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## Transcript of Proceedings

(Reconvened at 1:13 p.m.)
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Good afternoon.

ALL COUNSEL: Good afternoon.

MR. HODSON: I apologize for the brief delay, Mr. Commissioner, we had a technical challenge with one of the pieces of software. We will be able to see the documents but the touch screen will not work this afternoon at least for the next while.

One other matter. I have a little bit left to do with Mr. Sawatsky regarding his direct involvement for the RCMP in 1992 and onward. I had then proposed to ask Mr. Sawatsky some questions relating to a different function he currently performs, namely his involvement with the Saskatchewan Police Commission, and I intend to go through and question him about current police practices. They are not directly related to the work that he did in the Flicker investigation.

Mr. Wolch has advised me
that, number one, he is going to question
Mr. Sawatsky first. He has a trial scheduled out of the province tomorrow and Thursday, he alerted
me to that some time ago, and in the interests of ensuring that Mr. Wolch gets completed today I've agreed with Mr. Gibson and Mr. Sawatsky that I'll leave the Police Commission questioning, which is not lengthy, but I'll leave it until after Mr. Wolch questions Mr. Sawatsky, if that's all right?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.

## MURRAY SAWATSKY, continued:

BY MR. HODSON :
Just before we -- if we could get up 061913 . And where we left off last week, Mr. Sawatsky, was in the 1997 time period, early July, and the warrant for the DNA. Before we go to that document, though, $I$ just want to clarify one matter. You've given some evidence to date about the RCMP investigating information or allegations that originated from David Asper, is that correct, and I think we have seen that through the reports? That's correct.

Can you clarify for us, what was Mr. Asper's role as far as the original complaint or the criminal complaint that the $R C M P$ was investigating? Well I think it was our understanding that Mr. Wolch was the complainant, and that others had
been assisting him by gathering or reviewing material and had acquired, I guess, perhaps a level of knowledge above Mr. Wolch's in that particular area, and there are times when he would then ask us to deal directly with that person for a certain piece of information.

Did you view Mr. Asper as the complainant, or one of the complainants, in the criminal
investigation?
No, I viewed Mr. Wolch as the complainant, and then a host of others, Mrs. Milgaard and Mr. Bruce and Mr. Asper, as providing assistance to assist us with that complaint.

And sources of information; would that be one area?

Yes.
I think, when we left off on Thursday, you had told us about your concerns in providing the affidavit or the, I guess, the affidavit to support a search warrant for Larry Fisher's bodily fluids; is that correct?

A
Q
Maybe you could just go back and refresh us with what was your concern, then, about this time about Mr. Fainstein's request?

I think, if $I$ recall correctly, I might -- my -- I had two thoughts. One was that we needed to eliminate the best suspect at the time, and $I$ say "at the time", and that should be step one; and then once that was completed we should move on to eliminating the others. I also had concerns about who should conduct the investigation should any evidence come -- should Mr. Milgaard not be the donor and some other person be identified, namely Mr. Fisher, how would that be followed up, how would we investigate.

In July of 1997 , what was your understanding as to -- let me back up. If the purpose of getting the DNA testing done was to identify who may have killed Gail Miller, what was your understanding as to which police force would have the proper jurisdiction for that investigation?

Well of course, as $I$ indicated in June when $I$ testified, any evidence that we found would, of course, be reported up through to our legal folks, who would then deal with the government or whoever, but it was my own personal view that the police service with jurisdiction was the saskatoon Police Service and therefore, if evidence came up to support a charge in the murder of Gail Miller,
of course, who was murdered in the City of Saskatoon, any follow-up would be the responsibility or should go to the saskatoon Police Service first, before anyone else was asked or became involved.

And did you have any concerns that the request came from the federal Department of Justice rather than the Saskatchewan Department of Justice? Well, I guess I was a little surprised, because I think constitutionally the administration of justice in the province is the responsibility of the Attorney General, so for the federal Department of Justice to be concerned with an ongoing criminal investigation or with furthering a criminal investigation, it seemed a bit odd to me that they would have that interest.

If we could go to 061910 , and we'll go to that. This is a briefing note that you prepared; is that correct? I think on the third page, just go to the third page?

Yes, I likely prepared that.
And if you can just go to the second page and highlight -- sorry -- and the Current status, just the bottom half, you say here, the current status, you refer to Mr. Fainstein asking you to obtain a
warrant, you talk about the affidavit he provided, you believe it is flawed, and you have concerns about whether or not the Criminal Code provision is met; is that correct?

That's correct.
And you say here, in the third paragraph:
"In this case, this is not
true. We have no reason to suspect
Larry Fisher is involved nor do we believe he is involved. Therefore, we cannot swear under oath that we believe 'information concerning an offence will be obtained' by testing Fisher's sample."

At this time can you tell us; what was the basis upon which you made the statement:
"We have no reason to suspect Larry Fisher is involved nor do we believe he is involved."?

Well this is a number of years after the completion of our report and, as I indicated, the conclusions of our report was that there was no reason, we had found no reason to believe that Mr . Fisher was involved in -- at that time and, as I indicated before, my view was that we should first
eliminate Mr. Milgaard and then take steps to try and find evidence or grounds to then search for other persons.

And then, if we can go to the next page, it refers there in the first full paragraph:
"Murray Brown, Sask. Justice, handled the sec. 690 ... concerns for Saskatchewan. I spoke with him on the phone today and he is of the view that the Fisher examination can be considered after the Milgaard matter is concluded."

Do you recall anything further about that discussion or does this note reflect that discussion?

This note reflects that discussion, yes, and I recall Murray Brown indicated that he would contact Federal Justice and try and sort it out with them.

So that if David Milgaard's DNA was tested, or pardon me, the garments were tested and David Milgaard was eliminated as the donor of that semen, was it your view then, then, that it would be appropriate to test Larry Fisher's for the DNA match?

A
Yes, it was.

Q
You talk here, in the second full paragraph:
"I have spoken with Chief Dave Scott, Saskatoon Police Service, and have informed him of the circumstances surrounding this matter. Saskatoon Police have jurisdiction for any offences which arise in their area. Scott shares our views that there are no grounds to suspect Fisher is involved in the murder of Gail Miller."

And would that be an accurate note?
Yes, it is.
Can you tell us, was it a concern of yours at this time that there was no police agency investigating the murder of Gail Miller or investigating Larry Fisher as a suspect?

A
I think that was part of my concern. I think the other concern, as $I$ indicated before, was that it seemed a bit of a fishing trip, that in my view, you know, the logical sequence of events was to eliminate one person and then to move on to see if you had grounds to execute a search warrant to obtain bodily substance to work on your next person.

What, did you have a concern that a warrant was
being sought at a time in which there was no police force that was investigating Mr. Fisher as a culprit, or anybody else for that matter?

A And did you get back to Federal Justice, then, and advise that you would not swear the information yourself?

A
Yes, I did.
And they pursued other avenues; --
That's correct.
-- is that correct? If we can go to 077486 . And this is a letter July 21, 1997 from Deputy Chief Norm Doell for Chief Dave Scott to the Minister of Justice, and this would be, I think, three days after the DNA results, and requesting that -- the Saskatoon police is requesting the Department of

Justice appoint another agency to investigate the death of Gail Miller. Were you involved at all in any of those discussions about, once the DNA results came back, about whether it should be the Saskatoon police or the RCMP?

Yes, I was involved with our senior management, and I --

And can you recall what considerations were -I believe it was our view that Saskatoon police should be offered or given the opportunity to investigate it and then $I$ understand that, after some discussion, Chief Scott decided that Saskatoon police were probably not, in his view, the best to do this investigation --

And --
-- for a number of reasons that I'm sure Chief Scott felt were very legitimate, and then $I$ think he made a request of the Attorney General that the RCMP be asked to conduct the investigation. Do you recall being made aware of what those concerns were or having any discussions about that?

A
$Q$
No, I don't.
And then 329914 . And this is a media report July 24th, 1997 indicating that you would not be
involved in the investigation, and can you tell us, how did that come about? You did not have direct involvement in the Larry Fisher investigation; is that correct?

I did not. I recall a discussion with the commanding officer, who was Assistant Commissioner Brian Watt at the time, and he sought my advice as to whether or not $I$ should lead up this investigation, and my advice to him was that $I$ probably should not, that there possibly could be questions around my objectivity and my ability to investigate this. Put it this way, I think I could certainly have investigated, but $I$ think had -- there may be a number of people who may view it, from an optics perspective, as probably not the best position for the RCMP to put itself into, so my advice to him was that $I$ not conduct the investigation.

And would your concerns be related to the conclusions you reached in your earlier investigation?

A
$Q$ Just a couple of housekeeping matters, if we could call up 253854 , please. And $I$ believe this is a transcript from a voir dire at the Larry Fisher
proceedings, is that correct, at the trial? had been subpoenaed the day before and had appeared very quickly, had no opportunity to review the RCMP file and had been away from the investigation for some four years, but to the best of my ability what $I$ provided the Court was -certainly was the truth.

And for the record, $I$ think your concerns were expressed in the voir dire, in your evidence $I$
think you explained what knowledge you had. So one last item. There was a summary -- perhaps if we could, I don't have the doc. ID, but the list of interviewees, the new doc. ID? Once we get it up we'll identify it.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: This was for Flicker?

MR. HODSON: I'm sorry, coming up, the document?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Interviewees for Flicker?

MR. HODSON: Yes. And, Mr. Commissioner, this is a document we prepared, 338922, and it's based upon the records provided to the Commission by the RCMP, and it identifies, in alphabetical order, the people who were contacted or interviewed, the description of the interviews, the dates, the related doc. IDs, and the interviewers.

BY MR. HODSON:
And I'll maybe just go through for the record and indicate for you, Mr. Sawatsky, because I'll have a couple of questions, the list does not include people that were not formally interviewed either in person or by phone and so it doesn't include
attempted contacts; it does not include contacts with people who were called simply to find out where someone else might be; and $I$ believe the total is 236 people were interviewed in the investigation. Now I'm not asking you to accept this document as being -- it's not your document, it's ours, but does that accord with your recollection generally, the number of people that your investigators would have interviewed and investigated in 1992 to 1994 time period?

A
$Q$

A , Yes, that certainly sounds right to me.

And again, the document, Mr. Commissioner, does refer to doc. IDs for backup and these would be interviews, $I$ think you maybe alluded earlier, your investigators traveled extensively, did they, in the course of this investigation?

Yes, yes, all the way to Ontario, out to B.C. a number of times, Edmonton, various places in Alberta.

MR. HODSON: Okay. Those are all the questions $I$ have related to the RCMP part of it. I will have questions after Mr. Wolch questions you.

## BY MR. WOLCH:

Mr. Sawatsky, I'm Hersh Wolch and, for the record,

counsel for David Milgaard. Before commencing, I
would like to thank Mr. Hodson, Mr. Gibson,
yourself and the Commission for letting me come in at this point.

Good afternoon, Mr. Wolch.
I referred to you as Mr . Sawatsky. Is that the right title?

That's fine, yeah.
In regards the Flicker, where did that name come from?

Well, how those names are assigned is the "F" in Flicker stands for the division which is "F" division, so Saskatchewan, and then generally they just pick a word alphabetically, you know, from the start of the year, the fiscal year to the end of the year, so "L", I guess it was whatever, the fifth, sixth, seventh investigation, a word that started with "L", so I don't think there's any -other than that, there's no particular reason why the word Flicker was used.

So somebody picked the world licker?
Flicker.
Q But the "F" had to be there.

A
$Q$
$Q$
A

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
,

The "F" had to be there, yes.
Okay, all right. Now, would it be fair to say
that when you met with what I'll call the Milgaard group, that what you were being told was that David Milgaard was innocent, that the main witnesses lied either through manipulation or intimidation, that Larry Fisher was guilty and that the evidence of his guilt and involvement was withheld from the Milgaard group going back to 1970. Will you agree that was the, basically the position on the more important things taken by the Milgaard group?

A
Yes, I would agree with that, sir.
And you were told pretty early on that the Milgaard people were not particularly relying on Mr. Breckenridge?

Yes, $I$ recall in the interview that you and $I$ had, Mr. Wolch, that you sort of downplayed his importance, you know, towards the end of our interview.

Yeah. The points that $I$ mentioned were the points that the Milgaard group considered to be important, the ones $I$ just mentioned to you now? Yes, I would agree with that.

And I note there were words such as conspiracy, obstruction of justice, criminal actions, those were not the words that were spoken by the

Milgaard group, were they, that was an interpretation?

You know, I would have to refer to the tape to determine whether or not you ever said that. I wouldn't say you didn't, but certainly $I$ think we chose words in your report that put it into the context.

Yeah. What I'm saying is the Milgaard group was saying here's the facts, here's what we believe and then the other group, that is, yourself and Alberta, were saying, well, the allegation is criminal conspiracy, well, the allegation is obstruction of justice, when in actual fact what the Milgaard group was doing was saying to you, Inspector Sawatsky, as you then were, here are the facts, you look at them; isn't that true?

Yes, yes.
MR. WILSON: Mr. Commissioner, I must object, Mr. Wolch is attempting to paraphrase an awful lot of documentary evidence we have in front of this Commission, including the infamous 19th of September press conference that broke the so-called Breckenridge conspiracy, cover-up -obstruction of justice, sorry. The words used in there are somewhat different than the ones now
being put to the witness. Similarly, as the witness has said, the transcript of the taped conversation with Mr. Milgaard would have to be looked at. Mr. Wolch is trying to sugar coat a nasty situation and $I$ would suggest that as a participant in those conversations, it's inappropriate that he do so.

MR. WOLCH: I'm asking the witness questions, he's answering the questions. If Mr. Wilson sometime later on wants to try to ask questions, he can if he wishes, but I'm trying to do things in a practical --

MR. WILSON: It's fundamental not to put words in the witness' mouth that are not already in evidence.

MR. WOLCH: This witness is more than capable of taking care of himself.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, so far I don't perceive Mr. Wolch to have crossed any line into suggesting things for the witness' benefit that were for the purpose of his own interests, that is, Mr. Wolch's interest as opposed to that of his client. We have already seen evidence to the effect that -- from this witness in fact, that Mr. Wolch early on in the investigation
seemed to back away from the Breckenridge position, if $I$ can call it that, with a position that had been put forward in the press conference, so that's a fact, there's no doubt that the press conference reveals what it reveals and I'm well aware of its contents, and I think that Mr. Wolch can continue so long as he remains aware of the fact that he's here to look after his client's interests and not his own. I don't perceive that he's doing that so far.

The last thing you touched on, sir, was the terms criminal conspiracy and so forth, those terms which were reflected in the purpose of the investigation as it seemed to appear to the investigators to relate to charges under the Criminal Code.

MR. WOLCH: Yes.
A
If $I$ could, perhaps $I$ can answer that question perhaps with a little more detail than $I$ did. When the police are presented with a set of circumstances and they are requested to do an investigation, you need to look at those circumstances to see if there's any allegation or suggestion that there's a criminal offence because that's what the police investigate, are criminal
offences. Had there not been criminal offences, then perhaps we would have viewed this different, so the allegations that you presented to us were such that when we looked at the circumstances, were allegations of criminal offences such as obstruction of justice. That's why we used those terms because that's what you told us these people were responsible for. Now, you may not have used the word directly obstruction of justice, but certainly the circumstances would give one reason to believe that that's what we were investigating. BY MR. WOLCH:

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
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Okay. But criminal acts require there be a willfulness in the most part; do they not? That's correct, but you determine that sometimes through investigation.

Right. But we were alleging that David was innocent and we were right?

That's correct.
And that the kids didn't tell the truth and that was right too?

Well, that's not totally right. Some of the things that they said were the truth.

Well, by chance everybody says something truthful, but on the crucial points of seeing a murder, as

Nichol John supposedly did, that wasn't true was it?

A
$Q$

A

Q

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

A
$Q$
2

A

That was not true, no.
Okay. That's pretty crucial?
That's very crucial.
Okay. And that Fisher did it, that's pretty good, that's pretty accurate isn't it?

Yes, we know now that that's accurate.
You know now, but it was always the case?
Yes, it was always the case.
Fisher was always guilty?
Yes.
David was always innocent?
Yes, yeah.
Okay. And it's also true that for whatever reason the awareness of Mr. Fisher was not brought home to anybody supporting David Milgaard for many, many, many years after he was arrested?

Do you want to ask me that again? What do you mean by anybody?

Well, Justice Tallis, Mrs. Milgaard, any of Milgaard's lawyers, anybody from October the 8th, 1970 until the -- well, the phone call from a stranger brought it to light.

You know, $I$ can only answer for what's in our
report. That's a very broad question. I have a lot of difficulty answering that question.
$Q$

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
Q

You know, I don't recognize that writing and I don't think it was anybody in the RCMP. They didn't spell my surname correctly.

Q
A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

It's likely Saskatchewan I think, but --
Yeah, you'll see that my surname is spelled incorrectly there, so $I$ don't think it was anybody that $I$ worked with that would have written that document.

Okay. I'm not sure if $I$ can highlight it or not. I guess I can't.
"- Neil was a bit uncomfortable with the
Feds referring this matter to them as
they were stanch proponents of
provincial jur'd...

- I suggest this is an "optics" thing."

Do you recall who would have said that?
You know, you would have to put that document into context for me. I don't know when this conversation was, at what point in our investigation.

It's dated in the top, October the 8th, '92, right at the very beginning.

Yeah, I see that. Yeah, I see that now.
I'm sorry I can't highlight, but towards the bottom of the page:
"- He needs letter from Cotter re
"double referral" which he could live with

- wants copy to Chief Egan to est. his involvement on behalf of us as well as feds."

So it must be provincial.
"- Scope of Invest.

- agree obst justice but perhaps go beyond Mike Breckenridge's statement ask Wolch what else they have - expect nothing."

Do you recall that type of conversation?
A
You know, I don't, but, you know, if I did participate in a meeting, I'm suggesting that perhaps I also would have taken this discussion and made notes of it somewhere and made a report, so perhaps that's someone else's recollection of a discussion we had. It doesn't refresh my memory, but perhaps my own notes or report would be of assistance.

Okay. Do the words "expect nothing" seem to suggest that perhaps at this meeting there was a certain attitude to the complaints?

A
Well, that may have been someone else's perception. It certainly wasn't mine. I can't speak for someone else who may have written something like that.

Q Okay. Then it goes on:
"- Then do review \& release statement to
Feds \& Sask jointly

- we'd do joint announcement with Feds."

So you don't remember this meeting at all?
I'm sorry, Mr. Wolch, I can't help you very much with this particular document.

Just turn the page. I'm sorry, I want the page earlier, two pages earlier then, go back two. It says:
"1) Get McFarland to wait a few days
2) Apparently Cotter asked Tait to continue investigation more or less for
us

- would be confined to allegation
- would be of a criminal nature."

That doesn't refresh you at all?
I don't recognize this document. I don't think I've ever seen it before.

Just scroll down, and the bottom:
"- spoke with Bruce \& we appear now to
be on the same wave length."
A
$Q$
Yes.
So there's going to be a report, there's going to be a joint --

A

Q

A

Q

A
都
No, I don't suggest that at all. I think if $I$ can
kind of recall this, $I$ know very early on before we started the investigation there was a discussion amongst the $R C M P$ senior executive and perhaps the Department of Justice and I don't know if Mr. Fraser, McCrank were involved at that time about the scope of the investigation, and it started out being very narrow, to simply investigate the Breckenridge allegation, and then there was a suggestion that no, perhaps it should be broader. I think when the decision was made that it be broader, that's when we sort of decided that a more concerted effort, a larger number of
investigators, etcetera, was involved, but this particular meeting, like $I$ say, if $I$ had my own notes to refer to, perhaps it would be helpful, but looking at someone else's notes, $I$ don't recognize that at all.

Now, I'm interested in how you perceive the decision of the Supreme Court to affect you. Did you take it as having a significant or partial effect on what you were doing?

You know, Mr. Wolch, I don't think you are ever able to sort of put everything out of your mind with regards to the findings of the Supreme court and $I$ guess we always felt that if we found anything that sort of conflicted with what the Supreme Court said, we would certainly report on it and provide it upwards to our legal advisors, but $I$ think you are always conscious when you are doing an investigation that the supreme Court has looked at a lot of the material we had looked at, in fact, had gone into perhaps more detail in some areas than we had, and I guess if we had found something that was startling different, certainly we would have had to seek advice as to how we handed that particular piece of information. But the Supreme Court had quashed the conviction,
had they not, or at least recommended that?
I believe that's the case, yes.
Okay. And would you not consider that to be of extreme significance?

Yes.
Do you know how many times in history they have done that very thing on a 690 reference?

I don't know, but $I$ would suggest it's probably quite rare.

It's the only one in history.
I certainly take no dispute with that.
And that it is quite significant for the court to look at a person who has been in jail for a long time and then say we recommend the conviction be quashed and at best a new trial ordered?

I think that is significant and $I$ think in this case the Supreme Court certainly said more than simply quash the conviction, I believe there were other aspects to their decision as well, that wasn't the only thing they said.

Yeah. Well, particularly back then it was very rare for the, anyone to have a wrongful conviction quashed, at least have a conviction quashed after it's been through the entire appellate process? Yes, I think I've agreed with you, that that's
rare.
And I want to glance at the Supreme Court for a moment, 058828, at 31, please. Here's a paragraph that seems to cause some difficulty and $I$ think you've relied on it to some degree, and $I$ just want to deal with it briefly, and it's -- sorry, I can't highlight, but the last paragraph:
"It is appropriate to begin by stating that in our view David Milgaard had the benefit of a fair trial... We have not been presented with any probative evidence that the police acted improperly in the investigation..."

I pause there. We have not been presented, it doesn't mean it doesn't exist?

I would agree.
Yeah. And you were told that it wasn't the focus of the Supreme Court, police misconduct was not the issue?

Was told by whom?
Myself, among others, but the point was the issue was the conviction, the innocence of David, not whether there's misconduct or not, guilty people can be, have police misconduct, it won't affect their guilt, if they are guilty?

A

Are you asking me that question independent of the context of the Supreme Court or in the context of what the Supreme Court said? I'm just not sure where that question comes from.

Either one. I mean, surely on wrongful
convictions, if the question is posed at this stage of the game the court is looking for innocence, you are not looking for misconduct that doesn't amount to something that would lead to innocence -- it's the innocence that's the focus is what $I$ 'm saying, is the witness lying or not. In relation to this or just in a wrongful conviction?

I'm saying they weren't asked the question was there police misconduct, it wasn't the question. I'm not sure whether they looked, how extensively they looked at that or not.
"Nor has evidence been presented that there was inadequate disclosure in accordance with the practice prevailing at the time."

Did you check to see if there was any argument about disclosure?

Well, I think we investigated that as thoroughly as we could and certainly provided that to our
legal advisors who were probably in a better position to make comment on disclosure than we were, so yes, we investigated that as thoroughly as we could, just as we investigated the evidence of police acting improperly as thoroughly as we could.

But you were also aware of the fact that you found important disclosure the Supreme Court never even had and I'm thinking about the RCMP reports where before Milgaard came onto the scene, they believed that the perpetrator was Larry Fisher, unknown at the time?

I think those reports simply said that initially when Saskatoon police started their investigation, they had looked at whether there was links between the murder and sexual assaults and that's in the Saskatoon police file as well.

No, but I'm thinking more of the reports that outline why the perpetrator -- there are two RCMP reports -- why the perpetrator would have been that same predator that gave rise to the newspaper warnings and things like that?

I don't recall that the same way you do. Perhaps we should look at that document.

Well, you would -- I thought you were the ones
that found it, I thought Murray Brown found it and gave it to you.

A
$Q$

A

Q
A
Q

A
$Q$
That's correct.
But it was not for the Supreme Court, they never had it.

I agree with you, that as far as $I$ know the Supreme Court never had that.

And for sure it wasn't for trial available?
Well, I don't know that.
Okay. Take it from me it wasn't, assume it wasn't. If those two weren't available for the Supreme Court or the trial, we cannot agree that's important disclosure?

I would suggest that it likely is but, you know, I don't know that I'm the best person to comment on that. Like I say, issues of disclosure were sent to our legal folks who provided us with their views on that and $I$ think it's in their report and it's in our report.

All right. If we just turn the page, looking at the first new paragraph:
"However, fresh evidence has been
presented to us. Ronald Wilson, a key
witness has recanted part of his
testimony. Additional evidence has been
presented..."

Regarding the motel.
"More importantly, there was evidence
led as to sexual assaults committed by
Larry Fisher which came to light in
October 1970, when Fisher made a confession."

You see that?
A
Q

A

Q
Okay. But certainly people in authority knew about it, we know Mr. Karst took the statement, we know Mr. Kujawa prosecuted it shortly thereafter, the year after, so we know that, you know that?

A
$Q$

A
Q
A
$Q$

Yes.
Okay.
Yeah.
All right. If you go to the next paragraph: "In our view, this evidence, together with other evidence we have heard, constitutes credible evidence that could reasonably be expected to have affected the verdict of the jury considering the guilt or innocence of David Milgaard. Our conclusion in this respect is not to be taken as a finding of guilt against Fisher, nor indeed that the evidence would justify charging him with the murder of Gail Miller."

You see that?
Yes, $I$ do.
The reference to credible evidence. And if we can
just go to 33, the second paragraph:
"Third, we are satisfied there has been new evidence placed before us which is reasonably capable of belief and which taken together with the evidence adduced at trial could reasonably be expected to have affected the verdict. We will
therefore be advising ... to quash the conviction... In light of this
decision, it would be inappropriate to discuss the evidence in detail or to
comment upon the credibility of witnesses."

So they are saying the new evidence is capable of belief?

A
Yes, I believe that's exactly what they are saying.

And could affect innocence or guilt of David Milgaard; right?

A
At a new trial, yes.
Yes. And that would include, in particular, the evidence of Larry Fisher?

That's possible, yes.
Yet that's evidence you thought didn't mean much? No, I don't think that's the case at all, sir. As I indicated $I$ believe on Thursday of last week, we investigated Mr. Fisher as far as we could at the time.

Q If we can go to 35.
A
In fact, I recall writing his lawyer asking to interview Mr. Fisher and told his lawyer that he was a suspect and Mr. Beresh coming back quite

Well, during our investigation there certainly was no evidence came forward to us that indicated suggest that Mr. Milgaard was not the person responsible. However, $I$ will remind you that the dealing with him. no, I don't agree with you.

Well, you didn't think there was enough to even get DNA on him.

No, that's not what $I$ said either. What I said
was there needed to be a logical process, a
step -- a process of steps taken whereby one suspect is eliminated and then you look to see what grounds you have to get a warrant on the next suspect. I believe that's what I said. At least that's what I believe should have been the process.

I hear what you are saying, but why can't you have two suspects, what's the problem with having two suspects?

There's no problem having two suspects, but in this case I didn't have two suspects, I had one suspect.

Well, Mr. Milgaard was not convicted when you were
there had been any wrongdoing that we should
surprised that we would consider him a suspect, so
$Q$

都
Cole
focus of our investigation was not on the guilt or innocence of David Milgaard or Larry Fisher, it was about allegations that you made about improper conduct of a number of people, so that was the focus of our investigation and that's what we looked at.

But surely if you came to the conclusion that Milgaard was innocent and Fisher was guilty, as a police officer you weren't going to just walk away were you?

No, and in fact $I$ think it's very early on in our report where we indicate, and $I$ know $I$ told this inquiry, that should evidence come up that would point to anyone, that that would be forwarded through our legal advisors, Mr. McCrank and Mr. Fraser, onto the Attorney General, and I'm sure the Attorney General would then ensure that some action was taken on that information, but that it was not our role to investigate Mr. Fisher or Mr. Milgaard's guilt or innocence.

I'm jumping ahead to the DNA. At that point in
time nobody was convicted of the murder of Gail Miller?

That's correct.
So what would possibly be the harm of saying to
the scientists can you compare the known against the sample -- or the unknown, rather, against the two knowns, Mr. Fisher and Mr. Milgaard? I don't understand your reluctance to do that.

Well, you know, Mr. Wolch, perhaps if that had come forward very early on in our investigation and there had been a suggestion that we should do the DNA on both persons, I may have viewed it differently, but when our investigation was complete and $I$ saw no evidence that would point me in the direction of Mr. Fisher and considerable evidence that would still lead me to believe Mr. Milgaard was responsible, $I$ felt it was appropriate that you eliminate people in the order of importance, and certainly Mr. Milgaard appeared to be the best person at that time; therefore, $I$ felt that he should be eliminated first. Now, I know now that Milgaard is innocent and $I$ have no problem saying that, but at that time we didn't have the benefit of the DNA analysis.

Look at the second last paragraph on this page:
"While there is some evidence which implicates Milgaard in the murder of Miller, the fresh evidence presented to us, particularly as to the locations and
the pattern of the sexual assaults committed by Fisher, could well affect a jury's assessment of the guilt or innocence of Milgaard. The continued conviction of Milgaard would amount to a miscarriage of justice if an opportunity was not provided for a jury to consider the fresh evidence."

Now, here's a Supreme Court saying that in reviewing the pattern of Larry Fisher, that that could have a considerable effect and has probative value, it's valuable, yet you are saying that you didn't find that yourself?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$ That's correct.

But yet you say you were guided or influenced by the Supreme Court yet, where they are favourable to David Milgaard, you are not being guided by them?

No, I think $I$ was always conscious of the supreme Court's decisions and findings in this case, and certainly we conducted our investigation with the full knowledge of what the Supreme Court said. We certainly went out to find whatever evidence we could.

But what $I$ am saying is that the supreme court
seems to think, obviously, that the Fisher evidence was important?

A
Q
A

Q

A

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
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A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Well we certainly had information that you could place a varying amount of reliability upon. I don't believe you could place a lot of reliability upon Mrs. Fisher, we did not view her as being strongly credible, and same with the jailhouse informants, $I$ mean there's often credibility issues with those.

And you had location, you had Fisher living in the Cadrain house, you had where articles were found? Well that, that's suspicious, I don't believe it's evidence.

So all that's not evidence? Okay.

> I'd like to go over a few
things with you in the report of Alberta Justice, the McCrank and Fraser report, which is 032805 .

You can go to 06 where it starts. It starts
off -- and I wish I could highlight:
"In late September ... '92, Brent Cotter
... contacted Neil McCrank...",
etcetera. I won't belabour it, that doesn't seem to jive with the October 8th memo, but that doesn't really matter. If we could turn to 07 , it says in here that there were 12 members under your direction?

Well, the number 12 has been used, and the number

10 has been used. I can tell you, quite frankly, that there were times when we had more investigators and there were times when we had less investigators, just depending on the issues, but generally speaking $I$ think 10 or 12 was a pretty steady number throughout the investigation. Did you make any use of Rick Pearson?

I know we interviewed Rick Pearson at the very beginning to get a sense for what, the work that he had done and some of his findings, but he didn't participate in our investigation.

I don't want to interrupt you, but he was at that meeting October the 8 th, so it seems he had some involvement or his name is said to be there? That's correct, he participated in a couple of meetings at the beginning of our investigation. Yeah. I'm sort of puzzled as to how manpower is assigned, that is when Pearson was doing it all he was by himself, and now we have 10 to 12 members doing this. It seems -- you see what $I$ am getting at in terms of a weighing of the use of manpower? Well I think Mr. Pearson's investigation was very narrow in its focus, and it was limited to providing assistance to the Department of Justice, if my recall is correct. Our investigation was
much broader, and of course it was investigating the conduct of a number of people, and some, I forget the number, 65 or 68 allegations that we were able to synthesize from the material that you provided. So, certainly, I think the scope of the investigations was markedly different. If we could turn to page 11, please, I want to focus a bit on the evidence of the key witnesses which you look into and which is in this report, based on your report, and it starts off under number 2. It is alleged the police pressured these witnesses to assist in convicting Milgaard, not true, all of these witnesses and many more have been interviewed, and when Albert Cadrain returns to Regina from his trip out west he was arrested for vagrancy -- and $I$ should put, for the record's sake, I am skipping words just for the sake of speed-reading and the document speaks for itself -- vagrancy in early February '69, and it wasn't until he returned the beginning of March that he became aware of details through a conversation with his mother. After discussing what he knew with his brother and his sister and perhaps his parents went to the police, he thought Milgaard may have committed the murder.
"It has been suggested these allegations are substantial because Cadrain did not mention anything about Milgaard when he was arrested in Regina. The obvious answer is that Cadrain did not know the details of the murder at that time and therefore could not have suspected Milgaard."

Is that your conclusion? Do you --
Yes, I believe it was. But to be quite frank with you, you read so fast there I couldn't keep up with you, so --

Oh, I'm sorry, I was going -- I thought you could read faster than $I$ could speak. But take your time, $I$ don't want to rush you through it, I just --

Yeah, if we could go back to the page -Okay. Take your time. I won't read it aloud, you just read it to yourself.
(Witness reading) Yes, I believe the substance of that is what our report said.

Yeah. What $I$ am getting at is, or trying to get to, is that in Regina Cadrain was questioned about the murder.

A By Regina Police.

Q Yes.
A That's correct, yes.
Q Yes.
A I --

Q

A

Q
A
$Q$

A

Q

A
Well I think what the suggestion is, is that until, at least our investigation determined that until Cadrain was at home after his trip and had come back and was sort of provided the details of the murder by members of his family, that he didn't make -- draw a connection. That's what our investigation determined, and I think, I'm suggesting that's what Mr. McCrank and Fraser are
saying here in their report.
Well as an investigator would you not expect, if he had actually seen blood, when he is spoken to by the RC -- by the Regina Police, "a murder occurred the morning you left, do you know anything about it", he might have said, "yeah, I saw blood on my friend"?

He wasn't asked that, and there's no evidence to indicate that he made a connection, it was simply a general conversation put to him by a police officer about a murder that happened in his area, --

Uh-huh.
-- there is no evidence that he made that connection.

Q Okay. Just scroll down to farther on the -- if $I$ can -- sorry. Okay, I'm pointing in the middle of the top paragraph where it says:
"The RCMP ..."
Yes, I think I'm with you there.
Yeah:
"... have uncovered corroboration for
Cadrain's statement to the police from
his sister and his brother. He
discussed his concerns about Milgaard
with them before going to the police. His younger brother Kenneth, confirms evidence that Milgaard had blood on his clothing ... and the same explanation for the blood from Milgaard.", etcetera, etcetera. Are you saying you actually put substance in Kenny Cadrain's statement? I'm saying that we took down the evidence of witnesses, made a record of it, and provided that in our report.

Okay. But, here, it --
And that, that's what he told us.
Okay. But, here, it doesn't say that he was five or six at the time or -- and didn't recall it for maybe 20 years later?

A
No, but it certainly says that in our report, and --

Well --
-- Messrs. McCrank and Fraser had the opportunity to read our report, and in fact -I appreciate that. But, as an investigator, would you have placed credence in the statement of somebody who says "when $I$ was six years old I saw blood, I never told anybody about it, it wouldn't have been an issue for maybe two months until the
murder was even brought to my attention as a six-year-old, I didn't tell anybody about it and now I remember it 20 years later"? That's silly, isn't it?

I think Mr. Hodson asked me about that and I believe I told him that $I$ didn't feel that that was particularly strong. There may or may not have been blood there and, if there was blood there, it could have been from some other source, so that was not a particularly strong piece of evidence in my view.

So okay, well, let's go to Nichol John. She was interviewed for an extensive time and:
"Although she appears to have an actual mental block of the details surrounding the murder, she was not pressured by the police to make the statement she gave at the time."

So you concluded she had a mental block regarding the murder; correct?

I'm not sure if that's our conclusion or their conclusion from reading our report, but $I$ think a number of people told us that she had blocked some of this out or was unable to recall, so whether that -- those were our words to them or words they
have produced themselves, I'm not sure. Perhaps I would need to refer to our report to see what we said about Nichol John.
$Q$
A

I don't believe she saw David Milgaard commit the murder.

Q
Do you think she saw Larry Fisher do the murder?
A
Q
A
Was that your conclusion?
I think a number of people, $I$ know she had been interviewed by psychologists and psychiatrists, and certainly this had been a traumatic -- there had been some trauma in her life, and certainly she was incapable of recalling some events, whether you call that a mental block or what I'm not sure.

Well are you satisfied she didn't see the murder?
I don't think there is a very good chance she did, --

Well --
-- I think there's a pretty good chance that she simply is unable to recall.

Yeah, but can't you go farther than 'a pretty good chance'? The fact is she never saw a murder.

I don't know.
And nobody else saw it?
I don't know, Mr. Wolch, you know. Like I don't
believe she saw a murder, --

Q
A

Q

A

Q
A

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q
A
$Q$

A

All right.
-- that murder, that's for sure.
Okay. So she didn't block one out; correct?
Well, we didn't know that at the time, we know that now.

Of course we know it now.
I'm talking about 1993, when we did our
investigation, we didn't know that at the time.
I'm -- I agree with you. Your whole report is
based on wrong premises. You are based on David
being guilty, and etcetera, etcetera?
I don't agree with you.
Well it's based on the premise that David was likely guilty?

The conclusions are that. The report itself is not based on that. The report --

Well --
-- was an objective analysis of the information that we were able to obtain from the witnesses.

Well, sir, isn't there a huge difference as to
whether or not Nichol John saw a murder and
blocked it out or never saw a murder; isn't there a big difference?

Well we now know what we know. We know that she
didn't see David Milgaard kill Gail Miller, we didn't know that in 1993.

Why did she say she did?
Well, $I$ think she said she did one time, and then another time she said she didn't.

Why would she --
My belief was, and $I$ think it says -- suggests in our report that she was an unreliable witness, we couldn't rely on her --

I understand that.
-- as a witness.
But why did she ever say she saw a murder?
I have no idea.
No idea? Okay. It says here:
"Further corroboration that the evidence came from her own knowledge is provided by statements taken by the RCMP from ... Wispinski, whom Nichol John told about Milgaard killing a girl in Saskatoon prior to giving the statement to the police, and from Nichol John's mother whom she had told at some point in time that she had seen a girl stabbed..."

Now when, when, from your investigation, did she tell Nichol's mother; was that before the
statement or after the statement?

A

Q
A

Q

A
Q

A
Q
A
$Q$
A

Q obviously I share your perspective on that.

Yeah, but 'weak', you are saying there is
corroboration here from --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, he's not saying it.

MR. WOLCH: Okay. But this is a report
prepared from your report though, $I$ think, in fairness?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Be careful to make that distinction. You keep accusing him of being -- as you would the author. MR. WOLCH: Okay.

BY MR. WOLCH:

Q
You read this report over thoroughly before it was published?

Umm, I don't know if $I$ did have a chance to read a draft of that, --

Okay.
-- or whether it simply went straight to Saskatchewan.

Okay. Now we have:
"Ronald Wilson claims he did not witness the murder, but through a number of statements he gave evidence that corroborated some of the evidence of both John and Cadrain. When in Calgary at the bus depot Milgaard told him that while in Saskatoon he grabbed a girl and tried to take her purse, and because she resisted he had jabbed her with a knife and put her purse in the trash can."

Now I'll go through it, perhaps after the break, in a little more detail, but you have both these kids saying there was a conversation, conversations with Milgaard in Calgary about the killing or murder of, presumably, Gail Miller; you are aware of that?

Yes, I am, yup.
How could they make that up if it wasn't fed to them?

Well, I'm not sure what you are asking me? Well how can they both -- well, first of all, that conversation couldn't have happened; correct? Well, $I$ don't think that was known to us in 1993, that that conversation couldn't have happened. I -- I'm talking today?

You know, I can't comment. I can only tell you what $I$ investigated, what came out in my investigation, and what my report was. Everything that's happened after that $I$ can't comment on. But you are an expert in the field, you are a trained, very highly-ranked RCMP officer with tremendous credentials, surely $I$ can ask you, or from what you learned, all this investigating, that that conversation could not have occurred with what we know now, not what you knew then,
what we know now?
A
Yeah, but you are asking me to now say, to make a comment that is contrary to my findings in my report simply because of what $I$ know now. Absolutely.

And that's not fair.
Well --
How can $I$ say to you, "yeah, what we said in 1993,
how could we have said that?" We said that because of the evidence we had in 1993.

But now is a chance to correct it if you're wrong; is it not?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I don't know how much more correction you want. The man has acknowledged that he now believes Milgaard to have been innocent, Fisher to have been guilty.

MR. WOLCH: Okay, but the point I'm getting at now is -- well I think, Mr. Commissioner, I -it will take me a little while to go through, I'm happy to go through, $I$ don't know when the break is?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, keep going a little while, we started late.

BY MR. WOLCH:
Okay. If we could turn to 813. Now you're aware
of the Mackie summary?

A
$Q$

A
Q

A
$Q$
A
Q
It was then, it is now. Okay? The last paragraph:
"It is further suggested that support for this allegation is provided by a five page police report ... which allegedly illustrates the fact the evidence of witnesses John and Wilson was fabricated by the police. The RCMP investigation indicates this summary was prepared during a meeting of the investigators ... after Cadrain had made his statements to police. This summary appears to be an attempt to pull
together all of the known information ... develop a theory of how the murder occurred. The summary ends with a direction as to how the investigation should proceed ... which would be to conduct further interviews of ... John and ... Wilson. The RCMP suspect the first three pages were prepared by ... Mackie ... last two ... Penkala ... It is the summary the accusers say corroborate the allegation."

Now here's the part that $I$ want to focus on: "Upon a review of the summary and a comparison with the crucial statements obtained from John and Wilson and to an independent report prepared by ... Riddell ... it would appear the summary is a combination of conjecture and suggestions, and ... the conjecture vaguely corresponds to some of the points made in the statements by John and Wilson. It is more an indication of good police work than it is coercion of witnesses. We do not see that this document is supportive of anything,

A
Q

A
except an indication the police were on the right track."

Do you see that?
Yes, I do.
Okay. Now, with what you know today, would that be correct?

I -- I'm really uncomfortable suggesting that -- I mean in 1993 we investigated this, for me to now sit here and put my mind around a different context, a different place in time, it's difficult. In 1993 we have our findings, we did a detailed analysis of that summary report, we reported on it to Mr. McCrank and Mr. Fraser, and this is their interpretation of that report. Yes, but there are people who will say that "this report exonerates us, this report clears us", and I want to make it very clear that you were going on the assumption that there was truth in the police theory that these kids, in part, adopted. Well I --

Doesn't it change completely if it was all false, you are not on the right track, you're on the wrong track?

You know, I can't get my head around the fact that -- what it appears today. I was asked to
investigate allegations of wrongdoing in 1993, I investigated those and $I$ reported on them, and those are my findings.

Yes, but they are based on the premise that there was truth in what they said, what Wilson and John said, that there was truth in asking for directions, David leaving the car, Wilson leaving the car, "I fixed her", "stupid bitch", all that stuff is presumed to have truth?

Well I think, if you look back on our analysis, you will find that there were a number of things that they speculate in that summary that were true and corroborated in various ways, and there were some things that they said in that summary that were not true, and there are additional pieces of information or -- that came out above and beyond that summary.

I appreciate --
My investigation here was to look at whether or not there was any evidence from that summary of obstruction of justice and, in my view, there wasn't.
$Q$
Well, might you agree that today we have to look at it in a different light, given that we now know for a fact David was innocent?
 ,

A

I mean, you'll see.

Well, I'm going to take you through a bit of it.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Well, Mr. Wolch, before we do break I have a question about your some of the things that were in the summary were in fact corroborated, and some of the things weren't. Do you want to go through that analysis,
approach.
Surely it was not this
witness' function to proceed on any assumption that the witnesses were spouting a pack of lies, nor was it his function to proceed on the basis that they were telling the truth, he was there to get the evidence, as he said, and he did it to the best of his ability.

MR. WOLCH: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: So it is not fruitful, in my view, to be looking at the problem he faced at that time by reference to what we know now.

MR. WOLCH: Well no, I appreciate that, but what $I$ am saying is, Mr. Commissioner, is that when you go, when you say that "they are on the right track", it means -- is totally different when you know they weren't on the right track, and I want to draw on his expertise. I mean he has been, with respect, I think quite defensive of his report. I don't, I'm not worried about that.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: No, I don't think he is, $I$ think he is being defensive about his approach, which he is entitled to do.

MR. WOLCH: Well, I'll modify it a bit, but I just want to get his expertise.

BY MR. WOLCH:

Q

A Mr. Wolch, I believe I answered the question, and my answer is this. We looked at that, at the statements of both witnesses, we compared it to the summary, and you will find that some parts of
that summary are able to be corroborated by what -- by several areas, one of them being -- and you mentioned purse snatching, Mr. Milgaard told his counsel that they were looking at committing a robbery, so there are aspects of the summary which were corroborated and there were aspects of the summary which weren't corroborated. What we were looking at is whether there was criminal wrongdoing here, we didn't find any evidence of that.

Okay. I want to briefly go to the summary at 001502 . Okay? It's about four down: "- All were out of funds and may have gone driving with a view to getting money.

- On seeing nurse (Miller) she was approached on pretence of getting directions with a view to stealing her purse.
- This would be around funeral home which would coincide with statements of Nichol John - Diewold seeing lights in alley - Doell saying Miller took bus at ... 'N'.
- Wilson appears to be driver of car,

A 25

A
$Q$
therefore, Milgaard would leave car to get purse - having seen Miller closer his sex drive takes over and he forces her down alley to where she is found. - Nichol John knows or suspects results and leaves car. Runs west on 20 th ... is girl seen by Indyk at St. Mary Church ... she changes her mind about saying anything and goes north on ... 'O' where she meets car again.

- Milgaard after murder returns to car with boot and sweater (car possibly followed down lane) to which Wilson objections to and as a result are buried in the snow.
- Purse thrown in garbage on way through
alley from Avenue 'N' to 'O' ..."
Now "purse thrown in garbage", that's something that did happen; isn't it?

Yes, I believe it did.
Okay. Well we'll deal with is there any way that that really did happen between Milgaard, Wilson, and John that morning, "purse thrown in garbage"? That they are responsible for that? I don't believe so now, no.

Q

Okay. We've gone over this many times, I'll skip the rest, but it's their suggestion that Nichol John, Wilson and Cadrain be brought to Saskatoon where with all present the true story can be obtained even if hypnosis or polygraph are necessary. Do you have any comment on that suggestion?

I quite frankly don't see anything wrong with that. I think what they are doing is suggesting an operational plan here, a plan of direction from a supervisor or someone in a position of management of the file to the investigators as to what their next step should be. As I mentioned to the inquiry, that's not uncommon, you know, in police work to form very good, very early leads in an investigation and then develop a plan to follow up on those leads to either disprove or prove them.

Okay, but that's assuming that these kids have not told the truth to begin with, $I$ mean, they all have made statements before.

I'm just not sure what they had said up until this point. I think we can go to the analysis and we would find out, but it could be that at this point they have provided very little. I'm just not
sure. I would have to look at the analysis, Mr . Wolch, to be accurate in --

Accept that they all gave --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just a minute, please.
MR. WOLCH: I'm sorry.
-- to be accurate in my answer to you.
BY MR. WOLCH:
Please accept that all three gave relatively consistent statements about that morning in question. The only difference of any note is David mentioned that he had asked an old woman for directions, the rest was basically the same. That morning?

Yes.
That very morning?
Yes.
I don't think they said really anything.
Well, no, they made long statements. Were you not aware of it?

Well, $I$ was aware of it, but the statements really didn't say very much.

Q
Well, very much to implicate, but they described the morning's activities, they described the Danchuks, the motel, they described going to

A
Q

Cadrains', they went through that morning. analysis of those statements and what we were able to find is that some of the things that they said in those May $23 r d$ and 24 th statements were corroborated and others weren't, and some of them were corroborated by what Mr. Milgaard told his own counsel as to what happened that morning and that was very helpful to us. The police of course didn't have that available to them in 1969, but we did in 1993 -- 1992.

What about the suggestion hypnosis or polygraph are necessary?

A

Now, we know that Roberts spoke to them, we've heard evidence that it was eavesdropped upon or recorded by the police who were all listening, we know that $W i l s o n$ and John were spoken to many -COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: I'm not so sure we heard evidence that the police were all listening. I think the person who put the device in, $I$ think he said he probably -- he couldn't even remember according to him who was listening or if anybody was listening.

BY MR. WOLCH:
Q
I appreciate that, Mr. Commissioner. It might be a logical conclusion though $I$ suppose, but we know that there was a listening device placed in the room next door and a number of police officers of senior rank were there. We know that statements were taken from Wilson on two occasions that day and the next and John the next day. Did it ever concern you that we have a remarkable scarcity of documentary evidence as to what took place in any of these interviews?

Well, certainly $I$ think the more evidence, documentary evidence that we had, the more helpful it would have been, you know, to our
investigation, and $I$ remind you it was about obstruction of justice and wrongdoing, and we certainly interviewed John and Wilson, or attempted to interview Wilson to try and determine if in fact there had been misconduct on the part of the police or the police had suggested that they adopt certain theories and we were not able to uncover any evidence of that, Mr. Wolch.

I don't think that was my question. My question was would you now be concerned of the lack of notes, the lack of reports, the lack of transcript
from all that took place over those two days?
I don't recall being particularly concerned in
1992, '93 when we did this investigation. I know that we reviewed all the material we had and of course, as I indicated, we asked the witnesses themselves. What do you mean by concern, am I concerned? Do I -- do you mean do I think somebody did something wrong, do I think somebody is withholding something? We had no evidence of that.

I simply asked -- I mean, you were prepared to express concern over how Paul Henderson framed questions. At least Paul Henderson had the benefit -- or you had the benefit of transcript of what the questions were to offer that concern. Well, not in all cases.

Okay. Most cases you had -- in fact, you had -and Paul Henderson was not a police officer. In this case where you have police officers involved, there is a paucity of documented record. Would that not concern you?

I don't know what your question is.
We have nothing as to what Roberts said or did. Doesn't that bother you?

Well, as far as the actions of Mr. Roberts, I
mean, he was examined extensively in the supreme Court, we had the benefit of that transcript, we interviewed him ourselves and we tried to get as much as we could. I think I told this inquiry earlier that it would have been much more helpful to us had we had his notes, records, charts and those sorts of things.

But it would have been extremely important to have a record of what he said to the kids and what they said to him.

It would have been helpful, I agree, it would have been helpful to our investigation. I think I've acknowledged that several times when Mr. Hodson was questioning me.

And it's something you would normally expect to have in a police file?

Yes, you would, but $I$ think Mr. Roberts' explanation was that the records had been destroyed or were no longer available. But you would expect them to be on a Saskatoon police file for the prosecutor's benefit and for those acting in the trial?

A
I don't know if $I$ expected to see them there or not. I think it would have been helpful as I indicated before, it would have been helpful if we
would have had those notes.
But what Nichol John would have said, did say on
May $23 r d$ would have been helpful had it been recorded?

Yes. I think, you know, from 1969 to today, you'll find that most, particularly in major crimes and serious crimes, most police interviews are taped, audiotaped, certainly audiotaped and sometimes in many cases videotaped. Something like that would have been very helpful in this investigation, to know exactly what was said to the witnesses and exactly what they said back. In terms of Mackie interviewing Nichol John, do you have his notes from the interview, or did you have?

I would have to look back in the file. I don't have specific recall of that. I know the investigators certainly would have looked at whatever information they had available for them. Would you agree, looking back, that you would have expected to have much more documented than what you found?

A I don't recall making particular mental note of the fact that there should or should not have been more documents provided. We were provided with
the full file and we examined all of that documentation.

I'm focusing on the interviews on May 23 rd and May
 You know, I don't recall. I would need to look at my report. I would need to look in those files to find out exactly what we had.

Now, would $I$ be correct that on that particular -on May 23 rd Ronald Wilson made comments that in some ways supported the Mackie summary and they were recorded in a statement?

I know that wilson at some point corroborated some of what was in the Mackie summary and in other areas he didn't.

Okay. And Nichol John even told Roberts that she had seen the crime, but nobody took a statement from her that day?

I believe she was turned over to the police interviewers that day. They were advised of, orally of what she had said and then $I$ think they took a statement from her the following day, so I think you are right, I don't think there was a statement taken that day.

And that's very unusual, would it not be, that you have somebody who says she saw a murder and you

A
leave it until the next day?
I don't think $I$ uncovered any reason why there wasn't a statement taken that day. Likely -- it could have been done differently certainly, there could have been a statement taken that day, and one may say perhaps it should have been, but I didn't draw any particular thoughts around why there had been or hadn't been one taken that day. That wasn't my question. Would you agree it's unusual?

No, I wouldn't agree it's unusual.
I'm going to suggest to you that any police officer who has a witness now saying they saw a murder would record that as fast as they could. Well, $I$ can tell you from my experience as a polygraph examiner, Mr. Wolch, that there's many, many times that $I$ got statements from people that furthered the investigation; in other words, I got statements from people that perhaps they had not been previously disclosed. Very often $I$ turn them over to the investigator, the investigator left with that person, and may have taken a statement then or may have taken a statement the next day, so it's not -- I'm not going to sit here and suggest that it's unusual that it happened that
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way.
I want to turn to Ron Wilson's statement which is 065361 . In the second paragraph -Mr. Commissioner, before I go further, I'm going to go through the statement for a bit.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Do you want us to break now?

MR. WOLCH: Whatever you say is appropriate.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: That's fine, yeah. 15 minutes.
(Adjourned at 2:44 p.m.)
(Reconvened at 3:12 p.m.)

BY MR. WOLCH:
If we could bring up 065361 . Now, Mr. Sawatsky, just to set the stage, as $I$ understand it, on May 23rd Ronald Wilson made this statement, Nichol John had already verbally somewhere indicated that she had seen the murder, presumably to Mr. Roberts and to whoever else, but this will be the only written statement taken on May $23 r d$ that I'm aware of. Does that jibe with your recollection?

A I would have to refer to my notes and to my report. I'm not certain as to whether there was another one. I'll take your word for it that that
was the only one taken.
Okay. Now, I don't know if -- I guess we still haven't got that marker working, but he talks in the second paragraph about knives and it's interesting to note, $I$ would suggest, going down to the last paragraph on that page, now here's what he says happened:
"Dave and I got out to push when we got stuck but we couldn't get out. Dave said he'd go for help and he left and disappeared behind the car. About 15 minutes later Dave came back, kind of running and breathing heavy and got into the car. He said something to the effect that "I got her" or "I fixed her". I said "You what" and that ended the conversation. I don't remember if Dave had his shoes on or off when he left the car. I don't remember just when we got out, if it was before or after Dave came back to the car that 2 men in a cream colored dodge or chrysler pushed us out by hand. I think we were stuck there about 6:30-7:00 AM. We eventually got to Cadrain's about 9:00

AM after we drove around, got a map at a motel where Dave had his shoes off, got stuck in the lane."

So if you look at this, it would appear that Nichol John never left the car; would that be fair?

In that particular paragraph, yes.
Yeah. He says he and Dave got out to push, which presumably Nichol stayed in the car.

That's presumably a --
A logical conclusion, okay.
You can presume that --
Yeah.
-- if you want, yeah.
By the way, did it ever cross your mind how bizarre it would be that somebody would commit a rape or a murder or whatever, a robbery, when the get-away car is stuck?

Well, you know, Mr. Wolch, it's my experience that quite often criminals don't think out their crime all that well and sometimes someone may do something impulsive in front of a number of witnesses that perhaps doesn't make sense either, so yes, one could certainly say that it doesn't make any sense, but when you sort of balance that
with the fact that quite often criminals don't, and when they do something on the spur of the moment don't plan it out, don't take into account those things, so yes, on one hand you could look at it as a bit surprising and on the other hand you could say, well, I'm not surprised by it, so I don't know if I've answered your question, but I wasn't surprised by it, no, because as I've said, sometimes people do things impulsively that don't make sense.

Okay. Something like Larry Fisher grabbing (V4)---, something impulsive?

Possibly, yes.
Yeah. Okay, now, if just turn to the next page, and just a few lines down:
"This is when Dave told me he hit a girl in Saskatoon, or maybe he said he did a girl in in Saskatoon. I don't remember for sure which. He told me he grabbed her purse and she fought and he said he jabbed her with a knife a few times, and said he put her purse in a trash can." Now, you didn't know it then, but you know it now, that would be false?

A
I believe so, yes.

$Q$

A
Q

Yeah. And it had to come from somewhere to get into Ron's statement?

Yes.
Now, the next paragraph:
"A little later in Calgary when Nicky and I were together I told her what Dave had told me and she said she already knew. I don't know when he told her. We talked about ditching Dave but we were afraid of him so we decided against it."

Now, that further confuses matters because supposedly Nickey had not remembered anything, she blanked it out or whatever, so now in addition to her mother and Barbara Berard, we now have Ron Wilson saying that she seemed to have remembered it. Does that cause concern or should it cause concern?

Well, you know, I think as our report indicates, we never ever were able to get satisfactory responses from Mr. Wilson. We tried a number of times to interview him to find out what went on that morning and, of course, you know, our interviews were sort of less than complete with him, so yes, I had a lot of concerns with what Mr.

Wilson said, but unfortunately, you know, we were never able to interview him to sort of try and get to the bottom of some of those concerns, so we were left with what we were left with and we reported on that.

No, I appreciate that, but you do agree with me that now, with the change in circumstances, it puts a whole new light on it?

What do you mean by now, present day?
Yeah. Well, you know that that conversation couldn't have taken place?

You know, Mr. Wolch, $I$ think it's unfair of you to ask me to comment on in today's light on what $I$ did in 1993 and, you know, what we know now changes a lot of things, but in 1993 we had no other evidence, so $I$ would appreciate it if you would perhaps talk about $m y$ report and what $I$ did and not what $I$ know today. I think if you want to get at my actions and what $I$ did and the appropriateness of those, it's fair to put them in the proper context.

No, but it's quite important that we appreciate that what we know today may very well have changed your report had you known it then.

A
consider putting it in the context of 1993 when $I$ worked on this and when $I$ had that information available.

Okay, we'll deal with what you had available. So this statement here has Nichol in the car -Well, you presume that, you presumed she was in the car.

It's logical from reading the statement; is it not?

You wanted to make that presumption. I agreed with you.

Okay. But we also know that Nichol is saying that she saw a murder and left the car. Well, let's turn to it, to be fair, 065356 . Now, we have to be cautious here because this is May 24 th. You see that?

A
Q

A
Q Okay. Now, she is saying in the third paragraph:
"This knife was a kitchen knife used to peal potatoes and things like that. It
had a maroon handle. This knife was the same as one of a group of knives that $I$ was shown by Mr. Roberts."

Now, when you read this you didn't place any particular weight on that because of what you knew then as compared to what you know now? Well, I think I told you that $I$ always had difficulty with Nichol's statements because she changed throughout the years, she changed the things she said, so $I$ don't think we were ever able to place an awful lot of weight on her statements, but $I$ remind you that our investigation was about wrongdoing on the part of police officers and Justice officials and David Milgaard's guilt or innocence was not the focus of our investigation, so, you know, you need to bear that in mind.

I understand.
There's no evidence in there that the police have done anything wrong.

Well, there's no evidence in there unless the statement was provided by the police or planted by the police or manipulated by the police?

But there's no evidence of that, Mr. Wolch. That's a conclusion?

A

No, you presumed that.
Okay. Let me go further, I'm sorry:
"The next thing I recall is seeing Dave
in the alley on the right side of the car. He had a hold of the same girl we
spoke to a minute before. I saw him grab her purse. I saw her grab for her purse again. Dave reached into one of his pockets and pulled out a knife."

Etcetera.
"I don't know if Dave had a hold of this girl or not at this time. All I recall seeing is him stabbing her with the knife.

The next $I$ recall is him
taking her around the corner of the alley. I think $I$ ran after that. I think $I$ ran in the direction Ron had gone. I recall running down the street. I don't recall seeing anyone. The next thing $I$ knew $I$ was sitting in the car again. I don't know how $I$ got back to the car.

I seem to recall seeing Dave
putting a purse into a garbage can. I
don't remember which time it was or
where I was when I saw this."
Now, I'm not going to ask you to look at it in what we know today, so we know that he didn't put a purse in a garbage can even though a purse was

A
found in a garbage can. In her scenario here, she's running out of the car; right?

Uh-huh.
It's a horribly damning statement for David; right?

Yes.
But she's running out of the car. Ron's statement
has her in the car. They can't both be right.
Well, $I$ think you said you wanted to presume that and I gave you that, you can presume that. Okay, all right.

You didn't comment whether she was in the car or wasn't in the car.

Well, if we go further down:
"I recall there were two garbage cans.
The one on the left had the lid tipped.
I don't recall which one he put it in.
The next $I$ remember is
sitting in the car. I don't remember
Ron being in the car or coming back. I
remember Dave coming back and getting into the front seat of the car. I remember moving over toward the drivers side because $I$ didn't want to be near him."

I mean, that's sort of an understatement, you've just seen somebody murder somebody, but I didn't want to be near him.
"I don't remember talking to Ron before Dave got back. I do not recall Dave saying anything."

And then we were driving down the alley, we turned down another alley. Now if you can just scroll down. Next page, please. Please scroll down, here we are in calgary again, last three lines:

A
$Q$
A
"As I stopped I saw Ron following me.
We sat on the steps inside an apartment block. Here Ron told me Dave had killed a girl in Saskatoon. I told him "I know"."

Now, that would be, from an investigator's point of view, kind of a bizarre comment isn't it? You leave it at that, oh yeah, $I$ know, and Ron telling her when she saw it?

Yeah, $I$ think you would try to get an explanation on that and, like $I$ say, we were unable to do that.

Okay.
There are a lot of statements, both of Wilson and

John, that we simply couldn't get explanations about.
$Q$ Okay.
"I do not recall anything further being said ...

I have not told anyone about witnessing this murder."

Well that leaves out Berard and everything else.
"I didn't recall actually witnessing a murder until yesterday when $I$ talked with Mr. Roberts. I was aware that however ... I was somehow involved."

He:
"... showed me a coat. This
coat as $I$ recall is identical to one worn by the girl we spoke to and Dave attacked."

Now that is the statement on May 24 but, as you said earlier, we can assume that that was the gist of what she had said on May $23 r d$ to Roberts and whoever talked to her that day when the statement wasn't taken, but what I'm asking you as an investigator; do you see the problem, that both statements can't jive?

A Yes.

Q
A
I think $I$ told you that we tried our very best to get both of those witnesses to give us what they could and, you know, as I told you, with Mr. Wilson we had a less-than-satisfactory interview, and Ms. John was simply unable to recall a lot of the events. We did ask them about coercion, we asked them about whether they'd been told to say certain things, and they both said that wasn't the case. So yeah, there are things about the statements that suggest that perhaps -- that caused concerns, that caused me to say "well lookit, this isn't what this witness said", I think you find that very often, but in this particular case that really isn't evidence of anything.

Okay, well, but you have here a situation where Wilson is saying that Nichol John was in the car, he left to push, David came back, etcetera, etcetera, and Nichol John is saying "Wilson left". You have a major discrepancy; would you not agree? I -- I think I did agree with you, yeah. Yeah. You said that. So what should investigators do at that point?

Well I think you have to remember what our focus
was here. Our focus was on wrongdoing, and so we tried to go as far as we could with this to make a determination as to whether or not this was any indication of any wrongdoing on the part of the police, we didn't find that.

Okay.

Wilson was, as I mentioned, less than helpful, and Ms. John was simply unable to recall a lot of the details, so although we tried to see the genesis of that we were unable to get any further.

But I'm gonna suggest to you, isn't it obvious that John was not committed to writing until Wilson was spoken to the next day to see if the two stories could coincide, isn't that what happened?

It may be obvious to you. It wasn't to me at the time.

Well, let's look at it, let's look at Wilson's second statement. I think that's 065360. This is the May 24 th. Now to put it in sequence, and somebody may correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe this statement was taken and then Nichol John's within a half an hour or so later.
"I would like to add further occurrences to what $I$ said yesterday in
my sworn statement. When Dave and I got out to push the first time we were stuck we couldn't push the car so I said to Dave "You go one way for help and I'll go the other". I went to the corner on the drivers side of the car and walked down the block, $I$ couldn't find help so I went back to the car the same way I had left. The car was still stuck. Nicky was waiting in the car almost hysterical. I asked her what was wrong and she told me she saw Dave carry or drag a girl down the lane and bring out the knife and stab her a few times."

I think -- and then -- I'm sorry:
"Then she broke down again. Dave came back to the car from the back I think and got in beside Nicky. She shrugged away from him. The rest is the same as I told you in the other statement." Now you'll notice "she shrugged away from him"; exactly what Nichol had said in her statement to come?

A
That's correct, yeah.
That's a matter of concern, isn't it, they both
adopt that?
A
Well I think, if you look at the way the
statements evolved, it may be an area of concern
and it may not. But, like $I$ say, we went into
that as far as we could, we focused on what the -our investigation was all about, and there was no evidence, either from those two witnesses, that they had been coerced into saying that.

Not --
That was our investigation.
Looking at it as you look at it there, does it not appear that on the $23 r d$ the police, however they got the kids to adopt, in general, the summary, ended up with statements that couldn't be read together?

A

Q

A
Well, you're assuming there. I think I answered the question as to Wilson's account of whether she was in the car or not in the car, he doesn't specifically say.

But now you have, now you have not only Wilson going further than the day before, he is saying
that Nichol told him that she saw David stab a girl. Which leaves aside the fact that, in the previous statement, he's telling her in Calgary and she's saying "I know", so in Calgary he's saying "by the way, you know, David did something in Saskatoon", and he is saying it to someone who saw it. It makes no sense but that's neither here nor there.

But, in any event, do you not see how this statement enables the police to go back to Nichol and get her to make that statement because, now, Wilson is out of the car?

You know, the way these statements evolved is not necessarily unusual, because $I$ have seen that before. And I'm not suggesting for a minute that it's the truth, but $I$ have seen it evolve where one witness is interviewed, then another witness is interviewed, then you go back to the witness and -- who provides you with a little bit more. You may put a statement to a previous witness that you now know something that another witness has told you. So, in some ways, to have a story evolve over a number of interviews is not unusual, it happens regularly, it happens very often in investigations. Witnesses and accuseds aren't
always forthright and don't always tell the truth when they are immediately spoken to, so to say that one story evolves or that the truth evolves over a series of questioning by the police and sometimes over a period of time, that's not unusual.

Okay. Yeah. But given that Nichol was giving the statement basically as we looked at it, would it -- and looking at Ron's, Wilson's statement, would it not be logical to assume that the investigator went to Ron and said "look, Nichol says, you know, she saw the murder and she ran out of the car and etcetera, etcetera, well you never said that, what's going on", and then Ron gives this statement to allow for that?

That, that could be exactly what happened. I've done that myself, where I've went to one witness and said "look, the other witness told me this", and the witness can either say "yes, that happened", or "no, that didn't happen".

But when the witness suddenly remembers all that shouldn't there be some, a red light going on, like "whoa, what is going on here with these people?"

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I don't know if $I$


#### Abstract

understood your question? Sorry?


COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Where does it say, in Wilson's supplementary statement that we're looking at now, that Nicky was out of the car?
"The car was still stuck, Nicky was waiting in the car almost hysterical."

MR. WOLCH: Oh no, no, I'm sorry, I misstated it. It gave the opportunity for Nicky to leave the car without him seeing it, he was gone, that is what $I$ meant to say. That is in his previous statement, she couldn't have left the car because he was there; in this one, with him gone, she could have left and come back, his first statement didn't allow for that possibility, in his first statement only he and David left the car.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes.
MR. WOLCH: In which case -- and -- but in this statement, with him gone, Nicky could have left and come back, he wouldn't know that. It doesn't disprove her statement, the first one does, this one doesn't.

BY MR. WOLCH:
Wouldn't it be important, really important, to
have notes or some record of what these kids were told before they made their statements?

A

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

A
.

Well, $I$ can only speak from my own experience, but certainly what you try to do is clarify those areas where there's contradictions. But I think
you to have bear in mind that rarely do, well, never do two witnesses say -- perceive things exactly the same, so you generally don't get a statement from witness one and witness two that you can lay over top of each other and they are exactly the same.

No.
Generally speaking, witnesses will differ on their interpretation of different things, but in a general sense usually the statements are very close in content and events.

Well, it's pretty major that Ron Wilson would leave out that Nicky had told him that she saw Dave drag a girl down the lane and stab her, that's a pretty major omission; correct?

Well I think I told you Mr. Wolch, this is probably the fourth or fifth time, that we did have difficulty with Mr. Wilson's statement and Nichol's statement and we tried our very best to get from them what really happened that day. Nichol didn't recall very much, she was a very difficult interview, and Mr. Wilson provided us with very little, so it was difficult for us to try and put that all together. But we didn't find, in our conclusions, we didn't find any
evidence of wrongdoing on the part of anyone. I don't know that $I$ can answer that any more completely than that.

Q

A
$Q$

A

Q

Okay.
The focus of our investigation was not on David's guilt or innocence and, therefore, we were looking at misconduct of the police. We saw nothing in the process here, the procedures by the police, that were misconduct. Are there questions that you can draw from comparing the statements, sure there are.

Okay. But if you have witnesses who give different recounts, and in this case you have not only their original stories, you have these stories which some might call recantations; is there any duty on the police to try to get them to dovetail?

Would you please explain that, what you mean by that?

Well they don't match, should the police just leave that, or should they explore from both parties what's going wrong, or should they try to come up with a consensus view?

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Do you mean the Saskatoon police or his investigators?

MR. WOLCH: Anybody, in a general sense?
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: No, but I think it's important to the witness to know whether your critique applies to the actions of the Saskatoon police at the time, or the other, the propriety of his investigation.

MR. WOLCH: Thank you, sir.
BY MR. WOLCH:
Let's talk generally for a moment. You have statements that don't dovetail?

A Would you explain what you mean by "dovetail", because I think $I$ told you before that when you look at statements of witnesses you generally expect that they -- the events will be described somewhat similarly, but sometimes one witness will say something that another one didn't, one witness will perceive something differently, one witness may see something that another witness didn't. So

I think, when you read statements of witnesses, you try and read them for their content, you question them, you make a determination through instinct or a gut feeling, or whatever, as to whether they are being truthful with you or withholding things, and then you compare those statements. And, generally speaking, they are
usually pretty consistent.
So --
There are things -- there are differences in them. So might you agree --

So if that's what you mean by "dovetail", that you could lay one over top of the other, not necessarily; but if by "dovetailing" do they say basically the same thing, yes, I think you do question witnesses to try and determine what they saw and as to whether or not they saw things similarly, bearing in mind the fact that witnesses often interpret things just a wee bit differently and see things differently.

Okay. Might you agree with me that, if you are going to perhaps guide a witness by telling them what somebody else said and see what their reaction is, it is best to do that after you've got their statement?

I don't know why you'd do that before, because your first opportunity is to allow them to tell you what they told you, so yes.

Q
A
I see.
I wouldn't consider it common practice to walk in and say "this is what this witness told me, now what are you gonna say", you generally sit down
with your witnesses and interview them and find out what they have to offer you in a pure version or a forthright manner.

Okay. And if $I$ might refer, and $I$ probably haven't got the document number particularly right, but the actual page number is 033876 .

Okay. For the record, it's document 033872 , and perhaps, if we could go back to 72 for a second. I'm just going back there so you can perhaps familiarize yourself with the document. If you can perhaps just turn the page so you can get more familiar, okay, $I$ think it has to go the other way. Maybe not. No, that's right, go further. That's --

It's paragraph --

I didn't get a chance to read that.
It's paragraph 6, is the one $I$ want to draw your attention to, but --

But $I$ didn't get a chance to read the page before that.

Go ahead, I don't want to take it out of context, go ahead.
(Witness reading) Okay.
Okay. If $I$ can pause there just for a second, tell me when you've finished reading it, go ahead.
I'll stop in paragraph 5.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Whose note is this; do you know?

A
bloodstained nurse's uniform?

What about the propriety of showing her a bloodstained nurse's uniform?
BY MR. WOLCH:
Gagne? If we can go back to paragraph 5 -- or what paragraph are you up to, sorry?

I think paragraph 5 was where you wanted to stop.
Have you read that far?
I have, yes.
Now, just briefly, now you know Nichol John was about 16 years of age?

Yes.
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A

Q

A

Well, you know, that's not a technique that's commonly used, but $I$ know it is used at times, to show someone a photograph of a crime scene or something like that in an attempt to try and get them to tell you something. It's not a common technique but $I$ know it's, it is used from time to time.

What about the circumstances here where we know she -- well, there is no reason to believe that Nichol John had ever seen the uniform in any way, shape, or form, she's 16 years of age, what about the idea of showing her bloodstained clothing, autopsy pictures, things like that; any comment? Well it may be something that $I$ wouldn't do but, you know, or $I$ may do depending on the circumstances. But, obviously, he was trying to get further information from her and he thought, as he was doing his interview of her, that that may help him get further information.

On the other hand, it may just scare her silly? Exactly, yes.

Did she remember being shown that?
I -- I don't recall if she remembered a lot about that interview so, I mean, I'd have to look at the report to be certain, Mr. Wolch, but I don't
recall that she had any recollection, in our interview, of that having happened.

Okay. Now paragraph 6 is:
"After this, Roberts called
for Ed Karst and he discussed both John's \& Wilson's statements in their presence in order to eliminate the possibility of any discrepancy when they supplied written statement to Karst."

Any comment on that?
That's, that's not uncommon for someone to take an interview of somebody and then, when you're passing them over to someone else, to say "okay, just so that $I$ 've got this right now, this is what we said", and talk about it. That also provides both Wilson and John an opportunity to say "well no, we didn't say that, $I$ didn't say that, we didn't discuss that". So, generally speaking, it's an opportunity for the investigator or the interviewer, who's turning someone else over to another interviewer, to say "these are the things that we talked about during our interview".

Well, no, but the idea of having both John and Wilson present to hear what the other has said?

Well when he said "in their presence", I'm not
sure if that means they were together, or
"their presence" being first one and then the other. I don't know from that, we would have to have some clarification on that. But the way $I$ read that, it could be that it was discussed either together, or independently.

In order to eliminate the possibility of any discrepancy when they supplied written statements, like --

You --
-- $I$ thought you said that wasn't a good thing?
I don't think -- I don't recall saying that wasn't a good thing.

I thought, a few minutes ago, you said it's not a good thing to do before the written statement. Maybe after, you can, after they have given you their statement you might go and say "here's discrepancies". Here they haven't given written statements and we're trying to avoid discrepancies; is that --

Well I think that perhaps $I$ wasn't aware of what you were getting at. Obviously, he has sat down with them and conducted a full, or a statement with them and told them everything he knows.

Whether he condensed that to writing or simply
took that down orally, $I$ wasn't commenting on, I was commenting on where you walk in cold and you have never talked to somebody and you say to them "lookit, witness X told me this" and you put that to them. Here, it's obvious that he had discussed fully with both of them, and then he was now saying "okay, I've conducted a full interview with both of these people", in their presence he said to Detective Karst "this is what they told me", and he told them that in their presence to ensure that he was getting it right --

Well --
-- and so that they understood what he was telling Detective Karst so that the next day, or later when Mr. Karst went off to interview them, he knew what they had told Roberts in the room and they knew that he knew that. So $I$ don't see anything wrong with that.

> But that's totally different
than when you said, before, putting a statement -putting a written -- putting a witness' statement to someone before the written statement. I mean, that's a misleading question, in that these people, they'd been interviewed extensively and had a chance to provide their full statement
before he put this to the next interviewer.
Okay, well, but there is no written statement at this point in time?

Well, they have a full statement from them, whether it's an oral statement or a written statement doesn't make a lot of difference, they have -- he has the full circumstances.

But not recorded anywhere?
Not recorded anywhere, that's right.
Okay. And now he is saying to Karst, in the presence $I$ take it of either one or both, "here's what they are saying, we don't want discrepancies in the written statement"?

Exactly. So what he is saying is -- how I take this, you may look at it differently, but how I take this is he is saying "this witness and I sat down and discussed this case and here's what this witness told me", he did it in the presence of the witness so that the witness knew what he was telling Detective Karst. That is an opportunity for a number of things, it's an opportunity for the witness to say "no, that's not what $I$ told you", or it's also the opportunity for the witness to know that what they said in there is now known to the second interviewer.

And it may be that it's an opportunity for the witness to know what the other witness said? If it -- if it was discussed with both of them together that's certainly possible, yup.

And that could account for both of them talking about having a conversation in Calgary, and things like that, that they were put together and "he says this", so the next day Wilson can say what he wants, add on?

I don't have any evidence of that happening though.

Well, you have it right here in the paragraph? Well no, no, that's not evidence of that having happened.

Just a few more areas $I$ want to deal with. You mentioned that David Milgaard attended on you a couple times but didn't contribute very much?

A
You had been told he wasn't in very good shape? Yes, yeah, you -- "in fact $I$ fear", as closely as I can recall to your exact words was, "you likely wouldn't get anything out of him", I think that's what you told me.

Okay. Knowing he was in jail for all those years for a crime he didn't commit and went through all
kinds of horrible things, that's not surprising to you, is it?

Well, $I$ guess it is and it isn't. I mean $I$ can certainly understand where perhaps David had some mistrust of the police or mistrust of persons in authority, but $I$ guess $I$ also assumed that he may have been prepared, to the extent that he understood that this investigation was in his best interests and that perhaps it would have been helpful if he could come in and cooperate, so I kind of looked at it two ways, Mr. Wolch. Okay. Well as far as his accounting of what occurred, you had access to the notebook that he may or may not have given to Mr. Tallis, but at least it was written in 1969 ?

No, I wasn't. I wasn't even aware of that.
Okay. Let me ask you this: At the end of your investigation $I$ think you said you were of the opinion that David likely did it; is that fair? I don't want to put words in your mouth.

Well there was nothing in our investigation that would cause me to change and to think that he hadn't done it, I mean, the evidence that we got was the same as had been out there before.

Okay. But he --
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Okay. I wasn't suggesting you were thinking that. But let me ask you this, if you can do it fairly quickly, and if you can't you can't: But can you
-- you know. Well, I need to say that, because I don't want it -- I don't want someone to think that $I$ am doubting Mr. Milgaard's innocence, you know, as was reported in the paper.

A
$Q$


A
Q

A

Q
A
Q
tell me, back in 1993, what you thought happened that made -- with David being responsible? What did you think happened?

You know, Mr. Wolch, we ran through a number --
now when you say "happened" you -- happened January 31st, 1969, in the morning?

Yeah, of course, where did it happen, how did it happen?

We went through a number of scenarios in our discussions, you know, both as investigators and with our legal support, Mr. Fraser and Mr.

McCrank, we discussed a number of scenarios, and, you know, $I$-- we don't know what happened.

Well --
You know --
Well it's not what you know now, it's what you knew then, what you thought then?

Exactly, yeah, we didn't know what happened. Sorry, --

Okay.
-- that was a bad choice of words on my part.
You ended up thinking he was responsible, so I'm asking you, how did it happen?

Well we based, I guess when I am -- sort of sit back and say that the evidence was that he was
responsible, you base that on what you know. He went to trial, he was convicted at trial, it went to appeal, it went to the Supreme Court, I mean we had nothing to change any of that, so it was our belief that he was likely responsible.

No, but -- okay, the end of the trial system he wasn't convicted, so $I$ don't know why you're placing weight on that. But, factually, Gail Miller left her house; what did you think happened that made Milgaard guilty?

Well, like I say, we had a number of scenarios. We had scenarios where there was two perpetrators, you know, we discussed a number of scenarios. Well --

One of the most difficult things with this case all along has been to try and reconstruct exactly what happened that morning at the crime scene. There's three people who could have helped us who were very little help to us; one was David himself, another one was Nichol John, and Ron Wilson, and --

Q Well --

A -- they were unable to give us any good account of their activities that morning.

Okay, well, let's pause for a moment. David can't
help you, he says nothing happened, he says he wasn't there; how can that help you?

But he did say a number of things to Mr. Tallis that, certainly, were -- could be considered incriminating, that certainly would be, I guess if you were looking at this as objectively as possible, that would make you be suspicious. Suspicious? Okay. But what is a scenario? You know what, --

Could you, as an investigator, place one in your brain?

No. No. But then $I$ remind you, our job was not to investigate the guilt or innocence of David Milgaard.

I understand that, but as a human being, you are there, you are believing or thinking that he committed the crime. There must be a scenario that supports it, something.

I'm sorry, like $I$ say, we discussed a number of different scenarios and we never did settle on one scenario being the theory. We know now that he didn't do it, we know that Mr. Fisher did, but we don't even know what his actions were that morning because he's never confessed.

Okay, but you can certainly create Fisher's

A

A
scenario.
You may be able to. I'm not. I haven't been told what it was.

How about this, Gail Miller leaves the house, she walks up O, which is where she walked normally to get the bus, Fisher hides in the alley, drags here in the alley, rapes and kills her. How difficult is that?

Well, that's not what you told me before, Mr. Wolch, you told me he had a car, he dragged her into the car.

I haven't gone that far. Dragged her into the car, drove the car back to Pambruns' and walked down the railway track, attacked Miss (V4)---, went home, yeah.

So it's just as difficult for you as it was for us.

Well, $I$ have no difficulty.
We didn't settle on a theory.
No, no, I've never had a difficulty with that theory. I'm asking you what your theory is?

I told you, we never settled on a theory, that wasn't our investigation.

Okay. All I'm trying to get at is why you think, or you thought then that David was guilty when you
haven't even got a theory as to how it happened. I don't know how it happened. Knowing Larry Fisher is guilty, I still don't know what happened at that crime scene that morning.

But you can as an investigator put together a theory. I mean, you know his mode of attack, hiding in alleys and grabbing women with knives, women who come off busses, women whom he knows are in the nursing business, you know it. It's not hard to put it together.

Well, I'm certainly aware of the similar fact evidence and the rapes where we have victims who said what happened. In this particular case the victim was unable to tell us what happened.

But --
And I don't have a theory as to how the crime was committed and we didn't develop a theory as to how it was possible for Mr. Milgaard to do it, otherwise that would have probably been in our report.

No, I understand that. I'm just curious as to why you would have an opinion that somebody did a crime when you have no theory to base it on. Well, the focus of our investigation was not David Milgaard's guilt or innocence and $I$ think we said

A
in the report at the end what our conclusions were. We can agree to differ on that if you don't like those conclusions $I$ guess, but those were our conclusions.

Well, you also, as $I$ understand it, came to certain conclusions about Ms. (V4)---. I don't want to put words in your mouth. Tell me, what did you conclude about her attack?

I believe I said I felt her identification was perhaps unreliable and wasn't convinced in my own mind that it was Larry Fisher who attacked her.

Okay. But she did identify her attacker as I think between five foot two and five foot four and stocky, so the physical description isn't that far off.

No, it's not.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: When was that, in
1969 or --
MR. WOLCH: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes, okay.
BY MR. WOLCH:
But leaving aside her positive ID or whatever it is, but what else caused you to doubt that it was Larry Fisher?

I think that's the principal reason.

Q Just her identification?

A
$Q$

A
Q

A

Isn't that enough?
Well, many people are convicted without the victim ever identifying. Other evidence can support it; can it not?

What other evidence was there?
Well, let's look at the circumstances. You are aware that where she was attacked was on the path between Pambruns' and the Cadrain house?

You know, Mr. Wolch, we examined that and we tried to put together as to whether that theory could occur and $I$ think that if you believe that Fisher attacked (V4)---, it almost provides him with an alibi, that it would be very difficult for him to be in that location. Notwithstanding that, of course, we didn't know about Fisher when we did our investigation, so, you know --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: The witness testified at length about this in his direct examination. Maybe you weren't here.

MR. WOLCH: No, I was here.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Were you? Okay. MR. WOLCH: I simply want to challenge him on it.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes. Well, that
was another reason, in addition to the
identification being weak in his view, he thought that if Fisher in fact had attacked (V4)---, he didn't, he couldn't have attacked Miller, that was what --

BY MR. WOLCH:
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A
-- for some accuracy. I don't recall exactly how we wrote it up, but we can certainly refer to that piece of the report. If you want to take me there, $I$ would be glad to go there with you.

Q

A

I'm not going to take you through it, but I'm always concerned about the scenario where David is involved in the crime gets him to the motel just after seven, and the motel is many times a further distance than where (V4)--- was hurt, or attacked or whatever.

Well, I think that's your evidence, that it gets him there shortly after seven. I think there was some doubt on the time that we got, so -COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: We have evidence from the motel attendant that it was sometime between seven and 7:30 I think.

BY MR. WOLCH:
We started off at seven, shortly after, so whatever it is, no one is saying that David couldn't get halfway across town, but yet here we have Fisher having to get a matter of yards, 800 or whatever it is, but anyway.

Now, I touched on it earlier, but $I$ want to ask it again, the DNA was discussed many times between yourself and McCrank and Fraser about whether it should be tried again or not, and my question, I'm a little unclear as to why it was left in limbo.

Umm, as I recall, when we initially started our
investigation, $I$ think we were all, including Mr. Fraser and Mr. McCrank, of the view that we would likely have a DNA result before we completed our investigation. As we got very close to the end, $I$ think we were informed that it was unlikely that they would be able to conduct that test on that very small amount of substance and therefore a decision was made that we would complete our investigation without the benefit of that analysis being completed and $I$ believe that was my advice, but we wouldn't need to refer back $I$ think to some of the documents for me to be accurate with time frames and to put this in perspective.

Now, at the outset when you and I met with others, it was understood you would come back and speak to us?

A
$Q$
Yes. Yeah, I think we had that understanding. Where we could correct or advise or do whatever to give you more information?

Well, I'm not certain, Mr. Wolch, if that was my understanding. My understanding is that we would provide you with the results and I think that's the undertaking $I$ gave to you.

Well, that, with respect, doesn't make sense, because the results are going to come out anyway.

Well, yeah, but you would know them before someone else.

For what purpose?
Just to inform you because you were the complainant and that's very often the way that police work is done, is you inform the complainant of the findings once your investigation is complete.

Well, leaving aside that issue, does it not make sense that you would come back and say look, I'm finding this, I'm finding that, do you have any comments, is there something I'm missing?

Well, $I$ think if you recall, we did come to you a number of times during the investigation for clarification and further information.

Oh, yeah, but at the end of the investigation is there something we missed, David's notebook, look at the rest of the clothes for DNA, whatever.

I can only tell you that my, what $I$ intended to do was to come and provide you with a report of the findings.

Okay, but you were overruled anyway, so it didn't really matter.

Correct.
With the benefit of hindsight now, do you think it
might have been a good idea to come back and say look, here's what we've been told, here's what we are being told, is there anything further we may have missed? What harm could be done by that? Well, we did do that throughout the investigation, we came to you with questions, various questions and asked you for your perspective on things. Well, on certain points, but on things you may have found or looked at, we had no way of knowing. How could we know what you were doing?

Like I told you, it was my intention to come to you at the end of the investigation and provide you with the results.

Okay. Might you agree with me that while your report and your findings made in the early '90s are important, they may very well have to be looked at in a different light in view of the fact that we now know that David Milgaard is innocent and Larry Fisher is guilty?

You are going to have to be a wee bit more specific on that. Does it change the actions of people that happened in 1969 or 1970? Absolutely not. Does it change our final line? Absolutely. No, but now you can say with certainty that a witness was lying or not telling the truth when

A
back then you didn't know.
I don't think $I$ can say that with certainty. I think I've told you all along that we had a great deal of difficulty interviewing witnesses because of their inability to recall and things like that. That doesn't necessarily mean they were lying, it just means that they perhaps are unable to tell us what happened.

Well, would you agree with me, for example, there has to be some explanation as to how Nichol John and Ron Wilson made the statements they did when we now know that those statements simply aren't true on the essential points?

What do you mean by the essential points now? Well, seeing a murder, confessing to a murder. Because there was a lot in their statements that was true and was verified through other means, but as far as some of the points, that's right, they weren't true.

I'm talking about the crucial points, the essential points, seeing a murder, confessing to a murder, those are the key points. Do you want to go through those statements and we can certainly look at what they said that was true and has been corroborated elsewhere and then we
can I guess assume that the other parts aren't true, but to ask me to essentially agree with you that those statements weren't true, $I$ can't do that. I would be pleased to go through them with you if you want.

Well, I'll give you a chance, give me your best shot, what's the biggest corroborating fact, the one that came out that was so important?

Well, I think there were a number of things.
Like what?
The compact being stuck --
Pause, one at a time. The compact?
The compact.
If Gail Miller wasn't missing a compact, how does that help?

No, I think that's not the suggestion. The suggestion was from you that initially that that was made up, that that was planted by the police, that the police somehow planted that piece of evidence in their minds.

Okay, but how does that make their statements -Well, I think we're at different purposes here. You are trying to get me to tell you why that is evidence of David Milgaard's innocence. What I'm trying to suggest to you is that we looked at it
from the perspective of wrongdoing, and whether or not there is evidence that there was coercion or the police made them say certain things, a number of things that they said have been corroborated by other means. The compact is one of them.

Okay. Another one?
David having a knife.
That's been corroborated?
He told his defence counsel that he had a knife. He said he may have, didn't know.

It seems to me --
He bought a knife later.
It seems to me he was a little more certain than that, but --

But in any event, let's get down to it, seeing a murder, confessing to a murder, talking about a murder, that's all made up; isn't it?

Well, I think we can assume it didn't happen.
So why did they say it?
I don't know.
You have no idea?
They appeared at this inquiry. What did they say?
It's irrelevant.
They were unable to tell us.
No, using your head, what is your belief as to
what happened?
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A
$Q$

Well, I don't know, Mr. Wolch, because, you see, in our investigation we explored that with them, we tried to find out whether they were coerced, whether there was thoughts put in their mind and they didn't confirm that, so $I$ don't know. Okay. But they bought into the police theory? No, I don't agree with that either. MR. WOLCH: I have no further questions. BY MR. HODSON:

I am back. I'll just finish up, Mr. Commissioner, where $I$ intended to go on some Police Commission matters.

Mr. Sawatsky, can you tell us, you are currently the executive director of the Saskatchewan Police Commission; is that correct? That's correct.

And how long have you held that position? Since 1998.

And can you tell us just briefly what the police, Saskatchewan Police Commission, what its mandate is?

Yeah, its mandate is the promotion of effective and adequate policing in the province.

And would that involve putting in place and
administering standards with respect to hiring, training police officers in the province?

Yes, and there are regulations under the Police Act that deal with training, recruiting, discipline, etcetera. There's I think five regulations. Six actually.

And can you tell us your roles and responsibilities then as executive director? Yes, my role is to administer to the Commission, to set up meetings, to prepare correspondence for the signature of the chairperson, in some cases I also appoint -- sorry, the minister appoints hearing officers. I confirm hearing officers to hear discipline matters, $I$ set up meetings with the Commission, tele-conferences, and then of course prepare any related correspondence that comes from those meetings. I also have a whole number of other tasks that $I$ perform within the department as well, this isn't my sole function. And can you tell us the role the Police Commission would have as far as overseeing the standards, training, practices and techniques, for example, of the Saskatoon City Police currently?

Currently, yes, the Saskatoon City Police, like all municipal police services, are required by law
to conform to the regulations and the Police Act and the Commission has a role in establishing a policy and procedures manual in auditing police services and in directing the Saskatchewan Police College which trains all municipal police services, both for basic training and for in-service or progressive training throughout their careers.

And so are you telling us that the legal regime in place currently for standards, training, practices of the Saskatoon City Police and its members would be under the purview of the Saskatchewan Police Commission and its regulations?

That's correct.
And do you have a fairly good knowledge, sir, of what is in place currently as far as -- and let's focus on training standards, practices, techniques, for police officers?

I supervise the director of the college, I'm not intimate with what's being provided at the college, but certainly $I$ can say that it's similar to other police training academies nationally and the RCMP as well.

And can you tell us to what extent if any does the Police Commission have any dealings with the RCMP
who may be providing police services to municipalities in the province?

The Commission doesn't have any oversight role over the RCMP.

So it would relate to Saskatchewan municipal police forces; correct?

That's correct.
And I think in all of the major cities in Saskatchewan, each municipality has their own police service reporting to a Board of Police Commissioners?

That's correct. There's six major police services in the province and then a number of smaller ones. There are 13 municipal police services all together in the province.

And one of the -- we've heard a fair bit of evidence in this inquiry about what happened back in 1969, 1970 and have heard from a number of police officers and other witnesses and retired police officers about practices and standards in place at the time. Would you agree with the general proposition that in looking at policing in Saskatchewan today, it's different in many respects from how policing was conducted in 1969 ? Yes, I would agree with that.

And would you again generally, would you characterize that change as being significant? I would think it's significant. I think major investigations are handled much differently now. In fact, there's a policy that the Commission has that all major investigations are supposed to be conducted with the use of major case management. Certainly interviewing techniques, interrogation techniques have advanced significantly since, you know, 1969, so I think there has been a number of changes that have occurred, both in the way major crimes are handled and in the way the police do investigations since 1969 .

Q And again let's look at a couple of areas, the techniques that police officers employ in investigations, again contrasting 1969 to today, would there be significant changes in those areas?

A I think probably the most significant change would be in the area of how the cases are handled now, and like $I$ say, they all use major case management now which is very similar to the manner in which we conducted our investigation here under project Flicker where you assign an investigator to be responsible for the file, you assign a case manager, you assign an exhibit person, and then
the investigators are all tasked on various issues and then those issues are all reported back to the major coordinating centre where all the material is handled, so you never really have one or two investigators doing it all, rather you have a team of investigators investigating various issues that are then brought back and coordinated through the file manager.

And we've heard mention from a couple of police officers and retired police officers that back in 1969 one area where matters might have been improved upon would be by having a reader or a coordinator, somebody to read everything and be all knowing with respect to what's happening. Would that be similar to what is the, a leader in the case management?

That's correct, that would be the file coordinator or the senior case manager would be responsible for that.

I'm sorry, senior case manager. Would that person be a person who then knows everything, at least have an opportunity to read everything that's done by everybody and coordinate who does what?

A That's correct.

And so would one of the purposes be to ensure that
the right hand knows what the left hand is doing; is that a fair way to put it?

Yes, that would be that person and possibly someone else working with that person, would know, have total knowledge of the file and what's going on with the file.

And it's my understanding that the major case management system, if $I$ can call it that, originated with the $F B I$ in the United States; is that correct, or that has that as its origination? That's very likely, yes.

And that it has evolved over the years and is in place in all provinces in Canada?

I believe it is, all police services, the RCMP and all major municipal or accredited police services use the Canadian Police College and the major case management course is taught at the Canadian Police College, it started about 1990, 1991, somewhere in there. Although major case management was in use by a number of police services prior to that, it actually became an item on the curriculum at the Canadian Police College in the 1990s I believe. I know $I$ was asked to critique that course at one time and if my recall is correct, it was around 1989 or so that $I$ critiqued it, so basically I
think it's safe to say that, you know, most police services are using that. And I think the other thing that $I$ need to add is that it's something that's continually improved upon. In other words, as new techniques advance or as lessons are learned with regards to the management of the file, those are continually moved into the curriculum and adapted into the curriculum. You talked about the Canadian Police College. Can you tell us a little bit about what they are and what role they would play in educating police officers, not only in saskatoon, but in Saskatchewan?

Yeah, the Canadian Police College is a national police service which is, comes under the RCMP, but it's funded for all police agencies in Canada, and the most fairly advanced courses or long-term or long-time courses where it's three weeks, a month, six weeks in duration, most of those courses are taught at the Canadian Police College. Major case management is one of the cases that's thought at the, or one of the courses that's taught at the Canadian Police College. All accredited police agencies in Canada have access to that and in Saskatchewan there's a coordinator actually
working out of my office that actually assigns people to the courses at the Canadian Police College. That just very recently changed where it's now an internet-based access to enrolment at the college. All police services in Saskatchewan have the opportunity to go to the Canadian Police College, so, for example, if Saskatoon police, to use Saskatoon, decided they wanted to train another investigator or two investigators in major case management, they would make application to have those investigators put on a waiting list and through a rotational system they would eventually get a spot at the Canadian Police College and would be provided with that training.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I missed what you tole me the role of the RCMP is in that? The RCMP administer or are sort of in proctorship over the college, but the college is actually part of the National Police Service which is intended to fund all policing in Canada, not just the RCMP, so even though the college comes under the RCMP's umbrella for funding and those sorts of things, it's for all police services, not just the RCMP. BY MR. HODSON:
$Q$ And so for a homicide investigation conducted by
the Saskatoon City Police Service today, are you telling us that that investigation would be undertaken using the major case management technique taught at the Canadian Police College? I'm certain it would be, yes, and as I indicated, that's a requirement of the policy and procedures manual, but I'm certain that that's how it would be handled today.

And so we'll get to that. So in Saskatchewan right now, the Saskatoon City Police Service is required by regulation of the Police Commission to utilize the major case management technique in homicide investigations?

That's correct.
What about homicide investigators, can you tell us, are there any requirements for homicide investigators to have any classes or accreditation in major case management before they undertake homicide investigations?

Yes, and there's also, and I would have to look at the policy and procedures manual to just be certain of the terminology, but there's also a requirement that they be trained in investigations prior to that, so some of the training could include interviewing techniques, investigation
techniques, those sorts of things to prepare them for being a major crimes investigator.

And --
And generally speaking, major crime investigators are senior, experienced investigators who have a history of, you know, doing investigations. And is it your evidence, sir, then, that the system in place for investigating homicides in Canada is fairly consistent with major urban police forces; in other words, utilizing the major case management technique?

A

Q
Yes, I think that's -- it's a pretty common practice.

Now, let's -- you talked about training investigators. How are homicide investigators, what training do they receive on how to do a homicide investigation?

A
There's a number of cases where senior
investigators are put on courses where you go from very basic training where you are sort of taught the fundamentals of interviewing and investigating, to a junior constables course where it becomes a little bit more specific, to a senior constables course where of course it focuses much more on major crimes, major crime investigation,
and then of course a number of the police forces have the option to send their officers to outside agencies for training as well; in other words, they are not just restricted to using the Saskatchewan Police College or the Canadian Police College, they may send their investigators somewhere else to acquire that expertise if they wish to do that.

You mentioned the Saskatchewan Police College. Can you tell us a bit about what it does and where it fits in as far as training, educating police officers in this province?

The Saskatchewan Police College provides all recruit, or basic training for municipal police officers, and then provides training on a continuum throughout their career, and although the college $I$ think provides about 35 in-service training courses, there are a number that the Commission has mandated through regulation that all police officers must take. What comes to mind is a race relations course or a cultural awareness course, investigators courses, those sorts of things, those are mandated by the Commission that all municipal police officers must take. Just if we could go back to, we started down this
path talking about what systems were now in place as far as, that are different now than back in 1969. I want to touch on another one and ask for your comment about the role of forensics in
investigation, police investigations today compared to 1969, and specifically sexual assaults and murders.

Well, I think probably one very important, certainly the advent of DNA has been helpful, but I think crime scene examiners, the identification people are trained, you know, to examine exhibits and crime scenes perhaps better. I mean, it's an evolving thing, they continue to get better. I think the other noteworthy thing and perhaps big event in this province, at least in the last couple of years, has been that we've hired a forensic pathologist and our intention is that there will be another one hired this year as well, or in '06/'07, fiscal year '06/'07.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Who has hired him?
A
A forensic pathologist.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah, who has
hired the pathologist, the Government of
Saskatchewan or the college or who?
Yes, the Government of Saskatchewan, sir. The
coroner's service is something that's run actually out of my office, it's one of the programs that is in my area of responsibility, so we hired Dr. Latham who is presently in Saskatoon last year. BY MR. HODSON:

And can you tell us, what role would the forensic pathologist add to the tools available to the police in investigating sexual assaults and murders?

Well certainly, you know, forensic pathology is a discipline unto itself where the examination -- I think a normal pathologist, when they examine a body, are looking for cause of death; I think when a forensic pathologist examines a body they are looking for, you know, criminal means for gathering evidence and things, so $I$ think their approach is somewhat different than a normal clinical pathologist would do. And, certainly, the expertise is crucial when it comes to helping the police reconstruct what happened to the victim. Police also have a number of other techniques available that have been refined over the last few years, such as blood, blood pattern analysis, where they are able to analyse patterns of blood, drippings of blood, to sort of help
determine how the blows were -- how the victim was killed, how the blows were landed, etcetera. So I think, you know, crime scene analysis has become much more advanced than it was many, many years ago.

I think the other big change is we have the Violent Criminal Analysis Unit now which assists investigators by providing reconstructing the crime scene as best they can, and also doing the V.I.C.L.A.S. system, which of course, as we've heard evidence about, tracks patterns of offending and victimization.

Okay. Just on that last point, then, when we're talking about differences that exist today compared to what was available in 1969 I think, number one, you've told us that police techniques have advanced and changed, you talked about major case management; secondly, we talked about the area of forensics; third, what about the role of technology, and in particular the ability of computers to assist the police in investigating, cross-referencing, storing, accessing, etcetera, can you comment on how that advance has assisted or changed the way the police investigate matters? Certainly. It, now with the advent of computers,
the storage and retrieval is much better. The, you know, the police are capable of indexing things where they can retrieve data. I'll give you an example.

If you were looking for a maroon-handled knife, for example, you could search that particular piece and it would go right throughout your database and it would tell you any instances where that particular object was mentioned, so information storage and retrieval is much better.

Certainly what could be improved upon, $I$ think, is the ability for some police to be able to access what other police have. We know that information-sharing, at least in this province, is very good, the municipal police share with one another, they share with the RCMP, and vice versa, the sharing is very good. But in some ways, sometimes what could assist them would be some sort of a common platform for the sharing of information where, for an example, an investigator in Regina who is following up on a request by Saskatoon may be able to actually access those portions of the file that he or she needs to do their investigation. There could be
improvements made there. But I think technology has made significant advancements in the way police can store and retrieve information.

I think another big thing that
has made big changes is the fact that statements now, particularly in serious crimes, are generally either audio recorded, and in many, many cases video recorded, so what it does is it gives you the opportunity to provide to the courts the most accurate account of what the witness said or an accused person said.

I see it's 4:30, Mr. Commissioner, probably an appropriate spot to break.

I will have a few more areas
to cover with Mr. Sawatsky tomorrow, but I'm wondering if counsel -- and we can do it either now or when we break -- just to give me some indication of who will be examining Mr. Sawatsky and then how long? I'm thinking for our next witness.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Just before we do that, and $I$ take it you've left the subject, so I don't want to forget to ask him.
You said there's room for
improvement in the sharing of information between
forces, and we had an example here where the RCMP's continuation reports -- the RCMP being an assisting force to the Saskatoon city -- where the RCMP's internal continuation reports went to the Attorney, the Department of the Attorney General, who was the other contractual side of the policing arrangement in Saskatchewan, but they didn't go down, or in the other direction, let us say laterally to the Saskatoon City Police so that they formed part of the records of the Saskatoon City Police. Now I'm, I'm curious to know whether that system of demarkation still exists; does an assisting police force give all of its findings and records to the force being assisted, or does it still regard those as its own property and keeps them?

A
I think, My Lord, in major case management now, if there were -- if another police service were assisting, as happened there, the RCMP assisting Saskatoon, there is a very good, in fact $I$ think an almost 100 percent likelihood that if they generated the report as a result of that, that would go back into the major case system and would be fed up.
guess I looked at that a number of times and I thought to myself "it really doesn't add anything to the investigation" -- I'm referring to this Miller murder now --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: We've heard evidence from the Saskatoon police officers that they knew all this anyway. Exactly.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: But, irrespective of that factual finding, you can easily imagine cases where that wouldn't be the case, and if the RCMP, in a case like this, investigator found out something and kept it to himself, or to members of his own force, how could that help the person he was supposed to be helping, namely the Saskatoon police force?

Exactly. And I'm confident that, now, that if the RCMP were following up on a lead provided by Saskatoon police, for example, once they had completed that it would be fed in the major case management system and would become part of their file so that down the road, if the RCMP destroyed their file because of time requirement, because it's an assisting file and it only needs to be kept for a specified period of one or two years or
something, if that file were destroyed at least the copies of the investigation would still be present on the major case file and would be retained as long as they are required under the regulations.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Now, you're confident that this would happen, but would it necessarily happen, is there any regulation to oblige collaborating police forces to share information as a matter of record?

A

A in your view?

Yes, it may be helpful, it certainly may be something you want to comment on.

MR. HODSON: I will go through, Mr. Sawatsky, I will go through that part of the manual with you tomorrow and --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh, I was wrong, sorry.

MR. HODSON: No, no, there are a few areas there to cover, but there are some -- I will go
through the regulations that do exist as well as the manual and $I$ think that, as Mr. Sawatsky has pointed out, there is a general comment there and I do propose to put to him some specific questions not only of the RCMP but, for example, the Regina City Police and their contact with Mr. Cadrain.

BY MR. HODSON:
If -- is that something that currently, with the current system -- again, $I$ guess it may be a bit of uncertainty as to what they did in Regina -but is that something that, under the current system, a record of that would end up with the Saskatoon police?

A
Yes, I think under the current system that would have been sent right up here to Saskatoon and it would have been put right into the file and of course, you know, then it's there for as long as the file is in existence.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay. Now that will be fine, now ask your question.

MR. HODSON: Who intends to examine
Mr. Sawatsky. Two? And any estimate of --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Saskatchewan is ambivalent?
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