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## Transcript of Proceedings

(Reconvened at 9:01 a.m.)
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Good morning.
ALL COUNSEL: Good morning.
MR. SOROCHAN: Mr. Commissioner, I don't know if you were going to make any rulings on things from yesterday, but before My Friend Mr. Loran continues with his cross, I thought I should make a couple of comments.

Mr. Asper is being asked to comment on the evidence of others and normally I would be objecting to that, but it has been done so frequently in this Inquiry that it would seem to be a futile objection, but he's also been asked on a number of occasions is it your position this, is it your position that, and I wanted to make it clear that insofar as this Inquiry is concerned, Mr. Asper's position will be coming through his counsel, that is, me, and there are matters that relate to the evidence that I don't believe Mr. Asper is even aware of, and before the cross-examination continues, I thought $I$ should advise you and counsel what one of them is, because this relates to the Saskatoon Police Department and Mr. Asper is being asked to
comment on various aspects of the saskatoon Police Department and what his position would be and this is an area he may not be familiar with, and it relates to the investigation at the outset, and it will be the position that is being advanced by counsel for Mr. Asper that there were serious flaws in that investigation right from day one, flaws that could have almost instantly led to identifying the correct perpetrator and exonerating David Milgaard and I'll just very briefly, because $I$ don't want to waste any time for my client on the stand, but I'll tell you what it is.

There was blood of Larry Fisher found on the glove of Gail Miller and, as far as I can see, this is a mystery to most of the people in the room, they haven't twigged on this. I've been looking at the case as if $I$ was a prosecutor right from the outset looking at exhibits, etcetera, and $I$ received assistance in finding material --

MR. LORAN: Mr. Commission, -MR. SOROCHAN: -- from Mr. Hodson. MR. LORAN: -- I'm not sure this is the appropriate place for counsel for Mr. Asper to be
making submissions in that he's received standing and it would appear that these are submissions which will be made in due course and $I$ guess $I$ would object to an attempt to interrupt the examination by making submissions.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Sorry, Mr. Loran, I'll hear him out.

MR. LORAN: Thank you.
MR. SOROCHAN: I'll be very brief because I know My Friend might, he should know about this because I'm not sure he does. There was testimony by a witness that $I$ understand will come but has not yet come, and yet the material is in the CaseVault, and that is an RCMP lab analyst by the same of A.E. Charland and her testimony at the preliminary inquiry into the Larry Fisher case starts at CaseVault number 315822. She says -- and the trial testimony of Ann Charland starts at CaseVault reference 31296 (sic). In essence, what happened is that she tested the gloves for the first time almost 30 years later. They were seized at the scene and put away by the Saskatoon Police Department and not examined by anyone until 30 years later. Thirty years later it was found to have Larry

Fisher's blood and Gail Miller's blood on the glove.

Now that, $I$ understand last week Mr. Rossmo caused some excitement in this room when he testified to something he had been told by a forensic scientist in the United Kingdom. Now, whether that proves to be true or not, it was an assertion that, right from the outset, the technology that was available could have cleared David Milgaard and implicated Larry Fisher and the debate there was, well, he didn't, Mr. Rossmo and that scientist did not know about the blood on the glove, they were thinking they were only going to have to do a serological examination of other bodily fluids, but there was blood on the glove, and that stayed in the Saskatoon Police Department's custody for the better part of 30 years and $I$ think when suggestions are being made about what Mr. Asper's position is about the investigation of the Saskatoon Police Department, he doesn't know about it, $I$ don't even know if My Friend knows about it, but $I$ can give, and $I$ will give counsel separately from here the full list of all of the exhibits that show what was done by the Saskatoon

Police Department, how they, when they did the autopsy, they checked for scrapings for flesh underneath the arms -- or sorry, the fingernails of the deceased, but she was wearing gloves and nobody checked the gloves for 30 years.

Thank you.
MR. HODSON: If I may just address those points. These issues will be dealt with with future witnesses, certainly we'll be hearing some witnesses on the DNA and as well as a review of the forensics. I'm certainly aware of what Mr. Sorochan talks about and have been since the start of the Inquiry. I'm not so sure, and I'm not disputing him that it was blood, I wasn't clear whether it was blood and/or skin, but certainly it was evidence put in at Mr. Fisher's trial, so certainly when we get to that stage of the Inquiry, which is right near the very end, we will be hearing evidence about the physical exhibits, the DNA, the testing, etcetera, so again, it's matters that are part of the Commission database that Mr. Sorochan talks about and we will hear evidence on it.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

## DAVID ALLAN ASPER, continued:

## BY MR. LORAN :

Q
Thank you. Mr. Commissioner, I had ended yesterday, you had indicated that $I$ should listen to the tapes, and I've considerably reduced the portion of the tapes that $I$ would like to have played. I've indicated to the technical staff what portion $I$ would like played and it's just a portion of, a smaller portion of one of the three passages we referred to.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
MR. LORAN: I guess we can proceed then. It is a portion of tape 102. It's commencing on page 336793.

## (EXCERPT OF TAPE 102 PLAYED)

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Maureen, I need my
little book with Len Sawatzky's number in it.
(Joyce returns to conversation)
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: So, umm --
MR. DAVID ASPER: I mean, I know exactly who $I$ would love to get to go and do this, but they're two -- they're active police officers in Winnipeg and $I$ don't know if they'd do it. MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Ha. They might love it.

MR. DAVID ASPER: Yeah.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Love to turn - now the other one, David, is would like to maybe turn out to be a hero.

MR. DAVID ASPER: Well --
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: (Laughs). Well --
MR. DAVID ASPER: These are the two smoothest guys in the whole world.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh.
MR. DAVID ASPER: They get blood from a stone.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh.

MR. DAVID ASPER: Umm, and I have seen how they operate, and they can play the game, and they're smart.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh.
MR. DAVID ASPER: They're real smart.
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh.

MR. DAVID ASPER: And they can play the game any way --

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: It has to be played?
MR. DAVID ASPER: -- it has to be played, and if you tell them what you want, they'll get it.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh.
MR. DAVID ASPER: Even if what they're
getting is a lie, they'll get it.
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Oh, well, we don't want that.

MR. DAVID ASPER: Well listen, umm, we don't know that it's a lie, first of all.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: No, but I mean --
MR. DAVID ASPER: But, I mean, if you get
Cadrain saying "umm, of course I didn't say anything, $I$ was afraid that Fisher was gonna kill me", --

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh.
MR. DAVID ASPER: -- we take that down and we run with it, whether it's true or not, because, you know, how are we to know whether it's true or not.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Hmm, well I think the only way, we've just got to be very truthful in everything. His number is 985- --

MR. DAVID ASPER: Yeah.
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: -- 8100. I don't
think we make any --
MR. DAVID ASPER: 8100?
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: -- yeah -- make any
mileage for ourself by lying.
MR. DAVID ASPER: No, no, I'm saying --

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Or taking lies.
MR. DAVID ASPER: No, no, I'm saying if we get a statement from these people --

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh.
MR. DAVID ASPER: -- we don't know whether they're telling the truth or not.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: I realize that. But, you know, anyhow --

MR. DAVID ASPER: I mean if they say, if they give us a statement denying that there was any impropriety, how do we know that that's the truth?

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: I see what you are saying. Well --

MR. DAVID ASPER: You know, so you know, we're not sitting as judge on these statements. So that, you know, whoever we send there, we say -- we tell them up front --

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh.
MR. DAVID ASPER: -- what our theory is, I mean we have to because they don't know anything about the case.

## (EXCERPT OF TAPE 102 ENDED)

BY MR. LORAN:
Thank you. Can we agree that in this conversation
you begin by suggesting that the interviewers will be given the information they want to retrieve?

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q
A

Q

A

No, I don't agree with that. I suggest, I tell Mrs. Milgaard that the people I'm recommending are people who are capable of getting whatever you want them to get.

Yeah. I think your words were, "If you tell them what they want, they'll get it."

Right.
Okay. And you follow that up with, "Even if what they're getting is a lie."

Right.
And then you go on to say afterwards that it's not your job to decide whether the witness is telling the truth or not; is that fair?

Well, can $I$ see the transcript please? I can't see it on the screen.

It's page 336794.
I believe the import of what I'm saying is we don't know if it's a lie or not, we don't know -we're not in a position to judge.

You say, "Even if what they're getting is a lie, they'll get it." And I agree that later on you say --

No, no, not later on, the next notation, "Well
listen, umm, we don't know that it's a lie, first of all." It's the next thing I say.

Q
A
Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

Right.
We don't know if it's a lie, right?
You'll agree then that that's the way you approached this?

Yes.
Okay. Does this passage and the two others reflect the standard that you believe should be applied when taking witness statements?

Under the circumstances we were dealt with, yes.
MR. LORAN: Thank you. Those are all the questions I have.

MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, we're not ignoring your ruling yesterday as to the order of witnesses, $I$ spoke with Mr. Pringle and, as he was just coming in this morning, $I$ offered that $I$ would continue because it was part of the way that Mr. Loran, Mr. Boychuk and I had planned to proceed in any event. So, if it's agreeable to you, I will go next.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right.
Please?

## BY MS. KNOX:

Mr. Asper, just while I'm getting my materials
organized a little bit here, and I'm going to just try to be as efficient as $I$ can and as fast as I can because $I$ do know that you have a time constraint, but one of the issues that had come up during the cross-examination of Mr. Henderson was that the audio tape that was done of his interviews with, particularly $I$ think we were looking at Ron Wilson and the Cadrains, nobody appeared to be able to locate them up until the time that Mr. Henderson was here. Do you have any knowledge as to what became of those tapes that he did of the interviews he did with Dennis Cadrain, Albert Cadrain, and Ron Wilson? I may be wrong on one of them, but my memory is that we can't find them, or --

I don't have any knowledge.
Do you know, do you recall whether they were ever turned over to you, whether you actually had possession of them?

I can't say.
Okay. Do you have any memory -- and I know you are going to get mad at me about testing your memory before this session is over -- but do you have any memory, as you look back in time, of actually being physically at a place where you
were listening to the interview, where you could hear Mr. Henderson's voice and you could hear the voice of the young man who gave the recanting or clarifying statements, whichever word is appropriate, when we include Dennis Cadrain? I can't say.

Okay. Now I indicated that $I$ am going to try to be concise, and I appreciate that there is a risk in trying to be concise, that I'll upset your counsel, because at some point in time it may appear that $I$ am trying to stop you from answering a question, and $I$ assure you that's not my intention.

I'm going to work on being concise too, I promise. This may work for both of us then. And I want to, I guess the second thing that $I$ want to say before I start, in the event it's difficult in these situations, as you may appreciate, both in your chair and in my position as $I$ stand here, and all other counsel, to ask some of the questions that we need to ask to represent the interests of our clients without causing, in some, an impression that we're minimizing or not taking seriously the very tragic thing that happened to David Milgaard in that he was wrongful convicted of a criminal
offence that he was innocent of, and as a consequence of that he spent 20 years in jail and will, for the rest of his life, pay a price for that in terms of the person who he is and will become, so if we can be clear that $I$-- anything I say in terms of framing my questions, I'm very aware of that, my client is very aware of that. As you know, I expect, he extended an apology to your client, or your former client and his family, and continues to have great regret to know that he played a part in a young man being wrongfully convicted. So if we can sort of set that out as a parameter, and both have us try to keep it in mind, if $I$ start to annoy you on that point it is on the record in various forms, including immediately after the DNA results became known in 1987 (sic) and $I$ presume you are aware -1997, I presume you are aware of that? Well, I'm actually not aware of all that Mr. Caldwell may have said, but if he has said what you said he said I say let's move on. Okay. For the record, if $I$ could have brought up document number 332039, and just if $I$ could have the first paragraph of that brought up, please. You will note, sir, in accordance with what $I$ have
said or I've tried to summarize, there was a press conference done by my client and Mr. Kujawa on the 21st of July, 1997, and the first thing that they said in that public setting was the first and most important statement they wanted to make -- and I speak particularly for my client -- is that he wanted to extend his sincerest apologies to Mr. Milgaard, his family, and all others directly affected by the failing of the system that resulted in his wrongful conviction?

A
I don't want to be -- sound picky, but you're very familiar, Ms. Knox, with a different kind of statement in which -- and $I$-- maybe it's intended. I would have preferred, and $I$ think the family would have preferred, and I think it would have diffused a whole lot of animosity, had Mr. Caldwell and others not simply said in general that there was failings of the system, because of course there was failings of the system, but to accept personal responsibility --

So maybe --
-- for that failing. And if it appears, as I said, great.

```
I'm glad.
```

Q

Perhaps we could bring up paragraph 2, sir, and that might address why it was framed in the way it was. You are aware that, at that time, that Mr . Caldwell was under investigation, there were allegations of collusion, -Yeah.
-- criminal conspiracy, misconduct, and many other horrendous allegations made against him in a civil lawsuit launched?

Right, I -- okay, I understand the context now. And would that put your mind at ease as to the different situation that caused the wording of an apology, given the jeopardy that he was facing -Yes.
-- at that time?
Yes.
With a strong and still-contended belief, as you know from reviewing his evidence, that while he made mistakes and regrets those mistakes, he didn't intentionally do anything wrong?

I understand that, yes.
Does that allow for the difference that you identify in this particular situation?

Yes.
Mr. Asper, $I$ want to move away a little bit, and
at various points during your testimony you've talked about recognizing mistakes that you've made -- and again as he has to, we all have to sometimes come to the plate and know that we've made mistakes whether we meant to or not -- and you've talked about things that you would do differently if you had to engage in this process again. And as $I$ was reviewing my notes of your transcript in preparation for the questions I wanted to ask you, I had noted you made a mistake -- made a statement in your, in response to Mr. Hodson, wherein you said that if you had to do this over again the first thing that you would do would be write a letter to Mr. Caldwell?

I think that's fair, yes.
Okay. May I suggest to you, since you've identified yourself as a student of the subject of wrongful convictions, that it might be prudent to, as a counsel who, as you said yourself, was bound by or attempting to be in compliance with the Rules of Professional Conduct, that you needed to go back or others like you would need to go back a step further, and before contacting Mr. Caldwell it might have saved a lot of time delays, a lot of misunderstandings and, indeed, a lot of wrongful
accusations against parties who were players in this system, if you had gone back even further and, indeed, you had gone back and gotten the file of Gary Young who was first counsel acting with Mrs. Milgaard, and perhaps the file of Tony Merchant?

A

Q

A

Q
That probably would
yes, I would agree.
Okay. And, if you could just bear with me, I want to ask if $I$ could have brought up document 331926. I'm gonna ask to have brought out the second portion of this. And for your benefit, Mr. Asper, this is a memo that was contained in the file of Gary Young that was obtained by the Commission. I don't know if you've seen this before? I may have been shown it during the proceedings, I don't recall seeing it otherwise.

What $I$ want to draw your attention to is a notation that Mr. Young made in a memo on February 2nd, 1981 that he had had -- and what it -- in summary what he is saying and what he testified to is that he had a telephone discussion with Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Caldwell told him that:
"... he gave copies of material statements to Mr. Tallis - however he is
prepared to go over his file with me
-..." ,
"he" being Mr. Young as counsel for Mrs. Milgaard:
"... but will not release copies ...", of statements:
"... to Mrs. Milgaard."
So you will see that as early as first approach, or first formal approach by another solicitor in 1981, Mr. Caldwell was indicating "come, look at my file, I'll give you copies of statements, my reservation being that $I$ won't give copies to the mother of Mr. Milgaard"?

Right.
Now sir, just on that point, would you agree with me certainly in those times, and perhaps even today, it would be most unusual that a Crown counsel would turn over, to the mother of somebody either charged with or convicted of a crime, witness statements?

A
Q
That's true.
So what he said there would be perfectly appropriate and understandable in the circumstances?

A Oh yes.

Q

A

2

A

Q

Okay. And had you had the benefit of that would you agree with me that it would have prevented many unfortunate occurrences in this file, including the allegation that was made in July 1990 that Mr. Caldwell had failed to disclose witness statements to Mr. Tallis at the time of trial, this certainly would have triggered you to go looking and make sure you were right?

Well, we were correct, we just didn't know how correct, when that unfortunate incident occurred. The problem is that after, after the comment was made in 1990, we did come to know what wasn't disclosed.

Sir, the comment that was made in 1990, or the story in the newspaper was that Mr. Caldwell either had failed to disclose the first statement of Ron Wilson --

Right.
-- or, if he had disclosed it -- although the weight of the belief appeared to be that he was guilty of wrongdoing -- but certainly the allegation that was made very publicly and repeated in various news medias many times was that he appeared to have withheld the first statement of Ron Wilson, which would have meant
that David --

A
$Q$
A

Q
A
Q ,

Well, Ms. Knox, --
-- didn't get convicted?
-- I've answered that and I've said to you that my belief as to the genesis of that story, I accept how it was played and $I$ accept responsibility for how it was played, my belief is that the story was two separate statements that got conjoined.

Uh-huh?
Two separate statements.
Okay. In the interests of time, then, perhaps I'll move to -- and Mr. Commissioner, in light of the objection from Mr. Sorochan yesterday, I will indicate that $I$ have asked the staff to have available for playing a portion of a taped conversation that took place between Mr. Asper and Mrs. Milgaard immediately after this story in the -- accusing Mr. Caldwell of misconduct appeared in the paper in July 1990. I have the excerpt of it, I provided it to the staff, and $I$ understand they have it. And I've particularly asked to have this played because, when Mr. Asper was being questioned by Mr . Hodson in this regard, he made the request that he'd like to hear the whole tape, and I'm assuming that it would be helpful to you,
given that we're moving along into an area that $I$ intended to get to, if you can in fact hear the conversation that you had with Mrs. Milgaard after this story appeared in the paper?

A

Q
Okay. If I could just have a moment to get it. And Mr. Asper, for the record, the newspaper story is -- has a document number 004752 , if you need to take a look at it to refresh your memory, if we could have it brought up please? And this is the story by Mr. Lett, and $I$ won't go over it in detail, but essentially the headline captures the essence of the allegation made against my client, but within the body of the story you are -- you speak, and you specifically say that Mr. Tallis -and I'm looking down the middle column here, starting right here -- you specifically stated in that newspaper story, according to the story, that Mr. Tallis made no reference to the first statement in questioning at either the preliminary hearing or the trial. So you were stating, as a fact, certain things to not exist within either transcript; you will agree with that?

A
Yes, and I believe I have testified that $I$ was using shorthand for a technique, cross-examination
technique, as opposed to -- and you can ask the journalist, $I$ don't know if the journalist recorded that part of the conversation, but that's my recollection.

Okay. Regardless, sir, of whether you were using shorthand or not, you became aware that the journalist took you to be saying, and he represented you to be saying that you, with your knowledge -- as you had said at various points in time, you had memorized the transcripts, you knew them inside out -- you, on the record, were put forward as stating that it had not been raised at either the preliminary inquiry or at the -Had not been what?

Had not been raised by Mr. Tallis at either the preliminary inquiry or the trial?

I'm not sure where you see that. I believe I said he didn't put it to him.

Q
A
Q

A

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

I've heard Mr. Tallis' evidence and I understand, now, why -- I believe $I$ was referring to the technique where you actually take the statement and put it to him --
$Q$
A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$
A
respect of my client?
A
I, absolutely, and I've accepted responsibility
for that very wrong interpretation.
And do you have any appreciation of the consequences, for him, of that very wrong interpretation by your -- what you say a reporter did of what you told him?

Well, I've read about it, yes.
Okay. You've read about it in the transcript of his evidence at this Inquiry?

Yes I have.
Some 16 years later?
Yes.
Okay. You can appreciate that, for 16 years, this
has been hanging out there as an allegation against him?

A
$Q$

A
Okay, Ms. Knox, --
You say inadvertently made by you but,
nonetheless, one that he has had to live with in the public record?

Ms. Knox, $I$ gotta tell ya, I understand that's unfortunate, but you have to weight that against 23 years that a man spent in prison being beaten and degraded, and so Mr. Caldwell's feelings I know are important to him, but $I$ put them in the
context of what my client suffered, and I'm sorry, but my client's interests and my client's suffering makes yours pale.
$Q$
A
$Q$

Q

MR. DAVID ASPER: Hi.
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Hi.
MR. DAVID ASPER: Umm, a couple things. MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh.

MR. DAVID ASPER: Let me tell you about the status of the case first.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Okay.
MR. DAVID ASPER: Umm, I've played
telephone tag with Watson over the past couple of days. As you know, Hersh is in Edmonton. MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh, with Tallis. MR. DAVID ASPER: Tallis didn't show. MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Really. MR. DAVID ASPER: But Williams is there. MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Really.

MR. DAVID ASPER: And Williams has been spending a lot of time with the Head Prosecutor from Saskatchewan, who's also there.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh.
MR. DAVID ASPER: And we can speculate all we want, but I, I would think that those conversations must be related to how do we logistically, you know, deal with this case, not whether it's gonna be re-opened, but we're gonna re-open now, what do we do. Okay?

Umm, Williams also saw Fisher, and he won't tell Hersh anything about their meeting, but Hersh thinks he's going back. MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Really. MR. DAVID ASPER: Which I think is a good sign.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Hmm.
MR. DAVID ASPER: Umm, next thing. When I told Hersh about the statements --

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh?
MR. DAVID ASPER: -- he gasped. He said "I shouldn't be surprised but $I$, it's just amazing". MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Okay, yeah. MR. DAVID ASPER: Like, yet another thing. MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh.

MR. DAVID ASPER: Okay.
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: The only problem is, according to the testimony, I think Tallis knew about these statements.

MR. DAVID ASPER: Yes, except he never put them directly to him, he does -- there is a short passage where he talks about "when you first spoke with the police you told them nothing happened".

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: But, no, there is a
part there where he talked about the statement to Riddell.

MR. DAVID ASPER: Yeah?
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: I've got the, I've got page numbers for you, and I'd like you to look at what $I$ give you, okay?

MR. DAVID ASPER: Okay.
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Hold on. (Pause) now it may be in my being naive in the matter that $I$ don't, you know, that $I$ am not understanding it the way I should so you, you read these references.

MR. DAVID ASPER: This is, this is trial transcript; right?

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: All right. Yeah, this one is trial transcript.

MR. DAVID ASPER: Okay.
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Page 320 -- page 291, police visits in March, Riddell is mentioned; page 292, "at the time Riddell was there there was no suggestion you were a suspect in connection with the case, $I$ don't believe so, there might have been, I'm not aware" --

MR. DAVID ASPER: Correct.
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: -- "but it was at
that time $I$ gave the statement to him" -MR. DAVID ASPER: Uh-huh.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: -- he says. Okay? MR. DAVID ASPER: Uh-huh.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Then on page 324 and 325 --

MR. DAVID ASPER: Uh-huh.
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: -- and 331 and 349, on page 349, this is when the jury was out and the Court said that they had no recollection of any specific statement.

MR. DAVID ASPER: That's right.
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Yeah. And then page 540.

MR. DAVID ASPER: This is what I am saying. When you have -- you see, umm, I don't know that Tallis necessarily has a copy of the actual statement.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh.
MR. DAVID ASPER: Umm, very often the Crown will write a letter saying that "he made a statement to, umm, on such and such a date to such and such an officer" --

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh?

MR. DAVID ASPER: -- "and provided no
useful information", or something like that.
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Right.
MR. DAVID ASPER: Because let me tell you, and, and I don't think you will find a lawyer who will disagree with me, that when you have in your hand that statement, you put it to him word for word, and you show him the statement --

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Yeah, some -MR. DAVID ASPER: -- and you show it to the jury.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh. Uh-huh. So this is like, umm, the same thing as he did almost with what he said on the prelim?

MR. DAVID ASPER: Yeah.
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Yeah. Well, he hasn't that -- he hasn't done that, but $I$ know in the --

MR. DAVID ASPER: It doesn't mean that he has the statement.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Okay.
MR. DAVID ASPER: All it means is that he knows, umm, that a statement may have been given, umm, to Riddell.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh.
MR. DAVID ASPER: Period.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: But wouldn't, if he knew that, wouldn't he get the statement?

MR. DAVID ASPER: Not necessarily. Not necessarily. To this day, Joyce, I have trouble, I mean in this era of the Charter and acute awareness of procedural fairness --

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh.
MR. DAVID ASPER: -- I still have trouble getting statements from the Crown.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Okay. Well, there was something else in here that $I$--

MR. DAVID ASPER: And in addition, in addition --

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh?
MR. DAVID ASPER: -- let me just -- I mean it goes beyond simply taking him through the statement word for word. When Wilson testifies at the trial that the car gets stuck and he and David get out of the car, --

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh?
MR. DAVID ASPER: -- well, that's
contradictory to his first statement.
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Entirely.
MR. DAVID ASPER: And he was not
cross-examined on that, he was -- I mean when --

Tallis didn't get up and say "your evidence is that the car got stuck and you two were apart, is that right, right".

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh.

MR. DAVID ASPER: Umm, "do you recall making this statement and do you recall in that statement saying that you were never apart?"

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Right.
MR. DAVID ASPER: I mean those, those are the red flags that tell me that he doesn't have the statement, that he may have a general idea that one was given and that it was a -- a -- in essence a denial of any involvement.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: But are you saying, then, that it's not -- well, I don't know.

MR. DAVID ASPER: Because it inhibits the ability of the defence to make full answer in defence --

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh.
MR. DAVID ASPER: -- when you don't know the details, because what you get is the Crown decides the value of the statement, and editing the information in the statement in a summary.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Okay. Here it is, the one that $I$ had in the, in the prelim, page

540, it's in the prelim.
MR. DAVID ASPER: Okay.
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Umm, it says "and who was the first policeman to -- I take it you knew nothing about the murder of the girl in Saskatoon on January 31st until the policeman told you about it, that's right, and who was the first" -MR. DAVID ASPER: Is this cross-examination?

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: This is prelim page 540, it doesn't, on the prelim it doesn't tell you --

MR. DAVID ASPER: Well what does it say at

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: -- ahead what it is. MR. DAVID ASPER: Does it -- okay, okay. MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: I think it's examined, or $I$ think it must be, because it's Tallis.

MR. DAVID ASPER: Okay.
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: I think it's Tallis.
MR. DAVID ASPER: Okay. Whatever.
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: And "Ken Walters in
Regina and that would be on approximately what date, sometimes in March, sometime in March and I
take it that during the trip up to Alberta there was never any mention about the murder of a girl in Saskatoon, no there wasn't, so that when you told Mr. Riddell that all during this trip there was never any mention about the murder of a girl in Saskatoon, in fact $I$ didn't even know about this murder until the police told me today you were telling him the truth, were you, yes", and then "I take it Mr. Riddell was the type of person who was friendly and courteous with you, yes he was, he literally let you tell your own story, yes, and you weren't cross-examined on answers and so on by him, I was when -- every once in a while, every once in a while, but to the best of your ability at that time you told him the truth didn't you, no I didn't, you didn't tell him the truth, no, just part of the truth, and the part that $I$ have referred to here was the truth, yes, but you didn't tell him the complete truth you say and it was later on after you've told us when you think, I think on May the $22 n d$, that you made some reference implicating David". MR. DAVID ASPER: Uh-huh. MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: And that's when he goes on.

MR. DAVID ASPER: It doesn't, it doesn't mean he's got the statement.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: And then he says here, "now" -- on page 541 -- "now when you had this meeting or discussion with Mr. Riddell on March the 3rd $I$ take it that before you gave him any statement you told him that there was nothing to hide about what had happened on the trip and, and you know, and you'd be straightforward with him and to the best of the ability and the jacket he was wearing and, umm, what, all the rest of it", and then he goes into this stuff there.

MR. DAVID ASPER: Yeah. No, I -- listen, as $I$ say, umm, what could very well have happened is that Tallis would -- or Caldwell would tell Tallis that Wilson was interviewed and gave a statement in which he describes nothing happening, I --

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: It's interesting, it's to the RCMP that his statement of innocence is, and it's the saskatoon one that --

MR. DAVID ASPER: Well, because the Saskatoon Police have an interest.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Right.

MR. DAVID ASPER: The RCMP, you know, are
probably doing --
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Just a job.
MR. DAVID ASPER: -- just a job.
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: A statement, yeah.
MR. DAVID ASPER: Umm, I don't, I don't, I
don't think that any of that --
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Okay. Well --
MR. DAVID ASPER: Umm, --
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: -- that's fine, but I
MR. DAVID ASPER: Because, because --
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: -- I dug them out
because $I$ remembered that part of it, I
remembered --
MR. DAVID ASPER: Oh, yeah, oh --
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: -- in there about
Riddell and his statement.
MR. DAVID ASPER: Oh yeah, oh yeah.
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: So when I read that
in the paper yesterday $I$ just about freaked right
out.
MR. DAVID ASPER: No, no, I -- no, no, I --
I don't think that any of that makes it any less
clean.
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Okay.

MR. DAVID ASPER: Because as I say, and particularly at the trial, Joyce, at the preliminary inquiry you can ask any questions because there is no downside, I mean you know he's going to get committed to stand trial.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh.
MR. DAVID ASPER: But when you are at the trial, in front of a jury, --

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh.
MR. DAVID ASPER: -- if Cadrain -- if
Tallis had the statement --
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh.
MR. DAVID ASPER: -- then there's some serious questions about his --

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: That the --
MR. DAVID ASPER: -- conduct of the defence.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Right.
MR. DAVID ASPER: If he didn't have the statement, then there's very, very, very grave problems with the prosecution, because a summary of the statement does not suffice. And I mean, look, Tallis is in there theoretically fighting for Dave's life.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh.

MR. DAVID ASPER: Everything is on the line.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Uh-huh.
MR. DAVID ASPER: You are telling me that he would not put the contra -- Wilson's contradictions to him?

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: No.
MR. DAVID ASPER: Come on. Come on.
MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Okay.
MR. DAVID ASPER: His only hope is to discredit Wilson.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: What is -- what did your litigation lawyer say?

MR. DAVID ASPER: He hasn't reported to me yet.

MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: Okay.
MR. DAVID ASPER: Umm, they're not ..."
(Excerpt of Tape 30 ended)
MS. KNOX: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Could you identify that to me, somehow, by reference?

MS. KNOX: Certainly, Mr. Commissioner. It is transcript that's taken from tape 30, the start number on the tape is 336059 , the conversation with respect to -- that we just
played begins, I believe, at about 33106-107 and it goes through to page 336116, approximately, but it's within the context of that tape which is, as I said, tape 30, and the date on the front of that tape and the transcription we have is July 1990.

MR. HODSON: If I might just add, the tape 30, the doc. ID of that actual tape is 336991 , that's 336991, that's the actual tape, and the doc. ID of the transcript, 336054 .

BY MS. KNOX:
Mr. Asper, that conversation continues for some period of time, and for all our sakes I didn't ask the staff to play it, but $I$ can indicate to you that toward the conclusion of it, at about page -at about -- not at about -- at page 336135 you made the statement to Mrs. Milgaard in relation to this, and a number of other matters that were the subject of your continuing discussion, that the truth -- and the words, if $I$ have recorded them properly, is that the truth is very, very bad. And $I$ took it, from that, that you were referring to the truth about what the police and prosecution had done in respect of the investigation and prosecution of her son, and $I$ presume that would
make sense as to what you were suggesting to her,
that when you found out the truth or you were coming to learn the truth, that you believed it to be very, very bad?

A

A
Q
A
Q

Probably, but $I$ don't recall the context of that.
No. And as I said, I would have played it for
you, but --
No, I'm --
-- it's another 16 pages, and it would have gone through a lot of extraneous information to get us there, we can bring up the page for you if you wish to see it. But essentially it's a
continuation of the theme of -- and I don't want to lean on or to repeat words that you used -- but that you were engaged in a battle, that there were enemies here, and that people had done bad things? Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv

Q Have you seen this before today?

A
If $I$ have, $I$ don't recall.
Okay. I'm going to, for the record, advise you this is a letter that was contained on Mr.

Caldwell's file, he directed it to Mr. Tallis on August 15 th as $I$ said, and you will note that in it he's providing him or confirming provision of copies of certain statements, including number 2, R.D. Wilson March 3rd, 1969, R.D. Wilson May 23 and May 24, 1969 put together as one statement?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
a call from Ken Watson. Ken Watson told you he opened a package of information that had been sent
to him by Federal Justice in preparation for
Eugene Williams' interview of Ron Wilson.
A

A
Q
A
Q Okay.

Are you remembering any of this?
No.
Okay.
Okay.
That when he opened the package and he started to
go through it, he found two statements of
Wilson's, one from March that was an exculpatory
statement and then the May statement or statements
combined that was inculpatory.
A
Q
A
$Q$

A
Q
-- let's assume that the record is correct and that's essentially what transpired.

A

Q
Right.
You had a phone call, the guy saying to you look,
I just got a statement from Justice and my guy
says that, you know, he forgot giving this statement, you know, if Tallis had put this to him, if this was the truth, you know, David Milgaard never would have been convicted.

A

Q

A And would you agree with me whether Mr. Watson went directly to Dan Lett or you were the one who turned it over to Dan Lett, that unlike Dan Lett
you had a higher responsibility, you had a professional responsibility as a member of the bar with respect to what you did and in particular what you did that got reported, whether correctly or incorrectly, in this newspaper article that impacted on both Mr. Tallis and Mr. Caldwell? Yes, which is why, as I say, I'm quite certain that the import of the story got conjoined. Sir, and the reason, one of the reasons why $I$ played the tape is because your testimony is that the import of the story got joined, but would you agree with me that when you listened to that conversation that you and Mrs. Milgaard had immediately following, that you appeared not to want to hear of the possibility that there had been a, the statement had been there, she's the one who's saying to you but wait a minute, $I$ think it was there because, and in fact Mr. Tallis used words in his cross-examination at the preliminary inquiry where he said and the part, part, referring to a physical object, that $I$ refer you to was actually part of the transcription, and yet knowing the transcript inside out as you said, having your memory refreshed by Mrs. Milgaard and I presume still having physical possession of the
transcript, so after you got off the phone with her you could have gone and looked at them; couldn't you?

A

Q

A
Q

A

Q
A
$Q$

A
Q So whether you talked to him about it or not, you
don't know, but if you did, nothing was done about So whether you talked to him about it or not, you
don't know, but if you did, nothing was done about it? this event pretty closely, did anything appear in any media, anywhere, including in Mr. Lett's Winnipeg Free Press, to say whoops, we might have overstated this?

No.

A
Q

A
Q
A
Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

That's correct.
Did you, at any point in time, do you recall having a passing thought or should you have a passing thought that maybe, if $I$ made this wrongful accusation here, I should try and correct the record?

No.
Why?
I didn't believe $I$ had made the error.
Sir, is it that you didn't believe it or you didn't want to believe it?

I didn't believe I made the error.
Okay. Sir, one of the tasks that I've engaged in, and I presume to some extent you may have engaged in over the last number of days, is reviewing many conversations that were recorded by Mrs. Milgaard, and what's --

To be honest, I've not had the time to do it.
And I haven't had time to finish them, so I'm not fully up on them either, but what becomes apparent, unfortunately, after Mrs. Milgaard's conversation with you, and $I$ can provide references at a later point if they are needed, it was just too overwhelming to get them all organized, but what becomes apparent after the
conversation with you, I suggest to you, is Mrs. Milgaard set aside her own reservations and she started telling the press that Mr. Caldwell was guilty of misconduct, that he had withheld the statement. Did you have any appreciation that that might be a consequence of your persuading her out of her concern that a wrong had been perpetrated in the media here?

Ms. Knox, $I$ can tell you that from the day $I$ met Mrs. Milgaard, she was of the view that some kind of misconduct must have occurred that would have led to her son's conviction.

Q

A
$Q$
But, sir --

So if this encouraged that view or revived it, it's possible.

Mr. Asper, as a master of language, may $I$ suggest to you, to say that it "revived it" understates what happened here. What you took and identified for her as your client was a specific act that you imputed to my client that you described as professional misconduct didn't you?

I described it, my recollection, is that if it occurred, it would be professional misconduct, and I believe that's true.

Okay. But basically what you did, instead of sort Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv
of maybe, what about, ifs, it must have happened, you gave her, and she repeated many times, and she will be cross-examined on that undoubtedly, but she repeated many times that this was an indication, a proof -- not an indication, but proof that she was right all along and that people had set out to wrongfully convict her son?

Well, Ms. Knox, I take the telephone conversation to be critical of the manner of cross-examination, I take that conversation to be a discussion about the way Wilson was cross-examined as much as it was anything else.

Okay. Would you appreciate, if you can step back a little bit from the fact that you were the second person in the conversation, that third parties looking at it might not draw from it what you say you take from it?

I can accept that, sure.
Mr. Asper, I'm going to move to another area, and I apologize, I'll probably give you quite a headache because you and $I$ are going to be all over the board with this unfortunately. I've asked you, and $I$ started by asking you whether instead of starting with -- the first thing you would do, being send a letter to Mr. Caldwell,
whether you would agree with me that it might have been helpful, indeed not might have been, it would have been extremely helpful to you as a lawyer, vested with responsibility to carry some part of this case, to have had Mr. Young's file because it would have given you a perspective of the attitude of the Crown independent of what you may have been getting from Mrs. Milgaard which understandably was that somebody had to have done something wrong here because my son is not guilty and he's in jail for murder?

A
Q

A
Q 2 ,

Mr. Young would have given you a little bit of separation from the emotion of a mother and perhaps the paranoia that $I$ believe she has self ascribed in her circumstances?

I think that's true, yes.
And had you gone a step further and gotten the file of Mr. Merchant, whatever the issues may have been with Mr. Merchant ultimately that have been canvassed in a book and in this Inquiry and in other places, it might as well have helped you get some other information that wasn't coming from the mouth of an emotionally distressed, understandably emotionally distressed mom?

A

Okay, I'm going to confine myself to the answer. Yes.

Okay. Then if $I$ could move you to another area, and I'm trying to do a step through events preceding your involvement, we had the Gary Young file that was available, we had the Tony Merchant file that was available, for what use if any it may have provided, but as a prudent practice as a solicitor taking over a new file to get a release from the client and get the previous counsel's file is usually quite, one of the first, second things you do; would you agree?

Yes.
Okay. Then intervening or coming along in this package of events that were unfolding, we had the arrival of Peter Carlyle-Gordge and you were aware of his involvement in the file, the assistance that he provided to Mrs. Milgaard?

Yes.
Okay. And, sir, in reviewing the material that's available to us, and I struggled with it a bit, and $I$ don't want to be unfair to you, $I$ want to first start by asking you what you remember, if you remember anything of the material that you personally received from Mr. Carlyle-Gordge or
from Mrs. Joyce Milgaard that had been generated by Mr. Carlyle-Gordge and shared with her?

A

Q
A

Q

A

Q

A

Well, this is where $I$ get confused as to what we received and when. My recollection is that we received some material initially in March of 1986 and then other material came at later points, I think up to and including the reference, and $I$ just don't know, $I$ don't recall what came when. Okay.

I think Mr. Carlyle-Gordge had gone to England with all his material and $I$ just don't recall.

Do you have a memory of receiving through your office materials of Mr. Carlyle-Gordge's that had been in the possession of the Fifth Estate in Toronto, a Gordon Stewart?

Yes, that rings a bell.
And I indicate to you that this correspondence in the files that Mr. Stewart wrote in 1986, I think around April, saying that, and this was in response to a direction given by Mr.

Carlyle-Gordge from England, that because he was away it would be easier to get his transcripts from the Fifth Estate because he turned them over to them? Sounds familiar.

And $I$ can pull up documents if you want.
I accept it. I did have dealings with the Fifth Estate, so I accept that.

But essentially there's documentation in the file to suggest that transcripts done by Mr.

Carlyle-Gordge were made available through the Fifth Estate.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Do you have the doc. ID?

MS. KNOX: I will pull it up for you, I have it with me, Mr. Commissioner, I just have to find the right file. Mr. Commissioner, if you could bear with me, I'll get it for you, I do have it physically with me, it's just that my materials aren't as organized as $I$ would like them to be.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right.
BY MS. KNOX:
Sir, in respect of that we have, through the Commission, a number of transcriptions of interviews that Mr. Carlyle-Gordge did with Albert Cadrain, with Leonard Cadrain, Estelle Cadrain, Father Murphy, Ray Mackie and Mr. Caldwell of course, among others, and all of them appeared to be part of the file materials that were either in

Mrs. Milgaard's possession or in the possession of you, and by you $I$ mean your firm. Do you have any memory at this point in time of whether all of those transcripts would have been received back from Gordon Stewart at the Fifth Estate in 1986? No, I don't recall.

Okay.
We must have -- I just -- no, I don't recall what we got from them.

Okay. And, sir, additional to those transcripts, Mr. Carlyle-Gordge had done a recording or he had done a dictation of material that he was reading on Mr. Caldwell's file. Do you remember receiving that or reviewing that dictation?

At some point, yes.
You don't know when you did that dictation? No.

Additionally, Mr. Carlyle-Gordge had been provided with not the court transcription, but Mr.

Caldwell's transcription of his opening and closing addresses to the jury and there's, you know, there's certainly documentary evidence that that was in your file. Do you recall reviewing those in the early stages?

A Yes, I assume I must have in order to recreate for
myself the Crown's theory at the trial. I must have had one of the two.

Mr. Commissioner, I'm going to refer just to, and I will get all these documents together, but if we could bring up document number 332045, and you'll see that this is a letter directed to Mr. Caldwell by Peter Carlyle-Gordge on February 22nd, 1980, it doesn't have the date on it, I think it's 1983, somebody can correct me on that, but in any event, if you bring out -- have you see this before? Let's start there.

A
Let's bring out the first paragraph so it's readable. You'll see that this is a letter expressing appreciation to Mr. Caldwell for having spent time with Mr. Carlyle-Gordge the previous weekend and we know from the evidence that he went into the office on a weekend, he made his file available to Mr. Carlyle-Gordge, he left him to go through it at will and this letter indicates that obviously he was unable to get all the work he wanted to do complete and they are making cordial arrangements for him to return to continue his review of the file?

A Right.

Okay. And if we could go to page 2, please, you'll see documented at the bottom of the file in handwriting that the record will show, or has -will show, and which $I$ presume you'll accept, is the handwriting of Mr. Caldwell, that on the 25 th of February, 1983 he sent his opening and closing address to Mr. Carlyle-Gordge as he requested as well as copies of the plans, or street areas I think he's referring to by plans, where these events occurred, or were believed to have occurred, okay. So clearly that was in the possession of you, or available to you I should say, through the offices of Mr. Carlyle-Gordge and/or Mrs. Milgaard when you became involved in the file in 1986?

Well, as $I$ say, at some point early on in the process $I$ came to Saskatoon with stopwatch and all and tried to reenactment the Avenue $O$ and the Avenue $N$ theories, so $I$ assume $I$ must have had something, either the opening or the closing, fairly early on.

But it was available to you, whether you read one
or both, certainly you think you had to read some of it?

A
$Q$

A
Q

I think so, yes.
In order to be over doing the walk-through that you were attempting?

Right.
Sir, without getting into a lot of detail of everything that was involved in that, do you recall indicating to Mrs. Milgaard in a conversation with her, and if you want $I$ can bring up the tape to show you, but there was, and Mr.

Hodson put this to you last week, that you indicated to her that you hadn't looked at the closing address, you had only looked at the opening address and in your view the closing wasn't important?

I don't recall that.

Okay.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: You only looked at which one?

I don't recall that being put to me.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Ms. Knox, he only looked at the opening was --

MS. KNOX: The opening was how I understood it.

A BY MS. KNOX:

Q

A

Q Okay. If you'll bear with me.

I would have thought $I$ would have said the reverse, or the inverse.

If we can go to transcript page number 27074, actually if $I$ could start on 27073.

Mr. Commissioner, this is transcript from April 19th, 2006, if we could bring it up from line 15. These are questions that Mr. Hodson is asking you and he's talking about a telephone transcription of a conversation between you and Mrs. Milgaard, which $I$ can also give the document $I D$ number for, and he's saying to you that Mrs. Milgaard asked you about Mr. Caldwell's closing, he thinks this was around September of 1990 shortly after a Fifth Estate documentary had been aired, and if we could go to the next page, please, and you answer okay, and Mr. Hodson's question, it looks like around this time a discussion about Mr. Caldwell's closing address and it looks like at that time you indicated you don't have it, is that correct, and your answer is it looks like that, yes. And then at the next page he's quoting from the telephone conversation or the telephone recording, you
saying it doesn't really matter what he said in the closing, what matters is what he said in the opening?

A

Q
I see that, yes.
Okay. Now, sir, to assist you in that, if we could bring up the conversation transcripts, the first would be at page 337127, and I believe the beginning number of that document ID is 337105. You see that what is recorded here is a conversation between yourself and Mrs. Milgaard, if we accept that the staff have got this right when they did the transcription. Perhaps I brought up the wrong one. Just bear with me a moment, I didn't highlight this particular one. My apologies, Mr. Commissioner, the one that $I$ needed in that regard is 33 -- the pages I needed, it's from the same document, it's 337131, and again, I'm not taking you right back, but you can see JM, DA is always used by the transcription staff to indicate yourself and Mrs. Milgaard, and if we could go further down the page, please, starting right here, you'll see after some lengthy discussion between yourself and Mrs. Milgaard she asks the question:
"What about in his closing address."

And your response is:
"Well I don't have that."
And then your answer is, or her answer is:
"Well we did."
You indicate:
"All we've got are his rough notes."
She says:
"That wasn't his rough notes. That's
what he had in his file. That's what he
addressed from."
And your response:
"Are you sure. Because it..that... it was on big paper, it was on a big photocopy paper."

And Mrs. Milgaard, she says:
"Yeah and he even had his own notes written in it."

And then you indicate:
"Yeah, I know."
If we go to the next page, please, and then
there's the reference to he told Peter that,
presumably referring to Mr. Carlyle-Gordge, who
he had given his own original notes and
transcription to, or a copy of his original
notes, and you see here you say:
"... well, it doesn't really matter what he said in closing. What matters is what he says in the opening. I mean he may change his theory halfway through the trial because of what he sees with the evidence."

And Mrs. Milgaard says to you:
"Well there's lots in the closing too if you wanna look at it."

A Yes, I see that.
Now, sir, are you aware now, and I don't know that after that you went and actually read the closing address, are you aware now of some significance in terms of the opinions of individuals such as Dr. Ferris is that in his closing address what Mr. Caldwell said to the jury about the forensic evidence, and in particular the secretor evidence, was that it neither exculpated or inculpated Mr. Milgaard?

Sir, do you know now, and having gone through these various documents with you, do you know now whether you were aware of that then back before the Supreme Court of Canada reference?

Q

Assuming for the moment that you were, can you give us any reason or any explanation for why the opening and closing -- the opening remarks and the closing address done by Mr. Caldwell in particular were not forwarded to Dr. Ferris, Dr. Markesteyn when you were asking their opinion on the forensic evidence at the trial?

Well, it appears that $I$ wasn't aware that the rough notes was the actual closing.

Okay. Sir, in terms of the material that you had in front of you, given that it was, you knew it to be material from Mr. Caldwell's file, did it matter that you didn't have a certainty of what it was?

I'm not sure $I$ understand your question.
Did it matter -- it was clear on the face of it, I suggest to you, that one document, one large document that you refer to that was photocopied was identified as his opening remarks? Right.

And it was also clear on the second of those documents, and $I$ can have them brought up if you wish, in his handwriting that the second one was his closing address?

I assume that that's the case, but it looks to me
from this conversation that $I$ wasn't, $I$ didn't understand that that was his actual closing.
$Q$

A

Q
A
Q

A

Q

A
Q
A
Q

A
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Mr. Commissioner, with the assistance of Mr. Boychuk, if $I$ could go back for a moment. I referred Mr . Asper to a letter with respect to the Carlyle-Gordge materials which we're still looking at from Gordon Stewart. The document number is 218627, if we could have that brought up, please, and it's a letter dated, as you can see, April 21st, 1986, no doubt who it's from. If we could -- although it's not difficult to read it, if we could bring the body of it up closer, please. You see that Mr. Stewart forwarded transcripts mostly of telephone conversations between Mr. Carlyle-Gordge, a journalist, and witnesses who gave evidence at the murder trial. He indicated trial transcript being sent to you separately by our researcher in Regina, Ms. Sandra Bartlett, who will be contacting you should you find grounds for a new trial.

That's correct.
So does this confirm your sentence when $I$ asked you that you had in fact had correspondence from Mr. Stewart of the Fifth Estate?

Sure, yes.
If we could then bring up document number 162432 .
Now, keeping in mind that that letter from

Mr. Stewart was April 21st, 1986, you'll note this one is dated June 5th, 1986?

A

Q

Yes.
And it's directed to Mr. Peter Carlyle-Gordge in England, and if we could bring up this part of it, please. I'm bringing it up so that you can have an opportunity to review it to refresh your memory before $I$ ask you the question that $I$ intend to ask.

Right.
And perhaps if we could bring up the next paragraph for you to look at as well, please. All right.

And if you wish to look at the next one, you certainly can, for the fullness of the matter. All right.

Okay. Now, sir, if we could go back to the first paragraph, please, the particular part that $I$ wanted to direct your attention to is you were, you indicated to him that you were wading, you were beginning to wade through trial transcript, which the letter from Mr. Stewart indicated was being forwarded to you, if you didn't have it already, and $I$ think you did, as well you were reading transcripts that he had conducted with
several, of the interviews he conducted with several key witnesses?

A

Q

A

Q

That's correct.
This is 1986?

Yup.
Okay, thank you. Now, with respect to the transcripts that you were wading through, I have a list of document numbers, if you want any one of them brought up $I$ will have them brought up for you, but the transcripts that $I$ have recorded as Mr. Carlyle-Gordge's interviews is an interview that he did with Mr. Leslie, and this has been referred to previously, Mr. Leslie, Mr. Merchant, Mrs. Milgaard and Nichol John?

That's correct.
He was present at and recorded document number 048643, and do you have any memory now, and $I$ know you referred to it yesterday, of whether as part of this review that you were doing in 1986, that you gave Mr. Carlyle-Gordge indication of -Nichol John's was one of the transcripts that you looked at, and $I$ should say to you that $I$ think what we're bringing up now when we bring up these documents are versions done by the Commission, in their original form they may have looked somewhat
different in typing style.
A
$Q$
A

Q

Okay. The next one, document number 048529 , this would be a conversation between Mr. Carlyle-Gordge and Father Murphy?

Don't recall that.
You recall though, I presume, that Father Murphy became of some significance in the case because,
at a certain point in time, Mrs. Milgaard
certainly put forth the view that Father Murphy had been used by the police to get Albert Cadrain to go in and give his original statement?

A

Q

A
Q
You don't have a memory of a newspaper story done where it was said that Albert Cadrain came forward to get the reward and there was various documents that said that a priest was used by the police to get him in?

No I don't.
You don't remember discussions about whether a police officer had set Father Murphy up and used him to help them orchestrate a conspiracy, collusion?

A
Q
No I don't.
Okay. Sir, there are other, the other Peter Carlyle-Gordge witnesses -- or, sorry, interviews -- Dennis Cadrain -- and I'm sorry, I didn't copy down the document number on my sheet that $I$ have in front of me, $I$ didn't do them alphabetically in my files either -- but in any
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event we've reviewed the Dennis Cadrain transcript here at this Inquiry, and have you reviewed it in your preparation for the giving of evidence at the Inquiry?

A

Q

A

Q

No.
Okay. You would not be aware then, at this point in time, whether you knew it in the past, that in his interview of Mr. Cadrain Peter Carlyle-Gordge questioned him, as he did Albert Cadrain, about the presence of Larry Fisher in their basement? I'm not aware of that. Okay. But that -- and I don't want to provoke the response that Mr . Boychuk provoked yesterday by causing you to think I'm saying or I'm implying that you should have known, somehow, that Larry Fisher was the perpetrator because this information was available, but if -- if you did, in fact, review the file in its entirety, the transcript, you may have read that, and as Mr. Boychuk said yesterday, just not made a connection, because there was no reason why you should have $I$ hasten to point out, but certainly it was information that was available in the file? That's correct.

Okay. Sir, on that point, in the Peter

Carlyle-Gordge materials there were a series of documents and correspondence that have been identified at this Inquiry that show efforts being made by Mr. Carlyle-Gordge after he did his review of Mr. Caldwell's file, after he had contact with Larry -- sorry -- with Dennis Cadrain, Albert Cadrain, and I believe Estelle Cadrain as well he questioned about Larry Fisher, about efforts made by him to locate Linda Fisher?

I recall that.
You are aware that there was a newspaper ad placed by him asking anybody knowing her whereabouts to be in touch with him?

I believe $I$ was shown that at the Inquiry, yes. Yes. And, as well, that there were responses to that information coming at -- identifying, in fact, where she was found in 1990, that she was living in Cando, Saskatchewan?

Right.
When you received the file materials and when you were reviewing the file, as you indicated to Mr . Carlyle-Gordge in 1986, do you remember if that was part of the material that you looked at but obviously would have no significance for you back in 1986?

A

I can't recall specifically.
Are you -- sorry -- you indicated in response to a question last week, or last day when you were here I believe, that when you left your offices at Wolch Pinx Tapper, that you left the entirety of your file behind?

Yes.
And there are various discussions in telephone conversations that were recorded by Mrs. Milgaard that you were working frantically to organize your file, that you had a whole bunch of material, and you were telling her at one point you were going to have it so organized she'd be impressed with you. Did you, in fact, organize the file to a large degree?

Before I left?
Well, before the Supreme Court of Canada reference, and --

Oh, no. What -- no. I mean the simple answer to that is that we were caught in a whirlwind, it came on us very quickly, and I don't believe we were ever as well-organized as $I$ would have preferred.

But whatever you had access to, copies of, you left in the office when you left?

As far as I'm aware, yes.
Okay. No, and I'm not suggesting otherwise, I'm --

I don't have anything, $I$ can assure you of that. The only import of my question, in all the times that you were running around with this and all the hours that you were putting in on it, you were working out of your office, you weren't working out of your own home or anything?

Oh, I was working on it every place $I$ was, -Okay.
-- but I don't have any files anywhere.
Okay, but the files were kept in the office? In the end, yes.

In the end? Okay. Now, sir, I have asked you about a number of transcripts that were done and forwarded, apparently forwarded, at least some of them, by the Fifth Estate to you because they were transcripts of interviews done by Mr.

Carlyle-Gordge. In Gary Young's file, and in the materials before this Commission, there is a transcript of an interview that Mrs. Milgaard did with Ron Wilson January 12th, 1981, and you have been referred to that previously in your evidence, and as $I$ was going through my notes in preparation
for the cross-examination of you $I$ wasn't clear so I'm gonna ask, and if it's already been asked I apologize: Do you remember whether or not you actually physically reviewed that transcript of the interview of Ron Wilson and Mrs. Milgaard back in 1981 prior to preparation for the Inquiry, if I could narrow it that way?

I must have. I don't think I can specifically recall it but $I$ must have.

Okay. And, sir, also in the materials that have been provided to us -- and we can bring it up -document 155260 , and this may have been referred to you as well already, is a transcript of a telephone conference call that took place on January 22 nd, 1981 between Mr. Milgaard from jail, Mrs. Milgaard, Peter Carlyle-Gordge we know that to be, and Mr. Young?

I see the document.
Okay. Do you have any memory of --
Well let me, if $I$ may, have a quick look at it. Could we get it enlarged?

Yes. Mr. Commissioner, --
Thank you.
-- it may be of some assistance, if Mr. Asper is willing to work a bit through his coffee break,
that we give him a copy. I do have a number of questions in relation to this document and we could do two things if it will help, have him look at it and then $I$ can direct him specifically to the parts I want to go to, --

A
Q

A
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It's about 28 minutes after by my clock. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: That would be fine. Can you give me the doc. ID, if you have it, of the Joyce Milgaard/Wilson transcript, Fifth Estate, January 19 -- sent from the Fifth Estate January 1981 that you just referred to? MS. KNOX: January 12th, 1981, 333953. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you. Break, 15 minutes, thank you. (Adjourned at 10:26 a.m.) (Reconvened at 10:44 a.m.)

BY MS. KNOX:
Thank you, Mr. Commissioner, and thank you Mr.
Asper for taking time to look through the document, $I$ know it was lengthy and $I$ didn't have
a hard copy for you.
As I -- for the record, there are basically three parts of the document that I want to refer you to, $I$ don't think we need to bring them up as I've made you aware of the points that $I$ wish to ask you about.

A
Q

Okay. And in -- and I'm not going to belabour the motel room re-enactment but I'll, because I'm on that point right now, I'll deal with a couple questions $I$ do have about it. Do you have a memory, now, whether you knew that, in 1981, the
Yes.
information that was coming forward, albeit in a somewhat indirect way at that point in time from Mr. Milgaard, wasn't that the motel room incident didn't happened but essentially it could have happened, but if it did, he was on drugs.

I can't say I recall specifically if I had that information.

Okay. I'm going to ask a follow-up question. If you had had that information of that very conference call where David was a participant in 1981, a number of years before you became involved, might that have put a note of caution into how you viewed and conducted yourself, both within the application itself and in the public media, about whether or not, you know, the -- that Melnyk and Lapchuk were out and out liars?

A

Q
A

Well I guess -- and we get into this debate about semantics -- I guess my view, rightly or wrongly, was that, irrespective of whether David said it didn't happen or that it did happen but it was a crude joke or not intended, I guess I look at that as whether it was an admission or not.

Okay.
And if $I$ had felt that David had agreed that he had made an admission, yes, I would have conducted
myself very differently.
Okay. If you had been aware that while he couldn't make an admission, he couldn't say, as was later said and in fact put in an affidavit that it didn't happen either; might that have made -- and I'm going to use the expression with no intention of disrespect -- but slowed you down a little bit, caused you to look deeper, maybe research a little more before you took certain stands with respect to that? I'm thinking, frankly, of the Deborah Hall affidavit which was a principal part of your first application and the material that you brought forward on your application; might it have introduced a little bit of caution, as in, "eh, hold on a minute, we've got to take a close look at this"?

Well, again, $I$ guess if $I$ was of the view that there was -- that what David was saying that, no matter what happened, there was no admission, --Uh-huh?
-- I'm not sure that $I$ would have slowed down. Okay. And --

A
I would have pursued with vigour the idea that there was no admission.

And sir, with respect to that, are you aware that
documented within Mr. Caldwell's file, and available had you written that letter that you wish you had written, was a chronology of every event giving rise to Melnyk and Lapchuk, Ute Frank coming forward, statements being obtained from them, and that kind of information, starting with the very bald fact that the first the Crown heard of them was on the evening of January 18th, 1970, hours before they were about to start the trial? I think $I$ became aware of that at the Supreme Court, at the reference.

And, again, looking -- if you had gone looking you would have been aware, as the documents show, that Mr. Caldwell immediately contacted Mr. Tallis and said, that very night, that "this just dropped into my lap, $I$ don't know if there's anything to it, this guy, he said this to the police on the way back from Regina this afternoon, I'm sending police down to get statements, I'm not going to say anything about it in my opening address out of an abundance of caution, $I$ don't know if $I$ would even be able to get this evidence in", but he very prudently gave notice and then went through a practice of getting statements, his file documented that he had them in, interviewed them,
he disclosed the statements to Mr. Tallis, in fact although Ute Frank wasn't called made her available, as we know from Mr. Tallis and the file, to be examined by him?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A



No, Ms. Knox, I always understood that these were last-minute witnesses, and $I$ don't know when we became aware of it, we were aware that Mr.

Caldwell had informed Mr. Tallis and done exactly as you said.

I think what we were taking issue with was that there were other witnesses. Now, with the information you've provided me, I think that would have been very helpful to know
what other steps were taken, --
Q
Uh-huh?
-- there is no question about that.
Would it have been helpful to you, and might it have slowed you down a bit, had you known -- which you would have if you had accessed his file or talked to him or Mr. Tallis -- that Deborah Hall wasn't around on January 19th, 1970, that she was -- and no disrespect to her, but it was the generation of hippies and kids ran away from home all the time -- the suggestion to the police that first, at first instance was that she was in Vancouver, she herself has said that she was Vancouver, Toronto, I'm not sure exactly, but certainly she was not in the Province of Saskatchewan when this trial happened?

A
$Q$
I went through the materials with respect to Deborah Hall, there's an interview transcript that I don't know if you saw, it's done by Chris O'Brien in 1981, there's your affidavit or the affidavit that she signed before you in 1986; were you aware, when you were dealing with her, that in fact she hadn't even been in Saskatchewan when
this trial went ahead?

A

Q

A

Q

A

Q
A
$Q$
Mr. Asper, in light of that comment I'm going to ask you whether when you were, in 1986 , judging the actions of the people who were part of this at the time.
process in 1969-1970 -- and I'm thinking of particularly the police and my client, Mr. Caldwell -- did you ever stop for a minute and think, okay, it's easy to jump on a flight right now and go to Mexico, it's easy to do whatever, but did you ever for a minute turn your mind back to what the mobility, availability of the kinds of services we had in 1986, and have even better today, were in 1969?

A
$Q$
A
$Q$
'Mobility' in terms of what?
Like if, for example --

People?
Well if, for example the police, you said you would have wondered why they hadn't made a greater effort to get her. Trial is starting tomorrow, police officer goes to Regina, he gets a statement and somebody says "I think she's in Vancouver", got to find her, got to get her back here because the jury is being, already being empanelled as that information is being obtained, flights, availabilities, address?

Well certainly things would have been slightly more primitive in 1969, but $I$ wouldn't accept the proposition that they were so primitive that an effort couldn't -- that -- and I'm going back to

A
what $I$ might have said in the hypothetical circumstances that you and $I$ are talking about here -- that greater effort couldn't have been made.

I'm not suggesting that $I$ want you to accept that they were so primitive it couldn't have been made, I'm simply asking you, and $I$ 'm thinking back to your own characterization of your duty of professional conduct, --

All right.
-- whether you stopped for a moment, different from Mrs. Milgaard, different from everybody who would have been civilian parties to this, different from David Milgaard, and said, "yeah, but I gotta look at this through the eyes of sober second thought, professional judgement, professional detachment", whatever the right word is; did you ever -- and I'm asking this because there is another area I'll come back to -- did you ever, in 1986-'87 up through when you left the file in 1992, ever sit down and think "all these presumptions $I$ 'm making right now, is this the way it was in 1969"?

Yes, $I$ think we did.
Okay. Sir, to get back in terms of the motel --
or of the, of the transcript that $I$ had asked you to look at of the January 22 nd, 1981 conversation, we've dealt with the motel room incident and I've gotten off track a little bit.

The second area that $I$ have directed you to, or indicated that $I$ wanted to ask you about, were some statements made or some comments made by Mr. Milgaard in that conference call to Mr. Young and his mum and Peter

Carlyle-Gordge that he had some thoughts, or may have had some thoughts, of snatching the purse of the woman that he saw on the sidewalk -- and I don't even want to go whether she was old, young, or whatever -- but that he confessed -- and that's the wrong word -- he told them that, back on that morning in 1969, he/they were thinking that they might roll someone to get some money?

A
$Q$
I saw that, yes.
Okay. Do you know whether you were aware of that up to the point in time in 1986 when you drafted an -- or helped Mr. Milgaard draft an -- the affidavit that he filed in the Supreme court of Canada?

A
$Q$
I can't say when $I$ would have known that.
Okay. Did you know it when you filed your
application on December 28th, 1988, with the Deborah Harris (sic) and the Dr. Ferris material, that David Milgaard had acknowledged having thoughts of engaging in criminal misconduct that morning when Gail Miller died?

We may have.
Okay. And, sir, if you had that $I$-- and given your answer $I$ suspect that asking the next question is probably pointless -- but do you know whether it would have, or whether it did, influence the way you approached the handling of the information that you were receiving, the drafting of your application, and in particular the strategy that you developed when, eventually, you decided that the gloves were off and this was a war?

I don't think it would have changed anything, no. Okay. Sir, the third point, or the third issue I want to raise with you with respect to that transcript is the issue of Mr. Milgaard's notebook. And you will recall that there is some, still some question of what happened to the original notebook, there's correspondence from Mr. Tallis that says he returned it to him after the trial, --
-- there's indications that Mr. Tallis testified in the Supreme Court of Canada that was, what was purported to be Mr. Milgaard's notebook was not what he had at the trial, and he has given that evidence here. In this transcript Peter Carlyle-Gordge said he had the notebook and he was making reference in the transcript to right as -it seemed to me at least, and I'm not sure if it seemed to you -- as they were talking, he had physical possession, he was talking about entries in it, pages, and stuff like that; do you recall whether you were aware of that?

I was not aware of that. That notebook, I recall -- and $I$ don't know when -- seeing a photocopy of handwritten notes where the coil, I recall the spine or the coil was on the photocopied pages. I don't know where I've saw -I saw it.

Q Okay. Would it have been helpful to you to have known that, in fact, Peter Carlyle-Gordge had had it in 1981, and that perhaps would have allowed you to go down a path where you might have been able to recover it in 1986-'87-'88?

A I assume so, yes.

And I take it, since you didn't know it, obviously you didn't make any efforts to try to recover the original from him, and that you have no evidence to suggest that Mrs. Milgaard or anybody attempted to, or were able to, recover that original notebook from Mr. Carlyle-Gordge? I think that's correct. Sir, it has been said at various points in time, when one goes back and reads the history of Mrs. -- and it, I'll try to phrase this so that it doesn't sound like a criticism, because I don't intend it to be -- but through the history of her dealings on this file Mrs. Milgaard expressed the view, at various points in time, that the police, Saskatoon Police Service, had interfered with her ability to talk to the original trial witnesses? Yes.

And did you accept, in 1986 -- or with -- in the instructions or in the discussions that you were having with her in 1986 forward, did you accept that her assessment of that fact, if $I$ can characterize it as a fact, was correct; that there was a --

I think $I$ probably took it as information. Okay. Sir, I wonder if we could bring up document
331953. Sir, and I, I'm gonna ask you, this is a document, a letter from Gary Young's file?

A
$Q$ I think we have seen this, yes. Yeah. You note, in that letter, there's some indications from Mr. Young that he contacted the police and asked them to basically assist them in finding these witnesses, and then subsequent correspondence in Mr. Young's file, which is before the Commission and which he has testified about, is that the report back was that these witnesses didn't want to speak to Mrs. Milgaard, in fact one of them became very angry and accused -- and Nichol John, in fact, had a lawyer contact them and accused them of giving out her address even though she told them she didn't want it? That's correct.

Okay. And I, I know I'm probably annoying you by going back to "if you had known this would it have made a difference"; again, if you had taken the step of getting Mr. Young's file, would it perhaps have helped you in determining, or in hindsight, whether or not you would have gone to war so readily and so strongly, had you been aware that --
unquote, $I$ saw the -- was designed to achieve an outcome vis-a-vis Federal Justice for -- with whom we had sought a remedy.

Uh-huh.
I can't say that knowing this information would -yes, it probably would have had an effect, $I$ can -- I agree with that.

Uh-huh. And I'm not suggesting that you, or asking you to say, "well $I$ wouldn't have done what I did"?

A
$Q$
It's just difficult to know, to go back into the context of that time, given the outcome that we were trying to achieve, what we would have done with this information, what we would have done differently. I just don't know.

Okay. Sir, in Mr. Young's file -- and I can pull the exact document if anybody needs to see it -there's some suggestion that in 1981 -- not some suggestions -- documented that in 1981 he obtained Mr. Tallis' file, that he provided Mrs. Milgaard with an opportunity to go through, what we have from his billing a record that she made 85 pages of photocopies, and there is reference to Dennis Cadrain's statement of March 1969 being on his file. One of the parts of the formulation of the
theory of misconduct by police and Crown was the mistaken belief that Albert Cadrain had been coerced by police into giving the statement -- and we won't, $I$ promise you we won't go through the details of that -- but do you recall whether, when you took over the file, you were provided with a copy of Dennis Cadrain's statement that had been on Mr. Tallis' file in 19 --

A

Q
I don't believe I saw that.

Okay. Have you had an opportunity to look at the statement that Dennis Cadrain gave to the police that first time when Albert Cadrain attended there?

In 1969?
Yeah?
I --
March '69.
Not re -- I haven't looked at it recently.
If you had looked at the statement and seen, as the statement documents, that Albert Cadrain presented himself to the police station after talking with Dennis and with his parents, and as stating the belief that he had seen blood, might that have been another piece of information that might have not changed the plan, ultimately, but
caused you to step back and say "we gotta be, you know, really sure of what happened here"?

A
$Q$

It would have changed things, certainly.
Okay. And that was information that was availability, apparently, through Mr. Tallis' file or through Mr. Young and had been apparently
reviewed by Mr. -- by Mrs. Milgaard, according to the documentation in his file, but you have no record that you were provided with it by her if she had a copy of it?

I don't have any recollection of that.
Okay. Okay. Sir, you've stated a number of times during the course of your evidence, and $I$ appreciate that a number of times you've expressed regret for actions that you took that, in hindsight, turned out to be based on wrong assumptions or wrong facts, you've expressed regret for some difficulties that have been caused to my client, also a number of times you've indicated that the reason why you didn't go to look for a copy of my client's file -- and in the context of Mr. Wilson he asked you about going to Mr. Kujawa -- was because you expected the federal Department of Justice would do that? That's correct.

And I'm, I guess I need you to help me understand what the thinking was beyond that. Your indication is, or what $I$ think $I$ heard you say is that you wanted the federal Department of Justice to be the ones who were the distant third party who did oversight of the police and Crown actions and took the responsibility for getting the files from the police and Crown; am I right in that? That's correct.

Am I correct in understanding that you were also expressing a concern that, had you and other colleagues of yours, in 1986 when you took over the file, gone to look for either the police file or the Crown file, you had a fear that somehow they might corrupt their files -- and I use "corrupt" in a small c sense -- but they might alter, manage, remove things, you know, add things to their file, that would cover up misconduct?

Or not disclose.
Okay.
Or just simply not disclose.
Yeah, or simply not disclose, okay. That's one I hadn't factored in, and $I$ appreciate that, that's fair comment.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: The question was
directed to what party not disclosing?
MS. KNOX: The -- well, in particular my client, Mr. Caldwell. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I see.

BY MS. KNOX:
That, if you had asked for the Crown file, he might not have given you everything that was on it?

A
Yes, or the police, or whoever else was involved in it.

Mr. Asper, one of the reasons why $I$ have a bit of a struggle with that, and $I$ ask if you can assist me, is that in 1981 when Mr. Caldwell was contacted by Gary Young, whether you obtained the file or not, Mrs. Milgaard knew, when she was instructing you, that he had been fully co-operative with him, indeed Mr. Caldwell thinks Mr. Young came in and looked at the file, Mr. Young thinks he only had the offer but because he got taken off the file he didn't actually go in and look, but in any event, he extended an open invitation come look at my file.

Peter Carlyle-Gordge documented,
and in a series of some of the correspondence $I$ referred to you this morning, very cordial
correspondence, that when he contacted Mr.
Caldwell in the guise of writing a book about Western Canada murders and wanting to include this one, that he received a very warm reception from Mr. Caldwell. Do you recall -Yes.
-- that? And in your dealings with him did he communicate that to you?

Yes, $I$ think so.
Not only did he receive a warm reception, Mr.
Caldwell accommodated him to the extent of going to his office on weekends so he could look at the file?

Yes.
Gave him what appeared to be unfettered access, allowed him to take a Dictaphone and dictate anything he wanted from the police reports, witness statements or whatever, there was no attempt to circumscribe what he could take or use except for a small detail regarding other alleged criminal acts by Mr. Milgaard in Calgary?

Okay. And then in 1988 when you were doing your application, at the same time, the same day you filed the application with the Federal Department
of Justice, December, 1988, you got a, you filed a copy of it with the media, you sent it to CBC in particular and it came to the attention of a producer, Sandra Bartlett, who you had previous contact with. Do you remember that?

Right.
Do you remember getting a letter from Ms. Bartlett
almost immediately saying she had been in Mr.
Caldwell's office sometime previously working on a
television documentary, he was co-operating with
them, and in fact she had an opportunity to go
through his file?
I think $I$ remember that, yes.

I can get a document number if you wish.
No, I accept that.

Okay. Now, would it be fair to say that up to the
point in time when you filed your application in December of 1988 , all of the indications, independent indications, independent of your suspicion, paranoia or whatever the right word is, is that Mr. Caldwell was ready, willing and able to extend courtesies to anybody who wanted to look at the file, within the proper context of course, Joe Blow citizen couldn't come in off the street and look, but people with proper credentials
could, and proper reason for acces were given it? .

A

Q

Okay. Not only that, were you aware that when Mr. Carlyle-Gordge attempted to contact Ray Mackie, a senior officer, Mr. Carlyle-Gordge interviewed him and in the course of doing it Mr. Mackie documented that he had reservations about talking to him when he first called, that he called up Mr. Caldwell and said should I be talking to this guy, (
and Mr. Caldwell encouraged him to go right ahead?

A

Q
convicted, and somehow -- if that was true,
somehow that happened.

Q Uh-huh.
I'll accept that's the case. I don't recall that, but I accept that.

We can provide the transcript number for you and the evidence is before the Commission. So I guess, Mr. Asper, of the parts that you recall and the knowledge that you had, the information that's available as a result of the inquiries done by this Commission and the evidence that's been presented here, have you found, this day or any days that you've been sitting here and in the months that you've had to think about this, anything that gave validity to your concern that Mr. Caldwell would somehow not give full access to his file?

I will tell you what the mindset was, and you've asked for assistance in understanding $I$ guess our mindset.

Uh-huh.
We were confronted with the possibility and came to our own independent belief that there had been a wrongful conviction, that David was wrongly convicted, and somehow -- if that was true, somehow that happened.

A
And as I've said in my evidence, it can happen as a result of innocent behaviour or it can happen for degrees, as a result of degrees of more nefarious behaviour, and our attitude, rightly or wrongly at the time, was one of suspicion. We sought a remedy. Mr. Caldwell couldn't provide us with a remedy. He might, in hindsight, if we look, he might have provided some assistance. Mr. Karst couldn't provide us with a remedy, Mr. Mackie couldn't provide us with a remedy, the only place we could find a remedy was the Federal Department of Justice, so notwithstanding looking back that there may have been all this opportunity for co-operation, coupled -- take the approach that the co-operation may not be fulsome, coupled with the remedy that was being sought from the Federal Department of Justice, that's where we went and that's how we proceeded.

And, Mr. Asper, I'm fully aware of where you went and the way you proceeded. My question to you was given that you were operating of a particular mindset, for whatever reason, you were operating from it, and whether it's right or wrong, I'm not passing judgment --

A Right.

Q
-- but that was your mindset at the time despite the history of co-operation that Mr. Caldwell had given, some of which you were aware of in terms of allowing access to his file. My question to you was whether you know of any evidence as a result of the preparation that you've done for this Inquiry or other work that you did that would give any credence to your concern that Mr. Caldwell might in some manner have engaged in a course of conduct that would either have corrupted information on the file, not disclosed information on the file or in some manner or other engaged in unprofessional, unethical conduct had he been requested to give you access to his file?

I'm -- I can't say where all of the -- we became aware at some point of a whole bunch of statements of canvassing the neighbourhood, we've talked about it in this proceeding, the Merrimans and George Jones and all the people walking on Avenue $N$ and $P$ and $O$ and all those ones. Uh-huh.

I don't know where they were.
Okay.
They would have -- and Mr. Tallis I think has testified that the Mackie theory document, I don't
know where that was.
Uh-huh.
So I can't say that that existed and wasn't disclosed and gives rise to unprofessional conduct, $I$ can't say that now.

Okay.
I can tell you, had it been, you know, clearly -I believe that information would clearly have affected the outcome at the trial, it could have prevented a wrongful conviction.

You've had an opportunity to review some of Mr. Caldwell's evidence at this Inquiry, I know you haven't been able to review all of it because of time constraints, but have you gotten to the part in his evidence where he agrees with you on that? Yes.

That had he to do it over, he now recognizes significance to material, some that was on his file, some that was on the police file and not unfortunately given to him, and I say unfortunately, he might not have done anything with it anyway, but back in 1969 he thought that he had disclosed everything that was relevant and that he had no appreciation of the significance of some pieces of information embedded in police
reports like the Merrimans, he had one part of it, not the other, and (V4)---- (V4)---, for example, if we could go with a bigger point of concern, that he now recognizes he should have disclosed, do you have anything to suggest, any evidence to suggest that it was more than an honest mistake by a man who failed to recognize the importance? No, I don't.

I'm going to refer you to a document, 157294. Mr. Asper, this is a letter dated January 29th, 1992, and when we get to the end of it you'll see it's a list of materials that were provided by you to the Department of Justice to be included in the Supreme Court of Canada reference, and these were materials that you received from the Crown, or from Federal Justice as you were doing a review of the original Crown file.

A
$Q$ Okay.

Were you aware that the documentation, much of the documentation that you were given that forms the subject of this letter, like the witness statement of (V4)---- (V4)---, the witness statement of (V11) (V11) (V11)--, the witness statement of (V9) (V9)----, the witness statement of (V13)- (V13)--, witness statement of (V6)--- (V11) (V6)-, were
pulled off the file after an inquiry was directed about Larry Fisher by Mr. Caldwell himself and forwarded to the Department of Justice?

A
$Q$


I don't think $I$ was aware of that.

Okay. Sir, the evidence before this Inquiry is that when Mr. Williams started doing the work, Mr. Caldwell happened to have moved offices and he was working in the Federal Department of Justice office and as a consequence became a direct link between the Department of Justice inquiry and the old file, and the documentation indicates that everything that was of issue, or everything that could have been of issue was pulled off his file by him, forwarded by him to the Department of Justice completely without any apparent effort on his part to do any of the things that you suspected that he might do, he went over and got his own file and he pulled everything off it, some of which he had to say, and has to say, regrettably, he wishes now he turned over to Mr. Tallis or he recognized the importance of in 1969.

Well, $I$ think that's very laudable, I really do, but $I$ also believe that he should never have been put in that position, like, you know, nor should
we have had to rely on his good offices.
Q
A

Q

A
$Q$
You say you don't believe you did that. Were you party to the news story that appeared in the Saskatoon paper with the headine that Mr. Caldwell was in a conflict of interest because he was being allowed access to his own file, and the argument was, well, he could do things, bad things, but even if he doesn't, there's a perception that this is not right?

A Yes, yes, and I don't think that's Mr. Caldwell's fault.
$Q$

Sir, did you have any, at that stage in time, other than the fact that you were engaged in a war, did you have any reason to put forward in the public media the suggestion that somehow, because he was assisting in an investigation, some wrongdoing could occur, obviously at his hand because --

As I said to Mr. Wilson, I am of the view, and I'm not going to be shaken from my view, that one should not be investigating ones self.

Okay. Then we'll leave that. I want to bring up -- oh, before I bring up the next documents that $I$ want to ask you about, at various points in time as I reviewed the taped conversations between you and Mrs. Milgaard in preparation for the Supreme Court of Canada hearing, you made reference, or reference was made to you going to Regina to look at files, and I take it by that you were going to the provincial Crown prosecutor's office to look at police files, prosecution files? Yes. I believe that was after the reference. After the reference had been ordered or -Right. -- recommended or whatever the right language is? Right.

But you did attend on a number of occasions. Do you have any memory when you went to Regina to look at the files of how the prosecution file was presented to you to review, and I'm asking it in that way because it's an important issue.

I do not have any recollection of the meetings in Regina.

Okay. I wonder if we could bring up document number -- actually, what I'm going to do, if the Commission will indulge me, is I'm going to pass a series of file folders, I would like to have them brought up on Elmo. This is a colour photocopy of the file jacket that was the original file jacket on Mr. Caldwell's closed file involving Mr. Milgaard.

A
Right.
And it had, and I'm going to say to you, the record, or the evidence shows that there were six file folders with very nice handwriting, not his unfortunately, it was his secretary's of the day, but they were numbered Milgaard number 1 through, and we'll go through six in total, and then there's some writing on them in a fountain pen in a green ink that he liked to use that indicated what he was including in each file.

A Right.
The first of them being the correspondence file which, in its original form, is at the Commission's office and you can, if you wish, access it, a fairly thick file, probably two inches thick, that had a lot of the correspondence leading up to him, post trial, pegged with original, as $I$ said, lots of original red ink markings, the green fountain pen ink markings. Do you have any memory of seeing those original documents when you went there?

The next one, if we could, number 2, please, Milgaard number 2 with the nice handwriting and a documentation by Mr. Caldwell, if you'll trust me, as everybody else knows, that that's his ink and his handwriting, that it was the opening address, the trial notes, and he in brackets put (mine and Ullrich's), Ullrich being the police officer who was in court with him, and closing and charge?

A
$Q$ Yes.

The next one if we could, number 3, please, again,
same setup, main file, summary, autopsy report, lab report, indictment, exhibit chart, photos. You see the setup again that he organized his file and the materials that would have been in it. If you go back and look at the original, I just took the file cover jackets off because it's too hard for me to bring everything with me.

Right.
And $I$ could indicate $I ' m$ not totally anal, $I$ made colour photocopies because it was easier for him to work with. The next one, please, number 4, has a handwritten notation, witness statements (used) by him?

Yes.
Which contained statements of witnesses obviously, logically, who testified at the trial?

Right.
The next one, please, number 5, his notation, witness statements (not used)?

Right.
Mr. Asper, would it surprise you to know that within that file, pegged very neatly in numbered ordered as they were received from the police, were all of the witness statements that, exactly as it said, weren't used, including (V4)----
(V4)---, (V9) (V9)----, (V11) (V11)--, all of the ones that in retrospect it would have been important to disclose, but he kept them on his file?

A

Q

Are these the files, and $I$ know I'm not supposed to ask you questions. I don't know if these are the files that Carlyle-Gordge actually saw. Yes.

I don't know.
The evidence from Mr. Caldwell is that these were the files as he concluded his file and the order he organized them in, that they were all provided to Mr. Carlyle-Gordge. He doesn't have a strong memory of Ms. Bartlett being there, but certainly
her letter indicated she saw them and certainly saw some of the things in this file, including the statements that became the subject of interest.

A

Q
A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
Q Mr. Caldwell's memory was he thought Mr. Young had actually gone over, but whether he did or he didn't, these are the only files that were there
and this is what, according to Mr. Caldwell's evidence, and the record would seem to be, were being made available to those to whom he deemed it appropriate to give access.

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q 2
  Now, as $I$ said, all of the documentation as he organized it sits in the Commission's office because $I$ requested and they obtained the original materials and I've had an opportunity, repeatedly unfortunately, to go through it, but does it jog any memory with you as you look at these file folders of whether, when you went to Regina after the Supreme Court of Canada reference was
initiated, that you saw the files in this condition or, as has been suggested, they might have been disassembled and put into different categories by the Crowns who were working on them in preparation for the Supreme Court of Canada reference?

A

Q
A

Q
A

Q
-- the originals are in the possession of the Commission.

A
$Q$
I honestly don't recall seeing them in this
condition. I'll tell you that it looks like there's a yellow sticky on the file.

I think that might be our --
I think that might be mine, that looks like my writing.

You talk about new facts. I'm going to --
I don't know if I actually labelled those for the court or -- I mean, I'm looking at them as you flipped them through and I'm thinking, oh, where is she going with this one.

I wasn't going there, trust me. Mr. Asper, if it will, and if Mr. Hodson is in agreement, $I$ will say to you only that --

I don't recall seeing the actual files.

All right.
They were in intact in the order that they were
returned to the police, or to the Crown after the Supreme Court of Canada reference and all other matters. Whether or not they are in the exact order they were in at the time Mr. Caldwell concluded his file, it will never be able to be established, but certainly they are there, and if you want to look at them, I invite you to do so. I don't.

But I'm staying out of that.
I don't. Thank you, but no.
Whether that's your sticky or not, I don't want to
know. Sir, and $I$ bring these to your attention for a couple of reasons, and eventually I'll get where I'm going with this, but assuming for the moment that when Mr. Carlyle-Gordge went in, when Sandra Bartlett went in, all of this information, as I've suggested to you, was made available to them, you've expressed at some point some discouragement that you could have done things faster and better if you had taken different steps. May I suggest to you that if you had gone in and looked at this file, you would have gotten a really organized review of how the case was put together, how it was presented and what was not presented by Mr. Caldwell?

A
Q
I think that's very fair, yes.
Thank you. And, Mr. Commissioner, each of these file folders actually now has a document number assigned to it, I neglected to have them moved up the screen. Would it be helpful to have those? COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, it would. MS. KNOX: For the record, the Milgaard number 1 file has a document ID number on the cover 331789. File number 2 has a document number on the cover of 007081 . Document number 3 doesn't have a number on it, I guess I neglected to put one on.

MS. BOSWELL: 009371 .
MS. KNOX: Thank you. 009371. The document number for file cover number 4 I don't have.

MS. BOSWELL: 331786 .
MS. KNOX: 331786. For file number 5, the document cover number?

MS. BOSWELL: 331788 .
MS. KNOX: 331788. And document cover number 6?

MS. BOSWELL: 331791.
MS. KNOX: 331791. Thank you for saving me on that.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.
BY MS. KNOX:
Mr. Asper, I'm just going to go back to something that we were talking about earlier, and I was asking you about the documents that had been sent to Peter Carlyle-Gordge by Mr. Caldwell in February $I$ think it was, he made a note on that letter, remember, he was sending him the opening address and closing address?

A
$Q$

And the next one, if we could bring up document 007311, it has the handwritten notation at the top that it is his closing address?

A Yes.
Q
It goes through from 311 to 345 for the record, and it's interspersed in places with some handwritten notes, but essentially starts out very formally as:
"Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I am sure my learned friend and His Lordship would wish to join me in thanking you for your patient attention..."

Sounds like the boilerplate for the start of what it says it is, a closing address doesn't it? Yes.

I see you looking through some papers. If you wish to --

No, I asked for a copy of it just to refresh my memory and I'm just looking at the same document. So it is the same document? Yes.

So when you talked about, in your conversation about, and we talked about whether you had the closing address, clearly, while you didn't have the transcript version, you had, and $I$ haven't compared this word for word by any means, but substantially the body of what he was intending to say and presumably did say to the jury in his
closing?

A
$Q$正

Mr. Asper, I'm just going to, on the subject of what was contained in his files, I'm just going to bring up a couple of documents and ask you if you remember seeing them. The first one $I$ would like to have brought up is 007014 . These -- in its original form it's handwritten in Mr. Caldwell's blue ink, so they have more of a presence in their original form, but nonetheless, in photocopy form you'll see that this is dated September 9th, 1969. It goes through various witnesses, some that he needs to recall, remaining witnesses and whether they would be required or there could be agreements between him and Mr. Tallis it would appear to be, and then a notation at number 3 that there were certain witnesses, Mrs. Wilson and Art Roberts, that Mr. Tallis wants and notations about statements he wants, the Danchuks' statements?

Yes.
Then if we could go to --
This is for the preliminary inquiry $I$ think? Yeah, it is for preliminary, the September date will show you that.

A
That appears to be the case, yes.
Right, okay.

And there's no magic to these forms, I'm just bringing up some to show you what was on his file, and I will, after $I$ show you this next one, ask if you remember seeing it when you went to Regina.

The next one is 007016, a document on his file that has a heading "possible witnesses which tend to show prisoner innocent," and this is a document he was preparing in response to a request from Mr. Tallis to review the file about possible statements that could assist the defence?

Right.
Do you have any memory of having seen this previously?

No.
Okay.
I must have, but $I$ don't remember seeing it. And the next one, 007073, again because it leads nicely into the question $I$ want to put to you with respect to these three pages, a notation made during the trial, and $I$ bring it up because it contrasts with your earlier observation properly that $I$ was referring you to a document from prelim. This is a document during the course of the trial and what we know is that it's notes that

Mr. Caldwell made at a meeting that he had with Mr. Tallis on the Saturday about various issues that were outstanding in terms of the conduct of the trial and how the trial would go forward?

A
Q

A

Q

A Okay.

And I had had -- do you have any memory of having seen this before?

I must have seen it, I don't remember seeing it, though.

I in looking at these -- and very briefly, I know I'm giving you snapshot looks of what, as you say, you must have seen before, but you don't remember -- do you agree with me that what they do and what they illustrate is contained within those six file folders that $I$ just showed you were lots of pieces of information that might have been of some assistance to you in your assessment of how the Crown conducted themselves with respect to disclosure, discussions, attitude indeed, toward how this prosecution proceeded, and demonstrate, I would suggest to you, a fair level of cooperation in how this case was presented?

Well I'll agree with the first part of your question, certainly, yes.

Okay.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Which part was that?

A
That the file -- that we had, if we had had the files and the information it may have affected, $I$ think, our approach. Is that fair, Ms. Knox, I -BY MS. KNOX:

Q
A Uh-huh.

Yes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thank you.
BY MS. KNOX:
Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. Sometimes I ask the questions but $I$ 'm not sure that $I$ wait for the answer.

I have to say, you know, I would be remiss in not including the federal Department of Justice in my answer as well, that it would have assisted in their approach as well.

And I'll leave Mr. Frayer to speak to that.
I --
I speak only to what Mr. Caldwell could have offered you if you had done what you now say you wish you had done, written him a letter?

But that could have affected everything.
Uh-huh. Sir, on that point, since you bring me here -- I wasn't sure that $I$ was going here -- and
at various points throughout the course of your evidence you talk about what the federal Department of Justice could have done and you ascribe to the federal Department of Justice -and trust me, I'm leaving that area entirely for Mr. Frayer -- you describe certain things that you did, particularly some of what $I$ would characterize as the fairly nasty things against certain individuals, in retrospect you sort of say "well, if the federal Department of Justice had done what we thought they'd do when we sent this application in on December 28, 1988, none of this would have happened", and $I$ guess where -- and maybe I touched on this already -- where I have some difficulty in understanding what it is that you are attempting to say when you make those comments is that, on the very day that you were sending your application to the federal Department of Justice, you sent it to the media?

Well, but $I$ think if you look at the character and tone -- first of all, the case had been reported on up to that point, the information that was reported by the media at the time, and our position at the time, was very neutral and factual versus where it became. It was purely
information.
My only issue with respect to that, though, is that you're indicating on the one hand that you were looking to the federal Department of Justice to be the good guys, --

Right.
-- but what you did from -- with the federal
Department of Justice -- to an extent from the very day you framed your application, did you not, and you put it in the hands of the media -- is you started to cut the legs from under them?

I wouldn't agree with that. I can understand some people would see it that way but $I$ don't agree with that.

Would you go so far as to say that it created the potential that the media, or your actions, could cut the legs from under them? Because your evidence was a number of times, as I reviewed it last night, that when you put something in the hands of the media you lose control?

It's true. It cuts both ways, because on the other hand the media were able to develop information for us, ultimately, that they may not have been interested in doing unless we had had them involved.

But my question to you was --
But, yes, it cuts both ways.
-- that potentially, by doing what you did at that very early stage, you set a scenario in place that may have caused some of the difficulties that evolved with the Federal Government -- and I'll go a step further -- may have developed with my client, as an example, --

I have no doubt about --
-- because they weren't given the courtesy and respect of being able to answer the allegations, accusations that were being made against them, they woke up in the morning and read it in the paper?

That's true.
They woke up in the morning and sometimes, in the case of my client, called downstairs to his wife to find out if it was safe to go downstairs or whether his house was being inundated again, his street blocked by media?

Well okay, but Ms. Knox, I'm sorry, and I
appreciate that your client may have had
difficulty; my client couldn't go downstairs and speak to his wife because he was locked up in jail for 23 years, so $I$ guess we come at it from a
different perspective.
But, Mr. Asper, would you agree that one of the consequences of the approach that happened was that it may, in fact, have taken much longer for the whole review process to take place because everybody got put on the defensive?

I don't -- I wouldn't agree that -- I wouldn't agree with you that that was the case from the day we filed the application. I would agree with you, looking back, that, yes, that did become a problem --

Okay.
-- at some point.
And, sir, would it -- if $I$ could have brought up a document 001543, please. This is a newspaper story that we've looked at before in the context of an accusation being made about Albert Cadrain, but $I$ want to refer you to the part right here, I'm -- that starts:
"The Crown prosecutor was T.D.R. Caldwell ...",
and if we could bring out these two paragraphs, please. Sorry, I'm all over the screen here. Okay. If you could just take a minute to read that part, please.
(Witness reading) Yes, I'm familiar with it.
And you note the date is October 20th, 1989, the media is ratcheting off the rhetoric, Mr. Caldwell is contacted and he said:
"'The Minister of Justice is in the process of preparing a review of the case, and in light of that, it would be improper for me to comment on it whatsoever.'"

Sir, I suggest to you that that was appropriate for Mr. Caldwell to take that stance when he was contacted by the media in 1989, given the role he was in and the review that was going on, and ask whether you take any disagreement with his assessment of his professional and ethical duty? I don't take any issue with it, no.

Sir, there was some testimony that $I$ wasn't present for from Mr. Boyd, or Dr. Boyd I believe he is now, that he contacted Mr. Caldwell and Mr. Caldwell refused to talk to him. Would you not agree that the position that he took in 1989, that it wasn't proper for him to become engaged in a public debate because it was under ministerial review, still remained the proper and ethical course of conduct for him to take?

A
Q

A
$Q$ to Mr. Caldwell when Mr . Boyd contacted him, do you reconsider whether it might have been appropriate for him to be cautious and to, in fact, take the position he did as he did in

1989 --
A
$Q$

A
$Q$
Yes.
-- in -Boyd.

BY MS. KNOX:

A

Yes. Absolutely.
I'm getting there, honest.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: It was appropriate
for who to be cautious, Boyd or Caldwell?
MS. KNOX: I'm sorry, Mr. Commissioner, I didn't hear your question?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: It was appropriate
for who to be cautious, Boyd or Caldwell?
Mr. Caldwell.
MS. KNOX: Mr. Caldwell to be cautious and to decline to become engaged in debate with Mr.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Uh-huh.

Sir, if $I$ can globalise a question -- and if $I$ misstate anything, it will be unintentional, but I'm looking at saving some time -- sometime after this article in 1989 where Mr. Caldwell said, very professionally, "there is a review going on by the Minister of Justice, it's not proper for me to comment", the level of rhetoric --

Q -- vitriol -- thank you, that's a very good word -- the vitriol that was being extended in the media towards him, his department, his conduct, increased exponentially up to that article in July of 1990 where he is accused of misconduct on the front pages of the paper; where not too long after that he is accused of paying witnesses for their testimony, referring to Melnyk and Lapchuk; where it's asserted that a substance that he had introduced in evidence at trial as semen was probably dog urine when he knew in fact that there were human pubic hairs in that substance and it couldn't be dog urine -- as examples of what he would have been thinking at the time -- does it cause you pause to think that it's no wonder that he had a, perhaps a -- you might have to help me with another word, but a skeptic -- a reluctance to fully embrace the concept that was being put forward that David Milgaard had been wrongfully convicted?

I completely sympathize with his view.
Thank you. Sir, do you think that maybe being repeatedly the -- and I'm using "victim" with a small v, no way comparable to how David Milgaard was a victim -- but being repeatedly the victim of
unwarranted attacks, to know that stuff that's being put out there is wrong, would perhaps cause him to continue to be faithful in his belief, that I suggest to you was an honestly-held belief, that in 1969 and 1970 the police had arrested the right guy and he prosecuted the right guy?

I can understand how that would have -- how that would be the view, yes.

And if that had been approached in a different way, where somebody had come in a -- I'm -- I was going to use the word "sensible" and I won't because that sounds like my mother -- in a more -No, I'd agree "sensible", because I think that's the right word.

Had he been approached in a more appropriate, non-warlike way, not been ambushed in the media like he was ambushed in the media with what he knew to be untruths, that his participation and his assistance in this matter might have continued to be as it was with Mr. Young, with Mr.

Carlyle-Gordge, with the media who came, that he put forth an honestly-held belief that he had done the right thing?

A
I completely agree. I think our line of separation is only as to how that should have
occurred, should it have been via the federal Department of Justice or should it have been done directly, but $I$ agree that either one would have been more sensible than what happened.

Okay. Thank you for using my word. Sir, I -you'll recall that yesterday there was a point in time when $I$ stood and raised a concern about a paraphrasing that was done by Mr. Wolch as to certain information that would have been in the possession of Mr. Caldwell about Larry Fisher? Right.

And I objected because $I$ was asserting, whether you were listening to me or not, that there was a very limited contact recorded and remembered by him with respect to the file, and in that regard $I$ want to bring up a letter dated March 17th, 1971, and I have to apologize to the staff, I have my version of it that came from the original file that we had for Mr. Caldwell and it doesn't have the number on it. But it's a March 17th, 1971 letter to Mr. Ken MacKay authored -- pardon me -yes, authored by Deputy Chief Corey, if anybody can assist us with the number I'd much appreciate it, I didn't realize $I$ had taken an original from my old file pre-Inquiry.

MR. HODSON: 110590 ?

MS. KNOX: 110590 ?

MR. HODSON: 010718 .
BY MS. KNOX:

Thank you for assisting me with that. Every now and then, if you see me with a strange look on my face, it's because I've touched the screen with a pen and I'm gonna be in trouble with the staff because $I$ break it. A March 17th, '71 letter from the Saskatoon Police Service to Mr. MacKay?

A Yes.
Have you had an opportunity, in the course of your preparation or during the time that you were preparing for the Supreme Court of Canada reference, to look at this letter?

I think the latter, yes.
Okay. And you will see, if $I$ could direct your attention to this part, that Deputy Chief Corey was indicating that he was contacted by Mr.

Caldwell on March 16th, 1971, and requested to forward a summary of a fax relating to offences of rape allegedly committed by the above-named, the above-named being Larry Fisher?

A Right.

Who was in custody in Manitoba?

A Right.
Q
In your review of the testimony that Mr. Caldwell gave at the, at this Inquiry, did you review the -- his evidence with respect to this aspect of the allegations of misconduct that were made against him?

I don't think I did.
Okay. If $I$ can summarize for you -- and others may correct me if $I$ don't get this exactly right -- it was his evidence before this

Commission of Inquiry that he had no involvement whatsoever in the investigation or prosecution of the Larry Fisher matter, the only documentary
evidence found which triggered a memory for he -him, that he had long forgotten of a non-event of his professional practice in 1971, is this letter that caused him to remember receiving a phone call from Mr. MacKay asking about this character Fisher who was in jail in Manitoba; he checked he says the Crown files, prosecution files, and there were none, there was nothing whatsoever in respect of Larry Fisher; that the practice of the day was that police did investigations and police held files until they were ready to charge and have the matter brought forward for prosecution, in most
instances, there being an occasional opinion file, but this wouldn't have been one of them?

A

Q

A isn't it?

Q Yes.
A Yes, okay.
$Q$

A
$Q$

Yes, perhaps further than most of us, given the amount of time we have had to look back on your actions that aren't so quite dated in time. But essentially, if $I$ can get myself back to where I was going here, in the course of the disclosure of
the Larry Fisher connection, the possibility that he was the real killer because he was the rapist, and apart from anything that you and others may have said in the media and to the police and others about the fact that my client was complicit in covering up who the real killer was and knowingly let an innocent man either, number 1 , be
convicted in the first place, or if he didn't know it then he let him stay in jail once he found it out, but do you have any evidence to suggest there's any truth --

A
Or let a real killer stay on the street -Yeah.
-- was the third part.
Yeah. Do you have any evidence that would suggest anything, objectively, to sustain that allegation that was made against him so many times?

I think the whole thing from the beginning was circumstantial.

Sir, and I want to take you -- and I'll, this will be my last question before lunch, I see that you are getting uncomfortable from sitting, but -- and I will finish shortly after lunch -- but the point that you make is that the third point being that if they had done that, what was being suggested that he and others had done, they would have left a real killer on the street; when you were mulling over your information, you were formulating your strategies, you were looking for the bad guys, did you ever for a moment step back from the rhetoric and the emotion that you brought to this at a certain point in time -- as is evident from any of
the tapes that $I$ have listened to that this was a very emotionally-engaged file for you -- but did you ever step back for a moment and say to yourself, "okay, $I$ don't know this man, what $I$ do know is that he has been a prosecutor for a long time", if you'd looked at his background you would have seen a career of public service in his prosecutorial service, involvement in his community, involvement in his church, a husband and a family man, and did you ever for a minute say to yourself "how is it possible that a decent man could do this, let an innocent guy go to jail, let a real killer walk, but more importantly how could he put his head on his pillow every night as a husband and father and a member of a community that he was integral to, knowing that when he woke up in the morning, that real killer could have killed somebody while he slept. Ever think about that?

I think that, when we considered that, we were of a view that the magnitude of the wrong was so, potentially so huge that those involved, if there was some misdeed, may be more concerned with their own self-interest than the interest of the system at large.

Q
A
$Q$

A
Q

A

Q

A
Q

A
jail.
Q
And I take it, then, that that view has been
tempered by time and experience, because you've testified at this Inquiry that you now realize
that good people can all do their jobs properly, or in their -- to the best of their ability, and with an honest belief that they're doing the right thing, and bad things like wrongful convictions can still sometimes happen?

Ms. Knox, absolutely, good people can do their jobs and make mistakes.

Okay. This would be an appropriate place to break for lunch, Mr. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
(Adjourned at 11:58 a.m.)
(Reconvened at 1:31 p.m.)
BY MS. KNOX:
Thank you, sir. Mr. Asper, I just want to go back to a couple of, hopefully not more than a couple of things that $I$ referenced this morning, and closer to the end of the day where I didn't have a document $I D$ number, but you recall $I$ was asking you about the fact that Mr. Caldwell declined to speak to Mr. Boyd and suggested $I$ had a memory of a press conference at the airport in Winnipeg?

A Right.

Q
If $I$ could bring up document ID 004633 , please. You'll see that this is a headline in the Winnipeg Free Press, I think on July 10th, 1991, and it shows Mrs. Milgaard greeting Professor Boyd at the airport that ran in the local media, this is a Winnipeg Free Press version, but would it make sense to you that if Mr. Caldwell, already feeling a little -- no, a lot under attack, might conclude that to accept the invitation that came from Mr. Boyd some weeks later might be equally inappropriate as it was to talk in 1989 when he took the position the matter was under review? Well, yes, and I thought about that a little bit. I understand Mr. Caldwell's view. I guess -- I guess $I$ look back at it, it may not be fair, but $I$ guess $I$ just sort of wonder if Mr. Caldwell felt that something erroneous was being said why he didn't say something to us, but $I$ understand why he wouldn't.

Okay. May I suggest to you that Mr. Kujawa attempted to do that and he got crucified and that might have been a factor that would have influenced Mr. Caldwell?

A
I'm not even necessarily saying publicly, but I
understand, having seen that, or seen other examples of it, why one might not.

And just to pick up on that, when you say not publicly, you are aware, of course, that Mr. Caldwell was available, willing and indeed made himself available as necessary to Mr. Williams of the Federal Justice Department to Sergeant Pearson, I believe, when he came involved, and ultimately to every other person in an official capacity who sought his assistance in exploring what had happened?

Yes, I understand that's the case.
So it wasn't that he didn't choose to speak about it, he chose to speak about it in a professional forum, if $I$ can use small "p" professional to represent --

A

Q
I'm not going to debate that. Yes, I'll agree with you.

Sir, this morning, and I'm going back a bit, but trust me, there's a whole bunch of stuff over on that table now which means I'm finished with it, but there are some issues or some points as $I$ went through my notes that $I$ need to go back, and I'll be very brief $I$ hope, to clarify, but $I$ was asking you whether you have had the opportunity to look
at the materials contained in the six volumes of files that were how Mr. Caldwell housed his file, and $I$ phrase that in concert with your expressed concern that if you had gone to Justice, or you and your associates had gone to Justice looking for the file, you had a fear that he might somehow do something that would be not proper and you wouldn't get a true picture?

A
$Q$
He or others, yes.
He or others, okay. I wonder if we could bring up document 00938 -- sorry, 009374 is the document ID. Sir, what is on the screen is, as you probably recognize by now, a page with Mr. Caldwell's handwriting on it. This is a group of materials, or group of reports that come out of his file number 3 as he labelled it, if I'm remembering his labelling correctly.

Right.
And it is a gathering, or for closing his file purposes he put all of the lab reports into a complete collection and kept them on his file, and

I wonder if we could go to page 009386 of that series of pages of lab reports. Sir, this grouping on his file of lab reports goes on for some period of time and this is kind of in the
middle of it, if $I$ could characterize it that way?

A
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$
Reder Right.

And you'll note that this is a lab report that contains the names (V2) (V2)- (V2)----- and (V1)--- (V1)-?

Right.
And we don't have the benefit of having a colour copy of it which is how it existed in his original file and how the Commission has seen it during his evidence, but if you look at this in his original file, this long line that comes down through it is done in his fountain pen ink, the green fountain pen ink, there is a notation made by him to omit this particular report, and there's a note made on it up here that it is a different file, and if you are not remembering, the file number assigned to it, 286-69, is a different file than the David Milgaard/Gail Miller file?

I accept that.
Sir, one of the pieces of, or one of the many allegations made against him that followed on your suspicion or your concern in the early stages, that if you went to him you might not get a true picture, but in fact this document was on his file when it was taken or reviewed by the Department of

Justice in preparation for the 690 review and ultimately for Supreme Court of Canada, and you can see it clearly relates to two of the women who were victims of Larry Fisher?

A

Sir, I suggest to you that the fact that Mr.
Caldwell, number 1, identified it as a different file not connected to the Milgaard prosecution, and number 2 -- and identified it that way at the time, and number 2 , and perhaps more importantly, that he kept it on his file for all to see, Mr. Young, if he had come to look at it, Peter Carlyle-Gordge, Sandra Bartlett, you, if you had come to look at it, anybody who wanted to come to look at it, would be another factor that, had you gone about this the way you now wish you had, would have been some, given some weight to putting to rest your concerns about misconduct on his part?

I think that's true, yes.
You know, why would he keep the very thing that was going to be evidence that he could have had knowledge and that he should have -- that he should have made the connection where he says he didn't or might have made the connection?

And on that point as well, is it not true that you became aware very early in your dealings with this file that the very exhibits that ended up being the materials that were able to be used in 1996, 1997 to exonerate David Milgaard were available to you because Mr . Caldwell had made a direction to the registrar of the court and a note was put on those exhibits that they were not to be destroyed except by express direction from him?

Yes, I think $I$ was the first of our -- I was certainly the first lawyer after our firm was retained to inspect those exhibits. I don't recall seeing the note, but I became aware later that Mr. Caldwell had in fact preserved them.

And, sir, and I didn't bring it with me, but you'll recall that you used Audrey Brent as the agent for your firm here?

Yes. Ultimately, yes.
And perhaps you don't have a memory of it, but there's a story that appeared in the media where Ms. Brent is quoted, as to her amazement when she went in she found this sitting on top of this pile of exhibits in a grocery cart $I$ believe.

A
That's true.

A

Q

A

Q

A
Q

The note was sitting on top of the exhibits when she went in on direction from your firm as your agent to get the exhibits released.

Right. Well, I had been there before Ms. Brent became involved. I just don't recall seeing the note. I may have.

Okay. But that she's -- and as I said, I didn't bring the article.

I don't dispute the note was there.
But again, if you became aware of that, that the man that you were suspicious of and who you weren't comfortable trusting to give you basic information, including access to the Crown file, was in fact the man who was preserving the exhibits, should that have, if you were thinking logically, and I'm going to borrow a term from Peter Carlyle-Gordge, if you had been using rigorous logic, that that too would be another indication, just as this lab report is, still in his file, that this guy doesn't sound like he's done anything wrong, because if he is, he's not going a very good job of trying to cover it up?

A
Q Well, yes, $I$ would agree with that. Sir, I asked you this morning, and I didn't have a document number, about the fact that as he was
under siege in terms of his actions and his integrity, a media report was done or a further attack on his present day integrity was done when it was alleged that he was in a conflict of interest because he was getting access to his file?

Right.
I want to bring up document 332361. If you can flip it a little bit, please. You'll see this is an article that appeared in the StarPhoenix in his home city on the 30 th of August, 1990 and essentially quotes in part yourself and Mr. Asper, but the headline makes it very clear that in another time frame, additional to what's been alleged about him in 1969, 1970, '71, '72, in 1990 further allegations of improper conduct are being made about him?

That's correct.
And I don't think I need to ask the question, I think you are agreeing with me, that in hindsight looking at that, you could see why that would keep him silent and cause him to be skeptical of the claim being made by Mr. Milgaard because, after all, while innocence is not a right word, he's the man who hadn't done any of the things he was being 9

A
$Q$

A

Q

```
accused of, in his mind?
accused of, in his mind?
```

In his mind, yes.
Yes.

Okay.
I also made reference to an allegation that was made against him in the public media and I didn't have the document ID, if we could bring up 332331. This, you'll see, and you've been referred to this before $I$ believe in the course of your evidence, and you'll be happy to know that you are not the spokesperson here, that your principal, Mr. Wolch, but again, this is an article that appeared, as you can see, August 21st, 1991 in the Saskatoon StarPhoenix that makes some pretty serious accusations against Mr. Caldwell?

I'm just --
Please, take your time.
(Witness reading) Well, okay, I see it.
See why he might be upset by that?
Oh, I can see why Mr. Caldwell might be upset, sure.

Uh-huh. Sir, and again if you'll be patient with me, $I$ 'm sort of going back in terms of some stuff I did this morning. At one point in time $I$ asked you whether at any point between 1986 , when you
became involved in the file, and 1992 when you left the office to go on to another aspect of your life, whether you had turned your mind back to the way things were in 1969, 1970, and you were talking about air traffic and mobility and things like that in that respect and you indicated that you believed that you had to an extent?

Well, I mean, yes, to a large extent, because we thought that things were a lot closer in terms of the relationship among police officers, the police department was smaller, communities were smaller, the crimes that Fisher was committing we assumed would have seemed larger given the size of this community, yes, we certainly put our mind back to 1969.
$Q$ Okay. As much as we could I guess. Okay. I want to take you back to the, out of the mobility of people and with respect to practices and rules that govern the practice of law, particularly criminal law at that time, and did you make any attempt, and particularly in light of the allegation that was reported as made by you in July, 1990 that Mr. Caldwell had engaged in misconduct by withholding statements from

Mr. Tallis. Did you make any attempt before you took that position publicly to go back and look at what the rules were or the law was respecting disclosure at that point in time?

Well, $I$ 'm not going to give you a free pass on the interpretation because my recollection of that incident is that $I$ was being critical of Tallis on his cross-examination and suggesting that if he didn't have the statements, if he didn't, then it would be misconduct on the Crown. If your question is if Mr. Tallis didn't have the statements did $I$ consider, under the rules of the time, as to whether that would have been misconduct by the Crown attorney, is that -We can go there, that works for me. Because I just -- I'm sorry, I just can't accept, because that's not my recollection -Okay.
-- of how that quote came about. As I've said over and over again, $I$ accept for how it came out, I accept that.

And, Mr. --
A
And in terms of, $I$ believe you are referring to Boucher standard of disclosure, $I$ don't recall it and can't recite it at this moment, but I'm pretty
sure we would have been looking at the standards for the time.

And if $I$ paraphrased inappropriately what your evidence is, $I$ apologize for that. You and $I$ have I think a slightly -- I have a different view of how you interrupt it, but that's not for us to decide, that's for the Commissioner to decide. Right.

I want to -- and this may be a quick reference, I'm not going to ask you to give me the cite for Boucher, I want to have brought up document 009289 , please, a letter dated June 10th, 1969 to Mr. Caldwell from Mr. Tallis.

Yes.
And $I$ want to direct your attention to the second paragraph of that letter if $I$ may, and the second sentence more importantly is where $I$ want to ask you a question.

Yes.
Okay. Perhaps paraphrasing the law as it was set out in Boucher, you recognize -- first off, have you ever seen this letter before? I know you hadn't gotten Mr. Tallis' file or Mr. Caldwell's file up until December of 1991 , but had you seen it at any point in time prior to that?

A I may have. I don't recall.
Q
Okay. Would you agree with me that the statement of law as put forward by Mr. Tallis at that point in time appears fairly definitive, that there wouldn't have been an automatic entitlement to physical receipt of statements; in fact, I don't think we were even using words like disclosure back then, although we may have been, I wasn't old enough to be, but that in fact the standard or the practice of the day for many was that counsel were given opportunities to read and review, Mr. Tallis had a very good working relationship, as he attested to, as did Mr . Caldwell and others, and was freely given materials, including witness statements and so forth, but there was no -It wasn't certainly as we know it today, that's for sure. Yes.

And $I$ don't want to go down the road of debating that issue with you again, but I'm going to ask one more question with bated breath. If -- if -just possibly if you had been thinking in terms of the requirements on the Crown, or the duty on the Crown at that time in the context of how Mr. Tallis outlined it in that letter that $I$ just showed you, which he sent to Mr. Caldwell in
respect of this file, might that, might that have in any way introduced a note of caution to your interpretation of what the implications were of whether or not Mr. Tallis had physical custody of the statement, it being a non-issue of course because indeed we know he did have it?
over the lunch hour, but if you want to -- if we could bring it up in paragraphs closer for you to do a quit scan of it.

A
Q

A
$Q$

A

Q
A
$Q$

Okay.
Would you agree with me that essentially it confirms what $I$ summarized for you, that this was how Lapchuk, Melnyk, Ute Frank came to their attention and the course of action that was engaged in as consequence of it?

Right.
Now, again going back to a question I've asked you a number of times, would you agree with me that had you looked at the Crown file, as you wish now that you had, and seen this, that that would have had some influence on the side of being less aggrieved or less vitriolic towards Mr. Caldwell in terms of his action?

I'm not sure $I$-- it may. I'm just not -- I don't recall being, that this issue was anything that drove me particularly more than anything else. Sir --

Other than the characterization. I don't think the disclosure issue here was an issue.

And perhaps, sir, I'm placing an emphasis on a piece of the process of events that unfolded
different than you did, but I'm premising the importance of this issue on the fact that it was the affidavit of Deborah Hall with respect to this incident that was the second peg of your re-opening application in December, 1988, and it may be that I'm giving it more importance in the greater scheme of things than you attributed to it and, if that's case, then $I$ apologize again, the Commissioner will make that determination, if it's necessary to be made, as to whether or not I'm overemphasizing.

A

Q
Well, I mean, look, to be clear, as I said from the outset, we needed something new, that was new. As the case wore on, $I$ think it's very clear that the role of the Deborah Hall statement diminished quite dramatically.

I won't go there. Mr. Asper, in your -- I
referred you this morning to the content of the original prosecution file and $I$ have passed to the staff three documents that $I$ want to ask you to look at because there's a single point in respect of them, and if we could start with the (V4)----(V4)--- statement that was contained in Mr. Caldwell's file which he sent to the Department of Justice. Again, this is a colour photocopy taken
from the original which is in the possession of the Commission, it has a document ID number 006404 , again for the record, and $I$ draw to your attention, because in Mr. Caldwell's file it had written in red ink a comment, "Indecent assault not connected." The evidence before the Commission is this was an assessment or a preliminary assessment done with respect to this incident by a police officer, we're not sure exactly who, but certainly a member of the Saskatoon Police Service before it was sent to him, and he has suggested that it may have been a factor in his not making a connection. If you had reviewed the file and been aware that of these particular statements, and there were others, (V9) (V9)---- and the other three have the same kind of a notation, would that have given you some pause with respect to the expectation that you would have had on Mr. Caldwell as to how he fit this into the big picture given what little information he had about, the fact that he had no information about Larry Fisher?

A I find it, $I$ just find it odd that files of this potential importance were in Mr. Caldwell's file and marked not connected, $I$ can't explain that.

Q
Okay. Sir, as part of an explanation, would it, you consider the fact that there's still a debate to this day as to Larry -- and I believe Dr. Boyd visited here in my absence this week as to whether the person who killed Gail Miller could have perpetrated the assault on (V4)---- (V4)--- as she describes it, just in terms of location and time line?

There may be debate. I was taking one side of it.
And, Mr. Asper, I have to say to you that my memory tells me, as $I$ had a brief humorous comment that was exchanged between Mr. Wolch and I with respect to this, but somewhere in the Federal Government file there is a memo that says that in discussions with you, and the merits, or the suggestion that the same perpetrator had killed Gail Miller and indecently assaulted (V4)----(V4)---, you had conceded that the one person couldn't have done it because the time lines were too tight?

Well, I think that's referring to a conversation that I had with Inspector Sawatzky, -Okay. -- and I had a fairly free-ranging discussion with Inspector Sawatzky about time lines, and if you
move one time this way or that way it's not possible.
$Q$
Okay. Sir, given that you, with your view of the file, were prepared to acknowledge that slight variations in time would make it impossible, does that make it so astonishing that Mr. Caldwell -that and other factors -- didn't make a connection?

I have to say certainly, at the time, the fact that there was another sexual assault within blocks of the Miller murder was something that we thought would have been important.

Okay. I'm going to go completely away from my files for a minute because there is a question that's kind of been niggling at me, and I've raised it with several, including Mr. Hodson, as we go along. But throughout the course of the representations that have been made in respect of your view -- and by "your view" I mean the collective counsel representing Mr. Asper in this application from 1986 forward -Milgaard.
Sorry.

A
2 I'm Asper. I'm sorry. I'm very tired, I didn't sleep a lot
last night, you will be -- you kept me up -- Mr. Milgaard, but --

A

Q

A
Q I gave you something to read in the National Post, so --

I haven't looked at the National Post, I have been looking at this stuff, but -I've got a subscription for you.

Thank you again. You are just taking me off track. But at various points of time in the course of various pronouncements that were made in the media, the various salvos that were blown in the war that had begun to happen around this whole inquiry into the merits, or lack thereof, of Mr . Milgaard's conviction, reference has been made by many people to the fact that the Saskatoon Police Service and Mr. Caldwell should have realized that they were dealing with a serial rapist. And I don't know, $I$ can't bring to mind -- and there are many things about this, unfortunately, $I$ can readily bring to mind -- $I$ can't bring to mind any time when $I$ heard or read that you had said it; but were you aware that one of the assertions as to the lack of bona fides of the Saskatoon Police Service and the prosecution in bringing these charges and prosecuting Mr. Milgaard was that they
had to be aware, that the statements were strong, they had to have known that they had a serial rapist, they covered it up was one allegation, if they didn't, you know, if they didn't know they should have known, they were professionals, but generally the language of the serial rapist was -is part of the explanation being offered for why, in the mind of their detractors, these policeman and this prosecutor should have known and made a connection to Larry Fisher; do you remember those kinds of --

A

Q
A

Q
A
But, yes, we took the view -- and I to have say this. You have to wonder why, with all of the Fisher activity going on, in the context of the Gail Miller murder, you know, it's not crazy to wonder why somebody didn't -- it didn't twig.

Q
Uh-huh. Sir, I want to take you back and ask you again if you consider that, in the context of 1969, that offences of violence against women, sexual offences in particular, were, according to -- certainly according to the literature and many women who were victims of assaults or who were advocates of victims of assaults in those days, weren't taken as seriously as they are in the current age, and as they have been for the last 20 plus years; would you --

A

Q

A

Q
A
$Q$
Okay. And I apologize to the Saskatoon Police Service, because you're right, that's a wrong use of language. What $I$ should have said is that the investigative style was somewhat different, and review of what the Saskatoon Police should have known, what the Saskatoon Police Service should have done?

Oh, I don't think $I$ would be prepared to say that the Saskatoon Police weren't taking these crimes seriously.

Okay. And --
I think, $I$ think it is fair to say we were in a much more paternalistic world.
'paternalistic' is a good word I think, to describe what was often done with respect to the offences?

A

Q

A
$Q$ 2 $\square$ Did you canvass or attempt to determine what the practices or policies were around notification to
victims when cases were either closed because they were unsolved and the police felt they had no place to go, or when they were concluded by way of guilty plea, as an example like happened in Larry Fisher?

I don't recall if we did or not.
Okay. Are you since aware that there's evidence before this Inquiry, and likely perhaps will be more evidence, that there was no policy within the Saskatoon Police Service that required notification?

A

Okay. I -- and are you aware that -- and I'm trying to remember long back, this has been a long process -- or, no, I won't ask you if you are aware -- but the summary of what you're telling me, I take it, is that you didn't check it out, you presumed that the normal course of events for a policing authority would be to give notice to women like the women in the Larry Fisher files? I don't know that we presumed that there -- well, I guess that's the implication, we were surprised. And you went further than being surprised, because
that notification wasn't given you made -- you, and I say "you" in a collective sense, your group -- made a conclusion and drew a conclusion and made public assertions that the failure to notify had sinister overtones as opposed to an unfortunate paternalistic policy as might -- it might be described?

That was an interpretation we were offering, yes.
But to bring an end to this point that $I$ am belabouring, perhaps unnecessarily, it was a viewpoint that wasn't based on any factual information that you obtained or any evidence of policy or practice of the day, it was an assumption made in 1986 forward about what would have happened or should have happened in 1980 -in 1969, and an assumption made, because it didn't happen, that meant that something wrong was done here -- being done here?

A
Q
A
Q Mr. Asper, at various points in times, I'm not sure if you said it in your evidence this past while or whether it is something that $I$ have read and that $I$ am reflecting on because $I$ read it as
opposed to heard you say it, but I have a recollection that you have indicated, either in this forum or in other forums, that as soon as you read the transcript of the evidence given by Albert Cadrain at Mr. Milgaard's preliminary inquiry and at his trial you knew something wasn't right here; do you remember saying that?

No.
Okay. Was it your view or do you remember if it was your view, after you read his evidence of the preliminary inquiry and trial, that there was something wrong with this guy?

I don't recall.
Okay.
I haven't read that evidence in a long, long time.
Okay. I won't bore you with the detail, but I want you to know that Mr . Wolch didn't share your opinion. According to an interview he did with the RCMP, document number 023046 at page 023059 , he made -- he offered to Inspector Sawatzky to show Albert Cadrain on tape, he -- and I'm quoting from the document without needing to bring it up -- oh, sorry, we have it up. He says here: "We could show him to you on tape. It would appear that he had mental problems
early on. Going through the trial, you
don't have any sense of him being mentally ill."

And on that point, with respect to Mr. Cadrain and his mental health status at the time of trial, were you aware, in fact, that there were no indications made to the police or the Crown, according to the evidence before this Commission, that Albert was experiencing any mental health problems at that time?

A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q
A
$Q$
I think that's what the evidence is, yes.
Yeah. And you were aware that when Peter
Carlyle-Gordge interviewed Dennis Cadrain in 1983,
and Dennis was very helpful to him, Dennis made no
allegation, at that time, that his brother was
exhibiting any signs of mental illness.
I'm sorry, was that in '83?
'83, I believe, was the Carlyle-Gordge. Yeah,
'83, I can --
Well I'm not sure that -- I'll accept it. At some
point, though, I think we found out that Cadrain
was in a psychiatric institution in '73.
Yes, and I'm --
In '73 though.
I'm going there, yes. But in terms of, I'm
talking about the knowledge base that persons who's conduct you were calling into question had, --

A
Q

A No, not until 1990 or -- sorry, no, we never -no, there was no indication that anybody had that knowledge.
$Q$
Do you -- so I take it that you would be prepared to accept that Mr. Caldwell, as he has testified, had no idea that there was anything wrong, in fact didn't become aware some couple of years after the trial that Albert Cadrain was admitted to a psychiatric hospital and received treatment, and didn't become aware of the information about him and his comments that Dennis has reported, about seeing Mr. Milgaard's face on a snake or some object or something like that, until well after this review had started?

A
$Q$
I accept that, sure.
Okay. Mr. Commissioner, for -- and for the
benefit of Mr. Asper, with reference to the Peter Carlyle-Gordge interview of Dennis Cadrain, the document number, $I$ don't have the first couple of pages, I believe it starts at 325634 .

MR. HODSON: Correct.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.

BY MS. KNOX:
And while I'm back in that document, if I could go back to something $I$ had asked you about this morning and you said you weren't sure if you had read it, if we could go to page 325644 of that document. And $I^{\prime} d$ asked you this morning if you could -- if you remembered reading the transcript, if it was one sent to you when you first started the file in '86, and if you remembered -- if you'd read it you would have noted the reference to Larry Fisher, you said you didn't remember it, but you see that it was, in fact, canvassed by Mr. Carlyle-Gordge in that interview? The question starts here:
"Did you know a Larry Fisher?"
And this is the Dennis Cadrain.

A
$Q$
-正

Okay. So he canvassed it with Dennis, he canvassed it with Albert?

A Right.

Q
In that, I'm confusing myself, I think it was 1983. Now, sir, that -- and, sir, I'll move off, and that document can go. Reference has been made, in the examination of you by others, to the document that's called, now, the Mackie document, which was that summary that showed up -Right.
-- in around the time that you were in preparation for Supreme Court of Canada. And if I -- I could have brought up a version of it, please, 008920 is the number $I$ have in front of me, $I$ could work with a different version -- I'm sorry, 920. I have a different version with document number 006799 . If we could use 006799 , that's the one $I$ think that we've all been working with.

MS. CHERYL ELLERMAN: (Assistant Document Manager) Could you repeat the number? MS. KNOX: 006799 .

BY MS. KNOX:
Okay. Same document, the other one had a cover sheet from Murray Brown to Chief Montague with a letter attached that you -- in any event just going back to your evidence, and in particular to some of the material $I$ read in your conversations
with Mrs. Milgaard, that you started going to Regina to look at the Crown file in December, I think, of -- just in advance of the Supreme Court of Canada reference. When you went to Regina do you remember seeing this document in what was provided to you as the prosecution file?

I don't think $I$ recall seeing it, or at least twigging to it, until we were in Ottawa. Okay. You are aware, as you've reviewed Mr. Caldwell's evidence, that it is his evidence that this was not in his original prosecution file when it was in the offices over here, when it was examined by him at Mr. Williams' request, and prior to it being sent to him in Regina; that this was not a document that was part of his file? Right.

And do you know, when you became aware of it, what the source of it was that got it into your hands? I believe it was through the federal Department of Justice.

Okay. Are you -- do you have a -- and I'm going to be pushing your memory for sure now -- but do you remember whether there was anything given to you, either of a document ID or a cover letter or a memo or anything, that would have documented the
source of this document as it was being passed on to you?

A
Q
I'm sorry, I can't recall.
Okay. Sir, this may have been canvassed with
you -- and I'm, and I apologize if, to you and to
the Commissioner and other counsel if I'm going
over something that you've already covered, but
because of time constraints I didn't have time to
go back and read all of your transcript -- but one
of the criticisms, if $I$ could use that word, that
you made at various points in time, as did others,
of Mr. Caldwell and his conduct of the trial, in
particular as it relates to Nichol John, was that
he got to examine Nichol John in front of the jury
about a statement that, ultimately, she didn't
adopt?
Right.
Okay. Now you had read the transcript of the
trial as -- and I believe, well, I know you read
the transcript of the preliminary inquiry, but do
you recall that when that issue became live within
the conduct of the trial, that Mr. Tallis and Mr.
Caldwell asked to have the jury removed before
they brought it -- it became an issue?
I'll accept that.

Q
A
Q

A

Okay.
I don't recall.
Okay. And that both of them took the position, before Justice Bence, that this was an examination that should have been done in the absence of the jury?

I'll accept that.
Okay. There's much evidence on it in addition -I don't recall. It's in the transcripts and I'll accept your evidence on it.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: May I just ask you to make a distinction between the examination under 9(2) and the one under 9(1) after the declaration of hostility, where the statement was actually read point by point, -MS. KNOX: Okay. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: -- and I don't think Caldwell and Tallis asked that that particular examination be done in the absence of the jury?

MS. KNOX: And you are correct in that, I was summarizing inappropriately, but that just in terms of -- if $I$ can wrap my mind around it, because $I$ just did a scribble note to myself -but in the preliminary stages of the application
there was an agreement that the jury should be out of the room, and that would be with respect to the -- I'm confusing myself, even, on the sections -- but as to whether or not she should be declared adverse, that there was an application to have her --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah, that was under 9(2), which was the new section at that time.

MS. KNOX: Right.
BY MS. KNOX:

Do you have any memory of reading that, or sort of directing your mind to how the ruling of Justice Bence might have impacted on the way that application unfolded from the perspective of Mr . Caldwell, and $I$ should say from the perspective of Mr. Tallis as well?

I'm not sure. Well, I'm not sure I understand your question. I'm not sure what you are asking me. Are you asking did they -- did the statement have an effect on the jury?

No, I'm asking you whether you gave any consideration to the constraints that Mr. Caldwell was operating on in the course of that part of the trial --

A No.
Q -- when you made your --
A No.
-- assertions about wrongdoing on his part?
I don't think so.
Okay. And I'll leave it at that. Mr. Asper, when you engaged the services -- and I think I may have touched on this this morning, I just want to bring sort of a summary question or a question to get a summary of what your position was, as I'm not sure that $I$ got a clear answer this morning -- but when you engaged the services of Dr. Ferris -- or not you -- or Dr. Markesteyn -- and Dr. Markesteyn to do a review of the serological evidence, and in Dr. Markesteyn's case the whole of the evidence, did you sit down and do any sort of a detailed review of what it was necessary for you to provide to these experts to be sure that any opinion they rendered would rest on the fundamental necessity for any expert opinion, but a solid foundation, a solid factual foundation?

A
I'm sure there was conversation with the doctors. I don't recall it specifically.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I -- Ms. Knox, as
I recall this witness' earlier testimony, he did
not engage Markesteyn, he came to them as a matter of interest, and also that he said that he didn't have a chance to, or he didn't have time to examine the larger picture of the forensic evidence and its effect on the trial; am I right? I think that's what Dr. Markesteyn said, yes.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah, uh-huh.
MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, I'm going to ask your indulgence in spite of time constraints, and ask if we could bring up some documents in relation to that, because I'm not quite clear, I only made notes on the documents.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Uh-huh.
BY MS. KNOX:
If we could bring up document 155505. And, sir, you will recognize this, I'm sure, as you are the author of it. This is your letter to Dr. Markesteyn on March 1st, 1990?

A

Q

A

Q

Yes.
And as l look at it, and I'm looking at it for the first time in a long time, there is no indication --

Well I think the last sentence, Ms. Knox, thanks for your concern in the matter, --

Yeah, that's okay.

A
-- might suggest that he contacted us. I don't know, I'm not gonna stand on it, $I$ never -Okay. And trust me, $I$ don't have anything that $I$ am going to pull out of the hat and say to you "well, I know that that's not true", I'm looking for the first time at these documents in a long time, I made note of the numbers last night.

## If we could also bring up

document 155507, please. This is a May 15 th letter, and directed to Dr. Markesteyn from you, indicating that subsequent to your May 1st letter that we just looked at there was a telephone conversation between you and you requested that he offer an opinion on the overall evidence in -that might or might not support the theory of the Crown in the Milgaard case?

Right.
Okay. Now I, appreciating how difficult it is to try to remember, I'm not wanting to suggest to you that you were wrong in your belief that Dr. Markesteyn approached you; would it be fair to say that, once Dr. Markesteyn was involved in the process, that you opted to use his services for some more extensive work, if -- as indicated in this May $15 t h$ letter?

A Yes.
Q
Okay. And $I$ guess it is in the context of that, then, that $I$ would ask you whether you gave any consideration to the importance of giving him a solid, accurate, factual background to the inquiry that you asked him to conduct, because of course the weight and value of his opinion would only be as good as the legs that he based it on?

Yes, I think we would have thought of that.
Okay. Sir, $I$ have taken the liberty of going through, on this point, some of the transcript from the preliminary inquiry, and $I$ don't want to take you to much in the preliminary inquiry, but $I$ am -- I refer you to the transcript of evidence of Victor Sam Molchanko, the document number is 108916. And what is on this, sir, the cover page is a notice sent out to witnesses by Mr.

Caldwell's assistant providing them with their transcript to review prior to the trial, and a request to bring it back, and then the next page, at 108917, this is the start of Victor Molchanko's evidence.
$Q$ Yes.

If we could go to 108930. In Mr. Molchanko's evidence there's some reference to vials at line

61, I believe -- yes, two vials, he talks about some vials that he received as part of the exhibits turned over to him; do you see that?

A
Q

A
$Q$
$Q$

$$
-1+0
$$ Yes.

And if we could go to page 108950 of that transcript, in a re-examination by Mr. Caldwell -if we could bring out that part -- it was Mr. Molchanko's evidence that he found seven hairs in one of those vials?

Yes.
Okay. And now if we could go to the transcript of his evidence at the trial, which has -- was on January 28th, 1970, and the first page of the document indicates 211936.

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: Is this a new doc.
ID?
MS. KNOX: Yes, 211936 would be the trial evidence --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
MS. KNOX: -- of Corporal Molchanko.
BY MS. KNOX:
And, sir, I'm not going to go through the bulk of it, but before $I$ direct your attention to a specific part of it do you remember, when you were reviewing the file or the trial transcripts, that
there was a period during the course of
Mr. Molchanko's evidence when the -- there was a request that the jury be removed and an argument was engaged in, by Mr. Tallis in particular, that the evidence about the presence of the pubic hair should not be admitted in front of the jury?

No .
Okay. Direct you to 211955. And I won't go back further, but basically this is the conclusion of a submission being done, that Mr. Caldwell is
notifying the Court that there is a matter that Mr. Tallis wishes to go into in the absence of the jury, the jury is excused?

Yes.
Do you see that?
Yes.
If we go to the next page, from page 211956
through to 211966 the -- there is a motion or an application, in the absence of the jury, about whether or not the evidence should be admitted?

Yes.
But -- and without taking the time to go through every page of it, unless you wish to do so, Mr. Asper, do you remember, with the transcript in front of you, reading this excerpt from the trial
back in '86, '87 and back when you were preparing to deal with Dr. Markesteyn?

A
Q

Okay. Now, sir, when Dr. Markesteyn was
interviewed by Dr. Boyd for purposes of the report that he did reviewing the Milgaard question, you are familiar with the report, and you are aware, of course, that it was Dr. Markesteyn's position that had he known about that presence of the hair in the sample, that he would not have come to the conclusion and we would not have had the resulting furore that what was out there was really probably dog urine, not human semen?

A
$Q$
I'll accept that.
Okay. Sir, I don't know from reviewing the record
exactly what material was in the possession of Dr. Markesteyn as sent to him by you, but -Well, $I$ did see a reference in the letter that you showed me asking him if he had received all the identification evidence.

Right.
So I don't know.
And I don't know the answer, there appears to be a conflict here, he's saying if $I$ had it, $I$ wouldn't have made the conclusions and wouldn't have made the public statements that $I$ made, and $I$ truly am not meaning to be unfair to you here, I don't know what in fact was sent to him.

Right.
But my question to you is a very, I suppose, a simple question. To the best of your ability, looking back on it now, would you, for any reason, would you have had any reason not to give him that fairly critical piece of evidence?

No.
If I could just have a moment. And, Mr. Asper, again $I$ 'm not meaning to impugn any criticism of you, $I$ 'm just simply working with a large amount of material and trying to find out why certain things happened, but in reviewing the taped
conversations that Mrs. Milgaard has provided to the Commission, if $I$ could refer to tape 1 -- I think it's 102, the first page being 336785, this is a tape, if you could bring up this part here, that references May 17 th , and I don't know the significance of these dates, whether they were talking about conversations all on one day, but this is the cover of the tape, if you can see that?

A

Q

A
I have not had time to look at any of these transcriptions.

And I appreciate that. If I could do a quick summary for you, and if you want to look at the entirety of the pages that $I$ 'm going to summarize, or essentially what, there's a discussion between yourself and Mrs. Milgaard about Dr. Markesteyn's report that continues through pages 336792 , and at page 336797 , if we could go to 336797 , and you'll have to bear with me while $I$ find it, I only have a note, $I$ didn't mark it, there is -- Mrs.

Milgaard asks you -- if we could bring up this page, please. You'll see that the discussion is about some of Dr. Markesteyn's findings, and if we could go on to the next page, please, there's some discussion about materials that would have been provided, or could have been provided to him. If we could go to the next page, please, and the next page, please. Maybe I'm not finding the spot and I apologize, Mr. Commissioner.

MR. HODSON: I think those -- those are all the same pages. Do you want the next page? BY MS. KNOX:

Q

A

Q
A

And $I$ guess, given that you were sending him material to found an opinion for you, if $I$ may ask you without appearing to be in any way critical, And your response to her was that he hadn't asked? Right.
why, in that particular circumstance, you wouldn't have automatically sent him the preliminary inquiry material.

A

Q
A
$Q$

A
Okay, but if you look at the second part there: "I said to him "if you want it I've got a whole", I mean $I$ got all this, this is the prelim right here, and I'm -- I got a list..."

Etcetera, so I think it looks like I offered it to him.

Yes, okay. My question to you, and I wanted to bring it up just because $I$ wanted to make sure that the record was fully clear, I'm not trying to misrepresent here, that's why $I$ was searching for it, but my question to you still is given the
request that you made of him in your May 12, May 14th letter, why you wouldn't have automatically sent it to him.

A

Q

A
Q It is, it truly is. I have three files left, and none of them are black. Two files, thank you. I'm being monitored by both you and Ms. McLean. Sir, at various points in time, and I apologize, I didn't bring the references for you, but at various points in time in telephone discussions that you have with Mrs. Milgaard, as I've been able to get through a number of them, not all of them, there's reference that is being made often to a fact sheet and she's asking you to prepare a fact sheet with key points with respect to David's circumstance and the allegations regarding his wrongful conviction and continuing imprisonment, and $I$ tried in my various databases to find a document that $I$ could bring to you and say is this the fact sheet that you prepared, and I haven't been able to narrow it down because
there are many -- not many, that's stretching it, but there are more than one version of assertions, facts, myths and things like that, and $I$ wonder if you could, without the benefit of me providing a document to us, give us any guidance as to what if anything you ultimately prepared that would be labelled as a fact sheet in this case?

When you -- it's interesting, when you use the word fact sheet, $I$ believe that's a phrase that David Milgaard actually insisted, or created and insisted on creating.

Uh-huh.
It was, you know, it would be a piece of paper that he could have that would say this is why I didn't do it.

Q

A

Q
A
That's my -- there may have been other documents along the way that summarized things up to a certain point, but $I$ don't recall anything called a fact sheet.

I'm wondering --

It may have been, but $I$ don't recall it. Okay. I'm just going to direct your attention to a couple of documents, not because $I$ believe them to be fact sheets, but because they might match what would have been fact sheets, and I simply want to know from you if you, to your best memory, had any input into creating them, because the ones that $I$ will refer you to have some references to, or contain allegations against Mr. Caldwell and I'm trying to stay restricted to what affects him. Okay.

If we could bring up 048350 . Now, this is a five page document that has --

Is this the original, is this the actual document?
This is a document that's in our database that contains various allegations. I can bring up parts of it for you to take -- and it's clearly around the time of or after the Supreme Court of Canada reference because it refers to Mr. Beresh, but I'm wondering if this is something that you were, you authored or were party to authoring to your best memory?

No, I don't recall this at all. It's certainly not my font.

Okay. If you would, if I could go to --

MR. SOROCHAN: Mr. Commissioner, these documents show a source in the Commission's database, so I trust that My Friend is not ignoring that when she's putting documents to the witness. I mean, it specifically says where they came from.

MS. KNOX: Mr. Commissioner, I appreciate Mr. Sorochan's identification of that and say only that for those of us who have been working in the file for approximately two years now, we've made copies of various documents and as I was going through materials $I$ had set aside for Mr. Asper, unfortunately I didn't describe to them the source. If Mr. Sorochan is able to tell me what the source is on this one, I would be happy for the assistance. I'm not meaning to be disingenuous or to prolong time, but as with most of us, I expect our hard copies don't always have attribution of where they originated from.

MR. SOROCHAN: Somebody named Ethel.
BY MS. KNOX:
Okay. Then if it's written by somebody named Ethel, Mr. Asper, can $I$ narrow down the question and say did you ever work with Ethel on putting together this kind of a document?


A

Q

A

BY MS. KNOX:
Thank you. Sir, there was some suggestion that a fact sheet was prepared to be used, and if anybody can help me in terms of this $I$ would be grateful for the help, there was some suggestion, or some of the discussion that you had with Mrs. Milgaard was about doing a fact sheet that would be available for public circulation, in particular, with respect to a John Howard offer to be of assistance to the efforts to have Mr. Milgaard's conviction overturned, and $I$ couldn't find one that was particularly given to them, but $I$ wonder if you have any memory of whether you would have created or participated in creating one for those purposes?

Well, it's conceivable that, there was a group called the Milgaard Support Group that may have created -- and I may have participated in creating a document that they used to inform each other of
what was in the case, but $I$ don't recall a specific piece of paper. I mean, there may have even been something on a free David Milgaard poster that could qualify as what you say is a fact sheet.

Okay. There will be some issues with respect to it and I'm anticipating some questions for others, but it would be helpful, since we only have you this one time, that $I$ know the answers now. And, sir, just a couple of other points, one of them is short, you in your testimony over the last while, and $I$ don't remember exactly when, made reference to the fact that there was a lot of information in the file that Mr. Caldwell should have disclosed and had he disclosed it, it might have had an impact on conviction. Do you recall making reference to the roommates of Gail Miller who testified that she always went down Avenue o to go to the bus?

Yes.

I wonder if we could bring up document 009334 , and
I want to direct your attention to the part that's underlined, if we could bring that out down to here. And, sir, it's a little bit hard to read because of the underlining, $I$ have the original,
or a coloured copy of the original from Mr. Caldwell's file, and starting with the reference to Simon Doell, what this reads is that they give his former address as Avenue $R$, indicate that he has now moved, indicate that he moved out previous to the murder and that he stated that on occasions when he had been riding the bus and Miss Miller got on the bus, she always got on on the corner of Avenue $N$ and 20 th Street directly across from the funeral home.

A

Q
And $I$ bring this to your attention because you are correct that there was various pieces of
information about Miss Miller walking down on
Avenue $O$ to go to her bus stop that were not made part of the record at trial, but would you accept from me that this piece of information that would have corroborated the Crown theory that she went on Avenue $N$ was not introduced at trial either, that it wasn't just keeping out what might have helped the defence and not putting in, and $I$ suggest to you that --

A
Ms. Knox, $I$ mean, this is a single statement. Mr. Caldwell, or certainly the police, or both, were aware of dozens and dozens of different statements
from people in the neighbourhood who contradicted the Avenue N theory and you've got at least two witnesses specifically who directly contradict the Avenue $N$ theory, one of the witnesses staring at the point, who would have had to have been as much a witness as Nichol John to the murder right across the street, so $I$ have to tell you when $I$ see this and how $I$ place it in the context of the larger trial, is a very unfortunate thing that took over, which is this becomes more believable and corroborative than the weighted evidence that contradicts the theory.

Okay. Mr. Asper, I'm not sure if I didn't state my question very well or you misunderstood my question, but the preface to the question is this was not evidence that was used at the trial -Right.
-- even though it would have had some evidentiary weight to support the theory of the Crown. Okay, but I'm suggesting that there was a mountain of evidence that contradicted the Crown. Could I be allowed to finish my question? Right.

And $I$ put it to you with the intent of saying to you that as Mr. Caldwell has said many times, that
had he to do it over again, there are things that he would have recognized and used differently, but to suggest that this may simply be an illustration of where the -- there were so many people interviewed, there were so many things going on, that it was simply a thing that got missed through no malfeasance or no improper motive, but it was just a matter of managing a large amount of information and perhaps not having done 100 percent coverage of all of it, but certainly had he been looking with an ulterior motive, this was a piece of evidence that he could have used to the benefit of the Crown isn't it?

Yes, okay.
But just to say to you that it wasn't all about the one, there was the other side of the equation too?

Okay, all right. I mean, I suppose I could debate with you, Ms. Knox, that when you've got all the roommates saying something different you might choose not to use that, but let's accept that yes, it could have been corroborative of the Avenue $N$ theory.

And, Mr. Asper, on that point, again, and you remind me of something that $I$ didn't bring documentation on, but you said that you were familiar with the transcript from the preliminary inquiry?

At one point, yes.
At one point. And you were aware that one of the roommates, Adeline Nyczai, did testify?

Yes.
You are aware that she testified at trial?
Yes.
Do you remember her in response, I believe, to questions in cross-examination by Mr. Tallis, informing him that roommates that she had had, one was living in Whitehorse, one to whom you prefer, another was living $I$ think in B.C. or something like that, but by the time the trial came around these young women were no longer available?

Well, okay, they weren't in Saskatoon, right. I don't recall that, but based on what you've told me, they were apparently not in Saskatoon. I'm not going to ask you if you think that might have been a reason why they did not call them, because $I$ don't want to engage in a debate with you.

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
$Q$
A

Q
And, sir, with great respect, $I$ can say to you that Mr. Caldwell perhaps is in the same position you are in because he doesn't know what the issue was, but in a public forum many times, including in a book written by Mrs. Milgaard, he has been accused of getting rid of evidence. You are aware issue was.


A
A
of that?

Okay. Sir, the transcript of the preliminary inquiry, and in particular the evidence of Thor Kleiv, and I'm going to take you to, I'm just going to identify it --

Sorry, but let me just, I guess I should also say, that's information that has been put to me and, as officer's locker or something, I think that was at the preliminary inquiry.

I say, I'll do my best, but I really don't --
Q Right.

And if we could go to page 3 of that release, please, again, it would be 162468, and $I$ don't have these allegations in order when they started to come, but just because this is specifically
apparently authored by you, I bring it to your attention. And do you remember where you got the information that you put in that draft for Mrs. Milgaard?

A
$Q$

A

2

A
Q

A

Q
No.
Mr. Asper, what you say there is that a second knife found at the scene, which may have played an important role and which mysteriously went missing at the time of the trial, was in fact released during the trial by Mr. T.D.R. Caldwell?

Right.
Do you agree with me that whether this got released or not, that when you were writing it, it was making some relatively serious allegations about the conduct of the prosecutor?

In a draft internal document, yes.
Yes, in a draft internal document.
Yes, yes.
And that you go on to say it was a knife that was seized at the crime scene. Now, would it be fair to expect that when you were doing a draft internal document and given that you were bound by a code of professional conduct, that you would have wanted to, or you should have wanted to be sure that what you put in it was in fact an
accurate reflection of the evidence that you were referring to?

A
Q

Sir, $I$ want to direct your attention to that transcript at page 108272. Actually, if you could go back to 271 so we can place this.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Is that our
transcript?
BY MS. KNOX:
That is Commission transcript, yes. And if we could start bringing out here, and I'm not going to take you back through the examination of Mr . Kleiv on recall by Mr. Tallis, but you'll see that there is a re-examination of him by Mr. Caldwell? Right.

And if we could go to the next page starting at question 13, there is a question put to him, you told my learned friend about this hunting type knife found on the stringer of the fence near where the scene of the body was, and he answered that's right. And then there's some discussion about where exactly it was located, and if we could go to the next page, we go to question 18, he's asked whether it was he who actually discovered the knife and he indicated that it wasn't. And then if we could continue down, and we know from other evidence and from the police file that it was a Constable Oliver who found it about a month after the murder. If we continue down to question 21 and in re-exam the identification officer is asked, in answer to a question from my learned friend, you said at that
time -- that time being $I$ believe when it was recovered -- it was possible it could have been connected with this crime, referring to the hunting-type knife, and the answer given by Mr. Kleiv at that point in time as the knife was ceased and turned over is that, was yes, and then the next question, please, the question is, now, have you established any connection -- and if we could go to the next page, please -- any positive connection of the knife with the crime to your knowledge, and the answer given by the identification officer at that time was that no, they hadn't established any connection between the crime, the death of Gail Miller and this knife that was found a month or so after, and it's about four weeks after.

A Right.

And then if we could go, for fullness of the record, if could go to 108277, this is a re-cross by Mr. Tallis, and at that time he questions the answer to Mr. Caldwell effectively, that he didn't rule out the possibility and he said he didn't, he didn't rule it out and when he was asked if he, being Mr. Kleiv, had ruled it out, and asked if he still had ruled it out today, he answered no.

108279, and if we go to the next page, please. If we could go to the bottom of the page, and perhaps this part as well, you will see that when Mr. Kleiv is recalled there's further examination by Mr. Tallis about the knife in question. And if we go to the next page, please, if you've finished reading that?

Yes.
And it is in this question that Mr. Tallis established that the hunting knife in question had been received from Constable Oliver on February 28th, 1969; do you see that? Uh-huh.

All right.
Yes.
Now, sir, I next want to direct you to a portion of testimony of Lieutenant Penkala at the trial, and if we could go to page 177176 you will see that this is the commencement of the trial transcript of Mr. Penkala, -Right.
-- or Lieutenant Penkala as he then was. I just have to find my spot about the knife. If we could go to 177214. And Mr. Asper, unless you wish to
do so I'm gonna summarize, I don't wish to go through all of it, I'm going to summarize for you what Lieutenant Penkala's evidence was about the area where they found the knife. And essentially what Lieutenant Penkala testified, that on -- at the point in time, the January 31 st when Gail Miller's body was found, there was an examination of the area surrounding the body, and that there was no indication of any traffic between her body and the area of the fence where, a month later, Constable Oliver found the knife. And they go on, they talk about photographs, they talk about no indentations in the snow, and, indeed, part of his evidence is that, at the point in time when she died, there was snow piled up over that stringer on the fence to quite some depth, way beyond where the knife was found. And this would have been information, $I$ take it, that you had available to you, whether or not you remembered it, but that you had reviewed in your preliminary preparation for the conduct of this trial?

A
Yes.
Q Or not the conduct of the trial, for the application --

A The application.


Q

A
Q Okay. Sir, in September 1992, when you did this draft press release, had you wanted to could you have walked yourself over to the offices of Wolch Pinx Tapper and looked to be sure that what you were drafting out for her as a script of wrongdoing was borne out by the evidentiary record that you had had possession of?

A
$Q$

Okay. So while I appreciate that having to review, you indicate you spent a lot of time in Australia or you spent some time in Australia around this time, would this suggest to you, in
transmitted from CanWest Global in Winnipeg?
Right.
fact, that when you did this you were in Winnipeg?

A
Q
A

Okay. You are aware, though, that this and other information -- and I'm not suggesting it was because of this document -- but this document, or these thoughts that are set out in this document in form for a draft press release, ultimately became part of what is a book that is in circles, question of physically walking across the street, I believe -- I mean, I just don't know the circumstances of how this document got created.

available for purchase within -- throughout the world, I suppose?

A

Q
A

Q

A
$Q$

A
A I'm fine.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Are the reporters okay to continue? Anybody else have to stop? Okay. Go ahead then.

BY MS. KNOX:
Okay. If I could have brought up document 332404.

MS. KNOX: I can continue with the witness?


Q

Do you recognize the picture?
A
Good-lookin' guy. I was a smoker then, boy do I want a smoke now.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: 332404?
BY MS. KNOX:
332404. I've never been a smoker, but you might make me tempted at this moment too. If we could go to page 2 of the document, please, 332405 . And, Mr. Asper, I'm putting them to you in this order not because $I$ was meaning to set you up or anything, and $I$ hope you don't get that feeling, but because I'm getting very tired of my documents and my file on this one, because it's so large, aren't very well organized. I want to direct your attention to a passage in a newspaper article that was done on an occasion when, as the article indicates, you and Mrs. Milgaard were in Saskatoon going over transcripts and exhibits. And you see as early as the date of this article, which was March 15th, 1990, and well in advance of your press release, allegations were being made about the missing knife?

A
Okay. I -- well, okay. I don't think that there's an allegation, $I$ think it's a factual
statement, the knife went missing.
Sir, are you aware that the --
I believe it did, actually, for a period of time. Okay. Are you aware that the evidence before this

Commission of Inquiry is that the knife was available for trial, it was brought to the courthouse by Constable Oliver, who was prepared to give evidence about it, that after some discussion between Mr. Tallis and Mr. Caldwell Mr. Tallis indicated that he didn't want to hear from Constable Oliver and he didn't want the knife introduced into evidence?

A
If that is -- if that's the case, then -- then -then we were wrong here, but at the time $I$ think we were of the view or of the belief, and that there was some -- my recollection is that the knife went missing from a locker or something to that effect.

Okay. Mr. Asper, I'm going to say to you or ask you a couple of questions that go back to -- and I'm almost finished -- go back to where I was earlier this morning, and it's with the concept of if you had to do this over differently. Would you agree with me that had you talked to Mr. Tallis, gotten Mr. Caldwell's file and maybe talked to Mr.

Caldwell, that what was knit -- and I'm using "knit" like my mother would use knit -- out of pieces of information into whole cloth that cast a very negative spin on my client could have been avoided, and he could have been avoided -- and he could have avoided that other allegation following him that is now contained, as $I$ said, in a book $A$ Mother's Story that will continue to be published alleging wrongdoing by him? The book we have in our database, it's a document number -- and we don't need to bring it up -- page 269317 at, I believe, page 369 .

I think that -- like there is no question if $I$ could do it over again, I still -- I still -- I don't know, $I$ have to say I'm a little torn, because I do think that the dispassionate neutral party should be the one to do the investigation, and that being the federal Department of Justice. But I will tell you this. I really wonder what would have happened -- and I want you to consider the possibility of an even greater doomsday scenario, frankly -- if we had Mr. Caldwell's file and the federal Department of Justice was still not granting us relief. In other words, if we knew all that Mr. Caldwell had
in the file in terms of the witness statements and some of the police statements, and we still weren't getting action from the federal Department of Justice, $I$ have to be very candid with you, it could have been worse.

Sir, I haven't gotten instructions from my client on this point because you raise it now, but my expectation is that he would say that he would rather subject a review of his conduct to the good offices of the office of the federal Department of Justice than have it subjected, as it was, to allegations and -Oh, no, I don't think ---- vitriolic in the public media. I don't think, no, $I$ don't think it would have been that at all. Really, $I$ don't think that would have been that at all. I think the whole character of the assault, if you will, vis-a-vis the federal Department of Justice, would have been on the basis of the hard evidence that was in Mr. Caldwell's file. I don't think it would have -- I think Mr. Caldwell would have been out of it, frankly.

Okay. Mr. Asper, there was one area that $I$ had wanted to review in preparation for the
cross-examination for you -- of you, and it was with respect to a conference that took place in Winnipeg last year that you were a speaker at. And I, for the record, $I$ would indicate that $I$ know that you have given your consent to that information being made available to me for my review?

What information is it?
A presentation that $I$ understand was done, or presentations that were done at this conference?

I don't believe I submitted one.
No, no, of an oral --
I know I had written notes and I gave a speech -oh, you are looking for a tape of the speech? I'm looking for -- yes.

Okay.
Okay. Subject to my being able to get that, and $I$
make the point because $I$ know that $I$ don't have it has nothing to do with you, it's about some technical issues about --

A

Q
A

Q

A
Q
A

Q
make the point because Iknowthat I don'thave it

I think $I$ own the video rights.
(Laughs)
I'm not kidding you.
I really seriously invite you to talk to Mr.
Hodson.
Okay. I will speak with him.
Okay.
I think $I$ can fix that.

I wish -- and, if you can do that, I will end your day by saying that subject to my having an opportunity to review that and the last binder of the transcriptions of Ms. Milgaard's various conversations with you, $I$ can indicate that $I$ won't have any further questions, and, indeed, once I look at that $I$ may not. But may $I$ end by asking you a final question.

You indicated yesterday -- I
believe it was yesterday, it might have been the day before -- that sometimes when conduct comes under review -- and in this particular case, of course, we're talking about the conduct of officials within the criminal justice system, be
they police, prosecutors, sometimes judiciary and others -- that there is a syndrome that comes over in these kinds of cases, and $I$ think you were averting to it and at various times you've used the label "tunnel vision" becoming a real problem in these kinds of investigations, and I'm going to ask you whether you have ever, in your times that you've looked back on how you conducted yourself from 1986 forward, how Mr. Wolch and others advised you to conduct yourself or how they conducted themselves, whether you have ever thought that the shoe could go on the other foot too, and sometimes those of you who embrace the cause of those you believe to have been wrongfully convicted can be equally guilty of tunnel vision? It's an interesting philosophical question. Is it tunnel vision if you're correct? And I don't know, I -- but the syndrome might be spreadable across the spectrum of the interests in a wrongful conviction case. The question is, is it tunnel vision if you're correct, whether you're the police officer in the original investigation, or the prosecutor, or someone trying to free a wrongly convicted. I don't know.

And Mr. Asper, I don't know the answer, but maybe
next day when we come here, outside the confines of this room, you and $I$ can debate it?

A

Q

A

A

Look forward to it.
Thank you.
MR. HODSON: I think, just on the point of the tape, I had been asked to obtain a copy of, I think, the tape recording of Mr. Asper's presentation at the Unlocking Innocence Conference --

Do you know who organized that is Mr. MacFarlane, don't you, --

MR. HODSON: Uh-huh.
-- from the former federal Department of Justice.
MR. HODSON: -- yeah, I'm getting there -and we had made efforts to get the tape directly from the conference due to the request. We were told we needed a subpoena, I raised it with Mr. Sorochan and Mr. Asper and they kindly agreed to consent, and they -- and assist us in getting it, because Mr. Asper indicates he has no objection to it. Apparently that was not good enough for them and they still require a subpoena. That requires us to issue a subpoena registered in Manitoba. We became aware of that this week, so I will talk to Mr. Sorochan and/or Mr. Asper, and
see if Mr. Asper's influences can get it without a subpoena. I'm not sure what the contents are or what it's needed for, We were --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well maybe the people who want to see it should go and get the subpoena?

MR. HODSON: I think the subpoena has to come from you initially. I --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: They can ask Queen's Bench.

Mr. Commissioner, I'll -- I was -- I was on the organizing committee for that conference, I -maybe I'll speak with Mr. Hodson and we can try and do this without an order, --

MR. HODSON: Sure.

A
-- if that's easier?
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, it certainly would be, sure. Thank you.

MR. HODSON: Sorry. And I think next is Mr. Frayer. In light of the time, I'm not sure if it's wise to --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Frayer, we're in your hands?

MR. FRAYER: My Lord, given the time and the time that Mr . Asper has been on the stand,

I'll make very little inroad into my cross-examination in about 15 minutes.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right. So obviously, Mr. Asper, you will be needed again at some future time; do we know when that might be? Mr. Commissioner, this is getting to be a very serious problem. I have undertaken to speak with Mr. Hodson and try to find something that works. MRS. JOYCE MILGAARD: No Fridays.

MR. HODSON: Your former client has asked that you not pick a Friday.

A
Well, as I say, I'm going to speak with Mr.
Hodson. I'm moving into an extremely difficult business cycle.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Mr. Sorochan, you should be asked, first of all as counsel, to speak to this.

MR. HODSON: I have -- what I can indicate is I've provided to Mr. Sorochan the list of remaining dates, and the dates that $I$ can't. I mean I'm committed next week to Mr. Henderson, there is a couple dates in June, notwithstanding Mrs. Milgaard's comments I did indicate to Mr. Sorochan that if a Friday makes it work, that $I$ will look at that, depends on the week. So I
will do anything $I$ can to accommodate Mr. Asper's schedule within the dates that we have, and I guess $I$ will wait to hear from Mr. Asper and Mr. Sorochan, and work with them.

MR. SOROCHAN: What we said last time is we -- that Mr. Asper wasn't available this week, and we had hoped that we would be concluded, because -- I don't know if I said it on the record or just to Mr . Hodson -- the meetings that had to be re-arranged had people coming from all over the world, so it's not an easy matter to try to, with the responsibilities that Mr. Asper has, to find dates, and Mr. Hodson and $I$ worked through it, and I guess that's what we'll have to do.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So we don't know? That's _-

MR. SOROCHAN: Well, that's --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: All right. His,
the resumption of his cross-examination is
adjourned sine die, then, on the usual
understandings about communication with other counsel.

MR. HODSON: And we have Paul Henderson here Monday, Monday at 1:00.

```
(Adjourned at 3:15 p.m.)
```
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