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## Transcript of Proceedings

(Reconvened at 9:00 a.m.)
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Good morning.
THOMAS DAVID ROBERTS CALDWELL, continued:

## BY MS. KNOX:

Good morning, sir. Thank you, sir. Mr. Caldwell, if $I$ can continue from where $I$ was when we left off yesterday, but just having had the benefit of more time to make more mischief, just take you to, or go back to the story that $I$ referred you to where it was suggested in 1989 in a newspaper report that you read that Albert Cadrain had been induced to give evidence by that $\$ 2,000$ reward that was offered by the Police Commission? Uh-huh.

You remember us talking about that yesterday. If we could bring up document number 006905 , please. Mr. Caldwell, this is one of your to-do lists that we found in your file --

Very good.
-- and it has a number of pages, this is the first page, and if $I$ could go back to -- sorry, yes, go to 906, the second page of that to-do list. Thank you. Do you see number 14 of that list of things that you had for yourself to do as you prepared

for trial?
A
Q

A
I don't believe I had any discussion with him along those lines.
he, like you, was preparing for these witnesses who were coming forward?

$$
5 \mathrm{y}
$$

The reward?
Yes, and whether anybody might have claimed it as

I'm going to direct you to point number 2 in your list of to-do things that appears to be being done in January, because the page previous to this one in your file references Melnyk and Lapchuk and you have a reference there, "Cal - reward" and you have a phone number, 374-5219. I don't know if you remember, and others will be able to tell us whether in fact that's Mr. Tallis' phone number, but does this in fact refresh your memory and does it suggest to you that like you, he may have queried and you proffered information to him that none of the witnesses coming forward had applied for a reward and therefore that factor, he could, I guess, put his mind at rest on in terms of the bona fides at least of the reasons for coming forward?

A Yes. That Cal, I assume that's his home phone number. The first item is reward and then three Regina witnesses advised, Cal 8:45 Sunday, January 18th, and then nil, meaning nothing, in opening address re -- I advised him that $I$ wouldn't be putting in the three, two or three Regina witnesses in my opening address, the way $I$ read that to be, on the cautious side $I$ would assume, and then the same day $I$ heard goes back to the
advised Cal. In other words, I told him the same day $I$ heard about it.

And that day, as look at it now, being January 18th, which was the night before trial?

That's right, ma'am.
Okay. So the night before trial you had done your to-do list, at some point in time you had determined the issue about the reward and whether through his question or your first offering you let him know prior to trial that nobody had looked for or was getting the reward at that point?

That's how I see it now, ma'am.
So, sir, again to take us back to where we were yesterday when you saw that newspaper story about Albert Cadrain, would this have been the kind of memory or the kind of material that you had somewhere in your memory that caused you to react to that story and know with a degree of certainty that it wasn't true that Albert Cadrain had been induced by the fact of getting a reward when he gave testimony in the trial?

I'm sure that struck me immediately, and that of course was the true situation, what you just mentioned.

And again to go back where $I$ started with this in
response to questions put to you by counsel for, on behalf of Mr. Milgaard and Mrs. Milgaard, would this kind of misinformation that was bing put in the public record, as you knew it to be, influence whether or not, or how you perceived the allegation or the suggestion being put forward of David Milgaard's innocence and perhaps your determination, as it were, $I$ think Mr. Lockyer suggested that you didn't sort of jump on board and say, 'oh my God, there's good reason to think that an innocent man has been wrongfully convicted here at that stage'?

No, I didn't think that, and I had a good regard for Albert Cadrain as I'm sure I've made clear. I didn't, you know, believe for one minute what was alleged in the story and of course $I$ felt it was terribly mischievous to put that kind of thing out because it's so difficult to pursue and remedy later on. I don't know if that's what you are getting at, but that's certainly how it seemed to me.

Q Okay. And, sir, I made note in passing last night, and I'm not going to take the time to go back and find my page, I should have been more efficient, and I'm sure it was a misstatement, but
in a question to you last Friday when Mr. Wolch was asking you about Albert Cadrain, he made a statement in his question that he thought that by this time, referring to the time he gave evidence at trial as $I$ read the transcript, that Albert Cadrain was in a mental home was the word he used. It's correct, is it not, that there was no -COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I don't think he said that. We can find it for you if you like. MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, if I can just have a minute.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Uh-huh. He said he was mentally ill at one point, but I think that related to a later time period.

MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, if I could go to the transcript, page 18272, the question reads:
"Q 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." COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, but what was the context of that?

MS. KNOX: It was in terms of assessing the witnesses that he had available. If we go back a
bit in terms of assessing Albert Cadrain, he indicated the suggestion, preceding the question, that as time went on, Albert Cadrain's story was getting more incredible, and $I$ took that to refer to talking that by August 26 th he was talking about sex in the bathtubs in Regina and so forth. And the question that precedes it, perhaps we've gone a bit, but in any event he's talking about the fact that -- and $I$ may be wrong, I noted this last night and $I$ didn't read the entire passage, and it -- but certainly the suggestion was made that, at a point in time, that he was in a mental home. I took it to be, as I started with prefacing my question just perhaps in phrasing his question it wasn't stated quite clearly, and I was wanting to clarify for the record that at the time of trial, to this witness' knowledge, there was no suggestion of that, and in fact the early indications would appear that it was about 1972 that he went into the Royal University Hospital.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, those facts are right, but $I$ don't know if Mr. Wolch's suggestion is --

MR. WOLCH: No. I think, Mr. Commissioner,
what $I$ was saying -- and I'm going by memory, I haven't rechecked this -- was that by the time the letters were written to the parole board, -MS. KNOX: Okay.

MR. WOLCH: -- referring to the bathtub incident, that he was in the mental home. MS. KNOX: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.
BY MS. KNOX:
Okay. And perhaps with that clarification, sir, in 1972 when you wrote that first letter, had you received any information from anyone, post-trial and up to June of 1972 , to suggest that Albert Cadrain had begun to experience some mental health problems?

No, that had never come to my attention, neither plus nor minus. In other words I hadn't heard another word about Albert, in my memory, after the trial, Ms. Knox.

So after 1972, if that was the case -- and certainly at some point it was, although Mr. Wolch referenced it in the way he just inscribed it with that intention -- in fact that wasn't information that was in your store of knowledge?

A It absolutely was not.

And in 1974, when you wrote the second letter, I take it from your answer you didn't know that? No. I essentially didn't hear anything more from or about Albert for a lengthy period after the trial.

And so in 1977, when the parole board contacted you again and you told them to refer to your 1972 letter, this wouldn't be information that you had? No, no, I would not have.

And in 1989, when you read the article in the newspaper, $I$ take it this wasn't information that you had, this is information that's come to you as a result of the years between the investigation re-opening with the 690 review in 1990 and this Inquiry?

Yeah, that's right, Ms. Knox.
Okay. Sir, and I, again I'm just going to highlight some of the pieces of information that was -- that were coming to you, some because I found them in a file that you kept so we know they were in your possession, but $I$ next want to bring up a document 004752. This is a document that's previously been referred to in the examination of Ron Wilson, among others, but is the story in the Winnipeg Free Press July 17th, 1990, and in that
story -- and I believe Mr. Hodson may have referred you to this in his direct examination for you -- but in this story two counsel, one in British Columbia, Mr. Watson who was counsel for Mr. Wilson, and Mr. Asper in Regina on behalf of the Milgaard efforts, basically went into a national press release, in effect indicating that they had good evidence that you had misconducted yourself in 1990. And you've reviewed this article and you know they said that they had looked at the transcripts of the trial and that you had not given to Mr. Tallis that first exculpatory statement of Ron Wilson on March 3rd, $1969 ?$

That, that's correct. It appears that Mr., Mr. Asper, as one would expect, was in Winnipeg in the article, but other than that that's -- I agree with you completely.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just a moment. I think probably you just misspoke yourself, but "you had misconducted yourself in 1990", you said?

MS. KNOX: In 1969.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: In 1969 , you're referring to the article in 1990? Thank you.

BY MS. KNOX:
In 1990 it's alleged that in 1969 you acted unethically and contributed, it clearly says contributed to a wrongful conviction, because if Mr. Tallis had had that and he'd been able to use it he could have blown Ron Wilson out of the water.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just refer to the exact reference in the article, if you would, ma'am.

BY MS. KNOX:

Okay. And I'll bring you to the first part of the article, Mr. Caldwell:
"A statement given by a star witness in
the ... Milgaard case that could have discredited his entire testimony appears
to have been withheld from defence
counsel during the 1969 trial, two
lawyers close to the case have charged."

A
Q

A

Q

I see that.
And you see it goes on to refer to that March 3rd,
'69 statement where he denied any knowledge?
I see that now.
And then $I$ 'll skip down to the next part:
"Wilson's first statement stands in
stark contrast with another dated May 23rd, in which he gave ... police officers several important pieces of testimony."

And I'll skip, however, the last part and go to the top. There is reference to the statement given to Paul Henderson in June 1990 where Ron Wilson claimed he was pressured by the police into testifying against Milgaard and in his -and in fact what he told Mr. Henderson, he was pressured into giving these statements; do you recall that evidence?

I -- I do.
Okay. Now all the significant part, here, starts right here:
"The revelation of the first statement has created serious concerns about whether Cal Tallis, Milgaard's lawyer in 1969 and now a Saskatchewan Court of Appeal justice, was ever told of its existence."

It notes that Mr. Tallis, understandably, will not discuss the case, and then goes on:
"David Asper, Milgaard's Winnipeg
lawyer, noted Tallis made no reference
to the first statement in questioning Wilson at either the preliminary hearing or trial."

A
$Q$ to a document 007042 , that being your letter to Mr. Tallis dated August 15th, 1969, and we have seen this a number of times. Your items number 2 and 3 clearly sent to him, in advance of the preliminary inquiry, the March 3rd statement of
I see all that. I -- of course it's clear that he, Mr. Tallis, did get the so-called first statement and if I'm correct, Ms. Knox, actually cross-examined on it as $I$ recall?

Yes, and I'm going to direct you, for the record,


Ron Wilson together with his March (sic) 23rd and March (sic) 24th; --

Yeah, I see that.
-- do you see that?
Yes, I do, and that all happened of course.
And, sir, you've indicated that it's your memory that at the, at the trial it was -- certainly he was cross-examined on it, and again, if you recall, the witness, the cross-examination of Ron Wilson by myself, that was established. More importantly, however, $I$ want to bring up document 071707 . And, sir, I'm not sure that you have seen this, but in looking to find, again, the passages of the transcript of the trial where Ron Wilson testified I located this document.

Mr. Commissioner, I don't know
the authorship of this document, it is in
CaseVault, it comprises a number of pages, but it -- basically what it is, it's a review of the trial transcript of Ron Wilson. The trial transcript itself is document ID 005172 with respect to Mr . Wilson's transcript, and it comprises page 179 to 365 , chronologically, of the transcript of evidence at trial and it's on the basis of that numbering that this chronology
appears to be prepared.
And I'll skip the first parts and go to 071710 , sir, and there is a reference to page 292 of the transcript, and $I$ use it for this reason, because it's the shorthand way to establish on the record. In this chronology it's noted that at page 292 Mr . Wilson is questioned, and this was by, in fact, Mr. Tallis in cross-examination, he was -- that he gave a March $3 r d, \quad 69$ statement to Inspector Riddell and that he made no suggestion that -- or Riddell had made no suggestion to him that he, being Wilson, was a suspect in the Gail Miller murder; do you see that?

I do.
So, clearly, the existence of that March 3rd, '69 statement was not only known to Mr. Tallis, as established in your correspondence, but clearly apparent to anybody who read the transcript at trial?

Yes, and he evidently acted on it the way $I$ see this, Ms. Knox.

Okay. And if we could go down to an entry beyond that in terms of what he canvassed in front of the jury, this summary suggests that it was put to him
in his questioning by Mr. Tallis that when he was talking to Mr. Riddell, being the March 3rd, 1969 reference just two blocks earlier or two points earlier, he told him, being Wilson, no one in the car had anything to do with the terrible thing that happened in Saskatoon, not him or the accused. So, again, you see that during the course of the cross-examination on page 295 this issue was clearly canvassed?

A

Q

Okay. So, Mr. Caldwell, you had knowledge, as the records indicate, that the possession of the transcript of this Inquiry was certainly in the hands of Mr. Asper and others, including

Mr. Watson, at the time this serious, very serious allegation was made against you, more specifically, and to some lesser degree against Mr. Tallis; didn't you?

A
Now sir, continue on, if we could go back to the article 004752. Referring to Mr. Watson, and
there's evidence before the Inquiry through
records that $I$ won't bother to bring up, but a chronology of correspondence between representatives of the Federal Department of Justice to Mr. Watson in preparation for an interview of Mr. Wilson by Eugene Williams where they send material to him, including transcripts and statements?

I see that in this.
And while Mr. Watson hasn't given testimony $I$ assume, and I presume you assume, that the transcripts sent to him were of Ron Wilson's evidence, certainly at trial, and maybe preliminary inquiry?

Yes, that's the only way that paragraph would make sense, because he acted for Wilson, as I recall, at some point.

Yeah. And in fact Mr. Watson says that he is
clearly making this statement to the press after he has got the package because he said he was shocked when he opened the package containing, among other things, the two conflicting statements; do you see that?

Yes I do.
And if we could go to the next column, please. And then to bolster, if $I$ may use that term, what Mr. Asper is saying about you, Mr. Watson took off the mantle and said not only does the first statement lend credibility to his client's recent recantation, it suggests a serious omission in information given to Mr. Tallis.
"'I can see no reason (for the statement to be withheld),' Watson said. 'Any lawyer would have questioned it and it could have been quickly exposed in a court.'"

A

Q So what we have here on July 9th, 1990 in the Winnipeg Free Press, to be picked up by press throughout Canada, is this accusation of misconduct against you by people who indicate they
have the records, they have read the statements, they have read the transcripts -- or Mr. Watson doesn't come right out and say that but certainly Mr. Asper is on record in a number of places saying he has read the transcripts -- and are making this allegation against you?

I see that as well, Ms. Knox.
MR. WOLCH: Mr. Commissioner, just for clarification and in fairness to Mr. Asper, whether Mr. Asper read the preliminary hearing transcript or the trial transcript is something we'll canvass later, but $I$ have heard no mention of any cross-examination at the preliminary hearing on those statements and $I$ wonder if My Friend can set the record straight if there was or was not?

MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, I frankly don't remember. I cross-examined Ron Wilson on it extensively in his evidence here, I have a specific memory of the testimony at trial, and last night my computer froze on me, I couldn't pull up the preliminary transcript or the transcript of the evidence given by Ron Wilson, certainly it's on the record, it's in $J$ folder before this Commission which is the folder in

CaseVault containing the Ron Wilson testimony.
MR. WOLCH: But I think, in fairness to Mr. Asper, it may very well be he read the preliminary hearing transcript and --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I think we're going to hear from him in any event.

MR. WOLCH: No, but if there was no questioning at the preliminary, that's something that will have to be canvassed at this Inquiry. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh yes. MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, I note, I appreciate the concern for Mr . Asper raised, but in light of the language used in this article I don't know the significance of whether it was raised at the preliminary inquiry, they concluded after a brief review of transcript that it wasn't?

MR. HODSON: If you go to the second column, the reference that Asper makes is to the trial, if you go down in the middle column about the sixth paragraph. Right there. No, up one, up two lines.

MS. KNOX: Yes, he does make specific reference in the article, it's inconceivable that, if he had known it, he would have ignored
it at the trial.

MR. HODSON: I will review right now the prelim, $I$ don't know the answer whether he did or didn't, do you know if he did?

MR. WOLCH: No, I don't.
MR. HODSON: I can review the prelim transcript right now and we can clarify it on the record, but maybe you can --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right, thanks. BY MS. KNOX:

Yeah. But that being said -- and I thank you, Mr. Hodson, for the assistance -- clearly Mr. Asper, in the national press, is indicating to all to read and see that he is talking about what happened at the trial; isn't he?

Well Ms. Knox, that very top line we're looking at, perhaps if it could be scrolled down, what $I$ see is:
"... Tallis made no reference to the first statement in questioning Wilson at either the preliminary hearing or trial."
is the way $I$ understood it, but --

Thank you, a good point, Mr. Caldwell. Whether he read the preliminary inquiry transcript or not, he
was -- he stepped forward and went on public record --

A
Uh-huh.
-- saying that it wasn't in the transcripts?
In either of those --
Thank you.
-- things.
So again, sir, did this kind of information, coming forth in the public which you were being called by the media about, examined about, and the world was talking about, the world as you know it in your community; did this in any way cause you to have concern or to formulate your opinion and the -- take the non-action that you did that Mr . Lockyer seems to, or seemed to suggest to you was a bad thing or an inappropriate thing on your part, that you should have stepped in, because of the possibility of an innocent man being convicted, and tried to set the record straight? No, the -- first of all $I$ knew at that time, Ms. Knox, that this was not a correct statement of the facts. I believed I knew what, indeed, had happened in the -- in a broad sense in those proceedings.
that I -- pardon me -- that I felt I, as an individual, could start trying to correct these false news stories that were going out. It was just extremely disturbing to me and people who'd know me, if you will, and I simply -- I just couldn't envision how $I$ could start trying to correct it story by story, line by line, and untruth by untruth. I didn't do a whole lot at that time.

Okay. And sir, without meaning to pry into your personal life or your personal resources, at that point in time, for you to attempt to challenge this, you -- were you able -- in a position where you had access to counsel without going into a personal hardship of paying for it yourself? Yeah, no, this -- at that point $I$ did not have counsel, Ms. Knox, on the enterprise in any, in any fashion.

And did you have the resources that would have allowed you to get drawn into this fray with counsel to represent you to respond to these wrong allegations of misconduct being made by members of the bar in Manitoba and in British Columbia, indeed?

A
No, that would be totally out of the question. I
see this -- it simply couldn't happen in my state at that time.

Okay. The next document that $I$ want to bring up is document number 332361. And, sir, this is another news story found in a file that you kept in 1990, and the headline reads Conflict of interest alleged in Milgaard review, it's a story reported August 30 th, 1990 in the StarPhoenix. And it's an allegation being made that, because you are providing some information and assistance to Mr. Williams about the history of this file and so forth, that you are in a conflict of interest. And in fact I'll point you directly to a paragraph where David Asper and Hersh Wolch charged, it indicates that Mr. Asper and Mr. Wolch charge that Mr. Williams is in a conflict of interest and they are talking about filing a formal complaint to the Minister of Justice, and the statement is made, 'If anybody asks me to illustrate a conflict of interest $I$ could use the example of Caldwell being involved in the investigation of his own case, Asper said. He is clearly biased, how could they involve him.'

And, sir, again having that kind of allegation made about Mr. -- about Mr. Williams
was also making an allegation about you; wasn't it?

A
Q

Okay. If I could bring up the next document, please, 054461 . And, sir, this is another document that was in the, $I$ believe in the public domain in -- as of August 1991, and if $I$ could take you to the clear indications is that this is a document -- if you go to the next page, page 054462 -- that this is a document being prepared on behalf of Mr. Milgaard, maybe with some assistance from him as it quotes from him and makes a reference to putting his photograph in here, and I want to go to page 054464 , please. And it's headed, it's part of this article, A Portrait of a Canadian Injustice, and it's the second question in the article, Unresolved Questions, and again it reads:

```
"Questions remain that seriously
```

undermine the credibility of the
evidence used to convict David ...", Milgaard:
"... raise doubts about police
procedures and investigation practices
... and, point out how additional
victims can be created by the
ineffectiveness of the ...",
justice:
"... system ...",
etcetera. It identifies a number of questions and puts in the number of questions, again number 1:
"Two (2) knives were found at the scene
... one (1) disappeared and was never
brought to Court."
The question is:
"Why?"
A
Q
Yeah.
And Mr. Caldwell, there's been evidence from Mr . -- Mr. Kleiv and Mr. Oliver and others that a knife that was found by Mr. Oliver, Constable Oliver as he was then, late in February '69, was kept -- it was made available to, or knowledge of it was made available to Mr. Tallis, the record
shows he cross-examined the -- Mr. Kleiv on it during the preliminary inquiry, it was available up to the time of trial and presumably, because of a decision made that it was not needed to be used for trial, the records show that it was turned back to Constable Oliver. But was there anything sinister, or any effort made to have a knife disappear, or did a knife disappear and not ever be brought to Court, as this question suggests in the public forum?

A
$Q$

Yes, during project Flicker or project Ferric somebody went to look for it, but in fact there is a clear chronology of that knife, descriptions of it, and Mr. Tallis had ample opportunity to work with it and he certainly didn't impute anything sinister about it. And this is something that's come in recent years, but repeatedly been put in the public media in various ways -Yeah.
-- to confront you or to impute some misconduct to you and others about that knife, isn't it?

A

Q
Yes, that's correct, and that's simply flatly wrong, that paragraph 1.

You've thought ahead of me, my question was was any such wrongdoing engaged in.

I want to go now to the bottom of the page, unresolved question number 10:
"Two woman (Deborah Hall and Ute Frank) who could refute the motel testimony of George Lapchuk and Craig Melnyk were never brought into Court to testify under oath; however, David's accusers were given the opportunity to testify. Why?"

And again, sir, with respect to Ute Frank you
had, had you not, disclosed her statement to Mr . Tallis? 7

A

Q
'm sure I did that.
Sir, to refresh your memory there is a letter to,
that you sent to him after you had interviewed her
and she'd run out of your office -- or before
you'd interviewed her telling him that you had
gotten the statements that you anticipated from
Detective Karst January 19th, 1969 -- sorry --
1970, and you sent over the statements of Lapchuk,
Melnyk, and Ute Frank to him; do you remember that
letter?
Yeah. The one thing, Ms. Knox, is that Ute Frank
is not the person who ran out of my office, that
of course was Nichol John.
Right, thank you for correcting me on that, Ute
Frank was the one who indicated she was not going
to testify?
Absolutely. I got prepared for her, I had notes
made, and she simply stopped and I knew that there
was no point in me getting into -- her into Court
in that state. And, of course, she attempted a
come-back later on in part of the Supreme Court
hearing, --
Right.

A

Q

A
Q
A

Q

A , I'm sure I did, because there'd be a question, "why are we not hearing from Ute Frank", undoubtedly $I$ communicated all that to him.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What's the doc ID on the disclosure, please.

MS. KNOX: On the disclosure letter is 007070 dated January 21st, 1970 to Mr. Tallis, second paragraph, I had Detective Karst go to Regina on January $19 t h$ to interview the people -and here it is -- supposedly involved in the incident, and on January 20 th $I$ received three statements, and I'll just summarize, from the three people. I now enclose a copy of each of those statements for your file.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks.
BY MS. KNOX:
And, sir, the notes that you made reference to
with respect to your interview, if we could bring up doc ID 006298, those are the notes contained in your file from 1970 of your attempt to interview her and apparently you brought the termination of the interview for whatever reason?

Yeah. This, Ms. Knox, would be the sort of guide sheet $I$ intended to use when examining her in chief and a lot of introductory and background material, education, this and that, and then getting down to about three-quarters of the way down the page she just simply was not going to continue with the interview and clearly would not, would not be going to Court and changing that, in other words, being what $I$ thought was truthful about her evidence, so I stopped at that juncture. And, sir, if we could bring up document ID 277584. Sir, this is the statement of Ute Frank taken by Detective Karst January 19th, 1970 which attached presumably to the letter that you sent to Mr. Tallis?

Yeah, it would have been.
And in terms of what information she had given and
the reason why she was brought from Regina, I
direct you -- well, number 1, she confirmed the party that Melnyk and Lapchuk were talking about
that Ron Wilson said they told him it happened in the motel didn't she?

A
Q

That she was having sexual relations in the room while the others were there with Mr. Milgaard, Hoppie she referred to him as?

Yes, that's correct.
And she indicated she was quite stoned, wasn't aware of what was going on around her, she was
statement, she talked about the fact that they
were doing drugs?
That's correct.
That she was having sexual relations in the room
while the others were there with Mr. Milgaard,
Hoppie she referred to him as?

## -

hallucinating quite a bit, but the important piece from the point of view of what information you had available, $I$ recall asking Hoppie if he had killed that nurse they were talking about, which would confirm her remembering the news had come on and it was a subject of discussion in the room at least, and he just looked at me and smiled, so she didn't report the conversation in verbatim of what Melnyk and Lapchuk said, but certainly in January of 1970 she confirmed that the event had taken place, and at least the bare bones of it, if $I$ could use that phrase?

A That's right, Ms. Knox.
Now, sir, if we could go back to question number 10 in document 054464 , that number 10 also refers to Deborah Harris -- Deborah Hall who could refute the testimony of Craig Melnyk and George Lapchuk and says she was never brought to Court to testify. Was it your information, or do you remember the information being given to you, which has subsequently been confirmed by Deborah Hall, that in fact she was not in the province in January of 1970?

A
That's correct, and as you say, that has since been confirmed.

That in fact what appears to be the case, and $I$ mean no disrespect to her, she was 16 years old, she could probably best be described as a run-away at that time?

That's how I would take it.
Okay. So in fact in response to that question, if you had been asked it, the answer would be, as to why she was never brought into Court to testify under oath, was that she wasn't around to do it? That's how $I$ recall the facts at the time. Okay. Now, sir, with respect to Deborah Hall, you've become aware through the passage of time of how or what Deborah Hall has said about what happened in the motel room that night, and presumably we can extrapolate from that what she would have said had she been called to give evidence in 1970. Do you recall that in a 1981 interview with Chris O'Brien, which is doc ID 178010, where she's in a room, she's going through a transcript that he's giving her of trial testimony of Craig Melnyk and George Lapchuk, that if $I$ can do a quick shorthand summary of what she's saying to Mr. O'Brien at that time, she's saying they are big fat liars, that never happened, $I$ can't believe they said that, and I
won't take you to any part of it, one would have to read the whole of it because it's interspersing parts of what they said in their evidence with what she's saying to Mr. O'Brien, but summarily, and what she's testified to here, she told Mr. O'Brien, who was working for Mrs. Milgaard or working with Mrs. Milgaard, that these young men had lied in 1970?

A
$Q$

A
Q

That's correct. We looked at this document earlier $I$ think in the hearing.

And you were familiar with and you were made aware, as this matter was unfolding, of an affidavit she gave in the 690 application, or 617 as the code was then, that was filed in the Supreme Court of Canada, and I refer to doc ID 026356. Are you familiar with this? You've reviewed it with me?

I have.
And, sir, you are aware that the essence of what she gave in her affidavit that was filed in Supreme Court of Canada, and if we could go to page 026361, it's found at page 5, and it is this paragraph that I've just drawn the parameters around, she says I remember seeing news pictures of the Gail Miller murder on television but
couldn't hear what was being said. Everybody in the room was chattering -- and I'm going to skip little bits of it, but not lose the essence -'Craig Melnyk said to David Milgaard, 'You did that, didn't you?' As Craig was saying this, David was punching a pillow trying to fluff it up. I remember him saying, in response to Craig Melnyk, 'oh yeah right' in a sarcastic or joking manner. David Milgaard then put the pillow back against the head-board, leaned back, crossed his arms against his chest. I believe his response to the comment made was in a joking manner. At no time did he use the pillow to reenact the murder. My interpretation of David Milgaard's response was that it was completely innocent and perhaps crudely comical. I know that if $I$ had thought he was serious $I$ would have left immediately. No one in the room thought anything of the conversation,' and then she goes on to say:

> "Craig Melnyk and George Lapchuk both
> lied when they stated in their evidence
> that David reenacted the murder by going
> through a series of stabbing motions
> against the pillow."
> That essentially was what she said in $1986--$

I see that.
-- in a sworn affidavit?
I see that.

Now, sir, again in terms of how you were responding as to the bona fides of the suggestion that David Milgaard was an innocent man and whether you should have jumped on the band wagon, you became aware that Deborah Hall's evidence in this regard became substantially enhanced in 1989 when she was examined by Eugene Williams as part of the 690 application didn't you?

Yes, I did.
And, sir, I refer us to document ID 001285 , the transcript of a November 6, 1989 interview with Deborah Hall --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Interview by whom? MS. KNOX: Eugene Williams. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right.

BY MS. KNOX:
If we can go to the next page, 286 , perhaps that will make it clear. Eugene Williams was present, Deborah Hall and a court reporter in Regina were the persons present during this interview, for the record, and, sir, if we could skip to page 001313 in terms of the examination of Ms. Hall as to the
information contained in the affidavit filed as part of the application, and go to question 183, Mr. Williams directs her to her affidavit material that David Milgaard was fluffing up a pillow in what had been described as, by others untruthfully, as a reenactment of the murder. Do you see that question?

I do.
Now, sir, if we could skip to, and I'll have you look at page 001320, and in the ensuing pages there is a continuing examination by Mr. Williams of the content of her affidavit and at question 238, contrary to, or expanding on what's in her affidavit, as the questioning goes on Miss Hall says -- Mr. Williams started to question:
"Q You, at that time --"
And she interceded with:
"A I thought he was a bit sick for his remark, you know, because he said something - excuse my language but I remember it as such - "fucking her brains, oh, yeah, right. I stabbed her I don't know how many times and then $I$ fucked her brains out. Right." You know, something like that in that
respect. It was crude; it was crude and it was, you know, sarcastic."

And Mr. Williams says:
"Q That is your recollection of what Milgaard said?"

And she said yes. And then he says:
"Q Notwithstanding what you heard, you viewed that as just an innocent example of a young man's crudity?"

And she said:
"A Yeah, and being silly and stoned."
And then:
"Q Now, you're certain today of your recall
of those words from Milgaard "I fucked
her and I stabbed her"?"
And she says in answer:
"A It was something quite crude like that."
A
$Q$

A
Q
Sir, again, number 1 , if a statement had been taken from Deborah Hall in 1970 and she had said in her statement what she said in the interview
with Eugene Williams in 1989 as to what David Milgaard had said in that room, but the only variation from Craig Melnyk and George Lapchuk being that she thought it was a sarcastic response as -- or a joking response as opposed to their perception that it was a kind of a scary response --

Yeah.
-- would you have looked at and possibly put her on the stand at the trial?

Yeah, I would. The first ingredient of course is that we had her available, which we didn't, but if she was physically in Saskatchewan, in Regina or in Saskatoon, I would have called her, I would have notified Mr. Tallis, and the fact that her statement, as $I$ would have then understood it, would be slightly different from Melnyk and/or Lapchuk, would not act to prevent me calling her. I would feel I would have to call all the, what appeared to be credible witnesses at that time. But, Mr. Caldwell, if you can take your mind back to 1979 and your role and task as the prosecutor, what Deborah Hall would have done in 1970 would have been to corroborate what the two boys said, Melnyk and Lapchuk, what Ute Frank gave in much
less detail, and which Ute Frank had sort of given a very limited amount of, but clearly she would have corroborated what -- that the incident had taken place, that that rather unfortunate language had been used and, believing as you believed at the time, David Milgaard had killed Gail Miller, that would have been of substantial significance left to the jury to decide if she said then that she thought it was only a joke, what weight they would give to it?

A
$Q$

That would be exactly how one would have to handle it, you would have to call her and get her evidence out, and of course differences between these witnesses are things the jury has to sort out as they do reviewing any one incident, Ms. Knox, is the way $I$ would describe it.

Okay. And, sir, we've talked a lot, and I, like others, and last week you were questioned by Mr . Wolch about whether you were concerned enough, afraid enough or careful enough about Craig Melnyk and George Lapchuk giving evidence because of their criminal past and their pending charges, and he suggested to you that somehow because you hadn't directed your mind to the possibility they might be influenced by the hope of reward or
favour, that you had done something wrong or put damaging evidence before the Court, but whatever those young men might have hoped for in their own minds, unbeknownst to you in 1970, if we look at what Ute Frank said and what Deborah Hall has said, that in fact those boys weren't lying to the jury when they said the motel reenactment had occurred?

That's correct.
They weren't lying when they said that David Milgaard had engaged in certain motions that they described as stabbing motions with a pillow, but they might have had Deborah Hall saying well no, he really wasn't stabbing the pillow, he was just fluffing it up?

That's quite right.
And they would have had the serious versus the joking, but when all is said and done, despite everything that has been said about them and the suggestion that you dropped the ball because they were rounders who had something to gain, they gave factually, it appears, if we listen to Deborah Hall in 1989 and subsequently as she's testified in Supreme Court of Canada and in these proceedings, that what those boys said in 1979 is
what happened in the hotel room, subject to one's interpretation of his intent and his physical actions, be they hand going up and down, or as was seen in the Fifth Estate, taking the pillow by the side and pushing it back and forth versus up and down --

Yeah.
-- the motions that were in issue here?
That's exactly how $I$ would describe it, Ms. Knox. With any two, three or four witnesses there are inevitably differences in detail. Had I had all four of them, (a), available, and (b), willing to testify, in the case of Frank, I would have called them, and then a jury, as with every other factual issue, would have to decide who they believed and what they believed.

Okay. Sir, if we could go to the next page of that article, "A Portrait of Canadian Justice" at 054465, number 11 talks about the slash wounds, evidence that they were inflicted and most likely caused by a right-handed person, David is left-handed, why was that fact not explored by the police and the Crown prosecutor, T.D.R. Caldwell. Mr. Caldwell, you did in fact, or this issue was addressed in the trial wasn't it?

Sir, there's number 14, and I'm not going to take any time to go there because $I$ still haven't figured out human semen and dog urine, but you became aware of information that was put in the public press that the evidence with respect to human semen being found in the snow was actually dog urine as determined by forensic specialists who we'll hear from, Dr. Ferris and Dr.

Markesteyn?
That's my recollection.
Okay. Now, at this point in time, in 1969, '70 when you were relying on -- doing the trial, were you relying on the expertise of your experts, Mr. Paynter or Mr. Penkala and others?

That's correct, Dr. Emson, Mr. Paynter and any people in the investigative process who could shed light on that $I$ would say.

Okay. And, sir, again in terms of the suggestion
by Mr. Lockyer as to whether or not somehow you failed in that you didn't come forward and try to find out the truth when it was being put forth that Mr. Milgaard was innocent in 1990, '91, did you subsequently come to learn that the opinion that this was dog urine was revised and likely in error, and I'm stating that in a shorthand way, I'm sure we'll hear much more about it -Okay.
-- but certainly there was forensic information to suggest that Mr. Paynter had checked and that this wasn't dog urine, it was human semen back in $1969-170 ?$

That's correct, Ms. Knox, and I think in the fullness of time, if I'm not mistaken, the gentleman who gave that opinion retracted it based on having more and better information.

Okay. But, sir, again in terms of your assessment or your participation in the campaign on behalf of Mr. Milgaard, would this have been a factor that influenced your perception of the bona fides? No, it would not.

Sir, the next document that you are familiar with, and that I'll refresh your memory on, is document ID 026935. This is a letter sent to Robert

Mitchell on April 20th, 1992 by Mr. Wolch, and I draw your attention to it because, if we can, and this is basically a letter written after the Supreme Court of Canada ruling where the Supreme Court of Canada made the statement that it was their perception based on the hearing that was the reference hearing that there had been a fair trial, that disclosure was proper in accordance with the standards of the day and so forth, a decision that you took some comfort from I believe?

A
Q
Oh, absolutely.
Okay. I want to direct you to page 026937 . You earned yourself a specific three paragraphs in that letter in which it was essentially, if $I$ can summarize what you are being accused of at this point in time to the then Minister of Justice, Mr. Mitchell, is having knowledge about the Larry Fisher tie to and possible involvement in the death of Gail Miller in 1971 and being quite complicit in covering up --

That's the gist of it $I$ take it.
-- in these first two paragraphs, and then of course there's the area that has been canvassed with you at length by him and by me yesterday

regarding your letters to the parole board?
A
$Q$
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Particularly Mr. Wolch said to Mr. Mitchell, the minister, that in those letters there were anecdotes from unnamed social workers, stories from a mentally ill Albert Cadrain and references to non-existent psychiatric records which were clearly prejudicial and irresponsible and, in the absence of the ability to respond, extremely damaging. Sir, again we canvassed this yesterday, but when you wrote those letters you were relying
on existing psychiatric records?

A
$Q$

A
That's correct.
Anecdotes from named social workers I take it?
Yeah. The unnamed social worker, Ms. Knox, could very well be the document which ended up with the phrase 'I think some day he will kill someone, but of course this is just a stab in the dark,' that, as we know at this point, hasn't resurfaced, but $I$ read that document.

And in 1972 when you wrote the letters, you were aware as a result of a communication from Dr. McDonald five days earlier, June 5th, 1972, that those records were in existence?

Oh, yes.
He invited you to invite the parole board to get them?

That's correct.
So you weren't relying on non-existent, when you wrote your letters you knew the records existed, although you hadn't looked at them in some time, you told that to the parole board and you persisted up to 1977 inviting them to go and get the records for themselves didn't you?

That's correct.
And that would have been clear to Mr. Wolch based
on the correspondence that they had from the National Parole Board?

A

Q

A

2
A

Q

A

I would assume it would have to be clear. The mentally ill Albert Cadrain, to the extent that there's something to support that, of course, was a situation that prevailed substantially after the end of the trial and prelim when he gave his evidence.

Okay. But certainly not in 1972 when you wrote the letter to the parole board, 1974 and 1977, information that was within your purview? No, no, quite so. Okay.

And I think I mentioned that I essentially heard nothing either from or of Albert post trial, if you will.

But to take you back to the fact of the writing of this letter in 1992 to the Minister of Justice, post the Supreme Court of Canada, would it be fair to say that this, in this forum and others, bolstered or kept you in a position where you were continuing to be in, professionally and personally accused of ongoing misconduct from 1970 -- '69, '70, '71? Absolutely.

Okay. Sir, the next document $I$ want to go to is document 162466 and, sir, this is a covering letter from Mr. Asper and it sets out a draft news release. I'm not sure that -- I couldn't lay my hands on the actual news release, but it, if we go to page 162467 , it essentially goes through some of the history of developments between April 16th, 1992 when the Supreme Court of Canada was, decision was released, and September 9th, 1992, which is the date of Mr. Asper's letter, and if we could go to the next page, please, again intended to be put out, and subsequently at various points put out in the public forum, you will see the, an allegation of misconduct against you, that you ordered released an exhibit, a knife, that was mysteriously missing at the time of trial when in fact it was, Constable Oliver was there and Sergeant Kleiv was there, the knife was there and in fact returned to him to take back to the police station, according to the records, January 28 th, 1970, so certainly not mysteriously missing?

No, not in any sense of the word.
And certainly nothing about this that would be factually accurate from your perception because it clearly imputes wrong -- misconduct to you?

And again, was this the kind of information post the Supreme Court of Canada, post the relief that you got, temporarily from the decision that continued to cause you concern and might have influenced the actions that you took or didn't act, or didn't take as suggested to you by Mr. Lockyer?

It -- I'm not sure, can you --
Reminding you -- maybe you haven't spent as much time thinking about this as $I$ have, but it was suggested to you that somehow the fact that you didn't step forward and become engaged in investigating with the Milgaards or on behalf of the Milgaards the suggestion that David had been wrongfully convicted was somehow a negative action on your part as, if I'm summarizing Mr. Lockyer correctly is where $I$ was going -- and I see that Mr. Wolch is standing.

MR. WOLCH: Mr. Commissioner, the witness has been asked before to comment on documents that he has never seen and then being asked to comment on how he would have reacted or how he did react to a document with that suggestion even though he hasn't seen it, and I've been patient a
bit because My Friend, to use that term cherry pick, here's allegation 2 out of 16 , comment on that one, or whatever, I've been kind of patient, but now we have a draft release that My Friend acknowledges never even went out.

MS. KNOX: If you bear with me for a moment I'll get there.

MR. WOLCH: Well, then why are we asking him to comment for the third time on the second knife in a draft release that he couldn't possibly have seen to influence his conduct? If there is one in the public domain, again, that we have to go through, let's do it, but to start with a draft release $I$ don't think is an appropriate use of our time.

BY MS. KNOX:

Q
And -- I take Mr. Wolch's point in that regard. I'll try to stick to what $I$ can clearly show today was in the public domain. On that note, sir, if $I$ could have brought up document 004204 , this is a fax from Murray Brown that went to Eugene Williams, which is not as significant from your point of view as the next page, 204205 , which was the document that Mr. Wilson referred you to during
the course of his examination, and this is the transcription of a press conference that was done by Mr. Milgaard, Mrs. Milgaard and Mr. Wolch in September, September 19th, 1992 you'll see?

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
0
I see that, ma'am.
And, sir, this is a press conference that was done
where the allegations were made that Mr. Wilson
canvassed with you about Mr. Romanow, Mr. Lysyk,
if I've got that pronunciation right, --
Huh U.
-- Mr. Kujawa, and in that press release it
referred to other senior government officials.
Within the Province of Saskatchewan, were you the
clearly-identified prosecutor in respect of this
file, the representative of the government, as it
were, with respect to the prosecution and
conviction of Mr. Milgaard?
Yeah, that would have to be known to the public,
clearly, --
Now the --
-- Ms. Knox.
Now, Mr. Caldwell, you were aware of this press
conference, --
Yeah.
-- it got great wide play in Saskatchewan, didn't
it --
I ab --
-- because, again, it imputed misconduct
post-Supreme Court of Canada?
I absolutely recall it. When it hit the airways and papers $I$ was absolutely dismayed by it because I couldn't believe that the allegations therein could be true, but clearly they needed to be followed up, the ones that didn't directly accuse me that is, the Regina part of the matter.

But certainly it dealt with your file, going from your hands to Mr. Kujawa, and making people -- or officials in the prosecution making the connection between Fisher and Milgaard, and making -- or apparently having meetings behind closed doors for what was imputed to be clearly sinister purposes --

Yeah.
-- that needed to be investigated?
That's exactly how $I$ took it.
Okay. And, sir, it was as a result of this press release in September 1992, wasn't it, that you became under investigation by the RCMP, eventually gave what we have before us in the audio tape, a cautioned statement, --

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q

A

Uh-huh.
-- because there were clear, serious and pointed allegations of misconduct being made by -- about you related to this? This, in fact, was what triggered the review where the Alberta Justice was brought in to do an independent opinion after the RCMP had done an investigation, because these, indeed, were extremely serious --

Yeah.
-- allegations, they weren't about mistakes, they were about conspiracy, collusion, deliberate coverup; weren't they?

That's correct, Ms. Knox, and if my memory is correct $I$ believe my statement in that respect has been reviewed in our Inquiry here, if I'm not mistaken.

Yes, it has, sir.
Yeah, that's good.
And perhaps the best thing for me, best place for me to go in light of Mr. Wolch's caution, which I take as appropriate in fact, is to document number 061236. Sir, this is a letter written by Inspector Sawatzky to Mr. Halyk of our firm regarding you, it's dated the 11th of May, 1993? I see that.

A
Q

And you retained counsel, did you not, not in 1992 when these serious allegations were made in that press conference about conspiracy, collusion, and deliberate wrongdoing which could be proven by Milgaards based on information that they had received from a former employee of the Department of Justice, it wasn't then that you got counsel, it wasn't until May 19 -- March 1993 when you were sued civilly?

That's correct.
And, sir, at that point in time, when a civil suit was launched, you were able to avail of resources available through your Law Society insurance, and ultimately through your former employer, to get counsel for the first time; is that correct? That's correct, Ms. Knox.

Sir, in this letter, is it correct that this letter was directed because, as your counsel, Mr. Halyk wanted to know what it was that you were being accused of before you engaged in a cautioned statement with the police? Okay. And, sir, $I$ won't review all of these but I -- I'll go through some of them. Paragraph number 1 , paragraph number 2 , are just some
background as to the role that the RCMP are playing and why they want to talk to you. Number 3 :
"In more specific terms, it is alleged that Mr. Caldwell obstructed justice by withholding evidence. Outlined below are the allegations and/or areas of concern we wish to have Mr. Caldwell address during our interview."

And if $I$ could just for a moment go to the last page, 061239 , to place a frame of reference around the allegations, some of which I will canvass with you, Inspector Sawatzky wrote in his letter these allegations that he has gone through over the previous three pages are derived from meetings we had with Mr. Wolch, Mrs. Milgaard, and Mr. Milgaard?

A

Q

A

I see that.
This is your understanding of where these allegations of obstruction of justice were coming from in respect of you, obstruction of justice of course being a criminal offence apart from and separate from any ethical issues that it may engage for you as a member of the bar? That's right, Ms. Knox.

Q
Number -- if I could go back to 061236, the first, 3 a) the police reports in the Miller murder file link the Miller murder to the sexual assaults being committed, Mr. Caldwell had available all police reports and files and, I quote:
"... was well aware that ... police saw similarities between the rapes and the . . ."

Gail Miller:
"... murder ...";
that was one of the allegations?
That's correct.
Go to page, the next page, please; that in that vein you had knowledge of Larry Fisher being apprehended for several of these sexual assaults, that -- and that that knowledge was suppressed by Mr. Caldwell so as not to arouse a concern that Fisher may have killed Miller?

That was an allegation that had been, in roundabout ways, put out many times, but clearly captured here by Inspector Sawatzky for you to be confronted with?

That's correct.
Thank you. I'll skip the next one. And the one

I see that.

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
after that, an allegation that a victim by the name of (V4)--- was attacked and police reports revealed the police assumed the same person that murdered Miller attacked the victim, this offence committed by Fisher was not disclosed to the defence; did you have any police reports in your file that showed that the police assumed, during the course of your prosecution of David Milgaard, that the same person who attacked (V4)---- (V4)--had killed Gail Miller?

A
Q

A
$Q$

A
Q
A
$Q$

No I did not.
And sir, just on that note, in your extension of opportunities to review the file $I$ don't think I've asked you, but when you let Gary Young review the file in '81, Peter Carlyle-Gordge review the file in 883 , the (V4)---- (V4)--- statement was on it; wasn't it?

It must have been, ma'am.
And all of those other women, (V6)-, (V11)--, (V9)----; those statements were in those -- in your file --

Yeah.
-- 1981-1983?
That's right.
Okay. And b), if we could go to b), and this has
been dealt with, a minor point, that you failed to disclose the identity of two witnesses, Mr. and Mrs. Merriman, who were in or had a view of the alley. The evidence through that investigation and this Inquiry establishes you had the reference to Mrs. Merriman, you didn't have the reference to Mr. Merriman?

That's correct.
MR. WOLCH: Sorry, Mr. Commissioner, I have to rise again, $I$ don't mean to, but My Friend should be careful in describing evidence or giving evidence herself. To say that the Merrimans were a minor point when they would be the people at the exact location where the offence occurred is hardly an apt comment to come from counsel as a minor point, that people of that significance weren't disclosed. That's a matter for argument at some point in time, but it shouldn't be led to the witness that this is a minor point, it's said to -MS. KNOX: And, again, I take Mr. Wolch's caution, I didn't mean to minimize the importance of it for purposes or argument.

BY MS. KNOX:
$Q$
But in -- and I think my reference to 'minor' was
that there was a single passage in your file in a report that made reference to Mrs. Merriman, that was the only part of the police file that contained that entry, albeit it turned out to be significant?

That's how $I$ recall it exactly, Ms. Knox.
So I stand corrected on the inappropriateness of the 'minor' phraseology.

Sir, in c) it's -- there is a
reference to Mr. Rasmussen's evidence;
Mr. Rasmussen was called to give evidence?
That's right.
And it was opened to have evidence led with respect to him, and $I$ believe you said if he didn't say he saw it then you would take that the jury would conclude he didn't see it, --

A
Q
A Yeah.
-- but again --
No, that's exactly what $I$ said earlier in the Inquiry, that if Mr. Rasmussen says he didn't see something, that's a presumption in favour, if you will, of the accused, because that's evidence that there was nothing. Someone wanted to pursue it and cross-examine, that would be another situation, but his evidence of not seeing (a)
blood or (b) unusual behaviour was all in favour of the accused, as $I$ read it.
$Q$
Okay. I'm gonna skip some of them, we've canvassed them, and go to f) in the list; non-disclosure of evidence that Rasmussen, John, Danchuk and Sharon Williams did not see blood on Milgaard's clothes. Again, clearly apparent on the transcript of evidence was that Mr. Rasmussen testified at preliminary inquiry and trial, -That's right. -- the Danchuks testified and said they didn't see blood, their statements were disclosed to Mr. Tallis, but that evidence was put before the jury? Yeah, that's all correct.

And Sharon Williams, in fact, didn't see David Milgaard until after he got to St. Albert two days later and after you had evidence that he changed his clothes at the Cadrain house two days earlier? That is how $I$ recall the sequence of events. Okay. So her not disclosing that she didn't see it would -- there'd be no opportunity for her to have seen it?

A That's right, and evidently we were talking about a different set of clothing at that point, as $I$ read this.

Okay. Sir, g) Mr. Caldwell failed to disclose certain facts and Simon Doell's evidence concerning the bus used by Miller, if we could go there for a moment. We've reviewed the report, you remember -- the police report -- you will remember the references to Mr. Doell, Mr. Doell in fact said that she used the bus at Avenue $N$; didn't he?

That's what $I$ recall, as we went on, was that it was somewhat ironic because if $I$ had disclosed his evidence or called him he would have been another person giving evidence supportive of the Avenue N theory, as we've come to call it, so --

Yeah, but in fact, if that evidence had been proffered by you, --

Yeah.
-- it would have been to support the theory that you were more inclined to lean towards, that she went to the bus at Avenue N?

Exactly, right.
Yeah, so exculpatory versus inculpatory. So h), if we can go to the next page, please, to h) that the prosecution file is incomplete, various material from the file has been destroyed, what about the "C" file - yellow file folders purported
to have been used, did that exist and so on. Now your evidence is clear that your file is not incomplete, you kept everything that you had?

A
$Q$

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

A
That's -- that's correct.

And I believe Mr. Hodson asked you and you don't know what this $C$ file thing is about, you never used yellow folders?

That -- both of those are correct.
i) I'll just highlight, but that's referencing the script document?

Okay, I'm sorry, letter i)? Yeah, I see that.
Yeah, basically indicating that you have possession of a very troubling document, noting that you denied seeing it, and it's here that it's -- it was alleged it confirms the allegation by Mr. Wolch, and in fairness to him there were two others from his office present when he was interviewed by Inspector Sawatzky, Mr. Bruce and Mr. Rodin I think, --Uh-huh.
-- so I'm not sure which one of them in the interview actually said that there were file markings indicating it was received and filed at Crown counsel's office, but you are clear --Uh-huh.

Q

A

Q
-- that it was not seen by you and you've never seen a copy with markings on it to suggest that it was?

Both of those are absolutely correct.
Okay. I want to go off on a little bit of a tangent on that point just for a moment. In the allegation with respect to file markings, if we could bring up script document 006799 as one that we'll use, the file there in the interview done with the RCMP of Mr. Wolch and others that gave rise to these allegations, the markings that were talked about were these page numbers that appear on the side. At some point in time, we'll hear in particular there is a statement number 9, and it was the allegation to the RCMP that these were the markings that meant that you had to have it in your possession; do you see that?

The -- that left-hand column of --
Yeah?
-- numbers and names?
Uh-huh, names and numbers.
I see, I see the column.
Okay. And but these are the only numbers and so forth that appear, and when these numbers -- were these numbers created by you?

A
Q

A

Q
A
$Q$
A

Q
 ,

A
2

A

2
No, absolutely not.
These statement numbers, were these numbers assigned by you to the police statement, or were they on them when they came to you?

I didn't create them and unless, unless these fall
into the category that there was some determination later, $I$ think, that Sergeant Mackie
had done, had done something with a numbering
scheme, --
Right.
-- if that's --
And we have evidence in that regard.
Yeah. But $I$ don't know anything about them in this form, ma'am.

But these numbers, if that's what's being referred to in the allegation --

Yeah.
-- as the way to know that you had seen the file because it had markings on it --

Yeah.
-- that would have been put on it by you, these
have no bearing or reference to any numbering
system that you used except insofar as it was on
the file materials --
A
Yeah.
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q
A

Q

A
$Q$
,
-- that you received from Saskatoon Police Service; right?

That's right. That's the maximum you could give to it.

Okay. And sir, just continuing on -- and we'll skip the parole board one, we have been there a number of times -- if $I$ could go back to 061238, please. In terms of allegations, I'll just skip a number of them, they have been canvassed. The 1 l) there is the question about whether you provided the materials that were used by Mr. Romanow, Mr. Kujawa, Mr. Lysyk and others when they had the supposed closed-door meetings that were indicative of conspiracy, collusion, and so forth?
都

A Yeah.
$Q$
allegations that were put in the record that generated this police investigation were based on information, or that could have been checked, was clearly wrong. Mr. Breckenridge said that he used to bring the files to those meetings in 1971, and subsequent investigation, as this document indicates, where he wasn't even working there in 1971, he only went there in October 1973?

That's what $I$ learned in due course, Ms. Knox, through this investigation, so --

Unless and until that information was put out there would it be fair to say that the dismay that you felt when that press conference was done and you were, you with others were accused of serious criminal misconduct, continued to plague in your community and to affect you in your life?

A Well, it certainly did. I -- the -- the accusations of this conspiracy in Regina between the Attorney General, the Deputy Attorney General, the Head of Public Prosecutions, was such a shocking accusation that $I$ absolutely, you know, reeled back from it. I didn't believe it could be true, but I -- I was absolutely stunned by it when it happened, and of course somewhere down the way, of course, it would be a reflection on myself,
obviously.
Okay. And it did take a number of months for that police investigation to be completed and a report to be released that exonerated you of these many allegations that were made against you, in part based on what turned out to be al -- information from somebody who wasn't even working in the Department of Justice head office at the time? That's right, Ms. Knox.

Okay. Sir, the next big event, apart from your participation and being under suspicion of criminal misconduct, in your life and its impact on you would have come, I take it, when you were sued personally?

That's correct.
And again, sir, can you indicate how it affected you when it was made public that you were being sued personally, and the theory that you had colluded, conspired, and done all kinds of awful things that resulted in an innocent man being convicted for murder impacted on you with your family and in your community, if $I$ may?

A
It was another, you know, very serious blow in the series that did happen to me, and of course the press were all over it and got to a stage where,
in our two-storey house, I would call down the stairs to my wife and say "how does the paper look this morning", and she would often reply "terrible".

I am quite conscious of a number of friends and acquaintances, not extremely close friends but people I'd known over the years in the city, who very clearly looked at me askance or avoided me completely after that for some period of time, and it was a thing that would, even though we got legal counsel, was extremely difficult to cope with for me and my family, Ms. Knox.

Okay. Sir, as a practicing member of the bar, all of your years of work had been in public service; hadn't they?

A
That's right.
And as a practicing member of the bar, and as a member of the community, was your personal reputation and your integrity an important, perhaps the most important thing that you walked away from your career with?

A
Yeah, that's what $I$ have come to learn, $I$ think through this Inquiry, in fact everyone's career comes to an end eventually. The one thing which
is irreplaceable is to come away from that, whenever it happens, with the respect of your peers and with your integrity intact. That, that's the one factor, when everything else such as salary and this, that, and the other is gone, that's -- I have now learned, of course, is of great -- is of the utmost importance in every respect.

Okay. Sir, I just have a couple of more items to canvass in this regard, and it's almost time for coffee, $I$ think $I$ can finish them fairly quickly. I want to refer you to an article that appeared in the StarPhoenix March 31st, 1993, I don't have a doc. ID, I have the original, $I$ did give it to the staff this morning so that they could find it, it's in the database. Sir, this is a newspaper story $I$ pulled from your Civil litigation file within our office and the markings that appear beside it are mine.

Okay.
If we could just go back for a minute, I handwrote the date on it as well, March 31st, 1993, it was put up by my office at the bottom when it was collected. But this is, again, a news conference that you became aware of because it was very much
front and centre in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan on March 31st, 1993 when you were sued civilly? Yes, that's so.

And it's quoting David Milgaard, and it basically says he is renewing his pitch for a public inquiry, the provincial government refuses to act, and then it says, 'In a news conference here Tuesday, Milgaard said the lawsuit he launched on Monday against saskatchewan prosecutors and detectives in this case will force everyone involved to be accountable for their actions.'

I see that.

And he is quoted as saying, 'That means the people will have to answer. They will be forced to answer now to all the different things they have lied about and all the different things that are evidence against them. And they are dead. That's how strong this claim is, it's that solid, Milgaard said. He also said that, by launching a civil suit, he will spark renewed interest in his case.'

And, sir, one of the people he was talking about there was you?

A
Absolutely.
Okay. And how did that affect you in terms of,
again, reading this assault on your integrity on this date, post the Supreme Court of Canada decision as to your conduct in the trial? It -- it again was -- had a cumulative effect. After all the other accusations had been made and essentially piled one on the other it was going to be another, beginning of another long and arduous process, because we're now into a civil action is how $I$-- how it affected me at that time, ma'am. Okay. And this civil suit continued to hang over your head until the $20 t h$, or actually the 25 th of May, 1999 --

That's correct.
-- when the notice of discontinuance was filed in the Saskatchewan Court of Queen's Bench? Again, Mr. Commissioner, $I$ don't have a doc. ID, I have an original with the Queen's Bench stamp as to when it was filed.

And, sir, Mr. Hodson referred you to a book that was done by Mrs. Milgaard, document number 269317 , and $I$ have a copy of the book in my hand.

I know it's in CaseVault but $I$ have the physical volume in my hand.

A Okay.
Q
You became aware of allegations made in this booklet about you and assertions that you had engaged in misconduct, deliberate misconduct, leading to the wrongful conviction of her son; -I did --
-- did you not?
A
Q

A
$Q$
I did, I did become aware of that.
And again in that vein this continues to be out there, a troubling public document, I suppose, from your point of view?

Absolutely.
And before we take the coffee break, if $I$ could bring up 332039, and this is the press release that was given with you and on your behalf in 1997
after you learned of the terrible -- or got the terrible confirmation that a wrongful conviction had occurred and extended your apology. You've been quizzed about this by Mr. Lockyer in particular and said "well, even though you were sorry, you didn't really mean it". I want to direct you again to paragraph -- or to the next page, the paragraph that $I$ have circled. Sir, in 1997 when you learned that you had been wrong, you and others had been wrong and that a miscarriage
of justice had occurred, you stepped up to the plate and you too asked for a public inquiry; didn't you?

A That's correct, Mr. Kujawa and myself did that, and that's set out in this paragraph.

Whatever you may have done by oversight or otherwise, you were quite prepared to have the light of public review cast on it by an objective forum, in fact you wanted that because of the -and was that, in part, because of the many wrong allegations that had been put out over the many years about you and how you had acted in respect of this file?

That certainly was the final sentence:
"We ask that this decision by him be one that includes an instruction that the inquiry be held as soon as is practicably possible."

And of course, with all the massive incorrect information that was afloat over all those years, a public inquiry certainly would be the, in my estimation, the only way to follow the thing through and get down to, you know, truthful evidence, and that's where we are, getting there, today.

Q

A
$Q$

BY MS. KNOX:

Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. Mr. Caldwell, I had gone through with you this morning and a little bit yesterday a number of, and skipped to the more significant of the allegations made against you that put, attack upon your personal integrity, your professional integrity, and $I$ neglected to refer you to a document, 00707 -- sorry, no, I'm looking at the wrong number. 332331, if we can have that brought up. Thank you. Sir -- and the cover page on this is a fax cover sheet to Mr. Eugene Williams from you, so clearly a document that in, on August 22nd, 1991, fax cover sheet is 332322 for the record, but clearly a document or an allegation that you became aware of on or about August 21st, 1991, of course you sent
it to Mr. Williams, and do you recall the allegation or reading in your local paper that a Winnipeg lawyer, whose firm represents David Milgaard, says that the prosecution may have paid two key witnesses for their testimony during the Milgaard 1970 murder trial of nursing assistant Gail Miller?

I do recall that and I see that article here. If $I$ could go back to the side, referring to this part here, and in the article it said in an April letter to Justice Minister Kim Campbell, Hersh Wolch says during his firm's investigation of the case, it was impossible to find out what arrangement was made with the two to secure their evidence, which he described as one of the strongest pieces of the testimony against the then 16-year-old Milgaard. And, sir, within your file that was made available to Mr. Young and to Mr. Carlyle-Gordge, were all of your notes there about how Lapchuk and Melnyk had come forward as a result, or been found as a result of Ron Wilson's information on his drive to Saskatoon the night before trial?

A
$Q$
All those notes would be in that file.
The documentation with respect to your contacts
with Mr. Tallis, your interviews of them, all of that was part of your file?

A
$Q$

A

Q

It was, and would still be there at that time.
Part of the record of the trial was their criminal
records being introduced and essentially all of the information respecting their backgrounds being made public in front of the jury?

That's right, it was all on that file.
Sir, you made your file available to Mr. Young, you made it available to Peter Carlyle-Gordge, Sandra Bartlett at some point in time saw it. Had Mr. Asper, when he was looking to find out what had gone on when he came to the file in about 1986 I think, and Mr. Wolch asked to see your file, would that same information have been proffered by you to them up to the time you left the department in 1987?

Yeah, it would have been proffered to them because it would still have been on the file, among other things.

And was your file available, in fact, to them by August 21st, 1991 in parts at least because of the reference and ultimately -- or sorry, the 690 review and ultimately the Supreme Court of Canada reference?

A

2

Yeah, the file should have been as it was and various information from it would have gone forward on those matters, Ms. Knox, in my view. Do you recall being particularly disturbed when you read in the article that Mr. Wolch said a member of your department, referring to Kim Campbell, implied to us that they were paid -Yeah, that's --
-- Wolch said, adding it was his respectful suggestion that the entire ministerial system of review was seriously flawed?

Yeah, this would be, since he's writing Kim Campbell, it would be the federal Department of Justice he's accusing there without names, and of course that, you know, that absolutely shocked me, that that accusation would be made, period. Okay. And I'll skip parts of it and go to the paragraph where it was said, apparently by Mr. Wolch, at the trail there was no mention two other people were in the hotel room at the same time and those witnesses were not called to testify, which we canvassed earlier, being Ute Frank and Deborah Hall, for which obvious logical, legitimate explanations were available in your file, and indeed in statements given to Mr. Tallis, where it
was recorded by those witnesses, one of them at least, that Deborah Hall was no longer in Saskatchewan in January of 1970?

A
Q

Certainly, because, among other, you know, incorrect and damning accusations, $I$ can't think of anything as a category worse than accusations that witnesses have been paid to give evidence, period. This is totally outside the realm of what
certainly we're used to in this province and that absolutely almost floored me.

Okay. Sir, at -- and I'm almost finished everybody will be please to know -- in his cross-examination of you when he was questioning you as to your opinion, I suppose, as it were, of Mr. Milgaard, Mr. Wolch said to you in the transcript starting at around 18266, or in that vicinity, that you were dealing with a bunch of people, you had Melnyk with a criminal record, you had Lapchuk with a criminal record, Wilson with a criminal record, you had a whole bunch of people with criminal records, that David Milgaard in 1969 when you were preparing this file for trial and you were looking at the bona fides of the suspicion or the accusation, charge against him, that he was the only one with no criminal record and he was the only one who was working at that particular time, and he referred to the fact that he was working for Maclean's Magazine at line 14, 15 of that transcript?

A
$Q$ I see that.

Sir, again when you were dealing with him up to the point in time this offence was alleged to have occurred, on January 31st, 1969 is it fair to say
that the only information substantial that you had with respect to his history of working, or supporting himself, involved much of what was set out, including by Sharon Williams, about selling drugs, stealing, doing a whole bunch of things that didn't necessarily result in criminal conviction, but all of the information you had about him hardly painted him as a stand-up kind of guy, and $I$ mean no disrespect in saying that?

That would certainly be how $I$ would have to take it in view of all those sources of evidence as opposed to the simple and evidently true statement that he was working for Maclean's Magazine. Was it your understanding in 1969 that that employment with Maclean's was a new thing post January, 1969 and just weeks, maybe months, a few months, but certainly no more than a couple of months before he was arrested on May 26 th, 1969 ? That's how I recall the evidence, Ms. Knox. Okay. Mr. Wolch suggested to you that, and I may have covered this, but the notion that you would take seriously allegations like the ones being made by Albert Cadrain about him having sex with virgins in bathtubs was ridiculous. Balanced against that, or to weigh against that, and in
assessing the bona fides of that kind of conduct, would you agree with me you had the Ute Frank information from the motel information about not public acts of sex, but engaging in sexual activity in the presence of others after his partner had ingested drugs either with his assistance or by provision of the drugs to her in the room through him?

That's correct, ma'am.
Sir, during the course of your cross-examination Mr. Wolch had played a tape that was, or a reenactment that was put in evidence in the Supreme Court of Canada and he, as that tape did, implored upon you to think how could the events have happened in 1969 in the way that you theorized in your preparation for trial and for the jury given the time frames and distances involved. Do you recall that?

I did see that.
And at various points in time he and Mr. Lockyer urged upon you that if you had been thinking critically about this evidence, you would have had to conclude that somebody would have seen it?

Somebody would have seen?
Seen Mr. Milgaard and the car being in the area,
being stuck and things like that, but basically they said to you it was ridiculous to think in that busy area of the city that this kind of thing could have happened and nobody would have seen it and you should have been aware of that, you were the prosecutor, that was your job. Do you remember --

I --
I'm summarizing, $I$ hope not unfairly, the tenor of the remarks made to you, particularly by Mr. Wolch.

A
I recall that line of questioning, ma'am.
Mr. Caldwell, it's true, isn't it, when you are being -- it's being urged upon you that you should have been smarter than that and that somebody would have seen it, you know, people would have known. Mrs. Merriman, if she looked down the lane, she would have seen it and those kinds of remarks are being made to you as indications that you didn't sort of really put an objective mind to this, but your reality in 1969 was that somewhere between 6:45 a.m. and sometime after eight o'clock in the very area that people were talking about looking down the alley and so forth, Gail Miller got dragged off the street, she got stabbed and
brutally murdered and left either dead or to die and nobody saw anything or heard anything did they?

A

Q
where the young woman ended up, what happened to her, the surrounding factors and the, and the evidence we did have, $I$ certainly reviewed and made an attempt, and $I$ hope successfully, to call only admissible evidence about those things. There was no other, if you will, substantial or competing theory available at that time, Ms. Knox, and I attempted to call what $I$ did in a proper fashion.

Q
Mr. Caldwell, during your examination by Mr. Hodson he asked you questions about when you were made aware of the identification of Larry Fisher
as the possible rapist, potential perpetrator of the Miller murder, and you had indicated initially you thought it might have been 1989, October, 1989. Mr. Hodson said he would attempt to find documents that would pin this down for us. He did find a memo from Mr. Williams. I'm going to ask if $I$ can have brought up 332399. Mr. Caldwell, do you recognize this document at all, and in fairness to you, I should say $I$ haven't shown it to you because I've been reluctant to engage in conversation with you given that you are under cross-examination.

Yeah. I have in fact not seen the document previously during the Inquiry.

Do you famously recognize the handwriting?
Yeah, everything but the phone memo is my writing, Ms. Knox.

And the phone memo itself on the letterhead, or on the phone message pad is of the Government of Canada directed to Bobs, February $28 t h$, from Gene Williams, which $I$ presume means Eugene Williams? That's correct.

And within the -- it doesn't have a year on it, but other documents place a year around it, but certainly, and in particular we go to the bottom,

A

Q

there's a notation by you of work that you did, 15-3-90, which would be two weeks after this phone message came in? okay. But certainly would you agree that this document would pretty clearly put the date that you were requested by Mr. Williams to check into whether there was references to Fisher, Larry or Linda, in your file, to February 28th, 1990?

A Yeah, this would be -- again, I hadn't seen it, but this would clearly indicate the accurate date on which he, on which he phoned me and $I$ returned his call evidently the same afternoon, got the directions to check any Linda Fisher or Larry Fisher -- address was added there, 334 O -- and that's I'm sure the accurate version of that, ma'am.

332387, please. Handwritten notes again by you? That's right.

Okay. And your notation respecting Linda, Larry Fisher, you've got the name Sidney Wilson in brackets, the date Friday, March 2nd, 1990? That's right.

You are indicating that you read files 1, 2, 3 and 4, referring to files, your prosecution files back at your old office $I$ presume?

A
Q
That's right.
That in file 3 you found McCorriston's police notes that had the reference to Fisher on page 5? That's correct.

And you indicated then you resumed review of the file, went through the witness statements and so forth and this essentially $I$ presume represents what you found with respect to Fisher?

A

Q

That's correct.
Okay. And again this would place the dating of it to be 1990, not 1989 as you initially thought? That's exactly so.

Okay. Sir -- Mr. Commissioner, for the record, I should say there have been two new files added to CaseVault that were retrieved, as Mr. Hodson pointed out, from the federal Department of Justice, and we have the originals here, but essentially these files, or the file materials, if

I can just grab them, these have been put on CaseVault -- if you can just open that envelope please -- and, sir, you recognize that as the file that is the $S$ file that you were part of keeping when you were providing assistance to Mr. Williams while you were employed at the federal Department of Justice?

Yeah. This is, as you note, ma'am, the first time I've seen it, but yes, I do.

And essentially what's represented there I suggest to you is a large bulk of documents that represent everything that you sent to Mr. Williams as a result of your, his first inquiry with the letter that we've had referred to of October 25 th, 1989 being, in this bundle, document 332101 it looks
like?


A
$Q$

I see that letter here, ma'am, of --
And with a couple of exceptions, if you do a quick cruise through it, it has all of the attachments, the only exceptions being some transcript that you would have sent are outlined in the letter, if we go to the next page, and sent to him in October, 1989, and the next page after that?

Yes, $I$ see material relating to trial and then $I$ see on page 3 miscellaneous material.

And if we could go to 104 , please.
And four other attacks on nurses or other women by knife-wielding assailants is the last heading. And this is the (V4)---, (V11)-- and all the others that you sent as a result of your first canvass of the file; would you agree?

That's correct.
Okay. And, sir, then the second file, apart from the documents $I$ just drew out that confirm your first contact about Larry Fisher, contains basically a record of documents, news clippings, calls made to you by the media, repeated calls made by the media and so forth during the time that you were still in that office; would you agree? Okay. There's a reference in the note, if $I$ could go back to 332387 to Sidney Wilson in brackets up here, and you were asked if you knew a Sidney Wilson, the person who had allegedly called Mr. -not allegedly, who had -- the person who had called Mr. Wolch and told him that the real killer was Larry Fisher and he knew this because of information he got from Linda Fisher. You remember that evidence?

A
Q

You didn't know anybody by the name of Sidney Wilson?

A
2
Yes, that's correct.
Clearly document to some extent what $I$ was canvassing with you earlier, your ongoing interest in the allegations that were being made about you as part of these efforts to investigate or have investigated the bona fides of David Milgaard's conviction in 1970?

Yes, that's what it would be, represent, ma'am.

Yes.
And documents that show that to be the case, but you were asked if you knew Sidney Wilson?

All right.

That's right.
Ultimately Sidney Wilson was determined to be

Bruce LaFreniere who testified here, and you didn't know Bruce LaFreniere?

A
Q

But that is another allegation that was put out there to suggest, or impute improper conduct or knowledge that you might have had that you suppressed; was it not?

A
$Q$
Either. No, that's so, ma'am.
And in subsequent documentation that got put on the file there's a memo done, and $I$ had it in front of me and I moved some papers back and I lost it, but it doesn't have a year on it, but it's a notation of three or four different allegations being made, one, that arising from the Sidney Wilson information, one, that you had met with Linda Fisher and talked, interviewed her at some point in time, that came out and it has been part of the record, and it was your evidence that that never in fact happened and her evidence that never in fact happened.

Did you say and her evidence as well?
Yeah.
Yeah, my evidence certainly is that it did not happen.

That's correct.
Sir, in my final cherry picking, at some points in
time you have testified that when you examined your file in 1991-'92 at the Department of Justice offices in Regina, that there were things that had been taken off it?


A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

important piece, the yellow sticker that was on that document, please. Yeah. There's a note on my copy of it that "None of this was part of my file." You made that note didn't you? That's my writing.

And this was something that indeed you found that somehow got added to your file after it went out of your hands and these various reviews of it started isn't it?

Yes. This gentleman showed up in Saskatoon and interviewed me, Ms. Knox. I don't know if anyone realized that or not, the author of this matter, and somehow an article came out and I added that sticky editorial, if you will.

But clearly, and I'm not -- I don't know that this is exclusively what was found, and $I$ know it's not exclusively what was found to be added, but this is an illustration of the fact that things have gotten added to your files?

Oh, yeah.
Since 1969?
Absolutely.
Just one other area and I'll be finished. Mr. Hodson to some degree, Mr. Wolch to a greater degree, quizzed you about actions that you took
during the prosecution, particularly around notations and the decisions you made in your file regarding accomplice evidence and possible instruction to the jury on accomplice evidence?

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q
But it goes through a chronology of items that were brought to the lab by the Regina City Police to be tested? report --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Excuse me, went to the Regina RCMP to be tested?

MS. KNOX: Went to the Regina RCMP from the Regina City Police. Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.

BY MS. KNOX:
If we go to the next page of the report, he outlines the purpose, to conduct a serological exam of Exhibits AA to HH inclusive, and his indication that next -- that the data, that Exhibit AA, among others, was examined for the presence of blood?

I see that.
And his conclusion that no blood was found on Exhibit AA, being the front seat of -- or sorry, that AA was tested for seminal fluid as well as being examined for blood?

I see that, yeah, in the second line there.
And his conclusion that neither of those -- no seminal fluid was found on $A$ ?

That's correct, in the further down.
And no indications that blood was found, or blood was found on AA either, in paragraph 2 ?

A

A

Yeah, and my bracket went through that, but not intended to obliterate it that no blood was found on AA, among other things, ma'am.

Okay. And if $I$ could have brought up document 009282, a report in your file from Regina City Police and had a covering letter dated June 2 nd, 1969, but basically indicating that they had gone out and found -- sorry, Ron Wilson's car that he and Mr. Milgaard and Nichol John had been in on January 31st, 1969?
have given you all of the laboratory reports I have received except one, and $I$ enclose a copy of that which is November of 1969. Not this lab report that we just looked at, but indications that you had given over all the laboratory reports on the Gail Miller file that you had to Mr. Tallis?

Yeah, that's how this reads.
Okay. So apart from any decisions or considerations you were giving as to whether there was any issue of accomplice evidence here, all of this information, excluding any involvement either certainly through use of the car of Mr. Wilson or contact by Mr. Wilson --

Did you intend, when you made your decisions with respect to trial strategy, to do anything improper, unethical, or in any manner to pervert the course of justice for David Milgaard?

Okay. Sir, it was said to you by Mr. Lockyer during the course of his cross-examination of you, or you were asked whether you were familiar with -- and it has been raised be others -- the concept of tunnel vision in the investigation and prosecution of persons charged with criminal offences, and you and he agreed that it can happen and it's a really bad thing?

Absolutely.
You were also introduced to the concept of, by Mr. Lockyer, of noble cause corruption --

Yeah.
-- where police officers, who in their minds believe they have the right guy, do and say things that will cause the conviction to happen even though in their heart and soul they know they are either perjuring themselves, or massaging evidence, or rigging exhibits, or whatever, but because the ends justifies the means they will do what they have to get a conviction?

Yes, Mr. Lockyer reviewed, went over that with me at some length, ma'am.

And Mr. Caldwell, not meaning in any manner whatsoever -- because my instructions from you are
certainly not that $I$ ever should -- not meaning in any way whatsoever to diminish/minimize what happened to Mr. Milgaard, because you, as you said in your press conference release in 1997, realized it was a horrible thing and it had horrible consequences for him; during the years and months when the process started to review the bona fides of his conviction, and in particular when you look at some of the public statements made by counsel on his behalf and by advocates on his behalf that accused you of wrongdoing where there was clear evidence that you hadn't engaged in wrongdoing, does it occur to you that advocates can sometimes, too, fall into tunnel vision and become so driven by their cause that people who may have made innocent mistakes can become victims --

A I think ---- of their zealotry?

Yeah, I think that would be a very legitimate example of how that could happen and can happen, Ms. Knox.

Q Using the term loose, very, very loosely -- and by no means comparable to Mr. Milgaard's torture -have you, over the years, sometimes felt, as regards your integrity, your professional
reputation, that you have become a different kind of victim?

A
Oh yeah, I'm quite sure that the cumulative effect of all of the accusations that were made over all the years have certainly made me, put me in a class, among other things, in which my, you know, I'm -- let's say my future career would certainly be very, very much circumscribed, to put it awkwardly.

Thankfully $I$ hope, given your age now, you don't want to have a future career?

A

Q

A
$Q$
is it not, that you have always been a very -apart from your professional integrity and your concern about your professional reputation and always doing your job fairly, ethically, and properly, you've been very profiled in this community as a musician, a member of your church, as a father and a husband, and all of those aspects of your life have been affected by these many allegations that have been made against you?
Yeah. I'd like to have a few months at the very least, ma'am.

Apart from your career, Mr. Caldwell, it's true, That's correct. Thank you. I have no further questions.

A Yeah. Thanks, Ms. Knox.

MR. HODSON: Just a couple of points, not in -- not by way of re-exam, but the issue raised about whether or not Mr. Tallis cross-examined Ron Wilson or referenced the March 3rd, '69 statement at the preliminary hearing as opposed to the trial. If we could call up 007595 and go to page 007 -- so this is the preliminary hearing and this is Ron Wilson -- if we can go to 007671 . And this is Mr. Tallis cross-examining Mr. Wilson and he says at 122:
"Q Pardon? Well, let's get it this way. About on March the 3rd, a policeman came to see you at the jail, is that correct?

A It must have been the one that came with Ken Walters at the time."

Then goes on to say in 124:
"Q I'm referring to a specific occasion when a Mr. Riddell came to see you.

A Riddell, that's the name.

Q On an occasion when Mr. Riddell came to see you, you did give a statement in writing?

A Yes, I did."

So there was just, $I$ was asked to clarify that,
so I wish to do that.

Secondly, Mr. Commissioner, the issue of the publication ban. I'm not sure if that -- that was put in place yesterday with respect to Ms. Knox's examination on the pre-'69 Yorkton records, I presume that that's to continue? I simply wish to raise it and get direction.

We have not, obviously, put the documents up, and we have got the transcript and we have -- we will take out those portions of the transcript where reference is made to those records, $I$ just want to ensure that that is so?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Do you wish it to continue, Mr. Wolch?

MR. HODSON: I think Mr. Wolch has said he doesn't care if the transcript goes public, the -- and my only concern or issue, $I$ raise it, is that in the course of questions and answers the documents, or parts of the documents are quoted in the question, and that's why I raise it.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.

MR. HODSON: And I will take whatever direction you provide on that, knowing that even Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv
if we keep the documents off, if we put the full transcripts in, excerpts from the documents are in the transcript.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So two questions, Mr. Wolch; do you wish the publication ban to continue with respect to the Yorkton documents themselves?

MR. WOLCH: Well I guess, Mr. Commissioner, I can commence by saying that I've always had a reluctance against publication bans. I just don't like them. And, having said that, I really have a difficult time supporting the fact that evidence can be given here and not in the public domain, that is if people could hear it here, why can't they hear it somewhere else as people here are representatives of the community. So I have that basic reluctance.

## And I think we can

differentiate between the reports themselves and the testimony here, that is -- and I'm reminded, sir, by the document that My Friend put up at the end, the Christian Science Monitor article where Mrs. Milgaard is quoted in, herself, as saying that David wasn't a choirboy and he wasn't violent, and so it's never been our position that

David didn't have some difficulties, that's out in the public domain. Our focus has been whether those reports support a contention that David was in any way violent or there was anything in those reports about the 'stab in the dark' comment.

And, having said that, I don't see any difficulty in what $I$ heard My Friend, Ms. Knox, question Mr. Caldwell about in public. I think most people hearing it will feel 'thank goodness that their backgrounds when they were in kindergarten wasn't being explored'. I think there are many of us in the courtroom who had more schoolyard fights than David ever did, many of us have been expelled from school or put in detention -- I'm probably speaking personally -and I think that a lot of us have had those kind of things, so $I$ don't think anybody is going to get really, really carried away. But on the other hand, $I$ just don't like the public thinking there is a ban on something, and so I really don't have any problem with anybody taking out of the transcript what's in the transcript. My Friend was given the opportunity to, I suppose, give it her best shot, pick out what she can, she did, I'm not too concerned about that.

I am concerned, though, about the reports themselves, and My Friend quite correctly left out portions that -- well, they aren't germane, but they deal with family, siblings, that sort of thing. So I would prefer that the documents not be made public because they really aren't involving David, or even come close to the issue.

But $I$ believe I'm fair to say that the comments made under oath by the witness that My Friend thought were germane should not be subject to a ban, keeping in mind the principle that none of us like publication bands to begin with, and we try to use them as infrequently as possible.

So I think I've stated my position, sir, unless you have any other questions.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks. Anybody else?

MR. HODSON: Ms. McLean, on behalf of Mrs. Milgaard, might wish to.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes?

MS. McLEAN: Just for the record, sir, so it's clear, Mrs. Milgaard and I did discuss this
with Mr. Wolch this morning, and $I$ was aware of what position he was going to take, and that's what we agreed with this morning. Mrs. Milgaard has no objection to the transcript of what was said yesterday becoming public, but the documents themselves ought not to. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you. And Ms. Knox, you were up a minute ago, do you have a position on this?

MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, perhaps my position is more driven by a discussion $I$ had yesterday, mostly in the presence of Mr. Hodson, but $I$ was approached by two members of the press at the end of the day asking me if I could help them know what they could report. And they, I was pleased to hear, pointed out that the public impression with respect to Mr. Caldwell's actions in writing those letters to the National Parole Board was now not quite right because of what they learned, and we learned, yesterday.

So Mr. -- so whatever way it's
done, $I$ think it's important that the press be in a position that they be able to set the record straight as they have a sense of unease, in particular the two who spoke with me.

But the other point that I would like to make, and I didn't have time to go back and look, but Mr. Wolch cast the actions of Mr. Caldwell in writing the letters in terms of the psychiatric reports. What we had yesterday was a little bit, but his -- and I canvassed with him yesterday, and the record reflects, that also what he had, for example, was information about acts of coercive sexual behaviour, use of a gun on one occasion, and so forth, from Nichol John, Sharon Williams, and others. And in particular with Sharon Williams there was some --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, but Ms. Knox, I just want to hear about the Yorkton records. That's all. $I$ know all the rest of it.

MS. KNOX: With the Yorkton matters, certainly. Where $I$ was about to go with this is that when Sharon Williams testified there was a publication ban as well, of some form, or there was a restriction on how she could be cross-examined.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, yes.

MS. KNOX: And that's where, in my
prolonged and tired way, I'm trying to go.

Because I would suggest, given the attack that's
been made on him with respect to his bona fides and his actions with respect to the parole board, that it's important that we go back and revisit that because that was information --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh no, but I mean that ban was only a temporary one and it had nothing to do with the sensitivity of the material, it had to do with the authenticity of the document.

MS. KNOX: Okay.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Which was cured later on by the appearance of former Constable Malanowich, I think it was.

MS. KNOX: Okay, then that's what I needed to know, that's where I --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I think that's right.

MR. HODSON: Yeah. My understanding of that, that once Mr. Malanowich testified and confirmed the statement, there is no longer --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah, there is no restrictions on that at all, no.

MS. KNOX: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So, anyway, the result of all that, $I$ believe, is that counsel
does not object to the transcript being posted on the web as it appears, however the publication ban which I imposed temporarily the other day relating to the Yorkton records and the numbers quoted by Mr. Wolch when he put them up is continued.

MR. HODSON: Thank you. And I believe that is all.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I just have a question if you have none?

MR. HODSON: Oh, I'm sorry.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I'll just make a note of this, please.

## BY COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM:

Mr. Caldwell, you will recall that during the course of the evidence you gave $I$ believe it was Mr. Pringle had some questions to ask you about the trial itself, and he pointed out the rather extensive interventions by the trial judge, Justice, former Chief Justice Bence, and you know what $I$ am talking about; don't you?

A
Q
A
$Q$ I do.

During the course of the Section 9 application -Yes, Mr. Commissioner, I recall it.
-- he rather closely questioned Nichol John, if I
can put it that way. And in your long experience as a prosecutor you will know that it matters very much what a trial judge asks a witness like Nichol John, especially when he asks it in front of a jury, it might have a profound effect upon the jury. And to be fair $I$ think the tenor of the questions, as you yourself have said, as they appear on the record, demonstrate impatience by the judge?

Demonstrated -- did you --
Demonstrated impatience?
Impatience, Mr. Commissioner.
Yes. But it matters not only what he said, but how he said it, and perhaps you are one of the very few people around now that can tell us, or perhaps can tell us from your memory, what was his manner when he put those questions to the witness? Well Chief Justice Bence was a, certainly an imposing figure, and with the -- he, I would suggest right up to, to if not including the piece of evidence we're talking about, that he in effect stayed out of questioning witnesses or taking questions that weren't necessary. I thought he stayed completely away from that in the trial proper. dealing with the Nichol John Section 9(2) matter it had -- it -- the non-contentious parts of that, I thought $I$ was making the expected headway with them, Mr. Commissioner, that I would have hoped had continued through the whole process, but he -there came a point when she -- she was simply not going to continue. There had been a pattern of similar questions to which $I$ thought she replied fine, there came a point when she was not continuing that, and I -- I -- clearly His Lordship would -- became, I think, impatient with that. And, of course, he would have a good knowledge of the overall evidence in the case at that point. He certainly, in my view, attempted to encourage her to get on with that process.

But $I$ don't know, Mr.
Commissioner, if I'm answering what you are --

Q

A
Q
A
Q

A No.

Yeah, okay.
We all know what he said, it's on the record. Yes.

He said things like "stop crying, you didn't have any difficulty answering me before".
"Now, when it comes to the stabbing, you say you can't remember".

Yes.
That's the sort of thing he would say.
Yes.
What $I$ want to know was what was his tone of voice and so on; was he being a bully, was he just saying it nicely to her, what was he doing? By no means being a bully, but $I$ would suggest in a firm manner, indicating to all of us that he felt she wasn't coming through with things that she knew and could have said. I wouldn't -Well, that's right, that's apparent from the words themselves.

A
Q
A
Yeah.
Did he raise his voice, sir?
No, he -- he'd be sitting at the -- a distance from the witness, and of course the jury off to one side of him, I would be in front of him. The witness would be very close to him because the, in that courtroom, the witness box was right by the judge's dais. I would certainly feel that he may have raised his voice, sir, to the extent of making it clear that he, you know, he thought she should, should and could, do better with that
process.
I don't know, Mr. Commissioner,
if I'm --
Well you are certainly being diplomatic, I'll put it that way, Mr. Caldwell.

Yes.
I -- you see, my big concern is that an
intervention by the Bench at that crucial stage, when the inquiry is into the witness' credibility, if the judge, inadvertently or otherwise, manages to destroy the witness' credibility in front of a jury --

Uh-huh.
-- who then are -- have put to them the words of a statement which is not supposed to be considered by them for the truth of contents, the effect, possible effect of all of that is what concerns me, and so that's why $I$ was interested in his manner of speaking --

Yeah.
-- and whether he treated the witness kindly or didn't.

A
I would think, Mr. Commissioner, he certainly -- I would call it a forceful statement of his views as that went on, and certainly he clearly was -- had
become impatient with how she was doing, and I wouldn't, $I$ wouldn't think she was incapable of handling what His Lordship --

Well I --
-- advanced to her.
That's something for me to decide, I guess, but -so thanks, Mr. Caldwell, I didn't want to put you on the spot, but I'm afraid I had to.

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: Is there any questions arising from that from other counsel? Mr. Caldwell, thank you very much for coming and for testifying for so long, and you are excused.

A
Mr. Commissioner, I wanted to thank both Mr. Hodson, yourself, and other counsel for the consideration $I$ have been shown. Thank you. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you. MR. HODSON: The next witness is

Mr. Pearson. I'm wondering, given the time of day, whether we should maybe break and allow Mr . Caldwell to gather up his documents and get Mr. Pearson ready? I can start now but --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: We can do that, yes, sure. 1:30 then? MR. HODSON: Sure.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Fine.
(Adjourned at 11:42 a.m.)
(Reconvened at 1:30 p.m.)
MR. HODSON: Good afternoon,
Mr. Commissioner. Just one clarification just on that publication ban regarding the documents, our document people have asked us to be clear. It is only the pre 1969 documents, the Yorkton records and the other ones are not, the later ones are not; correct?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: That's correct. MR. HODSON: Okay. And our next witness is Mr. Rick Pearson.

## RICHARD ALLAN PEARSON, sworn:

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Pearson, the second name is $A-L-L-A-N$ ?

A
$A-L-L-A-N$.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: A-L-L-A-N, thank you.

BY MR. HODSON:
Good afternoon, Mr. Pearson. Thank you for agreeing to attend and thank you for your patience in waiting to appear.

I understand, just for the
record, that you are represented by counsel for
$Q$
A

Q
the RCMP, namely, Bruce Gibson and Rochelle Wempe;
is that correct?

And that your primary involvement in the David Milgaard matter, if $I$ can call it that, was to assist the Federal Justice Minister, and namely a solicitor employed by the Federal Justice

Minister, Mr. Eugene Williams, in the review of
David Milgaard's two applications to the Federal
Minister under Section 690 of the Criminal Code;
is that correct generally?
As it pertained to Larry Fisher, yes.
And so just, and we'll get into the details about
what work you did, but as far as your involvement, if $I$ can call it that, in the David Milgaard matter, from start to finish, it would be primarily related to the Section 690 application?

A

A
2

A
$Q$
And again we'll touch upon some of the later events a bit more specifically, but the Flicker investigation, if we can call it that, in 1993, and we'll deal with the details there, but just generally $I$ understand, sir, that you did not play a significant role in the Flicker investigation; Mr. Williams.
is that fair?
I was not involved in the actual investigation. I was involved in the Court process regarding exhibits that had been handled by me previously. And then when Larry Fisher was investigated and prosecuted in 1997, I understand, sir, that you were not involved directly in that investigation; is that correct?

That is correct.
And we will deal a bit more, again specifically, $I$ just want to get some general background. If we --

I would just like to make a correction. Sure.

I talked about Flicker. I really meant my involvement in the trial in the handling of exhibits. In Flicker itself $I$ was not involved as I recall.

Right. So Flicker -- the 1993 investigation, and I believe, and $I$ will take you to the specific documents, $I$ think at the outset of their investigation you had a meeting with them, but my understanding from the documents and discussions, sir, are that you were not one of the investigators out doing the day-to-day work on

Flicker; is that fair?

A
Q

That's correct.
If we can just get a bit of your background, your police background starting in 1966 through to 1990, if you can give us just a brief outline of your career with the RCMP, what types of police work you were doing?

I was really what is considered a general detachment uniform police officer, had all of my police experience in the Province of Saskatchewan. I was primarily in small town detachments and had mostly operational experience. The years prior to 1990 I was in charge of three different uniform detachments and when $I$ moved into Saskatoon, that was my first experience on a plain-clothes, general investigation unit.

And when did you move into Saskatoon?
I believe that was in 1988.
1988. So from '65 to '88 you would have been in uniform and in various detachments working in the field; is that fair?

That's correct, yes.
And then prior to Saskatoon when you were working in the field, did you investigate suspicious deaths, for example, serious crimes, were you
involved in that?
A
Yes, we were involved in all different kinds of sudden death situations.

And so prior to coming to Saskatoon were you in charge, did you have any supervisory function prior to Saskatoon?

Yes, I was in charge of three different detachments in the Province of Saskatchewan.

And which ones were those?
That was Kindersley, Battleford town and Pierceland.
$Q$

A
At the time there were 13 in Kindersley, I think five or six in Battleford, five or six in Pierceland.

And then when you moved into Saskatoon, tell us -in 1988 tell us what your job description was then?

A
The general investigation unit is a plain-clothes unit made up of, at that time, five personnel, and they provided investigative assistance to detachment personnel within the Saskatoon subdivision within our organization, and they also provided assistance to outside agencies that may
seek our assistance in gathering information or investigating and assisting in crimes.

And were you in charge of that five person unit? Yes, I was.

And what was your rank then at that time; sergeant?

That carried a sergeant rank.
And we've heard some evidence about this before, but the Saskatoon subdivision, what would that cover, the city and what else?

Well, the RCMP as an organization is broke into operational divisions. Saskatchewan is a division and the province is broke down into six geographical subdivisions, Saskatoon is one of those subdivisions, and each subdivision is managed by an executive officer and within that subdivision there are a number of uniform detachments. Saskatoon subdivision covers basically an area from the Alberta/Saskatchewan border to a perimeter halfway between North Battleford and Saskatoon, 60 miles east, halfway to Regina sort of thing, and in that there's support services and GIS is one of those support services that provide assistance to a geographical area.

And so then who would you report to?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
the uniform member away from his day-to-day duties over a period of time. We also provided assistance to outside agencies that may request of them to provide assistance.

And, for example, would the Saskatoon City Police be an example of an outside agency that you might assist from time to time?

Yes, we had a close working relationship with the city police.

And so again February of 1990 , would it be fair to say that the GIS would then be involved in murder investigations or suspicious death investigations? Yes.

And that would be part of your regular work; is that fair?

Yes, that's correct.
And can you tell us, and again just estimate, February of 1990, how many suspicious death cases would you have been involved in as an investigator?

A
I had about 25,25 years served by the time I came to Saskatoon, and when you talk about all the sudden deaths, $I$ 'm not talking about homicides, but all the sudden death situations, I would say probably 150 deaths that $I$ would have been
involved in as far as investigating.
And what about homicides, murder, manslaughter, death investigations with a criminal element, can you give us a ballpark of how many cases you would have been involved in investigating?

Oh, directly involved, probably 25 or 30 , directly involved.

And did you head up any murder investigations, had you, prior to February of 1990 , been in charge of any murder investigations?

I can't give you a name offhand, but $I$ probably was, but $I$ just can't tell you offhand over the years what the names are.

And again let's go to February of 1990 , and as far as your experience and training, sir, would you have had attended courses through the RCMP on investigative techniques, things of that nature? Yes, there was ongoing in-service training provided through the organization, depending on the level of service and experience you had, the type of duties you were doing, but there were courses in interviewing and investigating and evidence gathering and managing and supervising and things like that.

And had you attended those, many of those courses?

A

Yes, I've had, over the years, quite a number of courses.

And so again $I$ 'm not asking you to give a self evaluation, but in February of 1990 , sir, did you feel comfortable and qualified to be involved in an investigation looking into a previous murder conviction and perhaps some information that might suggest someone else might be responsible for the murder?

I felt $I$ was, yes.
Now, let's just again, when we're talking background, $I$ think from 1990 to 1992 is the time frame we'll focus most of our time on, and I think towards the latter part of 1992, at least according to the documents, $I$ understand you would have had little further involvement in the Fisher, Milgaard, Miller matter; is that fair, after you were done in '92? You had some, I know you had some work, and I'll deal with all the details, I'm just talking generally.

That's the primary time frame, yes.
Can you tell us again just briefly from 1992 through until your retirement in 2003, sir, what your general duties were with the RCMP?

I was promoted to staff sergeant, went in charge
of the drug section, and after a few years we then developed the integrated drug unit which was a culmination of the Saskatoon Police Service drug unit and the RCMP and we actually physically relocated our unit into their building to carry on all the drug functions in the geographical area, and then in the fall of 2001 I was approached if $I$ would be interested on going on a 13 month contract, because $I$ was considering retiring at that time, and asked if $I$ would go on a contract to St. Lucia in the West Indies, and the government there had approached, I believe through the RCMP, to attempt to reorganize their police force and four RCMP members travelled to St. Lucia. We spent 13 months there reworking their organization as far as dealing with the criminal side of what was happening in their country and also reorganizing their public complaints system to deal more effectively with the complaints that the public had of their service.

Q
And that would have brought -- then you retired after that; is that correct?

A
Yes.
So again just a couple more questions about the

RCMP organization in 1990 to 1992. You would be a sergeant in charge of GIS in the saskatoon subdivision; is that correct?

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
.
He reported to the division headquarters which is located in Regina, and $I$ think at that time there was the criminal on the operational side and there's the administrative side of the organization, depending on which issue you are dealing with, but for a criminal matter you would deal with the criminal operations officer, and I believe at that time Chief Superintendent Egan was in place.

Now, we'll deal specifically with the notes and
reporting that you did in connection with your work for the Federal Justice Department, but can you tell us generally your reporting requirements back in 1990 to 1992, to what extent were you required to report up the line, if $I$ can call it that, about what you were doing?

There was a reporting requirement to put reports in on an ongoing basis, there was no real definite time frame that you had to submit the reports, but there was an internal reporting procedure. The crime reports would go ahead with a summary of really what you were doing.

So, for example, in 1990 you in GIS could have been working on a murder case in Saskatoon, a fraud case south of Battleford and a rape case elsewhere, various different cases, various different locations with different agencies; is that fair?

That's fair.
And notwithstanding that, there was a general requirement where you would report up the line on some basis to let your superiors know what it was you were doing; is that fair?

A
Only for certain offences, certain offences that you were directly involved in, there was a
reporting requirement.
Would that be serious offences then?
Yeah, that's basically categorized as serious offences.

Now, I want to turn now to your documents, sir.
We have had, in our Commission database, a significant number of documents that we have already looked at from the 1990 , 1992 time period that originated from you, and $I$ want to just spend a bit of time to go through your, to go through these documents and what they mean to assist the Commission and to assist other counsel so that they know what reports you prepared and for what purposes. I intend to go through the significant parts of those documents in detail with you, but right now $I$ wish to just touch on how these documents came to be.

Actually, I'll tell you what,
I'll leave that, Mr. Pearson, let's maybe just touch on your involvement with Mr. Williams and than we'll go to the documents. Can you tell us when and how you first became involved in the David Milgaard/Gail Miller matter?

A
A telephone call was received in my office and, as
I recall, I had to, I returned a call to him and
he explained to me that he was involved in the application for -- $I$ forget the term that he used, but it was under 690, and he had information that he wanted me to follow up on regarding the involvement of Larry Fisher.

And at that time, sir, did you become aware, either in that discussion or within a day or two of that, that Mr. Williams had been working on this matter for a number of months prior to the call with you?

I don't have a memory of him relaying to me that this application had been in the process a long time. I was under the initial impression that this was something that had come up and it was the start of it.

And he then, I think you said, he had asked you to make some inquiries regarding Larry Fisher; is that correct?

If we can, if you can describe it for us, Mr. Pearson, in your -- we'll go through this, as I say, in detail, were you involved in every aspect of the work that Eugene Williams was doing on the 690 application?

A No, $I$ wasn't.

And just generally can you tell us, what role did you play, according to your understanding, what role did you play in the work that he was doing? I was providing assistance to him on the inquiries into this suspect Larry Fisher.

Did you take directions from Mr. Williams then as far as what type of things you should look at? In general terms, yes.

And so again would it be correct to say that you would only follow up an area, or pursue an avenue if Mr. Williams had asked you to do so?

A
I don't think it was that restrictive, but $I$ was providing answers to the issues that he was raising, but $I$ never felt myself so restricted that $I$ couldn't think outside the box.

And did you become aware, as you started to deal with Mr. Williams, that he was pursuing other avenues and looking at other matters that he was not involving you in?

Yes, absolutely.
And so again trying to look at it, to try and get a sense of where you fit on it, I'm trying to understand the degree of involvement you would
have had with him. On the one hand, let me suggest to you, and you tell me if this is right, were you Mr. Williams' confidante and assisting him in every aspect of the investigation and doing everything and knowing everything he did and he knew everything you did, for example; was that the type of relationship?

I was reporting to Mr. Williams on the areas pertaining to Larry Fisher. I was not receiving ongoing reports from the Justice Department on what was taking place on the investigation as a whole, $I$ really had no information as to what was happening on their end with regards to the thought process going on in their office, but I did have discussion on an ongoing basis with Mr. Williams on the issues, but when you follow through on, you know, suspects Wilson and Lapchuk and Melnyk and John and the DNA evolution, those were issues that were primarily head manned by Mr. Williams. I was not involved in that day-to-day process.

And so you tell me if this is correct, that to the extent that Mr. Williams was investigating or reviewing matters, a part of what he was doing you were involved in; is that correct?

A
$Q$

A

And a part of it you were not involved in; is that correct?

Had you ever been involved in a section 690 or a similar review by the Federal Justice Minister?

This was my very first time.
And can you tell us, what do you recall, what was
your understanding of what it was, or what section 690 meant and what was being reviewed and what was it that the Federal Minister of Justice, through Mr. Williams, was asking you to investigate? Well, as I recall in very general terms, I didn't know a lot about the section, it's not something that we deal with on an ongoing basis, but I knew enough about it to know that there was a review that was being done and the Minister of Justice would be making some decisions based on a possible wrongful conviction.

And was it unusual for, and $I$ think you said you were in an operational unit of the RCMP, to get a call from the Federal Justice Department to give them assistance, was there anything unusual about that?

A
$Q$

A
You mean getting a direct call rather than going through official channels, so to speak? Well, both that and the fact you would get involved. Was this -- I think you said earlier you provided assistance to outside agencies? Yes. No, this wasn't unusual. I'm sure there's a protocol in place, but $I$ got a direct call, $I$ never thought that as being unusual. It happens all the time.

Now, you've touched upon this earlier, but $I$ want to go over this. At the time you got the call from Mr. Williams, had you ever heard about the David Milgaard case?

No, I didn't.
Had you heard about the Gail Miller murder?
I never, no.
And Larry Fisher, did that name mean anything to you?

Didn't ring a bell, no.
Did you know anything about the facts of the case prior to getting a call from Mr. Williams?

Absolutely none.
If we can call up 332532, please, and, Mr.
Pearson, this is an outline that $I$ put together that $I$ intend to use in my examination, and $I$ just want to quickly go over and try and identify at the outset sort of what parts of the section 690 review you were involved in and what parts you were not involved in, okay, so just generally, and I think if we go through, I've covered off the background, I'm going to go through in a moment the chronology and your documents. Then if we go down to the first 690 application, and just for the record, the first application was December

28th, 1988 and it was February 27 th, 1991 that it was dismissed, and then a new application in

August of '91, end of November, '91 it went to the Supreme Court with a reference that concluded with a decision in April of '92, so we'll cover your initial engagement and we've touched on some of that already.

Two, Larry Fisher as a suspect, if we can scroll down, $I$ understand, sir, that that would be the primary focus of your work for Mr. Williams, was to investigate Larry Fisher as a suspect in the death of Gail Miller?

Yes.

And again you spent some time directly with Larry Fisher himself and matters related directly to Larry Fisher; is that right, investigating matters?

A

Secondly, and we'll go through this with Linda Fisher, if we can go to the next page, you had direct dealings with Linda Fisher again presumably
in connection with your investigation of Larry Fisher as a suspect; is that correct?

A
Yes.

And again these are all matters that I've listed
that relate to Larry Fisher as a suspect that you had some involvement in. The (V10) (V10)- file you reviewed; is that correct?

A
Q

A
Q

A

Q

A

Q

Q

A

Q

A

Q
There was an interview with Jack Parker, a city police officer, and you had some involvement in the timing of events, and $I$ put drive to the Trav-a-leer Motel, and again we'll touch on that, and in fairness, there's probably some other matters in here that $I$ didn't list that might fall into this category, but again, at the end of the first application you would have looked at matters primarily relating to Larry Fisher as a suspect and some matters that went to David Milgaard's guilt or innocence with respect to the crime; is that fair?

That's fair.

And is it correct as well, sir, that you had no dealings with Ron Wilson, Nichol John, or Albert Cadrain in relation to the first application? None whatsoever.

And in fact similarly with the second application; did you have any involvement with any of those three individuals?

None, no.
And then if we go into the second 690 application, which $I$ think August 14 th of 1991 was when that was formally initiated, $I$ will go through with you your engagement and then we'll get into the review of the Larry Fisher sex offences. And I think, as we'll see when we get to the document, the second application to the federal minister, the primary ground in that application was that Larry Fisher had committed a number of offences and that, based upon the circumstances and facts and modus operandi of those offences on a similar fact analysis, that suggested that he killed Gail Miller and that that was -- and that that was sufficient such that the federal minister should review David Milgaard's conviction. And I'm summarizing what $I$ think was in the letter. Is that your understanding, generally, of what was
put forward in the second application?
That's fair, yes.
And your involvement there, then, would be to review the police files, the records, and again we'll go through this about other offences at that time, Mr. Fisher's offences, the Fort Garry files, and we'll see your involvement in gathering information, and $I$ think sending off to others the comparison of the sex offences and Gail Miller murder, and as well information from the Saskatchewan Police Commission regarding Larry Fisher's offences and some records; is that correct?

Yes.
And then the next page, number 3, (V14)-- (V14)-. And Mr. Commissioner, before I get into this area -- and we will be dealing with this in some evidence from Mr. Pearson later -Ms. (V14)- is a sexual assault victim, and from 1968, and that offence became part of the second application by Mr. Milgaard. Mr. Pearson was involved in investigating that matter, there's obviously sensitivity to those matters, and I would ask, at least at this time, that there be a publication ban on her name. And $I$ have been
reminded by the media, and rightfully so, that when the Commission is dealing with publication bans the media may have a right to be heard on the subject matter and at least to be told what we're seeking, so at this time $I$ simply want to make sure that this woman's name -- whether it be, call it a temporary publication ban -- and I don't suspect the media will be concerned about the name but it may be from what follows -- and I will be asking for a broader publication ban on anything that might identify this woman when $I$ get into it in detail and $I$ will alert the media as to exactly what $I$ am asking for and see if they have any concerns.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay. For the moment, then, her name won't be published. MR. HODSON: Her -- the name or anything that might, anything that might suggest her name. BY MR. HODSON:
$Q$
A

I'm sorry, Mr. Pearson?
Can $I$ just add, now this is a very sensitive issue, and $I$ really made some long-term promises to this family that we would take care of this issue. There are some other family names involved here as well that don't come under the (V10)--
(V14)- name, and $I$ just hope that the identity can't be revealed through the other names.

And certainly at this, once we get into that, $I$ will craft a much broader publication ban and allow the media an opportunity to see what it is I'm asking. And that's a fair point, Mr. Pearson. My intent would be that we can deal with this subject matter in a way that the names or identities of these people ought -- isn't necessary.

So at this point the temporary publication ban would be her name, or any family member name, or anything that might tend to identify her or her family members, if $I$ could ask for that, and then $I$ will deal with it more specifically once we get into the documents. And I raise it now because her name is in the outline. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right. It's so ordered. MR. HODSON: Thank you.

BY MR. HODSON:

Q
And so again, and $I$ think $I$ have covered that and we'll get into that information as well, you had some involvement in reviewing the (V4)---- (V4)--matter; is that right?

A
Q Court of Canada reference case in 1992, your involvement there, you were involved in interviewing two of the sexual assault victims, you were involved in obtaining some police officers' notebooks you did a number of interviews in connection with people who might be called to testify there or who gave statements for the reference, that list of people may not be complete but at a minimum $I$ think those are the people you interviewed in connection for the Supreme Court. And just on that, Mr. Pearson, I
think Mr. Williams asked you to do some of these interviews; is that correct?

And Murray Brown for the Government of Saskatchewan?

A
Yes.
And then $I$ think, if we then go to the Supreme

Yes.
And did Mr. Asper ask you to do some interviews as well; do you remember?

I believe he did. I just don't recall the name
but $I$ believe there was a request.
And Mr. Beresh?
Yes.

As I, as I recall.

Q Yeah. And so -- and I think we'll get into this -- it looks like, from the documents that at and around the time of the reference, through Mr. Williams you were gathering information, statements and witnesses, for all of the parties; is that fair?

That's fair.
And then, as well, you handled the, $I$ think the transfer of exhibits to The Court; correct?

From Saskatoon to the Supreme Court?
Yes.
Yes.
And then as well I've just put general assistance, we'll see that, $I$ think throughout the course of the reference certain tasks were assigned to you; is that correct?

A
Q

Q
Yes.
And then the interview and statement from T.D.R.
Caldwell we've heard about, and we'll talk about that, but that was a statement that you took during the reference?

Yes.
And then assist in DNA testing 1992. I understand
you went down to North Carolina with the group
that went to test Gail Miller's clothing; is that
correct?
A
$Q$

Court reference, we'll touch on again what further investigations you may have been asked to do or not asked to do. There's some vehicle theories that were passed on by you that we'll touch on, I think you did a review of the police theory document, the five-page document that became an issue at the Supreme Court; you know which one I'm talking about?

Yes, yes I do.
I'm scared to call it anything but the police theory document, $I$ think it's been called many things, but it's the five-page document that it was suggested might have been a script for the police and their prosecutor?

Yes, I recall the document, yes.
And then, last, the Breckenridge allegations of a cover-up, you were involved in the latter part of
'92, I understand, in following up on some of that; is that correct?

A
$Q$

And it's quite possible, Mr. Pearson, that you may have been contacted in '93 and had some involvement, $I ' m$ just trying to get a general understanding?

A

And I think it's important that we all understand, before we get into all the details of your documents, what -- what was your responsibility and what wasn't, and what you did and what you didn't do, and that's all I'm trying to cover now.

And then last, the Larry Fisher proceedings in 1997, $I$ understand that again you had some role in the continuity of the exhibits, is that correct, in that you had handled some of the exhibits in ' 92 and therefore were part of the trial process?

A That's correct, yes.
Q
And you, in fact, testified at the trial; is that right?

That's right.
Next if we could call up 332525, please.
Mr. Commissioner, this is a
document that $I$ prepared or our staff prepared to put together a chronology of events again just to assist, assist the questioning of Mr. Pearson and to get an understanding of dates and what happened, and $I$ just want to quickly go through parts of this. Again, we will see that Mr. Pearson has extensive and detailed notes of the steps that he took and we just wanted to capture,
in a few pages, the timing of what he did.

And again, I've touched on this already, December 28th, 1988 is the application, again your involvement in February 28 of 90 . If we can scroll down, and I'll just touch on a couple of the highlights. March 14 th of '90 you interviewed Linda Fisher. March 24th -- if you can scroll down please -- March 24 th you attended with Eugene Williams to obtain her deposition. Next page. April 10th of '90 is your first meeting with Larry Fisher. May 8th, another interview with Larry Fisher. Scroll down. July 9th, 1990, the polygraph exam of Larry Fisher. Then July 13th of 1990, identifying the Saskatoon City Police offence files or looking at those. Scroll down. July 18 th you took a statement from Ken Cadrain, we heard from Mr. Cadrain about that, and $I$ will be questioning you about that. Next page. Again, some statements up until $I$ think December 1990 , and then the Minister's decision dismissing the application on February 27th.

And then $I$ think we jump down to

August, being the second application, and then it looks like on -- two days later Mr. Williams calls you again and sets out the work you are supposed
to do for the second application. And scroll down to the bottom. We see on September 12 th you get approval for an analysis of Larry Fisher's offences and the Gail Miller murder. And then the next page. October 10th, '91 that's forwarded to Mr. Williams, and again this is where you get a statement from Ms. (V14)-, and I think that's when that matter comes into your area of responsibility. And down at the bottom, actually, go to the next page. You will see the interview of one of the assault victims December $9 t h$ and then a selection of other interviews. And then we get into the January '92 period when the reference starts. And then I've covered this general period January to March 1992. And then scroll down to the bottom of the page. March lith the DNA samples are taken and you travel, on March $23 r d$, to get the DNA checked. Next page. Again, this just touches on conclusion of the reference case, the decision, and some follow-up matters that we'll touch on. If we could scroll down to the bottom, please. September 18th, '92 you are requested by Mr. Williams to do some work with respect to allegations being made and you interview a couple people related to the

Breckenridge allegations. And then here, I think
October 8th -- and we'll spend some time on
that -- ' 92 is when you meet with -- if we can go
to the next page -- the officers, RCMP officers and other senior officials from Alberta on the Flicker matter, is that right? So that would be the time frame?

That's correct, yes.
And then again we look -- skip ahead, 1997 the release of the DNA, and then as well some involvement in the Fisher proceedings. So, again, is that generally a
fair time outline of where it was you were
involved? And I appreciate, Mr. Pearson, it
certainly doesn't have everything in there, but some of the high points.

A

Q
Yup, yeah, I agree.
If we can call up 056743 please, and I'll come back to what this document is in a moment when we touch on that, but this would be the typed notes that you would have prepared as part of your office file; is that right?

Yes.
And, again, this would be the first entry, if you could just call out that, it was a call from Mr .

Williams soliciting assistance in the investigation involving an application under Section 690 Criminal Code filed on behalf of David Milgaard, it goes on to talk about receiving information from an individual who calls himself Sidney Wilson, the name Larry Fisher. And then paragraph 2, if you could call out please, it says:
"Williams advises there is potential for publicity and media interest in this case, and it is requested that we conduct our investigation as sensitively as possible. I advised Williams to send his instructions in writing with a brief history on the information that he was in possession of, and we would provide whatever assistance we could."

And, again, would that be an accurate note of what, generally what Mr. Williams -Yes.
-- would have asked you to do? If we can go to the next page. And it looks here, sir, that you then called Inspector Goodman and briefed him on what you were doing?

A That is correct.

And then it looks like March the 6th, 1990:
"Correspondence received from Mr.
Williams, outlining the requests that he wished fulfilled, as well as a copy of a letter he received from Milgaard's lawyer, outlining the new source of information. Our investigation will now begin. Copy of information received from Williams has been faxed for the info and file generation of OIC Crim Ops, "F" Division."

And the last point, can you tell us what that is, "OIC"?

That's the officer in charge of criminal
operations for division headquarters, $F$ Division, that is the Province of Saskatchewan within the RCMP .

So is that who you would be sending reports to then?

A
It was -- my report would go to Superintendent Goodman -- I see I have Inspector Goodman but I believe he was a superintendent at that time -and then he forwards the report to criminal operations.

So March the 6th, 1990, you say that's when your
investigation begins; is that correct? .

A
Q
investigation begins, is that correct?
That's correct.
And then if we can go to 001810 , and your note indicated that on March 6th, 1999 -- 1990 , correspondence was received from Mr. Williams with the request, and it --it's dated March 1990, but I'm assuming that this is the letter of instruction that Mr. Williams sent you on March 6th, $19--$ or that you received on March 6th, 1990; is that fair, sir?

That's fair.
And this would be, $I$ think when we looked at the call you had a discussion, he asked you to do some work, you said "send me your instructions in writing"; is that fair?

That's fair.
And so, again, we'll just touch on parts of this. And, again, he refers to the call of february $28 t h$ and he says:
"I sought to identify the person, whose assistance $I$ should obtain, to investigate certain facts concerning David Milgaard's application for mercy, pursuant to section 690 of the Criminal Code."

And again, would that be your understanding, that you were to investigate certain facts --

A

Q

And then, if we can just scroll down to the next full paragraph, Mr. Williams writes:
"This case has stimulated widespread public and media interest. As a result every investigative step may, at some future date, be subject to careful scrutiny."

And here we are, Mr. Pearson, doing just that. "Accordingly, to avoid any suggestion of a conflict of interest by an
organization responsible for determining the veracity of certain allegations, I am seeking the assistance of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. I understand that the force did not take a leading role in the conduct of the Gail Miller murder investigation in 1969."

And, again, your note of the call on the $28 t h$ talked a bit about that; is that fair?

That's fair.
And would you have known early on, Mr. Pearson, that this matter was a significant matter and one that was drawing public attention?

I don't recall having that knowledge.
And then again, if we can scroll down, Mr.
Williams says:
"Against this background, I am writing to obtain your assistance in determining:"

And then if we can go down:
"Re: Larry Earl Fisher",
who is the Larry Earl Fisher who was convicted in -- of killing Gail Miller subsequently as opposed to Larry Brian Fisher, he outlines a number of requests:
"Please provide details of Mr. Fisher's personal history for the period December 1968 to February, 1990 relating to his age, marital status, family members and associations, employment history, residence, illnesses or medical treatment, and his correctional institutional history. For example, was he a fellow inmate of David Milgaard, at any time? If so, what were the circumstances of their association? Further, of particular interest is Mr. Fisher's association, if any, with the Cadrain family, whose residence is noted above. For example, did they have a tenant named Larry Fisher."

And, again, some information about that. And if I can just pause here; is it fair to conclude from this, Mr. Pearson, that at this time these would be your marching orders, if $I$ can call it that, the specific inquiries that Mr. Williams wanted you to make on his behalf?

A Yes, yes, he was specific there, but, you know, there was curiosity, $I$ suppose, in Larry Fisher. I don't think it was just restricted to that
point-form request, but that was his initial
official request to me, yes.
So that in the course of gathering information
that Mr. Williams specifically asked for, if you
came across something that, as a police officer,
you might -- you thought might be relevant to what
you or Mr. Williams was looking at, that that's
something that you would obviously pursue; is that
correct?
A Yeah, yes.
And then again to the next page, if we can go to:
"C. Re: Linda Fisher and Sidney Wilson",
he asks you to:
"... determine the whereabouts of Linda
Fisher, and whether she did form the
conclusions attributed to her by
Wilson."
And, again, that's the Sidney Wilson who phoned
Mr. Wolch and said Linda Fisher had information
that suggested her husband killed Gail Miller.
And so again, "if she can", it's asking you to go
to see her and get her story; is that fair?

A

Q
That's fair.
And then, as well, to gather some personal
information about Linda Fisher and find out some
information from Sidney Wilson, who I think we now know is Bruce LaFreniere. Did you ever know a Bruce LaFreniere or deal with him at all?

A letter.

If we can just pause there, and
I want to just compare if $I$ can, Mr. Pearson, was this -- this would be the first time you were involved in a Section 690 application; right?

A
Q

A
would go about this.
If we could call up 001810 .
And I take it, just on that point, would there be a difference if you were in charge of the investigation versus taking directions from someone else?

Well I was, I was in a situation where $I$ was following up on what somebody else wanted. They were taking the lead, so to speak, as to what they had to, I suppose, determine under their purview of 690, which was not something the police were really familiar with.

I see. This letter -- I'm sorry, 001814 . And this was the attachment in the letter that Eugene Williams wrote to you on March the 6th, or that you received on March the 6th, 1990 , and this is the letter that David Asper wrote to Eugene Williams that had the information on Sidney Wilson. And $I$ take it, sir, that you would have been aware of the incident, or the version of events that the person named Sidney Wilson had related to Hersh Wolch, that Fisher had arrived at home on the morning of January 31, 1969 covered with blood, and that Fisher's wife had seen this, Fisher's wife then apparently heard of the murder
later that day and concluded that Fisher may have had some involvement, and that Fisher's wife went to the police a number of years ago with this information; is that -- so $I$ take it that would be your first bit of information about Linda Fisher, is that fair?

That's fair. In addition to telephone calls, of course, I had with Mr. Williams.

Right.
I'm sure we had talked about this.
And then, down at the bottom, Mr. Asper writes that -- to Mr. Williams, he says:
"As we have indicated in our earlier correspondence, we have no funds with which to retain an investigator. We would very much appreciate your considering making sufficient funds available to us in order that we might take the appropriate steps, failing which we would very much like to be advised as to the status of any investigation that your office might undertake."

And at some subsequent point, Mr. Pearson, did you have occasion to talk directly to David Asper
in the course of your work on this investigation?
A
Q

A with Mr. Asper, we had communicated back and forth on an ongoing basis, $I$ always thought that we had a fairly cordial relationship. He provided information to me directly and $I$ updated him on matters that $I$ thought were appropriate at the time, and so we did, we did communicate via telephone. I think they are documented in my notes for the most part.

And generally, we'll get into the specifics, but generally did Mr. Asper, from time to time, provide you with information that assisted you in your investigation?

Yes, he did.
And did you, from time to time, call him without him calling you first; in other words not report to him but give him a call and tell him what was happening?

A
$Q$

A

2

A
$Q$

A

Q for him.

I'll show you some documents, and it may have been after they took the statement from Linda Fisher, but at some point you would have become aware that
but at some point you would have become aware that

Joyce Milgaard and a fellow from Centurion Ministries were investigating as well; is that fair?

A
later, but I think you asked Mr. Williams to give
you some background facts to help you when you
went out to interview Linda Fisher and others;
does that sound correct?
Yes, I did ask for, you know, just like I say, a
synopsis of what this was all about.

And so, here, this is what Mr. Williams says: "... a synopsis of the facts concerning the location and timing of the murder; and, the physical evidence that was discovered at or near the murder scene." And then he says, scroll down:
"I hope this will provide you with the necessary background information to assist your investigation."

So this would be your first, other than your phone call with Mr. Williams -- if we can go to the next page, please -- this would be your first, the first set of facts or information you had about what it was that led to Mr. Milgaard's conviction; is that fair?

A That's fair.

And, as well, the circumstances of Gail Miller's death; is that fair?

A That's fair.
Q
And $I$ won't go through all of this, but certainly the parts, $I$ take it you would have learned that the evidence against Mr. Milgaard came in part from his travelling companions Nichol John and Ron Wilson, who had testified or given statements about seeing a knife that matched the murder
weapon; do you remember --


A
$Q$

A
$Q$

Uh-huh.
-- seeing that? I take it you would have gone through and got an idea of what it was that -Yes.

If we can go to the next page, please, and it goes on, and $I$ don't propose to go through it, it just talks about the details of a sketch of where things happened, where the body was found, and the Wilson and John evidence. If we can go to the next page. And then $I$ think Mr., I think this is Mr. Williams' document that he prepared, but the author goes on to describe about Nichol John giving a statement to the police that included where she saw Mr. Milgaard grab a knife and begin to stab the woman, but then later on at trial when she testified she neither confirmed nor denied the truthfulness of the information. Do you remember that being a feature of the case, Mr. Pearson, when you first got it; that Nichol John had given a statement to the police saying a number of incriminating things, including that she witnessed the murder, but at trial said she couldn't remember?

A I eventually -- whether I picked up on that at
this particular moment I'm not too sure, but I certainly did become aware of it.

And then it says here, and it looks like this is Mr. Williams saying when $I$ interviewed her she said that she told the truth in her statement even though she did not recall all the events today, and I'm assuming the I is Mr. Williams, and then again he sets out -- if we can just go back to the full page -- and $I$ won't go through this, but Mr. Williams set out from the trial transcript, and if we can go to the next page, the questions and answers from the transcript, and again to the next page, and it goes on to talk about what happened at the trial. Here -- I take it you would have become aware that the issue of witnessing blood on David Milgaard's clothing that morning was evidence that was used against him at the trial and that Wilson noticed it and Albert Cadrain noticed it? Uh-huh, yes.

Scroll down a bit. He talks about Albert Cadrain's testimony confirming blood. Then the next page. Sorry, go to the next page. And at some point, either when you read this or at some subsequent point, you would have become aware of
the condition of Gail Miller's clothing; namely, that her uniform dress was down, rolled down at her waist and the stab mark was through the coat, but not the dress. Do you remember that being a feature of the crime scene?

Yes.
And then the next page, it sets out about some forensic evidence at trial, about a frozen lump containing semen that suggested the perpetrator had blood type A, and I take it that would have been a fact, and we'll see when you pursue Mr. Fisher in your investigation that his blood type is an issue that you follow up on; is that fair? That's fair.

Now, just generally, are you able to recall whether you had any reaction when you read this summary, or learned the facts about anything related to guilt or innocence of David Milgaard or anything about the circumstances of the crime, does anything jump out that you remember today? I didn't form any opinions based on that primarily because it had very little to do with Linda Fisher. My task was to go and follow up on Linda Fisher. The material in here really had very little to do with any knowledge that, you know, of
-- the Fisher side, so to speak, wasn't part of this, but -- so it certainly enlightened me as to the history of the details leading to the conviction of David Milgaard, but how $I$ could apply this to anything that Linda Fisher may have to say would be limited.

Just again back on the document that $I$ read you, it says in there, and $I$ think it's Mr. Williams, talks about him having interviewed Nichol John. Do you remember that point I showed you? Did Mr. Williams ever send you copies of the other work he had done on the file; for example, here's all the interviews I've conducted to date and here's all the other information?

I received no information at all that $I$ recall pertaining to those other witnesses.

Now, can you tell us, what reporting protocol was in place for you to report to Eugene Williams and anybody else with respect to the work you were doing on this file? Let's talk firstly with Eugene Williams.

As I recall, there was no official protocol set up between the two of us, we didn't say $I$ would like you to report to me in a certain format every so many days, it was an informal arrangement that was
really at the phone call level, and we certainly exchanged faxes, as far as getting statements and faxing him the statements, and from time to time he had material that he forwarded to me that I think is all on the record. As far as the documentation that $I$ was generating, was primarily the police notes, and then there is the file report that stayed locally and then, as $I$ mentioned earlier on, there was a reporting requirement that was an internal reporting requirement and those are reports of summaries that went forward to our headquarters, and on those $I$ provided, as I recall, specific instructions to ensure they sent a copy of that report to Mr. Williams.

On how many occasions did you meet personally with Eugene Williams?

A

And would those be, and we'll go through those, would those be in connection with the interviews of Linda and Larry Fisher, for example?

A Yes.

And I think there was one visit with the city police; is that fair?

A

Q

A

Q
And so again just back -- let's just talk as far as between you and Eugene Williams, and I'll go through your reporting to your superiors within the RCMP, but as between you and Mr. Williams directly, you said by phone call, by fax as well; is that correct?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
That's correct.
And did you have any concerns or issues with the flow of communication between you and Mr. Williams in the course of your work?

What do you mean by the concerns about the flow? Did you get information to him -- did information flow back and forth without any difficulty, was
there any issues there that caused you concern
that he wasn't getting your information or you weren't getting his information?

No, $I$ think the information that $I$ intended to provide him he received. I'm not sure what information he had that $I$ should have had or could have had or -- but $I$ didn't think there was any --

When you needed to communicate with Mr. Williams and provide him information, were you able to do so?

Oh, yes, absolutely, sure.
And when you asked him for information, did you get it, you know, in a reasonable time? Oh, yes.

Let's just talk again about your notes. I understand, sir, and there's three separate sources of your documents, if $I$ can call it that, the first one would be your officer's notebook; is that correct?

Yes.

And that would be your handwritten notes? Yes.

And can you tell us, just generally, what was your practice at the time for recording notes? Well, you would hand write them into your notebook Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv
on chronology of time and date as much as possible. There were times when you would put a note to file and pick it up at possibly a later date if you didn't have access to your notes at the time or -- but for the most part the notes were a chronology of what went on and for the most part they were entered at the time. There were times that you might come back at a later date and enter a note, there's a few times when the chronology does not fit, but for the most part that's the way they unfolded.

And I take it, sir, that in your other
investigations, your, if $I$ can call them, regular investigations, for example, where you are investigating a murder, and you keep a notebook in that type of investigation; is that correct?

A

Q

A Yes.

And in this case you kept the same type of notebook?

Well, this was not the only duty $I$ had. Like I say, I was in charge of the GIS section and we probably had 35 or 40 investigations going on at any given time, so $I$ was carrying some of the files myself, but $I$ was primarily overseeing and supervising the other investigators who really
carried a lot more than $I$ did as far as the operational work and there were general notebooks and on this particular case the notes were specific for this particular investigation, so they were kept separate.

Right. So you have a separate notebook for work on the 690 investigation?

Yes, that's right.
But your practice and procedure as far as keeping notes would be the same as you would for other police files; in other words, I think we're all familiar with standard police officer's notebooks, and did you apply the same standards and system on this case as you did all of your other files; is that --

Generally what $I$ did, if $I$ was on a serious long-term investigation, that $I$ would have a set of notebooks specific to that particular investigation. If $I$ was doing ongoing inquiries and general investigation over other investigations that weren't so "serious", I would have an ongoing notebook, might have entries covering numerous different files and investigations.

And just again on the time frame, $I$ think when

Mr. Williams asked you to become involved, I take it you would have had other investigations unrelated to this matter that you were working on?

A
Q
A
Q

A

Q

A
Q
So I take it you had other murder -- you had murder investigations you were working on at the same time you were assisting Mr. Williams; is that right?

A
Oh, yes, yes.

And did you continue to work on those matters?
Yes.
Are you able to give us any sense of how much of your time was devoted to the work for Mr. Williams in the 1990-'91 time frame?

Well, it's pretty hard to put it in a percentage figure, but it did take a lot of time, but there was a lot of other things going on as well, there was other homicides in the works and we had a lot of other priorities as well going on, but to give you a percentage of time $I$ spent on this, it was significant.

And $I$ take it you had, and we'll see a reference in here $I$ think to a Caron murder, a Braun murder or Malm is it?

Yes.

Yes, and I don't want to take credit for all this
because there were other investigators who were certainly involved in these investigations, but I was supervising and overseeing what was going on there, yes.

Just on your notebooks, and I understand, Mr.
Pearson, that all of your notebooks were not only provided to the RCMP in the Flicker investigation, but as well had been turned over to the

Commission; is that correct?
That's correct, yes.
And if we could call up 332535, please, what we've done, Mr. Commissioner, to assist Mr. Pearson and other counsel, and $I$ don't know that the need will arise to go to the notebooks very often, but if they do, they are all up here in paper copy by date, and we've put together in this document, which has been provided to all counsel, the date and the page range for that date and the notebook number, so that for any given date we can fairly readily find the note, and $I$ will leave these up for counsel to look at, and certainly, Mr. Pearson, if at any time in giving your answers you wish to refer to part of your notebook, we can call them up on the screen for you or have your originals here if you need them.

I should point out, and maybe we'll just call up 058212, and $I$ can show you, the manner in which they photocopied the notebooks was very efficient; however, somewhat confusing, and they have put two notebooks, different notebooks on the same page, and so $I$ just want to point that out to everybody. You'll see this -- I'm not sure if you can tell from this, this is February 28th, 1990, 4:00 p.m., called Eugene Williams, Federal Justice Ottawa, explained need to do further investigation on the David Milgaard case, etcetera, so that would be your note for February 28 th .

If we can just go back to the
main page, please, and you'll see this note over here is from a different notebook, and $I$ think that is April 20th, but if we could just -- I just want to show that.

If we can go back to 332535,
you'll see what we've done for notebook number 1 , it's got left column, so for the dates this is all left column. If we can go to the next page, please, 332536, you'll see notebook number 2 is on the right column and there's the April 20 th date, so I am sure, Mr. Pearson, we will have this
figured out if we need to go to the documents, and as $I$ say, the notebooks are up here by dates with tabs so if anybody needs to get them.

So those would be the entirety
of your notebooks, sir, is that fair, that you provided for the relevant time frame? primarily on my notes, and to a degree my thoughts, and they are not identical to the handwritten notes, there are some differences; not much mind you, but there are some details in the handwritten notes you may find that don't match up, so it's not like a transcript or something like that.

And let's just go through, this is titled at the top occurrence report and it's got some general information about Mr. Williams, and I take it --
and the file, although we can't see it very well, I think it's file -0893.

90-893; is that right?
That's right.
And so this would be a standard occurrence report form that you would prepare when you initiate a file?

That's an RCMP report, yes.
And if we can just go to the next page, please, we'll see it's got continuation report at the top, page 2, and that you number the paragraphs and in fact have the date, and maybe go to the next page, and the time, so it looks as though, sir, that this is a running set of your dictated notes and thoughts; is that fair?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
Yes.
And I should go back to the full page, please. So here's something on March 7th, on March 8th there's an entry from nine o'clock, an entry from 11 o'clock. Can you tell us, did you dictate these notes, did someone type them up for you then?

Yes, a secretary typed them up.
And would you do this on a regular basis?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

They would accumulate for quite a while before I got to dictating them onto a report, yes.

And you take them from your notebook and then dictate onto this file?

Yes.
And what was the purpose of this document, where did it reside and what was its function?

It was a file report just to move material,
information from the personal notebook into I guess a readable format.

And so this would be at your office at all times if someone wanted to -- if your superior, for example, wanted to find out what you were doing, they could go look at this file?

Yes.
And so this would be a running chronology outlining what you undertook in this investigation; is that fair?

Yes.
And again, for the record, it runs from February 28th, 1990 to April 28th, 1992 and all the paragraphs are sequentially numbered; is that correct?

Yes.
And we've had a chance to review this, Mr.

Pearson, in preparation for your evidence, and I think there's a couple of dates that might be out a bit which we will, $I$ will identify as we go along, but for the most part, can you tell us that this would be an accurate record of the notes you would have made at the time that would outline the work you did on the investigation?

Subject to some human error, yes.
When you mean human error --
You know, like, I didn't proof them, I didn't proof the notes to what's there, so they are a different document, but they are accurate as far as I'm concerned.

And I think at least to the extent that where they've been compared to your notebook, there are certainly many similarities; is that -- they are not verbatim, but they are close; is that fair? Oh, very close.

And then the next report -- so again,
Mr. Commissioner, and for the benefit of the parties, this document 056743 I intend to use as the primary document when $I$ go through Mr.

Pearson's evidence, $I$ may from time to time go to the notebooks if we need to. The third type of report $I$ think is the investigation report; is
that right?
A
Q
A
$Q$
A

And those notes have been disclosed to the Commission, but I think that is about another 250 pages of notes.

Right. So --
So that is -- there's more in the system, but it's not typed up.

Q
I see. So the end of April, '92 you continued to make notes in your notebook, but they never made its way onto the office chronology because you were assigned elsewhere; is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q
And then if we could, on the investigation report, if $I$ can call it that, $I$ take it that on the basis of a month or two you would send a report to your superior outlining what you had done; is that right?

A summary report, yes.
And if we could call up 332553, please, this is a document that we prepared, Mr. Commissioner and Mr. Pearson, this just outlines the dates of the reports that you sent up, the doc ID and then the appendices attached to the investigation reports, and I understand, Mr. Pearson, that when you prepared a report; for example, if you took a statement, you would attach the statement as an appendix and send it up the line? Is that correct?

A Q That's correct, yes. And in fact we have seen in documents that we have used today your appendix numbers on some of the documents, but this is just to assist the parties.

The next document, if $I$ could call up 332520, you'll see the appendices there and the dates.

332520 is again a document we prepared that lists the appendices $A$ to $X X X$ referred to in the reports
and we've got the appendix, the date and the doc ID, and each of these doc IDs, we'll see at the top, reference to the actual appendix.

And so if $I$ might, maybe if $I$ could just call up the first report, we'll just take a quick look at that before we break, 004906 , and I think $P C R$ means what, is that --

Previous crime report.
Previous crime report. So this is the first report, "F" Division, April 17th, 1990, your file number, and then you go on to talk about persons subject to this report. Maybe go to the next page, and then you talk about the complaint and investigation, and can you tell us, what would be the purpose of this report and when would you prepare it and what would you put in it?

A

Q

A
This is a report that goes up through headquarte
advising senior management of what's evolving on

There was no real set time that you had to have it in, but there was follow-up.

And again these reports, I take it you would rely this particular investigation.

And $I$ think we'll see from the dates it wasn't monthly, but it would be some time frame you would report? And
on your notebooks and the office file, the chronology to assist you in preparing this report?

A

Q

A
$Q$
A
Q

A
$Q$
Q For the most part, and knowledge that you felt you accurately possessed.

And again, and we'll see this when we get into the specifics, but in some of these reports would it be fair to say that you will make comments or observations or express some views about things you have done or what might need to be done, is that fair, that might not be in your notes and the chronology?

Yes. In the policy for setting up this, this is kind of a standard format, several of them changed over the years in the RCMP, but at this time $I$ recall this was the format being used and there was a provision in there for "investigator's comments" where you could put some --

And so I --
-- input.
Sorry. The point is, in these reports we may find items expressed by you that we don't find in your notebook or your chronology; is that fair?

Yes, that's right.
And if we could maybe just go to the last page of this report, you'll see here -- actually, just go
to the previous page, and maybe just give an example here, in your summary you talk about expressing views on weapons and things of that nature. You are expressing your views on what has been done and what might need to be done; is that fair?

A
Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$

Officer commanding. That would be Goodman upstairs in my office.

And you say two copies for forwarding to "F" division and then criminal operations, please ensure material forwarded to Mr. Eugene Williams; is that correct?

That's correct.
And so your understanding, or your intentions were to have this report go to Eugene Williams as well?

Yes.
And I take it that prior to this report going to Mr. Williams, you may have discussed some or all of the information in this report?

Yes. We had ongoing telephone calls and I don't believe there are too many surprises, so to speak, in these reports, as far as Mr. Williams is concerned.

MR. HODSON: This might be an appropriate spot to break.
(Adjourned at 2:55 p.m.)
(Reconvened at 3:15 p.m.)
BY MR. HODSON:
Mr. Pearson, if we can now go to the work that you did on the first Section 690 application, and $I$ think you told us that primarily it was to investigate Larry Fisher as a suspect in the death of Gail Miller; is that correct?

Yes.
And let's go to the document 056743 which is your chronology and go to page 056745 , and $I$ think your earlier letter said March 6 th is when you were going to start the investigation, it looks like March 7th you contacted North Battleford RCMP, and by March 8th you had identified Larry Fisher's
mother and his ex-wife Linda and contact
information; is that correct?

A
$Q$

Q

A
$Q$
Yes.

And then if you can go down, and we'll take a look at paragraph 11 , it says:
"Penitentiary Service has a letter on
file addressed to Chief Kettles,
Saskatoon Police Department, dated 20

Oct 70, indicating that members of the

Winnipeg Department interviewed Fisher
and he denied any involvement in these
offences (not sure which offences he was interviewed on)."

And again if we can call up 002019, and this is a letter that we have seen many times before, Mr. Pearson, $I$ think this is the October $20 t h$ letter, that it appears the person in the Prince Albert Penitentiary office may have read parts to you over the phone, and where it says he denied any knowledge of the offences committed in your area, this is the one to Kettles. Do you see that?

A
$Q$

A Yes.

So if we can just go back to the report, 056745, what $I$ think the evidence is we've heard so far, Mr. Pearson, is that the Fort Garry police file on Larry Fisher for the 1970 offences, that that file was destroyed. In fact $I$ think -- did you not follow up to try and get their police file? Yes.

And what were you told?
That when they amalgamated, the files were destroyed.

And did you in fact get a file from the Prince Albert Penitentiary at some point on Larry Fisher that had information about the Fort Garry offences?

Yes.

And the letter that $I$ just showed you from

Inspector Perry of the Fort Garry police to Chief Kettles, was that document -- do you remember that being on there?

I can't specifically remember the document, but there was a document that was saying some things that $I$ was questioning about which offence they were related to.

So if we can just go back to at the time, and this
is March 8th of '90, paragraph 11, at this time you make a note not sure which offences he was interviewed on. At this time were you aware as to whether or not Larry Fisher had been, other than the conviction in Winnipeg that was given to you, any other information about any offences anywhere else?

Not that I recall.
And do you remember what if anything you made of this information in paragraph 11 that you got from Penitentiary Services?

Well, it was just a question that $I$ wondered which offence they were talking about.

Go to the next page, please, and again just for the date, this is still March 8th, and $I$ think
this is where you called Mr. Williams and asked for -- advising you located Linda Fisher and you
asked for a synopsis of the file so that you can better brief yourself before interviewing her, and I think that's the document that $I$ just went through earlier, that synopsis; is that right?

A

And then we see down here, paragraph 15, about again Larry Lafleur at Prince Albert Penitentiary about blood type of Larry Fisher. I won't go through all of these reports, but you'll see in the chronology here, Mr . Pearson, or at least I did when $I$ went through it, a number of situations where you were seeking to get Larry Fisher's blood type; is that correct?

A

Q
A
Q

A

That came back to the blood type that was involved in the Milgaard conviction.

Yes.
And there was the type $A$ blood and the antigens of
Yes.
And was it difficult to find his blood type?
Yes, it really was.
And why was his blood type important, or learning his blood type?
the blood and $I$ was just trying to find out if the blood type was the same or different.

And again would that be to either eliminate or leave him in as a potential suspect? Well, $I$ don't think $I$ would have made the decision to eliminate, but it would have been helpful in addressing some question.

And then again if you go down to paragraph 17 and 18, I won't go through it, but it looks as though you made contact with RCMP in North Battleford and got some information about Larry Fisher's friend, or common-law relationship that he was living with in 1980, so again, you would be getting whatever information you could about Larry Fisher?

Just some general information gathering, yes.
And then down, paragraph 18, you talk about checking the medical records at the Pen in an effort to get a blood type for Larry Fisher and making arrangements to go down there and review the file; is that correct?

Yes.
Q
And if we can go to the next page, please. So this is March 12th, which $I$ think is a Monday, I've checked the calendar, so on March 9th the Friday, or March 8th the Thursday, you had a phone
number for Linda Fisher, March 9th you talked -on Friday talked to the P.A. Pen people, and on Monday, March 12th this details a conversation with Eugene Williams, and Mr. Williams advised that he had been in contact with David Asper and Mr. Asper said Sidney Wilson doesn't exist, they think it's Brian Wright. And then it says Asper apparently obtained this information from Joyce Milgaard, and it is not known exactly how accurate this is, and that at:
"Sometime during the past weekend, Joyce Milgaard went to Cando, Sask., and interviewed Linda, and also went to North Battleford and talked to Larry Fisher's mother, Maria."

I think that should be Marcy.
"Mrs. Milgaard apparently made inquiries to determine if the Justice Department has been investigating her compliant. Maria Fisher apparently called the RCMP members in North Battleford as she felt she was being bothered unnecessarily by Mrs. Milgaard."

And then again, if we can just pause there, is that accurate; did you become aware of that at
the time that contact was made?
A

Q

A
$Q$
Yes. Yes, $I$ believe there was more detail in my notebooks on that, but basically there was a concern about what is written there.

If we can just go down to paragraph 21, and then again this would be information that Mr. Williams gave you before you went to see Linda Fisher, I take it; is that right, by the date?

Repeat that?
I say the date of this is March 12 th and, according to your notes, this would be before you went out to see Linda Fisher; is that all right? Yes.

And then this talks about:
"Mrs. Milgaard provided her lawyer with information as follows."

Starting here:
"The night before the murder of Gail
Miller, Larry Fisher went out in the evening and did not return, while Linda waited up ... When Linda awoke about 9 am the day of the murder, Larry was present ...",
they had an argument, Linda heard a report on the radio -- just reading parts of this -- Linda
immediately accused Larry of the crime and went into a rage of accusations, Larry is said to have dropped his hands to his side and took on a look of shock. And then Linda has two uncles, Roy and Cliff, at the time Cliff loaned his car to Larry, and then also indications about what was observed.

So, again, $I$ take it you would have received this information or had this, then, before you went out to see Linda Fisher?

A
$Q$ And if we can go to the next page, please, you write:

> "Eugene Williams expressing concern at this time to me that Mrs. Milgaard is conducting her own investigation, which may hamper the investigation the authorities are trying to pursue. Williams and myself discussed the possibility of taking a legal deposition and arrangements will be made to have this done."

Can you explain or elaborate on what Mr. Williams may have said to you about his concerns about Mrs. Milgaard conducting her own investigation?

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
A

I think he was just basically concerned that someone else outside the so-called system was conducting investigation, inquiries, that may hamper ours.

And did you share that concern?
Umm, I had concerns that developed more later on. At this point the fact that she had been there and was talking to Linda didn't really alarm me, but later on, in the attempt to develop Fisher, there were some concerns, yes.

And what were those concerns?
Well when we got to the point of trying to get the confidence of Fisher, as a suspect, to get him to talk to us, there was this issue that negative publicity may influence how he will deal with us, so I really was interested in having a quiet a time as possible and getting through to Larry Fisher. The more publicity, the more noise being made about it, the more alarmed he may become and the more difficult that may be for us, that's -that was the negative side.

I suppose you could argue the fact that maybe he would be scared into talking to us, but that was my concern at the time.

So at this time, again on March 12th, I think you
are saying -- I think you told us it was a concern later -- at this time the fact that Mrs. Milgaard had been to see Linda Fisher, tell us again; did that cause you any concern?

A

Q

A
$Q$
A

Q

A
I -- no, I can't really, when $I$ reflect back I can't really say that $I$ was alarmed. I know I realized this was David's mother out there looking for answers and evidence and, at that point, it didn't really alarm me that that was being done. Did --

But it had the potential to create difficulties, you know.

In what way?
But that would -- but I'm talking about the very initial time. I think the potential to introduce, introduce evidence or -- you know, you don't have any control over what you are getting or not getting when you go to talk to an individual, it's difficult enough sometimes for a policeman to do it without having to go when someone else has been there before you, so there was some potential downsides to it.

So when you say "introduce evidence" what do you mean by that?

Well introduce -- not, maybe I shouldn't use the
word "evidence" -- but introduce information that may influence what the person says or does when they respond to you when you interview them. Now would the, would the flip side be true from -and I don't want to call it from the Milgaard side -- if you had interviewed a witness first and they then went and interviewed them, might they have the same concern, in other words whoever gets there first, the second person may have the same concern about the first person?

Oh I -- yes, that potentially exists. People will react in a lot of different ways, but that was my concern, particularly when it got to dealing with Larry Fisher.

And again, we'll deal with this more specifically when we get into it, but was that an issue then? As far as your investigation, by the time you first met with Larry Fisher, to your knowledge, had he become aware that he was a suspect prior to you seeing him?

Oh, I believe yes, he did.
And $I$ think we'll see some documents here that suggest, after his mother was visited and after his sister, both his mother and his sister informed him that Mrs. Milgaard was making
inquiries about him; is that fair?
That, that's fair.
And did that, the fact that he --
And I may add some of that information may have also come from the fact that $I$ was making inquiries as well.

I see. So the fact that he was aware -- I take it
that if he was told "Sergeant Pearson of the RCMP
is here to talk to you about Gail Miller's murder"
he would be aware that he is a suspect --
I --
-- or that he is being talked to?
Yes.
Well we'll maybe deal with that when we get into the specific timing.

Sure.
Now again, at this time, this talks about a phone call with Mr. Williams on March the 12th. If we could call up 016114, and this is a memo that Mr. Williams wrote to the file, and on March the 12 th, and again it outlines -- and we will be hearing from Mr. Williams, Mr. Pearson -- but this is, I think, a file memo where Mr. Williams outlines his call with David Asper about the information of Sidney Wilson and the fact that Mrs. Milgaard, I
think, had gone to interview -- Joyce. It looks as though that this memo was the information that David Asper gave to Eugene Williams that at least some of which he passed on to you according to your note; is that -- do you see that?

Uh-huh.
And my question here, there is a reference here about:
"Mr. Asper provided more particulars concerning Larry Fisher. For example, he filled in his middle name, and recited portions of Fisher's criminal record."

And then if we can call up 050467 , and this is a letter of March $15 t h, 1990$ from Mr . Asper to Mr . Williams, which again says:
"It's our understanding that Mr.
Fisher's record is as follows:",
and what $I$ want to focus on is these December,
'71 Regina, it lists Regina, two counts of rape, rape/indecent assault. We now know that these are the four Saskatoon offences and I think we've heard some evidence, Mr. Pearson, that the CPIC, when it prints off the record, it would print off the city where the guilty plea is entered as
opposed to where the offences took place; is that correct, that information?

That is correct, yes.
And in fact, if we scroll down, you will see that for the (V10) (V10)- attempted murder, which we know took place in North Battleford, there had actually been a change of venue and Mr. Fisher pled guilty in Prince Albert. So this, it looks as though the criminal record would identify the charges as being Regina, and we'll see when we go through your notes that for some time it appears everybody, you, everybody who is dealing with Linda and Larry Fisher is of the view that these offences of Mr. Fisher's in '68 to '70 took place in Regina rather than Saskatoon; do you remember that being an issue or having that misunderstanding for a while?

A
$Q$

A
Yes, I -- I think it was. I think the earliest one was March, March the 8th, I do believe. March the 8th?

And I guess, are you able to tell us where, sort of when we see your interview with Linda Fisher -and $I$ don't want to get ahead here -- but $I$ think in Linda Fisher's, both her statement to Joyce Milgaard and her statement to you, I think refers to offences in Regina, or certainly the interviews do; when Eugene Williams questions her on March $24 t h$ she refers to offences in Regina, and then it's corrected, $I$ think in July of 1990 it becomes apparent, and I'll take you to that. I'm just trying to understand, Mr. Pearson, are you able to tell us where or how you came to believe that they were Regina offences?

I think, $I$ think probably like everyone else, off the records that were generated. And if I, if my memory serves me correctly, I do believe the penitentiary records regarding the fingerprints that were taken also indicated Regina.

Okay. So --
So that's where we got off track.
So if we can go back, and again, whether it was -are you able to tell us whether it was your own CPIC information or whether it was from Mr. Williams, who may have heard it from Mr. Asper,
are you able to tell us where you got your information from?

A
Might have been more than one source, but I couldn't itemize them out now, as to which one came first.

Okay. If we could go back to 056748, please. And again, this is March the 12 th, this is Monday, so after your conversation with Mr. Williams it looks as though the RCMP in North Battleford call you, and they have a complaint from Larry Fisher's mother that there were two people who were on her steps wanting to get in to talk to her about Larry Fisher, and that it was Mrs. Milgaard wanted to talk to Mrs. Fisher, she has a heart condition, she does not wish to engage in conversation, therefore called the police, and this was explained to Mrs. Milgaard and everyone departed.

So I guess, at this time, that
you would have become aware that, in addition to Linda Fisher, that Joyce Milgaard and a male person had also visited Larry Fisher's mother; is that correct?

Yes.
And did that, at the time, cause you any concern as far as what you were doing in your
investigation?

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Well it was starting to, starting to cause some issues in the fact that you are getting complaints from individuals calling the police saying that this, this is happening, and you are also tasked with doing the investigation that is obviously being followed up by, you know, a family member of David Milgaard.

Now this is March 12th, and I think you said you started on March 6th; did you feel that you were going quick enough at this time?

Well, yes, I did. If we can go down to the bottom paragraph, it's probably not a great question, "quick enough"; did you think that you were proceeding in a timely fashion is maybe a better question?

Yes.
And at paragraph 28 it looks as though you requested information as to whether Mr. Milgaard and Mr. Fisher served time in the same institution, and back when $I$ showed you Eugene Williams' letter of instructions to you, that was one of the things he asked you to follow up; correct?

And so, again, $I$ take it that would it be fair to say that part of what you were doing was gathering information to answer the specific questions that Mr. Williams asked you to do?

Yes.
And then, in addition to that, I take it applying your skills as an investigator to gather information that might be relevant to Larry Fisher as a suspect; is that fair?

Yes.
If we can then go to the next page, looks as
though then on Tuesday, March 13th you went up to the Prince Albert Pen and got the file, is that right?

A
Yes.
On Larry Fisher?
Yes.
And then went to North Battleford to interview Linda Fisher?

Yes.
Now again, before we go through this, maybe you could just tell us, sir, in your own words, what is your recollection of your first meeting with Linda Fisher? And, again, I'll take you to the statements and the specifics, but just generally,
what do you recall about your dealings with her?

A
Well I, $I$ met her as $I$ recall at the institution where she was taking some upgrading. We actually talked in the police car. I was quite impressed, actually, with her. She was a very everyday, down-to-earth individual, $I$ got the feeling that she was sincere about what she was saying. I felt good about what she was saying, she never really left me the impression that she was being vindictive or was looking for revenge or in scorn or disappointed, she gave me a generally good feeling about who she was. That was my gut feeling by the contact $I$ had with her.

And again, I'll get into the specifics, but did you have any sense -- describe for us what you understood Linda Fisher's position to be, or thoughts regarding her ex-husband, Larry Fisher's, responsibility for Gail Miller's murder; was it 'he might have done it', 'I think he did it', 'I'm sure he did it', can you tell us what was your sense of what she was communicating to you about her belief that Larry Fisher may have been involved in Gail Miller's murder?

I think she believed strongly that he could possibly have done it.

And, again, can you tell -- and we will get into the statement in detail -- can you tell us what she was relying upon to say that? Does anything stick out in your mind as to what it was that prompted her to say "lookit, I think he did commit the murder"?

Well I think, over the years, she had accumulated a lot of thoughts on it, but she had some information about the missing knife, she had information about him not being home that -- not coming home that night, not being at work the next day when he was supposed to, the argument, those kinds of things, I think, stuck in her mind as 'could Larry have been involved'. So, again, let's just maybe go through those. One would be, I guess, opportunity and the fact that -- and we'll see this when we get into the statement -- that she felt that the night before the murder and the next morning, that Larry was not at work, in fact he was in his work clothes when she woke up; is that right?

A
Q

A

A

2 Yes.

And, again, $I$ 'll get into the details about whether --

You say he was in what clothes when she woke up?

Q
A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q
A
Q

A
$Q$

Sorry, his dress clothes.
Yes.
That's right, in dress clothes, and that she believed he had not gone to work and had been elsewhere; correct?

Yes.
And I'll take you to statements and the deposition where there's some questioning about whether he might have been home or might not, but just generally speaking she was telling you "lookit, the morning of the murder $I$ don't think he went to work", so that would be important, number 1 , opportunity; is that correct?

Yes.
Secondly, the knife she had -- and again we'll go into the details -- but she was missing a paring knife --

Yes.
-- that morning?
Yes.
And she was of the view that it might be the murder weapon or similar to the murder weapon; is that right?

I believe that's fair to say.
Initially -- let me back up -- initially she is
saying "a knife went missing, I know the nurse was killed with a paring knife, you know", --

A
Q
A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
2
And that's -- I'm sorry, I should have brought that up -- that's where she accused him of, that morning, of having committed the murder and his

Well she was talking about the argument and that very shocked look that he had. that weighed on her mind, that he had committed similar offences and maybe was the type of person who could have committed the murder?

Yes, I think that's a fair characterization.
And is there anything else that you can think of -- and I'll go through the statements with you -- that were sort of significant in her mind that she might have been relying upon to say "I think he might have been responsible"? marder and his
shocked reaction?
Yes.
And she felt that that was a factor, in her mind, that he may have done it?

That's right.
And again just generally, was -- when you met with
her the first time was there -- did you get any impression of her having views as -- let me try and phrase this better. Was she saying "lookit, I have some views that David Milgaard didn't do it, that are completely unrelated to Larry Fisher", or were her concerns solely "I think my husband, ex-husband, committed the murder"?

As I recall, it was more that she thought Larry could have done it.

And that, if he did it, therefore David Milgaard didn't do it; is that --

Yes, obviously.
But did you get any sense from her that, apart from her suspicion that Larry Fisher had committed the murder, she otherwise had concerns or doubts about David Milgaard's guilt?

Oh, I think that's fair, that she felt that. I just can't give you specifics but -Sure. So then if we could go through -- so I take Oh, think that s fair, that she felt that. I
it in your dealings with her, then, the areas that we touched on $I$ think were opportunity, the knife, the previous offences, and the argument? And again, we may want to add to this list once we go through the statements, but at least those -Not going to work.

Pardon me?
Not going to work.
Right. I had opportunity, that he wasn't at work, or he was home and not at work.

Okay.
So those would be matters that you would be probing with her to see what -- what her evidence or her statement was with respect to those matters; is that fair?

She pretty well knew what she was going to tell me, there wasn't too much probing, she had all this stuff that she was going to say.

Okay. But again as an investigator, though, to investigate whether or not Larry Fisher might have been, at the time might have been a person who was a suspect to have killed Gail Miller, would it be fair to say that establishing that Larry Fisher was in the house with Linda Fisher that morning of the murder rather than at work, that would be an
important task I take it?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$
And as well the previous offences that she had concerns about, $I$ think in her statement she said it wasn't until Larry was convicted in Winnipeg that she first thought he was the one who committed, may have committed Gail Miller's murder, that would be an important thing to look at; is that fair?

Yes, yes certainly.
And as well the argument that she had and Larry's reaction, that would be something to follow up to get a sense on, is that fair?

That's fair.
So again your report, and $I$ think you probably touched on most of this, you put at the time: "She is a very open, sincere individual and did not appear to be motivated

A
$Q$
A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$
through revenge, and seemed sincerely concerned about the facts surrounding the death of Milgaard, ...", that probably should be Miller: "... and the information that she possesses. She indicated to me the Miller murder had been on her mind since Larry Fisher, her ex-husband, was convicted of the rapes in Winnipeg in $1970 . "$

And, again, is that an accurate recording of what you would have thought at the time, sir?

Yes. You know, of all the times I've reviewed, this was the very first time I realized that error. But, yes, that's generally what -That "death of Milgaard"?

Yes, yes.
If it makes you feel any better I didn't notice it until now either.

Yeah. Amazing, isn't it.
So again, apart from that typographical error, that is what you thought then?

Yes.
And is that -- again, do you have any reason to change your views, today, of what you thought of .

Linda Fisher?
A
Q

No. I've dealt with many people with alcohol problems, but they could still function honestly her -- in the veracity or the credibility of what she had to say?
Well we just had a general discussion about her life, and where she was from and who she was, and she was very open. It was kind of, I suppose, probing, probing who she was, trying to get a feeling of whether or not she was, you know, sincere.

Did you have any concerns, before you went to see her, that alcohol may have been an issue, or an alcohol problem she had may have been an issue in
and sincerely and relate to the past, so that really wasn't an issue at that point.

Did it become an issue at any point?
No, no, it really didn't.
Now, again, it goes to talk about her visit to the city police in 1980, and we've covered that with other witnesses, and $I$ think on August 28th, 1980 she went and gave a statement to the Saskatoon City Police at about 4:00 in the morning. And I take it she, here, it looks like she told you about that the first time you met with her; -Yes.
-- is that right?
Uh-huh.
What, if anything, did that do as far as your assessment of her credibility and where did that play into the picture?

Well it, it was obvious that she had this on her mind for many many years, and it had been on her mind, obviously, prior to going into the police station, so it's not something that just developed as a result of some recent activity that changed her life and she wanted to go out and get even with Larry Fisher, so it gave her some credibility as far as the continuity of how she felt.

And it says here that it was late at night, she had been drinking at the time; do you remember if that's something she volunteered or did you ask her?

A
I think she, I think she explained that to me. But, you know, she was very open about that, she didn't -- you know, she thought possibly that might have been a negative to her, but she didn't really seem to hide it.

And so if we can just scroll down, then, to 32. You asked her about Sidney Wilson, which I don't think we need to spend any time about, and then you say it:
"The following key points were raised by Linda during our interview."

One:
"- A paring knife was lost from the Fisher residence just prior to the Miller murder."

And we've talked about that, that could be the murder weapon. Two:
"- Larry was in dress clothes at the time Linda go out of bed the next morning."

And, again, that might suggest that he, well he
certainly wasn't at work at the time, and may not have gone to work at the time of Gail Miller's murder; is that correct?

A
$Q$
reah. point:
"- That Miller was residing
approximately two blocks from Fisher's
residence, the murder scene being very
close to the Fisher residence."

So I take it, again back to opportunity, that he was in -- certainly lived in the area; is that fair?

A

And then again you say:
"- Linda gave a statement saying
basically the same things that she told
me, to the Saskatoon City Police in
1980."

And again you told us that that, I think your words were, added to her credibility; is that right?

A
$Q$

Q
Now can you tell us just generally what was your practice, Mr. Pearson, regarding your interviewing technique; tell us generally or even specifically with Linda, did you do interviews the same way every time or did you vary it on the subject?

I -- there's a number of ways that interviews were done. A lot of times operationally you don't have the benefit of recording devices, you don't have the benefit of a comfortable office, you -- you are sitting in a police car writing out the best you can, and in this case, and in many cases when you are gathering information, $I$ use the narrative portion, like, a discussion, and try to keep the conversation on topic and flowing and writing it out, and that's what was used in this particular case, of me writing out what she was saying. It
is written out generally in my words, it's not word for word, it's not a recording, but -- so you are trying to stay on topic and you are trying to move it through as she is covering the points that you want to have covered, and there is prompting and there is discussion during the statement taking.

When you say prompting, do you mean tell me about this?

A

Well, I'm doing -- in this case I'm doing the writing based on what she is saying, I'm capsulizing her words in what $I$ think she is saying, so that's what $I$ mean.

And we've also heard of an interviewing technique, the question and answer, where a question is written out and an answer is written out?

A Yes.

Is that a technique you used from time to time? Yes.

And when would you use one over the other?
A
It depends how much, you know, the -- if you've got specific questions in your mind, it's a good way of doing it, it's a cleaner way of doing it. It's still not as good as a taped interview where you actually get word for word and you get the tone of voice and you get, you know, probably a better product, but --

At the time, in 1990, was it your practice to tape record some interviews or --

A
Sometimes.
Now, I don't believe this interview -- and most of
your interviews were taped?
No, they weren't.
And was there any reason for that?
Well, most of it you were out in their home or in a police car or in an environment that really didn't, it wasn't conducive to good taping, and there are a lot of difficulties with taping as well, unless you have a good quality tape recorder and a controlled environment, there's background noises and there's sometimes gaps, and the other part is that you have to then have the tape transcribed and then the original tape becomes an exhibit and there's some side effects that come
along with that.
Once you had finished the narrative or the statement, what was your practice as far as witness review?

A

And I think, on your files, you've generally used typed versions but had the original statements on file; is that correct?

The originals of all these are on file, yes. Yes.

Yes, the handwritten ones.
So, if we can go back, do you remember where this statement took place, where you were when you first -- where you took this?

The -- the -- the first statement?
Yes?
The first statement, as $I$ recall it, was in the
police car at the high school in North Battleford, or out in the school yard. That's my recollection.
Did she seem at all intimidated by you; was it
your impression that she was intimidated?
No, no, I don't think she was intimidated by me.
And let's just talk generally; this was your first
meeting with her, is that right, $I$ think you
talked to her on the phone?
Yes, yes.
After this did you have occasion to have further
meetings and discussions with Linda Fisher over
the following couple of years?
Oh yes.
Did she phone you frequently to talk?
Yes, she did. She phoned me sometimes for
so-called advice, you know, she was having some
issues and she -- about going to the media, she
was -- somebody wanted her to go to the media and
she didn't want to, she asked me if I -- if she should, things like that. So, you know, we had a pretty open dialogue.

When you met with her were you aware -- and I think that we touched on earlier the note that Eugene Williams had told you -- were you aware that she had met previous, the previous few days, with Joyce Milgaard and Paul Henderson, an investigator, and given two statements; did you become aware of that in your meeting with her?

I -- I believe I did. I might have been aware of it before $I$ went there.

Did you --
I probably was but --
I'm sorry, did you actually have the physical statements before you interviewed Linda Fisher?

No, no.
But you, would you have been aware that she actually gave statements?

I'm not sure $I$ was even aware she gave statements.
I was aware that she had been talking to
Mrs. Milgaard.
Q
And, again, do you remember, after interviewing Linda Fisher and going through and getting her statement, did you have any concerns with the fact
that she had been previously interviewed by Joyce Milgaard and Paul Henderson before you talked to her?

A
some general background, it appears here:
"As far as $I$ know, Larry never knew David Milgaard and $I$ certainly didn't, I still don't."

Would this be something -- again, I referred to earlier where Mr. Williams had asked you to follow up to find out if Mr. Fisher and Mr. Milgaard knew each other; is that right?

Yes.
And so would that be a case where you might prompt her and ask her that question --

A
$Q$ Sure.
-- and she'd give that answer? And then, again, I just want to go through parts of her description of the evening of January 30 th, which is the night before the murder, she was at home:
"At that time Larry was still working
for Masonry Contractors. I don't recall
if Larry came home for supper, but went
out after supper. What $I$ mean to say was that Larry was not home after the supper hour. I waited up until the bar closed, 1 or 2:00 a.m. Larry never came home so I went to bed. I expected Larry to go to work the next morning. I do not recall him coming home, but when $I$ got up sometime in the morning, I saw Larry in his dress clothes. He was dressed in flashy ... pants ...", ? etcetera.
"He was definitely not in his work clothes ...".

And $I$ just want to go, maybe go back to the first page at the bottom, there is a couple where she says 'I don't recall if he came home for supper' and 'I don't recall him coming home when $I$ got up'. And do you remember, Mr. Pearson, because this was an issue that was dealt with later by Mr. Williams in the deposition, what do you remember about Linda Fisher and whether she had a memory or whether she was sure that -- whether or not Larry Fisher was even home the previous night? Let me back up.

I think the issue is this, did

Larry come home after work on the 30 th of January before he went out for the night, and secondly, was he possibly home and perhaps went to work and came back and was there when Linda Fisher woke up in the morning; and do you understand that being an issue --

Yes.
-- that was probed later?
Yes.
And again, just going back, when $I$ look at this statement what was your assessment as to whether Linda could remember those things, I mean she -about those two issues?

You know, I -- I'm not sure I can really
accurately tell you what she thought at the time because $I$ know, later, there might have been some discussion shortly after this where there was, the issue was "is it possible that he, you know, left and came back before you got up", and but --

To --
To elaborate on that when that came into play.
And why would that be important, Mr. Pearson, to find out from Linda Fisher whether it's possible that Larry Fisher may have come home late at night while she was sleeping and got up and left early
in the morning and then came back at nine, between nine and 11 a.m.?

A
Well, $I$ suppose it would have given him an opportunity to commit the murder if he was out and around that morning.

So one possibility is if he came home, got home at
two in the morning and was in bed until nine o'clock, that would mean he couldn't have committed the murder?

If he was there, that's right.
Or if he came home at two in the morning and got up at 6:30 and went on the bus, went to work and then came home at nine a.m. and got into his dress clothes and was actually at work at the time of the murder, that might be something -That's the other option, yes. Or three, that he got home at two in the morning, got up at 6:30, went out and killed Gail Miller and then came home at nine o'clock, that's, I suppose, another option?

A
Sure, but to really, in fairness back then, those three options $I$ don't think were articulated like that at that time. It was the belief that, you know, he didn't come home and the view of whether he may have left and come back, I'm not sure where
that came into play. I don't know if that's some questioning that we had introduced or that she had thought about, but it came into play.

And again was it your impression after taking her first statement that Linda Fisher was of the view that Larry Fisher was not at her home at the time that Gail Miller was killed; in other words, not with her at home at the time that Gail Miller was killed?

A
Yes, yes.
And was it your impression that Linda Fisher felt that Larry Fisher had not gone to work the morning of the murder?

Yes.
And in fact had not come home the night before? Yes.

And then --
At least didn't come home until she went to sleep.
Okay. If we can go to the next page, and then if we can just, it talks about here:
"I can't remember what Larry gave as an explanation of his whereabouts and $I$ don't even know who he was with the night before."

And then talks about the argument and the news
cast, and then she says:
"... I immediately recalled that a paring knife was missing from our kitchen. The knife blade was silver with a wooden hande held together with rivets. It was an ordinary paring knife, it did not have the jagged edge." And I take it, Mr. Pearson, getting a description of the knife would be an important part of your investigation?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

I don't think $I$ ever eliminated all the suspicion that was going on on behalf of Linda. As far as saying was this a defining moment in whether or not $I$ continued to suspect Linda, no. I know this description of the knife and all the issues that
Linda based on this description, did you come to any conclusion as to whether or not her missing knife was or was not the murder weapon?
evolved, but we were talking with someone who had a sincerity in what she was saying, she had a series of activities, and when you patch that into some other knowledge out there about Larry Fisher, you have to say who is really believable and would you dismiss this based on a different knife.

Let me just go back. First of all, I think the -a good description of the knife would be important?

A
Q

So, number 1, getting a description of the knife was important?

Yes.
And do you recall, did you have the view that she had a good recollection of the knife? I mean, it appears that it's described in a fair bit of
detail.

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Q

A

Q

A
-- and her sincerity, my gut feeling about her was that she had something here that she believed in,
Well, there were two people, there were two people that really -- there was Larry Fisher and Linda Fisher --

Yes. (
and the knife became described differently than the weapon that was used. However, at that point I didn't feel that $I$ was going to eliminate Larry Fisher as a suspect.

Let me ask that -- I'm sorry?
It has to be, you know, it's a mitigating factor here about, you know, are all the other things true or is she wrong.

But as a police investigator, then, the fact that, and assuming that her description is accurate and credible, the fact that the knife she described going missing the evening before the morning of the murder was not the murder weapon --Uh-huh.
-- did that in your mind as an investigator eliminate Larry Fisher as a suspect?

A
$Q$

A
I don't recall at this point of probing her about her credibility, if that's the question. I'm just wondering if that fact -- now, in fairness, Linda Fisher wasn't saying to you that
my missing knife was the murder weapon; is that --

A
$Q$

A

Q Right.

She said I lost a knife that morning?
Yeah.

Go down to the bottom, it says:
"During the argument, in my anger, I said something like "my knife is missing, you're probably responsible for killing that girl". I was very accusing and used an angry tone of voice. Larry usually argued back, but when $I$ mentioned this murder, Larry just stopped, his face went pale and drained. Larry seemed shocked. At first I thought his shocked look was a reaction like "do you really think $I$ could do this". In past arguments, Larry never seemed shocked about anything, but never saw the same reaction as $I$ saw when $I$ accused him of killing the girl that night."

Can you tell us, sir, as an investigator, what did this piece of information from Linda Fisher, where did that weigh in your consideration of her story and Larry Fisher being a suspect?


A

Go on to the next paragraph, it says:
"I don't remember Larry's explanation for not going to work that morning. I don't recall if he went to work in the
afternoon or not."
And again $I$ take it that would relate to the issue of whether or not, if Larry was at work that day, that would obviously give him an alibi; is that fair?

A

Q

A
Q
"I don't recall seeing any scratches or cuts on Larry and $I$ did not see any blood on his clothes."

Would that be something that you would have asked her do you think?

Yes.
Now, when we saw the letter from Mr. Asper to Mr. Williams and the Williams' memo, the Sidney Wilson story that went to Mr. Wolch was that Linda Fisher saw Larry come home with blood all over his clothes, do you remember that, and that's I think what prompted you and others to go look for Linda Fisher; correct?

Uh-huh, uh-huh.
The fact that Linda is now saying lookit, I didn't see any blood on his clothes, did that in any way discredit the information from Sidney Wilson?

Well, nobody knew who Sidney Wilson was, it was
anonymous information, you really don't know how accurate that really is. I mean, they can say whatever they want, unless you can verify it, but it didn't really -- didn't really change much. So the fact that Sidney Wilson said lookit -phoned Mr. Wolch and said I know Linda Fisher told me that her husband or ex-husband killed Gail Miller and he came home that morning with bloody clothes, the fact that you've now verified with Linda that that didn't happen, did that in any way negatively affect your assessment of either Linda Fisher's story or Larry Fisher as a suspect?

I don't recall it as having a negative effect on how I viewed this. Like I say, the information came from where, someone out there that we didn't even know about that said certain things. She was saying look, this is what happened, and she was also saying I did not see blood. I don't think it diminished it, $I$ think it was just more factual confirmation.

Then if we carry on, it says:
"If Larry would have come home on the night of Jan 30 , he would probably have slept in the bed with me, but $I$ don't recall him being in bed with me. I
cannot recall if the clothes $I$ saw on Larry the night before, after supper, were the same clothes $I$ saw on him the morning of Jan 31. He had very few dress clothes, only about two that he liked to wear."

And again, would you have been probing a bit with Linda Fisher?

A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

when you were done with her first statement, did you still have some concerns as to whether or not it was possible that Mr. Fisher may in fact have been, had been in bed with Linda Fisher the morning of January 31 at the time of the murder, was that still a possibility that you thought might be --

That's a possibility, that was a possibility.

And would that be why you would probe her about that?

A
$Q$

And then the next page, please, just at the top she talks about learning about Larry's charges in Fort Garry and she says:
"He never made any confessions to me of any crime. Larry was convicted of the Winnipeg rapes (two) on 28 May 71 and got 13 years. From 1971 to 1976 I visited Larry often in P.A. Pen. He wrote me letters explaining the Winnipeg crimes. He also told me of the rapes in

1968 in Regina, $I$ wasn't aware of these crimes until he told them to me in the letters."

Now, I'm wondering, Mr. Pearson, did the Regina rapes, did that come from her or did that come from you as far as the location; do you remember? There was obviously quite some discussion going on there regarding the offences and where this was first introduced, was it from when Mrs. Milgaard had been talking earlier on or was it from me, because reading that statement, it could have possibly come from me as well. I mean, I can't say it absolutely did not, but $I$ don't recall, because there is some information there that looks fairly specific that possibly Linda would not have knowledge of.

And so again you are talking about the two Winnipeg rapes and the date. Is that possible that came from a CPIC that you had? That's possible, during our discussion, and that she was, we were having a discussion and that was introduced. That is a possibility.

And in fairness, Mr. Pearson, $I$ think Linda Fisher's evidence about this statement before the Inquiry was although she knew they were in

Saskatoon, she said at the time for some reason she thought they were in Regina?

A
Q

A

Q

Yeah, yeah.
So again you are telling us that at this time you thought that they were Regina rapes; is that fair? Oh, yes, I did.

And then it talks about a car:
"Larry and I did not have a car, but we did have access to Uncle Clifford's car."

And then:
"I don't know if Larry had Clifford's car on Jan 30/31. I've talked to

Clifford several times, but he cannot
recall loaning his car to Larry during
the time of Gail Miller's murder."
What significance if any would Larry's access to a car be in getting information or investigating him as a suspect?

I'm just reading this.
Uh-huh.
Well, I think that just gives him some mobility, but I think also at this point there was -- I'm not sure if the information was already introduced, it must have been, about this car
activity that was around the scene and whether or not Larry could have possibly been in a car that night.

And it may have been, and see if this refreshes your memory, there had been evidence of a fellow named Dennis Elliott who had dropped Gail Miller off at about two in the morning the night before the murder who noticed $I$ think a '63 Ford vehicle, I think it was Ford -Yes.

## MR. ELSON: Pontiac.

BY MR. HODSON:

Pontiac? I had a one out of three chance, I got it wrong.

A Yes.
Q Pontiac, red and black, I think I'm right on that. In any event, a suspicious person in the vehicle. And is that something that maybe the car might have been important for, access to a car? Yes.

What about the fact that the crime -- the morning of the murder it was 40 below, do you recall whether or not you had in your mind at the time any thought that a car might be involved by whoever committed the crime?

Q

That was one of the factors, yes.
So I take it that Larry Fisher's access to a car would be something then that you would pursue? Yes.

If we can just go back -- actually, let me just finish up the Roy Pambrun, and then as well she talks about her Uncle Roy burning a pair of good work boots in Roy's burning barrel.
"The other day, Mrs. Milgaard and I talked to Roy on the phone, all Roy recalls is that Larry came to the door without boots and borrowed a pair of Roy's."

Did that, the Roy Pambrun burning barrel thing, did that cause you to --

It was something rather unusual, but people do unusual things, and -- but it was something that was very unusual.

So back at the time, I take it certainly on March 14th, 1990 when you interview Linda Fisher, you are aware at that time of rapes in Regina in 1971 -- maybe just scroll up -- is that fair? Yes.

Sorry, in 1968 in Regina. Tell me again, what significance would the fact that Mr. Fisher had
committed rapes in what you thought was Regina in 1968 play in your thoughts or your investigation of Larry Fisher as a suspect in the death of Gail Miller?

A

Q

What about the location, at the time it says Regina. If you would have been aware at this time, sir, that they were in Saskatoon, would that
have changed your thinking in any way about either
Larry Fisher as a suspect or what avenues you might pursue at the time?

A

And whether the rapes were in Winnipeg, Regina or Saskatoon, that didn't really matter, it was the nature of the crime; is that fair?

A
That's fair.
We now know, and I'll get into this later, you
find out a number of months later that the crimes were actually in saskatoon and they are, three of them anyway are in two months prior to Gail Miller's death and they are within a six block, or two of them are within a six block area of where the murder took place -- and I think you are familiar now, are you, with the three pre Gail Miller sexual assaults that Mr. Fisher was convicted of?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

After talking to Linda, did you believe that Larry Fisher was a suspect for the murder of Gail Miller?

A
Did I believe he was a suspect?

Q Yes.
A
He certainly wasn't eliminated as a suspect, and the suspicion was certainly there.

And so after talking to Linda, in your mind as an investigator did you conclude that Larry Fisher might be a person who may have committed this offence?

Yes.
And someone that you ought to pursue and investigate further to get further information to either eliminate or confirm?

A
$Q$
And in simple terms as an investigator, and $I$ don't mean to say the job is simple, but the task would be with a suspect to either eliminate the suspect, and then if you can't eliminate them, then establish reasonable and probable grounds to charge; is that correct?

A

Q
In a criminal investigation, yes. This one here under 690, there's probably a few more complications to it, but in essence that's true.

And that's a fair point. And at this time $I$ take it you are not investigating Larry Fisher as a suspect with a view to charging him; is that right?

Now, is there a middle ground there, Mr. Pearson, just let's talk generally when you are investigating, where you can't eliminate a suspect
he's eliminated or there's reasonable probable
grounds?

Yes.
but yet you don't have enough evidence to lay a charge?

A
$Q$
A

2

A

Q

A Yes.
Q
So if we can just go through and have you summarize, then, after you took the statement from Linda Fisher, let's first talk about the knife, and I think you've told us that her description said to you that likely the wrong knife -- likely not the same knife as the murder weapon?

Uh-huh.
Is that correct?
(Witness nods in the affirmative)
Okay. And the fact that Mr. Fisher may have been convicted of a number of --

And can we just, sorry, if I could just make a correction. I'm not certain, at that point, if $I$ knew what the knife was like in -- even though there is a description, was it this maroon-handled knife.

I see.
But right at that point, when $I$ was taking the statement, I'm not sure the light came on and said "eh, we've got the wrong one here", but anyway. At some point after that you would have reached that conclusion; is that fair?

A Yeah.
Maybe not right at the time, but at some time
after?

A
Yeah, you'd notice that the knife she's talking about is different than the one.

And then secondly, as far as the opportunity, did you have a sense that, based on her statement, that based on what she said, if it was believable, that Larry Fisher was not at work on the morning of the murder; is that fair?

A
$Q$

A

Q
Yes.

And you would have had information about, general information about some previous rape crimes?

Yes.

This is probably an appropriate spot to break, Mr. Commissioner.

```
                (Adjourned at 4:26 p.m.)
```
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| ```18858:20, 18896:1 Reminding[1] - 18804:10 renewed [1] - 18826:20 renewing [1] - 18826:5 reorganize [1] - 18881:13 reorganizing [1] - 18881:18 Repeat[1] - 18948:9 repeated [1] - 18844:22 repeatedly [1] - 18781:7 replied [1] - 18866:9 reply [1] - 18824:3 report [61] - 18754:12, 18786:8, 18814:2, 18816:4, 18816:5, 18823:3, 18849:13, 18849:16, 18850:3, 18850:9, 18851:5, 18851:14, 18852:4, 18861:15, 18877:1, 18882:5, 18882:15, 18883:5, 18883:21, 18907:20, 18907:23, 18916:23, 18923:18, 18923:24, 18924:8, 18924:15, 18932:15, 18932:24, 18933:6, 18933:9, 18933:11, 18934:2, 18934:8, 18935:19, 18935:25, 18936:4, 18937:2, 18937:4, 18937:7, 18937:14, 18938:5, 18938:8, 18938:9, 18938:10, 18938:12, 18938:15, 18938:17, 18938:22, 18939:2, 18939:25, 18940:11, 18940:25, 18941:2, 18941:4, 18943:10, 18948:24, 18966:22, 18984:12 reported [2] - 18777:8, 18882:16 reporter [1] - 18790:22 Reporter[2] - 19006:14, 19006:20 Reporters[2] - 18751:10, 19006:3 Reporters [1] - 19006:1 reporting [13] - 18883:1, 18883:3, 18883:7, 18883:10, 18884:1, 18887:8, 18888:8, 18888:10, 18901:13, 18923:17, 18924:9, 18924:10,``` | ```18925:15 reports [26] - 18811:2, 18811:5, 18812:2, 18812:6, 18852:1, 18852:5, 18858:19, 18859:3, 18859:5, 18860:2, 18862:5, 18883:7, 18883:9, 18883:11, 18884:13, 18887:10, 18907:18, 18924:11, 18937:11, 18937:12, 18937:25, 18938:25, 18939:6, 18939:20, 18941:7, 18945:12 represent [3] - 18776:21, 18843:21, 18845:8 representative [1] - 18806:15 representatives [4] - 18770:11, 18858:16, 18901:9, 18901:11 represented [2] - 18843:20, 18870:25 represents [2] - 18831:3, 18842:24 reputation [3] - 18824:20, 18855:1, 18855:17 request [6] - 18878:3, 18893:3, 18898:20, 18908:6, 18912:1, 18912:2 requested [4] - 18841:23, 18904:23, 18906:11, 18958:19 requests [2] - 18907:3, 18910:25 required [2] - 18877:23, 18883:5 requirement [5] - 18883:7, 18883:21, 18884:1, 18924:10, 18924:11 requirements [1] - 18883:3 reread [1] - 18976:5 reside [2] - 18871:5, 18934:7 residence [8] - 18911:6, 18911:14, 18970:18, 18971:11, 18971:25, 18972:1, 18972:11, 18972:16 residing [1] - 18971:23 resources [3] - 18776:11, 18776:19, 18809:12 respect [31] - 18755:15,``` | ```18767:22, 18781:25, 18784:1, 18785:13, 18787:11, 18792:1, 18797:12, 18806:14, 18806:16, 18808:14, 18810:21, 18814:14, 18818:7, 18825:2, 18825:8, 18829:12, 18831:25, 18836:2, 18842:25, 18847:15, 18852:23, 18857:5, 18858:6, 18861:17, 18863:1, 18863:2, 18893:23, 18904:24, 18923:19, 18965:14 respectful [1] - 18833:9 respecting [2] - 18832:6, 18842:11 respond [3] - 18776:21, 18800:23, 18952:3 responding [1] - 18790:5 response [8]-18758:1, 18787:6, 18789:7, 18789:11, 18789:14, 18793:4, 18793:5, 18793:7 responsibilities [1] - 18877:13 responsibility [3] - 18902:3, 18904:9, 18960:18 responsible [5] - 18880:8, 18888:15, 18910:1, 18963:20, 18988:8 rest [2]-18756:14, 18862:15 restricted [2] - 18886:14, 18911:25 restriction [1] - 18862:20 restrictions [1] - 18863:22 restrictive [1] - 18886:12 result [11] - 18762:13, 18801:11, 18807:21, 18831:21, 18836:6, 18843:23, 18844:15, 18863:25, 18909:19, 18969:22 resulted [1] - 18823:20 resumed [1] - 18842:22 resurfaced [1] - 18801:8 retain [1] - 18915:15 retained [2] - 18809:1, 18917:13 retired [3] - 18871:13,``` | ```18881:22 retirement [1] - 18880:23 retiring [1] - 18881:9 retracted [1] - 18798:16 retrieved [2] - 18843:7, 18900:4 return [1] - 18948:20 returned [6] - 18803:19, 18841:7, 18842:3, 18884:25, 18971:10, 18971:18 returning [1] - 18925:8 revealed [2] - 18812:3, 18897:2 revelation [1] - 18765:16 revenge [2] - 18960:10, 18967:1 review [32] - 18762:14, 18767:19, 18773:16, 18774:2, 18774:6, 18777:7, 18808:5, 18809:23, 18812:13, 18812:14, 18812:15, 18829:8, 18832:24, 18833:11, 18842:22, 18854:7, 18871:20, 18888:23, 18889:8, 18890:19, 18894:12, 18894:23, 18895:4, 18900:2, 18900:13, 18901:4, 18901:12, 18924:18, 18925:11, 18934:25, 18946:19, 18976:4 reviewed [12] - 18763:9, 18788:17, 18808:15, 18816:4, 18839:16, 18853:22, 18889:2, 18892:3, 18892:9, 18893:1, 18893:7, 18967:13 reviewing [4] - 18794:15, 18887:23, 18897:24, 18925:3 reviews [1] - 18848:8 revised [1] - 18798:6 revisit [1] - 18863:3 reward [11] - 18754:13, 18755:4, 18755:11, 18755:20, 18756:5, 18756:13, 18756:18, 18757:8, 18757:11, 18757:20, 18794:25 Reward[1] - 18755:12 reworking [1] - 18881:15 Richard[2] - 18753:6, 18870:14``` | ```Rick[2] - 18752:7, 18870:13 Riddell[6] - 18768:10, 18768:11, 18769:2, 18856:19, 18856:20, 18856:21 ridiculous [2] - 18836:24, 18838:2 rigging [1] - 18853:19 right' [1] - 18789:8 right-handed [3] - 18796:21, 18797:4, 19003:22 rightfully [1] - 18896:1 ring [1] - 18890:10 rise [3] - 18813:10, 18818:11, 18821:14 rivets [1] - 18984:6 Robert [1] - 18798:25 Roberts[2] - 18753:3, 18754:4 Rochelle[2] - 18752:9, 18871:1 Rodin[1] - 18817:19 role []] - 18793:22, 18810:1, 18872:25, 18886:1, 18886:3, 18902:8, 18910:6 roles [1] - 18877:12 rolled [1] - 18922:2 Romanow[2] - 18806:8, 18820:12 Ron[21] - 18762:24, 18763:13, 18764:6, 18765:7, 18767:1, 18767:9, 18767:14, 18767:20, 18770:19, 18772:18, 18772:23, 18773:1, 18785:1, 18831:21, 18849:9, 18851:8, 18852:19, 18856:5, 18856:9, 18894:2, 18919:23 room [13] - 18785:5, 18785:14, 18785:20, 18786:6, 18787:14, 18787:19, 18789:2, 18789:18, 18793:2, 18796:1, 18833:20, 18834:12, 18837:8 roundabout [1] - 18811:21 rounders [1] - 18795:21 Roy6] - 18949:4, 18997:6, 18997:7, 18997:10, 18997:14 Roys [2] - 18997:8, 18997:13 Royal[3] - 18760:20, 18871:7, 18910:3``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| $\text { Rpr } 4] \text { - 18751:11, }$ | Sawatzky [4] - | section [10]-18877:16, | 18961:17, 18965:13, | 18771:20, 18815:19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19006:2, 19006:18, | 18808:23, 18810:13, | 18877:18, 18877:21 | 18968:19, 18990:9, | sequentially [1] |
| 19006:19 | $18811: 22,18817: 18$ | $\text { 18881:1, } 18888: 22,$ | $18990: 23,18991: 18,$ | 18934:22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ruling }[1]-18799: 4 \\ & \text { run }[4]-18755: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { scared [2]-18900:18, } \\ & 18950: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18889: 1,18889: 6 \\ & 18890: 18,18908: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18996:4, 19004:18 } \\ & \text { seeing }[7]-18788: 24, \end{aligned}$ | Serge [1] - 18752:6 |
| 18782:6, 18787:3, | scary [1] - 18793:6 | 18927:21 | 18814:25, 18817:14, | 18871:14, 18876:6, |
| 18955:20 | scene [6] - 18779:14, | secure [1] - 18831:14 | 18919:25, 18920:3, | 18876:7, 18877:14, |
| run-away [1] - 18787:3 | 18919:5, 18922:5, | Security [1] - 18751:12 | 18952:20, 18990:8 | 18880:25, 18882:2 |
| running [3] - 18932:12, | 18971:25, 18996:1, | see [114]-18754:24, | seek [1] - 18876 | Sergeant [3] - |
| 18933:15, 18934:16 | 18999:18 | $18755: 4,18757: 12$ | seeking [3] - 18896:5, 18910.3, 18945:15 | 18803:18, 18819:7, |
| runs [1]-18934:20 | school [3] - 18859:14, | 18764:23, 18766:4, | seem [2] - 18970:9, | series [4] - 18789:23, |
| S | 18977:1, 18977:2 | 18766:16, 18767:3, | 18977:10 | 18821:7, 18823:24, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { schoolyard [1] - } \\ & \text { 18859:13 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18767: 4,18768: 13 \\ & 18768: 21,18769: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { seized }[1]-18780: 12 \\ & \text { selection [1] - 18904:12 } \end{aligned}$ | 18985:3 |
| salary [1] - 18825:5 | Science[1] - 18858:22 | 18769:10, 18769:21, | self [1] - 18880:3 | 18766:10, 18770:1, |
| samples [1] - 18904:17 | scorn [1] - 18960:10 | 18770:16, 18771:5, | selling [1] - 18836:4 | 18771:12, 18789:17, |
| Sandra [2] - 18751:4, | scratches [1] - 18990:8 | 18771:14, 18771:19, | semen [4] - 18797:10, | 18795:17, 18808:2, |
| 18832:11 | screen [1] - 18930:24 | 18772:7, 18774:14, | 18797:13, 18798:12, | 18808:8, $18809: 2$, |
| sarcastic [3] - 18789:8, | script [4] - 18817:10, | 18774:18, 18777:1, | 18922:9 | 18821:25, 18822:14, |
| 18792:2, 18793:4 | 18818:8, 18847:8, | 18790:1, 18790:3, | seminal [2] - 18850:18, | 18823:23, 18874:25, |
| Sask [1] - 18947:12 | 18900:21 | 18791:7, 18792:18, | 18850:22 | 18877:24, 18884:2, |
| Saskatchewan [17] - | scroll [14] - 18785:16, | 18800:7, 18803:13, | send [6] - 18770:14 | 18884:3, 18928:16, |
| 18750:17, 18752:4, | 18891:9, 18903:5, | 18804:18, 18806:4, | 18906:13, 18908:14, | 18928:21 |
| 18765:19, 18793:13, | 18903:8, 18904:1, | 18806:5, 18808:25, | 18923:11, 18937:4, | seriously [4] - |
| 18806:13, 18806:25, | 18904:15, 18904:21, | $\begin{aligned} & 18810: 18,18811: 19 \\ & 18814 \cdot 16 \quad 18814 \cdot 20 \end{aligned}$ | 18937:16 | $18778: 25,18833: 11$ |
| 18826:1, 18826:9, | 18909:16, 18910:15, | 18814:16, 18814:20, | sending [2] - 18895:8, | $18836: 22,18989: 5$ |
| 18827:15, 18834:3, | 18919:6, 18940:13, | 18815:6, 18815:11, <br> 18815:15, 18815:20 | 18907:18 18006 | serological [1] - <br> 18850:10 |
| $18876: 12,18895: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18955: 4,18970: 10 \\ & 18997: 22 \end{aligned}$ | 18817:11, 18818:17, | senior [4] - 18806:12, | 18850:10 <br> serrated |
| 18898:24, 18907:16, | Scroll [3] - 18903:12, | 18818:22, 18820:17, | 18938:18 | $18985: 16$ |
| 19006:4 | 18903:16, 18921:21 | 18826:12, 18827:19, | sense [12]-18770:23, | served [2] - 18878:21, |
| Saskatoon [38] - | scrolled [1] - 18774:17 | $18831: 8,18832: 14$, | 18775:23, 18803:22, | 18958:20 |
| 18750:17, 18752:7, | scrutiny [1] - 18909:22 | 18835:22, 18837:19, | 18839:5, 18861:24, | serves [1] - 18956:17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 18769: 6,18793: 14 \\ & \text { 18820:1. 18826:1 } \end{aligned}$ | search [1] - 18851:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 18841: 4,18841: 5, \\ & 18844: 2,18844: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $18886: 24,18929: 7,$ <br> 18960:15, 18960:21 | Service [4] - 18752:7, $18820: 2,18881: 3$ |
| $18831: 22,18848: 10$ | searched [1] - 18780:20 | 18844:10, 18850:15, | $\begin{aligned} & 18960: 15,18960: 21, \\ & 18964: 19,18966: 20, \end{aligned}$ | 18820:2, 18881 :3, 18942:18 |
| 18874:14, 18874:17, | $18850: 17$ | 18850:20, 18851:15, | 19005:5 | service [4] - 18824:15, |
| 18874:23, 18875:4, | Second [1] - 18775:25 | 18856:14, 18856:19, | sensitive [1] - 18896:21 | 18879:18, 18879:20, |
| 18875:6, 18875:17, $18875: 23,18876: 9$ | second [19] - 18754:23, | $\begin{aligned} & 18856: 22,18859: 7 \\ & 18868: 7,18892: 17, \end{aligned}$ | sensitively [1] - | 18881:21 |
| $18876: 14,18876: 1$ | 18762:1, 18773:18, | 18894:14, 18895:7, | 18906:12 | services [2] - 18876:23, |
| 18876:21, 18877:2, | 18778:23, 187 | 18896:13, 18897:5, |  |  |
| 18878:5, 18878:22, |  | 18899:14, 18902:23, | $\text { sent [14] - } 18766 \text { :2 }$ | set [15] - 18772:15 |
| 18881:3, 18882:2, | 18892:14, 18894:5, | 18904:2, 18904:10, | 18770:19, 18782:5, | 18775:19, 18800:13, |
| 18883:14, 18892:9, | 18894:9, 18894:14, | 18914:13, 18922:11, | 18782:10, 18784:19, | 18815:24, 18829:5, |
| 18903:14, 18942:20, | 18895:1, 18895:20, | 18929:17, 18931:7, | $18798: 25,18830: 25$ | 18836:3, 18861 :23, |
| 18954:22, 18955:15, | $\text { 18925:5, } 18952: 9$ | $18931: 15,18931: 20$ | $18844: 7,18844: 15$ | $18921: 10,18923: 22$ |
| 18969:8, 18972:25, | seconded [1] - 18936:8 | $18931: 23,18933: 1$ 18933:11, 18936:15 | 18908:8, 18924:14, | 18928:17, 18932:8, |
| 18995:1, 18998:25, 18999.22, 19000.2 | Secondly [3] - 18857:2, | $\begin{aligned} & 18933: 11,18936: 15, \\ & 18936: 22,18937: 23, \end{aligned}$ | 18937:11 | 18933:15, 18938:23 |
| saw [15] - 18757:1 | 18891:19, 18962:15 | 18938:2, 18938:20, | sentence [1] - 18829:14 | sets [4]-18803:3, |
| 18811:6, 18814:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { secondly [2] - 18981:2, } \\ & \text { 19005:4 } \end{aligned}$ | $18939: 5,18939: 25$ | separate [4]-18810:23, 18926:16, 18928:5, | $18922: 7$ |
| 18832:11, 18839:2, | secretary [1] - 18933:24 | $\begin{aligned} & 18942: 9,18943: 8 \\ & 18945: 9.18945: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 18928:6 | setting [2] - 18769:13, |
| 18839:11, 18920:15, 18980:8, 18988:19 | Section [8] - 18864:23, | 18948:7, 18948:12, | September [6] - | 18939:12 |
| $18990: 14,18990: 17$ | 18866:2, 18871:22, | $\text { 18949:10, } 18951: 3$ | 18803:9, 18806:4, | seven [1] - 18999:11 |
| 18992:1, 18992:3, | 18872:4, 18877:17, | $18952: 22,18953: 7$ | 18807:22, 18904:2, | several [4] - 18765:3, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 18906: 3,18913: 11, \\ & 18941 \cdot 15 \end{aligned}$ | $18954: 5,18955: 4,$ | 18904:22 <br> sequence [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18811:15, 18939:13, } \\ & 18995: 14 \end{aligned}$ |


| sex [5] - 18760:6, | 18845:20, 18845:22, | 18945:14 | 18977:22 | 18973:12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18836:23, 18837:4, | 18845:25, 18846:10, | six [6] - 18875:15, | Sometimes [1] - | specifics [5] - |
| 18894:13, 18895:9 | 18906:6, 18912:12, | 18876:13, 18999:11, | 18975:11 | 18916:17, 18939:6, |
| sexual [9] - 18785:20, | 18912:18, 18913:1 | 19000:4, 19000:5 | somewhat [2] - | 18959:25, 18960:14, |
| 18811:3, 18811:15, | 18914:18, 18914:21, | sixth [1] - 18773:2 | 18816:10, 18931:4 | 18964:24 |
| 18837:4, 18862:9, | 18947:6, 18953:25, | sketch [1] - 18920:8 | somewhere [5] - | spend [3] - 18884:9, |
| 18895:19, 18898:5, | 18970:11, 18990:15, | skill [1] - 19006:6 | 18757:17, 18822:24, | 18905:2, 18970:12 |
| 18998:5, 19000:8 | 18990:24, 18990:25, | skills [2] - 18959:7 | 18838:21, 18858:15, | spent [4]-18804:10, |
| shape [1] - 18820:21 | $18991 \text { :5 }$ | 19002:15 | 18972:20 | $18881: 15,18891: 14,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { share [2] - 18800: } \\ & \text { 18950:5 } \end{aligned}$ | significance | $\begin{aligned} & \text { skip [12] - 18764:24, } \\ & \text { 18765:5, 18768:2, } \end{aligned}$ | son [1] - 18828:5 | 18929:15 |
| Sharon [6] - 18815:6, | 18773:14, 18794:7, | 18789:2, 18790:24, | sorry [16] - 18754:22, | 18941:10, 19005:13 |
| 18815:15, 18836:4, | 18813:17, 18971:13, | 18791:9, 18811 :25 | 18782:9, 18817:11, | squarely [2] - 18797:2, |
| 18862:11, 18862:12, | 18972:6, 18995:17, | 18815:3, 18820:6, | 18828:21, 18830:17, | 18797:5 |
| 18862:18 | 18997:25 | $18820: 8,18833: 17$ | 18832:23, 18850:17, | St [3] - 18815:16, |
| shed [1] - 18797:23 <br> sheet [3] - 18784:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { significant [14] - } \\ & \text { 18765:14, 18805:23, } \end{aligned}$ | 18905:9 | $18851 \text { :8, 18864:11, }$ <br> 18896.20, 18901•10 | 18881:11, 18881:15 |
| $18830: 20,18830: 23$ | 18814:5, 18830:14, | skipped [1] - 18830: | 18914:13, 18963:23, | $18920: 16,18922: 3$ |
| shock [1] - 18949:4 | $18872: 25,18884: 7,$ | slash [1] - 18796:19 | 18978:15, 18987:5, | stabbed [3] - 18791:22, |
| shocked [10] - 18771:3, | 18884:14, 18910:12, | sleep [1] - 18983:18 | 19004:13 | 18792:15, 18838:25 |
| 18833:15, 18963:22, | $18985: 16,18993: 14$ | sleeping [1] - 18981:25 | Sorry [6] - 18813:9, <br> 18893.6, 18921.23 | stabbing [4] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 18964: 1,18971: 6 \\ & 18988: 14,18988: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 19000:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { slept [2]-18991:24, } \\ & \text { 18992:20 } \end{aligned}$ | 18939:20, 18962:1, | $\begin{aligned} & 18789: 23,18795: 12 \\ & 18795: 14,18867: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 18988:18, 18989:7, | Silljer [1] - 18785:6 | slightly [2] - 18769:12, | 18997:24 | staff [4] - 18825:15, |
| $18989: 11$ | silly [1] - 18792:11 <br> silver [1] - 18984:4 | 18793:17 | $\begin{gathered} \text { sort [11] - 18758:9, } \\ \text { 18784:6, 18794:1, } \end{gathered}$ | 18871:14, 18880:25, 18902:18 |
| shorthand [4] - | $\text { similar [5] - } 18866: 9,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { small [2] - 18785:8, } \\ & \text { 18874:11 } \end{aligned}$ | 18794:14, 18838:20, | Staff [2]-18751:1, |
| $18768: 5,18787: 22,$ | $18888: 23,18894: 19,$ 18962:22. 18963:13 | smarter [1] - 18838:15 | $18860: 5,18867: 4,$ | $\text { 8: } 18751$ |
| 18798:7, 19006:5 <br> shortly [5] - 18769:17 | 18962:22, 18963:13 <br> similarities <br> [2] - | smiled [1] - 18786:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 18876: 22,18890: 18, \\ & 18956: 2,18963: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { stage [2]-18823:25, } \\ & 18868: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| 18916:4, 18917:11, | 18811:7, 18935:16 | 18877:1 | sought [1] - 18908:20 | stage' [1] - 18758:12 |
| 18981:17, 19003:14 | similarly [2] - 18894:5, | snow [1] - 18797:13 | soul [1] - 18853:1 | stairs [1] - 18824:2 |
| shot [1] - 18859:24 | 18966:3 | so-called | sound [1] - 18918:23 | stamp [1] - 18827:17 |
| show [9]-18780:5, | Simon [1] - 18816:2 | 18766:17, 18950:2 | sounded [2] - 18918:6 | stand [3] - 18793:10, |
| $18780: 16,18805: 18$ | simple [4] - 18836:12, | 18977:23 | source [3] - 18821:6, | $18814: 7,18836: 8$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 18834: 9,18845: 19, \\ & 18917: 23,18918: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19001: 13,19001: 14 \\ & 19002: 4 \end{aligned}$ | social [3] - 18800:19, | $18907: 6,18957: 3$ <br> sources [2] - 18836:11 | stand-up [1] - 18836:8 standard [3] - |
| $18931 \text { :2, } 18931: 18$ | simply [8]-18776:5 | 18801:3, 18801 : | 18926:17 | $\text { 18928:12, } 18933: 6$ |
| showed [6] - 18800:15, | 18777:1, 18781:12 | solely [1] - 18964:12 | south [1] - 18883:15 | 18939:13 |
| 18812:7, 18848:10, | 18782:20, 18784:11, | oliciting [2] - 18906:1, | spark [1] - 18826:20 | standards [2] |
| 18923:10, 18943:25, | 18857:7, 18866:7, | 19003:15 | speaking [4] | 18799:9, 18928:1 |
| 18958:21 | 18896:5 | solicitor [1] - 18871:19 | 18859:15, 18868:19, | standing [1] - 18804:19 |
| shown [5] - 18780:12, | sincere [4] - 18960:7 | solid [1] - 18826:18 | 18962:10, 18998:15 | stands [2] - 18764:25, |
| 18800:4, 18821:17, | 18966:24, 18968:9, | Someone [1] - 18814:23 | specialists [1] - | 18979:4 |
| 18840:9, 18869:16 | 18968:18 | someone [16] - | 18797:14 | star [1] - 18764:14 |
| shows [1] - 18780:1 | sincerely [2]-18967:1, | $18801 \text { :6, } 18880: 8 \text {, }$ | specific [17] - | stark [1] - 18765:1 |
| siblings [1] - 18860:5 | 18969:1 <br> sincerity [2] - 1898 | 18913:16, 18914:6, | 18772:20, 18773:23, | Starphoenix [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { sic [3]-18767:1, } \\ & 18767: 2,18851: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 18986:24 | $\text { 18918:9, } 18933: 22,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18799: 14,18810: 4, \\ & 18856: 18,18873: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $18777: 8,18825: 13$ |
| sick [1] - 18791:18 | single [1] - 18814: | 18934:12, 18950:2, <br> 18951:20, 18985:1, | $18911: 21,18911: 23$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { start [8] - 18776:2, } \\ 18776: 6,18805: 13 \end{gathered}$ |
| side [14]-18756:24, | sinister [3] - 18780:7, | $18991: 15,18998: 16$ | 18917:2, 18924:13, | 18869:22, 18872:3, |
| 18796:5, 18818:13, | $18781: 6,18807: 16$ | 18998:18, 18999:10, | 18928:4, 18928:18, | 18885:15, 18941:23, |
| 18831:9, 18867:19, | sister [2] - 18952:24 | 19001:9, 19002:2 | 18953:15, 18959:3, | 18972:9 |
| 18881:17, 18882:18, | sitting [3] - 18750:15, | Sometime [1] - | $\text { 18975:3, } 18986: 3,$ | started [7] - 18757:25, |
| 18882:19, 18923:1, <br> 18949:3, 18950:21 | 18867:17, 18973:19 situation [4] - | 18947:11 | 18994:15 specifically [9] - | 18760:13, 18791:15, |
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