLCH: I was working during that break.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Could we have some evidence on that point?
(Adjourned at 10:35 a.m.)
(Reconvened at 10:50 a.m.)
BY MR. WOLCH:
Mr. Caldwell, just before $I$ do get onto another area, the name George Jones came up earlier and I didn't have the handy reference.

Okay, sir.
And if we could turn to 183170. Now, this
Detective McCorriston's report that has been
looked at many times. I'm not sure, is this your handwriting here or not?

A
$Q$
That's your writing, so obviously this is something that --

This may, Mr. Wolch, be what $I$ was trying to describe a moment ago, the Diewold business may be built into this report, though I didn't have their statements. Maybe we could look at that.

Okay. If we could turn to the next page. This
has actually got Larry Fisher in it. You see that?

A

That's a relief. I see that, sir. Now, is this McCorriston's report?

Yes.
Yeah, this would be the one, Mr. Wolch, where he was checking people who might have been taking the same or similar busses and that's one of course that, among many other names, I read at the outset and essentially it didn't mean anything, but I think it's the same report, sir.

And if we can just turn one more page -Okay.
-- this is obviously a report that you had a fair bit to do with in terms of your writing all over the margins. Am $I$ wrong about that?

Only partially. I think the "purse" writing is mine. The "no compact, N. thinks it's squeeze-out," and the "purse found", sir, at the bottom, the two purse founds are not my writing, the two expressions purse found.

Okay. And if we can turn the page, here we have Merriman, Mrs. Merriman?

Okay.
You see that?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Q
-- pull up that portion:
"George B. Jones of the same address was also interviewed. He is also a University Student who states he left home shortly after his brother Jim, walked north on Ave. N. to 22 nd. Street and caught the same bus as his brother. He stated it was approximately 7:05 A.M. when he left home that date, however he heard nor saw anything and he has no information to offer."

I see that, sir. That would be just one of those McCorriston interviews that at the time didn't mean anything to me at least, the George Jones part that is.

Okay. You say it didn't mean anything to you, but
it's just one more example of somebody not seeing anything and $I$ think that perhaps should have been of some meaning to you.

Sir, that could well be. I said didn't mean anything in the sense that $I$ read it initially, undoubtedly read all of it, and it didn't -- I mean, presumably $I$ could have called him, or whatever, revealed something like that.

MS. KNOX: Again, this is just -- because I'm not sure that we've got it exactly right, but if I'm reading what this witness is saying, he says he was going to 22 nd Street would be the, which -- I took a quick look at the map, would be the opposite direction from 20th Street, he would have been walking away from. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right. MR. WOLCH: No, north from 20th. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: That's what she asked.

MR. WOLCH: You go right by the scene. MS. KNOX: 22 nd .

I think, sir, it's north on $22 n d, M r$. Wolch. MR. WOLCH: Let's go back to where he lives.

A Okay. Street.

MR. WOLCH: Yeah.
A Okay.

BY MR. WOLCH:
It speaks for itself. I thought it was somewhat significant. He lived on 1319 20th Street, walked north on $N$ to 22nd; right? Okay. In any event, I'm moving on.

That's fine, sir.
Now, I wanted to deal with a topic that has been skirted around for quite a while and it's one that I really don't like to deal with at all, but I take it one of the first things a prosecutor would look at in prosecuting somebody would be their criminal record?

A

Q Okay. Well, there's been all kinds of innuendo and everything else about David. What was his criminal record at the time of his trial?

A If my memory is right, Mr. Wolch, he didn't have one.

Q

A


That's my memory of it.

Right?
That's right, sir.
The other group was either in jail, pending on charges, running away from home. The other four, your mainstays of your case, on the face of it, compared unfavourably to David?

Yeah, in that respect they did, sir.
Right?

That's right.
And yet at the end of the case, leaving aside the horrific nature of the facts, you were prepared to write to the parole board and present David as some sort of monster based on previous conduct?

Yeah, at the end of the case, sir, I did write
those letters. I understood that they were, you
know, welcomed by the board and that of course at
the end of the case we, or whoever, he had been convicted of the offence as we all know.

Oh, I appreciate the nature of the crime, but you know that the penitentiary will get a clear understanding of what the inmate is there for? I assume that's the case, sir.

Okay. But you wanted to put before them this picture of David's previous history?

Yeah.
Knowing he had no record?
Well, those two things are correct, he did not have a record and $I$ did want to put before -- I believe you are speaking of the file or chart Dr. McDonald got for him, sir, is what $I$ assume you are talking about?

Well, yeah.
Yeah, that's right.

Now, the parole board could have sought out Dr. McDonald if they wanted to?

A
Yeah. I think there's, on the file, sir, there's some correspondence where they followed up in some fashion, I can't recite it to you, but --

I would like to deal once again with one of your parole board letters and $I$ can tell you, I just picked it at random, they all do seem to have the same theme, and in fact some of them are borrowed from the, from others.

A

Q

A
$Q$ Okay.

I'm having a little trouble here. I know it's 067386 is in it, but $I$ 'm trying to find the first page. I think I referred to it before. That's great. If we can just go to 86.

Yes, sir, I have it here.
Just look at this part here:
"Having been intimately involved in his case from the time of the killing until the final disposition ... I, of necessity, came to know a great deal about the personality of the accused, Milgaard."

Now, in fairness, you never even talked to him did you?

A
Q
No, I didn't, sir.
"While $I$ no longer have his psychiatric history available, it was an extremely lengthy record of continual trouble with educational institutions, persons attempting to help him, etcetera. Albert Cadrain, whose evidence was very important in the trial, knew Milgaard previous to this episode, and told the police and myself of episodes in Calgary wherein Milgaard had young girls in his living quarters to whom he would supply heroin to the point at which these girls completely lost their senses. One of these episodes involved Milgaard
inviting Cadrain to have sexual
intercourse with a girl in this state whom Milgaard had in a bathtub filled with water. This was only one example of the almost unbelievable lifestyle of Milgaard before this offence, which I came to know as a result of preparing for the prosecution of this trial."

Now, David Milgaard had no record and he was working.

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

No, you had, as $I$ understand it, the word of
Well, I did -- I had had the report that this had happened, sir.
Well, if you believe it to be true, what does it matter whether Carlyle-Gordge is writing it or you are writing it?
That's --
What was the rest of his lifestyle? What are we talking about?

The -- I think it was -- well, it would largely be based on this Calgary episode which I thought was very --

Well, I thought $I$ heard you to say, I think it was to Carlyle-Gordge, not to use this because it was slander --

Oh.
Let me finish -- slanderous and unsubstantiated.
Mr. Wolch, in Carlyle-Gordge's case $I$ was dealing with a person who was purporting to write a book about western Canadian murders. In this case, first of all, $I$ did have this information, and second, I'm writing to a responsible institution in the form of the parole board who would have a legitimate interest in it. They wouldn't be publishing it to anyone.
$\qquad$ -

Cadrain who said that Schellenberg would corroborate it and you had no corroboration from Schellenberg.

A
Q

you will.

I want to deal with how you would react to what some may say, and $I$ would be one of them, is an absurd allegation of lining up virgins, sticking needles in their arms, putting them in bathtubs and having sex in a bathtub, which is probably as

Well, Mr. Wolch, the material $I$ saw in the chart about his past, to my way of thinking, would describe quite a lot of very difficult behaviour, if you will.
hard as 40 below, but $I$ don't know, but whatever it is, it's a ridiculous notion, it's weird. That thing, as you know, was followed up, and we didn't know about the --

And Schellenberg didn't back him up.
Yeah -- the final situation until the hearing got underway in my --

But it's coming from a man, Cadrain, who, as time goes on, is becoming more and more incredible. In
fact, by this time $I$ think he's in a mental home.
I don't know about the timing. One thing about
Mr. Cadrain, the fact that he forgot that he had reported the matter to the Regina police in my view didn't discredit him with what $I$ knew about
his evidence. In other words, that happened
before he got back to Saskatoon if my memory is
correct.
I wasn't planning on getting into that, but why wouldn't it discredit him when he tells you or the police I learned about it first when I got back to Saskatoon when you later find out he was in jail
in Regina and was questioned about it? Why
wouldn't that cause you to think --
I didn't -- he was in jail in Regina and was questioned about it in Regina. I wouldn't think
that would necessarily leap out in his memory once he got back to saskatoon, so if in fact he was wrong in that, it wouldn't discredit him in my books as to everything that $I$ thought he was correct in.

Would you think that if David Milgaard made a mistake like that in his statement or talking to the police, you would consider that to be very significant?

A Now --

Do you think you would show the same degree of relaxation towards a mistake if it was the accused making it as opposed to the star?

Well, I don't think -- Mr. Cadrain of course was a Crown witness. I don't know how I could compare those things, sir. All things being equal, I should show the same degree of compassion, if you will, no matter who the statement was made by if, I assume, it was credible.

Getting back to my original point, I can't understand why you would think to tell the reporter that this is slanderous, don't do it, it's slanderous, when you don't think it's slanderous when you write it where it might have a real effect.

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q You got to see David Milgaard in Court?

A
Q
A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

Q

Q

I did, yeah.
He was a good looking young boy?
He was very presentable in his appearance.
And going into jail, it would be understood, presumed and accepted that he was guilty of the crime?

Well, that's correct because of the state of the case at the time when he was sentenced, sir.

Right. And staff, psychiatrists, psychologists would all accept the fact that he was a rapist/murderer?

The way the case ended up, I think they would, sir.

And inmates would look at him as a rapist/murderer?

That I assume would be the case.
And that would be one of the most precarious positions for an accused to be in, in jail?

I would think so, sir.
So being a terrified 16-year-old going into jail
with that stigma over your head would be
absolutely about as awful a circumstance as one could imagine?

I would think that's right.
And leaving aside what may have happened in jail
for a moment, would you appreciate that it would be almost impossible to convince anybody, such as a psychiatrist or a psychologist, that you are normal?

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
Q So to get reports out of the jail that says he's just a normal young man is almost impossible based on that premise?

A
Q

A

Q
A
Q
A
Q

A
Q

A

Q
etcetera.

And there's no question, $I$ think you would agree,
that Mrs. Milgaard, in public, has quite clearly
said that David had troubles, he was a
troublemaker, he was rambunctious, he had all
kinds of problems, but in fairness, I would
will, in various towns and with his family,
suggest, many kids have those kind of problems and turn around, get jobs and carry on with their lives?

A

Q

A
Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

Yes, I hope -- I'm sure that some do, sir, and there's indications in this material of the effort she and her husband made on his behalf of course.

Yeah. Now, I go into this area with some hesitation, and $I$ appreciate that I'll be asking the Commissioner to protect the privacy of people who come into reports and really have no bearing on the point that $I$ 'm trying to make -All right, sir.

I mean, I don't think we have to know much about, very much about David's siblings, parents, I'm focusing on David.

Okay, sir.
Okay. And I'm aware of the fact that Commission Counsel has provided to me and you with what Dr. McDonald provided to him, you've had a chance to read it, I've asked you to read it carefully and go over it; correct?

I did read it, sir.
And I'm going to go through a little bit of it, I'm not going to spend all day on it, believe me

MR. HODSON: If I might, for the benefit of other counsel, we did receive some documents from Dr. McDonald that we've heard about before. He has been interviewed, $I$ was not sure if he needed to be a witness, $I$ wasn't sure if his evidence is relevant. It appears that it now likely will be. The documents that he provided to us he described as remnants of his file. They were given to Mr. Wolch and Ms. Knox on Monday and they were put up on CaseVault for the benefit of other parties. I'm not sure if they are up -- they should be going up today as a separate folder called -- I'm not sure. They will be up for all parties.

There are -- the information in the documents are reports, for the most part, predating 1969 relating to David Milgaard's background history, working with social workers, and there is sensitive information in there and which is again, if it becomes relevant, which it now appears it is, we will deal with it and it may be that some parties may want to have some restrictions on external publication.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, we'll come to that question when it arises.

MR. WOLCH: Thank you, sir.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.
A I'm sorry, Mr. Commissioner. Mr. Wolch, the one thing that $I$ wanted to say, apropos of what counsel said, is that $I$ did get material, I'm sure I got what you did, but it is not -- it is not, in essence, complete, $I$ can tell that, so we can expand on that if you wish.

BY MR. WOLCH:
We're going to try and find out because some of these documents seem to summarize everything to date.

A
$Q$
Q okay.

So -- and the main one that $I$ see is a social history of November the 14 th of 196 when David was 14, which it seems very comprehensive, about six pages, and then there are others of the same period of time, December the 8 th, 196 , a social history. There is -- I didn't count them, believe me, but $I$ think there's at least 20 pages, single typed, so there's lots of material.

A
There is, sir, but $I$ just did want to mention I'm satisfied that not all $I$ saw when Dr. McDonald has it is in this.

Well --

A

Q
A
$Q$ The --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I just wanted to be sure that the question was appropriate.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just a minute, Mr. Caldwell.

Oh, I'm sorry, sir.
MR. WOLCH: I'm looking at document 067387
where it --
"... it could confidently be predicted
that he would return immediately to a
life of crime, which might well soon
lead again to another senseless and
brutal killing ..."
"He has a sociopathic personality, and
in my view there is not just a
possibility, but rather a certainty,
that he will return to crime on his
release, since he is unqualified for any
other occupation."
"... it is ironic to note that the only
occupation which Milgaard held with any
degree of success in the past was a
door-to-door salesman of magazine
subscriptions ... which is a
circumstance which should be of great
comfort to the housewives of the nation
if he is eventually allowed to return to
this trade."
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay. At the
bottom of the page:
"... confidently be predicted that he
would return immediately to a life of
crime which might well soon lead again
. . ."

MR. WOLCH: Top of the page, sir.

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: "... to another senseless and brutal killing of the sort described above."

So that's the --

MR. WOLCH: Yeah, I can --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So that's the tendency of, yeah, that's what you predict, that's what he predicts for the future. I'm interested, $I$ think your question was directed to "where, in his past records, did you see any indication of violence?"

MR. WOLCH: Perhaps I may, with your indulgence, have Ms. McLean look for it while we're talking, and perhaps interrupt me, and I'll provide it, and it might save a bit of time.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

MR. WOLCH: If I could?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: At the moment the witness -- now you were trying to say something?

A Oh, yes I was.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Have you found something in his past reports that indicated he
was violent?
A
I am not right there, sir. But the one thing I did want to mention, Mr. Wolch, was that the statement that was quoted, "I believe some day he will kill someone, only this is a stab in the dark", is not in this material.

BY MR. WOLCH:
Oh, $I$ know it's not, that's my point.
But $I$ wasn't aware of -- at one point it was, and of course it, it attracted everyone's attention, it -- as $I$ find it, sir, it's not in this material, sir.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well look, if we're going to continue with this, we simply have to know.

MR. WOLCH: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: The question was phrased on the premise that there wasn't anything to indicate violence in his past record, that is pre-1969, and Mr. Wolch was asking the witness "so why did you describe him as a violent person before 1969", the question. So did he describe him that way is one thing, and was there any records to that effect for another thing, so I don't -- do you want to take a minute to read?

A I'm --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: He didn't -- he doesn't seem to have said to the parole board "this person has a history of violence which predates the Miller offence"; would you agree with that, Mr. Wolch?

MR. WOLCH: Well I -- I'm not -- if you look at 067387, it might place a different interpretation on the paragraph I'm looking at.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So, if it isn't, then the -- if I'm right about that then the question is not fair.

MR. WOLCH: Yes. Here:
"The offence, of course, is of the utmost gravity, and was unprovoked, senseless and brutal in the extreme, resulting in a violent and horrible death ... As noted above, his past behaviour, which was well documented, from his psychiatric file, had been compounded of one endless series of trouble with the authorities of every variety."

A Yeah.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah.

MR. WOLCH: "He has a sociopathic personality, and in my view there is not just a possibility, but rather a certainty, that he will return to crime . . ."

Now documented problems of every variety, under these circumstances, would clearly suggest a history of violence.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right. So you are saying it's implicit in what Mr. --

MR. WOLCH: Yes. I think the impression --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- Caldwell said to the board?

BY MR. WOLCH:

Q
I mean, Mr. Caldwell, we've had a lot of trouble with your letters before but it just seems to me that, when you are writing about this young man, you are saying when he committed this crime it was all predictable, his history dictated it would happen, and it's going to happen again?

Well that -- that is -- that is, in effect, what $I$ said there, Mr. Wolch, I agree with you.

There is a -- I -- at a -- I
don't know. Did you wish me to proceed or -Well, here's what $I$ am pointing out.

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Q
都

A
$Q$

Okay.
Dr. McDonald first saw Mr. Milgaard when he was identified to McDonald as the killer of Gail Miller?

Yeah, that's correct.
He didn't come into it, "oh my goodness, here's a young man $I$ 'm looking at to see if he is going to go to school, $I$ can get his grades up", his first contact was with a vicious killer. I'm trying to say to you is there anything in the previous history that you have been able to find, in all the reports we've got here, to say there is a violence in this young boy? No one has ever denied he has difficulties, --

Okay.
-- we're -- I'm talking about having a violent disposition?

The -- the -- Dr. McDonald clearly was asked by me to interview Mr. Milgaard, and did so, and at that time he was a person charged with a criminal offence, as you know.

Yes, but there is all sorts of material pre-McDonald, pre-Miller, -Okay.
-- and no one disputes David had problems at
school, had problems not much different than
Wilson and John and all these kids who were
travelling around in the hippie lifestyle.
A

Q

A

Q
A

2
A
Q
A
Q
A

Q Well '79 is ten years later.

A
Q

A
$Q$
A
Q

But he did go into his history, sir, if that's what you are --

We'll get to that. Okay, that's fine.

Okay. I'm going to suggest to you, and I'll try to help you, --

Okay.
-- okay, that in reading the material the only suggestion ever of anything of that nature was on one occasion when he was being evaluated he tried to gain attention by striking out at nursing staff in a physical manner, and nothing much came of that?

I believe that's in the material somewhere.
That's the worst thing $I$ can find.
Yeah.
Okay? If you can find something worse, tell me? Okay.

I'm trying to -- I thought you had a number of nights to look through it, that's why $I$ am a little concerned, but you had other homework last night $I$ know.

Well, this was a couple of nights ago, and I -Well let me maybe do this, then, maybe it will speed it up.

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q
A
Q

A

Q
A

Q

e
"Before January 1969 ... Milgaard's only record of delinquency was joy-riding in a truck ...";
you see that?
That's right.
"Shortly afterwards he was admitted by
$Q$
Okay.
I will pick up, bring up a document, 325166. It seems to be a bit of a summary, and maybe it will help us, and it's got notes all over the place. Somebody did this in McDonald's file. You've seen this, have you?

I have, and I'm pleased to announce none of the notes are my handiwork.

Okay. You haven't seen this? It was given to you.

I said $I$ have seen, sir.
Okay.
Yeah.
Okay. This seems to be a summary, and we'll maybe find out who did it, but it comes from McDonald's file.

Okay.
So let's use this as the base; okay?
All right, sir.
his parents to the Yorkton psychiatric centre. He spent three months there before being discharged for refusing to keep regulations."

Okay?
Uh-huh.
Q

That is, on McDonald's file, is a summary of this boy before coming out to this murder.

Yeah. I don't, it says "CBC" at the top, I don't know who composed it or anything else, sir.

I don't know either.
Okay.
It comes from McDonald's file.
Okay.
But let's go on.
MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, if I can,
those documents had on them a covering fax sheet directing them to Eric Malling, who was a reporter at the $C B C$, and it appears that this may have been a compilation done at CBC, which is why it would have the notation "CBC internal". But these were some documents that were actually sent to the CBC by Dr. McDonald's office, according to the fax cover sheet that Mr. Wolch and I both got with the record, so that may be the answer to that.

BY MR. WOLCH:
Q Yeah. It does say it comes from Dr. McDonald, but --

A Mr. Wolch, just on that, it -- that document is here at 325155 , as $I$ read it.

Q Yeah.

A
Q
A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

The one that my counsel just mentioned.
Yeah, that -- from Dr. McDonald --
Yeah.
-- to Eric Malling?
It appears that way.
And how Dr. McDonald is sending out David
Milgaard's psychiatric, I don't know exactly, but let's leave it at that for the moment.

Very good.
Let's carry on then. You can see this, I might as well go through it:
"In 1971, Milgaard ...",
this is after being convicted, he:
"... is in Prince Albert penitentiary, and throughout the year one psychiatrist, Dr. James Grant, notes Milgaard's attempts to adjust to his new prison life.
"This frightened young inmate
is currently very concerned about the outcome of his appeal ... He claims his innocence vehemently and does not appear to me to be the criminal type. He has no criminal record whatsoever, and he is
supposed to have killed a nurse in Saskatoon.
"Today ... I learned that his thinking is very much confused in terms of how to function in an Institution such as this.
"He is making every effort to be accepted as a hardened criminal and yet his basic nature is not along these lines. As a result there is a dichotomy in his personality which is rather destructive."

A
I see all that.
You can understand that, how that would be; right?
I certainly do, sir.
All right. Just turn the page. He:
"... wants to leave Prince Albert for Stony Mountain penitentiary so that he can be closer to his family living in Winnipeg.

Dr. Grant: "There is no psychiatric
reason that he could not be transferred to Stony Mountain."

Yeah, I see that.
'71, he:
"... is examined by Dr. ... Saldivar, psychiatrist at Prince Albert ...

Conclusion: no psychotic or neurotic symptoms."

And keep in mind this is a young man who they believe has murdered Gail Miller and raped her.

A
Q April '72:
"Instead of being transferred to Stony Mountain, Milgaard has ended up far from his family in Dorchester, New Brunswick. He is examined by Dr. Michael Wright, the penitentiary psychiatrist.

Conclusion: Schizoid personality disorder. "This kind of disorder can be highly dangerous.""

Do you see that?
I see that, sir.
Right. You've got him, now he is in New Brunswick, now he is schizoid, of course, who else can murder Gail Miller, and we're getting that conclusion. '73:
"With two other men, Milgaard escapes from Dorchester and puts up no struggle
when arrested the following day. "The subject was not seen to be the instigator of this offence."

Now we're in '77:
"Milgaard is now in Stony Mountain pen and two reports are prepared by a parole service officer in preparation for a hearing.
"Milgaard is not involved in any in-depth counselling ... As he does not admit the offence, he probably sees no use for counseling."

You can understand that?

A
$Q$
I can, sir.
"He stated to this officer that perhaps it would be in best interest to plead guilty in hopes that then people would consider him for some form of release.
"He is an unknown quantity and it is not felt that any commitment should be made to him with regard to any form of release."

Do you see that?
I do, sir.
And if we could just turn the page:
"The second report states:
"Confinement occurred at a very crucial stage in Milgaard's
developmental years. Incarceration has further debilitated skills Milgaard may have had."

Now here:
"Surprisingly, subject is not
institutionalized. In fact, behaviour
record indicative of a lack of
adjustment to this milieu.
"That is, institutions are not
viewed as home to Milgaard, nor are they safe or secure. Therefore, motivation
to return to community is high.
"This is a difficult case ...
As Milgaard needs hope and as he functions better when a clearly defined program plan is established, I ask this board to clearly itemize what is expected of Milgaard and what the board would require and look to for release." Just carry down, now it's August of '78:
"At Stony Mountain, Milgaard is examined by ... Rockstro ...",

That's the name you mentioned earlier?
Right.
"... to determine if ...", ?
he:
"... should be sent to the newly-opened regional psychiatric center at Saskatoon.
"He was not particularly
vehement or bitter but at the same time he made it quite clear to me that there should be no room for supposing that he would change his mind on the issue of his innocence of guilt.
"With regard to his present situation, Milgaard displayed the usual amount of impatience for a young person eight years into a life sentence but he showed no hint of aggression or ill feeling toward the ... authorities."

Can you imagine? He has been in jail all this
time, I won't even go through what he has been
through, --

A
All right.
-- people will not believe him, and yet he, in those circumstances, he is not even showing
aggression; you see that?
I see that, sir, I do.
In January '79:
"Milgaard is again examined by Dr.
Rockstro after spending several weeks
. . " ",
in Saskatoon'. it's rather pathetic -prophetic, rather:
"There is a possibility -- although not
in my view a strong one -- that Mr.
Milgaard is innocent of the offence ..."
Just turn the page.
A
$Q$
I see that, sir.
"Mr. Milgaard is a man of average intelligence, who does not suffer from any of the major psychiatric illnesses.
"It may be said, however, that
he has a defect of personality and that this defect is of the psychopathic type.

He does not demonstrate the features of the psychopathic personality to extreme degree ... has not been violent ... nor did we witness any incidents suggestive
of his inability to control aggressive
tendencies here."

A
Q
 March of '79:
"Milgaard's supervisor of education at Stony Mountain ... Deverell, writes to the parole board that Milgaard has completed the first year towards a BA degree and has worked closely with her on the university advisory committee. She makes the following comments:
"He needs to be given a clear set of criteria for when he is being successful and when he is not. It is my impression that no one in this institution feels qualified to assess whether David is imbalanced and sick or not.
"Furthermore, it is my
impression that no one in this
institution is willing to take the risk of saying that he is healthy."

You can understand that, they have got a kid who --

A Yeah.
-- supposedly committed the horrible crime, they -- he appears to be okay, but how can you say
that.
I see what's -- they are saying, sir.
"... it is destructive to David to be continually left in the position that no matter what he does it cannot be good enough.
"Personally $I$ believe that the rehabilitative work necessary to take David to the street should be begun." After all that time, it's now going to begin. 1979:
"Dr Philip Haden, of Kingston, reports that he can come to no firm conclusions after examining Milgaard."

Just turn the page.
"However, it is Dr. Haden's impression
that Milgaard suffers from a
"schizoid-affective psychosis" that recurs and involves mood alteration. He then says that Milgaard's future is precarious and his potential for danger considerable."

Once again, this is a murderer he is talking about. 1980 he:
"... is examined at ... Abbotsford ...
in British Columbia. Conclusion:
schizophrenia in a psychopathic personality."

A
$Q$
June of
' 80 :
"Parole board member Ken Howland, who
has known about the Milgaard case since becoming a parole officer in 1970, makes the following note:
"It does not appear that he has ever been assessed by an independent psychiatric panel, as is usual procedure for inmates serving life sentences for murder."

August of '80:
"... Milgaard escapes and is at large in
Winnipeg and Toronto for three months.
He gets a job selling Grolier
encyclopedias and shares an apartment
with a new girl friend. No offences of any kind are committed during this period."

You are aware of the fact, though, that he was shot --

A Yeah, I am, sir.

Q -- in the back?
A That's right.
"Since his recapture, Milgaard is now in
Millhaven and is once again examined by
Dr. Haden, who comments:
"He showed no signs of psychosis yesterday ...
"I consider that he presents more as a mentally ill man than a criminal one and $I$ doubt that any prison is the best place for him ...
"The above comments are made with less confidence than $I$ usually have when assessing inmates and there are several uncertainties remaining in my mind."

A
Q
Just go to the next page. March of '81:
"Milgaard complains to Ottawa about the handling of his chase, in particular a plan to start a pre-release program in the social therapy unit of the Penetang mental health care centre, Ontario.

Solicitor-General Bob Kaplan
replies:
"During your assessment period, the psychiatrists could find no evidence of a psychiatric disorder and so recommended a transfer back to ... (Stony Mountain)."

January '86:
"Eric Malling: "You know, what's the bottom line here? Can psychiatrists tell us whether or not David Milgaard committed that crime?"
"Dr. Raymond Denson: "I don't think so. I don't think psychiatry has really much to offer ..".
... Denson recently carried out with Milgaard two narco-analytic sessions at the saskatoon RPC and concluded:
"I would say that the only
thing that came out of those two interviews was that he has a very deep conviction that he is innocent."

A Yeah.
$Q$
"David Milgaard, in his interview with ... Malling, says:
"They attribute problems that I
have with my behaviour inside the
institution to the sort of person that would commit that kind of crime in the first place. Now that's an error in logic ..."

Do you see that?

A
Q
A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

Yeah, I do, Mr. Wolch.
That creates a picture, correct?
It --
It's a synopsis of what occurred and --
Yeah, it certainly is, and it appears to be an orderly review of the steps he went through from time to time.

Right, and I've gone over it many times, these are assessments of a young kid growing up in an institution with a stigma of being a rapist/murderer.

Yeah.
Now the reports that $I$ don't intend to go through unless you ask me to, because there is a summary in this of the pre-penitentiary time that we went through at the very beginning, now I've gone through a Yorkton Mental Health Clinic Social History, which just for the record -- and $I$ hope it doesn't get public -- is 325175 which goes to

325181, it's dated November the 14th, 1968 -- '66 I mean, and deals with David Milgaard age 14; I've gone through another document, Social History December 8th, '66 which is -- starts at 325182 and goes to 325189; I've gone through another document called Social History dated December 29th, 1966, 325190; another document January 18th, 1967, 325191 by a psychiatric social worker; January 19th of '67 325192; I have a clinical director's report of somewhere between November and February of '66-'67 --

A
Q
A
$Q$

A
Q
Is that 192, Mr. Wolch, is it 172?
325172 .
72, okay, thank you.
I've gone through that. A Social History, 325173 dated February 13th, '67, from Haden again, it's two pages; I've gone through a case summary, 325194, dated, hard to say, but it appears to be January -- no, that can't be right, sorry, I'll try and find a date.

Okay.
It goes from 325194 to 325200 -- or I'm sorry, it goes further than that -- oh, I'm sorry, is it '79? That would be -- I'm sorry, this report is not of much help because it's after.

A

Q
$Q$
BY MR. WOLCH:
It's available but it's -- I'm not concerned about the content of it other than the fact it doesn't help us in the point that $I$ am making. The other ones, as $I$ understand it, were all reports that predate the tragedy for Gail Miller.

And I just want to get back to my point, because $I$ don't want to go through all those reports in great detail, but they are lots of pages; my concern is there is nothing in there about violence or anything like that?

Well, Mr. Wolch, I -- I -- I don't doubt you are correct in that you very carefully looked at them and, for this purpose, there's nothing about violence. There's an awful lot of cautionary material about the way he was dealing with his parents, schoolmates, etcetera, which would be
enough to, $I$ would think, attract the attention of any professional, but $I$-- for the sake of this, sir, there may have, if we assume there's nothing in there about violence, $I$ could read it again over noon-hour but --

Okay.
Yeah.
Well let me take you to document 036784. All right?

Is that a --
Just bear with me.
Okay.
MR. HODSON: I'm wondering if I could just
clarify -- and I apologize for interrupting,
Mr. Wolch -- just some clarification on the
documents from Dr. McDonald. And there was some suggestion that he may have faxed information to Eric Malling, and that is not the case from what I know, and perhaps, if I could, just a couple of documents that might explain the fax. And Mr. McDonald will be here to testify and he can explain what's in his files.

But just a couple of -- the fax document is 325155 , if we could just have it up, and again I'm doing this because Dr. McDonald is
not here to speak, or his counsel, which he does have, about this. This is the fax to Eric Malling of February of '89 and you'll see that it's three pages on the cover page.

If you go to the next page, and you will see that's just a fax transmittal. Then if you can go to 325157, and this is, at the top you will see this is what was actually faxed to Eric Malling, at the top it says the fax, and this is something Dr. Emson prepared to Dr. McDonald, who happened to be the Dean of the College at the time, and $I$ believe the evidence we'll hear is that that's why he was involved in sending information to doctor -- or to Eric Malling. And you'll see in this report -- I'm not sure if we have looked at this before -- Dr. Emson is commenting on Dr. Ferris' report of 1988. And in Dr. McDonald's file, this is a two-page document, and just -- this has nothing to do with any of Dr. McDonald's psychological work, it relates to Dr. Emson's review of Dr. Ferris' report.
If you could also call up

325159, which is also on Dr. McDonald's file, this is a familiar document we have seen before,
and so what $I$ believe the evidence that we will hear is to the effect that what was on Dr. McDonald's file was the Ferris report, Dr. Emson's comments, and McDonald then faxed Emson's comments to Malling, and then the remainder of the file is the psychiatric report.

The document that Mr. Wolch
read through, 325166 , if we could just quickly call that up, that document is on Dr. McDonald's file. The evidence $I$ expect that we will hear is that he is not the author of this, and $I$ can't tell you right now whether he can shed any further light, other than that's our information.

So, again -- and then $I$ think the balance of the documents that are on there are documents that he had and he provided to us. So if that can clarify that point. And again, as I say, I don't want to preempt Mr. Wolch's question, or what Dr. McDonald would say about it, but $I$ wanted to clarify the fax part of it. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So for the moment, Mr. Hodson, I should just say to everyone be very cautious about presuming what Dr. McDonald did or didn't send to Mr. Malling that is into the public domain, what he did send was something
that was unrelated to the point in question, and not to the psychiatric records of Mr. Milgaard.

MR. HODSON: That's my understanding of what he was --

MR. WOLCH: Yes, and I accept that fully, --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.
MR. WOLCH: -- and I make it very clear that $I$ have no allegation of improper behaviour on the doctor at all.

MS. KNOX: And I should indicate, since I raised it, I do as well. When Mr. Wolch and I were looking at it they were all attached to the cover sheet, and I think neither he nor I noticed that the fax sheet only said three pages, it was my assumption, and $I$ believe his, that it was all the same package, an unfortunate mistake on my part and on --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay. I think, until we get to the -- until we get to the end of the psychiatric records which predate the Miller murder, we should be very, very careful. And Mr. Wolch prefaced his remarks on this subject by saying that "I hope that this won't go into the public domain", and he quoted some doc. ID
numbers, so for the time being $I$ want the press to understand that none of this should be reported. We're not finished with the subject yet. But the doc. ID numbers which Mr. Wolch brought up, beginning with 325175 and ending with 325173, should, for the moment, remain in camera. All right?

MR. WOLCH: Yeah, I appreciate that, and just so $I$ don't mislead anybody at all, $I$ think those documents are relevant, Mr. Commissioner, for the limited purpose of laying a foundation for anybody's belief that David Milgaard was violent or prone to violence.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, yeah, I understand.

BY MR. WOLCH:

I just say, so there's no misunderstanding, those reports contain very sensitive material about the Milgaard family, their relationships, their siblings, illnesses, personal matters that really don't advance the Commission, but if anything in there advances Mr. Caldwell's perception that there is something in David in those reports that is germane to his evaluation of David as being violent or dangerous, $I$ want to hear that.

Mr. Caldwell?
A

Q

Mr. Wolch, $I$ can explain that, if you will. There was a report by a social worker of two or three or however many pages. The very last paragraph said, I believe, that some day he will kill somebody, but this is just a stab in the dark, that jumped out at -- and it's not on this file, Mr. Wolch, to the best of my -- and $I$ know that existed. I saw it at the time and the particular terminology was --
"In preparing this case, I had the privilege of reading ... the entire psychiatric history which, as it happened, was very well documented since his early youth. He had been in constant trouble since kindergarten days, and the file even contains predictions by social workers who had examined Milgaard, that he would one day kill somebody."

都

All I'm saying to you, sir, is that if you go through all the reports, and as you know most reports review previous reports --

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q
-- plus the fact, as $I$ read to you from the Yorkton report, no signs of psychotic behaviour, no mention of sexually deviant or aggressive
violent behaviour. It's hard to imagine writing that and having a report where somebody predicts that somebody is going to kill.

A

Okay. I believe it was a social worker. If the document shows up, it may prove to be workers, plural, in the sense of head of the ward or whatever it was. It certainly existed, sir. So you are saying it exists? and social workers.

Yeah.
But you have no knowledge of it ever appearing in any subsequent report that anybody can find anywhere?

No. I do know it did exist and I have no idea where it is now, but it conceivably may surface, but my sentence there, Mr. Wolch, however inappropriate, was based on that report, sir. That's what it was based upon.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And the report I think $I$ heard you say also said that this is just a shot in the dark?

Yeah, the language was $I$ think that some day he will kill somebody, but this is a -- I think, sir, it was a stab in the dark.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
A
That's what made it sort of stand out, if you will.

BY MR. WOLCH:
That doesn't sound very professional.

A

Q

A Yeah.
$Q$
If we could look at 002264 ? This is another one --

Okay, sir.
I'm sorry, $I$ thought it was one of your letters.
It's not. Is this your letter?
I think it is, sir.
Okay. Turn to the second page. It is your letter. Okay. And back to the first one.

MR. HODSON: 006822 . The ' 77 report?
MS. McLEAN: 1977, yeah.
MR. HODSON: The one on the screen is the one that we used.

MR. WOLCH: Just turn the page. Thank you.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: This is to the parole board again?

BY MR. WOLCH:
Q Yes, Nancy Flintoft Meronek I think.
"I have read my letter to Mr. Street over, and $I$ certainly have no reason to change the views set out ... subsequent events in this City have, as a matter of fact, strengthened my views of the danger of a person like Milgaard being allowed out of custody ... The most striking recent example in this City of the inadvisability granting freedom to dangerous persons is the case of David

Thrienen, and that case bears a
resemblance to this one in that there were adequate warnings ahead of time as to what type of behaviour could be expected from the accused if he had his freedom.

> I can't over-emphasize the danger which I think Milgaard would present to other persons if he were to have his freedom, even on a short or temporary basis, and we surely do not need any more striking a demonstration ... than Gail Miller."

Yeah. I think, Mr. Wolch, the Threinen case had happened in the meantime. It was -- attracted a lot of attention and there was, I suppose, a heightened public view that dangerous persons shouldn't be let out except appropriately, and very awkwardly stated, but that's -- the Threinen matter was a matter of the murder of three or four children and it post dated the Miller matter in my memory, and that's why the thing was this way, sir.

Right. I'm going to suggest to you that when David was charged with the murder, if you went
into his background you would see a kid who was restless, bright, couldn't sit still, a bit of a rabble rouser, but who really had no criminal record, may have taken a joy ride once, and was like a lot of kids travelling around like a hippie having a good time. me here I hope.

MR. WOLCH: Okay. It's time for lunch I think too, but go ahead.

MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, I just want -I'm going to refer to two documents, and maybe Mr. Wolch could look at them over lunch, but when it's put to the witness that he had no criminal record, contained in two documents, one of which is part of the social history, at page 325184 is
a lengthy recitation of information obtained from a town constable in Langenburg where, and $I$ won't go into the details now because the reports aren't yet part of the record, but also in the statement that David Milgaard gave to Detective Karst, I believe the March 3rd statement, 1969, he opens with giving Detective Karst -- I'm going to say lengthy, not because it was lengthy in terms of the actual size, but a recitation of conflicts that he has had and misconduct that he had engaged in, and $I$ haven't pulled the statement up, but in putting the question to the witness, there was that information in his possession, 1969, 1972, 1974, when these were written. So although formal convictions may not have been registered, there was much information about behaviours that would be characterized as criminal.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, there certainly was that, but $I$ think we're speaking in the context of criminal records and I just wouldn't like to move beyond that.

MR. WOLCH: No, I think if we talked about Lapchuk and Melnyk and Wilson and John, about not criminal record offences, we'd be here still.

MS. KNOX: No, I'm just talking about the indication that was made by Mr. Caldwell.

MR. WOLCH: Well, he answered the question, there was no criminal record. I mean, that's it.

A

Q

A

Q
BY MR. WOLCH:

If there was a criminal record and he testified, you would have put it to him probably? Yes, but he didn't -It's something you would have looked at because of that possibility?

Yeah.

Right? Mr. Commissioner, I note the time. I'm not going to be all that much longer, but it is lunchtime.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, I think we should break, thanks.
(Adjourned at 12:02 p.m.)
(Reconvened at 1:35 p.m.)

MR. WOLCH: Mr. Commissioner, before I commence questioning, $I$ can indicate that the document $I D$ number of the video that was shown is 078510 .

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: 078510?

MR. WOLCH: That's correct, 510 .
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.
MR. WOLCH: I can also indicate that there may be some replacements going on because the original that $I$ forwarded was a colour video.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, okay.
MR. WOLCH: So we may come back to colour
if we have to play it again. I would certainly prefer to play it in colour at that time or we may have to get a new doc number or whatever, I'm not sure, but I'm sure we'll cross that bridge when we get to it.

A

Q
A

Q

A BY MR. WOLCH:

The one that he tried to get out?
Yes, that's the one.
The reason to be moved $I$ think is what $I$ read.
Yeah, that's correct, struck out at nursing staff, and $I$ read the Yorkton matters and that, $I$ confirm, is the same thing you saw.
$Q$
A
Q

A
Q
A
Q
A
Q

    e
    $\square$

And were these notes you made for him or for yourself or --

No.
-- preparing for him?
In effect, preparing for him just so that $I$ knew, if you will, highlights and dates of things from the file.
$Q$
Okay. Because if we go to 332051 , you see, I'm not sure why you left a gap, but I did get your originals, this is accurate, you say you read

95 --
That's civilian statements.
Civilian statements?
Yeah.
There's a big long gap and then you have "... a stab in the dark." That's the only place $I$ can find that comment anywhere.

Well, Mr. Wolch, it was never part of my Milgaard prosecution file and that was something $I$
presumably wrote because it was an interesting comment and $I$ didn't want to, you know, forget it. No, but a stab in the dark isn't the interesting comment, the interesting comment is the prediction of killing, that's --

Well, Mr. Wolch, what this would bring back to me, this quotation "... a stab in the dark", in my mind $I$ would certainly remember the first half of the sentence, if you will, sir.

Well, a stab in the dark suggests to me that it's a remote sort of prediction.

That's the common interpretation of it, sir, but it did have that --

Well, I'm just surprised you didn't write down the actual prediction if there was one.

Well, I didn't -- that $I$ guess was my shorthand
for the episode, sir.
And because $I$ 'm now here, $I$ wouldn't mind turning a bit to the next page that $I$ know you've been questioned about.

Okay.
And "suggest omit", that's to Peter
Carlyle-Gordge?
That was strictly for him and it strictly referred
to David Milgaard in Calgary, and it, sir, if $I$ may, because $I$ didn't say this $I$ don't think, it clearly was not any reference to Saskatoon sexual assaults, unsolved or solved or otherwise.

Well, let's get to that.
Okay.
The first paragraph is bathtub Calgary, young girls, and you've talked about this, and $I$ say it's strange to me that you are telling him to omit it when you are publicizing it yourself, we've been through that, but if you have anything to add, I'm not really seeking an answer to that. I think I mentioned -- do you want me to -- this morning why $I$ did it that way, sir, if you would like $I$ can --

Okay, try very briefly.
Okay. Mr. Carlyle-Gordge was a journalist who I
later learned was operating under false pretences with me and he -- we got chatting and we've seen that on the screen previously. He -- this thing was to absolutely be sure that he did not do any of these things, print them, whatever, and because I wanted, $I$ just wanted to reinforce that on him and I don't know if $I$ succeeded or anything. Can you, and you don't have to, but can you possibly briefly tell me why he could not report this and you could?

A

Q
A Well, the -- it doesn't do anyone any good if a book is published in $X$ number of copies saying this happened. The National Parole Board matter would do him harm in the sense that they would
look at him very carefully, but it was a legitimate concern, sir, $I$ thought.

What I'm getting at is in the book it's not going to cause a great deal of difficulty. Once you are branded as a rapist/murderer, who cares whether you are thought of a little lower than that. Well, I didn't know that there was going to be any book branding him in that fashion. I don't know that there was.

Well, if you are going to write about the murder he's convicted of, but $I$ won't belabour that, but with the parole board who is considering release, that could have impact.

Yes, it certainly could.
But yet you are saying it's okay to give it, even though it's unsubstantiated, not followed up upon, from an unreliable source, it can go to the parole board but not to a book?

Well, Mr. Wolch, I saw the, as I think I said, the parole board as a proper institution dealing with people who were imprisoned and may or may not be getting out, that was my reason for writing them, and $I$ was, after all, involved in the trial.

Can you just very quickly tell me again, "- n.b. other rapes where he suspect," what you are
talking about?

A

Q
A

Q
A
$Q$

A

Q
communications with the parole board.

You are saying this does not refer to the ones that were on your file among the 95 statements you read, that's not what you are concerned about?
thing to be publishing. You can't say this John Smith is, you know, suspect of rape and then go on with the rest of the story, I would assume that's libelous, but $I$ don't think that, sir, about prosecutions.

But you don't know of any letter being written? I don't know of any, sir. Now, I -- heaven knows
Because I was not involved with any of Fisher's
That's right, Mr. Wolch.
Okay.
I think I said that before and I wanted to be sure that you understood that was my position on it because that's what it was.

I hear what you are saying.
Yeah, okay.
Whether $I$ understand it or not is another matter, but $I$ hear what you are saying.

Very good, sir.
I would like to just ask you one more question and
then I'll leave that. We've heard, and we know from the evidence, that Larry Fisher has committed many, many sexual offences, came within an inch of
killing (V10) (V10)-, killed Gail Miller. Have you or any other prosecutor written to the parole board about him?

Well, Mr. Wolch --
It's a yes or no and then I'll ask more, okay?
No, I didn't.
Okay. .

Q

A
what the situation is from the North Battleford matter. I would assume something would have been followed up. That was my reason why I didn't write.

Okay. I would like to briefly touch on your contact with Eugene Williams.

All right, sir.

If $I$ understand it, you were kind of helping to a degree?

I was in the limited extent of -- I was able to tell Mr. Williams and/or Sergeant Pearson possibly which policemen were still on duty, which civilians were still around, all the witnesses from the trial, which people may have retired and moved and all that, what $I$ would call sort of basic leg work, you know, to save them the trouble, if you will.

Okay. We know that you were giving them documents and files and things like that, but were you from time to time expressing opinions to them as to how -- what you felt about the case?

I don't think so, sir, because in one of these statements, if you will, of mine to the RCMP, at some point $I$ pointed out that $I$ had, in effect, bent over backwards to avoid trying to influence
them about the case. I think I said words to the effect of that $I$ knew that wouldn't be welcome and wouldn't be proper, $I$ said that as part of dealing about that same topic, sir.

Sir, are you saying you tried not to express opinions?

That's what $I$ said in my statement to the RCMP and that's what I did.

Okay. I know from time to time you say this is what $I$ said then, this is -- I'm trying to ask you now what you are telling us.

Okay. What I'm telling you, sir, is at some point when the investigation was going on $I$ was asked about my contacts with Mr. Williams and Sergeant Pearson. I repeated the business about basic leg work and specified in that statement that $I$ bent over backwards not to -- to try not to influence them in what they thought about the case, I had said that $I$ knew that would be unwelcome and I didn't do it, and that's in print somewhere, sir, I hope a little more briefly than my version today, but --

Q

A
Well, did you feel you were on the same side? No, I didn't, sir. I was employed with Federal Justice at that time as $I$ recall and $I$ was --

Mr. Williams knew $I$ had to do with the case, he was in Ottawa, I was in saskatoon. I tried to assist in that fashion.

I would like to refer to a document and I'm having, once again, my usual trouble reading the number, but it looks like it's 150883. The first eight could be wrong. It's a letter from yourself to Mr. Williams.

All right, sir.

If I have it right. It could be 683. I just can't see it, sorry.

MS. BOSWELL: What's the date of it?

MR. WOLCH: The date is October 31st, '89.

The 150 appears correct and the 83 at the end appears correct. The eight or the six in the middle is a bit blurry.

MR. HODSON: 150975 , October 31.

MR. WOLCH: I'm not that blind. MR. HODSON: It's 150983 .

BY MR. WOLCH:

983, sorry. This is a letter that you wrote to Eugene Williams, and $I$ think we saw it in direct examination, but $I$ want to focus on a different part.

A All right, sir.

Q Just the part down here. .

A
Q

What $I$ meant, or meant it to say, was that when you read the account in that book of the matter presumably attributed to Mrs. Milgaard, it would be difficult to think it was the same offence, is
I do see that, sir.
Okay. I start by saying $I$ wonder, if you are putting that in print, what you are saying verbally to the man; but does that not suggest to him that the views expressed by Mrs. Milgaard are unworthy of acceptance?
what $I$ am trying to say.
But why are you offering an opinion? You just told us that you didn't want to be offering opinions, you thought it was improper for you to be suggesting a view of the evidence, and here you are -Okay.
-- making unfavourable comments about Mrs. Milgaard's version of the event?

Yeah, I've -- that's essentially it, sir, and I think it may be an example of bad judgement on my part, among others, I mean among other examples of --

Other mistakes of judgement?
That's right, as opposed to --
This time you are admitting it was just plain wrong to do that?

Yeah, I think that was just unfortunate, yeah.
Okay. The next item $I$ have some real difficulty with is you stated, as $I$ understand it, that you understood you were going to be a witness at the Supreme Court?

A That's my recollection, sir.

And your recollection is that Mr. Williams indicated to you that you weren't going to be

A
called because counsel for David Milgaard had been informed that, should you be called, you would be recounting the alleged remarks of Nichol John outside the courtroom?

Hmm. Mr. Wolch, this -- first of all, I did go to Ottawa, I did phone Mr. Williams at that point, you know, assuming I might be testifying. At some point it was rightly or wrongly suggested that you were the person who wanted me to attend Ottawa but, in any event, I did. I phoned Mr. Williams, asked him what was going on, and he advised that the Crown -- or in the correct order -- that you had indicated that you wished to call me, sir, to talk about disclosure, which I thought was the idea in the first place; and that the prosecutor, whoever that was, replied that if you did that he would be asking me about the corridor statement by Nichol John, is in effect -- that's how I -- in other words, that would be potentially negative towards Mr. Milgaard, of course, that last --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You referred to
'the prosecutor'; who, exactly, was that, sir?
Well it was Eugene Williams, Mr. Commissioner, but
I -- there were a couple of Regina Crowns there.
MR. WOLCH: Murray Brown and Eric Neufeld.

A Yeah, I think it was one or other of those, sir.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But they weren't acting as prosecutors, they were simply government representatives, were they? No.

MR. WOLCH: If I can help, Mr.
Commissioner, at the Supreme Court Saskatchewan was represented --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.
MR. WOLCH: -- by Murray Brown and Eric
Neufeld, and the Federal Government was represented by Ron Fainstein and I believe Robert Frater, --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes?
MR. WOLCH: -- and Larry Fisher was
represented by Brian Beresh.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I realize all
that. So it's, I'm just quibbling about the term 'prosecutor', it's really Saskatchewan?

MR. WOLCH: No, I think it felt that way, but I'll go --

MS. KNOX: It might just be because Mr. Brown and Mr. Neufeld are prosecutors within the Department of Justice Prosecution Service.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.

MS. KNOX: So Mr. Caldwell would know them as prosecutors and refer them as prosecutors in their full-time --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I just didn't want a false impression of the nature of the proceedings to be left, That's all.

A

BY MR. WOLCH:
Q
A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q

A disclosure. That was the point of me being down there.

Q
A
Q
A

Q

A

Q
A
Q

A
Q
A
Q

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

A

No, but --
Why could I not give that?
Well, listen to me.
Okay.
Okay. Disclosure of this comment?
No, no, of the -- what had happened on disclosure in the Milgaard case.

Okay, fine, we'll get into that in a little bit.
Okay.
But disclosure, we know about disclosure, the issues of providing Mr. Tallis with proper disclosure, --

Uh-huh.
-- we've gone through it here at length.
Uh-huh.
But I'm talking about the suggestion that a member of the bar would tell another one that "if you want to go into this, we are gonna bring in something through Mr. Caldwell that is not admissible"?

Well, sir, in the best order $I$ can get this in, the -- when Sergeant Pearson --

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: Just a minute, this, I want to hear the objection first. Okay.

MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, before the witness answers -- and I'm drawn to speak because of the use of the word "inadmissible" --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes?

MS. KNOX: -- and I particularly have a recollection of reading in the public prosecutions file, on the Sunday that $I$ went through all the boxes, a great deal of correspondence between the provincial prosecutors office, Mr. Brown, the federal prosecutors office, and $I$ don't know if it also included Mr. Wolch's, about concerns about a great deal of information that was being put forward at that hearing that would ordinarily be inadmissible. And I raise it only for that concern, my -- I wasn't there, $I$ don't know the process, but my understanding was the rules of evidence were very much relaxed.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.
MR. WOLCH: We'll deal with that in a second.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: And inadmissible where?

MR. WOLCH: Let me ask this.

BY MR. WOLCH:

Q
A
Q

A

Q

A

Q
A
Q

A
$Q$
A
Q

A

Q
A
Q
Well she would be the best source of that evidence?

A
Q
Mr. Caldwell?
Yes.
The comment, the hearsay comment would have been one that you may have heard from Albert Cadrain, is that right?

What's that now, sir? No, it -- yeah, Albert, and at the time when two other people were there.

No, but you heard it from either Albert or one other person?

No, sir, Albert or Mary Marcoux or Mrs. Miller. Well, we'll deal with that.

Okay.
Actually, two people. All right. The comment was allegedly made by Nichol John; correct?

Oh, I'm sorry, you are right.
Right?
That's correct.
She was a witness?
That's right.
She was a witness in the Supreme Court?
That's my understanding.

That may be, sir.
If she made it, she is testifying, "Nichol John,
did you say this", anybody could put that to her; correct?

A

Q

Well, sir, $I$ went down there with the expectation that $I$ would be testifying about disclosure. Now before doing that, right around that time, Sergeant Pearson and $I$ had been to Regina. One of the things we were -- or the only thing we were looking into was disclosure. It seems to me that we found that the witness statements from the prosecution file had been sent to Ottawa, as I recall $I$ think there's evidence of that, and eventually they faxed them back to $I$ think either Regina or Saskatoon. We determined that, and it
would be after that $I$ went to Ottawa, I think.
Would it be correct to say that you don't even
know whether it was Mary Marcoux or Albert Cadrain
that supposedly told you that?
Yeah, it was one of the three, sir, --
Well --
-- I can't even tie it down to those two.
Well let's look at 301003 .
Okay.
You are not very sure of that, you say to -Okay.

You say here:
"At the Preliminary Inquiry, one of the witnesses, Mary Marcoux, or Albert Cadrain, or both of them, advised me that they, plus Mrs. Miller ..."

Mrs. Miller.
"... all heard Nichol John say ..."
So you say, at the preliminary, one of them told you and you don't know which one yet?

I said "one or both", and I said "plus
Mrs. Miller", they are all --
$Q$
No, you say they advised you that they were there, you don't say any one of the four said it?

A Oh, I see what you mean, all right.
"... who was present at the hearing
. . .",
and it says:
"... all heard Nichol John say, ...", etcetera.

Yeah. So Mary Marcoux, or Albert Cadrain, or both of them --

Uh-huh.
-- told you that everybody heard this?
That's how I'd read this, --
Okay, all right.
-- yeah.
And your files indicate no statements from Mary Marcoux, Albert Cadrain, or any of these people that they did hear this?

Not from them, that's correct.
Well where else would you get that statement?
Where $I$ got it, sir, was from the notes I made when they relayed this to me.

But you interviewed Nichol John three times; -Yeah.
-- would you not put that to her?
I did not do that, sir. There is two different places in the prosecutor's file where $I$ recorded that quotation, to the best of my knowledge no one
else did that.
But it's a quotation; you can't even say who said it?

I couldn't say who said it because this is how it was presented to me, it was one of those three, and it does not say --

Well did they say it to you or to somebody else? I mean $I$ don't understand "how it was presented to me"?

Okay, just a minute. Yeah, that's right, how it happened is that:
"... one of the witnesses, Mary Marcoux, or Albert Cadrain, or both of them, advised me that they, plus Mrs. Miller, Gail Miller's mother, who was present at the hearing, all heard Nichol John say, . . ."
etcetera, sir. That's how it happened.
I'm not disputing that. All I'm saying is you don't know whether it was Albert Cadrain -- not the most reliable person in the world -- or Mary Marcoux, who said it to you. Now let me pause there. Are you satisfied that one of them said it to you, or said it to somebody else who told you? No, no, I was -- I was in that hallway when they
brought this to my attention, I recorded it very quickly.
$Q$

A

Q

A
But you don't know which one brought it to your attention?

Okay. One --
Is that --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just let him
finish, he is trying to answer.
"... one of the witnesses, Mary Marcoux, or Albert Cadrain, or both of them, advised me that they, plus Mrs. Miller, Gail Miller's mother, who was present at the hearing, all heard ..."
her say that:
"I was right there, and saw it all, but I'm not going to say nothing."

I copied this down immediately and incorporated it so, you know, that's what happened, Mr. Wolch. BY MR. WOLCH:

But you don't know who said it to you?
A Not --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: He does. That's not quite -- he said it was either one of them, either Mary or Albert Cadrain.

MR. WOLCH: Well --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mary or Albert, yes, that's all he's telling you.

BY MR. WOLCH:

Q

No. Mrs. Miller was a somewhat older lady and Mary, as $I$ now realize, was a younger child, but $I$ didn't -- I never --

Q
A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Well they came from Albert Cadrain, this is the same guy who heard David say he wants to kill the witnesses in Calgary; right?

Well it was Albert, that much is right, sir. Okay. So sort of consistent with some of the, perhaps, falsehoods he has told?

I don't -- I don't believe that, Mr. Wolch. I thought I had a good knowledge of Albert and he seemed to be leveling with me. He obviously said a couple of far-out things later, and much later he was accused of mental difficulties, but that was, I think, quite a bit after all these events. But --

Might --

A
Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

Okay, sorry.
Might it be that, if she said something like this, the meaning she was conveying, now that we know what's really going on, --

Uh-huh.
-- is "if he is such a killer, and I saw a murder, why didn't he kill me"?

Well I, sir, couldn't read that into this set of words I'm afraid.

Well now, with hindsight, that we know -COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just a minute. MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, I don't have before me the transcript of Peggy Miller, but my recollection is there was some testimony from Peggy Miller that she was in the hearing -- here at the Inquiry, that she was in a waiting room when this was said, except she characterized Nichol John's tone of voice, or something to that effect, as being flippant or something. And I would have to check, and $I$ don't know that Mr. Wolch was here, -MR. WOLCH: Yeah. MS. KNOX: -- but it seems to me that we had testimony at this Inquiry from a witness who heard the comment but perhaps put a different
interpretation on it, but $I$ would have to go back and check the transcript.

MR. WOLCH: I thought she testified she didn't hear it.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, I can't remember, but --

MR. WOLCH: Or maybe I -- maybe counsel can help?

MR. HODSON: Peggy Miller testified that she heard the comment by Nichol John in the hearing room, the words were a bit different, we can -- I can find the transcript. They weren't exactly this, but she did give evidence, --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah.
MR. HODSON: -- and I can find it for you very quickly.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But -- thank you very much. I'm just a little mystified, at the moment, as to why we're spending so much time on this point?

MR. WOLCH: I --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: It was -- I take
it that it all began by you suggesting to the witness that, if an arrangement like that had been made at the Supreme Court, that is to say
you wouldn't call this witness to -- on the business of disclosure if the government wouldn't call Nichol John on the business -- or ask this witness about Nichol John's declaration?

MR. WOLCH: That's right.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But are we still on that subject?

MR. WOLCH: I --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You seem, now, to be challenging that this declaration was ever made?

MR. WOLCH: No, I'm trying to get through it quickly, but with all due respect I -- the answers are sometimes longer than my questions, instead of "yes" or "no" I go off on tangents, but I'm trying not to, I'm trying to focus.

The point, $I$ expect Mr .
Williams will testify, and $I$ want to find out if this was actually said. I want to challenge this witness, that is "if, if Mr. Caldwell is called --"

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes?
MR. WOLCH: "-- he is going to testify to this", because I think -- and I may be disagreed with -- that that is a very serious suggestion
because it shows, on the Department of Justice, a biased to protect, "let's not get this Crown, this guy on the stand", and it also shows a very, I think, improper, improper challenge that "if you want to talk about disclosure we're going to put in evidence like this through this witness --".

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Uh-huh, well --
MR. WOLCH: "-- when we could have put it in through John, Cadrain, or we could have called Mary Marcoux or Miss Miller who testified here, we're not going gonna put it in that way, we're gonna put it in through this witness if you dare have him under oath."

Now $I$ don't know if that
happened or not, but $I$ will put it to Mr.
Williams when he gets here, and $I$ just want to be clear that this witness is confident that this is what he was told by Mr. Williams, and I'm having trouble getting there. That's all my point is.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, there's
another problem here, the best evidence of
whether or not that happened would come from
Neufeld, or Brown, or you; would that --
MR. WOLCH: Well, that's correct, or

Mr. Asper.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But doesn't that put you in an invidious spot?

MR. WOLCH: No, Mr. Asper would know, and I don't know --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well how would Mr. Asper know?

MR. WOLCH: Well he was counsel with me there.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh.

MR. WOLCH: But that's not the point. I mean, I can't answer until somebody else, corroborates this. I mean, if somebody is going to say they told him that, $I$ want to hear that from somebody. This is all news to me. But I just want to make sure the witness is clear of what Mr. Williams said to him and then we will explore it with Mr. Williams, sir.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, I thought he had been clear enough to begin with, yeah.

MR. WOLCH: Oh, I'm just trying to understand, and $I$ think it's --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I just don't, I mean, think this is a place for you to be attacking the very happening that -- in question,
you know, even indirectly through cross-examination.

BY MR. WOLCH:
Well let me ask you this, then, Mr. Caldwell. I was unclear when you testified that you conveyed this, well, evidence or whatever it is to Mr. Beresh, and I'm really unclear as to the timing of that?

At this point $I$ am too, sir. I did tell him about
that hallway statement, $I$ know that was in Saskatoon, he -- because $I$ thought it might be, you know, important evidence on a case. But the thing that $I$ have told you about here was very brief, and essentially that was all the discussion was, and then it was indicated they wouldn't be needing me, either then or before, sir. Shortly thereafter $I$ phoned Murray Brown to ask him how the case was proceeding, I was in Ottawa but not at the building, $I$ was in a hotel at that time. No, but I'm a little concerned. You say you are not in the, in the litigation, you are -- you say you feel it's almost improper for you to be offering opinions or jumping in, and $I$ can perhaps see you trying to help Mr. Brown or Mr. Neufeld, but helping counsel for Larry Fisher strikes me as
somewhat beyond?
A
Well, Mr. Wolch, I -- the presumption of innocence applies to Fisher as well as all other kinds of people. He was charged, and at some stage of the game I relayed to Mr. Beresh that hallway conversation, because I didn't know if he had heard it and might make use of it.

The other thing is that, on
this, $I$ was very likely subpoenaed to go to Ottawa, $I$ was told to go to the airport and there would be a voucher, flew down by commercial airline, the night before this phoned Mr. -- Mr. -- I shouldn't say the night before this -- the night I got there I phoned Mr. Williams, and Mr. Brown after that, and $I$ never physically did go, even the next day or indeed any other time, to the Supreme Court.

No, but would there be any doubt in your mind that Mr. Brown, Mr. Neufeld, and Mr. Williams would all know about your notes?

Would there be any doubt that -- they knew about my notes, --

Okay?
-- because you were rightly or wrongly quoted as saying that you intended to call me on disclosure,
which would be, of course, very normal I would have thought.
$Q$

A
given his reason, "seemed to anyway".

BY MR. WOLCH:
Okay. Well, I mean obviously they would be the first person you would go to if you thought they didn't know it?

A About the hallway conversation?

Q
A

Hallway, yes.
Yeah. Well, sir, I -- I was there strictly to talk about disclosure. That was my understanding. No, Mr. Caldwell, please listen to me. Okay.

This is really simple.
MS. KNOX: If I may, and I don't know if I will help matters or $I$ will aggravate matters, but $I$ don't have readily in front of me -- and maybe Mr. Wolch does because he was a key party to it -- the scheduling of the Supreme Court of Canada hearings, the dates when witnesses appeared.

What we do have before us, and what was brought up on the screen, is a part of a statement taken from Mr. Caldwell somewhere during the course of the -- I can't even say it -- the Supreme Court of Canada proceeding. There is a date on it that $I$ believe is March $20 t h$. What that statement does is that a police officer who was assisting in the 690 review, Sergeant Pearson who we'll hear from next week, attended at Mr. Caldwell's residence and he canvassed with him three particular areas, as I recall.

One of the things he canvassed
with him was to show him a copy of this, one of his handwritten notes, so clearly there was some discussion going on that was brought to Sergeant Pearson that he was asked to take to Mr. Caldwell to seek some input, clarification, assistance. Now I don't know what part Mr. Wolch played in that, I don't know if the records will show us what part he played in it, but somewhere in the course of the Supreme Court of Canada hearing itself this became a live issue, and my memory of the materials that we have is that Mr. Caldwell was questioned on these matters, he gave that statement to Sergeant Pearson, there is a letter from Sergeant Pearson in our materials where he shipped it to Ottawa, and it was subsequent to that that Mr. Caldwell was sent a voucher and asked to attend.

So I think, in order to get a context for these questions and to assist in the answering, we need to get a chronology that would perhaps be of assistance to all of us, and that's what $I$ was whispering in Mr. Hodson's ear, trying to do it.

MR. WOLCH: Well I can help with that, Mr.
Commissioner, but $I$ really think we're making a
very simple issue very complex.

BY MR. WOLCH:
$Q$

A

Q

A
Okay.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I think he is
trying to say there is two different times involved here.

MR. WOLCH: Okay.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: When he told Beresh it was at a time not necessarily at -- in connection with that hearing at the Supreme Court.

BY MR. WOLCH:
Okay. Is that correct, Mr. Caldwell?
That's -- that's my impression now, and it did lead to, indirectly if you will, to me going to

Yorkton, as you know, to testify on the fisher matter.
$Q$

A
$Q$

Okay.
-- who maybe they made notes or whatever, but -MR. HODSON: Sorry, I just would like -before you move on, the reference to Peggy
witnesses, --


Miller's evidence is at page 7687 of the transcript, and her evidence was she was shown the specific note of Mr. Caldwell's, she had used the word 'arrested' instead of 'killed', but then went on to say that 'yes' -- let me just find the comment. The question was these words:
"Q These words here, "I don't know why he didn't kill me too," do you recall those words being --

A That could have been, it could have been either killed or arrested.

Q Arrested, okay. And so the rest of what's recorded here ...", which was Mr. Caldwell's notes: "... is that close to or accurate as to what you heard in that room but from Nichol John?

A Yes."
So that's at page 7687, on April 13th, of Peggy Miller's evidence.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks.
MR. WOLCH: I might point out, if I read it right, that Mrs. Miller was not in the room?

MR. HODSON: Yes. And I also asked her the question whether her mother was in the room at
the time, and she said "no" -- sorry -- "and was her mother", she said "yes" -- I'm sorry, it was "her mother", I think it was Mary Marcoux's mother there.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: "Your mother", line 12 and 13.

MR. HODSON: "Was your mother in the room at the time?

A No she was not."
MR. WOLCH: So whatever it says.
MR. HODSON: Do you have it up there?
Okay.
MR. WOLCH: I'm trying to move along.
Okay.
BY MR. WOLCH:

Q
Mr. Commissioner, I hadn't intended to do this, but it might be a bit helpful given some of the difficulties we're having. There is a letter that I might refer to that might be of some assistance as to the Supreme Court itself and what was going on there.

A
Okay, sir.
$Q$
And the letter was 158496 , and before $I$ go into the letter, sir, I'm going to suggest to you that disclosure and the conduct of the investigation
was a very minor part, if any, of the Supreme Court reference, the only area of disclosure was (V4)---- (V4)--- caused a little bit of concern, but really it wasn't, and the record will disclose that $I$ believe the reference was ordered in November, Mr. Hodson can correct me, but $I$ think it was November of '91 and somehow we were in the Supreme Court in December calling evidence in January, so it moved along very, very quickly, and in talking about the Supreme Court, given your normal -- or your background, sir, you might agree with me that time in all courts, and in particular the Supreme Court, is very precious?

Yeah, that's right. Mr. Wolch, one thing, very briefly, I hadn't realized these dates, but as of the 1st of October, 1991 I was no longer with either Department of Justice.

Okay.

A
Q
A
Q

A

Just so that that's --
Okay.
I was unemployed.
But you agree with me, you recall we discussed this morning that leave to appeals are limited to 15 minutes?

I believe that's right.

You know, in fact, I think you've been on the stand here about half the length of the reference, if you want to put it in perspective, how time is so limited --

Yeah --
-- in the Supreme Court and what you can do and what you can't do?

I follow you, sir.
But I want to go through this a bit just to set the framework, it's a letter to the Chief Justice: "Since our last meeting -- "

And I'm going to go through it quickly,
"-- counsel have been working diligently
to bring this matter before the Court
. . ."
"... there have been meetings between
Beresh and ourselves ... with all
counsel with the exception of Justice
Ottawa ... lengthy conference calls ..."
"It was during the last conference call
as a result of the difficulty we were having with direction that we suggested that Mr. Fainstein, with the blessing of all of us, perhaps attend upon yourself for some further guidance."
"The evidence to be considered by the Court seems to fall into basically four general areas. It would appear to be preferable to attempt to have the witnesses pertaining to each area called as closely in sequence as possible. The four areas would appear to be:"

The young people accompanying David, the motel, expert evidence, Fisher evidence. One of the difficulties is determining which area we should commence with. We talk about expert evidence. This area might be the easiest as it is non-contentious. If we can just turn the page. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Is this you speaking, Mr. Wolch?

BY MR. WOLCH:
Q Yes.
"... it was felt that this might be the best area. The difficulty we have is that requests have been received from both Justice in Ottawa and Justice in Saskatchewan to provide further blood samples from Milgaard and a sample from Fisher. Apparently Ottawa is aware of some testing techniques in England, and

Saskatchewan is aware of some testing techniques in Texas. It is somewhat frustrating to us that in his original application, Milgaard indicated that he would provide any samples requested of him, and in fact this is consistent with his behaviour right back to the time of his arrest, and this is the first such request. In any event, Mr. Milgaard is willing to provide samples, but given issues such as continuity and his current incarceration, we are simply in the process of facilitating the requests."

And I'll skip the next paragraph as it deals with what became later on obviously very important, the DNA and the possibilities of DNA.
Direct witnesses.
"It would appear that this would be the
most logical starting point. Many of
the witnesses who testified as to times,
places, findings, etc. would simply be
accepted from the trial. Their evidence
is not particularly in dispute, and
clearly with the passage of time could
not have improved.

The witnesses who have to be called from our point of view would be:" Number 1, Ronald Dale Wilson, and this talks about his need, $I$ won't go through it, need for counsel.

Next page, David Milgaard:
"It has always been our intention to have David Milgaard testify. The difficulty we are having right now is with David's emotional state.

After being convicted, David underwent numerous bouts of depression and emotional difficulties. This continued over the many years of incarceration, and we have brought this to Justice's attention numerous times as it is well documented, and in fact the Prime Minister himself at one point expressed concern. All penal authorities and experts that we have spoken to have told us that David's reintroduction into society will be very difficult to say the least. Those fears are being realized. Much of David's
time in jail was focused on proclaiming his innocence, helping others and correcting injustice. For approximately twenty-three years, nobody has ever listened to him. Now everybody wants to listen to him, and he has achieved almost celebrity status.

Unfortunately, but
understandably, he does not have a great deal of faith in the justice system. What we are faced with now is that David's main interest is to start experiencing living, and also rectifying the various ills in society. We are having a great deal of difficulty having David even focus on this reference. We have enlisted the aid of Dr. Stanley Yaren, the chief psychiatrist in the Province of Manitoba, who has had a long standing relationship with David. Our understanding is that Dr. Yaren will be meeting with David and his family this week. Dr. Yaren may be called as a witness to explain David's mental state."

Justice Tallis:
"In connection with David's evidence, Mr. Fainstein advised the Court may be interested in hearing from Mr. Justice Tallis. David has indicated a willingness to waive privilege, and with that in mind, we attended in Regina last weekend to meet with Justice Tallis. We understand Justice Tallis does not have his files, although he has searched for same, and he indicated to the writer that he has been deliberately avoiding the publicity and emerging evidence in order it keep his memory as unaffected by recent developments as possible. Justice Tallis expressed certain concerns, and in particular felt that the sanctity of solicitor/client privilege is so important, he was concerned that the public would be given the wrong impression. He was clear that the privilege belonged to David, and if it was to be waived, it should be as objectively and fairly done as possible."

I'll skip over that, but it talks about Justice Tallis, and I'll try to go through it fairly quickly. I'm sorry, can you just go back to the other page at the bottom:
"The other witnesses who fall into this category are more logically called by other parties."

If we can turn the page.
"Clearly we would not be interested in calling Cadrain or Nichol John. In the event that Cadrain or some of his family members aren't called to testify, we would certainly wish to call Dennis Cadrain, and would want him likely called in any event, although he would likely follow the others in sequence. Nichol John would likely be called by Justice in Ottawa, but in terms of commencing with her, we understand that she is still undergoing some medical assistance in order to revive her memory."

I'll -- I'm sorry, here:
"The calling of these witnesses may lead to the calling of police witnesses as to
the method of taking statements. This
of course would not be our
responsibility."

You see that? Then we get the motel room, Larry Fisher. I'll skip motel room, just go down to this part here. It talks about the witnesses who could be called and it goes through the Fisher evidence. Just go further down.
"Another witness who would likely have
to be called is Ms. (V4)---- (V4)---.
Ms. (V4)--- gives rise to potentially
other witnesses, and the question of disclosure or lack of same becomes rather important. It is inconceivable that if it were known that another lady was attacked at roughly the same time as Gail Miller, and within blocks, that would not have surfaced at trial if it were disclosed."

That is the issue $I$ had mentioned earlier of where disclosure focused on (V4)---- (V4)---. The above is not exhaustive and there may be additional witnesses.
"We will be influenced by who is being called by the parties with status and
your guidance.
We should add that it is also
our intention to file additional
material with the Court. Since our last
meeting, we would guesstimate that we have received approximately 5,000 pages of material that we have not seen before. Our sources of material have been the Department of Justice in Ottawa, the Department of Justice in Saskatchewan and the Parole Board. We are trying to work it down as to what is relevant and not duplicitous."

Turn the page.
"Another difficulty which requires some assistance from the Court is the matter of public access to information. Earlier we made reference to a new witness --"

And I'll skip over that, but that's Launa Edwards, we're not too concerned about her. "There are also matters in David Milgaard's personal life, and we are speaking in particular during his incarceration, that are very sensitive.

Clearly, the effect of his current mental condition is important for the Court to know; on the other hand, they are matters which Dave has never shared with even his siblings, and are matters that are extremely private.

Furthermore, if released while David is in jail, they are matters that could be perceived as breaking an inmates code of silence, and could put David in jeopardy. We query how we can put this material before the Court without causing tremendous sensationalism and great personal harm.

Having said all the above, we are still optimistic that we may proceed fairly expeditiously, and we hope the above will be of assistance to other counsel in determining needs and requirements. Our suggestion is that we have to pick one section of the evidence and proceed, and try to call all of the witnesses relevant to that area. The most obvious is the area of the "eye witnesses". We should immediately
address the problems of Mr. Wilson and his counsel, Justice Tallis' situation, and we would appreciate some guidance as to whether or not David Milgaard is expected to testify at the very beginning. If so, that does create problems. We can assure the Court it is not a matter of preparing him for Court since our experience is that he is absolutely impossible to prepare in any event."

And it then goes on about a Mr. Douzenko who was a witness.

That may clarify some of the background, but I'm suggesting police conduct, Crown counsel conduct, disclosure, were not at the forefront of this Inquiry.

From your letter, sir, I would agree with you. I can't see them being stressed or necessarily even mentioned in your letter.

Right.
So I, you know --
As counsel you can appreciate the focus, and the only focus was on the innocence or not of David Milgaard, --

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q

A

Uh-huh.
-- that was the focus, and if police acted improperly, it doesn't matter.

Yeah.
It doesn't matter, it's the truth of the evidence that counts. You see that?

Yeah, granted, Mr. Wolch.
Which then leads, at the end of the inquiry, to your press conference that we went over earlier, do you recall -- when the DNA came out, I'm sorry. Oh, yeah, the end -- the time the civil action was discontinued?

That's right.
Yeah, that was, to my knowledge, the only -- the press conference involving Mr. Kujawa, our counsel, Mr. Halyk, and myself.

Yes, at 332039, and if we can just turn to the next page, and $I$ think your knowledge of the law is such that you have found with time that courts are very careful in how they choose their words. I believe so, sir.

And you also know that courts are very careful in making findings or suggesting findings on issues that are not before them?

I would assume so, sir.

Q

A
Q

A
Q

So their words are carefully chosen, and if you
look at your quotation from the Supreme Court:
"It is appropriate to begin by stating
that in our view David Milgaard had the
benefit of a fair trial in January,
1970, 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 their interviews
with any of the witnesses."
You see that?
Yeah.
We have not been presented with any evidence of
that.
Okay.

Q Well, sir, that's so, and it very well may, at that time, it very well may be that $I$ did not know or realize they were failures to disclose, if you follow me.

I'm just trying to emphasize, but I'll carry on.
"Nor has evidence been presented that there was inadequate disclosure in accordance with the practice prevailing at the time."

There was no evidence presented at that, correct, but you know, I read you the letter, 5,000 pages, now, it's a bit misleading to say, we have 300,000 pages, but surely we have numerous documents here that are relevant, such as, I think it's Rasmussen and Edmondson's RCMP report, that has only surfaced here and wasn't present there.

Well, sir, that's true, and as we know, which did not come to my office.

Oh, I'm only saying in the global picture -Okay.
-- we are discovering, and I'm sure at the end Commission Counsel can point out what disclosure came here that's important that wasn't even present at the Supreme Court reference, let alone at the trial.

A
Yeah. I believe, Mr. Wolch, that we are in fact finding things out that did and didn't happen in a large measure as the Inquiry goes on. I presume
that's legitimate.
Absolutely, but $I$ noted there was some excitement when it was raised the other day that the Supreme Court somehow said disclosure was adequate or no misconduct. That's not what they said, they said there was no evidence presented of it.

Well, I must say, Mr. Wolch, the way I would read that is the former despite what the words say. In
other words, if $I$ read this, $I$ would take that as being the same as saying, you know, there was no evidence of police improprieties or inadequate disclosure, that's how $I$ would read it. It's a double negative almost.

Well, no, I now begin to realize why you have so much problem with your letter writing. Can't you look at the plain wording?

A

Q

A
I can see it, sir, it says we have not been presented with any probative evidence the police acted improperly, etcetera.

And you interpret that to mean that there is no probative evidence out there?

I would not think that they would write that if they meant to say the next time this happens we trust you will put in probative evidence that you knew you had.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I've got it written down, Mr. Wolch, and $I$ can interpret it.

MR. WOLCH: Do you accept my --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I know what you mean. I take your point.

MR. WOLCH: I thank you. I could be here all day if you didn't. Okay. I'm just about concluded, Mr. Caldwell.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I hope you won't allow modesty to prevent you reading the next line.

MR. WOLCH: Oh, I'm sorry, that's Mr. Tallis I think.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, I see.
MR. WOLCH: It was jealousy, sir, not modesty.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: If you are almost finished, I'll wait, but $I$ feel the need of a break coming only.

MR. WOLCH: That's fine, Mr. Commissioner, if we take a short break. I have about 10 minutes to go.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right. 15 minutes.
(Adjourned at 2:39 p.m.)

A
$Q$
(Reconvened at 2:58 p.m.)

BY MR. WOLCH:
Mr. Caldwell, $I$ only have a couple of questions for you. I want to take you to the day before the DNA results came to your attention.

Okay, sir.
Okay. Am I correct that on that day you would have been firmly convinced that David was guilty?

That -- until they came out, sir, I was.
So the day before you were firmly convinced?
Yeah.
So let me just ask you this. First of all, you would agree with me, I'm sure, that David was innocent the day before the DNA?

Absolutely, in that sense.
Yeah.
He certainly was.
The DNA didn't change anything in terms of his innocence or guilt, he was always innocent? That is correct, sir, as we now know. Yeah. Let me ask you this. The day before the DNA, if you looked at the case implicating him, and I'm going to do this in generalities -Okay.
-- you saw the film version, we saw it today?

Oh, today, yeah.
Yeah. The film version, you know that Wilson has recanted, you know that even with hypnosis Nichol John hasn't progressed, you know that by then Cadrain is, has serious mental difficulties, see, you look at the end of it, and then you look at the Fisher part where you know he was the serial rapist in the very area, that his method of operation was exceptionally similar, you know he lived in the Cadrain basement, you know his own wife thought he did it and contributed evidence to that part, and you know that (V10) (V10)- was attacked years later almost identically like Gail Miller and had Fisher tell her he had done it before. When you put that picture together on one hand and the other, I'm trying to understand why you would, on that day, be convinced of David's guilt when you hear what $I$ have to say. Can you help us?

A
Yeah, Mr. Wolch, and not to sound facetious, I don't, at this point don't recall exactly when and in what sequence all those various things happened. I assumed they had all happened by then, one way or another, including Linda Fisher's complaint. If $I$ had known that whole picture, if
indeed it had all, let's say, happened by then, and if $I$ were aware of it, part 2 , $I$ would certainly be, $I$ think, wondering what was happening.

Well, she had testified in the Supreme Court many years before. I'm talking the day before the DNA. Uh-huh.

You clearly were convinced of the guilt of David. Do you think you made the appropriate effort to try and look into the case further to satisfy yourself that that belief was well founded? In the meantime you mean, sir?

Yes.
I think I certainly had the belief, I thought it was well founded and $I$ can't say how much effort $I$ made, if you will, in the meantime to revisit or relook into the case.

Do you agree with the proposition that I've heard several times, that a prosecution's worst nightmare is getting a conviction on an innocent person?

I think that's a -- certainly a valid statement. So I'm just wondering, as time went on and you learned about Larry Fisher and you learned about the evidence pointing in his direction --

A
Q

So I'm just wondering why you wouldn't, as a human being, try to look into the facts carefully that maybe you could lend support to the Milgaards and say look, this Fisher evidence causes me grave

Yeah, as a human being, sir, that makes sense to me.
concern, or $I$ really see that this boy could be innocent. Like, why wouldn't you do that instead of just maintaining he did it, he did it, he did it?

A
$Q$

Well, Mr. Wolch, again $I$ can't, and I'm sure you can't either, you know, put dates on exactly when things happened and when they worked up. I didn't feel that, if $I$ had that sentiment, I didn't feel either that $I$ would be welcome in the, you know, anywhere near the Milgaard camp because they were very upset with me. I mean, what could I do.

Obviously if the prosecutor said that he thought it may be a wrongful conviction he would have been embraced I would think.

Well, $I$ can understand that.
No, but I'm just wondering, you didn't choose to read the Supreme Court transcripts or try to know what they said?

I certainly didn't read the transcripts, sir. I'm just wondering why you wouldn't have made the effort to really satisfy yourself of this boy's guilt as time transpired.

Well, do you mean innocence, or either way?
Innocence or guilt, yes.
Okay. Well, sir, I was -- I suppose at that
time -- what time did the DNA happen?
1997.

Come out?

That's about five years after the Supreme Court.
All right. It's of no -- I was acting as a relief judge at that time and that was, you know, keeping some of my time tied up that I might otherwise have used, but I can't say, Mr. Wolch, that it ever, you know, clearly occurred to me that $I$ could be any use.

Not a matter of use, sir, it's a matter for your own self.

A

Q
Your own satisfaction, to say to yourself look, if on the balance this young man was innocent, $I$ want
to know that, $I$ don't want to allow this
conviction to be maintained, and I have peculiar knowledge of it because $I$ was there, and I'm wondering why you wouldn't do that.

A
I don't know, Mr. Wolch, what more I can say. I certainly don't like the idea of anyone being convicted, imprisoned improperly.

Q No, I understand that.

A
Yeah. I didn't feel in this case that that had happened.

Q
Would it be fair to say, and I don't say this, you know, in trying to embarrass or make you feel criticized unduly, but would it be fair to say that you didn't really want to know, that if you found it out it was so horrific that you didn't really want it to be the case?

Not that exactly, sir. I must say that $I$ was, if you will, thoroughly, I guess, exhausted by the case in general, if you will. In other words, I was very -- I was tired of hearing about it in whatever manner virtually every second day of my life.

I understand that, tired of hearing about it, but there is still the prospect of this young man in jail.

Yeah.
If you are tired of it, you can imagine what he is 23 years down.

Yeah.
But what I'm saying is, I'm suggesting to you that the prospect that you prosecuted an innocent person and put in jail was something that weighed so heavily on you you didn't want, you didn't want to hear that, you just hoped you had the right guy and anything that might dissuade you you didn't
want to hear.
A
It $I$ think was a little more, I don't think I hoped $I$ had the right guy, $I$ felt, you know, based on everything that happened, that it was a proper conviction. It may well be that as things pointing toward his innocence came in, $I$ may have, you know, been reluctant to accept them, if that's the same thing as you are putting to me, because of the -- umm, what should I say, the huge tide of publicity that had gone on and the actual effort that had gone into the trial itself, of course, years before, but had $I$-- I don't think it ever came into focus for me, Mr. Wolch, about that time, that this person is, in all likelihood, innocent, if $I$ can put it that way.

Okay. And your reaction to the DNA was what? Well, it was shock, it was a total vindication of Milgaard, of course, and very shortly thereafter, you know, the damning of Fisher.

I'm just trying to understand why, given the balance $I$ told you earlier, the Fisher case, the Milgaard case, why you would be shocked?

A Well, because, sir, I had no earthly reason to think that any DNA -- first of all, it was still around, but second, that it would, if tested,
would prove that it belonged to another person. So you are not saying your shock was to the fact it was Fisher, your shock was the fact that it could be done?

No, no, no. I was shocked that the DNA conclusively proved that Milgaard was not the right person, there's no doubt about that. Okay.

Not that it could be done. I think it was a new science then, but it was done, apparently very validly.

We won't get into that, but anyway, Mr. Caldwell, those are all the questions $I$ have for you. Thank you, sir.

MR. WOLCH: Mr. Commissioner, if I may, during the break $I$ spoke with Ms. Knox who says she has a matter to address with you and I also spoke to Mrs. Caldwell who is here who approached me and I think I and Commission Counsel join her in the remarks she's going to make.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, the only
person that we haven't discussed this with is Mr. Caldwell, but counsel, and in consultation, as Mr. Wolch indicated, with Mrs. Caldwell, I
undertook to them that $I$ was going to ask that we adjourn at this time. We can't possibly finish today. My client $I$ believe is both physically and mentally exhausted. Mr. Wolch has a flight that he would like to catch and, for all kinds of reasons, if you would agree, then $I$ think we would all prefer that we adjourn today to come back on Monday, although it's about 45 minutes short of our usual closing time.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, of course, I'm always receptive to a reason like that. I just don't want people to get the idea that we'll adjourn early every week. I'm very anxious, as you can imagine, to not waste time before life expectancy becomes an issue in this case.

MS. KNOX: And certainly I appreciate the fact that you would give special consideration in this circumstance. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, thank you. (Adjourned at 3:11 p.m.)
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