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## Transcript of Proceedings

(Reconvened at 9:03 a.m.)
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Good morning.
ALL COUNSEL: Good morning.

## MURRAY BROWN, continued:

## BY MR. HODSON:

Good morning, Mr. Brown. If we could call up 234332 and go to page -- go to page 375 , please. We'll just pick up where we were yesterday, we were talking about Saskatchewan Justice's position to the Supreme Court on the Fisher rapes, and we had walked through -- I think you said there was a couple of distinctions. One, you were looking at the failure to disclose the information that was known at the time of trial, and $I$ think you've told us that basically analytically, that you had to look at it two different ways; first, what was the information known by the police and the Crown at the time Mr. Milgaard went to trial about these attacks, and $I$ think you told us that there were three unsolved attacks for which Mr. Fisher later pled guilty, there was the (V9)---- attack that was unsolved and the (V4)--- attack that was unsolved, and we talked a bit about what, how that might have affected the trial at the time, and I
think we went through that, and secondly, I think you told us that after the trial, when more information became known about Larry Fisher, sort of a different analysis was in order. Is that a fair summary of where we were yesterday? Yes, that's correct.

And then if we can just go to page 377 , and this is dealing with the first point about $I$ think the question of whether or not there was a failure or a breach in not disclosing information with respect to the unknown attacks, or the attacks with the unknown perpetrator, and then you are talking here about the similarities and differences between, $I$ think we're focusing here on the three rapes, the (V1)-, (V2)----- rapes and the (V3)------, and you say:
"While there are some similarities there are also some very major differences. The two rapes and the attempted rape occurred at night and not in the early morning."

And let me just pause there. Can you tell us, what was the significance of that in your view, that the three, the (V1)-, (V2)----- and (V3)------ were at night whereas the Miller
murder was in the morning?
A
Well, if you are trying to come up with a signature for the accused, or the person who has committed these crimes, then you look at all of the similarities, all of the dissimilarities. The fact that the person may be roaming around at night as opposed to the morning is a significant difference in circumstances.

And so then in comparing the three, (V1)- -- I think we're talking (V1)-, (V2)-----, (V3)------, comparing those three with the Miller murder in your view, the time of day of the attack was significant, or the difference $I$ guess?

It was one of the elements you look at in
determining whether you've got similar fact pattern.

And then you go on to say:
"The three sexual assaults were rape attacks and did not involve robbery or serious physical injury to the victims. Gail Miller was robbed, raped and slashed and stabbed to death."

And can you elaborate on the significance of that distinction?

A
Well, the degree of violence in the Miller attack
is, in my view, a very significant difference. In my experience that kind of violence is a signature of some people who commit rape and not of others. And so $I$ take it the process of trying to look at similarities, the objective there is to say based on what happened in these other offences, is there something with these offences that strongly signals the person killed Gail Miller; in other words, looking for something in those -- more than a propensity $I$ think was your language?

That's right.
With the knowledge that we now know that Larry Fisher did commit both those assaults and the murder and rape, can you comment on the, not the value, but the, $I$ guess the inherent, maybe the inherent subjectivity of similar crime analysis? Well, yes, it's subjective because it really does, I suppose, depend on what significance you put on the different factors involved. Nowadays I'm not sure, after Handy and Shearing, that the rapes in Saskatoon would be admissible as similar fact evidence because the Supreme Court seems to have gone back and raised the bar again and that difference in violence would be something that defence counsel would legitimately argue separates

A those four crimes from the Gail Miller.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Excuse me, would you spell the case, please, Handy, $H-A-N-D-Y$ ? It's $H-A-N-D-Y$ and Shearing $I$ believe is $S-H-E-A-R-I-N-G$.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Thanks.
BY MR. HODSON:
Is it fair to say, Mr. Brown, that when you are engaged in the process of looking at the similarities between the rapes and the Gail Miller murder, you are doing so with the perspective of a prosecutor or a court official and trying to determine how this information legally would come into play in either David Milgaard's trial or Larry Fisher's trial; in other words, what is the legal significance of this information, how can it be used and what does it tell me as a prosecutor. Is that fair?

Yes.
And so the analysis is not necessarily whether is it the same person or do $I$ think it is, but what does this information give me by way of admissible evidence in a legal proceeding. Is that fair? Yes.

Whereas a member of the public might look at this
and not view these offences and the similarities to the Gail Miller murder in the same way. Would you agree with that?

A


A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A
Q I I guess on the -- so on that hand, with the knowledge, though, that he did commit the murder, what does that tell us about the extent to which
similar fact evidence can be used to determine these matters?

A

Q

A
Q
A

2

Well, I mean, it tells you that sometimes that guess is right, but, quite frankly, my view of similar fact evidence is, for the most part, it's a fast way to a wrongful conviction because it is propensity evidence usually and nothing more.

And so again we talked about this yesterday, about where we place the bar on these things, and am I correct, sir, that the bar can fluctuate a bit about the use upon which similar fact evidence can be used in these cases? If you use it too liberally, you may end up relying on propensity rather than true signature and therefore wrongfully convict somebody?

That's right.
On the other --
And my view was that the bar had to be set very high before the Supreme Court decided Arp. I was of that view after the Supreme Court decided Arp, I thought they got it wrong, and they have come around to say, well, we didn't mean to suggest the bar was lowered in the Handy case.

Okay. So then if we can go on with -- you've talked about that difference. If we can go to the
next page, you say here, and again we're talking about $I$ think the comparison between the (V1)-, (V2)-----, (V3)------ incidents and the Gail Miller rape -- pardon me, the Gail Miller rape and murder:
"When the similarities are
looked at they don't amount to any kind
of special or unique pattern that gives
these crimes an identifying fingerprint
or unique characteristic that would set
them apart from other "stranger" rapes
and connect these sexual assaults in an
obvious way to the Miller murder.
The use of a weapon
occurring in two of the five incidents
to intimidate a victim is not uncommon
in stranger rapes. In our society,
knives are the weapons of choice for
this kind of crime.
The fact that all of these
women were attacked while walking alone
is hardly a unique or identifying fact
in a stranger rape situation. The fact
the woman is alone is the reason she is
chosen as a target. Very few rapists attack groups of women.

The fact the attack occurs in the dark is also common and that is why when women are given advice on how to protect themselves they are told to avoid places that are not well lit.

The fact that in two of these five events all or a sufficient amount of clothing is removed to expose the breasts and lower body and makes a sexual assault possible is also hardly a unique event. In this instance, however, it should be noted that (V1)and (V2)----- were made to remove all of their clothing. However, the condition the Miller body was found in indicates that she was not stripped of all of her clothing. The (V3)------ incident ended too soon to make it relevant to this consideration. In this respect the (V1)- and (V2)----- incident do not resemble the Miller facts."

Can you just comment or elaborate on that?
A
Well, again, if you are looking for similar fact evidence, you are looking for what amounts to a
signature of the accused and you look at all of the similarities and dissimilarities and see which column sort of balances out at the top.

Okay. You also comment here, I think one of the other similarities identified by counsel for Mr. Milgaard was the bus line, you say:
"The fact that (V1)- (V2)----- and
(V9)---- lived close to the 20 th Street bus line is interesting but doesn't amount to enough to be more than that. It certainly doesn't come close to suggesting that Gail Miller was killed by the same person who attacked the other three women. In attempting to make that connection, it should be noted that the (V1)- and (V2)----- incidents occurred quite some distance away from where Gail Miller was murdered."

And I suppose that's a case that it sounds like both sides of the similar fact argument, if $I$ can put it that way, are arguing location. On the one hand $I$ think the Milgaard group is saying look at location, that suggests they are similar. On the other hand, the other argument is, well, yeah, look at location, it shows that it's not
similar. Is that a fair way to put it?

A
Q

A
Q
That's correct, yes.
And so not only do we have some disagreement about
whether the -- whether there are unique
characteristics of the crimes, some of those
characteristics are used by both sides of the
argument?
Oh, absolutely, yes.
And you say:
"Consequently it is our
submission that given the lack of
telling similarities and the lack of any
factors creating an obvious pattern
...",
you go on to say:
"... it is not surprising that Mr.
Caldwell did not consider disclosing
these to defence counsel. More
important, we submit, is that fact that
this lack of similarity and lack of
pattern would also have made such
information of little value to defence
counsel in preparing his defence of
David Milgaard."
Now we've heard from Mr. Caldwell at this

Commission that he was not aware of these other offences, specifically he did not, $I$ think his evidence was that he did not see them as connected and they were not disclosed, but that he did not make a deliberate decision not to disclose it, it didn't happen; were you aware of that or did you have different information?

No, my -- that's slightly misleading. My understanding was that he never thought of them, that they never came to mind, and it wasn't a conscious decision not to disclose them.

And so in this argument are you addressing, then, the suggestion that the failure by Mr. Caldwell to disclose the (V1)-, (V2)-----, (V3)------, and let's include the (V9)---- and (V4)--- incidents to Mr. Tallis prior to the time -- prior to the trial, were you addressing that as an argument that that constituted a miscarriage of justice? Yes, on the basis that even if he knew, that was the case.

But just so that I'm clear here, on -- there was evidence on the record, and $I$ think you concede in your argument, these five incidents were not disclosed to Mr. Tallis. And so my question is was this issue before the Supreme Court, namely,
did the failure of Mr . Caldwell to disclose those five incidents to Mr. Tallis constitute a miscarriage of justice?

Yes, yes, that was part of the failure to disclose argument.

And this argument you are putting forward is addressing that issue?

That's right.
You then go ahead to the next heading, All of Fisher's Crimes on Fresh Evidence, and you say:
"The second argument advance with respect to the Fisher material is that since 1971 and Larry Fisher's conviction for the four offences in Saskatoon and two in Winnipeg, there has existed fresh evidence of a similar fact nature that points to Larry Fisher as the guilty party. It is argued that the known crimes of Larry Fisher have been committed in such a way as to create an obvious pattern of conduct that identifies Larry Fisher as the person who committed the Gail Miller murder." And then:
"In our submission, when a careful look is taken at the attacks on (V1)-, (V2)-----, (V3)------, (V9)----, (V4)---, (V5)---, (V7)--- and (V8)--- it becomes apparent that there in fact is no such pattern or identifying criminal fingerprint established by these crimes."

And If I can just pause there, these would be the incidents, then, if $I$ can call them now the Fisher rapes because -- actually, I'm sorry, I shouldn't, (V9)---- and (V4)--- he was never charged with -- but these would be the assaults that were the six assaults that Mr. Fisher essentially confessed to and pled guilty to in 1970-'71; correct?

A
Q

A
Q , S So and I'm assuming from that, and please correct me if I'm wrong, that this argument is addressed at
the following issue; that once the police and/or Crown became aware of a number of things; number one that the five, or that three of the five incidents that occurred prior to Mr. Milgaard's trial, that there was now a person who pled guilty or had confessed to those crimes, number one; number two, that there was a fourth incident in Saskatoon, the (V5)-- (V5)--- rape, after David Milgaard's trial for which Mr. Fisher pled guilty, and two offences in Winnipeg that Mr. Fisher had confessed to, and so that was the new information that existed in 1970-1971, and the question is to what extent, if any, did those facts give rise to a miscarriage of justice; is that a fair way to put it?

Well, and the failure to disclose that to -Yes.
-- Justice Tallis, yes.
And so this argument is addressed at that very issue, whether somehow the Crown and/or police should have disclosed this information to Mr.

Tallis; is that fair?
A
$Q$
A
Yes.
That's the issue you are addressing?
That was the issue.

And if we compare it to issue number one on disclosure what we -- the one we just went through -- what we now know on issue two is we now know about Mr. Fisher; correct?

Right.
And further assaults. And is it fair to say that Saskatchewan Justice went through a similar analysis and said, okay, now let's look at these same offences with the information that was known in 1970 and '71 and try and do the same analysis to see whether it would have given rise to something that would have assisted Mr. Milgaard?

A
Q



A
"We have not used the account of these assaults set out in the summary of Centurion Ministries Investigation into the crimes of Larry Fisher. It is clear when reading those summaries and contrasting them with what the victim actually had to say and what the police reports disclosed, that the Centurion Ministries summaries are not accurate." And can you comment on that?

Well my -- all $I$ can say is that my recollection
was that the Centurion Ministries report included some conclusions that they were drawing and not just the facts as taken from the statements of the witnesses or the police report.

And so I take it, in the course of your comparisons, you relied upon what the witnesses had said originally?

Yes.
And scroll down. You then go through and say:
"Below is a chart setting out the various aspects of Larry Fisher's offences that the applicant suggests form a pattern."

Let me just pause there. At the end of this exercise, if you conclude that there is no pattern, does that mean that it's not something that ought to have been disclosed; is that -Well, again, the pattern and the number of similarity points go to the issue of relevance. If you have a lot of similarity and a very close pattern, then it becomes relevant as potential similar fact; if you don't have a substantial degree of similarity and a lot of points where the two meet, then it's not relevant.

Okay. And $I$ think you made the remark, either in
the brief or in oral argument, that at one extreme that might require you to disclose every rape that occurred in Saskatoon; would that be -Well, that's right, every stranger rape.

And so here what you are saying is, $I$ think, is that no, there has to be some relevance or some connection to the Gail Miller murder that would take these rapes out of the general group and make them relevant to David Milgaard's defence; is that a fair way to put it?

That's correct, yes.
And so here you go through and look at the patterns, and you put "use of Knife", and you have four of the incidents with a knife and five without a knife, and $I$ think you've got a qualification. What is the importance of the knife in looking at the similarities of these assaults?

Well, $I$ mean, again it's an element of how Larry Fisher committed rapes or didn't commit rapes. If you can show a pattern where, for example, he invariably used a knife, that's a strong, a strong point of similarity; if you can't then it substantially weakens it, if it's an occasional thing, then the relevance of that information is
diminished.
And so are you saying that if Mr. Fisher used a knife in only half of his assaults, then it weakens the proposition that he committed Gail Miller's rape and murder, because he always used a knife; that's --

Yes.
And the next is "took something" and "took nothing", and you have (V1)-, (V2)-----, (V7)--with clothing and money, and the others he took nothing; why is that significant?

Well, again, if he's not just raping women but robbing them, that's of some consequence too, it's part of the signature or lack of signature. Now I think much was made, would you agree, in the submissions by Centurion Ministries and counsel for David Milgaard about the uniqueness of the, particularly $I$ think the (V1)- and the (V2)----rapes, about having the victim take off her coat and then take off parts of her clothing and then put her coat back on, and $I$ think the suggestion there was that that was similar or that might explain what happened to Gail Miller; namely that the perpetrator had her remove her coat, then removed her clothing, raped her, and then she put
her coat back on, which explains why the stab marks were through the coat and not the dress; and you would have been aware of that suggestion? Yes.

And so can you comment here, you've got (V1)-, (V2)----- under the "made woman undress", and then the other four being "he removed or displaced woman's clothes"; and what significance is that? Well I mean, again, it's just one more factor you look at. On its own, it's not particularly significant, but if you are trying to generate patterns of similarity you look at everything. Okay. Next page. You've got, for "time of attack", now the (V4)--- and (V9)---- ones were not -- is it correct to say, at that time, that there was no, there was no conviction of Mr. Fisher, in fact he denied both of those incidents; is that correct?

Umm, yes.
Whereas the other ones, I think the six referred to here are matters where -- and we've got (V10)
(V10)- now included -- where he did confess, or pled guilty to, or was convicted of; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q

Well the infliction of an extreme degree of violence is frequently something that separates different kinds or different types of sexual
offenders, some add the violence, most don't.
And have you heard the term 'punishment rapist' used? I think it was used in the Supreme Court in Mr. Wolch's argument.

Well there's, I mean there's certainly that kind of sexual assault, and $I$ mean that's the kind where they add the violence as part of -- prior to or as part of the sexual assault.

And, again, what, if anything, did your review of these offences tell you about whether or not Mr. Fisher was a punishment rapist?

Well, certainly the ones that occurred around the time of the Gail Miller murder didn't include that degree of violence, the only one that did was the (V10) (V10)- matter. And even under the Arp test, very likely the (V10) (V10) - matter couldn't have been admitted as fresh evidence because of the time difference, it's was some ten years later. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Sir, in that respect, do you make any distinction between the evidence being introduced by the Crown or the evidence in -- being introduced by the defence?

A Well, I suppose I'm looking at it from a prosecutor's perspective, and even -- even with, probably, the (V10) (V10)- one, I would see that as being much more difficult for a defence counsel to get in.

I think the essence of the Supreme Court decision was that well no, they disagreed with me on the similar-fact evidence, there was something that could go to a jury, but my view is it was with respect to the (V1)-, (V2)-----, (V3)------, (V5)---, (V8)---, (V7)---.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Right. Except, of course, in this context we should be looking at what might have been useful for the defence, not for the prosecution?

A
Oh no, I appreciate that, and that's what we were looking at, but I tend to see that through the eyes of someone who does prosecutions, -COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes?

A -- and that's how $I$ would assess them. BY MR. HODSON:

Q Just on that point, I guess if we leave the (V10) (V10)- out for just a moment, and I'll come back to it, the other --

A
Oh it, I think, is probably arguably admissible for a different reason, and that would be the comments he made to her.

Okay. And I'll come back to that. If we leave
the (V10) - assault aside for a moment, the rest of these assaults occurred 1968 to 1971 , and am I correct that the focus then would be, when you are going through this analysis for the court, is to say in 1971, for example, if this information had been provided -- number one, should this information have been provided to David Milgaard's counsel, and to determine that you have to say could it have been relevant and used by him at the trial; is that fair? Is that a fair way to put it?

A
Q

A
(V10) - assault aside

Yes.
Yeah. And I'm not trying to change the words in your brief --

Well except, you know, I go back to the notion that there were two kinds of disclosure that was the problem; the stuff that was sort of available at the time of trial, and the stuff that became available after trial, and $I$ think the argument was it should have been disclosed to Justice Tallis so he could consider what he would do with it in terms of an appeal or something like that. Right. I think, when you told us yesterday that when you get into this miscarriage of justice and the Palmer test, what you are forced to do is to
look at the information that was not provided to the defence and say, okay, could it reasonably affect, or could it have reasonably affected the verdict?

A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$


Yes.
In other words you are going back in time and saying we know it wasn't disclosed, if it had been, would it have made a difference?

Yes.
And so, in so doing that, you go down this path of, okay, what is the relevance of this. And I appreciate your point is we're not talking about whether it should or shouldn't have been disclosed at the time, we're looking at, in 1992, whether or not this information is significant enough to give a remedy at that time; is that a fair way to put it?

Yes.
Yeah. And so that requires you to say, okay, in 1971, if Mr. Milgaard's counsel had this information, might it have affected the verdict, and then we get into the would it be admissible and would it be, $I$ guess, relevant to show that there was another perpetrator, in other words to allow him to run the defence and say "find a
reasonable doubt, jury, because Larry Fisher is the perpetrator?"

A orrect?

Umm, yes. Well, parts of it, yes. Or parts of it. And I think you were saying the significance of that would have been the comments that Mr. Fisher made to Ms. (V10)- in the assault as opposed to the similarities of that attack?
evidence in defence of a prosecution against him;
correct?

That's correct.
Scroll down.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Sorry, just a second.

MR. HODSON: Yes.
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: I must confess to having missed your last -- your testimony a little while ago about the comments made.

There was a comment, now $I$ don't know exactly what it was, but $I$ recall that there were comments made by Larry Fisher when he was attacking (V10) (V10)-, something to the effect that he had done this before or something, umm --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yeah.
-- that in my view were probably more significant, and likely admissible in terms of the evidence, as opposed to a rape that took place ten -- or a sexual assault that took place ten years after the Miller event.

MR. HODSON: And we do have that, Mr. Commissioner, in one of the documents, it's in the (V10)- proceedings, --

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Uh-huh.
MR. HODSON: -- and there was that note. I think there was also, there was a police
officer's notebook that has that, and I think there was even a voir dire or some proceeding related to that.

BY MR. HODSON:
But so if Mr. Milgaard wished, if Mr. Milgaard was defending a charge, the charge after the (V10) (V10)- incident, you are telling us that that information or that evidence about what Mr. Fisher said to (V10) (V10)-, in your view, would be admissible and could be used by him to say he is the person who killed Gail Miller, and here is a confession or an admission that he made, although he didn't refer to Gail Miller?

If you add that to the four sexual assaults or six sexual assaults that he pled guilty to, the fact that he was living in the same place as Shorty Cadrain, and then the (V10) (V10)- statement, I think now you are coming close to having an argument you could put to the jury that it should raise a reasonable doubt. Coming close. It still doesn't deal with the Wilson evidence, it still doesn't deal with the Lapchuk and Melnyk evidence. And what about the suggestion, though, that that should be up to the jury to decide, whether or not Fisher information displaces the incriminating

Milgaard evidence?

A
Well that's, that's not the similar-fact evidence test. First, you have to convince an appellate court that it's something that's likely to raise, or something that the jury is likely to consider in looking at reasonable doubt. It's not enough to say, well, you can throw it in, I mean you can throw almost anything in for the defence. If $I$ can just scroll. You say here:
"The Crown concedes that there are some similarities in all of the sexual assaults committed by Larry Fisher and those alleged to have been committed by him and highlighted by the Applicant's counsel during his examination of Larry Fisher. The victim was always walking alone. The attack was sudden and unexpected by the victim. The victim was dragged to a secluded place. The victim was grabbed by behind or the side."

Actually, sorry, if we can go to -- I should note for the record in this version of the document page 49 is missing. If we can call up 046227 , which is part of 046184 , it's at page 49, Mr.

Commissioner, from another document. And we'll just go through. You say:
"When looking at the pattern established by the factors in the chart and the similarities conceded above, it is our submission that no pattern of behaviour emerges to give Larry Fisher's crime any unique criminal fingerprint suitable for use as similar fact evidence."

And are you saying that "for use as similar-fact evidence" by the prosecution, or by the defence, or both?

Well, probably $I$ was thinking in terms of the defence, but likely applying a, probably a higher standard than defence might have to meet.

But even conceding that, again, you can put all of that evidence in and the fewer similarities you have the easier it becomes for Crown counsel to pick it apart and say "this is nothing".

Q You say:
"On four occasions he used a knife. On five occasions he did not use a knife. On those four occasions when a knife was
used there was only one instance the weapon was shown to be a paring knife. In the (V8)--- instance, such a knife was found at the scene. In the (V1)incident the weapon used was a long bladed knife. In the (V2) ----- and (V10) - incidents while the victims felt a knife their statements to the police indicate they did not get a good look at the same."

And then you go on to talk about, scroll down:
"With respect to him taking something from his victims, again this occurs in three instances but does not occur in six incidents. On two of the occasions in which something was taken Larry Fisher appears to have taken clothing in order prevent the victim from rapidly dressing and either following him or going for help before he could escape. In none of the cases where something was taken is there any pattern of conduct that emerges as some sort of peculiar trait of Larry Fisher. On two occasions he made the
victim undress and on seven occasions he attempted to or did succeed in removing sufficient of his victims clothing himself to commit the assault but did not render the woman naked. Again, there is nothing established by this factor that would indicate any kind of pattern that is unusual in these kinds of sexual assaults."

Next page. If we can go back to the original document now, page 50:
"With respect to the time of the attack the sexual assaults we know to have been committed by Larry Fisher because he plead guilty to them all occurred at night. The two assaults that Larry Fisher has denied occurred in the morning. In this instance if there was any pattern it is one that suggests Larry Fisher attacked women at night and not during the morning hours.

With respect to the use of
the coat, on three occasions he made his victim lie on a coat and on six occasions he did not. Again, it's
difficult to see what the pattern is that connects these incident to the Gail Miller assault. It is equally difficult to see anything unique in Larry Fisher's conduct in this regard."

And then you go on to talk about the coat and then the infliction of violence. What did you make of the fact, Mr. Brown, we've heard some evidence about $I$ guess the fourth Saskatoon incident, the (V5)-- (V5)--- rape which occurred in February 1970, three weeks after David Milgaard's conviction. And sort of two questions about that; the first one is that in Saskatoon his -- the first three offences occur before Gail Miller's murder and then no offences, at least for which he was suspected or convicted, from the time of Gail Miller's murder until David Milgaard is convicted, and then the fourth assault. And I think the suggestion was that while this was going on, he did not commit offences, but as soon as Mr. Milgaard was convicted he went out and committed the fourth; any significance to that?

A Well, I mean, factually that appears to be the case. I don't know that $I$ necessarily attach any significance to it.

And the second question related to that rape, and I think this is in some of the analysis done by others, that in that rape the victim -- in the fourth rape the victim, $I$ think, bit his finger or tried to resist, and he may have hit her, but not the same degree of violence that was found in the Gail Miller murder. What was the significance of -- I guess, if you look at the first three incidents, there was not the degree of violence as Gail Miller, the Gail Miller murder, and then the rape that followed Gail Miller's murder being far less violence?

Well the significance is that, if the last woman offered some provocation and he did not resort to that degree of violence, it says something about the way -- or as -- what he is prepared to do to further these assaults, and apparently the use of serious violence wasn't part of it.

And is it necessarily a fact, Mr. Brown, that a rapist always commits the rapes the same way, the same time, the same manner, same techniques? Umm, it -- no, it's not, not necessarily a fact, but our experience would suggest that if you've got people who commit a number of these kinds of offences, they tend to have some pattern to their
offending. Now when $I$ say "pattern" I -- it's not that they do it identically, but there are times of day when they are out roaming around looking for trouble, there are types of people they choose for these kinds of assaults or places where they tend to feel comfortable doing them, so there is some kind of a pattern that you could find in these kinds of things. If we can go to the next page, please, 51. You go through a section here about stranger rapes, and can you just -- and $I$ think the essence of this is that, if you compare the similarities of these rapes with stranger rapes, that they are not much different; is that a fair summary?

Well I think my thesis before the Supreme Court was that, if you looked at the similarities, they basically broke into two things -- or three things I suppose.

The first was the kinds of things that are similar to almost any kind of stranger rape, where they attacked their victims, the victims are alone, things like that.

The second was when you look at the so-called pattern that they said emerges from Larry Fisher's activities the pattern, to the
extent there is anything, for example the use of the knife four times didn't -- used it, five times didn't, the pattern seems to suggest that Larry Fisher isn't the one who committed these offences.

And the third would be a few items where there was some similarity, but that it really wasn't of any significance. If we can go to page 384 , please. Your conclusion, then, is:
"... therefore, that when the Larry Fisher incidents are looked at closely the similarities found concern factors, common to almost all incidents where a woman is attacked and raped by someone she doesn't know. The other factors involved in his attack in which the applicant alleges to be of interest do not in fact present a similar pattern of behaviour. On the basis of the type of analysis used by the applicant, Mr. Fisher could easily be suspected of almost all of the 'stranger' sexual assaults occurring in Saskatoon at the time he lived this. In our submission, the applicant has filed to demonstrate
any pattern of behaviour arising out of Larry Fisher's known sexual assaults or the two alleged to have been committed by him but not proven against him that is in any way unique or unusual and that in any way identifies Larry Fisher as the person likely to have committed the attack, robbery, rape and murder of Gail Miller."

And, again, $I$ think that summarizes what you just told us?

A

Q
Now let's turn to (V4)---, Ms. (V4)---. You say here:
"With respect to the evidence of Ms. (V4)--- it is our submission her identification of Larry Fisher as her attacker is an almost text book case of unreliable eye witness identification evidence. She did not know Larry Fisher prior to the assault and therefore could not quickly recognize him as her
attacker. She admitted she did not get a particularly good or long look at her attacker because it was dark and she did
not see him for an extended period of time. She has in the past picked out several other men as resembling the person who attacked her. Finally, it would appear that her identification has more to do with her being erroneously told by a police officer who took her statement that whoever attacked her went on to kill Gail Miller. There is no question but that if she believe that it would have been a very chilling revelation and one that would have stuck in her mind all these years.

Consequently when she saw the newspaper story indicating that Larry Fisher was the one who attacked Gail Miller, it is not surprising that she unconsciously made the connection between his picture in the paper and her attacker. Under the circumstances, it is our submission that her identification of Larry Fisher as her attacker is most unreliable and cannot provide the applicant with much assistance."

And, again, would that be a fair summary of the

Saskatchewan Justice position on (V4)----
(V4) --- ?
A

Q

A
Q
You go on to say:
"In addition to the identification problem there is also the difficulty posed by the fact that (V4)--- assault occurred seven to eight blocks away from where Gail Miller was attacked and killed at about the same time. Even considering that Gail Miller left her residence sometime between 6:45 and 7:00, there would not have been time for Larry Fisher to rape, rob and murder Gail Miller then arrive over at Avenue $H$ in time to attack Ms. (V4)--- at 7:07
a.m. While there is a suggestion that
he had a car that morning there is absolutely no evidence beyond speculation to support that fact. Indeed it now appears the statement given by Linda Fisher to Ottawa Sun Report Tim Naumetz suggests it is unlikely that Larry Fisher would have had a car on that occasion. Finally, even if Larry Fisher had access to the automobile in question, Mr. Diewald's evidence was that the car was in the alley about 7:00 and shortly after that. Even with an automobile at his disposal it would have been impossible for Larry Fisher to have been in the alley at 7:00 and a few minutes after 7:00 and then be at Avenue $H$ on his way home on foot in time to attack Ms. (V4)---." Just a couple of questions there. I think in the case reference there's an affidavit from this reporter Mr. Naumetz and I think, and my understanding is that in the course of the Supreme Court hearings he interviewed Ms. Linda Fisher, wrote a story and Mr. Beresh went and got the reporter to swear an affidavit as to what

Linda Fisher had told him because Mr. Beresh
viewed that evidence to be relevant to Mr.
Fisher's position; is that correct?
A

Q

A
I believe that was correct. I think Mr. Naumetz was one of the reporters covering the Supreme Court matter.

What is your recollection about this suggestion that Mr. Fisher had a car when he raped and killed Gail Miller and then attacked Ms. (V4)---?

Well, I think there might have been some evidence that from time to time Mr. Fisher was able to borrow his uncle's car if he needed to take his wife and child, say, to the doctor or something like that. Other than that, the only reference to a car was there was some suggestion that Gail Miller could not have been raped and murdered where she was, she had to have been attacked and killed somewhere else and then the body dumped in that alley and that whoever did it would have to have a car to do it, but there was, in my view, no evidence beyond mere speculation to suggest any of that and certainly there was no reason that anyone knew of for him to have borrowed or used his uncle 's car that day.

What about the -- if in fact a car was used, or
your comment on this question about back to comparing similar fact between the assaults, and if Mr. Fisher had used a car in the assault and murder of Gail Miller, would that have been a similarity from other of his assaults, namely, the use of a vehicle?

Well, certainly he attacked the women when he was on foot and $I$ don't recall any of them having anything in their statements with respect to a car, but, $I$ mean, if he's going to hide his face, I'm guessing he's going to hide his car and license plate number from them too, so it would be parked some distance away.

Q And you comment in the next paragraph about the level of violence in the assault on both (V4)--and (V9)----, and can you comment on the significance of that, that if Mr. Fisher had committed both the Gail Miller rape and murder and the (V4)--- assault, the significant difference in the nature of the attack and the level of violence?

A
Well, again, $I$ mean, here you have an attack that is probably the least of, the least violent of all of them and it certainly doesn't even come anywhere close to comparing to the kind of attack
$Q$

A
that Gail Miller suffered and it just, it's a whole different kind of a crime.

In your view, if Ms. (V4)---'s identification of Larry Fisher was sound and that Larry Fisher was the person who assaulted her on the morning of January 31,1969 , in your view would that have provided Mr. Fisher with an alibi for the rape and murder of Gail Miller?

Well, if you could establish that Ms. (V4)---'s identification was sound, Mr. Commissioner, you may be back here doing another one of these because certainly Larry Fisher would then have some reason to complain, because it takes him away from that area.

So I take it the answer is yes?
Yes.
If we can then scroll down, it appears just again following through your argument on the Fisher information, you've looked at the similarities of those offences and you now look at the evidence of Linda Fisher, and can you just tell me generally, what was your sense of the significance and credibility of what Linda Fisher had to say at the Supreme Court?

Well, I mean, again, I suspect that Linda Fisher
was genuine in what she thought she saw, but Linda Fisher had a drinking problem, it was 11 years after the fact, she indicated that the knife found and that $I$ believe Dr. Emson indicated could have been the murder weapon wasn't her paring knife. Linda Fisher's evidence was interesting, but I didn't think it was terribly helpful or terribly credible or terribly reliable. I think she was doing her best to tell the truth, but $I$ don't think her evidence was reliable.

You say that:
"First, whatever else Linda Fisher now
says, she is certain the murder weapon
wasn't her paring knife. Without that
there is nothing in what she says that
links Larry Fisher to the crime.
Second, his response to her accusation
that he killed Gail Miller is as
consistent with him being shocked she
would even think such a thing as it is
with him being guilty of the crime.
Third, her failure to bring this to
light until some ten years after the
trial is also troublesome. Based on the
affidavit of Tim Naumetz it is clear
that shortly after the murder she had the opportunity to bring this to the attention of the Saskatoon City Police and did not do so. Living in Saskatoon as she did during this time, she would have to have known that David Milgaard was convicted of that crime. Based on her suggestion that she put her husband's guilt to the Gail Miller crime together after he plead guilty to the various rapes in Saskatoon and Winnipeg, she had all the information she needed by 1971. Despite this, she did not go to the police until almost ten years later. In our submission that tells against her credibility."

And can you elaborate on that last sentence?

A Well, if she had been genuinely concerned that her husband, who had just pled guilty to four rapes, or six rapes, was also the one responsible for a murder, and a nasty murder at that, why wouldn't she have gone to the police immediately. That she would wait 10 years and just ignore that fact is very curious.

Then you say:
"Finally, even taken at its face value, her evidence does not link Larry Fisher to the murder. Indeed much of it would indicate he is not guilty of killing Gail Miller. First, the evidence of his reaction to her accusation is at the very best ambiguous. It can just as easily be interpreted as supporting his innocence as it can be interpreted as supporting his guilt. Second, she indicates that the weapon known to have been used to kill Gail Miller was not her knife. Third, she indicated that when she washed Larry Fisher's clothing there was no blood on any of it. Given the nature of the homicide involved, some blood staining would have been inevitable. Finally, in her evidence to Tim Naumetz she indicates that when she asked her husband about his possible involvement with the Miller murder he flatly denied the same."

Can you comment on, and we've heard this term used again when Sergeant Pearson testified, about evidence that links Larry Fisher to the murder,
and I think Mr. Pearson, as a police officer, said it was evidence just as it's stated, it would actually put Larry -- some evidence that would put Larry Fisher either at the scene of the crime, an admission, some piece of physical evidence, as opposed to mere suspicion, and can you comment on that point? What is a link, what's necessary to link Larry Fisher to the murder?

A physical evidence that suggests he was there when it happened. If, for example, there had been blood on his clothing, that might have been a link to the murder, or if he had made some kind of incriminating remark to his wife that sort of could reasonably be interpreted as a reference to his being involved, that that would link him to the murder.

If we look at the case against, that was presented against David Milgaard, what would be -- what would have constituted links between David Milgaard and the murder?

A
Well, again, some physical evidence that might have connected him to that crime, and Cadrain said that there was blood on his clothing, that he saw
that when he opened the coat up, you have John and Wilson putting him in that location at the time, and certainly John in her statements to the police indicated she saw him attack the woman, the evidence of the contact with the woman that may well have been Gail Miller, those kinds of things are what linked him to that murder.

And what about Mr. Wilson's evidence about admissions from him?

Well, yes, admissions count too.
And the motel room incident?
And the motel room incident.
And so links would be then something to link Larry Fisher to the murder of Gail Miller. Was it your view then in 1992 that there did not exist evidence that linked him to Gail Miller's murder? That's right.

And at that time were you of the view that there was evidence that linked David Milgaard to the murder?

A
Yes.
$Q$
And I may have asked you this earlier, but I think, just on the similar fact evidence, $I$ think you told us that similar fact evidence would never be sufficient to be the link between Larry Fisher

A
and the murder; is that correct?
If all you were running was a murder trial based on similar fact evidence, no, that would never be sufficient.

This comment down at the bottom here, you comment on Linda Fisher's evidence about Larry Fisher being home the morning of the murder and you say: "The single fact left unexplained is her suggestion that Larry Fisher did not go to work that morning. That fact recollected to the police some eleven years after the incident is alleged to have taken place has to be contrasted with Larry Fisher's statement to the police four days after the murder. In that statement he indicates to the police officers that he in fact did go to work that morning. It is reasonable to assume that if Mr. Fisher whatever his degree of intelligence, was going to make up an alibi to take him out of the neighbourhood at the time of the Gail Miller murder, he would have been smart enough to figure out that he couldn't use an alibi that could be so easily
checked by the police. Mr. Fisher's statement to the police is corroborated by his evidence to this Court and to a lesser extent by the statements of the people who worked with him in the reference case materials and who indicate they do not recall his unexplained absence from work. While we concede the latter corroboration is of very limited value, it is nonetheless some corroboration for Larry Fisher's story."

And would you agree, Mr. Brown, that in 1990 or 1992 when you go back and try and find evidence that will link Larry Fisher to the murder, that it's much more difficult to do 20 years later than at the time of the offence?

A
$Q$

A

Oh, absolutely, yes.
And that if -- if, for example, Mr. Fisher's work records had been obtained at any point that showed he was not at work that morning, that might be evidence that would assist in the case against Mr. Fisher?

That would be evidence of interest, particularly put together with the statement to the police that
he had been at work that morning.
Scroll down, $I$ won't spend much time on the evidence of the jailhouse informants. Generally can you comment on your submissions or your view about the credibility or the significance of the evidence of people who had served time with Larry Fisher?

Well, for a number of good reasons we don't tend to rely on the evidence of those kinds of people unless in every substantial detail it's
corroborated by somebody not in jail. You'll get the strangest things coming out of inmates in correctional facilities. Whether it arises out of boredom or their natural desire to commit mischief I don't know, but the stuff that comes out of there is just something $I$ wouldn't place any reliance on, absent it being corroborated by, again, in substantial detail, by something from outside the corrections milieu.

Go to 234391 , you refer here to the evidence of Larry Fisher, you say:
"Finally, there is the evidence of Larry Fisher himself. He absolutely denies any involvement in the murder. Unlike David Milgaard, who also made such a
statement in his evidence, Larry Fisher
was not shown to be obviously lying to
this court."
And can you elaborate on what you state there? Well, just what's there, Larry Fisher was not shown to be lying, or obviously lying, and it seems to me I used obviously advisedly. David Milgaard was contradicted by other witnesses a number of times.

And so are you saying that Larry Fisher's denial of guilt was more credible than David Milgaard's denial of guilt based upon the evidence that was before the Supreme Court?

Yes.

Go to 234393 , here you summarize, you say:
"In our submission the Applicant has failed to show that there is credible new evidence to question or contradict the evidence given at his trial. As well, the Larry Fisher evidence does not amount to credible evidence capable of providing a properly instructed jury with a basis to change its verdict nor does it suggest that such a change in verdict would be probable. As a result,
we submit there is no basis upon which a new trial should be ordered."

And that would then summarize your position with respect to whether or not the Larry Fisher information would have affected the jury's verdict; is that correct?

Yes.
Then you go on to talk about, I think you dealt with $A, B$ and $C$ in the Supreme Court possibilities, here you talk about, saying that: "There was no miscarriage of justice but given the length of time David Milgaard has served in prison, some form of relief should be considered. In our submission, prior to suggesting a conditional pardon be granted David Milgaard, notwithstanding there is no miscarriage of justice, this court should inform itself of the contents of his parole file. Mr. Milgaard's assertions that he is being kept in jail solely because he will not admit his guilt to this crime, are patently false."

And can you comment on that, please, the
significance of that?
A
Well, that issue, or the reason that's in there is because you will recall that the last sort of test or possibility they set out was that notwithstanding they couldn't find the continuing conviction would be a miscarriage, they may be prepared to do something for him anyway, and I wanted them to know that his failure to get parole was not related to his refusal to admit he was guilty, it was his refusal to agree that he would comply with parole conditions.

And you go on to say:
"It is our submission that prior to
making any recommendation that would result in the release of David Milgaard, this court should take the opportunity to fully appraise itself of the contents of Mr. Milgaard's parole files. They paint a fundamentally different picture of the reasons for the Parole Board's decisions than is painted by Mr. Milgaard himself."

And then the next page you talk about simply report to the minister that there is no miscarriage of justice, leave the decision of
full release to the National Parole Board. Can you explain why you are putting forward that submission?

A

Q

A

Q

A
-
I wouldn't say $I$ was certain there was, but when they came out with the decision they did, it did not surprise me.

COMMISSIONER MaCCALLUM: Was this sense in your perception shared by, or was this thinking in your perception shared by both the minister's
office and by the Supreme Court, that he had done enough time in any event and he should be out? Well, $I$ don't know about the Federal Minister's office, $I$ would be inclined to think they weren't of that view, but $I$ recall discussing the supreme Court's options with, I believe it was Mr. Fainstein, and $I$ think he too shared the view that there was likely something coming because of that.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Yes. And but for that view, as $I$ understand your evidence, the second application wouldn't have succeeded on its merits? That's correct, yes.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.

BY MR. HODSON:

If we can go to 020952 , $I$ just want to have you identify a document, and in the event that Mr. Neufeld was the creator of this as opposed to you, I'll just go through parts. This is an appendix to the memorandum. The next page is a summary and it goes through $I$ think basically excerpts from the evidence at the supreme court that sort of tracks what's in your written brief, and is that a correct description of it?

Yes, I guess that's the case.
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And if we can just go to the next page, for example, it summarizes drug usage and then it has the evidence of the various parties and where they are in the Supreme Court transcript, and it appears to be an appendix of all of the relevant transcripts of evidence that goes with the written argument that's filed; is that correct?

That's correct.
Now go to 218223, and this is the argument filed on behalf of David Milgaard. After the Supreme Court reference handed down its decision, was there a difference in views between Saskatchewan Justice and Mr. Wolch and Mr. Asper about what issues were before the Supreme Court and what issues were decided by them in their decision? Well, ultimately that view surfaced, that $I$ think they took the view that they were not permitted to call any evidence of misconduct by the police or the Crown.

And did you have a different view about -- let me put it this way. Was it your view that the issue of police and Crown misconduct were dealt with by the Supreme Court?

Absolutely, they were not precluded from calling any of that kind of evidence, and indeed some of
that kind of evidence was heard.
Okay. And $I$ propose to go through parts of this argument with you and get your response about, or your comment about the extent to which

Saskatchewan Justice viewed what's in this brief as being issues before the court. If we can go to page 218227, and I'll try, I think try and track, to the extent $I$ can, what was in your submission, and $I$ believe, Mr. Brown, the briefs were basically filed contemporaneously as opposed to one side filing their brief, the other responding, the written briefs were simply -- or do you recall?

A
Yeah, I think that was the case. I don't recall sort of one side going first and the other sides responding, $I$ think we were simply asked to file our arguments by a certain date.

And so on the trial, the first point is:
"In the Milgaard case, it is submitted that the original trial was severely flawed by the failure to provide full disclosure."

And was that an issue that you felt was advanced and argued before the Supreme Court in the reference?

Oh, yes, that was one of their particular issues. Go to the next page:
"It is submitted that the Milgaard case, like that involving Donald Marshall, is an example of a situation where lack of disclosure has been an important contributing factor in causing a miscarriage of justice.

Counsel for Milgaard
submits that the following relevant information was withheld:"

Let me just pause there for a moment. Did you view the, this argument, the word to be
"withheld" to be anything different than failure to disclose?

No, I consider them the same. I didn't sort of put a sinister connotation to it.

As opposed to a deliberate withholding?
Yes, of relevant information.
Now, as far as the evidence that was before the Supreme Court on this issue of disclosure, I think you told us there is a significant volume of documents in the case on reference and we saw the affidavit of Joyce Milgaard that had attached copies of the correspondence between Mr. Caldwell
and Mr. Tallis; correct?
A
Yes.
You had the evidence of Mr. Tallis --
Yes.
-- on this issue, and I think you told us that Mr. Caldwell was in Ottawa at the request of someone else, but not called?

That's correct.
And that your view was that you didn't need to call him to give evidence to address any of the allegations of non-disclosure; correct?

A
$Q$
And the first argument, and $I$ won't go through these in too much detail, but these are the grounds of where counsel alleged that there was no disclosure. This is the Avenue $N$, or sort of the evidence in the area, if $I$ can put it that way. Go to the next page, and this deals with the argument that the police interviewed a number of people around the time of the murder:
"None of the statements provided by
these people were disclosed to the Defence."

So that would have been an issue then that had been advanced to say there was a miscarriage of

A

Q

A

Q
justice because Mr. Caldwell didn't disclose what's listed in this argument? It goes on for a couple of pages.

Yes, relying, as they were at that point, on the Stinchcombe standard.

And the Stinchcombe, if you can comment on that, and I guess -- go back to 218227. The Stinchcombe decision was mentioned in 1992. What was your view of that, as to whether the Stinchcombe -- did you sense that they were seeking to apply the Stinchcombe rule retroactively?

Yes, they were trying to apply a case that happened some 20 some years later retroactively to the Gail Miller murder, and there's no question that nowadays there's a lot more information exchanged, and in fact many defence counsel will tell you there's a lot more useless information exchanged, because relevant and useful aren't necessarily the same two things.

Go to 218231, and again this is just carrying on with the grounds of non-disclosure, it says here:
"The Defence was not advised of the witness, (V4)---- (V4)---."
"(V4)---'s evidence was crucial to the evidence since it is a logical
assumption that whoever attacked Gail Miller also attacked her."

And so I take it, Mr. Brown, that the issue of whether or not the prosecutor should have disclosed the (V4)--- information to defence counsel as being a ground of a miscarriage of justice was before the Supreme Court?

Yes. That was the point of calling her.
And, similarly, the (V9) (V9)---- matter in number 4.

Scroll down to number:
"5. The Defence was not advised of the evidence in the Crown's possession concerning the rape of (V1)--- (V1)...",
it goes on, next page:
"The defence was not given disclosure concerning the attack on (V2)-----...", I think there is a mention of (V3)------ there. Was it your view, sir, that the issue of whether or not the Crown's failure to disclose information relating to the (V1)-, (V2)-----, and (V9)---- attack as a ground of a miscarriage of justice was before the Supreme Court?

Well, certainly the (V1)- one was, because it was
mentioned, $I$ believe, in the police report. I don't recall the other two being mentioned in that police report, so it's unlikely that Mr. Caldwell would have ever heard of them at that point, but it was part of the pattern of sexual assaults that should have been, at some point, disclosed.

And I guess my question is just on the issue of whether or not it was your view that the Supreme Court dealt with, in the reference, the issue as to whether or not the Crown either committed this --

Oh, disclosure and failure to disclose at any point from the time of the trial or before the trial until after the Larry Fisher matters became known was clearly before the Supreme Court, and it was clearly part of Mr. Wolch's argument.

And so not only disclosure by Mr. Caldwell prior to trial but, also, disclosure by the Crown, be it Mr. Kujawa, Mr. Caldwell or the police post-conviction, when the Larry Fisher information became known in 1970 and '71, was an issue, in your view, that was before the Supreme Court and decided by them?

A
$Q$
Scroll down. The issue of disclosure relating to
the bone-handled hunting knife turned over to Constable Oliver, again, that would have been:
"The failure of the Crown to tender this exhibit, or to make it available ... deprived the Defence of the opportunity to show the knife to Milgaard's
travelling companions ..."
In your view was that an issue, in other words the Crown or police conduct with respect to this second knife; was that an issue that was, in your view, before the Supreme Court and decided by them in the reference?

Well it was certainly before the Supreme Court. Umm, I, you know, I don't recall them mentioning that specifically in the judgement, but the issue of the disclosure of that information was before them.

Go to 218234. It says:
"It is therefore submitted that lack of disclosure caused a miscarriage of
justice. The Crown was allowed to advance a theory that the Defence could not effectively rebut. It is submitted that this case provides another glaring example of how important disclosure is
to ensuring that the right person is found guilty of a crime."

And I take it you take no issue with that being an issue that was before the Supreme Court? That's correct.

Go to the next page. It talks about The Present State of the Evidence and it goes on to talk about:
"... possible to re-examine the evidence originally called, along with any additional evidence, to determine if there is any credible evidence that establishes, or even points to

Milgaard's guilt."
"It is the position of David
Milgaard that highly coercive and improper police tactics led to the witnesses, Wilson, John and Cadrain, eventually giving statements that incriminated Milgaard. With the benefit of hindsight, it is now possible to see that the statements (including that of

John which was never adopted at trial)
described a set of impossible events."
And was the issue of police misconduct in their
treatment of witnesses in the David Milgaard investigation, namely Wilson, John and Cadrain, an issue before the Supreme Court and decided upon by them, in your view?

Yes, the issue was put before them. Go to the next page. And, in fact, I think the position here on Ron Wilson:
"It is submitted that his recantation should be believed since his trial evidence does not bear up after detailed scrutiny. In 1969 , he was a suspect under pressure. There is no current motive to admit to perjury and to be publicly humiliated. His recantations to Paul Henderson and Bobbie Stadnyk were not made under pressure."

And, again, would the issue of whether Ron Wilson's trial evidence was improperly obtained by the police and/or Crown, was that an issue that, in your view, was dealt with by the Supreme Court?

A
Q
Yes, it was, it was raised and argued there.
If you go to page 218238. This is talking about Nichol John and the issue of her statement to the police that wasn't adopted, and the brief says:
"A more likely scenario was that she was afraid to admit that she had lied to the police.

This proposition is further supported by:
i) The investigative summary retrieved from the Crown's file which 'predicts' what she would say, and demonstrates strong determination to have the evidence conform to a pre-existing theory ...
ii) The pressure imposed on her by her being in custody and subjected to the highly objectionable techniques of Inspector Roberts;
iii) Her conversation with Wilson in which it was decided to tell a story which would satisfy the police."

And, again, would the allegation that Nichol John; number one, gave false evidence to the police because she was coerced into following the Mackie summary or the script; two, that she was pressured by her being put in police custody, be issues that the Supreme Court dealt with in considering whether or not there was a miscarriage of justice?

A

Well, yes, with the proviso that $I$ don't know that the allegation made in the Supreme Court was that she was coerced into following the script. I think the suggestion was that they were given evidence during their, or given information during their questioning by the police that, ultimately, they used to fabricate stories when they felt sufficiently pressured to come up with something. Well was it your understanding that -- or what was your understanding of whether or not the Mackie summary and the allegation that the Mackie summary was used by the police as a script to manipulate and coerce witnesses to provide fabricated evidence, and therefore there was a miscarriage of justice, in your view was that issue presented to the Court?

Well, that was a statement that Mr. Wolch was making, but he had no evidence whatsoever to support it.

But was it an issue that was put forward to the Court?

It was.
It's raised in the argument and I'm asking you whether, in your view, it was something that was --
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A
Q

A

Q

A
Q
A

Q

A

It was, oh yes.
And so you are saying you didn't think there was any evidence but it was something that was there; is that correct?

Yes, oh yes.
And, as well, this -- what was your understanding of the extent to which the Court was asked to
consider Inspector Roberts' conduct in his
treatment of Nichol John and Ron Wilson as being
--
Well, --
-- a ground of miscarriage of justice?
-- again, the thrust of Mr. Wolch's
cross-examination of Inspector Roberts was an attempt to show that, somehow, he had improperly coerced or intimidated, or whatever term you want to use, these witnesses into providing inculpatory statements against David Milgaard.

And if the Court would have concluded that
Inspector Roberts had, or other police officers had committed misconduct and manipulated witnesses to give fabricated evidence -- I think you've told us this -- but in your view that would have been a miscarriage of justice?

Go to 218239. The issue of Albert Cadrain. The argument states, $I$ think, essentially that he was also having mental problems -- let me back up. "What has now become clear is that Albert Cadrain was at the time of the police investigation a simple youth who has taken Grade VI three times. He was also having mental problems. Those mental problems continue today. As a result, it is submitted that neither his evidence at trial, nor the evidence that was given on the Reference can be given any weight by the Court."

And was it your view that the issue of whether Albert Cadrain was mentally competent at the time of trial was considered by the Supreme Court in determining whether or not his evidence in some way, and the giving of -- the getting and giving of his evidence, constituted a miscarriage of justice?

Yes, that issue was raised.
And George Lapchuk, Craig Melnyk -- if we can go to the next page -- it talks about the new evidence. If we can go to page 218242, it says:
"It is therefore submitted
that when the motel room evidence is examined in its entirety, the most that can be said is that David Milgaard, under the influence of drugs, made a statement in a manner and in circumstances consistent with sarcasm and poor taste."

So I take it that the motel incident issues, however many there were, were all before the Supreme Court, as to whether anything related to the obtaining of evidence or the presentation of evidence relating to the motel room incident was an issue considered by the Supreme Court?

Yes.

```
218243. It says:
```

    "Justice Tallis",
    it says:
"In this Reference, he
testified without the benefit of notes.
He was testifying as to conversations
that had taken place more than
twenty-two years before. In that time,
he has handled numerous other cases,
both as a lawyer and as a judge.
preface many of his remarks with the statement that he was relying on his best recollection. He was trying to assist the Court to the best of his ability, but without his file and his original notes, it is difficult to be assured that his memory was accurate." Next page. And the comment that at all times Mr. Tallis, his evidence was that David Milgaard had maintained his innocence, and that, as well, that he advised Milgaard against testifying at trial. And then:
"Justice Tallis recalled that Milgaard had admitted to having a knife in the car on the day of the Miller murder. He was clear that Milgaard had at all times denied that it was a paring knife. He believed that Milgaard had admitted to having a knife which he thought to be a small jackknife that was to be used to break into buildings. It is important to note that neither at the preliminary inquiry nor at the trial did Justice Tallis cross-examine any of the Milgaard travelling companions as to
whether they had seen a knife of the type described by David Milgaard. Such a cross-examination might have been relevant to establish that the knife Milgaard had could not have made the wounds found on Gail Miller. The cross-examination concerning this knife may have shown that no one saw Milgaard take it when he allegedly left the car. The fact that there is no reference to this knife in any of the cross examinations does cast some doubt on Mr . Tallis' recollection that Milgaard told him that he had a knife."

What was your view of what this submission was saying or this position was saying?

A

Q
A
$Q$
A

Well, essentially what he is trying, what he was trying to do was suggest that Justice Tallis' memory was not reliable --

Okay.
-- and you can see that by looking at the fact he didn't cross-examine with respect to the issue of the small knife.

And did you take issue with that submission?
I don't know whether we argued something at that
point. Certainly, we were of the view that putting another knife in David Milgaard's hand wasn't likely to be all that helpful.

I think Mr. Tallis' evidence before the Commission was to the effect that he did not, I think for similar reasons, did not want to ask other witnesses to put a -- to confirm that Mr. Milgaard had a knife, even though it was a knife different than the murder weapon, $I$ think was his evidence. Was that -- do you recall that being an issue? Well, I mean there was -- there were a number of issues with respect to knives. There was also the bone-handled one and there was no examination with respect to that. Well, and again, my -- my thinking on that, and Eric Neufeld's thinking on that, was there were too many knives around, you didn't need to bring that fact up to the jury's attention.

And I take it Mr. Tallis' evidence at the Supreme Court that David told him he had a knife, in light of what David Milgaard testified, was an issue, I think, that you said you felt harmed Mr. Milgaard's position; is that fair?

A
$Q$
Yes.
I see it's 10:30, Mr. Commissioner, probably
appropriate to break.
(Adjourned at 10:30 a.m.)
(Reconvened at 10:48 a.m.)
BY MR. HODSON:
Go back to 218223 and go to page 245 . Just following up, this is Mr. Wolch's written argument, this talks about the compact and $I$ think, similar to the knife, indicates that:
"The cross-examination at trial of the witnesses who testified they saw this event was designed to show that this event had never occurred. At no time did Justice Tallis cross-examine the witnesses in an attempt to establish that Milgaard may have been throwing an unrelated object from the window. If Milgaard had in fact admitted to throwing something from the car, this would have been a logical line of cross-examination. It is possible that Justice Tallis is mistaken in his recollection, given the passage of time."

Again, would you have the same comment there as you did with the knife issue, that this was

A
$Q$

A

A
2
attempted to show that he maybe doesn't recollect, Mr. Tallis does not recollect the right facts on the compact?

Yes.
And was the compact, just your comment on this, we've talked generally about the contradictions, but in the case of the compact or cosmetic bag, or whatever term is used, would you agree the fact that that was thrown out of the car after the group left Saskatoon was incriminating or suspicious?

Suspicious, yes.
Suspicious. And I take it when -- one way to eliminate the suspicion is to show that it didn't happen; correct?

Yes.
And I guess the suspicion would be that, I think, Wilson and John said it wasn't in the car when they left Regina, or some time, it was there, and the fact that Mr. Milgaard threw it out without explanation would be suspicious as well; is that correct?

That's correct, yes.
And the inference for the jury, presumably, would have been that this was Gail Miller's compact --

A Yes.
Q
A
$Q$ fact that Mr. Milgaard said that didn't happen and the other witnesses are lying, and then to have Mr. Tallis say, "well, he told me it happened and he couldn't explain it", and if you accept Mr. Tallis' evidence of that just your comment on does that draw more attention to the compact, does it make it more suspicious than if it had not been denied?

A
Well I -- I'm not sure, at the Supreme Court level, we're talking about whether it's suspicious or not. I think, at that point, it had developed
When we go to the Supreme Court reference, the , $A$ Cental Booking Call rene 1-800-667-6771 or go to wnicompucout.t.
as an indicia of credibility. My recollection is that Wilson said it happened, Justice Tallis said that David Milgaard told him it had happened, and now David Milgaard was saying it didn't happen. At that point what you are really talking about, I think, is it being used as an indicator of David Milgaard's credibility. Certainly, at trial, it was something that raised the suspicion that this was something left over from the attack on Gail Miller and David Milgaard wanted to get rid of it. So let me put it a different way. I think you are saying the compact itself was some incriminating evidence, it worked against, it harmed David Milgaard's interests?

Yes.

The evidence about that. My question is, the fact that he purported to deny it when his lawyer told him it happened, did it increase the harm that the compact incident caused David Milgaard at the Supreme Court, in your view and in your assessment?

Well I think, if you take as a given the conviction, at that point the use of the compact isn't so much as an indicator of guilt as it -- or it doesn't do him as much damage as an indicator
of guilt as it did as an indicator of lack of credibility. To the extent that he's denying the existence of this piece of evidence though, yes. If you were looking at what evidence there is that might suggest David Milgaard was guilty, ignore the issue of the credibility of his statements, then the fact that Justice Tallis and Wilson are still maintaining the compact incident, yes.

And so that if Mr. Milgaard, at the Supreme Court, had said either "lookit, I don't recall but I'll accept what Mr. Tallis said", or "yes, I accept that that happened, it wasn't Gail Miller's, I don't know where it came from and $I$ don't know why I threw it out but $I$ throw things out all the time", so that gave an explanation; if you compare that to what did happen I'm trying to get your sense as to whether Mr. -- how would you have viewed the credibility of Mr. Milgaard's case -Well it --
-- in those two scenarios?
Well it -- yeah. Obviously, if his evidence isn't conflicting with Justice Tallis or the other witnesses, that makes him more credible.

And so his denial then, as compared to either "I don't know, $I$ accept Mr. Tallis" or "I did it but

I don't have a explanation", by denying it, in your view, he harmed his position?

A
$Q$ think you are asking the Court to draw an inference from the fact that the question wasn't asked of Mr. Tallis on this issue; is that correct?

That's correct, yes.
And an adverse inference?
Yes.
Okay.
I mean our view was that it, while it may have added an element to the offence, he still had to

A
deal with Wilson, John, Lapchuk, and Melnyk and Cadrain.

But, again, $I$ think the point you had made earlier, $I$ think, was that it's not clear that Mr. Tallis -- or you are saying the Supreme Court did not have evidence that Mr. Tallis could have and would have done something at the trial if the unsolved assaults had been disclosed to him? Yes, he was never asked that, "how would you have played this at trial?"

And I think Mr. Wolch is asking the Court to infer that he would have done something different, and you are saying since Mr. Wolch didn't ask him that question and he could have, draw the inference that he couldn't have and wouldn't have done anything; is that a fair --
-- and it's not obvious.
Go to the next page.
"It is submitted that the
case against Larry Fisher is extremely
strong, and in fact amounts to proof
beyond a reasonable doubt of his guilt.

> In preparing a case against Larry Fisher, it is submitted that expert evidence could be called to establish the following facts:
a) Gail Miller was the victim of a punishment rapist; ...",
"Larry Fisher is a punishment rapist;"
"Punishment rapists are extremely rare;"
"Punishment rapists follow a pattern;"
"Gail Miller's murder and rape followed Mr. Fisher's pattern."

I would like your comment on what was your view of that submission, or your response?

Well there certainly wasn't evidence upon which Larry Fisher could be prosecuted and convicted beyond a reasonable doubt. There wasn't even evidence, in my view, that he could be charged. The notion that you can call an expert to explain what a punishment rapist is and that -- and give the opinion that Larry Fisher is the one, is a punishment rapist, I'm not so sure about that. And, again, 'Larry Fisher's pattern', at that point it was a pattern of one, at the time of the Milgaard trial.

And, namely, being the Gail Miller?

A

A

Q

A

Q

Yes. It was very different than the other sexual assaults.

And so does that --

And even after, all the way up until the (V10) (V10)- matter came along, it was a very different matter.

So how do you square, then, or are you saying you can't square the notion that -- or the line of, the line of prosecution that he's a punishment rapist, therefore he raped and killed Gail Miller, with the fact that the other rapes that he committed are similar?

Well $I$-- they are not similar, the only one that has a degree of similarity is the (V10) (V10)one, if you are talking about in terms of a punishment rapist.

So I'm putting aside (V10) (V10)-, we'll talk about the ' 68 to ' 71 rapes, then. Are you saying that it's your view that those assaults, that none of the Fisher assaults -- putting aside Gail

Miller, so we're talking (V1)-, (V2)-----,
(V3)------, (V5)---, (V8)--- and (V7)--- in
Winnipeg, let's leave (V4)--- and (V9)---- aside -- that those six rapes for which Mr. Fisher pled guilty; was it your view that any of those were --
that any of those identified Mr. Fisher as a punishment rapist, or did you view those as punishment rapes?

A
No. My understanding of 'punishment rapist' is that you have someone who not only commits the rape, but they then use a degree of violence that's designed to inflict physical suffering on the victim that's above and beyond what's necessary to commit the rape.

And so did you view the theory of punishment rapist actually suggests if Mr. Fisher was -- or let me ask you your comment. How did you see the punishment rapist theory fitting in as far as the value of the Larry Fisher assaults?

Well if you look at all of them together, six assaults plus the (V10) (V10)- matter, at that point there's only one of those that could have been considered a punishment rape, and that was (V10) (V10)-. The others, in my view, were not. And so, if you conclude that Gail Miller was murdered by a punishment rapist, was that something that you viewed as a possibility, or a likelihood, or consistent with a punishment rapist?

A

Umm, poss -- well, you could make an argument
there. Umm, I think it's also consistent with the fact that the woman resisted or she got a look at him.

Okay. If you can go to 218252, Position on (V4)---- (V4)---, I think here stated is that:
"An extremely important piece
of evidence implicating Larry Fisher in the death of Gail Miller is the evidence of (V4)---- (V4)---. Her attack takes place shortly after the Miller murder, about eight hundred yards away. It defies logic to suggest that two different people were responsible for these crimes."

And then it goes on to talk about the railway tracks and, $I$ think, the theory that -- next page -- Fisher may have visited the Pambrun home, borrowed and returned a vehicle to Cliff Pambrun or to Roy Pambrun, etcetera. And so you would have been familiar with that theory advanced, that Fisher committed the (V4)--- rape by using Cliff Pambrun's car, taking it to his house, and walking back on the tracks?

That was the suggestion made, yes.
Go to page 218257, this is in the conclusion, I'll
get your comment about the test, the argument states:
"The first test set out by
this Court states that a miscarriage of
justice will occur if the court is
satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that
Milgaard is innocent of the offence.
This test is a direct reversal of the
basic onus in criminal law which
requires that guilt be proved beyond a
reasonable doubt. A reasonable doubt is
defined as one based on the evidence and
not one which is fanciful or
speculative.

If the basic criminal law propositions are applied to the first test set out by the Court, then David Milgaard will have met this test if the Court has no reasonable evidence that points to guilt. If there is some credible evidence that points to guilt, then the court cannot be satisfied that Milgaard is innocent."

Let me just pause there. Would you agree with that statement about the test in proving David

Milgaard is innocent beyond a reasonable doubt?

A

Q
A

Q

A
$Q$
都 Well, it does seem to turn things around a bit. My understanding of that test was you take his conviction as a given and if he can establish beyond a reasonable doubt that he is in fact innocent, he gets the full pardon.

And so that do you --
It wasn't then a matter of us proving that there was evidence that he was guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

And so that if the court has no reasonable evidence that points to guilt, in your view would that be in and of itself to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that he's innocent?

No, it would prove that perhaps the continuing conviction was a miscarriage, but it didn't prove innocence.

Go to the next page, it says:
"If the Court is not prepared to state
that Milgaard is innocent beyond a reasonable doubt then it is submitted that the Court can still find that Milgaard is probably innocent of the offence. This is a civil standard... In considering the evidence as a whole,
it is submitted that it establishes that there is no credible direct evidence of Milgaard's guilt and there is a strong circumstantial case against Fisher. In such a situation it is submitted that it is more probable than not that Milgaard is innocent and to sustain a conviction in such circumstances would result in a miscarriage of justice."

And just your comment on that, do you agree with how that's put forward or what was your view about what Mr . Milgaard in your view was required to put forward to meet part B of the Supreme Court test and prove his innocence on a preponderance of the evidence?

Well, again, $I$ think they were taking the same approach to that as they took to the other test, and that is we don't assume there's a conviction outstanding, we'll simply say has the Crown proven that there is probable -- or that he is guilty. If we haven't proved he's probably guilty, then he's entitled to a remedy, and it seems to me that what they were trying to do was reverse the onus. And then if we can scroll down, and this is the reference to the part $C$ test about:

|  | 1 |  | "...new evidence which was reasonably |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 |  | capable of belief..." |
|  | 3 |  | And: |
|  | 4 |  | "..could reasonably be expected to have |
| 11:05 | 5 |  | affected the verdict." |
|  | 6 |  | It says: |
|  | 7 |  | "...it is submitted that the evidence |
|  | 8 |  | concerning the (V1)-, (V2)-----, |
|  | 9 |  | (V9)----, and (V4)--- attacks meet this |
| 11:05 | 10 |  | test. It is submitted that the evidence |
|  | 11 |  | complies with the test for fresh |
|  | 12 |  | evidence... This evidence was not |
|  | 13 |  | disclosed to the Defence though it was |
|  | 14 |  | available to the Crown." |
| 11:05 | 15 |  | And again, that would have been one of the |
|  | 16 |  | arguments advanced then on part $C$ of the test? |
|  | 17 | A | Yes. |
|  | 18 | Q | Page 218260 , it says here: |
|  | 19 |  | "In conclusion the Applicant Milgaard |
| 11:06 | 20 |  | states that for the past twenty-two |
|  | 21 |  | years he has been proclaiming his |
|  | 22 |  | innocence. He had long maintained that |
|  | 23 |  | his conviction was obtained on |
|  | 24 |  | fabricated evidence. He asks the Court |
| 11:06 | 25 |  | to consider all of the evidence that is |
|  |  |  | Meyer CompuCourt Reporting ertified Professional Court Reporters serving P.A., Regina \& Saskatoon since 1980 Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv |

now called on the Reference and to confirm his innocence."

And again, just on the fabricated evidence, was that your understanding of at least part of what was being put forward?

Oh, absolutely, yes.
If we can now go to 208379, and this is the transcript of the oral submissions. I checked -yesterday $I$ asked you about whether there was oral submissions on the test to be employed by the court, I think you said you didn't recall, and I think Mr. Wolch had advised me that he thought there were oral submissions and $I$ put that to you. I'm now advised that he was mistaken, he was thinking about the final submissions, so just maybe let's clear this up on the record. Certainly, and the transcript reflects this, final submissions to the court, you made oral submissions, as did all parties; correct? Oh, yes, yes.

As far as oral submissions to the Supreme Court on the test to be employed by them, do you recall whether you made oral submissions in addition to the written submissions?

I -- as $I$ say, I don't recall doing that. If --

I'm prepared to take Mr. Wolch's view that there weren't submissions made. I know there were written submissions, but $I$ don't really recall whether there were --

Go to 208383, just a comment on a couple of points. This is Mr. Fainstein, this is April 6th, '92, on the DNA, he says:
"I would like to give you a brief update on the matter of genetic testing. When we had known samples of bodily fluids from both Milgaard and Fisher, $I$ went back to our experts at the RCMP's central forensic laboratory to see if there was any avenue that we could now pursue. It was decided to try a test called "DQ alpha" which has recently been accepted in American courts."

And then goes on to say, unfortunately -- pardon me:
"Though it is not as discriminatory as other techniques which are now under development, it would only consume a small portion of the evidentiary material, leaving enough for
better tests when they are validated.
Unfortunately, due to the age and condition of the material from the crime scene, we are not able to achieve results with that test.

It is still possible that
other procedures which are not yet ready for court use will, in time, help resolve a case like this. We have at least the comfort of knowing that we have done everything we can for now." And just on this issue of the DNA at this time, would you have been involved, this is April 6, '92, would you or anybody at Saskatchewan Justice have been involved in, involved directly in the review of exhibits, the testing for DNA samples on the garments, the consideration of DNA testing, as to who to send it to and how to do it, and all of those matters relating to testing for DNA from the Gail Miller exhibits?

The only involvement we had with respect to the testing of the exhibits for DNA was we were, we continued to press the federal government to see whether this could be done because, in our view, if it could, it would certainly settle a lot of
issues, and we had obtained I think Fred Dehm, who was a prosecutor in Regina at the time, obtained the exhibits from the court in saskatoon and had them turned over to the police, but that was -and we discussed the matter with the feds on a number of occasions.

But as far as deciding who would look at the garments, what they would look at, who they would send it to and what tests would be conducted, was that something you relied upon Federal Justice officials?

A
$Q$
And what was your understanding in April 6, '92, what were you advised about, two things; number one, what human tissue or what substances were found on Gail Miller's clothing or in the exhibits that would be capable of doing a DNA test, and secondly, whether such a DNA test could be done at that time?

We were advised that when the garments were examined, there was one tiny spot of potentially analysable material on, $I$ believe it was the panties, but that it was a very, very tiny spot, and until a better technique, specifically $I$ think PCR was developed, if analysis was done, it ran
the risk of using up the entire sample and producing an inconclusive result.

Q
A

Q

A
$Q$
A
Q

A
$Q$
A
As I said, we were advised that the RCMP analyst was only able to find a very tiny spot of material and that in their view that wouldn't likely be enough to provide an analysis using the current

A
Q

A
Q
A
techniques and that it ran the risk, if you attempted it, of using up whatever sample there was. There was, however, on the horizon this new technique that could replicate even a tiny amount so that there was more for testing, that that in a few years perhaps would provide a better way to proceed than the $D Q$ alpha way and that's what -when we left it, we were expecting the federal government to keep track, Ron Fainstein or someone in that office to keep track of the development of the technology and to get the testing done when the $P C R$ technology permitted it.

And do you recall any discussions with Federal Justice officials about having the exhibits turned back to the Court of Queen's Bench pursuant to the order?

No.
Was Saskatchewan Justice in agreement with having Federal Justice officials carry the ball in getting further DNA testing done on Gail Miller's garments?

Yes.
And why was that?
Well, if we were going to get it done sort of at the cutting edge of the development of that
technology, at that point it was likely going to have to go either to the United States or to the United Kingdom. The federal people had the contacts and, as important for us, they also had the money to do that. We didn't have the contacts or the money.

And post reference, once the reference was done, is it fair to say that the DNA testing of Gail Miller's clothing would have been an essential investigative step for the province and/or police to take in the investigation into the death of Gail Miller?

Yes.
In fact, is it fair to say that with respect to Larry Fisher as a possible suspect, I think you've told us that that would be the only evidence left that you could pursue, barring some confession from him or some evidence that had not been obtained before; is that fair?

Yes.
And I think you told us that -- or let me back up. If the exhibits had been returned to the court of Queen's Bench at the conclusion of the Supreme Court reference, I think you told us Saskatchewan Justice would follow up to do DNA testing and
would rely upon the RCMP; correct?
A
If those exhibits had been returned to us, yes, we would have checked -- I would have checked with the $R C M P$ crime lab in Regina with respect to how to store them and asked whoever was in charge of serology at the time, $I$ believe it was Jean Rooney, to keep me apprised of the development of the DNA science so that we can, at some appropriate point, get these exhibits checked for that kind of thing.

And what would be your purpose, or Saskatchewan Justice's purpose in getting the exhibits checked? Well, I mean, aside from the fact that there was an undertaking to the Supreme Court to do that, it's something -- DNA technology is a very powerful tool and it gives you a result that's pretty hard to argue with.

And so would that be to assist you in considering whether to re-open the investigation into the death of Gail Miller?

Or to establish that in fact the right person had been convicted, yes.

Okay. And in the circumstances, I think the record reflects, and we certainly heard, and we'll hear more evidence, that Federal Justice officials
pursued the DNA testing up until July of 1997 when DNA results were obtained; is that correct? Yes.

And was Saskatchewan Justice then prepared to rely upon Federal Justice to $I$ guess control the process of getting the Gail Miller exhibits checked for DNA?

Yes.

And what was your understanding, and again you may have already answered this by way of the undertaking, what was your understanding as to why Federal Justice officials would be involved in this matter after the conclusion of the supreme Court reference; in other words, why would they be involved or interested in pursuing the testing of these exhibits in light of the conclusion of the reference case and the fact that the minister, in April of 1992 , concluded the 690 application by granting a remedy?

Well, part of it was the undertaking made to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, but I think part of it was that they were concerned that if there was some testing that could be done on them, it should be done, and that would provide whatever certainty it could provide.

Q

A Just give me a moment here. Do you recall, Mr. Brown, what was the position taken generally by Larry Fisher in the proceedings as far as they affected him, or where did you see -Yeah, Larry Fisher's view of the evidence against him pretty much paralleled ours, that it did not provide any kind of case, and as I recall, even the Chief Justice wasn't able to sweat a confession out of him.

And are you referring to -- that was Chief Justice Lamer's questioning of him?

Yes. Mano a mano I think it was.
If we can go to 208467 , and this is from your oral
submissions to the court, I think this is after Mr. Wolch has presented his argument, and you are talking here, the memo is the Mackie summary, you say:
"The memo that my learned
friend refers to and that he, indeed,
has produced in his new set of
materials, with the greatest of respect,
does not set itself up as some sort of
sinister masterplan to, in effect, frame
an innocent man. If you look at what
the police knew at that point from
having talked to Albert Cadrain, from having talked to David Milgaard, from having seen the scene and found the articles around it, everything in there is a perfectly reasonable statement of either fact or inference that could be drawn from the known facts."

And to the next page:
"Finally, you will note, my
lords and my lady, that that memorandum
ends with the police saying they want to
get at the truth. That is what Eddy
Karst said when he testified before you.
That is what Art Roberts said when he
testified before you.
I note that despite the

I note that despite the fact that we had found one other police, Charles Short, and had him subpoenaed, my learned friend did not press to have him brought her in spite of his condition or have him testify some other way before this Court. He, in effect, dropped that line of suggestion.

It is our submission that
at the end of the day there is nothing
to indicate that the police went out of their way to frame David Milgaard or even innocently pursued a false theory. The only evidence they had, based on what Mr. Cadrain had said, what Mr. Milgaard had said, was that David Milgaard was the most likely suspect." And again, this would be your submission relating to -- is it fair to conclude from that, Mr. Brown, that this issue about framing David Milgaard in reliance in part upon the Mackie summary was an issue that was put before the Supreme Court and addressed by you?

Yes.
And if the court -- I think you maybe told us that in your view, if that allegation were true, in your view that would amount to miscarriage of justice and be a basis to provide a remedy? Oh, if there was evidence to establish that they had framed David Milgaard, absolutely. And what significance, if any, do you place on the fact that this argument was raised, and we've seen it on a couple of occasions, but $I$ don't believe it was specifically dealt with in the written decision of the Supreme Court.

A

Well, there was a lot of evidence they didn't specifically deal with in their written decision, but the issue, that document was raised, the suggestion was put to them by Mr. Wolch that this amounted to some sort of script or a conspiracy to frame David Milgaard and when they said they found no evidence of police misconduct, in my view that's an implicit rejection of that argument, or the suggestion that that document has some sort of sinister value.

And what about the comment, and we'll get to the judgment, about no evidence or probative evidence of Crown misconduct?

Well, again, I mean, there was -- the allegation being made was that the Crown had, number one, sinisterly failed to disclose information to Justice Tallis that he could have used at trial and then sinisterly covered up after the Milgaard conviction had been obtained and Larry Fisher was known, and $I$ take that suggestion again to be a rejection of those arguments, they found no evidence of that.

And I guess the question, though, that came up later, was the one suggestion that the reason they did -- the reason they said there was no probative
evidence of that is because they didn't -- number one, they said the court directed the parties that they wouldn't consider those issues, and two, there was no evidence before the court on those issues. Do you take issue with those suggestions? Well, first of all, $I$ do not accept the suggestion that the court prevented anyone from putting evidence of that before it. Those were live issues that went to the minister when she was asked to do her job under 690, those were issues that the Supreme Court was prepared to hear about. They were not interested in listening to sort of how police forces go about doing things generally, they wanted evidence that was specific to this case, and had there been evidence of those two things, it could have been produced before the Supreme Court. There was no attempt made by anyone to stop them from doing that.

Okay. And I guess the second question then is was there some evidence and were the allegations before the court with respect to the Mackie summary, the frame and cover-up and the 1970, '71 misconduct or alleged misconduct with respect to the manner in which Mr. Karst obtained the confessions from Fisher, that Mr. Caldwell, Mr.

Kujawa and others dealt with the Fisher and Milgaard matters once they became aware of the Fisher rapes?

There was evidence before the court -- well, first of all, with respect to the police misconduct allegations, there was evidence before the court. That's why Eddie Karst was called, that's why Art Roberts was called, Mr. Wolch was waving the Mackie summary around saying that this was evidence of misconduct, so yes, that issue was explored and evidence was called on it.

With respect to the issue of Crown cover-up and failure to disclose, Mr. Wolch raised those issues and we took no argument with the fact that disclosure was not made with respect to certain items. We dealt with that issue on the basis of the fact that it didn't make any difference, so it was raised. There was the opportunity to hear from Mr. Caldwell and, if he had wanted to, Mr. Kujawa, but there was no desire on the part of Mr. Wolch and Mr. Asper to do that. If we can go to 229673 , please, go to the side here, you can't see this very well, this is an April 7th newspaper article, April 6th was the argument, and it says:
"Murray Brown told reporters the brutal sex-slaying of Gail Miller more than 22 years ago would never have come before the high court if not for the political pressure on Justice Minister Kim Campbell.

He said that pressure
forced the minister to send the case to a five judge panel even though she was convinced the original jury had delivered the proper verdict -- life imprisonment for Milgaard.
"I suggest the hearing process arose because of questions raised about the minister, the integrity of members of her department and the way the investigation was handled.

The suggestion that there was impropriety have turned out to be unfounded.

Over three years, they have
gone out and turned over every stone."
Let me just pause there. Can you -- do you take issue with what's reported in that column, or at least attributed to you?

A

Oh, I think it was the pressure created by the news media campaign, particularly the one between the dismissal of the first application and the filing of the second one, that did push the minister into doing that.

And your comment that after the hearing process over three years they've gone out and turned over every stone, can you comment, and you touched on this earlier, after the completion of the Supreme Court reference did what you learned at the reference, what you heard by way of evidence cause you to have any concerns with the issues that had earlier been raised about the integrity of members of her department and the way the investigation was handled?

No, nothing.
Go to 008879. This is the April 14th, 1992 judgment of the Supreme Court. If we can go to page 008885, please. Is it fair to say that this Supreme Court judgment was a significant piece of information, for lack of a better word, that guided Saskatchewan Justice's conduct from this point on, a matter that was relied upon?

Oh, absolutely. If they had found that there was significant evidence implicating Larry Fisher,
then that investigation would have to be opened. If they had said that there was evidence of Crown misconduct and police misconduct, an investigation into that would had to have been set up as well.

You had mentioned earlier that Saskatchewan Justice desired that the reference be as broad as possible so that $I$ think all issues relating to the alleged miscarriages of justice that had been in the media and that had been made against police and Crown and others would be dealt with; correct? You told us that, that was your desire? That they would have the opportunity to bring forward any evidence they had to suggest there was Crown misconduct, police misconduct, witnesses lied, anything at all.

And at the end of the process, what you participated in, were you satisfied that that opportunity had been provided to David Milgaard to put forward anything he alleged that related to a miscarriage of justice in the handling of his case?

Yes.
And was Saskatchewan Justice relying on the decision then from the Supreme Court, whatever it might be, to guide it in its future actions
relating to the various allegations?

A
$Q$
Yes.
The court cites out the four tests, I won't go
through that, the first paragraph says:
"It is appropriate to begin by stating
that in our view David Milgaard had the
benefit of a fair trial in January 1970.
We have not been presented with any
probative evidence that the police acted
improperly in the investigation of the
robbery, sexual assault and murder of
Gail Miller or in their interviews with
any of the witnesses. Nor has evidence
been presented that there was inadequate
disclosure in accordance with the
practice prevailing at the time.
Milgaard was represented by able and
experienced counsel. No error in law or
procedure has been established. At the
conclusion of the first trial, there was
ample evidence upon which the jury,
which had been properly instructed,
could return a verdict of guilty."
If we can just go back to the previous page.
What was the significance of this first sentence,
about that in the view of the Supreme Court of Canada, David Milgaard had the benefit of a fair trial?

A
Well, when you look at what follows in the paragraph, they start with the conclusion that the trial was fair and it was fair because there was no evidence of police misconduct, no evidence of failure to disclose in accordance with the practice prevailing at the time, he was represented by capable counsel, etcetera. Basically what they are saying is that the conviction was fair.

I want to deal with the second sentence:
"We have not been presented with any probative evidence that the police acted improperly in the investigation of the robbery, sexual assault and murder of Gail Miller or in their interviews with any of the witnesses."

And you are aware that later some took the view that this would -- we have not been presented with any probative evidence because David Milgaard's counsel was told by the court that they could not call evidence.

I'm aware that investigation was made, but with
the greatest of respect to Mr. Wolch's statements, it's just not true.

So there seems to be two parts here, one about the investigation, and two, in their interviews with any of the witnesses, and again, you've touched on this earlier, that -- and I think you told us, and please correct me if I'm wrong, that the Supreme Court did have evidence from Wilson, John, Cadrain and David Milgaard about their interviews with the police and from Inspector Roberts and Detective Karst; is that correct?

A
Q
That's correct.
In addition to documentary evidence in the way of police reports and other statements I take it? Yes.

And in your view, then, were the manner in which the Saskatoon City Police interviewed Wilson, John, Cadrain and Milgaard and investigated the Gail Miller death matters of which there was evidence before the Supreme Court and which they were asked to consider in reaching this conclusion?

A
$Q$
"Nor has evidence been presented that

A
there was inadequate disclosure in accordance with the practice prevailing at the time."

What was your understanding about this ruling and, in particular, whether the court was addressing disclosure in the trial setting and disclosure in 1970 and ' 71 when the Larry Fisher information came to light?

Well, $I$ took that to be a broad statement covering everything, that it dealt with the issues of disclosure of information at trial and disclosure of the information after 1971.

Was the issue -- was the following issue, in your view, before the court; namely, whether the police and/or Crown should have disclosed to David Milgaard's counsel the information they learned starting in October, 1970 about Larry Fisher's involvement in the Saskatoon rapes and the Winnipeg rapes and his conviction in December of 1971, is it your view that that, the issue of whether or not that should have been disclosed was an issue that was considered by the Supreme Court in deciding whether or not there was a miscarriage of justice?

Yes, that was one of the disclosure issues. The
other one was of course the trial information. And did you take this statement, and the rest of the judgment, I'll go through it with you, as being the Supreme Court of Canada concluding that there was no breach of any disclosure requirement in 1970 and '71 by the Crown in not providing the '70, '71 Larry Fisher information to David Milgaard?

Yes. If they had wanted to separate the trial disclosure from the disclosure following the Fisher convictions, they are perfectly capable of doing that and they chose not to. I read that then as meaning that they were satisfied with the statement they made, that based on the practice prevailing at the time, there was no error in the disclosure.

And what if the Supreme Court had concluded that there was, or that the Crown should have disclosed, that in 1970 or 1971 the Crown should have disclosed to Mr. Milgaard the information that they became aware of relating to Larry Fisher's confessions to the Saskatoon and Winnipeg rapes; how would you have reacted to that statement in the judgement?

Well that would, that would have provided David

Milgaard with some argument that he was entitled to some kind of remedy beyond simply being released from custody, because at that point you then have, if not error or misconduct, you at least have error by the prosecutor.

And would that be a miscarriage of justice, then, in your view; is that --

Well, I -- I don't know. I suppose it depends on what view you take of that. If the Supreme Court had said that this was an error, that seems to me to amount to a suggestion that there's been a miscarriage, that this should have been provided and it could have been useful.

And we'll talk about that a bit later. The -- and I think you have taken the view that the Supreme Court did not find that there had been a miscarriage of justice but, rather, that if Mr . Milgaard was not given an opportunity to have the conviction set aside and have a new trial, there would be a miscarriage of justice; is that correct?

A
Well, yes. The standards that -- for disclosure had changed dramatically. I believe the year that we're -- the 1991 I think, or 1992 when Stinchcombe came out, I don't remember which, but
yes, there had just been sort of an earthquake kind of change in the way that kind of thing was handled, something that didn't exist back in 1960 s, or even in the 1970 s. When I started, I frequently got into trouble with the RCMP for letting people, defence counsel, read their reports.

So then as far as the statement about, I guess taking two things, one is this statement there has been no evidence:
"Nor has evidence been presented that there was inadequate disclosure in accordance with the practice prevailing at the time."

I take it there was evidence, and the record reflects this, before the Court about Larry Fisher's 1970 confessions to Detective Karst, I think he was asked about that and Mr. Karst was; correct?

Yes.
And, as well, the follow-up, at least in the evidentiary record, about his disposition in 1971; that was before the Court, correct?

A
$Q$
Yes.
And as far as Mr. Caldwell's performance at the
trial then, or what -- Mr. Caldwell's performance at the trial and through to the appeals -- I'm sorry, let's start with the trial, his performance at the trial; what was your understanding of what the Court was saying here about his conduct as far as disclosure was concerned?

Well they were suggesting that he had not improperly failed to disclose information to Justice Tallis, that the practice prevailing at the time was observed, at the very least, because I believe the evidence was Justice Tallis knew most of the statements of the witnesses.

Yeah. If the Supreme Court would have concluded that, when Larry Fisher came to light in 1970, that the police and/or Crown officials linked him to the Gail Miller murder and took steps to conceal that information or took steps deliberately not to disclose it to David Milgaard --

It is unimaginable that they would not have commented on that specifically.

And the fact that they did not comment on that allegation, did you take that as being that that was included in:
"Nor has evidence been presented that
there was inadequate disclosure in accordance with the practice prevailing at the time?"

A
$Q$

A

Q

A that as saying. That judgement is basically saying "Mr. Milgaard, you have not produced any evidence of this", not that there isn't any
evidence or that it couldn't have happened, it's a statement that "you have not met the burden of proof on you to establish these allegations." Okay. And $I$ guess my question relates to this fact; that there was some evidence before the Court on some of these issues, and I suppose -and we're going to get into this in later letters -- I think Mr. Wolch took the position, after, that the Court didn't deal with the frame and coverup argument because we didn't put that evidence forward, and $I$ think your position was, well, they did deal with it because (a) you did put some evidence forward and the Court didn't buy it; and (b) you didn't have any other evidence; does that character --

Well the frame and coverup comes after Larry Fisher is discovered as the perpetrator of the four Saskatoon rapes. Umm, the argument was made that at that point the information should have presented -- been presented to David Milgaard or his counsel, and that that was part of the failure to disclose. Now I don't know that they argued specifically the frame and coverup, because they had no evidence of that, their best argument was that this was an error that should have -- and it
should have been disclosed.
And $I$ guess I'm trying to understand, Mr. Brown, that after the judgement, in your view, were there still some remaining issues relating to Crown and police misconduct that had previously been alleged but were not decided by the Supreme Court in the reference?

Well there were all kinds of allegations that, if you go back and look at their news media campaign from the very beginning there were all kinds of allegations that were still out there that weren't addressed in the Supreme Court. And the reason for that, $I$ expect, is that they were in no position to bring evidence with respect to them. My position, and what $I$ told my minister at that point, was they were given a full opportunity to bring all of their concerns before the Court, they appeared to have taken advantage of that, and after hearing all of their evidence and looking at all of the material they presented the Court was satisfied that there was no failure, or no errors in disclosure as per the practice at that time, no evidence presented with respect to impropriety by the Saskatoon Police Service in investigating it.

Q

Is it fair to put it this way; to the extent that there is evidence on the record before the Supreme Court, and to the extent that the issues were raised in either written or oral submissions before the Court, is it fair to say that that might be an indicator of what was and wasn't decided by the Supreme Court on the issue of Crown misconduct and police misconduct, in your view? Well, no, my -- my view would be that they put everything they had before the court one way or another, --

Okay.
-- either in written form or in evidence. The Court, I'm satisfied -- I have no reason to believe the Court didn't consider all of it -Okay.
-- and I have no reason to believe that they were misstating their position when they said that they find no support for these things.

I'll maybe revisit this when we get into some later exchanges of letters that you have. The, just again on this comment about the interviews with witnesses and inadequate disclosure; to what extent did you view these conclusions as dealing with the allegations relating to the manner in
which the police and Crown dealt with the motel room witnesses?

Well I mean, again, there were allegations that some of the evidence of persons talked to who were at the motel room was not disclosed to Justice Tallis. Again, the Supreme Court indicates that disclosure with respect to anything relating to the Milgaard case was appropriate for the time. If we can go to the next page. I take it, as well, the Court says:
"Milgaard was represented by able and experienced counsel."

Was that an issue, in your view, that was being presented to the Court, that Mr. Tallis' representation of Mr. Milgaard may, in some way, have been part of a miscarriage of justice?

Well, I don't recall whether David Milgaard made that allegation in the Supreme Court, but certainly before the Supreme Court reference there was a lot of media statements with respect to the fact that he was a Legal Aid counsel and really hadn't taken much interest in this case.

And what about the, in his evidence, the chicken soup/heater fix issue?

A
Well, yes, there was the suggestion by David

Milgaard that he had told Justice Tallis about this and that Justice Tallis hadn't followed it up.

And if that, in fact, had been true, then would that be something that would give rise, in other words if --

Well, if the Supreme Court had accepted that story and accepted the allegation that Justice Tallis ignored it, yes, that's -- that would be something that would be serious because, as I say, that, that would be a silver-bullet alibi.

The next paragraph says:
"However, fresh evidence has been presented to us. Ronald Wilson, a key witness at the trial, has recanted part of his testimony. Additional evidence has been presented with respect to the alleged motel room confession. 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." And let's talk, first, about the Ron Wilson information as being fresh evidence; what did you make of that statement in light of the contempt

A
proceedings?
Well my view was that the issue that $I$ had discussed with Justice Sopinka, that since he's incredible now can you look at him being or can you consider him as being incredible 20 some years earlier, I took that to mean that Justice Sopinka's view may have had some weight when they were looking at the decision --

So, in other words, --
-- because --
Oh, sorry?
-- because, if you simply take Ron Wilson's evidence in the Supreme Court, it establishes nothing.

And so did you take that as being the fact that a person who gave pivotal evidence at the original trial is now recanting, and even though his recantation may not be credible, that fact alone might be fresh evidence that might affect --

Yes, I -- that seemed to be the view that Justice Sopinka had.

And then, secondly:
"Additional evidence has been presented with respect to the alleged motel room confession."

A

And what was your understanding of that?
Well $I$ found that quite curious because, frankly, we had pretty much resolved the fact that the motel room incident happened, Deborah Hall says she thought it was a joke, others said she didn't --

Would that --
-- or they didn't.
-- perhaps be the additional evidence, perhaps the fact that some witnesses viewed it as a joke, -Yes.
-- as opposed --
I suspect that was the case.
And then:
"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."

Now I think much was made later about this comment:
"... which came to light in October 1970
..."
You recall that being referred to by Mr. Wolch in the media and his correspondence with you about
signifying something, the fact that the Court was saying it came to light and was known?

Well, I mean, that's -- that's certainly not new. I mean everyone knew it came to light in October of ' 70 when Larry Fisher, I believe, was arrested in Winnipeg. The fact that they put it in that paragraph, I think that whole sentence suggests to you what they found was really the significant aspect of the application, and that is that the Larry Fisher rapes, or those four rapes, suddenly became attached to someone who lived at the same place that David Milgaard was visiting.

And the Court says:
"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."

And your comment on that paragraph?

A
of the significance of the evidence, $I$ don't believe it would reasonably be expected to have affected the verdict.

But I go back to what I said earlier. When the tests came down and the options were set out, that last option seemed to me to indicate that the Supreme Court would likely be looking for some way to do something for David Milgaard, and this was the hook they could use and, really, the only hook they could use.

And this comment that, indeed, that evidence:
"Nor ... that the evidence would justify charging him with the murder of Gail Miller.";
any significance with that comment, in your view? Well, they got that part right. If we can scroll down to the options, number one:
"As to the first, we are not satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that David Milgaard is innocent of the murder of Gail Miller."

Next page:
"As to the second, we are not satisfied, on the basis of the judicial
record, the Reference case and the
further evidence heard on this
Reference, on a preponderance of all the evidence, that David Milgaard is
innocent of that murder."
How did you interpret that ruling, what was your view of that?

Well, I mean, the first one basically says they didn't believe what David Milgaard said because, of course, if they had believed him they would have found him innocent.

The second one says that not only don't they believe him but, on the basis of the rest of the evidence they heard, they are not satisfied that he has established he was innocent.

Let me just back up. If the Court would have believed David Milgaard when he said "I didn't kill Gail Miller", in your view that would have met the high burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt?

Yes.
On the second test -- and so you're saying the reason they didn't is because they didn't believe him when he said he didn't kill Gail Miller?

A

Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

A

Q
A

And on the second test, that:
"... on a preponderance of all the evidence ...",

I think that's also been characterized as 'more likely than not' or 'probable'; is that a fair way to --

And in 1997, when the DNA came out, I think the Minister of Justice acknowledged a wrongful conviction and indicated that compensation would be negotiated. If the Supreme Court of Canada would have concluded either that David Milgaard had proven beyond a reasonable doubt that he was innocent, or had established that he was probably innocent, can you tell us whether Saskatchewan Justice would have acknowledged a wrongful conviction at that point and commenced compensation discussions?

Well, that would have been my advice to the minister, and I'm assuming for the sake of that argument that he would have followed that, yes. And why would that have been your advice? Because in my view, if he can establish he's probably innocent, we're at a point where proof beyond a reasonable doubt would have been impossible at trial.

And would that have been sufficient, in your view, to establish a wrongful conviction on the -against David Milgaard?

A
$Q$
In my view it would have, yes.
And would that have provided the basis for the Government of Saskatchewan to negotiate

A
Q
compensation to Mr. Milgaard for the wrongful conviction?

Yes.
In light of the fact that the Supreme Court of Canada did not make either of those findings, what significance did that have to Saskatchewan Justice in considering the question of whether or not David Milgaard had been wrongfully convicted, and whether or not he was deserved of compensation? Well, the issue of compensation would only come up if there was some indication that something wrong had happened, if there was no finding that something wrong had happened then there wasn't going to be -- there wasn't likely going to be discussions about compensation, and it -- for my part, $I$ certainly wouldn't have been recommending that the government enter into those kinds of discussions.

And when you talk about "wrong", if the Court said that he is innocent, $I$ take it would that constitute a wrong?

Well, yeah, if you're innocent and spend 22 years in jail that's a good definition of "wrong". So the "wrong" -- so your last answer, though, the fact that the Court said "we don't find you
probably innocent", you said you would not acknowledge a wrongful conviction and not look at compensation because there was no wrong. And just so that we're clear, you are not looking at -- you were not limiting that to wrong conduct by the part of the Crown or police but, rather, wrong in the result? This is probably an appropriate spot to break for lunch.
(Adjourned at 11:57 a.m.)
(Reconvened at 1:31 p.m.)

BY MR. HODSON:
If you could call up the Supreme Court judgment, 008879 , and go to page 887. Just before lunch we finished dealing with that paragraph about probable innocence. Next it says:
"Third, we are satisfied that 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 the minister to quash the conviction and to direct a new trial under s. 690(a) of the Criminal Code. In light of this decision, it would be inappropriate to discuss the evidence in detail or to comment upon the credibility of the witnesses."

And the last point, I take it, Mr. Brown, was that if this matter was going to go to a new trial, that the court's comments on their evidence might be prejudicial to a subsequent trial, or how did you take that?

Well, I mean, just generally when an appellate
court orders a new trial, it doesn't comment on the evidence any more than is absolutely necessary to substantiate their decision.

And then if we can scroll down, the court says: "Nonetheless we will set out in brief the basis for our recommendation to the minister..."

And then it says:
"Without being exhaustive it will
suffice to observe that there is some evidence which if accepted by a jury could implicate Milgaard in the murder of Gail Miller."

What was your reaction, or the significance of this statement?

Well, it was simply that they thought there was still a sufficient case left, that it could point to -- that a jury could accept that it proved David Milgaard was guilty.

And did you read anything into the fact that this was included in the judgment?

Well, other than it sort of stands alongside with the notion that he hasn't demonstrated that he was innocent, no.

And then next it goes on to talk about the facts.

Did you take this recitation as being the court's finding of the facts, or the skeleton facts?

A
$Q$

Yes.
And in particular they talk about the vehicle, or sorry:
"The evidence of Nichol John and the final version of the recantation of Ronald Wilson indicates that in Saskatoon, sometime before 7:00 a.m. on that morning they stopped a woman walking by their car to ask for directions. Shortly after that, the car became stuck, Wilson and Milgaard got out of the car and walked away in different directions to seek assistance."

Now, on that point about getting stuck and leaving the car, I think the evidence of Nichol John, Ron Wilson and Mr. Justice Tallis was that that's what had happened; correct?

Yes, that remained as part of $I$ think what was legitimately left of the evidence we had from the trial.

However, David Milgaard had testified that they didn't get stuck and he didn't leave the car. Did
you read this conclusion or this statement in the Supreme Court as dealing with that issue and deciding against Mr. Milgaard on that factual point?

A

Q

And then it goes on to recite what Mr. Tallis testified and $I$ think we've gone through that. If we could go to the next page, go down here:
"In addition there is the evidence of
the motel room incident which could be
taken as an admission of murder by

Milgaard, or as a joke made in very poor taste, or as mere drug-induced rambling."

And what's not in there is a suggestion that it didn't happen.

A
Q

A
Q

A
$Q$

No. That's right, yes.
And so was it your understanding that the Supreme Court had concluded that the motel room incident did happen, and when I'm talking about incident, that David Milgaard did in some form stab a pillow and utter words confessing or admitting to killing Gail Miller?

Yes.
And the question was was it an admission of the murder, a joke or a mere drug-induced rambling? That's right. How you characterized it was the issue left.

The court says:
"While there is some evidence which
implicates Milgaard in the murder of
Gail 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."

Can you comment on the significance of the language used by the court in describing the miscarriage of justice?

A
Well, I think they are making it clear that consistent with their earlier view that there had been no demonstration of police misconduct, Crown misconduct, impropriety at the trial, there was no miscarriage of justice then, but his continued conviction at this point, without the opportunity to present the Fisher evidence, would continue, or would be a miscarriage.

And did you read this paragraph, and as part of the whole judgment, as a statement by the Supreme Court that there had not been a miscarriage of justice established, there was not a miscarriage of justice to that point?

Yes, that's what the language suggests very clearly.

Go to the next page, it says -- it talks about setting aside the trial, or pardon me, setting
aside the conviction and directing a new trial:
"It would be open to the Attorney General of Saskatchewan under the Criminal Code to enter a stay if that course were deemed appropriate in light of all the circumstances."

What if anything did you make of that statement? Well, the Supreme Court does not direct Attorneys General how to exercise their discretion usually. However, it's always open to them via this sort of a method to indicate where they think that discretion should be exercised or how they think it should be exercised, and $I$ read that as being a very broad hint to the Attorney General of Saskatchewan that he should have stayed the prosecution.

And on the basis that you found it unusual that this type of comment would be made in the judgment?

Well, it is unusual. As $I$ say, they don't usually direct a minister of justice how to exercise discretion.
$Q$ I take it that if they had not made this comment, it would be open to the Attorney General to enter a stay if that course were deemed appropriate; in
other words, you didn't need the court to tell you

A
$Q$

A
$Q$
that to have that discretion?

That's correct.
And is it your evidence then that this was a message from the court to the Attorney General?

Yes, that's my view.
And then:
"However, if a stay is not entered, a new trial proceeds and a verdict of guilty is returned, then we would recommend that the Minister of Justice consider granting a conditional pardon to David Milgaard with respect to any sentence imposed."

And what was the significance of that provision, statement?

Well, $I$ think that's their fall-back position if we didn't get the hint, ran a trial and got him convicted, as might well have happened had he been tried in Saskatoon, the Federal Minister was to nullify the proceedings.

Okay. If we can go to 153889, this is an April 14th, 1992 memo to the deputy minister from public prosecutions. If you can go to page 893, I think page 5, Murray Brown, director of appeals, that
would have been --

A
$Q$

It would have been me, yeah.
Can you just walk through what -- actually, let's go back to the first page and I'll go through parts of this. At the bottom on Milgaard's Innocence, it says:
"In their original statement of the tests to be considered, the Court indicated that it was open to David Milgaard to establish a miscarriage of justice if he could prove either beyond a reasonable doubt or on a balance of probabilities that he was innocent. The Court specifically notes in its decision that he has failed to do this. This failure comes despite the fact that he was allowed to the most incredible latitude in calling "evidence" that no trial court would every admit.

It should be noted here in
answer to any suggestion that Milgaard needs a new trial to establish his innocence, that he has now had three opportunities to establish that
innocence: Once at trial, once in the

Court of Appeal and now in an extraordinary proceeding before the Supreme Court. On each occasion he has failed to do so. In effect, he's failed on three attempts to prove he is innocent including, the chance to do so using the Larry Fisher and Ron Wilson fresh evidence. The justice system has given Milgaard three chances to prove he is innocent. If he wants another opportunity, it should be left to him to sue for wrongful imprisonment."

And would this have been your -- I take it this document would have been your analysis of the Supreme Court decision and what it meant to Saskatchewan Justice?

Yes, $I$ would think so. If we can just go back, sorry, to the first page, on Police Conduct:
"The Court has held that
there was no evidence to suggest that
the police had acted improperly in
either their investigation or their
treatment of witnesses. This should put
to rest the spurious allegations that
the police coerced witnesses into lying. There was simply no credible evidence to even suggest that happened."

And again if, and $I$ think you commented on this earlier, if the court had concluded that there was some misconduct, would that have prompted Saskatchewan Justice to do something?

A
Q

A
Q
Yes, absolutely.
And the fact that the court said there was no evidence to suggest that the police had acted improperly, did that, for Saskatchewan Justice's purposes, put to rest those allegations that had been made publicly and through the media and to you?

Yes.
Scroll down, Conduct of The Crown:
"The Court notes specifically
that Milgaard has had the benefit of a fair trial and that there was ample evidence the jury could rely on to convict. It also notes that the allegations that the Crown did not properly disclose information in its possession to the defence have not been substantiated.

The Court notes that the new evidence of Larry Fisher's confessions made in October of 1970 is relevant fresh evidence. However, the Court does not say that the Crown made any error in failing to revive the issue of Milgaard's guilt after Larry Fisher confessed to his sexual assaults. This failure is of significance because this was one of the major arguments put forward by the Applicant."

Can you just comment on that last part, please?

A

Q

A

Q 25 Well, certainly that was a huge part of the second application they made, and indeed part of the first one as well, that given that nobody was informed of these Larry Fisher offences, it was an error, if not a conspiracy, by the Government of Saskatchewan officials to hide this from Mr. Milgaard.

And did you view the Supreme Court judgment as deciding in favour of the government on that issue?

Yes.
Go to the next page. This is, again, dealing with David Milgaard's innocence. It says:
"In this regard there is also one other point of note. If Milgaard's evidence before the Court was accepted, they would have been compelled to declare he was innocent. The essence of Milgaard's evidence was that he did not kill Gail Miller. The fact they did not find him innocent means they didn't believe him when he said he didn't do it. While that may seem like a small point, in the public relations war that will follow over the issue of compensation, it'll be worth remembering that the Supreme Court did not believe David Milgaard's claim that he did not kill Gail Miller's."

And what was the significance of that comment? Well we were anticipating that, given the way the Supreme Court decision turned out, the Milgaard camp were not going to be very happy with the result. They weren't just after getting David Milgaard out of jail, they were after compensation, and this would make a compensation claim impossible to pursue, given that the Supreme Court didn't believe David, the Supreme Court
thought there was ample evidence to convict, etcetera.
$Q$
And so is it your view that the Supreme Court judgement itself presented a roadblock to David Milgaard advancing a claim for compensation for wrongful conviction?

Yes.
And that's because in order to get compensation, he must establish wrongful conviction, which requires probable innocence?

A
Well, --
Proof?
-- he has to establishing wrongful conviction, and
the Supreme Court decision said he wasn't
wrongfully convicted.
And I think I put this question to Mrs. Milgaard,
that on David Milgaard's position as far as advancing a claim for wrongful conviction and compensation, that his position in that regard was better before the Supreme Court decision than after; would you agree with that?

A
Yes.
$Q$
In addition to the compensation $I$ think
Mrs. Milgaard, and perhaps others, identified another important -- an issue that was important
to them, and that was clearing David Milgaard's name, in other words the -- whether it's an exoneration or declaration of innocence. Did you understand that to be a concern, either standing alone, or related to the compensation issue? Well, yes, they usually put the two together. And as far as the, Mr. Milgaard's quest to get a declaration of innocence or an exoneration, what was your view as to what the Supreme Court judgement did to that effort?

Well, it basically creates the same problem. It didn't say that it found he was wrongly convicted, it didn't say that it thought he was innocent, and the suggestion to us that we stay the proceedings pretty much blocks his avenue towards sort of any kind of exoneration, even the kind that might have arisen from a not-guilty verdict.

You had talked earlier about the media campaign and the effect it had on giving rise to the Supreme Court reference. What was your observation or your view as to what the Supreme Court decision would do to efforts to get David Milgaard's case and these issues in the media with the view of getting public pressure on political decision-makers to give favourable results?

A

Court of Canada basically saying that most of the allegations they made in their previous campaigns have turned out to be unfounded, they do not find David Milgaard to be innocent, they don't find him to be probably innocent, there is still evidence upon which he could have been, and could be, convicted, and his conviction was fair, there was no evidence of misconduct demonstrated to the Court, and it would be very difficult for them, in the face of that, to be able to produce the kind of media campaign that they'd been able to generate before.

And what about the fact that Larry Fisher participated and testified in the Supreme Court reference?

Well, I'm not sure the fact that Larry Fisher testified was all that significant, it was the
findings of the Supreme Court that were significant.

Q
Maybe I put that -- the fact that the Court had the opportunity to hear Larry Fisher -Oh.
-- and then made it, made the decision it did in light of hearing from Larry Fisher, and in hearing the arguments about the similarity of the rapes, etcetera?

That's a nicety that's a little subtle, I think, for the news media and the public.

As far as Miscarriage of Justice:
"In its advice to the
Minister, the Court notes that there has been no miscarriage of justice up to this point. Their concern in this regard is expressed by saying that $\underline{a}$ miscarriage will arise only if the conviction stands without Milgaard being given the opportunity to use this new evidence in his defence. Obviously, if the Federal Minister orders a new trial, the old conviction is set aside and the chance of a miscarriage occurring is avoided. While that may seem like a
lawyer's slight of lip, that is exactly the effect the Court seems to have intended."

Any comment on that?
Umm, no, I -- the Supreme Court, I think, chose their words there fairly carefully, intending to suggest that if the matter is dealt with by staying it, then there will be no miscarriage of justice if he's released and the matter stayed. And then, as far as a New Trial:
"The Court's decision is in effect, advice to both Ministers of Justice involved in this matter. In particular, it is apparent the Court is of the view that we should stay to matter and not run a second trial. Just in case we missed that message or ignored it, the Court goes on to indicate that even if we do run a new trial and get a conviction, the Federal Minister should grant a pardon. Such action by the Federal Minister of Justice would effectively make the new trial process a pointless waste of scarce resources."

And on that point, what about the effect a new trial process might have on David Milgaard, in other words the opportunity to be found not guilty, if that were the result?

Well, except that the opportunity comes with the opportunity to be found guilty as well. And as I said, certainly based on the readings that we were getting from Saskatoon, it's by no means clear, if a trial had been held in this city, that he would have been acquitted.

When you say "by readings in Saskatoon" what are you referring to?

The letters that we were getting from the people in Saskatoon and what the political people were coming back with from their constituents. So if, if there had been a new trial, I suppose we don't know what would have happened, either guilty or not guilty, one of the two. You became aware of Mr. Milgaard's desire to have a trial to be found not guilty; correct?

Yes.
And, if we explore that a bit, that would not be -- or that -- would that be the equivalent of the Supreme Court of Canada saying "you're innocent" or "you're probably innocent"; would that be an
exoneration?
A
Well, no. I mean, strictly speaking, our trials do not result in a statement that 'you are innocent', they result in a statement that 'the Crown has not proved its allegations beyond a reasonable doubt'.

But if David Milgaard had an opportunity to have another trial and was found not guilty, would that put him in a better position as far as the state -- as far as his status? Let me back up. Would it undo the original conviction or undo the effect of it?

Well, I'm not entirely sure about that. 20 some years after the fact, you should be able to generate some kind of doubt. I don't, you know, I don't really think, at that stage, having him acquitted would have changed the public's view of the situation. It may have, it may have given him some comfort, and $I$ don't deny that, but $I$ don't think it would have changed the public's view of the situation much.

Q When you say:
"Additionally, there are a
strong practical and moral arguments to be made favouring a stay. Twenty-three
years after the fact, the chance of being able to mount a successful prosecution in this or any other case is virtually non-existent. Memories fade or are lost and previously good evidence becomes so vague as to be meaningless.

Additionally, given the pre-trial
publicity this case has received, the chance of picking an impartial jury is pretty slim."

Can you comment on that?

A
Well, at that point we felt it would certainly be difficult to come up with a jury that hadn't heard of the case, perhaps that has more to do with our view that the universe spins around the things that we're involved with.

As it turned out, when they
went to do the Larry Fisher prosecution in
Yorkton, they had no trouble whatsoever finding 12 juries (sic) who had never heard of the matter. You go on to say:
"Morally, it would be difficult to justify a new trial. First, he has already served 23 years in prison. Most of the people convicted of
murder since 1970, have served their sentences and been released. Second, if the offence were committed today, a 16 year old would be tried in youth court and the maximum sentence available would be 3 years. In this province the chance of raising him to adult court even for this type of offence would be slim. And finally, since the Supreme Court has just indicated that our best possible outcome of a new trial should be nullified by the Federal Minister, how can we justify putting David Milgaard or the witnesses through a trial process again."

And anything to add to that?
A
No. It seems to me that those were the public, or the public interest reasons why you wouldn't run a new trial, and quite frankly $I$ expect that they would have been things we would have had to consider even if the Supreme Court hadn't said that we should enter a stay. It just, at that point, --

So --
-- I mean aside from providing an opportunity for

David Milgaard to enter a defence there just didn't seem to be, in my view, a compelling case for running a new trial against him.

And what about that point of allowing David Milgaard an opportunity to mount the defence, would --

Well that would be the only reason you would run a new trial. And quite frankly, after the process in the Supreme Court of Canada, to bring all of those witnesses back and put them through all of that process again, umm, no, I just -- I didn't see the point of that, even if it was what David Milgaard wanted.

Q And what about the notion of simply having a new trial, and not presenting evidence, and having him acquitted that way?

A
$Q$

A
And we would do that why?
Well, no, I'm asking you. I mean $I$ think that was, in other words, to give Mr. Milgaard the opportunity of being found not guilty?

He had that opportunity and he couldn't prove he was innocent, he couldn't make a case for the Supreme Court to suggest that they even thought he was wrongly convicted.

So did that finding, then, was that -- the Supreme

A

Court finding on that point; was that something that influenced your thinking in deciding to stay the charge?

It was our view that David Milgaard had been given every opportunity to establish that he somehow wasn't guilty of this offence, and he hadn't been able to do that, in fact all he had succeeded in doing was re-establishing that he likely was guilty.

I'm scared to venture into the next area, Mr. Brown.
"There is nothing left to
inquire into and therefore, no need to
hold such an inquiry. The supreme court has covered everything very thoroughly. As well, the result of the Court's inquiry is set out in the decision. They found no misconduct or impropriety of any kind. Again, absent some evidence that there is something that needs looking into, an inquiry isn't justified."

Comment on that?
Well, again, my view then, my view now, was they had every opportunity to present whatever evidence
they had to suggest that there had been misconduct by the police, misconduct by the Crown, incompetence by his defence counsel, some error made at trial, etcetera, and they had not been able to establish that. What would we inquire into? What further would we inquire into, other than say something like the systemic operations of the Saskatoon police, their training and stuff like that? Well, what would be the point of that when we were dealing with something that happened over 20 years ago.

Compensation. You say:
"In my view, the next battle we face is the claim for compensation. We know that Mr. Wolch and Mr. Asper have a contingency fee agreement with David Milgaard that entitles them to a portion of any compensation. We also know that the Milgaards were talking about this during the hearing before the Supreme Court."

What were you referring to there?
A
Umm, I don't actually recall the, what they were talking about before the Supreme Court, but I know in discussions with Ron Fainstein, and $I$ think

David Asper and Hersh Wolch in the room, the issue of a contingency fee agreement came out, and that may actually have been when they were talking about how people were going to be compensated for being involved in this.

In the Supreme Court reference?
So I -- so we knew there was an issue of
compensation that they wanted to pursue.
And did you view the supreme Court decision as being a fairly effective answer to a compensation claim?

A

Q
I think, yes, I think it was meant to be, actually.

You say:
"Given Milgaard's failure to establish even probable innocence there is no reason to pay compensation for wrongful conviction. No one has established wrongful conviction. The Donald Marshall precedent clearly does not apply because Marshall was found to be innocent by the court that reviewed his case at the request of the Federal Minister. Indeed, the Supreme Court notes that there was ample evidence to

A
Q
A
Q
establish that Milgaard was guilty and that there is no evidence that anyone has behaved in any improper fashion.

The Supreme Court has attempted to word its decision to leave no basis for any claim for compensation."

Is that the point you were referring to earlier?
Yes.
And was that because they didn't find a miscarriage of justice?
Yes.
You go on to say:
"... if the decision is that no
compensation will be offered or paid, we had better be prepared to vigorously and publicly counter such a campaign. If we do fail to do so and we'll end up losing the public relations fight and be forced to pay compensation of some amount. If the decision is to resist any payment of compensation, some thought has to be given to how we are going to wage this resistance campaign."

Well, the issue of compensation wasn't for me to decide, so $I$ basically left that to the people
that were going to look at it. Ultimately --
Q
A

Q

A

Would that be -- sorry -- a political decision?
Well it would be a political decision, plus it would likely be a decision that was dealt with in consultation with the civil is law division of the department, and that's ultimately what happened. So here, on the public campaign side, what was your view, or what were you referring to here about "vigorously and publicly countering a campaign"?

Well, I anticipated that you would get the same kind of response to the disappointment from the Supreme Court that we saw come from the
disappointment when the minister rejected their first application, and that is that there was going to be some kind of campaign from the Milgaards with respect to attempting to use political pressure to push the Attorney General of Saskatchewan into offering some kind of compensation, an inquiry, something like that, and it was my view that if we didn't want to get pushed into the same kind of problem that the federal minister did, we'd better be ready to answer any claims that were made.

And did you then attempt to do so?

A

The Government of Saskatchewan took that advice, yes.

And I'll have a chance to go through some of the media articles and some of the letters. Is it fair to say that there was a conscious decision, then, by the Government of Saskatchewan, once the Supreme Court decision came out, to be fairly vocal in the media, to respond to what was being said about the Supreme Court decision and said about the administration of criminal justice? Well, that's ultimately what the minister did. I prepared that, prepared a briefing note, and somebody else took it and discussed it with the minister, $I$ don't recall spending much more than a few minutes with him.

But you did, certainly we'll see from some of the articles, you, I believe, took a fairly vocal position on it; is that --

Well, something else happened in the department about that time, and that was we were basically told that we were free to respond to allegations by various parties in the news media. Prior to that, the department's position had basically been we didn't comment on these things in the news media, that general policy changed and now we did.

Q

Under Stay of Proceedings you say:
"The Supreme Court effectively recommends we stay the matter. Mr. Wolch has apparently insisted that this be an unconditional stay.

There is in law only one kind of stay of prosecution the Minister or his prosecutors can issue. There are no conditions we can attach to it. The effect of the stay in this case is to temporarily put the prosecution on hold subject to our lifting the stay and recommencing the prosecution. If the prosecution is not recommenced within one year of the stay being entered, we lose the right to recommence proceedings on that charge and the prosecution is permanently at an end.

With respect to Mr. Wolch's demand, he is really demanding the Minister stay proceedings and at the same time issue a statement saying David Milgaard is innocent. Obviously, Mr. Wolch wants the Minister to set himself
up for the big claim for compensation. Just as obviously, since Milgaard has now had three chances to prove his innocence before twelve jurors, three Court of Appeal judges and five Supreme Court judges and hasn't convinced even one of these twenty people he is innocent, there doesn't seem to be any reason for the Minister to make the proclamation Mr. Wolch wants."

And, again, that would have been your thinking at the time?

A
Yes.
And so, on the stay, I take it that Mr. Wolch was asking that the stay be entered with some acknowledgment of innocence; in other words not an equivocal stay?

A

A
That's right, yes.
And what were the reasons, then, other than -- I take it the reasons are stated in this paragraph as to why you wouldn't do that?

Well, I mean, the minister could have said, collateral with the stay being entered, that he was of the view David Milgaard was innocent, or he could have said that the government accepts that
he was innocent, but that wasn't our position. Our position was the Supreme Court had indicated the trial had been fair, it didn't find him innocent, didn't find he was probably innocent, felt that there was still evidence upon which he could be successfully prosecuted, and it was not the Government of Saskatchewan's view that David Milgaard had, in any way, established he was innocent.

Go down to Further Investigation. You write:
"There may be concerns raised by the press with respect to further investigations of Larry Fisher for the murder or some of the original trial witnesses for perjury.

In this regard we are open to
looking at any new evidence that may come to light in the future, but as of today there are no further
investigations planned or under way.
There is no evidence to corroborate that
Ron Wilson perjured himself at the
original trial and therefore no chance of a perjury prosecution. The Court indicated that it would deal with him
for contempt of Court for his
performance before them and therefore,
there is no reason for us to become
involved in dealing with Ron Wilson.
With respect to Larry Fisher, the Court
indicated there was no basis to charge him, and to say the least, that is an understatement."

Do I take it from this, these two paragraphs, Mr. Brown, that the Saskatchewan Justice had concluded, on April 14, 1992 after the Supreme Court reference decision came out, that it would not be re-opening the investigation into the death of Gail Miller?

That's correct, yes.
And for the reasons stated in this memo, and for what you have, I think you alluded to some of them earlier?

A
$Q$
Yes.
Now it's my understanding that if we can go to 0203 -- that's the wrong one -- sorry, 00442 -sorry, 004442 . And it's my understanding that, just the mechanics of the charge and the indictment, that after the Supreme Court rendered its advice to the federal minister the federal
minister directed that the conviction be set aside, which was done in Court of Queen's Bench, and then you filed a new indictment because the charging provision had changed since 1969, filed a new indictment, then entered a stay of proceedings

A
$Q$
A

Q

A
$Q$

A
$Q$ --

Yes.
-- simultaneously; is that correct?
Yes, that's correct.
And can you just explain, why was that necessary to go through, to actually file another indictment and stay it?

We thought that out of an abundance of caution, if you were going to put the proceeding back before the Court, it should be with respect to the proper current charge number.

So, just so that $I$ have this right, if the conviction -- if the order setting aside the conviction were made, then the original indictment would be alive again; is that correct? Well that's, yes, that's, strictly speaking, correct. But the original -- but that indictment now charged an offence that no longer existed. Right. And so then that was why a new indictment was filed --

A
Q

A

Q

A
$Q$


Yes.
-- and then a stay entered? This, I think, is a briefing note that you prepared. If we can go to page -- the third page, would this be your briefing note April 15th, 1992?

Yes.
I think this duplicates some of the earlier memo we went through. If we can go to the next page. And presumably these would be for the Minister to utilize, the briefing note?

Yes.
And:
"After consulting with my officials we have decided not to run a new trial for several reasons. Instead we have decided to enter a stay.

First, we accept the guidance provided by the Supreme Court. Given the time Mr. Milgaard has already served and the fact that the Court has indicated that even if he is convicted again he should be pardoned, there is no public interest to be served in running this case again.

Further, in practical terms,
running a case with evidence that is twenty three years old, would be difficult. We would only attempt such a prosecution in the most compelling of cases and where there is something to be gained by the effort. Here, when we assess the public interest factors we look at with respect to other prosecutions, there is no reason to undertake a new trial."

And would this decision, $I$ think you told us earlier the stay of the proceedings would be made by the Director of Public Prosecutions?

Next page. Under Further Investigation it's written:
"At this point we have no
plans to direct further investigations into anything surrounding this case.

The Supreme Court has
indicated that there is no evidence of wrong doing on the part of any police or prosecution agency in this province. Additionally, the Supreme Court has now conducted an exhaustive inquiry and there seems little left to inquire into.

In the future, should any further information come forward bearing on the guilt or innocence of any person with respect to the murder of Gail Miller, we will have that information investigated. However, at this point there is nothing left to investigate." And, again, that -- these would have been your words at the time?

A
Q

A
A
That was the only thing left, that $I$ could see, that needed further action.
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Q

BY MR. HODSON:
And was it your view that those criteria had not been met by David Milgaard?

A
$Q$
And then on the Compensation you say:
"We in turn will want to assess any claim against the background of the past practice in this country and the decision of the Supreme Court in this case which in effect says that Mr. Milgaard was not wrongfully convicted." And 'the past practice in the country' was what as far as compensating and wrongful conviction? Well we, with respect to the compensation issue, there was an agreement between the Federal and Provincial Governments with respect to cost-sharing and with respect, I believe, to the bases that we would be agreeing to pay compensation, and that required that there be some finding of a wrongful conviction.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Is this a Federal-Provincial agreement or a Federal-Saskatchewan agreement?

A Federal-Provincial one.

Yes, yes.
Go to 020392 , and this is a formal press release
or news release; is that correct?
Ah, yes.
And this is where Minister Mitchell announces the stay. If we can go to the next page, the quote here says:
"The bottom line is that there was nothing that was brought before the Supreme Court which convince even one justice that Mr. Milgaard is either innocent or a victim of a miscarriage of justice. Anyone who would suggest otherwise has no understanding of what the Supreme Court said."

And was there any significance to that language being used by the minister in the press release? Well, I didn't write the press release and, Candace, cover your ears, please, the communications people sometimes get a little carried away with their language and this -- the minister wouldn't have written this, this would have been written by somebody who -- it seems to me at that point they had communications staff attached to executive council and it would have been written there. Now, I suspect if you look at the language throughout the thing, you can see
where it has been lifted from, or parallels some of the language in the briefing note, but as $I$ say, I didn't write that, so $I$ don't know what they were referring to.

If we can go to 328328, and this is an April 16th, 1992 CBC interview with Mr. Wolch, and we won't go through all of these media articles, we've already reviewed many of them, but would you have become aware that following the Supreme Court decision and the government's decision to stay the charges, there was a fair bit of comment in the media by Mr. Wolch and Mr. Asper and Mrs. Milgaard about not only what the Supreme Court decision meant, but about the government's decision and what it was doing?

Oh, yes, yes, as we anticipated there would be.
And here Mr. Wolch is asked:
"...what is your reaction to what you heard this morning?"

And this is referring to Mr. Mitchell's press conference. He says:
"Well it went a little beyond what we expected. We assumed there'd be a stay of proceedings, there is no case."

Question:
"How did it go beyond what you were expecting?"

Answer:
"Well we knew there would be not the clear cut vindication we wanted.

We knew there would be some equivocation and whatever else and that's what happened."

Reporter:
"Your client seems to be left in a state of limbo. I mean his guilt or innocence is still up in the air or is that how you perceive it?"

Mr. Wolch:
"Not really, he is innocent. I mean he will have...he has of now no conviction, so he is innocent. He is no more in law guilty of the crime than you or I. Of course, there is a cloud left to some degree. But, the part that disappoints us in what was said was the prematurity of some of it that is, to say there will be no inquiry when we haven't even asked directly for an
inquiry nor have we given the reasons
for an inquiry. It's somewhat disconcerting. To say there is no compensation when we haven't even asked them for compensation is disconcerting because it's a qualified judicial decision. You normally hear both sides."

And just your comment on two things, Mr. Wolch's comment about -- just scroll up -- about how he characterized Mr. Milgaard's guilt or innocence at the time, do you take any issue with that?

A
No. Once the conviction is set aside, the presumption of innocence arises. Once the indictment was -- well, and since there was no new trial setting that aside, it continues, he is presumed to be innocent.

Then the question, if you scroll down:
"But, how are you going to get
compensation? How are you going to get an inquiry if Saskatchewan is so opposed to it?"

Answer:
"Well, we are going to show them what
the judgement said at the Supreme Court.
It appears that perhaps and I
don't fault the minister, I mean, he obviously is going by advice and it appears that the advisors, if it isn't Serge Kujawa is somebody who reads like him and they've missed the decision. What I'm trying to say and in part is the decision does not exonerate, the decision says that the miscarriage of justice came to light in 1970. It's in Black and White and why it's being not read is beyond me."

And your comment on that?
Well, my comment on that is that we didn't get the same secret decoder wheel with our copy of the Supreme Court decision that Mr. Wolch and the Milgaard camp got. We took a literal reading of the decision and based on that literal meaning there was no suggestion that there was a miscarriage of justice. It says it would be a miscarriage of justice.

Now, the suggestion here that Mr. Kujawa is
involved, $I$ think at this time he was a sitting MLA, was he, with the government?

With the government, yes.
And was he in any way involved in the decision

A
making of the director of public prosecutions?
No, not with us. What contact he may have had with Robert Mitchell, who was the Attorney General, $I$ don't know, but as far as I'm aware, there wasn't any.

And did you go to him to seek his assistance in interpreting the Supreme Court decision?

No.
And would you agree -- certainly the record reflects that in the days that followed, that Mr . Kujawa seemed to be one of the targets of Mr . Wolch and Mr. Asper in the media as far as criticism?

Well, I think they understood from previous experience that if you poked him, he might react, so they were, $I$ expect, hoping to get something juicy by way of a reaction from him that would play well in the press.

It carries on, the reporter says:
"You are referring to the fact that you believe the police should have known... did know about Larry Fisher's crimes after he confessed to them and they should have reinvestigated the case even after the conviction?"

Mr. Wolch:
"Well sure, it came to light then the Supreme Court said it came to light and it implies that there was a cover up from 1970 on. It's right in the wording and why that is not being read is beyond me but. I'm sure the Crown didn't bring that to the Minister's attention.

That's what we were going to show him."
And $I$ would like your comment on the suggestion that the Supreme Court judgment implies that there was a cover-up from 1970 on. That is nonsense, that is fantasy. As I said, if they were able to produce any evidence of that, why didn't they do that in the Supreme Court, and that's certainly not what the Supreme Court says in its judgment.

If you can go to 328357, and this is a media report, it says Al Thada, I'm not sure if that's the correct spelling, but the Saskatoon City Police, and there's a few other public comments here, where he says:
"He remains the chief suspect in this investigation. He was convicted of it once. The Police Department will not be
reinvestigating the Gail Miller Murder." And then scroll down, Justice Bayda:
"...doesn't know when Justice Officials will make their decision on the Miller Murder file. He says police are satisfied there will be no inquiry into the Milgaard affair. He says that clears police of any wrongdoing during the murder investigation in 1969." Do you recall whether you would have had any discussions with the Saskatoon City Police around this time or whether -- would they take their cue from you, from Saskatchewan Justice as far as the re-opening?

I would assume so. I certainly didn't have any discussions with them around that time. I can't say whether they may have talked to Richard Quinney or, for that matter, to Robert Mitchell directly because he was an MLA from Saskatoon. But as far as the decision to re-open, I think you said Saskatchewan Justice concluded that there was no basis to re-open the investigation into the death of Gail Miller?

A That's correct.

And if you had thought so, presumably you would
have asked the Saskatoon City Police to investigate?

A
$Q$

A
$Q$

A

Q

And do you agree with that comment?
No. Well, I don't agree with, first of all, the presumption that he would have been acquitted. I don't know how Anne Derrick would come to that given that she really had nothing to do with this matter, and the notion that if he was acquitted he would be entitled to compensation, people who are
acquitted aren't usually entitled to compensation.
And so the fact that if there had been a second trial and Mr. Milgaard had been acquitted, that that would not have, in the eyes of Saskatchewan Justice, given rise to an entitlement to a claim for compensation?

Well, you know, subject to whatever advice the civil law group would have given the minister, in my view it wasn't obvious that simply getting acquitted at this point in light of what the Supreme Court said would have entitled him to compensation.

Go to 160313, this is an April 18th, 1992
StarPhoenix article, it says:
"Murray Brown, director of public prosecutions in Saskatchewan, doesn't think Wolch can assume anything was left out from the Supreme Court's findings.
"Hersh Wolch had every opportunity to enter whatever information he wanted. If there was nothing before the court it was Mr. Wolch's fault."

At the justice minister's
request, Brown's department will
determine whether there is evidence to charge Fisher with Miller's murder, though this is unlikely, according to Brown.

All the information in
respect to that is already known. How do you go out and find something else?

Do you go out and knock on every door in Saskatoon?"

Do you know what prompted this? Just scroll over to the left. Was there some suggestion in the media that things were left out of the Supreme Court findings or do you know what prompted this? Well, I suspect this probably arises out of something that would have come from the Milgaards with respect to there needing to be further investigation of Larry Fisher because he was obviously the one that was guilty, etcetera, etcetera. I don't recall sort of any other source of concern about that at the time.

Q Go to 026935, please, and this is a fairly lengthy letter from Mr. Wolch to The Honourable Bob Mitchell, April 20, 1992, and you are familiar with this letter?

A Yes, I am.
Q

A

Q
And Mr. Wolch writes:
"The Supreme Court of Canada ruled on April 14, 1992 that there had been a miscarriage of justice in the conviction of David Milgaard inasmuch as there was fresh evidence put before the Court which is reasonably capable of belief, and which taken together with the evidence adduced at the trial, could reasonably have been expected to have affected the verdict."

Did you agree with that?
That's a misrepresentation of what's said in that judgment.

And why is that?
Because they hadn't said there had been a miscarriage of justice. It said his continued conviction would be a miscarriage of justice. It says:

```
"On Thursday, April 16, 1992, your
```

decision was announced not to proceed to trial. While we certainly agree with your decision, we found it somewhat troublesome that reasons were provided that witnesses were either deceased or had problems with memory. In our view, there was no material witness who is deceased, and since all of the key witnesses were very young at the time, they are all capable of giving evidence. Regarding Nichol John, who you mentioned in the conference, it should be noted that her so-called memory problem occurred right from the outset, and it has not been the passage of time which affected her, but rather the fact that she never did see anything in the first place.

In any event, it is not the purpose of this letter to debate those reasons, but to express further concern that you announced that there would be no inquiry and no compensation from the Saskatchewan Government. We had not at that time provided you with any of the
reasons, and we would respectfully suggest that your decision was premature, and we would ask that you consider what follows. It is our view that you could not have had the contents of the Supreme Court decision properly placed before you, and there is considerable evidence that you would not have been privy to."

And just your response to the fact that the minister said no to compensation and no to an inquiry before it appears to have been asked for.

A it for himself.

Scroll down, Mr. Wolch says:
"It should firstly be considered that compensation is not a matter of
necessarily attaching blame. It is possible for an innocent man to be wrongly convicted even though everyone has acted properly. It is hard to imagine why compensation should not be afforded in those circumstances, and why one must look at blame before doing what is right."

Do you agree with that observation?
A
Yes, that's -- you could do that, although I think traditionally in law compensation follows some sort of finding of wrongdoing.
$Q$

I mean, at that point you've got the opportunity then to make some kind of ex gratia payment and you've got a reason for doing it.

Yeah, $I$ think, and as $I$ read this, $I$ think what Mr. Wolch was saying, that it's possible that an innocent person can be convicted and it be a wrongful conviction even though no person or institution can be blamed for that or have acted improperly?

A Oh, yes, I think that's true.
Q

A
$Q$
And that in that situation, the innocent person who is wrongfully convicted would still have a basis for a claim for compensation?

Yes.
In other words, you don't need to show that either the Crown or the police or somebody did something wrong?

Yes.
The simple fact that an innocent person is convicted is sufficient; would you agree with that?

Yes, I would agree with that.
Then he writes:
"Unfortunately, in David Milgaard's case, there is prima facie evidence of blameworthiness, and it is found in the judgment of the Supreme Court at page 5: "More importantly, there was evidence led as to the sexual assaults committed by Larry Fisher which came to light in October 1970, when Fisher made a
confession."

What is your response to the suggestion that that is prima facie evidence of blameworthiness?

A

Q

Well, he seems to be suggesting that the blameworthy conduct is ours, not his client's or anything.

He then goes on to say that:
"The Supreme Court has offered the opinion that the Fisher evidence could reasonably affect the verdict of a jury. The Fisher evidence would have come under the heading of fresh evidence in 1970, and could have been presented to the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal. It must be remembered that in October of 1970, David Milgaard's appeal was still pending before the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal. He was deprived of the opportunity to present this very probative and cogent evidence."

Was it your view that this issue had been determined, considered and determined by the Supreme Court of Canada?

Yes. They concluded that there was no evidence that the Crown had misconducted itself or that disclosure was in any respect out of line with what was done in that particular time.

And then if we can scroll down, I think as far as
blameworthiness, it talks about:
"There are three main "players"... The role of each must be examined..."

The first one is Detective Ed Karst, and here:
"Why were the Fisher admissions withheld
from the Saskatoon investigators, and
from the very victims themselves?"
Was this issue canvassed by Mr. Wolch to
Mr. Karst at the Supreme Court, his dealings with
Larry Fisher in Winnipeg?
A

Q
Well, certainly the fact that Mr. Karst traveled to Winnipeg and interviewed Larry Fisher was raised in the Supreme Court. I don't know whether the issue of why the victims themselves weren't told was raised with them or not, I don't recall.

But the obtaining of the confessions from Larry
Fisher by Detective Karst, do you recall that
being evidence before the Supreme Court?
Yes, there was evidence that he had traveled to Winnipeg to interview him.

Next page, Mr . Caldwell, it talks about Mr.
Caldwell, indicating that, talking about the
March, 1971 dealings with the Fisher charges, and it says here:

```
"The Milgaard/Miller file clearly
```

demonstrates that Mr . Caldwell had to have made the connection. There is no evidence that he disclosed the information to David Milgaard's counsel."

And then down, Serge Kujawa:
"He would have been totally conversant with the files, and has since so indicated in interviews."

And I don't propose to go through them, but I think $I$ can summarize it by, I think that the letter suggests that Mr. Karst, Mr. Caldwell and Mr. Kujawa had committed misconduct and were blameworthy in the conviction of David Milgaard. Was that your understanding of at least this part put forward in the letter?

A Those were the allegations being made again, yes. And in your view, were those allegations all considered by the Supreme Court?

They were -- well, considered to the extent that they had the opportunity to raise them. Certainly Serge Kujawa wasn't called, Bobs Caldwell wasn't called. Had they had any evidence or concern that they could have presented through the courts about misconduct by these two people, they basically

Q
didn't bother doing it.
And what did you make of the fact that within days of the Supreme Court judgment, that the allegations against Mr. Caldwell and Mr. Kujawa were made to the minister?

Well, I mean, bottom line is they were going back to the old tactics they used after the first application, let's slander people, let's make outrageous allegations for which we have no basis in fact and see if we can can't generate some kind of publicity.

And had you expected the allegations with respect to Mr. Caldwell and Mr. Kujawa to be presented to the Supreme Court?

Well, we had rather expected they probably would want to call that and, $I$ mean, on its face it does permit the asking of the question, why did it take so long to produce, to push this matter through the Court of Queen's Bench in Saskatchewan, can you explain that. Now, to jump from that to providing your own sinister explanation is nonsense in my view, but there was at least a basis for them to want to ask it.

Go to 117592, this is a letter of the same date to the Federal Minister Kim Campbell. Do you know if

|  | 1 |  | you became aware of this letter, Mr. Brown? I'll |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 |  | maybe just go through parts of it. I'm not sure |
|  | 3 |  | if you were or not. |
|  | 4 | A | Well, I was aware that they were also going to the |
| 02:38 | 5 |  | Federal Minister asking for an inquiry too, which |
|  | 6 |  | after having called her corrupt and stupid and a |
|  | 7 |  | few other things $I$ thought would be an interesting |
|  | 8 |  | task to try and persuade her to be favourable to |
|  | 9 |  | them. |
| 02:38 | 10 | 2 | And he writes here: |
|  | 11 |  | "Following the Supreme Court opinion, |
|  | 12 |  | while you moved expeditiously, |
|  | 13 |  | Saskatchewan appeared to have delayed in |
|  | 14 |  | making a decision, and when they did, |
| 02:38 | 15 |  | they appear to have decided issues that |
|  | 16 |  | were premature. In other words, they |
|  | 17 |  | turned down a request for an inquiry and |
|  | 18 |  | for compensation before those requests |
|  | 19 |  | were even made. Accordingly, I have |
| 02:38 | 20 |  | written to the Attorney-General for |
|  | 21 |  | Saskatchewan setting out the reasons why |
|  | 22 |  | there should be an inquiry and |
|  | 23 |  | compensation to follow. For expedience |
|  | 24 |  | sake, I am enclosing a copy of my letter |
| 02:38 | 25 |  | to the Attorney-General, along with the |
|  |  |  | $\qquad$ Meyer CompuCourt Reporting $\qquad$ ertified Professional Court Reporters serving P.A., Regina \& Saskatoon since 1980 Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv |

enclosures. There is clearly an overlap, and while The Federal Inquiries Act allows for the Governor-in-Council to cause an inquiry, at the same time an inquiry could be launched provincially." And it goes on to talk about cost sharing:
"Accordingly, our request is before the Provincial Government, and at the same time we are bringing it to your attention. Clearly the matter does not call for two inquiries. What we are doing is providing the Attorney-General for Saskatchewan with an opportunity to review the material and perhaps consult with your officials so that needless duplication will not arise."

And the next page --
COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What was the date on that, I'm sorry?

MR. HODSON: It's April 20th, 1992. It's the same date as the letter to Mr. Mitchell.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Oh.
BY MR. HODSON:
Q
"There is overlap in connection with
the 690 application. You will note the
chart of Larry Fisher attacks. When we brought our first application, I am satisfied that the information you were provided with regard to Larry Fisher fell far short of what is contained in the chart. Larry Fisher was interviewed, and was not questioned about the other attacks and the similarity of pattern. We did not know of Larry Fisher's difficulty with the polygraph until a few days before he testified in the Supreme Court, and I wonder if you were aware that he was the same blood type as the attacker of Gail Miller.

There are very serious
questions as to what information was provided to you -- particularly in the first application -- in order for you to make a decision."

It goes on to talk about that and parole. Scroll down to the bottom, and then here:
"As I indicated at the outset of the letter, there does appear to be considerable overlap Provincially and

Federally, and we feel that the
Provincial Government should be looked to first in this matter. Obviously any initiative from the Federal Government would be greatly appreciated." I think you said, had you become aware, then, that David Milgaard's counsel was seeking help from the federal government to either prompt the province to have an inquiry or to have a joint look into the matters?

A
$Q$ Okay. Go to 077808, it's an April 21, 1992 newspaper article, StarPhoenix, quoting Mr. Asper:
"Mr. Asper on Monday said outstanding questions relating to Fisher, which need to be addressed by an inquiry, include:

- Who had the information about Fisher?
- Was it disclosed? If not, why?
- Was there a duty for whoever had the information to disclose it to Milgaard's lawyer?
- Was there a decision made to withhold the evidence from Milgaard's lawyer and,
if so, by whom?
- What steps were taken, if any, to
insure the information didn't come to
light?
- Have there been ongoing efforts to cover up the facts concerning when the information came to light?"

In your view, sir, based on your involvement at the Supreme Court reference, were those questions questions that were before the Supreme Court in the reference case and considered by them?

A

Q

A Well, certainly the issue of was it disclosed and was there a duty to disclose it were issues that were before the Supreme court. I don't know that they ever got into the notion of whether there was a decision to withhold it or what have you. As I say, they didn't pursue that issue in the Supreme Court.

And is it -- was it an issue that they could have pursued then if they chose to? If they had been able to demonstrate that David Milgaard had been the object of some kind of misconduct by prosecutors trying to cover up the fact that they knew he had been wrongly convicted, absolutely, and that would have been something the

Supreme Court would have been very happy to hear about.
$Q$

A
Q If we can go to 227974 , this is a Globe and Mail article of April 22nd, 1992, Saskatchewan accused of coverup. And I take it, is this something that you would have become aware of?

Yes.
And it says:
"Saskatchewan's New
Democratic government is afraid to hold a public inquiry into the David Milgaard case because it threatens to expose a decades old coverup and might embarrass high profile government members, Mr. Milgaard's lawyers and the province's Conservative opposition have charged." Scroll down:
"Mr. Milgaard's lawyers have released new information yesterday that they say points to a possible coverup by police and prosecutors who helped convict Mr. Milgaard of the murder of Saskatchewan nurse's assistant Gail Miller in 1969.
"We're alleging the facts

> indicate there was a coverup," said Hersh Wolch.

Mr. Kujawa is --"

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Excuse me, just a second. Could I have that blown up? I don't know whether I'm losing my sight or -I think it's just very faint.

MR. HODSON: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay, thanks.
BY MR. HODSON:

What was your reaction to these allegations, Mr. Brown?

A
Well, I mean, quite frankly, our view of the whole thing at this point, and by "our" I'm suggesting public prosecutions as well as myself, was that they had been given every opportunity to make the case in the Supreme Court of Canada, had failed to do so, chosen not to do so in some instances, and we were anticipating that there would be a lot of hysterical rhetoric coming from the Milgaard camp. We anticipated there would be another corruption/cover-up series of allegations and they were doing exactly what we anticipated they would do and, in the process, I might add, losing credibility every day.

Q In what way?

A

A
Q
A

Well, when you start off by saying the supreme Court said this when in black and white they clearly did not, you don't start yourself off on a very good foot, and then to start making allegations of corruption and cover-up when they haven't got any evidence to present on that when they had the opportunity to present evidence on it and they couldn't present anything, or wouldn't present anything, it was just getting to be, as we said, another one of the campaigns. It worked very effectively between the time of the first application being dismissed and the second one being filed and they were again trying it in Saskatchewan.

And what -- you said it, on credibility, what did it do to your assessment or Saskatchewan Justice's assessment --

Well --
-- of their credibility?
-- the more, the more they did this, the less credible they became. If they had evidence of anything, then they should have simply sent it in to the minister and said "here's our evidence that supports the fact that your officials deliberately
covered this up", they didn't have that and it wasn't until they actually got to that silly Breckenridge stunt that they began producing some -- or they produced what they thought was evidence or what they pretended was evidence.

And we will get to that this afternoon. If we can just go over to the second column, it says:
"But Mr. Mitchell would not budge, claiming Mr. Milgaard had a chance to raise all issues - including the conduct of police and prosecutors at the Supreme Court. Mr. Milgaard's lawyers, though, contend it was agreed before the Supreme Court began hearing the case that questions of police and Crown conduct would not be entered as evidence."

And your comment on that suggestion?
Well there were comments early on that $I$ suppose, if you sort of squint your eyes and look at them sideways, you could understand as being suggestions that we couldn't look at police misconduct and Crown misconduct. But, if they really believed that, why were they questioning Eddie Karst, why were they questioning Art

Roberts, what was the document that Hersh Wolch was waving around, what was the significance of that? The issue of police misconduct, of Crown misconduct, was very much available to them in the Supreme Court of Canada and they could have called any evidence they wanted on that.

If we can scroll to the right-hand side, it says:
"Mr. Milgaard and his lawyers
allege that what the Supreme Court now considers to be evidence relating to Mr. Fisher was concealed by the police and the Crown in Saskatchewan until after all Mr. Milgaard's appeals were exhausted in early 1971 and there was no hope of... exoneration.
'We are deeply concerned that the man who was most instrumental in prosecuting David ... [Mr. Kujawa] ... is the same man who now stands as an elected representative in the provincial government,' Mr. Wolch said."

So on the first part, again, was this issue here about the concealing by the police and the Crown of the Fisher evidence. In your view, was that something that had been dealt with by the Supreme

Court of Canada?

A
Well I mean, again, to the extent that it was part of the disclosure argument it was before the Supreme Court. The notion that it was deliberately hidden, $I$ don't know that that was necessarily put to the Supreme Court of Canada, though, as I said, if they'd wanted to do that they certainly could have.
160397. This is an April 22nd, 1992 article. It says:
"Former Saskatchewan chief prosecutor Serge Kujawa was either incompetent or dishonest when he failed to disclose key evidence that may have kept David from a 1970 murder conviction, Milgaard's lawyers say.

Hersh Wolch said even though Saskatchewan Attorney General Bob Mitchell has turned down the Milgaard family's request for a full inquiry into the Crown's handling of the case, the public will demand to know why the evidence was suppressed."
"Wolch said he fears Mitchell
is trying to protect Kujawa, now a
member of the Saskatchewan NDP
government."
Your comments to that? What was the response to those allegations?

A
$Q$
Go over to the right-hand side. It says:
"Wolch said Kujawa failed to
disclose the Fisher evidence to

Milgaard's lawyers either because he was incompetent or because he was trying to save his office from embarrassment over a wrongful conviction."

And I think you've maybe covered this before, but is that an issue that either was or could have been put before the bupreme Court on reference? Yes, yes, if there was any evidence of Crown misconduct it could have been put before the Supreme Court.

Q
This might be an appropriate spot to break. (Adjourned at 2:51 p.m.) (Reconvened at 3:13 p.m.)

BY MR. HODSON:
If we could get 164797. Following the Supreme Court reference decision, Mr. Brown, was there somewhat of a public relations battle about the interpretation of the Supreme Court decision, in other words that the government was putting forward what it viewed as the significance of the decision, and Mr. Wolch was putting forward a different view in the media and in the public?

Umm, well yes, he had an interpretation that he was putting forward, one that would support the call for an inquiry and compensation, and we were putting forward our view of what we thought it said.

Here is the minister's reply to Mr. Wolch's letter of April 20th, and I think if we go to the last page -- actually, we don't have that. Is it fair to say that the substance of this would have been drafted by you, Mr. Brown?

Yes, I expect that's probably true.
And just, it's got a date of April 22 on the front page, if we go to the second page it looks like
it's actually April $30 t h$ that it was actually sent out. I'm not sure if anything turns on the date, but this would have been the minister's response to Mr. Wolch's letter, is that correct?

Yes.

If we can go back to the first page, we touched on
some of this when $I$ went through Mr. Wolch's
letter, but the first item is:
"... let me correct your mistaken impression concerning the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in this case. You indicate the Court found that your client suffered a miscarriage of justice. Clearly Mr. Wolch, a fair and careful reading of the judgement does not support that statement."

And then it goes on to quote:
"... 'The continued conviction of

Milgaard would amount to a miscarriage of justice if an opportunity was not provided ...",
etcetera. You say:
"Since the Federal Minister and I have followed the advice of the Supreme Court, no miscarriage of justice has
occurred. While you may not like this position, your quarrel is obviously with the Supreme Court since it is they who found there had been no miscarriage to this point."

Can you comment on, did you view some of the allegations or complaints being with the Court decision as opposed to your interpretation of it? Well, no, the suggestion Mr. Wolch was making was that it said there was a miscarriage of justice, and that clearly was what it did not say. If we can scroll down.
"Second, $I$ note in your
letter, that you are happy with our decision not to proceed with a new trial. Based on your press statements and those of your partner and your client, you would like me to go further and declare your client innocent. With the greatest of respect, I do not see why or how $I$ can ignore the findings of the Supreme Court. Your client testified before that Court that he did not kill Gail Miller. Had the Court believed his evidence, it would have
been compelled to declare him innocent. Apparently, the Court did not believe him because they specifically said that they did not find he was innocent using either the high criminal standard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt or the much lower civil standard of proof of balance of probabilities."

Again, $I$ think you've touched on the significance of that. Would that be the reason, then, that the minister would not give the declaration of innocence requested?

A
Q
Yes.
Next page. You say:
"After hearing your client testify, after hearing what little evidence there was left from the original trial witnesses and after hearing your new evidence, if you could not convince even one judge of that Court that your client was innocent, how can you expect me to, in effect, overturn the Courts finding and pronounce your client innocent? Your request Mr . Wolch, is totally

|  | 1 |  | unreasonable." |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 |  | And was that your view of his request to the |
|  | 3 |  | minister to have him declared innocent, -- |
|  | 4 | A | Umm, -- |
| 03:17 | 5 | 2 | -- that it would be overturning the supreme |
|  | 6 |  | Court's ruling on that issue? |
|  | 7 | A | Well, it would be ignoring it, I -- the language, |
|  | 8 |  | quite frankly, doesn't sound all that familiar to |
|  | 9 |  | me and I'm wondering if perhaps the reason you've |
| 03:17 | 10 |  | got a different date on the front of the letter |
|  | 11 |  | and a different date on the second page is that |
|  | 12 |  | somebody in the minister's office may have decided |
|  | 13 |  | to punch up the language or change something, |
|  | 14 |  | because these documents are produced in a word |
| 03:18 | 15 |  | processor -- |
|  | 16 | 2 | Yes? |
|  | 17 | A | -- and whatever date is entered at the top is |
|  | 18 |  | going to pop up automatically on the header on the |
|  | 19 |  | second page. |
| 03:18 | 20 | Q | I'm -- and I -- if $I$ can, let me just show you |
|  | 21 |  | something that may assist you. When I looked at |
|  | 22 |  | this, if we can go back to page 1, because I too |
|  | 23 |  | had some confusion about this letter, and this is |
|  | 24 |  | an exhibit in an affidavit sworn by Bob Mitchell |
| 03:18 | 25 |  | in a proceeding, a defamation proceeding. There |
|  |  |  | Meyer CompuCourt Reporting $\overline{\text { Reporters serving P.A., Regina \& Saskatoon since } 1980}$ Central Booking - Call Irene @ 1-800-667-6777 or go to www.compucourt.tv |

is also -- and, in that, it indicates that the letter was sent out April 30 th.

As well, let me just find it here, if we can go to 334791. This is a fax from you to Ron Fainstein of May 8th, 1992. It says:
"Ron - this just went out to H.W. this afternoon."

Then, if we can go to the next page, it says:
"I have reviewed and considered the issues raised in your letter of April 20 ... and the material ...".

And then go to the next page. And so it's a two-page letter of May 8th, and I'm not sure if that assists you, Mr. Brown? It may be that the May 8 th letter is the one you drafted and the earlier one is some, is a letter someone else drafted; are you able to --

A
Umm, that's possible. By this point I think we had the new, refined process for minister's letters that saw just about everybody in the department read them and correct them and add to them in some form or other. I would provide a draft and it would then go to communications, it would then go through the deputy minister's office, it would then go through an executive
assistant at the minister's office, the minister would then see it, and if he accepted it then he could sign it then, if he didn't then it could be sent back for changes.

Okay. So if we can go back to 164798 or 797 , and is it fair to say that although this appears to be the minister's letter, what you are saying is that you may well not have been the drafter of much of the substance; is that fair?

Umm, yes, I suspect that might be -Okay.
-- because I don't -- the language, I'm not -it's not doing, not coming to mind -Okay.
-- the way some of the other letters have. If we can go, I'll just ask you a couple of questions about 164800. It says here:
"Before leaving this aspect of your letter, I again note, there is not one fact you have raised in this regard that was not before the Supreme Court. There is not one argument you have put to me that you did not put to the Supreme Court either in the materials that were filed as part of the
reference or in the evidence you called or in the argument you presented.

Notwithstanding your doubtless very able efforts in this regard, the Supreme Court still concluded the Crown had done nothing wrong in failing to bring the Fisher matters to defence counsel's attention. Given that, Mr. Wolch, there is nothing $I$ can see requiring the ordering of any other kind of inquiry into Crown counsel's conduct." And again is that something, whether you drafted it or not, would have reflected your views at the time?

Yes, it reflects the views.
Next page, 801. Here it says:
"Fifth, you have stated
several times that the Supreme Court did not inquire into the conduct of the police and that the subject wasn't raised during the Court's inquiry. That statement is misleading. With respect,

I would remind you that going into the
inquiry in the Supreme Court and during
that inquiry, you and Mr. Asper
repeatedly assured the news media that you were going to show there had been police misconduct involved in procuring the evidence of Ron Wilson and Nicole John. Towards that end, you requested subpoenas be issued for 4 police officers. Two of those officers testified, including Detective Eddie Karst. After hearing from those two officers and getting nowhere in trying to prove your misconduct theory, you chose not to pursue having the other two testify. My assertions in this regard are supported by the materials filed with the Court, the transcripts of the hearing and the findings of the Supreme Court that there was no evidence the police had misconducted themselves during the investigation. Given that police misconduct was one of central features of your case and that you required the calling of evidence with respect to the investigative process, it is misleading for you to now claim this avenue of inquiry was never explored.

A
$Q$

That claim simply is not true."
And, again, would that have reflected your view of that issue?

Yes.
Next page, comment here:
"Again in this regard, it
seems I have to remind of what the Supreme Court said in its decision. You presented this information to them and they concluded that the facts did not disclose any impropriety on the part of the Saskatoon City Police. While you may not like that finding, that is what the Court said after being apprised of all the facts you mention in your letter.

Eighth, you indicate that the reason for there being no inquiry is to protect Mr. Kujawa, a sitting member of the Saskatchewan Legislature. That allegation is nonsense and would seem to suggest the level of desperation you have reached in order keep your claim for compensation alive. As you must be aware by now, Mr. Kujawa is quite
capable of taking care of himself."
And would that have been your thinking at the time or your position at the time?

Well, to be honest with you, I don't ever recall addressing the issue of Serge Kujawa as being connected, and --

Okay.
-- it may be that this was part of what was added after $I$ had sent the draft.

Okay. If we can go to 004450 . This is a May 5, 1992 letter from you to access to information and privacy coordinator, and it appears that there was a request from Mr. Asper, $I$ think from the letter, to have access to prosecution files. And you say:
"At the time he was free to take whatever copies he wished and there is no reason now to restrict his client's access to those same materials on your file. This letter will serve as your authority to release those materials to Mr. Milgaard."

Can you comment on what this related to?
Well, it's obviously something off Federal
Government files. It would be -- or they, the documents that he was requesting would be
provincial government documents created here and sent to the Federal Government or something that was copied off one of our files, because the only time that a federal access to information and privacy coordinator would contact the provincial government is to determine whether we were prepared to allow access to documents that the federal classification people would consider as 'protected', that is communications between the federal and provincial officials or materials received from the provincial officials. So I'm assuming that, at some point, Mr. Asper wanted access or information, documents, what have you, off the files that the federal Justice Department had put together on this and the documents he was particularly asking for were ones that would have originated with Saskatchewan.

If we can go to 338943. And this is an article from The Lawyers Weekly May 8, 1992 referring to comments made by Mr. Wolch about various matters, and I believe you then followed it up to -- with a letter to The Lawyers Weekly magazine; is that correct?

A
Q Yes.

And, generally, what were the concerns you had
with the comments?
A
Well, he was misstating what went on in the Supreme Court and what the result of their decision was, and $I$, as part of the process that we looked at and decided upon, we were going to challenge that kind of thing whenever it appeared. And so, if we can go to the next page, I'd ask you to comment on some parts here:
"Mr. Wolch called the Supreme
Court review a 'very, very difficult' experience. The burden of proof wasn't established until half-way through the hearing, and since there was no set procedure, the rules were made (and changed) as the hearing went along." Do you agree with that?

A
Well, certainly there's truth to that, certainly we didn't know what the burden of proof was and who carried it until $I$ think it was the end of February when the Supreme Court provided us with the test it was looking at. And I think the reference to the rules changing had to do with being advised on the 16 th that the Court was going to question all the witnesses and then being told on the 20 th or 21 st, when we started, that David

Milgaard was his witness and he was expected to examine him.
$Q$
Right. And $I$ think Mr. Wolch refers to that, about the hearing, that:
"... he was given to understand that the Court itself would be leading the witness.

And:
"The rules of evidence were also bent out of shape. 'The stuff that was let in was absolutely remarkable,' Mr. Wolch said. 'Put in whatever you want' was virtually it."

And:
"Above all, there was a very strong pressure from the court to get to the point quickly. 'You always felt like you were imposing, that you had to move faster', Mr. Wolch said. 'You had
to get it done. That was a feeling that bothered me a fair bit.'"

Now I'll go to your letter in a moment that has comment on that, Mr. Brown. Maybe I'll just touch on a couple of the points that you dealt with.
"Mr. Wolch said he also felt constrained in his examination of Mr . Milgaard's former defence counsel, Calvin Tallis, now a highly-respected member of the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal.
'Anything I said about the defence of Justice Tallis $I$ was going to get killed', by the court, he said. Even innocuous questioning prompted remarks from the court to move along.
'[Mr. Justice Tallis] was not a witness to attack in front of that court. That was the impression I had.' Mr. Wolch noted that Mr. Justice Tallis was testifying from memory about a 23-year-old file. 'I think he would be the first to agree that there was too much made of what he
said because of who he is.
'An ordinary witness, after 23 years, would be questioned a lot more.

Asked by a member of the audience to assess Mr. Justice Tallis's defence of Mr. Milgaard, Mr. Wolch replied 'my personal feeling, and reading, is that in his own mind he thought that David was guilty and relied on his [legal] skills [to defend him] as oh testified to digging. That's my personal view. It could be very unfair.

Mr. Wolch cited
inconsistencies between Mr. Justice Tallis's testimony at the Supreme Court and his cross-examination at the Milgaard trying as the basis for his opinion.

He said he was also
bewildered by Mr. Justice Tallis's testimony that he was unaware that there had been a series of rapes in Saskatoon at the time of the murder, a fact that was highly publicized.
'He may have an answer for all this and he was never asked about that. But those are difficult questions that maybe a [public] inquiry could find out about,' Mr. Wolch said. 'I could be very unfair to him ... but those problems definitely bother me deeply.'" And again, if we can just go to 020383 , and this is your letter to the editor of The Lawyers Weekly responding to that article; is that correct?

A
$Q$

A
Q
A
$Q$
A

Q Okay. I'll show you a document that confirms that. And I'll go through parts of this with you, but what was it that -- I mean you mentioned the fact that you thought it was not your view of what

A
happened at the Supreme Court, but was there something in what he had said or in the article that prompted you to write?

Well, just that here you had a very sort of visible account of Mr. Wolch's view of what went on in the Supreme Court of Canada, in our view it contained inaccuracies and, as part of the fact that we wanted to answer public allegations that we thought were inaccurate, we were gonna do that. I believe it was Richard Quinney that told me to prepare the response.

And what about the comments regarding Mr. Justice Tallis; did those concern you?

Well they did to the extent that $I$ don't know that a fair reading of the transcript or a fair observation of what was going on when Justice Tallis was testifying would support that Mr. Wolch wasn't permitted to question him as fully or as thoroughly as he wanted to. The opportunity was there. I mean certainly, when he says that he had to be careful or when he implies that he had to be very careful about the way he attacked Justice Tallis' testimony, that was certainly correct. But, at the end of the day, the real damage from Justice Tallis' testimony was the fact it
contradicted David Milgaard and he really didn't attack that much at all. I mean he may well disagree with the way Justice Tallis presented the defence, you know, I suspect that if you had ten lawyers take a look at that and -- ten defence lawyers take a look at that each one would come up with a different view of how they would go about doing it, and fair enough, if he wants to suggest that there was a different strategy that would have been pursued, fine. But the real problem was that Justice Tallis had a devastating impact on David Milgaard's credibility.

Your letter here, and $I$ think this is reproduced in the article, you say:
"First, my recollection of the proceedings was that the Court was indeed anxious that the matter proceed in an expeditious fashion. Their concern however, was that time not be wasted. At all times we were assured that we would have whatever time was reasonably necessary for this inquiry. While $I$ cannot speak for how Mr. Wolch felt, there was no reason that $I$ could see for feeling rushed. Indeed, we
didn't even use all the time that was
set aside for the hearings."
And is that an accurate statement?

A
$Q$

$$
0
$$ view?

Of my view, yes.
Scroll down, please:
"It's also annoying that Mr. Wolch
should feel free to take some rather
cheap shots at Mr. Justice Tallis. The fact the evidence Justice Tallis gave had a devastating impact is hardly the fault of the witness and does not justify this kind of attack. Even young counsel know that if there's going to be bad news coming down the line, you do your best to lessen its impact during examination of your own witnesses or client. Mr. Wolch certainly knew there was bad news coming."

And can you elaborate on that?
Well, at that point Eugene Williams and Hersh Wolch and David Asper were the only three that had interviewed Justice Tallis with respect to this particular matter and $I$ expect that $M r$. Wolch and Mr. Asper knew what Justice Tallis was going to say about the various aspects of what David Milgaard told him, and if they knew that, and of course they would have, I suspect, canvassed what their client was going to say, they would have known that there were going to be some substantial conflicts and tried to do something to sort of deal with that during the examination of David Milgaard in chief.

Q And then if you can scroll down, you say:
"Before, David Milgaard testified, Mr. Wolch knew his client had waived privilege to allow his trial counsel to be interviewed by the federal Justice department investigator. He knew what Justice Tallis had said. He knew what his client was now saying conflicted in dramatic ways with what Justice Tallis had told the investigator. Mr. Wolch also knew that Saskatchewan Justice lawyers were taking the position that Justice Tallis should be a witness. In this regard also, he knew what David Milgaard was going to say and should have known his evidence would give my partner, Mr. Neufeld, and $I$ the legal basis to insist Justice Tallis be called to give evidence. What's more, counsel with Mr. Wolch's experience should have known, that given what his client intended to say, the Supreme Court would insist that Justice Tallis be given to opportunity to comment on David Milgaard's allegations of impropriety."

And what were you referring to there as the allegations of impropriety?

A
Well, the fact that he wanted to testify and wasn't allowed to, that he gave Justice Tallis the alibi information and Justice Tallis refused to follow it up, the fact that Justice Tallis didn't spend enough time trying to prepare a defence, things like that.

And if we can go to the next page, your concluding paragraph:
"While I can appreciate that Mr. Wolch isn't happy with the result from the Supreme Court, I'm disappointed that counsel of his stature finds it necessary to vent that displeasure by disparaging the activities of others. Mr. Wolch was given all the time and leeway he needed to call whatever evidence he wanted. If some evidence was omitted or other evidence left unchallenged, the fault lies much closer to home than Mr. Wolch seems prepared to allow."

And can you elaborate on that?
Well, as I've said several times, it's my view
that while the court did not want us wasting their time, they were not saying that we could not present evidence we thought relevant to the issue of a miscarriage of justice and Mr. Wolch was not constrained, in my view, from doing that. Go to 02 -- just for the record, we don't need to call it up, but 334803, Mr. Commissioner, includes a copy of the printed article. COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: What was that number? MR. HODSON: 334803 .

BY MR. HODSON:
If we can go to 026996 , and $I$ 'm just going to go through a couple of letters here, Mr. Brown, there are many $I$ think on the file from 1992 onward to 1996, letters written to various people who wrote in presumably to the Minister of Justice asking, or commenting on the David Milgaard matter; is that fair?

Ah, yes.
And I'll show you when we get to the back page that this was prepared by you. You indicate: "...I indicated that no police officers were called. In fact, that was not correct, retired police officers, Eddie

Karst and Art Roberts, were called and did give evidence at Mr. Wolch's request. Further, two other police officers were under subpoena but Mr. Wolch decided not to call them to the stand to give evidence. Similarly, Mr. Wolch could have called both Mr.

Caldwell, the trial prosecutor, and Mr.
Kujawa, the appeal prosecutor, if he had wanted them. Indeed, Mr. Caldwell was flown to Ottawa to be ready to testify at Mr . Wolch's request. It was Mr. Wolch who decided not to call Mr. Caldwell or Mr. Kujawa."

And is that an accurate statement?
Yes.
And then down at the bottom:
"With respect to the allegations of police misconduct, that argument was put to the Supreme Court and they have rejected it as baseless. There has been no evidence whatsoever produced to suggest police misconduct. The same applies to the allegations of prosecution misconduct. That theory was
put to the Supreme Court and the Court rejected it."

Again, the next page, and again it appears that this letter may have been in response to a letter from the public seeking an inquiry; is that correct?

It looks that way, or supporting the notion there should be an inquiry.

Then 026986, this is a letter to the same lady. I don't have the letter she wrote back, but it appears that a further follow-up letter was written, and this is a bit of a different subject matter. It says:
"You will note from the Supreme Court's decision that they considered the matter of disclosure by the Crown. The court notes that proper disclosure was made in accordance with the law of the day. The latter phrase is the key to understanding the judgment. The Larry Fisher evidence would not have been admissible in 1970 . Even if Mr. Milgaard's lawyer had known about Larry Fisher's conduct, that evidence would not have been considered
sufficiently relevant to be admissible at Mr. Milgaard's trial. This lack of relevance at law is also the reason Crown counsel did not have to disclose it to defence counsel at that time. It was because of this the Supreme Court was able to say that the Crown disclosed all that was required by law in 1970.

The law since then has changed. First, the Fisher evidence is now considered to be sufficiently relevant to be admissible if, and only if, it's being used by the defence. It still would not be admissible if the Crown wanted to use it to prosecute Larry Fisher for Ms. Miller's murder."

And --

A
Just if I can interrupt?
Yeah.
I can tell you that that first paragraph is not what $I$ would have written. It's been reworked I think by somebody.

Q
A Okay.

I don't think $I$ would have ever suggested that it wasn't admissible by the defence. There certainly
was an argument against it, but it could have been, and the notion that lack of relevance was the reason it didn't have to be disclosed, no, that -- I'm pretty sure $I$ wouldn't have put that in. I may have -- what $I$ suspect has happened is somebody has taken the second paragraph which would have dealt with the Stinchcombe decision and the issue of disclosure of relevant evidence and tried to work some of that into that first paragraph.

If we can go to 334872 , I now want to deal with the Michael Breckenridge allegations, and you have some familiarity with that, Mr. Brown?

I do.
And I'll go through some of the documents. Do you recall how you first became aware of, and just for your benefit, we've had an opportunity and have read into the record all of the press conference statements, witness interviews and so much of that information is already on the record. What's your recollection -- maybe just generally walk through how you became aware of it and what happened. I became aware of it through the news media. I believe we obtained one of those news monitoring agency transcripts of the press conference and I
read that. I think $I$ also -- in fact, $I$ know $I$ also saw some of the press conference, so, you know, that's how $I$ became aware of that going on. And so this would have been -- I think the date of the press conference was September 19, 1992, so about five months after the Supreme Court decision. Can you tell us, in early or mid September, 1992, before the Breckenridge information became public, what was your sense of what was happening in the media, and again, I'm just looking for your observation about what the status was of the media reports on the David Milgaard matter.

Well, aside from Dan Lett and -- who was with the Winnipeg Free Press I think, and Dave Roberts with the Globe and Mail, the news media just wasn't paying a whole lot of attention to the things that were coming from the Milgaard camp. It seemed like their campaign this time wasn't working as they had hoped.

If $I$ can call -- this document, 334872 , is a letter of September 18th, 1992 from Bruce MacFarlane to you attaching a copy of the letter dated the $16 t h$ of September, 1992 together with an attachment headed statement:
"I understand that Mr. Milgaard and some
of his supporters will be holding a rally in Winnipeg tomorrow. I also understand that this letter, or its contents, may be made public at the rally."

And then if we can go to the next page -- sorry, 117785, and it looks like this is a copy of a fax you are sending to the minister's office, and go to page 787, this is the September 16th, 1992
letter from Mr. Wolch to Kim Campbell that talks about the statement, and it appears that, and let me ask you, on September 18th, 1992, that Bruce MacFarlane would have sent to you a copy of the letter Kim Campbell, the minister's office, received with a copy of the statement; does that sound right?

A That's -- yes, that's right.
And then so this would be $I$ think the day before the press conference. Does that sound right? Well, according to the dates, that's correct, yes. I don't have any recollection of that specifically, but that's the 16 th and if they didn't have their press conference until the 18th or 19th, then obviously it was sent out early.

Q
Yeah. I think, if I may assist, I think from the record it appears that on September 16th, 1992 the letter was written to Kim Campbell that had a copy of the Breckenridge statement, it wasn't identified, the name wasn't identified at the time, it was sort of an unnamed statement, and then on September 19 th was the press conference, and I think in the intervening time we've heard some evidence from Sergeant Pearson about some investigations he did at the time checking into some of this. So anyway, does that sound right, do you have any recollection of that?

Well, again, my recollection was that we got it from the news media and that may be because I watched the press conference itself and it made more of an impression than this, but, you know, I accept --

In fairness, Mr. Brown, the press conference had more information in it than $I$ think what was in the statement and this letter, so maybe I'll just walk through parts of this. Would you have been made aware of the fact that Mr. Wolch had written to Kim Campbell with the Breckenridge statement asking for a federal inquiry?

Yes, I accept what the document shows there, yes.

Q

And here, he says that:
"Briefly this evidence consists of a witness who was a former employee of the Saskatchewan Attorney General's Department who has come forward with information concerning activities in the Department shortly after David Milgaard's conviction. Enclosed please find a photocopy of the statement which the witness has provided to a private investigator in Saskatchewan.

It is clear from this statement that some information came to the attention of this witness which suggested that there was a mistake made in the Milgaard case. This witness brought this information to Mr. Kujawa's attention, and was told to mind his own business if he valued his job. The witness also indicated that by virtue of the filing which was required in his position, he became aware that meetings were held where both the Milgaard and Fisher files were considered together.

These meetings were behind closed doors and involved senior attorneys in the Attorney General's office.

Mrs. Milgaard, along with
the investigator in question, met with this witness to follow up on the information contained in the statement. The witness described an incident which involved his refiling the Milgaard and Fisher files, which were requested for a meeting which was attended by Mr. Romanow, attorneys in the Attorney General's office, and police officials."

And then goes on to talk about the court ruling.
The following -- sorry:
"Accordingly, we know the evidence of Larry Fisher was suppressed. The following, however, has not yet been established:"

And then goes on to talk about the questions, and the next page:
"Mr. Mitchell has not seen fit to order an inquiry into the Milgaard matter, nor does he seem inclined to do so. In light of the evidence linking the
present Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan to the Milgaard case, we would suggest that it would be impossible for the Milgaard family to obtain any form of impartial inquiry in the Province of Saskatchewan. A full and proper inquiry into this matter is absolutely essential to deal with this new evidence and with other issues which need to be addressed.

Accordingly, we are now formally requesting that you order an inquiry into the entire matter of the arrest, conviction and continued incarceration of David Milgaard... The issue of compensation should also be placed before this inquiry."

Do you recall, and just for the record, the next page of this letter is the statement, and you'll see at the bottom, $I$ think the bottom right is Mr. Breckenridge's signature. Is this your writing, the middle part?

A I think so, yes.

So Breckenridge and Buckholz, it looks like you are trying to identify --

We were trying to identify who it was, yes. So did you become aware, and I'm not sure if it matters on September $18 t h$ or not, but did you become aware of Mr. Wolch's request to Kim Campbell to hold a federal inquiry and the nature of the allegations being made that supported that request for an inquiry?

Yes.

And what was your reaction to that?
Well, frankly, my reaction to the entire Breckenridge stunt was that it was so outrageously dishonest and malicious that we shouldn't even reply to it. However, other persons in the department, particularly $I$ believe the deputy minister and the minister, determined that the matter had to be referred to the RCMP for an investigation.

And why do you say it was so dishonest and malicious?

Because anyone with a half an ounce of sense wouldn't believe that statement, would be very concerned about verifying the accuracy of it. To suggest that the Attorney General and the deputy and the director of prosecutions got together to conspire to suppress evidence is just nonsense and
to release that without any real amount of checking and to discover a few days later that in fact Michael Breckenridge didn't even work in the department at that time, it clearly went beyond being careless to being malicious and it suggested a level of desperation that $I$ didn't think had existed at that point. The other thing that made it truly appalling is that this time they couldn't even excuse their behaviour by saying that this was aimed at a desperate attempt to get David Milgaard out of jail. David Milgaard was out of jail and this was all about grubbing for money.

Q

A

2

A And what about the fact that the request was made to the Federal Minister?

Well, they obviously knew that if they slandered officials in the provincial government, particularly the premier, that they weren't likely to get much sympathy out of us.

Can we just go to the next page of this statement, and $I$ take it, Mr. Brown, did you have an opportunity to review the statement and consider what was in the statement and to determine whether it had credibility?

Yes, I looked at the statement and listened to what was said at the press conference, and it was

A
just -- it was outrageous. The notion that some file clerk would be in on what was going on in the office of the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General, the fact that they would so blithely slander these people by suggesting that they were involved in some kind of cover-up was, in my view, just outrageous and showed a degree of malice that $I$ didn't think was there at that point.

When you say you watched the press conference, was that a televised press conference or a news clip or do you recall?

I don't recall whether it was a televised one or just a news clip that $I$ saw, but $I$ saw -- it was -- what $I$ recall is Joyce Milgaard making, or putting the news out there and Mr . Wolch sitting beside her.

And do you recall at what point you discovered, number one, that it was Michael Breckenridge who they had been relying on who had made the statement, and number two, that he didn't work there at the time that he was alleged to have worked there? How did that come about?

Umm, my recollection is that there were people still in the department at that time who were
familiar with who was there and who wasn't there in the beginning of the ' 70 s and they thought that kind of thing sounded like Michael Breckenridge because he had a bit of a reputation for being a little off the wall and when the records were checked, it was clear Michael Breckenridge didn't start until considerably after this point.

And what information did you find out about Mr. Breckenridge and his reputation?

Well, certainly Richard Quinney had known Michael Breckenridge and he knew him to be somebody who was -- well, he marched, let's say he marched to the beat of a drum that he was the only one that could hear. The last anyone in the department heard from Michael Breckenridge, he was off to go racing for Jesus.

If we could go through a couple of documents, 219290, and this is a news release of September 18th, 1992 that's talking about -- this is Friday, September 18th, which is the day $I$ think you got the letter from Bruce MacFarlane, and then it talks about a news conference being held on Saturday, September 19th:
"Copies of a letter to the Minister of Justice containing new
evidence that supports an application under The Federal Inquiries Act will be released.

David with other members of the Milgaard family and Hersh Wolch will be in attendance. David and Mrs. Milgaard will be available for background shots etc should they be required by request from 10 o'clock until 12.30. Mr. Wolch will be available after the press conference for any questions."

Do you recall being made aware in advance of the press conference that this was going to happen?

I don't recall seeing that.
And sorry to belabour the point, but is it your recollection that you became aware that there was going to be a press conference when you watched a clip of it on the news?

Well, no, $I$ think the communication from the Federal Department of Justice people indicated there was going to be some kind of news event, but I didn't -- we didn't get a copy of that, and $I$ would have seen whatever it was $I$ saw of the news conference the day it was held I expect from

Q
A
watching the news.
And 047110 --
I should, however, say that $I$ have seen $a$ transcript of that conference because that was prepared for us at some point.

Right, and I'll show you that in a moment.
047110, this is a memo of Officer Egan of the RCMP
to file and it appears, maybe I can just summarize
it, it appears, Mr. Brown, that when the federal
government, Federal Justice Department received
the letter from Mr. Wolch on September 18 th with
the statement from Mr. Breckenridge, they investigated it for a while, for at least a number of days, and engaged Sergeant Pearson to go interview some people and at some later point it appears from the documents that it was agreed that it was really a provincial matter because it related to a criminal investigation. Do you recall that generally being the case?

Yes.
And so here, it says Sergeant Pearson, it talks about Pearson and Williams discussing this matter -- just scroll up -- so this is Friday, this is before the press conference:
"There is an indication that
a further employee in Sask Justice, believed to be Mike Breckenridge, may have some knowledge.

Sgt. Pearson has been tasked to locate the people involved and have them interviewed."

And these are people named Dave Wollbaum, and it says:
"Sgt. Pearson will be
contacting Mr. Murray Brown directly to obtain any relevant information which may assist his investigation. There has also been a reference that Mr. Bill Logan, who worked at Justice at the time, may have some information to lend. Mr. Quinney is aware of the investigational steps being made." So it appears that on the Friday, September 18th, 1992, that upon receipt of the letter, Federal Justice lawyers and Sergeant Pearson began to investigate these allegations and notified the province; is that a fair summary?

A They may have notified Richard Quinney, that appears to be what he's suggesting there. I wasn't told that.

Q

Well, again, it just struck me that the whole thing was so sleazy and so corrupt that they really had reached a new low. As I said, I was prepared to forgive the nonsense that went on before on the basis that David Milgaard was in jail and getting him out, getting his freedom was a strong source of motivation, but David Milgaard was out now, this wasn't about getting him out, and, frankly, it wasn't about clearing him, it was about getting a compensation package from the Government of Saskatchewan, and apparently they were willing to do anything or say anything to get
that.
Did this Breckenridge incident, if $I$ can call it that, did that change the way that you dealt with the matter from that point on?

From that point on, had they marched in with the Pope and a stack of affidavits indicating misconduct, $I$ wouldn't have believed a single word of it.

And why is that?
Because, as $I$ say, at this point in became clear that they were prepared to do or say anything that would get them closer to the compensation package they were after and the truth wasn't something they were going to be worried about. If we can go to page 004071 , some comments here, this is Mrs. Milgaard talking about the, her discussions with Mr. Breckenridge, although she doesn't name him at the meeting. It says:
"He said we would never receive an impartial hearing with the Saskatchewan government. He told of delivering the Milgaard and Fisher files together, to Serge Kujawa. He told of meetings behind closed doors with Roy Romanow, Kujawa and other senior police and Crown
officials with the Milgaard and Fisher
files."
Just on that, you had mentioned this earlier, was
that something that happened, that the Minister
of Justice, senior police and Crown officials
would meet on prosecution files?

No. In my experience with the Department of Justice, which starts in 1975, neither the deputy minister nor the minister in that case -- and the deputy was Ken Lysyk, the minister was Roy Romanow -- ever involved themselves in criminal law matters, they just -- it wasn't something they were interested in. They believed they had competent officials running the public prosecution service and when $I$ joined, that would have been Eugene Ewaschuk who is now a judge in the Ontario courts, followed by Del Perras who is now a judge in Alberta, and it just, they did not get involved, Roy Romanow had a conscious policy of not getting involved, and on two occasions when some other cabinet ministers even called the director of public prosecutions to make inquiries, he came down hard on them, and at one point when one of those people made a second call, he took that to the premier because it was his view that
politics had absolutely no place in the criminal prosecutions division.

Now, at the time these allegations were made, Mr. Romanow was the premier; correct? That's correct.

And what did you make of the fact, if any, that the allegations being made in the Breckenridge incident were directed at the then premier?

Well, I mean, if you are trying to create attraction for your demands for an inquiry or compensation, alleging corruption and cover-up by the premier would be about as good as it gets. The comment here, it says:
"The Supreme Court said the Larry Fisher evidence that the police had in 1970 was credible evidence which could affect the verdict of the jury. Justice Tallis said they never ever told him about Larry Fisher. Somebody suppressed that evidence and there has been no inquiry into it to see just how this happened. This new evidence says that these people had the files together. Since there was no disclosure we can only assume a decision was made to suppress it. Pure
and simply put, a coverup."
And just your comment on that, and in particular the comment about what the Supreme Court had said.

A
$Q$ it had to have been suppressed.

The bottom of the page, the question is asked of Mr. Wolch:
"What is the significance of the letters you have from - legally."

And I think this is referring to Breckenridge. Top of the next page. No, next page. Mr. Wolch:
"It's simply more evidence of what we know to be a fact. Ah, ah um I take a bit of a different view than Joyce $I$ think the letter simply adds one extra feature of evidence that the coverup was established a long time ago and this is
just one more piece in the puzzle that's all it is."

And this comment about the cover-up being established a long time ago, your comment on that in light of what you understood the Supreme Court to be saying?

Well, the Supreme Court didn't find that to be the case. Had they found that the Department of Justice officials had covered up anything, I have no doubt they would have not said that they didn't find any evidence of improper conduct, or that the disclosure was proper according to the processes in place of the day.

And scroll down, Mrs. Milgaard says:
"What we're saying is we have
information that says Roy Romanow and this we have said in the letter to the Minister of Justice - that he was in these meetings. Now I'm not about to judge his evidence. I met with him and I thought that he was credible. Ah I met with him ... and private investigators. We made sure that he was employed where he said he was at that time, and that the people he mentioned
were also employed and that he in fact did the things that he said he did, but he's the one that has come forward and said that Roy Romanow was in these meetings behind closed doors."

What was your -- did you ever -- can you tell us, what steps did you take to check this issue about whether he was employed where he said he was at the time; namely, Mr. Breckenridge?

Well, we got -- we went looking for the records from the human resources office. There are files on everybody that has been employed for years and years and years and those files contain the dates of commencement and the dates of termination and one quick look made it clear that Michael Breckenridge wasn't there when he said he was. Go to page 004075. Now I think Mr. Breckenridge's first letter to Mr. Wolch is dated March 21st, '92-- if I'm not mistaken $I$ think it was March, yeah, March '92-- so before the conclusion of the Supreme Court reference. So there is a question here from a reporter:
"Did you ask him why he didn't come forward?"

Mr. Wolch:
"... just on that question, it wouldn't have been relevant to the Supreme Court. It simply wasn't relevant."
"I'm not saying it affected him, but it wouldn't even have been admissible."

And if Mr. Breckenridge's allegations were true, would that have been admissible evidence at the Supreme Court reference?

Well, never mind if they were true, if Mr. Wolch thought for a moment they might stand up under any kind of scrutiny they would have been brought forward and they would have been something the Supreme Court would have been willing to hear because that is direct evidence of Crown misconduct.

And so is the answer to that is that, yes, Mr. Breckenridge's evidence would have been relevant and admissible as far as the scope of what the Supreme Court was looking at?

Yes.

Go to 334858, please. This is a letter, I think from Mr. Williams to you dated September 21, 1992, that has attached the statements of David Wollbaum and Patricia Styles. And do you -- maybe just go to the next page -- do you have a recollection of
that, at least for a while, that Mr. Williams and Mr. Pearson were investigating this matter?

A

Q

A officials investigated anything, we checked the records to determine when he was employed there, and in fact he wasn't employed there when he said. We knew the RCMP, that Rick Pearson was in fact doing some checking as well, and we left it at that point. The next thing $I$ heard was that the RCMP were going to do a full-blown investigation of the whole thing, the whole case.

And was that a decision made by the Premier, do you believe, or by his --

Well, $I$ know it came as a surprise to me and it came as a surprise to Richard Quinney, so I'm guessing it probably came out of the deputy minister's office and perhaps Bob Mitchell's office. Again, $I$ can't imagine that Roy Romanow would have been involved in making that decision,
he would have left it to his minister.
And so, again, the view of you and Mr. Quinney was that nothing further should be done with this? I think your words earlier were there shouldn't even be a response.

It was almost immediately discredited in the press when it was published, or the fact that he wasn't even employed in the department at the time became publicly known, and it was our view that that's as much of a reply as this deserved.

If we can go to 117965, please. And, again, I
think -- are these Mr. Quinney's notes of --
Umm, yes, it looks like Richard Quinney's writing.
And I don't know that we need to go through them.
It would appear that there were some discussions between the province and the Federal Justice departments about who should be doing the follow-up, the federal Justice Department I think received the information, and it appears from these notes the question became, well, if it's a criminal investigation, the allegations are that the Premier and Mr. Kujawa and Mr. Lysyk and others committed criminal conduct, that that's a matter for the province to investigate; is that correct?

Q
$Q$

A Yes.

And this
piece says -- talks about the -- it says:
"David Milgaard and his
supporters are making serious
allegations about suppressed evidence
and a coverup involving Premier Roy Romanow and MLA Serge Kujawa in a bid to get a public inquiry in the handing of Milgaard's prosecution for murder.

But the latest announcement by the Milgaard camp leaves the public wondering about just how long this saga will drag on.

The latest reason for
Milgaard and his mother Joyce Milgaard demanding a public inquiry are the recollections of a former Justice Department employee. They say the former employee saw then justice minister Romanow and senior prosecutor attend meetings where Milgaard's file was reviewed along with that of serial rapist Larry Fisher.

If that's the evidence they
have about the alleged coverup, they should release the informant's name. If revealing the person's identity is not practical for whatever reason, the public is owed a full explanation as to why

The Milgaards have so far relied heavily on the media to carry the ball for them and it appears they are taking the same route this time around. Nobody - not provincial or federal officials, police forces or the media - can do what's presumably being asked of them by the Milgaards without having enough information to go on.

Innuendos and allegations against two senior government officials, without even a name to back up the claims, aren't a beginning. They are a dead end."

And just your comment on that piece?

Well I -- again with -- I think by this point the news media was not prepared to unquestionably accept anything that Joyce Milgaard put out, they were very skeptical of what she was saying, and on its face the statement by Michael Breckenridge was incredible, nobody with half an ounce of sense could accept that.

Q In we can go to 061702 , sorry, 061701 . And this is the October 30,1992 letter from Brent Cotter, who was the Deputy Minister of Justice and Deputy

Attorney General, to Mr. Wolch, and this is the letter that's advising that his letter of September $16 t h$ to the federal minister was referred to the Minister of Justice for Saskatchewan, and that the matter has been referred to the RCMP for consideration. And I think it's your evidence, sir, that after the -the day or two around the Breckenridge press conference, after that, you did not have much to do with the decision to have the RCMP investigate; is that correct?

A
$Q$
Yes, that's correct.
If we can go to 154281. This is an October 30th, 1992 letter or fax from Mr. Williams to you, and go to the next page, it says:
"Our view re the R.C.M.P. request".
And at this time $I$ think we've heard evidence from Sergeant Pearson the inclusion of the (V14)-(V14)- assault in the second application to the federal minister prompted the RCMP to investigate the (V14)- assault as a ground of that application, and $I$ think in his investigation Sergeant Pearson interviewed Ms. (V14)-, who indicated that -- at least according to Sergeant Pearson -- that she was not saying that Larry

Fisher assaulted her, that she thought David Milgaard had. And you're aware of that, of the (V14) - assault and that issue?

A
Q

A
$Q$
Yes.
And I think Sergeant Pearson then after, even after the matter went to the Supreme Court reference, found himself dealing with Ms. (V14)and this issue of trying to identify who had raped her?

That's correct, yeah.
And so this memo appears to be, again, October of 1992, a number of months after the conclusion of the reference, and $I$ think this relates to an issue about whether or not Sergeant Pearson, the RCMP, could use the blood provided by David Milgaard and Larry Fisher in the Section 690 process, correct, for further DNA testing in relation to Ms. (V14)-?

That's correct.
And $I$ believe the federal position here is that:
"Our minister's role is conditioned on
the existence of a section 690
application; there not being one at the moment, we must be careful to ensure
that she does not overstep her
responsibilities."

And:
"The second point concerns future charges arising out of this issue. It is of fundamental importance to remember that the entire question whether there is sufficient evidence to implicate Milgaard in the (V14)controversy falls exclusively to the Attorney General of Saskatchewan. We have no role whatsoever. Accordingly, advice on the lawfulness of seizures and the development of the case falls to the Province of Saskatchewan ..."

And then it goes on to say about the blood samples are being held by the RCMP, the lawfulness, etcetera, is something that Saskatchewan should deal with; is that correct? Yes.

And:
"... the blood samples ... presently
being held by the R.C.M.P. ..."
are in fact, $I$ believe, the same blood samples that ended up going to England in 1997 for the DNA testing; is that correct? the next page, it says:
"Having said this, it is important to remember that we cannot provide the advice to the R.C.M.P. on these issues. It must come from Saskatchewan. On this basis, I agree with the recommendation that you have set out in the last three lines of your memorandum."

And I'm just wondering why there would be a distinction between the handling of the (V14)DNA and accessing the blood of David Milgaard and Larry Fisher provided in the 690 proceedings, and the DNA testing of Gail Miller's clothing? Well, actually, $I$ was just sitting here thinking the very same thing. The Federal Government seemed to be taking two different views.

Certainly, Ron Fainstein's view was that they legitimately held the samples and the clothing for the purpose of doing the DNA. Perhaps their view was that that was still connected to the 690 process, albeit the minister had already provided her advice, whereas this was something that was
right outside that process, this was a whole different offence.

And $I$ guess as far as the -- if you put it down to this basic issue, that getting the -- getting the blood that was provided in the reference case to enable the RCMP to do a DNA test to try and identify or eliminate who was involved in the assault of (V14)-(V14)-, compared to getting the blood used in the Section 690 proceedings of Milgaard and Fisher to use to do a DNA test to determine -- from Gail Miller's clothing to determine who did or did not commit that crime, I'm just wondering if there is a distinct -- I - what the distinction there as to why one would be dealt with differently than the other?

Well, as $I$ say, the only thing $I$ can think of is that the Federal Government, having committed itself to the comparison or to the testing of the clothing and so on, and the DNA work there, and that arising out of the 690 process, perhaps they saw themselves as being in a slightly different position in that regard than they were with respect to using those exhibits to investigate a case that had nothing to do with the David Milgaard accusations.

Q again, go to page 37. And this is the letter that Mr. Sawatsky wrote to Mr. Quinney about getting files for the RCMP investigation, and if you can go to page 36 it talks about providing access: "... to both the Milgaard and Fisher files as per your request.

As Murray Brown handled this matter in the Supreme Court $I$ would normally appoint him to assist however, he will be on holiday after the end of the year. Anyone else should be able to assist - just call before you come."

Were you involved in putting together the documents to provide to the RCMP for their Flicker investigation, or was that someone else in your department?

Umm, I can recall going through some boxes to see whether there was what appeared to be all of the materials that Eric Neufeld and I had generated there. But, no, umm, it seems to me that they came while $I$ was away on vacation so $I$ wouldn't have been the one that put that together.

If we can go to 061373. And this is a September 9th, 1993 letter to Inspector Sawatsky from you,
it says:
"Enclosed is another portion
of the Department's file in this matter. It would appear this is the missing head office file put together before and after the appeal. Until now it has been languishing in the correspondence files. Why it was there I have no idea. I personally disclaim any knowledge of it as the file contains material I have never seen before.

Would you please pass this on to your investigators for their consideration."

And I think this head office file was identified by -- maybe $I$ can just call up the document -061389 . And $I$ think that what's included in that, and $I$ think the evidence that we've heard from Mr. Sawatsky and perhaps some other witnesses, is that the RCMP in 1969, in their contract policing, provided reports to the

Attorney General's office -- or to their superiors, which in turn were provided to the Attorney General's office, and that that may have been the source of or the reason as to why the

Attorney General of Saskatchewan had some of the RCMP reports. And do you have any -- do you have a recollection of where these files were and how they came -- how they were discovered?

Well certainly at that time, and even when $I$ started reviewing materials in head office in the early '80s, if the RCMP took a breath pursuant to the provincial policing contract some paper would come flying over to us reporting what they'd done. One of the things that $I$ did was try and get them to cut down on some of that because we simply didn't need to know the detail that we were getting.

How those files ended up in the correspondence files, I don't know, I mean obviously somebody has misfiled them.

And prior to you -- and do you recall how they came to your attention in 1993?

I suspect somebody was reviewing or looking for something in the correspondence files to see whether there were any letters or anything that were missed, and they discovered that, because the correspondence files are exactly that, they are letters of -- or copies of letters that were sent out, they weren't copies of letters received or of
police reports received, so they would stand out
if you were just even sort of quickly going
through those files.

Q

A

Q
And so they were not where they should have been;
is that a fair way to put it?
Yes, that's correct. Ordinarily, they would have
been filed under the subject of the inquiry.
I see it's 4:30, Mr. Commissioner. I expect to be
a short while tomorrow morning, maybe half an
hour, 45 minutes, and $I$ expect that, based on my
discussions with counsel, we should have no
difficulty finishing Mr. Brown tomorrow, but -COMMISSIONER MacCALLUM: Okay.
(Adjourned at 4:30 p.m.)
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